



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 24, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 24, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER, to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

THE SEVENTH UNANSWERED QUESTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I've come to the floor to raise the seventh in a series of critical but unanswered questions about the terrorist attacks on the U.S. consulate and annex in Benghazi last September 11.

Despite a year of investigation in a number of committees, the American people still do not know the answers to these questions, nor do they know if they have even been asked.

With only 5 legislative days remaining before the Congress departs for August recess, I'm increasingly concerned that none of these questions will be an-

swered by the one-year anniversary of the Benghazi attack.

According to a recent excerpt in the forthcoming book, "Under Fire: The Untold Story of the Attack in Benghazi," which was published in this month's Vanity Fair magazine, Ambassador Stevens made several calls for help after reaching what he believed was a safe room on the consulate compound.

As we well know now, one call was placed to his Deputy Chief of Mission, Gregory Hicks, who was at the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli. In May, Hicks provided powerful testimony about that final conversation with Stevens.

He also called "local militia and public-security commanders in Benghazi, pleading for help."

What I found interesting in the Vanity Fair excerpt is that Stevens also made calls to "nearby consulates" on the BlackBerry of someone on his security detail. Assuming the authors are correct, the government must have the phone records from Stevens' calls to the militia and foreign consulates that night.

This raises the important question of what foreign consulates did he call, and how did these consulates respond?

If Stevens was calling foreign consulates, it also begs the question, did U.S. officials in Tripoli or Washington call any allies with assets in Libya to help respond to the attack?

Furthermore, did the Pentagon connect any NATO allies with military assets in the region that could have provided assistance that night?

Given how close many of the European allies are to the Mediterranean, wouldn't they have planes or response teams stationed in locations in or near by the region that could have mobilized upon a request from Washington?

After speaking of force posture, what have we done to ensure that if another incident were to happen this September 11 that we're prepared to respond?

We're less than 2 months away from the 9/11 anniversary, but the American people don't know whether we're any

more capable of responding to an incident in North Africa or the Middle East.

The American people have lost confidence in this investigation. We can help restore it with a bipartisan select committee.

EFFECTS OF THE SEQUESTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I've come to this floor nearly every week since the sequester took effect in March to highlight its dangerous consequences to our national security, its harmful impact on our economy, and the pain it is causing the most vulnerable people in our country.

Now, with the sequester in its 21st week, this Congress has still not achieved the big, balanced and bipartisan solution to deficits that we need to replace the sequester and put America back on a sound fiscal path.

Only such an agreement, Mr. Speaker, can provide a viable alternative to the irrational cuts this sequestration has imposed. Those cuts are already exacerbating the many challenges we face as a Nation.

Later this week, I will be delivering meals to seniors in my district with the Meals on Wheels program, which could be delivering 4 million fewer meals nationwide as a result of the sequester.

One small business owner from my district recently reached out to my staff to say that he was personally impacted by Meals on Wheels when the grandmother who raised him was diagnosed with cancer and came to rely on Meals on Wheels during the final part of her life.

He couldn't believe that after all the good work the Prince George's County Meals on Wheels office had done, that they were being forced to reduce their operations significantly as a result of the sequester.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the richest country on the face of the Earth does

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

not need to leave people, particularly seniors who can't get out, hungry.

Other harmful effects on the most vulnerable Americans include an 11 percent cut to emergency unemployment insurance payments and 125,000 fewer rental assistance vouchers.

Mr. Speaker, as many as 70,000 children could be kicked out of Head Start—they're only going to be 4 once—including approximately 800 children in my own State.

I read on Monday in The Washington Post about the Whitney Young Head Start Center in Yonkers, New York, Mr. Speaker, which has served primarily Hispanic families for more than 12 years, teaching kids English and providing them medical services and meals. It closed down on Friday, a victim of sequestration.

And on Monday, an article in the Huffington Post drew attention to an effect of the sequester that represents a dangerous undermining of justice, and that is the cut to public defenders who represent defendants in the Federal court system who cannot afford their own attorneys. This fulfills the Constitutional requirement that everyone is entitled to legal representation. It can't be waived.

That report in The Washington Post says, "The Public Defender system hasn't just been stripped bare by sequestration, its bones have been chiseled away as well."

Mr. Speaker, can we risk delaying justice for victims and their families because our country can't afford public defenders?

Do we want cases dismissed against people who have done wrong because the Constitution says they have to have a defense that we can't afford, apparently?

I met yesterday with Maryland District Court judges, about eight of them, and they raised this issue as one of critical importance. And one of the judges, a Reagan appointee, was obviously very animated at how we were undermining the very essence of the judicial system. Surely no one on this floor intends to do that.

At the Defense Department, 650,000 civilian workers are already being furloughed 2 days a month. That's an effective cut in pay of 20 percent for hardworking people on whom we rely to maintain the national security of our country.

On July 2, I visited with civilian defense workers from Pax River Naval Air Station in St. Mary's County, and I heard from my constituents there who are being forced to stay home from work without pay. They were certainly concerned about their families' finances.

But Mr. Speaker, these hardworking and patriotic public servants were far more worried about furloughs' effect on our military readiness and support for our troops in the field on those Fridays

when many are forced to stay home, and not at their post. Legally, they can't even come to work and volunteer their time.

The sequester is hurting morale and putting our security at risk, Mr. Speaker, at a moment when our troops are still in harm's way every single day, Fridays, otherwise known as furlough days, included.

I'll be going to another installation in Maryland's Fifth District on Friday, Mr. Speaker, the Naval Surface Warfare Center at Indian Head, to meet with civilian employees there. I will tell them that Congress has the ability to end the furloughs they are experiencing now.

We have the ability to keep those kids from losing Head Start, and our seniors from losing meals. We have that ability now. We can do so by coming together in a bipartisan way to replace the sequester with a balanced alternative that includes spending cuts and, yes, revenues.

This is what Budget Committee Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN has put forward seven times, Mr. Speaker, only to see it prevented by the majority from receiving a vote.

The Speaker says, let the House work its will. Well, perhaps this is the will of the House. I hope not.

I urge my colleagues to work together across the aisle so we can end the sequester and restore fiscal discipline in a way that does not harm our security, our economy, the most vulnerable in our country, or America itself.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to traffic in the well while another Member is under recognition.

FEAR OF MAN IS A SNARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this morning to call for a change in the House calendar.

Mr. Speaker, leaders set priorities. They identify the challenges and opportunities that face their organization, then they assess them and put them in the right order, and then they align their organization's calendar to make sure that those top priorities get addressed. That's what the American people rightfully expect of each of us.

Overall, our calendar and the priorities of the House are right on track. I'm so proud of the legislation that we've passed that would move America to energy independence and create hundreds of thousands of jobs.

But in one very critical area we're seriously off track. Our calendar does not

reflect the challenges and the top priorities of our country. Specifically, we're not on track to pass all 12 appropriations bills that fund the Federal Government for 2014.

The fact is, we're not even close to passing those bills. And with our current congressional calendar, I cannot possibly see a way that we can pass those bills by September 30, which is the end of the current fiscal year.

This is not without consequence. It damages our economy, job creation. It damages our military in a very real way. And ultimately, it hurts hardworking American families.

Now, let's look at the status of the 12 bills, and then look at the time that remains on the congressional calendar to debate and pass those bills in time to avoid what's referred to as a continuing resolution.

And make no mistake here. A continuing resolution is wholly inadequate as a financial vehicle to fund this government. It has serious adverse consequences, and that's why this topic merits the careful attention of this body, and that's why it merits a change in our congressional calendar.

Well, here are the 12 bills that must be passed. We've passed four of them. Well, that leaves eight. My math's pretty good—there are 12 bills, 4 have been completed.

Now, they're not past due right now, but they surely will be, at least some of them.

As I mentioned, this has serious repercussions. I've spent a tremendous amount of time in our district listening to the hardworking men and women who keep our country safe and those who support them.

Every time we pass a continuing resolution, our military reels with uncertainty. We have a deep obligation to the young men and women around the world who are keeping this country safe to use every dollar wisely to ensure that we get the very best equipment and support to each of them.

That's why I feel so strongly about this issue, and it burdens me when we fail the American people in this respect.

Well, let's look on at the calendar and see what we've got to work with here.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, we have 15 calendar days. They're indicated right here in the teal green color. These areas here represent constituent work periods. I work really hard in our constituent work periods. I know that every Member here does. It's important that we're in our districts. There's value to that—to listen and to be accountable to the good folks who sent us here.

That said, a principal function and what the American people are expecting of us is that we pass these 12 appropriations bills. So if what is referred to

as the August recess is brought to this body for a vote, I will vote "no." I'll encourage every Member of this body to vote "no," Democrat and Republican. When an organization is facing profound challenges, you do what you must do to set it on a better course. It may be House tradition to break, but I submit that it's not wise.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe we ought to be in session 6 days a week, starting at 8 a.m.—earlier, if it were up to me—and then end around 7 p.m. Six days a week. I'm convinced that just that pressure alone would help us to find some common ground that I know exists in this place. That's why I call for a change in the calendar.

THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my friend from Virginia. I respect his opinion; but with all due respect, I think we've got a more fundamental problem than the calendar. The Republican leadership refuses to allow a conference committee on the budget between the House and the Senate to reconcile our differences. We can be here 24 hours a day, 7 days a week; but if the Republican leadership refuses to allow the process to work, we're not going to get anywhere. And that's where we are right now.

My friends on the Appropriations Committee refuse to deal with the budget level that was passed into law 2 years ago that fixed us on a course. They have a level of funding that is literally slashing and burning Federal spending. The latest manifestation of this battle is putting in jeopardy the very existence of public broadcasting.

I would have hoped that we were past that when the last Congress targeted NPR and tried to defund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Luckily, the 170 million Americans who don't just listen or watch public broadcasting, but depend on it, unleashed an unprecedented show of support. As a result, the Republican leadership walked it back.

One good thing about that budget battle 2 years ago was that it called for a study to look for alternatives for the 14 percent of Federal money that supports public broadcasting. The study is in and it clearly shows there's no viable alternative to those 14 cents on the dollar.

Many of the proposals that have been suggested would actually result in less money, overall, for public broadcasting in the long term. Yet the House appropriations bill, we're told, is going to eliminate Corporation for Public Broadcasting funding.

Last summer, I had a fascinating conversation with my friend Ken

Burns, who pointed out that his six projects in the pipeline would never have been made, let alone be seen, without funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. So I hope you enjoyed his show last fall about the Dust Bowl, because if the Republicans have their way, you will never see his programs about the Roosevelts, Jackie Robinson, Vietnam, or Hemingway.

Remember how well it worked for Governor Romney when he singled out broadcasting as one of the five projects that he would defund? The Republicans, sadly, pander to a tiny fraction of the American public that is even a minority in their own party. Polls show two-thirds of Republicans surveyed would either keep funding for public broadcasting where it is or increase it. What resonates with some Republican primary voters is not what America wants, needs, or believes.

The unprecedented threat comes at exactly the time when America needs public broadcasting the most. "NPR News," the object of the greatest Republican scorn, is the most trusted brand in American news media. PBS shows like "Sesame Street" have helped three generations of parents raise their children with effective, commercial-free educational program.

Locally owned news is becoming only a memory for most America, as large corporations buy up local stations and newspapers. There's no money to be made by commercial stations that cater to the special needs of rural and small-town America. Luckily, public broadcasting is there because their mission is to inform and serve, not just make money.

We must stop the attack on this critical service, especially for rural and small-town America. It's time for the 170 million Americans who depend on public broadcasting every month to again fight back and for Congress to finally listen. The radical proposal to slash public broadcasting, defund NPR, to terminate public broadcasting as we know it is a powerful signal of how far out of step the Republican leadership is from the country they're supposed to represent.

There's no reason to make public broadcasting, which Republicans including Barry Goldwater, helped launch, into a partisan issue. Public broadcasting has broad support from Republicans, independents, and Democrats alike. That's why PBS and its member stations were named number one in public trust and an excellent use of tax dollars for 10 years in a row.

It's time for the people who believe in public broadcasting to stand up to this extremism and settle the question once and for all about the future of public broadcasting. Unless we fight now, there may be nothing left to defend.

RULE OF LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to shed light on Attorney General Eric Holder's blatant disregard for the rule of law. Mr. Holder's violations of the law are egregious, and he should not be immune from prosecution or given license to act without restraint.

An ordinary citizen would go to jail for selling guns to Mexican drug cartels. An ordinary citizen would go to jail for secretly obtaining phone records and emails. An ordinary citizen would go to jail for lying to Congress about an investigation. What would happen to an ordinary citizen for lying to a judge? This is just a small part of what Attorney General Eric Holder is responsible for.

As Supreme Court Justice Brandeis said:

In a government of laws, the existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. If government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law. It invites every man to become a law unto himself. It invites anarchy.

I ask you, has Attorney General Eric Holder invited anarchy?

I will continue to make this case here in the people's House at the people's pulpit. Folks, I will be back.

COAL ASH AND ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, we can do better. When it comes to legislatively establishing a national energy policy to address climate change, we can and must do better. But we're not. As Members of this body, we're not doing anything. Why?

We are hamstrung by our inability to work together to do great, important, vital things here in this Chamber: things like addressing our national debt, tackling comprehensive immigration reform, and to ever, in the history of this Nation, establish a national energy plan. The only way forward is to establish a national energy plan to address climate change, something this great Nation has always lacked, and to work with public and private entities alike to get this done.

For the climate doubters out there who still question climate change, I remind them that over 200 peer-reviewed scientific studies have said that climate change is real and that man contributes significantly to it. And zero scientific peer-reviewed studies have said the opposite.

So we must craft a plan that focuses on working with the business community hand-in-hand to be competitive internationally. We must go toe-to-toe with India and China. We must craft a plan that focuses on public transportation and green infrastructure. We

must pass a multiyear transportation bill. We must focus on conservation, as demonstrated so adeptly by our own President's increase in Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards and his call to action on climate just a few weeks ago. Above all, we must compromise and work together and be inventive and creative.

I'm not calling on the President for another executive order. I'm not calling on the Senate to move one more piecemeal energy bill that lies holed up in committee. I'm calling on this House.

I know what the critics will say, and my argument is the same as theirs: it's about jobs. Setting standards for carbon-pollution limits for coal plants under the Clean Air Act will not shutter all U.S. plants. On the contrary, it will set achievable standards for existing plants until we can use a patchwork solution to transition to cleaner sources.

Still others will say the Clean Air Act is a draconian doctrine that kills jobs, slows down American progress, and sets us back as a technology-advanced Nation. Right? Wrong. The Clean Air Act has been the impetus for the only existing technologies that currently exist for power plants, having been required to reduce emittance by 90 percent by 2015. Without such directives coming out of the EPA over the past 40 years, such advancements by polluting power plants would never have been voluntarily made.

We can transition with incentives and a patchwork approach—and compromise.

Several weeks ago, when the President made a major drive on combating climate change, it's too bad he had to bypass Congress to do it. But as a Member of this body, I don't blame him. I would love to say we here in this Chamber would be part of the solution, but I understand why he believes we cannot.

Since Congress has abdicated its desire to pass climate legislation, natural gas has become a panacea for fossil fuel. It's dirt cheap and "cleaner," they say. But it's brought about a renaissance of dirty extraction like hydrofracking or extracting gas from shale in an oftentimes negligent and toxic manner.

Also, our nuclear energy can't compete with China's solar energy. China provided over half the solar panel cells in the U.S. That's over \$3.1 billion within our domestic market—\$3.1 billion we could be capitalizing on, infusing small and mid-sized solar companies across the country, creating and retaining green jobs.

Our attempt to deregulate or fight rules promulgated from the EPA isn't working either. Take the bill we're considering this week, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act, which would set up a separate management

stream which would bypass the EPA. Per the Congressional Research Service, this standard, as established by the bill, pays no mind to public health. The CRS memo, written at the request of the House and Energy and Commerce Committee states:

This bill fails to establish minimum national safeguards, fails to establish Federal backstop authority, fails to define what facility the bill applies to, fails to contain any minimum Federal requirement to protect health and the environment.

It's time this body became a relevant advocate and participant in solving the great questions that plague our Nation today before we lose a chance to have a tomorrow.

ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it's been a tough week for American consumers. Yesterday, it was reported that under the Federal Bureau of Land Management's new proposed onshore hydraulic fracturing regulations, businesses will suffer—as will the rate of production in developing our Nation's plentiful natural gas. Yes, a clean and affordable resource.

Reuters News reports:

The Obama administration hopes the rules on public lands will serve as a model for State oversight of drilling on private lands.

This plan is no secret. U.S. Interior Secretary Sally Jewell said as much in her testimony before the House Natural Resources Committee in July. Make no mistake: these Federal regulations are being developed as a model to be used across the country.

The development of our Nation's domestic energy resources has been one of the few bright spots in a struggling economy. It's very clear how and why this era of growth and innovation came to be. Take a look at the production rates on State and private lands versus Federal lands and you will see why. Production is up on the former and way down on the latter. Unfortunately, the administration wants to close this gap by putting the Federal Government in control and imposing costly new mandates everywhere that production is taking place.

□ 1030

It's bad for business, Mr. Speaker. What's worse, it's bad for consumers by making the cost of heating their homes that much more expensive.

And it doesn't stop with natural gas. Coal is also in the administration's crosshairs. Only with coal, the White House has a hair trigger, a scope, and a silencer. Case in point: a sweeping new coal regulation quietly being put forward by the administration known as the Stream Buffer Zone Rule.

Yesterday, Joseph Pizarchik, Director of the Federal Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement at the U.S. Department of the Interior, testified before the House Natural Resources Committee on the new rule. The Interior Department has largely stonewalled the Committee's investigation into the rewrite of the coal regulation and failed to comply with multiple subpoenas.

Similar to the Director's testimony, the entire rulemaking process for this new regulation has lacked transparency. What we do know is that the administration has failed to even consider the new rule's economic impact on local economies, such as those in my home State of Pennsylvania.

Unfortunately, the conduct of OSM is emblematic of the Obama administration's complete disregard for the health of our economy. As many as 220,000 jobs are at risk in the Appalachia region alone as a consequence of the proposed rule. Thousands more are at stake nationally.

DOI regulations require that OSM collaborate "to the fullest extent possible" with the States developing this rule. DOI regulations also require that OSM collaborate with States "at the earliest possible time" so that all stakeholders can evaluate the rule and consider possible alternatives.

Yesterday, when asked whether or not States have been provided with information regarding the new rule and related changes, the OSM Director stated he does not believe that there have been any contacts during the last year with the impacted States. When further pressed as to whether his office had made any contact with States and other cooperating agencies, the Director stated that he was unaware of any such communications.

Mr. Speaker, this White House will stop at no end to assault the fossil fuels industry along with the millions of jobs it supports and the low energy costs that it provides.

Mr. Speaker, protecting the environment and developing our abundant natural resources, such as coal and natural gas, are not mutually exclusive, but this is not something that this administration would like to admit.

This week, the administration continued to move ahead with policies that will cost more jobs and further harm family budgets through higher electricity rates. This week, the administration continued to grossly underestimate the cumulative impact of their regulatory actions. And this week was another tough week for the American consumer.

ISSUES FACING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I listened to many of my good friends

and to colleagues. We are, in fact, good friends and colleagues hoping to do what is right on behalf of the American people. I always appreciate and respect those individuals who have chosen to serve the Nation, so I take issue very briefly with my good friend and colleague about the criminal acts of one of the most honest and forthright Attorney Generals of the United States of America.

Attorney General Holder has not been charged with criminal activity, except for the aggressive and desperate actions of our Republican friends. He has been noted for his great leadership on civil rights and criminal justice issues. He's been a leader on the prohibiting and fighting against human trafficking. And certainly he has been one who has stood up for our children in this Nation, and also the many law enforcement officers who are on the front lines protecting us here in America. I hope that we can respect those who offer themselves to the service of this Nation for as long as Attorney General Eric Holder has done.

I have listened to friends as well speak about the devastation of the sequester. I again suggest to my colleagues that, through H.R. 900, a simple bill that eliminates the sequester and goes back to the budget reconciliation of 2011 and, as well, to force or to push this Republican majority to move to conference, would be the better approach.

I, too, have gone and delivered meals for Meals on Wheels, and I've seen the faces of seniors who will now face serious cuts in this effort. I see the loss of 750,000 jobs. I see the impact on the economy, where the unemployment has stayed somewhat static. But when you go into the business community and the hesitation, even though Wall Street is thriving, it all points to the fact of the sequester. It has become a dirty word. It has become one that has victimized the American public; it has victimized young families; it has victimized college students; it has victimized seniors; it has victimized those who are ill. And yet we continue to, piece by piece, fix the FAA problem but do not address the 70,000 children that are suffering and losing seats in Head Starts.

I remember, as the Head Start seats were being lost, fathers crying when they were told by their Head Start facility that their child would no longer have a seat. It seems sad that we would cut Head Start or disaster aid by \$1 billion because we have Head Start, or the Department of Transportation, \$1.9 billion, when many of us know that those are the basic reasons for job creation is building America's infrastructure.

As we plod along with sequester and we see good public workers not being able to work—and might I just say, let me thank our own staff, which gets condemned all the time. You work for

a U.S. Member of Congress, and every day our staff fights to help some constituent keep their house from being foreclosed on or keep a Medicare recipient continuing to get their benefits or veterans, and yet we are furloughing them. We are cutting people that are mere workers, that are working for us. They can't make ends meet. They're getting second jobs. It's a disgrace. It's an absolute disgrace. I am not going to condemn our staff—committee staff, government staff. They are working for the American people.

Then I want to offer a disagreement, Mr. Speaker. I know the Senate is going to vote on a student loan program. They say it's a compromise. Well, I've got to tell my students, because I've held campus meetings, we've met, I've got to tell them and I've got to tell the parents, yes, they're going to get a low interest rate today, but watch out for tomorrow because it's a trigger. Before you know it, they may be paying 10 percent.

They say it's a cap, but I don't know what the cap is going to be as it relates to whether a student can pay 6 percent or 7 percent, when they can stay at 3.4 percent. As someone said, why should the Federal Government be making money on the backs of students? I'm concerned about that.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say there has been a lot of discussion this week about issues of race, issues of the tragedy of Trayvon Martin. I intend to introduce the Justice Exists for All Act, a review, as Senator MCCAIN has suggested, of the Stand Your Ground legislation across America. It will increase public safety. It will reduce the incidence of gun violence, among other things, by providing incentives for any State with the Stand Your Ground law to amend it to require a duty to retreat. For States that do not require a duty to retreat, we will question their Federal funding and assess their Justice Department funding and reduce it by 20 percent.

We will also decrease the incidence of gun violence resulting from vigilantes by reducing by 20 percent the funds that would otherwise be allocated for that fiscal year to any State that does not require local neighborhood watch programs be registered with a local enforcement agency, and require the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, to study Stand Your Ground laws.

Let's speak to the pain of the American people. Let's look at ways of fixing the law.

COMMENDING ERIC WOLF ON HIS ACCEPTANCE TO THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DESJARLAIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend an extraordinary

young man from Tennessee's Fourth Congressional District. Eric Wolf was accepted to and is now attending the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

Since middle school, Eric has been preparing for a career in the military. He follows the path of both his grandfathers—one who was a marine, and the other a World War II veteran.

Eric said that he felt the call to serve his country after reading the book "Lone Survivor," which led him to look at what he was doing to give back to our great Nation.

In addition to his appointment, Eric built a solid reputation in his hometown of Cleveland, Tennessee. He graduated from McCallie High School with a 4.1 GPA and was a star athlete.

Eric's drive and unabashed patriotism exemplify the best of our country. I wish him the best of luck and know that he will make us all proud.

END HUNGER NOW #19—CHEFS FIGHTING HUNGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the 19th time this year, I rise to talk about my effort to End Hunger Now. Nearly every week this year, I've stood on this floor and talked about hunger in America and how we can End Hunger Now.

Today, I want to talk about a group of people who are fighting hunger around this country. At first, they may seem like an unlikely group of antihunger advocates; but look deeper, and it's easy to see how their connection to good, healthy food makes them natural allies in our effort to End Hunger Now.

Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about America's chefs, the culinary artists who cook for all of us, whether we're eating at a neighborhood restaurant or fine dining establishments. America's chefs have recognized that hunger and obesity are problems in America, and they know how important access to healthy food is for proper development no matter what age a hungry or malnourished person is.

Chefs across this country, including White House Chef Sam Kass, have rallied behind First Lady Michelle Obama's Let's Move Campaign, and especially the healthy eating component of her campaign. They understand that healthy food is critical for healthy bodies and minds. But what's less well known is that these same chefs have also picked up the mantle of hunger in America. They realize that hunger and obesity are the opposite sides of the same coin—that it's possible to be hungry and obese simply because you lack money to buy healthy foods; and, in many cases, healthier options, including fresh fruits and vegetables, simply aren't available.

That's why these chefs have been working on eliminating food deserts, those areas, both urban and rural, where there isn't access to low-cost, healthy, and nutritious foods. And they've been working with food banks and other antihunger organizations on ways to provide food to poor and needy Americans. This includes vigorously defending SNAP and the child nutrition programs.

One of the great leaders on hunger from the culinary industry is Tom Colicchio, someone I'm proud to call a friend and ally. Tom wears several hats: he's a successful restaurateur with restaurants across this country from Los Angeles to New York, and he's a television celebrity with his role as judge on "Top Chef"; but most recently, and more importantly to millions of Americans who may never have the opportunity to eat at one of his restaurants, Tom is an advocate for the hungry and for those who are trying to improve their lives.

He was a vocal supporter of the Child Nutrition Reauthorization Act that increased funding for school meals in order to improve the nutritional quality of food served at schools. But he's also a producer of the documentary "A Place at the Table," a beautifully filmed, heart-wrenching movie about hunger in America. His role in our fight to End Hunger Now cannot be understated, and his efforts are needed and appreciated.

Then there is my dear friend, Chef Jose Andres, who brings a passion and a commitment to ending hunger. He has dedicated himself to raising awareness, challenging policymakers, and giving back to the community in ways, both large and small, that have really made a difference to ending hunger in America and around the world.

And he's not alone. Chefs like Mark Murray, Rachael Ray, Bryan Voltaggio, and Charlie Palmer, just to name a few, all lend their names, their restaurants, and themselves to the fight to End Hunger Now. Working through antihunger organizations like Share Our Strength, founded and run by my good friend Billy Shore, these chefs are reducing hunger in so many different and unique ways.

But it's not just the famous celebrity chefs who are helping. Share Our Strength has a program called Cooking Matters, where chefs teach low-income families healthier ways to cook food. Together with their Shopping Matters program, where these same families can learn how to navigate their local markets to purchase the healthiest food they can afford, these programs are fighting hunger at local levels. And the chefs involved, from Arkansas to Colorado to Massachusetts, are using their expertise to teach these families the healthiest ways to cook food.

Chefs are just one of the nontraditional groups that are out in the real

world fighting hunger. They are leading by example. And their actions need to be highlighted not just on the House floor, but at the White House, at a White House conference on food and nutrition. Chefs should absolutely be part of such a conference where they can talk about their efforts and ways they can help low-income families improve their cooking and eating habits.

These chefs and the organizations they partner with are a key part of our fight to End Hunger Now. I commend them for their dedication, and I look forward to working with them in this effort.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LILLIAN KAWASAKI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of Lillian Kawasaki, who proudly served the Los Angeles community for more than three decades, working tirelessly to protect our environment.

Lillian was an inspiration and a trailblazer. In 1990, she was named general manager of the Department of Environmental Affairs for the City of Los Angeles, becoming the first Asian American in city history to be appointed a department chief.

It is because of Lillian's leadership and her vision that Los Angeles launched major initiatives in air and water quality protection and environmental cleanup. Local businesses began investing in renewable energy thanks to Lillian Kawasaki.

I had the privilege of working with Lillian when she served as board director for the Water Replenishment District. It would be hard to find a public official more involved in her community than Lillian was.

On a personal note, it was an honor for me to call her a close friend. Lillian was an extraordinarily giving person. She always remembered birthdays and anniversaries. She asked me often how my family and my son were doing because she truly cared.

□ 1045

I offer my condolences to Lillian's husband, to her family, and to her loved ones. She was a tremendous public servant, a shining example for others, and a generous and truly kind human being, and I will miss her greatly.

DETROIT BANKRUPTCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, last week, the city of Detroit, Michigan, became

the largest municipality in our Nation's history to file for bankruptcy. Without a doubt, the situation in Detroit is extreme. Their problems in part have been driven by local mismanagement. But it would be an oversimplification, and I think a dangerous oversimplification, for folks to continue to lay the entire responsibility for Detroit's situation on the failure of management.

Since last week, Detroit has been on the front page of America's newspapers and has become the recent, I guess, poster child of municipal decline and insolvency. But for the few cities like Detroit that have actually filed bankruptcy, there are many other legacy cities in this country that continue to struggle day in and day out to provide basic services for their residents.

Many municipalities are facing not just fiscal insolvency but service level challenges, perhaps not on the same scale as Detroit, but that does not mean that they are immune to the problems that Detroit is facing. My own hometown of Flint, Michigan, is on that same path and is struggling every day to provide basic services in an increasing period of fiscal stress.

Detroit's bankruptcy should be a call to action to have a much bigger conversation in this country about how we support and fund our cities and our great metropolitan areas. Cities are where our creativity takes place and where much of our wealth has been generated in the past, and that can and should be the future for America's cities. Let me be clear: bankruptcy for Detroit will not be a solution to its problems or for any other city.

While it is arguable that this bankruptcy may be necessary, it will not be sufficient to solve the problem. It may bring order to an otherwise chaotic situation, but it will not solve the problem itself, and it will have real consequences for people in Detroit and southeastern Michigan and the entire State.

You can simply dissolve a corporation through bankruptcy, but you can't dissolve a city, which is a place where hundreds of thousands of people, in this case, live and raise their families.

Lots of factors have contributed to the decline of a whole subset of America's cities—population laws, trade policy that moves jobs out of those communities overseas or out of those cities into the metropolitan areas through land use practices, a municipal finance system that fails to recognize the realities of the 21st century. This is a big issue, and it is one that calls for a much larger national conversation about how we support our cities.

First, Mr. Speaker, we have to make sure to do no harm to these places that are struggling. The Republican budget that will come to this floor within the next few weeks proposes deep cuts to programs like the Community Development Block Grant program and the

HOME program—a 40 percent cut for programs that are intended to help communities reposition themselves in this challenged economy. Yet, at a time when cities are facing distress, like the city of Detroit, my hometown of Flint, and many others, when the Federal Government could provide some help that would be in our national interest, we see cuts proposed to these really important programs.

So whether at the State or Federal level, we all have a role to play. It is time that all levels of government start thinking about the long-term sustainability of our cities not because it is good for those places, but because it is in our national interest. Detroit's bankruptcy should be a day of reckoning for all of us, not just for the residents of the Motor City, but for everybody.

Rethinking the way we support our cities and our metropolitan areas is not an easy conversation for us to have. It will be tough. It will cause us to challenge conventional thinking and challenge our own views of the importance of cities.

These may be tough conversations, but they are absolutely necessary that we have to take on as a Nation. We cannot sit idly by and pretend that Detroit won't matter and that it won't affect us and wait for the next Detroit to happen. It is important for our Nation, it is important for our people, it is important for our competitiveness, it is important for our economy, it is important that we be a competitive place. And the only way we do that is with vital and rich growing communities, and we have to get places like Detroit and Flint and Saginaw and Pontiac and other places that are important to this economy back on that trajectory.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the recent rising unacceptable unemployment numbers in some regions of our Nation. The fact is Republicans control this House, and they are not only doing nothing to create jobs in America, they are actually creating more unemployment.

In my home State of Ohio, the unemployment rate jumped up to 7.2 percent. In the city of Cleveland, the unemployment rate rose from 9 percent to 10.1 percent over the past month. In the city of Lorain, unemployment dramatically rose from 8.7 to 10.6 percent. In the city of Toledo, we saw an increase in unemployment from 8.7 to 9.3 percent.

Nationally, the unemployment rate remains stalled, stuck, at 7.6 percent. But in too many neighborhoods across our country unemployment is a daily reality.

When you incorporate labor underutilization, the real national unemployment rate is actually 14.3 percent. There are currently 11.8 million, nearly 12 million, unemployed people in this country—4.3 million people have been jobless for 27 weeks or more and are considered long-term unemployed.

New Federal Government employment has declined by 65,000 persons over the past 12 months—65,000 more people spit out.

The unemployment rate for the construction industry is 9.8 percent. Manufacturing employment has declined in the past 4 straight months.

Do those job numbers sound like an economic recovery to you? What is the Republican response to these dubious unemployment and jobs numbers? Block the President.

So what do they do? Let's repeal the Affordable Care Act 38 times. And they've tried again and again to do that.

Let's not appoint budget conferees so we can negotiate a budget deal that puts people to work and strengthens the middle class. No. Sequestration is arguably the primary driver of these poor job numbers. So, let's ignore the harmful effects of sequestration. The Congressional Budget Office estimates just the unemployment resulting from sequestration costs our economy an additional 1.5 percent in lost economic growth.

Remember when the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimated that sequestration would reduce economic growth and cost about 750,000 jobs? Well, they were right. We are seeing the effect of that today. The sequester was the largest cause of the negative growth numbers in the fourth quarter of last year.

According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis, the economy is growing far slower than expected, despite the fact that personal consumption and business inventory spending has increased recently. You would think that if consumer and business spending is up, we would see strong GDP growth, given that our economy is based on consumer spending.

Unfortunately, this is where the sequester and the Republican policy of cut and run, cut and run, cut and run comes into play. Government spending has declined in 11 of the last 13 quarters since the first quarter of 2010.

We may have seen robust growth if we took a sensible, long-term approach to deficit reduction instead of using the Republican shortsighted sequester and steep unfair budget cuts. They are even kicking thousands of mentally ill citizens out of their assisted housing—thousands—over 27,000 people who can't make it on their own being kicked out of their humble shelters across this country.

With the Republicans refusing to replace their mindless sequester, 600,000

civilian defense workers are currently being furloughed. The economic impact of these defense furloughs will be the loss of over an estimated \$2 trillion for our economy; just in Ohio 22,000 furloughs in the civilian defense sector. The policies of this Republican House are hampering robust economic growth across our country.

The Federal Reserve agrees with what I am saying. In a recent hearing the chair of the Fed said, "the economic recovery has continued at a moderate pace in recent quarters despite the strong headwinds created by Federal fiscal policy."

Unfortunately, Republicans will likely continue to refuse to compromise and focus on slowing the economy even further. Congress has already cut spending by \$2.5 trillion. That has real impacts on job creation. Discretionary spending is at its lowest level in 45 years. The Federal deficit is projected to be at its lowest level in recent memory. And the Treasury has actually even recently made payments on the national debt.

We need a jobs bill here, not more reckless cuts. The President has a plan; the Republicans don't. I would urge my Republican colleagues, bring to the floor the President's jobs agenda. Let's show America which party is committed to job creation in this country, not more stalling.

UPDATE ON PUERTO RICO'S POLITICAL STATUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the birthday of the late Dr. Jose Celso Barbosa, the father of the statehood movement in Puerto Rico, I rise to update my colleagues on the progress that has been made to resolve the territory's political status.

Last November, Puerto Rico held a referendum. As I described in a floor speech the following week, the results show that a majority of the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico do not support the current territory status, a supermajority favor statehood among the three alternative options, and more voters want statehood than any other option, including the current status. These results are now part of the historical record, and they cannot be dismissed or diminished by those who find them inconvenient.

Now that American citizens living in an American territory have informed their national government, in a free and fair vote, that they do not consent to a political status that deprives them of the most basic democratic rights, it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to take appropriate action in response. For the President and Congress to do otherwise would be to contravene

the principles that have made this country a light to the world.

Today, I can report that positive steps have been taken. In April, the administration requested an appropriation of \$2.5 million, which would be provided to the Puerto Rico Elections Commission to conduct the first federally-funded status vote in the territory's history, with the specific purpose of resolving this issue. The administration's action was favorably received by Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, who rarely find common ground. Earlier this month, thanks to the leadership of Congressmen WOLF, FATTAH, and SERRANO, that funding was approved by the Appropriations Committee, confirming that the effort to secure fair treatment for Puerto Rico is not, and should never become, a partisan issue.

The committee's report endorses the conditions proposed by the administration stating that Federal funding will not be obligated until DOJ has certified that the ballot and voter education materials are compatible with U.S. laws and policies, thereby ensuring that the vote will deal with one or more status options that can actually be implemented and that would settle the issue.

I will continue to fight for the approval of this appropriation by the full House and for its retention in any conference negotiation with the Senate.

There is additional progress to report on another front in this struggle. In May, I introduced stand-alone legislation that proceeds from the indisputable premise that statehood obtained more votes than any other option in the November referendum. The bill outlines the rights and responsibilities of statehood and asks voters in Puerto Rico whether they accept those terms.

□ 1100

If a majority says "yes," the bill provides for the President to submit legislation to admit Puerto Rico as a State after a transition period.

Two months after its introduction, this bill already enjoys support from 100 Members of Congress from both parties and from every region of this country despite the predictable opposition of the status quo party in Puerto Rico and its allies in Congress. I always find it ironic when some of my colleagues from the States, who, along with their constituents, enjoy all the benefits of statehood, seek to prevent my constituents from exercising those same rights and responsibilities. I have concluded that these forces cannot be reasoned with. They must simply be defeated, and they will be.

Next week, I will appear as a witness at a Senate hearing on the November referendum and the Federal response to that vote. Just as I told a United Nations committee last month, I will tes-

tify that I have faith that the Federal Government will fulfill its obligation to facilitate Puerto Rico's transition to a democratic and dignified status but that deeds, not words, are required.

Much work remains to be done, and like any civil rights struggle, it will not be easy; but through our sound and steady action, we are closer than ever to finally realizing Dr. Barbosa's dream of equality for the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend John Reynolds, Volusia County Baptist Church, Orange City, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Father, we are humbly grateful for Your blessings on our lives and on our Nation. We ask Your forgiveness in every area where we have failed You.

I pray these honorable Representatives elected to serve You here in this House will seek, find, and follow Your wisdom. You can give simple solutions to complex problems. Our country needs a revival of solutions.

I pray, also, for the needs of all in the House today. Bless them, their families, and their constituents with Your loving care and protection.

Please bless and protect those serving in our military striving to maintain the peace and freedom we enjoy. May we not neglect nor abuse those blessings.

My Father, at Your instruction, I pray for all those in authority over me. I ask that You help Your people to be good citizens for Your glory and the good of this Nation.

In Jesus' name I pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will remind the House that on July 24, 1998, at 3:40 p.m., Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police were killed in the line of duty defending the Capitol against an intruder armed with a gun.

At 3:40 p.m. today, the Chair will recognize the anniversary of this tragedy by observing a moment of silence in their memory.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
The Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In light of the fact that I have been working with Alabama Governor Robert Bentley to find the earliest possible date for the special election which will occur following my resignation, so that my successor can be seated at the earliest possible time during the 113th Congress, I wish to inform you that I will resign my seat effective 11:59 p.m., August 2, 2013.

Sincerely,

JO BONNER,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2013.

Hon. ROBERT BENTLEY,
Governor, State Capitol,
Montgomery, Alabama.

DEAR GOVERNOR BENTLEY: Pursuant to our conversations, I am notifying you that I will resign from Congress at 11:59 p.m. on August 2, 2013. I share your view that the seat should be vacant for as short a time as possible, and I am pleased the August 2nd date will allow

the special election to be completed during 2013.

I remain grateful to the people of the First District of Alabama for allowing me the honor of representing them. Thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,

JO BONNER,
Member of Congress.

WELCOMING PASTOR JOHN REYNOLDS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, it's a great honor today to introduce to the House our Guest Chaplain, Dr. John Reynolds of Orange City, Florida.

To our good fortune in Florida, he was invited by four families to found a church in Orange City, Florida, in 1996. It now has 1,500 members—one of the largest congregations in Volusia County in central Florida—and supports hundreds of missionaries worldwide. In addition to his pastoral work, Dr. Reynolds has preached at conferences across the Nation and foreign countries. His leadership and willingness to help others is an inspiration to us all.

Dr. Reynolds graduated in 1964 from Tennessee Temple College in Chattanooga and started his church ministry. He returned to Temple Baptist Seminary and graduated in 1968. His life experiences include many positions, which include president of a Christian recording company, vice-president of development at his alma mater, and minister of music.

Dr. Reynolds married his lovely wife, Becky, in 1964. They have four children, two of whom are preachers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Dr. Reynolds and his wife, Becky. We thank him for offering this morning's opening prayer in the United States House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PRESIDENT SPEAKS ON THE ECONOMY

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I was interested today to hear that the President was going to give a speech about the economy. After all, Republicans have a plan for growth and jobs. We've been focused on that plan, and we certainly welcome the President's ideas.

But the White House says not to expect any new proposals in this speech.

The President himself said it isn't going to change any minds. All right, so exactly what will change? What's the point? What's it going to accomplish? I've probably got the answer: nothing. It's a hollow shell. It's an Easter egg with no candy in it.

If the President wants to help, he ought to approve the Keystone pipeline that has bipartisan support here in the House. He ought to work with the bipartisan majority to delay the health care bill to give the American people, their families, and individuals the same break he wants to give to big businesses. And he ought to stop threatening to shut down the government unless we raise taxes. Because Americans aren't asking, Where are the speeches? They're asking, Where are the jobs?

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATHS OF CAPITOL POLICE OFFICERS JOHN GIBSON AND JACOB CHESTNUT

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as Speaker BOEHNER has said, later today Members and staff from both parties will come together to remember the tragic shooting that occurred 15 years ago in this Capitol when a lone gunman tried to enter the building through what we now know as the Memorial Door. U.S. Capitol Police Detective John Gibson and Officer Jacob Chestnut—Gibson from Virginia and Chestnut from Maryland—courageously placed themselves between the gunman and not only all of us who serve here but all of us who visit here.

They gave their lives, Mr. Speaker, to protect this institution that is the foundation of our democracy. They died protecting the many people who come here each day to serve our country, to see their government in action, and put so much of themselves into making America better and stronger and safer for us all.

On this day—and every day—let us remember the heroic sacrifice of Detective Gibson and Officer Chestnut and let us appreciate the dedicated and often unsung service of the United States Capitol Police personnel, who stand watch every hour over our safety, our lives, and our ability to perform our duties without fear of violence.

May God bless their families and keep us safe.

FOURTH AMENDMENT

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in the run-up to the American Revolution, American colonialists were

concerned over the English Government's use of general warrants—giving British authorities the right to enter into private homes or businesses without evidence of wrongdoing—to search for and seize anything they considered contraband under English laws and taxation. This led to the Founding Fathers including this in the United States Constitution:

Amendment IV. The right of people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable search and seizures, shall not be violated and no warrants shall be issued but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

That is why this debate over NSA programs is so important. Americans should be secure in their private papers—electronic or otherwise—against unreasonable searches and seizures.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the United States Senate passed a bipartisan immigration bill that brings each of our 50 States under the umbrella of a single, uniform immigration policy that is easy to understand, is fair, focuses on uniting families, protects new immigrants from exploitation, secures our borders, and creates a path to citizenship for new Americans. It's critical for us to seize this moment.

A group of Republicans and Democrats are working to craft a bipartisan House proposal that establishes a roadmap that is achievable and accompanied by a demonstration of the responsibilities of citizenship for the millions of men and women already living here today to aspire to become citizens of this great Nation. The American people deserve a vote on comprehensive immigration reform.

According to the Center for American Progress, immigration reform would create 121,000 jobs each year for the next 10 years. In addition, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that fixing our broken immigration system will reduce the Federal deficit by about \$200 billion over the next 10 years and about \$700 billion in the decade after that.

For far too many years, Congress has failed the American people on this issue. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do what is right for our country and for families all across America and fix our broken immigration system.

SUPPORT CANCER RESEARCH

(Mr. GIBBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to talk about the benefits of cancer research and the importance of the National Institutes of Health, or NIH.

In my home State of Ohio, over 66,000 people will be diagnosed with cancer this year and over 25,000 will lose their battle with this devastating disease. Like every State, Ohio receives essential funding from the NIH each year. The NIH funds lifesaving medical research leading to the development of innovative ways to prevent, diagnose, and treat cancer. This research takes place at universities, hospitals, cancer centers, and labs across my State, including the Case Comprehensive Cancer Center and the James Cancer Center at Ohio State University.

In addition to the benefits of combating cancer and so many other diseases, NIH funding also produces tens of billions of dollars in new economic activity across the country. According to the Ohio Council of Medical Deans, every dollar invested in biomedical research translates to a \$2.21 investment in the local economy. In 2012 alone, Ohio received almost \$800 million in NIH funding, which supported more than 13,000 jobs.

Cancer is a disease that does not discriminate against age or race. Many people have friends or loved ones who have been affected by this terrible disease. I urge my colleagues to support cancer research.

□ 1215

DEVASTATING FUNDING CUTS TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill, which is currently awaiting consideration on the House floor, has a devastating 50 percent cut to the Community Development Block Grant program. These grants provide eligible communities with funding to increase economic activity and create jobs.

Many regions, including western New York, have benefited from the availability of Community Development Block Grants to support neighborhood reinvestment, affordable housing, and economic development.

Mr. Speaker, this program has a strong history of bipartisan support since its creation by President Gerald Ford in 1974. Shamefully, the amount funded this year is actually \$1 billion less than what was allocated to the program 39 years ago.

I'm proud to have joined over 100 of my House colleagues to express concern with this funding cut and urge Community Development Block Grant

funding to be fully restored. These cuts, that come at the expense of our local communities, would have a negative impact on the national economy.

OBAMACARE EMPLOYMENT

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, every week I hear from constituents who are being hurt by the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. The law is imposing new costs on businesses and workers, reducing take-home pay, reducing the number of jobs available, and reducing the number of hours employees are working.

Survey after survey confirms that the anecdotes I hear from back home are true for Americans across the country. A survey of 300 accountants finds that employers are holding back on hiring workers and that some are even paring back their payrolls.

CNBC reports that doctors are skeptical and confused about the implementation of the law. Workers, doctors, and employers have every right to be confused since the Affordable Care Act is being implemented haphazardly and without regard to the law as it is written. Beneficiaries will sign up for subsidies without income verification.

We don't truly know what we'll get until October, but we can say with confidence that it won't be what the President promised years ago. Americans won't be saving \$2,500 a year, many will lose the coverage they have, and others will have to switch to a new doctor.

Many promises have already been broken, and more disappointment is bound to happen.

OFFENSIVE REMARKS ABOUT DREAMERS

(Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, recently, one of our Republican colleagues made remarks about the Hispanic community and children that have no place in our public discourse. These words offend DREAMers, who have been brought to this country through no fault of their own, and they offend our entire Nation. In talking about DREAMers, Representative STEVE KING said:

For every one who's a valedictorian, there's another 100 out there who weigh 130 pounds, and they've got calves the size of cantaloupes because they are hauling 75 pounds of marijuana across the desert.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what's more disappointing, that the most extreme voices in the Republican Conference continue to make appalling comments about the Hispanic commu-

nity or that the rest of my Republican colleagues are silent on this kind of offensive and outrageous rhetoric.

At a time when we should be working together to address our broken immigration system, these hateful words only seek to divide rather than bring people together to find common ground.

It's no wonder that the American people continue to see House Republicans as out of touch when comments like these are made.

ENERGY VISION 2020

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Energy Vision 2020, it's an all-American, all-of-the-above energy vision that puts our Nation on the path to energy independence and security.

How? We don't take anything off the table. We harvest and explore all of our energy options, not stifle them. We do this through real regulatory reform, cutting red tape, and empowering private market innovation.

We work to keep our projects and technologies safe. If a venture is dangerous or environmentally unsafe, then say "no." But the key is, "no" can't be the final answer.

Regulatory agencies must become partners in progress with America's industries and businesses, striving to reach our full potential and finding the answers we need to get there.

There will be opponents to progress. Environmental extremists will throw their tired rhetoric around with no basis in scientific fact. But we can't sit idly by, letting America remain dependent on foreign energy sources and letting other countries seize our businesses and innovation opportunities.

Energy 2020 will get us focused. It's the next great horizon of American exceptionalism.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's now been 934 days since I came to Congress and there has not been a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis.

Amidst the distractions, amidst the scandals, amidst the tragedies, the single overriding focus of the American people remains the same: jobs and the economy. The polls speak volumes.

Mr. Speaker, today I'm taking an important step to end distractions and get the Congress back to work for the people, for the unemployed, for the suffering. Today, I am reintroducing President Obama's American Jobs Act, which expired last year without even

reaching the House floor. The American Jobs Act is popular for a reason: independent analysts have shown it would create 1.9 million jobs.

Mr. Speaker, bring this bill to a vote and you will restore public trust in the Congress of the United States of America. The American Jobs Act deserves a vote. Mr. Speaker, our mantra should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, more than 100,000 Arkansans work in retail, restaurant, lodging, and other service sectors. These service industries have helped keep the American economy afloat in recent years.

From restaurants like U.S. Cafe in Dardanelle, where I flipped burgers and fried fish as a teenager, to the convention hotels in Hot Springs, Arkansans rely on service industries every day as both employees and customers.

Unfortunately, the Obama administration's many failed policies are imperiling our service sector. Nowhere is this more true than with ObamaCare. Service-oriented companies often have large and shifting workforces, they operate on extremely thin margins, and they cannot thrive on uncertainty. ObamaCare brings nothing but uncertainty.

The House took an important step last week by voting to delay both the employer and the individual mandates in ObamaCare, but the only real solution is to repeal this awful law. Otherwise, service-sector employees and businesses will suffer continued setbacks, which means our economy will suffer yet another blow.

DEFENDING FREEDOMS PROJECT: NABEEL RAJAB

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss a Bahraini prisoner of conscience, Nabeel Rajab, a prominent human rights activist and the president of the Bahrain Center for Human Rights. Nabeel Rajab was sentenced to 3 years in jail simply for engaging in nonviolent political protests.

Nabeel Rajab is not alone. Scores of prisoners are incarcerated in Bahrain because they have called for meaningful reforms. Nabeel Rajab's abusive treatment by Bahraini security forces starkly contradicts Bahrain's pronouncements of full-fledged support for human rights.

I ask for the immediate release of Nabeel Rajab and seek the full support of Congress and the Obama administration.

Nabeel Rajab is a focus of the Defending Freedoms Project, a collaborative initiative spearheaded by the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission that invites Members of Congress to stand up for prisoners of conscience around the world through various actions. Today, I invite my colleagues to take part in this important nonpartisan opportunity. Our voices can make a difference in the release of these prisoners.

DAINES SPEAKS IN SUPPORT OF AMASH AMENDMENT

(Mr. DAINES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, after spending 12 years in the technology sector—more specifically, cloud computing—I know firsthand the power that data holds. I also understand the potential for abuse and the threats to Americans' civil liberties that come with mass collections of data.

Recent reports of the NSA blanket collection of Americans' phone records demonstrate the serious need for reforms to protect liberty and prevent abuse. That's why I'm proud to support Congressman AMASH's amendment to prevent the NSA from using the Patriot Act to collect the records of Americans who are not subject to a Patriot Act investigation.

This amendment helps protect law-abiding Americans from government overreach. The status quo is not unacceptable, and I hope this amendment will be a driving force for much-needed reforms and greater transparency and accountability.

We've seen what Big Government looks like. No one would have thought that the IRS would turn against the American people, and yet here we are. We must always be vigilant and guard against the overreach of power.

I will continue fighting to defend liberty. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and stand for Americans' Fourth Amendment protections.

SAINT ANNE CATHOLIC PARISH 40TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, Saint Anne Catholic Parish in Union City is celebrating its 40th anniversary festival.

Saint Anne was founded in 1860 as a mission in the old Alvarado District before the city of Union City even existed. The current parish was established in 1973 and has been serving the surrounding community ever since.

Today, Saint Anne is one of the largest parishes in my congressional dis-

trict, with over 5,000 parishioners, led by my friend, Father Geoffrey Baraan. With Father Geoffrey's guidance, Saint Anne helps serve the ethnically and culturally diverse community of Union City, and it helps ensure that the church lives up to its core mission, to "lead with compassion."

Through its parishioners, youth ministry, and hardworking staff, Saint Anne continues to help the homeless and the hungry of its community. This annual festival serves as a celebration and a reminder of the hard work and selfless service that went into building Saint Anne's. The funds raised during the festival will help the church continue to serve with collaboration, fellowship, and stewardship.

I wish Saint Anne all the best and hope they have a great 40th anniversary festival.

LACEY ACT

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, an American can be tried in a U.S. court and sent to an American prison for violating an obscure foreign law. Yes, you heard that right. That has already happened under a little-known provision in the Lacey Act.

The Lacey Act became the law in 1900 as a good protection against poachers, but it's been expanded since. Now, if you unknowingly import a product that violates a regulation from an exporting country, you can end up in a U.S. Federal courtroom and sent to a Federal prison.

One seafood importer spent 6 years in jail for importing lobsters that violated a regulation in Honduras. A few lobster tails were too small, and they were shipped in plastic instead of cardboard. Even the Honduran Government said these rules were obsolete.

Then Gibson Guitar had to pay \$350,000 to settle Federal charges that the company bought wood from Madagascar that was a sixth of an inch too thick.

It's time to end unreasonable and unconstitutional prosecutions of Americans on American soil for obscure foreign laws. The Lacey Act violates the rule of law and it needs to be changed.

DEROGATORY STATEMENTS REGARDING DREAMERS

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, America expects Members of Congress to exemplify what is great about our country. They expect us to represent virtues of tolerance, respect, and intelligence. Generalizations about children, about entire races of people are intolerant, disrespectful, and not very

intelligent. Our country expects better from us. Recent comments made by one colleague across the aisle are far below those expectations.

Forget for a moment that the DREAM Act is the right thing to do and will help grow our economy. Forget that most DREAMers are the best and the brightest of our country, and that passing the DREAM Act will increase DREAMers' earnings by an aggregate of 19 percent, totaling \$148 billion in wages by 2030, triggering more spending on goods and services throughout our economy and generating \$181 billion in increased economic growth by 2030, creating millions of jobs for Americans. Forget that providing a strong incentive for DREAMers to further their education will add 223,000 college diplomas to the workforce and open doors to better paying jobs. Forget all that, and remember that these are children and young adults. These are human beings. They deserve better than the derogatory statements of my Republican colleague. The American people deserve better.

□ 1230

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is not the master puppeteer of higher education, though a litany of burdensome regulations suggest that's what it's angling for.

We all want college to be more affordable and we want to ensure students throughout the country who work hard have the opportunity to attend a high-quality school. But Federal attempts to regulate those goals into existence unilaterally are counterproductive and costly.

Restrictive regulations stifle pioneering institutions at a time when forward-thinking solutions are desperately needed to meet the changing demands of an increasingly diverse American student body.

With less punitive Federal intervention, Congress will be able to work carefully with students, families, educators, and higher learning institutions to address the issues of college affordability, accountability, and transparency during the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

The administration should think outside the box with us so that education can be more accessible and affordable. We should start by reducing the size of the costly regulatory footprint in higher education.

CUTS TO EPA FUNDING

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was dismayed to see the Interior, Environment Appropriations Subcommittee approve a 2014 funding bill that cuts EPA funding by 34 percent. Such a drastic, unnecessary cut would prevent EPA from addressing critical air quality, water quality, and climate change issues that have direct impacts on human health.

As everyone knows by now, we are already feeling the impacts of climate change—stronger storms, more severe droughts, hotter heat waves. But it's our children and our grandchildren who will bear the brunt of these impacts in the future.

Children are especially vulnerable to the effects of climate change. We've already seen that there are higher rates of asthma and infectious diseases in children. These proposed cuts to EPA will only make things worse.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity and the responsibility to act now to protect our children and our grandchildren from the impacts of climate change.

I urge my colleagues, let's stop these shortsighted political games and start taking action to address climate change and protect the long-term health of future generations.

KILAH DAVENPORT CHILD PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. PITTINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask once more that my colleagues in Congress will help protect children by cosponsoring the Kilah Davenport Child Protection Act.

Until recent changes by the North Carolina legislature, the punishment for someone who caused permanent, severe, mental and physical injury to a child in our State was just 4 to 6 years. Sadly, inadequate, and ambiguous child abuse laws are not unique to North Carolina.

My little friend Kilah was severely abused by her caretaker, who smashed her head against a wall, leaving her with minimal function for the rest of her life. As a father and a grandfather, I was deeply moved by her situation, as I'm sure you are.

Now is the time to find an appropriate response to ensure the safety and the protection of our most precious treasures—America's children. This new legislation focuses on child abusers guilty of the most heinous acts of abuse. Those who destroy a child's future should receive much more than a slap on the wrist.

May God bless Kilah and her family and all whom we seek to protect.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVE KING'S DISGRACEFUL REMARKS

(Mr. SIREs asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the disgraceful remarks recently made by another Member of this body.

My parents brought me to this country at the age of 11. They brought me here for the freedoms, they brought me here for the opportunities, and they never told me to strap 75 pounds of marijuana on my thighs so we can sell it in America.

It is disgraceful that a Member of this body would demean this House and what this country represents when you make remarks like that. I recognize that not all Members of this body feel the same way.

I represent Ellis Island and the Statue of Liberty, two monuments that symbolize the history of America as a Nation of immigrants. So when you make remarks like one of the Members made, it's not only ignorant, but quite frankly stupid, not recognizing the history of this country.

CALLING ATTENTION TO PRISONER OF CONSCIENCE ZHU YUFU

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the plight of Zhu Yufu.

Today, Zhu Yufu has been in prison in China for 520 days. He is a prisoner of conscience, unable to enjoy the fundamental freedoms enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

An advocate for democracy, Christian dissident and poet Zhu Yufu helped found the unrecognized Democracy Party of China. For this, he was arrested for "inciting subversion of state power."

Zhu Yufu cannot speak for himself, so others, including myself, must advocate on his behalf. My own efforts in support of Zhu Yufu are part of a project created by the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission through which Members of Congress can bring attention to the plight of prisoners of conscience.

Through this work, we seek to pierce the darkness and shatter the silence that has enveloped Zhu Yufu and others like him.

Silence is not an option. Silence means Zhu Yufu likely will remain in prison and the Government of China will elude accountability for its deplorable human rights violations.

I call on all people of conscience to raise their voices in support of Zhu Yufu.

WE NEED A NEW AGENDA

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, I was shocked to hear the new standard for productivity, leadership, and good governance set here in the House of Representatives. Rather than looking at the success of the American people, the Speaker of the House said we should be judged by the number of laws we repeal.

This isn't a standard; this is an excuse for failure. Good governance is not measured by the 38 times that we voted to repeal health care. It is measured by the ability to compromise and create substantial solutions to the issues facing this country.

While House Republicans continue to obstruct, repeal, and repeat, 11 million undocumented immigrants remain in the shadows; 7 million students bear the burden of high student loan rates; 16.7 million children risk going to bed hungry; and every single woman in this country makes 77 cents to the dollar made by a man.

I say it is time that we need a new agenda and certainly a new standard for success.

RECOGNIZING HELEN SILLIMAN
AND FLOSSIE BRAGG

(Mr. COLLINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor to recognize the contributions of two great women from New York's 27th Congressional District.

Tonight, Helen Silliman and the late Flossie Bragg will be honored in South Wales for becoming the first female firefighters in Erie County 50 years ago.

It was back in 1963 when Helen and Flossie decided to join the ranks of what was then an all-male department. In doing so, they made history in not only South Wales, but all of Erie County.

As a result, Helen and Flossie became pioneers for women in the fire service in western New York, leading the way for women to join the ranks of volunteer fire companies, which is now commonplace.

Today, it is estimated there are 35- to 40,000 women involved in volunteer fire services across this great country.

I want to thank and acknowledge Helen and Flossie for helping to lead the way.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERS'
"TO DON'T" LIST

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, a new NBC poll says that 83 percent of Americans disapprove of the job Congress is doing. But that shouldn't be surprising when we are not doing any job at all.

House Republican leaders are working off of a "to don't" list: don't pass gun violence legislation that could save lives; don't pass equal pay for women that could boost family incomes; don't help homeowners refinance, which could save families money; don't pass immigration reform that could grow our economy; don't create a national infrastructure bank that could create new jobs; and don't pass a green energy bill that could finally tackle climate change.

It doesn't have to be this way, but when your agenda is to do nothing, it's easy to get nothing done when you operate off of a "to don't" list. Solving problems and reaching compromise may be hard work, but it's the work the American people sent us here to do.

FIGHTING FOR AMERICAN JOBS

(Mr. MCKINLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, later today, the President will once again refocus his efforts on jobs. Well, House Republicans never lost our focus on jobs.

We have a plan to create jobs, grow our economy, and to secure our future for all Americans by expanding opportunity, not expanding government.

Our plan holds government accountable to hardworking taxpayers; our plan reins in runaway government spending; our plan combats waste and abuse in government; our plan promotes an all-of-the-above all-American energy strategy that will create jobs, lower energy costs, and strengthen our national security.

These are commonsense solutions that the American people deserve. It is not fair that Washington liberals keep offering up only more spending and political games. Real solutions to real problems, that's the American commitment.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MUSEUM

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, did you know that last Sunday marked the anniversary of the day in 1917 when 16 women demanded the right to vote in front of the White House? They were sentenced to 60 days in the workhouse for demanding universal suffrage for women.

Did you know that tomorrow is the day when in 1892 Doris Fleischman Bernays was born? She was to become the first married woman to get a pass-

port in her own name and to get her name on her daughter's birth certificate.

Or did you know that the famous Ginger Rogers-Fred Astaire partnership ended in part because she was angry over gender pay standards? She grew tired of being paid half of what her male colleagues were paid in films in which she was starring.

These are the sorts of things that one day visitors will learn about at the National Women's History Museum when it opens its doors—with a goal of educating, inspiring, and empowering women.

After all, American history is her story too. That is why I have introduced with MARSHA BLACKBURN H.R. 863, a bill to create such a museum. Join it and make your mother proud.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVE KING'S
IGNORANT COMMENTS

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, Representative KING's recent comments about children of immigrants are a disgrace to this institution. These comments are unacceptable and just plain wrong on so many levels.

We may not all agree on the best way to fix our Nation's broken immigration system, but we can all agree that it's broken.

Comments like Representative KING's don't do anything to solve problems or bring us closer to a true bipartisan solution on immigration. They only exacerbate the problem of extreme partisanship and inject needless divisiveness into the conversation on how to best reform our immigration system.

This sort of ideologically driven and hateful rhetoric has no place in this institution, and it must stop. It is time for both parties to put down the partisan talking points and make a good faith effort to work together to have a conversation and not a confrontation.

We need to act, and we need to act now. We don't have time for this partisan gamesmanship. We must reduce our deficit by passing this comprehensive immigration reform.

CREATE JOBS AND GROW THE
ECONOMY

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on the floor today we've heard some of our colleagues in the majority, starting with the Speaker of the House, demand the President work with Congress to create jobs and grow the economy. If Republicans were willing to spend time on these issues, that would really be good news.

I think it is necessary for us to have a reality check. In the 6 months of this Congress, with the Republicans in the majority, there has been no jobs bill brought to the floor; there has been no budget bill brought to the floor. The budget is the blueprint for job creation, for deficit reduction, for growing the economy, for creating jobs, for keeping America competitive, for making sure that America is number one.

At the beginning of the year, the Republicans said, we want regular order, we want to pass a budget bill—and we did—and then the Senate will pass a budget that is not a good budget and not a statement of our values, but nonetheless, a bill passed the House. They said, we want regular order, we want the Senate to pass a budget bill before we can proceed with any jobs legislation.

□ 1245

Over 3 months ago—I think nearly 4 months ago—the Senate passed a budget bill—again, a blueprint for job creation, deficit reduction, growth in the economy. The minute the Senate passed the bill, the Republicans said, Never mind.

Never mind? No. It is our business to mind, to mind this Congress to make sure that we create solutions, that we get results, that we are in the business of job creation in the public and private sectors with public and private partnerships. With no budget and with no jobs bill, that cannot happen.

So when the Speaker of the House comes to the floor and makes demands on the President—and the President has made offer, after offer, after offer. He has extended the hand of cooperation so many times that I want to count his fingers to see how intact his hand is because of the reaction from the Republicans. The Republicans' response to the President's offer of cooperation? Nothing.

"Nothing" is our agenda.

Does "nothing" work for you, Mr. President?

Our timetable: "Never."

Does "never" work for you? Because that's the only time that we are going to work together with you to pass a jobs bill.

Previous speakers talked about jobs being created. Why? By giving tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country?

I am so glad that the President is out there today, saying that we are going to build jobs and build our economy from the middle class out. It's really important that the prosperity of our country is enjoyed by many more people and, in fact, is inspired by their ingenuity, by their creativity, by their entrepreneurship; and we have to have policies that incentivize that.

Today, the President will put more ideas on the table to grow our economy. He recognizes—and I think we on

the Democratic side all agree—that the economy best works when it grows from the middle out, not by the trickle down, top down.

Our friends on the Republican side said, Trickle down, what's wrong with that? If it trickles down, it could create jobs. If that happens, that's great. If it doesn't, that's the free market. If it doesn't create jobs, in their words, so be it.

So be it? No, I don't think so.

Our country has come a long way since the depths of the Great Recession, which was caused by these very same trickle-down policies. Tax cuts for the rich, that is the Republican jobs program.

Do you know what is interesting to me? Coming up in September is the 5-year anniversary of the meltdown, of the announcement of the meltdown during the Bush administration. Under the trickle-down policies and the laissez, laissez, laissez, laissez, laissez, laissez-faire attitudes of the Republicans in Congress and in the White House, we were facing a great meltdown of our financial institutions, a great recklessness by some—not all—on Wall Street, causing joblessness on Main Street.

And what's interesting about it is, when we were notified finally—when we asked, what's going on here? and they finally told us what was happening—no less a person than the Chairman of the Fed said, in response to a description given by the Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary Paulson, about the seriousness of the meltdown that was occurring—and this was Thursday night—that we could, by Monday, have no economy.

Have no economy? That is the place that these trickle-down policies—this laissez-faire attitude toward no regulation and no supervision—took us in our economy coming up 5 years ago in September.

That's why it's really important for the President to be out there and for the public to understand, not so that we can create divisions between Democrats and Republicans, but so that we can come together as a people and make the decisions here about a budget that does grow the economy by creating jobs while reducing the deficit at the same time, keeping America number one—that we build the infrastructure of America, that we make it in America by giving incentives for jobs to stay here rather than, as the Republicans suggest, to give tax breaks to businesses that send jobs overseas. Building the infrastructure of America. Make It In America. Have our communities suggest how they would like to grow with the proper education of our children, with the safety of our neighborhoods, with the security of our people.

So, really, it's almost like another universe to listen to the Republicans

talk about the economy when they have had a complete "never, nothing" agenda and timetable for bringing a jobs bill to the floor that really does address the challenges that working families in our country face.

On the positive side, I am very pleased that the President's strategy for growth, of course, which is centered around the middle class, ensures that every American has the opportunity to have a good job that pays enough to support a middle-income life, a strong education that equips our youth for the job market, a home that is not at risk of being taken away as it was 5 years ago, a retirement free of financial anxiety, secure health care with decent benefits, a higher minimum wage.

And when I talk about what happened 5 years ago, what's interesting to me is that the Republicans still have the nerve to be asking the question: Are you better off now than you were 5 years ago?

Five years ago, we weren't going to have an economy by Monday. We weren't going to have an economy by Monday under their policies. The President has led us out of that Great Recession. He did so in the first 2 years with a Democratic Congress that had a recovery package and initiatives to grow the economy. Since then, it has been, again, the "never, nothing" timetable and agenda of the Republicans. How much faster our economy could be growing if the Republicans would cooperate with their ideas and the President's, working together in a bipartisan way to get the job done for the American people.

While I'm at it, I want to put in a word for our agenda for America's women and families.

When women succeed, America succeeds. It's an agenda that recognizes and values the work of women in the workplace by having pay equity, by raising the minimum wage, by rewarding work. It's an agenda that helps women balance home and work by saying—and we will be celebrating the 20-year anniversary of the implementation of family medical leave—that we need some paid sick leave as well and paid maternity leave as well. Third is the need—and a bigger issue that will take a longer time in facing the challenge—for affordable quality child care for all of America's families so that our children can be learning while their parents are earning. An important component of it is the entrepreneurship of women in the workplace. Women's business ownership is the fastest growing rate of small business growth in our country, minority women-owned businesses as well.

So we do believe that our economy will grow, that our families will prosper, that our Nation will continue to be number one to the extent that we invest in the middle class and in those aspiring to it, and that we should place

a special emphasis on women in the workplace, because, again, when American women succeed, America succeeds.

That's how we want to ignite the American Dream—to build ladders of opportunity for all who want to work hard, play by the rules, and take responsibility.

We have work to do. Let's do it instead of living in a world of illusion in which the leadership won't bring a real jobs bill to the floor that can be enacted into law. The Speaker has said that it isn't a measure of success as to how many bills you can enact; it's about how much law you can repeal.

You haven't even succeeded in that. You haven't repealed anything. So let's get to work on the positive side to create jobs. That's the best thing that we can do for the American people, and let's do it soon.

"Never" doesn't work for us.

REVISIONIST HISTORY

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I will be happy to address some of the revisionist history.

If we want to talk about reality testing, how about the fact that, in September of 2008, Democrats had controlled every level of power in the United States Congress for some 20 months, but we didn't hear a peep out of them until Lehman Brothers failed?

And, oh, by the way, who was on watch at the New York Fed when that happened? Timothy Geithner. He was rewarded by becoming President Obama's Treasury Secretary.

For the first 2 years of the Obama administration, it was so anti-employer that no wonder the recovery was, indeed, a jobless recovery and that it has continued in that mode until today.

And don't get me started about the Affordable Care Act. That has been a wet blanket on job creation in this economy. The President knows it, which is why he revised things last week.

And, oh, by the way, if he wants to reach out his hand to us, how about sending people from the agencies to our committees who at least will stop the propensity for prevarication when they will not admit to the fact that they have contingency plans in place for delaying and downsizing the implementation of the Affordable Care Act as they were, in fact, planning that very measure when those people came to the committee and spoke under oath.

WE MUST ACT NOW ON IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. DENHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, first, I would like to extend some thanks to Chairman GOWDY and Ranking Member LOFGREN, not only for giving me the privilege and the honor to speak before their Subcommittee on Immigration yesterday, but as well to have conversations in my district and to have conversations in my State with a number of constituents that are affected by our immigration policy.

This is something we have to act on now. This is something for which we need to make sure we've got a top-to-bottom approach. It is an issue on which Republicans and Democrats can actually come together that is vitally important to our economy and to the greatness of our country: making sure that our border security is actually secure, not only with a fence and greater law enforcement, but by actually redeploying the security technology and surveillance equipment from Afghanistan; making sure that we've got the internal security as we move forward—an E-Verify system—making sure that we can actually verify the jobs within our communities so we can address not only jobs, but the high unemployment in so many areas; making sure that we actually have a temporary worker program so that we can address our agriculture.

Let's make sure that we have a top-to-bottom approach. So I ask that this body address this in a bipartisan fashion.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2218, COAL RESIDUALS REUSE AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1582, EN- ERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 315 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 315

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2218) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of

amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-19. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All

points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1300

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 315 provides for consideration of two pieces of legislation passed by the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The first, H.R. 2218, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act of 2013 introduced by my friend on the committee, Mr. MCKINLEY from West Virginia, passed out of committee with a strong bipartisan vote with 54 bipartisan cosponsors. The second piece of legislation, H.R. 1582, the Energy Consumers Relief Act of 2013, was introduced by my friend Mr. CASSIDY from Louisiana.

The rule before us today provides for 1 hour of general debate on each of the bills included in the rule. A total of nine amendments were made in order between the two bills, six on the Democratic side and three on the Republican side. Further, the minority is afforded the customary motion to recommit, allowing for yet another opportunity to amend each piece of legislation before its final vote.

H.R. 2218, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act of 2013, is a product of hours of work over the course of the past few years that the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) has put in to perfect this legislation. Indeed, the legislation includes numerous provisions offered by Democrats and even reflects input by President Obama's own Environmental Protection Agency.

This legislation was prompted by a move in June of 2010 by the Environ-

mental Protection Agency to regulate coal combustion residuals. In this rule, the Environmental Protection Agency set out three proposals for coal residuals, commonly referred to as coal ash. Coal residuals are often recycled in an environmentally sound fashion and repurposed for use in roads, parks, golf courses, and any other number of safe manners. Unfortunately, many in the industry viewed these proposed Environmental Protection Agency regulations as placing barriers to the continued use or recycling of coal ash.

In response to these concerns, Mr. MCKINLEY's bill would provide for minimum Federal standards but allow States to craft a permitting program that could be tailored to the needs in each individual State. The bill makes clear that it does not provide the Environmental Protection Agency with new rulemaking authority. Further, it requires the Environmental Protection Agency to defer to the States with respect to the regulation of coal ash. This would allow States to protect human health and the environment by adapting an existing solid waste regulatory program for coal ash. To ensure adequate safety measures for human health, the bill requires installation of groundwater monitoring at all structures that receive coal ash.

The second bill included in today's rule has been carefully designed to protect consumers from a runaway Environmental Protection Agency which, in my experience as a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, constantly uses some pretty strange figures and some funny math in depicting the so-called benefits of its rules and rarely fully admits to the full cost of the rules it promulgates.

Since the beginning of President Obama's, Lisa Jackson's, and Gina McCarthy's tenure with the Federal Government, the Environmental Protection Agency has promulgated regulations imposing billions of dollars in costs on our critical power infrastructure. Famously, the Environmental Protection Agency has been so out of control that the President himself was required to intervene and pull the ozone rule in August of 2011, knowing that the cost to the country far outweighed the benefits that the Environmental Protection Agency was claiming.

In response to this out-of-control agency, Dr. CASSIDY has carefully crafted H.R. 1582, the Energy Consumers Relief Act, which would add another measure of protection for consumers legitimately frightened of whether or not they will be able to afford their air-conditioning this summer or their heating this fall, or even to turn on their lights at nighttime.

The bill is straightforward. It requires that, before promulgating a final rule that would impose an aggregate cost of \$1 billion on the American

people, the Environmental Protection Agency must consult with the Secretary of Energy, a Cabinet member who will be working for the very same President as the Administrator at the Environmental Protection Agency. The Energy Secretary must then determine that the rule before him would not cause significant adverse effects to the economy or to electric reliability, as is his job. That's what his mission statement is as the top energy official for our country.

For too long, the Environmental Protection Agency has dictated our energy policy rather than simply our environmental policy. Former Energy Secretary Steven Chu seemed to have no problem passively delegating his job to Lisa Jackson. I suppose he was too busy losing America's money to solar companies. The era of the Environmental Protection Agency dictating energy policy must end, and this bill is a solid step toward that goal.

Mr. Speaker, American consumers are struggling. They watch the cost of food as it rises right before their eyes. They watch the gas prices. Where are they going? Nowhere but up. They watch their electricity bills. They are also going up. There is no relief in sight on the horizon under this President and this administration.

House Republicans have not abandoned their promises to protect consumers from an out-of-control bureaucracy imposing cost after cost on the American people. Today's legislation is yet another few arrows in the quiver to stop the Federal Government from taking more money out of Americans' pockets.

As I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the two underlying bills, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin my remarks by correcting my friend from Texas with reference to his 1-minute statement previous to the time that we began the rule.

As I understood him, he said that for the last 20 months, Democrats have controlled every level of power. Somewhere along the line, I think my friend must be very confused about what the responsibilities of the United States House of Representatives is and are.

That said, my recollection is that in this Congress, which has consumed 6 months, and in the previous one, which took 2 years, that my friends in the Republican Party have controlled the House of Representatives. Unless there is no longer one level of power in Washington, something is misunderstood by me.

Mr. Speaker, the House faces a number of pressing issues that have bipartisan support and that we could be addressing in our limited time before the August recess. For example, we could be reforming in a comprehensive manner our Nation's immigration system. We could be ending the sequester. I have not met a Democrat or a Republican that did not say that the sequester was a bad idea. We could be addressing the doubling of student loan interest rates. We could be having a conference on a farm bill, or we could be appointing—something that I still find very strange—we could be appointing budget conferees.

It used to be that having a conference around this place was a real opportunity for Members, and Members sought to be on the conference. I know my first experience I was fascinated by the fact that I'm on a conference with the other body, the United States Senate. Little did I know that their rules provided for them to vote by proxy, but I came to learn that perhaps it wasn't as important as I thought it was, but it is important to the process.

But for any of these important issues to be addressed, Members would have to work together to resolve their differences. Instead, we're spending our time on two bills that my friends across the aisle know will never become law. I don't have to be a betting person to bet anybody in this institution that what we are discussing here today will not become the law of the land. The reason that I know that is we've already done it four times, this same measure, and it didn't see the light of day in the other body. This one ain't going to either.

These bills today show what I've been saying for quite some time now, and it's that my Republican colleagues really are not manifesting interest in actually fixing our country's problems. In fact, it seems that they're more happy to simply bring Congress to a standstill and call that success.

Mr. Speaker, political victories are not victories for struggling families. In case these bills are not clear enough evidence, my friends recently released their messaging plan for the August work period in our respective districts. That plan is called "Fighting Washington for All Americans." Wow. Despite the irony, I would almost want to call it hypocrisy of sitting Members of Congress trying to paint themselves as outsiders and reformers while ignoring their key role in creating the gridlock. Fighting Washington for All Americans urges Members to consider Washington as a place where nothing good happens, so the less governing that gets done, the better. Yet these two bills today completely contradict those ideas.

H.R. 1582 gives the Department of Energy unprecedented authority to veto Environmental Protection Agency-related regulations. Not only does the

bill prevent the EPA from finalizing critical public health and environmental rules, it instructs the Department of Energy to conduct a duplicative and convoluted analysis without any new resources. These are the people that say bureaucracy is a problem, and yet they're creating additional bureaucracy within the framework of these two measures.

□ 1315

I said yesterday in the Rules Committee I would be astounded at how much time it's going to take the Energy Department and the EPA to coordinate their efforts. Evidently, these people haven't been trying to talk to these bureaucrats the way that I have over the course of time, and it requires, this measure does, extra examination, despite the Office of Management and Budget's interagency review of all regulations, which includes the Department of Energy, in the review of EPA rules.

I did a little research, Mr. Speaker, on how many times over the course of the time that I've been here that Members on the other side have offered measures, that did not become law, to abolish the Department of Energy. Hear me loud and clear: to abolish the Department of Energy.

Now we come today, after that having been done numerous times, we come today and the Energy Department is the answer. These same people wanted to, I guess everything with an "E" that's in the Cabinet, they wanted the Department of EPA to be abolished at one time, the Department of Education. They need to change their acronyms over there or else they'll find themselves abolished, if they don't get past A, B, C, D—E.

Not only does the bill prevent the EPA from finalizing critical public health and environmental rules, it instructs the Department of Energy to do, as I said, duplicative measures.

As for H.R. 2218, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act, the second bill being considered under this rule today, it encourages, in my view, a race to the bottom, where the State willing to have the least protections will become the dumping ground for the entire country.

I said last night that I would be mad today. I tempered myself with my passion over my reflections of my comments in the Rules Committee, but I cannot but return to them when I think of the community that I live in, and have lived in for now coming up on 51 years, where every one of the Superfund Brownfields was in the minority community. Every dump that ever dumped anything in Broward County was in minority communities—treatment waste across the street from where I live, and I guess perhaps these people have not had those experiences.

While there are certainly inefficiencies within the Federal Government—

and they are numerous—the 2008 coal ash spill in Kingston, Tennessee, is evidence that the Environmental Protection Agency has an important role to play in protecting our Nation's public health.

This bill would allow States to undertake permitting programs for the management of coal ash; and let me talk about what's in coal ash. People seem to think that coal ash is all of this great stuff. Coal ash has in it mercury, lead, cadmium, hexavalent chromium, if you can say that. These are things that are poisonous. And yes, it is true that we have managed under the regulations to constrain ourselves with many of these products that have been utilized for benefit, but do not mistake arsenic and cadmium and lead for anything other than harmful products.

The Federal environmental standards that are put forward here do not take into contemplation how important it is to establish uniform protections for our Nation's health and environment.

Let me return to the Kingston, Tennessee, situation. The Tennessee Valley Authority is still paying in excess of \$1 billion, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1.2 billion for taking this stuff and dumping it in Uniontown, Alabama, 100 feet from where people live; and, I suggest, as is the case in the community that I am privileged to serve, where people that are friends of mine have died as a result of not coal ash but dumps being in their communities and incinerators burning it, and it's the same in many respects.

I compliment Florida Power & Light, the largest utility in my State, for destroying their two coal ash plants in Fort Lauderdale, and we still find that Florida Power & Light still manages their business well enough to make handsome profits.

As far as electric rates going up, I would suggest to my friend, it's sort of like health care measures. And I continue to ask everybody, tell me the day, before there was anything called ObamaCare, tell me the day when your insurance rates for health went down. Tell me the day that your utilities went down. I don't recall any period where that happened; and somewhere along the line, we need to address these things in meaningful ways.

Different standards in each State provide an economic incentive to send coal ash to the State with the lowest level of regulation. This bill will not ensure the safe disposal of coal ash or make current law any stronger.

Fighting Washington—that's what you're getting ready to say in August—does not keep our air and water clean. Fighting Washington does not provide the sick with medical treatment. Fighting Washington does not keep Wall Street from preying on the American people. Fighting Washington does not provide student loans for children

who aren't going to be able to return to school this year because of the prohibitive costs.

Fighting Washington does not provide immigration reform in a comprehensive manner. And somewhere along the line we have to understand there are more than 11 million people in this country that are here illegally. And I can point to you people that work right around this Capitol—and a few that are in it—that we rely upon, that we need to straighten this law out about. But we prefer to fight Washington.

Fighting Washington doesn't help the Centers for Disease Control prevent us from having diseases. At Robert E. Lee High School in Fairfax County, one of the best counties for education in this country, they've had a recall of students for tuberculosis, something I thought we had pretty much abolished. But when we can't find the necessary research money and we can't find the necessary provisions—largely because we're fighting Washington—then we're going to have other outbreaks like that that we have to contend with.

Fighting Washington doesn't provide the National Institutes of Health the things to do to provide women's health and male research in order for us to better the health of the United States of America.

Fighting Washington makes for great talking points, and might even make for great fundraising. It might make for a good bumper sticker, but it is far from a serious strategy to actually make this country better. A better title than "Fighting Washington for Americans" would be "Washington Fighting for Americans."

Now this do-nothing Congress, and I've been here 21 years, is giving new meaning to do nothing. And all of this repealing things didn't just start this year. Next week, we'll be back here on the floor talking more repeal. We're going to have something called the REINS Act. We're real good up here at naming things—R-E-I-N-S. We're going to be doing some more repealing.

But in the 112th Congress—I looked back—we had 137 votes to block actions to prevent pollution. We had 55 votes targeted at the Department of Energy. We had 57 votes to defund or repeal clean energy initiatives. We had 47 votes to promote offshore drilling. We had 81 votes targeted at the Department of the Interior. We had 87 votes to undermine protections for public lands and wilderness. We had 53 votes to block actions that address climate change. We had 38 votes to dismantle the Clean Water Act. So 317 repeal votes. I've changed you-all's name. It's no longer the Republicans; it's the "Repealicans." You must be people that just repeal.

And over in the other body, they're "Republustructionists" because their whole objective—and that gets ignored

here when we start talking about who's responsible for what. It gets ignored that the minority in the other body has arcane rules that permit them to block everything, and that's what they've done, everything you haven't blocked or sought to repeal. Here we have been trying to get health care for people, and you-all are voting to repeal health care 39 different times.

I'm tired of voting on that kind of stuff. I want to vote on something that's going to provide some jobs for America. I want to vote on something that's going to help some students have some jobs when they get out of school. I want to vote on something that's going to allow for technology and innovation to catch up with what's going on in the world. I want to make sure that we exact our responsibilities, particularly with reference to education.

I just left a meeting with homeless providers and nonprofits. I want to make sure that there's Meals on Wheels. I want to vote on something to make sure that every child has an equal opportunity for a very good education in this country. I want to vote on something that's going to look 50 years down the road to what America looks like, and not 50 months from now, or not 1 month from now in August when you're going to be fighting Washington.

I'm going to be up here with you in Washington, and we are consummate insiders, and it's ridiculous for you to go home and try to tell somebody you're anything other than that. And you do control one-third of the legislative body. And you do have exacting responsibilities given to you under Article I that you're not exercising. You have the Ways and Means' ability. You have the numbers to undertake to do those things.

So, yeah, I'm mad. And I think many in America are mad, too, with a Congress that's doing nothing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute for a couple of brief responses.

First off, I don't know whether the gentleman misheard or only caught me in midsentence. I was responding to the minority leader's statement about this September is the 4-year anniversary of the crash in the economy, and the preceding 20 months, from September of 2008, in the Congress, all of the levers of power were handled by the Democrats.

Now, on this issue of fighting Washington, good strategy, bad strategy, I can't address that. But I do know what's going on out in this country—people are frightened of Washington. They're not fighting Washington; they are scared. Why are they scared? What are they seeing with the NSA? What do they see with the TSA when they go to the airport? What are they seeing with

the IRS? Nobody likes the IRS to start with, but now people are concerned that their First Amendment rights are going to be trampled by an out-of-control Federal agency. And I have to tell you what, Mr. Speaker, it all devolves back to the administration. Yeah, the Congress has its own problems, but the administration is actually what is driving the frightening of America, not the fighting of America.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule.

For over 33 years, Congress has wrestled unproductively on how to deal with coal ash, which is an unavoidable by-product of burning coal.

The bill before us today provides a resolution, finally, to this issue and avoids kicking the can down the road.

H.R. 2218 has two parts. The first part codifies the previous EPA studies that were conducted in 1993 and 2000 under Bill Clinton, both of them. I have copies of it here. And perhaps those that need to read those reports would understand that in the 1993 and in the 2000 reports, they concluded that coal ash is a nonhazardous material and should be beneficially recycled for use in products such as concrete block, brick, wallboard, and used in our roads and bridges across America.

The second part, unfortunately they're not aware of it yet, but if they'd read the bill, they would find that it has been significantly rewritten since last year. We listened to what people were saying. We listened to the EPA, we listened to the administration, and incorporated those into this bill, so that this second part now provides for all new and existing landfills to be State run, using a Federal law known as RCRA, which in and of itself incorporates the Federal guidelines for protecting "human health and the environment."

Consequently, disposal requirements under H.R. 2218 will require composite liners, dust control, groundwater monitoring, financial assurances, emergency action plans, inspections, and structural stability, just to name a few. In fact, the EPA states that RCRA's primary goals are to:

Protect human health and the environment, to reduce the amount of waste generated, and to ensure that wastes are managed in an environmentally sound manner.

□ 1330

For the first time, there will be a uniform national standard for disposing of coal ash. However, as you just heard, you hear opponents of this legislation state this legislation does not protect human health and the environment. But quite frankly, that's not the case.

H.R. 2218 not only includes nine different references and sections of RCRA

which protect human health and environment, but also incorporates the existing RCRA part 258 regulation.

To use the words of the EPA, "EPA believes that part 258 criteria represents a reasonable balance ensuring the protection of human health and the environment."

The opponents of this measure seem to lack a fundamental understanding, Mr. Speaker. There are jobs at stake here, 316,000 jobs across America. It's really that simple.

A compromise is available. Anyone who opposes this rule will continue to support the status quo. If we do nothing, coal ash, which is generated every day in 48 of the 50 States, will continue to be disposed of. The status the way it's been since the 1950s and '60s and the unwarranted stigma that's associated with recycled materials will continue.

Fortunately, finally, today, after listening and compromising and working together, there appears to be an emerging consensus to allow for the beneficial recycle of coal ash, and the concerns raised by a previous Congress have been addressed.

Mr. Speaker, after 33 years of fussing with this issue, it's time to put it to rest.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

And would the Speaker be kind enough to tell both sides how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Several of our colleagues, including the previous speaker, are suggesting that this bill is better than previous versions. But this is actually the worst version yet from a public health and environmental perspective.

All you have to do is look at the Statement of Administration Policy to see how this bill has gotten worse. The administration is concerned that there's no clear and appropriate authority for taking corrective action on unlimited or leaking impoundments or units.

Unlike H.R. 2273, from the last Congress, this says that an unlined impoundment that is found to be contaminating groundwater only has to close after alternative disposal capacity is available at the same site. Well, many of these facilities don't have the space for additional capacity at the same site. That means that the pollution can go on for years, or even indefinitely.

This bill is the worst version of coal ash legislation yet. That's why all the environmental groups oppose this legislation. They even sent a letter to the

House today that states, "This bill is more dangerous to human health and environment than previous versions of this legislation."

Mr. Speaker, I'm very sad today. One of my college classmates is being funeralized, or has been funeralized as we are speaking. Her funeral was at 11 o'clock. She lives in a community called Golden Heights. In Golden Heights, in a 2-square mile radius from a dump that dumped into that community for a considerable period of time, the incidence of cancer of dear friends of mine, male and female, is inordinately high by comparison to any other place in the State of Florida.

Something is wrong with the picture of continuing to pollute and to not be mindful of who are the victims of that pollution.

Mr. Speaker, I make the distinction that I was not talking about coal ash, and I'm glad I don't live near one of those places where they are dumping like in Uniontown, Alabama.

If we defeat the previous question, I'm going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 2070, Representative TIM BISHOP's bill to protect consumers from price gouging at the gas pump.

To discuss his bill, I would like now to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), my friend.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule, and urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that the House can consider pro-consumer, job-protecting legislation, the Federal Price Gouging Prevention Act, which would deter the sale of gasoline at excessive prices.

I introduced this legislation so that my constituents and Long Island businesses are not harmed by unscrupulous business practices designed solely to increase profit margins.

My constituents are facing rising prices at nearly every turn, on top of stagnated wage growth. They're worried about paying for college, paying the mortgage, saving for retirement, or just paying for groceries. They're also wondering what Congress is doing for them to create jobs and to raise their standard of living.

AAA estimates gas prices are expected to increase as the summer continues. In fact, AAA reports that the average price per gallon is up to \$4 on Long Island from \$3.87 a week ago. This comes as Americans are heading to Long Island's beaches, historic villages, and open spaces. Excessive gas prices will cost Long Island businesses and jobs, and that's something that we cannot let happen on Long Island or anywhere else in this country.

The east coast is also in the midst of hurricane season, which can bring out the unscrupulous who would take advantage of hardworking families, as we

witnessed in the aftermath of Sandy. In fact, just this week a New York State judge fined one Long Island gas station, and two others have reached settlements with the New York Attorney General's Office for price gouging.

This Congress should protect those harmed by natural disasters so they don't have to worry about price gouging while they rebuild their homes, communities, businesses, and livelihoods. Let's do it now before the next crisis erupts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, support consumers and jobs, and support the Federal Price Gouging Prevention Act.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself 30 seconds for response, pending which I'm going to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from West Virginia.

In the brief 7 months that I have spent on the Rules Committee in this Congress, there's only one time where the administration has not issued a veto threat to legislation we were considering under the Rules Committee. This is H.R. 2218, Mr. MCKINLEY's bill. They voiced problems, but they did not issue a veto threat. That is a red letter day in this institution.

Every other piece of legislation that's come to the floor has done so under a threat of a veto by the administration.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and the two underlying energy bills that the House will consider today. I'm a proud cosponsor of both of these bills because they will protect West Virginia jobs and prevent increases in electricity costs for many of those millions of folks across this country that cannot afford it.

My colleague, Mr. MCKINLEY, has worked tirelessly to see that H.R. 2218 has met the demands and answered the questions.

And to my colleague from Florida, when he stated that he's glad he doesn't live in these areas, guess what? We do. So it's exceedingly important to us that we do this the right way. And that's why I'm supporting the framework for state regulation that will ensure that coal ash will be used productively.

I visited the Sutton Dam in my district for its 50-year anniversary. And I can tell you, I was there when it was built, and I was there 50 years later. As they were describing the Sutton Dam and how successful it's been—and it's still a fortress of strength, holding the water back—they started talking about the construction materials used 50 years ago.

And guess what?

Coal ash was one of those construction materials that was used to strengthen this dam, and to also have it stand the test of time.

So, I think the regulatory uncertainty that's been around for years about what to do about coal ash has really cut the use of coal ash by millions of tons. But also, wouldn't we rather be recycling and reusing this in a productive measure, rather than increasing the impoundments and increasing any kind of risk to the environment?

This bill just makes perfect sense.

And the second bill addresses the growing number of billion-dollar EPA rules. In my view, billion-dollar EPA rules have two major costs: costs of jobs, and the cost to seniors and those on fixed incomes and the folks who are trying to heat their homes or cool their homes to be able to meet the high cost of electricity. So these make great sense to me.

I'm very proud of my colleague from West Virginia for bringing this to the floor for the fifth time, and it will pass again.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The previous speaker is a person that, there are few in Congress that I have greater respect for. I certainly understand the dynamics of living in communities. In my judgment, she's absolutely correct that what we should be doing is everything we can to constructively make sure that we are about the business of ensuring the health of the communities that we live in.

So, to that degree, while I stand by my position that I'm glad I don't live next to these facilities, unfortunately, I live close to, and have for some time, facilities that have been harmful that claimed that they were protecting the health and the environment of people.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Rules Committee, my friend from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) said something that I would like to correct. He'll be down here, I'm sure, later today or whenever this measure comes up. He noted that the Environmental Protection Agency testified "that they do not oppose" this coal ash bill.

I want to make sure that everyone knows that the Environmental Protection Agency said that because they are not permitted to take a position on legislation, only the administration is allowed to say they support or oppose legislation. And in the administration position last night, they did not say that they don't support the coal ash bill, nor was it a veto threat.

I would urge my colleague from Texas to point me to the time that Barack Obama has vetoed something.

One of the things, I've been on that committee—he's been there 7 months. I've been there years, and I've been there with other Presidents, and it is not uncommon for Congress to propose and to have the administration oppose and vice versa.

Mr. Speaker, both of these bills before us today are so tilted toward commercial operations that they reflect a warped sense of what is important to the people in this great country of ours. These bills undermine environmental laws that have been proven to protect communities and provide for the development of energy to run America.

While we need to develop laws that promote energy and commerce, snide commentary regarding failed policies at the Department of Energy ignores the number of successes through the years under different administrations and this one that the Department of Energy has put forward.

We cannot, in many respects, develop laws that promote energy and commerce and ignore the consequences of those activities. Pollution is not equivalent to progress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying bills, and I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment to the rule in the RECORD, along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and to stop being "Repealicans" and be about the business of trying to do something constructive in this House of Representatives.

I would ask them to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we all know, in order for this economy to flourish, energy has to be available and energy has to be affordable. Unfortunately, the situation we've seen in recent years is anything but that.

The Department of Energy was created back in the 1970s in response to the Arab oil embargo. The Department of Energy was created to deal with the situation of scarcity.

□ 1345

Unfortunately, the Department of Energy has not evolved since that time. And where do we find ourselves today? We find ourselves right on the threshold, right on the horizon of America being an energy exporter, again, for the first time in a couple of decades. That's a huge change.

Has the Department of Energy changed and kept pace with the reality that is going on in development of energy in State lands, private lands, and, yes, some Federal lands? Have they kept pace with the development within the industry? I submit they have not. I submit that they have been an impediment.

Yes, I'd be happy to work on improving where the Department of Energy could be, in fact, a facilitator rather than an obstruction for developing energy for our economy. Because we know without available and affordable energy, the promise that the economy can create the number of jobs that it needs to create—not just to replace those jobs that have been lost, but all of those people who are getting to the age where they expect a job to be there for them—and without that energy production, it's not going to happen.

Now, I do want to talk about the other bill that's before us today, Dr. CASSIDY's bill, H.R. 1582. Let's think about this for a minute. The Congress works its will on a bill. It becomes law. That law then goes to the regulatory agency. They work their will on the bill. And we all know the story. A thousand-page bill here on the floor of the House can generate 10,000 pages of regulation in the Federal Register.

I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but it's hard to discipline myself to wake up every morning and read what was written in the Federal Register the day before. The American people who are out there creating and producing certainly don't have time to do that.

But when these rules are then visited upon the people, what happens then? Well, they just simply have to accept the effect of those rules. Congress did that a couple of years ago. They are not playing in that arena any longer.

Here's what Dr. CASSIDY says. He says that before promulgating a final rule that would impose an aggregate cost of \$1 billion on the American people, the Administrator of the EPA has to consult with the Secretary of Energy. This seems like a logical and straightforward maneuver. In fact, we will talk about the REINS Act in the weeks to come. And they have to come back to Congress and get us to either say "yes" or "no" on that regulation that is going to have such a profound effect on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I've been in business before. I've made investments before. I know very well if someone comes to investors with a cash call and says you're going to have to pony up a lot more money here, the very least that the investor expects at that point is a pro forma, a profit and loss sheet, or some reasonable expectation that there can be a return on investment.

You say, Wait a minute, nobody's coming to the American people with a cash call. Well, it's called April 15. And it is a cash call. And we owe them that scrutiny. The Congress owes them that scrutiny; the Department of Energy owes them that scrutiny. I would assert we owe them an up-or-down vote on those regulations that are going to have such a profound effect on the economy.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of two critical

bills ensuring that the American people are not further penalized by out-of-control policies coming out of the Environmental Protection Agency. Consumers need relief, it is clear.

For that reason, I urge an “aye” vote on the previous question, an “aye” vote on the rule, and an “aye” vote on the two underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 315 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2070) to protect consumers from price-gouging of gasoline and other fuels, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2070.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against Ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition.

Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 191, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 399]

YEAS—224

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei

Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Barton

Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)

Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper

Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts

Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—191

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene

Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch

NOT VOTING—18

Barletta
Bustos
Campbell
Cárdenas
Carter
Coble

Cohen
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Pallone

Rokita
Rush
Schock
Sewell (AL)
Speier
Whitfield

□ 1413

Messrs. MCINTYRE and LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MENG, and Mr. GARAMENDI changed their votes from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GRAVES of Missouri and CULBERSON changed their votes from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote 399, if present, I would have voted “no.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 188, not voting 13, as follows:

Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barber
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger

[Roll No. 400]

AYES—232

Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce

NOES—188

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)

Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu

Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee

NOT VOTING—13

Barletta
Bustos
Campbell
Coble
Grimm

Herrera Beutler
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Owens
Pallone

Rokita
Simpson
Tipton

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1422

Mr. LOEB SACK changed his vote from “present” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT). Pursuant to House Resolution 312 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2397.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1425

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 23, 2013, amendment No. 66 printed in House Report 113-170 offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on amendments printed in House Report 113-170 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 48 by Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 51 by Mr. LAMALFA of California.

Amendment No. 55 by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 60 by Mr. STOCKMAN of Texas.

Amendment No. 62 by Mrs. WALORSKI of Indiana.

Amendment No. 65 by Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for each electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. JONES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 246, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 401]

AYES—177

Alexander	Broun (GA)	Cleaver
Amash	Buchanan	Coffman
Amodel	Burgess	Cohen
Bass	Camp	Cole
Becerra	Capuano	Collins (GA)
Bilirakis	Cassidy	Conyers
Bishop (NY)	Chabot	Courtney
Blumenauer	Chaffetz	Cummings
Bonamici	Chu	Daines
Boustany	Cicilline	Davis (CA)
Brady (PA)	Clarke	DeFazio
Braley (IA)	Clay	DeGette

DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Radel
DesJarlais	Lewis	Rangel
Dingell	Lipinski	Ribble
Doggett	Loeb	Rohrabacher
Doyle	Loeb	Ross
Duffy	Loeb	Roybal-Allard
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Rush
Edwards	Lummis	Ryan (WI)
Ellison	Lynch	Salmon
Eshoo	Maffei	Sánchez, Linda T.
Esty	Massie	Sanchez, Loretta
Farenthold	Matsui	Sanford
Farr	McClintock	Sarbanes
Gabbard	McDermott	Scalise
Garamendi	McGovern	Schakowsky
Garrett	McIntyre	Schrader
Gibbs	McKinley	Scott (VA)
Gibson	Meadows	Sensenbrenner
Gohmert	Meng	Serrano
Gosar	Messer	Sessions
Graves (GA)	Mica	Sherman
Grayson	Michaud	Shimkus
Green, Gene	Miller (MI)	Sinema
Griffith (VA)	Miller, George	Sires
Grijalva	Moore	Slaughter
Gutiérrez	Mulvaney	Smith (NJ)
Hahn	Nadler	Speier
Hall	Napolitano	Stockman
Hanna	Neal	Stutzman
Harris	Negrete McLeod	Thompson (CA)
Hensarling	Neugebauer	Tierney
Higgins	Nolan	Tonko
Himes	Nugent	Tsongas
Hinojosa	O'Rourke	Upton
Holt	Pastor (AZ)	Walden
Honda	Paulsen	Walz
Huelskamp	Payne	Waters
Hultgren	Perry	Waxman
Johnson (OH)	Peterson	Welch
Johnson, E. B.	Petri	Westmoreland
Jones	Pitts	Yarmuth
Jordan	Pocan	Yoder
Keating	Poe (TX)	Yoho
Kennedy	Polis	Young (AK)
Kirkpatrick	Posey	
Kuster	Price (GA)	
Labrador	Quigley	
Larson (CT)		

NOES—246

Aderholt	Crawford	Hanabusa
Andrews	Crenshaw	Harper
Bachmann	Crowley	Hartzler
Bachus	Cuellar	Hastings (FL)
Barber	Culberson	Hastings (WA)
Barr	Davis, Danny	Heck (NV)
Barrow (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Heck (WA)
Barton	Delaney	Holding
Beatty	DeBene	Hoyer
Benish	Denham	Hudson
Bentivolio	Dent	Huffman
Bera (CA)	DeSantis	Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (GA)	Deutch	Hunter
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Hurt
Black	Duckworth	Israel
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Issa
Bonner	Ellmers	Jackson Lee
Brady (TX)	Engel	Jeffries
Bridenstine	Enyart	Jenkins
Brooks (AL)	Fattah	Johnson (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Fincher	Johnson, Sam
Brown (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Joyce
Brownley (CA)	Fleischmann	Kaptur
Bucshon	Fleming	Kelly (IL)
Butterfield	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Calvert	Forbes	Kildee
Cantor	Fortenberry	Kilmer
Capito	Foster	Kind
Capps	Fox	King (IA)
Cárdenas	Frankel (FL)	King (NY)
Carney	Franks (AZ)	Kingston
Carson (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Kinzing (IL)
Carter	Fudge	Kline
Cartwright	Galleo	LaMalfa
Castor (FL)	Garcia	Lamborn
Castro (TX)	Gardner	Lance
Clyburn	Gerlach	Langevin
Collins (NY)	Gingrey (GA)	Lankford
Conaway	Goodlatte	Larsen (WA)
Connolly	Gowdy	Latham
Cook	Granger	Latta
Cooper	Graves (MO)	Levin
Costa	Green, Al	LoBiondo
Cotton	Griffin (AR)	Long
Cramer	Guthrie	Lowey

Luetkemeyer	Pittenger	Stewart
Lujan Grisham	Pompeo	Stivers
(NM)	Price (NC)	Swalwell (CA)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rahall	Takano
(NM)	Reed	Terry
Maloney,	Reichert	Thompson (MS)
Carolyn	Renacci	Thompson (PA)
Maloney, Sean	Rice (SC)	Thornberry
Marchant	Richmond	Tiberi
Marino	Rigell	Tipton
Matheson	Roby	Titus
McCarthy (CA)	Roe (TN)	Turner
McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Valadao
McCollum	Rogers (KY)	Van Hollen
McHenry	Rogers (MI)	Vargas
McKeon	Rooney	Veasey
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Vela
Rodgers	Roskam	Velázquez
McNerney	Rothfus	Visclosky
Meehan	Royce	Wagner
Meeks	Ruiz	Walberg
Miller (FL)	Runyan	Walorski
Miller, Gary	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Moran	Ryan (OH)	Schultz
Mullin	Schiff	Watt
Murphy (FL)	Schneider	Weber (TX)
Murphy (PA)	Schock	Webster (FL)
Noem	Schwartz	Wenstrup
Nunes	Schweikert	Whitfield
Nunnelee	Scott, Austin	Williams
Olson	Scott, David	Wilson (FL)
Owens	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (SC)
Palazzo	Shea-Porter	Wittman
Pascarella	Shuster	Wolf
Pearce	Simpson	Womack
Pelosi	Smith (MO)	Woodall
Perlmutter	Smith (NE)	Young (FL)
Peters (CA)	Smith (TX)	Young (IN)
Peters (MI)	Smith (WA)	

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta	Grimm	Pallone
Bustos	Herrera Beutler	Rokita
Campbell	Horsford	
Coble	McCarthy (NY)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1429

Mr. LAMALFA changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 188, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

AYES—235

Aderholt	Barrow (GA)	Blackburn
Alexander	Barton	Bonner
Amodel	Benish	Boustany
Bachmann	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Bridenstine
Barr	Black	Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson

Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)

NOES—188

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas

Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster

Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren

Barletta
Bustos
Campbell
Coble

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1433

Ms. DUCKWORTH changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 206, not voting 12, as follows:

Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger

NOT VOTING—10

Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)

Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

[Roll No. 403]

AYES—215

Amash
Andrews
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Garrett
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Grayson
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)

NOES—206

Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Cole
Collins (NY)

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth

Ellmers Long Roskam
 Farenthold Lucas Ross
 Fattah Luetkemeyer Rothfus
 Fincher Maloney, Sean Royce
 Fitzpatrick Marchant Ruiz
 Fleischmann Marino Runyan
 Fleming McCarthy (CA) Ryan (WI)
 Flores McCaul Salmon
 Forbes McHenry Schock
 Fortenberry McIntyre Schweikert
 Foxx McKeon Scott, Austin
 Franks (AZ) McKinley Sessions
 Frelinghuysen McMorris Shimkus
 Gabbard Rodgers Shuster
 Gallego Meadows Simpson
 Gardner Meehan Smith (MO)
 Gerlach Messer Smith (NE)
 Gibbs Miller (FL) Smith (NJ)
 Gibson Miller (MI) Smith (TX)
 Gingrey (GA) Miller, Gary Stewart
 Granger Mullin Stivers
 Graves (GA) Murphy (PA) Stockman
 Graves (MO) Neugebauer Takano
 Griffin (AR) Noem Terry
 Guthrie Nugent Thompson (PA)
 Hall Nunes Thornberry
 Hanna Nunnelee Tiberi
 Harper Olson Tipton
 Hartzler Owens Titus
 Hastings (WA) Palazzo Turner
 Heck (NV) Pastor (AZ) Upton
 Hensarling Paulsen Valadao
 Holding Pearce Vargas
 Hudson Perry Vela
 Hultgren Pittenger Visclosky
 Hunter Pitts Wagner
 Hurt Pompeo Walberg
 Jenkins Posey Walden
 Johnson (OH) Price (GA) Walorski
 Johnson, Sam Rahall Weber (TX)
 Joyce Reed Webster (FL)
 Kelly (PA) Reichert Wenstrup
 King (IA) Renacci Whitfield
 King (NY) Ribble Williams
 Kingston Rice (SC) Wilson (SC)
 Kinzinger (IL) Rigell Wittman
 Kline Roby Wolf
 LaMalfa Roe (TN) Womack
 Lamborn Rogers (AL) Yoder
 Lankford Rogers (KY) Yoho
 Latham Rogers (MI) Young (AK)
 Latta Rooney Young (FL)
 LoBiondo Ros-Lehtinen Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta Gohmert McCarthy (NY)
 Bustos Grimm Pallone
 Campbell Herrera Beutler Rokita
 Coble Horsford Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1438

Messrs. GRAVES of Georgia and POSEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. STOCKMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STOCKMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 137, noes 286, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]

AYES—137

Aderholt Gohmert Mica
 Amodei Goodlatte Mullin
 Bachmann Gowdy Neugebauer
 Barber Graves (GA) Palazzo
 Barr Graves (MO) Pearce
 Barrow (GA) Griffin (AR) Pitts
 Barton Griffith (VA) Posey
 Bentivolio Guthrie Price (GA)
 Bilirakis Hall
 Bishop (UT) Harris
 Black Holding Renacci
 Bridenstine Hudson Rice (SC)
 Brooks (IN) Huelskamp Roe (TN)
 Broun (GA) Huizenga (MI) Rooney
 Bucshon Hultgren Thorn-Lehtinen
 Burgess Hunter Ross
 Capito Hurt Rothfus
 Chabot Issa Royce
 Coffman Jenkins Ryan (WI)
 Collins (NY) Johnson (OH)
 Crawford Jones
 Culberson Jordan
 Daines Kelly (PA)
 Davis, Danny King (IA)
 Davis, Rodney Kingston
 DeFazio Kirkpatrick Shuster
 Dent Labrador Sinema
 DeSantis Latta Smith (MO)
 DesJarlais Lipinski Smith (NE)
 Diaz-Balart LoBiondo Smith (NJ)
 Duncan (SC) Luetkemeyer Southerland
 Duncan (TN) Maffei Stewart
 Farenthold Marchant Stockman
 Fincher Marino Stutzman
 Fitzpatrick Massie Thompson (PA)
 Fleischmann Matheson Tiberi
 Fleming McCaul Tipton
 Flores McClintock Wagner
 Foster McGovern Weber (TX)
 Franks (AZ) McHenry Webster (FL)
 Gardner McIntyre Westmoreland
 Garrett McKinley Williams
 Gerlach McMorris Wolf
 Gibbs Rodgers Yoder
 Gibson Meadows Yoho
 Gingrey (GA) Messer Young (AK)

NOES—286

Alexander Clarke Fattah
 Amash Clay Forbes
 Andrews Cleaver Fortenberry
 Bachus Clyburn Foxx
 Bass Cohen Frankel (FL)
 Beatty Cole Frelinghuysen
 Becerra Collins (GA) Fudge
 Benishek Conaway Gabbard
 Bera (CA) Connolly Gallego
 Bishop (GA) Conyers Garamendi
 Bishop (NY) Cook Garcia
 Blackburn Cooper Gosar
 Blumenauer Costa Granger
 Bonamici Cotton Grayson
 Bonner Courtney Green, Al
 Boustany Cramer Green, Gene
 Brady (PA) Crenshaw Grijalva
 Brady (TX) Crowley Gutiérrez
 Braley (IA) Cuellar Hahn
 Brooks (AL) Cummings Hanabusa
 Brown (FL) Davis (CA) Hanna
 Brownley (CA) DeGette Harper
 Buchanan Delaney Hartzler
 Butterfield DeLauro Hastings (FL)
 Calvert DelBene Hastings (WA)
 Camp Denham Heck (NV)
 Cantor Deutch Heck (WA)
 Capps Dingell Hensarling
 Capuano Doggett Higgins
 Cárdenas Doyle Himes
 Carney Duckworth Hinojosa
 Carson (IN) Duffy Holt
 Carter Edwards Honda
 Cartwright Ellison Hoyer
 Cassidy Ellmers Huffman
 Castor (FL) Engel Israel
 Castro (TX) Enyart Jackson Lee
 Chaffetz Eshoo Jeffries
 Chu Esty Johnson (GA)
 Cicilline Farr Johnson, E. B.

Johnson, Sam
 Joyce Nadler
 Kaptur Napolitano
 Keating Neal
 Kelly (IL) Negrete McLeod
 Kennedy Noem
 Kildee Nolan
 Kilmer Nugent
 Kind Nunes
 King (NY) Nunnelee
 Kinzinger (IL) O'Rourke
 Kline Olson
 Kuster Owens
 LaMalfa Pascrell
 Lamborn Pastor (AZ)
 Lance Paulsen
 Langevin Payne
 Lankford Pelosi
 Larsen (WA) Perlmutter
 Larson (CT) Perry
 Latham Peters (CA)
 Lee (CA) Peters (MI)
 Levin Peterson
 Lewis Petri
 Loeb sack Pingree (ME)
 Lofgren Pittenger
 Long Pocan
 Lowenthal Polis
 Lowey Pompeo
 Lucas Price (NC)
 Lujan Grisham Quigley
 (NM) Radel
 Lujan, Ben Ray Rahall
 (NM) Rangel
 Lummis Reichert
 Lynch Ribble
 Maloney, Richmond
 Carolyn Rigell
 Maloney, Sean Roby
 Matsui Rogers (AL)
 McCarthy (CA) Rogers (KY)
 McCollum Rogers (MI)
 McDermott Roskam
 McKeon Roybal-Allard
 McNerney Ruiz
 Meehan Runyan
 Meeks Ruppertsberger
 Meng Rush
 Michaud Ryan (OH)
 Miller (FL) Salmon
 Miller (MI) Sánchez, Linda
 Miller, Gary T.
 Miller, George Sanchez, Loretta
 Moore Sanford
 Moran Sarbanes
 Mulvaney Schakowsky
 Murphy (FL) Schiff Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta Grimm Pallone
 Bustos Herrera Beutler Rokita
 Campbell Horsford
 Coble McCarthy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1443

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 185, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

AYES—238

Aderholt	Griffith (VA)	Petri
Alexander	Guthrie	Pittenger
Amodi	Hall	Pitts
Bachmann	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Bachus	Harper	Pompeo
Barber	Harris	Posey
Barr	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Radel
Barton	Hensarling	Reed
Benishek	Holding	Reichert
Bentivolio	Hudson	Renacci
Billirakis	Huelskamp	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Black	Hultgren	Rigell
Blackburn	Hunter	Roby
Bonner	Hurt	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Jones	Rooney
Brown (GA)	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Joyce	Roskam
Bucshon	Keating	Ross
Burgess	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus
Calvert	King (IA)	Royce
Camp	King (NY)	Ruiz
Cantor	Kingston	Runyan
Capito	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kirkpatrick	Salmon
Cassidy	Kline	Sanford
Chabot	Labrador	Scalise
Chaffetz	LaMalfa	Schock
Coffman	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cole	Lance	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Latham	Sessions
Conaway	Latta	Shimkus
Cook	Lipinski	Shuster
Cotton	LoBiondo	Simpson
Cramer	Long	Sinema
Crawford	Lucas	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Maloney, Sean	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Southerland
Denham	Marino	Stewart
Dent	Matheson	Stivers
DeSantis	McCarthy (CA)	Stockman
DesJarlais	McCaul	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	McClintock	Takano
Duffy	McHenry	Terry
Duncan (SC)	McIntyre	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Thornberry
Ellmers	McKinley	Tiberi
Farenthold	McMorris	Tipton
Fincher	Rodgers	Turner
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Upton
Fleischmann	Meehan	Valadao
Fleming	Messer	Wagner
Flores	Mica	Walberg
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Walden
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Walorski
Fox	Miller, Gary	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Wenstrup
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Westmoreland
Garrett	Neugebauer	Whitfield
Gerlach	Noem	Williams
Gibbs	Nugent	Wilson (SC)
Gibson	Nunes	Wittman
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Wolf
Gohmert	Olson	Womack
Goodlatte	Owens	Woodall
Gosar	Palazzo	Yoder
Gowdy	Paulsen	Yoho
Granger	Pearce	Young (AK)
Graves (GA)	Perry	Young (FL)
Graves (MO)	Peters (MI)	Young (IN)
Griffin (AR)	Peterson	

NOES—185

Amash	Bass	Becerra
Andrews	Beatty	Bera (CA)

Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Bishop (NY)	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Payne
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Braley (IA)	Heck (NV)	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Peters (CA)
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Pingree (ME)
Butterfield	Himes	Pocan
Capps	Hinojosa	Polis
Capuano	Holt	Price (NC)
Cárdenas	Honda	Quigley
Carney	Hoyer	Rahall
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Rangel
Cartwright	Israel	Richmond
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Clarke	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kelly (IL)	T.
Cleaver	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Connolly	Kind	Schiff
Conyers	Kuster	Schneider
Cooper	Langevin	Schrader
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Cuellar	Levin	Serrano
Cummings	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Sherman
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Sires
DeGette	Lowe	Slaughter
Delaney	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	(NM)	Speier
DeBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Deutsch	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Maffei	Tierney
Doyle	Maloney,	Titus
Duckworth	Carolyn	Tonko
Edwards	Massie	Tsongas
Ellison	Matsui	Van Hollen
Engel	McCollum	Vargas
Enyart	McDermott	Veasey
Eshoo	McGovern	Vela
Esty	McNerney	Velázquez
Farr	Meeks	Visclosky
Fattah	Meng	Walz
Foster	Michaud	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Schultz
Fudge	Moore	Waters
Gabbard	Moran	Watt
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Waxman
Garamendi	Nadler	Welch
Garcia	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Neal	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Negrete McLeod	
Green, Gene	Nolan	

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta	Grimm	Pallone
Bustos	Herrera Beutler	Rokita
Campbell	Horsford	
Coble	McCarthy (NY)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1447

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chair, on rollcall vote No. 405, I inadvertently voted "aye." I intended to vote "no."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DENT was allowed to speak out of order.)

WASHINGTON KASTLES CHARITY CLASSIC

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, do you see this trophy before us? We've been on this House floor many times to celebrate baseball victories, football victories, or, I should say, baseball debacles in our case. But we celebrate a lot of things, also golf.

I want to point out that we had a wonderful experience last week, Thursday night, with the Washington Kastles, who are seated up in the Members' gallery. We had a wonderful bipartisan game of tennis between, obviously, the Members, Republican and Democrat intermixed, as well as members of the media.

I'm pleased to report to you that there were two teams, the Stars and the Stripes. My colleagues here, Mr. WATT, Ms. EDWARDS, and SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, were on the Stripes, and I'll introduce the Stars team in a moment. Mr. BISHOP will do that. We had a wonderful game.

We should also let you know, too, that members of the media played. I should let you know that part of Stripes' team included David Gregory of "Meet the Press." He's a bigger problem on the tennis court than he is in an interview on "Meet the Press." I also want you to know he's got a big serve. You've got to watch him. Our coach was Leander Paes, who's seated in the gallery, a professional. Our team also included former Senator John Breaux; SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, a Division I player from Duke. Did I say, "Go Lehigh"? That's basketball. Sorry. There was also Peter Cook from Bloomberg; myself; DONNA EDWARDS, who received the Good Sportsmanship Award; MEL WATT, who I must say was one of the most feisty players I've seen; Mark Ein, the owner of the Washington Kastles, who's also here; David Gregory; Jonathan Karl from ABC News; and Hans Nichols from Bloomberg—a very competitive individual, I might add. It was a great time had by all.

I know it's never appropriate to gloat when you win, but we'll do it anyway since we're Members of Congress. Here's our trophy. Stripes beat the Stars.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Thank you very much. I appreciate my friend for yielding, although I must point out I don't remember Coach DOYLE gloating like that when we won the baseball game.

We had a great night, and I was pleased to play with my fellow Members: JIM COSTA, MIKE MCINTYRE, and CHERI BUSTOS. We had two members of the press from Fox News: Ed Henry and Bret Baier. We had two people from the White House: Gene Sperling and Alan Krueger. We had Ben Olsen from D.C. United. We had Ambassador Dino Djalal, and we were joined by three members of the Kastles: Murphy Jensen, Martina Hingis, and Anastasia Rodionova.

Mr. DENT. Now I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Thank you very much.

I, too, want to thank my colleagues who participated with the Stars and Stripes. Fun was had by all. We raised

a good amount of money for charity. I want to thank the Kastles for their wonderful hospitality. I got a tennis lesson from my partner, Martina Hingis.

But I do have, from a reliable source, that the Stripes, our opposition, pulled in two ringers from the Main Street media with NBC's David Gregory and Bloomberg's Hans Nichols. These two failed to disclose their professional tennis status in an amateur charitable tournament. So much for press ethics under full disclosure.

Mr. DENT. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE).

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, when you talk about helping with education, when you talk about helping food banks, and when you talk about helping our military families, it really was worth raising a racket about. That's what happened down at the Kastle stadium. We want to thank them for their hospitality.

Tennis is a lifetime sport, but this offers a lifeline to those in need in our schools, those who are hungry, and also to our military families. We appreciate the great opportunity. It truly was a great time to have the ball in our court to do something in a positive way.

Mr. DENT. Reclaiming my time, I just wanted to say, in conclusion, it was a wonderful cause. Many charities were supported.

I should also let you know the Washington Kastles are playing tonight down at the waterfront. Get down there and watch them. It's not tennis anyone; it's tennis everyone. So get out there and do it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair reminds Members that the rules do not allow references to occupants of the gallery.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 264, noes 154, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

AYES—264

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Pelosi
Alexander	Green, Al	Perry
Andrews	Griffith (VA)	Peters (CA)
Bachmann	Guthrie	Peterson
Barr	Hahn	Petri
Barton	Hall	Pingree (ME)
Bass	Hanabusa	Pocan
Beatty	Harper	Poe (TX)
Becerra	Harris	Posey
Bera (CA)	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Hastings (FL)	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Quigley
Blackburn	Heck (WA)	Rahall
Blumenauer	Hensarling	Rangel
Bonamici	Higgins	Reichert
Bonner	Himes	Richmond
Boustany	Hinojosa	Roe (TN)
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Huffman	Rooney
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (FL)	Israel	Ross
Brownley (CA)	Issa	Roybal-Allard
Bucshon	Jackson Lee	Ruiz
Burgess	Jeffries	Runyan
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Calvert	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Camp	Jones	Salmon
Capito	Jordan	Sánchez, Linda
Capps	Kaptur	T.
Capuano	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Cárdenas	Kennedy	Sanford
Carney	Kildee	Sarbanes
Carter	Kilmer	Scalise
Cartwright	Kind	Schakowsky
Cassidy	Kuster	Schiff
Castor (FL)	Labrador	Schneider
Castro (TX)	LaMalfa	Schrader
Cicilline	Lance	Schwartz
Clarke	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Lankford	Scott, David
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Sensenbrenner
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cole	Latham	Sewell (AL)
Cook	Latta	Shea-Porter
Costa	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Courtney	Lewis	Shimkus
Cramer	Lipinski	Simpson
Crowley	LoBiondo	Sires
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Smith (MO)
Daines	Lofgren	Smith (TX)
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Lowey	Speier
DeFazio	Lucas	Stewart
DeGette	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Delaney	Lynch	Stutzman
DeLauro	Maloney, Sean	Swalwell (CA)
DeBene	Massie	Takano
Denham	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Dent	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (MS)
DesJarlais	McCaul	Tiberi
Deutch	McCollum	Tierney
Diaz-Balart	McDermott	Titus
Dingell	McGovern	Tsongas
Duckworth	McIntyre	Valadao
Ellison	McKinley	Van Hollen
Engel	McMorris	Vargas
Enyart	Rodgers	Veasey
Eshoo	McNerney	Vela
Esty	Meadows	Visclosky
Farenthold	Messer	Wagner
Farr	Mica	Walden
Fattah	Michaud	Walorski
Fincher	Miller (MI)	Walz
Fitzpatrick	Miller, Gary	Wasserman
Fox	Miller, George	Schultz
Frankel (FL)	Mullin	Waters
Frelinghuysen	Napolitano	Webster (FL)
Fudge	Neal	Welch
Gabbard	Negrete McLeod	Westmoreland
Gallo	Noem	Whitfield
Garamendi	Nolan	Williams
Garcia	Nugent	Wilson (FL)
Gerlach	Nunes	Woodall
Gibson	Nunnelee	Yarmuth
Gohmert	Owens	Yoho
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Gosar	Pascarell	Young (FL)
Granger	Pastor (AZ)	Young (IN)

NOES—154

Amash	Graves (MO)	Olson
Amodeli	Grayson	Paulsen
Bachus	Green, Gene	Payne
Barber	Griffin (AR)	Pearce
Barrow (GA)	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Benishek	Hanna	Peters (MI)
Bentivolio	Heck (NV)	Pittenger
Bishop (NY)	Holding	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Holt	Polis
Black	Honda	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Radel
Braley (IA)	Huizenga (MI)	Reed
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Renacci
Buchanan	Hurt	Ribble
Cantor	Jenkins	Rice (SC)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Chaffetz	Joyce	Rogers (KY)
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Rohrabacher
Clay	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Coffman	King (IA)	Rothfus
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Royce
Collins (NY)	Kingston	Ryan (OH)
Conaway	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Schock
Conyers	Kline	Schweikert
Cooper	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Cotton	Levin	Sessions
Crawford	Long	Shuster
Crenshaw	Lujan Grisham	Sinema
Culberson	(NM)	Slaughter
Cummings	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Davis (CA)	Maffei	Smith (NJ)
DeSantis	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Carolyn	Stockman
Duffy	Marchant	Terry
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Thornberry
Edwards	McClintock	Tipton
Ellmers	McHenry	Tonko
Fleischmann	McKeon	Turner
Fleming	Meehan	Upton
Flores	Meng	Velázquez
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Fortenberry	Moore	Watt
Foster	Moran	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Wenstrup
Gardner	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Gibbs	Nadler	Wolf
Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer	Womack
Gowdy	O'Rourke	Yoder

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta	Grimm	Meeks
Bustos	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Campbell	Horsford	Rokita
Coble	Luján, Ben Ray	Waxman
Doyle	(NM)	
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1457

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 67 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue to a civilian employee of the Department of Defense a denial of a security clearance pursuant to Department of Defense Directive

5220.6 that lists in the notice of specific reasons of the clearance decision (as defined in section 3.2 of such Directive) financial hardships because of a "furlough caused by sequestration".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to protect the continued employment of needed and trusted Department of Defense civilian employees. DOD civilian employees who are critical to our national security mission may be in danger of losing their security clearances and their jobs if financial hardships from being furloughed result in financial delinquencies.

Right now, the DOD has issued vague guidance that they will take into account the impact that sequestration is having on servicemembers' financial situation.

While I appreciate those efforts, I believe that Congress should strengthen our commitment to our servicemembers by ensuring no funds are used to deny the renewal of security clearances to workers who are only experiencing financial hardship as a result of sequestration.

I believe this is a commonsense amendment, and it is my hope that it will receive strong support. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's intense interest in trying to protect these folks who would be affected by sequestration, but awarding or granting or giving a national security clearance is not a simple thing and it should not be taken lightly. If the Department of Defense or government agency decides that a person doesn't really qualify, they feel that they don't deserve a national security clearance, if the phrase "furlough caused by sequestration" is included in the denial, then the denial is null and void. You can't deny it if it is claimed that it's due to sequestration, and that's not fair. That's not fair to our national security. It's not fair, actually, to the Defense Department, and I just think this is not a good idea.

But I know what the gentleman wants to accomplish and would like to work with him to figure out how to do this without denying the Defense Department the right to deny a security clearance to someone that they think is not a good risk for a security clearance.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman KILMER for offering this amendment today and, frankly, for his tireless advocacy on behalf of our men and women in our civil service who support our servicemembers and veterans every day. Without this amendment, hard-working men and women who live in the district I represent and who work at Joint Base Lewis-McChord risk losing their security clearance through furloughs that are no fault of their own, thus complicating their employment situation. We should not let that happen.

The issue this amendment aims to resolve is yet another in a long series of issues that show why budgeting by sequestration is bad policy. I don't think anyone in this Chamber actually thinks civilian employees should lose their security clearance because they were furloughed, but the way sequestration was designed makes that a very real possibility.

This is a good amendment to fix a bad policy. I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks on the specific language of the amendment, and I do hope that we will continue to work through the conference process to address any concerns about the language because we can all agree that this is a serious issue. It is extremely important that the DOD continues to grant security clearances to employees who are charged with doing critical and sensitive work.

There are many factors that DOD considers when determining if an individual can do these important jobs and to ensure that an employee is trustworthy. Sequestration-related furloughs and any financial hardships that come from sequestration are not an employee's fault. No civilian employee should be denied a security clearance because of Congress' inability to undo sequestration.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support DOD civilians and the work they do for our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, again I sympathize with what the gentleman is trying to do. It's just the problem in the denial, if they use the phrase "furlough caused by sequestration," they can't deny that request for a security clearance, and there may be a lot of good reasons why that person should be denied.

And so it's a question of do we protect the national security by giving the Defense Department the authority to deny regardless of what the furlough language is, or do we allow this amend-

ment, which is probably poorly written; and we would like to work with the gentleman to write it in such a way that it doesn't cause us great distress. But I just don't want to see someone who should be denied a security clearance given one because of a technicality.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 69 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the continued detention of any individual who is detained, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, by the United States at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and who has been approved for release or transfer to a foreign country.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits funds from being used to detain cleared individuals held at Guantanamo. Of the 166 people currently being held there, 86 have been cleared for release; that is, they have not been charged with any offense. They have been found guilty of nothing, and they have been judged by our military to pose no threat to the United States if released. We should release them now. Holding these 86 people who have been cleared for release is against everything we claim to stand for.

In response to this very situation, President Obama asked: Is this who we are?

I hope today we will answer: No, we are better than that.

I hope we support this amendment and move expeditiously to support the release of these detainees. It is truly astonishing that in 2013 the United States continues to hold people indefinitely who have not been charged, let

alone convicted of any crime, who admittedly do not pose any threat to the United States. They should be released.

Guantanamo is an affront to America and to the founding principle of the United States that no person should be deprived of liberty without due process of law. Our continuing to hold prisoners indefinitely, without charge and without trial, is a rebuke to our professed support of liberty.

If they've been judged not to pose a threat and we hold them anyway, what kind of message are we sending? By what claim of right do we hold people in jail who have been charged with nothing, whom we're not bringing to trial, and who we have decided pose no threat to us? What are we saying about the United States and our values? We must change course and we ought to support this amendment.

Now, I know some will say these are dangerous terrorists. No, they're not. They're people who were captured in some way who have been judged by our military not to pose a threat to the United States, who have not been charged as terrorists, who have not been judged as terrorists. Some of them may be simply victims to the fact that we paid bounties to people in Afghanistan to turn in people who they said were terrorists. The Hatfields turned in the McCoys because—why not?—we were giving them a couple of thousand dollars.

So anyone who has not been charged with a crime, who has not been convicted, and who we have already decided poses no threat ought to be released. And, therefore, this amendment says no funds may be used to continue their confinement. I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would allow, and probably require, that a very large number of detainees from Guantanamo are sent back home to their home country or a country that they might have come to. They're detainees for a reason. They are detainees because they inflicted harm or danger or threats or death to our American interests, our American soldiers. They came from the battlefield.

Now, we know that two of the former detainees who have been sent back to their country established a group that's run by those two former Gitmo detainees, and so I don't think it's a good idea. I think we should keep the detainees that are dangerous. Until such time as they meet the requirements of the law, they should stay at Guantanamo. They would have to ensure that the remaining Gitmo detainees, whom most judge as the most dangerous, will not be released or other-

wise brought into the homeland where U.S. citizens could be threatened.

Second, the present law ensures that, prior to releasing Guantanamo detainees to a foreign country, a careful and deliberate assessment must be made that the detainee is not likely to re-engage in terrorist activities.

What's wrong with that? There's nothing wrong with that, so why change it? Why turn these people loose to go back to the battlefield, which many of them that have been released have already done, causing additional harm to our troops. So I'm strongly opposed to this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. NADLER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentleman from our Judiciary Committee for yielding.

And I want to say to my very good friend from Florida, the chair of the Defense Appropriations Committee, whom I greatly respect, I'm afraid there's a misunderstanding. This amendment is only about those detainees who have been cleared for release or transfer. This is not about the entire 166 people who are there.

These are the people who, after a very careful review, have been cleared for release by the intelligence community and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. So we're holding these people without cause. We're holding them because we've let our rhetoric get ahead of ourselves.

The fact is that they would be released to their countries of origin. Their countries of origin are going to watch them. But these are people who we have found we have nothing to charge them with, and we have determined that they are not a threat to the United States or to anyone else. They shouldn't have been rounded up. They shouldn't have been detained. And they've been detained for 12 years.

46 detainees are now having to be tube-fed. They're strapped down and a tube is forced down their nose and into their stomach. They're strapped down for 2 hours so the liquid gets digested.

People that have been cleared for release, how can we justify doing this to them?

And what's the end game of our current policy?

Are we going to keep them until they die in prison? People who have been cleared for release and transfer, and we're just going to keep detaining them until they die?

Because that's the only result of the current policy.

Once they get cleaned, they should be released.

Who are we, as a Nation to detain people indefinitely, without legal cause?

It doesn't make sense. It's not American. It's a complete violation of our Constitution, of our most fundamental principle of equal justice under the law.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left? How much time does the gentleman have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, it would serve a purpose if people actually read the amendment. The amendment says none of the funds made available may be used to detain an individual who has been approved for release or transfer to a foreign country.

We hear from the gentleman from Florida, these people are there for a reason. Yes, when we arrest somebody, a murder is committed, a rape is committed, we arrest somebody. But then, the grand jury says, no, we're not going to indict this person; there's not enough evidence.

Do we hold them in jail indefinitely, forever, even though there's no charge, even though the District Attorney says we made a mistake; it's somebody else; they didn't do it? No.

Because maybe they'll commit a crime? That's antithetical to every notion of what the United States is about. These are 86 people who are not charged as terrorists, who we have no evidence are terrorists, and who have been judged by the military and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the intelligence community to pose no threat to us.

By what claim of right do we hold them in jail? The United States, at this point, is no better than a kidnapper if it holds in jail people whom it charges with no crime and judges safe for release.

Approve the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I don't think it can be said any stronger or needed to be said any more often. These detainees are bad, bad people. They hate America. They've sworn to kill Americans, and, in fact, they have done so on the battlefield, and that's why, when they were captured, they were sent to Guantanamo. That's where they should stay unless the current law is abided by, and that is, to ensure that the remaining Gitmo detainees who are most judged as the most dangerous will not be released or brought into the homeland where U.S. citizens could be threatened.

Second, they ensure that prior to releasing Guantanamo detainees to a foreign country a careful and deliberate assessment must be made that the detainee is not likely to re-engage in terrorist activities and the foreign government can maintain control over the

individual. What's wrong with that law?

It protects Americans. It protects America, and it keeps the bad guys where they need to be kept. And in this particular case, it's at Guantanamo.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to construct any new Department of Defense facility at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, or to expand any existing Department of Defense facility at such Naval Station.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit any funds in the bill from being used to construct or expand detention facilities at Guantanamo.

The bill contains \$249 million to convert temporary detention facilities into more permanent structures. But the administration wants to close Guantanamo and to release or transfer the detainees. So why waste \$429 million to construct facilities that will not be used? Because many in Congress want to keep the detainees in Guantanamo forever.

Now, we have, we know, 166 detainees in Guantanamo; 86 should be released immediately. The gentleman from Florida says that they're bad people; they are terrorists; they're there for a reason. No, they're not. They're there for different reasons. Some because they were handed over for bounties by rival militias or rival clans. Some because a mistake was made. Some because they're terrorists. But we make distinctions.

The gentleman says we shouldn't release them until a careful assessment

has been made. Well, a careful assessment has been made: 86 of them, half of those in Guantanamo, have been cleared for release. That is to say, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the intelligence agencies have determined that these 86 people were not terrorists and were not likely to pose a threat to the United States if released. So they're guilty of nothing. They have been tried for nothing. We don't say that people are bad people, we ought to hold them in jail indefinitely without a trial normally, except here. So we ought to release the 86 who have been cleared for release immediately, and the others we ought to try, put on trial.

There's a separate dispute whether that should be an Article III court or a military tribunal. I prefer an Article III court, but either way, put them on trial in front of a court or in front of a military tribunal and let them be tried. Perhaps most of them will be guilty and put them in jail for long periods of time. Maybe some will be innocent. That's what the justice system is about.

Are we really going to say that Guantanamo is separate? Anyone who is unlucky enough to be sent there because at one time we thought maybe they were dangerous should stay there indefinitely until they die without a trial?

The assessment has been made for 86 of them. They have been judged not to be guilty, not to be a terrorist, and not to be a threat. That assessment has been made according to law, and these people ought to be released. The other 80 ought to be tried and, if convicted, ought to be put in prison in the United States. We have hundreds of terrorists in maximum security prisons in the United States. There's no reason a few more couldn't be put there, and we could save \$249 million.

Guantanamo was originally set up because it was thought by the Bush administration that if we held people in Guantanamo they could be tried or handled without having the constitutional rights of someone in the United States, but the Supreme Court said no. The people in Guantanamo have the same rights as if they were held in the United States. So it doesn't change what will happen to them, whether they're kept in prison in the United States or in Guantanamo.

So let's release the 86 who ought to be released because they've been adjudged that they should be released by the Joint Chiefs and by the intelligence agencies. Let's try the others, and let's keep them in jail if they're adjudged guilty. Let's proceed with American justice notions and do ourselves proud, and let's stop wasting billions of dollars on Guantanamo.

So this amendment says don't permanentize what should be and will be temporary, however temporary it is. Don't waste \$249 million on making these facilities permanent.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as I read the amendment, I'm assuming that the gentleman is trying to prevent any further construction or money of that type for the Guantanamo detainees. And I can understand that because we have just recently spent a lot of money building two brand new prisons, air-conditioned, comfortable, and we've already spent that money, so maybe we don't need to spend any money there.

But what the amendment doesn't recognize is that since 1903, we have had a presence at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for our own military purposes. The 4th Fleet is headquartered there and has been there for many years. Allied shipping, allied Navy facilities, allied forces move through Guantanamo Bay on a fairly regular basis. I don't know that they have any specific requests right now for any kind of construction, but I don't think we want to deny it in the event that the Defense Department finds it important to do a construction project there.

So, understand, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, has been part of the United States military facility since 1903, and so I don't think this amendment is a good amendment because it would deny our troops, our forces not even involved with Guantanamo detainees the right for military construction, or the right for whatever needs to be spent.

So, again, I just have to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1¼ minute remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, we just approved \$260 million in the defense authorization bill for Guantanamo. In addition, we approved another \$186 billion to construct a new temporary facility, almost half a billion dollars, in addition to what we're now spending. We've spent this year alone \$2,670,000 per Guantanamo detainee. Eighty-six of them have been cleared for release. We have no reason to keep them. And yet, we spend that much money on each of them.

In U.S. prisons we spend \$34,000 per year per maximum security prisoner. Imagine the discrepancy. We have now convicted 300 terrorists in U.S. prisons. They're being held at 98 Federal prisons for a fraction of the money. And we have no convictions at Guantanamo that haven't been overturned.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman just made my case. We don't really need a lot more money for construction for Guantanamo detainees. We've already spent a lot of money there.

The point is, we don't want to deny the ability of the Defense Department to provide whatever is needed for our own military forces at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, not part of the Guantanamo detainees.

I think we've talked this one to death. We're repeating ourselves now. So, in the interest of time, I'm going to yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. NADLER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the \$249 million in the budget is for expansion and making permanent detention facilities. I have no objection to construction of other military facilities at Guantanamo Bay. I don't know whether that makes sense or not. But the \$249 million we're talking about here is for more detention facilities. That's a pure waste of money. And I'll be happy to clarify, if this amendment passes, that it should apply only to detention facilities.

So if you're opposed to wasting \$249 million more on detention facilities so we can spend hundreds of thousands of dollars a year per prisoner instead of \$34,000 per year per prisoner in the United States, if you think that's a good idea to waste all this money, then vote against this amendment. I hope rational people who don't want to waste a quarter of a billion dollars for permanent detention facilities will vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. PIERLUISI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 71 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce—

(1) the first sentence of section 204(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1974 (Public Law 93-166; 87 Stat. 668);

(2) the first sentence of section 9 of the quitclaim deed of December 20, 1982 (transferring property on the Northwest Peninsula of Culebra to the government of Puerto Rico), or, with respect to such sentence, section 10 of the quitclaim deed; or

(3) with respect to a response action required under section 2701(c)(1)(B) of title 10, United States Code, with respect to property transferred by the quitclaim deed described in paragraph (2)—

(A) section 2(d)(15) of the enclosure 3 accompanying Department of Defense Manual No. 4715.20, dated March 9, 2012 (relating to "DERP Eligibility—Ineligible Activities"); or

(B) section 8074 of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, this budget-neutral amendment, which I offer with Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, would enable DOD to remove unexploded ordnance from land in Culebra, Puerto Rico, which was used as a military training range for seven decades.

In 1974, Congress enacted legislation directing the Navy to cease operations in Culebra. A provision stated that the present bombardment area shall not be utilized for any purpose that would require decontamination at the expense of the United States.

In 1982, the Federal Government conveyed land in Culebra to the Government of Puerto Rico, including a 400-acre parcel within the former bombardment area. The deed provided that, in accordance with the 1974 act, the Government of Puerto Rico would not hold the Federal Government liable for decontamination of the land.

Four years later, in 1986, Congress enacted SARA, which amended the 1980 CERCLA law. SARA states that DOD is responsible for cleaning up contamination it caused on current and former military sites and established the Defense Environmental Restoration Program for DOD to carry out these responsibilities. That program is funded by the bill under consideration today.

SARA directed DOD to clean up former defense sites conveyed to third parties prior to 1986. These sites are eligible for Federal funding, even though there were no specific authorities enabling their cleanup at the time they were decommissioned and conveyed. Nevertheless, DOD contends that the 1974 law and the 1982 deed that tracks it prohibits the use of Federal funds to decontaminate the 400-acre parcel on Culebra, and these prohibitions were not superceded by SARA. As a result of this restrictive interpretation, Culebra is the only former defense site in the Nation that DOD contends it is barred by statute from decontaminating.

This makes no sense. The 1974 act and the 1982 deed may have been consistent with Federal policy at that

time since there was no legal framework in place that would have enabled the Federal Government to pay for the cleanup of the conveyed property. However, they're now squarely at odds with Federal policy that has been in place for more than 25 years under SARA. Accordingly, there's no principled basis to treat Culebra differently from thousands of other former defense sites conveyed out of Federal hands prior to 1986 which the Federal Government is obligated to decontaminate.

The status quo poses a threat to human safety since this parcel contains beaches, walkways, and campgrounds visited by over 300,000 people a year. A recent DOD report found that since 1995, there have been 70 incidents in which members of the public encountered unexploded munitions that could have caused great harm. In fact, in March of this year, a young girl visiting a Culebra beach suffered burns after she picked up an artillery shell containing white phosphorous. The FBI responded and found six other munitions which it detonated and removed. This potentially tragic incident underscores the need for congressional action.

This amendment would ensure that the 1974 act ceases to function as an obstacle to implementation of current Federal policy, as reflected in CERCLA and SARA. The amendment simply ensures that Culebra will receive the same treatment as other former defense sites in the FUDS program. The citizens in Culebra sacrificed so our military could receive the training it needed. Congress, in turn, should take this small step to remove the barrier that is preventing DOD from addressing safety hazards that remain on the island.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly I appreciate the gentleman's passion on this issue and agree that is an important issue that needs to be addressed. As he is aware, Mr. Chairman, the Department estimates it will take multiple years and a significant investment to properly address these contaminated sites in Puerto Rico.

We look forward to working with the gentleman. We understand that he may be considering withdrawing his amendment so we can continue to work with him to address this problem, which significantly has impacted the Commonwealth.

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PIERLUISI. I look forward to working with the majority.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate my friend yielding to me.

I simply want to rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. The agreement that was reached—and I think some people used the agreement as an excuse to do nothing—is 40 years old. It was entered into in 1973. Well, they agreed to it. I graduated from law school in 1973. The world is a much different place today. People have changed. I certainly think our environmental consciousness has improved and our consciousness of our responsibility in this has improved. And I do think this is an opportunity to rectify that.

I serve on the Energy and Water Subcommittee of this great committee. The chairman chairs that Energy and Water Subcommittee. Unfortunately, in the Formerly Used Defense Sites that were cited by the gentleman, we have over 10,000 properties, which is one of the problems I think the gentleman alludes to as far as the costs we have to deal with. All the more reason, I believe, that we ought to be very assiduous and active in beginning to address these sites.

So I appreciate the gentleman raising it, and I certainly support his position.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, it was my understanding with Mr. YOUNG that the gentleman would consider withdrawing the amendment if we gave a commitment to continue to work with him on this very important issue, which he has dedicated so much time and effort to.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PIERLUISI. That's absolutely right. So I will withdraw my amendment. But let me just say that, again, this is one property. It's only one property out of thousands of properties facing these circumstances. So I hope we can work it out. It's not going to be costly. It makes sense to clean it up.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today, the House will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Will all present please rise for a moment of silence.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 72 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Defense—

(1) to implement or execute any agreement with the Russian Federation pertaining to missile defense other than a treaty; or

(2) to provide the Government of the Russian Federation with any information about the ballistic missile defense systems of the United States that is classified or unclassified by the Department or component thereof.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits funds to implement or execute any non-treaty executive agreement with Russia regarding missile defense or to provide Russia with information about America's ballistic missile defense systems, both classified and unclassified. The reason the amendment says classified and unclassified is to prohibit the administration from declassifying missile defense technology to skirt the law. A similar amendment was passed last year, with bipartisan support, and is included in the current continuing resolution that is funding our government during this fiscal year.

Multiple news sources over the years have reported that the Obama administration may seek to share our missile defense secrets with the Russians. I am concerned these reports may be accurate. While the danger to national security is a serious concern, so is the loss of billions of dollars we have sunk into creating these exceptional technologies.

The Congressional Research Service estimates the United States has spent approximately \$153 billion on missile defense. Roughly 90 percent of that \$153 billion, or \$140 billion, has been spent on hit-to-kill technology.

I ask the House to support this amendment to preserve America's lead in missile defense technologies, protect America's investment of billions of dollars, and ensure the viability of current and future missile defense technologies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I had my breath taken away with the assertion that the President of the United States might give away the most intimate defense secrets of this country to Russia, and that we are debating an amendment to Defense appropriations, with all of the other problems we face and all the threats we face in this country, based on the assumption that the President of the United States might give away the most intimate defense secrets of this country to Russia.

I would simply ask my colleagues to think about the underlying assumptions based in the gentleman's amendment and vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. There have been numerous occasions in which the media has reported that the administration is considering, as a part of negotiations or other things, divulgence of our sensitive hit-to-kill technology to the Russian federation.

□ 1545

I am thankful that my colleague across the aisle says that it takes away his breath, and I hope with that that he will support this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We support your amendment. As you said, it is similar to what the bill carried last year and what was a provision in the armed services bill, so we are supportive of it. We're obviously mindful and respectful of the ranking member's position, but the majority of Congress felt the way you and I do and the committee did as well.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman responds to my concern by suggesting that he has discovered the possibility that the President of the United States is going to give away the most intimate secrets this country holds to Russia through the media. I'm wondering—and I ask this question simply rhetorically, not necessarily of my colleague—I wonder if that was FOX News. I wonder if he saw that on the Colbert Report recently. I wonder if that was on the John Stewart program.

I was watching CNN, and I didn't see any report of that yesterday; although, I saw that a baby was born in another country. Despite the world coming apart, that was the headline news. I didn't see MSNBC, and I don't know if that was it. Perhaps it was even on a BBC telecast. But I'm wondering what media outlets are providing this inside information as to the deliberations of the President of the United States to give away these cherished secrets.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the appropriate way to gather the requested information is simply for the gentleman to Google what I have just stated.

This issue arose in 2011 with numerous comments by the White House that were reported in numerous outlets. By way of background, my source is not FOX News in this particular instance, but all he has to do is Google it and he can find it.

Also, there were numerous reports in 2012 where the President indicated—in

what turned out to be an open mic—that once the elections were over with, he could more freely negotiate or give away information to the Russians. Those aren't the exact words used by the President. Unfortunately, I don't have perfect recall, but it was words to that effect.

I would emphasize that this House has visited this issue previously. This has passed with bipartisan support. So I would urge this body to again, as a precautionary measure, adopt this amendment to prevent the sharing of our hit-to-kill technology with the Russian Federation to the extent that risk becomes a reality.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I reserve the balance of my time, and I understand I have the right to close.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman indicated, in query to my rhetorical question, that all I have to do is Google and I will discover the information that will lead to our knowledge that the President of the United States is considering giving away this very sensitive information.

It comes to mind, when the gentleman suggests I should Google it, how many different encounters I have had with members of the public who said, "I saw it on the Internet; it must be true." For example, Members of Congress, after serving one term, receive a full salary pension for the rest of their lives; and Members of Congress receive free health care for the rest of their lives; and Members of Congress, for the last 4 years in a row, have received significant pay increases because they Googled it on the Internet, and so they secured very specific, accurate information. Perhaps we should go to Facebook or LinkedIn or reddit, or maybe we should tweet each other.

Again, in very serious concern, I would suggest my colleagues absolutely reject this amendment. I would ask for their vote against it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 73 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available under this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) after December 31, 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funding the use of force pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force, or AUMF, effective on December 31, 2014, when the last American combat troops will rotate out of Afghanistan and the responsibility for security will have passed to the Afghan people after more than 13 years of war in that country.

New Year's Day 2015 should not only bring about a new relationship between the United States and Afghanistan, it should also mark the end of a conflict that was begun in our skies on that September morning and which was formalized days later when the Congress passed the AUMF.

That legislation provided the President with the authority to use "force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons."

The 2001 AUMF was never intended to authorize a war without end, and it now poorly defines those who pose a threat to our country. That authority and the funding that goes along with it should expire concurrent with the end of our combat role in Afghanistan.

In addition to this amendment, I have introduced bipartisan legislation, H.R. 2324, which sunsets the AUMF effective the same date, December 31, 2014, and calls on the administration to work with Congress together to determine what new authority, if any, is necessary to protect the country after that time.

The Constitution vests the Congress with the power to declare war and the responsibility of appropriating funds to pay for it. It is our most awesome responsibility and central to our military efforts overseas. We owe it to the men and women we send into combat to properly define and authorize their mission, and my amendment will effectively give Congress the next 16 months to do so.

In his recent speech at National Defense University, President Obama specifically called on Congress to work with him:

I look forward to engaging Congress and the American people in efforts to refine, and ultimately repeal, the AUMF's mandate, and I will not sign any laws designed to expand this mandate further. Our systematic effort to dismantle terrorist organizations must continue, but this war, like all wars, must end.

This amendment is a prudent first step towards meeting the President's challenge, a call that we must embrace, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Members of Congress sworn to defend the Constitution.

I urge a "yes" vote and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, in some ways I'm somewhat sympathetic to the hopes that underlie this amendment. I hope that terrorism has gone away by December 31, 2014. I hope that Zawahiri and the others responsible for 9/11 and those who authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attack or harbored them are all brought to justice in the next 14 months. I hope that our country and other countries around the world no longer have to worry about terrorists hiding bombs inside their clothing or inside their bodies, trying to kill as many innocent people as possible. And I hope that military and civilians who serve our Nation all around the world, and others in the private sector, are no longer the target for suicide bombings and assassinations and the other sorts of things that we've seen since 9/11.

But, Mr. Chairman, what if my hopes don't come to pass? What if the world has something else in store? What if terrorism still exists by December 31, 2014? Well, then it seems to me that this amendment doesn't make a lot of sense. Because this amendment says no matter what—not just in Afghanistan, but anywhere around the world—we're not going to fund anything through the Department of Defense pursuant to that AUMF.

Now, I've got to say, I have been and continue to be for updating that AUMF to better reflect the way that al Qaeda has evolved over the last decade or so. Unfortunately, that has been resisted by the administration, as the gentleman just pointed out.

Of course we all want this war against terrorists and other wars to end, but, unfortunately, the enemy gets a vote. So for us to unilaterally say, because of the calendar, we're done, and, oh, maybe we'll pass some new authority—but maybe not—in order to protect this country, I think, is dangerous. It's shortsighted. It is putting hopes above reality.

So I hope my colleagues reject this. We can do better in fighting terrorists in a variety of ways. But to bury our head in the sand and say it's all going to be over on a certain date is not the way to protect this country, and I believe it forfeits our most essential responsibilities under the Constitution.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. I want to yield to my colleague from Indiana. Before I do, two quick points.

No one is suggesting, of course, that terrorism is going to go away in 16 months or all of our problems will be over. But what we are saying with this amendment is that the authorization we passed that authorizes force against those who planned, authorized, and committed the 9/11 attacks shouldn't be used to go after groups like al Shabaab, which may not even have been in existence at the time of 9/11.

This AUMF is now outdated; and unless we have a sunset date, we're going to continue to rely on an AUMF that no longer describes the nature of the conflict we're in.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and rise in strong support of his amendment.

The gentleman who is in opposition mentions that the administration mentions the United States Constitution. The fact is we have a constitutional responsibility. With the passage of more than a decade and a changing world—and I would agree with the gentleman, something else may be in store—we ought to revisit that issue. We ought to exercise our constitutional, congressional prerogative and have a full debate.

Again, the gentleman is providing over 1½ years. In such a serious issue, I think even this Congress could come to grips with that type of fundamental issue and resolve the future.

So I strongly support what the gentleman is doing and appreciate his amendment.

Mr. SCHIFF. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I just point out to my colleagues, this House has voted 2 years in a row to update the AUMF so it does better reflect the way that al Qaeda has changed. We have included the exact language used by the Obama administration and the Bush administration in court proceedings and just adopted that. The House has passed that. I don't remember how the particular gentleman voted on that, but the House has passed it. The Senate has not gone along. But there has been an effort to update the language to better reflect the way that the threat has changed, but that's a far different thing from saying, okay, we're just going to make this go away and hope that in the meantime we can do something better. I think that is terribly risky.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. I would only say to my colleague, through the Chair, that this institution has proved that unless we have a deadline, we simply refuse to act.

What the President has said in terms of any new authorization for use of force—and it's something I agree wholeheartedly with the White House—is that he won't support a new author-

ization that is broader than the one that we seek to sunset. That, I think, is a problem with some of the drafts which the majority has proposed.

We don't want an expanded war. We do want an authorization that reflects the precise nature of the threat, and that threat has changed since 9/11. It no longer comes as much from the core of al Qaeda, which has been decimated; rather, it comes now from a group of franchises, loosely affiliated organizations that sometimes, as a product of convenience, will associate with al Qaeda for financing or legitimacy. But it is now a far-flung terrorist challenge, and any authorization ought to reflect the changing nature of threat.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is you have to read the amendment and the words that are in it. The amendment says we can spend no money for any part of the Department of Defense pursuant to the AUMF after December 31, 2014.

□ 1600

Now, we can have a very interesting discussion about how the AUMF should be updated, about different authority that could take its place, but none of that is before us. What is before us is that it basically says, no funding shall be used. It essentially repeals the AUMF.

Now, I realize the gentleman is trying to precipitate further debate, but the fact is terrorism is not going away. This prohibits any U.S. military action, not only in Afghanistan, but anywhere in the world that al Qaeda or its affiliates may have traveled. This stops all of that.

My point is that there is too dangerous a risk in a world where there are too many people still trying to find new, innovative ways to attack us and kill as many Americans as possible. We can't take that risk.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 74 printed in House Report 113-170.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$65,000,000) (increased by \$65,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, my amendment addresses a current issue that is undermining an already weakened system of justice in our military.

Any JAG will tell you that it is impossible to effectively prosecute a case if the investigation was improperly handled. That is why the DOD Inspector General report released last week was so troubling.

It uncovered that of the 501 investigations of sexual assault offenses they audited, all but 83 had some sort of deficiency. That means that less than 20 percent were completed without error. Fifty-six cases, 11 percent of the cases, had serious deficiencies. And 399 of these cases had interview and post-interview deficiencies. They also found weaknesses in collecting evidence, not developing leads, and photographing the scene. This in large part is a result of inadequate training in how to properly investigate these complex cases.

A February IG report found that criminal investigators want and need more training on conducting sexual assault investigations. For example, criminal investigators for the Air Force told the IG they wanted more training on the psychology of interviewing victims and evidence collection. One investigator said he would be “in trouble” if he only relied on the training he received.

That is why I'm offering this amendment that will provide an additional \$10 million in funds to train investigators on how to properly investigate sexual assault-related offenses.

My amendment realigns funds from the Operations and Maintenance Defense-wide account and shifts \$5 million to Army Operations and Maintenance, \$2.5 million to Air Force Operations and Maintenance, and \$2.5 million to Navy Operations and Maintenance, which are accounts that pay for training investigators.

Ensuring that assaults are investigated properly is the first step for holding perpetrators accountable.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I claim the time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, this is an issue that we

can't sweep under the rug any longer. We have got to face it square on. The gentlelady's amendment helps do that.

The subcommittee when preparing this legislation was extremely concerned about the issue, and we have included considerable amounts of money to deal with sexual predators and sexual assaults in the military, especially demanding that the military do a better job at enforcing the rules, the laws, to protect the rights of those who are sexually abused.

I thank the gentlelady for offering this amendment, and we do support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, I've got goose bumps that I actually have an amendment that my colleagues on the other side support.

I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding and the chairman's support.

Madam Chair, the amendment does seek to target an important part of the process when prosecuting a sexual assault—the investigation of the incident.

As the Congresswoman pointed out, the Inspector General found this particular part of the process lacking in terms of interviewing victims, investigating crime scenes, and notifying the sexual assault response coordinator. The funding proposed would provide the means to include special training for tactics and techniques when investigating crimes of these natures. I would join the chairman of the committee in thanking her for raising the issue and strongly support it.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, let me just say in closing, we all now recognize 26,000 cases a year of sexual assault and rape. This is not sexual harassment, I might point out; this is unwanted sexual contact. Of those cases, only 3,000 are actually reported. The fear of reporting, the fear of reprisal is so great, that very few of them, less than 20 percent, actually report them.

Then when you report these cases, to have them improperly or inadequately investigated, that then results in a handful of actual courts-martial, and then even smaller, some 250 convictions out of some 3,000 that are reported suggests that we have a lot of work to do.

I thank my colleagues for the support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Chair, I would like to thank my colleague, Ms. SPEIER for offering this amendment. Frequently, sexual-assault victims in the military are referred to Uniformed mental-health experts. From there, they are all too often subsequently diagnosed

with "personality disorders" and separated from the military. While the military is making some positive steps to correct the improper processes surrounding sexual assault cases, it is impossible to know how many veterans of the military have disputed their personality disorder discharges and it is even more difficult to know how many victims of sexual assault did not come forward in fear of being labeled or scapegoated. Instead of sweeping these crimes under the rug, this amendment will review these cases and identify individuals that were improperly separated from the military subsequent to reporting a sexual assault and correct their record. I urge support for this important way forward in addressing sexual crimes.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mr. SPEIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 75 printed in House Report 113-170.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 8, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

Page 8, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, since I began working on this issue of military sexual assault 3 years ago, I've had the opportunity to speak to over 100 courageous survivors of rape.

With each of their experiences, there is a unique nature to them. But many of these survivors that decided to report these crimes have had a very similar experience after they reported: they were retaliated against, ostracized, and involuntarily separated from the military on the grounds of a personality or adjustment disorder.

Mental health diagnoses are grossly misused to administratively discharge or retaliate against survivors of sexual assault and other servicemembers. Since 2001, the military has discharged more than 31,000 servicemembers on the grounds that they were subject to a personality disorder.

A GAO investigation found that 22 to 60 percent of the time personality disorders were either not diagnosed by a trained psychiatrist or psychologist, or there was undue command influence.

This pattern has become a potent lesson to servicemembers that are as-

saulted: report and get kicked out of the military with a personality disorder diagnosis. This designation amounts to a scarlet letter, pinned where their medals should be, and follows them for the rest of their lives. These servicemembers are re-victimized every time they apply for a job and submit their DD214s. It also makes it virtually impossible to retain a security clearance.

My amendment aims to address this clear pattern of retaliation against victims who report a crime of rape or sexual assault. The amendment provides funds to correct their service record and provide them with the benefits they have earned. My amendment realigns \$65 million within the Operations and Maintenance Defense-wide account to dedicate these funds to identifying and correct the service record of servicemembers who were summarily discharged from the military following reports of a sexual assault. This amendment requires the Department of Defense to review all separations of individuals that made an unrestricted report of sexual assault and determine if they were discharged, and on what grounds—including personality and adjustment disorders. My amendment will also direct the Secretary of Defense to correct their records of service—to right this wrong—and provide them with any compensation and services they weren't able to receive as a consequence of this error.

This is the very least we can do for these brave survivors. It is the first step in addressing the systemic re-victimization of courageous men and women who were brave enough to come forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I claim the time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Again, Madam Chairman, this is a good amendment. Those who are subject to sexual assaults, sexual attacks, and who have been separated from the military on grounds of a disorder need to have their records corrected if information indicates that that should be done.

Sexual assault victims have already suffered a great deal. They deserve to have their military records accurately reflect their military service. Those victims who were improperly discharged on the grounds of a personality disorder deserve to have those records corrected.

We do support the amendment. This bill already provides substantial funding to provide these services.

I notice a very distinguished gentleman rising who would like me to yield, and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding and would like

to associate myself with his kind remarks, and appreciate the gentlewoman for offering the amendment and would like to indicate my support for the amendment as well.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, needless to say, we support this amendment. We have already robustly financed sexual assault programs. We fully fund the President's request for sexual assault prevention and response programs at the service level and at the Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program office.

I would like to emphasize "prevention." If we can prevent these sexual assaults, then the other problems go away. So it is important that we do pay attention to prevention.

In addition, our bill provides \$25 million to the Department and the services, including the Guard and Reserve, to implement a Sexual Assault Special Victims program, such as the Air Force Special Victims Counsel program, to provide all victims with specially trained legal assistance throughout the investigation and prosecution process—fair play. That's important.

We also support a number of policy changes that were including the FY 2014 National Defense Authorization Act. I think our bill goes a long way on this issue, and this amendment goes even further, so we enthusiastically support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their unanimous support of this effort and of this particular amendment.

Madam Chair, let me just close by saying that the GAO says 20 to 60 percent of these personality disorder designations are either done improperly or are done with undue influence. Certainly, those who have been victimized deserve to be able to have that designation erased from their DD-214 forms so that they are not in a position of having to then in the civilian world explain why they have this designation on their discharge papers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Chair, I would like to thank my colleague, Ms. SPEIER for offering this amendment. While many protections for victims of sexual violence have recently been put in place across our Armed Forces, a review by the IG of military sexual assault cases revealed that over three-quarters (83%) of the 501 investigations conducted, were not properly investigated, and had significant deficiencies, such as a failure to collect key evidence; incomplete interviews; and only partial crime scene investigations. As a former District Attorney, I was stunned by these findings. I have worked to protect victims of abuse and violence throughout my career and know that such sloppy investigative work will only cause further injury to victims and their families. To add insult to injury, these victims are the very

men and women who have devoted their lives to the lives of others. With this amendment, we will be returning the favor of their commitment to our country's security and ensure additional funding and training to close the harmful loops that exist in the military's investigative processes related to sexual assaults. This amendment is a vital step towards ensuring an environment where there is justice for all victims. I urge support of our amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 84 printed in House Report 113-170.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. RADEL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 97 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. RADEL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to Syria in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), including for the introduction of United States forces into hostilities in Syria, into situations in Syria where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into Syrian territory, airspace, or waters while equipped for combat, in contravention of the Congressional consultation and reporting requirements of sections 3 and 4 of that law (50 U.S.C. 1542 and 1543).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. RADEL. Madam Chair, this amendment should serve as a reminder to the President that he does not have the authority to unilaterally send our children to war. In fact, it was Senator Obama who in 2007 said:

History has shown us time and again, however, that military action is most successful when it is authorized and supported by the legislative branch.

Here we are, again, seeing that Senator Obama and President Obama are two very different people; and with the rhetoric heating up on Syria in particular and with word that we will now arm rebel factions, we must make a statement today. What we are saying is: Mr. President, if you want to go to war, you go through us.

Don't get me wrong. My heart goes out to the innocent families who have been victimized and caught up in this fierce civil war in Syria, but that's exactly what it is—a civil war—and we cannot be the police of the world. If you thought that the situations in Iraq

and Afghanistan were complicated, the situation in Syria has history going back 1,000 years with deep and profound complexities. We cannot just go into Syria and pick and choose who to arm. Too many times we have seen those we arm often turn their own weapons against us, weapons that we have provided. We do not have to use military force around the world to be a leader for democracy.

This amendment is about Congress doing its job instead of following the President's cloudy, unclear foreign policy. This is about the House of the people making decisions for the people—for our young men and women in the military who are serving our country today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the additional 10 minutes on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman for offering the amendment.

Madam Chair, I would point out in my opening remarks that I think the fundamental responsibility of this body is to be engaged in these types of situations and to make determinations relative to our constitutional responsibility, particularly in dangerous situations when it involves military action. Syria, for example, is reported to have the fourth most sophisticated, integrated air defense of any nation on the planet Earth. Reports in the media indicate that Russia has kept these systems resupplied and up to date technologically.

It is but one of many things that we have to consider as far as the safety and well-being of those who are in our military forces, as well as, ultimately, what our national interests are.

At this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RADEL. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, first of all, I want to congratulate our colleague from Florida for having a very successful first few months in the Congress. He has done a really good job.

I am happy to rise in support of this amendment. It is a responsible approach to a critical national security issue. We appreciate the gentleman working closely with the committee to address this issue in a responsible manner that protects our national interests.

So I say, again, thank you for the initiative that you have offered here today.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I would make an additional observation on the gentleman's amendment.

There are political and diplomatic issues of Russia's relationship with the

Assad regime. Altering this relationship over the long run may become an objective of U.S. foreign policy. Maybe. Maybe not. However, entering into an armed conflict with this relationship in mind is a dangerous step, among many other dangerous steps, and it renews the prospect of a more openly hostile relationship with a country that otherwise had ended the Cold War. So it's certainly an additional reason as to my appreciation for the gentleman offering the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RADEL. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, I now yield 2 minutes to my neighbor up north, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY. I want to thank my friend from Florida (Mr. RADEL) for bringing this amendment to the floor today.

Madam Chair, I would have liked to have seen something that went specifically to not arming the so-called "rebels" in Syria, but I think it's important that we also address this issue of the President of the United States and what his obligations are to this Congress and to the American people under the War Powers Act.

The Founding Fathers didn't want one person to be able to take us to these wars in foreign lands. They wanted there to be debate, deliberation, and for the President to have to come and make the argument to the American people through their representation as to why something is such an important part of our national interests that he would send our men and women into harm's way to potentially die for us in that land.

In this case, we have Assad, who is a dangerous dictator in the Middle East. On the other hand, we have the rebels, who are infiltrated by al Qaeda and other bad actors—the same people we've been fighting, by the way, over the last 10 years.

So whose side are we on—Sunni? Shia? It's a civil war in the Middle East. What is our national interest?

Ladies and gentlemen, if you can't answer that question, if you're not absolutely sure—as the President needs to make us sure through the War Powers Act and through authorization, which this amendment requires—then you cannot support sending our men and women or getting involved in Syria or even sending weapons to the so-called "rebels" over there.

Support the Radel amendment. Make the President make the case for Syria. Come to Congress, and let the people decide.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

I thank my colleague for this extremely important amendment.

Madam Chair, we have a dire situation in Syria, and everyone's heart

breaks for the suffering of the Syrian people. Over 100,000 people are getting slaughtered by the leader of their own government. It's absolutely unconscionable. So the questions for us are: What can we practically do? Whatever it is that we do do, does Congress have a say in the "yes" or "no" of military action?

I thank the gentleman for this amendment because there are two questions here.

One is as to the policy itself, the use of military force, arming the rebels. Is that a wise policy? Will it make things better or will it make things worse?

The second question is: Whatever the policy is, is it the responsibility of those of us who have been elected to represent Americans as Members of Congress—and we all do—to be accountable in making that enormously important and consequential decision that has the potential to send our troops into combat?

Let me talk briefly about the policy.

The military situation there is chaotic. The rebels are united loosely in an effort to bring down Assad, but distinguishing between the "good rebels" and the "bad rebels" is impossible. In fact, we are reading reports right now of how rebels who are having disputes with fellow rebels are settling them by beheading them. That's literally what's happening. So the notion that we can have a micromanaged approach and pick the good guys and arm them and not have any reasonable and, actually, inevitable expectation that the arms will get into bad hands, I think, is naive.

Also, General Dempsey, who is a hard-headed thinker about military matters, testified and laid out very clearly, if we just want to arm the rebels, that it's going to be like \$500 million, or it could be into the billions. If we want to do standoff attacks, which supposedly will be surgical, that could be in the \$1 billion-a-month range. If we want to actually have a no-fly zone, it will take hundreds of ships and aircraft in order to implement that—over \$1 billion a month. That's a consequential decision that we can't stumble into.

Then the second question, Madam Chair, is the congressional responsibility to act. One of the frustrations that, I think, Americans have with all of us is the sense that we are not accountable. Do you know what? If we allow an action to be taken that has the potential to send troops into combat and if we haven't actually stood up and voted "yes" or "no," then they are right. We have a job to do under the Constitution. This amendment is really saying to all of us here in Congress on both sides of the aisle that, if the moment comes when that decision is going to be made by the President, he has to return to us for approval, and we have to stand and make our decision.

So with regard to that constitutional responsibility, what is more important?

We all talk about how much we admire the troops for their willingness to sacrifice—and all of us do—but do you know what? All Americans admire the troops, but 435 Americans in this Chamber have the responsibility to make certain that, when we take advantage of the willingness of these young men and women to serve and to sacrifice, including to give up their lives, we are the ones who must make the decision about the policy. Our responsibility—all of ours—is to make certain that whatever policy it is we are asking them to pursue be worthy of their willingness to sacrifice. That has to be done at the beginning.

Once our troops are in the field, yes, we have to support them. Then, once they're in the field, we find ourselves conflicted about having a discussion about how it is they got there. Do you know what? They got there because we sent them there. Sometimes we do it consciously. Sometimes we stumble into it. That's not right. There are 435 of us in this House who are united by a common responsibility to the soldiers and sailors who serve and to the citizens whom we represent.

So I thank the gentleman as I see this as an opportunity for Members of this House on both sides of the aisle, who share a common admiration for the people who serve in the military and who share a common sense of duty to the people we represent, to be accountable for any policy that has the potential to send our soldiers into combat.

Mr. RADEL. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RADEL. I would like to thank the gentleman from Vermont as well.

Madam Chair, it is times like these as we debate this that we realize the heavy weight we carry on our shoulders. We are talking about people's lives as we approach this. Once again, this re-asserts the fact that this is the people's House and that we want to have a say in our foreign policy.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

□ 1630

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding and for this important amendment. Madam Chair, not only should there be no American troops sent to Syria, there should be no American weapons sent to Syria.

Several weeks ago, a Catholic priest named Father Francois Murad was murdered in northern Syria. Who killed him? The very people that we're considering arming. What was he

guilty of? Serving the poor. We have no business shipping weapons to those who would raid convents and kill innocent civilians.

Madam Chair, there are now 100,000 people dead from this conflict. What began as a hopeful exercise of civic engagement by the Syrian people against the brutal Assad regime has now become a wanton slaughter. We don't know who is who among this Syrian rebel movement. No one there is safe, and no happy projections of democratic ideals will make this better. We do not have control over the Syrian battle space. Americans must not be complicit in this killing field.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, from my perspective, I would also make it clear that what we're talking about at this point is the use of military force. There is no question that there is a significant and tragic humanitarian crisis taking place.

It is estimated that about 6.8 million people are in need of various types of humanitarian assistance in Syria itself. There are about 4.25 million people displaced within that country. We have 1.78 million Syrians displaced to neighboring countries. There were 486,972, as of the latest count, that are refugees in Jordan; 607,908 are refugees in Lebanon; 412,789 are refugees in Turkey; 161,014 are refugees in Iraq, and 92,367 in Egypt. It's one reason why today it's estimated that about \$814 million of U.S. humanitarian aid has been expended for good purposes. That's certainly not what we're talking about here today, and I certainly would want to make our colleagues understand that as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RADEL. Madam Chair, this is excellent bipartisan discussion; whereas, this country tends to be a little war weary these days, but we see where the United States can have a role, most especially when it comes to humanitarian aid, with our allies in the region and how exactly we can help.

Once again, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have highlighted just how deeply profound these complexities are in Syria. We're not only confused when it comes to who the rebels are—I don't even know if they're good or bad anymore. We simply don't know what rebel factions are playing a part in this. You've got Hezbollah, you've got al Qaeda, and then you have the state players in this; and we know that we have sensitive relationships with Russia, with China, who also potentially, at least diplomatically, are involved in this.

Again, I just want to commend our colleagues here. This is excellent discussion.

At this point, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I feel very strongly about this issue, Madam Chair. I believe without a shadow of a doubt this is one of the most insane policies that borders on madness. For the United States to give funding, training, and arms most likely to al Qaeda in Syria doesn't make any sense.

Can we realize what it is we're talking about right now? This is Islamic jihad, which has declared war on the United States and declared war on our ally Israel. And we're now in a position when we're authorizing arming, training, and funding for allies of al Qaeda, and al Qaeda themselves, in Syria? This is absolute madness.

You see, Madam Chair, the decision to arm the Syrian rebels by the Obama administration just this week will likely have catastrophic consequences for our United States national security and the national security of our ally Israel. The Syrian rebels that the President wants to arm consist mostly of al Qaeda members that we've spent the last decade fighting a war against. Have we forgotten the thousands of Americans that were killed on September 11 in the horrific Twin Towers attack and here in this city at the Pentagon? We lost over 3,000 Americans that day. Are we forgetting who we fought in Iraq and in Afghanistan? It's my opinion, Madam Chair, that this is insanity to aid those who've taken the lives of Americans with impunity and continue to do so.

Just take note that the leader of al Qaeda is an individual named Zawahiri. Zawahiri called on Muslims from around the world to make their way to Syria and support the rebels and, in fact, become the rebels who are seeking to overthrow Assad.

We don't have a great track record, Madam Chair, of putting arms into the hands of terrorists. Take a look at the Fast and Furious program in Mexico and the terrorists who received arms from the United States. Take a look at Benghazi and the tens of thousands of weapons, MANPADS, that went into the hands of al Qaeda after Benghazi. And now we're intentionally going to make a decision to send money, training, and arms to al Qaeda?

How about a referendum with the American people? I think this would be more than a 90 percent issue. Don't do it. That's why we're standing here today. Don't do it.

The top spiritual leader of the Muslim Brotherhood is a man named Qaradawi. He has been outlawed from the United States because he's a terrorist. Also, he was outlawed from Egypt because he's a terrorist. He has called for jihad in Syria, and he has said:

Every Muslim trained to fight and capable of doing that must make himself available.

So you have the head of al Qaeda and the head of the terrorist organization the Muslim Brotherhood both calling

on Islamic jihadists to go to Syria to fight and be the rebels. And we're going to arm them, and we're going to train them, and we're going to provide material support to them? Not my vote.

Madam Chair, former President Morsi, who was formerly the head of the Muslim Brotherhood, which was outlawed under Mubarak in Egypt, he supported the call from hardline Egyptian clerics who called for Egyptians to go fight jihad in Syria. So you see, there's a common thread here. All the wrong guys on the wrong team are all calling for jihadists to go to Syria and fight. It was reported that over 2,500 Egyptians have already gone to Syria to fight jihad.

Pakistan Taliban fighters have left Pakistan to join the fight in Syria, and they're working with al Qaeda-affiliated groups in Syria.

On Monday, al Qaeda's Iraq-affiliated attack on the Abu Ghraib prison helped 500 inmates escape, most of whom were part of senior positions in al Qaeda. These prisoners included trained fighters and ideological extremists who are expected to travel to Syria to join the fight with the rebels.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield the gentlewoman as much time as she may consume.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, my friend.

These prisoners included trained fighters and ideological extremists who are expected to travel to Syria to join the fight with the rebels.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the top military officer in the United States, Martin Dempsey, has warned us that intervening in Syria could assist Islamist extremists, helping them gain access to chemical weapons and biological weapons and further erode United States military readiness already suffering from sharp defense budget cuts. He has said that using force is "no less than an act of war," and stated that some of the military options for Syria may not be feasible without compromising U.S. security elsewhere.

He made reference to the chaos in Iraq after the fall of Saddam Hussein and Libya after Qadhafi. He warned of the unintended consequences if Assad fell without having a viable opposition. He said "we could inadvertently empower extremists or unleash the very chemical weapons we seek to control."

This is a hub for jihadist activity. The American taxpayer has no obligation. In fact, I say this body must protect the American taxpayer from being involved in arming al Qaeda in Syria. We must defeat this effort, and that's why I'm in support of this today.

Again, we have the major general from the Israeli military intelligence, and he said that right before our eyes

the center of global jihad is developing; let's not do it. I agree with him.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 98 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____ No funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to fund military operations in Egypt, nor may funds made available by this Act be used by the Department of Defense to fund individuals, groups, or organizations engaged in paramilitary activity (as that term is used in section 401 of title 10, United States Code) in Egypt.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There's been some misunderstanding about what my amendment does. I welcome the opportunity to clarify the intention of the amendment.

I realize that Members of the House have different views about the current U.S. relationship with the Egyptian Government and the Egyptian military. This amendment is not designed to affect the current military-to-military relationship with Egypt. It is not intended to prevent U.S. participation in the Multinational Forward Observer mission in the Sinai, in other words, the peacekeeping mission. It is not intended to curtail the activities of the Office of Military Cooperation. It is not intended to prevent U.S. military exercises with the Egyptian military. And it is certainly not intended to prevent U.S. marines from providing security at our diplomatic facilities in Egypt.

My amendment is quite simple. It's intended to prevent the U.S. military from engaging in offensive operations in Egypt and to prevent the Defense Department from providing assistance to Egyptian paramilitary or terrorist groups.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Chair, I'm so pleased to hear my friend from Ken-

tucky further discuss the true intent of what his amendment does; and respectfully, I recognize that, in order for the amendment to be made in order, it has to be written broadly. And because it was written broadly, there were concerns expressed by a number of people on both sides of the aisle about what an amendment written this way might do that would negatively affect a lot of the things that we presently do and have been doing for a long time in Egypt.

I can speak personally to it because it was right after 9/11, while commanding an infantry battalion in Arkansas with the Arkansas National Guard, that I was called to duty to lead a task force of infantry soldiers and other personnel of over 500 men and women to the Sinai in Egypt to become the U.S. battalion so that other forces of the 18th Airborne Corps could go prosecute missions elsewhere in support of the war on terror.

The gunslingers of Arkansas distinguished themselves by going to the Sinai in Egypt on very short notice and executed that mission, the U.S. battalion in the South Sinai Peninsula that does the observe-and-report mission, consistent with all of the protocols that were established with the Treaty of Peace in 1979. In fact, our unit was there during the 20th anniversary of the MFO. Since that time, other State National Guard units have followed this mission and have been doing it consistently—Oregon, Oklahoma, and others—until, because of sequestration, the active component has accepted responsibility for that mission once again. So we've had a lot of our men and women across the country into the Sinai to do the mission of the MFO.

On top of that, our country has had a number of exercises called Bright Star, which is, if not the largest, one of the largest military training exercises that takes place on a biennial basis.

□ 1645

Now it didn't happen in 2011 because of unrest in Egypt, but my understanding is that Bright Star is certainly going to occur again.

So it is our hope, and as I said, I'm glad that my friend from Kentucky has further clarified the intent of his amendment, that it is not designed to affect the Multinational Forward Observer, nor is it designed to affect the training exercises that would happen with a Bright Star operation, nor does it affect what goes on with the Office of Military Cooperation or the Defense Attache program or, as he has indicated, our marine security to outposts in that region.

So again, I am very, very pleased, and we can breathe a bit of a sigh of relief that there is no intent in here at all to abandon, Madam Chair, the Treaty of Peace that was famously signed

in 1979, and everybody has the vivid reminder of that picture with Jimmy Carter in the middle and Anwar Sadat and Menachem Begin signing over that peace treaty.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I appreciate the words from my good colleague from Arkansas, and I certainly appreciate the service that he's provided to our country and the service that others have provided there in the mission of keeping the peace.

If we count the two chairmen of the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces, Egypt has been led by five different men in the past 2½ years. So five of them in 2½ years, only one of them democratically elected. I would say this is not a stable environment, and so my constituents have concerns that we don't escalate military activity in the region.

My good friend is correct about the intention of the amendment that I have offered. My amendment, again, is intended to prevent the U.S. military from engaging in offensive operations in Egypt and to prevent the Defense Department from providing assistance to the Egyptian paramilitary or terrorist groups. It's certainly not intended to prevent the peacekeeping missions or the current military missions there or, most of all, protecting our embassies. We want to make sure that we allow the service of our good marines over there in Egypt.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Chair, situations in Egypt have been problematic, and we're all dealing with that and trying to come to terms. But I want to remind Members that one reason we have a relationship with Egypt is the Israel-Egypt Peace Treaty. We helped forge peace between Egypt and Israel, a peace that has held for over 30 years.

Our military-to-military relationship has been a key component to keeping that peace. Since the signing of the treaty, the Egyptian military has been a reliable partner and ally. Throughout all the changes and turmoil, the Egyptian military has upheld our security arrangements, including the peace treaty. They've also maintained priority access for U.S. ships through the Suez Canal and allowed U.S. military planes to use their airspace. We cannot underestimate the importance of this.

Furthermore, since July 3, the Egyptian military has successfully closed nearly 80 percent of the tunnels used to smuggle goods and arms into the Gaza Strip. This is an important part of our partnership and how we've worked together. The relationship between the

United States and Egypt has never been more critical than it is now. This amendment could jeopardize our ability to help Egypt and Israel secure the Sinai if the intent were other than it has been explained just a few minutes ago. It could harm our efforts to secure the Libyan border with Egypt, which is used to smuggle weapons to be used against Israel.

It's vital to the United States national security that we maintain our long-standing relationship with the Egyptian military. I'm not going to oppose this amendment as long as the intent is not to interfere with this 30-year partnership and relationship. U.S. and Israeli security are simply too important to put at risk.

I appreciate the time and the effort.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Either to yourself or possibly for the author of the amendment, the question I have, because there has been a lot of talk, it is "not the intent of the amendment" to interfere with any intercooperation we have today with the Egyptians. It is not our intent not to be involved in the Sinai, but the amendment reads no funds, and then goes on to fund military operations in Egypt.

If I am an adviser, if I am a member of the uniformed services, how is the intent met under the particular restrictions of the amendment? That would be my question.

Mr. WOMACK. Reclaiming my time, I don't want to put words in the mouth of the author of the amendment, but I would yield to the gentleman from Kentucky to further clarify, as I understand it, his willingness to make sure that we make the appropriate adjustments to this amendment in a conference.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

To allay your concerns and the concerns of the gentlelady who spoke, the intentions are the intentions that have been mentioned here, and the verbiage that was allowed in the amendment process was very difficult to convey the intention. It would be our intention to work through the process going forward in conference or otherwise to ameliorate the language and to ameliorate your concerns.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. If the gentleman will yield, as a Member of the House and the committee, I would want to participate in that to ensure we do not disrupt the very positive interchange that is taking place.

Mr. WOMACK. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his further clarification of the intent going forward beyond this.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WOMACK. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, it is in our interest that we have a strong, stable, moderate, and truly democratic Egypt. It's in the best interests of both our countries. We've had a 30-year relationship, and those interests would be damaged if we decide to in any way disengage from Egypt and its people in their quest for a true democracy or reduce current levels of support for the Egyptian military. This is a country of 80 million people, a cornerstone of peace in the Middle East, despite its recent troubles, and we need to make sure that we keep the Egyptians close to us as a strong ally and work with their military operations.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Chair, let me just say in conclusion, I do appreciate my friend from Kentucky for further clarifying this intent of his amendment. It is something that I believe we can work with so long as we can make the proper adjustments once we get to conference.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113-170 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 67 by Mr. KILMER of Washington.

Amendment No. 69 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 70 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 73 by Mr. SCHIFF of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 277, noes 142, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

AYES—277

Andrews	Gibbs	Murphy (FL)
Bachus	Gibson	Nadler
Barber	Gohmert	Napolitano
Barr	Goodlatte	Neal
Barrow (GA)	Grayson	Negrete McLeod
Bass	Green, Al	Noem
Beatty	Green, Gene	Nolan
Becerra	Griffin (AR)	Nugent
Benishek	Griffith (VA)	O'Rourke
Bera (CA)	Grijalva	Owens
Bilirakis	Grimm	Palazzo
Bishop (GA)	Guthrie	Pascrell
Bishop (NY)	Gutiérrez	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Hahn	Payne
Black	Hall	Pearce
Blackburn	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Hanna	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hastings (FL)	Peters (CA)
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Peters (MI)
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Peterson
Bridenstine	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Brooks (AL)	Hinojosa	Pocan
Brooks (IN)	Holt	Poe (TX)
Broun (GA)	Honda	Polis
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Hudson	Quigley
Butterfield	Huelskamp	Rahall
Camp	Huffman	Rangel
Capito	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Capps	Hurt	Rice (SC)
Capuano	Israel	Richmond
Cardenas	Jackson Lee	Rigell
Carney	Jeffries	Roe (TN)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Cartwright	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rothfus
Castro (TX)	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Chu	Kaptur	Ruiz
Cicilline	Keating	Runyan
Clarke	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Clay	Kennedy	Rush
Cleaver	Kildee	Kilmer
Clyburn	Kilmer	Kind
Coffman	King (NY)	King (NY)
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Kuster
Cole	Kuster	Lamborn
Connolly	Lamborn	Langevin
Conyers	Langevin	Lankford
Cooper	Lankford	Larsen (WA)
Costa	Larsen (CT)	Latham
Courtney	Latham	Lee (CA)
Cramer	Lee (CA)	Levin
Crowley	Levin	Lewis
Cuellar	Lewis	Lipinski
Cummings	Lipinski	Loebach
Davis (CA)	Loebach	Lofgren
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Long
Davis, Rodney	Long	Lowenthal
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Lowe
DeGette	Lowe	Lujan Grisham
Delaney	Lujan Grisham	(NM)
DeLauro	(NM)	Luján, Ben Ray
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	(NM)
Dent	(NM)	Lynch
Deutch	Lynch	Maffei
Dingell	Maffei	Maloney,
Doggett	Maloney,	Carolyn
Doyle	Carolyn	Maloney, Sean
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Marino
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Massie
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Matheson
Edwards	Matheson	Matsui
Ellison	Matsui	McCollum
Engel	McCollum	McDermott
Enyart	McDermott	McGovern
Eshoo	McGovern	McIntyre
Esty	McIntyre	McKeon
Farenthold	McKeon	McKinley
Farr	McKinley	McMorris
Fattah	McMorris	Rodgers
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	McNerney
Fleming	McNerney	Meadows
Flores	Meadows	Meehan
Forbes	Meehan	Meeks
Fortenberry	Meeks	Meng
Foster	Meng	Messer
Fox	Messer	Michaud
Frankel (FL)	Michaud	Miller, George
Fudge	Miller, George	Moore
Gabbard	Moore	Moran
Galleo	Moran	
Garamendi		
Garcia		

Wilson (FL) Wittman
Wilson (SC) Wolf

NOES—142

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barton
Bentivolio
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Ellmers
Fincher
Fleischmann
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Harper
Harris

Hartzer
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nunnelee
Paulsen
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel

Reichert
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—14

Barletta
Bonner
Bustos
Campbell
Coble

Herrera Beutler
Horsford
Joyce
McCarthy (NY)
Olson

Pallone
Reed
Rokita
Vela

□ 1722

Messrs. PERRY and YOHO changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”
Messrs. ELLISON and STIVERS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. UPTON, PEARCE, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, MESSER, LEWIS, THOMPSON of Mississippi, BROOKS of Alabama, GIBBS, DENT, GUTHRIE, BISHOP of Utah, and RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. TERRY). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 242, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 408]

AYES—176

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownlee (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia

Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—242

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishke
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)

Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)

Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzer
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance

Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta
Bustos
Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Horsford

Johnson (GA)
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
McCarthy (NY)
Olson
Pallone

Rokita
Speier
Waters
Wittman

□ 1727

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 408, Nadler (NY) amendment No. 69, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 237, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

AYES—187

Amash	Grijalva	Nolan
Andrews	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Bass	Hahn	Pascrell
Beatty	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bera (CA)	Heck (NV)	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Peters (CA)
Blumenauer	Himes	Peters (MI)
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Holt	Petri
Braley (IA)	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Broun (GA)	Hoyer	Polis
Brown (FL)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Israel	Quigley
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Capps	Jeffries	Richmond
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Carney	Jones	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rush
Cartwright	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	T.
Chu	Kildee	Sanford
Cicilline	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clarke	Kind	Schakowsky
Clay	Kuster	Schiff
Cleaver	Langevin	Schneider
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Lee (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Conyers	Levin	Serrano
Cooper	Lewis	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lipinski	Sherman
Crowley	Loeb sack	Sires
Cummings	Lofgren	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lowey	Speier
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	(NM)	Takano
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Lynch	Tierney
Dingell	Maffei	Titus
Doggett	Maloney,	Tonko
Doyle	Carolyn	Tsongas
Duckworth	Massie	Van Hollen
Duncan (TN)	Matsui	Vargas
Edwards	McCollum	Veasey
Ellison	McDermott	Vela
Engel	McGovern	Velázquez
Enyart	McNerney	Visclosky
Eshoo	Meeks	Walz
Esty	Meng	Wasserman
Farr	Michaud	Schultz
Fattah	Miller, George	Watt
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Waxman
Fudge	Moran	Welch
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Nadler	Yarmuth
Garcia	Napolitano	
Grayson	Neal	
Green, Al	Negrete McLeod	

NOES—237

Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Alexander	Black	Camp
Amodei	Blackburn	Cantor
Bachmann	Bonner	Capito
Bachus	Boustany	Carter
Barber	Brady (TX)	Cassidy
Barr	Bridenstine	Chabot
Barrow (GA)	Brooks (AL)	Chaffetz
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Coffman
Benishek	Buchanan	Cole
Bentivolio	Bucshon	Collins (GA)
Billirakis	Burgess	Collins (NY)

Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Rice (SC)
Cook	Jordan	Rigell
Costa	Joyce	Roby
Cotton	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
Cramer	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Crawford	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Cuellar	Kinzing (IL)	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Kirkpatrick	Rooney
Daines	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Roskam
Delaney	LaMalfa	Ross
Denham	Lamborn	Rothfus
Dent	Lance	Royce
DeSantis	Lankford	Runyan
DesJarlais	Latham	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Salmon
Duffy	LoBiondo	Sanchez, Loretta
Duncan (SC)	Long	Scalise
Ellmers	Lucas	Schock
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Schrader
Fincher	Lummis	Schweikert
Fitzpatrick	Maloney, Sean	Scott, Austin
Fleischmann	Marchant	Scott, David
Fleming	Marino	Sessions
Flores	Matheson	Shimkus
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Shuster
Fortenberry	McCaul	Simpson
Foster	McClintock	Sinema
Fox	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Franks (AZ)	McIntyre	Smith (NE)
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Smith (NJ)
Galleo	McKinley	Smith (TX)
Gardner	McMorris	Southerland
Garrett	Rodgers	Stewart
Gerlach	Meadows	Stivers
Gibbs	Meehan	Stockman
Gibson	Messer	Stutzman
Greene (GA)	Mica	Terry
Gohmert	Miller (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Thornberry
Gosar	Miller, Gary	Tiberi
Gowdy	Mullin	Tipton
Granger	Mulvaney	Turner
Graves (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Upton
Graves (MO)	Neugebauer	Valadao
Green, Gene	Noem	Wagner
Griffin (AR)	Nugent	Walberg
Griffith (VA)	Nunes	Walden
Grimm	Nunnelee	Walorski
Guthrie	Olson	Weber (TX)
Hall	Owens	Webster (FL)
Hanna	Palazzo	Wenstrup
Harper	Paulsen	Westmoreland
Harris	Pearce	Whitfield
Hartzler	Perry	Williams
Hastings (WA)	Pittenger	Wilson (SC)
Hensarling	Pitts	Wittman
Holding	Poe (TX)	Wolf
Hudson	Pompeo	Womack
Huelskamp	Posney	Woodall
Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)	Yoder
Hultgren	Radel	Yoho
Hunter	Rahall	Young (AK)
Hurt	Reed	Young (FL)
Issa	Reichert	Young (IN)
Jenkins	Renacci	
Johnson (OH)	Ribble	

NOT VOTING—9

Barletta	Coble	McCarthy (NY)
Bustos	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Campbell	Horsford	Rokita

□ 1732

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 236, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

AYES—185

Amash	Hahn	O'Rourke
Bachmann	Hanabusa	Pascrell
Bass	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Beatty	Heck (WA)	Payne
Becerra	Higgins	Pelosi
Benishek	Himes	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Blumenauer	Holt	Peterson
Bonamici	Honda	Petri
Brady (PA)	Huelskamp	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Huffman	Pocan
Broun (GA)	Israel	Poe (TX)
Brown (FL)	Jackson Lee	Polis
Buchanan	Jeffries	Posney
Burgess	Johnson (GA)	Price (GA)
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Capuano	Jones	Quigley
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Rahall
Carney	Keating	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Kelly (IL)	Rohrabacher
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Rooney
Castro (TX)	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Chu	Kilmer	Ruiz
Cicilline	Kind	Rush
Clarke	Kuster	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Labrador	Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	T.
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
Coffman	Lee (CA)	Sanford
Cohen	Levin	Sarbanes
Connolly	Lewis	Schakowsky
Conyers	Loeb sack	Schiff
Cooper	Lofgren	Schrader
Courtney	Lowenthal	Schweikert
Crowley	Lowe	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Lujan Grisham	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Serrano
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray	Sires
DeGette	(NM)	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lynch	Speier
DelBene	Maffei	Stockman
Deutch	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
Dingell	Carolyn	Takano
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	Massie	Thompson (MS)
Duckworth	Matsui	Tierney
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Titus
Edwards	McCollum	Tonko
Ellison	McDermott	Tsongas
Engel	McGovern	Van Hollen
Enyart	McIntyre	Veasey
Eshoo	McNerney	Velázquez
Esty	Meeks	Michaud
Farr	Miller, George	Miller, George
Fattah	Moore	Moore
Frankel (FL)	Moran	Moran
Fudge	Mulvaney	Mulvaney
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Murphy (FL)
Garamendi	Nadler	Nadler
Garcia	Napolitano	Napolitano
Grayson	Neal	Negrete McLeod
Green, Al	Negrete McLeod	Nugent

NOES—236

Aderholt	Blackburn	Cartwright
Alexander	Bonner	Cassidy
Amodei	Boustany	Chabot
Andrews	Brady (TX)	Chaffetz
Bachus	Bridenstine	Cole
Barber	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)
Barrow (GA)	Brownley (CA)	Conaway
Barton	Bucshon	Cook
Bentivolio	Butterfield	Costa
Bera (CA)	Calvert	Cotton
Billirakis	Camp	Cramer
Bishop (GA)	Cantor	Crawford
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Crenshaw
Black	Carter	Cuellar

Culberson	Joyce	Rogers (AL)
Daines	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Davis (CA)	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Delaney	Kingston	Roskam
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross
Dent	Kirkpatrick	Rothfus
DeSantis	Kline	Royce
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Runyan
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Lance	Ryan (WI)
Duckworth	Langevin	Salmon
Duffy	Lankford	Scalise
Duncan (SC)	Latham	Schneider
Ellmers	Latta	Schock
Engel	Lipinski	Schwartz
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Scott, Austin
Fincher	Long	Scott, David
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Sessions
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Sewell (AL)
Fleming	Lummis	Shea-Porter
Flores	Marchant	Sherman
Forbes	Marino	Shimkus
Fortenberry	Matheson	Shuster
Foster	McCarthy (CA)	Simpson
Fox	McCaul	Sinema
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Smith (NE)
Fudge	McKinley	Smith (NJ)
Galleo	McMorris	Smith (TX)
Garcia	Rodgers	Smith (WA)
Gardner	Meadows	Southerland
Garrett	Meehan	Stewart
Gerlach	Messer	Stivers
Gibbs	Mica	Stutzman
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)	Terry
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Gosar	Miller, Gary	Thornberry
Gowdy	Mullin	Tiberi
Granger	Murphy (PA)	Tipton
Graves (MO)	Neugebauer	Turner
Griffin (AR)	Noem	Upton
Grimm	Nunes	Valadao
Guthrie	Nunnelee	Vargas
Hall	Olson	Vela
Hanna	Owens	Wagner
Harper	Palazzo	Walberg
Harris	Paulsen	Walden
Hartzler	Pearce	Walorski
Hastings (WA)	Perry	Walz
Heck (NV)	Peters (CA)	Weber (TX)
Hensarling	Pittenger	Webster (FL)
Holding	Pitts	Wenstrup
Hoyer	Pompeo	Westmoreland
Hudson	Radel	Whitfield
Huizenga (MI)	Reed	Williams
Hultgren	Reichert	Wilson (SC)
Hunter	Renacci	Wittman
Hurt	Ribble	Wolf
Issa	Rice (SC)	Womack
Jenkins	Richmond	Yoder
Johnson (OH)	Rigell	Yoho
Johnson, Sam	Roby	Young (FL)
Jordan	Roe (TN)	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta	Herrera Beutler	Neal
Bustos	Horsford	Pallone
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Rokita
Coble	Meng	Young (AK)

□ 1737

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 99 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of Mr. NUGENT to offer the Nugent amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, is it in order for a designee to offer an amendment on behalf of its sponsor on this bill?

The Acting CHAIR. Would the gentleman please restate the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, is it in order for a designee to offer an amendment on behalf of its sponsor on this rule?

The Acting CHAIR. Under the terms of House Report 113-170, the named sponsor of an amendment may name a designee.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, point of further parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Does the gentleman from Kansas have a formal designation of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT)?

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair has been made aware that the gentleman from Kansas is the designee of the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____ . None of funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Security Agency to—

(1) conduct an acquisition pursuant to section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 for the purpose of targeting a United States person; or

(2) acquire, monitor, or store the contents (as such term is defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code) of any electronic communication of a United States person from a provider of electronic communication services to the public pursuant to section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) and a Member opposed each will control 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer this evening clarifies and confirms the scope of two programs that Mr. Snowden illegally exposed while sitting in a hotel room in Communist China.

First, the amendment clarifies that under section 702 no U.S. citizen or person in the U.S. can be targeted, period. I say again, no U.S. person under section 702 may be targeted in any way by the United States Government. While there are other specific authorities the U.S. person may be subject to an investigation, the U.S. Government may not do so under section 702. That's what this amendment intends to clarify.

The second part of the amendment clarifies section 215, also known as section 501 of FISA. The amendment clarifies that no content of communications can be stored or collected by the National Security Agency—that's no emails, no video clips, no Skype. No record of the actual conversation or

the contents thereof may be recorded or collected by the National Security Agency. I can't repeat that enough. That's the intent of this amendment.

I want to make clear to everyone that, contrary to the suggestions of some, the NSA has not been acting outside of the scope of its authorities. The Meta-Data program is carefully designed with program layers of oversight by all three branches of government. This is precisely the way our government ought to operate, with input from Article I and Article II and Article III of the United States Constitution.

It is, of course, our duty to ensure that the NSA stays within these legal bounds here in Congress, and this amendment makes those boundaries perfectly clear for everyone to know and understand.

And we shouldn't mislead the American people into thinking that the NSA has been acting illegally. There is perhaps no program in the United States Government that is as carefully monitored and overseen as the programs this amendment attempts to clarify.

To the extent that some in this Chamber wish to review or provide more protections and controls for these programs, we should proceed through a carefully considered and debated legislative process so that the full implications for our security are clearly understood.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 7½ minutes.

□ 1745

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been described and offered as an alternative to the Amash-Conyers amendment that we will consider next. It is not.

This amendment restates the existing ban on the intentional targeting of United States persons under section 702. It also places into law for the next fiscal year the Obama administration's current ban on collecting the contents of the communications of U.S. persons under section 215. I agree with these prohibitions. But they have nothing to do with the current misuse of section 215 to engage in the suspicionless, bulk collection of Americans' telephone records.

The dragnet collection under section 215 telephone metadata program reveals call information—including all numbers dialed, all incoming phone numbers and call duration—but not the content of communications. Therefore, this amendment would have no impact whatsoever on this misuse of section

215. Metadata reveals highly personal and sensitive information, including, for example, when and how often one calls the doctor, a journalist, or the local Tea Party or ACLU affiliate. By tracing the pattern of calls, the government can paint a detailed picture of anyone's personal, professional, and political associations and activities.

Congress never authorized this type of unchecked, sweeping surveillance of our citizens. It is this problem—the indiscriminate, bulk collection of metadata under section 215—that we need to fix right now.

The Amash-Conyers amendment does so by restoring the required reasonable relationship between the collection of records and specific persons being investigated under section 215. The Amash-Conyers amendment ensures that this standard is not ignored by the administration or by the FISA Court, as is happening now.

This amendment does not fix the problem with 215. The Amash-Conyers amendment does. However you vote on this amendment, and I intend to vote in favor of it, it is imperative that we also vote in favor of the Amash-Conyers amendment because this amendment, although doing no harm, does not solve the problems that Congress and Mr. SENSENBRENNER and many others have articulated with respect to the misuse of section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Kansas for offering this amendment, because it helps focus on what concerns most Americans and it clarifies what really is and is not happening.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes it is a challenge for those of us on the Intelligence Committee to talk openly about this—even the safeguards—in some of these programs. But this amendment helps make it clear and reassures Americans about some of the things they may have read or heard that is occurring with NSA. But at the same time, this amendment is not an overreaction that actually increases the danger that Americans face from terrorism around the world.

This amendment says clearly that NSA cannot acquire information for the purpose of targeting Americans, and it says clearly that NSA may not acquire, monitor, or store the content of the communication of any Americans.

I think the key point that Members need to know is there are multiple layers of safeguards to make sure that these programs operate exactly in the way that the FISA Court has laid them out to operate.

The Intelligence Committees of both the House and Senate do a considerable amount of oversight, get regular reports. Even if somebody accidentally punches a “2” versus a “3” on their keyboard, we get a report about that. And it even goes so far as members of the Intelligence Committee can go sit next to the analysts and watch what they are doing.

But it is not just the Intelligence Committees. The FISA Court has oversight of the same sorts of reports. They can change the guidelines that it operates under. But in addition to that, there are internal inspector general monitoring of these. So you get every branch of government involved in making sure that the safeguards are in place and those same safeguards will be in place to make sure that the provisions of the gentleman's amendment are followed as well.

Some, however, Mr. Chairman, would do away with these programs. No amount of safeguards are good for them. But they never say what would replace them, they never say what would fill the gap in meeting our responsibilities to defend Americans. They would just have them go away, and I guess assume that somehow or other that Americans could be made safe.

The truth is, we had been incredibly successful and somewhat lucky since 9/11 as far as preventing further terrorist attacks on our homeland. That is because of the work of the military, intelligence professionals, law enforcement and, as I say, a fair amount of luck.

But these programs at NSA have made a crucial contribution to that success over the last decade. It seems to me it would be foolhardy to toss them away, as some would want to do.

I think this amendment strikes the right approach. I also believe, Mr. Chairman, The Wall Street Journal makes a good point in today's editorial when it says:

The last thing Congress should do is kill a program in a rush to honor the reckless claims of Mr. Snowden and his apologists.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Thank you, Mr. POMPEO.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pompeo amendment.

This amendment strongly reaffirms that in America, privacy and security must coexist together. This amendment states in no uncertain terms that the government cannot use section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISA, to intentionally target an American for surveillance.

This important amendment also reaffirms that phone conversations cannot be collected through section 215 of the

PATRIOT Act. It makes the intentions of Congress very clear.

I believe the Pompeo amendment makes a powerful statement that NSA cannot target Americans for the collection or listen to their phone calls. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.” However, I do understand the concerns of the American people and of Congress when it comes to these programs.

On the House Intelligence Committee, we are reviewing and evaluating potential ways to change the FISA Act that will provide the intelligence community with the tools it needs to keep our country safe while also protecting privacy and civil liberties. We are committed to having this important discussion. However, I do have concerns about the amendment we will debate next.

The Amash amendment is an on/off switch for section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. It will have an immediate operational impact and our country will be more vulnerable to terrorist attacks. This authority has helped prevent terrorist attacks on U.S. soil. A planned attack on the New York City subway system was stopped because of section 215.

But the Amash amendment passes this authority and it will end it. This amendment goes too far, too fast, on the wrong legislative vehicle. We need to debate the scope of this program, and we are, but this is an extreme knee-jerk reaction to the situation.

This program has been authorized and reauthorized by Congress. It receives extensive oversight by the Intelligence Committee and is a vital tool for our intelligence community to protect our Nation. Remember, 9/11 happened in part because we failed to connect the dots. One of the critical tools we now have and use to connect those dots is section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. Remember, this is just phone records—just phone numbers—no conversations.

I respectfully urge a “no” vote on the Amash amendment and a “yes” vote on the Pompeo amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the State of California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Thank you, Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote on the amendment. Why? Because it restates current law, and current law has been interpreted by the administration in a way that is, frankly, contrary to the intent of the crafters of the PATRIOT Act.

Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act says that you can obtain information that is relevant to a national security investigation.

Now, what has happened since Congress enacted that provision? It is a low bar, but under the NSA's interpretation, it is no bar at all. Because, as has been widely reported, they are collecting the information about every

phone call made by every American. Clearly, that is not relevant to a terrorist investigation.

I think it is important to note that business records that are the subject of 215 include a lot of sensitive information. What are business records? phone records? Internet records? credit card records? medical records? Are these things that we would voluntarily give up to the government? No. They are incredibly sensitive, and that's why they are being sought.

I do think it is important to note that the amendment that will follow after this one doesn't end the ability of the government to pursue terrorism. We are all for that. It merely requires that the government adhere to the law, which requires that there be relevance to a terrorist investigation.

I certainly do not challenge the motivation of the gentleman who has offered this amendment, but I do think if you think that this provides a remedy, then you are wrong. This provides a fig leaf.

We should vote against it, and I hope that we will move on to the Amash amendment and solve the problem today.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to correct a couple of things.

This legislation is not a fig leaf. It is intended to clarify some things that have been said, some beliefs that people hold, about what section 215 authorizes and what section 702 authorizes.

It is intended to make crystal clear to everyone here, as well as to the American public, the boundaries of these two important national security programs. These laws have been in place and interpreted by multiple administrations in the same way. There was no change in this law when this President came into office, and we should continue to support these programs regardless of who is the Commander in Chief for the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 100 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to execute a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court order pursuant to section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) that does not include the following sentence: "This Order limits the collection of any tangible things (including telephone numbers dialed, telephone numbers of incoming calls, and the duration of calls) that may be authorized to be collected pursuant to this Order to those tangible things that pertain to a person who is the subject of an investigation described in section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) and a Member opposed each will control 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

We are here today for a very simple reason: to defend the Fourth Amendment, to defend the privacy of each and every American.

As the Director of National Intelligence has made clear, the government collects the phone records without suspicion of every single American in the United States.

My amendment makes a simple, but important change. It limits the government's collection of the records to those records that pertain to a person who is the subject of an investigation pursuant to section 215.

□ 1800

Opponents of this amendment will use the same tactic that every government throughout history has used to justify its violation of rights—fear. They will tell you that the government must violate the rights of the American people to protect us against those who hate our freedoms. They will tell you there is no expectation of privacy in documents that are stored with a third party. Tell that to the American people. Tell that to our constituents back home.

We are here to answer one question for the people we represent: Do we oppose the suspicionless collection of every American's phone records?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 7½ minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am very happy to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished chairman of the House

Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I think the American people and, certainly, some well-intentioned Members in this Chamber have legitimate concerns. They should be addressed. We should have time and education on what actually happens in the particular program of which we speak.

I will pledge to each one of you today and give you my word that this fall, when we do the Intel authorization bill, that we will work to find additional privacy protections with this program which have no email, no phone calls, no names, and no addresses.

Fourteen Federal judges have said, yes, this comports with the Constitution; 800 cases around the 1979 case have affirmed the underpinnings of the legality of this case—800. So 14 judges are wrong, and 800 different cases are wrong. The legislators on both Intelligence committees—Republicans and Democrats—are all wrong.

Why is it that people of both parties came together and looked at this program at a time when our Nation was under siege by those individuals who wanted to bring violence to the shores of the United States?

It is that those who know it best support the program because we spend as much time on this to get it right, to make sure the oversight is right. No other program has the legislative branch, the judicial branch, and the executive branch doing the oversight of a program like this. If we had this in the other agencies, we would not have problems.

Think about who we are in this body. Have 12 years gone by and our memories faded so badly that we've forgotten what happened on September 11?

This bill turns off a very specific program. It doesn't stop so-called "spying" and other things that this has been alleged to do. That's not what's happening. It's not a surveillance bill. It's not monitoring. It doesn't do any of those things.

What happened after September 11 that we didn't know on September 10—again, passing this amendment takes us back to September 10, and afterwards we said, wow, there is a seam, a gap—was somebody leading up to the September 11 attacks who was a terrorist overseas, called a "terrorist," living amongst us in the United States, and we missed it because we didn't have this capability.

What if we'd have caught it?

The good news is we don't have to what-if. It's not theoretical. Fifty-four times this and the other program stopped and thwarted terrorist attacks both here and in Europe—saving real lives. This isn't a game. This is real. It will have a real consequence. This is hard.

Think about the people who came here before us in this great body—Madison, Lincoln, Kennedy served here—and about the issues they dealt with and about the politics of “big” and of moving America forward while upholding the article I mandate to this House in that we must provide for the general defense of the United States. Think of those challenges. Think of those challenges that they met.

Are we so small that we can only look at our Facebook “likes” today in this Chamber, or are we going to stand up and find out how many lives we can save?

Let us get back to the big politics of protecting America and of moving America forward. Soundly reject this amendment. Let's do this right in the Intel authorization bill.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, this amendment will not stop the proper use of the PATRIOT Act or stop the FISA authorities from conducting terrorism and intelligence investigations. I'd never block that.

All this amendment is intending to do is to curtail the ongoing dragnet collection and storage of the personal records of innocent Americans. It does not defund the NSA, and it will continue to allow them to conduct full-fledged surveillance as long as it relates to an actual investigation.

Our joining together on this bipartisan amendment demonstrates our joint commitment to ensure that our fight against terrorism and espionage follows the rule of law and the clear intent of the statutes passed by this Congress. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this amendment.

I rise in support of this amendment, which I am cosponsoring with my colleague from Michigan, Representative JUSTIN AMASH.

This amendment will prevent mass collection of personal records, such as phone calling information, under Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act. When Congress passed and later revised this provision, we did not intend for it to authorize the bulk, indiscriminate collection of personal information of individuals not under investigation.

However, we have learned that this law has been misused to allow the collection of call detail information on every phone call made in the United States under a bizarre interpretation of the statute's authorization to collect “relevant” information. As my colleague and author of the statute, Representative JIM SENBRENNER, has stated, “This expansive characterization of relevance makes a mockery of the legal standard.”

This amendment will not stop the proper use of PATRIOT Act and FISA authorities to conduct terrorism and intelligence investigations. All this amendment is intended to do is curtail the ongoing dragnet collection and stor-

age of the personal records of innocent Americans. It does not defund the NSA, and it would continue to allow them to conduct full-fledged surveillance as long as it relates to an actual investigation.

Our joining together on this bipartisan amendment demonstrates our joint commitment to ensuring that our fight against terrorism and espionage follows the rule of law and the clear intent of the statutes passed by Congress. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this amendment to demonstrate our bipartisan commitment to protecting individual liberty.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am very happy to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Madam Chair, this is a very important issue that we are taking up today because the number one duty of the Federal Government is the safety of the American people—of our constituents and of our own skins, the skins of each one of us in this Chamber today. As we know all too well, national security is a real and present danger, and it is something that we have to take quite seriously. We can't deal in false narratives.

A false narrative has emerged that the Federal Government is taking in the content of Americans' phone calls. It's not true. It's not happening.

A false narrative has emerged that the Federal Government is taking in the content of the American people's emails. It's not true. It's not happening.

We need to deal in facts. The facts are real, and the facts are these:

The only people who have benefited from the revelation of classified information by someone who worked for this government—who intentionally and without authorization declassified some of the most sensitive national security information that we have—are those who are engaged in Islamic jihad. They will have been benefited, and those whom we seek to protect will have not.

Consider this:

There is more information about each one of us contained in the phone book that sits at home on your kitchen counter than information that is in the National Security Database that we're talking about today. Your name, your address are in the phone book. Your name, your address are not in this National Security Database.

No other nation in the world has the advantage that the United States of America has on national security—no other nation—and we by this amendment today would agree to handcuff ourselves and our allies by restricting ourselves? Let it not be. Let us not deal in false narratives. Let us deal in facts that will keep the American people safe.

When you look at an envelope, when a letter is put in the mail, is there a

privacy right as to what has been written on that envelope? No, there isn't. There is a privacy right as to what is contained inside that envelope. That's a Fourth Amendment right.

Is there a Fourth Amendment right to the record that you called someone on a certain day? No, there isn't—that's a record—but there is a Fourth Amendment right to what's in that phone call. Let's deal in reality, not in false narratives.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENBRENNER).

Mr. SENBRENNER. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of the Amash amendment. I do so as the person who was the principal author of the PATRIOT Act in 2001, who got that law through quickly after 9/11 and who supported and managed its 2006 reauthorization.

Let me make this perfectly clear that unlike what we have heard from speakers on the other side of this issue, this amendment does not stop the collection of data under section 215—the people who are subject to an investigation of an authorized terrorist plot. What it does do is to prevent the collection of data of people who are not subject to an investigation.

Now, relevance is required in any type of a grand jury subpoena or in a criminal collection of data for a criminal trial. This goes far beyond what the NSA is doing. The time has come to stop it, and the way we stop it is to approve this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership on this important issue.

Madam Chair, reports of the NSA surveillance program have broad and far-reaching consequences.

Many Americans feel that our fundamental liberties as a country and our constitutional rights are threatened. In addition, it has ruined and hurt our reputation abroad—threatening our trade relationships with allies, threatening American jobs as a result, and putting in danger our cooperative security relationships that we need to fight the war on terror.

The responsible thing to do is to show some contrition. Let's pass this amendment. Let's make sure that we can have a practical approach that shows that protecting our liberties and securities are consistent and critical for the United States of America. I urge a “yes” vote.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chair, here is the question:

It's a question of balancing privacy versus security. It's a question beyond that. It's a question of who will do the balancing.

Right now, the balancing is being done by people we do not know, by people we do not elect and, in large part right now, by somebody who has admitted lying to this body at a hearing. That's wrong.

We should be doing the balancing. We were elected to do that. We need to pass this amendment so that we can do the balancing, not the folks who are not elected and whom we do not know.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. May I inquire of the Chair how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN). The gentleman from Michigan has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. I want to talk about the much ballyhooed oversight.

Every year, there is a report to the Judiciary Committee, an annual report, on section 215. This year, the report was eight sentences—less than a full page. To think that the Congress has substantial oversight of this program is simply incorrect. I cannot match Mr. SENSENBRENNER's brilliant remarks; but I do agree that when we wrote the PATRIOT Act relevance had a meaning.

Madam Chair, I submit for the RECORD a letter to Mr. SENSENBRENNER from the Department of Justice, which basically says, because 300 inquiries were made, the records of every single American became relevant. That's a joke.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2013.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SENSENBRENNER: This responds to your letter to the Attorney General dated June 6, 2013, regarding the "business records" provision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), 50 U.S.C. § 1861, enacted as section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act.

As you know, on June 5, 2013, the media reported the unauthorized disclosure of a classified judicial order issued under this provision that has been used to support a sensitive intelligence collection program. Under this program, which has been briefed to Congress and repeatedly authorized by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) obtains authorization to collect telephony metadata, including the telephone numbers dialed and the date, time and duration of calls, from certain telecommunications service providers. The National Security Agency (NSA), in turn, archives and analyzes this information under carefully controlled circumstances and provides leads to the FBI or others in the Intelligence Community for counterterrorism purposes. Aspects of this program remain classified, and there are limits to what can be said about it in an un-

classified letter. Department of Justice and Intelligence Community staff are available to provide you a briefing on the program at your request.

In your letter, you asked whether this intelligence collection program is consistent with the requirements of section 215 and the limits of that authority. Under section 215, the Director of the FBI may apply to the FISC for an order directing the production of any tangible things, including business records, for investigations to protect against international terrorism. To issue such an order, the FISC must determine that (1) there are reasonable grounds to believe that the things sought are relevant to an authorized investigation, other than a threat assessment; (2) the investigation is being conducted under guidelines approved by the Attorney General under Executive Order 12333; and (3) if a U.S. person is the subject of the investigation, the investigation is not being conducted solely upon the basis of First Amendment protected activities. In addition, the FISC may only require the production of items that can be obtained with a grand jury subpoena or any other court order directing the production of records or tangible things. Finally, the program must, of course, comport with the Constitution.

The telephony metadata program satisfies each of these requirements. The lawfulness of the telephony metadata collection program has repeatedly been affirmed by the FISC. In the years since its inception, multiple FISC judges have granted 90-day extensions of the program after concluding that it meets all applicable legal requirements.

Of particular significance to your question is the relevance to an authorized international terrorism investigation of the telephony metadata collected through this program. First, it is critical to understand the program in the context of the restrictions imposed by the court. Those restrictions strictly limit the extent to which the data is reviewed by the government. In particular, the FISC allows the data to be queried for intelligence purposes only when there is reasonable suspicion, based on specific facts, that a particular query term, such as a telephone number, is associated with a specific foreign terrorist organization that was previously identified to and approved by the court. NSA has reported that in 2012, fewer than 300 unique identifiers were used to query the data after meeting this standard. This means that only a very small fraction of the records is ever reviewed by any person, and only specially cleared counterterrorism personnel specifically trained in the court-approved procedures can access the records to conduct queries. The information generated in response to these limited queries is not only relevant to authorized investigations of international terrorism, but may be especially significant in helping the government identify and disrupt terrorist plots.

The large volume of telephony metadata is relevant to FBI investigations into specific foreign terrorist organizations because the intelligence tools that NSA uses to identify the existence of potential terrorist communications within the data require collecting and storing large volumes of the metadata to enable later analysis. If not collected and held by NSA, the metadata may not continue to be available for the period that NSA has deemed necessary for national security purposes because it need not be retained by telecommunications service providers. Moreover, unless the data is aggregated by NSA, it may not be possible to identify telephony

metadata records that cross different telecommunications networks. The bulk collection of telephony metadata—i.e. the collection of a large volume and high percentage of information about unrelated communications—is therefore necessary to identify the much smaller subset of terrorist-related telephony metadata records contained within the data. It also allows NSA to make connections related to terrorist activities over time and can assist counterterrorism personnel to discover whether known or suspected terrorists have been in contact with other persons who may be engaged in terrorist activities, including persons and activities inside the United States. Because the telephony metadata must be available in bulk to allow NSA to identify the records of terrorist communications, there are "reasonable grounds to believe" that the data is relevant to an authorized investigation to protect against international terrorism, as section 215 requires, even though most of the records in the dataset are not associated with terrorist activity.

The program is consistent with the Constitution as well as with the statute. As noted above, the only type of information acquired under the program is telephony metadata, not the content of any communications, not the identity, address or financial information of any party to the communication, and not geolocation information. Under longstanding Supreme Court precedent, there is no reasonable expectation of privacy with respect to this kind of information that individuals have already provided to third-party businesses, and such information therefore is not protected by the Fourth Amendment. See *Smith v. Maryland*, 442 U.S. 735, 739–42 (1979).

Moreover, it is important to bear in mind that activities carried out pursuant to FISA, including those conducted under this program, are subject to stringent limitations and robust oversight by all three branches of government. As noted above, by order of the FISC, the Government is prohibited from indiscriminately sifting through the telephony metadata it acquires. Instead, all information that is acquired is subject to strict, court-imposed restrictions on review and handling that provide significant and reasonable safeguards for U.S. persons. The basis for a query must be documented in writing in advance and must be approved by one of a limited number of highly trained analysts. The FISC reviews the program approximately every 90 days.

The Department of Justice conducts rigorous oversight to ensure the telephony metadata is being handled in strict compliance with the FISC's orders, and the Department of Justice and The Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) conduct thorough and regular reviews to ensure the program is implemented in compliance with the law.

The program is also subject to extensive congressional oversight. The classified details of the program have been briefed to the Judiciary and Intelligence Committees on many occasions. In addition, in December 2009, the Department of Justice worked with the Intelligence Community to provide a classified briefing paper to the House and Senate Intelligence Committees to be made available to all Members of Congress regarding the telephony metadata collection program. It is our understanding that both Intelligence Committees made this document available to all Members prior to the February 2010 reauthorization of section 215. That briefing paper clearly explained that

the government and the FISC had interpreted Section 215 to authorize the collection of telephony metadata in bulk. An updated version of the briefing paper was provided to the Senate and House Intelligence Committees again in February 2011 in connection with the reauthorization that occurred later that year.

Finally, we do not agree with the suggestion in your letter that the Department's March 9, 2011 public testimony on section 215 conveyed a misleading impression as to how this authority is used. Quoting a portion of that testimony, your letter states that it "left the committee with the impression that the Administration was using the business records provision sparingly and for specific materials. The recently released FISA order, however, could not have been drafted more broadly." In fact, key language in the testimony in question noted that orders issued pursuant to section 215 "have also been used to support important and highly sensitive intelligence collection operations, on which this committee and others have been separately briefed." We hope that the explanation above regarding the use of this authority to identify specific terrorism-related telephony metadata records helps to clarify the point.

The recent unauthorized disclosure of this and other classified intelligence activities has caused serious harm to our national security. Since the disclosure of the telephony metadata collection program, the Department of Justice and the Intelligence Community have worked to ensure that Congress and the American people understand how the program operates, its importance to our security, and the rigorous oversight that is applied. As part of this effort, senior officials from ODNI, NSA, DOJ and FBI provided a classified briefing for all House Members on June 11, 2013 and separate classified briefings to the House Democratic Caucus and the House Republican Conference on June 26, 2013.

The Department of Justice is committed to ensuring that our efforts to protect national security are conducted lawfully and respect the privacy and civil liberties of all Americans. We look forward to continuing to work with you and others in the Congress to ensure that we meet this objective.

We hope this information is helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact this office if we may provide additional assistance with this or any other matter.

Sincerely,

PETER J. KADZIK,

Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, this is not about how sincere the NSA people are in implementing this technique. It is not about how careful they are. It is whether they have the right to collect the data in the first place on every phone call on every American every day.

The PATRIOT Act did not specifically authorize it. Section 215 talks about tangible things that are relevant to an authorized security investigation. In the NSA's interpretation of that, "relevant" is all data all the time. That is simply wrong. We should support the Amash amendment and vote for it.

□ 1815

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chair, amendment IV:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, house, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Those who choose to trade liberty for security will find they have neither.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Warrants need to be particular and specific about the place to be searched and the items to be seized.

No judge would ever sign a general search warrant like the British did, allowing the police to search every house on the block, much less seize everybody's phone records, but this is what has happened under section 215 under the government.

The government has gone too far in the name of security and the Fourth Amendment has been bruised.

Rein in government invasion. No more dragnet operations. Get a specific warrant based on probable cause, or stay out of our lives.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairperson, this amendment stops the government from misusing section 215, to engage in the dragnet collection of all of our personal telephone records. Congress did not grant the executive the authority to collect everything it wants so long as it limits any subsequent search of that data.

This amendment restores the requirement that records sought are relevant to an authorized foreign intelligence or terrorist investigation. It restores the minimal relevant standard required by Congress but ignored by successive administrations.

No administration should be permitted to operate above or beyond the law as they have done in this respect. I therefore urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of the Amash-Conyers amendment.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. General warrants, writs of assistance, that's what we're looking at, and the Founding Fathers found that to be anathema. What they're doing does violate the Fourth Amendment. We took an oath to uphold the Constitution, and we're supposed to rely on a secret agency that deals with a secret court that

deals with a selective secrecy committee; and Members of Congress are limited to their access to the actions of that committee, but we're supposed to trust them.

Folks, we've got a job to do. Vote "yes."

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 45 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Chairwoman, countless men and women from my State of Hawaii and all across the country have worn the uniform and put their lives on the line to protect our freedoms and our liberties. I cannot in good conscience vote to take a single dollar from the pockets of hardworking taxpayers from across the country to pay for programs which infringe on the very liberties and freedoms our troops have fought and died for.

Ben Franklin said:

They who give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We're here to answer one question for the people we represent: Do we oppose the suspicion list collection of every American's phone records?

When you had the chance to stand up for Americans' privacy, did you?

Please support the Amash amendment and oppose the NSA's blanket surveillance of our constituents.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes for the closing argument to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. Madam Chairwoman, I rise to strongly urge opposition to the Amash amendment.

This program has stopped dozens of terrorist attacks. That means it's saved untold American lives.

This amendment is not simple. It does not limit the program. It does not modify it. It does not constrain the program. It ends the program. It blows it up. Some of you've heard the analogy that if you want to search for a needle in a haystack, you have to have the haystack. This takes a leaf blower and blows away the entire haystack. You will not have this program if this amendment passes. And it does so, despite all of the safeguards you have already heard.

This program is constitutional under Supreme Court precedent—not recent precedent. Precedent goes back to 1979, just 2 years after I was born, the year that one of the young sponsors of this amendment was born. This program is approved by large bipartisan majorities of this body on the statute—text that they approved, not their secret intents or wishes.

It is overseen by article III judges who have been confirmed by the Senate and are independent of the executive branch. It is reviewed by the Intelligence Committees, and it is executed primarily by military officers, not generals, but the majors and the colonels who have been fighting and bleeding for this country for 12 years.

What is it, metadata? It sounds kind of scary. It's nothing more than an Excel spreadsheet with five columns: called to, called from, date, time, and the duration. Five columns, billions of rows. It's in a lockbox. It can't be searched unless you have specific suspicion of a number being used by a terrorist. Only then do they go into that database and do they run a search for what that number has been calling.

Why do you need it? Verizon, AT&T, other companies will not keep this data for the years necessary. Secondly, you need it quickly. When I was in Iraq as a platoon leader with the 101st Airborne, if we rolled up a bad guy and we found a cell phone or we found a thumb drive, we would immediately upload that data so intelligence professionals could search it so they could go roll up another bad guy, because you only have a few hours to stop a terrorist once you catch another terrorist.

Folks, we are at war. You may not like that truth. I wish it weren't the truth. But it is the truth. We're at war. Do not take this tool away from our warriors on the frontline.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I want to thank Representative AMASH for offering this amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for 2014. We now know that the National Security Agency (NSA) is keeping a phone log of all calls made in the U.S. This issue merits heightened congressional scrutiny. We need to strike a balance between our efforts to prevent terrorist attacks and our protection of civil liberties. The committees with jurisdiction are conducting a thorough review—as they should. I look forward to hearing their recommendations.

That said, rewriting laws—especially one that NSA Director Gen. Keith Alexander says is vital to our safety—is not within the scope of the appropriations process. I welcome further discussion about the scope and intent of the PATRIOT Act, and look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that the law is not overly broad. So though I commend Mr. AMASH for raising this issue, I must respectfully vote against his amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and wish to express my appreciation to Defense Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for their skillful leadership in shepherding H.R. 2397, the Defense Appropriations Act for FY2014, to the floor.

This body has no greater obligation than to ensure that our men and women in uniform, and those civilians who support them, have the resources needed to keep our country safe. I want to thank the Chairman and Rank-

ing Member for crafting a bill that keeps faith with our obligation to those who risk their lives to protect our freedoms.

Madam Chair, let me also express my appreciation to my friend and colleague, Congressman AMASH, and to Congressman CONYERS, the gentleman from Michigan and the Ranking Member of Judiciary Committee, for their good and hard work in fashioning the bipartisan amendment before us. Their work on the Amash-Conyers amendment is an example of what can be accomplished when members put aside partisanship and work across the aisle in an effort to come up with workable solutions to serious problems.

Madam Chair, the Amash-Conyers Amendment to H.R. 2397 prohibits the use of appropriated funds execute any order issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISA Court) that does not include the following sentence:

This Order limits the collection of any tangible things (including telephone numbers dialed, telephone numbers of incoming calls, and the duration of calls) that may be authorized to be collected pursuant to this Order to those tangible things that pertain to a person who is the subject of an investigation described in 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861).

The Amash-Conyers Amendment was prompted by the recent unauthorized disclosures regarding the National Security Agency's collection from Verizon of the phone records of all of its American customers, which was authorized by the FISA Court pursuant to Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

Public reaction to the news of this massive and secret data gathering operation was swift and negative. There was justifiable concern on the part of the public and a large percentage of the Members of this body that the extent and scale of this NSA data collection operation, which exceeded by orders of magnitude anything previously authorized or contemplated, may constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy and threat to the civil liberties of American citizens.

To quell the growing controversy, the Director of National Intelligence declassified and released limited information about this program. According to the DNI, the program does not allow the Government to listen in on anyone's phone calls. Nor does the information acquired include the content of any communications or the identity of any subscriber.

The DNI stated that "the only type of information acquired under the Court's order is telephony metadata, such as telephone numbers dialed and length of calls." The DNI stated that the data collection was "broad in scope because more narrow collection would limit our ability to screen for and identify terrorism-related communications. Acquiring this information allows us to make connections related to terrorist activities over time."

As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I have long been committed to safeguarding and protecting the constitutional rights and civil liberties of all Americans. Indeed, in 2001 I voted against the Patriot Act on the House floor because I was concerned that it did not contain sufficient protections to safeguard civil liberties, after it was rewritten from the bipartisan committee product that had strong civil liberties' protections.

I am also a charter member of the Homeland Security Committee, which is charged with the indispensable role of providing direction, guidance, and oversight to the Department of Homeland Security so that it fulfills its mission of keeping the homeland safe. So I am very familiar and sensitive to the inherent tensions between liberty and security.

I believe the questions raised by supporters of the Amash-Conyers Amendment about the NSA metadata program are legitimate, particularly the question whether there are sufficient protections for Americans' civil liberties. On the other hand, I am concerned that the amendment would also have the effect of precluding the use of section 501 to obtain an individual order for any business record (not just telephone data) about a person associated with someone who is the subject of an authorized investigation because of the defunding.

Madam Chair, striking the appropriate balance between the competing interests of national security and civil liberties requires thoughtful and careful deliberation. I believe that decisions of this scope and moment should be made in the regular legislative process where they are first vetted by the committees of jurisdiction which have the resources and expertise to examine the issues carefully, debate them fully, and to compile a legislative record that will enable the House to render a wise and informed judgment.

Because a funds limitation provision on an appropriations bill is poorly suited for this purpose, I do not support the Amash-Conyers Amendment. In contrast, I support and am an original co-sponsor of H.R. 2399, the "Limiting Internet and Blanket Electronic Review of Telecommunications and Email Act of 2013" ("LIBERT-E" Act), introduced by Congressmen CONYERS and AMASH and look forward to working with them and Chairman GOODLATTE to ensure that this legislation is considered under regular order by the Judiciary Committee.

Similarly, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings, markup, and report favorably to the House H.R. 2440, the "FISA Court in the Sunshine Act of 2013," bipartisan legislation I introduced last month that will bring much needed transparency without compromising national security to the decisions, orders, and opinions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or "FISA Court." Specifically, my legislation, which is the House counterpart to bipartisan companion bill introduced in the Senate:

requires the Attorney General to disclose each decision, order, or opinion of a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), allowing Americans to know how broad of a legal authority the government is claiming under the PATRIOT Act and Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to conduct the surveillance needed to keep Americans safe;

addresses national security concerns by providing that if a decision of the FISA Court cannot be declassified without undermining national security interest, then the Attorney General shall disclose a summary of the opinion;

provides that if the Attorney General determines that even a summary of opinion would

The Acting CHAIR. The request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 24 is

New York
Florida, Mr.
PORTER, M
California, M

NOT VOTING—12

Messrs. COLLINS of New York, GALLEG0, HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. DOYLE. Ms. LEE of California. Ms.

KELLY of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. MCGOVERN, McDERMOTT, GRIMM, LEWIS, PEARCE, PAYNE, ANDREWS, and CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 205, noes 217, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

AYES—205

Amash	Duncan (SC)	Lujan Grisham
Amodei	Duncan (TN)	(NM)
Bachus	Edwards	Lujan, Ben Ray
Barton	Ellison	(NM)
Bass	Eshoo	Lummis
Becerra	Farenthold	Lynch
Bentivolio	Farr	Maffei
Bishop (UT)	Fattah	Maloney
Black	Fincher	Carolyn
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Marchant
Blumenauer	Fleischmann	Massie
Bonamici	Fleming	Matsui
Brady (PA)	Fudge	McClintock
Braley (IA)	Gabbard	McCollum
Bridenstine	Garamendi	McDermott
Broun (GA)	Gardner	McGovern
Buchanan	Garrett	McHenry
Burgess	Gibson	McMorris
Capps	Gohmert	Rodgers
Capuano	Gosar	Meadows
Cárdenas	Gowdy	Mica
Carson (IN)	Graves (GA)	Michaud
Cartwright	Grayson	Miller, Gary
Cassidy	Green, Gene	Miller, George
Chabot	Griffin (AR)	Moore
Chaffetz	Griffith (VA)	Moran
Chu	Grijalva	Mullin
Cicilline	Hahn	Mulvaney
Clarke	Hall	Nadler
Clay	Harris	Napolitano
Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Clyburn	Holt	Nolan
Coffman	Honda	Nugent
Cohen	Huelskamp	O'Rourke
Connolly	Huffman	Owens
Conyers	Huizenga (MI)	Pascarell
Courtney	Hultgren	Pastor (AZ)
Cramer	Jeffries	Pearce
Crowley	Jenkins	Perlmutter
Cummings	Johnson (OH)	Perry
Daines	Jones	Petri
Davis, Danny	Jordan	Pingree (ME)
Davis, Rodney	Keating	Pocan
DeFazio	Kildee	Poe (TX)
DeGette	Kingston	Polis
DeLauro	Labrador	Posey
DelBene	LaMalfa	Price (GA)
DeSantis	Lamborn	Radel
DesJarlais	Larson (CT)	Rahall
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Rangel
Dingell	Lewis	Ribble
Doggett	Loebuck	Rice (SC)
Doyle	Lofgren	Richmond
Duffy	Lowenthal	Roe (TN)

Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)

Aderholt
Alexander
Andrews
Bachmann
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishke
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boehner
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Delaney
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa

Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeke
Meng
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi

Barletta
Beatty

Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton

NOES—217

Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeke
Meng
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi

NOT VOTING—12

Bustos
Campbell

Tonko
Tsongas
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Schakowsky
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman
Schultz
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Horsford
McCarthy (NY)

Negrete McLeod
Pallone

Rokita
Schock

□ 1851

Mr. CICILLINE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall Nos. 411—Pompeo amendment #99, “yes” and 412—Amash amendment #100, “No.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Chair, on rollcall Nos. 411, “yes” and 412, “yes.”

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider a final period of general debate.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I would rise to enter into a colloquy with my colleague from Washington (Mr. HECK) and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Madam Chair, every summer, Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Washington's 10th Congressional District hosts nearly 6,000 ROTC cadets from all across the Nation. These cadets conduct an assessment exercise we call Warrior Forge. The exercise is an invaluable tool in shaping our next generation of Army officers.

For 40 years, this course has honed the skills, provided the cohesion, and fostered the knowledge necessary to create the Army's next leaders. I have visited this program, and you need not have a single doubt about the quality of the next generation of military leaders in our Nation.

Yet, Madam Chair, an effort is afloat to radically change this proven system, without the knowledge or input from this Congress. Members of this body, including myself, the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee, and the former ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee have been requesting from the Army a simple brief and cost-benefit analysis of this proposed radical transformation. And for over 2 years, those requests have repeatedly been delayed and dismissed and denied.

Now, while my preference would have been to offer a limiting amendment to this legislation, I asked the ranking member and the chair if, in this instance, we could work together to seek from the Army a timely report so that Congress and the relevant committees can do our job, which is to ensure proper oversight.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman raising the issue. I am aware of it, and would gladly work

with him to get the answers on this proposal.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the ranking member very much.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I simply want to take this time to thank someone I have a profound respect for, as we all do, my chairman, our chairman, BILL YOUNG from Florida, for the masterful job he has done leading us to this point. And I would ask that he be given a round of applause.

I want to thank the members of the subcommittee and the staff. And I would also want to thank four young people who've worked in our offices this summer for all of their efforts on our behalf: Craig, Morgan, Deepa, and Matt.

Finally, I want to thank all of my colleagues. We did work our way through 100 amendments. From my perspective, this is exactly how this institution should work, to have issues and disagreement, to have discussions, to have votes, and to have a conclusion to the process, and to report a bill.

So, again, I thank my colleagues, and I thank the chair and the colleagues I work with every day on the Defense Subcommittee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chair, I'd like to use my time to say thank you to the House and all of the Members who participated in some vigorous debate, for having conducted the affairs of the House in a most professional way, proving to our constituents that we can work things out, that we can work together.

□ 1900

I just want to say thank you to Mr. VISCLOSKY, who is handling the minority leadership on this bill for the first time. I think he deserves a lot of credit and a lot of applause for the good job that he did in keeping this schedule on track.

PETER, thank you very much.

While it seems a long time ago, it was only Monday night that we finally received the 100 amendments that would be filed and considered during the debate. We had to analyze those amendments by Tuesday—yesterday—so that we could begin the debate on this bill. Our staff did an outstanding job in working late into the night Monday night analyzing these amendments so that we could consider where we would be on those amendments.

I would like to read the names of the members of our staff, headed by Tom McLemore as staff director and Paul Juola in a similar position for Mr. VISCLOSKY. Also, Becky Leggierrri, Brook Boyer, Ann Reese, Megan Rosenbush, Tim Prince, Walter Hearne, B.G. Wright, Paul Terry, Maureen Holohan, Jennifer Miller, Adrienne Ramsay, and Sherry Young. They are a professional staff. It's hard to find any more of a professional staff than those that I just mentioned.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014".

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, directed her to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 312, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2397 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 86, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

Page 86, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Page 87, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send

it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will re-appropriate resources in areas critical to our national security and to defend Israel, our most important ally in the Middle East.

The motion to recommit adds \$20 million in funding for Israel's Iron Dome defense program and \$5 million for the Arrow defense program in order to bolster protection against short- and long-range missile attacks.

Now here's something on which we can all agree. Defending Israel is in the interest of our national security. The bond between the United States and Israel is rooted in our shared national interest and our common values of democracy, rule of law, and basic human rights. Israel's security is our security. The same forces threatening Israel jeopardize the United States. And this is not a partisan issue.

All of us who have been to Israel are struck by how close Israelis live to neighbors who want to destroy them. As a former mayor of a city, I ran a city where we had real problems like gangs and crimes; but never did I have to worry about the towns next door shooting rockets at my residents. I can't imagine what it would be like to be the mayor of Sderot.

In 2008, before we had Iron Dome, a surge in Hamas rocket attacks forced Israel to launch a ground operation that, tragically, claimed over a thousand Israeli and Palestinian lives.

Fast forward to last November. In just 1 week, over 1,500 rockets were fired at Israel again by terrorist groups in Gaza. Thankfully, this time, Iron Dome intercepted over 80 percent of the deadly attacks, preventing war and saving lives.

I know that we can all agree that support for Israel's missile defense program is not merely a favor we do for Israel. Our political and military leaders have long praised the strategic significance of Israel's powerful military advancing our interests in the region, saving our Nation billions of dollars on military personnel and equipment that we might otherwise be forced to deploy.

Looking at Israel's neighborhood, never has this situation been so urgent for both our countries, with increased threats from Iran, Hamas, Hezbollah, and al Qaeda, and instability in Syria, Egypt, and Jordan. We must do all we can to strengthen Israel's defenses, and that is why this amendment to increase funding for these defense systems is so timely and so necessary.

Support for Israel has always enjoyed overwhelming bipartisan support. So I urge my Democratic and Republican colleagues to come together on this important amendment to support Israel and promote stability in the Middle East.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. There's no doubt that Iron Dome is an extremely effective missile defense system. And because of that, the committee fully funded this bill at \$220 million for Iron Dome, which is fully in line with the President's request and the recently passed defense authorization bill.

Additionally, this is the third year of consecutive funding for a 4-year commitment. The truth of the matter is they really can't spend it any faster or any more effectively.

So as is so often the case, this motion is purely a political statement, and I urge its rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill; and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 231, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]

AYES—192

Andrews	Cummings	Holt
Barber	Davis (CA)	Honda
Barrow (GA)	Davis, Danny	Hoyer
Bass	DeFazio	Huffman
Beatty	DeGette	Israel
Becerra	Delaney	Jackson Lee
Bera (CA)	DeLauro	Jeffries
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Deutch	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	Dingell	Jones
Bonamici	Doggett	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Keating
Braley (IA)	Duckworth	Kelly (IL)
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Kennedy
Brownley (CA)	Ellison	Kildee
Butterfield	Engel	Kilmer
Capps	Enyart	Kind
Capuano	Eshoo	Kirkpatrick
Cardenas	Esty	Kuster
Carney	Farr	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Larsen (WA)
Cartwright	Foster	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Lee (CA)
Castro (TX)	Fudge	Levin
Chu	Gallego	Lewis
Cicilline	Garamendi	Lipinski
Clarke	Garcia	Loebsack
Clay	Grayson	Lofgren
Cleaver	Green, Al	Lowenthal
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Lowe
Cohen	Grijalva	Lujan Grisham
Connolly	Hahn	(NM)
Conyers	Hanabusa	Lujan, Ben Ray
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	(NM)
Costa	Heck (WA)	Lynch
Courtney	Higgins	Maffei
Crowley	Himes	Maloney,
Cuellar	Hinojosa	Carolyn

Maloney, Sean	Pocan	Sires
Matheson	Polis	Slaughter
Matsui	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)
McCollum	Quigley	Speier
McDermott	Rahall	Swalwell (CA)
McGovern	Rangel	Takano
McIntyre	Richmond	Thompson (CA)
McNerney	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)
Meeks	Ruiz	Tierney
Meng	Ruppersberger	Titus
Michaud	Rush	Tonko
Miller, George	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Moore	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Murphy (FL)	T.	Vargas
Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Vela
Negrete McLeod	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Nolan	Schiff	Visclosky
Owens	Schneider	Walz
Pascarell	Schrader	Wasserman
Pastor (AZ)	Schwartz	Schultz
Payne	Scott (VA)	Waters
Pelosi	Scott, David	Watt
Perlmutter	Serrano	Waxman
Peters (CA)	Sewell (AL)	Welch
Peters (MI)	Shea-Porter	Wilson (FL)
Peterson	Sherman	Yarmuth
Pingree (ME)	Sinema	

NOES—231

Aderholt	Gabbard	McKeon
Alexander	Gardner	McKinley
Amash	Garrett	McMorris
Amodei	Gerlach	Rodgers
Bachmann	Gibbs	Meadows
Bachus	Gibson	Meehan
Barr	Gingrey (GA)	Messer
Barton	Gohmert	Mica
Benishek	Goodlatte	Miller (FL)
Bentivolio	Gosar	Miller (MI)
Bilirakis	Gowdy	Miller, Gary
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Moran
Black	Graves (GA)	Mullin
Blackburn	Graves (MO)	Mulvaney
Bonner	Griffin (AR)	Murphy (PA)
Boustany	Griffith (VA)	Neugebauer
Brady (TX)	Grimm	Noem
Bridenstine	Guthrie	Nugent
Brooks (AL)	Gutiérrez	Nunes
Brooks (IN)	Hall	Nunnelee
Broun (GA)	Hanna	O'Rourke
Buchanan	Harper	Olson
Bucshon	Harris	Palazzo
Burgess	Hartzler	Paulsen
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Pearce
Camp	Heck (NV)	Perry
Cantor	Hensarling	Petri
Capito	Holding	Pittenger
Cassidy	Hudson	Pitts
Chabot	Huelskamp	Poe (TX)
Chaffetz	Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo
Coffman	Hultgren	Posey
Cole	Hunter	Price (GA)
Collins (GA)	Hurt	Radel
Collins (NY)	Issa	Reed
Conaway	Jenkins	Reichert
Cook	Johnson (OH)	Renacci
Cotton	Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Cramer	Jordan	Rice (SC)
Crawford	Joyce	Rigell
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Roby
Culberson	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
Daines	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Davis, Rodney	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
Denham	Kinzing (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Dent	Kline	Rohrabacher
DeSantis	Labrador	Rooney
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Roskam
Duffy	Lance	Ross
Duncan (SC)	Lankford	Rothfus
Duncan (TN)	Latham	Royce
Ellmers	Latta	Runyan
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
Fincher	Long	Salmon
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Sanford
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Fleming	Lummis	Schock
Flores	Marchant	Schweikert
Forbes	Marino	Scott, Austin
Fortenberry	Massie	Sensenbrenner
Fox	McCarthy (CA)	Sessions
Franks (AZ)	McCauley	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	McClintock	Shuster
	McHenry	Simpson

Smith (MO)	Tipton	Williams
Smith (NE)	Turner	Wilson (SC)
Smith (NJ)	Upton	Wittman
Smith (TX)	Valadao	Wolf
Southerland	Wagner	Womack
Stewart	Walberg	Woodall
Stivers	Walden	Yoder
Stockman	Walorski	Yoho
Stutzman	Weber (TX)	Young (AK)
Terry	Webster (FL)	Young (FL)
Thompson (PA)	Wenstrup	Young (IN)
Thornberry	Westmoreland	
Tiberi	Whitfield	

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Bustos	Horsford	Rokita
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	
Coble	Neal	

□ 1915

Messrs. STEWART and RICE of South Carolina changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 315, nays 109, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 414]

YEAS—315

Aderholt	Connolly	Gohmert
Alexander	Cook	Goodlatte
Amodei	Costa	Gosar
Andrews	Cotton	Gowdy
Bachmann	Courtney	Granger
Bachus	Cramer	Graves (GA)
Barber	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Barr	Crenshaw	Green, Al
Barrow (GA)	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Barton	Culberson	Griffin (AR)
Beatty	Daines	Griffin (VA)
Benishek	Davis (CA)	Grimm
Bentivolio	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Bera (CA)	Delaney	Hall
Bilirakis	DelBene	Hanabusa
Bishop (GA)	Denham	Hanna
Bishop (NY)	Dent	Harper
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Harris
Black	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (WA)
Bonner	Dingell	Heck (NV)
Boustany	Doggett	Heck (WA)
Brady (PA)	Duckworth	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Duffy	Higgins
Braley (IA)	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Bridenstine	Ellmers	Hoyer
Brooks (AL)	Engel	Hudson
Brooks (IN)	Enyart	Huizenga (MI)
Broun (GA)	Esty	Hultgren
Brown (FL)	Farenthold	Hunter
Brownley (CA)	Fattah	Hurt
Buchanan	Fincher	Israel
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Issa
Burgess	Fleischmann	Jackson Lee
Butterfield	Fleming	Jenkins
Calvert	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Camp	Forbes	Johnson, E. B.
Cantor	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
Capito	Foster	Jordan
Cárdenas	Fox	Joyce
Carter	Franks (AZ)	Kaptur
Cassidy	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (PA)
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Kilmer
Chabot	Gallego	King (IA)
Chaffetz	Garamendi	King (NY)
Clyburn	Garcia	Kingston
Coffman	Gardner	Kinzing (IL)
Cole	Garrett	Kirkpatrick
Collins (GA)	Gerlach	Kline
Collins (NY)	Gibbs	Kuster
Conaway	Gingrey (GA)	Labrador

LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebback
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson

Owens
Palazzo
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)

NAYS—109

Amash
Bass
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Caster (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva

Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano

Shea-Porter

Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Barletta
Bustos
Campbell

Coble
Herrera Beutler
Horsford

McCarthy (NY)
Pallone
Rokita

□ 1930

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1911. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2397, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2397, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section and title numbering, cross-referencing, conforming amendments to short titles, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2397.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, during the final vote series last night, I inadvertently voted "no" on the DeLauro amendment No. 44 that would prohibit the use of funds to train the Afghan Special Mission Wing. I would say for the record that I support the amendment offered by Ms. DeLauro, and had I voted correctly, I would have voted for the amendment.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 2641

Mr. MARINO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove as cosponsors Congressman CAPUANO and Congressman PALLONE from my bill, H.R. 2641, the Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development (RAPID) Act of 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMERICA DESERVES AN ECONOMIC RECOVERY

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, the President said today that it is time for the House to lay out our ideas to give the middle class a better shot. He said it is time to move past stale debates.

Madam Speaker, the only reason these debates are stale is because the House bills that have been passed to create jobs in America are stalled in the Senate and by the President.

This isn't difficult. We need to cut burdensome regulations that stop job creation. The President needs to agree to build the Keystone pipeline. The President needs to agree to explore for American energy to lower the price of gas and diesel. The President needs to agree to permanently delay all of ObamaCare. America deserves an economic recovery.

REPEAL THE AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first, let me just commend Congressman SCHIFF and the 185 Members who voted today to restrict the authorization for the use of military force.

Today's vote is a very important step in our effort to repeal this overly broad blank check to wage war anywhere, at any time, and for any length, which of course I could not vote for September 14, 2001.

I have a bipartisan bill which would repeal the authorization to use military force, and doing so would provide Congress an opportunity finally, a long overdue opportunity, to have a meaningful debate about our constitutional role in declaring war.

Last week, I released a public report from the Congressional Research Service citing 30 instances where this resolution has been invoked. Most Americans, and of course my colleagues in Congress, would be surprised to know that these activities include deploying groups in Ethiopia, Djibouti, Georgia, Yemen, Kenya, the Philippines, Somalia—I could go on and on. It also includes justifying detentions at Guantanamo Bay and warrantless surveillance activities.

Finally, let me just say it is time to repeal this authorization and rein in the overly broad and deeply troubling NSA domestic spying program.

I urge all Members to join our continuing efforts and cosponsor my bill, H.R. 198, to repeal the AUMF.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2013.

MEMORANDUM

To: Honorable Barbara Lee.
From: Matthew Weed, Analyst in Foreign Policy Legislation.
Subject: The 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force: Background in Brief.

This memorandum responds to your request for information on presidential utilization of the Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF; P.L. 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note), enacted in response to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States, to justify and undertake military and other action. It contains very brief discussions of the relevant provisions of the AUMF, and the use of U.S. armed forces and other actions initiated under AUMF authority. Material in this memorandum may be used in other Congressional Research Service (CRS) products.

2001 AUMF USE OF FORCE PROVISION

Section 2(a) of the AUMF authorizes the use of force in response to the September 11 attacks:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international

terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons.

ANALYSIS

Scope: The authorizing language is broad in its scope concerning the prevention of any future acts of terrorism that might be perpetrated against the United States, but is circumscribed by authorizing the targeting only of those nations, organizations, or persons determined to be involved in perpetrating the September 11 attacks or harboring those who perpetrated the attacks.

War Against Non-State Actors: The AUMF is considered groundbreaking as it (1) empowered the President to target non-state actors, even to the individual level, as well as states, and (2) did not specify which states and non-state actors were included under the authorization.

Current Debate: After nearly 12 years in force, executive branch reliance on the AUMF has raised a number of concerns for a number of commentators and Members of Congress. These concerns relate to Congress's constitutional role in exercising its war power, as well as several types of executive branch activities to counter terrorism that are perceived as problematic. In contrast, Obama Administration officials have testified that the legal framework for the current conflict against Al Qaeda and associated forces, which includes the AUMF, remains valid and effective in meeting the U.S. military's requirements for conducting counterterrorism operations.

ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER AUMF AUTHORITY

CRS has located 30 occurrences of a publicly disclosed presidential reliance on the AUMF to take or continue military or related action (including non-military action like detentions and military trials).¹ Of the 30 occurrences, 18 were made during the Bush Administration, and 12 have been made during the Obama Administration.

Pursuant to the AUMF, President George W. Bush notified Congress that he was deploying U.S. armed forces to Afghanistan in 2001 to oust the Taliban from power and eliminate al Qaeda training sites and safe harbors in the country. In addition, Presidents Bush and Obama have invoked the AUMF to use U.S. armed forces or engage in other actions to: counter the terrorist threat against the United States following 9/11; deploy and direct such forces, or report on ongoing use of such forces in: Afghanistan; the Philippines; Georgia; Yemen; Djibouti; Kenya; Ethiopia; Eritrea; Iraq; and Somalia. Engage terrorist groups "around the world".

Engage terrorist groups "on the high seas".

Detain individuals at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and to take other actions related to detainment decisions; and Conduct trials of terrorist suspects in military commissions.

¹See Appendix for information on each notification. Based on notifications from the President concerning deployments of U.S. armed forces in the Federal Register and Compilation of Presidential Documents. It is possible that actions have been taken under the AUMF without being disclosed in these publications, and may have been disclosed to Congress through other means.

APPENDIX

Table 1, below, provides dates and subject matter of each of the presidential notifications located by CRS that reference the AUMF as authority for the deployment or use of U.S. armed forces or other activities. In many cases, the notifications indicate the continuation of a given deployment or activity.

TABLE 1—LIST OF PRESIDENTIAL NOTIFICATIONS
REFERENCING AUMF

Date	Relevant country, geographic area, targeted group, or type of action
9/24/2001	Afghanistan; the Taliban.
10/9/2001	al Qaeda; other terrorist organizations.
11/13/2001	Military detention and trial of terrorist suspects.
9/20/2002	Afghanistan; Philippines; Georgia; Yemen; Guantanamo Bay.
3/20/2003	Yemen; Djibouti; Guantanamo Bay.
9/19/2003	Afghanistan; Philippines; Georgia; Yemen; Guantanamo Bay.
3/20/2004	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Georgia; Djibouti; Yemen; Kenya; Ethiopia; Eritrea; high seas.
11/4/2004	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; Yemen; Ethiopia; Kenya; Eritrea; Djibouti; high seas.
5/20/2005	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; Djibouti; Yemen; Kenya; Ethiopia; Eritrea; high seas.
12/7/2005	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; Djibouti; Yemen; Kenya; Ethiopia; high seas.
6/15/2006	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; Djibouti; Yemen; high seas.
12/15/2006	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; Djibouti; Yemen; high seas.
2/14/2007	Executive Order 13425: includes Military Commissions.
6/15/2007	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; Horn of Africa; Somalia; high seas.
7/20/2007	Executive Order 13440: includes detention and interrogation of terrorist suspects.
12/14/2007	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; global counterterrorism; Horn of Africa; high seas.
6/13/2008	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; global counterterrorism; Horn of Africa; high seas.
12/16/2008	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; global counterterrorism; Horn of Africa; high seas.
6/15/2009	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; global counterterrorism; Horn of Africa; high seas.
12/15/2009	Presidential Memorandum includes Guantanamo Bay issues.
12/16/2009	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Iraq; global counterterrorism; Horn of Africa; high seas.
6/15/2010	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; Djibouti; Horn of Africa; global counterterrorism; high seas.
12/15/2010	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; global counterterrorism; high seas.
3/7/2011	Executive Order 13567: includes detention at Guantanamo Bay.
6/15/2011	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; global counterterrorism; high seas.
12/15/2011	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; global counterterrorism; high seas.
2/28/2012	Military detention of terrorist suspects.
6/15/2012	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; global counterterrorism; Somalia; Yemen; high seas.
12/14/2012	Afghanistan; Guantanamo Bay; global counterterrorism; Somalia; Yemen; high seas.
6/14/2013	Afghanistan; Somalia; Yemen; Guantanamo Bay; high seas.

Sources: Federal Register; Compilation of Presidential Documents.

39TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S
INVASION OF CYPRUS

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark an anniversary that has pained the Cypriot and Hellenic communities for 39 years.

On July 20, 1974, in blatant violation of international law, Turkey violently invaded Cyprus and captured the northern part of the island.

Since the invasion, Turkey has established a heavily armed military occupation that continues to control nearly 40 percent of Cyprus and has forced 160,000 Greek Cypriots from their homes.

Mr. Speaker, it is not impossible to conceive a unified Cyprus that respects the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all Cypriots.

Cyprus has long been a strong and faithful ally of the United States, and we owe our support for both peace and the end of this illegal occupation.

SARATOGA RACE COURSE

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, “and they’re off.” That traditional refrain as horses come out of the gate ushered in yet another Saratoga season just days ago—this time a very special season.

I recognize Saratoga Race Course as it celebrates 150 years of thoroughbred racing in Saratoga Springs, New York.

On August 3, 1863, a son of Irish immigrants, John Morrissey, who served two terms in this body, staged the first horse race at what is now known as the Oklahoma Track, giving birth to the oldest continually active sporting venue in the United States.

Notable sportswriter Red Smith once said of the Saratoga Race Course, “From New York City you drive north for about 175 miles, turn left on Union Avenue and go back 100 years.”

Racing in Saratoga produces over 2,000 jobs, nearly \$15 million in tax revenue and an economic boost of \$200 million to the surrounding region each year.

I am honored to recognize 150 years of tradition and community spirit that come to life in a most unique and exciting way, that have a special place in our American story.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, the following way: “And down the stretch they come.” Happy 150th, Saratoga.

BEATRIZ ARREDONDO

(Mr. VARGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the memory of Beatriz Arredondo, an inspiring woman who embodied the spirit of love and compassion.

Beatriz, or “Nena” as she was called by her loved ones, passed away on June 28, 2013.

Beatriz was born on January 16, 1943, in Tamaulipas, Mexico. At a very young age, she knew that she wanted to be a loving wife and mother, and she dreamed of one day seeing her grandchildren. She accomplished these goals magnificently.

Fifty-four years ago, she met Ernesto Arredondo, Sr. and they were married for 46 years. They have four beautiful children—Ernesto, Jr., Edoardo, Everardo, and Elizabeth.

Beatriz is survived by her husband, her children, and her 10 grandchildren.

As is said in St. Paul’s Second Letter to Timothy:

She fought the good fight. She finished the race. She kept the faith.

She is now in God’s arms.

Our prayers are with the Arredondo family.

GOP DOCTORS CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOK). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am joined this evening with my colleagues in the House GOP Doctors Caucus, and other Republican Members, to talk about this most, most important subject, and that is this recent delay of the employer mandate.

The Obama administration’s announcement that it will delay implementation of the employer mandate due to the enormous regulatory burden on businesses, Mr. Speaker, is proof positive that the Affordable Care Act is a job killer.

The administration’s excuse for the delay was to simplify reporting requirements for small businesses. But employers haven’t been against the mandate solely due to its burdensome reporting requirements.

□ 1945

While it’s estimated that ObamaCare will require American job creators, families, and health care providers to spend more than 127 million hours a year on complying with the law, a far greater concern to business owners is the impact the mandate will have on job creation. The cost of the health insurance and of ObamaCare’s fines will drive up the costs of labor and will continue to be a drag on this economy. This is further evidence that the administration does not get how the law will impact the economy.

The U.S. Chamber reported that 72 percent of small business executives would have a harder time hiring because of ObamaCare. The employer mandate has been cited by business owners repeatedly as a major obstacle to expansion. They simply cannot afford it. At a recent small business roundtable, one Georgia business owner said to me, I want to provide health care insurance for my employees. ObamaCare has forced me to choose between that and hiring new people.

For instance, one common deterrent to growth that is often cited by small businesses is the 50 employee threshold, at which point a business must provide insurance to its employees once the 50th full-time employee is hired. This misguided provision has repeatedly forced different hiring practices by these companies.

I heard that Heatco, a company which specializes in the design and manufacture of world-class heating solutions, which is located in my district in Bartow County, Georgia, had looked into expanding. The thing is that it currently has—you guessed it, Mr. Speaker—49 employees, and due to the added ObamaCare cost, to expand by adding an additional employee, it will

cost more than automating some of their processes.

The administration cannot say with a straight face that businesses are more concerned with reporting requirements rather than with the overbearing costs that ObamaCare will add to their bottom lines.

President Obama’s announcement doesn’t reduce the harmful effects that the mandate will have on employers as we move forward. It could, however, provide cover. Let me repeat that: it could, however, provide cover for Democrats during an election year. This political calculation protects them from voter backlash and from the reality that ObamaCare—their law—is to blame for an economy that is literally hemorrhaging jobs.

This is yet another example of the Obama administration’s replacing the rule of law with partisan, raw politics. This unilateral decision is an abuse of executive power; and in my opinion, it is a clear demonstration that President Obama will disregard for political gain the laws he has signed.

In 2010, Democrats in Congress determined that the enforcement of the egregious employer mandate would begin on January 1, 2014. As bad as the law may be, the administration does not have the power to rewrite the law. That responsibility belongs—where?—right here in Congress. Just look at your Constitution, which I keep in my pocket. It’s somewhere deep inside my pocket, but I guarantee you that it’s in here, because I put it in here every single day.

Legalities aside, postponing the mandate for 1 year is not enough. It simply delays the inevitable. When it’s eventually enacted, Mr. Speaker, hours will still be cut, and pay will still be reduced. Businesses hovering just under the 50 employee threshold will still have to weigh the costs of expansion; and because of the requirement, many will be unable to grow. It is just further proof that the administration does not understand how business works.

The lack of response from this administration is also increasingly frustrating. House Republicans have held numerous hearings, asking for more information as to how this decision was reached. We have sent letters to the Secretary of the Treasury, and we have sent letters to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. We have asked witnesses in order for us to gain a better insight into this ruling, but have continuously been rebuffed, in other words, no response to our requests. It’s offensive to the American people that the administration cannot offer clear guidance on a central piece of its ObamaCare fiasco.

This delay will also affect the verification of individuals in this insurance exchange. It’s amazing that the administration is suggesting that we will rely on the honor system to determine

Federal payments. This is truly outrageous. According to the law, you aren't eligible for ObamaCare subsidies if your employer has offered you what the government considers to be affordable coverage. This is spelled out clearly in the law. With the delay of the employer mandate, however, the government won't be able to verify whether the individual has been offered coverage, and this will open the door—wide open—for enormous fraud and abuse, and the costs will skyrocket.

We've seen the same thing in other entitlement programs that rely on this so-called honor system. It's clear that what we are seeing is a tactic of "subsidize first, ask questions later."

Remember the old phrase "pay and chase" on Medicare claims? It is the administration's goal to enroll as many people in the ObamaCare exchanges as they can and as soon as they can, i.e., in this year of delay, so that we will never be able to repeal this bill. The Federal takeover of one-sixth of the economy raises taxes on small business owners and on middle class families. It guts Medicare, seniors—it guts Medicare—and it will irreparably harm the doctor-patient relationship.

Instead, we need State-based reforms that will lower costs, give patients more control of their own health insurance policies, increase access, and ensure a higher standard of care.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, Dr. HARRIS, who was an anesthesiologist by profession before coming to Congress.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the doctor is absolutely right. That employer mandate will increase the costs for employers, which means we're going to get less job creation and less job growth in an economy that can't do with any less job creation. In fact, as the doctor probably knows, since January, virtually all of the jobs created in this country because of this mandate have been part-time jobs. We are rapidly converting to a part-time economy. That's not what Americans expect—that's not what Americans deserve—and that problem won't be solved until that mandate goes away, not just delayed but goes away.

The doctor talked about the costs per employee when the employee pays. What the doctor hadn't mentioned is the cost if you go on the individual market, because that's the other market created under the President's Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare. You've also heard much in the past week because the President has gone around, pointing to New York and saying, Do you see, premiums are going to go down 50 percent—the wonders of ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the President can only talk about New

York because, in virtually every other State, there will be huge increases. So we have to examine why the decrease in New York is 50 percent. It's because they start with such a high premium that, even at half the cost, they're still multiples of the premiums of those in the other States.

For instance, let's take a look at what the average premium in New York right now is for a healthy 30-year-old nonsmoker who is buying a policy, because the President and the Secretary of HHS and everyone who has screened this plan has said, unless you get healthy young people to buy insurance, the whole plan falls apart. So let's look at what it will cost for that 30-year-old nonsmoking male—the people who are among the highest of the uninsured, the highest in number. This is the average plan. The median-priced plan in New York is \$5,750 a year, or about \$500 a month right now.

Now, that median-priced plan in the President's home State of Illinois is \$1,450, or about \$1,300 a month—about one-fourth the price of the New York policies, because New York has ObamaCare-type regulations in place. That's why their costs are so high right now. In fact, ObamaCare is not quite as regulated as is the New York market, so the prices can come down a little bit, but do you know, if it comes down from \$500 to \$250, it's still twice the cost of that policy in Illinois right now.

Maybe we should look at the Vice President's State of Delaware where the average 30-year-old male's policy price is about \$1,380, or let's round to \$1,200 a month. That's about one-fourth the price of the current policy in New York, and even with those tremendous ObamaCare savings, it will be half the price of the policy in New York, the ObamaCare policy.

Let's look at what has happened in some other States other than New York. I'll talk about my home State of Maryland, which is the largest nonprofit insurer. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I said the "nonprofit" insurer, because you can't blame profit as the reason for a high cost. The largest nonprofit insurer said that the average price increase is 25 percent; and for a young healthy person, exactly the ones who have to be signed up for the ObamaCare scheme to work, it's as high as a 150 percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, if we can't get healthy young people to buy insurance now, how in the world are we going to convince them to buy insurance in Maryland when it costs almost twice as much?

We can run all the taxpayer-financed ads, because that's what it's going to be. All of the people watching who have televisions will see what happens this fall as we spend millions and millions of taxpayer dollars to try to convince healthy young people to buy a plan that's way too overpriced.

Let's look at California. Maybe the big States are different. New York is expensive. Maybe California is different. In California, the average cost of that plan for a healthy young person is \$2,200, or about \$200 a month. Why, it's less than half of the cost in New York. Sure enough, in figures released last month in California, the costs of the ObamaCare individual plan will increase by 64 to 146 percent. So that \$200-a-month premium is now going to be \$400 a month.

Mr. Speaker, young people who are entering the job market are entering at relatively low levels of pay. Where in the world are they going to find \$400 to pay for an overpriced plan that they've seen advertised on their local NBA game—and, of course, with the ads paid for with taxpayer dollars?

This is why this house of cards will collapse. We are in for a rough time this fall. People in America who depend on their health care insurance are in for a really rough time. The costs are going to go up, and the confusion will be immense. Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve better, so that's why we have called on the President. Forget the 1-year delay of the mandate on employers only. We need a permanent delay on the entire plan, and the time for it is now. The President today made a big deal on his pivot to jobs.

Mr. President, I would suggest stopping the \$100 million trips to Africa and go talk to some of our small business employers and ask them what are their concerns. How will they create jobs? This is what they would tell the President, Mr. Speaker. They would tell the President to get rid of that ObamaCare. That's a weight hanging over my business's head that I can't afford, that I can't predict, and that is stopping me from hiring people; and for the people I have now, it's making me shift them to part-time jobs.

□ 2000

So we've come full circle, Mr. Speaker. If what we want is a part-time economy, let's barrel ahead with ObamaCare. America deserves much better than part-time jobs. We deserve to create full-time, good paying jobs by the small businesses and large businesses in this country that are just waiting to show economic growth. We have got to remove this lead weight from around their neck.

I thank the doctor from Georgia for yielding the time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Before I yield time to the gentleman from Kentucky, colleagues, I want you to look at this first poster because a lot of what the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Speaker, was talking about in regard to costs shows it pretty simply here. The change in the cost per employee, because of the health care law, if you have 49 employees, as we've

talked about, there is no increase in the cost of health care because you don't have to provide the government-mandated expensive coverage. So there is no increase. That's why, of course, they keep the employee rate at 49 and don't hire those extra employees.

If you're at 50, though, and you are under the mandate, the increase is \$800 per employee; if you are at 75 employees, the increase is \$1,200 per employee; 100 employees, a \$1,400 increase; and 150, a \$1,600 per year increase per employee. That's why so many of these small businesses are right there, my colleagues, at 49, with no increase because no job growth or employees that are hired at 29 hours a week. Try to support yourself, much less a family, on 29 hours a week.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

Mr. GUTHRIE. I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding. I appreciate him letting me be a part of the Doctors Caucus for tonight.

I don't want to pretend that I am a doctor. I certainly am not, but I appreciate the opportunity to be here, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the health care bill. It's nice that this has been organized so we can be here tonight to talk about a topic that is critical to the American people, and that's the crushing mandates in ObamaCare.

As we know, last week, Mr. Speaker, the House considered two bills to relieve the American people of these mandates: the Authority for Mandate Delay Act would give large employers a reprieve from compliance with ObamaCare's employer mandate until 2015, and the Fairness for American Families Act would grant individuals until 2015 to comply with the law's individual mandate.

This one-size-fits-all health care law is a train wreck. It's been quoted as a train wreck by members of the other party who voted for it in the other body. The administration has clearly realized its employer mandate will hinder businesses in their ability to grow and, just a few weeks ago, announced their decision to delay the implementation of this bill.

I appreciate being here tonight because I come from a small business manufacturing background that provides health care at a low cost to our employees. I believe I understand the complexities that an employer faces in providing health insurance for their workers. This law encourages employers to cut workers' hours, pare back their numbers of workers, and move workers from existing health insurance plans onto the exchange.

Well, I'm glad to see the administration is finally paying attention to the disastrous consequences of this law. It is disappointing that they expect families and small business owners to comply with the crushing mandates while they give big businesses a break. Im-

proving access to health care and making it more affordable should be the goal and the outcome. I will continue to fight for full repeal of this law, but in the interim, I'm glad the House moved last week to delay the implementation of the crushing mandates.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky. Although he is not a member of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, I think that we might take a vote here on the House floor. The cochair of the House GOP Doctors Caucus is here with me, and I'm going to recognize him in just a second. So he and I are cochairs; so, Mr. GUTHRIE, we may indeed make you an honorary member. Thank you very much. We appreciate your input.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the issue is not just about the doctor-patient relationship. The reason we're giving this presentation tonight and the leadership has asked us to talk about this issue, the members of the House GOP Doctors Caucus—and it includes medical doctors, I think about 16 of us. It includes dentists. It includes a clinical psychologist. It includes a hospital administrator—formerly, before becoming a Members of Congress—advanced practice nurses, bachelor of science nurses, people in the health care space that know of what they speak. And in that regard, I can't think of anybody, Mr. Speaker, who knows this issue better than my cochairman of the House GOP Doctors Caucus and fellow OB/GYN physician, Dr. PHIL ROE from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, as I want to talk about what Dr. HARRIS just spoke about a minute ago. I want to do that before I actually explain how we got where we are to our viewers.

What Dr. HARRIS didn't say is that in the small group market in New York in 1992, there were 1.2 million people who got their insurance through the small group market. At that point in time, Governor Cuomo initiated no pre-existing conditions in the small group market community rating. And "community rating," for those who don't know what that means, it means that your sickest patient or your sickest customer can't be charged more than three times what a well person is. So they're not actually paying the cost of their care; someone else is paying that cost. So that's community rating. And "guaranteed issue" means you can't be turned down, exactly what we're doing here.

What happened to that market? Within 10 years, that market all but evaporated in New York. There were 120,000. It dropped by 90 percent. Today, in a State with almost 20 million people, there are 31,000 people—that's .0016 or so percent of the people—who are in

that State that get their insurance through that market.

What is it? Not only did they basically ruin that market, it's now one of the most expensive in the United States, and the only way it's going to come down is for those premiums to be subsidized by young, healthy people. As Dr. HARRIS said, young people like my three children, who just got out of college and are starting their families, cannot afford something that basically they're not paying for. I wanted to point that out. I thought it was very important to understand how we got there and to why we think this won't happen again.

Let's go back, Dr. GINGREY and Mr. Speaker, to how we got here. Basically, the health care debate started because health care needed reform in this country. The reason it needed reform is we had costs going up more than inflation—no question that was occurring—and we had a group of our people in this country who work every day who were uninsured. We needed to do that. We had people with preexisting conditions that couldn't get health insurance. You and I saw them. It was maybe a woman who had developed breast cancer, dropped out of the job market, and on the way back in couldn't find it. So there's no argument from us that we needed to have health care reform.

So what did we have? We had a Doctors Caucus at that time that had nine physicians, and not one of us was asked one thing about this health care bill. I brought 31 years of experience to the House floor and experience with health care reform in Tennessee where we tried to reform our Medicaid program, called TennCare.

How is this supposed to work? The idea was we're going to expand coverage and make it more affordable.

What was the President's promise, Mr. Speaker? The promise was, if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. If you like your health insurance coverage, you can keep your health insurance coverage, and we're going to make the costs go down.

What is the reality? People are losing their doctors for a variety of reasons, the cost has gone up dramatically, as Dr. HARRIS pointed out. Let me also point out about what sectors are involved and who in health insurance. It is complicated.

In ERISA-approved plans, if you work for a company that provides health insurance coverage, that covers about 60 percent of the people in this country. About 160 million people work under that. Let's say in my practice we have 400-plus employees in my medical practice that get their health insurance through their job. That covers about 60 percent of the people in this country. Sadly, in the last 4 or 5 years, because of the change in the percent of people who are employed in the workforce, that number has actually gone

down 2 percent to 58 percent, instead of going up as it usually does in most recoveries. Number two, Medicare, and number three, Medicaid.

So all of this entire debate about—remember, preexisting conditions are not an issue in that group of people, and we're looking at over 80 percent. So this 2,700-page bill really had to do with less than 20 percent of the population. I think we could have done something much simpler, much less expensive, and certainly much easier to explain.

We're going to spend an hour here tonight, Mr. Speaker, in trying to break this down to where the average person can understand it, understand how it affects me and my family. I'm going to hopefully share some of those things with you.

I chair the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions in the Education and the Workforce Committee. I've held three hearings around the country. I held one in Evansville, Indiana, one in Butler, Pennsylvania, and recently in Concord, North Carolina. What happened is we had businesses come in. Remember, the market that wasn't functioning was a small group market and the individual market. And let me explain how the individual market works.

When I left my practice 5 years ago to run for Congress, after 31 years of practice, I left the practice, I had group insurance covered under ERISA, that 160 million people in my family. I left that, and I then am on the individual market. Because I'm treated differently tax-wise, the day before, I had a tax-deductible health plan. The next day, I could buy that plan, but guess what? It was much more expensive because it was not tax deductible. That's how individuals find themselves. So those are the people we were trying to help.

What's happened to them? Well, I'll give you an example. In our State of Tennessee—Dr. HARRIS spoke about several States. I spoke to our State insurance commissioner just recently, and in the individual market, someone out there who is a young person going out to get insurance, they've just finished college or whatever—we'll talk about the under 26-year-olds in a little bit, about what the bill actually did. Those rates are going up between 45 percent and 75 percent in my State; in the small group market—that's where small businesses go out and select their insurance—50 percent to 55 percent. Does that sound like rates are going down? And this story is all over the country. State after State after State you see this in.

I wanted this plan to work because, as I said, we did need health care reform, but we needed patient-centered, market-driven health care reform that would help hold those costs down and put the decision making not in bureau-

crats' hands, not in insurance companies' hands, but in doctors' and patients' and families' hands. That's who it needs to be in.

I think the ObamaCare plan started this way: How do we fund this plan? Well, they knew it was going to be expensive because of all the tax subsidies that were going to go out.

Where did the money come from? The money came from about a \$700 billion grab from Medicare, a plan that's already underfunded, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we have a plan now in Medicare where for every dollar placed in that plan—and I'm on Medicare, as Dr. GINGREY is. Every dollar we spend, the recipient gets \$3 out. We know that's not sustainable. We have as many as 10,000 people a day entering Medicare age, which means that every year we're going to have 3 million people who turn 65 years of age as the baby boomers hit. We have an already underfunded Medicare plan adding in the next 10 years 30 to 36 million people onto a plan that we're taking \$700 billion out of.

How do we control that cost, Mr. Speaker? We pass a part of that bill called the Independent Payment Advisory Board. Wow.

What is that? Well, I think that's one of the most egregious parts of this entire health care plan, and it's an interesting little thing.

You have 15 unelected bureaucrats proposed by the President, approved by the Senate, paid \$164,000 or \$165,000 a year to a 6-year term accountable to no one. The courts can't do anything about it. We have to have 60 votes in the Senate to overturn what they do or agree with what they do, and you couldn't get 60 people in the Senate to agree that the sun was coming up in the east tomorrow. So don't worry about them worrying about your health care.

What can they do? Basically what they can do, they start out—and this board is now supposed to be appointed this year, and they have a budget, which we've tried to cut the funding for because, as I said, I think it's the most egregious part of this plan.

□ 2015

What can they do? Well, they can withhold and cut providers. And when you cut providers enough, and that's doctors and hospitals and medical providers, they will refuse to see those patients. I've had it pointed out a thousand times. Oh, it says in the bill, you cannot ration care.

Well, there is a very good article—and I still read my medical journals—in the New England Journal of the Medicine, one of the most prestigious journals in this country, that reviewed the Independent Payment Advisory Board and looked back over the past 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, 21—and this analysis of the Independent Payment Advisory

Board wasn't for it or against it; it was just analyzing the effects of it. And in looking back over the past 25 years, in 21 of those 25 years, cuts would have occurred. We all know, Dr. GINGREY and I know, and we know that our colleagues out there have been prevented from cuts by the action of this body right here and the sustainable growth rate in Medicare.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time just for a second, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is bringing up a subject that is so important that our colleagues understand on both sides of the aisle, this IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board that Dr. ROE is talking about, it's 15 bureaucrats. Well, none of them have been appointed yet. Not one. Nada. And the law says that if the Secretary doesn't appoint, or these 15 are not appointed—and, yes, they are going to make about \$175,000 a year—then she, and it's a "she" right now, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or whomever in the future, they don't have to have that board; one individual bureaucrat can make these cuts, these, really, rationing cuts is what it is.

I yield back to my colleague.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for pointing that out. It will put the power in one person and take the power away from this body right here, which is why we have a bipartisan bill to overturn this and reclaim the power which the people gave us. We are accountable to the people, and right now when you make those cuts, we would have almost no way to fix it.

I think that is a great point, and I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, Dr. GINGREY pointing that out.

So we have that board, the money grabbed from Medicare.

Number two, 21 new taxes to pay for this bill. One of them is a medical device tax. Let me assure, you as a physician, I have been the recipient, as many of my patients have been, from all of the incredible improvements in laparoscopic surgery. I watched it start from its infancy, learned my first laparoscopic procedure when I was a captain at Fort Eustis, Virginia, in 1974 in the military after having returned from Korea. I learned how to use a laparoscope, and I watched all of this wonderful new equipment occur to where we are doing absolutely marvelous things, minimally invasive to patients, and it has improved patient care dramatically.

There will be taxes on that new innovation. What I'm fearful of, in my State, the single biggest export we have is medical devices, that this will be pushed offshore, and the thing we have been the shining star in the world is medical innovation. There's no question about it, and we do not want to lose that.

So we have 21 new taxes. And there are taxes on health care plans; the

mandates are taxes. So we have the taxes.

ObamaCare works because of a three-legged stool, Mr. Speaker. This is how it works:

It works because of Medicaid expansion. That is over half of the new people there, a plan that already is under siege in most States in the Union;

Number two, the individual mandate—that's what I'm getting around to—the mandates that occur because we have to have young, healthy people subsidizing others to make the individual market work; and

Number three, the mandate on business.

And last week in a blog from the Treasury, not in an announcement from the White House, just a blog came out and said, hey, we are not going to have the business mandate for a year. And I applaud the President for that. It is not something that I disagree with. The disagreement is it's the law of the land. I don't see how you can unilaterally decide I'm going to enforce this part of the law because I can't make it work right now, or the individual mandate, and we voted last week, as the Speaker knows and I believe the Speaker supported, both of the bills that Mr. GUTHRIE talked about.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time just for a second, Sunday it was, on the Sunday morning "Meet the Press," and that's what this next poster shows, yesterday, on NBC's "Meet the Press," Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID, the Democrat majority leader from Nevada, proclaimed that:

ObamaCare has been wonderful for America.

Well, let's just take a look at some of the headlines from this past week on just how wonderful it has been.

Investors Business Daily says:

ObamaCare mandate delay, employers keep job cuts. For many workers, the 1-year delay in ObamaCare's employer mandate was too little too late.

Reuters says analysis:

ObamaCare struggles to meet make-or-break deadline. With time running out, United States officials are struggling to cope with the task of launching the new online health insurance exchanges at the heart of President Barack Obama's signature health reforms by an October 1 deadline.

Time magazine:

ObamaCare increases cost and complications. The Obama administration's recent announcement that the Affordable Care Act's employer mandate will kick in a year late could ripple beyond the brief extension, increasing costs and complicating implementation of other vital parts of the law.

Think the exchanges as an example.

And then CNN Money says this:

Delay in the ObamaCare employer mandate has simply put off rules businesses had already started to adjust to.

That's the reality here, Mr. Speaker. My colleague from Tennessee knows it.

I think my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle know it, and that's why, in my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that, hey, is it really the employers, the small business men and women that were knocking on the White House door saying, We can't meet these reporting requirements, please help us do something; or was it some of my Democratic friends, whether in this Chamber or the other body, saying, 2014 is going to be kind of a tough year for us having to defend this train wreck? I think that's what the Senator from Montana said. Of course, he's going to retire rather than face the music. I can't say that I blame him.

That's what's going on here. People are not dumb. I think they can read between the lines. I hope my colleague can stay awhile longer. I'd like to yield to him at this point.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You always hear, Mr. Speaker, that Republicans have no ideas for health care. Well, we had plenty of ideas; they just weren't heard. We had 80 amendments to this bill. None—and I want the people who hear this, to show you how frustrating this process has been, now that we're looking at this almost incomprehensible bill, is that we had 80 amendments to the Affordable Care Act taken to the Rules Committee. I think I had 10. Not one—not one—amendment was ruled in order. Not one.

Dr. HARRIS was here a moment ago and talked about the price of an individual insurance policy in the State of New York, and then he talked about the price of an insurance policy in Delaware and Illinois. Think about if a person in New York, an employer, a person in a small business, an individual there, hey, I'd like to buy my plan in Illinois. If I could buy it across State lines, I could save myself a lot of money, and I can guarantee you the price in New York State would come down or people would buy those plans somewhere else. That's why empowering the free market system will help and work in health care.

Let me go to the real world, Mr. Speaker. Let me go to Concord, North Carolina, and I held a field hearing there. I want to introduce you to a business owner there, Mr. Horne, who has a textile manufacturing business. He has 350 employees. If you are in the textile business, you're a pretty good businessman if you're in business today, as difficult as that is. He provided 80 percent of all the health care costs for his employees. They covered 20. He covers all preventive services, everything. If you need a colonoscopy, if you need a mammogram, he covers all of that. In addition to that, he has a health nurse at his business to help if you have issues there. So he has a prevention and wellness program. He's done everything right.

So what exactly does he get for this? What he gets for this, when the fiscal cliff bill was passed, because of the way his company was set up, he got an increase in his personal tax rate. He got that. Number two, he got a \$62 per person, not per policy but per person, which will cost him tens of thousands of dollars. And guess what that money goes to do? It goes to indemnify insurance companies so that they'll be induced to provide this insurance on the exchange and they won't lose money. Mr. Horne gets absolutely nothing.

So what will he have to do? He'll either have to cut his salaries, he'll have to cut the benefits, or he won't hire someone or he won't be able to make needed investments.

Let's go to my hometown of Johnson City, Tennessee, where I was mayor before I came here. My political job there was being mayor of our local community. I just talked to our city manager not long ago, and we're going to get a bill in our community of 60,000 for \$177,000, of which we get absolutely nothing because it is on the self-insured market. And anybody who is self-insured, and a lot of major businesses, and I talked to one who's going to get a \$25 million—and I won't mention who it is. It's a major company. Everyone in this room will know who it is. They write a \$25 million check. That could be to hire new employees. It could be for new plant and equipment. It could be to grow their business. It's a globally competitive company that has to compete around the world.

Let me introduce another person here, Sonny's Real Pit Bar-B-Q. That's a famous restaurant in the Charlotte area. We had the field hearing over there, and we sampled Sonny's barbecue the night before we had the field hearing. It was great. What that company is doing is that they found out that 70 percent—since the recession, 70 percent of people changed their eating-out habits by reducing or even eliminating dining out. And increasing menu prices, which is what they'll tell you to do, people quit coming to your restaurant and you go out of business. What they are finding out is they have had to cut, as Dr. GINGREY clearly pointed out, they're looking at cutting their employees' hours to 29 or under so that many full-time employees will now be part-time employees so they'll go under that threshold of 49.

The community college where we held the hearing made a very eloquent statement that they were going to have to not allow adjunct faculty. What most community colleges do, about 65 percent of their faculty are full-time, but the others are people in the community, Mr. Speaker, maybe like Dr. GINGREY, who would teach a health class or a class on whatever issue would be in his specialty.

Well, now, because of what the IRS has said, you can only teach three

classes or you hit the 29-hour threshold. How does that happen? Well, for every hour you're in the classroom, they count 2 hours outside the classroom. I think it's called the Cambridge hour. So you can only teach three classes. It will mean in their community college that they won't be able to offer certain classes on time. It'll delay students getting out. The State of Virginia has 7,000 part-time workers, and they're going to be sure they stay under those 29 hours. And they make it a little more individual.

Someone that I know in my district works for a chain restaurant, Mr. Speaker, divorced woman who works full-time. She relies on tips and relies on her 40 hours a week. She has a health insurance policy. She's going to lose her health insurance policy, and they are going to cut her hours to 29, which means that for every month, she loses an entire week of wages.

□ 2030

So she now has got to go find a second job to pay her bills, Mr. Speaker. And I can go on and on with examples like this that I've heard in testimony.

Just yesterday, we had testimony on the mandate. Certain of the businesses appreciate the year of reprieve. We voted here on the House floor in a bipartisan manner, Mr. Speaker, I might add, to also take individuals. My goodness, here's a person out here that just graduated from college, got their first job, and we're taxing them if they don't buy this insurance. And let me point out how quickly the young people will figure this out.

I did something rather unique, as Dr. GINGREY did. I heard here on the House floor we should pass the bill and then read it and find out what's in it. Well, guess what? I did just the opposite. I read the bill and found out some things. I went back and checked to be sure I was correct on this.

But here's what happens if you don't pay the penalty. Let's say you're a young individual out there and you say, I just can't afford \$400 or \$300 a month out of my paycheck. I've got student loans and other things to pay for. I'm trying to get into my first apartment. The penalty is this: it's \$95 for the first year.

So what can the IRS do to collect that money? They can't garnish your wages. They can't do that. There's no civil or criminal penalty so there's nothing they have to come after you. The only thing they can do is if you have overpaid your taxes or if you have a refundable credit coming in like an earned income tax credit or child tax credit, they can withhold your refund. That's the only recourse they have.

Young people will figure it out. And why will they figure it out and not buy it? Why is this going to collapse? It's going to collapse because these young people are going to pay the \$95, not the

\$300 a month or \$200 a month that they're going to pay. They'll pay the one-time penalty, if the IRS can ever figure out how to collect it. That's what they're going to do. And if you don't have all these young, healthy people paying in, it doesn't work.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I've got one last poster that I wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues. It's a little complicated. I'll try to make it as simple as I can.

Basically, let's start right here with the employer. Under that, in this diagram, fewer than 50 full-time employees, including full-time equivalents, then no employer penalty for offering a health insurance benefit. But in the most egregious situation, the employer has 50 or more full-time employees, including full-time equivalents, and the employer decides not to offer coverage. If a tax credit is obtained by at least one of those full-time employees in an exchange, then the annual penalty to that employer is \$2,000 for the year—not just for that one, but for every single employee that he or she employs. It could be hundreds; it could be thousands.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Above 30.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. They get a break for 30, yes.

Again, we just have maybe a little bit of time left, and I wanted to point out some things to our colleagues.

I want to call this "ObamaCare Shot and Chaser." Bear with me a little bit because I think this is interesting and cute at the same time.

ObamaCare has been a train wreck since its inception. March 23, 2010, almost 3½ years ago, the Democrats passed it to see what's in it. And now families, taxpayers, and job creators are paying one steep price. Between its skyrocketing cost, unsustainable and wasteful programs, and job-strangling policies, a majority of Americans disapprove of this law—and they disapprove of it today.

On top of that, implementation of ObamaCare has become a full-fledged disaster, as we've pointed out this evening. Some of its biggest supporters agree with us—and not news media publications that are considered particularly conservative.

As for the President, he just can't seem to make up his mind on the employer mandate. He was against it in 2009 before he was for it in 2010. After signing the mandate into law, the administration announced earlier this month it would delay the employer requirement for 1 year. When the House of Representatives acted last week to really make it constitutional—because he didn't have the right to do that—but when we voted to allow him to do that, the same White House issued a veto threat on the bill. The thing that he had done and that we made it legal for him to do, he's going to veto that.

So the shot:

We have heard concerns about the complexity of the employer mandate requirement and the need for more time to implement them effectively. We have listened to your feedback and we are taking action. The administration is announcing that it will provide an additional year before the Affordable Care Act mandatory employer mandate and insurer reporting requirements begin.

The chaser. That was the bill that we passed, H.R. 2667. Employer mandate delay is unnecessary. These are the words of the administration:

Enacting this legislation would undermine key elements of the health law.

That was stated July 17 by the White House veto threat. President Obama's repeated flip-flops on the individual mandate are well-documented. He pledged support for it in 2007 on the campaign trail to a group of union workers. When his health care plan was released months later, the individual mandate was noticeably absent. He went on to attack his Presidential primary opponents—think HC—for supporting the requirement, only to change his mind once again shortly thereafter.

I could go on and on. I think we've made our point here tonight, and maybe we can yield back a little time. I will yield to my colleague, and he can yield back to me for closing.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we're here to get it right. I've always said this—and I truly believe it—the politics will take care of itself. The people will decide. We don't need term limits. They term-limit us. Let's quit worrying about the politics, and let's do the policy. Let's get the policy right.

A 2,700-page bill crammed down the throats of the American people will never work. It never has worked. It never will work. And that's why we're here tonight, taking pains to explain and make sure that anybody within earshot understands that we're sincere about this. It's not partisan. We need to get rid of this law, and we need to replace it with something that truly will effect those changes that Dr. ROE was talking about in regard to the cost of health care and the accessibility. We didn't even talk about accessibility and about whether or not there will be any doctors there to see these patients.

So I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. People ask me if there are things in the bill I like. Absolutely. You can't write a 2,700-page bill and not put some things in there that are positive. There are positive things in the bill. We should have worked together in a bipartisan way to look at those positive things we agreed to and then things we didn't agree to.

I think the approval rating now for the Affordable Care Act is at 35 percent. Is this objection just Republicans? Are just Republicans out there?

Well, let me read to you just a little bit here. This came up in testimony

yesterday in my subcommittee hearing. The letter was from James P. Hoffa, general president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Joseph Hansen, international president of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union; and Donald D. Taylor, president of UNITE-HERE, a union representing hotel, airport, food service, gaming and textile workers. This is to then-Speaker PELOSI, now minority leader:

When you and the President sought our support for the Affordable Care Act, you pledged that if we liked the health plans, we could keep them. Sadly, that promise is under threat. Perverse incentives are causing nightmare scenarios. First, the law creates an incentive for employers to keep employees' work hours below 30 hours a week. Numerous employers have begun to cut workers' hours to avoid this obligation, and many of them are doing so openly. The impact is two-fold: fewer hours means less pay while also losing our current health benefits.

These are the presidents of three major unions.

So it's not just Republicans, Mr. Speaker. It's the public beginning to focus on this now, because this bill is becoming the law of the land January 1. I wish it had worked as smooth as it could. It has not. And it has not because it's not doing what it promised, which was the single most important thing, which is cut the cost of care so more of us out there could afford to have it.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank all of the members of the House GOP Doctors Caucus who participated tonight. If I tried to add up the number of years of clinical experience in our group of about 21 members on the Republican side of the aisle in this caucus, it would probably be 600-plus years. So we really do know of what we speak. We don't have every answer, but we know of what we speak; and we want to get it right. That's what this is all about.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PROTECTING THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. Tonight, the Congressional Progressive Caucus would like to talk about voting rights and how important that is to this country and to every single person in our country.

Last week, both the Senate and House Judiciary Committees held hearings on the Voting Rights Act and what steps we need to take forward to protect the right to vote in this country. There's potentially no right that is

more important, no issue that is more important to this country that we should consider than our right to vote. It should be our most fundamental right. It's the right that preserves all other liberties that Americans hold dear.

When aspiring Americans take the citizenship test, they're asked, What is the most important right granted to U.S. citizens? And the correct answer: the right to vote. Protecting this right should be the primary concern of our democracy. So you would think that when that question is asked, What are our most important rights, and the answer is, The right to vote, it would be something that's enshrined in our U.S. Constitution and you would think there is explicitly a right to vote. I certainly thought that. But you would be wrong. It's startling to think, at first. It seems against everything you think you've been taught and against the principles that our country has been built on. But within our Constitution there is no explicit right to vote.

We have to remember that when our Constitution was originally ratified, the right to vote was specifically not guaranteed. In fact, it was an incredibly restrictive law. Only white male property owners above the age of 21 could vote. That was less than 20 percent of the country's population at the time. Many of our Founders specifically did not want to expand the franchise of voting, believing most in society were unqualified for the privilege. In fact, John Adams famously wrote:

It is dangerous to open so fruitful a source of controversy and altercation as would be opened by attempting to alter the qualifications of voters. There will be no end of it.

Mr. Speaker, since that time, our Nation's attitudes towards voting have changed slowly but very progressively. But the fact that we have needed constitutional amendments prohibiting discrimination based on race, gender, and age demonstrates that we possess no guaranteed right to vote in our Constitution.

Meanwhile, these accomplishments have oftentimes been accompanied by a myriad of tactics, laws, and strategies meant to suppress the vote: literacy tests, poll taxes, grandfather clauses, voter intimidation.

□ 2045

These targets of discriminatory efforts have changed as well. Our first literacy tests were adopted to keep Irish-Catholic immigrants from voting. Then we saw a wide array of efforts to stop African Americans from going to the polls.

Now, today, the bills introduced to restrict the right to vote may be a little less obvious and voters lawmakers wish to suppress are a little harder to define, but these efforts are nonetheless discriminatory.

We have seen burdensome registration requirements and reduced early

voting opportunities, which are often critical for low-income Americans who cannot take off work on Election Day. African Americans and Latinos, in particular, have utilized early voting days in very high numbers.

College students have been the targets of a number of efforts to decrease their participation, from disallowing student IDs as an acceptable form of voter identification, to stricter residency requirements, to limited polling locations on campuses.

Voter ID and burdensome registration requirements often make it harder for senior citizens also to be able to vote. In Wisconsin, we've had this issue before us. Many senior citizens no longer carry their driver's license because they no longer drive, and yet that's one of the very things that they may need to go vote with a photo ID.

I myself didn't realize the full extent of the attack on our right to vote until voter ID laws were actually introduced in my home State of Wisconsin. As is often the case with voter ID laws, Republicans justified the photo ID requirement as a way to counter voter fraud in our State.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is this crisis of voter fraud is a fraud in and of itself. As the Brennan Center for Justice points out, you are more likely to be killed by lightning than you are to commit voter fraud in your lifetime. To be killed by lightning is more common than voter fraud in this country.

Now, in Wisconsin, we're very proud that we're one of the top three States for voter participation—Maine, Minnesota, and Wisconsin—and we're known for our clean and effective elections. Our chief elections officer found that since the year 2000 in statewide elections the State has seen about 20 instances of voter fraud out of more than 6 million votes cast. Most of those instances of voter fraud involved felons who were ineligible to vote but voted—a problem that doesn't get fixed with a photo ID.

So why did the Wisconsin Legislature believe we needed to combat against voter fraud? What does it mean when you have a cure in search of a disease? Well, in my experience, there's usually an ulterior motive. And in the case of restrictive voting laws, the design is to suppress the vote, to encourage lower voter turnout in the hopes of influencing elections. In other words, it's about elected officials trying to pick their voters rather than the voters picking their elected officials.

Now, in Wisconsin, we're very fortunate because our State constitution specifically guarantees the right to vote. Because of this provision, the suppressive voting laws that have been introduced in our State have largely been blocked by the courts.

But what I did realize is that, while Wisconsin had a strong amendment

that protected our right to vote, our U.S. Constitution does not. Unfortunately, without a guaranteed Federal right to vote, we will continue to see the types of disenfranchising efforts that have become a plague on our modern society.

Mr. Speaker, that takes us to today and last month's Supreme Court decision that struck down section 4 of the Voting Rights Act. Section 4 was the act's preclearance formula, the formula that determined which States and counties needed to get Federal approval before they make voting law changes. The Court ruled that the formula was outdated and, thus, unconstitutional.

Now, I think the Court may have forgotten that when we reauthorized the Voting Rights Act, overwhelmingly, just from 2006, we had 390 supporters in the House of Representatives and a unanimous 98-0 vote in the Senate. Clearly, there was strong support in the legislative body for the Voting Rights Act that was now turned aside by the Supreme Court.

Either way, what we know for certain is that before the ink was even dry on the Supreme Court decision, State legislatures began to act. Of the nine States that were fully covered by the Voting Rights Act, six have already started to move on legislation that would restrict the right to vote. Let me just read you a couple quotes from a couple of these States.

Texas—this was really quick. This is the headline: "That was quick: Texas moves forward with voter ID law after Supreme Court ruling." That's from the National Journal on June 25:

The Texas law requires voters to show photo identification to vote—a measure that was blocked by the Justice Department, arguing the law would discriminate against racial minorities. At the time, Attorney General Eric Holder called the law a "poll tax."

And that's where Texas went as soon as that Supreme Court decision happened.

In Mississippi, the headline: "Mississippi's Secretary of State Moves to Enforce Voter ID Law." Their new voter ID law may seem innocuous, but more than one out of 10 of every eligible voters do not have a government-issued ID, clearly making it harder for people to vote in the State of Mississippi.

Finally, just another example is in the State of North Carolina. The headline: "Senate Republicans Unveil Stricter North Carolina Voter ID Bill." Again, according to the article from the Charlotte Observer, Republican lawmakers are emboldened in their effort to push a photo identification requirement for in-person voting after the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a key part of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. The ruling means the bill would no longer need Justice Department approval before it becomes law.

So we're seeing in State after State after State that was protected by the Voting Rights Act that States now are trying to change those laws and make it harder for people to have that ability to go out and vote.

Now, I happen to agree with the Court that the formula was outdated. As I previously detailed, it doesn't reflect the current attempts to restrict the right to vote. In fact, it underestimates them.

Let's look at it this way: under the Voting Rights Act, nine entire States and certain counties in six others were covered, but just this year already, more than 80 restrictive voting laws in 31 States have been introduced.

Given my experience in Wisconsin and what I'm seeing in States across the country, I knew that we had to take action at the national level. So I got together with Congressman KEITH ELLISON from Minnesota and we worked with FairVote to work on a right to vote amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would guarantee an affirmative right to vote for every single American.

Our amendment is as simple as it is necessary. It says that every American citizen possesses the fundamental right to vote in any public election where they reside, and Congress has the power to protect this right.

This amendment would create an important change from current policy. No more would Americans have to prove that their right to vote has been infringed. If you live in a State right now, you have to prove that that State, in changing voting laws, has somehow infringed your ability to vote in order to have success. Instead, under our constitutional amendment, the burden of proof would go to the States, and the States would have to demonstrate that any new law they put in place would not burden any of their citizens' ability to have a right to vote.

Now, our vote is the great equalizer in this country. My brother and I have one thing in common with the Koch brothers: we each come with one single vote. The average person in the world, you may not have billions of dollars like Sheldon Adelson, but the one thing that you have in common with Sheldon Adelson is that you each have one single vote.

Now, I understand that ratifying the Constitution is not an easy task, but on this measure, it's a deeply important one. We can, and we must, build a grassroots movement needed to ensure our most fundamental right is not subject to the partisan whims of State legislatures.

I am holding in my hand pages and pages of people across the country who support a national right to vote constitutional amendment. Over 28,000 people have signed petitions. They're circulated by U.S. Action and PCCC, Bold Progressives that have got signa-

tures saying we need to make our Constitution work for every single American, that every single person has that right to vote. This has 28,000 names right here of people who support this most fundamental right.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, the right to vote is not a Republican right or a Democratic right, it's an American right. And if the recent Voting Rights Act decision demonstrates anything, it's that we need to do everything we can to help protect that right.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reinforce that the Congressional Progressive Caucus is going to do everything that we can to make sure that every American has the right to vote, and that a right to vote amendment to the U.S. Constitution is the most sure, most effective way to get that done.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

CHALLENGES FACING INDEPENDENT AND COMMUNITY PHARMACISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Well, it's good to be here at the end of a day in which there's been a lot of excitement here on the floor, a lot of voting going on, a lot of debate, which is what we're up here for.

One of the things that I have committed to, as we talked about a little bit last week, is pointing out some things that may fall a little bit under the radar but actually matter a great deal to the people of not only the Ninth District, but to the people of the United States.

Up here, we can get, many times, lost in what I'll call the big picture items or the latest of what's hot, so to speak, and tonight I want to talk about our local pharmacists.

I have a little pharmacist I go to. We have several, but one of the main ones I go to is Woody's Pharmacy, Kevin Woody. And I go in there and I know that when I ask him about the drugs for myself, for my wife, my kids, he gives me answers. He helps me know why they interact, what goes on. We've got pharmacists in all kinds of settings that do that every day for folks. But our local pharmacies, and especially our community pharmacies, right now are under attack.

I'm going to be joined, hopefully, here in a little bit by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to talk about the challenges facing independent community pharmacies. You see, local pharmacists play a vital role in America's neighborhoods and communities, particularly in the more rural areas of northeast Georgia. They provide unparalleled guidance, assistance, and resources for families, including my own.

I'm committed to protecting access to independent and community pharmacists and helping to level the playing field through effective and robust oversight of pharmacy benefit managers, or PBMs.

It's a tough enough task to survive in this economy, and the overregulation by the administration is only making it more difficult. I am committed to working with my colleagues, particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania, to promote legislation that will provide consumers with greater choice of pharmacies, require fair standards for PBM pharmacies, support access to diabetes testing supplies, protect traditional pharmacy compounding, and ensure that our military families can enjoy the many benefits that community pharmacies provide.

In many cases, independent and community pharmacists have dedicated their careers to providing quality patient care. However, they've been continuously cut by unfair reimbursements, overbearing audits, and a take-it-or-leave-it approach to contracts. Over the next 30 minutes, I look forward to discussing the challenges facing independent and community pharmacists and the important role they play in the lives of many of our constituents.

Although we cannot sufficiently cover these issues in the next half hour, I hope this will be the first of many conversations on this floor about this important topic. And this is what I mean about ideas and topics that may not make the headlines, they may not bring the stories on the opening of the evening news, but they affect us daily in our lives and they're often overlooked.

When we deal many times on this floor, and I have spoken of it before, is how do we deal with and what is the cost of regulation and how they are affecting our everyday lives, this is one of the areas, especially with our community pharmacists, that they're affecting right now. It's affecting how they do business.

As one community pharmacist told me recently, that if something doesn't change soon, that in my area of northeast Georgia, which has a vibrant community pharmacy along with PBM pharmacists and others, that within 10 years there may not be a community pharmacist left in northeast Georgia. That's a scary thought, Mr. Speaker.

When you think about that for a second, when you look at an industry that many of us grow up and you have stories going back to when many pharmacists had soda stands; they had just a full-service place where you could go. Even my pharmacist today still has the scoops of ice cream. One of the ways my kids want to come with me to the store is they say, I'll go with you if you're going to Woody's because I want a scoop of ice cream.

So it's a family place. It's something that I think brings back a sense of Americana, but it also hits at the very idea of what we'll just take as just good old-fashioned entrepreneurship—businesses that mean something to our community but also provide a service that is invaluable. Right now I think those are under attack, and those are the things that just concern me.

When we look at that possibility, as the pharmacist told me, he said that there possibly may not even be community pharmacists in our area within the next 10 years, that really struck my attention; and it's made me, before I was even elected, begin to look at what are the problems and how can we address those as we go along.

□ 2100

I can give examples. And I bet almost every Member here on both sides of the aisle can come in and talk about their pharmacist, wherever they may work, but a community pharmacist who they can call on and ask about. My parents—I have watched them grow up and they get older, and when we have questions about their medicines I know that I can call my pharmacist and ask him questions. I know that many of you—and maybe even you, Mr. Speaker—have that person that you can talk to about the drugs and the issues that just keep us healthy.

One of the things that they also help us do, and community pharmacists do, is provide that preventive care that keeps us from getting into these long-term illnesses which drive up the health care costs, which is talked about so much on this House floor. And really from my perspective the tragedy of ObamaCare is: let's get back to the very roots of medicine. And as the doctors were speaking earlier tonight on the floor, talking about how we can do preventive medicine and make sure that the health of our constituents is taken care of, community pharmacists do just that.

One of the first challenges facing our local pharmacists I want to discuss here tonight relates to diabetic testing supplies and the competitive bidding process. Earlier this year, I wrote the Comptroller General Gene Dodaro expressing concern about the impact that the Medicare Competitive Bidding Process will have on patient access to diabetic testing supplies.

Seniors in northeast Georgia, and across the State, rely on their ability to get the testing supplies from their local pharmacists. Many have written to me expressing their concerns that applying competitively bid pricing to independent community pharmacies could negatively impact their access to these essential supplies.

In more rural communities, such as northeast Georgia, an independent community pharmacy may be the only available option for seniors. Their local

pharmacist helps them properly use their test strips and meters and provide much needed resource and guidance in managing their disease.

A 72 percent reduction in reimbursement for retail pharmacies that are currently supplying these items to Medicare beneficiaries was announced on January 30, 2013. This reduction in reimbursement took effect on July 1 of this year.

Here are some of the feedback that Georgians have given about the impact that this reimbursement reduction is having on their quality of life and access to care. We've heard things like: "I've had difficulty finding a new provider; my product of choice was unavailable; I've been forced to change providers; the quality of my care and services is poor; my cost has increased; I've experienced poor communication from CMS; I'm confused about the changes."

Independent community pharmacists typically sell diabetic testing supplies to provide a service to patients, not to make money. Even before the reduction in reimbursement rates, the profit margins on these supplies were very low.

Now, pharmacists have to choose between keeping their business open or giving their patients the supplies and care they need. This isn't a choice they should be forced to make. In an area and a time in which our economy and jobs are suffering, this is another example of a business that is fighting against the world, so to speak, to stay in business and to employ those 3 or 4 or 5 or up to 10 or 15 people that take care of the people in our communities, Mr. Speaker.

This is something we need to take care of. This is something when you hear the feedback from folks who are calling our office and writing our office and calling their pharmacist and saying: "I'm having difficulty finding a new provider; I can't make sense of this; I'm forced to change my provider; and the quality and service are poor." We need to take a look at what's going on.

Another pressing issue from my local pharmacists is the lack of oversight and transparency when it comes to the pharmacy benefit managers. PBMs are actually one of the least regulated segments of the health care market, yet they are the cause of numerous frivolous audits that local pharmacies are subjected to.

Now, supporting strong PBM transparency requirements is key to delivering real savings to patients. Unlike my local pharmacist, and those across the Nation, PBMs do not have a real relationship with patients. In fact, it is not uncommon for them to secretly retain most manufacturer payments—e.g. rebates, discounts and other fees—instead of passing the savings on to patients.

Additionally, PBMs have been known to switch plan members from low- to high-cost drugs and manipulate generic pricing. At the end of the day, the data points to the fact the PBM market is broken. I can speak to this from my own personal experience. As I've shared before, I believe when we talk about problems, we need to relate it to what people can understand. For this, I can understand it through my family, but also through my parents, who have talked about how their drugs have been changed, or they've been given short notice of changes, or when they get them from their doctor, who gives them the prescription to take them to their pharmacy, they have a problem because they're not going to be certified because there's been a change just in the last little bit in what drug the coverage will make, and the PBMs have had a large part in that.

What I believe is, their conduct is anticompetitive and anticonsumer, and independent community pharmacists are often left vulnerable to their market power.

But there are solutions to this problem. For example, allowing the smaller to collectively negotiate will help level the playing field.

The threat of antitrust liability in the status quo prevents these collective negotiations, and I believe an antitrust exemption is appropriate and consistent with past exemptions enacted by this Congress.

It is with that that I am proud to be an original cosponsor of what is known as the "Protecting our Hometown Independent Pharmacies Act of 2013," which I believe achieves this goal.

The author of this bill, Mr. MARINO, and I have had several conversations discussing his examples and what brought him into an understanding of what is going on with our community pharmacists and the problems that have developed here. And I want to applaud, and I want to take out and highlight Members who have brought forward pieces of legislation that I believe matter to our constituents and they matter to the American people.

This is a conservative piece of legislation that brings forward and highlights a problem with our community pharmacists, who are reliable businessmen in their communities. And by doing so and taking that part, Mr. MARINO has helped bring forth a piece of legislation that I am glad to support and look forward to moving forward, hopefully through the committee process and onto this floor and eventually signed into law.

Now, understand, there's a lot of discussion that needs to be had here. PBM takes their fair share of blame, and there are a lot of problems in this situation. It is something that we need to discuss because it matters to the people back home, it matters to the very essence of health and health care,

which we come down to this well and we talk about all the time. We talk about costs, we talk about the problems with access. This is an area where I believe we can continue to move forward.

There's also another pressing matter facing independent community pharmacists, particularly in northeast Georgia, and that is abusive audit tactics. I believe, like many Americans, that pharmacy audits should be focused on uncovering actual fraud and abuse. Audits play an important role in ensuring high-quality patient care and services.

Unfortunately, PBMs are leveraging their power to abuse the auditing process. They're singling out expensive drugs and using typographical and other trivial errors to recoup from pharmacies significant amounts of money—not to return to Medicare, but to line their own pockets.

Now, this is where I'm going to use an example that I had a few months ago. I had a number of pharmacists, my local pharmacists all over northeast Georgia, came in and they met with me. All I did was, I sent out a note because I had been hearing about this from my local pharmacist and from others, and I said, come talk to me about what you're experiencing.

Like a lot of times—and Mr. Speaker, maybe you've done a similar thing with businesses—you expect maybe three or four people to show up. In my conference room I had a full house. Pharmacists who left and drove, some as many as 2 hours, to come to that office to sit down and talk about the problems that they were facing. What that told me in the middle of the day was that the issues and the problems that they have were more important to them than spending time at their shop that morning, and were finding somebody to cover their shop so they could come talk about this because it's affecting the very quality of their existence.

Now, as we look at this, they began to give me examples. For example, let's say your local pharmacist fills a \$500 prescription for you that you called in over the phone or you had called in from the doctor's office. The pharmacist dispensed the correct drug in the correct amount and provided you the correct directions for taking the drug. Mr. Speaker, do we have a problem at this point? I don't think so. You're getting the right drug in the right amount in the right container with the right label. Everything is there on what your doctor had wanted you to have.

But if the pharmacist makes a mistake in his personal records in his checking off—instead of checking the "called in over the phone" box he checks "the faxed in" box—a PBM could then during their audit of the pharmacy find the mistake and take

back the entire \$500. Not just the copay, and not just the profit the pharmacy received; they take back the entire cost of the drug.

Now, I've said before, there are a lot of things that make me scratch my head. This is one of them. It's one thing to come in and be audited, it's one thing to find a mistake in which there's a clerical error—and there needs to be some correction to that clerical error. But let me go back, Mr. Speaker, and remind you that it was dispensed properly in the correct amount with the correct drug and the correct facility with the correct directions on there. But, however, on the paperwork on how the call came in, how they took the prescription down, they were audited and deemed for that, and they were not just deemed for the amount of their copay or their profit even; they were deemed for the entire amount of the drug.

What's really interesting about this is I've also had several of my pharmacists say it is eerily interesting to them that when they're audited, it's not the generics that are audited, it is the brand names that seem to be audited, the higher cost drugs that find their way onto the audit list. I think that's really interesting because what happens is if one mistake comes, you're talking about a major cost for these pharmacists. This is not something they can continue to eat.

Now, it can be said they can appeal it, and they can go through the process, but it is something over and over. They don't get to appeal it and hold the money. They have to send the money in and then appeal. Now, does that sound fair? I don't think so.

I think what we've got to do here is begin to look at this problem in its entirety. The PBM could pocket the entire cost of a correctly dispensed drug, even what the pharmacy paid wholesale. This leaves me baffled. Obviously, an auditing measure should be in place, but for transparency and accountability, not to financially penalize one's competitors.

Oh, by the way, some of the PBMs are actually involved in the competitors to the local pharmacies in which they audit. Just a small reminder.

I can stand here all evening and tell you story after story of the unfair and almost unbelievable auditing practices that my local independent folks have had to deal with.

One local pharmacist told me about how they had already been audited three times that year, and they were preparing for their fourth. Mr. Speaker, do you know when he told me that? March. He had been audited three times, getting ready for a fourth, and it was January, February, March. This seems to be a problem.

Interestingly enough, the audits don't focus, as I've already said, on generic drugs. The audits typically look

at administrative errors on high-priced drugs.

This comes as no surprise. We know that the PBMs are looking to take money, line their pockets, and not care for patients. They don't sponsor baseball teams, they don't participate in chili cook-offs, and they sure aren't going to any tomato festivals. Patient care takes a back seat to profit margins.

I believe that Congress should take a closer look at PBMs because, in the status quo, after a pharmacy has been audited, recoupment funds go back to the PBM. This is unacceptable. In other words, you're auditing, and the fines that you get, the penalties that you get, go to you. Again, there seems to be an incentive problem here. You're dealing with the high-cost drugs, you're missing the generics, you're looking for clerical errors on correctly dispensed drugs. The patient never had a problem, but yet the pharmacist was deemed.

I'm committed to working with my colleagues to make sure that Medicare is getting its fair share of funds back. There is one word we hear a great deal on this floor. No matter the debate topic it is bound to come up at least once. And that word is "transparency."

But there are few areas in which this concept is more important. You see, transparency saves money and helps markets work better. It helps it work as it was intended to work.

Transparency allows plans and payers, including large corporations and governments, to confirm that a PBM is, in fact, providing the service it was hired to do: to secure low drug costs.

Now, remember, in this world of regulation—and for those who know me in my short time up here in Washington, this is one of the issues that I have focused like a laser on, regulation. In fact, tomorrow morning, I encourage Members if they are not busy and they want to come to a regulatory reform caucus breakfast, come see us. We'll have breakfast there for them, and we're going to discuss the effects of regulatory reform and why this matters.

Many times, we in the elected office, we talk about regulatory reform and why it matters, and it's going to make sense. I believe tonight we've shown how it affects local community pharmacists, and that's something that needs to be looked at.

□ 2115

But again, what were the PBMs supposed to do? They were supposed to secure low drug costs. They were supposed to secure a better way for our Medicare savings. This is not what is happening.

Unfortunately, under today's policy, the plan's sponsor has no way to verify that their PBM is sharing manufacturer rebates or that the PBM is nego-

tiating the lowest possible cost for specific drugs. In fact, recent data indicate the exact opposite is occurring. For example, TRICARE anticipates a savings of \$1.67 billion by negotiating its own drug prices and rebates for its 9 million beneficiaries rather than going through a PBM. Let me state that one more time, Mr. Speaker. TRICARE anticipates saving \$1.67 billion by negotiating its own drug prices and rebates for its 9 million beneficiaries rather than going through a PBM.

I happened to be on this floor for the last couple days and in that chair, listening to discussions on our DOD appropriations and on the struggles that we're having with our funding for our vital services in our defenses. Don't you think that this is something that we can afford, not only in defense, but in other areas as well? I believe it is. The State of Texas estimates it could save \$265 million by switching to a transparent PBM contract. This is no chump change we're talking about here tonight.

Although my time draws to a close, I am pleased that the conversations are just beginning. The challenges facing independent community pharmacies are great, but the important role they play in our towns and States is even greater. It is coming to a time and a place like this in which we can look forward to solutions that matter. I did not come to Washington, D.C., simply to watch things happen and to wonder why. I came to be part of a solution. Like you, Mr. Speaker, we are part of a freshman class that came here believing, as I've said before, that this is a place to which people still look to make this country continually the greatest country on Earth, and people look to us for solutions and answers. The way they do that is by looking at commonsense legislation. They look at commonsense solutions that affect them every day.

For many, many people in this country—and especially in my home of northeast Georgia—local pharmacies are a place that sponsor those football teams and baseball teams. They are the places where senior citizens go as I have watched many times in the pharmacies that I go to whether it be my own pharmacy or not.

Just the other day, I went in and saw a sweet little senior citizen lady I'd pastored for 11 years. In my first church, I actually had 45 senior adults. They were all that was there. I was 28 years old, and all of a sudden, I gained all of these grandparents. So, for me, it was something I learned a great deal from. When I watched this sweet old lady come up to the counter, she asked Kevin about some issues that she was having with her drugs. She was trying to figure out what was going on, and Kevin took the time to talk with her and to explain. No, this is not what's

really happening. This is what you need to do, and this is the medicine you need to take. He took the time to care.

Pharmacists all across this country—and I want to make this very clear; this has nothing to do with pharmacists individually. Pharmacists, whether they work in large shops or small shops, in community stores or large box stores, are wonderfully dedicated professionals who do a wonderful job. They work hard in helping their customers, and they work hard at helping those who have come in between.

When we deal with this kind of environment, we make sure that our local pharmacies are the ones that can have a chance to continue to grow and to prosper in their communities. When we have our community pharmacies operating as they should, then we are going to be able to continue the process of making sure that our communities have the pharmacies that they can depend on and also a transparency that comes with dealing with these PBMs and with the auditing practices which have been really tearing apart our pharmacies and community pharmacies as a whole.

I go back to that one statement that my local pharmacist said to me. He was sitting there, and he was looking across, and he was explaining what I've talked about here tonight about the auditing practices. He said that, if this doesn't change, our pharmacists will be out of business, that there won't be any pharmacies left in the community world. For northeast Georgia, that would be a tragedy.

I am pleased tonight to also see my good friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), who has been a real leader in this area, and I am a proud cosponsor of his legislation, the Preserving Our Hometown Independent Pharmacies Act of 2013. I would love to yield to him now to share further on what we've experienced during this time.

Mr. MARINO. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, today, independent pharmacists are facing an increasing number of challenges that threaten their very livelihoods. These are the independent mom-and-pop pharmacies that all Americans have come to know and to love. They are the neighborhood staples that you have come to rely on. They are where you can go for basic medical advice, and they are where new parents can have their children's prescriptions filled. On average, independent pharmacies fill over 200 prescriptions every day, provide immunization, durable medical equipment, diabetes training, and other vital services. Unfortunately, these independent pharmacies are more vulnerable than ever and are having to lay off workers at an alarming rate.

As more independent pharmacies are forced to close their doors, I am increasingly concerned about the impact

that this will have on American families, especially on those in rural areas like my district in northeast Pennsylvania. Not only does their closure jeopardize the local drug supply, but it also has dangerous consequences for the surrounding areas' medical providers—that's right—dangerous consequences for the surrounding areas' medical providers.

One of the biggest dangers to local independent pharmacies is the pharmacy benefit managers industry, or PBMs. Over the past few years, the PBMs' power has become concentrated in the hands of a few, enabling them to dominate over their competition. Independent pharmacies are at a competitive disadvantage, which prevents them from providing their customers with vital prescriptions at a reasonable cost.

I have heard from a number of pharmacists that PBMs have an incredible market power over independent pharmacists. Even worse, the political power of only a handful of companies has enabled them to grow and to swallow their competition, which is only expected to intensify if ObamaCare is fully implemented.

This is why I, along with my colleague to my right and JUDY CHU of California, introduced H.R. 1188, the Preserving Our Hometown Independent Pharmacies Act of 2013. This bipartisan, commonsense legislation provides a limited exemption for independent community pharmacists from antitrust laws. My bill would level the playing field by enabling the mom-and-pop pharmacies to work together in order to negotiate better contract terms from the large drug companies and pharmacy benefit managers, or PBMs. The unchecked practice of PBMs has gone on for too long, and it's time we passed H.R. 1188 in order to stop these harmful practices.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate that.

As our time draws to a close tonight, I am pleased that we can begin these conversations. That's what I want to have with the American people and with our body here, bringing out and highlighting legislation and the work that I believe is being done here, because I believe there are great things that can happen when we pull together and when we find the things that matter to Main Street. When we do that—Congressman MARINO and others as we pull forward like this—we are actually bringing ideas to the forefront that help and build our economy, that talk about those jobs, that keep those jobs in the community, and provide a great public service.

When we are looking at a health care situation and an aging population, our community pharmacists need to be a vital player in that market, making sure that our health and our well-being are taken care of in a kind and caring

and compassionate way. The challenges facing independent community pharmacists are great, but the important role they play in our towns and States is even greater still.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership, and I want to thank him for joining me here tonight and for being a part of discussing real solutions and real answers of why a conservative agenda is important to America, because it matters to Main Street, because it matters to real people in everyday life situations.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE RULE OF LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, thank you, and thank you to the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence and to the rules of this body that allow for Members to come down to this well in the most important place where free speech is allowed, and I am extremely grateful for that opportunity to be here tonight.

One subject that I would like to focus on this evening is the issue that is being taken up here in Washington, D.C. It has gotten some attention in recent weeks—certainly with a bill that came through the United States Senate—and that was a bill that granted amnesty to illegal aliens. That bill passed through the United States Senate. Unfortunately, that bill does nothing about the main problem that we deal with in immigration, and that's border security.

Twenty-seven years ago, Ronald Reagan made a deal with the American people, Mr. Speaker. He said this, that we're going to have a onetime deal. We're going to deal with immigration right now.

It kind of sounds like very familiar rhetoric that we're getting today—we're going to deal with this issue once and for all. We're going to take this issue off the table. Then President Reagan said, We're going to secure the borders. We're going to make that happen, but we're also going to grant amnesty to the illegal aliens who are here in the United States. He estimated about 1 million illegal aliens would be here in the United States.

Once the bill was passed, the American people found out it wasn't 1 million illegal aliens. It was 3.6 million illegal aliens who were granted amnesty status. Once that amnesty status was granted, the United States had a policy of dealing with chain migration, and pretty soon that turned into 15 million foreigners or illegal aliens who were allowed to come into the United States as immigrants.

Now, we're all immigrants. I'm an immigrant. Mr. Speaker, I imagine you're an immigrant. All of us are descended from immigrants. This is a good thing. We're not here bashing immigrants. If we didn't have immigrants, we wouldn't have a country. We love immigrants. What we love also is the rule of law. We believe in the rule of law.

That's what this Chamber is. In fact, this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, is surrounded. There are medallions above every door in this Chamber, and those medallions have the faces of lawmakers over the time of recorded human history. Each one of these is a silhouette, and they contributed to the rule of law by adding to the certainty for mankind—for good rules and a good society that we can live under. In this Chamber, many of the American people may not know that our motto, "In God We Trust," is written above the stand, Mr. Speaker, where you're standing today just above the American flag. Just opposite from "In God We Trust" is a lawmaker unique among all of the lawmakers in this Chamber. That lawmaker is Moses. Moses faces the Speaker, and you'll note, Mr. Speaker, that Moses is the only lawmaker who has a full face.

Why would that be? Why would Moses be given a status different than all of the other lawmakers in this Chamber?

Mr. Speaker, I believe it's for this reason. I believe it is because of the great English jurist Blackstone, who is the mentor to the Founders of this Nation. Blackstone wrote that English common law and all of law in England is based upon the foundation bedrock of the Ten Commandments as given through Moses, and Moses is the full face—the most important lawgiver—because all of the law you see, all of the subsequent lawmakers down throughout the recorded annals of human history rest on the foundation of law and the rule of law as given by Moses and as given by God—according to the holy Torah and to the Bible—to Moses, and all of law descends from there.

Why that history lesson? Why that lesson on talking about law and a lawgiver while we're in the middle of talking about immigration?

It's because, right now, Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill and also the proposed House bill, the so-called DREAM Act, are premised upon the condition that people who came into the United States by breaking the law would receive an unparalleled benefit, much more so than the benefit of those who come into America legally. How many people come into America legally every year? It's shocking. People think we're not allowing people in. A million people a year, Mr. Speaker, are allowed into the United States legally. They go through the process, and they become

American citizens, and we applaud. I have been to naturalization ceremonies, proudly welcoming individuals in.

□ 2130

Today I was in a cab just before I came over here. A man from Pakistan was thrilled to be an American citizen. I shook his hand. I said, I'm so grateful that you're here, and I'm grateful that you came into our Nation legally. I'm grateful. Welcome. We're happy you're here.

I married a family of immigrants. My in-laws came here through the legal process. Why is this important? It's important because we as a Nation of laws must observe those laws. Now we're looking at changing that status by rewarding people who broke laws and putting them at the head of the line in front of people who stood by the law and did everything they could to follow the law to become legal citizens.

If you look at every nation in the world and their immigration policy, and if you look at the numbers of people of every single nation of the world—remember, Mr. Speaker, the United States is not the most populated country—there are more people in China than there are in the United States, and yet the United States is such a generous group of people, we allow more legal immigration in one year than the rest of the world. Every country of the world combined, we allow more legal immigrants, a million people a year.

Yet we still have 4 million people on a waiting list doing everything right, trying to come into the country legally. So why, I ask, Mr. Speaker, would we put to the front of the line lawbreakers, people who decided we're not going to pay attention to the law to the lawgivers of history, to Moses who gave the original Ten Commandments? We're going to break this law in this body where law is made; we're going to break this law. And for some reason this body would choose to benefit those who broke our laws? I say no, because the real problem with immigration, Mr. Speaker, is that we need to keep it legal and make it legal. That's why our very first consideration and only consideration should be complete border security first.

Border security for America first. Why? Because amnesty for illegal aliens is incredibly expensive. The estimate, Mr. Speaker, is \$6 trillion of additional debt for our children, \$6 trillion in redistribution of wealth with amnesty for illegal aliens. Nearly half of that number, Mr. Speaker, shockingly would be for retirement benefits for illegal aliens. So while you and I and millions of Americans have been working and paying in over the decades to Social Security and to Medicare, while we've been paying in and while people who are baby boomers

like myself are just about at that time to draw down on our Social Security and our Medicare benefits, now we would open the door wide, we would benefit and grant citizenship, a legal protected status, and immediate access to Social Security and Medicare, ObamaCare, Medicaid, 80 different means-tested welfare programs. Why would we do this? Is it because we have an abundance of money that's overflowing from our Treasury and we have absolute no idea what to do with it? I don't think so. Just in my brief time in Congress, we have doubled the national debt. That's one bill, essentially full-on amnesty, perpetual amnesty, with no means of deportation ever, with no border security ever. That's the fake bill that is coming out of the Senate.

What is the House of Representatives looking to take up? It is a different bill. It's called the DREAMers bill, and we're all told that what we need to do is get behind this effort to reward instant legalization status to children of illegal aliens. I want to put this on the floor for the American people. The children of illegal aliens very well may make up the largest subset of illegal aliens in the United States, but we need to recognize this is fake, back-door amnesty.

This isn't feeling sorry for kids or trying to deal with people through no fault of their own who are here in the United States illegally. This is what we're talking about. We're talking about millions of individuals who would be given instantaneous legal status. But it isn't just the children, Mr. Speaker. Because they would be given amnesty, they would immediately have the right to apply, and it would be granted, for their parents to have legal permanent status.

We aren't just talking about millions of kids, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about all their parents, too. So take all of the kids, and then double the number for their biological parents. Then, if there is a waiting period—let's say 5 years until they get their full legal status—then the parents can apply for legal status for their parents. And it goes from there. Very likely what we will see is a family reunification, chain migration, and rather than tens of millions of illegal aliens, some have estimated as much as over 100 million additional illegal aliens would be given amnesty in addition to the generosity of every year.

Why is this important? Again, because we hate immigrants? Absolutely, 1,000 percent no. That's not true. Number one, the rule of law. We need to observe the law. Number two, dealing with our debt and with the cost. It costs a fortune to have illegal immigration. Here's the third reason: it's because we will never solve this problem. You see, all we will have done, Mr. Speaker, is made sure that we will increase this problem, and we will have it

with us forever because we will have ongoing perpetual amnesty.

I would like to ask to join me right now, my fellow colleague, Representative STEVE KING from Iowa, who has been essentially the leading voice on this issue in Congress, talking about making sure that we, the American people, recognize what we're going into.

You see, we had the ObamaCare bill. The former Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, said we had to read the bill to know what was in it. It's a travesty. It's bankrupting America. Also, with the so-called DREAM Act, which, let's face it, it is three-quarters of the cost of the terrible fake border security bill in the Senate. So you've got this terrible full-on amnesty bill in the Senate. Mr. Speaker, the DREAMers bill takes you three-quarters of the way to the full-on amnesty bill. So when you take these two bills and you put them in conference committee, you can have either 100 percent amnesty or you can have 75 percent amnesty. When you split the difference on that, where are you? You've got amnesty. That's the problem, Mr. Speaker. It's a fake, no-border security, but it's a total authentic, nearly 100 percent amnesty bill.

I'd like to ask Representative STEVE KING to speak to that now as I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for yielding, and I appreciate the delivery you make and understanding in driving this issue. If a few of us don't stand up and drive this issue and remind, Mr. Speaker, that the American people observe what we do here—and they are thoughtful, they're intelligent, they're analytical, and they understand the history of this country, and they don't want to have somebody feed them a line. They want to know the squared-away truth. That's why I dig down into a bill like S. 744, the Gang of Eight's bill in the Senate, and take it apart and analyze it and put it back together and come down with this conclusion.

From the beginning, I called it the Always Is, Always Was, and Always Will Be Amnesty Act. The reason I say that is because you'd have to just kind of have a little bit of license with our grammar. But if you is in America, you get to stay. If you was in America, you get an invitation to come back. And if you ever get here, you always will get to stay here. So it's the Always Is, Always Was, and Always Will Be Amnesty Act.

If that doesn't trip your biblical trigger, then I can describe it this way in more secular terms. It is the Perpetual and Retroactive Amnesty Act, which means it was on forever and it also invites the people who have been deported in the past. It says, We really didn't mean it. If we deported you in the past, it was by a mistake that we didn't realize because our President

hadn't been elected yet, and he hadn't decided that he was going to violate his constitutional oath and grant this executive edict that's called the "Morton Memos" that legalizes the people that are here.

I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that we had 400,000 people that were adjudicated for removal in this country, and the President issued an order and used our precious resources to go back and comb through the records again, and that directive said, Look at them on an individual basis. The reason they do that is because they claim they have prosecutorial discretion. If they deal with individuals, then they cannot enforce the law. But if they have to put it into classes of people, then they know that they don't have prosecutorial discretion from a legal point.

So they use resources to comb through those 400,000 names of people to find ways they can waive the application of the law. That's amnesty by executive edict, and it's using resources to grant that. It didn't matter that they were young or old. If they hadn't committed a felony and been caught at it, or if they didn't commit and been caught at these three mysterious misdemeanors, they were going to get the application of the law, which was removal. They were just waiting for their final removal order, and so the President believed that he had the constitutional authority to grant this amnesty.

Now, this was just the precursor to the balance of the Morton Memos, which are the DREAM Act lite, so to speak, this executive edict for the DREAM Act. And it then sets up four categories of people, generally young people, but now we see, according to the Gang of Eight's bill, age up to 35. If up to age 35, if you want to test that you came to America, say, before your 16th birthday or your 18th birthday, depending on which policy you want to take—now, it really wasn't your fault; it was your parents' decision.

Well, it reminds me of a long shirt-tail relation who found himself in jail on Christmas Eve, and his father decided he would bail him out and bring him home for Christmas Eve, Christmas Day, Christmas dinner, and take him back to the jail where he belonged again. When his father showed up, let me say this uncooperative son was so resentful that he said to his father, It's not my fault, Dad, it's your fault because you controlled everything. You controlled my genes and you controlled my environment. I didn't control either one. I'm a product of nature and nurture, and you are the one who produced the nature and nurture; therefore it's your fault that I'm in jail. I can tell you what his father said: You can stay in jail if you think it's not your responsibility and think it over.

Well, I heard this new theory come in the committee here just yesterday, I

guess it was, that young people can't form intent. I wondered about that. That was a bit of a new theory for me. We do prosecute intent in this country and we prosecute intent of juveniles.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, Representative KING had stated that in the committee they were told that young people could not form intent. And my question would be, under the proposed DREAM Act that we have looked at so far, we're looking at that from age zero to 35. These people would be given automatic amnesty from being an illegal alien. Then, of course, we know their parents would immediately be able to come in as legal permanent residents, as well. So my question would be: Do we consider that you are not legally capable of forming an intent when you're age 35?

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, as that is my point.

We know that young people can form intent. That's why we discipline them at a young age; 2-year-olds get a little discipline because they have intent; 3-year-olds have a little more intent, and they get a little more discipline. By the time they get to be 7 or 8, they are actually disciplined. So I think that's an argument that moves us off the target. Regardless of whether they have intent when they're 1 day old, 1 week old, 1 month old, 1 year old, or 10 years old, whenever that time comes, when they become of age and they realize that they're unlawfully present in the United States, the law requires that they remove themselves. It's just the law. So we expect them to accept this responsibility, whether it was the intent that they had when they came in or the intent that they have to stay tomorrow. If we don't do that, then we've absolved a whole class of people from a responsibility and rewarded them with the objective of their crime.

These are the things that trouble me. If we destroy the rule of law, an essential pillar of American exceptionalism—we could not be a great Nation without the rule of law. If we destroy that even in the narrower version of immigration or the even narrower version of the DREAM kids, if we do that, then it expands into all people that are here illegally because age is the only difference, and you cannot draw a bright line.

Furthermore, then you have expanded the amnesty throughout all immigration, and you've destroyed the rule of law. And if we can't restore it in this time, since we've been struggling to do so since the 1986 Amnesty Act, we could not restore the rule of law with regard to immigration for all time. And we could therefore, then, not control immigration in this country any longer, only by trying to keep people out by barriers at the borders. But we

then couldn't enforce the law against anybody that got in.

□ 2145

Can you imagine, turning over the immigration law in the United States to everybody but those who are in America? If you're not in America, you get to decide immigration law; and if you're in America, you don't get to decide immigration law. That's what we're dealing with.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you so much. One thing that I wanted to mention as well, in speaking with one of the experts, Mr. Speaker, Robert Rector from the Heritage Foundation, we asked him: What is the average age of the average illegal immigrant into the United States? He said it is age 34. Isn't it a coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation being proposed is to grant amnesty to anyone 35 or below. And again, they would instantaneously be able to apply for legal permanent residence for their parents, and it would be granted automatically.

So we are talking not about a tiny subset. We're talking about a tremendously huge subset. But here's the other identifying feature that Mr. Rector had said: the average age being about 34, the average education level being something less than 10th grade. Now, that's not to make fun of anyone that they don't have the education level, but I'm talking about the impact now not on the illegal immigrant, I'm talking about the impact on the American people, on American citizens who are senior citizens, American citizens who are in the working age population, and also the young people who will shoulder the burden for all of the debt that is being handed to them right now.

I'm thinking also, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that when an individual comes into this country and they have less than a 10th grade education, the statistics bear it out, Mr. Speaker, according to Heritage Foundation, that those individuals over the course of their lifetime are revenue consumers. In other words, they take more out of the United States Treasury than they pay in.

And so if we allow the DREAM Act, which is three-fourths of the way amnesty, which is backdoor amnesty, for all practical purposes full-on amnesty, if we allow that, we are bringing into this country legally tens of millions of individuals who would be taking out of the Treasury at the worst possible time—when we have pensions to pay, when we have health care to pay, when we have education to pay for, police, fire protection. And the estimate is that we're looking at over \$30,000 a year in annual subsidy, direct payout for the average illegal alien that's coming into the United States.

Now, they do pay taxes. They might pay about \$10,000 in taxes, but they are

a net minus. They are a cost to the Treasury of about \$10,000. Why is this important? Because we are talking about people. Yes, we are, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about American people, American senior citizens who worked their whole life for their Social Security and their Medicare and who are nervous about the fact that we are going into bankruptcy.

And yes, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about people all right. We're talking about the American worker, 22 million of whom can't find full-time employment. And now we have James Hoffa from the Teamsters Union who wrote a letter this last week, and he said, Mr. President, what's wrong with you? Mr. Speaker, he said we worked hard for a 40-hour workweek, and now the new norm is 30 hours a week or less, and no benefits package. So where's the jobs? Where's the wages? Where's the benefits packages? Are the jobs all fleeing to illegal aliens that we're making legal? Or are we going to think about our senior citizens who are Americans who fought and bled and died for this country, for the workers of this country, and for the people that we are about to hand the baton to, the next generation, who are going to take over this country?

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady.

I think we have some intelligent and some responsible Members of Congress that probably haven't contemplated something that I'm about to say. I hear them talking about they're okay with increasing the workforce, especially in the low-skilled categories because they believe that agriculture needs laborers and food processing needs laborers. I hear that from agriculture and I hear that from food processors, too. But here are the facts. The double-digit unemployment, the highest unemployment levels that we have, are in the lowest skilled jobs.

So when you go into double-digit unemployment and the low-skilled people are in oversupply, you have to believe that labor is a commodity like corn or beans or gold or oil, and it is determined by supply and demand in the marketplace. And if you have an oversupply of people that are willing to work in unskilled or underskilled jobs, then the wages go down and get suppressed.

An example would be like this. In the packing plant in the town where I was born, people that worked in the packing plant 25 or perhaps 30 years ago made equivalent to the salary of a college-educated teacher working in the same town, and they could raise their family and pay for a modest home. Those children would have an opportunity to go to college, if they chose, and they could live a happy life by punching the clock and going to work every day and cashing the check and paying the bills.

Today, people working in the same plant are making about half of what the teachers are making; and the teachers aren't overpaid in that community, either. That's what we're dealing with. The difference is that the people who used to work in that plant 30 years ago, they're not there anymore. But people who came to work in the plants have been recruited from foreign countries and put into that workforce, and there has been such an oversupply that they've driven the wages down—supply and demand.

So why would we as a Nation, when we have an oversupply of people who are willing to do low and unskilled work, and the wages are suppressed and the unemployment rate is up, why would we go out and legalize another 11 or 22 or 33 or 44 or 55 million people? Why would any nation do that? Why would a nation that has 100 million people of working age that are simply not in the workforce decide we don't want to pull those people to work, we're going to let them collect the 80 different means-tested welfare benefits, and instead we're going to go over here and import tens of millions of people to do this work, then realize that you've got a double liability here because people working in the lower skilled jobs can't sustain themselves in this society with the wages that they're getting because they're suppressed by oversupply. And on the other side of this, you've got these 100 million people, a lot of them are drawing from the public Treasury and we're paying them not to work. You put that all together, we've got a double liability here instead of a double asset.

I spent part of my life in the trucking business. We always say we want a payload both ways. We don't want to go empty two directions. We want a payload both ways.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's true.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we can underscore enough the fact that when we are looking at the DREAM Act, people think we are talking about a very small group of people. This is a large group of people, and we're talking about amnesty, three-quarters of the way of amnesty. So the Senate bill is 100 percent amnesty for all illegal aliens in the United States. The DREAM Act is three-fourths of the way toward full amnesty. It isn't just children. We're talking about 35-year-olds, with the average age being 34 of an illegal alien, and we're talking about them having an immediate ability to make their parents legal.

So the \$6 trillion cost is pretty darn close with the DREAM Act as well. Again, just realize politically what happens here. We're looking at 100 percent amnesty in conference committee with three-quarters of the way amnesty in conference committee. Does anybody think we're going to have anything less than full-on 100 percent amnesty and no border security.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I think the gentlelady has described it very accurately. We have to be very careful what vehicles get sent over to the United States Senate that could eventually be turned into a conference report.

I know that we have an assurance that it's not going to be such a thing, but we also know that there are things that come up that surprise us. So I ask people that are advocating for different pieces of legislation that would come off of this floor, paint for me the path through which enforcement legislation could get to the President's desk without amnesty attached. And even if it did get to the President's desk with the best enforcement model that you could imagine, that amnesty attached, the President would sign it and he wouldn't enforce the law; he would just grant the amnesty.

I had a statement that I would like to introduce into the RECORD just for clarity purposes. And I want to say that I appreciate the gentlelady coming down here and leading on this event here tonight and taking such a strong voice. We have a great country still, and we can be a greater country yet, but we must reanchor and reestablish ourselves to the principles and the pillars of American exceptionalism. We cannot do it without holding the rule of law intact.

[From the Associated Press]

MEXICO CHILDREN USED AS "MULES" BY DRUG GANGS

(By Omar Millan)

TIJUANA, MEXICO.—Luis Alberto is only 14 but has the wizened gaze of a grown-up hardened by life. He never met his father, worked as a child, was hired by a gang to sell drugs and then got addicted to them. In October he checked into Cirad, a rehab center west of this border city that handles about 500 drug addicts at a time, a fifth of them younger than 17.

"They brought me here because I was using and selling 'cri loco,'" Luis Alberto said, referring to methamphetamine, the drug of choice for 90 percent of adolescents in detox because of its low cost and easy availability.

Luis Alberto is just one of an increasing number of young people being used as "mules" to ferry drugs across the border into the U.S. or sell them in nearby Mexican towns, said Victor Clark, an anthropologist who studies drug trafficking.

"Minors are cheap labor and expendable for organized crime in an area where there are few job opportunities or places for recreation, and where the distribution and consumption of drugs have grown fast," Clark said.

Mexican authorities say they are aware of the problem, but there are no official figures on the number of adolescents detained for selling or distributing drugs because the law forbids keeping criminal records for minors.

The U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement says that between 2008 and 2011, the number of youths aged 14 to 18 caught trying to cross the border between Tijuana and San Diego to sell drugs has grown tenfold. Lauren Mack, spokeswoman for ICE in San Diego, said 19 minors were arrested in

2008, 165 in 2009, 190 in 2010 and 190 again last year.

Most of them were high school students who carried drugs, usually methamphetamine or cocaine, hidden in their bodies or in their cars, Mack said.

Clark said similar things are being seen all along the border, at Mexican cities like Nogales, Ciudad Juarez and Reynosa. "It's growing at a worrying pace," he said.

Officials at drug rehab centers across Tijuana estimate that of the approximately 500 adolescents now undergoing treatment, about a tenth of them are like Luis Alberto, not only addicted to a drug but also used by cartels to sell it.

Luis Alberto, whose last name cannot be published because he is a minor, said he started selling drugs about two years ago in a neighborhood of east Tijuana along with other minors who were hired by "a boss." He made about 200 pesos (\$16) a day, which he says he spent on food and drugs.

"Between me and my friends we sold about 40 packets a day. My boss kept 1,100 pesos (about \$88) per packet and the rest was for us. Sometimes there were about three or four packets left over and we just divided them among ourselves," he said.

Sometimes the drug bosses used the children as lookouts in case police or soldiers approached, he added.

Mexico's cartels have also employed children for their hit squads.

In what may be the most shocking case involving a youth in Mexico's drug war, a 14-year-old boy born in San Diego and known only as "El Ponchis" was arrested in December 2010 in central Mexico and told reporters he had been kidnapped at age 11 and forced to work for a cartel. He said he participated in at least four beheadings.

The number of youths 18 and younger detained for drug-related crimes in Mexico has climbed from 482 in 2006, when President Felipe Calderon launched his offensive against drug traffickers, to 810 by 2009. The latest available numbers indicate 562 youths under age 18 were arrested in the first eight months of 2010.

In Tijuana, officials grew aware of the growing involvement of young people at the end of 2008 as more and more youths turned up at drug rehab centers and told their stories, said Jose Luis Serrano, director of the El Mezon rehab center.

Serrano said that on average 70 adolescents come to his center each month with addiction problems, and about a tenth of them have also worked in the drug trade.

Jose Ramon Arreola, director of the department for children and adolescents at the Cirad center, has seen a similar trend. "There are a lot of drugs on the street; anybody can tell you how easy it is to get some," he said.

Serrano said drugs became extremely cheap by the end of 2008, with methamphetamine easily available and selling for about 15 pesos (a little over \$1).

Due to increased border vigilance, "it became harder for the drug traffickers to cross the border into the U.S., and they started paying their employees with merchandise, which the employees then had to distribute along the border. That was when we noted an increase in teen drug use, mainly crystal (methamphetamine)," Serrano said.

According to the National Survey on Addictions, Tijuana has Mexico's worst methamphetamine addiction problem. The Tijuana Psychiatric Institute says it has about 22,000 meth addicts.

Serrano and Arreola point to outdated laws as one reason gangs have recruited

young people to help push drugs. In Baja California, children under 17 can be jailed for no more than seven years even if they are convicted of serious crimes such as murder, violent robbery or involvement in a drug cartel.

Tijuana was one of the first cities to which Calderon sent troops to fight the cartels five years ago, yet hundreds of kilos of drugs still arrive each week for local consumption or for sale in other cities, military and police officials said.

The Sinaloa cartel, considered Mexico's most powerful crime organization, is mainly responsible for bringing in heroin, cocaine and marijuana, said Gen. Gilberto Landeros, the military official in charge of Baja California. Other gangs from Jalisco and Michoacan bring in mainly methamphetamine, he said.

"We are fighting the supply but not the demand, and as long as there is demand, there will be people producing and distributing the drugs," said Jose Hector Acosta, director of the treatment department at the Youth Integration Center, an organization that has been treating drug addicts for 37 years.

John: "A moment ago you mentioned the issue of amnesty here, and this seems to be a big sticking point in the House on what to do moving forward. Would you describe amnesty as anything that allows people who are in this country illegally for any amount of time, for any reason, that if those folks are allowed to gain full citizenship you would define as amnesty?"

SK: "That's pretty close, John, I mean you know I defined it as a pardon and a reward for immigration lawbreakers coupled with the reward of the objective of their crime. I think that your definition's very close to that of mine."

That doesn't mean there aren't groups of people in this country that I have sympathy for, I do. And there are kids that were brought into this country by their parents unknowing that they were breaking the law. And they will say to me and others who defend the rule of law "we have to do something about the 11 million." And some of them are valedictorians—well my answer to that is—and by the way their parents brought them in. It wasn't their fault. It's true in some cases, but they aren't all valedictorians. They weren't all brought in by their parents.

For everyone who's a valedictorian, there's another 100 out there that they weigh 130 pounds—and they've got calves the size of cantaloupes because they're hauling 75 pounds of marijuana across the desert.

Those people would be legalized with the same act. And until the folks that want to open the borders and grant this amnesty can define the difference between the innocent ones who have deep ties with America and those who have been, I'll say have been undermining our culture and civilization and profiting from criminal acts, until they can define that difference they should not advocate for amnesty for both good and evil."

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa, and I am grateful that he is putting into the RECORD the pillars of American exceptionalism. That is our Nation. Again, what we are concerned about is America first; the American people first; American jobs first; American wages first; American benefits first. And unfortunately, a study came out in April from Harvard that said illegal

aliens have contributed to a loss of income of \$1,300 a year. Let's not drive that number any further. So I am very grateful to have had this opportunity to discuss this with the American people this evening.

I yield back the balance of my time.

WHAT AMNESTY FOR ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS
WILL COST AMERICA

(By Jim DeMint and Robert Rector, Heritage Foundation)

The economist Milton Friedman warned that the United States cannot have open borders and an extensive welfare state. He was right, and his reasoning extends to amnesty for the more than 11 million unlawful immigrants in this country. In addition to being unfair to those who follow the law and encouraging more unlawful immigration in the future, amnesty has a substantial price tag.

An exhaustive study by the Heritage Foundation has found that after amnesty, current unlawful immigrants would receive \$9.4 trillion in government benefits and services and pay more than \$3 trillion in taxes over their lifetimes. That leaves a net fiscal deficit (benefits minus taxes) of \$6.3 trillion. That deficit would have to be financed by increasing the government debt or raising taxes on U.S. citizens.

For centuries immigration has been vital to our nation's health, and it will be essential to our future success. Yet immigrants should come to our nation lawfully and should not impose additional fiscal costs on our overburdened taxpayers. An efficient and merit-based system would help our economy and lessen the burden on taxpayers, strengthening our nation.

A properly structured lawful immigration system holds the potential to drive positive economic growth and job creation. But amnesty for those here unlawfully is not necessary to capture those benefits.

We estimate that when those who broke our laws to come here start having access to the same benefits as citizens do—as is called for by the Senate "Gang of Eight" immigration bill—the average unlawful immigrant household will receive nearly \$3 in benefits for every dollar in taxes paid. The net annual cost is \$28,000 per unlawful immigrant household.

Given the U.S. debt of \$17 trillion, the fiscal effects detailed in our study should be at the forefront of legislators' minds as they consider immigration reform.

Already, illegal immigrants impose costs on police, hospitals, schools and other services. Putting them on a path to citizenship means that within a few years, they will qualify for the full panoply of government programs: more than 80 means-tested welfare programs, as well as Social Security, Medicare and Obamacare. The lifetime fiscal cost (benefits received minus taxes paid) for the average unlawful immigrant after amnesty would be around \$590,000. Who is going to pay that tab?

Our government is now in the business of redistribution. As Nicholas Eberstadt, an economist at the American Enterprise Institute, has pointed out, federal transfer payments, or taking from one American to give to another, grew from 3 percent of spending in 1935 to about two-thirds of all spending in 2010. Adding millions of unlawful immigrants to U.S. programs will have a massive negative fiscal effect.

Our findings are based on empirical research and reflect common sense. Unlawful immigrants have relatively low earning potential because, on average, they have 10th-

grade educations and low skills. Heads of households like that, whether from the Midwest or Central America, will receive, on average, about four times as much in government services and benefits as they pay in taxes. Adding millions more to bloated welfare and overburdened entitlement programs would deepen the fiscal hole our country is in.

In addition to costing taxpayers, amnesty is unfair to those who came to this country lawfully. More than 4 million people are waiting to come to the United States lawfully, but our dysfunctional bureaucracy makes it easier to break the law than to follow it.

Our cost estimates are in some ways very conservative: The \$6.3 trillion figure does not factor in the waves of unlawful immigrants who could pour into this country hoping for another future amnesty. As scholars at the Heritage Foundation and elsewhere have explained, the comprehensive immigration bill being considered in the Senate differs little from previous empty promises to secure our borders and enforce immigration laws on the books. When amnesty was granted under a similar plan in 1986, there were about 3 million unlawful immigrants; now we have more than 11 million.

Instead of forcing through a complicated, lengthy bill, Congress ought to advance piece-by-piece immigration solutions that enjoy broad support and build trust with the American people. We should move to streamline our legal immigration system, encourage patriotic assimilation to unite new immigrants with America's vibrant civil society, fulfill promises to secure our borders and strengthen workplace enforcement.

We are proudly a nation of immigrants. People the world over are attracted to the United States because we are a nation of laws. Granting amnesty to those who broke the law and putting them on a path to citizenship would be unfair, would encourage more bad behavior and would impose significant costs on American families.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BARLETTA (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and July 25 on account of a family emergency.

Mr. HORSFORD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical-mandated recovery.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 25, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2323. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2012 Annual Report regarding the Department's enforcement ac-

tivities under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1691f; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2324. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report pursuant to Pub. L. 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2325. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rescission of Supervised Investment Bank Holding Company Rules [Release No.: 34-69979] (RIN: 3235-AL35) received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2326. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Programs: Essential Health Benefits in Alternative Benefit Plans, Eligibility Notices, Fair Hearing and Appeal Process, and Premiums and Cost Sharing; Exchanges: Eligibility and Enrollment [CMS-2334-F] (RIN: 0938-AR04) received July 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2327. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90] received July 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2328. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-39, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2329. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's No FEAR Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2330. A letter from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Use of Meeting Rooms and Public Spaces [FDMS No.: NARA-13-0001] [Agency No.: NARA-2013-033] (RIN: 3095-AB77) received July 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2331. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on the Contract Support Costs of Self-Determination Awards; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2332. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the Office's report on applications for orders authorizing or approving the interception of wire, oral, or electronic communications and the number of orders and extensions granted or denied during calendar year 2012, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519(3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2333. A letter from the Ombudsman for the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's 2012 Annual Report of the Ombudsman for the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2334. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety

Zone; City of Martinez Fourth of July Fireworks Display, Carquinez Strait, Martinez, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0345] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2335. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Diego Symphony Summer POPS Fireworks 2013 Season, San Diego, CA [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0388] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2336. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Execpro Services Fireworks Display, Lake Tahoe, Incline Village, NV [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0383] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2337. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fifth Coast Guard District Fireworks Displays, Barnegat Bay; Barnegat Township, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0431] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2338. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Red Bull Flugtag National Harbor Event, Potomac River; National Harbor Access Channel, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0114] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2339. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Transportation Statistics Annual Report 2012, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 111(f); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2340. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medications Prescribed by Non-VA Providers (RIN: 2900-AO77) received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2341. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's report "The Year in Trade 2012"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1961. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line (Rept. 113-175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HOLDING (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 2804. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to publish information about rules on the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 2805. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the range of conduct punished as sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2806. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that importation of certain containers containing de minimis residual matter shall be excepted from the Customs laws of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DENT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENYART, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HURT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr.

ROKITA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-POR-TER, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 2807. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2808. A bill to designate certain National Forest System land in the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest in Salt Lake County, Utah, as wilderness, to facilitate a land exchange involving certain land in such National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. YODER, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 2809. A bill to delay the application of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Rules, House Administration, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 2810. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform the sustainable growth rate and Medicare payment for physicians' services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2811. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BASS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2812. A bill to encourage States to prohibit "stand your ground" laws and require neighborhood watch programs to register with local law enforcement agencies and the Department of Justice, to direct the Attorney General to study such laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

H.R. 2813. A bill to amend the Water Supply Act of 1958 to establish a mechanism to permit State and local interests to release to the United States future water storage rights associated with Corps of Engineers reservoir projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 2814. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 North Main Street in Strawberry, Arkansas, as the "Noel Austin Harris, Jr. Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 2815. A bill to authorize a pilot program to improve asset recovery levels, asset management, and homeownership retention with respect to delinquent single-family mortgages insured under the FHA mortgage insurance programs by providing for in-person contact outreach activities with mortgagors under such mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. CHU, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 2816. A bill to extend the pilot program under section 258 of the National Housing Act that establishes an automated process for providing alternative credit rating information for mortgagors and prospective mortgagors under certain mortgages; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2817. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to remove the non-discrimination requirements relating to health care providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 2818. A bill to repeal the USA PATRIOT Act and the FISA Amendments Act of 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), Financial Services, Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. TURNER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JOYCE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 2819. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 275 Front Street in Marietta, Ohio, as the "Veterans Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 2820. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for equity relating to medical costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ENYART, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BASS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs.

NAPOLITANO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 2821. A bill to provide tax relief for American workers and businesses, to put workers back on the job while rebuilding and modernizing America, and to provide pathways back to work for Americans looking for jobs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.J. Res. 52. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States allowing the States to call a limited convention solely for the purposes of considering whether to propose a specific amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia):

H.J. Res. 53. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the effect of treaties, Executive orders, and agreements with other nations or groups of nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.J. Res. 54. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the use of foreign law as authority in Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H. Res. 316. A resolution expressing heartfelt condolences and support to the people of India and all those affected in the aftermath of the deadly flash floods and landslides triggered by massive monsoons of June 2013, which devastated many states in northern India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HOYER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS,

Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. WATERS, Ms. CHU, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H. Res. 317. A resolution celebrating the upcoming 2015 Special Olympics World Games in Los Angeles, California; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

109. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to a Joint Resolution opposing section 9 of H.R. 1919; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 2804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of specific legislative powers granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; and, Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause “to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof”

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This trade related bill is addressed under the Constitution's Commerce Clause; Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power “to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 2807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause Art I Sec. 8 and the fifth Amendment.

By Mr. COTTON:

H.R. 2813.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—The Commerce Clause provides for regulation of commerce between the states.

Article II, Section 3, Clause 2—The Property Clause allows Congress to manage the lands under its control, including water resources.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 2814.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 2815.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 2816.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. Art. I, Sec. 8.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 2818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio

H.R. 2819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the authority to establish post offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section, 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 2820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 2821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce clause and provisions to provide for the general welfare.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.J. Res. 52.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V.

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.J. Res. 53.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.J. Res. 54.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 102: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 129: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 176: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 279: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 301: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 366: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 506: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 508: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 647: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 676: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 680: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 685: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 721: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 752: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 760: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 822: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 850: Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
H.R. 855: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 900: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 920: Mr. CASTRO of Texas and Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 921: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 985: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1001: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1020: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 1024: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LONG, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1095: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 1150: Ms. WATERS and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1250: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1281: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1286: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 1318: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1340: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1354: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1389: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1409: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1416: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 1579: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1621: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1634: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1652: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 1726: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1734: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1755: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1771: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1775: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1787: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1805: Mr. BARBER and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1816: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1825: Mr. LONG, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1827: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1845: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1851: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1867: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1920: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1931: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1980: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 1982: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 1998: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2000: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2009: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 2019: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MICA, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2084: Mr. OWENS and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2099: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 2116: Ms. TITUS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2144: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2146: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 2149: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2150: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2224: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2264: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2273: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 2288: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2310: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 2315: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2332: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MAFFEI, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2366: Mr. CLAY and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2399: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2401: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2403: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 2418: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2429: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 2449: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 2453: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2456: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 2468: Mr. LOBIONDO and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2476: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2542: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 2553: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2557: Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 2575: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 2581: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 2586: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2607: Mr. WOLF, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2613: Mr. ENYART, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 2614: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2619: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2633: Mr. HONDA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. WATERS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 2641: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2643: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 2646: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 2682: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. YODER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 2692: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2700: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2708: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BOUTSTANY, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2709: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BOUTSTANY, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 2717: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2720: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2721: Ms. TITUS and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2750: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2771: Mr. HALL.
H.R. 2775: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 2776: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.J. Res. 19: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.J. Res. 34: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.J. Res. 44: Mr. CUMMINGS and Ms. BASS.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. FORBES, Mr. BOUTSTANY, and Mr. HUNTER.
H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H. Res. 285: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 293: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H. Res. 307: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H. Res. 314: Ms. LOFGREN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2641: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. PALLONE.

SENATE—Wednesday, July 24, 2013

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord of life, as Senators deal with today's challenges, purge their hearts of anything that does not honor You. Remove that which divides them, uniting them in the common task of doing what is best for our Nation and world. When they are tempted to doubt, steady their faith. When they feel despair, infuse them with hope. When they don't know what to do, open their minds to a wisdom that can change and shape our times according to Your plan. Lord, empower them to trust You more fully, live for You more completely, and serve You more willingly. We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks there will be 1 hour of

morning business, with the first half controlled by the Republicans and the second half controlled by the majority.

Following morning business the Senate will resume consideration of the Transportation appropriations bill. Senators MURRAY and COLLINS have done good work. We hope to wrap up this bill in the next 24 hours. We hope to vote in relation to the Portman amendment sometime this morning. We also expect to consider the student loan legislation today. Under the orders that have been entered, we have the ability to vote on the student loan bill, which is so important. There are several hours of debate—4 hours plus other time on various amendments—so I think Members should consider that at about 4 p.m. this afternoon or thereabouts, we could have a series of votes. We also have other nominations that are subject to vote. So we should have a number of votes today. I hope that, in fact, is the case.

I admire and appreciate the work, as I have already mentioned, on the appropriations bill. Hopefully we can wrap it up soon.

OFFICER CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE GIBSON

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is hard to believe that 15 years ago, as the Presiding Officer knows, Police Officer Jacob Chestnut and Detective John Gibson were killed trying to prevent a crazy man from entering the Capitol. We will have at 3:40 p.m. a moment of silence in memory of these two good men. And, of course, every year their families are there.

I really appreciate the work of the Capitol Police to make this building safe for us, staff, and all the visitors, and there is no time more directed toward that than events like this. But because of the sacrifice those two men made, the Capitol is a safer place as a result of the Visitor Center, which now allows people to come into the Capitol in an orderly fashion. They can have their bags checked and everything so very quickly. In addition, there are restrooms and meeting halls. So the sacrifices made by these two men have made this place safer. It is just tragic that it took both their lives to do that.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half.

The Senator from Illinois.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 2668

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I understand that H.R. 2668 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2668) to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I now object to any further proceedings on the bill at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar subject to the provisions of rule XIV.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, my understanding is that the minority has the first half of morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING OFFICER CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE GIBSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning I would like to start by remembering the sacrifice of two 18-year veterans of the Capitol Police, Detective John Gibson and Officer Jacob

Chestnut. On this date in 1998, Gibson and Chestnut paid the ultimate price while standing in defense of the U.S. Capitol. We know these men fell defending more than just the structure, though. We know they fell defending more than just the Members sent here or even the staffs who help each of us better serve constituents and our country. No, these men died while protecting everything this building represents—our democratic way of life, the freedom granted to each of us by a creator we often thank but never see.

We honor these men for their lives, and we honor them for the final act of heroism that ended those lives. That is why a plaque inside the Capitol commemorates their sacrifice. That is why the Capitol Police headquarters bears both of their names. That, I know, is of little solace to the wives, children, and friends left behind, but it is a small way of saying “we remember” when the scale of the debt owed can never truly be repaid in full.

So today the Senate honors John Gibson and J.J. Chestnut for their sacrifice, and the Senate sends its condolences and its gratitude to those who loved them most.

WORKING TOGETHER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I am glad to see that Senate Democrats have finally ended their obstruction of the bipartisan student loan bill. It has been weeks since the Democrats blew past the July 1 deadline they kept warning about, and it has been even longer since the House passed a bill similar to the one they are actually now agreeing to. But at least Democrats have finally stopped obstructing and arguing. At least now they are ready to put their partisan political fix aside and join President Obama and congressional Republicans in enacting real permanent reform for all students—the only real reform on the table that is designed to help every middle-class family.

I would like to thank the sponsors of this bill for their hard work: Senators MANCHIN, KING, ALEXANDER, BURR, and COBURN. They may come from different political parties, but they all really care about students, and this bill certainly proves it.

There is something else this bill proves too: that Democrats can work with Republicans when they actually want to—when they check their partisan take-it-or-leave-it approaches at the door and actually talk with rather than at us.

That is why it is really disheartening to hear about the partisan speech President Obama plans to give today, the one the White House can't stop talking about. With all the buildup, you would think the President was unveiling the next Bond film or something, but in all likelihood it will be

more like a midday rerun of some 1970s B movie because we have heard it all before. It is really quite old.

These speeches are just so formulaic, and they are usually more notable for what they leave out than what they contain. Here is what I mean. We all know the President will bemoan the state of the economy in his speech, but he won't take responsibility for it. He will criticize Republicans for not rubberstamping his policies but will leave out the fact that for 2 years Democrats did just that, and yet the economic recovery is still stagnant.

He won't talk about the fact that since he lost control of the House and his ability to have things exactly the way he wanted, he has refused to engage with seemingly anyone in Congress on ways to get the economy moving. A perfect illustration of that is the fact that instead of working with us on solutions, he is out giving speeches. And here is the kicker: Instead of taking responsibility for his failure to lead, he will probably try to cast this as some titanic struggle between those who believe in “investing” in the country and those who supposedly want to eliminate paved roads or stop signs or whatever ridiculous straw man he invents this time.

Give me a break. There is a real philosophical debate going on in our country, but it is not anything like how he imagines it. I would say it is more of a debate between those who believe in a government that is smarter and more efficient and some who seem to believe in government against all the evidence; between those who draw the obvious lessons from human tragedies in places such as Greece and Detroit, and some who cannot face up to the logical endpoints of their own ideology, who cannot accept the terrible pain their own ideas inevitably inflict on the weakest in our society.

It is between those who understand the necessity of empowering of private enterprise if we are ever going to drive a sustained recovery for middle-class families and some who can't seem to let go of ivory tower economic theories, even after 4½ years of an economy literally treading water.

Speaking of ivory tower theories, here is another difference. Some of us believe it is actually possible to act as good stewards of the environment without declaring war on vulnerable groups of Americans. I know a lot of people here in Washington who think of Appalachia as fly-over country, but many in my State have another word for it. They call it home. When these struggling families hear one of the White House climate advisers say a war on coal is exactly what is needed, can you imagine how that makes them feel? It makes them feel as though they are expendable, as though Washington does not understand them or, frankly, simply doesn't care. “[It is] like going

to some of these big cities and shutting Wall Street down,” is how a coal worker from eastern Kentucky recently put it. “See how it affects everything,” he said. “Coal is our Wall Street.”

This is just one of the many reasons Republicans have long called for an “all of the above” strategy. We understand that traditional sources can be developed in tandem with new alternative energies and technologies and that there is no other sane strategy anyway, since it is basically physically impossible, even putting the catastrophic economic consequences aside here for a moment, to even come close to meeting our energy needs with renewables today. We cannot even come close.

What are we going to do in the meantime, power our country with foreign energy or American energy? This should be a no-brainer, but then again we are talking about Washington here. That is why it is so frustrating when the administration drags its feet on projects such as the Keystone Pipeline. The North American oil that Keystone would bring is basically going to come out of the ground whether we take it or not. So will the administration take it and the jobs that would come along with it or surrender it to places such as China? The White House will not say. The President's spokesman was asked for a decision again yesterday. You know what his answer was? Don't look to us.

Look, this pipeline has been under review for years and years. It is basically being held up for one reason and one reason only: because the President is afraid to stand up to some of the most radical elements of his base, the kind of people you will find at one of those meetings of the Flat Earth Society he likes to talk about.

It is time for him to choose between his political friends and the middle-class families who stand to benefit from the jobs, growth, and energy that Keystone would bring. Keystone is just one example of a project the President could work with both parties to implement right now, that would help our economy. There is a lot more we can get done if he would actually pick up a telephone and try to work with us every once in a while. I know Democrats would love to hear from him every now and then as well, because every time he goes out and gives one of these speeches, it generates little more than a collective bipartisan eye roll.

It is such a colossal waste of time and energy, resources that would actually be better spent working with both parties in Congress to grow the economy and to create jobs. I know that is what my constituents in Kentucky expect and, frankly, they should expect that.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to follow the remarks of our Republican leader on the President's pivot to the economy. Over the last 4 years, the Obama administration has given us one of the biggest economic experiments in American history. The numbers tell the story. Under this President, the Federal Government has increased the Federal debt by \$6.1 trillion, raised taxes by \$1.7 trillion, and imposed \$518 billion worth of new regulations. The President, when he came to office, when he had a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House—in other words, his party controlled all branches of the legislative and executive branch—got virtually everything he wanted.

He got a \$1 trillion stimulus package. He wanted a government takeover of America's health care system and that is what he got. He wanted extensive new regulations for the financial industry and he got that too. He wanted to impose, through the Environmental Protection Agency, radical environmental regulations and that is what he got as well.

From 2009 through 2010, until the voters spoke in November 2010, our friends on the other side of the aisle controlled the White House, the House of Representatives under Speaker PELOSI, and the Senate. They got virtually everything they wanted. That was their great experiment, to see whether a growing and intrusive and expanding Federal Government was the answer to our economic challenges and high unemployment.

We now know what the results have been. America's unemployment rate hit 10 percent for the first time since the early 1980s and it stayed above 8 percent for 43 straight months. Meanwhile, many Americans have simply given up looking for work. How do we know that? The Bureau of Labor Statistics publishes something they call the labor participation rate. We know the percentage of people in the workforce is the lowest it has been for more than 30 years. That is a tragedy. Add it all up and we have been experiencing the weakest economic recovery and the longest period of high unemployment since the Great Depression in the 1930s.

Even by the President's own measuring stick, by his own standards, his economic record has been a huge disappointment. Hence, his repetitive pivots to the economy, time and time again, particularly at a time when his administration is having to answer a lot of hard questions about various scandals. But I am with Speaker BOEHNER. I say: Welcome, Mr. President. Let's talk about the economy. Let's talk about what works and what does not work.

I think we know now what does not work, which is another government program that raises taxes, increases regulations, and creates uncertainty on

the job creators upon whom we are depending to put America back to work.

As a Washington Post correspondent noted this past week:

The President promised 1 million new manufacturing jobs by the end of 2016. But factory employment has fallen for the last 4 months, and on net is only 13,000 jobs toward that goal.

There is some good news. I was on the floor yesterday, admittedly bragging a little bit about the economic growth in my State, in Texas, and one of the reasons is because we are taking advantage of the innovation and the technology boom in the energy production business and we are actually seeing a huge movement back onshore, to the United States, of a lot of manufacturing because of the low price of natural gas. But, unfortunately, the President does not seem to recognize the benefits of producing our own domestic natural energy and what that would mean in terms of bringing jobs back onshore and creating more manufacturing jobs.

The President has promised to increase net take-home pay and expand the middle class. You may recall particularly on the health care bill he said it would reduce health care premiums by \$2,500 for a family of four. Unfortunately, he proved to be wrong because the cost has actually gone up \$2,400 for a family of four, not down. We know from Labor Department statistics that median earnings for American families have fallen by 4 percent since the recession ended.

I think even its most ardent advocates now are coming to the realization that ObamaCare is not working out the way they had hoped. Indeed, I was on the floor a few days ago with a letter from three union leaders who said that basically it is turning out to be a disaster. It is hurting their own members. Again, these are people who were for ObamaCare, saying it is not turning out the way we had hoped.

The administration itself has implicitly acknowledged this by saying the employer mandate; that is, the requirement for people who employ 50 people or more, is stifling job creation and prompting many companies to take full-time jobs and turn them into part-time jobs. Between March and June, the number of Americans working part time jumped from 7.6 million to 8.2 million. I think the administration saw that number and it scared them a little bit, as it should. Hence, they delayed the employer mandate for another year, unilaterally.

A new survey finds that in response to ObamaCare, 74 percent of small businesses are going to reduce hiring, reduce worker hours, or replace full-time employees with part-time employees.

I am not suggesting those of us who did not vote for ObamaCare should be rejoicing in this development. Indeed, I think it is a sad moment. But even its

most ardent advocates are finding out that their hopes and their dreams and their wishes for this government takeover are not turning out the way they should. Again, this is not a time for anyone to spike the ball or to rejoice in the failure of this program. This is a time for us to work together to say: OK, there are people who opposed ObamaCare. They ended up being right in their predictions. There were those who supported ObamaCare and unfortunately for the country it did not work out the way they had hoped. Now is the perfect time for us to come together and say: What do we do next to prevent the failure of this health care takeover by the Federal Government hurting the very people it was supposed to help? This is an opportunity for us to work together to do that.

We need to do something different. Someone said a long time ago that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results. It is not going to happen so we need to do something different. We need to do something different in terms of delivering access to quality health care and making it affordable. Instead of more tax increases and more temporary tax gimmicks, we need fundamental tax reform. This is something that Republicans and Democrats I think all agree on. The President himself said he believes we need to do revenue-neutral corporate tax reform that lowers the rates, broadens the base, and gives us a revenue system that is more conducive to strong economic growth.

Instead of having people in politics pick winners and losers in the economy or pick which parts of the law to enforce and which parts to waive, we need to dismantle what is left of ObamaCare and replace it with sensible, patient-centered alternatives that will lower costs, improve access to quality, and not interfere with that important doctor-patient relationship—something the Senator from Wyoming has eloquently spoken about many times.

Instead of letting the Environmental Protection Agency regulate our entire economy, we need to expand domestic energy production by eliminating misguided Federal regulations. Instead of adopting energy policies that hamper job creation, we need to adopt policies that help promote jobs such as approving the Keystone Pipeline from Canada and not trying to overregulate something that is already subject to State regulation, such as fracking.

Here in Washington, people act as though this horizontal drilling and this fracking process is something new. We have been doing it in Texas for 60 years and it has been regulated by the oil and gas regulator in our State. They protected the water supply and benefited job creation and economic growth for a long time.

I understand it is hard for those of us who were wrong about their predictions for many of these policies to say: You know what. It did not work out the way we planned. None of us are relishing the failure of some of these policies, but we need to work together and get outside of our ideological comfort zone and address the problem of chronic high unemployment, the fact that our young people are graduating from college and they cannot find jobs. They know they are going to be burdened by the debt we continue to rack up, and that our economy is bouncing along the bottom. I am afraid if we continue with the policies of the last 4 years we will create a lost generation of young Americans who cannot find good, full-time jobs. None of us—Republicans and Democrats alike—wants that to happen, but it is time we did something about it.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, later today President Obama is scheduled to give the first in a series of speeches about the economy. He is pivoting one more time to turn his attention to the millions of Americans who are still struggling 4 years after the recession ended. The reason I say “one more time” is because this morning one of the reporters said this is about the tenth time the President has pivoted to the economy.

A White House adviser said on Sunday that the President is going to speak about “what it means to be middle class in America.” Well, I hope President Obama will talk about how his own policies have harmed and continue to harm the middle class in America. I hope he will talk about the harm that his health care law has done to hard-working families. I hope the President will finally start talking about these things because the American people have been talking about them for a long time now.

I hear it every time I go home to Wyoming—almost every weekend. It doesn't matter whether I am in Fremont County, Park County, Laramie County, or Natrona County—wherever I am in Wyoming, I continue to hear about this law. Now we are even hearing about it from the very union leaders who were among the law's biggest supporters. The heads of three major labor unions put out a letter recently that warned of the damage the health care law is doing to the middle class. They wrote:

The unintended consequences of the ACA are severe. Perverse incentives are already creating nightmare scenarios.

Perverse incentives are already creating nightmare scenarios. That is what the law's supporters are saying.

They wrote that the health care law “will shatter not only our hard-earned health benefits but destroy the founda-

tion of the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class.”

If the President wants to talk about what it means to be middle class in America, he needs to explain why his policies are destroying the backbone of the middle class. That is what the union leaders are saying. They are seeing, just like the rest of us, that the job numbers are not good for America.

In June, the number of people working part time who want to work full time soared by 322,000. There are more than 8.2 million Americans working part-time jobs because their hours were either cut back or because they can't find the full-time work they seek.

The White House conceded that the law was a problem for employers when it said they needed relief from the logistical mess the law has created. That is why the Obama administration decided to delay the so-called employer mandate. That was one of the signature parts of the President's health care law. Under the law, every employer with 50 people who were working 30 hours a week or more was going to have to offer expensive government-mandated health insurance. Now we have a 1-year delay on this extremely unpopular and damaging Washington mandate.

If the law is so bad for businesses that they can't handle it in 2014, it is still going to be bad for them in 2015, and that was just one regulation. The President's health care law has already created more than 20,000 pages of new regulations. Well, those regulations concern middle-class families I hear from in Wyoming, and it is not just Wyoming. The front page of the Washington Post has a headline that reads “Health law's unintended impact on part-timers.”

For Kevin Pace, the president's health-care law could have meant better health insurance. Instead, it produced a pay cut.

Like many of his colleagues, the adjunct music professor at Northern Virginia Community College managed to assemble a hefty course load despite his official status as a part-time employee. But his employer, the state—

The State of Virginia is his employer. This is not some company, it is the State of Virginia—

slashed his hours this spring to avoid a Jan. 1 requirement that all full-time workers—

As a requirement in the health care law.

for large employers be offered health insurance. The law defines “full time” as 30 hours a week or more.

This isn't a business worried about a bottom line, this is the State of Virginia.

Virginia's situation provides a good lens on why. The state has more than 37,000 part-time hourly wage employees, with as many as 10,000 working more than 30 hours a week.

Remember, 30 hours is the key number.

Offering coverage to those workers, who include nurses—

An important part of our economy and important as far as the needs of our country—

park rangers and adjunct professors, would have been prohibitively expensive, state officials said, costing as much as \$110 million annually.

“It was all about the money,” said Sarah Redding Wilson, director of Virginia's Department of Human Resource Management.

The health laws have an unintended impact on part-timers, and as a result it is hurting the middle class.

Middle-class Americans are also worried about their health insurance premiums—and they have a right to worry. The McClatchy News Service ran this headline last week: “Obama boasts of health care saves, but costs likely to rise for many.”

The article went on to say:

Experts predict that premiums on individual plans will increase in most states because of the new consumer protections this sweeping legislation requires.

“Consumer protections” is just the White House's way of saying more red tape. That includes all of the new, required services people have to have in their Washington-mandated, Washington-approved health insurance. It is all of the health care services people have to pay for in advance whether they need them, whether they want them, or whether they will ever use them. Those requirements are a big part of the reason—and another reason—that health insurance costs are still going up even though Washington Democrats promised the health care law would have the opposite effect.

It is happening all across the country. Indiana was the latest State to announce that premiums are going to go up next year—not down. Last Friday the State insurance department—this is not just somebody looking around—said the average rates for people buying individual plans will go up 72 percent. That announcement follows big increases in Ohio, Maryland, Idaho, Missouri, and Kentucky.

In one State after another, rates for next year are being announced, and they are much higher than they were before the President's health care law went into effect. When President Obama gives his speech today and over the next few weeks he should tell his audience the truth about what is happening to the rates and why. He should also talk to middle-class Americans about what might happen as far as their access to their family doctor under his health care law.

Remember when the President said: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor? That was something the unions wrote about in their letter. It is a promise they think the President now isn't going to keep. Well, I think they are right.

Now the Health and Human Services Department admits that individuals

may not be able to keep their doctors. This comes from the Web site the Department set up to try to answer questions people have been asking about the health care law. The Department's Web site now says if you get your coverage through the government's new insurance marketplace "you may be able to keep your current doctor."

That is a long way from when the President of the United States stood up and promised—actually he used the word "guarantee"—you will be able to keep your doctor. It is that kind of backpedaling and broken promises that has union leaders worried. It has them worried, it has job creators hesitant, and it has middle-class Americans all across this country concerned.

Of course, the health care law is just one of the areas where overregulation is hurting the economy. Another example is President Obama's announcement last month of tighter regulations on powerplants. That is on top of the excessive redtape the administration has already put in place that makes it harder and much more expensive for America to produce American energy.

Last week I introduced a bill to block President Obama from going around Congress to implement his national energy tax through regulations. The American people have repeatedly told Washington to focus on jobs, not to roll out more redtape that increases energy bills and decreases economic opportunities.

The President promised that he cared about hard-working, middle-class families, but his policies, one after another, are hurting those families and are making their lives much more difficult.

President Obama needs to stop the Washington spin and tell the truth about his health care law and the truth about his other failed policies. Then he needs to come back to Washington, put aside his tired, old rhetoric and work with the Republicans to do the right thing for the American people. That means coming up with a replacement health care plan to finally give people what they were asking for all along: The care they need from a doctor they choose at a lower cost.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, are we in morning business at this point?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, we still are.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, later today we will consider a student loan bill that will affect 11 million students across America.

On July 1 the interest rate paid by students for their student loans doubled; it went from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. We know students are graduating with more and more debt. We also know the cost of that debt—the interest rate—makes a big difference in their lives. Sometimes they postpone important life decisions because of student loan debt.

My daughter has a business in New York with two employees who are paying off student loans. She said the biggest worry they have from month to month is making that payment. I understand that too. After taking a look at the increase in debt, we find that student loan debt has now surpassed credit card debt in America. It is more than \$1 trillion, and it is growing faster than any other form of debt. It is an indication of an indebtedness we need to take seriously. We will have a chance to do that this afternoon.

There are many different points of view on what to do with student loans. Some people say that the government should be involved but it really should be a market-based system. Others say, no, the government should be involved and it should be a subsidy. We should help students go to school. We should find ways to keep the cost of education affordable, and lowering interest rates is one way to do it.

We will have two amendments this afternoon. Senator JACK REED and Senator ELIZABETH WARREN are offering an amendment that will cap the interest rate on student loan debts at 6.8 percent for most debts affecting undergraduate students and 7.9 percent for other loans. To put a cap on that interest rate means we have to subsidize. In other words, as we project out what the cost of student loans will be based on market interest rates, a subsidy is necessary to honor that cap.

The second proposal will be from Senator SANDERS of Vermont, and his approach is a little different. He basically says we ought to sunset any changes we make to student interest rates today after 2 years and then revert back to the current 6.8 percent rate. That ends up costing about \$20 billion. Senator SANDERS may or may not offer a means to pay for that. I believe, from some statements he has made publicly, he believes that should be a debt of the government, but I will leave it to him to make his explanation.

At the end of the day, after those two amendments are considered, we will come down to one basic decision we have to make as a body, Democrats and Republicans. It can be simply stated, and here is what it is: Should the student loan interest rate—currently at

6.8 percent for most students—stay at 6.8 percent or be reduced to 3.8 percent? That is the question.

If we pass the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act, which I have worked with Republicans and Democrats to craft, the interest rate for undergraduate students—that is almost two-thirds of all students—goes down 3 percent, from 6.8 percent to 3.8 percent. I won't mislead my colleagues. It is based on a 10-year Treasury rate and will be projected over a period of time. As general interest rates go up, so will the student loan interest rate from 3.8 percent, but we put a cap on it and say that rate can go no higher than 8.25 percent in a 10-year period of time, protecting students even if interest rates go up dramatically. So there it is.

The final vote will be whether to reduce the student loan interest rate from 6.8 to 3.8 and to cap it for two-thirds of the students at 8.25 percent—no higher than that—for the next 10 years. Students who are receiving subsidized loans won't have to pay the interest while they are in school, and they will have some other benefits at the end of the day. What we are setting out to do is to make student loans affordable for students and to make sure families are not burdened with loans they can't pay back.

I hope my colleagues, no matter what their philosophy on student loans—whether they believe they should be market-based or government-subsidized—realize that at the end of the day we have a very clear choice to make: Stick with the 6.8 percent interest rate or lower it to 3.8 percent.

What does that mean for students, the 3-percent difference? We calculated it. We looked at the average undergraduate student in America, and here is what it means: If we don't lower it to 3.8 percent, if we keep it at 6.8 percent, it means that student, over the course of 4 years of undergraduate education, will pay an additional \$2,000 in interest. Why would we want to do that? Why at the end of the day would we want to keep interest rates at 6.8 percent and penalize students with \$2,000 in interest over the next 4 years? That is the wrong thing to do.

I urge my colleagues, when the bipartisan alternative comes up, to vote for it. Even if my colleagues believe it should be a government subsidy, which we have not been able to enact, or if they believe it should be market-based—either way, this is a better outcome.

Personally, I hope this isn't the end of the story. Senator TOM HARKIN of Iowa chairs the HELP Committee—the education committee—and he is going to come to the floor soon to start working on the reauthorization of higher education. We understand it is more than the interest rate that is causing a problem for students; it is the cost—the cost—of higher education.

I went to Georgetown Law School. I couldn't get in there today with the standards they have. Currently, I am told it costs over \$50,000 a year to go to this law school—\$50,000 a year for 3 years, in addition to undergraduate debt. Well, a person better get a darn good job at a Wall Street firm afterward because they will face a mountain of debt. They are not alone. All across the United States we are seeing tuition rates go up—even at public universities—to record levels.

We have to find a better way to prepare the next generation of leaders in America. The old model of 4 years of undergraduate and then graduate school and professional school has gone beyond the reach of most students and families.

Keep in mind, too, that student loans are different from most other debt. Student loans are not dischargeable in bankruptcy. The debt a 19-year-old student and his family sign up for is a debt that can trail them to the grave. We have cases where people are signing up to basically guarantee the loans of granddaughters to make sure their granddaughter can go to college, and then the granddaughter either drops out or can't find a job and defaults on the student loan, and they proceed to collect it from grandma. I am not making this up. They are garnishing the grandmother's Social Security benefits to pay for student loans she guaranteed for her granddaughter. That is how ruthless this industry is and how tough this debt is.

We have a chance today to make this debt more affordable for students now, to reduce the interest rate from 6.8 percent to 3.8 percent and cap it over the next 10 years at 8.25 percent. I won't mislead my colleagues. In some debt categories of borrowing—graduate students and parent PLUS loans—in the second 4 years the interest rates go up more, and many of those who borrow in those categories are going to find 5 years from now that they are facing a much tougher debt situation. I won't mislead my colleagues on that at all.

I think we can't leave the conversation today and say we are finished and we don't need to talk about it anymore. Let's give the students and families the help they need today, but let's not stop on this issue. On the higher education reauthorization bill, we will have a chance to address overall student indebtedness and affordability for families.

Let me close by saying that the worst offenders—the worst offenders—when it comes to college loans are the for-profit schools. People may not know much about them unless a person is 18 or 19 years old and they can't escape them when they go on the Internet. They are trying to sign up students to for-profit schools, many of which are worthless—worthless.

The numbers to remember are three, and they are going to be on the final,

so listen carefully. Twelve percent of all students coming out of high school go to for-profit schools. Twenty-five percent of all Federal aid to education goes to for-profit schools. Forty-seven percent of all student loan defaults are students at for-profit schools. So what is the message there? They are raking in Federal dollars at twice the rate they should, and their students are failing at a rate greater than any other category of schools. Their students are failing to get a job, failing to graduate, failing to pay back their loans.

For-profit schools are a national scandal. We need to deal with them in the higher education reauthorization. I know Senator HARKIN has held hearings on these schools, and he understands this. We need to take an honest look at the schools that are misleading our students and their families. These schools aren't worth the accreditation, they certainly aren't worth the time, and they aren't worth the debt they are pushing on students.

Let me make a marketing pitch, if I may. I say it in Illinois, and I will say it anywhere. If you are graduating from high school and not sure where to go, what you want to do, what you want to major in, your safest bet is your community college. It is nearby. It is affordable. It offers many options. In most States the hours are transferable to other colleges. It is a good way to start your college education. Also, for vocational training, community college is a smart investment. When it comes to these for-profit schools, exactly the opposite is true.

So when we reauthorize higher education, let's come up with a good student loan approach that builds on what we can vote for today, but let's also start looking at the overall cost of higher education, sensitive to the needs of families today to make sure their kids have a fighting chance for the best jobs in America.

I travel all around my State, and I go to businesses. I asked my staff: Find me businesses that have done well in the recession and are hiring today. I find a lot of good businesses, including Kraft Foods in Champaign, IL. Each year they need over 100 industrial maintenance engineers—people to keep the assembly lines running—who understand how to repair things, understand computers, and are good employees. The starting wage for those employees, by and large, is \$50,000 a year. That is the average wage in my State. Think about it—a starting wage.

Well, what is holding them back? Why didn't they fill the jobs? The students coming out of high school are not ready. They do not have the math skills or the computer skills. But if they go to Parkland Community College in Champaign, they can acquire it affordably.

That makes sense. That is a way to bring a student out of high school with

a year or two of good training at a community college and have a good job and opportunity for a lifetime. It is a great place to start. Those jobs are all over my State and all over America.

So let's focus on affordability in higher education, on training for vocational skills that give people a chance to become skilled apprentices and beyond, and let's make sure today that we do not miss this opportunity to reduce interest rates.

A "no" vote on the bipartisan plan will keep interest rates for students at 6.8 percent. A "yes" vote will lower the interest rates for two-thirds of students to 3.8 percent and save those students \$2,000 over the next 4 years. It caps that interest rate at 8.25 percent. That is a guarantee that no matter what happens to interest rates, these students will be protected.

This is a pretty basic choice. We need a strong bipartisan vote. Regardless of your philosophy on what student loans should look like, keep these families and students in mind. If you are frustrated with the legislative process, frustrated that Congress is not doing it exactly the way you want to have it done, do not take it out on the students and their families. Give them a break today with a "yes" vote for the bipartisan bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is currently in morning business.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I yield back the remaining time in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1243, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1243) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, for the information of all Senators, we are now back on the transportation and housing appropriations bill. My colleague and I, Senator COLLINS from

Maine, will be here all day working our way through any amendments that our Members have to offer. We encourage Members to come to the floor and let us know what those are so we can get this done in a timely fashion.

Madam President, I believe, under the previous order, Senator PORTMAN is here to offer his amendment, and I yield to him at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 1749, AS MODIFIED

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 1749 and send a modification of my amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio, [Mr. PORTMAN] for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MCCONNELL, proposes an amendment numbered 1749, as modified.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prioritize certain projects under the bridges in critical corridors program)

On page 26, line 12, after "benefits" insert "", and projects shall be carried out on bridges that the Federal Highway Administration has classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete".

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, thank you for allowing me to offer this amendment today, and I thank my colleagues from Maine and Washington State for agreeing to work with us on this important amendment. I also thank them for the way they are conducting this appropriations bill by allowing amendments to come forward and having debate.

This amendment is one that I think will be relatively noncontroversial. This is an amendment to the underlying Transportation and Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill. It simply says that our nation's bridges that need repairs the most ought to be prioritized.

There are bridges that are classified by the Federal Highway Administration as "functionally obsolete" or "structurally deficient," and we want to be sure they receive priority consideration under the section of the bill that provides for Bridges in Critical Corridors. This is a fund that is established under the appropriations bill. In this way, we are helping to ensure that fund in question actually accomplishes its objective.

We all know the Federal Government's highway trust fund dollars are stretched very thin and, frankly, there are not enough dollars that are making their way to the core infrastructure needs we have in this country. In fact,

in 2008, the fund got in trouble, and since that time it has been bailed out four times from the Treasury's general fund, and a fifth bailout is now scheduled for fiscal year 2014. Clearly, the funds are very limited, and we have to be very careful and resourceful in how we spend those funds.

This appropriations bill does include, as I said earlier, a separate funding mechanism—\$500 million—for Bridges in Critical Corridors across the country. I know there are some in this Chamber who wonder whether that is necessary in the legislation, and I understand their argument. But if we are going to include this special fund, let's be sure the money is used in the most efficient way possible, and that is what this amendment is all about. Let's be sure we target the limited resources we have in a way that addresses our Nation's bridges that are outdated and often at risk.

This amendment narrows the number of bridges that receive priority consideration by 75 percent, and does so by focusing these resources on functionally obsolete and structurally deficient bridges throughout the country that need the funding. These are the bridges with problems that if left unaddressed could be in tomorrow's headlines.

We do not have to just deal with hypotheticals, it is happening. We have all seen recent accounts of this functionally obsolete Skagit River Bridge on Interstate 5 in Washington State that collapsed in May. I know Senator MURRAY was very involved in responding to this. It was struck by a truck that exceeded the bridge's height limit. The good news is there were no direct fatalities, unbelievably—at least in this instance there were not. The bad news is there are a lot of bridges that are functionally obsolete or structurally deficient around the country. There are thousands of them, and we need to be sure that, again, they are prioritized in this legislation.

One of those bridges happens to be the Brent Spence Bridge in my hometown of Cincinnati, OH. The bridge is located at the critical intersection of I-75 and I-71—an important artery—and it is a bridge between southwest Ohio and northern Kentucky.

This Brent Spence Bridge was built nearly 50 years ago, and it was designed to carry 80,000 vehicles every day. As of this year, it is carrying more than double that number every day. It is expected to exceed 200,000 vehicles per day by 2025.

To facilitate the increased traffic and congestion on the bridge, the engineers actually removed the bridge's emergency shoulders, so there are no emergency shoulders on the bridge anymore. They also had to narrow the lanes to 11 feet rather than the 12 feet recommended by the Federal Highway Administration. So this makes it hazardous for drivers. It also has not alle-

viated the congestion much because it continues to result in an average of 3.6 million hours of delay for passenger vehicles every year.

So Brent Spence is one example of an endangered bridge this amendment could help. We need to ensure that bridges such as Brent Spence receive the priority access to the funds in the Bridges in the Critical Corridors section of this legislation.

So for this reason, I would urge my colleagues to support this common-sense amendment.

Again, I want to thank Senator COLLINS and Senator MURRAY for allowing this amendment to be part of the process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I support this amendment. What it does is it clarifies that when the Department of Transportation awards funding under Bridges in Critical Corridors, priority should be given to structurally deficient and functionally obsolete bridges.

The Federal Highway Administration uses those terms to talk about the status of the bridges across the country. So when a bridge is "structurally deficient," its condition has deteriorated over time. And when a bridge is "functionally obsolete," its design does not meet today's standards. Both situations, obviously, can be a serious concern.

In the underlying bill itself, I took the initiative to include an additional \$500 million for these bridge investments so that we can address these serious concerns across our country and make sure our transportation network is safe and reliable.

So I support this amendment. I urge our colleagues to vote for it.

I would ask the Senator from Ohio if he wants a voice vote and would allow us to move forward on it now or if he requires a rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I would defer to the chairwoman. I would like a voice vote, if that is what the chairwoman would prefer. But it might be a good amendment to have a recorded vote on.

What is the chairwoman's preference?

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, it is completely up to the Senator from Ohio. As I said, if the Senator offers us a voice vote right now, I can guarantee its adoption quickly. How long does the Senator want to wait to vote?

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I think I will take the Senator up on her offer.

Mrs. MURRAY. A wise choice and a good example for those Senators who follow the Senator in offering an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I just want to commend the Senator for his amendment. The fact is that 25 percent of our Nation's bridges are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete, as described by the Senator from Ohio.

In my home State of Maine, nearly a third of our 2,408 bridges are deficient. Senator PORTMAN's amendment targets these funds to ensure that they are awarded to structurally deficient or functionally obsolete projects in an effort to respond to our Nation's crumbling infrastructure.

Like Senator MURRAY, I support this amendment, and I too am prepared to accept it on a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment (No. 1749), as modified, was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. COLLINS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for bringing his amendment before us and setting a good example for all Members, as we now move forward, to bring their amendments to the floor. We will work our way through them. We hope everybody can contact myself and Senator COLLINS as quickly as possible so we can get these amendments up.

AMENDMENT NO. 1760

With that, Madam President, I call up Senator CARDIN's amendment No. 1760.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY], for Mr. CARDIN, proposes an amendment numbered 1760.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Transportation to submit to Congress a report relating to the condition of lane miles and highway bridge deck)

On page 38, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 127. The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the percentages of lane miles and highway bridge deck in each State that are in good condition, fair condition, and poor condition, and the percentage of Federal amounts each State expends on the repair and maintenance of highway infrastructure and on new capacity construction.

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, as the chair of the full Committee on Appropriations, I rise today to comment on this bill, but also to thank and acknowledge the really important role that Senators MURRAY and COLLINS have played. Really, it has been the way the Senate should operate. They have held extensive hearings in the subcommittee on America's needs in transportation—an ever-piling up backlog that we need to address.

It would accomplish several good, agreed-upon public policy goals. No. 1, safety. Because when we are talking about roads, bridges, and the other infrastructure areas in this bill, safety is our No. 1 priority.

No. 2, when you are building or repairing a bridge in Maryland, Maine, Washington State, or North Dakota, those people are working in the United States of America, and, hopefully, the supply chain involved—whether it is asphalt to steel—is made in the good old USA. So what we would do is improve the safety rates and lower the unemployment rate and at the end of the day have something to show for it.

So many of the American people are frustrated with us when it comes to spending because they think if they give us \$1, we will spend \$2 and not have spit to show for it. But yet in this bill, at this time, we have a legislative framework, and a restrained fiscal framework, to be able to move on important transportation infrastructure needs and on housing.

The appropriate role for the Federal Government to be involved in is housing: those things that are involved in, No. 1, promoting economic development in blighted areas, regardless of whether you are in an urban State or a rural State. The needs of North Dakota are different than the needs of Maryland. Even in my very dear State of Maryland, we have different needs in different parts of the State. The robust Baltimore corridor, which is more urban, requires one framework for the community development block grant money.

If you go to Garrett County, in the western part of my State, that was hit by a blizzard during Hurricane Sandy or you go down to the Eastern Shore, Somerset County, that was hit by a hurricane, literally flooding to dangerous proportions—those two counties have as high a poverty rate as Baltimore City.

So when we talk about the great things in this bill, what I like about it is it is local—it is money that will come for local needs. The needs of Garrett County and Somerset County are different than the needs of Baltimore City. But what we do know is that we

need jobs and we need to be able to address the needs of the people who want to be middle class and are looking for an opportunity to get there and also for the compelling needs particularly of the elderly and disabled.

Again, we in the Senate know because we are urban and rural and suburban. You meet different needs according to the locale. In Baltimore City, it is a high concentration of elderly in certain areas. We can meet those needs through a combined effort of housing, Meals On Wheels, helping people be able to receive coordinated services to keep them independent and healthy. When you get to the rural parts, that is even harder.

So what I like about this bill is it is, first of all, focused on rebuilding America. I so salute our troops. We have been in a 10-year war. The consequences of that war will be felt by the men and women who served and the taxpayers who have to pay it for many years to come.

But as we look at this, what they fought for is for America. Now we have to think about rebuilding America. I am glad we gave it a try in Iraq. OK. We gave it a try in Afghanistan. But come home, America. As the troops come home, and hopefully the money comes back home, we begin to show results there. If we rebuild our infrastructure, focus on compelling human needs, I think we will not only serve the Nation well but people will begin to have trust in us that through smart approaches, restrained spending, we can get there.

I am proud of what this bill does in Maryland. It does create jobs. It helps with infrastructure. This bill is absolutely crucial to Maryland. First, the THUD bill provides \$40 billion for highways and nearly \$9 billion for mass transit. We need that. This means Maryland will receive in fiscal year 2014 \$700 million.

We are not waiting only for the Federal Government. The Maryland General Assembly recently increased the gas tax—very controversial—because of our compelling needs. Governor O'Malley and our general assembly wanted to rise to the occasion, but they want us to rise to the occasion as well.

As we look at some of these projects, they affect not only the State of Maryland but they affect the region and the Nation. The Presiding Officer was not here when we had a horrific accident in 2009 on the Metro. The Metro suffered a terrible crash: brakes failed, safety systems failed, a lot failed—nine people lost their lives.

We said we were going to create a safety culture and turn to our National Transportation Safety Board to be able to do it. I made two promises to families: that I would do everything I could to see what were appropriate Federal safety standards and to put money in

the Federal checkbook to improve that safety. I demanded reforms at Metro management to a culture of safety.

So where are we now? Guess what. We have put money in the Federal checkbook, \$150 million to continue to buy the important crash-resistant cars that will be able to help them. The money will be used for signal improvement, rail car maintenance to make sure we are improving this.

Safety is the No. 1 obsession with me. In addition to working on Metro, I know this bill deals with FAA's contract tower program, a subject of much debate during last year's continuing funding resolution. I remember real debate with Senator MORAN on how we could keep those airports open.

They are the first to be hit by the sequester. I have five of them. They are in communities called Easton—by the way, Secretary Rumsfeld is down there. Cheney would come by as well—the Frederick Municipal Airport that the President uses periodically for coming to Camp David, Hagerstown, Martin, Salisbury, and Ocean City.

Those towers are important for two reasons: national security and economic security. So we are looking at how we can make sure we keep these towers open so airplanes can come and land safely and take off safely and aid the commerce to our communities.

You have heard me also speak about housing and community development. When I got started in Congress, we had something called revenue sharing that was started by President Nixon so the local communities would get formula-based funding to help them rebuild their communities or strengthen them in the area of economic development.

That changed. That ended. That ended during the Gingrich era. But we came up with community development block grant money. Again, that money comes locally to meet local needs. The criteria are: eliminate blight, improve employment opportunities, and be able to create a sustainable infrastructure that will not need government subsidies so the community can be able to sustain itself and build on that to create jobs.

We are very impressed with this. Again, this legislation meets needs for seniors and housing. I could go on about it. But this bill is a very important accomplishment for the State of Maryland. When I talk about safety, I note the Portman amendment. I note Senator CARDIN has an amendment on a report on the highway deck.

I wish to say something else. We had some tough things happen in my State over the last couple of days on the Bay Bridge. Many of the people in this Senate travel the Bay Bridge, some to go to their State. We are a next-door neighbor with our pals from Delaware, Senators CARPER and COONS, who represent the Delmarva Peninsula, a wonderful place. We hope the Presiding Of-

ficer comes over sometime and actually sees real water, oceans and rivers and crabs and so on, the Senator from North Dakota.

But this bridge, we now have two of them because of the volume, and then, second, the way people travel on it, the velocity has increased. Last Friday, we had a terrible situation where a truck tailgated a passenger vehicle and pushed it off the bridge—off the bridge. The car fell 40 feet.

Thank God the passenger survived, a young lady who—the impact was so hard, the windshield broke, so she was able to get out. She is a fitness instructor. So she had the robust and physical vigor to be able to swim to safety. We thank God for her survival. But we are now scared on the Bay Bridge.

Yesterday, we had another head-on collision on the bridge. The AAA, the American Automobile Association, has called upon the National Transportation Safety Board to review the conditions on our bridge. Are the barriers high enough? Should we be using two-way traffic now to alleviate the traffic jams because transportation is changing? In other words, these are very important questions related to safety.

Do we need another bridge? An analysis needs to happen. If we build another bridge, should it be there or further south? Controversy. But again we need analysis.

I cite that example because as I review the facts of this case and consult with the State, I too am considering joining with the American Automobile Association to ask for the NTSB to review the accidents on the bridge and give us recommendations in terms of what we need so it does not happen again.

You cannot fall 40 feet. It could have been someone elderly. There could have been babies in that car. It does not matter. You cannot fall 40 feet off the bridge being rear-ended by a truck and think it is OK. You cannot have a head-on collision and think it is OK. I do not think it is OK what is happening on the Bay Bridge.

I now want to work with my Governor and consider what are the best steps forward. But as of today, I am very strongly recommending a review by the National Transportation Safety Board to look at it. It is not only what is happening in Maryland. It is what is happening all over America.

I see on the floor the Senator from Oklahoma. I am going to yield the floor so others can speak. But before I do, I wish to compliment Senators MURRAY and COLLINS and the way they have been moving this bill. I think it is important.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. COBURN. I wanted to speak for a moment about—

Ms. MIKULSKI. Wait a moment, I suggested the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded just to talk about the THUD bill.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk continued the call of the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, my colleague from Oklahoma was waiting to offer amendments, but filling in for Senator MURRAY, I was trying to get a sense what that meant. The reason I wanted the quorum to go on was so I could have a chance to talk to the Senator from Oklahoma. Wherever he is, I want him to know that if he thinks I was trying to stifle him or not allow him to have his rights on the Senate floor, I apologize. What I was trying to do was create an orderly process so we could keep this excellent momentum going. I invite Senator COBURN to please return to the floor. If in any way he felt I was being negative toward him, I do not mean that. In fact, what I meant was let's get it clear so he could go forward.

The Senator from Oklahoma and I have an excellent relationship. We have agreed on many things, and we have duked it out on others. We did promise an open amendment process, and we intend to keep it.

Again, I apologize. I invite him to come back to the floor. Let's have a discussion and let's keep it going.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I wish to add some further comments on the bill while we are waiting for Senators to return to the floor to offer amendments. I note the gentlelady from Maine is returning.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. BALDWIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. BALDWIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STUDENT LOANS

Ms. BALDWIN. Making college affordable is one of the most important steps we can take toward completing our economic recovery and ensuring a path to the middle class for all Americans. As a Nation, we are still working to recover from the largest economic downturn since the Great Depression. Access to student loans at affordable interest rates represents an incredibly important piece of this vital recovery.

I often use a quote of President Obama that he included in his State of the Union Address a couple of years ago. It says to win the future, we must outeducate, outinnovate, and outbuild the rest of the world. I believe we do this best by supporting our students and investing in their future.

Unfortunately, the Student Loan Certainty Act on the floor today is a step in the wrong direction. A college education should be a path to prosperity, a path to the middle class, not a path to indebtedness.

As many of my colleagues have described, the bill before us today offers students and families lower student loan interest rates in the near term, but we can fully expect higher student loan interest rates in the years to come.

For families with multiple children who are college bound, their children's education becomes more expensive in each ensuing year. This means that under this plan, a current freshman in college may get a decent student loan interest rate for a few years, but a current freshman in high school will end up with rates much higher than the cap contained in current U.S. law.

Not only does this legislation raise long-term interest rate loans for students, it fails to close tax loopholes. It does not ask the wealthy to pay their fair share, and it burdens students who can least afford it with deficit reduction.

The bill before us lacks a true vision for outeducating the rest of the world. It doesn't ask our country to invest in the future, nor does it offer a comprehensive solution to college affordability. Rather, it offers a poor permanent fix and slaps students and their families with the bill.

I remind my colleagues that there were multiple alternative solutions proposed before Congress slumped over the July 1 deadline that doubled the interest rates on student loans. I supported two measures offered by my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator REED, that would have paid for lower interest rates for students by closing tax loopholes for the very wealthy in our country. The Senate twice voted on Senator REED's proposals and they received a majority vote each time.

We are also making a good-faith effort to address the shortcomings of the bill before us to work toward a deal that would be a true win for students

and their families. The Reed-Warren amendment, which I proudly cosponsor, would impose a lower cap to protect student borrowers. Why on Earth would we wish to expose our students to higher rates?

Senator SANDERS' amendment would sunset the current deal in 2 years and allow for a return to regular order so Congress can rightly deal with interest rates and a host of other issues that affect college costs. These amendments are sound improvements to the underlying bill that would allow us to invest in students and families, rather than obfuscate the student loan and debt problem. I am disappointed that we have reached the point where debates about the future of college affordability are less about the lives of students and their families and more about protecting loopholes for corporations and the wealthy.

It wasn't always this way. In 1944, starting with the compact to returning soldiers from World War II made through the GI bill, our Nation made a commitment to future progress by investing in education. Between 1944 and 1951, 8 million veterans received education benefits, including many former distinguished Members of this body.

In 1958, President Dwight Eisenhower, a Republican, signed the National Defense Education Act, providing loans for college students and funds to encourage young people to enter teaching careers, the precursor to our current program for student loans.

President Lyndon Johnson built upon this legacy. A cornerstone of the Great Society was a path to the middle class through a college education. The Higher Education Act of 1965 gave us the Federal student loan program, known today as the Stafford Loan Program, and the Educational Opportunity Grant Program, known today as the Pell Grant Program. This generation of American lawmakers lived in trying times—winning a war, fulfilling the dream of the civil rights movement—yet they still had the foresight to make the hard choices, the choices necessary to invest in the future—our future.

Legislation I supported as a Member of the House of Representatives built on this investment and lowered the subsidized Stafford loan rate to 3.4 percent, which was the rate at which students borrowed until July 1. We recognized that investing in students is important, and lowering rates is a part of that investment.

The fact that State investment in higher education has declined significantly over the past decades has exacerbated the problem. Particularly as States struggle to balance their budgets in these tough economic times, their investments in students have decreased, meaning higher tuition, fewer grants, and fewer scholarships.

I hear regularly from Wisconsin students that the cost of higher education in my State puts college out of reach for some. Thirty years ago undergraduate tuition at the University of Wisconsin-Madison was about \$1,000. Today it is well over \$8,000. And it is not just my home State of Wisconsin. Across the country tuition at public 4-year colleges has tripled. This means more students are borrowing through Federal student loan programs to cover the higher cost of higher education. For students at the University of Wisconsin System, unmet needs after grants and scholarships is over \$9,000—nearly doubling in the last decade. Yet the Federal Government limits on subsidized loans have remained relatively stagnant over the past 30 years. In many cases the limits on what a student can borrow through the Stafford Loan Program means their loans will not even cover the cost of their tuition.

This is what it all comes down to—a series of choices. Are we going to sacrifice the progress of our next generation because we are unwilling to do the hard work and make those tough choices now? Are we going to gradually chip away at the ladders of opportunity put in place by the generations before to lift Americans into the middle class and out of poverty; do we ask the wealthy to pay a little bit more; do we ask corporations to pay their fair share. Or do we say to students: You are on your own; sink or swim.

I say to students across Wisconsin and this great country: We should all be in this together. We must continue this compact from one generation to the next. The veteran who was educated on the GI bill wants to see his neighbor's children able to afford college. The teacher who earned her education through the Pell Grant Program wants the same opportunity for her students. The mother who attended college through the Stafford Loan Program does not want to see her savings for retirement depleted or her children sapped with debt.

I reject sacrificing the progress of the next generation because we are unwilling to do the hard work and make the hard choices now. I reject short-changing the next generation of young Americans by making college more expensive and then using the profits from their high interest rates to pay down the deficit, particularly when we ask the wealthiest to contribute nothing.

If we are to win the future, we must make the hard important choices now. For this reason and for the hard-working people of Wisconsin, I oppose this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Well said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, we have had a good discussion about how

to proceed with this bill. The chairman of the full committee has been extremely constructive in exercising her leadership. She very much wants a new approach, and I commend her for bringing bills individually to the Senate floor.

What we are going to propose—and through the Chair I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the full committee—is that, as usual, we would go back and forth, one side then the other, in considering amendments but that we would allow Senator COBURN to file a series of amendments at this point. They are already filed, but he will call them up and make them pending, with the understanding that we would set aside individual amendments so we could keep going back and forth and so that other colleagues on the Republican side who have amendments would not be shut out but, rather, would be accommodated as well.

Is that the understanding of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator, and I wish to respond to the ranking member of THUD to say this: No. 1, yes, that is our understanding. As we move ahead on this bill, remember that this is the first appropriations bill on the floor in 2 years and the first time THUD has been on the floor in 4 years. The Senator from Maine and Senator MURRAY are to be commended. The old-school way—old school, with respect—was an open amendment process with alternating amendments back and forth. Old school was never to bring up 12 or 15 amendments at one time; it was usually 1 amendment.

So the understanding is that it is to go back and consider one amendment at a time, alternating sides, with the understanding that the Senator from Oklahoma wishes to speak on a variety of amendments and offer them.

Again, I think we have cleared the air, and I am so happy about that. So I do concur with the Senator from Maine.

We also understand, in addition to his amendments, alternating among the ranking member, the chair, and the chairman of the subcommittee, there might also be other intervening amendments; is that correct?

Ms. COLLINS. I would say through the Presiding Officer that is my understanding as well. And I think this was a very good example of everyone operating in good faith.

I, for one, am prepared for the Senator from Oklahoma to proceed, but I would note that the Cardin amendment is the pending amendment.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, first of all, I thank the chairman of the full committee and the chairman and the

ranking member of the subcommittee. I first want to give them some praise. Although I don't agree with the total numbers in this bill, I do recognize the significant changes they have made to the bill with ideas we had 2 years ago, and I am very appreciative of the fact that the slumlord problem is being taken care of, the count on vehicles for the Federal Government is being taken care of, and the conferences are being taken care of. Almost all of my concerns have been addressed very faithfully in looking at those issues we raised and actually including them in the underlying language, and I am very appreciative of that.

In terms of getting amendments up, my desire is just to get them up and pending and to be flexible with the chairman and the ranking member on which ones they will accept, which ones they do not want to take a vote on, and then talk about that and not to ramrod the process. It is only a matter of efficiency for me. If their pleasure is for me to do one or two or three and then come back later and do it again, as long as we have an open amendment process, I don't have any problem with it.

I do think we have some ideas to improve this bill, and I think the amendments ought to be considered. So I thank them for their consideration and allowing me to make some amendments pending, and I will talk with both the chairman and the ranking member about when and what we will do with the disposition of those amendments.

AMENDMENT NO. 1750

Madam President, I call up amendment No. 1750, and I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside for the purposes of calling up this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] proposes an amendment numbered 1750.

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit funds from being directed to federal employees with unpaid Federal tax liability)

On page 185, lines 9 and 10, strike “or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation” and insert “provide a loan or loan guarantee to, provide an annual salary to, or provide any other federal funding to, any Federal employee, any individual, or any corporation”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1751

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and that I be allowed to bring up amendment No. 1751.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] proposes an amendment numbered 1751.

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent that amendment be considered as read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit Federal funding of union activities by Federal employees)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____.

None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to pay an employee (as that term is defined in section 7103 of title 5, United States Code) for any period of official time (as that term is used in section 7131 of title 5, United States Code).

AMENDMENT NO. 1754

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and that we bring up amendment No. 1754.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] proposes an amendment numbered 1754.

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit Federal funds from being used to meet the matching requirements of other Federal Programs)

On page 104, line 12, strike “*Provided further*” and all that follows through “use of any such funds” on line 18, and insert “*Provided further*, That for all match requirements applicable to funds made available under this heading for this fiscal year and prior years, a grantee may not use as a source of match funds other funds administered by the Secretary and other Federal agencies”.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I would like to spend a moment talking about amendment No. 1750.

This bill has a prohibition in it that I think is long overdue and very good. What it does is it prohibits the transfer of funds for Federal assistance in the bill to corporations with delinquent taxes. I believe that is a great step in the right direction.

Companies that are contracting with, doing business with the Federal Government have an obligation to pay their taxes, but I also believe our Federal employees ought to be paying their taxes as well. We have \$5 billion due to the Federal Treasury from Federal employees where the cases have been adjudicated. They are not under question any longer. There is no question about whether the money is owed.

They have run through all their appeals. All this amendment would do is to strike the same balance for both independent contractors, which is not a part of the Senate bill as presently on floor, and individual Federal employees who have a tax obligation.

When the average Federal compensation fully absorbed is calculated, it is in excess of \$134,000 a year. That includes all the benefits and everything else. That is twice the per capita median family income in America. So the fact that we have this large of an outstanding amount—it is about \$1 billion—with current active Federal employees, I believe there ought to be some consequence for Federal employees who have a tax obligation but aren't paying it and whom we continue to keep in our employ and continue to pay them with no payment back to the Federal Treasury.

In one division of the Federal Government—the Internal Revenue Service—if, in fact, an individual is found in a situation such as this, they lose their job. It is grounds for termination. So this is a simple improvement that would say what is good for American taxpayers is also good for Federal employees and what is good for businesses that do business with the Federal Government is good for Federal employees. And what is good for the businesses ought to also be good for independent contractors who owe the Federal Government money.

So I would be happy to have any modifications the committee might recommend to this as well, but in terms of fairness and running a \$17 trillion debt and running \$600 billion in deficits, we ought to be aggressive about collecting the taxes owed to us that there aren't any questions about. The principle the committee used in terms of businesses that deal with the Federal Government ought to be applied to individual contractors and individuals as well.

With that, I thank the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee, as well as the chairman, for the opportunity to offer this amendment and will await their disposition and their plan.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, President Barack Obama today is in the Midwest talking to folks about how important it is that Congress return its focus to our Nation's economic recovery. I couldn't agree more. Flustered by filibusters and paralyzed by politics, Washington has gotten off track, and it is time that changes.

The Senate this week has an opportunity to pass an appropriations bill. I am grateful for the leadership of Senator MURRAY of Washington and ranking member Senator COLLINS of Maine in bringing this appropriations bill to

the floor. I am still fairly new here, relatively speaking, but I am told it wasn't an unusual or shocking occurrence back in the day for the two parties to come together to negotiate and pass a bipartisan spending bill.

The bill in front of us would fund the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development. While I think to most people these agencies aren't especially related to their daily lives, both are actually fundamentally about investing in our Nation and its critical infrastructure—the roads we drive on, the homes we live in, the trains and planes we ride on, the ports our goods are shipped through. This bill is about infrastructure. We know that when we invest in America's infrastructure, we are actually investing in America's communities and in America's future.

This bill is about building the infrastructure for the long-term strength and stability of our communities and our country, and it is about putting Americans back to work. This bill will put Americans back to work on a wide range of major transportation projects in communities across our country. The programs in this bill have meant an enormous amount to my home State of Delaware, as I know they have to the Presiding Officer's. They can continue to have an important, positive impact on communities across our country, but only if we can come together to fund them.

The so-called TIGER grants program helps States and local governments pay for new highways and bridges, public transit projects, railways and port infrastructure. It is a competitive, highly sought-after program. For the current fiscal year, the Department of Transportation received nearly 600 applications from across all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and American Samoa—\$9 billion in requests for just \$470 million in available funds. That competition helped focus these resources where they were best leveraged and where they would have the best impact. In my view, our communities need these funds, and they need this bill to make possible this program.

TIGER grants in Delaware made possible the building of the Newark Regional Transportation Center, which will support 350 high-skilled, high-wage construction jobs a year while it is being built. This new center will give folks in New Castle County new options for public transportation, cutting down on the number of cars on I-95 and our local roads, and strengthening the community.

TIGER grants are a core part of our Nation's infrastructure strategy, and they will be at risk if we don't move this bill forward.

The new Bridges in the Critical Corridors Program is another significant part of our infrastructure strategy, and

I commend Senator MURRAY for her efforts to ensure that our Nation's bridges are safe. At home in Delaware, one out of five bridges is deemed structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. Let me repeat that. One out of five bridges in my little home State of Delaware is structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. They may have major defects and need major repairs or may have been built so long ago that they are not up to current code. Either way, I think we would agree that this Nation, our constituents, our communities need our bridges to work, and work safely.

We also need and rely on our highways. The Federal-Aid Highway Program uses the highway trust fund to help States and local governments to help plan, build, and repair our Nation's needed roadways. It is a true Federal-State-local partnership and has helped ensure consistent quality and safety standards on highways across our country for nearly a century.

I shouldn't have to explain to this body why having functional roads is important to businesses, to families, or even to the public's safety, but I will say this: There are more vehicles on the roads year over year than ever before. Part of our responsibility is to make sure those roads work—and work safely. Another part is to offer our citizens other options to reduce the traffic burden on those roads.

This bill also contains two new programs to do just that, that I think are worth highlighting. The New Starts Transit Program supports projects to provide new or expanded public transportation services. The passenger rail grants, of particular interest to me, are focused more narrowly on intercity passenger rail services designed to reduce traffic congestion.

How are we going to move this country forward if we can't move around within this country? As a Congress, we have to do more to strengthen our Nation's infrastructure, and that is a big part of what this bill does.

I recently joined the Appropriations Committee after the passing of a great senior Senator—Senator Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey—who was for many years a great and tireless champion of Amtrak. He fought harder than anybody to build Amtrak into what it is today because he saw that with our population steadily growing we needed to be prepared to provide reliable, safe, affordable transportation, in particular here in the eastern region.

At his funeral, Vice President BIDEN said that, "If it wasn't for Frank, Amtrak wouldn't be what it is today." He is right. And, of course, our Vice President famously rode Amtrak down to Washington every morning and home to Delaware every night that he served as a Senator, as I do now. I took the 6:25 down, and I hope, God willing, to be on the 7:00 home. We will see.

Amtrak, in this region in particular, isn't a luxury, it is a fundamental and critical part of the economy, not just in my home State of Delaware and at least a dozen States on the Atlantic seaboard but across the country for communities that rely on passenger rail to connect with the Nation's major economic centers.

Senator Lautenberg once said,

If we shut down the Northeast Corridor rail service, you'd have to build seven new lanes on Interstate 95 just to carry all the travelers that use these trains every day.

In the last fiscal year, Amtrak achieved a new milestone of 31.2 million riders. In fact, they had record ridership 9 out of the last 10 years, and Amtrak continues to make steady progress in reliability, capacity, and on-time performance. How could we possibly afford to replace this vital service with, as Senator Lautenberg suggested, seven new lanes of interstate running up the entire length of the east coast?

Now is not the time, in my view, given all these standards of progress that they have met, to gut Amtrak, as our counterparts in the House seem determined to do. Now is the time to help Amtrak build on its steady gains and progress and continue to grow. Amtrak is a vital part of dozens, even hundreds, of communities across this country. So in my view, to invest in Amtrak is to invest in those communities and their future.

The other major portion of this bill that we consider today is housing, the transportation and housing appropriations bill. As our economy continues to recover, people in communities all across our country are looking to us to help them grow. Housing infrastructure is just as important a part of the foundation of our country and our communities as is transportation. In low-income neighborhoods, restoring community infrastructure is the foundation for future economic growth. That is why this bill's strong investment in the Community Development Block Grant Program, one of HUD's longest running and in many ways most successful programs, is so critical.

As the Presiding Officer knows, I served as a county executive before joining the Senate. In that role, our local government made efficient, focused, targeted use of CDB grants to provide for housing assistance for low-income seniors, for the disabled, for communities across our country in New Castle County, DE.

CDB grants are high-yield investments that work all over this country, that are controlled in many ways at the local level, and that enable communities to rehabilitate buildings, streets, and sewer systems that literally lay the groundwork for new business growth and vibrant revitalized communities. As the hardest hit Americans work tirelessly to get back to

work and back on their feet, housing programs, also included in this vital bill, ensure they can keep a roof over their heads or that they have the possibility of safe, clean, sanitary, affordable housing in their future.

In Delaware, nearly 4,000 people were homeless in our small State at least once last year, and more than 200 of them were veterans. All over this country, I know many of our colleagues are concerned about the number of our veterans who fought for us overseas and now face and endure homelessness here at home. For those who felt the despair and loss and loneliness of homelessness, those who lived with this fear that they will one day experience it as well, the housing programs funded in this bill are a lifeline. I want to particularly thank Senator MURRAY for her leadership on ensuring that we end the scourge of veteran homelessness in our country.

Homeless assistance grants, another key provision in this bill, help Delaware organizations, and organizations all over this country, to offer permanent and transitional housing to once-homeless persons, while providing services including job training, health care, mental health counseling, substance abuse treatment, and childcare.

And last, the HOME Investment Partnerships Program helps to expand the supply and affordability of housing to low-income families and individuals, many of whom are elderly or disabled. In my home State of Delaware, a recent grant from the Project Rental Assistance Demonstration Program will create and sustain 170 units of affordable housing over 5 years for persons with disabilities.

For millions of Americans and for thousands of Delaware families, the key to a better home lies in good counseling, in home ownership, and in these sorts of investments in a stable, affordable housing market.

Elisa, one of my constituents from Middletown, did not believe she would ever be able to purchase a home for herself and two children, but a federally funded class called Preparing for Home Ownership helped her navigate the housing market and find a home that she could afford. She is now spending less on her three-bedroom home than she had on her two-bedroom rental, and her children have a backyard of their own for the first time.

If we want families to succeed, if we want children to focus in school, if we want to create communities with safety and stability, moving toward sustainable home ownership is a vital investment by this country in creating and sustaining quality communities.

Dedicated organizations, such as NCALL and Interfaith Community Housing of Delaware, have leveraged Federal funding such as this to help with mortgages, loan modifications, and private capital to help put more

than 1,000 families each year in Delaware into better housing. Their services include workshops, foreclosure prevention services, and counseling.

Another constituent who contacted me, Eva from Rehoboth, was in danger of losing her home when she met with a foreclosure prevention counselor to discuss her personal situation. A counselor helped her to develop a plan to stabilize her finances and to modify her mortgage into a more affordable interest rate. Because of a counseling program funded by this bill, Eva avoided foreclosure and was able to save her home.

The National Foreclosure Mitigation Counseling Program, administered through NeighborWorks, has helped hundreds of households in Delaware to avoid the pain, loss, and dislocation of foreclosure. Last year, counselors from NCALL, First State, and YWCA conducted more than 5,000 home ownership counseling and education activities, including one-on-one counseling appointments, workshops, and homebuyer fairs. Funding from this program will allow them to reach even more Delawareans in need in the year ahead.

We may have made some progress as a Chamber last week in getting through the executive branch nominations that had been the subject of a number of filibusters and quite a bit of contention, and I was pleased that this bill earned six Republican votes in the Appropriations Committee when taken up and considered. Surely it can earn enough votes in this full Senate to move forward to debate, to consideration, and, I hope, to final passage. It is the challenge of this Chamber to listen to each other, to work together, and to provide the vital investments in infrastructure and in housing that ensure a steady recovery and a brighter future.

Senator Lautenberg once said that his career in business taught him that if you want to be successful tomorrow, you have to lay the foundation today. That is exactly what this bill does. That is what we are voting on—the foundation of tomorrow's success for America's families and communities.

I earnestly hope we will come together to pass this bill, to create jobs, and to invest in our country's future.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

SMARTER SOLUTIONS FOR STUDENTS ACT

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1911, as provided under the previous order.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, the clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1911) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, we are now on the student loan bill, so to speak. There is going to be a few hours of debate on the bill itself—actually 3 hours. As I understand it, there will be three amendments in order under the rule on this bill. So we will probably be on this bill for some time this afternoon. But we do want to finish it. I know the leader wants to finish it. Both the majority leader and Republican leader want to get this finished today, so we will be working on this bill for probably the better part of this afternoon.

I would like to set the stage for it by talking about the situation with student loans and why we are where we are right now. First of all, I would like to say the bill before us basically is the House bill. There will be a Manchin-Burr amendment that will be offered as a substitute. I will be supporting that. That is the compromise bill. That is the compromise we reached through several weeks of negotiations between the Republicans on the Senate side and the Democrats on the Senate side and the White House. It was a three-party negotiation that went on, and this is the compromise that was reached. So the bill before us represents a number of compromises that were made on both sides to produce legislation that would give certainty to students who borrow money from the Federal Government to attend college this fall.

As we all know, we have debated several different measures related to student loan interest rates for several weeks. This is the closest we have gotten to an agreement that represents at least two core Democratic principles, our side's principles, related to student loan interest rates.

I think it is only right to point out that we have had a couple of votes on keeping the interest rates at 3.4 percent for subsidized student loans for next year. That did not receive the 60 votes needed to move. As a consequence, on July 1, the interest rates on subsidized loans snapped back from 3.4 to 6.8 percent. We have been work-

ing hard to try to keep students from paying that 6.8 percent interest and on how we could reach some agreement, and that is what this bill does that is before us.

The two core principles we fought for were that the front-end caps—they have front-end caps to ensure that undergraduate students taking out Stafford loans will not pay above 8.25 percent interest even if there are extreme fluctuations in the market. I point out that 8.25 percent is exactly the caps we had on student loans in the 1990s. This is not something new or out of line with what we have done before. We had 8.25 percent in the nineties, and I might add five times in the nineties we bumped up against that cap, so that cap protected students five times in the nineties from going above 8.25 percent.

Graduate students taking out these Stafford loans will have a cap of 9.5 percent in interest. Parents and graduate students taking out PLUS loans, these are the parent loans, will never pay above 10.5 percent. That is the first principle, to have these upfront caps.

Second, the principle we had is to get as close to budget neutral as possible. The composition of this bill places us about as close to budget neutrality as possible, meaning that billions of dollars will not be generated off the backs of students to reduce our budget deficit, something that was included in the version of this legislation that passed the House and which was a key feature on an earlier Republican bill that received a vote in the Senate—not a passing vote, it received a vote.

Again, these are the compromises made on the Republican side. They had several billions of dollars to raise on the student loans in the future. We did not. So we compromised down. Basically, it is \$715 million over 10 years. Since there is going to be over \$1 trillion over 10 years, \$715 billion is not much compared to the \$1 trillion in student loans that will be taken out over the next 10 years. That comes down to about \$71 million a year. That is just about as close as we can get it to budget neutrality.

What does this mean for students? It means this fall all undergraduate students, subsidized or unsubsidized, will only have to pay 3.86 percent interest. That is down from 6.8, down to 3.86 percent. That means they will have that interest rate for the life of the loan. That is locked in. It will not vary.

Graduate students will see a 1.4-percent rate decrease from what it would be and parents will see a 1.5-percent rate decrease, so in all cases a decrease. That means real savings for borrowers. That means an average of \$1,500 savings for undergraduates, \$2,913 for graduate students, and \$2,066 for parents, again over the life of the loan.

This bill also includes a provision that requires the GAO to submit a re-

port to Congress within 4 months, detailing what the actual cost to the Federal Government of administering the Federal student loan program is and what the appropriate interest rate should be to avoid generating any unnecessary revenue. Again, I am sure people referred to it. There was an editorial in the New York Times this morning talking about the fact that the government should not be generating revenue off the backs of students. We all agree with that. That is why we tried to get this as close to budget neutrality as possible. As some will point out, under the system the way it is set up over the next 10 years, the CBO estimates the Federal Government will make more than \$180 billion on Federal student loans.

I might just say, deriving savings was not the intended purpose of the Federal student loan program when it began in the 1960s, and it should not be a purpose of it now. The purpose should be to keep interest rates as low as possible for students and their families. So in 4 months, when the GAO submits its report to Congress, I plan to use that information to inform us on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act—I will have more to say about that in a second—to get a loan system that does not generate money for the government. This debate on student loan interest rates will continue, and I hope my colleagues will join us in that discussion as we move to the Higher Education Act reauthorization next year. As I said, I will have more to say about that in a second.

I have cosponsored this bill that is before us. I will vote for its passage. I will oppose other amendments because we have an agreement to move ahead. I believe this was the best deal we could get for students at this time.

The bill before us is supported by a number of groups, including the United States Student Association, the American Council on Education, Rock the Vote, Center for American Progress and Generation Progress, Generational Alliance, the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, and the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. Also, this morning we received a letter from the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights that supports this with a “yes” vote on the bill before us.

I wish to make it clear that I plan to revisit the issue of student loan interest rates, along with other facets of the higher education system, in order to address the whole issue of college affordability. This fall the Senate HELP Committee, which I chair, will start consideration on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act that expires this year.

The interest rates—what we are talking about here today—we attach to Federal student loans is an important issue. I don't deny that. It is one that

deserves our attention, but I want to point out that it is just one piece among many that go into college affordability. We will be tackling the many pieces that go into the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act so we can address the whole issue of college affordability.

When I am in Iowa, I hear from students and parents about the financial squeeze they are facing from the spiraling costs of college and their anxiety about student loan debt.

I have charts here. The first chart shows the increase in the cost of a public 4-year education over time. It has tripled since the 1980s. If we look at that chart, we can see that from 1980 to today the cost of a college education has tripled. That is the red line. The blue line is the Consumer Price Index. As we can see, our current system is out of step with the marketplace.

The cost of that degree has skyrocketed for students across the country. The costs have risen far higher and faster than the rate of inflation. Why is this happening? Why has it gone up so rapidly? If we look at 1990 to 1991, it just shot up. From about 2000 to now, it has really skyrocketed. I think it is legitimate for us to ask this question: Why is that happening? It is not just student loan interest rates causing that. We have had low student loan interest rates, so that cannot be the sole cause. Something else is going on. Again, that is why we need to examine that in the Higher Education Act—so we can find out why that has happened.

The second chart I have shows what is happening to our students. The average loan debt for a bachelor's degree has doubled since the 1990s. In the 1990s the cumulative debt a student would have after going to college would be \$9,350. Today it is \$26,660. That is over a 20-year period. Why has that gone up so much? That is why we have to get into the whole panoply of issues that affect college affordability.

In light of this crisis, I have chaired a series of hearings in our committee focused on what is being done to curb the cost and how we can have strategies to help keep the dream of higher education alive for students without giving them a ton of debt when they graduate. To date, we have examined promising strategies employed by innovative colleges and universities to curb costs while improving student outcomes. We have looked at State policies for improving affordability and State barriers to innovation, efficiency, and effectiveness. There is much room for progress and improvement when it comes to our system of higher education. I believe a consensus is emerging on the need to break away from business as usual. We cannot keep going on the way we have been doing over the last 20 years in funding for higher education.

Among the many ideas we have heard in these hearings, three major themes

have emerged. First, States are cutting funding to public universities, shifting the costs to students, their families, and Federal financial aid programs. In all of our hearings—and we have looked at all that goes into these charts, such as the increase in costs to students and the cost of college—the single largest correlative factor has been the decrease in State support for higher education.

What has become clear—at least to this Senator—is that State legislators have figured it out. They can cut their budgets and cut their support for public universities, shift the burden back on students and their families, the students come to the Federal Government and borrow more money, we increase Pell grants, and the burden on the student grows because their debt grows. Yet the colleges themselves are not stepping in to do anything. There are some colleges doing innovative things, but they are not doing enough to control the costs. Something has to be done about the States backing off of their support.

The second theme that emerged was that many of our more than 7,000 degree-granting institutions are not making college affordability a priority. It is just not a priority. They are focused on chasing rankings, investing in efforts unrelated to academic success, and they are failing to respond to a rapidly changing higher education landscape.

The third theme that emerged was that students and families are not empowered with accurate, clear, and accessible information about the comparative costs, quality, and value when shopping for a college education. While college affordability is a complex issue with no easy answers, there is much that all stakeholders—the Federal Government, State governments, institutions, families, and students—can do to increase college access and success and keep the costs down regardless of a student or family background.

Again, we are going to have to look at this in the higher education bill. Interest rates are just one piece of it, and that is what we are addressing today, but there is a lot more going on than just interest rates. We have to look at our system of accreditation. We have to look at our campus-based aid programs, the financing of Pell grants, and the regulation of the for-profit colleges that my friend from Illinois is always consistently pointing out here. We need to look at the structure that supports our Federal loan system, from the loan origination process to the servicing done by private and nonprofit contractors after students have completed their course of study, and debt collection should they default. The system we have is complex. I will repeat that the interest rate on student loans is only one piece of this jigsaw puzzle. It is an important piece to be sure and one we are addressing today.

Throughout the discussions about the interest rates, both President Obama and my ranking member and good friend Senator ALEXANDER have personally committed to working with us as we take up the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in the coming year so we can address all the issues affecting our entire higher education system and hopefully enact much needed reforms.

We all understand how serious and important the issue of affordability is for a higher education. I look forward to working with Senator ALEXANDER, members of our committee on both sides, and the White House in the months ahead to come up with a Higher Education Act reauthorization bill that is comprehensive and really gets to the bottom of college affordability so we can start to break away from the way we have been doing things in the past. As I said, we cannot continue on the way we have been doing this.

There are many who have been involved in negotiating the legislation before us today. Compromises are tough sometimes. I have said before—and I know my friend from Illinois said this at our press conference last week—if I were to write this bill and if I could have it my way, this would not be what I would write. I understand that. It wouldn't be what my friends on the other side would write either. And that is the art of compromise—to bring both sides together and get the best agreement we can. This is a good agreement. It is good for undergraduate students, it is good for graduate students, and it is good for their families.

I thank President Obama for his leadership in negotiating this bill. I would also like to thank my friends and colleagues. I thank Senator DURBIN, who was a great leader in bringing this about. I thank Senator MANCHIN, Senator KING, Senator CARPER, as well as Senator ALEXANDER, Senator COBURN, Senator BURR, and their staffs for all the hard work and diligence in putting this proposal together.

As I said, this might not have been the bill I would have written, and I think everybody who has been involved in this would say the same. But it is the best we could do. Quite frankly, it is going to lower interest rates this year. For undergraduate students, for the next 4 years it will be lower than 6.8 percent. In the fifth year it goes up just a little bit. As I said, as we look at the Higher Education Act and as we get this back from GAO in 4 months, we are all going to work together to see what exactly is the best path forward.

We can keep the interest rates low for students this year and into the future, and I support this bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage.

I am glad to yield for my friend Senator DURBIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, through the Chair I would like to direct a question to the Senator from Iowa. I respect the leadership he has shown on this issue and so many issues, whether it is health, education, or disabilities. He has been the voice of leadership in the Senate for a long time. I know this is his last term as a Senator, but I also know he still has one big job ahead of him, and he has talked about it—the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. We are going to hold the Senator to that because we need his voice and leadership in that room or it won't happen.

I saw his leadership on this particular issue. Senator HARKIN came to this negotiation with conservative Democrats and Republicans and sat down and said: There are some basics we are going to have to include in this before I will sign off.

I remember this—No. 1, keep the interest rates as low as possible for students so that students and their families don't have an increased burden.

As he said, in the next 2 years—whatever category of a student loan we are talking about—this bill is a break. For undergraduate students, it saves \$2,000 in interest over the next 4 years that they otherwise would pay if this bill fails to pass.

The second thing he said: We want a cap on interest rates so that if something unforeseen happens, if all the economic predictors are wrong and the base interest rate on 10-year Treasuries goes up faster than we thought, there will be a cap to protect the students. He insisted on it, and we put it in there. For undergraduate students, it is 8.25 percent. That is a guarantee that it will not go to the high heavens. And 8.25 percent has been a traditional ceiling cap.

The third thing—and I want to make a point of this because it is likely to come up in debate. This is an interesting compromise. We would dream up scenarios. Well, what if we put the cap at this number? What would happen to the interest rates? When it is all over, if we calculate it over 10 years, do we break even? We don't want to make a penny off of students and their families on student loans. We don't. We tried to avoid it.

I think the best effort of the Senator from Iowa netted some \$600 million to the Treasury over 10 years. This bill is in the range of \$715 million.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, will my friend from Illinois yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I am asking a question of Senator HARKIN and then I will be happy to yield.

What I would like to put in perspective is \$715 million to the Treasury over 10 years. Over a 10-year period of time, CBO estimates the government will make \$1.4 trillion worth of student

loans. This \$715 million, when compared against that, comes out to .005 percent. So we cut it as close as we could.

What does it mean to the students? It means to the students, according to the way they factored it out, that for each loan a student takes out—\$2,000, \$3,500, whatever it happens to be—there will be on average a surcharge of \$2.76. That is what comes to \$715 million. So the net result of it is—we would like to bring it to zero; that was our goal. The way this place works, that was hard to achieve. I thank the Senator from Iowa for dedicating himself to those things.

I wish to address him in the form of a question, to be complicit with the rules of the Senate: If we fail to pass the bipartisan approach we are bringing to the floor, what will be the immediate impact on students and families in the United States?

Mr. HARKIN. Again, I thank my friend from Illinois for his great leadership. Before I get right to the answer, I would point out the art of compromise, which we did. The Republican proposal we had before us a few weeks ago raised \$15.6 billion over 10 years. So they have compromised a long way too. We have gotten it down to \$715 million, over 10 years, from \$15.6 billion. The Senator is absolutely right. We are looking at close to \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years, and that kind of puts that \$715 million in perspective.

If we don't pass this today, there is one sure effect: Student loans will be almost twice what they would be under this bill—this year, almost twice—for them and their families.

Mr. DURBIN. Interest rates.

Mr. HARKIN. And that would be true for this year and next year and the year after, almost—not quite—this is 3.86, it would be 6.8. So they would be paying 6.8 percent on every loan they take out this year rather than 3.86 percent, which I might point out also covers both subsidized and unsubsidized loans. That is a good deal.

Again, I say to the Senator that by keeping the rates like that—and this is another good point to make and I think people should understand. A student borrowing this year at 3.86 percent locks that in for the lifetime of the loan—locks that in. It doesn't go to 8.25 percent. That 8.25 is a cap in case interest rates start going up.

I would point out to my friend from Illinois that 8.25 is what we had in the 1990s, and five times in the 1990s we hit that cap, so we protected students five times in the 1990s at that 8.25 percent.

I say to my friend we have to pass this bill to keep students from paying 6.8 percent on their loans this year.

AMENDMENT NO. 1773

On behalf of Senator MANCHIN, I call up his amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], for Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BURR, Mr. KING, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. DURBIN, proposes an amendment numbered 1773.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish student loan interest rates, and for other purposes)

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. INTEREST RATES.

(a) INTEREST RATES.—Section 455(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “AND BEFORE JULY 1, 2013” after “ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2006”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “and before July 1, 2013,” after “on or after July 1, 2006,”;

(C) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “and before July 1, 2013,” after “on or after July 1, 2006,”; and

(D) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “and before July 1, 2013,” after “on or after July 1, 2006,”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) INTEREST RATE PROVISIONS FOR NEW LOANS ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2013.—

“(A) RATES FOR UNDERGRADUATE FDSL AND FDUSL.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct Stafford Loans and Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans issued to undergraduate students, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

“(i) a rate equal to the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 2.05 percent; or

“(ii) 8.25 percent.

“(B) RATES FOR GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL FDUSL.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans issued to graduate or professional students, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

“(i) a rate equal to the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 3.6 percent; or

“(ii) 9.5 percent.

“(C) PLUS LOANS.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct PLUS Loans, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

“(i) a rate equal to the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 4.6 percent; or

“(ii) 10.5 percent.

“(D) **CONSOLIDATION LOANS.**—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, any Federal Direct Consolidation Loan for which the application is received on or after July 1, 2013, shall bear interest at an annual rate on the unpaid principal balance of the loan that is equal to the weighted average of the interest rates on the loans consolidated, rounded to the nearest higher one-eighth of one percent.

“(E) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall determine the applicable rate of interest under this paragraph after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and shall publish such rate in the Federal Register as soon as practicable after the date of determination.

“(F) **RATE.**—The applicable rate of interest determined under this paragraph for a Federal Direct Stafford Loan, a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan, or a Federal Direct PLUS Loan shall be fixed for the period of the loan.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on July 1, 2013.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) **PAYGO SCORECARD.**—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) **SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.**—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

SEC. 4. STUDY ON THE ACTUAL COST OF ADMINISTERING THE FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) complete a study that determines the actual cost to the Federal Government of carrying out the Federal student loan programs authorized under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), which shall—

(A) provide estimates relying on accurate information based on past, current, and projected data as to the appropriate index and mark-up rate for the Federal Government's cost of borrowing that would allow the Federal Government to effectively administer and cover the cost of the Federal student programs authorized under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) under the scoring rules outlined in the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.);

(B) provide the information described in this section in a way that separates out administrative costs, interest rate, and other loan terms and conditions; and

(C) set forth clear recommendations to the relevant authorizing committees of Congress as to how future legislation can incorporate the results of the study described in this section to allow for the administration of the Federal student loan programs authorized under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) without generating any additional revenue to the Federal Government except revenue that is needed to carry out such programs; and

(2) prepare and submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee

on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives setting forth the conclusions of the study described in this section in such a manner that the recommendations included in the report can inform future reauthorizations of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1774

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 1774.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide a sunset date)

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 5. SUNSET.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendments made by this Act shall be effective for a 2-year period beginning on July 1, 2013.

(b) **REPEAL.**—The amendments made by this Act shall be repealed on July 1, 2015, and section 455(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)) shall be applied as if this Act the amendments made by this Act had never been enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I have a lot of affection for my friend from Iowa Senator HARKIN and Senator DURBIN from Illinois, but I must respectfully disagree with them and rise in opposition to the bill.

I ask for support for an amendment I am offering which is being cosponsored by a number of Senators. I wish to thank Senator LEAHY, Senator WYDEN, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator GILLIBRAND, Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator SCHATZ, Senator MURPHY, and Senator HIRONO for their support for this amendment. I also wish to thank the largest educational organization in America, the National Educational Association, for their support of this amendment, and I thank the American Federation of Teachers for their support of this amendment.

The truth is that if the bill on the floor is passed without amendment, it would be a disaster for the young people of our country who are looking forward to going to college and for the parents who are helping them pay their bills. The job of the Congress, it seems to me, is to improve upon the dismal situation we face today in terms of student indebtedness and college afford-

ability. These are major crises in this country. Millions of kids leaving school are deeply in debt and parents are borrowing at high interest rates to send their kids to college. We have a crisis. This bill makes a bad situation worse, not better.

I ask my colleagues to support the amendment I have offered which would provide a 2-year sunset to this bill—an approach which would prevent student interest rates from soaring and allow us the time, through the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, to deal with the issue of student indebtedness in a constructive long-term manner. This issue is too important not to go through a hearing process, not to go through a committee process. I hope we will pass my amendment, supported by eight other Senators, which will sunset this bill in 2 years and allow us to take advantage of the relatively low interest rates now and prevent student interest rates from soaring into the future.

The very sad truth of the matter is that in a number of ways, our government—Congress, the White House—is failing young Americans today, at all ages. We have the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country on Earth. Almost 22 percent of our kids live in poverty.

I think every working American understands that our childcare system is a disaster. If a person is a working-class mom or dad in Vermont, or I suspect any other place in this country, it is hard to get the quality childcare they need, so that many kids today, because of inadequate childcare from zero to 3 and 4, enter kindergarten or first grade already years behind where they should be intellectually and emotionally. We are failing our young children.

We are failing our teenage young people as well. Today, the unemployment rate for high school graduates is close to 20 percent. That is the official rate. For real unemployment, counting those who have given up looking for work and those who are working part time when they want to work full time, it is even higher than that. What does that mean for millions of kids who graduate high school, can't get a job their first year out of school, their second year out of school, and their third year out of school? What does this mean for their entire lives? We are not dealing with that issue.

I had passed an amendment as part of the immigration bill to provide 400,000 jobs over a 2-year period for young people. That is a start. We have to go a lot further than that. By and large, we are failing working-class, middle-class young people today who are desperately searching for jobs.

For minority youth—for African-American youth—if my colleagues can believe this, the official unemployment

rate for ages 16 to 19 is over 43 percent—over 43 percent, African-American young people, unable to find jobs. That is unacceptable.

Our goal must be to make sure the youth of this country, if they graduate high school and they want to go out into the workforce, are able to get decent jobs or if they choose to go to college, to be able to afford to go to college, and to make sure our young people do not end up on street corners doing drugs—not in jail, not in self-destructive activity. That is our job, to make sure those who have the ability and capability are able to go to college and others are able to get meaningful work. Frankly, we are failing in both of those areas. When we do that, we fail not only the young people of this country but the future of this country because the future by definition is with our young people.

All of us know we live in a highly competitive global economy. If this country is going to succeed economically, we need the best educated workforce in the world. Unfortunately, compared to much of the industrialized world, we are doing very little to make that happen.

In June, the OECD—the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—released its annual snapshot on the state of education in developed nations. The report showed the United States is losing ground to other nations that have made sustained commitments to funding higher education opportunities. We are losing ground, and the legislation on the floor today, which will result over a period of years in a strong likelihood that interest rates for student loans will go up, making it harder for moderate and low-income kids to go to college, will only accelerate those losses.

The United States once led the world in college graduates. Thirty, forty years ago, we led the world in the percentage of our people who were college graduates. In fact, as a result, today those people between age 55 and 64 in the United States still lead their peers in other nations in the percentage with college degrees—about 41 percent. So if a person is between 55 and 64, compared to the rest of the world, that age group has the highest percentage of people who are college graduates.

Tragically, over the years, we have lost substantial ground. In 2008—and this is a very sad story indeed, something that should concern every Member of Congress and every American—the same percentage of Americans aged 25 to 34—the same percentage of that younger group—has a degree compared to the older group of 55 to 64. What does that mean? What it means is that for the last 30 years, every President, every Governor, every Member of Congress, virtually every parent in America has said to our young people: The world is changing. Technology is ex-

ploding. A high school degree no longer will do it if you are going to make it into the middle class.

That is what everybody has said for the last 30 years. But 30 years later, nothing has changed. The percentage of Americans who have a college degree today is no higher than it was 30 years ago. The result is that other countries have significantly surpassed us in terms of the percentage of their younger people who now have college degrees.

In terms of the percentage of college graduates, we lag behind Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Ireland, Israel, Japan, South Korea, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. In other words, where we were once first in the world in terms of percentage of college graduates, we are now 15th in the world.

How do we compete in a global economy if we have descended from first to fifteenth in the world in terms of people with college degrees? That is why on the immigration bill we have people coming to the floor and saying: Americans are not educated. They cannot do these high-tech jobs. We need people from all over the world to come in to do that work.

Well, I do not agree with that, but that is the argument out there: Our people do not have the education. Does anyone believe in any serious way the bill on the floor today is beginning—beginning—to address the issue of making it easier for kids in this country to go to college? The answer is nobody does because, according to CBO projections, interest rates are going to go up, and, in fact, it is going to be harder for families to send their kids to college. I will get into that in a moment.

The other very important point to be made—and I think a lot of people do not understand this—according to the Congressional Budget Office, the U.S. Government is making huge profits—huge profits—from college loans. In fact, according to the CBO, the estimate is that the U.S. Government will make about \$184 billion in profits over the next 10 years.

So what do we have? We have a middle class which is disappearing. We have poverty at a level as high as it has been in the last 60 years. We have millions and millions of families struggling to be able to send their kids to college. My parents did not go to college. My brother and I were the first in our family to go to college. Millions of families are in the same boat.

What is the U.S. Government doing now? We are helping to balance the budget not by asking multinational corporations—that make billions of dollars a year in profit and pay nothing in Federal income taxes—to pay their fair share of taxes; no, that is not what we are doing. We are saying to working-class and middle-class families: Oh,

you want to send your kids to college? You want to borrow money from the government? Well, over the next 10 years we are going to make \$184 billion in profits off of you.

Let me go on record as saying I think that is a very counterproductive idea. It is a dumb idea. We have to get out of the business of making profits off of struggling families who want nothing more than to be able to send their kids to college.

Let's be very clear about what the legislation on the Senate floor would do. According to CBO—and I fully agree; I do not know what interest rates are going to be tomorrow, next year. You do not. Nobody does. And the CBO is by no means infallible. But the CBO and most economists believe we are leaving this period where interest rates have been historically low. Are they absolutely right? I do not know. Could they be wrong? Quite possibly. But that is what the CBO is estimating. This is what the CBO says.

The CBO says the 10-year Treasury note on which this entire legislation is based is now at 1.8 percent. In 2014 it will be at 2.57 percent; in 2015 it will be at 3.35 percent; in 2016 it will be at 4.24 percent; in 2017 it will be at 4.95 percent; in 2018 it will be at 5.2 percent.

Everybody has to understand that what this legislation is about is basing student loans on a variable interest rate. Interest rates go up; student loans go up.

So let's look at what will happen with student loans under this legislation. The good news is that because interest rates are low now, for the next few years the interest rate for the subsidized Stafford loans will be, in 2013, 3.8 percent; in 2014, 4.6 percent; in 2015, 5.4 percent; in 2016, 6.2 percent; in 2017, 7 percent; in 2018, 7.2 percent. That is for undergraduates.

For the graduate Stafford loans, under this proposal on the floor today, in 2015, 6.9 percent; in 2016, 7.8 percent; in 2017, 8.5 percent; in 2018, 8.8 percent.

For the PLUS loans—those are for parents who are helping their kids—in 2015, 7.9 percent; in 2016, 8.8 percent; in 2017, 9.5 percent; in 2018, 9.8 percent.

Now, does anybody really believe that at a time when families and young people are having an enormously difficult time paying for college that these interest rates make any sense whatsoever? They do not. They are going to put an increased burden on working families and young people.

Today, the average student graduating from a 4-year college leaves school \$27,000 in debt. If you are paying interest rates of 7 percent or 8.5 percent for graduate school, there is no doubt in my mind that indebtedness will rise.

Furthermore, not only is it a question of families and young people struggling with enormous debt—on my Web site I asked Vermonters and people all over the country to tell me what

the impact would be on their lives of student indebtedness. We heard just enormously painful stories from people who said: You know what. My husband and I wanted to have a baby. We cannot have a baby right now because we do not have the funds. We are paying off our student debt.

We heard from people who are going into professions they really did not want to go into because they just have to make a whole lot of money to pay off their debt rather than doing what was the love of their life, what they studied to do. So what we have is a bad situation which, if the CBO is correct, will only make that situation worse.

My amendment is not my preferred option. My preferred option would be to do what a majority of the Members in the Senate voted to do, which is to freeze interest rates for another year at 3.4 percent while we come up with a long-term solution. My Republican colleagues, as they do on virtually every piece of major legislation, chose to filibuster that bill, and we needed 60 votes. I think we only got 51. A majority spoke for the American people, for the young people, for working families, but we could not get the 60 votes. That was my preferred option.

But this approach, at least, and what my amendment would do is to say, OK, between 2013 and 2014 we will keep interest rates fairly low—not as low as I would want it—4.6 percent for undergraduate Stafford loans, 6.1 percent for graduate Stafford loans, and 7.1 percent for the PLUS program. It is not ideal by any means, but it is a lot better than what will likely take place in years to come. So we take the best of this bill and sunset it at the end of 2 years.

So if people say there is no option to going forward as opposed to 6.8 percent, I say: Sorry, you are wrong. There is an option. That is what we have done. We have a 2-year sunset on this bill that would be at least a reasonable compromise to give us the opportunity to take a hard look at the higher education bill and figure out two issues: how we create low-interest loans over a long period of time and, second of all, how we, in fact, make college more affordable than it currently is.

Let me be a little bit political, as I finish my remarks, and say this: I respect everybody's point of view, and there are different points of view here. But I think what a lot of Americans are asking themselves—they say: Well, let's see. We just had elections in November, and we were told elections matter. We had a candidate for President of the United States, Barack Obama, who won a very decisive victory, who ran on the platform of saying: Hey, I am going to stand up for the middle class. I am going to stand up for working families.

We had an election in which Democrats, Independents, retained control of

the Senate. Now there are 54 votes in the Democratic caucus, and almost without exception Democratic candidates—I ran—Independents stand for working families, stand for the middle class.

So what I do not understand is, when we have a Democratic President, a Democratically-controlled Senate, why we are producing a bill which is basically a Republican bill—very close to what the House Republicans passed.

As most people know, the House Republicans are perhaps the most conservative majority in the House that we have seen maybe ever—the most conservative body. They say: This is a pretty good bill. We will accept it.

Well, if the most rightwing Congress in American history thinks this is a pretty good bill, I would hope that many Democrats would say maybe there is something wrong with this bill; maybe we can do something better than that.

The other point I would make, as I did a moment ago—and people have to understand this—a majority of the Members of the Senate voted to keep interest rates at 3.4 percent for another year. Fifty-one Members voted for that. Most people assume that 51 out of 100 is a majority. But we were unable to pass that legislation because of a Republican filibuster.

What we have seen on virtually every single important piece of legislation is that the majority does not rule in the Senate. We need to have a supermajority of 60 votes. The result is legislation like this, which could well end up raising interest rates for students and their families to an absolutely unacceptable level.

So let me conclude by saying we have a huge crisis in this country. The crisis is that today hundreds of thousands of bright young people who have graduated from high school are now saying—now saying—I would love to go to college. I can do it. I would like to be a professional. I would like to be a doctor. I would like to be a nurse. I would like to do one of many professions. I would love to do it. I am smart enough to do it. I have the drive to do it. I just come from a family that does not have the money to send me to college.

So for those hundreds of thousands of young people whose dream it was to go to college, this legislation only makes that situation worse because it will make college even more unaffordable. Let's be clear: This is a loss not only to those families and to those young people; it is a loss to our country.

A couple months ago I had the Ambassador from Denmark come to the State of Vermont to do some town meetings with me.

The Presiding Officer may or may not know the cost of college education in Denmark in terms of out-of-pocket costs. It is zero. It is zero. It is not just Denmark, there are a number of coun-

tries around the world that have the intelligence to understand that the most important thing they can do is invest in their young people. So they say to their young people: You do well in school, regardless of your income, and you are going to be able to go to the best colleges we have. Not only the best colleges but graduate school, medical school, law school, and your cost will be zero.

You know what. I think that is pretty smart. I think investing in our young people is investing in the future of our country. That is what some countries do. They make college education free in terms of out-of-pocket cost. Other countries do not go that far.

I live an hour away from the Canadian border. They heavily subsidize college. So we are seeing many American kids now going off to fine colleges and universities in Canada, where even for people from the United States college costs are less than they are in the United States.

In terms of what we are demanding of young people and parents in out-of-pocket expenses, there is no country in the industrialized world that asks more than we do. The result is that we have seen virtually no gain in the last 30 years in terms of the percentage of our people graduating from college.

We have a crisis. It is a crisis which impacts millions of young people: those who have given up on the dream of college and those who are graduating from college deeply in debt.

It impacts our entire Nation. It is insane to me that we are conceding to other countries around the world and saying: OK, you are graduating large numbers of people. You are allowing them to go to college. But we in this great country, we cannot do that. It makes no sense to me at all. It is bad for the future of this country, bad for our economy, bad for millions of families.

The legislation on the floor today only makes a bad situation worse. It is based on variable interest rates. It is, according to the CBO, likely that those interest rates will rise. In 2018, we are talking about subsidized Stafford loans at 7.25; graduate rates, 8.8; PLUS loans, 9.8. Can anybody really come to the floor and tell me this is where we want to go as a country? So we have a bad situation which we have to address, not make it worse.

Once again, I wish to thank all of the Senators who have cosponsored this legislation: Senators LEAHY, WYDEN, WHITEHOUSE, GILLIBRAND, BLUMENTHAL, SCHATZ, MURPHY, and HIRONO. I want to thank the NEA, the largest educational organization in the country, for their support, and the American Federation of Teachers for their support.

Let's stand tall today for the working families of this country who believe in the American dream, and that

dream is significantly about the desire of our young people to do better than we have done. That was the dream my parents had. It is the dream that millions of families have had. An important part of that dream is to work hard as a parent to enable my kid to get a college degree.

We are failing millions of families right now. This legislation will make a bad situation worse. We can do better. We can do better. Let's stand with the working families of our country today. Let's reject the underlying amendment, and let's pass the Sanders amendment.

With that, I ask unanimous consent the time during quorum calls be charged equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, we all know that on July 1 interest rates for subsidized Stafford loans doubled from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. I have twice voted to extend the 3.4-percent rates to protect our Nation's students. Unfortunately, both times we had those votes the extensions were defeated. Without congressional action, the 6.8-percent interest rates will stand as current law.

I think today we are going to vote for a bipartisan compromise to keep student loan interest rates low this year. I plan to vote for that compromise, but I have some concerns about it. I do want to thank my colleagues who have spent many hours coming to an agreement that can pass this body. This is a bipartisan compromise, and I think it is very important we work together to address this issue. While the compromise isn't perfect, our undergrads and our graduate students will be able to go to college this fall with peace of mind knowing the interest rates are well below those they would otherwise face.

In fact, this compromise will save \$30 billion in interest debt for students over the next 4 years. Undergraduates borrowing this year will save about \$2,000 over the course of their studies, and graduates could save between \$4,000 and \$9,000.

Today, assuming it is offered, I also plan to vote for the Reed-Warren amendment to lower the cap on interest rates. I would have supported Senator MURRAY's effort to allocate any resulting savings to shore up Pell grants, which would help fund those students who need it the most, but I

understand we are not going to be able to vote on that amendment.

While today's vote is important to keep student rates low for this year's students, I wish to be very clear I do not consider this compromise to be a permanent fix for our students. Included in the bill is a requirement for a study to be conducted by the non-partisan and independent Government Accountability Office which will analyze the cost of running the student loan program. Once we have the results of the study, we should use the information to determine what course of action is best for our students.

One thing is very clear: Any solution should not come at the expense of our students. Affordable higher education is one of the best investments we can make in our country. It is essential to growing this Nation's economy, to creating jobs, and to protecting the middle class. Our businesses need educated workers to compete in the new global knowledge-based economy.

In an immigration bill the Senate recently passed, which I voted for, we increased the number of highly skilled workers businesses could bring in because there is currently a shortage in this country of those highly skilled workers. I supported that, but that is a crutch, a short-term fix. We should be educating American students for these high-skilled jobs.

In my home State of New Hampshire, the student loan debate is a very important one. Last year a survey found our State had the highest average student debt in the Nation, at \$31,408 per student. Nearly three-quarters of New Hampshire students have some amount of student loan debt—the second highest percentage of students with debt in the country. We must protect our students. We should not be trying to solve the fiscal challenges facing this country on the backs of our students. We can't afford to price middle-class families out of a college education.

Studies show adults with degrees from 2- and 4-year colleges have far higher family incomes than adults who have high school degrees. In fact, according to a recent study from Georgetown University, people with bachelor's degrees earn about \$1 million more over their lifetimes than those who don't have a college degree. We need to get rid of any barrier that stops students who want to pursue degrees.

Recently, I met a woman named Anne, from Manchester, who had been a recipient of student loans. She was able to go to school and get a degree because of Pell grants. Anne will quickly tell you that without aid she would never have even thought about pursuing a college degree. She is now working in a professional capacity and she is contributing to her community in so many ways. Unfortunately, Anne is now worried about her daughter, a

single mother who works part-time and who has limited options to pursue her own dream job because of the high cost of education. Anne told me:

These kids are our future. We cannot limit them in this way; student loans should not be an obstacle that is insurmountable.

She is right. We need to make it easier and more affordable for Americans to go to college, not harder and more expensive.

I also heard from a woman named Patricia. She is 45, a single mother with three children under 18 years of age. She is currently a student at Granite State College who is relying on loans to get her degree. For the past 10 years, she and her family have been in and out of homeless shelters. She grew up as the youngest of nine children in a family where the option of college was never even considered or discussed. Patricia has an incredibly tight family budget. Student loans are critical to her getting a degree and ultimately being able to provide for her family. Sadly, any increase in student loan interest rates could limit Patricia's ability to continue her education.

The bottom line is clear. We all know it. We have to make college more affordable. It is essential for our students, it is essential for their futures, and it is essential for the future of this country. If we expect to compete in this global economy, we have to make sure we have the high-skilled workforce we need, and that means making sure those young people who want to go to college can afford to get that degree. It is just too important for our country's future to fail at this.

I thank the Chair, and I would just note that I will be voting for the bill, but as I said, I certainly hope we are all committed to making greater progress and making college education more affordable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 1778 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1773

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent at this time that my amendment, which is at the desk, be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], for himself and Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MURPHY, proposes an amendment numbered 1778 to amendment No. 1773.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for interest rate caps for certain Federal student loans)

Beginning on page 3, strike line 9 and all that follows through line 13 on page 5 and insert the following:

“(i) 6.8 percent.

“(B) RATES FOR GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL FDUSL.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans issued to graduate or professional students, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

“(i) a rate equal to the yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 3.6 percent; or

“(ii) 6.8 percent.

“(C) PLUS LOANS.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct PLUS Loans, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

“(i) a rate equal to the yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 4.6 percent; or

“(ii) 7.9 percent.

“(D) CONSOLIDATION LOANS.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, any Federal Direct Consolidation Loan for which the application is received on or after July 1, 2013, shall bear interest at an annual rate on the unpaid principal balance of the loan that is equal to the weighted average of the interest rates on the loans consolidated, rounded to the nearest higher one-eighth of one percent.

“(E) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall determine the applicable rate of interest under this paragraph after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and shall publish such rate in the Federal Register as soon as practicable after the date of determination.

“(F) RATE.—The applicable rate of interest determined under this paragraph for a Federal Direct Stafford Loan, a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan, or a Federal Direct PLUS Loan shall be fixed for the period of the loan.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on July 1, 2013.

SEC. 2A. SURTAX ON MILLIONAIRES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

“PART VIII—SURTAX ON MILLIONAIRES

“Sec. 59B. Surtax on millionaires.

“SEC. 59B. SURTAX ON MILLIONAIRES.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation for any taxable year beginning after 2013, there is hereby imposed (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to 0.55 percent of so much of the modified adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for such taxable year as exceeds \$1,000,000 (\$500,000, in the case of a married individual filing a separate return).

“(b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2014, each dollar amount under subsection (a) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2012’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of \$10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next highest multiple of \$10,000.

“(c) MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘modified adjusted gross income’ means adjusted gross income reduced by any deduction (not taken into account in determining adjusted gross income) allowed for investment interest (as defined in section 163(d)). In the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be determined as provided in section 67(e).

“(d) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) NONRESIDENT ALIEN.—In the case of a nonresident alien individual, only amounts taken into account in connection with the tax imposed under section 871(b) shall be taken into account under this section.

“(2) CITIZENS AND RESIDENTS LIVING ABROAD.—The dollar amount in effect under subsection (a) shall be decreased by the excess of—

“(A) the amounts excluded from the taxpayer’s gross income under section 911, over

“(B) the amounts of any deductions or exclusions disallowed under section 911(d)(6) with respect to the amounts described in subparagraph (A).

“(3) CHARITABLE TRUSTS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a trust all the unexpired interests in which are devoted to one or more of the purposes described in section 170(c)(2)(B).

“(4) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter or for purposes of section 55.”.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I am pleased to offer this amendment, along with Senator WARREN and 18 of our colleagues. Our amendment would provide the kind of certainty students deserve and that they will not receive under the proposed bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act as it is currently drafted.

Simply put, our amendment will ensure that students and parents will not be any worse off than they would be under the current fixed rates of 6.8 percent or 7.9 percent. To illustrate this, let me present a chart.

Under the underlying legislation, Stafford loans for students are essentially subject to the same interest rates, and they are depicted here. These are the undergraduate loans in yellow and the graduate loans in white. We can see in the first year for the undergraduate loans it is just under 4 percent, and that is less than the 6.8-percent current statutory limit. For the graduate loans, they are up roughly about 5½ percent, which, again, is below that. But very quickly, by 2015, the graduate loans exceed this 6.8-percent threshold. That is the current law. Then it keeps going up and up and up.

Actually, this chart does not represent the entire impact because the last bar represents the estimates not just for 1 year but for 5 years. So we can see these increments—the white increments for the graduate loans—keep going up and up and up indefinitely. This is permanent legislation. This is not a 5-year fix or a 10-year fix. It is permanent legislation. A similar process is that the undergraduate Stafford loans go up and up and up and up.

Our legislation will simply say if you want to provide an incentive and a benefit for students who are today going to school, that is commendable, but at some point we are going to have a much worse deal for students than we have just with the current law. So we are proposing, very simply, to cap at 6.8 percent the Stafford loans and then at 7.9 percent for the parent PLUS loans.

This is a projection of the percentage interest rates for parent loans. Again, 2013, it is below the present 7.9-percent statutory limit, but quickly, by 2015, it is above, and then it is indefinite. From 2018 to 2023 and beyond, it goes up and up and up and up. Our amendment simply says if we want to give everybody a benefit in the next several years of lower rates, do it, but let us give real certainty that rates will not exceed the current statutory rates.

As I have indicated previously in my remarks, I wish to commend the authors at least for putting in caps on rates.

Some of the original proposals coming from the Senate Republicans and other places had no real caps in place. At least now we have caps.

I want to particularly thank Chairman HARKIN, because he committed himself to ensuring that all these loan programs have a cap. Our point, though, is the caps are so large that effectively students and parents in a very short period of time will be paying much more than they are today. These caps are too high. They could go as high as 8.25 percent for undergraduate Stafford loans, 9.5 percent for graduate Stafford loans, and 10.5 percent for PLUS loans. Those are significantly higher than our threshold. We can do better. We want to protect students from these high interest rates.

In Rhode Island, roughly 49,000 students will borrow for this coming academic year. They would benefit from this approach, but their brothers and sisters, who may be freshmen in high school, will be taking out loans when the interest rates will be exceeding the current rates.

Adopting the Reed-Warren amendment means students can benefit from these low rates initially, but then we will have the existing statutory cap in place for future generations. As it exists now, if you are a senior in high school and you are going to college next year, you are going to get the benefit of the rate, but your younger

brother or sister, who may be a freshman or junior in high school, and your parents are paying for it in the future, and will be paying indefinitely.

As my colleague Senator WARREN has pointed out, they are doing it in a situation in which the government is making billions of dollars a year on these loans. This is not a question of putting subsidies in. Contrary to the history and purpose of the student loan programs, we are actually reversing the subsidy. We are saying, No, the students pay.

Education is so important to the future of America, yet we are no longer going to invest in it as a Nation. We are going to let students pay. That is the way this whole approach has been structured. They picked as their benchmark the 10-year Treasury bill. Typically, we use the 91-day Treasury bill. Just in the baseline, there is a higher interest rate. Then they picked a premium to put on top to compensate the government for potential risk of loss. As some of my colleagues suggested, we are not quite sure what the premium should be, and we feel very strongly that premium is much too high for the actual risks and costs of the program. So this proposal has baked in higher interest rates for some students after the first 2 years, and for all students and parents in the long run.

I believe what we are doing in the Reed-Warren amendment makes a great deal of sense. Many people are struggling in many different ways, and particularly students are struggling with student debt. We should ensure that the new rate structure does not leave students worse off—and not just for the first 2 years, but let's be realistic and serious. Let's look down the road. This road is taking us to higher and higher interest rates for students. I think we can do better. I think we must do better.

I would point out that we have paid for this amendment by putting a very small surcharge of 0.55 percent on incomes over \$1 million, so this is fully paid for, and it will give students the real certainty that they will not see interest rates go beyond the present statutory limits.

I think what we should be doing as a Nation is not shifting the burden to students but investing through students in our future. We know if students are able to go on to college and to postgraduate education, they are going to make more money, they are going to contribute more to the economy, we are going to be more globally competitive, and we will be in a much better position.

Frankly, that was the wise judgment our parents and grandparents made when, in the 1950s, 1960s, and the 1970s, they decided to invest in the future of America by investing in higher education.

I daresay there are very few people in this Chamber who in one way or another did not directly benefit from that investment. But now we are saying today, No, it is on the students, they are going to pay market rate premiums, and, according to CBO numbers, we will be generating about \$184 billion—the difference between our borrowing costs and what the students and families are paying. That is not the way to grow a strong, prosperous America.

Because there have been elaborate studies, we also understand that we have a jobs gap already between highly educated individuals and the jobs. By 2020, there will be about a 5-million-jobs gap between those jobs requiring higher education and the projected graduates in the next several years going forward.

So we have to do much more, and I think we also have to look at the issue in a comprehensive way. We have to build in incentives for lower costs at colleges and universities. That is not being done in this legislation, and I think once we pass it, the likelihood of getting on to that issue is diminished.

We also have to try to come up with ways in which students can refinance loans. A trillion dollars of student debt has surpassed credit card and automobile debt as the second biggest household debt in the country, and that is going to grow. It will particularly grow under the underlying proposal. We have to figure out a creative way to do that. And, by the way, that is going to cost money. So if one of the principles and premises of this whole legislation is we will spend no additional money for higher education support, how are we going to fix that issue of students and families who are deeply in debt—not just those who are carrying the debt today but those who are going to accumulate the debt going forward?

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Reed-Warren amendment. This will be the certainty that is proclaimed in the title of the underlying legislation.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I want to start by saying to Senator REED how much I appreciate his leadership in putting forth this amendment that takes a bad bill and turns it into something that will be helpful for our students and for our families struggling with student loan debt.

I also want to say how much I appreciate the leadership of Senator HARKIN, Senator DURBIN, Senator MANCHIN, Senator KING, Leader REID, all of whom have worked very hard and made best efforts under very difficult circumstances. We had a better bill that passed the Senate, but it was filibustered by Republicans and, as a result, we are where we are now.

Today the Senate will vote on a plan that would fundamentally change the way government sets interest rates on student loans. My colleagues who support this proposal say it will lower interest rates on loans for this year, and that is all that matters. That is the same thing credit card companies said when they sold zero-interest credit cards, and it is the same thing subprime mortgage lenders said when they sold teaser-rate mortgages. In all these cases, the bill comes due. Nobody disputes the fact that within a few years, according to our best estimates, all students will end up paying far higher interest rates on their loans than they do right now.

I want lower interest rates for students. With more than \$1 trillion in existing student loans, our students are drowning in debt. We must find a way to address this crisis by lowering the interest rates, refinancing existing student loan debt, and bringing down the cost of college. But I cannot support a plan that asks tomorrow's students to pay more in order to finance lower rates today. And I cannot support a plan that raises interest rates on students in the long term while the government continues to make a profit off of them.

According to official government estimates, the Federal Government will make \$184 billion in profits off student loans over the next 10 years under current law. This is obscene. Students should not be used to generate profits for the government. We should be doing everything we can to invest in students and to offer them the best deal we can on student loans, not find more ways to make money off them.

I am a realist about this. I know that eliminating those \$184 billion in profits is going to be hard. The government and our Republican friends liked having that money to spend. I know that it will take time to wring the profits out of the system, and I know it will take compromise. But the plan before the Senate today is not a compromise, and it doesn't remove a single dime of profits from the student loan program. That is not an accident. It was designed that way, on purpose, with the high interest rates in the future, to preserve every penny of that \$184 billion in profits. I want a compromise that actually saves some money for our students.

In fact, the plan we will vote on makes even more money off the backs of our students—an additional \$715 million over the next 10 years. That is right; the total profits of the plan we will vote on are nearly \$185 billion.

Some have sought to minimize these profits. They say this money is only a fraction of what students will borrow in the next decade. But I have spent months talking to families in Massachusetts, and it doesn't look small to them—families who are already

squeezed by the economy and who are fighting to put kids through college, young graduates who are struggling to buy a home, buy a car, or to put away a little bit of savings in the future. That money should stay in their pockets, not go to the government. These students don't think that \$184 billion in profits is small change. These students don't think adding another \$715 million on top of these already huge profits can be ignored as rounding errors. These numbers are not abstractions, they are real dollars coming out of the pockets of hard-working Americans. Middle-class families work hard and pay their taxes, and now they have to pay an extra tax—an extra \$184 billion tax to put their kids through college.

Meanwhile, this plan asks for nothing from our biggest corporations which take advantage of loopholes in the Tax Code to avoid paying their fair share. It asks for nothing from millionaires and billionaires who get away with paying less taxes than their secretaries. It asks for nothing from the enormously profitable companies that get billions of dollars in subsidies from the government every year. It is our kids—our kids who are trying to get an education—who will pay more.

Senator JACK REED has introduced an amendment that would change this. His amendment would substantially improve the plan before us today. His idea is a simple one: It would cap interest rates on all Federal loans at their current levels. These caps would allow students to get a good deal right now while the interest rates are low. But the caps would also ensure that when interest rates go up in a few years, as we all expect them to, our students will still be protected.

The Reed amendment is the only way to ensure that no students will be worse off under the new plan than if Congress did nothing at all. It makes sure we don't pit our students against each other, making tomorrow's students pay more so today's students can get a break.

Senator REED's amendment creates these protections for students by taking a chunk of profit out of the student loan system and replacing it with 55/100th of 1 percent—about one-half of 1 percent—surtax on people whose annual income is more than \$1 million.

This amendment would turn this bill into a true compromise. It does not come close to taking all the profits out of the student loan system, as I would like to see, but it is a very good first step in that direction.

Like most of the things we do around here, this is a choice. Anyone who says we can't afford this amendment is in effect saying it is more important to keep making profits off the backs of our kids than to ask millionaires to pay a tiny bit more. These dollars have to come from somewhere—college kids or millionaires.

A vote against this amendment is a vote in favor of higher interest rates for our students. A vote against this amendment is a vote in favor of making profits off the backs of our students. I don't believe that is how we build a future. I believe we build it together.

I support Senator REED's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, as we know, Congress has trouble with deadlines. That is why we always seem to be missing them. When we have trouble finding a permanent solution, we seem to kick the can down the road, hoping to find a solution later.

We are here today trying to fix the problem we have with the government student loan programs because we kicked the can down the road last year, and if we do not stop and start fixing things, we will continue to do it. That breeds a lot of uncertainty into the minds of the families and the children who are trying to go on and better themselves. The result was that on July 1 rates on government-subsidized undergraduate Stafford loans doubled to 6.8 percent. That is a fact. That is what we know we are dealing with, and we are trying to reverse that.

Not surprisingly, it set off alarms. My goodness, we all got excited about this. What are we going to do? We had a year to do it, but we didn't do anything; we just extended it—3.4 percent and only for the Stafford subsidized loans and nothing for other loans people were taking. When you consider that 11 million students who are trying to better themselves are borrowing money every year, we were only talking about 1 million. That was all we were trying to help. We forgot about everything else.

It is time to fix it today with a "yes" vote on the bipartisan compromise we worked out. It is really tripartisan—Democrat, Republican and Independent. That is pretty special around here, if you can get everybody agreeing and moving in the right direction.

Let me explain what the bill does and what this bipartisan compromise will do. We can lower the rate for all undergraduates—all of them—from 6.8 percent, which is where it is right now, to 3.8 percent. So we understand, that means a savings of \$2,000 in interest for the average freshman student who starts college this year. Remember, doing nothing and voting against the

long-term fix means that the 11 million students who will be borrowing money for this school year will pay a higher rate than they have to.

Let's look at the amount of people we are talking about, and the money. This is what we are actually talking about.

The legislation, the bipartisan plan, has been scored and we know this first year saves \$8.1 billion that students will not have to pay in interest. That we know. For the first 4 years of this plan, 2013 through 2016, it is \$31.8 billion. By doing nothing, that is what we are leaving. We are making the students pay that much more by doing nothing. Anything else we do other than the bipartisan, this is the type of money they will be paying in higher interest rates and more obligations on the families.

All of us understand the importance of education. It is what has made America the land of opportunity. All of us want to help students go as far as they can with their talent, as far as their talent is going to take them. That is what brought so many of us together to come up with the tripartisan fix, if you will, for the student loan program.

We all understand that the student loan rates are only one piece to the issue of making college more accessible and more affordable for all Americans who want to further their education. We will get to the other pieces when we debate the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, on which Senator HARKIN has been working so hard. I truly look forward to having those discussions, but today we have to know what we are dealing with. We are dealing today with something that has an immediate impact on the pocketbook of student borrowers and their families—people who need to borrow money to go to school. That is what is in front of us. We talked all over and around it. We are talking about accounting principles. We are talking about everything that needs to be looked at. But it is not going to change what we are dealing with today because this bipartisan agreement truly has savings that families need.

As I said, it is probably more accurate to call our proposal tripartisan, and I am proud to do that with all of us working together. If you think bipartisanship is hard work and hard to get around here, tripartisanship is like hitting the trifecta; that is the megabucks. We are doing something really right when we can get all three sides going in the same direction.

This legislation is a long-term fix that is fair, it is equitable, and it is fiscally responsible. We all agreed on a set of priorities when we began our negotiations—that is everybody: Democrats, Republicans, my colleagues on my side of the aisle, the Democratic side, who have other proposals. What

we all agreed on is that the interest rate should be as low as humanly possible. We also agreed that there should be strong front-end caps on interest rates to protect student borrowers in high interest rate environments so that it does not just run wild with them. It has a cap of 8.25 percent, which has been historic for some time. We kept that cap.

We ensured that the government did not profit or lose money on the loans. I think that was a big thing, that we all came to agreement. Some of the bills we had, had anywhere up to \$16 billion of profit built into them. That money was going to go to debt reduction. We said basically that every penny we can reduce in the interest, that money should go right back toward education for the student, and we have done that.

I admit there is no legislation that is perfect. I have been around this process for many years, and I have never voted on a perfect piece of legislation. But I tried to get the best we possibly could that made a difference and made sure we can get it passed, and we have that today. It is a good piece of legislation. Anything else that we think needs to be fixed that we have talked about, we can do that when we do the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act under Chairman HARKIN, which will be looking at everything.

Here is how good this bipartisan—tripartisan—compromise is. The undergraduate Stafford loans, both subsidized and unsubsidized, are based around the 10-year T-bill plus 2.05 percent, which would yield a 3.86-percent rate for this year. The current rate is 6.8 percent; now we are at 3.8 percent.

Let me show another chart. Nearly 8 out of 10 undergraduate borrowers will have both sub and un-sub loans, while only 1 out of 10 will have subsidized loans. That is how many students will have just the subsidized loans. That is what we thought we were fixing when we froze it at 3.4—that is all the people we helped. I don't think a lot of us understood. Some people thought it helped everybody, and it did not. Only subsidized is this, the Stafford subsidized. Those who borrow only unsubsidized is this. But if you look at those who needed both, this is what we are talking about—6.5 million more students we are helping and serving through this bipartisan—tripartisan—piece of legislation, the compromise.

This is what we worked to do. How could we help? You want to help the middle class? This is where the middle class is. This is where the people are who need to have the assistance, this is where they come in, and I think we have done a very good job at doing that.

We still have the PLUS loans. We have the graduate unsubsidized loans. Right now the graduate unsubsidized Stafford loans are paying 6.8 percent.

Under our legislation they will be paying 5.4 percent. If you look at the PLUS loans today, the PLUS loan current rate is 7.9 percent. Under our bill it is 6.4.

One hundred percent—every student—11 million of them who are borrowing money—will be benefited by the bipartisan agreement. Everybody benefits. That is what we tried to do.

Our plan keeps in place the IBR, which is the income-based repayment plan.

Let's say you graduate after years and you borrowed a lot of money. You have a lot of debt. You get a job that pays \$40,000, and you have two kids now. We put in a protection that basically says they can only charge you—you only have to pay 10 percent of your disposable income. With a \$40,000 income, with two children, that can be as low as \$142 a month. Now, \$142 a month—let's say that with the economy, the job you have that is where your heart and desires are—after 20 years it is completely forgiven. After 20 years, you made a good effort and maybe 50 percent of your loan is still owed. The taxpayers are picking up that. When people are saying that we are not helping, that we should be subsidizing higher education, we are doing that and I think with tremendous help.

The Congressional Budget Office said our bipartisan proposal will save the government \$715 billion over 10 years with \$1.4 trillion of money that will be borrowed, and \$700 million—that is over 10 years, and that is \$70 million a year. That is about as close as they are able to come. What that really amounts to—let me give it to you this way. It might be better. Over the 10 years, \$715 million means that the Federal Government—if someone says: Oh, but they are making a profit, over 10 years the Federal Government will make \$2.76 on each loan. If we can get it to zero, we will take it to zero. We don't make a penny. That is about as close as we can get working with the numbers we have.

We should not deny students starting college this fall \$2,000 in savings for the sake of a principle. You say we are making \$2.76 over 10 years, so they should not have the \$2,000 in savings? It doesn't make sense to me.

Chart No. 3. This indicates that the average freshman in 2013 who graduates in 4 years will save over \$2,000 on our plan—\$22,000 versus current law, \$24,000. In the years ahead, the interest rates on newly issued Federal student loans will be tied to the U.S. Treasury 10-year borrowing rates plus add-ons to offset costs associated with defaults, collections, deferments, forgiveness, and delinquencies.

What we are talking about is—what they are saying is that rates are going to go up. CBO projects this. They projected it before. If everything that you are hearing—and they say that rates

will go up; that is where the difference of about \$500 comes in. That is the difference. That is in the worst-case scenario that the \$500 would come in. Setting the rates to the market borrowing costs is fair, and it is equitable and sustainable as long as we have strong borrower protections, and it is fiscally responsible.

This way, Washington doesn't wind up profiting from students or losing money on them. Depending on the methods of accounting that you use—you heard how much money we are making on this and that. Let me explain a little bit about the accounting procedure. The student loan program either generates \$184 billion, if you used the Federal Credit Reform Act—and I will say the Federal Credit Reform Act has been the way the CBO has scored for the last 23 years. For 23 years that is the way it has been done. If you use fair value accounting, which some have basically supported and want us to change to—even CBO has pointed toward that—there would be a \$95 billion loss. There is a \$280 billion swing between what some people say we are making in excess profit; others say we will be losing money, it is not paying for itself, and we are still subsidizing at the \$95 billion rate.

That is a tremendous swing. We are not going to fix that. Senator HARKIN will look at all of this, and we will be able to address all of this in the comprehensive bill. We should all agree it is simply not fair to make a profit on the backs of students, and we agree on that, and that is why no matter what happens in the market in the long-term, the Senate compromise—and we fought hard for this—on the front end, the Senate compromise includes an interest rate cap of 8.25 percent. Much of this is important because there will be approximately \$140 billion in new loans issued every year, which means \$1.4 trillion in loans will be issued over the next 10 years.

In just a few short weeks students will be returning to school, and they will have plenty to worry about: what books to buy, where their classes are, how to haul all their stuff to all the rooms, and much more.

There has been so much discussion and argument. We will be voting on amendments that are based on what will happen after 4 years.

This chart shows what the CBO said the interest rates would be. In 2003, we start at around 4 percent. They felt they would go up to 5.8, to 5.9 percent, and level off for the past decade, which is from 2003 to 2013. This is actually what happened. If we locked into some of the amendments some of my colleagues, whom I respect, are telling us to lock into, no one would ever be able to take advantage of these historic lows. We are able to adjust that based on the market rate rather than just a fixed rate.

These are the things we don't know, but we know we are going to score \$31 billion in savings in the first 4 years. We do know that. This is how far they have been off before, so there is no science in this. If anyone thinks this is the gospel, it is not.

With a "yes" vote on our legislation today, there is one less thing students and their families will have to worry about: what the interest rate will be this year and how it will be calculated for years to come. We all came here to help our constituents do what we believe is right. We all agree that ensuring college remains affordable and accessible for this generation and future generations of Americans is the right thing to do. There simply is no better investment we can make than the education of our children and grandchildren.

We will count on today's students to be the driving force of American creativity and innovation in the years ahead. Some bedrock values define America, and one of them is pretty fundamental: We believe in opportunity. We believe everyone who wants to work hard and play by the rules should have a shot to succeed. To make good on that American promise—the promise of the American dream—we must do all we can to ensure that students can have an affordable education.

With a vote today on this bipartisan—more appropriately a tripartisan—agreement to lower the interest rates on all student loans, we will take a large step in the right direction. That is why I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan, tripartisan, agreed-upon legislation that helps students in the future.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I rise in support of the effort that my friend Senator MANCHIN has done to reach a conclusion. I hope we reach that conclusion today.

I was a university president for 4 years before coming to the Congress. There are 11 million families—between now and the start of the school year—who will be making decisions on how these programs work, so they are very impacted by what we do. Working together to make this happen is important, and I will be supporting that.

I am glad to be a cosponsor of this bill that deals with scholarships, but I wish to talk quickly about one other topic and then I have another topic I came to the floor to talk about.

REMEMBERING OFFICERS CHESTNUT AND GIBSON

Mr. BLUNT. Fifteen years ago this week, we had two of our Capitol Police officers killed in this building. Officer Jacob Chestnut and Detective John Gibson were killed. An intruder came into the building, and these two people, trying to protect and defend others, were killed. Later today there will be a

moment of silence in honor of them and at the same time remembering all of those who do this every day for us.

I happened to be working in this building on 9/11. I was one of the last people to leave the building that morning, and I remember the people who were still here when I left were the Capitol Police. I remember one of the policewomen I saw as I was going out the door—Isabelle said: You need to get out of the building as quick as you can. But she was still here.

Officer Gibson actually died in the doorway of an office that was my office for a couple of years in this building. I moved into that office shortly after he and his family both made the sacrifice that all of those who work here to protect us are willing to make.

The other thing I would like to say is that in light of all of that, this building was kept open for people who were not only from the United States but from all over the world to come and see. One of the things Congress appropriately never talked about after that tragedy was: What do we do to keep people out of this building? The discussion was: What do we do to let people continue to be in this building, and we will be remembering that day.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I rise principally to talk about the fact that today President Obama is pivoting back to jobs and the economy in a series of speeches in Illinois, Florida, and in my State of Missouri.

He will be speaking at the University of Central Missouri at Warrensburg today, and I am glad he is. I was there recently. This campus always hosts Girls State and Boys State. It is one of our great schools. Warrensburg is a great community. I am glad he is there, and I am glad the President is going to get to see that.

These speeches the President is giving sound an awful lot like the 2012 campaign speeches. I think we need to move beyond that. We need to not just pivot to the economy, but we need to stick with the economy. Missourians and all Americans are concerned about the economy and for good reason.

In June, a Gallup poll found Americans continuing to say the economy is the biggest problem facing the country. Certainly, if we look at what we ought to be focused on in our domestic agenda of what we are going to do for America, private sector jobs have to be at the top.

The President has pivoted—and I think usually the press and maybe even the administration were pivoting to jobs and the economy—to the economy and has done that a lot over the last several years. It is sort of like he goes to this issue and then he goes away from it. I believe that when he is there, he is talking about the right thing, but he has to talk about the right thing all the time if he wants the right thing to happen.

There is an old saying that even a stopped clock is right twice a day. The President and the administration's focus seems to be like that. Occasionally, we come around to the right topic, but then we quickly get to other topics.

In May of this year, the President pivoted to jobs during his middle-class jobs and opportunity tour. In February, he pivoted to jobs during a State of the Union Message. In June of last year, he pivoted to jobs during a campaign speech in Cleveland, OH. Aides said he was framing the speech but didn't have any new proposals. That was the way that speech was described that day.

In September of 2011, President Obama pivoted to jobs during a speech before a joint session of Congress that was held to bring attention to jobs, where he said he wanted to vote on a \$447 billion jobs package.

In August of 2011, the President pivoted to jobs during a speech at the White House following a Senate debt ceiling vote, and then he had a Midwest bus tour.

In January of 2010, he pivoted to jobs amid news that unemployment reached 10 percent in the wake of what I think was clearly a failed stimulus plan. It was a stimulus plan that didn't work. During the speech, he announced there would be more tax credits for clean energy jobs.

The December before that, he pivoted to jobs during a White House forum for business leaders. I think I read somewhere this morning that we could count as many as 18 pivots to jobs. We need to pivot to jobs and stay with it.

When the President is talking about private sector jobs, he is talking about the right thing, but what he says after pivoting to jobs is what matters. Hopefully, tomorrow the President will still be talking about jobs. Hopefully, the President will talk about jobs every day in the next week and longer until we get this done. We need to stay on the economy until we get it done.

Action speaks louder than words, and unfortunately the record is not as good as we would like it to be. We have lagging job creation and devastating manufacturing loss. The economy is now adding jobs again but barely enough to keep up with the numbers of people going into the workforce. Manufacturing has been particularly hard hit, despite the President's goal of adding 1 million new manufacturing jobs by the end of the second term. I would like to see that happen. If the President stays focused on that as the premier domestic topic every day for the next 3½ years, it might, but it will not if he doesn't.

We have too much debt, and that doesn't help in adding jobs. We have added \$6 trillion in debt and saw a stimulus plan that added a lot of that debt and didn't appear to create the jobs it was supposed to create.

As far as the health care law, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates 7 million people will lose their coverage because of the health care law. The Chamber of Commerce said that more than 70 percent of small businesses say the health care law makes it harder and less likely for them to hire new employees. The Congressional Budget Office says the health care law will not reduce the number of uninsured below 30 million Americans, but it is going to cost a lot of money in holding back full-time jobs.

I read articles every day in different papers that people are looking at part-time jobs rather than full-time jobs because of the health care law. Surely that is not what we should be doing.

There are energy policies that don't make sense: the continued blockage of the Keystone Pipeline that would have added tens of thousands of jobs just to build it. After it is built, more American energy equals more American jobs. The President and administration need to embrace that concept of more American energy.

Republicans in the Senate and House are united in calling for progrowth policies such as replacing the President's health care plan with something that will work. Encouraging more American energy of all kinds—from renewables to solar to wind—is important. We need to also understand that traditional sources of energy will be the main source of energy for the foreseeable future and that will grow our economy—approving things such as the Keystone XL Pipeline, stop overregulating in ways that hold our national energy policy back.

Obviously, we need to rein in wasteful government spending, give Americans more economic certainty, and simplify. There is much we can do. We need to simplify the Tax Code. There is a lot we can do.

I say to the President, it is time to keep talking about jobs. I hope today is the first of lots of days in a row when we are talking about jobs but also doing the things that help create private sector jobs, doing the things that help create an environment where people want to take the chance to create an opportunity because our society needs to be about that.

By the way, it is the private sector jobs that do that. The public sector jobs are fine, and I am glad to have one right here, but public sector jobs don't pay the bill. They are the bill. Private sector jobs are where we need to go, and I encourage the President to stick with the pivot this time.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the student loan issue, and my time should be allocated to the time of Senator ALEXANDER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, we have been hearing really two debates around here the last few days—in fact, over the last few days and months—about student loans. Both are important, but they are separate, and I think they need to be separate and thought of as two separate debates as we consider the issue before us this afternoon.

The first and larger issue is the cost of college. It is too high. Everyone agrees to that. In fact, the cost of college—of higher education—has exploded in the last 30 years.

In a former life, I used to interview people for a living on television. In the 1980s I interviewed the financial aid officer at one of our Maine colleges. He made a very interesting point.

He said: ANGUS, if you look back over the last 40 or 50 years, the cost of a private college education in the United States has almost exactly tracked the cost of a new Ford automobile. In the 1950s, \$1,500 bought a car and a college education. In the 1960s, about \$3,000 bought a car and a college education. That relationship continued into the 1990s. Then something happened because today a new Ford is about \$18,000 and a private college is approaching \$60,000, something like \$58,000.

That is a real problem for all of us. It is a problem for parents. It is a problem for students. It is a problem for the government that supplies the loans. It is a problem for Pell grants. It is a problem for all of us. It is one we need to discuss. But that is not the issue before us today.

There has been some discussion in this bigger debate about college costs and what the Federal role should be. Should it be to support and help students go to college? Indeed, we have had this discussion for the last 25 or 30 years, going back to the time of Pell grants, which were designed to help students—particularly low-income students—go to school. We have had various iterations of the student loan program. At first it was lodged in the banks, and it was a guaranteed student loan. Then some years ago it was made exclusively a Federal loan.

I can make the arguments—and we have heard some of them on the floor, including from the Senator from Vermont, who very eloquently made the argument that we need to make college accessible. We should do that, but not in the context of the discussion we are having today about student loans. It is a larger issue. I am sure

Senator HARKIN and his committee are going to take that up in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act later this year.

I can be very passionate and persuasive about the importance of the affordability of college. In fact, I would argue that the GI bill, back in the early 1950s and late 1940s, is one of the most important economic development investments this country ever made because it sent a whole generation of young Americans to college, and it was the mainspring of our great economic growth in the 1950s and 1960s.

The problem now, though, if we are talking about massive new Federal support for higher education—it runs into three problems, it seems to me, that we are going to have to examine and think about as we move forward in this debate. One is financial, another is political, and the final one is economic.

The financial problem is we are broke. Every dollar we spend—in addition to what is being spent now; in fact, including about 30 percent of what we are spending now—is borrowed. So if we are going to significantly increase Federal grants or subsidies to students, they have to come from somewhere else. I heard Senator CARPER speak yesterday about this.

He said: Do we really want to say, OK, we are going to cut Head Start in order to give funds to students? Are we going to cut somewhere else? How are we going to make those kinds of allocations?

Every dollar must be borrowed, and that is just the financial reality we are in today.

The political reality is we are in a situation of divided government. The central reality of our political times is nothing happens in this city without votes from both parties. It is simple arithmetic. We have a President who is a Democrat. We have a House of Representatives that is controlled by Republicans, and we have a Senate with a majority of Democrats but with important powers to the minority party. So the bottom line from all that is nothing happens without bipartisan votes. So as much as we—or any group, whether it is the Democrats, the Republicans, or our two Independents—as much as we might want something, if it doesn't have bipartisan support, it is simply not going to happen. That is the reality.

That is indeed the reality that drove JOE MANCHIN and I to begin these discussions about 6 weeks ago when we were talking about student loans. There was a Democratic proposal which didn't get enough votes, there was a Republican proposal which didn't get enough votes, and everybody walked away. I was haunted by the experience of the sequester, where the same thing happened: Democratic proposal, Republican proposal, everybody hates the sequester, but it is happening.

So we believed we had to open some discussions because we have to find a way to get enough votes to get a proposal through the Congress so students aren't facing way higher interest rates this month than they should be. No action, make no mistake about it, means students will be paying dramatically higher interest rates than they should be, given the current cost of money. Why? Because Congress fixed an interest rate.

I would argue the last thing Congress should ever do is fix an interest rate. It will always be wrong—either wrong for the students as it is now, dramatically, or wrong for the taxpayers at some point in the future. We can't predict what interest rates can or should be, and fixing a rate, which is what we are facing now—6.8 percent—is always—at this point, as I said, is dramatically wrong for students.

In terms of the political realities around here, my dad was a lifelong poker player. One of the things I learned from him—one of the guiding principles of my life—is you have to play the hand that is dealt. The hand that is dealt us right now is that it takes both Republican and Democratic votes to get anything through the Congress. That is the reality, and that defines our ability to get things done. It doesn't mean we can't get things done, it just means we can't always get our way, and compromise has to be part of our lexicon.

The final issue about whether we want to create a massive new support program for college education is economics. I am not saying this is a dispositive argument, but I think it is something we have to think about. The explosion of college costs I talked about that started in the 1990s corresponded, to a large extent, to the availability of additional money for scholarships and loans and grants, and the colleges essentially ate it up. We can go through great effort to find money to increase Pell grants by \$1,000, and we will all feel good that we have done something for the students. But if the colleges increase their costs by \$1,000, nobody wins. The Federal Government and the taxpayers are out \$1,000. The students are in exactly the same position they were in before. They still have to find the difference because the money has just been eaten up by the increases in costs.

I think that is why we have to be thinking about what the implications are of the actions we take. Just saying we want to give more money to students for college—if, indeed, that money immediately turns into higher costs and higher tuition, nobody has gained, least of all the students because they end up with this huge debt burden.

We can and should have this discussion. It is an important one. But it is not the discussion before us today. The

discussion before us today is pretty simple: Do we want to continue a program that has fixed rates at 6.8 percent when currently rates are running more in the 3-percent range?

In other words, do we want to balance the Federal budget for the next 4 or 5 years on the backs of our students? I don't think we should do that. I think we have come up with a proposal that doesn't do that—that dramatically benefits students as long as interest rates are where they are, and it protects students on the upside.

I try to always think about problems as if we didn't have all of the history and we simply had a blank sheet of paper and said: How should we go about this? How should we structure a student loan program in the Federal Government if we didn't have all the back-and-forth and the history and the fixed rates and all of those things?

It would seem to me if we sat down in a room with a group of bright people, they would say: Well, No. 1, the government is going to have to borrow this money that it then lends to the students because we are broke. Therefore, in order to be fair to the taxpayers and the students, the students should pay what it costs the government to borrow the money, plus a little bit for the cost of administering the program and the risks of default. That is exactly where we landed in this proposal.

People talk about market rates. Yes, there are market rates, but it is the 10-year Treasury bill, which is one of the lowest rates in the country. This isn't the prime rate. This isn't LIBOR. This is one of the lowest borrowing rates we can ever have. It is the borrowing rate for the U.S. Government, which heretofore anyway has had a pretty good credit rating. Therefore, the students are guaranteed that they will always be below the outside market. If they went to a bank for a loan with no collateral, no cosigning, no job, the rates would be much higher than what we are talking about.

By the way, it is important to understand, because there has been so much discussion about this, that this is not an adjustable rate mortgage. If we can manage to pass this bill and get it through the House and get it to the President in the next week to 10 days, once a student signs up for a loan this fall their rate for that loan will be fixed at 3.86 percent for the term of the loan—for the term of the loan.

It is true that the following year, if they need another loan, that rate will be the T-bill plus 2.05 percent for the term of that loan. In other words, the loan rate doesn't change each year according to the rates. I think that is an important distinction. I think there has been some confusion about that. In addition, there are provisions in current law which this bill doesn't change that allow for forgiveness of student loans under certain circumstances, de-

pending upon how long the loan has been in place and the employment a person has, as well as limits on how much a person has to pay as a percentage of their income.

As I said before, I don't believe Congress should be setting rates.

Let's talk about the effect of this proposal on students. The first effect is that it will cut almost in half the rates students are going to have to pay for their loans this year, from 6.8 percent to 3.86 percent, as this side of the chart shows. So a freshman going to college starting in 2013—this year—this is what they would pay for their total loans under this proposal.

It says "bipartisan"; it should say "nonpartisan." This is what they will pay under current law. That is a dramatic difference. That is money out of the pockets—billions of dollars out of the pockets of students over the next 2 or 3 years.

Everybody says, well, what if rates go up? Rates might go up. They might stay the same. They might go down. But even if they go up, under the projections of the Congressional Budget Office, here is a student starting college in 2017, and they would pay a little bit more under our proposal—it is the difference between \$24,800 and 24,295—about \$500. This difference is about \$2,000. This is money in hand. This is maybe, depending upon what happens with interest rates—what is worth more, \$1 billion in hand or \$1 billion in the bush? I think it is \$1 billion in hand because these are the rates kids are going to have to face right now.

I think this is a great deal for students. No. 1, it dramatically lowers the rates in the early years. No. 2, thanks to the hard work of TOM HARKIN, who negotiated like a tiger, there is a cap on the upside. So students aren't subjected, if rates happen to go way up—as they have occasionally but not very often in our recent history—into double digits, there is a cap of 8.25 percent.

So the students enjoy the benefit of the low rates, but their exposure to the upper rates, to too-high rates, is capped. I think that is a sensible and prudent and beneficial proposal for students.

The savings to students next year will be something like \$8 billion or \$9 billion; otherwise, if we do nothing this week, that is the amount they are going to have to pay.

The future is uncertain, but I think it is important to talk about projections of interest rates because a lot of the discussion is that the students are going to have to pay so much more because the CBO projects interest rates to go up. By the way, even on the CBO's projections for undergraduates, the rates would never hit the cap. They would be in the low 7s—very close to where the present rate is.

But let's just talk about CBO interest rate projections because that is

what is driving a lot of the anxiety around here. Here is the CBO. Let's pretend it is 2003—10 years ago—and we go to the CBO and say: What are you projecting for interest rates—just as we did a few weeks ago? Here is what they projected. They said: Well, interest rates are at about 4 percent, but we think they are going to go up around 5, 5.5, 6 percent. That is the projection CBO used in 2003. OK.

The good news is, we know what actually happened. Again, starting in 2003, here is the actual cost of interest rates. Look at the difference. If we were basing our decisions on projected interest rates, look at the huge difference that took place, and all of this represents money in the students' pockets as opposed to fixing the rate.

So, yes, the projections are that they will go up, but we do not know that. I would take money in hand anyway against a possibility that there might be a payment later on. And we do not know that. It could go either way.

If interest rates go way up, as I said, the cap kicks in. The cap of 8.25 percent is very close to the 6.8 percent we have now. It results in about—I do not know—\$20 a month difference between the cap and the 6.8 percent, if, indeed, we go all the way to the cap.

I think this is a prudent and responsible proposal. It is the best of all worlds for the students because they get low rates now, and they get a cap if rates go up. I think it makes sense for the taxpayers. I am perfectly willing to have the debate, to have the discussion about, A, what do we do about college costs, and, B, should the Federal Government be playing a greater role in terms of support for students? I think that is a very honest discussion.

But this is called the student loan program. It is about loans. And the implication of a loan is that it is to be paid back with some reasonable rate of interest. Pell grants are grants, and we have tax credit programs that are, in effect, grants. This is one part of the student aid puzzle, and what we have before us today is a prudent, sensible, beneficial program for the students.

I will conclude by saying the choice is very clear because if we do not act on this bipartisan proposal that we believe will have a receptive ear in the House of Representatives—we know the President supports it and is ready to sign it tomorrow—if we do not move this bill, nothing happens, nothing happens during August, students are signing up for loans at almost double the rate they should be. I think that is unfair to students, and I think they sent us here to solve problems. This is one I believe we can tackle. We can and have solved it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I would like to be recognized on the student

loan bill. The time can come out of the Manchin-Burr amendment. I am not sure exactly how we are allocating time.

Let me take this opportunity to thank the cosponsors of the bill: Senator ALEXANDER, Senator COBURN, Senator CARPER, Senator KING, and Senator MANCHIN. Without this bipartisan approach, we would not be here today. It has not been lost on me that four of the six cosponsors are former Governors. They recognize the importance of education. They recognize the importance of students having access to that education. I think all of them are stalwarts as it relates to good education, and I think they recognize, as do Senator COBURN and I, that this is a good bill. It is good policy, the Manchin-Burr-King-Alexander-Coburn-Carper bill.

Let me take a minute to share with my colleagues or remind my colleagues where we are today. Senator KING just did it. Under current law we are at 6.8 percent for all undergraduate students. It is higher for graduate students. It is higher for PLUS loans. A month ago, we had a bifurcated system where some undergraduates paid 6.8 percent and other undergraduates, who were considered subsidized, paid 3.4 percent. I would suggest that is morally wrong. I think collectively what we did was we said: How can we come up with a system that shows the equity we believe in and that provides a financial benefit to all students who participate?

So I say to my colleagues, I want to point out the single most important part of this bipartisan bill or nonpartisan bill is the fact that for two students seated side by side—one whose parents have a different income level than the other one's parents—we treat them both the same.

For the one who has a lower income level, as Senator KING said, they qualify for Pell grants, for education tax credits, for loan forgiveness, for a lot of different things. But from the standpoint of the rate the Federal Government charges them to borrow money to go to school, we treat them the same. I think that is what we are supposed to do.

If we did not treat them the same—let me back up for a second—and we were treating this one at 3.4 percent and this one at 6.8 percent, understand that this one can only borrow \$3,500 at a subsidized rate. Well, you are not going to enter any college today for \$3,500. It is not going to happen. So you are going to have to borrow a little more. If you borrowed the maximum you can get, it is \$5,500 in your freshman year. So you are going to get \$3,500 over here, and you are going to get \$2,000 over here but you are going to pay 6.8 percent.

What the bipartisan or nonpartisan bill does is it provides every undergraduate with, this year, 3.86 percent.

In the case of the subsidized student, they are not, as before, borrowing at a lower rate for some money and a higher rate for other money, actually subsidizing themselves. And for the undergraduate who is not subsidized, they are not paying way more than they should for their college loan.

So what did we do? We used the 10-year bond, with market forces. I am not sure there is a fairer way to do it—fairer for the student, fairer for the institution, fairer for the American taxpayer. We tied it to the 10-year bond, and we got an add-on which is reflective of the cost to run the program and the risk of the loan. We hope every student pays it back, but that does not always happen. What we tried to be is good fiduciaries for the American taxpayer.

Within that, as Senator KING said, they are capped. If you are an undergraduate, it is capped at 8.25 percent. It came out a little higher than that. But the tradeoff for doing that, in comparison to what my colleagues in the House have done, is that when you take out a loan this year at 3.86 percent, that is your interest rate for the life of the loan. We do not readjust it on an annual basis. This is like getting a 15- or 30-year amortized loan for a home mortgage. We are not going to come in and change the rules on you and say: Well, the United States wants more interest in the future. But it does mean, just like in a home mortgage purchase, if you buy one this year, the likelihood is, the one you buy next year might have a different interest rate because the market has changed.

I think the American people can deal with that because it is predictable. It brings with it some certainty. You can calculate it on your own. As my colleague said, the last to set rates is the Congress of the United States. We should not be in that business. It should be market forces. With this legislation, it will be.

I sat over here trying to think of just the one phrase I would say to my colleagues is the primary reason they should support this bill and provide this benefit for the American people. I wrote down two words: financially sustainable. You see, in 2007, Congress created the current student loan program rate. A year ago—after we had extended the program because it ran out for 2 years—we said: Well, we are going to fix it. We are going to have a long-term solution. Then, all of a sudden, we did a 1-year extension. The Senator from West Virginia was the most vocal person. He said: What happened? We were going to fix it. We did not fix it. Thank goodness that is why, when it came up this year, there was such outcry over the fact that now is the time to fix it if we are going to do it. Let's go ahead and fix it.

Well, what is the test of: Did we fix it? I would suggest to my colleagues, it

is financial sustainability. Can this withstand the test of time? Today we need that certainty from the standpoint of Federal spending, from the standpoint of the American taxpayer. But we also need it from the standpoint of America's children.

We are speaking as much to the 10-year-old as we are to the 18-year-old. The 18-year-old may be a freshman next year. The 10-year-old has aspirations, down the road 8 more years, that they are going to have the ability to go to college. We want to provide them with the certainty that there is going to be a student loan program out there that is equitable and fair that they can participate in and not question whether, in fact, it will exist. I think with the option we have on the table, we will be able to say that from one generation to the next.

I know we will consider this afternoon a couple of different options. I want to urge my colleagues. I think there will be two options from the standpoint of plans you can choose. If you believe equitable treatment is right, then the bipartisan bill is the one you need to support. If you believe financial sustainability is important, then the bipartisan bill is the one you need to support.

I think if you tick down all the things you probably ought to look at—what makes it most affordable; what is best for the students—I think what you will find is it is the bipartisan bill.

There has been a lot of work put into making it a long-term solution. I want to urge my colleagues. Congress changes every 2 years. That is the length of "long term." But let's not put into law a sunset on this in 2 years. That is the other amendment. Why would we say we have come up with a great plan, one that sort of passes the test of equitability and sustainability, and then turn around and say: But we are going to sunset it in 2 years? Congress has the ability, with every new Congress, to look at any piece of legislation and change it. Let's make that the function of what we learn from this and not prejudge it and say: Let's cut it off in 2 years.

I am going to conclude because my colleagues are here to speak on the program as well. I thank the cosponsors—the four Governors and Senator COBURN. Without their help we would not be to this point. I thank the leadership on both sides of the institution—the majority leader and the minority leader and those who have brokered the ability for us to be here today. Without them, we would not be considering what I think is the best piece of legislation to address the challenges we have for students in need of loans for college this year and future years.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. I come to the floor today to speak again in support of the

permanent solution to the student loan program. Like my colleague from the great State of North Carolina, I think that is exactly what we have with the bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act.

I want to acknowledge all of those who worked so hard to come together and support this legislation. It is actually not bipartisan, it is tripartisan. Former Governor KING is an Independent, so you have Republicans, Democrats, and Independents all in support of this legislation. That is what it takes. It takes people coming together across the aisle doing good work. That is what they have done here to put this legislation together. I am pleased to be supporting it.

I come today to call on all of our colleagues to support it as well. The plan provides students with dependable low-cost financing on a long-term basis. That is the key. This is a long-term fix. It is called the Student Loan Certainty Act because it provides just that, it provides certainty for students and for families.

Again, let's take a minute to review how the plan works. The plan would tie all student loan rates to the 10-year Treasury note rate to reflect both current market and employment conditions. For this year that rate index would be 1.81 percent. Then both subsidized and unsubsidized Stafford loans would be 2.05 percent over that rate. Graduate student rates would be 3.6 percent over the 10-year Treasury rate, PLUS loans would be 4.6 percent over the Treasury rate.

It is important to note that the rate on those loans is then fixed, so you have that certainty when you take out the loan. You know what the rate on that loan is going to be for the life of the loan. It is important for our borrowers.

Let's take a minute to compare this program with the existing student loan program. Subsidized Stafford loans right now are charged at 6.8 percent. It was 3.4 percent, but now it is 6.8 percent, because as my colleague identified the program had expired.

We are in this situation where we are going with short-term extensions. So we faced these periods like right now where the program has expired, so the rate for Stafford loans is 6.8 percent. Under this program, that goes to 3.86 percent this year—3.86 percent compared to 6.8 percent.

The same thing for unsubsidized Stafford loans. Now 60 percent of the borrowers, the undergraduate borrowers, borrow unsubsidized Stafford loans. A lot of the lower income students who borrow subsidized loans also borrow unsubsidized loans. They were paying that 6.8 percent even before the program expired. For all of those undergraduate students, the rate goes down to 3.68 percent. That is a big-time savings for undergraduate students.

Furthermore, the program is capped at 8.25 percent, so they have the certainty of a cap as well. They save money now. As was pointed out by my colleagues, they save money now and they have the certainty of a cap as well.

There are caps for both the graduate students and for the PLUS loans that parents take out as well. In addition to the caps, there is another safety net in the program. The other safety net in the bill is the income-based repayment level. Under the income-based repayment level provisions, student loan payments are limited to 15 percent of income. Any balance remaining on the loan after 25 years is forgiven. So you have both safety nets. You have the caps and you have the repayment limit provision to protect borrowers.

This program is designed solely for students and their families. Let me repeat that. This program is designed solely for students and their families. Unlike the existing student loan program, it does not subsidize Federal health care or any other program. It is for the students and their families alone, period. Again, as my colleagues noted, a year ago we extended the student loan program. I was actually a member of the conference committee for MAP-21, the Department of Transportation reauthorization legislation. In that legislation we not only reauthorized the DOT budget, we also reauthorized Federal flood insurance as well.

In addition, we extended for 1 year the reauthorization of the student loan program. The reason we extended the student loan program for 1 year was so we could come up with a permanent solution, not so we could come up with another short-term extension but specifically so we could come up with a permanent solution. That is exactly what this is.

The bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act provides that certainty for students, for families. It is a long-term permanent fix for our students. So I join with my colleagues and I call on both sides of the aisle, all of us, to come together. Let's fix this for our students. Let's get it in place. Let's get it over to the House. I believe they will pass it as well. Let's have this ready for our students as they are preparing to enter college this fall.

With that, again, I thank everyone who has worked so hard on this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent that after I speak for about 10 minutes, the Senator from California be recognized for up to 30 minutes, and following her, the Senator from Oregon be recognized, Mr. MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Maine, the

Independent Senator from Maine, probably said it best when he observed on the floor and in private conversation that if you took four or five of us and said forget that you are elected to public office, here is a problem to be solved, we would have come up with something similar to the solution that the President, the House of Representatives, and the bipartisan proposal on the floor today. This is a very good solution on a very big problem that affects millions of families and about 9 million undergraduate students who are headed to college this year.

The bipartisan proposal makes it cheaper, simpler, and fairer for students going to college. It makes their loans more certain, because it locks in a rate for the life of the loan. It ends the political football game which we play every other year, it seems, on student interest rates and solves the problem permanently.

It is based upon an idea recommended by President Obama, passed by the House of Representatives, and endorsed by the bipartisan group that has been working on it. I wish all of the major problems that came before us could be solved in this way. As far as cost goes, it is a big difference. Two-thirds of all federal loans are undergraduate loans. There are about 11 million borrowers who will take out about 18 million loans, because students take out more than one loan.

For all of the undergraduate loans, about two-thirds of the loans, the rate of the loan will be cut about in half, which means if you get a loan this year at a 3.86-percent rate, that is the rate that is locked in for the entire life of the loan. It is simpler and fairer because there is a single rate for all undergraduates. Before, we had one rate for a subsidized loan and another rate for the unsubsidized loan. That is confusing. It was unfair, because 80 percent of the lower income students who had the subsidized loan also had an unsubsidized loan. So now everybody who shows up at the University of Tennessee and borrows money, if they are undergraduates, all of their loans will have the same rate.

It is fair to taxpayers because we asked the Congressional Budget Office to comment on what it costs the government to borrow the money and administer the loan, take into account the cost, and try to come as close to zero as possible to the cost of issuing loans for the taxpayers. They have done that.

It is fair to students because we also asked the Congressional Budget Office to do the same thing for students. They said, we are loaning more than \$100 billion a year over \$1 trillion over 10 years, so help us find a formula that comes as close to zero as practical so we do not overcharge students and make money on the backs of students. They came within seven-tenths of 1

percent in their estimates, which is only an estimate, and for all practical purposes that is a rounding error. That is a good-faith effort to get to zero in terms of fairness to the taxpayers and students.

But I would want to say to those who suggest it is not fair to students, let's keep in mind a few things. First, thanks to Senator HARKIN and many of the Democratic Members of the Senate, there are caps on the loans. So if rates go up too high, there is a limit on how high they can go.

Second, there is, as has been mentioned, the income repayment plan which means that under the existing law today, if you take out a student loan and then you get a job, you only have to pay back about 10 percent of your disposable income. That is not all of your income, that is after you subtract your living expenses and your taxes, about 10 percent of what is left. If that is not enough, after paying it back over 10 or 20 years, depending on whether you have a public or private sector job, the government forgives it. So there is that cap on there as well.

Then there is the interest subsidy. About 40 percent of the loans are subsidized for lower income students, which means the government, the taxpayer, pays the interest while you are in college. So if you are a low-income student at the University of Tennessee, you take out a loan, the government will pay your interest the whole time you are in college.

Then there is the Pell grant. We spend about \$35 billion a year of taxpayer money on Pell grants which go to low-income students. So a student at the University of Tennessee may have a Pell grant of up to about \$5,500 or so. They might have a Hope scholarship in the State another \$3,000. The tuition at the University of Tennessee is about \$8,000 or \$9,000. At the community college it is about \$3,000 or \$4,000. So you can see there is relatively a lot of financial aid out there before students borrow these low-rate student loans that taxpayers are making available to 9 million students at a rate of 3.86 percent for undergraduates.

Then there is one other aspect in which this is favorable to students; that is, the accounting system that we use. I have heard some say the government is making money on the backs of students. Let me try to put that in the simplest form I can. All we are doing with the proposal today is resetting the rates, a very simple bill with a few pages. It is on top of a student loan system with a lot of cash going in and out of it, \$100 billion going out this year in new loans, maybe about as much coming back in, being repaid from old loans. There are two ways of accounting for that cash back and forth to determine whether it benefits the taxpayers or whether it benefits the students.

Under the law, we have something called the Federal Credit Reform Act, which says the taxpayers are benefiting to the tune of about \$185 billion over 10 years. That is correct. That is exactly what it says. Not from what we are voting on today but for the underlying system that already exists.

But the Congressional Budget Office has said that is not the way they recommend measuring how we count the cost to the government of loaning money. To be specific, the Congressional Budget Office says the Federal Credit Reform Act estimates do not provide a comprehensive measure of what Federal programs actually cost the government, because they do not take into consideration the market risk.

CBO says that adopting a fair value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the cost to the Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of Federal assistance. The Congressional Budget Office says: We already use that fair value approach, which includes taking into account the market risk with such things as the International Monetary Fund, the IMF, the Troubled Asset Relief Program, the bailouts, as we called them in 2008. CBO uses those with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

In other words, the nonpartisan group we rely on to advise us about money says that if we actually use the right accounting tools, the current student loan system benefits students to the tune of about \$95 billion over the next 10 years, not taxpayers. So there is another benefit to students. It is not true that under the recommended form of evaluating the cost to the government that taxpayers come out better than students.

One other thing I would like to say—or two other things. One is, I would like to compliment those who have worked on this. My colleague Senator HARKIN, who is chairman of the Education Committee here in the Senate, argued forcefully for caps. I congratulate the President for including this idea in the budget and forcefully supporting it.

I congratulate the House of Representatives. I suppose it is not lost on anyone the Senate is run by Democrats and the House is run by Republicans. This is a bipartisan proposal. I like the sound of that. I think that shows we can get results done when we keep our eye on the ball.

I especially compliment Senator BURR, Senator COBURN, Senator MANCHIN, Senator KING, and Senator CARPER for working carefully on this, and Senator DURBIN for his leadership in putting this together.

As most speakers have said, it is true that we have a larger question before us. Do we need to make some changes

in student loans? It is a lot of money—\$100 billion a year. That is a lot of money. We need to make sure that it is available in the right way and that students aren't borrowing too much.

Right now, if you are a 20-year-old and you show up at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville and you want \$5,500, you get it. The university can't say to you: I am sorry, LAMAR, we don't think given your circumstances you are going to be able to pay that back in 10 years. I can say: Give me my money.

This is what the law says. Maybe we need to take a look at that and we need to be careful about our facts.

The Federal Reserve, for example, says that 70 percent of borrowers with student loans today—we are in the year 2012, in the fourth quarter—have a balance of less than \$25,000. Seventy percent of all student loans at the end of last year had a balance of less than \$25,000. Forty percent had a balance of less than \$10,000.

The trend is going in the wrong direction. Some students are borrowing too much money. But the average undergraduate loan debt is about \$25,000—that is the average debt—and the undergraduate student can't really borrow more than \$31,000, and that is two-thirds of the loans.

So while there may be some problems with the student loan program—and I, for one, think some students borrow more than they should—we have 6,000 institutions out there, from the Nashville Diesel College, to Harvard, to Notre Dame, to the University of Tennessee, and we need to be careful that we understand exactly what the problem is, that we focus in on it, we don't apply a lot of mandates from Washington, and that we work with the colleges and universities. We need to find those universities, such as Tennessee Tech University, where they have a very low level of student loans and others where they may have loan rates that are too high. We need to make sure students don't saddle themselves with too much debt.

But when we have a 20-year-old in Knoxville showing up who is entitled to \$5,500 in loans for a community college tuition that only costs \$3,000 and he or she can put the other \$2,500 in his or her pocket and the community college can't say no, well, that is one of the reasons many community colleges have gotten out of the loan business—because they think that is wrong for the student. If this is the case, then we in the Senate ought to look at that. Senator HARKIN and I are committed to looking at student loans in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

For today, if the Senate does what I hope it does, this will be a victory for students. It makes loans cheaper, simpler, fairer, and more certain. It stops this annual business of political foot-

ball with the student interest rates. It gives students a low interest rate that they can lock in over time and a cap at the top so that if rates spiral through the roof, student loans won't spiral through the roof. It is done in the context of a larger system that includes Pell grants and interest subsidies for low-income students. If it were based upon an accounting system that is recommended by the Congressional Budget Office, it would tilt the whole program to the advantage of students to the tune of an additional \$95 billion over the next 10 years.

I congratulate all those who have worked on it, from the bipartisan sponsors, to the Republican leadership in the House, to the Democratic President of the United States.

I hope that we adopt it by a big vote and that the 9 million students going to college this fall will have the advantage of planning their long-term futures with the lowest possible interest rate on 18 million student loans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the so-called bipartisan deal. I have very strong reasons for opposing it and supporting the alternative, which is the Reed-Warren alternative.

The Senator from Tennessee said he likes the sound of bipartisan deals. So do I. It feels good to get things done around here in a bipartisan way. But that doesn't mean, because it is called bipartisan, it is the right thing to do. Sometimes Democrats will have the right idea, sometimes Republicans will have the right idea, and we debate it.

I think it was interesting to hear Senator ALEXANDER's comments. It was a very interesting speech because it was part of—you know, saying that it is wonderful and we are going to help students on the one hand; on the other hand, he talks about changing the way we are doing our accounting to crack down on students; and then he says that in his State a student can get a \$5,500 loan even though it only costs \$3,000. What about the books they have to buy? What about transportation? What about all the other out-of-pocket expenses?

So I listened to my friend from Tennessee, and I know he is a leader on education, but I think he had kind of a dual message: On the one hand, it is wonderful to help our students. Well, maybe it is just too much of a risk.

I have to say that according to the information I have from my experts, it is pretty tough when you take out a student loan. The Federal Government, if you don't pay it back, can garnish your wages and it can do lots of other things.

I am opposed to this bipartisan deal and strongly support the Reed-Warren measure.

I am pleased that a lot of people are listening to this debate because it is very important. I am going to read some of the criticisms of this bipartisan deal that come from outside groups.

The first is the National Association of Graduate-Professional Students. This is what they said:

This bill falls short in preventing higher student loan interest rates, especially for graduate and professional students. A cap of 9.5 percent for graduate and professional students offers no guarantees that our rates won't significantly increase in the future. We should be encouraging students to enter higher education to help keep our economy growing, not deterring them with higher interest rates.

The Young Invincibles also oppose this bill, writing:

Even as the Federal Government makes \$184 billion off the Federal loan program, students and families will be forced to pay more under this bill than current law.

If you let the current law exist, at the end of the day, because of the difference in caps, students will be better off in the outyears and into the future. For anyone who says this is temporary, make no mistake about it—Republicans have said this is permanent. We may revisit other things, and I hope we do because there is a lot we should look at, such as the ability of students to refinance their loans. There are many other things I hope we can work on. But this particular deal, if you look at the Republicans' own words, is a permanent deal.

U.S. Public Interest Group says:

We oppose S. 1334, the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act, because it is worse than current student loan policy. Current law includes an unjustifiable 10-year revenue stream of \$184 billion flowing directly from student borrowers to the Federal Government. [This bill] does not address this problem. Instead, it exacerbates it, generating an additional \$715 million in new revenue off the backs of student loan borrowers to pay down the deficit.

They close their comments by saying, "Enough is enough."

I am sure people listening to this debate could be a bit confused about exactly what we are talking about. I am going to try to go through some of the facts surrounding this debate. I think it is important that we understand what students are feeling out there. I am going to read a few.

In California, Amy and Christian Diede owe over \$82,000 in student loans. Amy, who has a master's degree in psychology, and Christian, a cardiovascular nurse, say:

It's like carrying a big backpack filled with bricks all over the place, and I can't ever let it go. It's always there. I may get rid of a few bricks, but there's always going to be more. I don't see the student loans going away.

I have met people who are still paying off their student loans and they are on Social Security.

Last year, Tammy Brown of Redding, CA, said the government has been taking \$179 out of her Social Security disability check each month for the past 5 years. Brown, 52, became disabled in 1986 after being involved in a car accident. Unable to work, she fell behind on her student loan payments. She said the Social Security check is too small to cover her food and medical bills, so she quit taking prescription pain pills. She said, "It's kind of hard to live on this amount of money." This is a woman on Social Security disability, and what are we doing in the bipartisan deal? We are laying on top of what we already make from student loans an additional \$715 million.

Joseph Luka of Portland, ME, started college as a pre-med student, but he switched to mechanical engineering because the thought of graduating with more than \$100,000 in student loans after medical school was too daunting.

I will return to some of the comments at the close of my time.

We have to ask a few questions. Why are we piling another \$715 million of debt on the backs of our students—so we could stand here and say we did a bipartisan deal? And I know how hard it was. Yes, there are great improvements from where it started. I appreciate that, but we have a better deal. It is called Reed-Warren. It matches those low rates you see in the bipartisan deal for the first 3 years. It matches them, and then it keeps the rates down. I am going to show just how much money we save students in the Reed-Warren legislation because it keeps the rates down.

Did students put two wars on a credit card? Is that why they have to be punished? Were students running the banks that placed huge bets on Wall Street, leading up to the crash? Did students create a drug benefit in the Medicare Program without paying for it? Did students create and sell toxic mortgages, swaps, and securities? Oh, no, they didn't do any of that, but apparently we are forcing students to pay for that by tacking another \$715 million on their backs.

I have to say, when it comes to the banks, oh, hundreds of billions of dollars, no problem; too big to fail. It is very hard to explain to people and to students. We say we love our children and we want them to succeed. And yes, we do, but we don't follow our words with actions because if we followed our words with actions, we would embrace the Reed-Warren solution. But the handwriting is clearly on the wall, and we are not going to have the votes to do that, so we are going to ask our students to continue to pay more and more.

We ought to look at what past Presidents have said about the importance of education.

I feel I must point out that Americans have always said that our values

include valuing our students. So let's go back.

George H.W. Bush:

Think about every problem, every challenge, we face. The solution to each starts with education.

How right he was when he said that. Bill Clinton:

When we make college more affordable, we make the American Dream more achievable.

How right he was to say that.

George W. Bush:

Our country must focus our education system on helping workers learn the new skills of the 21st century so we can increase the job base of this country.

And Barack Obama:

The jobs of the future are increasingly going to be those with more than a high school degree. We all want Americans getting those jobs in the future. So we are going to have to make sure that they're getting the education they need.

OK. So how about charging our students \$715 million more? That really helps us do what these Presidents have called us to do, which is to value our children, to value education. Two Democrats, two Republicans. A clear message. And, believe me, that is hard to find on a lot of issues. Education is key. Our students are important. They need the education to get the jobs.

I am going to show exactly what this bipartisan bill is going to cost. I already said it is \$715 million over the course of time to the government. Let's look at how much more each family will have to pay under this so-called "deal" compared with the Reed-Warren substitute.

First, let's take a look at the 10-year loan. Now, what we do on all these charts is we go out to the cap because we know the caps will all be reached. All one has to do is look to the experts. They have told us the caps will be reached. Take the 30-year average rate of the 10-year note, add on the surcharge, and, bingo, the caps will be reached in a few years.

Let's look at the Reed amendment versus the deal. If you have a \$15,000 loan for 10 years, under the deal you pay \$1,363 more than you would under the Reed amendment. If you have a \$25,000 loan, over 10 years you pay \$2,271 more under the bipartisan deal. If you have a \$50,000 loan—and you can get those, by the way—for 10 years, you pay \$4,500 more.

So let's say you decided you wanted to take 25 years to pay back that undergraduate loan. Let's say you have decided you want to take 25 years. You will pay, for a \$30,000 loan amount, \$8,400 more under this so-called bipartisan deal than you would under the Reed-Warren amendment. You will pay \$14,000 more over the course of a 25-year loan if you have a \$50,000 loan amount.

So I am saying to the American people who might be watching this, the bad deal is the bipartisan deal and the

good deal is the Reed deal. Look at how much more money an individual has to pay for a \$50,000 loan over 25 years—\$14,000 more. Some people don't even make \$14,000 in half a year.

Let's look at what happens to graduate students, and this is why the graduate students are speaking out against this. Look at this: If you pay back your graduate loan in 10 years—and we all know the caps are going to be reached—you pay \$2,500 more for a \$15,000 loan, \$4,200 more for a \$25,000 loan, \$8,500 more with a \$50,000 loan, and for a \$100,000 loan you pay \$17,000 more under the so-called bipartisan deal compared to the Reed amendment.

So what we are seeing now is a breakdown of why we say it is going to mean \$715 million more in debt on the backs of our students. I am showing how it breaks down for a family.

This is worth looking at. If you are a graduate student—and I know the Presiding Officer probably has a doctorate—and you had to go borrow money under this bipartisan deal, if your loan amount was \$30,000, you would pay \$16,000 more than you would under the Reed-Warren amendment. If you had a \$50,000 loan, you would pay \$26,000.

Look at this: If you have a \$100,000 loan, which many people have—you hear about what the cost is, and many people who go to graduate school have this—you will pay \$53,000 more under the so-called bipartisan deal.

Let's take a look at the parents—the parents who will have the misfortune of having to live under this. Look at the cap. Under the Reed-Warren cap it is a 7.9-percent cap for the parent loan. Under the so-called bipartisan deal it is a 10.5-percent cap. So what does this mean? The additional money for a 10-year loan would be \$2,500 for a \$15,000 loan, \$4,200 for a \$25,000 loan, \$8,400 for a \$50,000 loan, and \$16,000 for a \$100,000 loan. That is how much more the parents of the students would pay.

The last chart, to bring it home to everyone, is the parents who are going to live with this bipartisan deal unless we pass Reed-Warren are going to have to pay, over 25 years—because their cap is 10.5 percent under this great bipartisan deal—\$16,000 more on a \$30,000 loan, \$26,000 more on a \$50,000 loan, and—hold on to your pocketbook—\$53,000 more on a \$100,000 loan.

Why would we not support the Reed-Warren bill? Did it cost us a few bucks? Yes. So we paid for the few bucks it cost us by putting in a millionaire's surtax of ½ percent. OK? But because the bipartisan deal expects students to pay, and is putting the deficit burden on the students, their cap ranges up to over 10 percent for the parent loans.

So you might hear: Oh, Senator BOXER, it will never reach the cap. We will not get to the cap. Well, I will use a—well, I will not go there. That is simply not true. We will get to the cap.

Why? I said before, the average for the 10-year Treasury bond over the past 30 years is 6.22 percent. That is what it is. The bipartisan deal plugs us into the 10-year Treasury bond and adds a few dollars, a few percentage points for handling fees, and we will get all the way up to the cap in every case. It is just going to happen.

If you don't learn from past interest rates, you can't predict the future. CBO predicts the future. They are using the past. We have to use the past. The cap will be hit. The cap will be hit.

So where does this leave us? We have a stark choice to make. We can go with a bipartisan deal that people worked very hard on—and I compliment them for all the work they put into it, believe me. We can go with that deal that puts debt on the backs of our students—an additional \$715 million worth of debt—or we can go with the Reed-Warren alternative that says to students: You are already paying enough. We are not going to lay this on you. We figured out a way to do it so that you are capped at a much lower rate.

This is what we are talking about. This is what we are talking about. The deal will take \$715 million out of our students' pockets over the next 10 years, and anyone who thinks that is fair should vote for the deal. Anyone who can look into the eyes of a student who is already struggling, who is already working, who is already asking their parents for help and trying to put it all together in a package, anyone who thinks that is fair, then vote for the deal. But don't kid yourself. This \$715 million is going right onto the backs of our families. I have shown the charts. This is a permanent deal.

Mr. COBURN. I am pleased Senators agreed on a permanent principled solution. On Friday, the Republican leader called this bill a permanent reform that ties interest rates to market rates. From the Republican HELP Committee, Senator ALEXANDER called this a long-term market-based solution. They are not going to revisit this issue.

I have to compliment Senators REED and WARREN. They deserve praise because they have come up with a plan that works, that is fair, and that will give solace to our students. For the undergraduate and graduate loans, we will see them capped out at 6.8, and for the parent loans the cap is 7.9 compared to over 10 percent in the so-called bipartisan deal.

Now, I promised I was going to revisit some of the stories, and I am going to close with those stories.

Sandy Barnett, 58 years old, of Illinois took out a \$21,000 loan to pay for graduate school in the late 1980s. But even after earning her master's degree, Barnett struggled to find a job that paid more than \$25,000 a year. She fell behind on her payments. She suffered through a layoff, a stretch of unem-

ployment, and the death of her husband while her student loan ballooned to \$54,000.

So what are we saying to Sandy Barnett? Oh, great news, we had a bipartisan breakthrough and now we are going to add \$715 million to student debt.

When Michelle Bisutti, a 41-year-old family practitioner in Columbus, OH, finished medical school in 2003, her student loan debt amounted to \$250,000. By 2010 it had ballooned to \$555,000. The entire balance of her Federal loans—over \$200,000—will be paid off over 351 months, when she will be 70 years old.

What are we doing? Who are we fighting for? How can we make one more speech on the floor of the Senate saying our students are our future? We have an immigration bill that is letting in high-tech workers because we don't have enough trained American workers to fill the jobs. Yet we are going to make it easier on students by piling on another \$715 million of debt on their backs and on the backs of their families?

Emmanuel Tellez's mother is a laid-off factory worker, and \$120 from her \$300 unemployment check is garnished to pay the Federal PLUS student loan she took out for her son.

Aren't we proud, Federal Government? This is great. We are garnishing Emanuel Tellez's mother, her unemployment check, because she took out a Federal PLUS student loan for her son. Why don't we talk about refinancing these loans? Why don't we talk about making it easier for people to pay back these loans instead of having a so-called bipartisan deal that adds \$715 million to students; that puts it on their backs?

Deanne Loonin, a staff attorney at the National Consumer Law Center in Boston, said she has been working with an 83-year-old veteran—Mr. President, an 83-year-old veteran—whose Social Security benefits have been reduced for the past 5 years.

The client fell behind on a Federal loan that he signed up for in the 1990s to help his son with tuition costs. Loonin said the government's cuts have left the client without enough cash to pay for medicine for his heart problems.

This is a national problem, and part of it is a national disgrace. So what is the solution? A so-called deal that makes it worse.

Last year, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York reported that Americans 60 and older still owe \$36 billion in student loans. Social Security checks are being garnished and debt collectors are harassing borrowers in their eighties over decades-old student loans. We can't do this.

There was a recession, the worst one since the Great Depression. Yes, people lost their jobs. Yes, people had problems. So why aren't we dealing with

the underlying issues and making it easier for our families, instead of having a deal that is cut—I wasn't part of it, that is for sure—that hurts our students and their families.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Oregon.

REMEMBERING OFFICERS CHESTNUT AND GIBSON

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, in approximately 8 minutes from now we are going to have a moment of silence for Officer Jacob Chestnut and Detective John Gibson in recognition of the sacrifice they made in defending the Capitol against an armed intruder.

I want to say how much we appreciate the forces deployed to protect us in our ability to share our thoughts on a host of issues that we speak to on the floor. If somewhere across America someone violently disagrees with us, if they decide they want to not engage in democracy but engage in violence, they might come to the Capitol, and our wonderful force protects us and gives us the ability to speak our hearts and minds on this floor on behalf of our constituents every single day.

So not only are we paying respect today to the officer and detective, but we are also paying respect to the entire delegation of security forces who work at the Capitol.

I am going to be brief in order to pause appropriately for that moment of silence and tell you that the conversation we are having today is part of a broader conversation about how to build the middle class in America.

There are some core pathways to the middle class, and one of those is fair mortgages. Indeed, when we were having a debate on Dodd-Frank in 2009 and 2010, we decided to put an end to payments in which mortgage originators were steering people from fair loans into predatory loans and getting big bonuses for doing so.

Today, the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau announced that they are bringing a case against a company that was doing exactly this, paying \$6,000 to \$8,000 per mortgage to an originator so they would betray their customer and not put them in the best mortgage they qualified for but into a much higher interest mortgage.

I am delighted that in this Chamber we decided to end such practices. I am delighted we proceeded to confirm the first Senate-confirmed Director just last week so that this agency can do its job. Its announcement today shows it is hard at work in this critical area of fair home mortgages.

Another key pathway to the middle class is living-wage jobs. We are going to have a lot of debate about what creates and destroys those jobs in America because there is no program that substitutes in terms of a foundation for a family more than a living-wage job.

Another key pathway is education. Now, this is very personal to me. I

grew up in a working-class community. My dad was a mechanic. I still live in that same community today, and I am surrounded by families that are struggling with near minimum wage jobs with often no benefits, hoping and praying that their children will be able to get the education necessary to have one of those remaining living-wage jobs. They are hoping we will do our job in Congress to help steer the economics of this Nation so there will be more of those living-wage jobs. But the viewpoint from the street is it doesn't look as though there are going to be a lot of jobs for those folks graduating from college.

They are also concerned if they send their child to college and their son or daughter ends up with a school loan the size of a mortgage, that is going to hang like a millstone around their neck and haunt them the rest of their life.

My colleague from California has just spoken eloquently to this issue. She has just been sharing stories of people on the ground and what they are facing in the context of how these big massive loans for school are weighting down the opportunities for our children.

In addition, it is discouraging our children from believing that they can even get that education. If they don't believe that, then they don't put in the work in high school to prepare themselves to get that higher education to fulfill their potential.

I grew up from a small child with President Kennedy speaking of a vision in which we could aspire to great things, of fulfilling the maximum opportunity for ourselves and for our families and for our Nation. But right now, on the ground there is an undercurrent of deep discouragement, almost desperation, not seeing a broad boulevard into the middle class but seeing a cooked, broken path complete with tricks and traps. That is what this conversation is about: How do we create that broad path into the middle class?

I am going to stop here, and I will come back later and talk specifically about the loan program.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police.

(Moment of silence.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of so many of my colleagues, I want to thank the security forces at the Capitol for the incredible job they do in protecting these rooms where debates and democracy take place.

The debate that we are engaged in right now is about how to create a

broad path to access education, as education is one of the key factors in developing and realizing the dream of middle-class jobs in America.

I was starting to share that this is very personal to me because I come from a working-class family. My parents and my grandparents had not gone to college. I didn't know people on my street who had gone to college. I didn't have siblings who had gone to college. I didn't know anything about college. But it was a scholarship, a loan, and jobs that enabled me to attend a university and pursue an education that took me into this realm of public policy, the realm that we are still in right now.

My first deep interest was Third World economic development, and I was blessed with a chance to work in Central America and India and to live as an exchange student in West Africa. Then that same education gave me a chance to go to graduate school, and there I was able to prepare for working here on strategic nuclear policy.

Education took me into realms that matter to our Nation, to our world, and matter in terms of creating the foundation to be able to have a living wage. So this is critically important to our children.

The proposal we have before us is that we are going to set up a loan program, and the loan program is going to take the cost of funds that are lent out and put on an additional 2.05-percent cap or add-on in interest for those who are getting undergraduate loans. For those who are getting graduate loans, it is going to add a 3.6-percent spread, as it is called. And for parents who are getting loans to help finance their kids' education, it is going to add on a 4.6-percent spread.

This 2-percent spread on undergraduates, 3.6-percent spread on graduates, and 4.6-percent spread on parents produces a lot of profits. I had my team consult with CBO to make sure the net profits of this program over the next 10 years are going to be \$185 billion, and make sure we understand that they are taking the profits that come from those spreads, the higher interest charged over the cost of money, and they are subtracting out the fact that some loans will be defaulted on. They are subtracting out the cost of administering the program, and they end up with a net profit. How much is that net profit? It is \$185 billion.

That means we are providing a service to our students, not at cost, but we are building in an equivalent of a massive \$185 billion fee on the children of working families who are aspiring to get an education. That is not a great deal. In fact, it is a terrible framework.

My colleagues who have worked to put this together point out that right now this may be the only option compared to locking in the 6.8 percent for the next 10 years. In the first few years

it produces a lower interest for our undergraduates than they would otherwise get. That is an important point to observe, that for a couple of years the loans our students will be getting will be at a significantly lower rate under the deal that is being proposed today. But over the course of the 10 years, the best estimate from CBO of the profits generated is still \$185 billion, in fact \$1 billion more, rounding off, than it is under the existing program.

To those who believe this is a great long-term solution, I disagree. Is it better in the next couple of years? Yes, it is. But I ask you, exactly why do we believe that adding on \$185 billion in fees as a profit center for the U.S. Government is a great idea if our goal is to create an affordable pathway to higher education? I have yet to have anyone explain that. In fact, I often hear: Well, you know, built into the existing law, which doubles to 6.8 from the 3.4 percent right now—that has profits built into that too.

That is a fair point. But let's step back and ask ourselves, sustaining the situation when we are charging extravagant fees to generate extravagant profits and lock them in for 10 years, is that a good idea?

There are a couple of proposals that would make this a much better program. One is to say, no, we are not going to have this big spread with a high cap of 8.25 percent on undergraduate loans and 9.5 percent on graduate loans and 10.5 on parent loans. But we are going to cap it at 6.8 percent. That makes a lot of sense. I applaud my colleague from Rhode Island who has come to the floor to speak for that proposal, and certainly I will be supporting that proposal.

Senator SANDERS has said: You know what. This is a pretty good solution for a 2-year period, so let's sunset this after 2 years so we can have this debate again. Because if we lock this in for 10 years and if we maintain the pay-for rules of the Senate in which if you eliminate the profit margin in one area you have to increase the profit margin in another, we might never be able to unlock this and we will continue treating college loans as a profit center for the U.S. Government, so let's terminate this after 2 years. Let's sunset this and rethink this.

That is a pretty good idea too. I encourage my colleagues to consider doing that. I certainly will be supporting that.

Nick writes to me from Oregon. He says:

After receiving paperwork the other day from DoE servicer "Direct Loans," I dove into my student loan [application] to see what I was filling out an application for.

I took out \$5,500 my Freshman year of college, \$6,500 my second year, \$7,500 in my third, and \$7,500 to finish my senior year. So in total I borrowed \$27,000.

In January I deferred payment on my loan because I had not found full time employment.

With a stroke of luck, in February I landed two part-time jobs making a whopping \$12 per hour doing manual labor to supplement my \$10 per hour part time gig in the health care field.

Since March I've been full-time with the healthcare company, and earned a \$1 raise. I've gained a lot of experience on the job, but from a monetary perspective, I wish I could be earning more so I could pay off my loans.

My loans are currently at 6.8 percent with a total owed as of today: \$32,266.

That is up from the \$27,000 he had owed before. He continues, saying:

At 6.8 percent my loans are accruing over \$1,800 in interest each year. That's about \$150 per month.

That is just the interest. Then when he is able to stop deferring and start making payments and include the capital being paid off it will be much more, and on a near minimum wage job that is extraordinarily difficult.

Here is a letter from a mother in Oregon, Melissa.

I graduated with a Master's degree in 1993. My loans have been paid off for over 10 years.

My husband enrolled in college when he was 36, 3 year ago. He will graduate next year with over \$60,000 in debt for a Bachelor's degree.

At this rate of increase in what it costs to get a college degree, I don't see how it is possible for our son, who is now 2, to ever have a college experience.

Please do the right thing and help make education accessible to everyone.

That is the plea of Melissa, to do the right thing. The right thing would be to cap the interest in this program so it doesn't go over 6.8 percent. The right thing to do would be to sunset this program after 2 years. Both of those amendments will be available to all of us here on the floor. I encourage my colleagues to support those amendments.

Our students already face \$1 trillion in debt. It is weighing them down. It means they are postponing getting married, they are postponing having children, they are perhaps postponing moving out on their own because they cannot afford an apartment with this debt. It is hurting the economy and it is hurting our future because children are discouraged about the possibility of going to college.

That is not the vision we want to have for America, where our children do not believe there is a path to the American dream for them. Today, if these amendments fail, it will be a very difficult choice, a very difficult choice between a couple of years of interest that is better than the status quo but a program that locks in a profit center for college loans, and we will have a very uncertain prospect about whether we can unlock that program a couple of years from now. I hope we pass those amendments.

I am not sure, frankly, which side I will come out on if we fail in that effort. But I will tell you this. If this deal becomes law we must return to this floor time and time again because

adding \$185 billion in fees so we can have a profit off working-class students trying to find a pathway to the middle class is wrong and deeply damaging to the American dream.

I yield the floor.

• Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, on Wednesday, the Senate will take votes in relation to the Manchin amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1911, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act. I was unable to be present for this vote, due to a pre-scheduled commitment in my home State for which my attendance was confirmed before the timing of these votes was set. Because my presence would not have changed the outcome of either vote, I honored my previous commitment. Had I been present I would have voted in support of Senator MANCHIN's amendment.

We are facing a crisis. On July 1, interest rates on new subsidized Stafford student loans doubled, from 3.4 to 6.8 percent. Already, officials at the Federal Reserve, the Department of the Treasury, and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau have all warned that student borrowing threatens to dampen consumption, depress the economy, limit credit creation, and pose a threat to our Nation's financial stability. Students and graduates in my State are already heavily in student loan debt. Two out of every three Missouri students will leave college with student loan debt. At a time when a higher education is vital to expanded opportunity for so many young people and with a 21st Century economy that increasingly demands workers with the skills earned as part of a college education, we cannot make it even more difficult for young people to financially achieve a college education. We need to act.

While not perfect, the Manchin amendment is the product of bipartisan compromise, forged and supported by Members from both sides of the aisle. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation because it will provide relief to our Nation's students by lowering interest rates for America's student loan borrowers. This relief will not only apply to subsidized Stafford loans; it will apply to loans to undergraduates, graduate students, and the parents of students seeking to pay for their education. Importantly, this legislation also includes interest rate caps; without this feature, I would not have been able to support this bill.

I would have also supported the second-degree amendment put forth by Senators REED and WARREN because it is consistent with my commitment to keeping rates low. The Reed-Warren amendment would provide certainty to students and families by ensuring that interest rates will go no higher than they would under the fixed rates in current law without adding to our deficit. I believe this is a responsible

measure that deserves bipartisan support.

To be clear, addressing the issue of student loan interest rates is only one piece of the puzzle of ensuring that higher education is affordable and attainable to those who seek it. We must also examine the issues of the rising costs of college attendance and the rapid growth of the proprietary college sector, where the share of Federal student aid payments and loan defaults is disproportionately and alarmingly high.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on all of these issues. Congress has an important role in helping American students attain the higher education opportunities they seek, to ensure that our Nation remain a global leader in the 21st century economy. •

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I appreciate the hard work of my colleagues who reached today's compromise student loan plan. However, I will oppose this bill, and I want to explain my reasoning.

The bill before us may be a good deal for current students in the short term, but it hurts their younger brothers and sisters in just a few years.

We must find a way to make college affordable for students and families—not just for those who are attending college in the fall or over the next few years, but also for those who will attend college in the future.

In Hawaii in the 2013-2014 academic year, the U.S. Department of Education predicts that over 20,000 undergraduate students, over 3,300 graduate students, and over 2,300 parent borrowers will take out Federal student loans.

Today's bill changes Federal student loans to variable interest rates, and raises caps above current law. While this bill will keep student loan interest rates low in 2013, the Congressional Budget Office—CBO—projects that by 2017, the rates for undergraduate student loans will rise above current law.

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities—AASCU—American Association of University Women—AAUW; Education Trust, The Institute for College Access and Success—TICAS; United States Public Interest Research Group, Young Invincibles, and other groups oppose this bill.

Under today's bill, undergraduates would see their student loan interest rate caps increase from 6.8 percent today to the higher cap of 7.25 percent by 2018. Graduate students would see their rate caps increase from 6.8 percent in 2013 to a new, higher cap of 9.5 percent. Parents using Federal PLUS loans would see their rates increase from 7.9 percent in 2012 to a new, higher cap of 10.5 percent. At these levels, future students will pay thousands of dollars more over the life of their loans.

I am a cosponsor of two of my colleagues' amendments that would improve this bill. To avoid hurting future students, I support an amendment by Senators JACK REED and ELIZABETH WARREN that would allow students to take advantage of the benefits of today's short-term low interest rates, but would keep the same cap as current law. This amendment is fully offset by a surcharge on millionaires. I also support Senator SANDERS' amendment to sunset today's bill in 2 years to prevent interest rates from exceeding current law and to foster a better long-term solution to college affordability.

Government should not be making money on the backs of students. Under current law, the Federal government already overcharges students for their student loans, to the tune of over \$180 billion over the next 10 years. This bill locks in that profit, plus it brings an extra \$715 million to the Treasury. It is encouraging that today's bill requires the Government Accountability Office to study the actual cost of the Federal Student Loan Program. However, only after getting this information can Congress make an informed decision to set student loan interest rates with just enough markup to make the program self sufficient. Without knowing the true costs of the student loan program, it is premature to lock in the arbitrary rates in today's bill for 19 years.

Instead, a few weeks ago I voted for both S. 953, the Student Loan Affordability Act, and S. 1238, the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act. Each of these would provide a temporary extension of a 3.4 percent interest rate on subsidized Stafford loans, completely paid for by closing tax loopholes. Such an extension would give Congress time to work toward a broader reauthorization of the Higher Education Act that can address many other important aspects of college affordability and completion all at once, beyond just this interest rate debate.

In sum, I do not support today's bill because it makes future students worse off than current law. Instead, I look forward to working on other initiatives to improve college accessibility and affordability for our young people.

BIPARTISAN STUDENT LOAN CERTAINTY ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, more than 3 weeks have passed since interest rates on subsidized Stafford loans have doubled for students next year. Unfortunately, this rate increase has taken effect despite numerous attempts by the Senate to extend the lower rates while we debate a comprehensive solution to the high cost of college, including student loan interest rates. Few if any bills that make their arduous way through the legislative process are perfect, but the legislation we are considering today is, in too many ways, too imperfect. Even after our attempts to win approval of better options, this legislation, in its final form, does not

offer enough to protect our future students from needlessly paying higher interest rates.

Education is a path out of poverty, a road to personal growth, and an access ramp to professional accomplishment and economic security. No student should be denied the benefits of a college education because of the cost, but unfortunately that is happening all too often. In recent years, average college tuition rates have been increasing faster than inflation and outpacing student financial aid. Tuition rates today are going beyond the ability of most families to pay. As a result, students and their parents take on significant student loan debt in order to have the opportunity at a college education.

I believe that the Federal Government has an obligation to support these students by subsidizing loans for the lowest income students and offering programs like Pell Grants to help students who never thought they could afford college. While the bill lowers interest rates for 11 million students in the near term, students and their parents by as soon as 2015 will likely pay higher interest than they pay under current law. Debt from student loans is climbing to new heights and outstanding student loan debt in the United States has reached nearly \$1 trillion.

This debate has included consideration of two amendments that I am pleased to cosponsor that would greatly improve the underlying legislation. Senators REED and WARREN filed an amendment to reduce the caps on interest rates to current levels, ensuring that students are no worse off under this legislation than they are today. We also have considered an amendment by Senator SANDERS, which will sunset this agreement after 2 years, ensuring that Congress continues the important conversation at how best to reduce college costs for students and their families. I very much hoped that these amendments could have been adopted.

This legislation is a mere patch on a much larger problem. We must have a comprehensive debate at lowering college costs through the Higher Education Act reauthorization this fall. As part of that debate I dearly hope we address the abuses of for-profit colleges and the raw deal they are giving to far too many students. While these schools are turning a profit and filling the airwaves with paid advertising, many of their students are defaulting on their federal loans because these schools by and large do not offer an adequate education that prepares students for the working world. Some of these schools are swindling our students, and we cannot adequately address college affordability without better regulating for-profit schools.

This legislation is not what I would have drafted. Under the new student loan bill, the Federal Government will

make an additional \$715 million in profits over the next decade, and all of the profit is coming from the pocketbooks of students and their families. While I am pleased the legislation includes a GAO study within 4 months to help us better understand the costs to the government of running the student loan program, so that we can better set appropriate student loan interest rates that do not generate revenue for the Federal Government, it does not go far enough to protect our students.

This conversation is not completed. The challenge and the obligation of making college affordable certainly remains. We have a responsibility to families across America to not only keep student loan interest rates low in the years ahead, as they plan their finances and manage their households, but to make fundamental reforms to help students and their families manage college costs. I am counting on that debate, and I know America's students are, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent at the conclusion of Senator CARPER's remarks I be recognized to use the time allotted to me under the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I think what I would like to do is try to set this discussion this afternoon in context if I can. One of the things I focus on a lot—I know the Presiding Officer does as well back in Delaware—is how do we create a nurturing environment for job creation and job preservation. I think that is one of the most important aspects of government. That is not the only one. One of the best things you can do to help people is make sure they have a job.

One of the ways to strengthen our economy is to make sure we are making smart investments with Federal, State, and local moneys as well as public funds. One of the ways we create that nurturing environment is to make sure we have a world-class workforce; that folks coming out of our high schools can read, write, think, do math, have science skills, technology skills, a good work ethic.

Other parts of the nurturing environment include access to capital; that is, to money, commonsense regulations, some certainty with respect to the Tax Code—a Tax Code that makes sense, is not burdensome—access to elected officials, modern infrastructure, broadly defined. Those are some of the elements.

But if we are going to be successful as a country in this century, we need to invest, among other places, in a world-class workforce, those kinds of skill sets. That is not just college, not just in postsecondary, it is almost from the cradle well into their lives.

A second area where it is important for us to invest is infrastructure, broadly defined: roads, highways, bridges, rail, ports, airports, water, wastewater, broadband deployed all across the country—those are the kinds of investments that will pay great dividends in the form of a stronger economy.

A third area we need to invest in is research and development. We were reminded by Dr. Francis Collins, head of the National Institutes of Health, of the kind of impact sequestration is having on our abilities to invest in all kinds of health-related areas and pharmaceutical areas, medical areas. They are finding it difficult to make the kind of investments needed to be made. Part of what we need to do is invest in the kind of research that can be commercialized and turned into goods and products we can sell not just in America but all over the world.

That is sort of the context. In my view, in the end this is how we strengthen our economy, how do we grow the economic pie for our country and citizens.

Going back to the first item I mentioned is a world-class workforce. It doesn't start when people graduate from high school and go off to college, whether junior college or whether it is a certificate program. It is what we do before they ever go to the first grade, the kinds of investments that are made before kids ever go into kindergarten, at the age of 5 in most States.

But today's debate is on college loans. I will focus on that. Let me remind us, the investments we do not make in the lives of children when they are young, before they ever go to kindergarten, can be demonstrated in Head Start. We only fund about half the kids in this country who are eligible for Head Start, only half. We fund roughly half the kids who are eligible for what is called title I, special education programs in our schools to make sure that, if they are way behind, they have a chance to at least catch up a little bit. We fund half the kids eligible.

Some of my colleagues said we should provide free college education for people; that should be our policy. We are not even meeting our obligation to fund Head Start for half the kids in the country, fund special education title I for half the kids in the country who are eligible. We have a \$750 billion budget deficit this year. It is down from \$1.4 trillion a couple of years ago, but it is large. It is going to come down for a while and then jump back up a number of years down the line.

I think for us the question is how do we get a better result for less money in almost everything we do. In a way college loans are the symptom of the problem but not the underlying problem. The underlying problem is less the Federal student loan program, it is

more the cost of education, what we are spending. My wife and I put two boys through college in the last half dozen or so years and we have a pretty good idea of what it costs to go to school these days. They got a good education but, boy, it costs a whole lot. One of the things we need to be focused on when we have this debate is what can we do to make sure our young people get a good education but how do we make sure it is done in a cost-effective way.

There is some interesting work going on in places such as MIT, Harvard, Stanford, that I think is informing us all in that discussion.

Let's talk about the program before us today, the student loan program. For a number of years we set the rate cap at 6.8 percent and then during the great recession we lowered that cap so the top rate students would pay on their student loans, Federal student loans, was 3.4 percent. That period of time expired more than a year ago, June 30 of last year, and so the rate was supposed to pop back up to 6.8 percent where it had been previously as a cap on what could be charged to students.

June 30 a year ago we were not sure what to do and we said let's kick the can down the road and put it off a year, the date of decision, and we will decide by June 30, 2013, what the new policy should be. We got here on June 30, 2013, and some were willing to kick the can down the road for another year and deal with it then.

The President said we cannot do that. We can't keep doing that. The President said we need to put in place a policy, a commonsense policy that is fiscally responsible but also that is morally responsible to the least of these in our society. I think we have both a fiscal imperative here, given the large deficits we face, and we have a moral imperative here to make sure the least of those in our society have a chance to have the ability to go to college and get a college education—be more productive in our society.

A lot is being said about the different rates.

There are two numbers we ought to keep in mind. People have said that in years to come interest rates will go up. I suspect they probably will go up since they are pretty low at this time, but we don't know. We have had Senators come to the floor and say the interest rates will be this amount or that amount. Who knows. We don't know.

What we do know is that under the current law right now and unless we pass something and get bipartisan support as well as the support of the President, the interest rate is going to be 6.8 percent for some time. If we adopt the bipartisan proposal that a number of us are offering—it is a tripartisan proposal, actually, with the support of the President—the rate for the student

loans this year will not be 6.8 percent, it will be 3.86 percent.

If the student takes a loan this year, that rate doesn't go up. Even if interest rates go up, they will owe 3.86 percent on the loan that students take out this year. If they take out another loan in the following school year and the rate is 4.1 percent, or whatever that rate is, that is what they will pay on that second loan for the balance of the loan, whether it is 5 years, 10 years, 15 years, or 20 years.

As interest accrues on these student loans over the next 2, 3, and 4 years while someone is in school, a reasonable question to ask is: Who pays for the accrued interest? If the student is in school, as most of us have been, the interest accrues. In the past, we have had subsidized loans for low-income students and unsubsidized loans for those who have a higher income. For a number of years, the student who had the subsidized loan—the lower income student—would accrue interest on their loan for year 1, year 2, year 3, year 4, and year 5.

As for the subsidized student, the Federal Government has paid the accrued interest. Then when they graduate from school and walk away, they don't owe that interest. It has been paid for—forgiven, if you will.

For the unsubsidized higher income student, the Federal Government defers the interest, but eventually interest—eventually it has to be paid by the higher income student. We don't change that. We leave that in effect.

Who pays the accrued interest for the lower income students? The Federal Government. When they graduate school, then they have an obligation to pay that interest and the principal on their own.

As I have talked to my colleagues, I find that not everybody knows what I just mentioned about the lower rate. As far as the example I just gave, if the rate for the student loan taken out this fall is 3.86 percent and the next year the rate is 5 percent or 6 percent, the House lets the rate go up each year. A permanent, assigned rate would not be in effect when the loan is taken out.

Somebody graduates and they go to work. In this example, they find a job that pays \$25,000. That is one person who has no spouse or kids. Let's say that person has \$45,000 worth of debt. How much can they be compelled to pay in interest starting the year after they graduate? The answer is not \$1,000 a month or \$500 a month. The answer is \$97 a month, and that is it. There is a mathematical formula where we take their income, less what the poverty level is for that person, multiplied by 0.15 percent. In this case it is \$97 a month.

Then we have this example. Let's say Sally gets married, has a child, and has a family of three. Let's say the family of three is making \$40,000 a year and

they have \$45,000 worth of loans. How much can they be compelled to pay in interest? Again, there are three people in the family with \$45,000 in loans. How much can they be compelled to pay? It turns out to be about \$120 a month. Not many people realize this is the law, and it is going to stay the law under the tripartisan proposal.

How about if somebody goes to work for the Federal Government or State government or local government or they go to work for a nonprofit and they do so at some sacrifice. Maybe they could make more money in the private sector, but they have this urge or compulsion for public service. After 10 years, their loan will be forgiven. If they are current on their loan, their loan will be forgiven after 10 years of public service. That has been the law and that would remain the law.

How about if they don't work in public service? What if they don't work for the State, local or Federal Government? What if they don't work for a nonprofit with a 501(c) designation? Let's say they are current on their loan. After 25 years, their loan is forgiven as well.

We can argue about the rate we use to determine what graduates, undergraduates or families would pay on their loan after the student graduates and whether it makes sense to peg or key that rate off the 10-year Treasury note. I think the 10-year Treasury the President has recommended is a reasonable place to begin.

Some have said we should use the Fed funds rate. What is the Fed funds rate? That is the rate that is charged overnight when one bank loans money to another bank overnight. Some people say that should be the rate. This is not an overnight loan from one financial institution to another, so I don't think the Fed funds rate is appropriate.

Some people said we should use a 90-day T-bill rate. This is not a 90-day loan. A 90-day T-bill rate may make sense for credit card interest rates, but a 5-year, 10-year, 15-year, 25-year student loan, I don't know that a 90-day T-bill rate makes a lot of sense as the interest rate for us to use.

Some people have said: Why don't we use a rate that might be charged for a 3- or 4-year car loan? This is not a car loan that is collateralized with a car. This is not a 20-, 25-, or 30-year mortgage that is collateralized with a house. This is a long-term loan that is not collateralized.

What the President has said—and I and our bipartisan group agree—is that it makes sense to use a 10-year Treasury note and peg the rate off of that and add to that a modest fee—in this case close to 1.5 points—to make sure the program is soundly run and doesn't make the deficit larger.

We have heard about some large numbers assigned as to what this

amounts to in terms of a transfer from students to the Federal Government. The President's original proposal had a very large amount, under his initial proposal, going from students to the Treasury, and he was going to use that money to pay for Pell grants. We would actually cover the cost of the Pell grant increases. We don't do that in our program.

What we tried to do is to take the very large transfer of money in the President's proposal to the Treasury and to change that and scale that down and come as close as we could to eliminating it. This is about a \$1.2 trillion college loan program, and that is about as close as we could come to eliminating the transfer, if you will, from students to the government to about \$600 million to \$700 million. That is a lot of money, but out of \$1.2 trillion, somebody told me it works out to \$2.50 per student who is getting a loan. If we can bring it down to zero from \$600 million or \$700 million, that would be great.

Let me conclude with these thoughts: Should we have a Federal student loan program? I am sure some people think we shouldn't, but I think we should. Should it be one where we use the Government's purchasing power to make it possible for people to access credit so they can go to school? I think we should. Should we allow people to use the Federal money the Government borrows—should we let them have that money at below Government cost? When we do that, it makes the deficit go up and it makes us squeeze programs such as Head Start and the Title I Program. It is like robbing Peter to pay Paul.

I think this is a good proposal. This proposal will use the Government's borrowing power and will be able to provide a lower-than-market rate for a lot of students. Students will be able to lock in the lower rate. It will then provide some help—with the Federal Government paying for the accrued interest—for the lower income students who have the subsidized loans. During the time they are in school, the Government picks it up, and they don't have to pay it back. It is covered by the Government.

This will make sure that when students graduate and get a job that doesn't pay a lot of money, there are significant limits on how much interest they can be compelled to pay in a year.

If somebody goes to work for the Federal Government, State government, local government, nonprofit or public service, after 10 years—if they are current on their loan—it is forgiven. For a person who doesn't go into public service but is current on their loan and still owes a ton of money after 25 years, their loan is forgiven. That is not heartless or unfair. I think it is pragmatic and reasonable. I think

it makes sure we meet our fiscal obligation for the taxpayers. At the same time, we are meeting our moral obligation for those who need to borrow money to go to college.

I think there was a UC request—as I was beginning to speak—from a Senator from a State smaller than Delaware. I believe he had a unanimous consent request to speak immediately following my remarks.

I yield with great pleasure for my Army buddy, the Senator from Rhode Island, JACK REED.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The senior Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I recognize it is a much larger State. The nice thing about the Senate is that we all have two Senators.

There has been a great deal of work put together by so many people here: Senator CARPER, Senator MANCHIN, Senator ALEXANDER, Senator HARKIN, Senator KING, and Senator BURR. I could go on. They have been trying—in a principled way—to help students. They provided short-term help, but the major criticism I have of the legislation is that it locks us into the long-run, predictable rate increases and will add further to the burden that students and families are bearing to send their children, and themselves, to college and beyond.

Despite these great efforts, I just do not believe this approach, if unamended, is going to be the way we want to move forward.

Mark Kantrowitz is a well-known expert on student aid. His comments are particularly telling.

It's still going to be, effectively, an interest rate increase masquerading as a decrease. Students currently enrolled will benefit from the low interest rates, but as the economy recovers and rates rise, today's high school students could end up paying more than 6.8 percent. It's far from a permanent solution.

I think he is right. I wish to emphasize the fact that as the economy recovers and rates rise, one of the fallacies of the CBO projections is that back in early 2000s they suggested that interest rates would stay very high. They did not anticipate the collapse in 2008 and 2009 of our economy.

Honestly, I don't think we want to premise our student lending on an economic collapse. I think what we want to do is assume and hope that the economy recovers, which will invariably increase interest rates. We are starting at the low point of interest rates, and then inevitably we are moving up. We are moving up as the economy recovers. We will also move up as the Federal Reserve limits their very aggressive quantitative easing program, where they have been buying securities to depress the rates.

If we look at the CBO projections, parents and graduate students will begin paying more than the current

fixed rate of 6.8 percent and 7.9 percent by 2015. That is not a long time. That means the young freshman who is going into college next year might benefit from this proposal, but the younger brother or sister who is a freshman in high school will be paying much more. I think collectively, over time, since this is a permanent proposal, the debts that will accumulate to American families and American students will be significant.

We are essentially adopting a new approach to Federal policy on higher education. We are not subsidizing it; we are not making it below market rates. We are shifting the costs on to students. That is because one of the premises in this proposal, quite obviously, is that there will be no cost to the government, and we are starting with the principle of a rate of 6.8 percent over time. So as we decrease rates for the first few years, just simple arithmetic tells us we have to raise rates going forward.

Also, I think the way this is structured has to be considered. We have chosen not a short-term T-bill rate—a 91-day rate—which is low; we have chosen a 10-year rate which, in itself, is higher. So we have begun our reconstruction of the rate structure by picking a much higher baseline than has been consistent in the past, even with variable rates, and we have had variable rates in the past. Then we have added a premium to that to cover our costs—the cost of default, the cost of the administration of the program.

Interestingly enough, in this proposal, there is a study the GAO is ordered to do to tell us if our cost estimates are in any way close to the real cost to the Federal Government. I think the factor is significantly sufficient that the premium—the delta, if you will—we are charging students is much higher than the real cost, even including default rates, to the Federal Government.

I think this is a proposal that, again, was generated with great sincerity and great diligence, but over time it does not meet the test of consistency with our previous support for higher education. We actually subsidized higher education, and we did it at below-market rates. We did it because we believed we had to give students a chance to educate themselves not only for their benefit but, just as importantly, for the benefit of this Nation.

I would suggest—and around this Chamber I have said this before—directly or indirectly, every one of my colleagues who is of a certain age has benefited from subsidized student loans. If they didn't, then a brother or a sister or someone did. Yet we are saying that was good for us, but it is not good for this generation of students. They should bear the risk of interest rate increases.

They should bear the full cost. This is at a time when we have to be much

more cognizant of the centrality of higher education in terms of the lifetime wages and earnings of individuals and in terms of our economic competitiveness across the globe.

We all have reached a point that unless we adopt the amendment I propose, we are locking ourselves into increasing rates that go way beyond the current statutory rate of 6.8 percent for Stafford loans and 7.9 percent for PLUS loans. Even with these rates—the current rates—6.8 and 7.9 percent—CBO has estimated that the government will generate about \$184 million in revenues. That is the difference between the cost of funding and the return. It is just what it costs the government to borrow and what they are getting in revenue from students, accounting for defaults and borrower benefits. So instead of investing in students, we are basically profiting from them, and that point has been made by my colleagues, particularly Senator WARREN, over time.

As we move to this new form of rate structure—10-year Treasury bills plus a premium; they are capped, but they are capped at high rates—the government will, in fact, be making even more money.

What I would like to do and what we have tried to do is to propose that we initially freeze rates at 3.4 percent and then spend the time to fix this problem as best we can completely. We need to develop a rate structure that does not provide a huge profit, as defined between the cost of funding and the revenue to the Federal Government, incentivize colleges to lower tuition—and that will be a very difficult and challenging endeavor—and think seriously about refinancing because right now we have students and families facing \$1 trillion in debt, and they are suffering under this situation.

We want to take a comprehensive approach, but this is not the approach. This is simply fixing rates. The one certainty in this legislation is that the rates will go up—not right away, but they will go up—and they could go up very quickly, and they could reach the limits very quickly, and that is an additional burden on students. As a result, it will begin to make college more expensive, less affordable, less of an option for many families and youngsters, and it will hurt us in the long run in terms of our economic competitiveness and our ability to grow our economy.

We have had experience with market-based rates in the student loan program before. This is not new. Most recently, the market-based rates for student loans from July 1, 1998, and June 30, 2006, was yield on a 91-day Treasury bill plus 1.7 percent while the student was in school and plus 2.3 percent while the student was in repayment. This rate was capped at 8.25 percent, and it applied to all Stafford loans—subsidized, unsubsidized, and graduate.

For parent PLUS loans, the rate was the yield on the 91-day Treasury bill plus 3.1 percent, capped at 9 percent.

Those rates were a good deal for borrowers. Students who are repaying their loans under this system have a rate of 2.35 percent this year and parents are paying 3.15 percent. That is because interest rates have come down dramatically. One of the reasons for that—perhaps the primary reason—is because we faced an economic potential catastrophe in 2008 and 2009. Economic activity shrunk, rates fell, and the Federal Reserve took a very aggressive program of quantitative easing to deliberately lower interest rates.

Instead of using the 91-day Treasury bill, what this underlying proposal uses is the 10-year Treasury bill. This decision results in a rate that in and of itself is 1.76 percentage points higher for this year alone. If we use the 91-day T-bill rate, we could lower rates even further, but we are using the 10-year rate, so we are already building in almost 2 percentage points of interest for students who will be subject to this legislation.

Since May 1 we have already seen the rates on the 10-year Treasury bill climb nearly 1 percent. Those rates are headed upward, and the CBO has projected them to rise. That is consistent, by the way, with an economic recovery. So the good news is if the economy recovers, interest rates will rise except it is not good news for students because their interest payments will rise. If CBO is wrong, that means we will probably have an economic shock ahead of us which will be bad news for everyone.

So I think we have to be very cognizant of the fact that there is a much better way to do this, and there should be a comprehensive approach.

What we are suggesting, and in the amendment Senator WARREN and I are proposing, is that we at least cap the interest rates for the Stafford loans—for the undergraduate loans—at 6.8 percent, which is the current rate, and for the PLUS loans at 7.9 percent so no one, regardless of whether one starts college next fall or 4 years from now, will be worse off than the current situation with the fixed interest rate. I think that would be an improvement. I think, if we don't adopt such an approach, then we are locking students and families into a very costly and predictably increasingly costly structure. We are not making any reforms with respect to the cost of college. We are not dealing with the issue of refinancing.

Honestly, I also think to say, well, if it gets really bad, if we really start hitting those caps—to say we will go back and fix it fundamentally ignores one of the principles that underlies this proposed legislation—that there be no further costs to the government. To fix the interest rate several years from now, when it is 8 percent, again, will

cost a lot more than staying with the current 6.8 percent fixed rate and 7.9 percent fixed rate.

So for that reason, I will be opposing the underlying legislation unless we can make significant progress with respect to at least capping the rates at 6.8 percent and 7.9 percent.

With that, I reserve the remainder of my time, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes about the loan program and concerns I have about it, particularly the scoring conventions used by the Congressional Budget Office in its cost analysis of these student loans. It is something I have looked at for some time as the ranking member of the Budget Committee. We have asked CBO to analyze these issues and have offered the honest Budget Act, which deals with all kinds of loans, and the improper way CBO scores them—not that they do it on their own, but because we require them to score it that way.

In sum, I would say the loans that have been referred to today do not make money for the government. They just do not. They are going to cost money. It is simply—and that would be a subsidy to the borrower. We are talking about 2.05 percent above the 10-year Treasury note, and that is a good way to figure what the interest rates are. When they rise, the cost of money rises. It rises for the U.S. Treasury as well as for the people who borrow from the U.S. Treasury.

But the Federal Credit Reform Act, or FCRA, requires CBO to score these loans in a way that gives the impression that they do, in fact, make money. In a recent report on student loans, the CBO wrote to us that FCRA—this is the law that tells them how they analyze the cost:

FCRA accounting does not consider some costs borne by the government. In particular, it omits risks taxpayers face because federal receipts from interest and principal payments on student loans tend to be low when economic and financial conditions are poor and resources therefore are more valuable. Fair-value accounting methods account for such risk. . . .

Fair value accounting methods aren't being used with these loans. In fact, CBO utilized a fair value accounting system—please get this, colleagues: They used that system to analyze these loans in addition to the system required by law, and that would show that student loans actually lose money for the American taxpayer. So often around here we have scores that indicate one thing, and Senators advocate that they say one thing, when the truth is it costs us money.

As the Senate moves forward in this debate, it is important that it consider the real costs associated with the Federal student loan program.

The budgetary costs of the Federal Direct Student Loan Program are de-

termined based on accounting rules specified by the Federal Credit Reform Act. Under the guidelines set forth there, the cost of Federal loans are recorded in the year in which the loans are made. The net cost of a student loan includes the estimated future repayment of principal and interest—the estimate of what would be repaid. The value of these future repayments are adjusted to reflect certain risks—the risk of default and the risk of inflation. CBO cannot, however, include an adjustment for market risk, such as if the country has a bad financial crisis, which periodically happens.

Examples of market risk include the current fiscal situation: Our Nation's current unemployment rate is 7.6 percent with 11.8 million people unemployed. Some want to continue to bring in millions of people to take those jobs from abroad while we have 11 million people unemployed, and it is time for us to reevaluate that policy, in my opinion.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, June 2013 figures, the unemployment rate among college students shows about 1.9 million unemployed college students. All of these factors lead to lower loan repayment rates and higher collection costs for the government. With an interest rate well over 7 percent and college students struggling to find work, default rates are going to increase.

Because the FCRA method of accounting for student loans does not take into account all of the risks that are associated with making a loan, the government should require that CBO adopt the fair-value accounting method. As I said, unrelated specifically to this legislation, I offered legislation 2 years ago to do just that because the American people need to know what the cost to the Treasury will be when we make loans, and we know, and CBO acknowledges, that this method they are using required by law is not accurate.

According to a June 2013 CBO report made for the Senate Budget Committee entitled "Options to Change Interest Rates and Other Terms on Student Loans" that I requested in my capacity as ranking member of the Budget Committee, CBO admitted and acknowledged that its current scoring rules failed to adequately account for the cost of these loans.

That is just a fact. I wish it were not so. I wish we could cut these rates even lower than they are. But I have to say, it is not accurate to say the Federal Government is going to make a bunch of money off of it.

It goes on to say:

[U]sing fair-value methodology represents a broader measure of cost that includes the cost of market risk.

So CBO has explicitly stated it would be better to use the fair-value methodology and not the other.

Well, does that make a difference? Does it change what the score and the analysis would be? They have their official analysis based on the requirements that Congress gave them, but they acknowledge the market risk is a better analysis. What did they say that would do?

The methodological difference between FCRA—the current system—and the fair-value accounting system produces alarmingly different results—alarmingly different. Under the FCRA, CBO estimates that the student loan program will reduce the deficit by \$37 billion in fiscal year 2013 and save \$184 billion over 10 years. With those results, of course, the program looks good.

But under the fair-value accounting procedure that CBO says is preferable, CBO estimates that direct student loans issued between 2013 and 2023 would cost the government \$95 billion—cost the government \$95 billion. Suddenly, the student loan program, when adjusted more accurately for market risk, is a deficit creator rather than an income producer.

As I say, I wish that were not so. I hate to report that. But we have been looking at these numbers for some time. I urge my colleagues. I know we need to do something about student loans. We need to get it done now. I am not here to try to say we should not pass anything. But what I am saying is, colleagues, we have to end this fooling ourselves system. We have to go to an honest system that the private markets utilize and the Federal Government should be utilizing. I am going to continue to push for that.

We will continue to work on this issue. I know we have a situation that is very painful for students, many of whom have overborrowed. They did not understand the significance of what they were doing and they ran up more debt than they should have. As a result, they are in a painful circumstance, for sure. But when we do our policy for the future, and we analyze what it costs to make a loan program—what it costs the taxpayers—we need to have accurate accounting.

If the matter is accurately accounted, using best accounting procedures, this bill, as now presented, would actually cost the taxpayers money rather than make them money.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we are debating student loans. We are here having this debate because of Russia. How did that happen? It was October of 1957. The Russians launched a satellite

called Sputnik. We did not have any satellites. We knew they had the bomb, and then they had the satellite. It scared us. It frightened Congress enough that they created the first student loan program. Oh, there were loans given to GIs coming back from the war, but this was a program available to those who were not veterans. They called it the National Defense Education Act. It was all about America's defense. What they said was: We will loan money to students across America to go to college. I think their rationale was sound. If more Americans went to college and got educated, we would have the engineers and scientists we need to make this a strong nation from a defense point of view and from our economy point of view.

So I thank the Russians for launching Sputnik, and I thank the Congress for creating the National Defense Education Act because a kid from East St. Louis, IL, whose parents had eighth grade educations, got a chance to go to college, and he is standing here today in the Senate.

It was a pretty good deal too. The National Defense Education Act said: You can borrow money to go to school, and you do not have to pay it back until a year after you graduate—10 equal payments at 3-percent interest. I remember these because I was frightened to death in 1969, when I finished law school and added up all my student loans, and they said to me: You owe \$8,500. I went home to my wife, and I said: We are doomed. We can't pay that back—\$850 a year. It is impossible. It was not impossible. We did it. And many others did too.

What happened as a result of that satellite and that student loan program was a dramatic change in higher education in America in the 1960s and ever since. We democratized higher education. It used to be the only folks who went to college were the sons and daughters of alumni and those who were supersmart and rich. Well, kids like myself got a chance all across America.

So now here we are today, many years later—some 50 years later—and we are talking about student loans for this generation of students. We have many choices before us. I happen to like the National Defense Education Act. I like holding interest rates at 3 percent. I like the payback terms. But the number of students taking out loans and the cost of higher education have reached a point where we cannot do that without some serious commitment of resources at the Federal level at a time when our budget problems do not give us much latitude and much opportunity.

So I sat down with a number of my colleagues—ANGUS KING, a new Senator from Maine, an Independent who sits on the Democratic side; JOE MANCHIN, a Democrat from West Virginia; TOM

CARPER, a Democrat from Delaware; and TOM HARKIN, who is the chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, and is in charge of this subject matter. That was the Democratic side. On the Republican side: LAMAR ALEXANDER of Tennessee, RICHARD BURR of North Carolina, TOM COBURN of Oklahoma. It is a pretty diverse group.

We hammered out a bipartisan answer to dealing with student loans that will be the last vote today. We will have a series of votes. That, I think, is the right answer because I think we have struck the right balance. There are many of my colleagues in the Democratic caucus who are still opposed to this bipartisan approach. Some of them believe—and I do not quarrel with it—we should go back to the old days of the National Defense Education Act. We should be subsidizing the interest rates. We ought to be putting a substantial amount of money into keeping the cost of higher education low in terms of interest rates.

I do not quarrel with that. I am a beneficiary of that type of approach and philosophy. But we have tried to pass that in the Senate several times with the leadership of JACK REED of Rhode Island, and we cannot come up with 60 votes. We cannot come up with the supermajority we need to make this a viable alternative.

So now we have to ask ourselves a very basic question: What will we do if we cannot have a subsidized Federal program? Well, I think what we have come up with is a good approach. What we have come up with says basically we are capping the interest rate any student will ever have to pay in undergraduate loans at 8.25 percent—8.25 percent—capped, no matter what happens to interest rates. And we are saying we are going to start at an interest rate that is even dramatically lower than the interest rate paid by students as of this moment. So if you vote against the bipartisan alternative on student loans, you are voting against an effort to bring student loan interest rates down from 6.8 percent to 3.8 percent and you are voting against the cap on interest rates at 8.25 percent. I do not see how that is going to benefit students. If you were offered a new home mortgage, reducing your interest rate by 3 percent, you could not wait to go to closing—right?—because the interest you are going to pay on your home goes down dramatically.

Our bipartisan approach is going to reduce the interest rates paid by 11 million students and for about two-thirds of them by 3 percent. And those who vote no, those who vote no to that approach, are saying: Keep it at 6.8 percent. How can that be good for students or their families? A cap of 8.25 percent on student loans for 10 years is a protection that says to students in the fu-

ture: The highest interest rate you face is 8.25 percent.

What does it mean in terms of savings? Our approach in the bipartisan bill means if you are an undergraduate student in America, over the next 4 years of your education, you will save between \$2,189 and \$3,191 in interest not paid—interest not paid.

So those who are going to vote against the bipartisan bill are saying to students: Keep the rate at 6.8 percent. Do not lower it. And pay between \$2,000 and \$3,000 more in interest over the next 4 years. With friends like that, students and their families—I will not finish the sentence. But people ought to think twice about this. We are giving students a lower interest rate and a guaranteed cap.

It is not just for undergraduates. In the next 4 years, those who are in the graduate loan programs will save over \$4,000 in interest with the bipartisan approach; and those in the parent loans will save over \$2,000 in interest paid. So for 4 years this is a solid winner.

In the effort of full disclosure and honesty, after 4 years, in the second 4 years, interest rates, we project, will be going up, and the cost of these loans go up.

My position is, let's vote for this now, roll up our sleeves and make sure that 4 years from now we can replace it with something that is as good or better. But why stick people with 6.8 percent, when we can bring the loan rate down to 3.8 percent?

At the end of the day, the groups that are supporting this bill are substantial: the American Council on Education, the American Association of Community Colleges, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, Rock the Vote, the United States Student Association, and the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, because, you see, we are not adding to our budgetary woes here.

We found out this program actually generates about \$715 million more than the actual cost of loans, as we project them. I wish it were zero. But put it in perspective: \$715 million over 10 years against the student loan program that will cost us \$1.4 trillion.

My colleague Senator KING did an analysis, and I think he calculated it at .005 percent or somewhere in that range.

Mr. KING. Three zeroes.

Mr. DURBIN. So .0005 percent. Do you know what it means to the cost of a student loan—that \$715 million I am talking about? Mr. President, on average \$2.76 for each loan over the ten year period. So if you borrow \$2,000 or \$3,000, over the life of the loan you will pay \$2.76 more, but you will save \$2,000 to \$3,000 in interest.

For those who argue that \$715 million is a deal killer, it is not. I wish it were zero, but it should not stop us. If you are frustrated with the current situation, if you think there ought to be a

different student loan program, work to change it. But do not be supporting a position which raises interest rates on the students who are struggling to get by. Do not be voting against the bipartisan bill that puts a cap on these student loan interest rates.

Let's roll up our sleeves in the next 4 years. Let's make sure we continue affordable interest rates for students.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I spoke on the floor earlier today about the proposal that is before us. I wish to reiterate what I said then: I cannot stress enough that this bill represents a number of compromises made on both sides to come to a solution on how to keep interest rates low for students in the coming years. The compromise we will be voting on shortly is the closest we have gotten to a deal that represents two core Democratic principles related to student loan interest rates: No. 1, the inclusion of hard, upfront caps for students, so should we experience high interest rates in the future, they will be protected from those high rates.

Let me repeat. Under this plan, undergraduates in this country will never pay more than 8.25 percent. That is what we had in the 1990s, and five times we bumped up against that in the 1990s. History could well repeat itself in that regard.

We have a hard cap. Graduate students will pay no more than 9.5 percent; parents and graduate students taking out PLUS loans, no more than 10.5 percent—hard cap.

Secondly, we wanted this to come as close to deficit neutral as possible, and this is what we have done.

To show how we made compromises around here, I will say that the Republicans' initial proposal that we had voted on here—and it went down, as well as the initial Democratic Senate proposal went down—the Senate Republicans' initial proposal raised \$15.6 billion in deficit reduction over 10 years. We negotiated down to \$715 million over 10 years. Put that in context. Over the next 10 years the student loan program will probably loan out somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1.4 to \$1.5 trillion. What we are talking about is only \$715 million over the next 10 years. That is the closest we could come to zero and at the same time

have hard caps and keep interest rates low.

I can't stress enough that this is a true compromise. If I were to write it, I would write it differently, and I have expressed myself in votes on the Senate floor in the past. But we have to deal with the art of the possible and reach compromises that answers both what the Republicans sought to do and what we sought to do.

I would also reiterate that this is not the end of the conversation. It is the beginning.

As important as student loans are—Stafford loans so students are able to get an education and their parents being able to afford it—as important as that is, it is only one part of the jigsaw puzzle that is college affordability.

In 4 months, when the GAO report comes back—and I will again repeat that one of the elements we got in this compromise was a requirement that the GAO do a study on student loans, what the real cost is to the government, what the real cost is to administer that, and get that back to us in 4 months. When we are in our committee reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, we can take that into account.

My good friend from Maine, who has been so instrumental in working out this agreement, has said many times that the rule book we have to go on is CBO estimates. I have been here long enough to see how many mistakes CBO has made in the past. We don't know if they are right. We have no way of knowing that. We also don't know what those interest rates are going to be in the future, and we don't know if a 2.05 add-on or 3.6 add-on is the right thing. We don't know. That is why we have required the GAO to give us an in-depth study so we can have a better handle on the cost to the government, what it costs to administer the program and all of its elements. We will take that into account.

I was pleased to hear, again, Senator ALEXANDER, my good friend and ranking member on our committee, earlier today on the floor. He expressed the same commitment he has expressed to me personally that I mentioned today; that is, working together to get a reauthorization of the Higher Education Act done in this Congress. Senator ALEXANDER is committed to that, and so am I.

I might also add that I am pleased that President Obama has also said he is personally committed to working with us to get a Higher Education Act through and working with us to look at all of the college affordability issues. This was displayed in his speech today.

This is just one element—an important element but only one element.

I look forward to working with Senator ALEXANDER, the White House, Secretary Duncan, the Department of Education, and members of my committee on the Democratic side to really look

at all aspects of college affordability and how we are going to address this issue comprehensively.

I again want to point out for the Record—because soon we will be voting—that there are two amendments that will be voted on. I think one is by Senator REED of Rhode Island and the other is by Senator SANDERS of Vermont, and then we will have our final passage, if I am not mistaken. I know the two amendments that have been offered—one by Senator SANDERS and one by Senator REED—look very nice, and I know many on my side will be tempted to vote for them, but I will not be voting for them. They look nice, they sound nice, they would be nice in a perfect world, but we have to deal with CBO estimates. Quite frankly, the cost of those amendments, as judged by CBO, is something we can't do. Again, they sound nice, they look nice, they might feel nice, but we can't do it. So I will be opposing those amendments. I will be opposing them because we can't do that at this time.

What we can do is do the compromise we have reached. That is what we can do. And don't let anyone tell you this is a bad deal for students. This is not a bad deal for students. If we don't pass this, undergraduate students this year will pay 6.8 percent on their loans. With this bill, they will pay 3.86 percent. Tell me which is the best deal. Next year it is 4.26 percent, the year after that it is 5.4 percent, and the year after that it is 6.29 percent. It doesn't get up to 7 percent for 4 years, if CBO is right. In any case, for the next 4 years it is going to be lower than 6.8 percent for every undergraduate student in college.

Don't let anybody tell you this isn't a good deal for students. It is a good deal for students. This is why today we received an endorsement by the United States Student Association endorsing this bill, endorsing the compromise. They are not walking away from it. The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights has endorsed this bill. Any way you look at it, this is a good deal for students, and it is a good deal for their families. Don't let anybody tell you otherwise.

Could there be a better deal? Well, I suppose. How about free money? That is always a good deal, free money. There is always something better out there. I say to my friends on the Democratic side, don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Yes, there is probably a more perfect thing we could do. We can't afford it. We don't have the CBO scoring that would allow us to do that. Plus, we need the votes of our colleagues on the Republican side, so that is why we have to have a compromise. That is the way this place should run—on compromises. Legitimate, yes, hard-fought-out, but good compromises.

What Senator MANCHIN and Senator BURR have offered is that compromise—a good bill, a good, solid compromise, one that will make sure interest rates for undergraduate students will be lower for the next 4 years and under 6.8 percent. As Senator ALEXANDER worked so hard to make sure we got into this compromise, when students get these loans at 3.68 percent this year, that is it for the life of the loan—that is a good deal—or next year at 4.26 percent or the next year at 5.24 percent. That is a good deal. So don't let what you might think would be more perfect take you away from voting for this bill. This is a good bill.

Again, I thank so many who are responsible for putting this together. I thank Senator DURBIN, Senator MANCHIN, Senator KING, and Senator CARPER, who worked so hard through so many days and weeks to get this pulled together. Of course, I thank my ranking member and good friend Senator ALEXANDER, who has been here from day one trying to find that sweet spot that we could all agree on and vote on. I thank Senator COBURN, Senator BURR, and all their staffs for all of their hard work and diligence in putting this proposal together. I thank President Obama and his team and Secretary Duncan and his team for working together, and all of our staffs.

This is the best we could do on a compromise for students given all the various priorities of this side, that side, the White House, and everybody else. This is a good deal. We shouldn't turn it down.

I will vote against the amendments offered by Senator REED and Senator SANDERS, well meaning though they are. As I said, they sound nice and they look pretty, but don't be lured into thinking that somehow that is going to happen. It is not. We have to stick with this compromise and get a good deal for the students, even though you may not think it is perfect. It is a good deal.

I support the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of its passing and against amendments that would detract from it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back with the exception of 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1778

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote in relation to amendment No. 1778, offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. The Reed-Warren amendment would provide students and families with certainty by ensuring that interest rates will go no higher than they

would under the current fixed rates in present law—6.8 percent for student loans and 7.9 percent for PLUS loans. The amendment is fully paid for by a very small—about one-half of 1 percent—surcharge on income over \$1 million.

We should do this for students all across the country, and we should do it not only for the students who might be going to college next year but for those who are in high school today and will face, as we know, predictably higher rates.

A young man from Rhode Island wrote a letter to me. He said:

My brother, who is in college, will be paying a lot of money for college and he's worried he will have a hard time paying the loan. I'm afraid that by the time I go to college, loans will be so expensive that I will not be able to pay it off. My parents help with paying for college but they might not be able to help with a loan that big. I really want to be able to go to college.

For those young men and women who are in high school today or who are going to high school, we have to at least vote for this Reed-Warren amendment to make sure interest rates stay at least within the present bounds.

With that, I urge a "yes" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator from Rhode Island knows I have the highest respect and affection for him. I might say that he makes excellent points.

As I said earlier, this amendment looks good, looks pretty, sounds pretty, and might be nice in a perfect world, but that is not where we are. Like my colleagues, like Senator REED, I want to make sure we are only asking students and families to pay as much interest as needed in order to properly administer the program and no more. Student loans should not be a profit center for the Federal Government. As I said earlier, that is why we put into our underlying bill, the Manchin-Burr bill, a requirement that GAO report back to us in 4 months as to what it actually costs. My good friend from Rhode Island doesn't know what it costs. I don't know what it costs. No one really knows what the cost of this is.

As Senator ALEXANDER said earlier, we are going to be looking at all of this in the Higher Education Act, what college affordability is.

Let me repeat. Under the bill before us, students pay less interest rates than 6.8 percent until 2017.

While the Reed bill may sound good, we are not there. We are not there to move on the Reed bill yet or anything like it. Plus, the offset he has for that, even though he has fully paid for it, is not acceptable to a lot of people here in the Senate Chamber.

Stick with the underlying bill and defeat the Reed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on

agreeing to the Reed-Warren amendment.

Mr. REED. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called roll

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 183 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reid
Baucus	Heitkamp	Rockefeller
Begich	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schumer
Boxer	Landrieu	Shaheen
Brown	Leahy	Stabenow
Cantwell	Levin	Tester
Cardin	Markey	Udall (CO)
Casey	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Nelson	
Hagan	Reed	

NAYS—53

Alexander	Enzi	McCain
Ayotte	Fischer	McConnell
Barrasso	Flake	Moran
Blunt	Graham	Murkowski
Boozman	Grassley	Paul
Burr	Harkin	Portman
Carper	Hatch	Pryor
Chambliss	Heller	Risch
Chiesa	Hoeven	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Coburn	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johanns	Sessions
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Corker	Kaine	Thune
Cornyn	King	Toomey
Crapo	Kirk	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Donnelly	Manchin	

NOT VOTING—1

McCaskill

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 1774

Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 1774, offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I want to thank Senators LEAHY, WYDEN, BROWN, WHITEHOUSE, GILLIBRAND, MERKLEY, BLUMENTHAL, SCHATZ, MURPHY, and HIRONO for supporting this amendment. I also wish to thank the NEA and the AFT, the two largest teachers organizations in the country, for supporting this amendment.

This amendment is very simple. It sunsets this legislation after 2 years, takes advantage of current, relatively low interest rates, and gives us the

time to reauthorize the Higher Education Act and come up with sensible long-term solutions to the crisis of student indebtedness and college affordability.

According to the CBO, by the year 2018, under this legislation undergraduate Stafford loans will be 7.25 percent, graduate Stafford loans will be 8.8 percent, and parent loans will be 9.7 percent. We have a crisis right now in student indebtedness. We need to solve that crisis, not make it worse.

I ask for support of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I can't support this amendment. By sunsetting this effort 2 years because CBO uses a 10-year window, the amendment would cost an estimated above \$20 billion, and there is no offset to pay for it. So, again, the lack of that offset would violate the agreement we made under our bipartisan agreement of trying to get as close to deficit neutrality as possible.

Like Senator SANDERS, I also want to make sure we make any needed changes to student loan interest rates before they become too high. Let me remind everyone, in the 1990s we had an 8.25-percent cap. We hit it five times. We got back in this agreement an 8.25-percent absolute cap.

Beyond that, for the next 4 years every student—subsidized and unsubsidized—in college will have a lower interest rate than 6.8 percent. In the out-years, who knows what the interest rates are going to be. We don't know that, and neither does CBO. But we do know what they are going to be this year and probably next year, and the students get a much better deal under the compromise.

So I say, don't support the Sanders amendment. Let's vote and let's keep the compromise in place and give our students a good deal, this year and next year and the year after and keep that 8.25-percent cap that we negotiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 65, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 184 Leg.]

YEAS—34

Baldwin	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Baucus	Klobuchar	Sanders
Begich	Leahy	Schatz
Blumenthal	Levin	Schumer
Boxer	Markey	Shaheen
Brown	Menendez	Stabenow
Cantwell	Merkley	Udall (NM)
Cardin	Mikulski	Warren
Coons	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Nelson	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	
Hirono	Reid	

NAYS—65

Alexander	Feinstein	McCain
Ayotte	Fischer	McConnell
Barrasso	Flake	Moran
Bennet	Graham	Murkowski
Blunt	Grassley	Murray
Boozman	Hagan	Paul
Burr	Harkin	Portman
Carper	Hatch	Pryor
Casey	Heinrich	Risch
Chambliss	Heitkamp	Roberts
Chiesa	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Coburn	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johanns	Tester
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Kaine	Toomey
Crapo	King	Udall (CO)
Cruz	Kirk	Vitter
Donnelly	Landrieu	Warner
Durbin	Lee	Wicker
Enzi	Manchin	

NOT VOTING—1

McCaskill

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. We will likely have one more vote tonight, and then Senator MURRAY and Senator COLLINS will determine what is going to happen on the appropriations bill that is before us.

ORRIN HATCH'S 13,000TH VOTE

Mr. President, I rise now to honor our colleague ORRIN HATCH. The next vote cast will be ORRIN HATCH'S 13,000th vote. This is a tremendous accomplishment. It speaks to his dedication to the State of Utah, his constituents, the Senate, and our country. He is the Republicans' most senior Member. He is now serving in his seventh term in the Senate. Before running for the Senate, Senator HATCH received a bachelor's degree from Brigham Young University, a law degree from the University of Pittsburgh, and was in private practice for a number of years.

He is the ranking member on the Finance Committee today. As we know, he made a reputation for himself when he was chair of the Judiciary Committee. We worked together with him for those many years. He serves on the HELP Committee and the Joint Committee on Taxation. He has truly had a significant impact on the Senate.

He is a dedicated member of the board of directors of the Holocaust Memorial Museum. He has done amazing work throughout his career.

His No. 1 accomplishment for me is not how many terms he has served in the Senate but his accomplishment for

his wonderful family. His wife Elaine has been a great helpmate for him for these many decades. He has 23 grandchildren, 6 children, and now 10 great-grandchildren.

Although ORRIN and I occasionally disagree on substantive issues, I have great respect for him. I am so grateful to him over the years for always expressing concern about me personally and his kindness and concern to my family, especially to Landra.

Congratulations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The senior Senator from Utah will not be known for the quantity of his votes but for the quality of his work. He is a man of extraordinary character. We are happy to have this intermission to congratulate him on yet another accomplishment in a long and outstanding career in the Senate.

ORRIN HATCH'S 13,000TH VOTE IN THE SENATE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have just cast 13,000th vote here in the Senate. I have to admit that I never thought I would cast so many votes, but I'm grateful that I have had the opportunity to serve the good people of Utah long enough to reach this milestone.

That said, I am not really one to dwell on the past. I have a lot more work here to do and a lot more votes to cast before I am done.

But, I do want to thank both the distinguished majority and minority leaders for their kind words this evening and for being gracious enough to take the time to mark this occasion. I have known these good Senators a long time and I am proud to call both of them my friends.

I am grateful for all of the friends and colleague I have made here in the Senate. They make it a great place to work.

AMENDMENT NO. 1773

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 1773, offered by the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a point of order. I believe we are prepared to voice vote this, and at the proper time I ask that such a motion be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, we can fix our student loan program with a "yes" vote on the bipartisan legislation to lower interest rates for all student borrowers. The bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act is a long-term fix that is fair, equitable, financially sustainable, and fiscally responsible.

This compromise will save students \$8 billion in interest this school year which translates to \$31 billion in savings over the next 4 years. That means a savings of \$2,000 in interest for the

average freshman student who starts college this year. A “no” vote will prevent our students from realizing this savings.

There is simply no better investment we can make than the education of our children and grandchildren. I urge my colleagues to make that investment and vote to support this long-term bipartisan fix.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I oppose the proposed amendment. It is short-term rate relief, but it is long-term rate pain for thousands of students and families across the country. We can do much better than that. In a few moments, we will have an opportunity after the voice vote to have another small discussion prior to final passage.

Again, I believe this amendment is not—despite the best work and best intentions and great effort by my colleagues—the best work we can do with respect to students and families.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. First of all, I respect my colleague, and we just have a difference of opinion, but we are still going to work together on everything we possibly can to make it better.

It is my understanding that we will be able to adopt the amendment by a voice vote since we will be having a rollcall vote on passage of the bill as amended with this language.

I ask unanimous consent to extinguish the previous order requiring a 60-vote threshold for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1773) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on passage of H.R. 1911, as amended.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the vote comes on what we are going to do and that is—as my good friend Senator MANCHIN said—to keep interest rates low for students.

What this means for our students is that the student loans for all undergraduate students will be reduced from 6.8 percent to 3.86 percent this year. It will be lower than 6.8 percent for the next 4½—almost 5—years.

Do our students and our families a favor. Vote for final passage. Keep the interest rates low and make sure our students are not paying a 6.8-percent interest rate this year, next year, and the year beyond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as I indicated previously with respect to the

amendment proposed by Senator MANCHIN, this proposal will provide short-term rate relief but lock in long-term rate pain for thousands of families and students across the country. It also represents the fundamental shift in our approach to student lending. It goes from investing in students and in our future economy to making those students be profit centers for the Federal Government. There is an estimated \$184 billion over 10 years of profit in the current baseline. It is the difference between the cost of funding and the revenue paid by the students to the Federal Government. This proposal adds \$715 million to that.

Also, we have done nothing to address the \$1 trillion of outstanding debt that students face today. This measure will add to that debt.

Education has always been the engine of opportunity in this country. With this legislation, that engine will leave the station with many fewer students aboard.

I urge a “no” vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will read the title of the bill for a third time.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, under the previous order the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 185 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Alexander	Durbin	Landrieu
Ayotte	Enzi	Levin
Barrasso	Feinstein	Manchin
Baucus	Fischer	McCain
Begich	Flake	McConnell
Bennet	Franken	Merkley
Blunt	Graham	Mikulski
Boozman	Grassley	Moran
Burr	Hagan	Murkowski
Cantwell	Harkin	Murray
Carper	Hatch	Nelson
Casey	Heinrich	Paul
Chambliss	Heitkamp	Portman
Chiesa	Heller	Pryor
Coats	Hoeven	Reid
Coburn	Inhofe	Risch
Cochran	Isakson	Roberts
Collins	Johanns	Rockefeller
Coons	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Schatz
Cornyn	Kaine	Schumer
Crapo	King	Scott
Cruz	Kirk	Sessions
Donnelly	Klobuchar	Shaheen

Shelby	Toomey	Warner
Tester	Udall (CO)	Wicker
Thune	Vitter	Wyden

NAYS—18

Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Leahy	Sanders
Boxer	Lee	Stabenow
Brown	Markey	Udall (NM)
Cardin	Menendez	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse

NOT VOTING—1

McCaskill

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 60-vote threshold having been achieved on this bill, the bill, as amended, is passed.

The bill (H.R. 1911), as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1911

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 1911) entitled “An Act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.”, do pass with the following amendment:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. INTEREST RATES.

(a) *INTEREST RATES.*—Section 455(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “AND BEFORE JULY 1, 2013” after “ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2006”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “and before July 1, 2013,” after “on or after July 1, 2006”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “and before July 1, 2013,” after “on or after July 1, 2006”; and

(D) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “and before July 1, 2013,” after “on or after July 1, 2006”; and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) *INTEREST RATE PROVISIONS FOR NEW LOANS ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2013.*—

“(A) *RATES FOR UNDERGRADUATE FDSL AND FDUSL.*—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct Stafford Loans and Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans issued to undergraduate students, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

“(i) a rate equal to the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 2.05 percent; or

“(ii) 8.25 percent.

“(B) *RATES FOR GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL FDUSL.*—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans issued to graduate or professional students, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning

on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

“(i) a rate equal to the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 3.6 percent; or

“(ii) 9.5 percent.

“(C) **PLUS LOANS.**—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct PLUS Loans, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

“(i) a rate equal to the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 4.6 percent; or

“(ii) 10.5 percent.

“(D) **CONSOLIDATION LOANS.**—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, any Federal Direct Consolidation Loan for which the application is received on or after July 1, 2013, shall bear interest at an annual rate on the unpaid principal balance of the loan that is equal to the weighted average of the interest rates on the loans consolidated, rounded to the nearest higher one-eighth of one percent.

“(E) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall determine the applicable rate of interest under this paragraph after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and shall publish such rate in the Federal Register as soon as practicable after the date of determination.

“(F) **RATE.**—The applicable rate of interest determined under this paragraph for a Federal Direct Stafford Loan, a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan, or a Federal Direct PLUS Loan shall be fixed for the period of the loan.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on July 1, 2013.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) **PAYGO SCORECARD.**—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) **SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.**—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

SEC. 4. STUDY ON THE ACTUAL COST OF ADMINISTERING THE FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) complete a study that determines the actual cost to the Federal Government of carrying out the Federal student loan programs authorized under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), which shall—

(A) provide estimates relying on accurate information based on past, current, and projected data as to the appropriate index and mark-up rate for the Federal Government's cost of borrowing that would allow the Federal Government to effectively administer and cover the cost of the Federal student programs authorized under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) under the scoring rules outlined in the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.);

(B) provide the information described in this section in a way that separates out administrative costs, interest rate, and other loan terms and conditions; and

(C) set forth clear recommendations to the relevant authorizing committees of Congress as to

how future legislation can incorporate the results of the study described in this section to allow for the administration of the Federal student loan programs authorized under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) without generating any additional revenue to the Federal Government except revenue that is needed to carry out such programs; and

(2) prepare and submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives setting forth the conclusions of the study described in this section in such a manner that the recommendations included in the report can inform future reauthorizations of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, if it is in order, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arkansas.

THUD APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in favor of the THUD appropriations bill that is on the floor this week. I know all of us have listened to the speeches and the commentators, and we hear a lot of people around Washington say: Cut, cut, cut.

Well, I am for cutting our spending, and I think we need to tighten our belt, but we need to do it in a smart way, and we need to do things such as cut programs that do not work. We need to also make smart and targeted investments in our future. The question is, how do we do that?

Well, one of the ways we do that is by supporting this legislation today. By working together and investing in our future, we can do great things for this country, and that is what the THUD bill is about.

Yesterday, the FAA announced seven airports in our State would receive a total of \$4.8 million from the FAA for infrastructure upgrades. That is part of what the bill is about. Some of these are runway rehabilitations, some are new lighting systems, some may be drainage improvements. These not only promote safety—and certainly they make air travel safer in this country, and that is extremely important—but also they are a way to spur economic activity. It is a great way to reinvest Federal tax dollars into my State and into the other 49 States to create jobs. Let me give Arkansas as an example of this.

In Arkansas—and I know we are only about 1 percent of the population, so you can kind of do the math here—commercial and general aviation air-

ports actually support 29,000 jobs and contribute \$2.5 billion every year in economic activity.

Our airports are important, but it is only actually a piece of the puzzle. We need to remember that we have other great infrastructure we need to invest in, such as waterways and ports and highways, and rural communities—we have to make sure they are not left behind—such as rural housing, but also rural broadband.

So there are a lot of ways we can invest to make this country stronger. That is why I believe it is very important to support this THUD appropriations bill.

The bill passed in committee on a bipartisan vote 22 to 8. I was proud to vote for it. I was glad to see it get such a large bipartisan vote in the Senate subcommittee. I certainly hope my colleagues will do this again on the floor in a very bipartisan way.

This bill includes things such as the Federal-Aid Highway Program. This is a program that helps support interstate maintenance, bridge repairs, highway safety. After all, how many reports do we have to read that talk about the distressed infrastructure of our highways? So if we want to replace these bridges that are beyond their lifespan, this is the way to do it.

Every \$1 billion in Federal highway and transit investment supports 13,000 American jobs.

This bill also includes popular programs that have been put to good use, such as TIGER. I could go through several of the TIGER grants my State has received, but one of those I am proud of is the TIGER grant for West Memphis, AR, to develop their port. It is an intermodal facility on the Mississippi River, right across from Memphis, which is crowded. West Memphis has all the same attributes that Memphis has, it just happens to be on the Arkansas side of the river, and that investment there is going to explode development and do great things up and down the Mississippi River.

The Airport Improvement Program is also part of this, the Contract Tower Program, the Community Development Block Grants. Every mayor, every elected official in the counties, the Governors—they all know how important the CDBG money is.

The other great thing about supporting this legislation is that it is one step in the right direction headed back to what we call regular order, trying to get things done in the Senate the way they ought to be done, with us working together, going through the committee process, coming to the floor with a bill, having amendments, having debate, sometimes fussing and fighting with one another, but nonetheless getting it done, and this is a great way to do that.

I believe moving our country forward with new jobs and a stronger economy

is something we all should be able to agree on. All of us should be able to agree on this, maybe with a little difference here and there. But I hope a big number of Senators will support this legislation.

Lastly, let me say a few words about Chairwoman MIKULSKI and her ranking member Senator SHELBY. Senator MIKULSKI has been amazing in her leadership of the Appropriations Committee. Everybody on the committee knows she is a breath of fresh air. She is so energetic and so knowledgeable and so good at what she does. We are so excited to have her there as chair of that committee. She is going to go down in history as one of the all-time greats. We are so proud she is pushing so hard to get these bills out of the committee and get them to the Senate floor and, hopefully, get them done on the Senate floor, so we can send them over to the House and get them conferenced.

Also, I have to say thank you to Senator MURRAY, who is the chair of this subcommittee, and also Senator COLLINS. I think Senator COLLINS is a great legislator. She knows how to get it done. She knows how all the bits and pieces work around here. She knows the process. She has great relations on both sides of the aisle. One thing I like about SUSAN COLLINS is a lot of times she will take on the hard items. She gets the hard work done. We need more Senators like her around here.

Certainly Senator MURRAY is incredible. She does so much good in the Senate and for the country and for her State.

With that, I encourage my colleagues to look at this bill. I know we are going to have some amendments, we are going to have some more debate. That is part of it. That is great. But let's get up-or-down votes and let's get this through the system.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here once again, actually now for the 40th time, to urge my colleagues to wake up to the threat of climate change.

I am very pleased to be joined today by our colleague Senator BRIAN SCHATZ of Hawaii, who is a champion of renewable energy and energy efficiency. As Hawaii's Lieutenant Governor, he co-authored his State's net metering rule, which encourages renewable energy, and he led the design of the State's Renewable Energy Portfolio, which is on track to be No. 1 in the Nation. He has pushed commonsense ways to boost energy security and battle climate change, and it is no wonder he has been called Hawaii's "Ambassador of Energy."

We are here today in the wake of a hearing last week in the Committee on

Environment and Public Works. The premise of that hearing was simple—"Climate Change: It's Happening Now." Disappointingly, again, allies of the fossil fuel industry attempted to discount or downplay that straightforward call to action.

Of the climate scientists on hand, everyone—even the minority witnesses—agreed that carbon dioxide causes climate change. That is physics 101. And all but one agreed that climate change is a real problem. The only academic who did not, Dr. Roy Spencer, is affiliated with the industry-backed George C. Marshall Institute and the Heartland Institute.

Regrettably, Dr. Spencer played a tried-and-true trick of the climate deniers: deselecting data that does not support your conclusions. Scientists around the world have been collecting high-quality surface temperature data for more than 100 years. To Dr. Spencer, however, the only data that matters are satellite and balloon readings of atmospheric temperatures in the tropics. Why ignore data outside the tropics? Why ignore surface temperature data? Why ignore ocean data, when the oceans cover two-thirds of the globe? Well, when you look at all the data, it shows the Earth warming at a much faster rate than his data in isolation.

Other minority witnesses played similar games.

Ms. Furchtgott-Roth, who is not a climate scientist, testified. She appears to be a sort of all-purpose witness-of-all-trades for the Republicans on topics that range from job training to health insurance to constitutional law, even to Samoan fisheries. She claimed that climate change has stopped.

Well, if you look at the past decade, you can convince yourself that climate change has stopped. Actually, on this chart I have in the Chamber, you can convince yourself that climate change has stopped five different times. But when you look at the whole picture, the only conclusion is that the Earth is getting warmer. The past 10 years were warmer than the 10 years before that. In fact, the past 10 years were warmer than any other 10 years in recorded history.

The continued, now-near-fraudulent denial of climate change is pernicious. Dr. Jennifer Francis of Rutgers called out in her testimony what she calls "climate misleaders." She explained—and I will quote her—

These are people who [are] deliberately ignoring and misconstruing the science in an attempt to convince [lawmakers] and the public that either human-caused climate change isn't happening, or that it's nothing to worry about.

Well, I am sure Senator SCHATZ is aware that observations around the world, including in his home State, show climate change is indeed real and already happening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Thank you, Mr. President.

I want to thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his kind words. He is a real expert and a leader on climate change, and I look forward to continuing to work together with him and our colleagues on this important issue. He has just discussed the overwhelming evidence that global temperatures are rising. I would like to build on his remarks and add that temperature is not the only indicator that climate change is real and it is happening now.

We see the changes in Hawaii and all over the world. One only need to look to the top of the world, where Arctic Sea ice is melting faster than scientists had predicted originally. Just last summer, the ice covering the Arctic Ocean retreated to its smallest size in recorded history, shrinking by 350,000 square miles—an area about the size of Venezuela.

Glaciers continue to retreat. The Greenland ice sheet provides a stark example of the rapid recession of the world's ice. For several days in July of 2012, Greenland's surface ice cover melted more than at any time in 30 years of satellite observation. During that month an estimated 97 percent of the ice sheet thawed.

Some types of severe weather are also on the rise. While climate scientists are extremely careful not to attribute any single weather event to climate change, there is no doubt that increased climate change has "loaded the dice," which means extreme weather events are increasingly likely.

Extreme weather events cost us in lives and in money. Of course, the sea level continues to rise. As water warms, its volume expands. Scientists have observed that the top layer of the world's oceans has stored an enormous amount of heat, raising sea levels in many parts of the world. This ocean warming has contributed to an estimated one-third to one-half of the increase in sea level rise to date.

Sea level rise is a serious challenge for my home State of Hawaii in particular. Just a 3-foot rise in sea level, which scientists project for this century, will flood many parts of Honolulu, including the iconic hotels and businesses along Waikiki Beach, leaving beaches eroded and hotels, businesses, and homes possibly inundated by the ocean.

My colleague from Rhode Island, an ocean State, is especially aware of these changes.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, tide gauges in Newport, RI, show an increase in average sea level of nearly 10 inches since 1930. That is a big deal for Rhode Islanders when we think about how devastating our great hurricane of 1938 was and what worse would now befall us with 10 more inches of sea for storms to hammer against our shores.

Those measurements show that the rate of sea level rise is also increasing. This matches reports that since 1990, sea level has been rising faster than the rate predicted by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Part of what has caused sea level rise is ocean warming, as described by Senator SCHATZ.

When fluids get warm, including ocean water, they expand and therefore rise. During last week's EPW hearing, we heard about the heat, significant amounts of heat, that oceans are now absorbing. Even if atmospheric warming had hit another temporary level, the ocean is still warming, and ocean warming hits ocean ecosystems.

Dr. Margaret Leinin testified at the hearing last week about a study that showed economically important species such as cod, haddock, yellowtail, and winter flounder shifting northward over the last four decades. The study suggests that the fish are moving to locations within their preferred temperature range.

Scientists have begun to tease out how what seem like small changes in average temperature are important to fish and other animals in the ocean. In Narragansett Bay, we have a continuous temperature record going back to 1959, along with data on what is living in the water. We know water temperature is rising. One study found on average winter temperatures are up almost 4 degrees since the 1960s in Narragansett Bay, and that is not good for the winter flounder.

NOAA scientists working in Rhode Island found that winter flounder incubated in warmer water are smaller when they hatch than those incubated in colder water. Juvenile winter flounder need time to settle to the bottom of the bay and to grow larger before abundant bottom feeders such as the sand shrimp arrive. It looks like warmer water brings the shrimp in earlier while the flounder are still small enough to eat, making them easier prey.

So the evidence is that warmer waters load the dice against winter flounder in Narragansett Bay, and the fisherman who relied upon this fishery paid the price. Catches are down to less than one-tenth of what they once were. Fishermen in Hawaii are paying the price as well.

Mr. SCHATZ. As Senator WHITEHOUSE has described, our oceans show the effect of climate change by absorbing much of the heat from our warming planet. But they do more than that; our oceans absorb almost 25 percent of the carbon that humans release into the atmosphere. If they did not, even more greenhouse gasses would warm our planet at an even faster pace. Our oceans and the life in them pay a price for all of this carbon.

Increasing carbon dioxide creates a chemical reaction that raises the acid-

ity of the sea water. This is called ocean acidification. So that is a technical term, but what does it mean as a practical matter? In plain terms, ocean acidification makes it difficult for shellfish, corals, sea urchins, and other creatures to form the shells that they need in order to live. As a result, fewer survive, which means entire populations are put at risk. Acidification negatively affects crucial parts of the ocean food chain from shellfish and coral reefs to fisheries.

So what does this mean for human beings? Ocean acidification has real economic consequences for communities that depend on the ocean for food, for jobs, and for tourism, such as my home State of Hawaii. Further acidification and warming will hurt our local fishing and tourism industries, industries that make up the backbone of our economy. All the fish and the seafood we depend upon may become scarcer and likely more expensive.

If we continue to burn fossil fuels at our current rate, our oceans may become 150 percent more acidic by the end of this century. That is a higher level of acidity than has been seen in the last 20 million years.

Today, more than 1 billion people worldwide rely on food from the ocean as their primary source of protein. So without solving the problem of ocean acidification, we will leave people, industries and entire economies, vulnerable, especially in developing countries. Climate change is threatening the basic foundation of many of our economies and especially the State of Hawaii. The Hawaii economy, culture, and history are derived from the ocean. So any dramatic changes to our ocean environment will impact our lives especially.

As I mentioned before, sea level rise threatens our beachfront property from Waikiki to Ka'anapali to the North Shore of Kauai. These beaches are important for Hawaii tourism and our economy and to local people across the State. Each year, Hawaii hosts an estimated 8 million visitors, with many of them drawn to our beaches. Tourist receipts alone made up almost \$12 billion in revenues last year. So climate change could also usher in a period of more frequent and severe weather, which could make Hawaii's communities increasingly vulnerable to flooding and storm damage.

Climate change threatens more than our economy. Our national security institutions face a similar risk from sea level rise and ocean acidification. The 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review, an assessment produced every 4 years by the Department of Defense, concluded that climate change will affect the military and its mission. In particular, low-lying naval installations, such as Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, face similar threats from sea level rise that

could leave parts of the base flooded, requiring millions of dollars in costly upgrades.

With the United States rebalancing to the Asia-Pacific region, sustaining our naval capabilities and ensuring that they too can weather the effect of climate change will be increasingly important for Hawaii and for our Nation.

I know the Senator from Rhode Island has concerns about his own State. I yield to him.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. As the Senator from Hawaii said, it is not just Hawaii, it is not just Rhode Island actually, it is all of our States that will be affected. Dr. Leinin, who testified at our EPW hearing, is from Florida Atlantic University. She highlighted how sensitive Florida will be to climate change.

In her testimony, Dr. Leinin said:

The Caribbean/Florida region has shown sea surface temperature increases of about . . . [2 degrees Fahrenheit] per decade concurrent with losses of viable coral reef area of between 5.5 percent and 9.2 percent per year. Western Atlantic reefs have the highest percentage area affected by bleaching of any reefs worldwide.

Not so great for Florida's diving and snorkeling economy. Dr. Leinin pointed out that Florida's population "is heavily concentrated, with almost 14 million people living along our coast. In South Florida, Miami, the seventh largest city in the country, the Florida Keys, coastal and inland portions of Broward County, the Florida Everglades and Ft. Lauderdale are all below 2 feet in elevation."

The effects of sea level rise that we discussed for Hawaii and Rhode Island appear to be more evident in Florida. Dr. Leinin told us: Although sea level rise has only risen these few inches in 50 years, that rise has been sufficient to prevent drainage systems from working during lunar high tides and during storms. The streets of Miami Beach are now routinely flooded at peak high tide. The addition of storm surges to these higher sea levels means that drainage systems no longer work reliably, causing seawater to move into storm sewer systems forcing water inland.

So South Florida is ground zero for sea level rise. As Senator SCHATZ said earlier, this is one of the effects of climate change. Sea level rise has not stopped or slowed down, especially not in South Florida. It is time to wake up and get to work slowing these changes where we can, and adapting our communities to their inevitable effects.

Mr. SCHATZ. Commonsense solutions to the threat of climate change are everywhere. We have been talking a lot about the risks of climate change, but let's talk a little bit about the opportunities—the opportunities to fight climate change, to transform how we produce and consume energy, and to grow a clean energy economy.

We know what we need to do. We also know how to do it. Congress may not

enact comprehensive climate legislation this year, but it can still take action to make a difference. As I see it, we have an opportunity for common ground in three areas: energy efficiency, tax incentives, and innovative financing structures to promote clean energy deployment.

Perhaps the greatest opportunity for compromise is in energy efficiency, the commonsense idea that we ought to save money and reduce pollution at the same time by simply consuming less energy to perform the same tasks. Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN have taken this up and are writing excellent legislation to improve and enhance energy efficiency across the Nation.

Their bill includes sensible measures that will help to achieve significant reduction in energy use. Buildings use close to 40 percent of the energy used in the United States. This bill will contain provisions that will update the building codes, increase efficiency goals for Federal facilities, and provide incentives to industrial facilities, commercial buildings, and homes.

In recent weeks, we have been hearing that Shaheen-Portman may come to the floor. We are encouraged by that. We encourage both the majority leader and the minority leader, as well as the managers of this legislation, to move it to the floor expeditiously so that we can take care of it before the August break.

Second, I urge my colleagues to support tax incentives for clean energy, many of which expire at the end of this year. Senators on both sides of the aisle have repeatedly worked together to extend these incentives, especially the wind credit. We can build on this common ground to support sensible solutions. We not only have the opportunity to extend clean energy incentives as a part of tax reform but to improve upon them. We should focus on creating credits that reward performance and innovation and do not pick winners and losers. They should help industries scale up, bring costs down, and become competitive on their own.

Finally, the Federal Government must do more to help new and innovative technologies reach the marketplace. New technologies face significant barriers to market entry; barriers that focused government intervention such as loan guarantees and other financing mechanisms can help overcome.

The Senator from Rhode Island may also have thoughts on other commonsense solutions. I yield to him for any comments he may have.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Rhode Island is preparing for climate change. We are doing it in commonsense ways. Along our coasts, we are identifying areas that are vulnerable to sea level rise. The University of Rhode Island Graduate School of Oceanography is a world leader in measuring

and understanding the effects of climate change on our waters.

Rhode Island's Department of Health, with a grant from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, is preparing us for the health effects associated with climate change. But it is not enough for individual States to have to act alone. That is why Senator SCHATZ and I, along with our colleagues in the House, Representatives WAXMAN and BLUMENAUER, have put forward a discussion draft for a fee on carbon pollution.

It is clear when we consider the damage climate change will cause, indeed already has begun to cause, there is a social cost of carbon pollution. It is not factored into the price of fossil fuel.

That is a market failure, and our approach would correct that market failure.

We wish to discuss with our Democratic and Republican colleagues how best to implement this solution, what the price should be, how fast it should rise, and how to return the proceeds back to Americans. A market solution like this should be right up Republicans' alley. This is why Republicans such as Art Laffer and George Shultz are talking about it.

A fee on carbon can reduce emissions. One option, to use the proceeds to reduce taxes, should be attractive to our Republican colleagues.

To give one example, with the majority of the carbon pollution fee proceeds, setting a little reserve aside for the lowest income people, putting the rest of it to work lowering corporate income taxes, and just with that you can reduce the top of the American corporate income tax rate from 35 to 28 percent, that is a pretty considerable value to those businesses that are still considering paying the top rate, and that should be worth something during negotiations.

As I have said before in these talks, it is time to wake up. It is time to get to work.

I wish to thank my friend Senator SCHATZ for his leadership in the effort to protect Americans from the harms of climate change.

I turn to him now for his final remarks and welcome Senator BLUMENTHAL, who will be joining us in this colloquy.

Mr. SCHATZ. I wish to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for being a leader for so long, for being so forceful and so factual on this issue. I applaud his leadership and look forward to continuing to work together on this important issue.

Climate change is real. Climate change is caused by humans, and climate change is solvable.

I wish to end on a note of optimism. The urgency of this situation creates a real opportunity. We have a chance to start a second Industrial Revolution that will drive our economy for decades to come.

We have the chance and the responsibility to transition into a clean energy economy and leave our world in better shape than we found it.

I yield the floor for Senator BLUMENTHAL.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I wish to join with my two very good friends and colleagues who have highlighted an issue that concerns the whole country, not just Hawaii, Rhode Island—and no two States are farther apart geographically—but we share this very dire and dangerous problem, often characterized as climate change. I think it is climate disruption. It is global destruction.

One of the myths that surrounds this area that my two colleagues have sought to expose is the supposed incompatibility of reducing destruction of our planet and, at the same time, growing our economy. Often, economic growth is thought to be in conflict with environmental protection and responsibility.

In fact, ecology and economy go together. We can expand our economy by developing new sources of fuel, renewables such as wind and solar, but also fuel cells, which in my State of Connecticut are a growing source of energy responsibility and economic growth.

Far from being incompatible, these two goals are complementary. More jobs, more economic growth, can be the result of controlling carbon pollution.

In fact, the President's program for controlling carbon pollution, which would dramatically cut the magnitude of our air contamination and make us a more responsible nation, will increase jobs and economic growth. It will also put us in a position of leadership around the globe and enable us to regain the position of trust and leadership that we have exercised on so many other issues. We cannot be a leader if we don't lead ourselves.

We cannot tell others what to do when we don't follow the example that we should be setting. It should be and it must be leadership by example.

My colleague Senator MURPHY and I—and he will be shortly speaking about another subject—brought together a very powerful coalition in Connecticut last week to highlight this issue of climate change and to dramatize how many different interests and ages have commonality in this goal: labor leaders, environmental activists, young people wearing T-shirts and carrying signs.

They get it. They know. The science is there. The reality is pressing, urgent, and we must address it.

I wish to thank all of my colleagues who are uniting on this historic cause. I hope we can join together in colloquies going forward.

The Presiding Officer has been a leader in the House and will be now in the Senate; most especially, my friend and colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE, who literally week after week, in many

different themes and widely diverse ways, has brought our attention, riveting our minds, on this very important subject. I congratulate him on the 40th speech, and I look forward to participating more with him.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I look forward to that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Connecticut.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. On July 20, a few days ago, we had a pretty somber anniversary in this country. Senator BENNET came down to acknowledge the occasion. It was the 1-year anniversary of the shooting in Aurora, CO, in which a young man killed 12 individuals and wounded 58 others when he walked into a crowded movie theater at a midnight showing of "The Dark Knight Rises." This, once again, showed the vulnerability of this Nation when the Congress refuses to act on the issue of preventing gun violence.

I have come down virtually every week—not, frankly, as often or as regularly as Senator WHITEHOUSE has on the issue of climate change, but in the short time I have been in the Senate I have tried to come down to the floor virtually every week to talk about the victims of gun violence. Today it is an apt moment to recognize the victims in Aurora, who now have been lost for over a year.

This number represents something different. On December 14, our world in Connecticut was absolutely shattered by a global tragedy in which 26 people, adults and children, including 7-year-olds, died in a splatter of gunfire at Sandy Hook Elementary School, as well as six of the professionals who were charged with protecting them.

What has happened since December 14 is, frankly, in a lot of ways even more egregious, even more unconscionable, even more difficult to swallow than what happened on that day, and that is that 6,497 people have died from guns since December 14 in, frankly, every manner.

There have been more mass shootings, accidental deaths, and suicides. There have been instances of one-on-one urban violence, suburban violence, and family-on-family violence. What has happened is this country has become kind of numb to it. We have to accept that every day we are going to be able to pick up a paper, and somewhere across this country there is going to be upward of 30 or 40 people who have died at the hands of guns at a rate that we can't find anywhere else in the civilized world. We just kind of accept it.

The number is startling. Since December 14, almost 6,500 people have died of gun violence. But we just can't

settle on that number. We have to talk about who these people are. I am trying to lend some voice to the victims of gun violence every week on the floor of the Senate to try to spur the Senate to action because I have become resolved that the numbers aren't enough.

Apparently, this number isn't big enough for the Senate to do something so that maybe if we humanize these tragedies, that might do the trick.

A.J. Boik was described as a ball of joy by his friend Jordan. He had just graduated from high school, and he was looking forward to attending the Rocky Mountain College of Art and Design in the fall. He wanted to be an art teacher and wanted to teach others the joy he felt for art.

He was known as a big personality, so much so that after he was killed in that movie theater in Aurora, over 1,000 people came to his funeral. Among those mourners were his girlfriend who was there in the theater the day he was shot.

Matthew McQuinn was one of the heroes that day. He was there with his girlfriend Samantha and her brother Nick Yowler. When the shooter came into the theater and started spraying bullets, Matthew, as well as Nick, attempted to shield Samantha from the bullets.

Samantha survived but Matthew did not. He was working in a Target, which is where he actually met his girlfriend when they were working at another Target. He was remembered by his co-workers very fondly. He died that day saving a life.

Also a victim that day was PO3 John Thomas Larimer. He was one of two Active-Duty servicemembers who died as a result of that mass shooting. His girlfriend Kelley Vojtsek, whose life was saved, said this:

John and I were seated in the middle area. When the violence occurred, John immediately and instinctively covered me and brought me to the ground in order to protect me from any danger.

In that act, he saved his girlfriend, but he was struck with a bullet that ended his life.

Alex Sullivan was 27 years old. His friends called him a gentle giant. He was ringing in his 27th birthday, in fact, by going to the premier of "The Dark Knight Rises." His family said he always had a glowing smile on his face. He made friends with everybody. He was a huge movie buff, a comic book geek—as his family called him—and the New York Mets. The Sunday following his attack would have been his 1-year wedding anniversary.

Micayla Medek was called Cayla by her friends. She loved her friends and going out with her friends. That is what she was doing when she went out that evening to see this movie. Her family didn't find out she had been killed that day until 20 hours after the shooting. They had spent that evening

and morning driving from hospital to hospital hoping to get news she had survived.

Veronica Moser-Sullivan was the youngest of the 12 people who were shot. She was 6 years old, not unlike the 20 6-year-old and 7-year-old children killed in Newtown. She was described as beautiful and innocent, excited about life. She was there that evening because her family wanted to get her mind off of the recent passing of her grandfather. She had become consumed with sorrow over the passing of her grandfather. So as a treat her family brought her to the premier of this movie. She was going to start swimming lessons the following week.

James Holmes walked into that movie theater with an AR-15-style rifle, which we have heard talked about over and over and over—the weapon of choice in mass shootings in this country. But just as important, he was armed with 100-round drums of ammunition. Why on Earth does this Senate allow for the continued legal sale of 100-round drums of ammunition? What possible legal reason could there be for the possession of 100-round drums of ammunition that go into an automatic weapon other than to kill as many people as possible as quickly as possible? There is no reason a hunter or sport shooter needs a 100-round drum of ammunition. Yet we can't even get the votes to ban the sale of those deadly accessories to semiautomatic weapons.

I get it. These 6,497 people didn't die at the hands of an assault weapon, they didn't die at the hands of a 100-round drum, never mind a 30-round magazine, but these mass shootings are going to continue to happen. Frankly, the one that happened in Santa Monica not long ago barely made the headlines in this country. Three or four people dying at the hands of a semiautomatic weapon is nothing these days. Now there have to be 20 or 30 people die in order for it to be a big story. Expectations have changed because these shootings are becoming regular, normal occurrences. But we can't let this country become numb to mass shootings in the way I would argue we have become numb to the 6,500 people who have died since December 14.

I understand we tried and failed to get legislation passed through the Senate—supported by 90 percent of Americans—that would extend background checks to more sales of weapons, to make sure criminals don't have weapons, to make gun trafficking a crime in a way that it is not, to provide some more mental health resources, but we shouldn't give up. We shouldn't give up because there is going to be another Aurora, there will be another Sandy Hook if we do nothing, and 30 to 40 people will still die every day if we stand by and continue to allow this kind of regular, everyday gun violence to be the background noise of this Nation.

Maybe if the numbers don't move people, the stories of the victims will. Maybe that will be enough to finally prompt the Senate and the House of Representatives to action.

I yield the floor.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, 4 years ago today, the Federal minimum wage increased to \$7.25 per hour. That was the final phase of a minimum wage increase that Congress passed in 2007. After 4 years, it is time to evaluate where wages stand.

Since 1967, the Federal minimum wage has increased from \$1.40 to \$7.25. While at first glance this seems like significant progress, when adjusted to current dollars the value of the minimum wage has actually declined by 12.1 percent. Had the minimum wage kept pace with inflation, it would be \$10.74 an hour today.

But the minimum wage for tipped workers is even worse. The current minimum wage for tipped workers is \$2.13, and that has not gone up since 1991. Employers paying the tipped minimum wage now pay just 21 percent of what that employee would make at minimum wage. This forces workers to use more and more of their tips simply to make up the difference between the tipped minimum wage and the standard minimum wage.

Working 40 hours per week at \$7.25 per hour translates to just \$15,080 per year. That's about \$400 less than the Federal poverty level guidelines for a family of two. Last week, The Atlantic ran an article that showed a budget chart produced by McDonald's to help its employees better manage their finances. And while I commend McDonald's for trying to help workers better manage money, the budget tells a sad story.

According to the chart, someone making the minimum wage and working 40 hours a week at McDonald's would have to work a second job to make ends meet. But to be clear for this budget to be accurate, a worker must hold nearly two full time jobs. According to the Washington Post's Wonkblog, a worker making the minimum wage would have to work 75 hours a week to have the after-tax income in the McDonalds sample budget. Working 75 hours a week at minimum wage with no vacation days and limited benefits—if any—one can make \$24,720 a year, after tax.

How does a person do that if they are a single parent? They can't. There are not enough hours in the day to raise a family working that many hours. And there certainly aren't enough dollars in the income to provide child care.

The sample budget drawn up for McDonald's employees might as well include a line for Federal and State assistance. Families living on the min-

imum wage have few alternatives but to turn to programs such as SNAP, housings assistance, and Medicaid to survive. These are the same programs that are regularly attacked by the ultra-conservative for growing too quickly. For those who insist that working be a requirement for receiving public assistance, shouldn't they also insist that if you are working full time you shouldn't need public assistance? Wouldn't that be a good definition of a minimum wage?

If we increase the minimum wage to \$10.10, more than 30 million workers would receive a raise. And while some of these workers are teenagers, 88 percent are adults. For many of those adults, these are not part time jobs or stepping stones to their next job, but the full time job they rely on for a living.

That is why 4 years after the last minimum wage increase, it is time to act again. I am a cosponsor of the Fair Minimum Wage Act introduced by Senator HARKIN in the Senate and Representative GEORGE MILLER in the House. The Fair Minimum Wage Act will increase the minimum wage from \$7.25 to \$10.10 per hour in three, 95-cent annual increments, and index it to inflation annually thereafter. The bill will also gradually raise the minimum wage for tipped workers from the current \$2.13 per hour to a level that is 70% of the regular minimum wage.

If we pass the Fair Minimum Wage Act that same full-time worker being paid minimum wage I mentioned earlier that makes \$15,080 a year—will make \$21,000. That can be the difference for a family that is getting by and one that is living in poverty. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in cosponsoring the Fair Minimum Wage Act.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, 4 years ago today, July 24, 2009, was the last time the minimum wage was increased. It rose from \$6.55 an hour to \$7.25 an hour. And it has been stuck there ever since. Four years is too long. It is time to raise the minimum wage.

To that end, I have introduced legislation along with Rep. GEORGE MILLER in the House. The Fair Minimum Wage Act will gradually increase the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour in three annual steps. Our bill will also link future increases in the minimum wage to the cost of living, using the Consumer Price Index, so that people who are trying to get ahead don't fall behind as our economy grows. Finally, our bill—for the first time in more than 20 years—will raise the minimum wage for workers who earn tips, from a paltry \$2.13 per hour, today, to a level that is 70 percent of the regular minimum wage. This will be gradually phased in over the course of 6 years, which will give businesses time to adjust while providing more fairness for hard-working people in tipped industries.

While millions of workers have been without a raise these past 4 years, costs have continued to climb. Between 2009 and 2012, rent has gone up 4%, auto repair costs have climbed 6%, food is 8% more expensive, child care costs 9% more, and public transportation takes a 13% bigger bite out of workers' wallets.

I do not need to tell you that when you are taking in \$1,000 a month, even a few dollars more at the grocery checkout line is a hardship. The tens of millions of working poor and low-wage Americans and their families know this. They know that the minimum wage, for many, is a poverty wage; it pays \$3,000 less per year than what is needed to lift a family of three above the poverty line. They know they can not survive on such meager wages. They know it because they live it.

Unfortunately, the McDonald's corporation does not seem to understand. Last week, a budgeting brochure that McDonald's provides its workers went viral on the Internet. It seems that, as the folks at The Atlantic said, "McDonald's can't figure out how its workers survive on minimum wage." Let's talk about McDonald's.

McDonald's is the third-largest employer of low-wage workers in the country, with 860,000 U.S. workers. According to Glassdoor, the average wage for a cashier is \$7.72 and for a crew member is \$7.68. That is just pennies above the minimum. Even managers only make around \$9.50 per hour, sometimes less.

The McDonald's budget brochure shows workers how to add up their monthly expenses to determine their monthly household budget. But wages at McDonald's are so paltry that its sample budget had to assume that its employees work two full-time jobs to earn \$2,000 a month. Never mind that most fast food jobs are part-time, and finding two jobs would be very difficult in today's economy with so many unemployed and part-time workers looking for full-time jobs.

On top of requiring two jobs, this budget's estimated costs are either out of sync with reality or simply missing. It estimated rent at \$600 a month, when in reality rent costs \$783 for a one-bedroom apartment and \$977 for a two-bedroom, according to the National Low-Income Housing Coalition. Those are national figures; rent is much higher in many parts of the country. The McDonald's budget also doesn't include necessities like child care or food. And I don't know where someone is going to get health insurance for \$20 a month. Even McDonald's charges \$54 a month for its most basic plan for one employee with no dependents, and that is after a year of working there. With just one dependent, it is \$140 a month. And that basic plan still has deductibles and copays on top of the premium.

This just shows how difficult it is for tens of millions of people—folks who do

some of the most demanding work in our country—to make ends meet. But it's not just low-wage workers who are hurt when they can't keep up with costs. This hurts our communities and our local businesses as well. When our neighbors can't afford to go to the grocery store or the auto repair shop or the hardware store, all of those businesses suffer. They lose customers and sales.

But imagine if the lowest wage workers all got raises. They would take their car in for that long-needed repair. They would pick up a few extra items at the store. They would buy a new pair of shoes for their growing son or daughter. And those local stores would all benefit.

And when we see that 30 million people across the country will get a raise thanks to the Fair Minimum Wage Act, all that extra spending really adds up. The local grocery might even have to hire new people to keep up with rising demand. In total, my bill will add \$33 billion to our GDP over its 3 years of implementation. And it will create 140,000 new jobs over that same period.

It's simple: more money in consumers' pockets means more spending, which means more economic activity, which means more jobs.

In fact, the financial and economic experts know this already. I have seen article after article, interview after interview from financial experts saying that we need more consumer spending in order to get our economy really going. Just last month, the Wall Street Journal interviewed the president of Naroff Economic Advisors. He analyzed a recent consumer spending report and said, "We're in a situation where we need much stronger increases in wages and salaries if households are going to have the money to spend and the economy's going to grow faster." He added:

We need wages to grow significantly faster. They're coming up from where they have been, but we need them to really begin to pick up. We need stronger job growth, but more importantly we also need average salaries and hourly wages to grow faster. Those have been largely flat and that's the problem. Right now, income's growing because we're creating more jobs, not because people are making more money. We need the average person to see their salaries go up before they can spend more and drive this economy forward.

Well, we can raise wages in this country, and we can provide those raises to the people who need it most—not to CEOs but to the people serving our food, watching our children, helping us when we call customer service, and assisting us at our local stores. These are the people who are earning wages so low, they work two jobs and still can't make ends meet. And these are people who will go out and spend just about every dime in their local stores, boosting their local economies.

Minimum wage workers want to support themselves. Ninety percent of the

people who would benefit from my legislation are adults, not teenagers. They are often parents. In fact, one in five working parents in this country will get a raise under my bill, and a third of single parents. A total of 18 million children have parents who would get a raise. Think about that. All of those millions of families with a little more money to spend. What a help that will be to those growing kids.

We owe it to millions of low-wage families struggling to just have a glimpse of the American Dream, to make sure that they get a raise and can support their families. But we also owe it to ourselves, to our economy. Our system works best when everyone has the opportunity to support themselves, to be productive, and to participate in our larger economy.

Raising the minimum wage is a simple and effective way to do this. And we know we can do it in a responsible way, with no unintended consequences. My bill would phase in an increase in three steps, giving businesses time to adapt. And because the minimum wage will apply to all businesses, no single business will be at a competitive disadvantage.

Also, my proposal is in line percentage wise with previous increases in the minimum wage. Decades of solid economic research shows us that these increases have not caused job losses. In fact, businesses stand to benefit from increased wages, because raises result in significantly lower turnover rates, which in turn saves those businesses money.

Four years without a raise is 3 years too many. We have to make sure that working families can keep up with the economy. That is why linking future increases in the minimum wage to the cost of living is so crucial. Small annual increases will be easy to absorb, but will make a big difference to American families. And it will help our businesses on Main Street as well as our national economy.

Mr. President, it is time to raise the minimum wage and link it to inflation for the future. It is the right thing to do, and it is the responsible thing to do. And it will give a much needed boost to both local economies and our national economy. I urge my colleagues to support this long-overdue legislation.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK J. SAMMARTINO

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise along with my colleague, the Ranking Member of the Budget Committee, Senator SESSIONS, to pay tribute to Frank J. Sammartino, who is retiring this week after 33 years of distinguished Federal service, including 26 years serving the Congress at the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. Sammartino began his Federal career in 1978, working in the office of the assistant secretary for planning and evaluation at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, where he worked until 1985. He left HHS for the Tax Analysis Division in the Congressional Budget Office, where he has worked for most of his remaining career. While at CBO, Mr. Sammartino has risen up through the ranks to his current position of assistant director for Tax Analysis, the director's top person on all tax policy and budget matters. In addition to his work at CBO, he has also served Congress as the chief economist and deputy director at the Joint Economic Committee.

As head of the Tax Analysis Division at CBO, Mr. Sammartino has worked tirelessly to ensure the Congress has quality and timely analysis of tax policy and budget issues. He has directly contributed to and overseen numerous baseline projections, policy studies, and cost estimates. In fact, early on at CBO, he developed the first microsimulation model used by CBO for analyzing tax policy. That model became the basis for CBO's individual income tax projections and its analysis of the distribution of federal taxes. In general, his expertise on a wide range of public policy issues has served as a valuable resource for Members and staff.

Mr. Sammartino exemplifies CBO's high standards of professionalism, objectivity, and nonpartisanship, and has received the highest awards for outstanding service while at both CBO and HHS. As chairman, I greatly appreciate the sacrifices that he—as well as his family, including his wife, Ellen, and children, Frank and Lulu—have made in assisting the Budget Committee and Congress.

I would like to turn to my colleague, Senator SESSIONS, for his remarks.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the chairman and join her in commending Mr. Sammartino for his many years of dedicated and distinguished service to CBO, the Congress, and the American people. We wish him and his family well in his retirement from Federal service.

We hope our colleagues will join us in thanking Mr. Sammartino—and really all of the hard-working employees at the Congressional Budget Office—for his and their service.

ENERGY SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee Assignments of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENERGY

Al Franken, *Chairman*

Tim Johnson, Mary L. Landrieu, Maria Cantwell, Bernard Sanders, Debbie Stabenow, Mark Udall, Joe Manchin, III, Martin Heinrich, Tammy Baldwin.

James E. Risch, *Ranking*, Dean Heller, Jeff Flake, Lamar Alexander, Rob Portman, John Hoeven.

PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINING

Joe Manchin, III, *Chairman*

Tim Johnson, Mary L. Landrieu, Maria Cantwell, Mark Udall, Al Franken, Brian Schatz, Martin Heinrich, Tammy Baldwin.

John Barrasso, *Ranking*, James E. Risch, Mike Lee, Dean Heller, Jeff Flake, Tim Scott, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mark Udall, *Chairman*

Mary L. Landrieu, Bernard Sanders, Debbie Stabenow, Brian Schatz, Martin Heinrich, Tammy Baldwin.

Rob Portman, *Ranking*, John Barrasso, Mike Lee, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven.

WATER AND POWER

Brian Schatz, *Chairman*

Tim Johnson, Maria Cantwell, Bernard Sanders, Debbie Stabenow, Joe Manchin, III, Al Franken.

Mike Lee, *Ranking*, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Dean Heller, Jeff Flake, Tim Scott.

Ron Wyden and Lisa Murkowski are ex officio members of all the Subcommittees.

TRIBUTE TO TOM ED McHUGH

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, today I wish to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Tom Ed McHugh, who will retire as executive director of the Louisiana Municipal Association. Mr. McHugh will step down on December 31, 2013, after 13 years of dedicated service.

Mr. McHugh began his career in public service in 1966 as a teacher in the East Baton Rouge Parish School System after receiving a Bachelor's degree in education from Louisiana State University. In 1989, Mr. McHugh was elected mayor-president of the City of Baton Rouge and served three terms in this position. Under his leadership, East Baton Rouge Parish experienced its greatest years of growth and prosperity. Through his years of service as an elected official, Mr. McHugh created enduring changes in a wide breadth of programs to impact and improve the lives of every individual within and throughout his community.

Mr. McHugh has worked tirelessly for 13 years as executive director of the Louisiana Municipal Association to maintain and promote the independence and self-sufficiency of Louisiana's municipalities while strengthening the relationship between the local, State, and Federal levels of government. He created municipal structures in which all people are taken care of, no matter their situation in life. Mr. McHugh had a vision to reach the lives of the citizens he vigorously worked to improve through dynamic enhancement models that provided quality management and services at all levels of government. Mr. McHugh also worked continuously to build a strong economic agenda to ensure the prosperity of Louisiana's municipalities and communities for generations to come.

Mr. McHugh's distinguished career includes many prestigious recognitions. Among them are memberships to the United States Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, and the governing boards of the Louisiana Conference of Mayors and the Louisiana Municipal Association. Mr. McHugh's career leaves a legacy of accomplishment and dedication to his family and all those who are a part of the educational systems and municipalities that he served. Together with his high school sweetheart, Betty Schilling McHugh, Mr. and Mrs. McHugh are the proud parents and grandparents of three children and eight grandchildren, all of whom have continued to inspire Mr. McHugh as a professional, a father, and a grandfather.

Mr. McHugh has been and continues to be an inspiration to all of those who have been impacted by his tireless efforts. It is with my heartfelt and greatest sincerity that I ask my colleagues to join me along with Mr. McHugh's family in recognizing the life and many accomplishments of this incredible leader and his impact in so many communities.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 6:48 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5. An act to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5. An act to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following measure was discharged from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and referred as indicated:

S. 1294. A bill to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2668. To delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2374. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Importation of Fresh Citrus Fruit From Uruguay, Including Citrus Hybrids and Fortunella spp., Into the Continental United States" ((RIN0579-AD59) (Docket No. APHIS-2011-0060)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2375. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program: Nutrition Standards for All Foods Sold in School as Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010" (RIN0584-AE09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2376. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations Based on the 2012 Missile Technology Control Regime Plenary Agreements" (RIN0694-AF81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2377. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13441 with respect to Lebanon; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2378. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations that was established in Executive Order 13581 on July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2379. A communication from the Associate Director, Financial Reporting and Accounting Policy, Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2012 Statement on the System of Internal Controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines and accompanying reports; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2380. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2012 Management Report; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2381. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2382. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Ireland; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2383. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Israel; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2384. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2385. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Singapore; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2386. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Disqualification of Felons and Other 'Bad Actors' from Rule 506 Offerings" (RIN3235-AK97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2387. A communication from the President and Chief Operating Officer, Financing Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's Statement on the System of Internal Controls and the 2012 Audited Financial Statements; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2388. A communication from the President and Chief Operating Officer, Resolution Funding Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's Statement on the System of Internal Controls and the 2012 Audited Financial Statements; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2389. A communication from the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, transmitting, the January 2013 Quarterly Report to Congress of the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Programs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2390. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, United States Enrichment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's eighteenth annual report regarding its activities as Executive Agent for the U.S. government in the implementation of the 20-year contract to purchase low enriched uranium derived from

dismantled Russian nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2391. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Critical Habitat Map for the Fountain Darter" (RIN1018-AZ68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2392. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Species Status for Six West Texas Aquatic Invertebrates" (RIN1018-AX70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2393. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Six West Texas Aquatic Invertebrates" (RIN1018-AZ26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2394. A communication from the Chief of the Foreign Species Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing One Distinct Population Segment of Broad-Snouted Caiman as Endangered and a Second as Threatened with a Special Rule" (RIN1018-AT56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2395. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Buena Vista Lake Shrew" (RIN1018-AW85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2396. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2013" (RIN3150-AJ19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2397. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Service Limits and Loading Combinations for Class 1 Linear Type Supports" (Regulatory Guide 1.124, Revision 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2398. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Service Limits and Loading Combinations for Class 1 Plate-and-Shell-Type Supports" (Regulatory Guide 1.130, Revision 3) received in the Office

of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2399. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Applications" (Regulatory Guide 4.2, Supplement 1, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2400. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Community Right-to-Know; Direct Final Rule to Adopt 2012 North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Codes for Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) Reporting" (FRL No. 9825-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2401. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Protection of Stratospheric Ozone; The 2013 Critical Use Exemption from the Phaseout of Methyl Bromide" (FRL No. 9809-7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2402. A communication from the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Part D Plans Generally Include Drugs Commonly Used by Dual Eligibles: 2013 (OEI-05-13-00090)"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2403. A communication from the Chairman of the United States International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Year in Trade 2012"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2404. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Media Space, Inc. v. Commissioner" (AOD 2012-08) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2405. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Applicable Federal Rates—August 2013" (Rev. Rul. 2013-13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2406. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates" (Notice 2013-46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2407. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revised Timeline and Other Guidance Regarding the Implementation of FATCA" (Notice 2013-43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2408. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Expanded Eligibility for Temporary Housing for Individuals Displaced by Severe Storms, Flooding, and Tornadoes in Oklahoma" (Notice 2013-47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2409. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Updated Static Mortality Tables for the Years 2014 and 2015" (Notice 2013-49) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2410. A joint communication from the Secretary of Labor, Chair of the Board and the Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's fiscal year 2012 actuarial evaluation of the expected operations and status of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation funds; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2411. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Ammonium Formate" (Docket No. FDA-2008-F-0151) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2412. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Animal Feeds Contaminated With Salmonella Microorganisms" (Docket No. FDA-2013-N-0253) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2413. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Labor's fiscal year 2011 Office of Workers' Compensation Programs annual report; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2414. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Health, United States, 2012"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2415. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2416. A communication from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2417. A communication from the Director of the Diversity and Inclusion Division, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2012 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2418. A communication from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Potomac Electric Power Company, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Company's Balance Sheet as of December 31, 2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2419. A communication from the Director, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's fiscal year 2012 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2420. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Commerce's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2421. A communication from the Chairman and Members of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General Semi-annual Report for the period of October 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2422. A communication from the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semi-Annual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2423. A communication from the Director, National Security Agency, transmitting a report relative to classified information sharing and safeguarding efforts on computer networks; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-44. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging Congress to pass the Marketplace Fairness Act; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas, In the case of *National Bellas Hess, Inc. v. Department of Revenue*, 386 U.S. 753 (1967), the United States Supreme Court held, in relevant part, that Congress alone has the power to regulate and control the taxation of commerce which is conducted between a business that is located within one state, and a customer who is located in another state and who communicates with and purchases from the business using only remote means; and

Whereas, The United States Supreme Court established in *Quill Corp. v. North Dakota*, 504 U.S. 298 (1992), that a state government cannot, of its own accord, require out-

of-state retailers to collect sales tax on sales within the state; and

Whereas, The United States Supreme Court also announced in *Quill* that Congress could exercise its authority under the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution to decide whether, when and to what extent the states may require collection of sales tax on remote sales; and

Whereas, The State of Nevada and municipalities within this State receive significant operating revenue from sales taxes collected by brick-and-mortar businesses and online vendors with a nexus to the State and from use taxes on purchases made online through vendors without a brick-and-mortar location in the State; and

Whereas, Remittance of use taxes not collected by a vendor from online purchases puts an undue burden and widely unknown obligation on consumers; and

Whereas, The unequal taxation schemes as between online and traditional retailers create a disadvantage for Nevada-based retailers, who are rooted and invested in the Nevada community and employ residents of this State; and

Whereas, The tax collection loophole for online retailers deprives local governments of revenue that could be used to fund necessities such as schools, police and fire departments, and other important infrastructure; and

Whereas, The Marketplace Fairness Act, S. 336, 113th Cong. (2013), and H.R. 684, 113th Cong. (2013), proposes to provide states with the authority to require out-of-state retailers, such as online and catalog retailers, to collect and remit sales tax on purchases shipped into the state; and

Whereas, The State of Nevada has enacted the Simplified Sales and Use Tax Administration Act, chapter 360B of NRS, which is in compliance with the Marketplace Fairness Act, S. 336, 113th Cong. § 2 (2013) and H.R. 684, 113th Cong. § 2 (2013); Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, Jointly, That the members of the 77th Session of the Nevada Legislature urge Congress to pass the Marketplace Fairness Act without delay; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation and the Executive Director of the Department of Taxation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

POM-45. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada expressing support for wild horses and burros in Nevada; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas, Wild horses and burros are an integral part of the ecosystem and rangelands of the United States and the State of Nevada; and

Whereas, Wild horses and burros helped to build this nation and are living symbols of freedom and our American Western heritage, as represented by the depiction of wild horses on the Nevada State quarter; and

Whereas, Wild horses and burros are natural resources and cultural assets, and have the potential to promote tourism and job creation in this State; and

Whereas, Building eco-sanctuaries that enable the public to view and photograph wild

horses and burros may provide a much needed boost to the Nevada economy; and

Whereas, Wild horses and burros depend on the understanding, cooperation and fairness of all interested parties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, Jointly, That the Nevada Legislature:

1. Supports the preservation and protection of our iconic wild horses and burros in the State of Nevada as living symbols of freedom, the pioneer spirit of the West and America's heritage, as well as valuable natural resources and cultural assets;

2. Supports the development of wild horse and burro related ecotourism in the State of Nevada;

3. Encourages the State Department of Agriculture to enter into cooperative agreements with local wild horse and burro advocacy groups pursuant to NRS 569.031 concerning wild horses and burros living on private lands that are under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Agriculture; and

4. Encourages a spirit of cooperation, collaboration and fairness among wild horse and burro advocacy groups, private land owners and the State Department of Agriculture; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation, the Governor and the Director of the State Department of Agriculture; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

POM-46. A concurrent memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona urging the United States Congress to amend the Clean Air Act and to fully consider the impact of the new regulations; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE CONCURRENT MEMORIAL 1001

To the Congress of the United States of America:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

Whereas, the Clean Air Act is a federal law designed to minimize air pollution nationwide; and

Whereas, the Clean Air Act requires the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to enforce regulations intended to protect the public from air pollutants believed to be hazardous to public health; and

Whereas, in 1970, Congress amended the Clean Air Act by mandating comprehensive state and federal regulations for both stationary and non-stationary sources of pollution; and

Whereas, the 1970 amendments dramatically expanded the EPA's regulatory authority; and

Whereas, additional amendments adopted in 1990 expanded the Clean Air Act by allowing the EPA to address acid rain, ozone depletion, gasoline formulation and evaporative emissions; and

Whereas, in April 2009, the EPA issued an endangerment finding, declaring that current and future greenhouse gas emissions pose a serious threat to public health and safety, allowing the agency to regulate carbon dioxide emissions; and

Whereas, as written, the Clean Air Act gives states, not the federal government, the primary role in establishing and carrying out plans to comply with EPA regulations; and

Whereas, as written, the Clean Air Act requires the EPA to consider the economic impact of its proposed regulations; and

Whereas, in spite of these provisions, recent actions by the EPA reflect a disturbing and legally questionable shift away from state and towards federal primacy; and

Whereas, these actions include the EPA's recent rejection of Arizona's State Implementation Plan for Regional Haze, which may cost Arizona consumers as much as one billion dollars for new technology that will make an imperceptible improvement in air quality compared to the state's plan; and

Whereas, while Americans support efforts to improve air quality, such efforts should be carefully balanced to ensure that the cost of new regulations on the economy do not exceed potential benefits; and Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, the House of Representatives concurring, prays:

1. That the United States Congress amend the Clean Air Act to further clarify that the states, not the EPA, have the primary role in developing plans for regulating air pollutants and fully consider the impact of new regulations on the state and national economy before approval or implementation of new regulations.

2. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit copies of this Memorial to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona.

POM-47. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon urging Congress to increase investment in the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund and Clean Water State Revolving Fund; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

To the President of the United States and the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Seventy-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas generations of Oregonians have enjoyed access to safe, reliable and accessible public water, but a lack of investment in critical water systems that are relied upon to bring clean, accessible water to communities and the aging of public water infrastructure pose significant threats to the quality, safety, reliability and accessibility of public water; and

Whereas water is widely viewed in Oregon as a public trust to be managed for the common good of the public at large; and

Whereas approximately 80 percent of Oregon residents get their drinking water from public water systems; and

Whereas the federal Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 created the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund for the purpose of assisting states with funding to ensure safe public drinking water; and

Whereas in 2010 the Department of Human Services determined that \$44 million would be needed in order to fund projects for protecting existing sources of public drinking water in Oregon; and

Whereas in 2010 the final amount of funding from the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund available for use on Oregon priority projects was \$9,752,311, representing less than 25 percent of the amount needed; and

Whereas according to the United States Environmental Protection Agency, approximately 45 percent of the investment needs in Oregon for public water infrastructure are in

communities with a population of less than 10,000; and

Whereas the Title VI provisions of the federal Clean Water Act created the Clean Water State Revolving Fund in 1987 for the purpose of assisting states with funding to ensure clean water resources and wastewater systems and treatment facilities for the public; and

Whereas in 2011 the Department of Environmental Quality determined that \$380,821,000 will be needed in order to fully fund projects for maintaining clean water resource programs and wastewater systems and treatment facilities to protect the public and Oregon water resources; and

Whereas in 2011 the funding from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund predicted to be available for use on Oregon priority projects was \$23,017,000, representing six percent of the amount needed; and

Whereas 50 percent of Oregon priority projects for funding from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund would serve communities with a population of less than 5,000; and

Whereas the current levels of funding for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund and the Clean Water State Revolving Fund are not sufficient to ensure that Oregon's public drinking water and wastewater systems and treatment facilities are maintained and protected to benefit the health and safety of Oregon residents and benefit Oregon water resources;

Whereas investing in Oregon's public drinking water and wastewater systems and treatment facilities will create and support family wage jobs for Oregon workers; and

Whereas according to the National Utility Contractors Association, for every \$1 billion that is invested nationally in water infrastructure, almost 27,000 jobs are created; and

Whereas it is critical for Oregon students to have access to safe and clean drinking water; and

Whereas there is currently no dedicated federal funding available for updating and repairing drinking water systems in public schools; and

Whereas protecting the public drinking water and wastewater systems and treatment facilities in the nation's communities is of crucial importance and requires an ongoing federal funding commitment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) The Seventy-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon urges the Congress of the United States of America to increase investment in the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund to upgrade and repair the nation's aging public drinking water systems in order to ensure that all citizens have access to safe, clean and affordable drinking water.

(2) The Seventy-seventh Legislative Assembly urges the Congress of the United States to increase investment in the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to upgrade and repair the nation's aging public water and wastewater treatment systems in order to ensure the health and safety of the nation's urban and rural environments and water resources.

(3) The Seventy-seventh Legislative Assembly urges the Congress of the United States to ensure that federal funding is available for public water systems in both large and small communities and ensure that dedicated funding is made available for updating and repairing drinking water systems in the nation's public schools.

(4) A copy of this memorial shall be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Senate Majority Leader, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

POM-48. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation reauthorizing the federal Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas, In 2006, Congress reauthorized the federal Older Americans Act of 1965 in its entirety, effective through the 2011 fiscal year; and

Whereas, The federal Older Americans Act of 1965 has not been reauthorized since 2006, although it was updated in 2009 and funding for its programs has been authorized since that date on an annual basis; and

Whereas, The congressional appropriations staff continue to stress the tight spending caps on discretionary programs imposed by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997; and

Whereas, A substantial number of older Americans living in the State of California will be at risk if there are significant reductions in allocated funds for the programs funded by the act; and

Whereas, Further delay in the reauthorization of the federal Older Americans Act of 1965 will erode the capacity of the act's various structures to deliver services to meet the needs of older Americans; and

Whereas, The federal Older Americans Act of 1965 should immediately be reauthorized to preserve the aging network's role in home- and community-based services, maintain the advocacy and consumer directed focus of the act, and give area agencies on aging increased flexibility in planning and delivering services to vulnerable older Americans; and

Whereas, The federal Older Americans Act of 1965 should be funded in the same manner in which the act has been funded for the past 48 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation that would reauthorize the federal Older Americans Act of 1965; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to the Chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

POM-49. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois relative to urging the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, and the United States Department of Education to consider communities in the State of Illinois as Promise Neighborhoods; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 0154

Whereas, The Promise Neighborhoods program was founded in 2010 on the premise of significantly improving the educational and developmental outcomes of children and

youth in distressed communities by providing access to great schools and strong systems of community support to aid in the transition from childhood to career; and

Whereas, The Promise Neighborhoods grant program consists of planning grants and implementation grants; and

Whereas, The United States Department of Education proposed to fund Promise Neighborhoods through the legislative authority of the Fund for the Improvement of Education Program in 2010; the level and allocation of planning and implementation funds are contingent upon each fiscal year's final budget; and

Whereas, The Promise Neighborhoods grant program is expected to continue in 2013 with another round of applications and award winners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Ninety-Eighth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we urge the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, and the United States Department of Education to consider communities in this State, including communities in the City of Chicago, as Promise Neighborhoods and award grants as such; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution be delivered to the President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, each member of the Illinois congressional delegation, the President of the United States, and the U.S. Secretary of Education.

POM-50. A concurrent memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona urging the United States Congress to protest against the closure of the Cherrybell Postal Processing and Distribution Center; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

HOUSE CONCURRENT MEMORIAL 2007

To the Members of the United States Congress:

Your memorialist respectfully represents: Whereas, the Cherrybell Postal Processing and Distribution Center (Cherrybell) serves the entire southern portion of Arizona covering the counties of Pima, Santa Cruz and Cochise. Currently, Southern Arizona is facing a potential economic downfall due to the initial decision made by the United States Postal Service Board of Governors to close Cherrybell; and

Whereas, more than 1.8 million people and 23,197 businesses use the Cherrybell postal services. According to United States Postal Service officials, over 3 million pieces of mail go through Cherrybell each day as it is the 15th largest facility serving the 33rd largest population area in our nation. Thus, the processing and sorting operations at Cherrybell that are being proposed to be moved to Phoenix affect approximately 280 jobs in Southern Arizona; and

Whereas, Southern Arizona, which includes both the Tohono O'odham nation and Pasqua Yaqui tribal lands, encompasses the California and Arizona border at Yuma south to Nogales, across to Douglas and Bisbee in Cochise County and the military installations located at Fort Huachuca and Davis Monthan, depends on the Cherrybell Post office; and

Whereas, Council Member Richard Fimbres went on record opposing the closure of Cherrybell Post Office and requested that the Tucson City Council work directly with Tucson's congressional delegation and community members to frame a campaign to protect the vital jobs at Cherrybell; and

Whereas, Pima County Recorder F. Ann Rodriguez, objects to the closure of

Cherrybell and firmly believes this change will clearly impact the activities of the state and county elections officials in Arizona and will cause a detrimental impact to voters. The information provided to the public by the United States Postal Services is based entirely on economic considerations with no apparent regard for the impact of the change on the fundamental right to vote of all citizens and, in particular, the significant additional detrimental impact to Native American voters in the region; and

Whereas, 600 people attended the public hearing, which was scheduled three days after Christmas, and 6,000 people wrote letters and signed online petitions urging the United States Postal Service Board of Governors not to close Cherrybell.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, the Senate concurring, prays:

1. That the Congress of the United States protest the proposed closing of Cherrybell Postal Processing and Distribution Center.

2. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit copies of this Memorial to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona.

POM-51. A memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona urging the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide rights to victims of crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE MEMORIAL 2002

To the Congress of the United States of America:

Your memorialist respectfully represents: Whereas, criminal defendants are afforded numerous federal rights and procedural protections; and

Whereas, victims of crime are not afforded any federal constitutional rights or protections; and

Whereas, the people of this state believe in the individual rights and liberties of all persons and have amended the Constitution of Arizona to provide crime victims with rights, and yet it is clear that without federal constitutional rights, crime victims' rights are less meaningful and enforceable.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

1. That the Congress of the United States propose to the people an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that provides rights to crime victims and that embodies the following principles:

(a) The right to be informed of and not excluded from any public proceedings relating to the crime.

(b) The right to be heard regarding any release from custody.

(c) The right to consideration for the safety and privacy of the victim, the victim's interest in avoiding unreasonable delay and the victim's interest in restitution.

(d) The right to be heard regarding any negotiated plea or sentence.

(e) The right to receive notice of release or escape.

2. That any amendment to the Constitution of the United States to establish rights for crime victims grant standing to victims of crime to assert all rights established by the Constitution.

3. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit copies of this Memorial to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of

Representatives and each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona.

POM-52. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 15

Whereas, The United States is predominantly a nation of immigrants that draws strength from the diversity of its residents; and

Whereas, Hardworking persons who aspire to become citizens of the United States have contributed to the prosperity of the State of Nevada in extraordinary ways through the years; and

Whereas, The operation of a strong and vibrant democracy is likely to be impeded unless all men and women, regardless of their race, creed, color, ethnicity or birthplace, are able to participate meaningfully in the political process with full rights and the equal protection attendant thereto; and

Whereas, We believe in the human dignity of all residents of the United States, regardless of their immigration status, and recognize the importance of the many contributions that immigrants have made to the social and economic fabric of Nevada; and

Whereas, A comprehensive approach to fixing our broken immigration system would strengthen the economy of our State and our nation, and would free aspiring citizens to make even greater contributions to our communities, our State and our nation; and

Whereas, We support immigration reform that keeps families together, upholds our values as a nation, promotes economic growth and provides long-term solutions to the current problems resulting from our immigration system; and

Whereas, Comprehensive immigration reform must include a significant reduction in the often unreasonable wait times and arbitrary rules that keep families separated from their loved ones; and

Whereas, Comprehensive immigration reform must include a realistic pathway to citizenship for all hardworking and tax-paying aspiring citizens who live in this country and meet reasonable requirements; and

Whereas, Comprehensive immigration reform must provide a mechanism for aspiring citizens who have grown up in this country to become citizens and be better able to fully contribute to our joint future; and

Whereas, The reform of our nation's immigration system must occur in a thoughtful manner which builds the strength and unity of working people, and guarantees the same rights, obligations and basic fairness for all workers, no matter their country of birth or origin; and

Whereas, Comprehensive immigration reform must include a new temporary worker program that provides for strict compliance with the labor standards and wage and hour requirements of the United States, portability of work visas so that workers may change jobs and the ability of workers to petition for permanent residency; and

Whereas, The enforcement provisions which accompany comprehensive immigration reform must restore respect for the law by promoting strict adherence to our nation's values, including due process, civil and human rights, accountability and proportionality; and

Whereas, The focus of law enforcement, both within and at the borders of the United States, should be to prevent criminals, and

those persons attempting to enter the country for the purpose of doing harm to this nation, from entering or remaining in the United States; and

Whereas, Comprehensive immigration reform must include a funding stream to address the entire spectrum of fiscal impacts that will be experienced by state governments as a result of programs for guest workers, earned legalization and increases in the number of immigrants; and

Whereas, Our federal elected officials must create an immigration process that strengthens our nation's economy and allows aspiring citizens to continue making contributions to our communities, our State and our nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, Jointly, That the members of the 77th Session of the Nevada Legislature hereby urge Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform as outlined in this resolution which addresses: (1) earned legal residency accompanied by a clear path to citizenship; (2) the future immigration of families and workers; (3) improved immigration enforcement and border security that is consistent with our nation's values; and (4) a funding stream to address the entire fiscal impacts on state governments; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

POM-53. A joint memorial adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado urging Congress to adopt comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 13-003

Whereas, Unlike most nations, America has a long and rich heritage of generous immigration laws; and

Whereas, Many employers are faced with an insufficient number of visas for workers to support the needs of the United States economy, with arbitrary visa caps creating backlogs, frequent exploitation by employers through wage and workplace violations, and inadequate government infrastructure to efficiently administer our numerous guest worker programs; and

Whereas, Colorado's identity is defined by its promise of equal opportunity, esteem for diversity and commitment to innovation; and

Whereas, Coloradans have prospered because of the contributions of hardworking immigrants who aspire to citizenship; and

Whereas, We believe in the human dignity of all Colorado residents, regardless of immigration status, and recognize the importance of immigrants' many contributions to the social and economic fabric of the state of Colorado; and

Whereas, Becoming a citizen of the United States means taking a solemn oath to uphold our nation's Constitution and to forsake allegiance to other nations; and

Whereas, Citizenship is the legal embodiment and symbol of full membership and participation in society that should be encouraged for all who can meet the lawful standards for citizenship; and

Whereas, Keeping families together not only is the correct and moral thing to do but

is also good for the economy because families provide a base of support that increases worker productivity and spurs entrepreneurship; and

Whereas, It is universally recognized that adequate border security is a fundamental prerequisite for successful and lasting immigration reform; and

Whereas, America's current immigration system is widely recognized as dysfunctional because it harms our economy and does not reflect Colorado's values; and

Whereas, A well-designed and efficiently enforced immigration system is a federal responsibility, and a comprehensive approach to solve our broken immigration system would strengthen Colorado's and the nation's economy and would free aspiring citizens to make an even greater contribution to our communities; and

Whereas, The federal government's inability to enact immigration reform has created severe economic, cultural, and political strains in communities across Colorado and has led to a patchwork of state laws that inadequately address immigration-related problems; and

Whereas, Immigration reform must occur in a comprehensive, thoughtful manner that builds the strength and unity of working people, keeps families together wherever possible, and guarantees the same rights, obligations, and basic fairness for all lawful workers, no matter where they come from; and

Whereas, Comprehensive immigration reform must provide a fair, equitable, and realistic mechanism for aspiring citizens who have grown up in this country to become citizens and be able to fully contribute to our joint future; and

Whereas, Comprehensive immigration reform must update the legal immigration system so that the future flow of legal guest workers more realistically matches our nation's labor needs and is structured to protect the employment, wages, and working conditions of U.S. and lawful immigrant workers; and

Whereas, Comprehensive immigration reform must strengthen the small business workforce and customer base, reward initiative with the American promise of opportunity, promote productivity, reduce red tape, and strengthen the American economy; and

Whereas, Any new guest worker visa program must provide for strict compliance with United States labor standards and wage and hour standards, portability of visas so that workers can change jobs under prescribed circumstances, and the ability for workers to petition for permanent residency; and

Whereas, Comprehensive immigration reform must aim to reduce the unreasonable wait times and overly complex rules that keep families unreasonably separated from their loved ones; and

Whereas, Colorado citizens support a comprehensive immigration reform that keeps families together wherever possible, upholds our values as a state and nation, promotes small business and economic growth, and provides long-term, practicable and enforceable solutions to our broken immigration system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring herein:

That we urge the 113th Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform as outlined in this Joint Memorial; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Joint Memorial shall be delivered to the U.S. Speaker of the House, President of the U.S. Senate, members of Colorado's Congressional delegation, members of Colorado's General Assembly, and the Governor of Colorado.

POM-54. A joint resolution adopted by the City of Sumter, Sumter County Council, and Sumter School District of the State of South Carolina supporting the preservation of tax-exempt municipal bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

POM-55. A resolution adopted by the Board of Education of the Mentor Exempted Village School District of the State of Ohio urging Congress and the Administration to mitigate across-the-board cuts to education that are scheduled to occur March 1, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

POM-56. A resolution adopted by the Municipal Assembly of San Juan, Puerto Rico expressing the San Juan Municipal Legislature's deepest rejection of the application of the death penalty by the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-57. A resolution adopted by the Governing Body of the City of Santa Fe, New Mexico expressing support for the Uniting American Families Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-58. A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Carrboro, North Carolina supporting the Uniting American Families Act and the inclusion of LGBT families in comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 960. A bill to foster stability in Syria, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-79).

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 156. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the 10-year anniversary of NATO Allied Command Transformation.

By Mr. SCHUMER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. 375. A bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HARKIN for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Kent Yoshiho Hirozawa, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring August 27, 2016.

*Nancy Jean Schiffer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2014.

By Mr. SCHUMER for the Committee on Rules and Administration.

*Davita Vance-Cooks, of Virginia, to be Public Printer.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 1349. A bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 1350. A bill to exclude from gross income compensation provided for victims of the March 29, 2013, pipeline oil spill in Mayflower, Arkansas; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1351. A bill to provide for fiscal gap and generational accounting analysis in the legislative process, the President's budget, and annual long-term fiscal outlook reports; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1352. A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1353. A bill to provide for an ongoing, voluntary public-private partnership to improve cybersecurity, and to strengthen cybersecurity research and development, workforce development and education, and public awareness and preparedness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1354. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the range of conduct punished as sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1355. A bill to provide regulatory parity among alternative fuel vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1356. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to strengthen the United States workforce development system through innovation in, and alignment and improvement of, employment, training, and education programs in the United States, and to promote individual and national economic growth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1357. A bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1358. A bill to establish an advisory office within the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission to prevent fraud targeting seniors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1359. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish national standards for discharges from cruise vessels; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1360. A bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 1361. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept additional documentation when considering the application for veterans status of an individual who performed service as a coastwise merchant seaman during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 20

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 20, a bill to repeal the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

S. 134

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 134, a bill to arrange for the National Academy of Sciences to study the impact of violent video games and violent video programming on children.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to add Vietnam Veterans Day as a patriotic and national observance.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 425

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 425, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to

improve the quality, health outcomes, and value of maternity care under the Medicaid and CHIP programs by developing maternity care quality measures and supporting maternity care quality collaboratives.

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 491

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 491, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify provisions relating to grants, and for other purposes.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 888

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 888, a bill to provide end user exemptions from certain provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

S. 967

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 967, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify various authorities relating to procedures for courts-martial under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes.

S. 983

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 983, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

S. 1007

At the request of Mr. KING, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1007, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program.

S. 1072

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1072, a bill to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

S. 1123

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1123, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 1128

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1128, a bill to clarify the orphan drug exception to the annual fee on branded prescription pharmaceutical manufacturers and importers.

S. 1143

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1143, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 1149

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1149, a bill to reauthorize the ban on undetectable firearms, and to extend the ban to undetectable firearm receivers and undetectable ammunition magazines.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1182, a bill to modify the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to require specific evidence for access to business records and other tangible things, and provide appropriate transition procedures, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1188, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue

Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1215

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1215, a bill to strengthen privacy protections, accountability, and oversight related to domestic surveillance conducted pursuant to the USA PATRIOT Act and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

S. 1236

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1236, a bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage.

S. 1279

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1279, a bill to prohibit the revocation or withholding of Federal funds to programs whose participants carry out voluntary religious activities.

S. 1292

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1292, a bill to prohibit the funding of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1306

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1306, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to improve environmental literacy to better prepare students for postsecondary education and careers, and for other purposes.

S. 1310

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1310, a bill to require Senate confirmation of Inspector General of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes.

S. 1334

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1334, a bill to establish student loan interest rates, and for other purposes.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to protect the information of livestock producers, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1749

At the request of Mr. McCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1749 proposed to S. 1243, an original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1749 proposed to S. 1243, *supra*.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 1350. A bill to exclude from gross income compensation provided for victims of the March 29, 2013, pipeline oil spill in Mayflower, Arkansas; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, on March 29, 2013, the ExxonMobil pipeline ruptured spilling an estimated 147,000 gallons of oil into Mayflower, Arkansas. Victims of this oil spill are rightfully being compensated by ExxonMobil, but the Internal Revenue Service has said that compensatory payments will be considered taxable income. These families should not have to pay taxes on this disaster relief assistance. The Mayflower Oil Spill Tax Relief Act of 2013 prohibits compensation to Mayflower oil spill victims from being taxed by treating it as “a qualified disaster relief payment” under current law. My colleague Senator PRYOR joins me in introducing this important legislation. I would also like to thank Representative TIM GRIFFIN for his support and leadership on the House companion version of the Mayflower Oil Spill Tax Relief Act of 2013.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1350

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Mayflower Oil Spill Tax Relief Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. MAYFLOWER, ARKANSAS OIL SPILL COMPENSATION EXCLUDED FROM GROSS INCOME.

For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

(1) the March 29, 2013, pipeline rupture and oil spill in Mayflower, Arkansas, shall be treated as a qualified disaster under section 139(c) of such Code, and

(2) any compensation provided to or for the benefit of a victim of such disaster shall be treated as a qualified disaster relief payment under section 139(b) of such Code.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1353. A bill to provide for an ongoing, voluntary public-private partnership to improve cybersecurity, and to strengthen cybersecurity research and development, workforce development and education, and public awareness and preparedness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, the cybersecurity legislation Senator THUNE and I introduce today is built upon several years of bipartisan hard work on the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. I am proud of that fact and proud of our work product.

I would like to sincerely thank Senator THUNE for working closely with me on this legislation. Senator THUNE appreciates the gravity of the cybersecurity threat to our national security and our economy—a genuine threat to the free flow of commerce. He has been laser focused in finding workable, private sector led solutions to mitigate this existential threat.

Our bill will go a long way to better secure our nation from ongoing cyber threats by having the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, a world-class, non-regulatory agency within the Department of Commerce—facilitate and support the development of voluntary, industry-led standards and best practices to reduce cyber risks to critical infrastructure and all businesses.

Our bill will give NIST the permanent authority it needs to continue the standards development process initiated by the President’s Executive Order on Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity to ensure such efforts remain industry led and voluntary.

It will also make sure that the Federal Government supports cutting edge research, works to increase public awareness, and improves our workforce to better address cyber threats.

Our country’s future economic success and security demands prompt attention to the cyber threat. It demands we all pull together to face the reality of cyber intrusions into every aspect of our nation’s business, our electric grid, our trade secrets, our water supply, and so much more. The stakes are great. This is about our national security—3 Directors of National Intelligence have said cyber attacks are the number 1 national security threat to our country. That is why we have to find a way to reach a consensus that allows us to responsibly legislate.

This bill is a very good start. There is a lot more we can and should do to protect our critical infrastructure, including promoting more sharing of private sector threat information. I will certainly keep looking for ways to work with my colleagues to provide

this nation with the tools and resources we need to take on this threat.

Again, I thank Senator THUNE for dedicating his time, talent, and energy to this legislation, and his fine staff.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1353

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Cybersecurity Act of 2013”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

Sec. 3. No regulatory authority.

TITLE I—PUBLIC-PRIVATE

COLLABORATION ON CYBERSECURITY

Sec. 101. Public-private collaboration on cybersecurity.

TITLE II—CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 201. Federal cybersecurity research and development.

Sec. 202. Computer and network security research centers.

TITLE III—EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.

Sec. 301. Cybersecurity competitions and challenges.

Sec. 302. Federal cyber scholarship-for-service program.

Sec. 303. Study and analysis of education, accreditation, training, and certification of information infrastructure and cybersecurity professionals.

TITLE IV—CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS AND PREPAREDNESS

Sec. 401. National cybersecurity awareness and preparedness campaign.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CYBERSECURITY MISSION.—The term “cybersecurity mission” means activities that encompass the full range of threat reduction, vulnerability reduction, deterrence, international engagement, incident response, resiliency, and recovery policies and activities, including computer network operations, information assurance, law enforcement, diplomacy, military, and intelligence missions as such activities relate to the security and stability of cyberspace.

(2) INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term “information infrastructure” means the underlying framework that information systems and assets rely on to process, transmit, receive, or store information electronically, including programmable electronic devices, communications networks, and industrial or supervisory control systems and any associated hardware, software, or data.

(3) INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The term “information system” has the meaning given that term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

SEC. 3. NO REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to confer any regulatory authority on any Federal, State, tribal, or local department or agency.

**TITLE I—PUBLIC-PRIVATE
COLLABORATION ON CYBERSECURITY**
**SEC. 101. PUBLIC-PRIVATE COLLABORATION ON
CYBERSECURITY.**

(a) CYBERSECURITY.—Section 2(c) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 272(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (15) through (22) as paragraphs (16) through (23), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (14) the following:

“(15) on an ongoing basis, facilitate and support the development of a voluntary, industry-led set of standards, guidelines, best practices, methodologies, procedures, and processes to reduce cyber risks to critical infrastructure (as defined under subsection (e));”.

(b) SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS.—Section 2 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 272) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) CYBER RISKS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the activities under subsection (c)(15), the Director—

“(A) shall—

“(i) coordinate closely and continuously with relevant private sector personnel and entities, critical infrastructure owners and operators, sector coordinating councils, Information Sharing and Analysis Centers, and other relevant industry organizations, and incorporate industry expertise;

“(ii) consult with the heads of agencies with national security responsibilities, sector-specific agencies, State and local governments, the governments of other nations, and international organizations;

“(iii) identify a prioritized, flexible, repeatable, performance-based, and cost-effective approach, including information security measures and controls, that may be voluntarily adopted by owners and operators of critical infrastructure to help them identify, assess, and manage cyber risks;

“(iv) include methodologies—

“(I) to identify and mitigate impacts of the cybersecurity measures or controls on business confidentiality; and

“(II) to protect individual privacy and civil liberties;

“(v) incorporate voluntary consensus standards and industry best practices;

“(vi) align with voluntary international standards to the fullest extent possible;

“(vii) prevent duplication of regulatory processes and prevent conflict with or superseding of regulatory requirements, mandatory standards, and related processes; and

“(viii) include such other similar and consistent elements as the Director considers necessary; and

“(B) shall not prescribe or otherwise require—

“(i) the use of specific solutions;

“(ii) the use of specific information or communications technology products or services; or

“(iii) that information or communications technology products or services be designed, developed, or manufactured in a particular manner.

“(2) LIMITATION.—Information shared with or provided to the Institute for the purpose of the activities described under subsection (c)(15) shall not be used by any Federal, State, tribal, or local department or agency to regulate the activity of any entity.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term ‘critical infrastructure’ has the meaning given the term in section 1016(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e)).

“(B) SECTOR-SPECIFIC AGENCY.—The term ‘sector-specific agency’ means the Federal department or agency responsible for providing institutional knowledge and specialized expertise as well as leading, facilitating, or supporting the security and resilience programs and associated activities of its designated critical infrastructure sector in the all-hazards environment.”.

**TITLE II—CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH
AND DEVELOPMENT**

**SEC. 201. FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH
AND DEVELOPMENT.**

(a) FUNDAMENTAL CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in coordination with the head of any relevant Federal agency, shall build upon programs and plans in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act to develop a Federal cybersecurity research and development plan to meet objectives in cybersecurity, such as—

(A) how to design and build complex software-intensive systems that are secure and reliable when first deployed;

(B) how to test and verify that software and hardware, whether developed locally or obtained from a third party, is free of significant known security flaws;

(C) how to test and verify that software and hardware obtained from a third party correctly implements stated functionality, and only that functionality;

(D) how to guarantee the privacy of an individual, including that individual's identity, information, and lawful transactions when stored in distributed systems or transmitted over networks;

(E) how to build new protocols to enable the Internet to have robust security as one of the key capabilities of the Internet;

(F) how to determine the origin of a message transmitted over the Internet;

(G) how to support privacy in conjunction with improved security;

(H) how to address the growing problem of insider threats;

(I) how improved consumer education and digital literacy initiatives can address human factors that contribute to cybersecurity;

(J) how to protect information processed, transmitted, or stored using cloud computing or transmitted through wireless services; and

(K) any additional objectives the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in coordination with the head of any relevant Federal agency and with input from stakeholders, including industry and academia, determines appropriate.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal cybersecurity research and development plan shall identify and prioritize near-term, mid-term, and long-term research in computer and information science and engineering to meet the objectives under paragraph (1), including research in the areas described in section 4(a)(1) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7403(a)(1)).

(B) PRIVATE SECTOR EFFORTS.—In developing, implementing, and updating the Federal cybersecurity research and development plan, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall work in close cooperation with industry, academia, and other interested stakeholders to ensure, to the extent possible, that Federal cybersecurity research and development is not duplicative of private sector efforts.

(3) TRIENNIAL UPDATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal cybersecurity research and development plan shall be updated triennially.

(B) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall submit the plan, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each updated plan under this section to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

(b) CYBERSECURITY PRACTICES RESEARCH.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall support research that—

(1) develops, evaluates, disseminates, and integrates new cybersecurity practices and concepts into the core curriculum of computer science programs and of other programs where graduates of such programs have a substantial probability of developing software after graduation, including new practices and concepts relating to secure coding education and improvement programs; and

(2) develops new models for professional development of faculty in cybersecurity education, including secure coding development.

(c) CYBERSECURITY MODELING AND TEST BEDS.—

(1) REVIEW.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director the National Science Foundation, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, shall conduct a review of cybersecurity test beds in existence on the date of enactment of this Act to inform the grants under paragraph (2). The review shall include an assessment of whether a sufficient number of cybersecurity test beds are available to meet the research needs under the Federal cybersecurity research and development plan.

(2) ADDITIONAL CYBERSECURITY MODELING AND TEST BEDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Director of the National Science Foundation, after the review under paragraph (1), determines that the research needs under the Federal cybersecurity research and development plan require the establishment of additional cybersecurity test beds, the Director of the National Science Foundation, in coordination with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Homeland Security, may award grants to institutions of higher education or research and development non-profit institutions to establish cybersecurity test beds.

(B) REQUIREMENT.—The cybersecurity test beds under subparagraph (A) shall be sufficiently large in order to model the scale and complexity of real-time cyber attacks and defenses on real world networks and environments.

(C) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—The Director of the National Science Foundation, in coordination with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall evaluate the effectiveness of any grants awarded under this subsection in meeting the objectives of the Federal cybersecurity research and development plan under subsection (a) no later than 2 years after the review under paragraph (1) of this subsection, and periodically thereafter.

(d) COORDINATION WITH OTHER RESEARCH INITIATIVES.—In accordance with the responsibilities under section 101 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511), the Director the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall coordinate, to the extent practicable, Federal research and development activities under this section with

other ongoing research and development security-related initiatives, including research being conducted by—

- (1) the National Science Foundation;
- (2) the National Institute of Standards and Technology;
- (3) the Department of Homeland Security;
- (4) other Federal agencies;
- (5) other Federal and private research laboratories, research entities, and universities;
- (6) institutions of higher education;
- (7) relevant nonprofit organizations; and
- (8) international partners of the United States.

(e) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY RESEARCH GRANT AREAS.—Section 4(a)(1) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7403(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (H), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (I), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(J) secure fundamental protocols that are integral to inter-network communications and data exchange;

“(K) secure software engineering and software assurance, including—

“(i) programming languages and systems that include fundamental security features;

“(ii) portable or reusable code that remains secure when deployed in various environments;

“(iii) verification and validation technologies to ensure that requirements and specifications have been implemented; and

“(iv) models for comparison and metrics to assure that required standards have been met;

“(L) holistic system security that—

“(i) addresses the building of secure systems from trusted and untrusted components;

“(ii) proactively reduces vulnerabilities;

“(iii) addresses insider threats; and

“(iv) supports privacy in conjunction with improved security;

“(M) monitoring and detection;

“(N) mitigation and rapid recovery methods;

“(O) security of wireless networks and mobile devices; and

“(P) security of cloud infrastructure and services.”

(f) RESEARCH ON THE SCIENCE OF CYBERSECURITY.—The head of each agency and department identified under section 101(a)(3)(B) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511(a)(3)(B)), through existing programs and activities, shall support research that will lead to the development of a scientific foundation for the field of cybersecurity, including research that increases understanding of the underlying principles of securing complex networked systems, enables repeatable experimentation, and creates quantifiable security metrics.

SEC. 202. COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY RESEARCH CENTERS.

Section 4(b) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7403(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “the center” in paragraph (4)(D) and inserting “the Center”; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) the demonstrated capability of the applicant to conduct high performance com-

putation integral to complex computer and network security research, through on-site or off-site computing;

“(F) the applicant’s affiliation with private sector entities involved with industrial research described in subsection (a)(1);

“(G) the capability of the applicant to conduct research in a secure environment;

“(H) the applicant’s affiliation with existing research programs of the Federal Government;

“(I) the applicant’s experience managing public-private partnerships to transition new technologies into a commercial setting or the government user community; and

“(J) the capability of the applicant to conduct interdisciplinary cybersecurity research, such as in law, economics, or behavioral sciences.”

TITLE III—EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.

SEC. 301. CYBERSECURITY COMPETITIONS AND CHALLENGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce, Director of the National Science Foundation, and Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(1) support competitions and challenges under section 105 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (124 Stat. 3989) or any other provision of law, as appropriate—

(A) to identify, develop, and recruit talented individuals to perform duties relating to the security of information infrastructure in Federal, State, and local government agencies, and the private sector; or

(B) to stimulate innovation in basic and applied cybersecurity research, technology development, and prototype demonstration that has the potential for application to the information technology activities of the Federal Government; and

(2) ensure the effective operation of the competitions and challenges under this section.

(b) PARTICIPATION.—Participants in the competitions and challenges under subsection (a)(1) may include—

(1) students enrolled in grades 9 through 12;

(2) students enrolled in a postsecondary program of study leading to a baccalaureate degree at an institution of higher education;

(3) students enrolled in a postbaccalaureate program of study at an institution of higher education;

(4) institutions of higher education and research institutions;

(5) veterans; and

(6) other groups or individuals that the Secretary of Commerce, Director of the National Science Foundation, and Secretary of Homeland Security determine appropriate.

(c) AFFILIATION AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Competitions and challenges under this section may be carried out through affiliation and cooperative agreements with—

(1) Federal agencies;

(2) regional, State, or school programs supporting the development of cyber professionals;

(3) State, local, and tribal governments; or

(4) other private sector organizations.

(d) AREAS OF SKILL.—Competitions and challenges under subsection (a)(1)(A) shall be designed to identify, develop, and recruit exceptional talent relating to—

(1) ethical hacking;

(2) penetration testing;

(3) vulnerability assessment;

(4) continuity of system operations;

(5) security in design;

(6) cyber forensics;

(7) offensive and defensive cyber operations; and

(8) other areas the Secretary of Commerce, Director of the National Science Foundation, and Secretary of Homeland Security consider necessary to fulfill the cybersecurity mission.

(e) TOPICS.—In selecting topics for competitions and challenges under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary of Commerce, Director of the National Science Foundation, and Secretary of Homeland Security—

(1) shall consult widely both within and outside the Federal Government; and

(2) may empanel advisory committees.

(f) INTERNSHIPS.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management may support, as appropriate, internships or other work experience in the Federal Government to the winners of the competitions and challenges under this section.

SEC. 302. FEDERAL CYBER SCHOLARSHIP-FOR-SERVICE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Science Foundation, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management and Secretary of Homeland Security, shall continue a Federal Cyber Scholarship-for-Service program to recruit and train the next generation of information technology professionals, industrial control system security professionals, and security managers to meet the needs of the cybersecurity mission for Federal, State, local, and tribal governments.

(b) PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND COMPONENTS.—The Federal Cyber Scholarship-for-Service program shall—

(1) provide scholarships to students who are enrolled in programs of study at institutions of higher education leading to degrees or specialized program certifications in the cybersecurity field;

(2) provide the scholarship recipients with summer internship opportunities or other meaningful temporary appointments in the Federal information technology workforce; and

(3) provide a procedure by which the National Science Foundation or a Federal agency, consistent with regulations of the Office of Personnel Management, may request and fund security clearances for scholarship recipients, including providing for clearances during internships or other temporary appointments and after receipt of their degrees.

(c) SCHOLARSHIP AMOUNTS.—Each scholarship under subsection (b) shall be in an amount that covers the student’s tuition and fees at the institution under subsection (b)(1) and provides the student with an additional stipend.

(d) SCHOLARSHIP CONDITIONS.—Each scholarship recipient, as a condition of receiving a scholarship under the program, shall enter into an agreement under which the recipient agrees to work in the cybersecurity mission of a Federal, State, local, or tribal agency for a period equal to the length of the scholarship following receipt of the student’s degree.

(e) HIRING AUTHORITY.—

(1) APPOINTMENT IN EXCEPTED SERVICE.—Notwithstanding any provision of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, an agency shall appoint in the excepted service an individual who has completed the academic program for which a scholarship was awarded.

(2) NONCOMPETITIVE CONVERSION.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), upon fulfillment of the service term, an employee appointed under paragraph (1) may be converted noncompetitively to term, career-conditional or career appointment.

(3) **TIMING OF CONVERSION.**—An agency may noncompetitively convert a term employee appointed under paragraph (2) to a career-conditional or career appointment before the term appointment expires.

(4) **AUTHORITY TO DECLINE CONVERSION.**—An agency may decline to make the non-competitive conversion or appointment under paragraph (2) for cause.

(f) **ELIGIBILITY.**—To be eligible to receive a scholarship under this section, an individual shall—

(1) be a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States;

(2) demonstrate a commitment to a career in improving the security of information infrastructure; and

(3) have demonstrated a high level of proficiency in mathematics, engineering, or computer sciences.

(g) **REPAYMENT.**—If a scholarship recipient does not meet the terms of the program under this section, the recipient shall refund the scholarship payments in accordance with rules established by the Director of the National Science Foundation, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management and Secretary of Homeland Security.

(h) **EVALUATION AND REPORT.**—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall evaluate and report periodically to Congress on the success of recruiting individuals for scholarships under this section and on hiring and retaining those individuals in the public sector workforce.

SEC. 303. STUDY AND ANALYSIS OF EDUCATION, ACCREDITATION, TRAINING, AND CERTIFICATION OF INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE AND CYBERSECURITY PROFESSIONALS.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Director of the National Science Foundation and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall undertake to enter into appropriate arrangements with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a comprehensive study of government, academic, and private-sector education, accreditation, training, and certification programs for the development of professionals in information infrastructure and cybersecurity. The agreement shall require the National Academy of Sciences to consult with sector coordinating councils and relevant governmental agencies, regulatory entities, and nongovernmental organizations in the course of the study.

(b) **SCOPE.**—The study shall include—

(1) an evaluation of the body of knowledge and various skills that specific categories of professionals in information infrastructure and cybersecurity should possess in order to secure information systems;

(2) an assessment of whether existing government, academic, and private-sector education, accreditation, training, and certification programs provide the body of knowledge and various skills described in paragraph (1);

(3) an evaluation of—

(A) the state of cybersecurity education at institutions of higher education in the United States;

(B) the extent of professional development opportunities for faculty in cybersecurity principles and practices;

(C) the extent of the partnerships and collaborative cybersecurity curriculum development activities that leverage industry and government needs, resources, and tools;

(D) the proposed metrics to assess progress toward improving cybersecurity education; and

(E) the descriptions of the content of cybersecurity courses in undergraduate computer science curriculum;

(4) an analysis of any barriers to the Federal Government recruiting and hiring cybersecurity talent, including barriers relating to compensation, the hiring process, job classification, and hiring flexibility; and

(5) an analysis of the sources and availability of cybersecurity talent, a comparison of the skills and expertise sought by the Federal Government and the private sector, an examination of the current and future capacity of United States institutions of higher education, including community colleges, to provide current and future cybersecurity professionals, through education and training activities, with those skills sought by the Federal Government, State and local entities, and the private sector.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Academy of Sciences shall submit to the President and Congress a report on the results of the study. The report shall include—

(1) findings regarding the state of information infrastructure and cybersecurity education, accreditation, training, and certification programs, including specific areas of deficiency and demonstrable progress; and

(2) recommendations for further research and the improvement of information infrastructure and cybersecurity education, accreditation, training, and certification programs.

TITLE IV—CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS AND PREPAREDNESS

SEC. 401. NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS AND PREPAREDNESS CAMPAIGN.

(a) **NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS AND PREPAREDNESS CAMPAIGN.**—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (referred to in this section as the “Director”), in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, shall continue to coordinate a national cybersecurity awareness and preparedness campaign, such as—

(1) a campaign to increase public awareness of cybersecurity, cyber safety, and cyber ethics, including the use of the Internet, social media, entertainment, and other media to reach the public;

(2) a campaign to increase the understanding of State and local governments and private sector entities of—

(A) the benefits of ensuring effective risk management of the information infrastructure versus the costs of failure to do so; and

(B) the methods to mitigate and remediate vulnerabilities;

(3) support for formal cybersecurity education programs at all education levels to prepare skilled cybersecurity and computer science workers for the private sector and Federal, State, and local government; and

(4) initiatives to evaluate and forecast future cybersecurity workforce needs of the Federal government and develop strategies for recruitment, training, and retention.

(b) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In carrying out the authority described in subsection (a), the Director, in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, shall leverage existing programs designed to inform the public of safety and security of products or services, including self-certifications and independently-verified assessments regarding the quantification and valuation of information security risk.

(c) **STRATEGIC PLAN.**—The Director, in cooperation with relevant Federal agencies and other stakeholders, shall build upon programs and plans in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act to develop and implement a strategic plan to guide Federal pro-

grams and activities in support of the national cybersecurity awareness and preparedness campaign under subsection (a).

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the Director shall transmit the strategic plan under subsection (c) to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1359. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish national standards for discharges from cruise vessels; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1359

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Clean Cruise Ship Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) cruise ships carry millions of passengers through North American waters each year, showcase some of the most beautiful ocean and coastal environments in the United States, and provide opportunities for passengers to relax and enjoy oceans and marine ecosystems;

(2) the natural beauty and health of the ocean and coastal environment is what draws passengers to travel along these waterways by ship;

(3) protecting the natural environment is beneficial to both the environment and to the cruise industry;

(4) the number of cruise passengers continues to grow, making the cruise industry 1 of the fastest growing tourism sectors in the world;

(5) in 2010, more than 10,000,000 passengers departed from North America on thousands of cruise ships;

(6) as of 2010, the average annual growth rate of cruise passengers is 7.5 percent;

(7) during the 2 decades preceding the date of enactment of this Act, the average cruise ship size has increased at a rate of approximately 90 feet every 5 years;

(8) an average-sized cruise vessel generates millions of gallons of liquid waste and many tons of solid waste;

(9) in just 1 week, a 3000-passenger cruise ship generates approximately 200,000 gallons of human sewage, more than 1,000,000 gallons of water from showers and sinks and dishwashing water (commonly known as “graywater”), more than 8 tons of solid waste, and toxic wastes from dry cleaning and photo-processing laboratories;

(10) in an Environmental Protection Agency survey of 29 ships traveling in Alaskan waters, reported sewage generation rates ranged from 1,000 to 74,000 gallons per day per vessel, with the average volume of sewage generated being 21,000 gallons per day per vessel;

(11) those frequently untreated cruise ship discharges deliver nutrients, hazardous substances, pharmaceuticals, and human pathogens, including viruses and bacteria, directly into the marine environment;

(12) in the final report of the United States Commission on Ocean Policy, that Commission found that cruise ship discharges, if not treated and disposed of properly, and the cumulative impacts caused when cruise ships repeatedly visit the same environmentally sensitive areas, “can be a significant source of pathogens and nutrients with the potential to threaten human health and damage shellfish beds, coral reefs, and other aquatic life”;

(13) pollution from cruise ships not only has the potential to threaten marine life and human health through consumption of contaminated seafood, but also poses a health risk for recreational swimmers, surfers, and other beachgoers;

(14) according to the Environmental Protection Agency, “Sewage may host many pathogens of concern to human health, including Salmonella, Shigella, Hepatitis A and E, and gastro-intestinal viruses. Sewage contamination in swimming areas and shellfish beds poses potential risks to human health and the environment by increasing the rate of waterborne illnesses”;

(15) the nutrient pollution from human sewage discharges from cruise ships can contribute to the incidence of harmful algal blooms;

(16) algal blooms have been implicated in the deaths of marine life, including the deaths of more than 150 manatees off the coast of Florida;

(17) in a 2005 report requested by the International Council of Cruise Lines, the Science Panel of the Ocean Conservation and Tourism Alliance recommended that—

(A) “[a]ll blackwater should be treated”;

(B) treated blackwater should be “avoided in ports, close to bathing beaches or water bodies with restricted circulation, flushing or inflow”; and

(C) blackwater should not be discharged within 4 nautical miles of shellfish beds, coral reefs, or other sensitive habitats;

(18) that Science Panel further recommended that graywater be treated in the same manner as blackwater and that sewage sludge be off-loaded to approved land-based facilities;

(19) in a summary of recommendations for addressing unabated point sources of pollution, the Pew Oceans Commission states that, “Congress should enact legislation that regulates wastewater discharges from cruise ships under the Clean Water Act by establishing uniform minimum standards for discharges in all State waters and prohibiting discharges within the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone that do not meet effluent standards.”; and

(20) a comprehensive statutory regime for managing pollution discharges from cruise vessels, applicable throughout the United States, is needed—

(A) to protect coastal and ocean areas from pollution generated by cruise vessels;

(B) to reduce and better regulate discharges from cruise vessels; and

(C) to improve monitoring, reporting, and enforcement of standards regarding discharges.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this Act is to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) to establish national standards and prohibitions for discharges from cruise vessels.

SEC. 3. CRUISE VESSEL DISCHARGES.

Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) **CRUISE VESSEL DISCHARGES.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

“(A) **BILGE WATER.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘bilge water’ means wastewater.

“(ii) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘bilge water’ includes lubrication oils, transmission oils, oil sludge or slops, fuel or oil sludge, used oil, used fuel or fuel filters, and oily waste.

“(B) **COMMANDANT.**—The term ‘Commandant’ means the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

“(C) **CRUISE VESSEL.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘cruise vessel’ means a passenger vessel that—

“(I) is authorized to carry at least 250 passengers; and

“(II) has onboard sleeping facilities for each passenger.

“(ii) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘cruise vessel’ does not include—

“(I) a vessel of the United States operated by the Federal Government;

“(II) a vessel owned and operated by the government of a State; or

“(III) a vessel owned by a local government.

“(D) **DISCHARGE.**—The term ‘discharge’ means the release, escape, disposal, spilling, leaking, pumping, emitting, or emptying of bilge water, graywater, hazardous waste, incinerator ash, sewage, sewage sludge, trash, or garbage from a cruise vessel into the environment, however caused, other than—

“(i) at an approved shoreside reception facility, if applicable; and

“(ii) in compliance with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws (including regulations).

“(E) **EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE.**—The term ‘exclusive economic zone’ has the meaning given the term in section 2101 of title 46, United States Code (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 109-304 (120 Stat. 1485)).

“(F) **FUND.**—The term ‘Fund’ means the Cruise Vessel Pollution Control Fund established by paragraph (11)(A)(i).

“(G) **GARBAGE.**—The term ‘garbage’ means solid waste from food preparation, service and disposal activities, even if shredded, ground, processed, or treated to comply with other requirements.

“(H) **GRAYWATER.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘graywater’ means galley water, dishwasher, and bath, shower, and washbasin water.

“(ii) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘graywater’ includes, to the extent not already covered under provisions of law relating to hazardous waste—

“(I) spa, pool, and laundry wastewater;

“(II) wastes from soot tanker or economizer cleaning;

“(III) wastes from photo processing;

“(IV) wastes from vessel interior surface cleaning; and

“(V) miscellaneous equipment and process wastewater.

“(I) **HAZARDOUS WASTE.**—The term ‘hazardous waste’ has the meaning given the term in section 6903 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6903).

“(J) **INCINERATOR ASH.**—The term ‘incinerator ash’ means ash generated during the incineration of solid waste or sewage sludge.

“(K) **NEW VESSEL.**—The term ‘new vessel’ means a vessel, the construction of which is initiated after promulgation of standards and regulations under this subsection.

“(L) **NO-DISCHARGE ZONE.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘no-discharge zone’ means an area of ecological importance, whether designated by Federal, State, or local authorities.

“(ii) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘no-discharge zone’ includes—

“(I) a marine sanctuary;

“(II) a marine protected area;

“(III) a marine reserve; and

“(IV) a marine national monument.

“(M) **PASSENGER.**—The term ‘passenger’ means any person (including a paying passenger and any staff member, such as a crew member, captain, or officer) traveling on board a cruise vessel.

“(N) **SEWAGE.**—The term ‘sewage’ means—

“(i) human and animal body wastes; and

“(ii) wastes from toilets and other receptacles intended to receive or retain human and animal body wastes.

“(O) **SEWAGE SLUDGE.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘sewage sludge’ means any solid, semi-solid, or liquid residue removed during the treatment of on-board sewage.

“(ii) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘sewage sludge’ includes—

“(I) solids removed during primary, secondary, or advanced wastewater treatment;

“(II) scum;

“(III) septage;

“(IV) portable toilet pumpings;

“(V) type III marine sanitation device pumpings (as defined in part 159 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation)); and

“(VI) sewage sludge products.

“(iii) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘sewage sludge’ does not include—

“(I) grit or screenings; or

“(II) ash generated during the incineration of sewage sludge.

“(P) **TRASH.**—The term ‘trash’ means solid waste from vessel operations and passenger services, even if shredded, ground, processed, or treated to comply with other regulations.

“(2) **PROHIBITIONS.**—

“(A) **PROHIBITION ON DISCHARGE OF SEWAGE SLUDGE, INCINERATOR ASH, AND HAZARDOUS WASTE.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided by subparagraph (C), no cruise vessel departing from, or calling on, a port of the United States may discharge sewage sludge, incinerator ash, or hazardous waste into navigable waters, including the contiguous zone and the exclusive economic zone.

“(ii) **OFF-LOADING.**—Sewage sludge, incinerator ash, and hazardous waste described in clause (i) shall be off-loaded at an appropriate land-based facility.

“(B) **PROHIBITION ON DISCHARGE OF SEWAGE, GRAYWATER, AND BILGE WATER.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided by subparagraph (C), no cruise vessel departing from or calling on, a port of the United States may discharge sewage, graywater, or bilge water into navigable waters, including the contiguous zone and the exclusive economic zone, unless—

“(I) the sewage, graywater, or bilge water is treated to meet all applicable effluent limits established under this section and is in accordance with all other applicable laws;

“(II) the cruise vessel is underway and proceeding at a speed of not less than 6 knots;

“(III) the cruise vessel is more than 12 nautical miles from shore; and

“(IV) the cruise vessel complies with all applicable standards established under this Act.

“(ii) **NO-DISCHARGE ZONES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, no cruise vessel departing from, or

calling on, a port of the United States may discharge treated or untreated sewage, graywater, or bilge water into a no-discharge zone.

“(C) SAFETY EXCEPTION.—

“(i) SCOPE OF EXCEPTION.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall not apply in any case in which—

“(I) a discharge is made solely for the purpose of securing the safety of the cruise vessel or saving human life at sea; and

“(II) all reasonable precautions have been taken to prevent or minimize the discharge.

“(ii) NOTIFICATION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—If the owner, operator, master, or other person in charge of a cruise vessel authorizes a discharge described in clause (i), the person shall notify the Administrator and the Commandant of the decision to authorize the discharge as soon as practicable, but not later than 24 hours, after authorizing the discharge.

“(II) REPORT.—Not later than 7 days after the date on which a discharge described in clause (i) occurs, the owner, operator, master, or other person in charge of a cruise vessel, shall submit to the Administrator and the Commandant a report that describes—

“(aa) the quantity and composition of each discharge authorized under clause (i);

“(bb) the reason for authorizing each such discharge;

“(cc) the location of the vessel during the course of each such discharge; and

“(dd) such other supporting information and data as are requested by the Commandant or the Administrator.

“(III) DISCLOSURE OF REPORTS.—Upon receiving a report under subclause (II), the Administrator shall make the report available to the public.

“(3) EFFLUENT LIMITS.—

“(A) EFFLUENT LIMITS FOR DISCHARGES OF SEWAGE, GRAYWATER, AND BILGE WATER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall promulgate effluent limits for sewage, graywater, and bilge water discharges from cruise vessels.

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—The effluent limits shall—

“(I) be consistent with the capability of the best available technology to treat effluent;

“(II) take into account the best available scientific information on the environmental effects of sewage, graywater, and bilge water discharges, including conventional, nontoxic, and toxic pollutants and petroleum;

“(III) take into account marine life and ecosystems, including coral reefs, shell fish beds, endangered species, marine mammals, seabirds, and marine ecosystems;

“(IV) take into account conditions that will affect marine life, ecosystems, and human health, including seamounts, continental shelves, oceanic fronts, warm core and cold core rings, and ocean currents; and

“(V) require compliance with all relevant Federal and State water quality standards.

“(iii) MINIMUM LIMITS.—The effluent limits promulgated under clause (i) shall require, at a minimum, that treated sewage, treated graywater, and treated bilge water effluent discharges from cruise vessels, measured at the point of discharge, shall, not later than the date described in subparagraph (C)—

“(I) satisfy the minimum level of effluent quality specified in section 133.102 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation); and

“(II) with respect to the samples from the discharge during any 30-day period—

“(aa) have a geometric mean that does not exceed 20 fecal coliform per 100 milliliters;

“(bb) not exceed 40 fecal coliform per 100 milliliters in more than 10 percent of the samples; and

“(cc) with respect to concentrations of total residual chlorine, not exceed 10 milligrams per liter.

“(B) REVIEW AND REVISION OF EFFLUENT LIMITS.—The Administrator shall—

“(i) review the effluent limits promulgated under subparagraph (A) at least once every 5 years; and

“(ii) revise the effluent limits to incorporate technology available at the time of the review in accordance with subparagraph (A)(i).

“(C) COMPLIANCE DATE.—The Administrator shall require compliance with the effluent limits promulgated pursuant to subparagraph (A)—

“(i) with respect to new vessels put into water after the date of enactment of this subsection, as of the date that is 180 days after the date of promulgation of the effluent limits; and

“(ii) with respect to vessels in use as of that date of enactment, as of the date that is 1 year after the date of promulgation of the effluent limits.

“(D) SAMPLING, MONITORING, AND REPORTING.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall require sampling, monitoring, and reporting to ensure compliance with—

“(I) the effluent limitations promulgated under subparagraph (A);

“(II) all other applicable provisions of this Act;

“(III) any regulations promulgated under this Act;

“(IV) other applicable Federal laws (including regulations); and

“(V) all applicable international treaty requirements.

“(ii) RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONS IN CHARGE OF CRUISE VESSELS.—The owner, operator, master, or other person in charge of a cruise vessel, shall at a minimum—

“(I) conduct sampling or testing at the point of discharge on a monthly basis, or more frequently, as determined by the Administrator;

“(II) provide real-time data to the Administrator, using telemetric or other similar technology, for reporting relating to—

“(aa) discharges of sewage, graywater, and bilge water from cruise vessels;

“(bb) pollutants emitted in sewage, graywater, and bilge water from cruise vessels; and

“(cc) functioning of cruise vessel components relating to fuel consumption and control of air and water pollution;

“(III) ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that technologies providing real-time data have the ability to record—

“(aa) the location and time of discharges from cruise vessels;

“(bb) the source, content, and volume of the discharges; and

“(cc) the operational state of components relating to pollution control technology at the time of the discharges, including whether the components are operating correctly;

“(IV) establish chains of custody, analysis protocols, and other specific information necessary to ensure that the sampling, testing, and records of that sampling and testing are reliable; and

“(V) maintain, and provide on a monthly basis to the Administrator, electronic copies of required sampling and testing data.

“(iii) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator shall require the compilation

and production, and not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection and biennially thereafter, the provision to the Administrator and the Commandant in electronic format, of documentation for each cruise vessel that includes, at a minimum—

“(I) a detailed description of onboard waste treatment mechanisms in use by the cruise vessel, including the manufacturer of the waste treatment technology on board;

“(II) a detailed description of onboard sludge management practices of the cruise vessel;

“(III) copies of applicable hazardous materials forms;

“(IV) a characterization of the nature, type, and composition of discharges by the cruise vessel;

“(V) a determination of the volumes of those discharges, including average volumes; and

“(VI) the locations, including the more common locations, of those discharges.

“(iv) SHORESIDE DISPOSAL.—The Administrator shall require documentation of shore-side disposal at approved facilities for all wastes by, at a minimum—

“(I) establishing standardized forms for the receipt of those wastes;

“(II) requiring those receipts to be sent electronically to the Administrator and Commandant and maintained in an onboard record book; and

“(III) requiring those receipts to be signed and dated by the owner, operator, master, or other person in charge of the discharging vessel and the authorized representative of the receiving facility.

“(v) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator, in consultation with the Commandant, shall promulgate regulations that, at a minimum, implement the sampling, monitoring, and reporting protocols required by this subparagraph.

“(4) INSPECTION PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish an inspection program to require that—

“(i) regular announced and unannounced inspections be conducted of any relevant aspect of cruise vessel operations, equipment, or discharges, including sampling and testing of cruise vessel discharges;

“(ii) each cruise vessel that calls on a port of the United States be subject to an unannounced inspection at least once per year; and

“(iii) inspections be carried out by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Coast Guard.

“(B) COAST GUARD INSPECTIONS.—If the Administrator and the Commandant jointly agree that some or all inspections are to be carried out by the Coast Guard, the inspections shall—

“(i) occur outside the Coast Guard matrix system for setting boarding priorities;

“(ii) be consistent across Coast Guard districts; and

“(iii) be conducted by specially-trained environmental inspectors.

“(C) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator, in consultation with the Commandant, shall promulgate regulations that, at a minimum—

“(i) designate responsibility for conducting inspections;

“(ii) require the owner, operator, master, or other person in charge of a cruise vessel to maintain and submit a logbook detailing

the times, types, volumes, flow rates, origins, and specific locations of, and explanations for, any discharges from the cruise vessel not otherwise required by the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973 (done at London on November 2, 1973; entered into force on October 2, 1983), as modified by the Protocol of 1978 relating to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973 (done at London, February 17, 1978);

“(iii) provide for routine announced and unannounced inspections of—

“(I) cruise vessel environmental compliance records and procedures; and

“(II) the functionality, sufficiency, redundancy, and proper operation and maintenance of installed equipment for abatement and control of any cruise vessel discharge (including equipment intended to treat sewage, graywater, or bilge water);

“(iv) ensure that—

“(i) all crew members are informed of, in the native language of the crew members, and understand, the pollution control obligations under this subsection, including regulations promulgated under this subsection; and

“(II) applicable crew members are sufficiently trained and competent to comply with requirements under this subsection, including sufficient training and competence—

“(aa) to effectively operate shipboard pollution control systems;

“(bb) to conduct all necessary sampling and testing; and

“(cc) to monitor and comply with recording requirements;

“(v) require that operating manuals be on the cruise vessel and accessible to all crew members;

“(vi) require the posting of the phone number for a toll-free whistleblower hotline on all ships and at all ports using language likely to be understood by international crews;

“(vii) require any owner, operator, master, or other person in charge of a cruise vessel, who has knowledge of a discharge from the cruise vessel in violation of this subsection, including regulations promulgated under this subsection, to report immediately the discharge to the Administrator and the Commandant;

“(viii) require the owner, operator, master, or other person in charge of a cruise vessel to provide, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, to the Administrator, Commandant, and on-board observers (including designated representatives), a copy of cruise vessel plans, including—

“(I) piping schematic diagrams;

“(II) construction drawings; and

“(III) drawings or diagrams of storage systems, processing, treating, intake, or discharge systems, and any modifications of those systems (within the year during which the modifications are made); and

“(ix) inhibit illegal discharges by prohibiting all means of altering piping, tankage, pumps, valves, and processes to bypass or circumvent measures or equipment designed to monitor, sample, or prevent discharges.

“(D) DISCLOSURE OF LOGBOOKS.—The logbook described in subparagraph (C)(ii) shall be submitted to the Administrator and the Commandant.

“(5) CRUISE OBSERVER PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Commandant, in consultation with the Administrator, shall establish and carry out a program for the hiring and

placement of 1 or more trained, independent, observers on each cruise vessel.

“(B) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the cruise observer program established under subparagraph (A) is to monitor and inspect cruise vessel operations, equipment, and discharges to ensure compliance with—

“(i) this subsection (including regulations promulgated under this subsection); and

“(ii) all other relevant Federal and State laws and international agreements.

“(C) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Commandant, in consultation with the Administrator and the Attorney General, shall promulgate regulations that, at a minimum—

“(i) specify that the Coast Guard shall be responsible for the hiring of observers;

“(ii) specify the qualifications, experience, and duties of the observers;

“(iii) specify methods and criteria for Coast Guard hiring of observers;

“(iv) establish the means for ensuring constant observer coverage and allowing for observer relief and rotation; and

“(v) establish an appropriate rate of pay to ensure that observers are highly trained and retained by the Coast Guard.

“(D) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Cruise observers participating in the program established under subparagraph (A) shall —

“(i) observe and inspect—

“(I) onboard liquid and solid handling and processing systems;

“(II) onboard environmental treatment systems;

“(III) use of shore-based treatment and storage facilities;

“(IV) discharges and discharge practices; and

“(V) documents relating to environmental compliance, including—

“(aa) sounding boards, logs, and logbooks;

“(bb) daily and corporate maintenance and engineers' logbooks;

“(cc) fuel, sludge, slop, waste, and ballast tank capacity tables;

“(dd) installation, maintenance, and operation records for oily water separators, incinerators, and boilers;

“(ee) piping diagrams;

“(ff) e-mail archives;

“(gg) receipts for the transfer of materials, including waste disposal;

“(hh) air emissions data; and

“(ii) electronic and other records of relevant information, including fuel consumption, maintenance, and spares ordering for all waste processing- and pollution-related equipment;

“(i) have the authority to interview and otherwise query any crew member with knowledge of cruise vessel operations;

“(ii) have access to all data and information made available to government officials under this subsection;

“(iv) immediately report any known or suspected violation of this subsection or any other applicable Federal law or international agreement to—

“(I) the owner, operator, master, or other person in charge of a cruise vessel;

“(II) the Commandant; and

“(III) the Administrator;

“(v) maintain inspection records to be submitted to the Commandant and the Administrator on a semiannual basis; and

“(vi) have authority to conduct the full range of duties of the observers within the United States territorial seas, contiguous zone, and exclusive economic zone.

“(E) PROGRAM EVALUATION.—The cruise observer program established and carried out

by the Commandant under subparagraph (A) shall include—

“(i) a method for collecting and reviewing data relating to the efficiency, sufficiency, and operation of the cruise observer program, including—

“(I) the ability to achieve program goals;

“(II) cruise vessel personnel cooperation;

“(III) necessary equipment and analytical resources; and

“(IV) the need for additional observer training; and

“(ii) a process for adopting periodic revisions to the program based on the data collected under clause (i).

“(F) OBSERVER SUPPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Commandant, in consultation with the Administrator, shall implement a program to provide support to observers, including, at a minimum—

“(i) training for observers to ensure the ability of the observers to carry out this paragraph;

“(ii) necessary equipment and analytical resources, such as laboratories, to carry out the responsibilities established under this subsection; and

“(iii) support relating to the administration of the program and the response to any recalcitrant cruise vessel personnel.

“(G) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of establishment of the program under this paragraph, the Commandant, in consultation with the Administrator, shall submit to Congress a report describing—

“(i) the results of the program in terms of observer effectiveness, optimal coverage, environmental benefits, and cruise ship cooperation;

“(ii) recommendations for increased effectiveness, including increased training needs and increased equipment needs; and

“(iii) other recommendations for improvement of the program.

“(6) REWARDS.—

“(A) PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator or a court of competent jurisdiction, as the case may be, may order payment, from a civil penalty or criminal fine collected for a violation of this subsection, of an amount not to exceed ½ of the amount of the civil penalty or criminal fine, to any individual who furnishes information that leads to the payment of the civil penalty or criminal fine.

“(ii) MULTIPLE INDIVIDUALS.—If 2 or more individuals provide information described in clause (i), the amount available for payment as a reward shall be divided equitably among the individuals.

“(iii) INELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—No officer or employee of the United States, a State, or an Indian tribe who furnishes information or renders service in the performance of the official duties of the officer or employee shall be eligible for a reward payment under this paragraph.

“(B) PAYMENTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.—The Administrator or a court of competent jurisdiction, as the case may be, may order payment, from a civil penalty or criminal fine collected for a violation of this subsection, to an Indian tribe providing information or investigative assistance that leads to payment of the penalty or fine, of an amount that reflects the level of information or investigative assistance provided.

“(C) PAYMENTS DIVIDED AMONG INDIAN TRIBES AND INDIVIDUALS.—In a case in which an Indian tribe and an individual under subparagraph (A) are eligible to receive a reward payment under this paragraph, the Administrator or the court shall divide the

amount available for the reward equitably among those recipients.

“(7) LIABILITY IN REM.—A cruise vessel operated in violation of this subsection or any regulation promulgated under this subsection—

“(A) shall be liable in rem for any civil penalty or criminal fine imposed for the violation; and

“(B) may be subject to a proceeding instituted in any United States district court of competent jurisdiction.

“(8) PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—A cruise vessel may operate in the waters of the United States, or visit a port or place under the jurisdiction of the United States, only if the cruise vessel has been issued a permit under this section.

“(9) NONAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Paragraphs (6)(A) and (12)(B) of section 502 shall not apply to any cruise vessel.

“(10) STATUTORY OR COMMON LAW RIGHTS NOT RESTRICTED.—Nothing in this subsection—

“(A) restricts the rights of any person (or class of persons) to regulate or seek enforcement or other relief (including relief against the Administrator or Commandant) under any statute or common law;

“(B) affects the right of any person (or class of persons) to regulate or seek enforcement or other relief with regard to vessels other than cruise vessels under any statute or common law; or

“(C) affects the right of any person (or class of persons) under any statute or common law, including this Act, to regulate or seek enforcement or other relief with regard to pollutants or emission streams from cruise vessels that are not otherwise regulated under this subsection.

“(11) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND; FEES.—

“(A) CRUISE VESSEL POLLUTION CONTROL FUND.—

“(i) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the general fund of the Treasury a separate account, to be known as the ‘Cruise Vessel Pollution Control Fund’ (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘Fund’).

“(ii) AMOUNTS.—The Fund shall consist of such amounts as are deposited in the Fund under subparagraph (B)(vi).

“(iii) AVAILABILITY AND USE OF AMOUNTS IN FUND.—Amounts in the Fund shall be—

“(I) available to the Administrator and the Commandant as provided in appropriations Acts; and

“(II) used by the Administrator and the Commandant only for purposes of carrying out this subsection.

“(B) FEES ON CRUISE VESSELS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant and the Administrator shall establish and collect from each cruise vessel a reasonable and appropriate fee for each paying passenger on a cruise vessel voyage, for use in carrying out this subsection.

“(ii) ADJUSTMENT OF FEE.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant and the Administrator shall biennially adjust the amount of the fee established under clause (i) to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Department of Labor during the most recent 2-year period for which data are available.

“(II) ROUNDING.—The Commandant and the Administrator may round an adjustment under subclause (I) to the nearest 1/10 of a dollar.

“(iii) FACTORS IN ESTABLISHING FEES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—In establishing fees under clause (i), the Commandant and Administrator may establish lower levels of

fees and the maximum amount of fees for certain classes of cruise vessels based on—

“(aa) size;

“(bb) economic share; and

“(cc) such other factors as are determined to be appropriate by the Commandant and the Administrator.

“(iv) FEE SCHEDULES.—Any fee schedule established under clause (i), including the level of fees and the maximum amount of fees, shall take into account—

“(I) cruise vessel routes;

“(II) the frequency of stops at ports of call by cruise vessels; and

“(III) other applicable considerations.

“(v) COLLECTION OF FEES.—A fee established under clause (i) shall be collected by the Administrator or the Commandant from the owner or operator of each cruise vessel to which this subsection applies.

“(vi) DEPOSITS TO FUND.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all fees collected under this paragraph, and all penalties and payments collected for violations of this subsection, shall be deposited in the Fund.

“(12) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator and the Commandant such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2014.”.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1760. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

SA 1761. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1762. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1763. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1764. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1765. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1766. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1767. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1768. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1769. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1770. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1771. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1772. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1773. Mr. HARKIN (for Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. KING, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. DURBIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1911, of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

SA 1774. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BROWN) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1773 proposed by Mr. HARKIN (for Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. KING, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. DURBIN)) to the bill H.R. 1911, supra.

SA 1775. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1776. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1777. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1778. Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MURPHY) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1773 proposed by Mr. HARKIN (for Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. KING, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. DURBIN)) to the bill H.R. 1911, of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

SA 1779. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1780. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1781. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1782. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1783. Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1784. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1785. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1786. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1787. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1788. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1789. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1790. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1791. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1792. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1793. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1794. Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1795. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1796. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1797. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1760. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 38, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 127. The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the percentages of lane miles and highway bridge deck in each State that are in good condition, fair condition, and poor condition, and the percentage of Federal amounts each State expends on the repair and maintenance of highway infrastructure and on new capacity construction.

SA 1761. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 169, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

SEC. 2. BUDGET-NEUTRAL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ENERGY AND WATER CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENTS AT MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL UNITS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) shall establish a demonstration program under which, during the period beginning on October 1, 2013, and ending on September 30, 2016, the Secretary may enter into budget-neutral, performance-based agreements that result in a reduction in energy or water costs with such entities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate under which the entities shall carry out projects for energy or water conservation improvements at multifamily residential units participating in—

(1) the project-based rental assistance program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f); or

(2) the supportive housing for the elderly program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) PAYMENTS CONTINGENT ON SAVINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide to an entity a payment under an agreement under this section only during applicable fiscal years for which an energy or water cost savings is achieved with respect to the applicable multifamily portfolio of properties, as determined by the Secretary, in accordance with subparagraph (B).

(B) PAYMENT METHODOLOGY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Each agreement under this section shall include a pay-for-success provision—

(I) that will serve as a payment threshold for the term of the agreement; and

(II) pursuant to which the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall share a percentage of the savings at a level determined by the Secretary.

(ii) LIMITATION.—A payment made by the Secretary under an agreement under this section shall not exceed the utility savings achieved during the term of the agreement as a result of the improvements made under the agreement.

(2) TERM.—The term of an agreement under this section shall be not longer than 12 fiscal years.

(c) FUNDING.—For each fiscal year during which an agreement under this section is in effect, the Secretary may use to carry out this section any funds appropriated to the Secretary for—

(1) project-based rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f); and

(2) the supportive housing for the elderly program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q).

(d) EVALUATION AND REPORT.—Not less frequently than once every 5 years after the date on which an initial agreement is entered into under this section, and not later than 2 years after the date of expiration of the final agreement in effect under this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct an evaluation of the program under this section; and

(2) submit to Congress a report describing each evaluation conducted under paragraph (1).

SA 1762. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ (a) Congress finds the following:

(1) On May 10, 2013, the Internal Revenue Service admitted that it singled out advocacy groups, based on ideology, seeking tax-exempt status.

(2) This action raises pertinent questions about the agency’s ability to implement and oversee the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152).

(3) This action could be an indication of future Internal Revenue Service abuses in relation to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, given that it is their responsibility to enforce a key provision, the individual mandate.

(4) Americans accept the principle that patients, families, and doctors should be making medical decisions, not the Federal Government.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury, or any delegate of the Secretary, shall not implement or enforce any provisions of or amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152).

SA 1763. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 26, line 4, insert “bridge” before “projects”.

On page 26, line 5, insert “and title 49” after “title 23”.

On page 26, line 9, insert “to carry out programs under title 23, United States Code, or transfer funds under this heading to other Federal agencies to carry out programs

under title 49, United States Code, as applicable" after "States".

On page 26, line 14, strike "of such title" and insert "of title 23 or subtitle V of title 49, United States Code, as applicable,".

SA 1764. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, after line 24, add the following:
SEC. 155. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to subsidize costs related to food and beverage and first class services on any route operated by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

SA 1765. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, after line 24, add the following:
SEC. 155. Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall submit to Congress a report on profits and losses related to food and beverage and first class services, with the data aggregated by route or rail line.

SA 1766. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 55, strike lines 11 through 13.

SA 1767. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 38, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 1. . . . The Secretary of Transportation shall submit to Congress an annual report that lists for programs carried out under chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, the total amounts made available to carry out—

- (1) each section of that chapter; and
- (2) as applicable, each eligible project type under that chapter.

SA 1768. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appro-

priations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 101, line 2, strike "\$1,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*" and insert "\$950,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the HOME investment partnerships program under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12721 et seq.) to determine the adequacy and effectiveness of such program and that upon the completion of the study, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives setting forth the findings and conclusions of the study: *Provided further*".

SA 1769. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . . . The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of, and prepare a report on—

- (1) the extent to which U.S. Customs and Border Protection (referred to in this subsection as "CBP") uses nonfederal roads along the Southern border, including State, county, or locally-maintained primitive roads;
- (2) the places where CBP use represents a significant percentage of the use of the roads described in paragraph (1);
- (3) the extent to which the CBP use of such roads causes increased degradation and increased maintenance costs for State, county, or local entities; and
- (4) possible ways for CBP to assist State, county, and local entities with the maintenance of the nonfederal roads adversely affected by CBP use.

SA 1770. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 42, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 1. . . . None of the funds made available under this Act shall be made available to the Secretary of Transportation to carry out activities of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration unless the Secretary extends the application of the exception described in section 395.1(d)(2) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to on-duty time not including waiting time at a natural gas or oil well site) to the

operators of commercial motor vehicles transporting supplies, equipment, or materials (including produced fluids, drilling and completion fluids, and any other fluids or materials used in the drilling, completion, and production of an oil or gas well) to or from a natural gas or oil well site, regardless of whether the operators have received special training or operate vehicles specially constructed to service wells.

SA 1771. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 26, line 18, insert "": *Provided further*, That not less than 20 percent of the funds provided under this heading shall be for projects located in rural areas" before the period at the end.

SA 1772. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, after line 24, add the following:
SEC. 155. Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall submit to Congress a report on profits and losses related to food and beverage and first class services, with the data aggregated by route or rail line.

SA 1773. Mr. HARKIN (for Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. KING, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. DURBIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1911, of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. INTEREST RATES.

(a) INTEREST RATES.—Section 455(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting "AND BEFORE JULY 1, 2013" after "ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2006";

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "and before July 1, 2013," after "on or after July 1, 2006,";

(C) in subparagraph (B), by inserting "and before July 1, 2013," after "on or after July 1, 2006,"; and

(D) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “and before July 1, 2013,” after “on or after July 1, 2006.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) INTEREST RATE PROVISIONS FOR NEW LOANS ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2013.—

“(A) RATES FOR UNDERGRADUATE FDSL AND FDUSL.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct Stafford Loans and Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans issued to undergraduate students, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

“(i) a rate equal to the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 2.05 percent; or

“(ii) 8.25 percent.

“(B) RATES FOR GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL FDUSL.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans issued to graduate or professional students, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

“(i) a rate equal to the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 3.6 percent; or

“(ii) 9.5 percent.

“(C) PLUS LOANS.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct PLUS Loans, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

“(i) a rate equal to the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 4.6 percent; or

“(ii) 10.5 percent.

“(D) CONSOLIDATION LOANS.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, any Federal Direct Consolidation Loan for which the application is received on or after July 1, 2013, shall bear interest at an annual rate on the unpaid principal balance of the loan that is equal to the weighted average of the interest rates on the loans consolidated, rounded to the nearest higher one-eighth of one percent.

“(E) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall determine the applicable rate of interest under this paragraph after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and shall publish such rate in the Federal Register as soon as practicable after the date of determination.

“(F) RATE.—The applicable rate of interest determined under this paragraph for a Federal Direct Stafford Loan, a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan, or a Federal Direct PLUS Loan shall be fixed for the period of the loan.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on July 1, 2013.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on ei-

ther PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

SEC. 4. STUDY ON THE ACTUAL COST OF ADMINISTERING THE FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) complete a study that determines the actual cost to the Federal Government of carrying out the Federal student loan programs authorized under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), which shall—

(A) provide estimates relying on accurate information based on past, current, and projected data as to the appropriate index and mark-up rate for the Federal Government's cost of borrowing that would allow the Federal Government to effectively administer and cover the cost of the Federal student programs authorized under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) under the scoring rules outlined in the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.);

(B) provide the information described in this section in a way that separates out administrative costs, interest rate, and other loan terms and conditions; and

(C) set forth clear recommendations to the relevant authorizing committees of Congress as to how future legislation can incorporate the results of the study described in this section to allow for the administration of the Federal student loan programs authorized under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) without generating any additional revenue to the Federal Government except revenue that is needed to carry out such programs; and

(2) prepare and submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives setting forth the conclusions of the study described in this section in such a manner that the recommendations included in the report can inform future reauthorizations of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

SA 1774. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BROWN) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1773 proposed by Mr. HARKIN (for Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. KING, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. DURBIN)) to the bill H.R. 1911, of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 5. SUNSET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this Act shall be effective for a 2-year period beginning on July 1, 2013.

(b) REPEAL.—The amendments made by this Act shall be repealed on July 1, 2015, and section 455(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)) shall be applied as if this Act the amendments made by this Act had never been enacted.

SA 1775. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In title I, under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION” under the heading “OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY” under the heading “NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS”, strike the period at the end and insert “: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish on a publicly available Internet site any criteria, including any required documentation, of the Secretary in selecting projects and awarding amounts under this heading: *Provided further*, That not later than 2 days after the date on which the Secretary awards funding under this heading, the Secretary shall publish on a publicly accessible Internet site the amount of that award and identify the Federal congressional district in which the project is located.”.

SA 1776. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In title I, under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION” under the heading “FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION” under the heading “BRIDGES IN CRITICAL CORRIDORS”, strike the period at the end and insert “: *Provided further*, That any project funded under this heading shall be treated as a categorical exclusion for purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).”.

SA 1777. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 188, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 4 _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require the use of a green buildings certification system to construct or modify a building other than a green buildings certification system that—

(1) is based on voluntary consensus standards that have an American National Standard Institute (ANSI) designation or were developed by an ANSI-audited designator; and

(2) only excludes a building material if the exclusion is well-founded and based on robust scientific data and risk assessment principles.

SA 1778. Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MURPHY) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1773 proposed by Mr. HARKIN (for Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. KING, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. DURBIN)) to the bill H.R. 1911, of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes; as follows:

Beginning on page 3, strike line 9 and all that follows through line 13 on page 5 and insert the following:

“(i) 6.8 percent.

“(B) RATES FOR GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL FDUSL.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans issued to graduate or professional students, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

“(i) a rate equal to the yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 3.6 percent; or

“(ii) 6.8 percent.

“(C) PLUS LOANS.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct PLUS Loans, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

“(i) a rate equal to the yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 4.6 percent; or

“(ii) 7.9 percent.

“(D) CONSOLIDATION LOANS.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, any Federal Direct Consolidation Loan for which the application is received on or after July 1, 2013, shall bear interest at an annual rate on the unpaid principal balance of the loan that is equal to the weighted average of the interest rates on the loans consolidated, rounded to the nearest higher one-eighth of one percent.

“(E) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall determine the applicable rate of interest under this paragraph after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and shall publish such rate in the Federal Register as soon as practicable after the date of determination.

“(F) RATE.—The applicable rate of interest determined under this paragraph for a Federal Direct Stafford Loan, a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan, or a Federal Di-

rect PLUS Loan shall be fixed for the period of the loan.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on July 1, 2013.

SEC. 2A. SURTAX ON MILLIONAIRES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

“PART VIII—SURTAX ON MILLIONAIRES

“Sec. 59B. Surtax on millionaires.

“SEC. 59B. SURTAX ON MILLIONAIRES.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation for any taxable year beginning after 2013, there is hereby imposed (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to 0.55 percent of so much of the modified adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for such taxable year as exceeds \$1,000,000 (\$500,000, in the case of a married individual filing a separate return).

“(b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2014, each dollar amount under subsection (a) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2012’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of \$10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next highest multiple of \$10,000.

“(c) MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘modified adjusted gross income’ means adjusted gross income reduced by any deduction (not taken into account in determining adjusted gross income) allowed for investment interest (as defined in section 163(d)). In the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be determined as provided in section 67(e).

“(d) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) NONRESIDENT ALIEN.—In the case of a nonresident alien individual, only amounts taken into account in connection with the tax imposed under section 871(b) shall be taken into account under this section.

“(2) CITIZENS AND RESIDENTS LIVING ABROAD.—The dollar amount in effect under subsection (a) shall be decreased by the excess of—

“(A) the amounts excluded from the taxpayer’s gross income under section 911, over

“(B) the amounts of any deductions or exclusions disallowed under section 911(d)(6) with respect to the amounts described in subparagraph (A).

“(3) CHARITABLE TRUSTS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a trust all the unexpired interests in which are devoted to one or more of the purposes described in section 170(c)(2)(B).

“(4) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter or for purposes of section 55.”.

SA 1779. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of

Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated by this Act or by Public Law 113-2 shall be prohibited from use by a Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery grantee to reimburse owners of residential buildings for the uncompensated costs of rehabilitation projects for such residential buildings that were completed after Hurricane Sandy, provided that the grantee completes an environmental review before committing to reimburse such an owner for the rehabilitation that was contracted for or performed prior to the submission of the homeowner’s application to the grantee requesting such reimbursement for the rehabilitation activity, regardless of whether the cost to rehabilitate such residential structures met or exceeded 50 percent of the value of the structure.

SA 1780. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 12, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 1 _____. (a) None of the funds made available under this Act to the Department of Transportation for cyber security may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Transportation submits to each of the committees described in subsection (b) a detailed plan describing how the funding will be allocated and for what purposes, including a detailed description of—

(1) how the cyber security funding will be obligated or expended;

(2) the programs and activities that will receive cyber security funding;

(3) if and how the use of the funding complies with the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) and any other applicable Federal law;

(4) the performance metrics that will be used to measure and determine the effectiveness of cyber security plans and programs; and

(5) the strategy that will be employed to procure goods and services associated with the cyber security objectives of the Department of Transportation.

(b) The report described in subsection (a) shall be provided to—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(5) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;

(6) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(7) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(8) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

SA 1781. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 169, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

SEC. 244. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this title may be used by any recipient of such funds to discriminate against any person because that person is a member of the uniformed services.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "member of the uniformed services" means an individual who—

(1) is a member of—

(A) the uniformed services (as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code); or

(B) the National Guard in State status under title 32, United States Code; or

(2) was discharged or released from service in the uniformed services (as so defined) or the National Guard in such status under conditions other than dishonorable.

(c)(1) Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit any recipient of funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this title from—

(A) making available to an individual a benefit with respect to a dwelling, a residential real estate-related transaction (as defined in section 805 of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3605)), or a service described in section 806 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3606) because the individual is a member of the uniformed services; or

(B) selling or renting a dwelling only to members of the uniformed services.

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term "benefit" includes a term, condition, privilege, promotion, discount, or other favorable treatment (including an advertisement for such treatment) having the purpose or effect of providing an advantage to a member of the uniformed services.

SA 1782. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. **ENDING HOUSING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 802 of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3602) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(p) 'Member of the uniformed services' means an individual who—

"(1) is a member of—

"(A) the uniformed services (as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code); or

"(B) the National Guard in State status under title 32, United States Code; or

"(2) was discharged or released from service in the uniformed services (as so defined)

or the National Guard in such status under conditions other than dishonorable."

(b) **DISCRIMINATION IN THE SALE OR RENTAL OF HOUSING AND OTHER PROHIBITED PRACTICES.**—Section 804 of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3604) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "or because the person is a member of the uniformed services" after "national origin";

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting "or because the person is a member of the uniformed services" after "national origin";

(3) in subsection (c), by inserting "or because a person is a member of the uniformed services," after "national origin,"; and

(4) in subsection (d), by inserting "or because the person is a member of the uniformed services," after "national origin".

(c) **DISCRIMINATION IN RESIDENTIAL REAL ESTATE-RELATED TRANSACTIONS.**—Section 805 of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3605) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "or because the person is a member of the uniformed services" after "national origin"; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking "or familial status" and inserting "familial status, or whether a person is a member of the uniformed services".

(d) **DISCRIMINATION IN THE PROVISION OF BROKERAGE SERVICES.**—Section 806 of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3606) is amended by inserting "or because a person is a member of the uniformed services" after "national origin".

(e) **RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATION OR PRIVATE CLUB EXEMPTION.**—Section 807(a) of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3607(a)) is amended, in the first sentence by inserting "or to persons who are not members of the uniformed services" after "national origin".

(f) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Section 808(e)(6) of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3608(e)(6)) is amended, in the first sentence, by inserting "(including whether such persons and households are or include a member of the uniformed services)" after "persons and households".

(g) **PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION.**—Section 901 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3631) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "or because the person is a member of the uniformed services (as such term is defined in section 802 of this Act)," after "national origin";

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting "or because a person is a member of the uniformed services (as such term is defined in section 802 of this Act)," after "national origin,"; and

(3) in subsection (c), by inserting "or because a person is a member of the uniformed services (as such term is defined in section 802 of this Act)," after "national origin,".

(h) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—The Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 821. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO THE TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

"(a) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act may be construed to prohibit any person from—

"(1) making available to an individual a benefit with respect to a dwelling, a residential real estate-related transaction (as defined in section 805 of this Act), or a service described in section 806 of this Act because the individual is a member of the uniformed services; or

"(2) selling or renting a dwelling only to members of the uniformed services.

"(b) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term 'benefit' includes a term, con-

dition, privilege, promotion, discount, or other favorable treatment (including an advertisement for such treatment) having the purpose or effect of providing an advantage to a member of the uniformed services."

(i) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall become effective 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1783. Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 34, line 23, after "shall" insert "assess the impact on domestic employment if such a waiver were issued and".

SA 1784. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Except for assistance relating to a natural disaster, none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to prevent a local government from being placed into receivership, to facilitate exit from receivership by a local government, or to prevent a State government from defaulting on its obligations.

SA 1785. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Congress finds the following:

(1) The Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 established an Office of Inspector General within the Federal Housing Finance Agency (in this section referred to as the "FHFA").

(2) The President has nominated Steve A. Linick, the current FHFA Inspector General, to be the next Inspector General of the Department of State.

(3) The nomination of Steve A. Linick to be Inspector General of the Department of State occurred on June 27, 2013, following a 1,989 day vacancy that began on January 16, 2008.

(4) The Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998 (5 U.S.C. 3345 et seq.) prescribes requirements for filling, both permanently and temporarily, vacancies that are required to be filled by Presidential appointment with Senate confirmation, and generally provides a

limit of 210 days for persons serving in an "acting" capacity.

(b) It is the Sense of Congress that should a vacancy occur in the position of Inspector General of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the President should act expeditiously to nominate a person to fill the position on a permanent basis and should wait no more than 210 days to nominate a person to serve in this position in the event of a vacancy.

SA 1786. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Except for assistance relating to a natural disaster, none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to prevent a local government from being placed into receivership, to facilitate exit from receivership by a local government, or to prevent a State government from defaulting on its obligations.

SA 1787. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 24, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 119F. (a) The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall—

(1) expand the program established pursuant to section 1097 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1608; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note) to include 2 additional test ranges; and

(2) not later than one year after the date on which the Administrator determines the locations of the 6 test ranges required by that section, the Administrator shall determine the location of the 2 additional test ranges.

(b) Of the 8 test ranges required under the program established pursuant to section 1097 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, as expanded pursuant to subsection (a), at least 2 test ranges shall—

(1) be located in States in which large wildfires that destroy significant amounts of property regularly occur; and

(2) prioritize the monitoring, mitigation, and suppression of wildfires, and other activities associated with preventing and containing wildfires, using unmanned aerial systems.

(c) Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Administrator determines the locations of the 2 additional test ranges required by subsection (a), the Administrator shall submit a report on privacy safeguards relating to the selection and operation of all 8 test ranges to—

(1) the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 1097(g) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012); and

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 1788. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, line 20, strike "\$1,452,000,000" and insert "\$1,565,000,000".

SA 1789. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, after line 24, add the following:

SEC. 155. Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration, in consultation with appropriate local government representatives, shall—

(1) evaluate existing regulations governing the use of locomotive horns at highway-rail grade crossings to determine whether such regulations should be revised; and

(2) submit a report to Congress that contains the results of the evaluation conducted pursuant to paragraph (1).

SA 1790. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, after line 24, add the following:

SEC. 155. (a) The unobligated balance of amounts made available for projects described in section 1307(d)(2) of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 322 note) is rescinded.

(b)(1) There is appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation an amount equal to half of the amount rescinded under subsection (a) to make grants to localities for direct costs associated with projects to establish quiet zones as described in parts 222 and 229 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) The amount of a grant made to a locality under paragraph (1) for a project may not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the project.

(c) The amount rescinded under subsection (a) that remains after the appropriation of the amount specified in subsection (b)(1) shall be dedicated to the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

SA 1791. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and

Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 101, line 2, strike "\$1,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*" and insert "\$950,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the HOME investment partnerships program under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12721 et seq.) to determine the adequacy and effectiveness of such program and that upon the completion of the study, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives setting forth the findings and conclusions of the study: *Provided further*".

SA 1792. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 169, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

SEC. 244. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to reorganize or restructure the Office of Multifamily Housing Programs or the Office of Field Policy and Management unless the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development provides a detailed report to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that includes, but is not limited to, the estimated costs, savings, benefits, and risks of implementation of the reorganization and restructuring of such Offices.

SA 1793. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used the Federal Housing Administration, the Government National Mortgage Association, or the Department of Housing and Urban Development to insure, securitize, or guarantee—

(1) any mortgage secured by a structure, dwelling unit, or other real property that secures a residential mortgage loan that a State, municipality, or other agency or political subdivision thereof, seized, took, or

otherwise obtained by the exercise of the power of eminent domain; or

(2) any mortgage-backed security collateralized by a mortgage or a pool of mortgages described under paragraph (1).

SA 1794. Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. No funds made available under this Act may be used to enforce vehicle weight limits established under section 127 of title 23, United States Code, for any segment of United States Route 78 in Mississippi that is designated as part of the Interstate System (as defined in section 101(a)(12) of title 23, United States Code) after the date of the enactment of this Act, with respect to the operation of any vehicle that could have legally operated on that segment before such designation.

SA 1795. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 101, line 2, strike “\$1,000,000,000” and insert “\$950,000,000”.

SA 1796. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, after line 24, add the following:
SEC. 155. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to subsidize costs related to food and beverage and first class services on any route operated by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

SA 1797. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used to provide assistance to any local governmental entity described in subsection (c), including—

(1) the purchase or guarantee of any asset or obligation of the local governmental entity;

(2) the issuance of a line of credit to the local governmental entity;

(3) the provision of direct or indirect access to any financing to the local governmental entity; or

(4) the provision of any other direct or indirect financial aid to the local governmental entity.

(b) No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be made available to a local governmental entity described in subsection (c) that is exiting a bankruptcy case under chapter 9 of title 11, United States Code, unless the local governmental entity has demonstrated a commitment to ensuring the solvency and generally sound financial condition of the local governmental entity.

(c) A local governmental entity described in this subsection is a city, county, township, borough, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State that, on or after January 1, 2013, has defaulted on the obligations of such entity, or is at risk of defaulting or is likely to default on the obligations of such entity absent assistance from the Federal Government.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2013, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a legislative hearing to receive testimony on the following bills: S. 235, to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium; S. 920, to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land; and S. ____, the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2013.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The FHA Solvency Act of 2013.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, “Cruise Industry Oversight: Recent Incidents Show Need For Stronger Focus On Consumer Protection.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate office building, to conduct a hearing, “Oversight Hearing on Implementation of MAP-21’s TIFIA Program Enhancements.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Health Information Technology: Using it to Improve Care.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, at 9 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, at 2 p.m., to hold an East Asia and Pacific Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, “Rebalance to Asia III: Protecting the Environment and Ensuring Food and Water Security in East Asia and the Pacific.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Judicial Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, at 9:50 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND
ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Implementation of the Affordable Care Act: Understanding Small Business Concerns."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, at 10:45 a.m. in room SR-418, of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, to conduct a hearing entitled "Payday Loans: Short-term Solution or Long-term Problem?" The Committee will meet in room 562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building beginning at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION, CIVIL
RIGHTS, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 24, 2013, at 2 p.m., in room SH-216 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Closing Guantanamo: The National Security, Fiscal, and Human Rights Implications."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SUPERFUND, TOXICS, AND
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Superfund, Toxics, and Environmental Health of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 24, 2013, at 2 p.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, "Cleaning Up and Restoring Communities for Economic Revitalization."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Gabe Sandler, Madeline Walker, Katie Kasten, and Megan Miraglia of my staff be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PATRICIA CLARK BOSTON AIR
ROUTE TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTER

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to Calendar No. 98, H.R. 1092.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1092) to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1092) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—S.
1294

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Energy Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1294 and the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 25,
2013

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 25, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 1243, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, we will continue to work through amendments to the THUD appropriations bill tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. MURPHY. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:22 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 25, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT B. ABRAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. GARRETT P. JENSEN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. BRUCE L. GILLINGHAM

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. THOMAS D. WALDHAUSER

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSEPH M. MARKUSFELD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DEONDRA P. ASIKE
ANTHONY C. BROWN
ELI N. COHEN
NICHOLAS J. DAVIS
BLAZEN DRAGULJIC
MATTHEW A. FRANK
KEVIN L. GRAY
LAUREN A. KANTER APPLEBAUM
DANIEL A. LARSON
DAVID S. LEWIS
JUSTIN D. MANLEY
KELLY M. MEEHAN
VILAS SALDANHA
MATTHEW L. SARB
GREGORY C. TROLLEY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR AT THE UNITED STATES

MILITARY ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 4333(B) AND 4336(A):

To be colonel

KARL F. MEYER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

STEPHANIE M. PRICE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

GREGORY C. PEDRO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531, 716 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOHN H. SEOK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

FREDERICK C. LOUGH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

ADMIRADO A. LUZURIAGA

To be major

JON KIEV

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

WILLIAM G. HUBER

To be lieutenant colonel

KAUSTUBH G. JOSHI

To be major

PAUL E. BORNEMANN
MICHAEL D. DUPLESSIE
MARK L. LEITSCHUH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CURTIS J. ALITZ

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. KEVIN L. MCNEELY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

GUY R. BEAUDOIN
FREDERICK T. CALKINS
JACKIE R. RITTER
WALLACE E. STEINBRECHER
REBECCA A. YOUNG

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

TIMOTHY C. MOORE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

PIERRE A. PELLETIER

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING OFFICERS JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, members, officers, and staff of the House, it was 15 years ago today that Officers Jacob J. Chestnut and John M. Gibson of the U.S. Capitol Police gave their lives in the line of duty, defending the Capitol against an armed gunman.

In the decade and a half since their sacrifice, the memory of their heroism has never dimmed. The sacrifices they and their families made will never be forgotten by this institution or by the people of the nation we serve.

At 3:40 p.m., the House will observe a moment of silence in memory of these officers. At that time, leaders of the House and the Senate will gather with their families for a wreath-laying ceremony at the Memorial Door.

We give thanks for all the brave men and women of the Capitol Police force who honor the legacy of Officers Chestnut and Gibson on a daily basis through their service and commitment to protecting our nation's greatest symbol of freedom and democracy.

CELEBRATING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF MR. MARVIN "BUZZ" OATES

HON. TOM MCCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 90th birthday of Mr. Marvin "Buzz" Oates, a third-generation Californian. Buzz is the founder of The Buzz Oates Group of Companies, a \$1.5 billion commercial real estate development company. But before his American dream was realized, Buzz was just a boy with very humble beginnings and an entrepreneurial spirit. Even at a very young age, he earned money mowing lawns and collecting bottles. Buzz graduated from Sacramento High School in 1941. He then served as a bombardier in World War II and attributes much of his business success to time serving his country in the military.

Buzz survived a mid-air collision during training in New Mexico and was eventually stationed in Asia flying missions over Japan in a B-29 Superfortress.

When two bombs engaged to be dropped from his jet at 23,000 feet failed to deploy, Buzz knew he had to act quickly. The two 100-pound bombs hung on the rack of the B-29, and with no oxygen and the bomb-bay doors open, Buzz inched across a cat walk

eight inches wide to wrestle both bombs out of the plane. For his bravery, he was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross.

Buzz returned home a decorated war hero to open a locksmith business—A&A Key Shop—which later turned into a building supply company. Since then, Buzz steadily grew his company into the largest commercial real-estate and management company in Sacramento.

Buzz is also well-known in the community for his generous spirit, charitable giving and commitment to God and his Christian faith. Thousands have worshipped in church buildings donated by Buzz and on the land he sold at a reduced rate. In the past several years, he donated \$2.5 million and one acre of land to Mercy Ministries, a group home for women. The group was able to open a home in Lincoln, California where 40 women recovering from drug addiction, sexual abuse and other problems, find sanctuary receiving free room, board and counseling.

Buzz has been honored with many awards throughout the years for his charitable contributions, most recently in 2011 as the Trainor Fairbrook Humanitarian of the Year Award and the Commercial Real Estate Women (CREW) Fame Award in 2007.

Buzz's heroism, hard work, business acumen, and his spirit of public service make him a man to be honored and admired. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to celebrate the 90th birthday of Mr. Buzz Oates and thank him for his dedication to country and community.

HONORING MARILYN E. HARRIS

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Mrs. Marilyn Harris for receiving the Rural Development Site Manager of the Year award for Elderly Projects. This award was presented to her on June 11th, 2013 at the Council for Affordable and Rural Housing Annual Meeting and Legislative Conference in Arlington, Virginia.

Marilyn was nominated by her friends and colleagues at Richland Senior Citizens Housing, Inc. in Ellettsville, Indiana. She was nominated for not just being an exceptional property manager but also being a dear friend to those senior citizens who count on her for a safe and comfortable living environment. She also enjoys the privilege of helping with several other properties that her company manages, including PRAC 811 properties for the developmentally challenged and a Rural Development property for families. As a Regional Manager of these properties, she oversees the daily operations of these communities in Indiana and Tennessee.

Being both state and nationally recognized, Marilyn's hard work has not gone unnoticed, and it goes without saying, that this sort of accomplishment is not reached overnight, but through a career dedicated to exceptional work. I once again commend Marilyn for all that she has done, and thank her for her service to South Central Indiana, as she stands as testimony to Hoosier compassion and work ethic.

IN HONOR OF STEPHEN
FREDERICK

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, with sadness, we acknowledge the passing of Stephen Frederick, a talented music teacher and mentor who spent 29 of his 35 years in education in the North Penn School District as high school band director and principal of North Penn Junior High School and North Penn High School. Earlier, he was an elementary music teacher in the Central Bucks School District, Bucks County, Pennsylvania. His career also included conducting the Montgomery County Concert Band. Although he retired as a high school principal from the North Penn School District, he later was welcomed back as a consultant. A husband, father and grandfather, Mr. Frederick had a rapport with students who recall his advice, and interest in their future: Never accept less than your own best effort—and often times the work is more important than the destination. Stephen Frederick leaves a personal legacy of achievement, his guidance and grace, and the example he set for others to follow.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM COTTON

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, during a late-night series of votes yesterday on amendments to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act FY2014 (H.R. 2397), I intended to vote "yes" on the Fleming amendment (roll-call No. 392), but inadvertently voted "no." Mr. FLEMING's amendment prohibits funds from being used to appoint "non-theistic" military chaplains, which would contravene current DOD policy. As I witnessed firsthand in Iraq and Afghanistan, chaplains are essential to our Armed Forces and they minister to troops of all faiths—and none. I strongly support the spiritual role of our military chaplains and I'm pleased Mr. FLEMING's amendment passed with bipartisan support.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HONORING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NASCAR TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

HON. ROBERT PITTENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, greetings to all those gathered to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the NASCAR Technical Institute.

For over sixty years, NASCAR has captured the hearts and minds of millions of Americans. Skilled mechanics and technicians are the lifeblood of the industry. The individuals graduating from the NASCAR Technical Institute each year are a crucial part of the teams that ensure the sport's safety and continued success.

Additionally, the Institute is an important part of the Mooresville community and the entire region. NASCAR Tech consistently boasts exceptionally high graduation rates as well as high rates of employment upon graduation. You provide your students with many opportunities to learn and excel, such as partnerships with some of the world's best known manufacturers and access to state-of-the-industry technology. All of this enables graduates from this Institute to transition easily from the classroom to the workforce.

Race City, USA, and NASCAR would not be the same without the influence of the NASCAR Technical Institute and its alumni. The Institute's growth and accomplishments in just ten years are amazing, and I look forward to watching your continued success in the next ten years and beyond.

Suzanne and I send our best wishes on this special occasion.

HONORING BUFFALOUIE'S OF BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, my home state of Indiana takes pride in its long tradition of Hoosier innovation and small business entrepreneurship. Hoosier businesses across Indiana's 9th District strive to offer quality products and services that become integral parts of their local communities. One such small business is BuffaLouie's, a popular restaurant in Bloomington, Indiana, which is known throughout the state for their amazing selection of buffalo-style chicken wings and homemade sauces.

BuffaLouie's has been a mainstay in Bloomington since they first opened their doors in 1987. It is a popular hangout for Indiana University (IU) students and Bloomington residents alike, who come and enjoy great food in a comfortable atmosphere. In fact, BuffaLouie's has such a strong reputation that they earned national recognition from USA Today as one of the Top Ten Wing Joints in the country.

Today, I commend BuffaLouie's on the success of their business, as well as their com-

mitment to improving the local Bloomington community. As part of my commitment to acknowledge Hoosier small businesses and the critical role they play in my home state, I want to recognize BuffaLouie's as the first in a series titled the 9th District's Hoosier Small Business Spotlight.

Jay Lieser, an IU student and native of Buffalo, New York, founded BuffaLouie's. His mother and father, Ed and Trudy—or Mr. and Mrs. Louie as they are often referred—joined their son in his venture, bringing their family recipes to BuffaLouie's. BuffaLouie's is truly a family business, getting its name and company logo from another member of the Lieser family, Jay's grandfather Lou. This tradition of family and service to the community has been carried on by the current owners, the husband and wife team of Ed and Jamie Schwartzman.

The Schwartzman's have continued to build on the cornerstone of what makes BuffaLouie's great: working hard to "serve quality food, prepared fresh and made to order using the finest ingredients in a family friendly atmosphere." It is not uncommon to see both Mr. and Mrs. Schwartzman at the restaurant helping serve customers and personally thanking patrons for their business. It is this philosophy and commitment that has garnered a loyal following of wing lovers in Bloomington.

BuffaLouie's strengthened its local ties when it relocated from its 17th street location to the famous Gables building on Indiana Avenue. The Gables, once known as the "Book Nook," often played host to the famous jazz musician and IU graduate Hoagy Carmichael. It is where the famous musician penned part of his immortal song "Star Dust." In keeping with this tradition BuffaLouie's hosts musical performances that allow customers to enjoy the historic venue.

BuffaLouie's has become a landmark in Bloomington, Indiana—exemplifying the spirit of Hoosier small businesses across Indiana's 9th district. The family friendly atmosphere and nationally recognized wings continue to bring satisfied customers through the doors of the historic Gables building. I would like to congratulate BuffaLouie's on more than 25 successful years in business and thank them for the dedication they show their customers. I wish them continued success for many years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHN "KIRK" KIRKPATRICK AND HIS CAREER IN SERVICE TO OWENSBORO, KENTUCKY

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of John "Kirk" Kirkpatrick. Born and raised in Owensboro, Kentucky, Kirk has strived to better his surrounding community in every way possible.

Kirk's career began with Owensboro on the Air, Inc., where he served in a number of capacities. Kirk also handled public relations for the city's television system before joining WaxWorks/VideoWorks in 1984. Kirk served as

President and CEO of the RiverPark Center Foundation for two years, working to help develop the riverfront. After facilitating major improvements to The RiverPark Center, he returned to WaxWorks/VideoWorks to continue his career until his recent retirement.

Kirk's background in communications made him a natural for Master of Ceremonies for the Greater Owensboro Chamber of Commerce's monthly Rooster Booster meetings. Kirk branded "the good news phone" as his signature personality to share the great happenings of Owensboro. For more than 35 years, Kirk has served in this capacity, with the Owensboro Chamber of Commerce recognizing him as "Member of the Year" three times.

Serving in numerous Board of Director positions, it is evident that Kirk has dedicated his career to serving the greater Owensboro community—for both current and future generations. Kirk recently accepted his latest role as an ambassador for the Owensboro Convention Center. I couldn't think of anyone better suited for this important role. Recently named an All-America City with Kirk's help, Owensboro is fortunate to call Kirk one of its residents.

I look forward to seeing Kirk's new endeavors and would like to thank him for all he has and will continue to do on behalf of Owensboro, Kentucky.

IN HONOR OF CLINT G. QUILTER

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Clint G. Quilter on the occasion of his retirement, with just shy of twenty-four years of service to the residents of Hollister. Since he first began his service in 1989, he held multiple posts with the city. Clint began as Public Works Inspector, where he was responsible for the upkeep of water, sewer, grading, storm drains and all city roads. In 1992 he was promoted to Assistant Engineer and the following year to Associate Engineer. In 1997, Clint assumed the Acting Director of Public Works position and within a matter of months was promoted to Acting Public Works Director/City Engineer. Because of his fine work, the following summer he became the Public Works Director/City Engineer position where he was responsible for the overall operation and maintenance for the city's entire infrastructure. He became Interim City Manager on May 10, 2004 and finally served as City Manager from May 17, 2005 through July 19, 2013.

During his tenor as City Manager Clint dealt with a number of challenges in governing the city but was dedicated to working with people to find solutions. When Clint took the City Manager position, the city was operating at a \$4 million deficit, but with time he was able to balance the budget. Clint also helped steer the city to a solution for its sewer treatment capacity and out of the building moratorium.

I had the pleasure of working with Clint on a number of federal projects and community events. In 2005, Clint assisted my office with

the plans for my annual "Proud to be An American" Citizenship Ceremony held at the Veteran's Memorial Building in downtown Hollister. We had over 250 new citizens from twenty-five different countries sworn-in as American citizens from the tri-county area. In the summer of 2009, Clint again facilitated the use of the Veteran's Memorial Building for my Hollister Health Care Town Hall meeting, where we had over 450 people, a record turnout of San Benito County residents.

It has also been a pleasure to work with Clint on issues pertaining to the Hollister Airport. Clint's expertise and knowledge was extremely important to my office, when the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) was leaning to deny the Hollister Airport's through-the-fence access. With his help, the FAA issued a no objection letter to the through-the-fence access at the airport business park. This was a great accomplishment involving many but Clint's work was noteworthy and has opened up other business opportunities as well as federal funding to do upgrades including the airport taxiways. It was great having him on my San Benito County team.

Mr. Speaker, Clint has had a long and successful career with the City of Hollister and has gained the respect of his fellow workers and members of the community as well as the business community. I extend my most sincere thanks and warmest wishes for her success and much success and happiness in his retirement.

THE 1965 LANIER HIGH SCHOOL
BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, 1965 will always be remembered in American History as a year of turmoil, unrest and great change. The Civil Rights Movement was in full swing, with marches, demonstrations and often dramatic confrontations by brave African Americans that were attacked, beaten and jailed as they struggled for equal rights. Their struggles shocked the world and made front page news and formented a change in the deep south.

Meanwhile as the war over civil rights raged, few noticed a sports revolution in the small city of Jackson, MS. They were seven skinny kids from Lanier High School and they dared to take on all corners. Under Principal Luther Buckley and Assistant Principal Will Anderson, legendary basketball coaches Harrison Barnes and Ormond Jordan, this team honed their skills, speed and prowess and developed into an unstoppable force whose starters came to be known as the Lanier Magnificent Seven. Known for their quickness, scoring offense and devastatingly tough defenses, this team ran up an amazing in-state record of 43 and 0 and averaged over 100 points a game in eight minute quarters and this was before the three point shot had been instituted into the game. With each game their record and legend grew and they not only won the State championship, in March 1965 they

were invited to compete in the National Invitation Interscholastic Basketball Tournament, the NIIBT at Alabama State College in Montgomery Alabama.

On March 6, 1965, those seven inner city kids from Jackson, MS took on the best in the Nation, the vaunted Bears from Booker T. Washington High School from Suffolk, Virginia. The Bears were a force to reckon with, with two fantastic guards and the team was described by some sportscasters as the "team of the century." While both teams were known for their scoring prowess and dynamic offenses, the game was a defensive struggle from the very beginning. It featured heart-stopping action, amazing shots and stellar defense by both teams that dazzled the spectators and fans. The papers described it as an amazing game between two titans of high school basketball that featured great ball handling, tough perimeter defense and some of the best high school players and most electric shooting many had ever seen. At the buzzer the Lanier High School Bulldogs prevailed 58 to 55 and had done it. They beat the team of the century and won the coveted National High School Basketball Championship and were deemed the best in the Nation. These proud, defiant and jubilant national champions rode a public bus back to Jackson, a bus also loaded with Freedom Riders determined to change the hearts and minds of a Nation. The Lanier Basketball Team came home winners but their triumph was swallowed up by the news of the day and the rabid turmoil of the civil rights movement.

These young men, heroes to their legion of fans at Lanier High School, the city of Jackson and the entire State of Mississippi never got their due. True champions, they held their heads high with their national championship trophy in their hands and placed it in the Lanier Trophy Case where it has sat for 48 years gathering dust and forgotten. But not anymore. Thanks to the efforts of Jackson businessman Johnny Morrow that has now changed. Morrow demanded that these men be recognized and put his name and clout behind the effort. He organized and brought together city, county and State government entities, local businesses and talented individuals to help with his cause. He energized schools and local and even national media and forced this recognition ceremony which he developed to right this long overdue wrong. And now due to his efforts they will be recognized.

Now is their time to be remembered and recognized. They have been called the best team you never heard of. Well now you have. Take pride Jackson. In 1965 seven inner city young men took on the best in the Nation and won. As we salute the accomplishments of African Americans during Black History Month, let us not forget our local heroes. Help us to remember, congratulate and salute the 1965 Lanier High School Basketball Team, the only Mississippi high school basketball team to ever win a NATIONAL championship.

We invite everyone to come out and show your love, support and admiration for what these men accomplished. On January 23rd at 6 p.m. at the Mississippi Sports Hall, the State will finally salute and give their due to the 1965 Lanier High School Basketball team. Come and meet the men who accomplished

this amazing feat and learn of their daring, their courage and of their basketball dominance in 1965. Come and meet the only Mississippi High School Basketball Team to ever win a national championship. Come and meet the men who were and are the Lanier High School Basketball Team Bulldogs of 1965. The National Champions.

Joe Usry Chrysler Dodge Jeep Ram is sponsoring the National Championship Rings to be presented to the surviving team members. Please join us on January 23rd at 6 p.m. at the Mississippi Sports Hall of Fame in Jackson, Miss. Come and meet the Magnificent Seven and the other members of the 1965 Lanier Basketball Team!

Coach Harrison Barnes and Assistant Coach Ormond Jordan.

Team Members: Marvin Scott, Cornell Warner, Larry Hayes, Eddie Clanton, James Hudson, Elliot Guinn, Mitchell Johnson, George Amerson, Louis Tucker, Arthur Brown, James Garland, Charles Dalley, Robert Mayberry, Otha Mitchell, Henry Brown Jr.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,116,336,111.15. We've added \$6,111,239,287,198.07 to our debt in 4 and a half years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF MR. JOHN B. BOY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. John B. Boy, the former President and C.E.O. of the U.S. Sugar Corporation, who died on July 16, 2013 at the age of 96. He spent 41 years at U.S. Sugar, serving as its President for 17 years until his retirement.

John held a degree in mechanical engineering from the Georgia Institute of Technology. Under his leadership, the Bryant Sugar House was built in Canal Point, Florida. Additionally, John acquired the South Bay Growers vegetable and sugar cane operations, where he began growing oranges and producing orange juice. Among his lasting contributions while serving as an engineer in his company's agricultural equipment shop, are the many important mechanical advancements in Glades agriculture that are still used today.

During World War II, John served in the U.S. Navy, becoming captain of three ships.

After the war, he moved from Ohio to Clewiston, Florida, where he began his employment in the sugar industry. John contributed immeasurably to his community, and encouraged employees at U.S. Sugar, as well as those around him, to do the same.

As a measure of their appreciation for all that he did for the sugar industry, Clewiston's civic auditorium, located within sight of the U.S. Sugar plant, is named after him.

John is survived by his daughter, Betsy Terrill (Jim); sons, John Boy, Jr. (Connie) and H. Lane Boy; grandchildren, Jamie Terrill, Christopher Smith, Jennifer Price, Suzanne Boy, Stephanie Crawford, and Rachael Boy; and 10 great grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, words cannot express how deeply sorry I am for John's passing. My thoughts and prayers go out to his family, friends, and all of those in the sugar community. I was privileged to know him and call him my friend. He will be dearly missed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and missed the following rollcall votes: Nos. 375 for H.R. 1542 and 376 for H. Con. Res. 44. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on these two rollcall votes.

Additionally, on July 23, 2013, I was also unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 377, on ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 312. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on this vote.

IN MEMORY OF DAVID G. RICH

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of David G. Rich, who left a lasting impact on the 23rd District of New York. After fighting a courageous battle against cancer, David, of Falconer, New York, passed away July 11, 2013, in the presence of his beloved high school sweetheart and wife, Cindy, as well as his friends and family.

Following graduation from Falconer Central School in 1961 and the completion of bachelor's, master's, and superintendent's degrees at the State University of New York at Fredonia, David enlisted in the U.S. Army. He served as a first lieutenant in Vietnam, First Air Cavalry Division, until he suffered critical wounds in action in 1968. After his honorable discharge, David taught Social Studies at Cassadaga Valley Central School from 1970 to 1998. During this period, he volunteered as an adviser for the student council, the junior and senior classes, the chess club, and he contributed to the production of school plays. David's long tenure at Cassadaga allowed him to positively impact the lives of generations of students.

David's community involvement stretched beyond his devotion to Cassadaga students. He served as a Distinguished President of the Kiwanis Club of Falconer and went on to work as the Lieutenant Governor and Foundation Coordinator of the Southwestern Division of New York Kiwanis. David also volunteered in other clubs and organizations including the Falconer American Legion, the Eastern Star, the Travel Club of Herons Glen, and the Vietnam Veterans of America. With an exceptional affection for animals, David was also considered a "Legacy of Love" member of the Chautauqua County Humane Society.

Through his dedication to others, David G. Rich made his community a better place. Although David will be greatly missed, his legacy will continue for generations to come. I am proud to honor him here today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 381, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MD ANDERSON CANCER HOSPITAL HOUSTON, TEXAS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am always pleased to see my fellow Texans succeed. Today, I want to take a moment to recognize yet another accomplishment by the University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Hospital. MD Anderson has been ranked as the top cancer treatment center by the latest US News & World Report's "Best Hospitals" study. Of course this should not come as a surprise considering that the hospital has been ranked number one by the study for the last six years in a row.

The accomplishments of MD Anderson do not stop there. In several subspecialties, the hospital has been ranked highly. In particular, the Ears, Nose, and Throat subspecialty is ranked third. MD Anderson Hospital succeeds because of the dedicated people that labor tirelessly every day with one shared purpose: fighting cancer. Under the direction and leadership of President Ronald DePinho, 20,000 employees and 1,100 volunteers help countless individuals through their expertise, research and simple compassion.

MD Anderson has had a huge impact on many children and gave them the hope of life despite adversity. For Joey Nichols, he received a diagnosis of lymphocytic leukemia at the young age of three. He couldn't understand what that meant or why he felt ill. Today, Joey acknowledges that he has no clear memories during his time at MD Anderson, but he sees it as a defining moment in his life. MD Anderson saved his life, and be-

cause of its work, Joey has aspirations to become a pediatric oncologist and to work at MD Anderson one day.

MD Anderson's dedication to fighting children's cancer should be acknowledged and celebrated. In a separate survey, the MD Anderson Children's Cancer Hospital was ranked 21st in the nation. MD Anderson's services go beyond the well-being of the patient. The children's hospital provides support groups, activities, and camps for families of children with cancer. In a difficult time for a family, there is some comfort in knowing that we have such knowledgeable and compassionate people to fight cancer alongside them.

Mr. Speaker, these remarks only scratch the surface of the accomplishments achieved by the MD Anderson Cancer Hospital. I am confident that the hospital will continue to exceed expectations and to remain as one of the top cancer centers in the United States. I am proud to see such a prestigious hospital in the great State of Texas—and the great City of Houston.

And that's just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on July 23, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for rollcall vote No. 389. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

CELEBRATING THE 24TH ANNUAL BRONX DOMINICAN DAY PARADE

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to twenty-fourth annual Bronx Dominican Day Parade, La Gran Parada Dominicana del Bronx, which will take place on Sunday, July 28, 2013. This celebration of heritage and culture is one that is eagerly anticipated by the Dominican and Bronx communities each year.

Under the leadership of Felipe Febles and Rosa Ayala, the Bronx Dominican Day Parade has grown exponentially in size, scale, and significance over the years. It has morphed into the extraordinary cultural celebration that it is today. For years the United States has largely recognized the Dominican-American community for its success on the baseball diamond, however, there are thousands of Dominican professionals and students that serve as community leaders in the fields of government, law, media, science, and technology.

As the second largest Latino community in New York City, Dominicans have made invaluable contributions to the city, as well as to the entire nation. Although the highest concentration of Dominican New Yorkers live in Northern Manhattan, a significant, and growing, number have enriched The Bronx with their

unique culture, spirit, and drive to live the American Dream. I am grateful that so many have chosen to make The Bronx their home.

The Bronx Dominican Day Parade is a unique event that celebrates the diversity of New York City, the distinct heritage of one of its most important communities, and the strong sense of unity that can be found in celebrating our different cultures. As a New Yorker, I am very pleased to see this event grow every year, and extremely proud to march alongside everyone celebrating the accomplishments and contributions of Dominican men and women in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to marching in the twenty-fourth annual Bronx Dominican Day Parade, and I am confident that this event will exist as a cultural landmark celebration for many years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF SGT. JUSTIN R. ROGERS

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sgt. Justin R. Rogers, a brave soldier and devoted family man who served our country for the past five years in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. Sgt. Rogers was only 25 years old when he passed away in Bagram, Afghanistan on June 28, 2013. He leaves behind his wife, Stefanie, daughter, Nateli, and his mother and stepfather, Teresa and Stan Vicki, who reside in Sgt. Rogers' hometown of Barton, New York.

Sgt. Justin Rogers enlisted in the Army in 2008 following his graduation at Tioga Central High School. While attending Tioga Central, Rogers was a standout athlete and leader, captaining both the football and wrestling teams. He utilized these leadership skills in his career as a soldier, earning multiple awards during his service including, two Army Achievement Medals and an Army Good Conduct Medal.

Sgt. Rogers was devoted to his country and planned on making the Army a career. A few weeks before his death, he had reenlisted to serve another three years as a horizontal construction engineer with the 101st Airborne Division based in Fort Campbell, Kentucky.

Today we remember the commitment and dedication of Sgt. Justin Rogers. He selflessly served his country to protect our freedom and it is imperative that we honor his sacrifice.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 383, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

A TRIBUTE TO CIVILIANS WHO HAVE SERVED IN DIFFICULT RE- GIONS AROUND THE WORLD

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to personally thank and honor the civilians who faithfully serve in war zones and high threat security environments alongside our military in so doing further our national security and peacefully advance American interests.

I am especially grateful to those civilians who served side-by-side with members of our armed forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

These civilians, as well as contractors and former military who return as civilians work for and with the U.S. military and varied U.S. government agencies, deploy into conflict zones such as Iraq and Afghanistan and into high threat security posts.

Dr. Peter R. Mansoor, the Raymond E. Mason Jr. Chair in Military History and the former Executive Officer to Gen. David Petraeus, when he was commander of the multinational forces in Iraq had this to say about civilian service: "The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have been difficult ventures, but the nation could not have achieved its objectives in either conflict without the support of American civilians, who came to the fight with a number of critical specialties and who shouldered more of the load than their numbers would suggest. The Nation owes our civilian veterans a great deal of gratitude for their service in the nation's wars since 9/11."

In September 2007 there were actually more contractors in Iraq than combat troops. According to a 2013 report of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (SIGIR): "In September 2007, the United States had more than 170,000 combat personnel in Iraq as part of the counterinsurgency operation, with more than 171,000 contractors supporting the mission." These contractors are credited in the report for supporting "the counterinsurgency mission in unstable, yet strategically significant, areas such as Baghdad, Anbar, and Babylon provinces."

More and more civilians are serving in conflict zone jobs traditionally held by the military. This proximity to dangerous and unstable security situations has come with a cost. The New York Times reported on February 11, 2012 that, "More civilian contractors working for American companies than American soldiers died in Afghanistan last year for the first time during the war," reporting that "at least 430 employees of American contractors were reported killed in Afghanistan: 386 working for the Defense Department, 43 for the United States Agency for International Development and one for the State Department."

More recently, just last year four of these civilians became household names—U.S. Ambassador Christopher Stevens, information officer Sean Smith, and CIA security contractors Tyrone Woods and Glen Doherty—when they were killed in Benghazi, Libya. Other civilian contractors were seriously wounded.

As with the military, casualties and serious injuries only tell part of the story. There are

other costs associated with prolonged wars, including PTSD, depression and traumatic bereavement.

I was pleased to learn of the recent formation of an organization called We Served Too—a group dedicated to honoring and supporting American and international civilian service in conflict zones and high threat security environments.

Writing in the Huffington Post, author and professor Anne Speckhard reported that when Major General Arnie Fields was asked to comment on the founding of We Serve Too, he remarked on how the shift to asymmetrical warfare now places civilian workers in the same danger that front line soldiers traditionally faced:

The dynamics of war have considerably changed in recent years. The past ten years have been most significant. The parameters that have heretofore defined the battlefield or battle space have been dramatically altered. Military commanders in Iraq and Afghanistan have learned early on that the conventional 'front' and 'rear', which in earlier wars defined the most dangerous areas of the battlefield and the safest, respectively, do not exist. The enemy's threat is virtually omnipresent. Soldiers not in direct pursuit of the enemy are in almost as much danger as those who are. This new paradigm, often referred to as asymmetrical warfare, places civilians assisting in the war effort in about as much imminent danger as the traditional uniformed warrior . . . For example, as a civilian department of State employee in Iraq and as the U.S. Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, I wore my military flak jacket and helmet with more consistency while conducting my work than I did on active military duty in the Marine Corps.

Unlike soldiers who are trained and prepared to face armed conflict, civilians who serve alongside them are often ill-equipped for what they experience. This can have lasting implications even after their return home.

I am pleased to recognize We Served Too and commend their aim of supporting and honoring the civilians who served alongside their military counterparts.

While we don't often remember the sacrifices of civilian workers in conflict zones, we have an obligation to recognize that they too sacrificially served this country and their service is worthy of our gratitude.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during rollcall vote No. 382 on July 23, 2013, regarding an amendment to H.R. 2397 offered by Representative BLUMENAUER of Oregon. I would have voted "yes."

2015 SPECIAL OLYMPICS WORLD
GAMES RESOLUTION**HON. JANICE HAHN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, after over a decade abroad, the Special Olympics World Games are returning to the United States. Two years from today, thousands of athletes, coaches, volunteers and supporters will descend on Los Angeles to see and cheer the skills and accomplishments of people with intellectual disabilities.

The Special Olympics were started by Eunice Kennedy Shriver, who saw how unjustly and unfairly people with intellectual disabilities were treated, and how many children with intellectual disabilities didn't even have a place to play. Her vision grew into the Special Olympics, and in 1968 the first International Special Olympics Summer Games were held in Chicago. For 45 years, the Special Olympics has harnessed the power of sport to create a better world by fostering the acceptance and inclusion of all people.

I could not be prouder that my city and my country are hosting these games. And I want the athletes, their loved ones, and those with intellectual disabilities across the world to know that the United States House of Representatives is with them.

So today, two years before the 2015 Special Olympics World Games open, I am introducing a celebratory resolution with Representative KENNEDY—who is continuing his family's commitment to the Special Olympics—Representative HOYER, and the full bipartisan Los Angeles delegation. I hope our colleagues will join us in supporting these games, and the achievements of those with intellectual disabilities everywhere.

HONORING BORING, OREGON AND
DULL, SCOTLAND**HON. EARL BLUMENAUER**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate two communities who, though oceans apart, found a way to honor their shared identities. I am honored to represent one of these communities in Congress: Boring, Oregon, a small community a few miles outside of the Portland Metro region. The other is Dull, Scotland, in the northern United Kingdom.

These two communities share cultural and geographic similarities, in addition to their quirky names. Both communities lie at the base of prominent regional mountain ranges and neighbor cherished farmland. The county surrounding Boring, Oregon, Clackamas County, plays a prominent role promoting and hosting equestrian events and I am told the same is true of Dull, Scotland's Perth and Kinross Counties.

The Oregon Legislature recently passed House Bill 2352 establishing August 9 as Bor-

ing & Dull Day. As a result of this alliance, both communities have received significant attention and have seen growth in economic activity and tourism. I was delighted to be contacted by the Boring Community Planning Organization to share in a celebration honoring this occasion. It is my hope that this "Pair for the Ages" thrive well into future.

RETIREMENT OF FRANK
SAMMARTINO**HON. PAUL RYAN**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my ranking member, Congressman VAN HOLLEN in recognizing the service of Frank Sammartino, who is retiring on July 26th after 33 years of public service, with 26 of those years in Congressional service. Frank is currently the Assistant Director for Tax Analysis at the Congressional Budget Office, where he has worked for most of his career. Frank's first job in Washington was as a staff economist at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. While there, he designed and developed a microsimulation model to analyze policies affecting Social Security, taxes, and means-tested transfers. Frank brought that modeling knowledge to CBO, where he developed the first microsimulation model used by the agency for analyzing tax policy. That model became the basis for CBO's individual income tax projections and its analysis of the distribution of federal taxes. Frank also served for two years as Chief Economist and Deputy Director at the Joint Economic Committee.

As leader of the Tax Analysis Division at CBO, Frank has led his staff in providing high quality and timely analysis of tax policy and budget issues. He has directly contributed to and overseen numerous baseline projections, policy studies, and cost estimates. His expertise on a wide range of public policy issues has been a valuable resource for members and staff. In addition, everyone who has worked with Frank appreciates his warm manner, gentle sense of humor, and helpful spirit. We wish him well in his retirement from CBO and hope he will continue to contribute to our understanding of public policy issues for years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 385, I inadvertently voted "yes." I respectfully request that the record reflect my corrected vote of "no."

IN TRIBUTE TO DR. SARAH MOTEN

HON. DONNA F. EDWARDS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the life and work of Dr. Sarah Moten, a woman who dedicated her life to furthering the causes of education and development in Africa. Dr. Moten passed away Tuesday, July 9, 2013. Dr. Moten will be missed, but her legacy lives on in the lives of those she touched through her work. Her prolific career in federal and international agencies and organizations serves as an inspiration for all of us who strive to impact others' lives in a positive way.

Dr. Sarah Moten was an accomplished academic. She earned a Bachelor's degree in Elementary Education from Hampton University, a Master's in Education, Guidance, and Counseling from George Washington University, and a Doctorate in Education, Administration and Supervision from Clark Atlanta University. She was awarded honorary doctorates from Elizabeth City State University, Chicago State University, and the University of Massachusetts Boston. Dr. Moten also served as the Director of International Affairs at the University of the District of Columbia.

Dr. Moten was dedicated to uplifting children in Africa through education, with particular regard to equal access to education for girls. In her decades-long career, Dr. Moten worked tirelessly as Country Director in Swaziland, Kenya and Sierra Leone and also as Special Assistant to the Africa Director for the U.S. Peace Corps. In addition, Dr. Moten served as the Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Refugee Assistance at the Department of State. She also served as Special Assistant to the President Emerita for the National Council of Negro Women, the Coordinator of the Education Democracy Development Initiative for Africa, and the Chief for the U.S. Agency for International Development's Africa Bureau Office of Sustainable Development, Education Division, among other notable positions.

Dr. Moten's continuous work on areas including education, refugee affairs, diplomacy, and economic development influenced countless lives and earned her a reputation as one of the greatest champions for Africa.

For her work, Dr. Sarah Moten was awarded the Medal of Freedom by the Foundation for Democracy in Africa, the Worldwide Award for Women in Education and Government by Swarthmore College, the Outstanding Partners in Education Award by World Education, the Distinguished Leadership Award from Boston University's African Presidential Archives and Research Center, and the John L. Withers Memorial Award from USAID, among other distinguished recognitions.

During this time of bereavement, I hope all who grieve find comfort and peace in remembering the profound impact Dr. Moten had on so many. Dr. Moten will live on through those who knew her and through those who were touched by her work.

Mr. Speaker, today we remember and celebrate the life of a generous and remarkable

woman. I send my thoughts and prayers to all who knew Dr. Sarah Moten and all who mourn her loss.

TRIBUTE TO MARCO WATSON
MCMILLIAN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Marco Watson McMillian was born April 23, 1979, to the union of Airy McMillian, Jr., and Patricia Unger in Clarksdale, Mississippi.

Marco accepted Christ at an early age at the New Jerusalem M. B. Church under the leadership of the late Reverend Johnny B. Woods, Sr.

Marco was educated in the public schools of Clarksdale, Mississippi. He was an honor graduate of Clarksdale High School. He was a magna cum laude graduate of the W.E.B. DuBois Honors College at Jackson State University. Marco received his master's degree from Saint Mary's University of Minnesota in the area of Philanthropy and Development. Marco also held a certificate in fundraising management and was a graduate of the Fundraising School at Indiana University. Additionally, he studied at Mississippi State University in the area of Public Policy and Administration and Boston University in the area of Financial Planning. Marco was a graduate of Huntsville/Madison County Leadership Connect Program, Youth Leadership Clarksdale, National Young Leaders Conference of Washington, DC, and the National Association of Student Affairs Professionals' Leadership Program in Bowie, Maryland.

Hailed by Ebony magazine in 2004 as one of the nation's 30 top leaders who are 30 and under, Marco was appointed as the Leadership Effectiveness Initiative Program Manager for New Leaders Memphis and had since been promoted to Director of Recruitment and Operations. Formerly, Marco served as the Executive Assistant to the President (Chief of Staff) at Alabama A & M University in Huntsville, Alabama. As a member of the President's cabinet, Marco was responsible for the day-to-day operations of the Office of the President. In addition, he was responsible for the university's strategic partnerships and legislative affairs in which he assisted the university in receiving its largest state appropriation ever—\$38 million. During his tenure as Associate Director for Development at Jackson State, he was responsible for managing the university's fundraising operations and programs, which led to the institution securing more than \$16 million in private support. Additionally, he assisted as one of the principals in the development of the \$50 million campaign for Jackson State University.

Most recently, Marco served as International Executive Director for Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Incorporated, a role he officially assumed on July 16, 2007, and served until October 1, 2011. As the Chief Operating Officer of the organization, whose membership is more than 150,000 and headquartered in Washington, District of Columbia, Marco was responsible

for the day-to-day operations of the almost 100-year-old men's fraternity. Of the organization's six COOs since its establishment in 1914, Marco was by far the youngest person to ever hold this top post in the fraternity. During his tenure, Marco secured a half-million dollars (\$500,000) for the organization including a federal contract for Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc., a first for the organization. Additionally, he professionalized many of the organization's systems and procedures and introduced electronic voting for delegates at the organization's 2011 national convention in Atlanta, Georgia. Notably, Marco led the charge for the organization's first international service project in Nigeria, South Africa; and was the organization's first and only Executive Director to travel internationally to visit a chapter (Seoul, Korea).

Previously, Marco served as Assistant to the Vice President for Institutional Advancement at Jackson State University where he was responsible for the day-to-day operations of the Division of Institutional Advancement.

Prior to Jackson State University, Marco served as a program coordinator and classroom instructor for Clarksdale Public School District and Noxubee County School District, respectively. As a program coordinator, he supervised 20 classroom teachers and revised the district's class-size reduction program.

Marco, who was honored by the Mississippi Business Journal as one of the "Top 40 Leaders under 40," was a lifetime member of the NAACP, Coahoma County Branch; a former member of Arms of Love National Project; Community Bridge Builders, Incorporated; the Mississippi School for the Blind Community Health Council, and the Kiwanis Club International President's Advisory Council. He was also a former Student Government Association President for Jackson State University, a former International Second Vice President for Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc., and past National Parliamentarian for the Jackson State University National Alumni Association, Incorporated.

Most recently, Marco, a certified grants specialist, registered meeting planner and certified event planner, served as secretary for March of Dimes, National Capital Area Chapter Board of Directors; chair for the William E. Doar, Jr. Public Charter School for the Performing Arts in Washington, DC Board of Trustees; president for Pigtown Main Street, Inc. in Baltimore, Maryland Board of Directors and was a member of the 100 Black Men of Maryland, Inc., the Association of Fundraising Professionals and the Rotary Club of Washington, DC. He was also a member of the Executive Committee for the National Pan Hellenic Council; a member of the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development at NIH Community Ambassadors Council, and board member for the National Coalition on Black Civic Participation. Currently, Marco served as a member of the International Community Ambassadors Network (!! CAN).

Marco was featured as one of 27 interesting personalities in the Who's Who in Black Washington, D.C. inaugural publication and was the recipient of the 2009 Thurgood Marshall Prestige Award presented by the Thurgood Marshall College Fund. He has also

been featured in the Who's Who in Black Washington, D.C. second edition and Who's Who in Black Baltimore inaugural publication. The Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, The Honorable Steve Beshear, commissioned Marco as a Kentucky Colonel; the Mayor of Augusta, Georgia, The Honorable Deke Copenhaver, recognized him for his outstanding service to the community; the Mayor of Meridian, Mississippi, The Honorable Cheri Barry, declared September 26, 2010, as Marco McMillian Day and the Mayor of Huntsville, Alabama, The Honorable Tommy Battle, and City Council honored him for his contributions to the Tennessee Valley. Marco was also the recipient of President Barack Obama's Lifetime Volunteer Service Award.

Upon the former life member of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc., Jackson State University National Alumni Association, Inc. and the NAACP was bestowed the honor of being the youngest member inducted into the Outstanding Sigmas of the Southern Region Chapter, the highest honor granted to a member of the fraternity by his region. He was the youngest person featured in Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity's 100+ Most Influential Members publication, commemorating the organization's centennial celebration. Marco had received numerous other awards and accolades.

Marco leaves to cherish fond memories: his parents, Patricia (Amos) Unger and Airy McMillian, Jr., Clarksdale, MS; his brother, Darius Jones, Atlanta, GA; his grandmother, Louise Taylor, Clarksdale, MS; a surrogate mother, Bertha (Samuel) Blackburn, Clarksdale, MS; two godmothers, Daisy (John) Burnett, Clarksdale, MS and Bobby (Stanley) Morton, Lincoln, NE; godfather, Carter Womack, Columbus, OH; godson, Rustin Holt, Jackson, MS; two godsisters, Ermalecia Johnson, Fort Worth, TX and Augusta Morton, Lincoln, NE; stepsister, Pamela Unger, Clarksdale, MS; stepbrother, Eligha (Celika) Keaton, New Orleans, LA; three godbrothers, Emanuel, Stanley, Jr. and Le Quan Morton, Lincoln, NE; thirteen aunts, Mary (Jessie) Tate and Annie (Elvin) Todd, Clarksdale, MS; Shirley (Leon) Pettis, Oklahoma City, OK; Ouida Earl, Clarksdale, MS; Vivian Whaley, Goose Creek, SC; Beatrice (Arthur) Sanders, Evans, GA; Diane Marie Brewer, Stone Mountain, GA; Gloria Haynes, Chicago, IL; Bennie Thomas, Baltimore, MD; Shirley, Yvonne, Angela, and Michelle Unger, all of Jackson, MS; ten uncles, Rickey Minor, Clarksdale, MS; Dennis (Jeanea) Butler, Houston, TX; Robert (Gail) Wilkins, Atlanta, GA; Terry Taylor, Chicago, IL; Ernest Taylor, Jr., Seoul, Korea; Donald Taylor, LaPlace, LA; Ronald Taylor, Hattiesburg, MS; Michael Taylor, Atlanta, GA; James Unger, Clinton, MS; Charles Unger, Chicago, IL; a special friend, Tinnia Holt, Jackson, MS; and a host of nieces, nephews, cousins, and friends.

CELEBRATING THE SEVENTIETH
ANNIVERSARY OF NAVAL AIR
STATION WHITING FIELD

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 70th anniversary of Naval Air Station Whiting Field.

Rich in its military history, Northwest Florida is home to several military installations that continue to play an essential role in contributing to our Nation's defense, including Naval Air Station Whiting Field located in Santa Rosa County. For seventy years, Whiting Field has provided support and training for some of our military's best aviation warfighters, and Northwest Florida is grateful and proud of its service to our community and our Nation.

In 1943, just months after the death of its namesake, Captain Kenneth Whiting, Whiting Field was already turning into a key naval air training facility. The need to quickly train elite aviators for missions led to Whiting Field becoming an efficient military flight school in a matter of months. The commissioning ceremonies for NAS Whiting Field were held on July 16, 1943, only six days after the invasion of Sicily. Whiting Field then became a leading training facility for our Nation's aviators that helped carry the United States to victory in World War II.

Whiting Field's storied history that includes a pilot training grounds and prisoner-of-war camp for German soldiers during World War II, a once home to the Blue Angels Flight Demonstration Team and the Navy's first jet training unit has today become the busiest Naval Aviation Station in the world where more than twelve hundred service personnel complete their essential flight training annually. It is situated on 12,000 acres, with 13 outlying fields and three separate and fully operational airfields. Whiting Field supports six Training Squadrons and two Instructor Squadrons, which comprises 141 T-6Bs and 124 TH-57s. Eleven percent of all of U.S. Department of Defense's flying hours are flown there, amounting to approximately 1.5 million annual flight operations. In fact, the majority of naval aviators can claim that they performed a substantial portion of their initial flight training at Whiting. Many helicopter students could say the same, resulting in hundreds of flights occurring each day. I am proud to have such a wonderful facility in Northwest Florida that is responsible for producing some of the best aviators in the world.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I am pleased to recognize Whiting Field for reaching this important milestone. My wife Vicki joins me in congratulating the military and civilian personnel at Whiting Field and wishing them continued success in their mission to provide the best services and material support for training U.S. Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard, and International student aviators.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on the rollcall vote, No. 386, for Rep. POE's amendment to H.R. 2397, I inadvertently voted "no," when I intended to vote "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 399 on the previous question, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 400 on agreeing to the resolution, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 401 on agreeing to the Jones amendment, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 402 on agreeing to the LaMalfa amendment, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 403 on agreeing to the Mulvaney amendment, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 404 on agreeing to the Stockman amendment, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 405 on agreeing to the Walorski amendment, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 406 on agreeing to the Bonamici amendment, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 407 on agreeing to the Kilmer amendment, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 408 on agreeing to the Nadler amendment No. 69, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 409 on agreeing to the Nadler amendment No. 70, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 410 on agreeing to the Schiff amendment, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 411 on agreeing to the Pompeo (for Nugent) amendment, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 412 on agreeing to the Amash amendment, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 413 on the Motion to Recommit with instructions I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 414 on the Final Passage of the Department of Defense Appro-

priations Act (H.R. 2397) I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Monday July 22, 2013, I missed the following votes:

H.R. 1542—WMD Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2013.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "yes" on rollcall No. 375.

H. Con. Res. 44—Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "yes" on rollcall No. 376.

PROTECTING AMERICANS'
PRIVACY

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the Amash/Conyers amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act because it is the only means available to the House at this time to seek to prevent the Executive Branch from having sole custody of over a trillion records regarding the phone calls of ordinary Americans. I hope the Administration will soon put forward a proposal that would maintain our national security, while including greater privacy protections. We need more than a promise by the Executive Branch that it will hold records but not look at them except for "relevant" purposes. Possession is 9/10 of the law. Even a credible promise of the Administration may be less credible in future administrations. We cannot necessarily trust unknown future administrations to maintain the privacy commitments of this Administration.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for

printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 25, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 30

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Admiral Cecil E.D. Haney, USN for reappointment to the grade of admiral and to be Commander, United States Strategic Command, and Lieutenant General Curtis M. Scaparrotti, USA to be general and Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea, both of the Department of Defense.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine mitigating systemic risk in financial markets through Wall Street reforms.

SD-538

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining

To hold hearings to examine S. 37, to sustain the economic development and recreational use of National Forest System land and other public land in the State of Montana, to add certain land to the National Wilderness Preservation System, to release certain wilderness study areas, to designate new areas for recreation, S. 343, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, S. 364, to establish the Rocky Mountain Front Conservation Management Area, to designate certain Federal land as wilderness, and to improve the management of noxious weeds in the Lewis and Clark National Forest, S. 404, to preserve the Green Mountain Lookout in the Glacier Peak Wilderness of the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, S. 753, to provide for national security benefits for White Sands Missile Range and Fort Bliss, S. 1169, to withdraw and reserve certain public land in the State of Montana for the Limestone Hills Training Area, S. 1294, to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, S. 1300, to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to provide for the conduct of stewardship end result contracting projects, S. 1301, to provide for the restoration of forest landscapes, protection of old growth forests, and management of national forests in the eastside forests of the State of Oregon, S. 1309, to withdraw and reserve certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for military uses, H.R. 507, to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, H.R. 862, to authorize

the conveyance of two small parcels of land within the boundaries of the Coconino National Forest containing private improvements that were developed based upon the reliance of the landowners in an erroneous survey conducted in May 1960, and H.R. 876, to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho.

SD-366

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights

To hold hearings to examine standard essential patent disputes and antitrust law.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

Business meeting to markup proposed legislation making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Defense.

SD-192

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine containing health care costs, focusing on recent progress and remaining challenges.

SD-608

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider the nomination of Joseph Y. Yun, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to Malaysia, Department of State; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nominations of Steve A. Linick, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Matthew Winthrop Barzun, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Liliana Ayalde, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Federative Republic of Brazil, Kirk W.B. Wagar, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Singapore, and Daniel A. Sepulveda, of Florida, to be Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Communications and Information Policy in the Bureau of Economic, Energy, and Business Affairs and U. S. Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider S. 134, to arrange for the National Academy of Sciences to study the impact of violent video games and violent video programming on children, S. Res. 157, expressing the sense of the Senate that telephone service must be improved in rural areas of the United States and that no entity may unreasonably discriminate against telephone users in those areas, S. 267, to prevent, deter, and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing through port State measures, S. 269, to establish uniform administrative and enforcement authorities for the enforcement of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act and similar statutes, S. 376, to reauthorize the National Integrated Drought Information System, S. 839, to reauthorize the Coral

Reef Conservation Act of 2000, S. 921, to amend chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the rental of motor vehicles that contain a defect related to motor vehicle safety, S. 1068, to reauthorize and amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002, S. 1072, to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes and the continued development of the general aviation industry, S. 1144, to prohibit unauthorized third-party charges on wireline telephone bills, S. 1254, to amend the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998, S. 1317, to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2014 through 2016, S. 1344, to promote research, monitoring, and observation of the Arctic, an original bill entitled, "Cyber", the nominations of Jannette Lake Dates, of Maryland, Bruce M. Ramer, of California, Brent Franklin Nelsen, of South Carolina, Howard Abel Husock, of New York, and Loretta Cheryl Sutliff, of Nevada, all to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Thomas C. Carper, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors, Thomas Edgar Wheeler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, Mark E. Schaefer, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, and nominations for promotion in the United States Coast Guard.

SR-253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 1240, to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste.

SD-366

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

JULY 31

10 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, "Workforce Investment Act of 2013", and any pending nominations.

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, "Federal Real Property Asset Management Reform Act", an original bill entitled, "Improper Payments Agency Cooperation Enhancement Act of 2013", S. 994, to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, an original bill entitled, "BETTER Border Act", S. 1276, to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management, strengthen the authority to terminate or debar employees and contractors involved in misconduct affecting the integrity of security clearance

background investigations, enhance transparency regarding the criteria utilized by Federal departments and agencies to determine when a security clearance is required, H.R. 1162, to amend title 31, United States Code, to make improvements in the Government Accountability Office, S. 1348, to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act, S. 573 and H.R. 1171, bills to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property, S. 643, to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government, S. 1045, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that persons having seriously delinquent tax debts shall be ineligible for Federal employment, S. 233, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the "Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building", S. 668, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building", S. 796, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the "James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building", S. 885, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, as the "Thaddeus Stevens Post Office", S. 1093, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, as the "First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building", and the nominations of John H. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Census, Department of Commerce, and Katherine Archuleta, of Colorado, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine strengthening privacy rights and national security, focusing on oversight of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) surveillance programs.

SD-226

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine preserving the rights of servicemembers, veterans, and their families in the financial marketplace.

SR-418

2 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Relations, and the District of Columbia

To hold hearings to examine how prepared the National Capital Region is for the next disaster.

SD-342

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine implications for economic development in Central Asia, focusing on if the govern-

ment can create the necessary conditions for more trade and exchange, including infrastructure development, efficient customs regimes and reliable transportation networks.

CHOB-340

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine how tax reform can boost economic growth, focusing on lessons from Reagan.

SD-G50

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine energy drinks, focusing on exploring concerns about marketing to youth.

SR-253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on National Parks

To hold hearings to examine S. 398, to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum, S. 524, to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Pike National Historic Trail, S. 618, to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain special resource studies, S. 702, to designate the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor as "The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor", S. 781, to modify the boundary of Yosemite National Park, S. 782, to amend Public Law 101-377 to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station, S. 869, to establish the Alabama Black Belt National Heritage Area, S. 925, to improve the Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site, S. 995, to authorize the National Desert Storm Memorial Association to establish the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, S. 974, to provide for certain land conveyances in the State of Nevada, S. 1044, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on D-Day, June 6, 1944, S. 1071, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make improvements to support facilities for National Historic Sites operated by the National Park Service, S. 1138, to reauthorize the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area S. 1151, to reauthorize the America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership in the State of Iowa, S. 1157, to reauthorize the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area, the Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor, and the Schuylkill River Valley National Heritage Area, S. 1168, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to limit overbroad surveillance requests and expand reporting requirements, S. 1252, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Missisquoi River and the

Trout River in the State of Vermont, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 1253, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, H.R. 674, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System, H.R. 885, to expand the boundary of the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, H.R. 1033 and S. 916, bills to authorize the acquisition and protection of nationally significant battlefields and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 under the American Battlefield Protection Program, and H.R. 1158, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

SD-366

Committee on Finance

Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure

To hold hearings to examine principles for energy tax reform.

SD-215

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 235, to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, S. 920, to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land, and S. 1352, the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-determination Reauthorization Act of 2013.

SD-628

AUGUST 1

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the November 6, 2012 referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico and the Administration's response.

SD-366

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

SEPTEMBER 11

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2014 for the Federal Communications Commission.

SD-138

SENATE—Thursday, July 25, 2013

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father, be with our Senators not only in great moments but also in the repetitive and common tasks of life. Make them children of faith and heirs of peace. May they tackle even mundane responsibilities with integrity and faithfulness, cheerfulness and kindness, optimism and civility. Lord, give them wisdom to be patient with others, ever lenient to their faults and ever prompt to praise their virtues. May they bear one another's burdens and so fulfill Your law. Keep them ever mindful of the brevity of life and of the importance of being faithful in little things.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of Senator

MCCONNELL, there will be a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with the first 30 minutes controlled by the majority and the second 30 minutes by the Republicans.

Following morning business the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1243, which is the Transportation appropriations bill. Senator MURRAY will continue to work through the amendments with ranking member SUSAN COLLINS from Maine. We also hope to vote on confirmation of the West nomination to be Associate Attorney General. Senators will be notified when votes are scheduled.

DOING WHAT IS GOOD FOR AMERICA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, about 80 years ago when President Franklin Roosevelt first proposed Social Security as insurance against poverty in old age, the idea was controversial, new, never been done before, nothing like it. But in 1935, 97 Republicans joined Democrats in Congress to create one of the most successful programs—if not the most successful program—in the history of our country and in the world.

Two decades, about sixty years later, President Dwight Eisenhower proposed the Nation's first interstate highway system, proposing the investment would pave the way for a new era of American growth.

Why did Dwight Eisenhower do this? As a young major in the Army, he was directed to bring a convoy of troops and equipment across the country and he determined at that time something had to be done. The roads were nonexistent, and those that existed were not in very good shape. So when he became President, after having been such a successful leader of our efforts in World War II, he asked Congress to invest \$50 billion. Under present-day dollars, that would be about \$500 billion. That meant almost 50,000 miles of new highways.

There are still ideas out there we should do. Eisenhower, along with Roosevelt, did some things that were new and unique. But look back at what they did. Look at the good of Social Security. Look at the good of our interstate highway system.

With the highway bill, back in 1956, the bipartisan vote wasn't even close. Listen to this: It passed the Senate 89-1. It was approved in the House of Representatives by a voice vote.

About 40 years after President Roosevelt decided he should do something about taking care of people in their

golden years here in America, President Harry Truman envisioned a program that would protect every senior citizen from illness and need. Well, 83 Republicans helped Lyndon Johnson and Democrats in Congress create Medicare. Democratic President Roosevelt, Republican President Eisenhower, Democratic Presidents Truman and Johnson were the reason we have Medicare. Since the law was enacted in 1965, poverty among seniors in this country has decreased and life expectancy has increased every 10 years because of Medicare.

On each of these occasions I have talked about, and countless others throughout the course of American history, lawmakers—divided by political party—have united to pass important groundbreaking legislation. On the issues that matter most—when lives are at stake, when the country and the economy of the country is at stake, when America's competitiveness is at stake—lawmakers, divided by political party, have been drawn together by shared priorities. It is time to renew that tradition.

Over the last 5 years, this Nation has dug its way out of the hole created by the great recession. I could go into reasons why the great recession happened, but let's drop that for now. It happened. We have an opportunity now to come together again, this time to lay the foundation for a stronger, smarter, and more competitive America.

As Democrats and Republicans came together in the past to ensure the health and dignity of our Nation's seniors, as Democrats and Republicans came together to pave the way for a mobile and competitive economy, so Democrats and Republicans today must come together to build a future where hard work is all it takes to turn opportunity into prosperity.

Yesterday President Obama laid out a roadmap to restore that promise for every American. The speech took an hour, but every minute of it was important. He laid out a vision to encourage responsible home ownership, to educate a new generation of workers, and to create jobs rebuilding Eisenhower-era roadways and bridges.

Every day I am impressed by President Obama's focus on restoring a vibrant economy. And every day I am encouraged by his optimism that with a little cooperation and the help of a few reasonable Republicans, we can achieve that goal. We only need a handful of Republicans to break away from what has gone on this past 5 years. I look forward to hearing more details from the President about his proposals in the coming days and weeks.

President Eisenhower understood that lawmakers—Republican or Democrat—should be drawn together by shared priorities. We should all play on the same team. This is what he said:

I have one yardstick by which I test every majority problem—and that yardstick is: Is it good for America?

General Eisenhower was right then and he is right today.

Throughout our Nation's history, Congress has used that same measure. But over the last 5 years, something has changed. When my Republican counterpart said his No. 1 goal was to defeat President Obama, the words "at any cost" were implied.

Since 2009, Republicans have refused to join Democrats in the important job of legislating. It has worked. They have refused to join us in leading, preferring instead to stake out ideological territory or try to score political points. Republicans have balked at new ideas. But they have also balked at old ideas they once supported, solely because those ideas are now favored by President Obama. This kind of opposition for opposition's sake has resulted in gridlock and dysfunction and bitter bipartisanship, hostage-taking and standoffs.

I was on a long interview on public broadcasting yesterday. They asked, What about the numbers of Congress being so low? I said, I haven't gotten a call from any of the pollsters, but if I had, I would agree with this number. Congress is dysfunctional, and that is unfair to the American people. It has made it almost impossible for Congress to advance the big ideas, to achieve the big things, to realize the big dreams it once could. But it is not too late for reasonable people from both parties and on both sides of the Capitol to change that. It is not too late for lawmakers, divided by political party but sharing the same priorities, to unite to pass important legislation.

Like President Obama, I am an optimist. I remain hopeful despite the disagreements and difficulties over the last 5 years. I am hopeful my Republican colleagues are using the same yardstick as I am. And I know they are asking themselves, as I am, Is it good for America?

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

WORKING WITH OTHERS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, like the President, I appreciate a good literary reference every now and then. Placed in the proper context, a citation from some great writer or thinker can sum up a vision and inspire people.

When Douglas MacArthur bade farewell to West Point, he echoed an an-

cient thinker's ominous warning that "only the dead have seen the end of war." And the biblical references in JFK's famous inaugural address represent another classic use of the well-placed quote.

But I think a lot of people are still scratching their heads about President Obama's promise yesterday to bring Americans an "ocean of tomorrows." Frankly, I don't even think that Carl Sandburg fans out there would get it. I wonder: Does he? Because the President himself said his speech probably wouldn't change any minds.

Even the advisers who endlessly hyped this thing more or less conceded there wouldn't be any there there—no groundbreaking proposals, no tack to the center, no promise to finally start working collaboratively with Congress. Well, they were right. So you have to ask, what was the point?

Look, this President is a terrific campaigner. We all recognize that. He has a way with words too. But at some point campaign season has to end and the working with others season has to begin. At some point you have to stop promising an ocean of tomorrows and start actually working with the representatives of the people. Because, let's be perfectly clear, Americans aren't worried about how many tomorrows there are to come. They are worried about what those tomorrows will actually bring: the bills in tomorrow's mail, the cuts in tomorrow's paycheck, the affordability of tomorrow's health costs. These are the things that can't be addressed with reheated speeches or clever quotes. They require actually working with people, including those you might not always agree with.

For instance, going around telling people ObamaCare is working the way it is supposed to or that it is fabulous or wonderful, as several of our Democratic friends have done, doesn't change reality. It is just words. It doesn't change the fact that recent surveys show only 13 percent of Americans now believe the law will help them or that about half believe it will make things worse for the middle class or that actuaries are now predicting cost increases of 30 percent or more in my home State of Kentucky.

I know the President likes to point to the few places, as he did yesterday, where premiums might actually drop under ObamaCare, but he is basically silent on the places where it has been announced that premiums will go up under ObamaCare, and he will not say a word about all the people who have lost their jobs or seen their pay cut.

For instance, the Washington Post recently profiled a part-time college professor from Virginia who, like many in his situation, will see his hours slashed as a result of this law. As the Post put it:

For [this man], the President's health care law could have meant better health insurance. Instead, it produced a pay cut.

And, many would agree, not for the better, especially for the growing number of Americans forced into part-time work with fewer hours and smaller paychecks as a result.

One part-time waitress interviewed in another paper said:

I can't believe I voted for this. This is not the change I wanted, and it feels like there's no hope.

So if the President is ready to pivot from campaign mode to governing mode, he can start by dropping the misleading claims and admitting what pretty much everybody knows: that a lot of Americans are going to feel the pain once this ocean-full of tomorrows finally crashes ashore. Americans are worried, and I don't blame them.

Just last week, as I often do, I met with employers from around Kentucky who expressed continued concerns about the impact this law will have on their operations. They want the Democrats who run the Senate to follow the lead of the House in delaying ObamaCare for everyone, both businesses and individuals, and they know it makes sense to do so. I know they want the President to sign the bill when it passes, and I agree he should. It would be a great first step toward implementing the permanent delay our country needs—a delay that would give Republicans and Democrats the chance to start over and work together, this time on a bipartisan step-by-step set of health reforms that would actually lower costs.

But we cannot get there until the President changes his mindset, until he puts the poetry down for a moment, flips the campaign switch off and the governing switch on. When he does, I think he will be surprised to find just how many Republicans want to do exactly what we have said all along—to work with him on solutions to get our economy moving, our jobs growing, and our health care more affordable. We are waiting. Americans are waiting. I hope he will finally be ready soon.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes.

Mr. McCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CREDIT RATING AGENCIES

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a problem I have spoken about many times over the past 3 years, beginning with debate on the Dodd-Frank Wall Street reform bill. That bill, which Congress passed in July 2010, contained a provision I authored with my Republican colleague Senator ROGER WICKER of Mississippi. Our provision gave the Securities and Exchange Commission the authority to issue rules to address the conflicts of interest inherent in the credit rating industry—conflicts of interest which contributed mightily to our recent financial collapse and which have continued to plague that industry through today.

I am speaking about this issue again because even though the conflicts continue to put our economy at risk, the SEC still has not proposed meaningful reforms. The SEC has studied the issue, the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission has studied the issue, and the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has studied the issue. Now it is time to move forward and take action on the issue.

Let me start off by briefly reminding everyone what this conflict of interest is about and why it is important. In the years leading up to 2008 financial collapse the credit rating agencies were enjoying massive profits and booming business. There is nothing inherently wrong with massive profits and booming business, but there was one fundamental problem: Booming business was coming at the expense of accurate credit ratings, which is supposed to be the entire reason for the existence of the credit rating agencies.

Credit rating agencies were and still are paid to issue ratings directly by the big Wall Street banks issuing the paper and requesting the ratings. If a rating agency—let's say Moody's—does not provide the triple-A rating the bank wants, the bank can then just take its business over to Fitch or S&P. That is called ratings shopping, and it continues to this day. The opportunity for ratings shopping creates an incentive for the credit raters to give out those triple-A ratings even when they are not warranted, and that is exactly what happened with the subprime mortgage-backed securities that played such a crucial role in the financial crisis—and it happened over and over. It became ingrained in the culture of the industry.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, chaired by Senator LEVIN, took a close look at the big three rating agencies, examined millions of pages of documents, and released an extensive report detailing the internal communications at Moody's, S&P, and Fitch. Among the many troubling e-mails, there is one in particular from an S&P official that sums up the prevailing attitude quite nicely: "Let's hope we are all wealthy and retired by the time this house of cards falters."

With all the risky bets in the financial sector—and bets on those bets—our financial sector indeed became a house of cards. But without the conduct of the credit raters, the house of cards would have been just one card tall.

Two years after that e-mail was written, that house of cards did not just falter, it collapsed. Because that house of cards had grown several stories high, when it collapsed it brought down the entire American economy with it. The financial meltdown cost Americans \$3.4 trillion in retirement savings. It triggered the worst crisis since the Great Depression with its massive business failures and mass foreclosures and job losses and the explosion of our national debt.

The crisis profoundly affected the everyday lives of millions of Americans in so many negative ways, including in Minnesota. People lost their homes, their jobs, their retirement savings, and their health insurance.

I have previously shared on the floor the story of my constituent Dave Berg from Eden Prairie, MN. He testified at a field hearing I had in May of 2010 and told his story about having to start over—finding a new job and rebuilding his retirement savings—at 57 years of age. His reflections on his experience in the recession mirror those of millions of other Americans.

He said:

The downturn of the economy, caused in part by the abuses on Wall Street, led to the loss of my retirement security. Reforming the way Wall Street operates is important to me personally, because I have a lot of saving yet to do—and I simply cannot afford another Wall Street meltdown. I need to have confidence in the markets—and I need to know there is accountability to those who caused a financial crisis.

It is hard to overestimate the extent to which the credit rating agencies contributed to the financial crisis in which millions like Dave Berg lost their jobs, their homes, and far too many Minnesotans had their hopes for the future dashed.

These Americans are not necessarily seeking retribution from Wall Street. They just need to be assured it will not happen again. They know there is a problem and the problem needs to be fixed.

We do not need further proof of that, but we get it in the February complaint filed by Department of Justice

against S&P in which DOJ alleges—as it stated when it filed the complaint—that the credit rating agency “falsely represented that its ratings were objective, independent, and uninfluenced by S&P’s relationships with investment banks when, in actuality, S&P’s desire for increased revenue and market share led it to favor the interest of these banks over investors.”

The complaint highlights the patently problematic way the credit rating agencies habitually did business. One e-mail obtained in that investigation from a high-level S&P official reads:

We are meeting with your group this week to discuss adjusting criteria for rating CDO’s of real estate assets . . . because of the ongoing threat of losing deals.

CDOs—collateralized debt obligations—are one of those derivatives, or bets, that added stories to the house of cards. This official had apparently become so comfortable with the culture of conflicts of interest that he appeared to have no reservations about putting it in writing.

In fact, a while ago, S&P asked the judge in the case to throw out the Justice Department lawsuit against them by pointing to a previous decision made by a U.S. district court judge in an earlier securities fraud case against them. That earlier suit against the S&P had been filed by shareholders who said they had bought their shares believing that S&P’s ratings were independent and objective—as the S&P had long declared. But the judge in the earlier case dismissed the shareholders’ suit, finding that the S&P’s statements that their ratings were independent and objective were “mere puffery.” In other words, no one could take S&P’s statements about their ratings objectivity and independence seriously. It was just puffery and advertising that no one could believe.

Very recently, S&P tried to use—in the Department of Justice’s case against them in their filing—the earlier “puffery” ruling to try to get the Justice Department suit thrown out against them. So S&P’s legal argument was that no one could reasonably think that they had a reputation for producing independent and credible ratings.

Thankfully, earlier this month, the judge in the DOJ suit ruled that the DOJ suit could go forward and said last week he found S&P’s puffery defense to be “deeply and unavoidably troubling.”

S&P’s rationale should strike us all as deeply and unavoidably troubling because their legal defense—this is S&P’s legal defense—said no one could possibly rely on their ratings. But their job is to provide independent, objective, and accurate ratings. Millions of Americans lost their jobs because S&P didn’t do its job. S&P didn’t do their one job. They have one job and that is to provide accurate ratings.

They didn't do their one job. They have no other job.

I am glad the Department of Justice is pursuing this case, but DOJ's action is not enough. It is backward-looking and addresses past harms. My concern is that the conduct continues to this day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I am glad the DOJ is going forward in pursuing this case, but as I said it is not enough. It is backward-looking and addresses past harms. My concern is that the conduct continues to this day. The credit raters are still influenced by the relationships with the banks because that is who pays them. It is a clear conflict of interest, and we need to prioritize actions that will prevent another meltdown in the future.

The Dodd-Frank provision I wrote with Senator WICKER, if implemented in full, would root out the conflicts of interest from the issuer pays model. The amendment we offered and the Senate passed directed the SEC, Securities and Exchange Commission, to create an independent self-regulatory organization that would select which agency—one with the adequate capacity and expertise—would provide the initial credit rating of each structured financial product.

The assignments would not be based just on the agency's capacity and expertise but also, after time, on its track record. Our approach would incentivize and reward excellence. The current pay-for-play model—with its inherent conflict of interest—would be replaced by a pay-for performance model. This improved market finally allows smaller rating agencies to break the Big Three's oligopoly.

The oligopoly is clear. The SEC estimates that as of December 31, 2011, approximately 91 percent of the credit ratings for structured finance products were issued by the three largest credit rating agencies—Fitch, Moody's, and S&P—each of which was implicated in the PSI investigation. The other five agencies doing structured finance make up the remaining 9 percent.

The current oligopoly does not incentivize accuracy. However, if we move to a system based on merit, the smaller credit rating agencies would be better able to participate and serve as a check against inflated ratings, thereby helping to prevent another meltdown.

In our proposed model, the independent board would be comprised mainly of investor types—managers of university endowments and pension funds—who have the greatest stake in the reliability of credit ratings, as well

as representatives from the credit rating agencies, the banking industries, and academics who have studied this issue.

Our amendment passed the Senate with a large majority, including 11 Republican votes. This is not a progressive or conservative idea, it is a commonsense idea.

The final version of Dodd-Frank modified the amendment and, to be frank, put more decisionmaking authority in the hands of the SEC as to how to respond to the problem of conflicts of interest in the credit rating agency industry. The final version directed the SEC to study the proposals that Senator WICKER and I made, along with other alternatives, and then decide how to act.

The SEC released its study in December. The study acknowledged the conflicts of interest in the credit rating industry and reviewed our proposal and many of the alternatives. They laid out the pros and cons of each proposal without reaching a definitive conclusion on which route to pursue.

The study also proposed holding a roundtable discussion to further examine reform opportunities. This SEC convened this roundtable on May 14, and both Senator WICKER and I had the opportunity to present opening remarks. Bloomberg News had a good article on the roundtable on March 14, including several key quotes that I am going to use in my remarks. The roundtable provided a rigorous examination of our proposal and of the alternatives.

One executive who was from a smaller rating agency endorsed the concept of a rotating assignment system to help break up the current oligopoly. Jules Kroll, the CEO of Kroll Bonding Credit Agency, said of the Big Three: "They're selling themselves out, just as they did before."

The Big Three were also represented at the roundtable. An S&P representative argued against meaningful reform by suggesting that "a government assignment system could create uncertainty, could slow down markets, and disrupt capital flows at a time when we could least afford it." He didn't mention puffery. Unsurprisingly, I disagree with his characterization and would indeed suggest that what we can least afford is to maintain the status quo.

An alternative proposal, the continuation of the 17g-5 proposal, was met with more than a little skepticism. The 17g-5 Program seeks to encourage unpaid, unsolicited ratings by requiring the sharing of data on which ratings are based. The theory is, unsolicited ratings will keep paid ratings honest. Joseph Petro of Morningstar Credit Ratings said using the unsolicited rating program "is not the best use of resources as we're trying to build out our ratings platform." SEC Commissioner Troy Paredes made a strong point

when he noted that negative, unsolicited ratings by a firm "may not be the best way to get business in an issuer-pays setting." By the time the report was written, the 17g-5 Program had produced only one or two ratings.

I have said all along that I believe the proposal of Senator WICKER and myself is a good one and the right one, and I continue to believe that more and more as I have thought about it and looked at it in the years now since we originally wrote the legislation. But I have also said I am open to any other meaningful proposals, and I will support any proposal the SEC recommends that addresses the conflicts of interest in a meaningful way. But the Roundtable made very clear once again that reform is necessary and that the status quo is inadequate to protect American investors, workers, and homeowners in the years ahead.

Dealbreaker.com, a satirical blog that covers Wall Street, ran a post on the day of the SEC Roundtable with this title: "The SEC Will Keep Talking About Credit Rating Agencies Until Everyone Stops Paying Attention." That is one approach Wall Street regulators can choose to take and it would be completely unacceptable. To do that would be to fail the American people. Senator WICKER and I have worked with the SEC continuously over the past 3 years, and I will continue to pursue this issue until the SEC fulfills its directive to address the conflicts of interest in the credit rating industry. I am obligated to my constituents and to the American public to make sure that satirical headline does not become reality.

I look forward to working with the SEC on the next steps toward a proposed rule on credit rating reform.

I yield the floor, and I note the presence of both of my esteemed colleagues from Hawaii, including the one presiding, and Senator HIRONO, who is about, I believe, to ask for the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of S. 1243, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for 2014. I wish to thank Senators MURRAY and COLLINS as well as Senators MIKULSKI and SHELBY for their hard work. The bill before us reflects the bipartisan agreement that funding our Nation's transportation and housing infrastructure is vital to creating jobs and supporting strong communities.

I wish to thank the committee for funding programs that support projects that are especially crucial for my home State of Hawaii.

First, the committee's bill provides nearly \$2 billion for capital improvement grants which support transit projects across the country. Especially important for Hawaii is Honolulu's rail transit project which, when completed, will provide much needed relief for Oahu's commuters. Studies have shown that during the morning peak period, the average travel time from East Kapolei to Honolulu is 89 minutes—89 minutes for a 17-mile drive. The rail will turn that into a 40-minute ride above traffic. The project is estimated to remove roughly 40,000 cars from Oahu's congested roadways, providing relief for buses and other surface public transportation services.

While the rail project is a crucial step forward for developing Hawaii's most populous island, it is the committee's support for Hawaii's indigenous people for which I especially extend my thanks. The committee's funding of both the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant and the 184A Loan Guarantee Program will help our Nation continue fulfilling its trust obligations to Native Hawaiians.

In 2010, the American Community Survey reported that 27.2 percent of Native Hawaiians in Hawaii live in overcrowded conditions, compared to 8.5 percent of Hawaii's total population. In addition, the overall cost of living in Hawaii is almost 50 percent higher than the United States average, and housing costs are almost 150 percent higher. Coupled with these costs is the fact that 18 percent of Native Hawaiians live in poverty.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the majority has expired.

Ms. HIRONO. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. HIRONO. Thank you, Mr. President.

Congress created the Hawaiian Home Lands trust to provide housing and settlement opportunities for Native Hawaiians. However, as the statistics I just laid out show, this indigenous population continues to struggle with finding affordable quality housing in their place of origin.

That is why the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant, or NHHBG, is so important. These funds can be used for a variety of initiatives. For example, the current wait list for access to housing on homestead land is long and continues to grow. Funding the NHHBG helps the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands to continue developing lands to meet the housing needs of those on the wait list as well as future beneficiaries, allowing the Department to effectively administer this trust responsibly.

The 184A Program is another important tool for assisting Native Hawai-

ians in securing homes on homesteads—lands they cannot own. As I have mentioned, the cost of living—especially housing—in Hawaii is among the highest in the country. On top of saving up the cost of a downpayment for a mortgage, there is the tricky task of securing a mortgage for a home without ownership of the land beneath it. This has proved problematic not only for Native Hawaiians but also Native Americans and Alaska Natives. The 184A Loan Guarantee Program helps get Hawaiians onto homesteads by providing a guarantee for lenders who are unfamiliar with the Hawaiian homes program.

I also wish to thank the committee for supporting the Essential Air Services Program. Being an island State, Hawaii is uniquely affected by any changes to air transportation policy. For us, driving between counties is not an option. So air service is, for all intents and purposes, the only way to get from one island to another.

There is a population in Hawaii that uniquely demonstrates the reason for the Essential Air Service Program: the residents of Kalaupapa. Kalaupapa is an isolated peninsula on the island of Molokai. Beginning in 1966, this area was used as an exile for Hansen's disease patients. This practice continued until a quarantine of the area was finally lifted in 1969. It was precisely because of Kalaupapa's remoteness and isolation that it was selected to serve this function for Hansen's disease patients.

There are Hansen's disease patients who still reside in Kalaupapa. Their only option for getting in and out of the area for medical treatment, or to visit family and friends, is flying. Maintaining proper funding for the Essential Air Service Program directly translates into assuring continued access for the people of Kalaupapa to other communities and the services they need.

The committee's bill also provides appropriate levels of funding for larger national programs such as the Community Development Block Grant, or CDBG. Certainly, Hawaii has been able to put CDBG funds to good use, and agencies across the country rely on this essential block grant funding to continue meeting the needs of their most vulnerable populations.

The HOME Investment Partnerships Program is yet another example where the funding level in the Senate's bill is warranted. If Hawaii is any indication, HOME funds move out the door so quickly that many subgrantees with equally worthwhile projects are left waiting for the next fiscal cycle to compete.

The support for CDBG, HOME, and other programs in the bill provides communities across the country with the means to provide safe, affordable housing for the least fortunate, the el-

derly, and others. However, as the wide support for these programs demonstrates, there is more need in our communities than there are resources. Since the sequester has taken effect, things have only gotten harder for those who are struggling the most. Every day it seems we hear about housing vouchers being frozen or rescinded or about how elderly or support services are being cut back or about how the lines for limited public housing grow as people who have been out of work for too long exhaust their savings. For many of the people who rely on these programs, there is nowhere else to turn.

This bill doesn't fix all of the problems caused by the sequester, nor does it fully address the critical needs to create jobs. However, it is a bipartisan step forward that makes positive progress in all of these areas. Perhaps it will give us some momentum in tackling those big challenges our Nation faces in a more comprehensive way.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we now know, the IRS targeting scandal implicates senior officials at the very highest levels of the Internal Revenue Service. Indeed, we know the Office of the Chief Counsel of the IRS, headed by an administration appointee, was aware of the abuses, according to sworn testimony in the House of Representatives. We know that former IRS Commissioner Douglas Shulman categorically denied those abuses in March of 2012, even though senior IRS officials learned about them as early as June 2011. We know the IRS official who first revealed the abuses to the American people decided to take the Fifth Amendment, invoking her right not to incriminate herself, rather than testify before Congress. Finally, we know IRS officials improperly targeted not only conservative organizations but also political candidates and donors.

Still, yesterday the White House Press Secretary called the various scandals involving this administration phony scandals. Well, I don't know anyone who actually believes that is true. When an institution such as the Internal Revenue Service, with its power to literally tax and destroy, is abusing that power, it deserves the investigation of Congress and we need to get to the bottom of it. The idea, as initially floated out, that this scandal was the work of a few rogue staffers in the Cincinnati office is no longer plausible, even if it was at one point.

This scandal clearly represents a serious breach of the public trust and has created a major credibility problem for this agency that is supposed to be objective and nonpartisan. It is bad

enough that America's tax collection authority has behaved like a thuggish political machine, indeed, policing political speech and rights guaranteed under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

To make matters worse, the Internal Revenue Service will soon be responsible for administering some of the most important provisions of the Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare, including the individual mandate. In other words, the Internal Revenue Service will be responsible for administering a law that affects one-sixth of the U.S. economy, and it will be collecting even more information about individual American citizens.

Are we comfortable with dramatically expanding the power of an agency that has proven so abusive and so untrustworthy? I know I am not, which is why 2 months ago I introduced a piece of legislation that would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from participating in its current role of implementing ObamaCare. Yesterday I submitted this legislation as an amendment to the appropriations bill we are currently considering.

Rather than give more power to the Internal Revenue Service, we should be giving more power to patients and their doctors. Remember, even before ObamaCare became law, the IRS had enough power to destroy the lives of American citizens. In the famous words, I believe, of a Supreme Court Justice, the power to tax is the power to destroy. He had it right. Now is the worst possible time to give this agency such massive influence over the U.S. health care system, and this is past overdue action on our part. Instead, we should be curtailing the power of the Internal Revenue Service, replacing ObamaCare with sensible, patient-centered alternatives, and my amendment would do that.

Before I conclude, I wish to mention another amendment we will be filing to the appropriations bill—one I cosponsored with my friend from South Carolina Senator GRAHAM. Our amendment would prevent any funds in this bill from being used to bail out Detroit or any American city that mismanages its public finances. We have a Federal bankruptcy code—chapter 9, specifically—that was designed to handle these problems, and Detroit has filed for bankruptcy. There is no good reason why Detroit or any other American city ought to receive a taxpayer-funded bailout from Washington. I hope that the normal bankruptcy process will be allowed to go forward, and I hope that the bankruptcy follows the rule of law and that the Obama administration resists any temptation to meddle in the process and play politics.

My colleagues might recall that during the 2009 government-run Chrysler bankruptcy process, the company's secured bondholders received much less

for their loans than the United Auto Workers pension funds. My colleagues might also recall that during the runup to the 2011 Solyndra bankruptcy, the Obama administration actually made taxpayers subordinate to private lenders, in violation of the law.

Detroit's financial woes offer a warning to all cities and States that are struggling with pension obligations and unfunded liabilities. And speaking of unfunded liabilities, the Federal Government currently owes more than \$100 trillion worth of unfunded liabilities ourselves for Medicare and Social Security—something that urgently needs our attention. It is time for government officials at all levels—State, Federal, and local—to make the hard fiscal choices we have been postponing for way too long.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, last summer the Supreme Court narrowly upheld as a tax the massive government takeover of health care in America, known more commonly as ObamaCare. Since then, as the law's provisions have slowly been implemented, the size and scope of this colossal monstrosity have become clear.

I opposed the ObamaCare bill from the very beginning as a Member of the House of Representatives serving on the Ways and Means Committee. Back then Americans were told that Congress needed to pass the bill before they could know all that was in it, but the more the American people learn about it, the less popular it becomes. In fact, news reports tell us the administration is now looking for help from Hollywood celebrities to push a bill that many Americans clearly do not support. That tactic has been used before. In the 1950s and the 1960s, Hollywood and some athletes were used to sell and glamorize tobacco products. Today, Hollywood and some athletes are being asked to peddle the Affordable Care Act, perhaps to make up for past sins.

While the American people grow more uncomfortable with this law, the administration has allowed \$54 million to be spent on "navigators" to help push people toward this program. Reports have suggested that there will be 175,000 of these so-called navigators, whose job it is to facilitate this law. Add that to the 16,000 new IRS agents

who are being hired to implement ObamaCare, and it has become even clearer now just how flawed this law is. It is being widely circulated that the administration is willing to spend nearly \$1 billion on advertisements to entice the American people into buying something they do not want.

The President's recent decision to delay for another year the law's mandate on employers and small businesses is more compelling evidence that the ObamaCare approach to health care reform is not working and is only going to make matters worse. It is remarkable that the same administration that pushed so hard for this health care takeover is now hesitant to put in place the very measures contained in the law, but I think the administration has a very good reason to be hesitant.

Since ObamaCare's inception, middle-class families have seen their premiums skyrocket by an average of \$2,500. Nearly 75 percent of small businesses in this country have been forced to fire their employees or cut their hours and turn full-time employees into part-time workers. In fact, just last month 322,000 workers were forced into part-time employment. So the administration has created quite the balancing act for middle-class families: At the same time they are dealing with increased health care costs and higher premiums, they are confronted with reduced work hours and the threat of being forced into part-time positions. I say that is an unacceptable situation in which to put the American people.

Clearly, at a time when we are approaching 5 straight years with an unemployment rate over 7.5 percent, ObamaCare's job-crushing provisions are only making things worse for our economy, and that is why the administration is having second thoughts.

No one argues that the health care system in this country is perfect. There are absolutely steps we can take to increase access to high-quality, affordable health care. But ObamaCare's massive expansion of the Federal Government's role in the health care industry is not turning out to be the solution its supporters said it would be. That is why the architects of the legislation are cherry-picking which parts of the law to enforce, delaying some of its key provisions. It is obvious this legislation is well on its way to collapsing under its own weight, and that will only further hurt the American people and cause even greater damage to our economy.

I have a three-part test that I have told my constituents about countless times. It is a test that I apply whenever I evaluate legislation, and it is called the more-higher-less test. When legislation hits my desk, I evaluate whether that bill will lead to more competition, higher quality, and less cost—hence the more-higher-less test. If the bill passes the test, then it is a bill I will consider supporting.

That test is rooted in my belief that the American free market system has created the world's greatest economy and allowed innovation and creativity to thrive. Competition is the key to improving our health care system, not burdensome regulations and mandates, especially when they are selectively enforced by government bureaucrats.

Perhaps the Obama administration has the same concerns about ObamaCare that I have, and that is why they would rather not fully enforce it until after the next election. But if that is the case, they need to make the tough decisions to address the problems instead of pretending those problems do not exist.

When I was recently back in my home State of Nevada, I toured a medical school and spoke with a number of bright, hard-working students who expressed serious concerns about the effects of ObamaCare. I told them that one of my biggest fears was that the law would turn them all into government employees and it would put a bureaucrat between them and their patients.

Instead of a system like that, we need to reduce the cost of health care services by enacting meaningful tort reform, making insurance more affordable, and providing market-based solutions to meet consumer needs. We need to create an atmosphere that will foster economic growth and job creation instead of punishing the middle class with higher health care premiums and fewer hours at work.

I can understand the Obama administration's decision to delay the employer mandate that is crushing small businesses across the country. That is why so many of us opposed the law to begin with. But the American people deserve far better than a cherry-picking, tax-increasing approach to health care reform. American families should not have to juggle higher health care premiums with the threat of losing their jobs or losing hours at work. They deserve commonsense solutions that will reduce costs and increase access to high-quality care. ObamaCare clearly is not that solution.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this week, the President of the United States, President Obama, has made yet another pivot back to the economy and

to jobs, issues the American people have not had the luxury of pivoting away from.

While the President is yet again attempting to refocus on jobs and the economy, giving speeches is not a real solution to our Nation's problems. In fact, yesterday President Obama said in his speech that Washington is taking its eye off the ball. Mr. President, you are Washington. You have been President now for 4½ years. These are your policies, policies that are hurting our economy and costing Americans jobs.

As for taking your eye off the ball, the President appears to be swinging with his eyes closed, with his eyes closed to the impact that his policies are having on the economy in this country. We do not have to look very far to see the impact of those policies. The ObamaCare legislation is having a crushing impact on jobs in this country—a crushing impact on the economy.

As we look at the unemployment rate, it is still over 7½ percent. It has been there now for 54 months. That is the worst job record of any President since the Great Depression.

The President's signature law, ObamaCare, continues to hamstring the job market. In June alone, the last month for which we have data, 322,000 Americans were forced into part-time employment status. Those are people who otherwise would have been willing to work full-time but because of these policies that are encouraging more employers to push their employees into part-time status, we have 322,000 individuals in this country who want to work full-time that are now having to work part-time.

ObamaCare and other policies put forward by this administration have been probably the best thing that has happened to part-time jobs. Unfortunately, for most Americans, they want to be working full-time. A recent chamber of commerce survey shows that nearly 75 percent of small businesses are firing workers or cutting hours. As implementation of the ObamaCare law continues, the number of small business owners who take those steps, unfortunately, is only going to increase.

According to a recent Wall Street Journal article:

Rod Carstensen, owner of 11 Del Taco restaurants around Denver began in April converting his mostly full-time workforce into one comprising mostly part-time help to minimize his health care costs. . . . He is plowing ahead despite the ObamaCare administration's reprieve, he said, because we need to get there anyway, and it will take until January 1 of 2015 to make this transition.

He is referring, of course, to the employer mandate which the President has chosen to delay for this next year when it was supposed to take effect, until January 1 of 2015. Most employ-

ers, unfortunately, are not taking great consolation in the fact that this is being delayed by 1 year. They know at some point they are going to have to comply with it.

So they are taking those steps already, which is adding and fueling the data—the numbers I just mentioned with regard to people being forced into part-time jobs. Americans are facing decreased hours which means decreased wages. Additionally, families are facing higher insurance premiums, which further erodes their disposable income and opportunities to invest in a new home or a better education for their children.

A growing number of Americans are realizing ObamaCare is the wrong prescription for families who are at the mercy of an already struggling economy. The administration has been forced to concede that the employer mandate, which is a key component of the ObamaCare legislation, is broken and unworkable, which is why they have delayed it.

We are starting to see Democrats, who have historically been supportive of the law, suddenly jumping from the ObamaCare sinking ship. On Monday, a headline in the Washington Post read, "Moderate Democrats are quitting on ObamaCare."

The article disclosed that fewer than 50 percent of moderate to conservative Democrats now support ObamaCare, which is down more than 25 percentage points since 2010 when it passed. Congressional Democrats are also becoming increasingly skittish about ObamaCare. The House vote last Wednesday on the employer mandate delay passed 264 to 161—35 Democrats joined 229 Republicans in support for that bill.

Additionally, there were 22 House Democrats who voted to delay the law's individual mandate. Even a Democratic Senator has introduced legislation for a 2-year—not a 1-year but a 2-year employer mandate delay. In a recent letter to the Democratic leadership, three large unions expressed grave concerns with the law, led by the Teamsters Union, the organization that Jimmy Hoffa leads.

Once some of the biggest supporters of ObamaCare penned a letter—three major unions penned a letter basically saying that the health care law will "shatter" health benefits and cause "nightmare scenarios." Shatter health benefits, create nightmare scenarios, that is what the unions are saying. The unions also slammed the law for defining a full-time employee as one who works less than 30 hours.

The unions went on to say in their letter that the law "will destroy the foundation of the 40 hour work week that is the backbone of the middle class."

It is very clear that even those who were vocal, those who vigorously defended and supported the ObamaCare

legislation, recognize this is not working and are making it abundantly clear in the statements that they are now making.

Just yesterday, as I mentioned, the President delivered a speech aiming to yet again pivot, as he says, back to jobs and the economy. He used the speech to kick off another campaign-style tour of speeches in hopes that touting his continued commitment to an economic recovery will overshadow these harsh realities of ObamaCare and other economic woes that plague this country.

During yesterday's speech, the President claimed he is dedicated to the middle class and growing the economy from "the middle out." What do these concerns tell us about the state of the middle class? Hard-working Americans are now fearful about their job security, about their health care coverage, and their ability to make ends meet all because of this catastrophic law.

The President's strongest political allies who represent millions of workers say the President's signature domestic achievement is "destroying the backbone of the middle class." Although the President continues to pivot to and away from these issues, Senate Republicans remain focused on creating jobs and growth in this country. It is time for a real recovery. The American people are ready to get back to work.

For 54 months, we have seen unemployment at or above 7½ percent. That number does not reflect the people who have given up looking for work. Let's remove the heavy hand of Washington regulations from our job creators. Let's create certainty for employers so they might hire new employees, not cut the hours of those they already have.

Let's spare the middle class from premium increases. I have seen studies all over the place that suggest, for families, for individuals, premiums across this country are going up. According to Kaiser, for families, it is \$2,500. In order to achieve the goals of addressing these issues in our economy, we have to start with a permanent delay of ObamaCare for all Americans—not just for the employers, not just the employer mandate but the individual mandates, the other regulations that are 20,000 pages high—7½ feet tall are the regulations that have been promulgated to implement this law. It continues to grow by the week.

We did not need a 2,700-page bill. We did not need 20,000 pages of regulations to address the problems we have in our health care delivery system and health care coverage system today. But that is what we got. But the President's job-killing tactics do not stop just at health care. The President's proposed climate change regulations alone would cost 500,000 jobs and reduce household income by up to \$1,000 per year.

Dodd-Frank has already cost \$15.4 billion and 58.3 million hours in paperwork burdens on businesses across the country. Rather than more campaign-style speeches touting the same old flawed ideas, the President should work with Congress to put more Americans back to work.

By working together, we can enact meaningful regulatory reform that will provide relief to employers and to employees alike. We can fix our health care system in a manner that lowers costs while allowing families to keep the doctors they want. We can enact tax reform that will create economic growth, lower the unemployment rate, and reduce our unsustainable budget deficit.

We can expand access to domestic energy resources in a manner that fully realizes the benefits of increased energy production. This cooperation must start with President Obama getting off the campaign trail and getting to work with Congress on these important issues. So instead of pivoting yet again to the economy, in campaign-style speeches, we need a President that is here, that is working to address the economic woes American families are experiencing.

If you want to start by going out and touting things that you are going to do for the economy, start right away by approving the Keystone Pipeline. That is a no-brainer, in most people's estimation. In fact, the President's own administration has analyzed and reviewed and scrutinized and studied this thing now four different times and concluded it would have not an impact on the climate.

It would create immediate jobs, thousands of jobs, construction jobs, and then jobs over a long period of time. It would help lessen the dependence we have on foreign sources of energy by freeing up transportation of energy resources that come from friendly allies in countries such as Canada to get to American consumers in this country.

There are things the President could be doing that actually will create jobs. Come up here and engage in the debate on tax reform. Commit to tax reform that is revenue neutral, that does not raise taxes on people who create jobs in this country but, rather, lowers the rate to unleash economic growth and job creation in this country. Work with us to repeal, permanently delay, the ObamaCare regulations that are crushing jobs and the economy and, as I pointed out earlier, are forcing more and more Americans into part-time jobs, forcing employers to either cut and reduce their workforce or not hire people they otherwise might hire, and raising premiums for hard-working middle-class families.

Mr. President, it is not Washington that does not have its eye on the ball, it is you who does not have your eye on the ball.

We need you to focus like a laser on the economy and recognize that you can't close your eyes to the harmful, economic impact that your policies are having on too many middle-class Americans and small businesses who create jobs in this country to generate the economic growth that is necessary to improve the standard of living and the take-home pay of every American family. This is what we need.

I hope the President will get off the campaign trail, come back, and focus on what really matters to middle-class Americans; that is, jobs, the economy, and a better life for their children and grandchildren.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 11:30 a.m., and at 11:30 a.m. the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 186, as provided under the previous order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as the House and Senate have begun debating our separate appropriations bills for the coming year, we have been forced to take a very hard look at the numbers and exactly what so many important programs and services will look like next year under cuts that are forced by sequestration. I am here to tell you, it is not pretty.

As chair of the Budget Committee, it has only served as a reminder to me of just how important it is to fully replace the across-the-board cuts that sequestration has forced us to make, because it is only getting worse.

Some of my Republican colleagues in the Senate, and most of them in the

House, it seems, don't believe sequestration has had a real impact on families, their communities, and our military.

I wish to take a few minutes to talk about what I have already seen in my home State of Washington, where the impacts of sequestration have been very severe.

Washington State has a proud history of supporting our Nation's Armed Forces. From Fairchild Air Force Base in eastern Washington to Joint Base Lewis-McChord in the Puget Sound region, our State is home to thousands of military families.

In addition to those active-duty servicemembers, Washington State is also home to thousands of civilian defense employees who work at these various military installations. Under sequestration, these men and women have borne the brunt of these across-the-board budget cuts. This month, weekly furloughs began for nearly 10,000 of these civilian employees in my home State of Washington. So now, once every week, they can't go to work. That amounts to a pay cut for them of 20 percent.

These are men and women—many of them veterans—with mortgages and medical bills and tuition costs, just like the rest of us. And thanks to the gridlock here in Congress, their lives have become 20-percent tougher. One of those people who is impacted is Will Silva. He lives in Tacoma, WA, and he works at Joint Base Lewis-McChord. We call it JBLM. Will is a former marine, he is an amputee, and he is a fire inspector at the base. Thanks to sequestration, he is one of 6,700 people in that community who won't be going to work tomorrow because Friday is furlough day at JBLM.

So tomorrow, Friday, in my home State of Washington, the 911 call center and fire departments will be understaffed, air fields will be shuttered except for emergencies, the military personnel office and the substance abuse center will be closed, the Madigan Army Medical Center will be forced to close clinics, and even the wound care clinic is going to be understaffed. All of this is because of the cuts we all agree are hurting our country.

Jennifer-Cari Green is another person who won't be going to work at JBLM tomorrow. Jennifer happens to be a single mother of a 6-year-old boy. She works at the Madigan Army Medical Center in the neurosurgery department. Her job is to care for servicemembers, many of whom are undergoing serious brain operations.

Jennifer was here in Washington, DC, on Tuesday to testify at our Budget Committee hearing about the impacts of sequestration. It is impossible to forget her story. Jennifer works very hard. She started there as a volunteer in the surgery center but has worked her way up. She doesn't make much

money to support herself and her young son, and so she budgets every month right down to the dollar. She has no luxuries, and in her only spare time she cares for her son and works toward an associate degree at the community college.

Jennifer told me that because of these furloughs her take-home pay will be almost exactly \$1,000 a month—\$1,000 a month. That isn't enough for her to pay her most basic expenses. But even with all of the challenges she faces, Jennifer came here to talk about what those cuts will mean for others, for the people she cares for at the army hospital where she works.

Because she has been furloughed—by the way, along with doctors and technicians and other employees at the hospital—servicemembers and veterans aren't going to get the care they need. These furloughs mean that everything from routine checkups to brain surgeries is being delayed for these men and women who served our country. Let me repeat that: brain surgeries at military hospitals are being delayed because of cuts from sequestration. That is unacceptable and, unfortunately, it is very real.

The impacts on our civilian defense employees are just the tip of this iceberg. Sequestration has resulted in dramatic cuts to countless other programs throughout our country. Head Start facilities have been forced to shut their doors, Meals-on-Wheels Programs—vital to our Nation's seniors—are serving less needy seniors, and even our judicial system has been forced to let go of prosecutors and public defenders. The cuts are clear and they are, across the board, impacting so many people in this country in our communities and in our families.

I understand many of us have different opinions here on how to address our Nation's financial challenges, but before we do that, all of us have to understand the devastating impact sequestration has already had on our Nation. I want to remind all my colleagues that it doesn't have to be this way. It doesn't have to be this way. It is now 124 days since the Senate passed a budget that fully replaced the sequestration, and 17 times my colleagues and I have stood here and asked to go to conference with the House to fix these ridiculous cuts. But 17 times now our Republican colleagues have said no. They have refused.

So I am here today absolutely committed to replacing sequestration. If some of my colleagues think this is about politics or this is some kind of game, I would ask them to talk to Will or Jennifer or any of the thousands of families who suddenly today can't pay their bills, because, for them, these cuts are very real and they need a solution now.

I hope other Members of the Senate will come and talk about these cuts.

We can fix this. We can replace sequestration. We can manage our country responsibly. We can be much smarter about what we are doing, but we need the will of the Senate to allow us to go to conference to fix this and move forward and tell Will and Jennifer we, as a country, can work for them.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF DEREK ANTHONY WEST TO BE ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Derek Anthony West, of California, to be Associate Attorney General.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form prior to a vote on the nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate considers President Obama's nomination of Tony West to be the Associate Attorney General, the No. 3 position at the Justice Department. He is a superbly qualified veteran of the Department of Justice who has been serving in this position in an acting capacity for over a year. He had previously been confirmed by the Senate to be the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Division.

Before his work in the Justice Department, Mr. West spent 8 years in private practice in San Francisco, where he was a partner at a well-respected law firm and specialized in complex commercial litigation. He also served as a special assistant attorney general in the California Department of Justice, as an assistant U.S. attorney for the Northern District of California, and as a special assistant to two Deputy Attorneys General at the U.S. Department of Justice. Mr. West earned his B.A. from Harvard, and his J.D. from Stanford University Law School, where he was elected president of the Stanford Law Review.

The Judiciary Committee received dozens of letters in support of Tony West from various individuals and organizations, including the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the

National Association of Attorneys General, the National Sheriff's Association, and Taxpayers Against Fraud. The National Association of Black Law Enforcement Executives wrote that "throughout Mr. West's career, he has proven to be an effective partner to law enforcement. With this experience, we believe him to be well-qualified to serve as Associate Attorney General and look forward to working with him on a broad range of law enforcement and public safety issues. It is our hope that the Senate will confirm Mr. West promptly to serve as the Associate Attorney General of the United States." This endorsement is typical of the many letters sent in support of Mr. West. I ask unanimous consent that a list of all 36 letters of support for Mr. West's nomination be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

I am confident that Tony West is well-qualified to be Associate Attorney General, and I hope he will be confirmed without further delay.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS RECEIVED FOR TONY WEST

May 14, 2013—Esta Soler, President and Founder, Futures Without Violence
 May 14, 2013—Ann Harkins, President and CEO, National Crime Prevention Counsel
 May 14, 2013—William J. Bratton, President and CEO, The Bratton Group LLC
 May 15, 2013—Randy I. Bellows, Circuit Court Judge, Fairfax County
 May 15, 2013—Gregory P. Suhr, Chief of Police, San Francisco
 May 15, 2013—Robert Wolf, CEO, 32 Advisors, LLC
 May 15, 2013—Anthony W. Batts, Police Commissioner, Baltimore Police Department
 May 15, 2013—Charlie Beck, Chief of Police, LAPD
 May 16, 2013—Christine Varney, former AAG (Antitrust)
 May 16, 2013—Aaron D. Kennard, Executive Director, National Sheriff's Association
 May 16, 2013—Richard Parsons, Senior Advisor, Providence Equity
 May 16, 2013—Kim J. Raney, President, California Police Chiefs Association
 May 16, 2013—Scott R. Seaman, Chief of Police, Los Gatos/Monte Sereno Police Department
 May 16, 2013—Jamie S. Gorelick, former DAG
 May 17, 2013—Luis G. Fortuño, Former Governor, Puerto Rico
 May 17, 2013—Alejandro J. Garcia-Padilla, Governor, Puerto Rico
 May 17, 2013—National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives
 May 20, 2013—Jefferson Keel, President, National Congress of American Indians
 May 20, 2013—MARCIA L. FUDGE, Chair, Congressional Black Caucus
 May 20, 2013—David S. Kris, former AAG (National Security)
 May 20, 2013—NAACP
 May 20, 2013—William M. Lansdowne, Chief of Police, San Diego
 May 20, 2013—Bill Lee, former AAG (Civil Rights)
 May 20, 2013—Ken Salazar, former Secretary of the Interior
 May 21, 2013—Mai Fernandez, Executive Director, National Center for Victims of Crime

May 21, 2013—Bernard K. Melekian, former director, DOJ Office of Community Policing Services

May 22, 2013—State Attorneys General

May 22, 2013—Craig T. Steckler, President, International Association of Chiefs of Police

May 22, 2013—Leadership Conference

May 22, 2013—Michael A. Nutter, Mayor of Philadelphia, President of the U.S. Conference of Mayors

May 22, 2013—Mark L. Shurtleff, former Utah Attorney General

May 22, 2013—Catherine W. Sanz, President, WIFLE Foundation, Inc.

May 23, 2013—National Association of Attorneys General

May 23, 2013—Janet Murguia, President and CEO, NCLR

May 28, 2013—Neil Getnick, Chairman, Taxpayers Against Fraud

May 28, 2013—Michael Brune, Executive Director, Sierra Club

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is considering Tony West's nomination to be Associate Attorney General of the United States today. I have a great deal of respect for Tony. As a fellow Californian, I know he will serve the position of Associate Attorney General with distinction.

The role of the Associate Attorney General—the third-highest ranking position at the Department—is to help lead the Justice Department and to oversee the Department's civil units, such as the Civil Division, Antitrust Division, and Tax Division, as well as the Office of Justice Programs, which provides grants, including to State and local law enforcement.

Mr. West's qualifications for this position are unquestionable. He has served as Acting Associate Attorney General since March 2012. He also spent 3 years as Assistant Attorney General of the Civil Division, so he is no stranger to the responsibilities and demands of leadership in the Justice Department.

From 2001 to 2009, Mr. West was a partner at Morrison & Foerster LLP, where he represented major corporations in securities litigation, antitrust cases, and white-collar criminal defense.

From 1994 to 1999, he served as assistant U.S. attorney in the Northern District of California for 5 years. He prosecuted high-tech crimes, bank robberies, fraud schemes, and sexual exploitation offenses.

He received his bachelor's degree from Harvard University and later earned his law degree at Stanford Law School, where he was president of the Stanford Law Review.

Simply put, Tony West brings a great deal of experience in Justice Department leadership, private practice, and criminal prosecution to this position.

I am confident he will do an outstanding job, and I urge my colleagues to support his nomination.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time under the quorum call be divided equally.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THUD APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise to propose and support two amendments to the appropriations bill that is on the floor today and will continue into next week. They both have a common theme, and that theme is to keep faith with the American people; to not put ourselves here in Washington, here in Congress, in a different, higher class than middle-class Americans but to be one of them; to truly represent them; to truly fight for them here in Washington.

The two amendments address this in different ways. One is to block a pay raise that would otherwise happen for Members of Congress even in the midst of this very sluggish economy, barely getting out of the recent recession. There is an automatic pay raise in the law. This was done years ago, really behind closed doors in a bit of a smoke-filled room, to put an automatic pay raise for Members of Congress in the law so that almost every year it just happens automatically. There is no inconvenience of having to propose it, actually having to come to the Senate floor and come to the floor of the House of Representatives and justify it and, God forbid, have to vote for it. It just happens.

I disagree strongly with that system. I think that entire system and premise is offensive. For that reason, Senator CLAIRE McCASKILL of Missouri and I have a bill, a proposal to undo that and require that any future pay raise has to be proposed, justified on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House, and actually voted on. This amendment is not that entire bill. This amendment is focused on the here and now, to block the automatic pay raise that would happen this year if we do not act.

You will hear from members of the committee, handlers of this appropriations bill, that this amendment is not relevant, is not germane to this bill. The folks who set up the automatic pay raise system several years ago were very clever. They figured out a way that an amendment such as this would not be germane to any appropriations bill, would not be germane to any bill. That is why we need to act on this bill—because this may be one of

the few appropriations bills, spending bills we actually deal with on the floor of the Senate this year.

To the credit of Congress, in the midst of the recent recession Congress denied itself these automatic pay raises, so they have not happened since 2009. But we are not into healthy growth. The American middle class is not doing just fine. Unemployment is still over 7.5 percent—7.6 percent, which is well above the 5 percent promised when Congress and President Obama passed a \$1 trillion stimulus. In fact, we have had 53 straight months with unemployment above 7.5 percent. That is not a healthy economy. That is not recovery.

As Americans continue to suffer, continue to look for work, continue to look for full-time work as part-time becomes more the norm, particularly in the era of ObamaCare, we need to relate to them and not set ourselves apart. We need to be a fighter for them, not a member of a higher, different class in Washington. One simple but important way to do that is to say no pay raise when we are in the midst of this very sluggish nonrecovery.

Again, Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL of Missouri has joined me in this effort. I appreciate her partnership on the broader bill, and I appreciate her partnership on this amendment, the Vitter amendment No. 1746. I urge all my colleagues, Democrats as well as Republicans, to adopt and support this commonsense amendment.

This is an important message. This is an important statement. The question and the choice is simple: Are you going to be a true representative of the folks back home, relate to them, be one of them, or did you really come to Washington to put yourself in a different, higher class? The answer needs to be the first answer provided. We need to represent the folks back home, not put ourselves in a different, higher class. This pay raise amendment is one way to do that. Say no to any congressional pay raise in the midst of this horribly slow economy.

My second amendment also continues this theme. It relates to our health care benefits, but it is really the same issue, the same theme. Are we one with the folks we were elected to represent or are we trying to set ourselves out as a different, higher class here in Washington?

This amendment is Vitter amendment No. 1748. It would ensure that all Members of Congress, all congressional staff, and all executive appointees deal with ObamaCare in the same way ordinary Americans do. They have to go in the exchange; they have to deal with their health care that way. They do not get special treatment.

In the midst of the ObamaCare debate, that issue came up. I brought up the issue. I brought an amendment to the floor. My Louisiana colleague JOHN

FLEMING did the same thing in the House. Because of the attention we focused on that issue, there was a limited provision in the law that said Members of Congress and their direct staffs would be in the exchanges. However, very conveniently, some of the details were jiggered around so that Members of the leadership and their staffs and committee staffs would somehow be in a different, higher category and they would not be subject to the same ObamaCare rules. They would benefit from the very generous and very lucrative Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan that Congress has traditionally been under.

I think we should undo that. I think we should be one of the American people, relate to the American people, and get the same treatment through the exchanges that the great majority of them will get under ObamaCare. The problem is that here on Capitol Hill, again behind closed doors, the effort is largely in the opposite direction.

The Wall Street Journal unveiled this on April 25 of this year. It reported that Senator REID and Congressman STENY HOYER had initiated some behind-closed-doors secret discussions to actually fix the problem, as they saw it, and put all Members of Congress and all of our staffs back in that select category—not with the American people, not in the exchanges, but in that select higher category and be granted preferential treatment. Because that hit the press, because that word got out, I am hopeful that those secret negotiations have stopped. We need to make sure we do not move in that direction.

ObamaCare is a train wreck. Implementation is causing dramatic problems for millions upon millions of Americans. But the solution is not to fix it selectively for us; the solution is to fix it for everybody, to fix it for average middle-class Americans. If we do that we would benefit as well.

So this amendment not only blocks the effort by Senator REID and STENY HOYER and others to move Members of Congress and our staffs back into a select category and protect us from the train wreck of ObamaCare implementation, the solution is to broaden that pool and actually have that same treatment, along with ordinary Americans, for every Member of Congress, for all of our staffs, for leadership, for committee staffs, and also for President Obama's appointees.

My amendment, Vitter amendment No. 1748, on which DEAN HELLER is a cosponsor, would do just that. It would ensure that all bureaucrats, all Obama appointees, all congressional staff, all Members, leadership and otherwise, all of our staffs, committee and otherwise, are subject to ObamaCare and are not put into a select higher class and offered preferential treatment—again, the common theme with my other amendment. That is how we relate to

the folks we represent. That is how we are truly one of them.

ObamaCare is a problem. Implementation is a train wreck. But the solution is not to put ourselves in a higher class, divorced from that problem; the solution is to live that problem ourselves, and hopefully that will promote us and motivate us to solve that problem for all of the American people.

This is not a partisan amendment. This should not be a partisan fight. This is about are we truly part of the States we represent? Do we truly relate to those citizens who sent us to Washington or do we come here and put ourselves in a select, different class, give ourselves preferential treatment under law, after law, after law—in this case, ObamaCare?

Again, this is Vitter amendment No. 1748. I urge all my colleagues—Republicans, Democrats, Independents, everyone—to support it, to tell your constituents: No, I did not come here to put myself in a special class. I did not come here to get preferential treatment. I came here to fight for you.

And, yes, ObamaCare has major issues, major problems. Implementation is, as one of my Democratic colleagues has forthrightly said, a train wreck. But the solution is not to fix it behind closed doors selectively for us; the solution is to fix it—which personally I think means delay or repeal it—for the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, am I in order to speak about the nomination of Tony West?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is in order.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, today the Senate will vote on the nomination of Tony West to be Associate Attorney General. Although I will be supporting Mr. West's nomination, I have some concerns about his record that I want to share with my colleagues.

This is a very important position. The Associate Attorney General is the third highest ranking official within the Department of Justice. Mr. West is currently serving as Acting Associate Attorney General, and as far as I can tell he has generally done a pretty good job. However, before serving as Acting Associate Attorney General, Mr. West was confirmed as Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Division. My concerns are with his record while serving in that position.

Specifically, while heading the Civil Division, Mr. West was involved in and even defended the quid pro quo deal between the Department of Justice and the City of St. Paul, MN. That scheme was orchestrated by Tom Perez, who headed the Civil Rights Division and was recently confirmed by the Senate to be Labor Secretary.

My colleagues have heard me on the floor of this body many times talking about this quid pro quo, most often emphasizing Tom Perez's involvement with it, but not too much about Mr. West.

The quid pro quo involved the Department agreeing to decline two False Claims cases pending against the City of St. Paul. Remember, if successful, those two False Claims cases were estimated—and they were pretty good cases—to bring \$200 million back into the Federal Treasury. In exchange, the City of St. Paul would agree to drop a case pending before the Supreme Court.

As I have said, I have spoken at length on the St. Paul quid pro quo as it relates to the nomination of Mr. Perez to be Secretary of Labor.

As my colleagues know, I have been a major supporter of whistleblowers and their protection under the laws of this country. Whistleblowers are a very important source of information in helping us if laws are not being abided by or money is being misspent. Of course, that is why I authored the 1986 amendments to the False Claims Act. It was to protect whistleblowers, but it also gives a resource for getting money back into the Federal Treasury if it is misspent.

Those amendments—meaning the False Claims Act amendments—revitalized the law by empowering individual qui tam whistleblowers to come forward and file suits on behalf of the Federal Government to recover taxpayer dollars lost to fraud. Since those amendments were enacted, over \$40 billion has been recovered.

Under Mr. West's tenure as head of the Civil Division, that Department has been successfully utilizing the tools of qui tam whistleblowers' information. Of course, they are not shy about saying so, and as far as I am concerned it is their right to do that. The more publicity we can have about recovering money under the False Claims Act, the more we may encourage more whistleblowers to come forth and recover even more money.

The False Claims Act is within the purview of the Civil Division, which Mr. West oversaw at that time, not the Civil Rights Division. However, in the quid pro quo, the evidence uncovered by my investigation suggests that Mr. West allowed Tom Perez to take control of the Civil Division in order to cut this deal that saved Mr. Perez's favored legal theory referred to as the "disparate impact" theory. As I have discussed previously, Mr. Perez was

concerned the Supreme Court was going to strike down this theory as unconstitutional.

In doing so, the Department undercut a viable case against St. Paul and, in the process, left the whistleblower who filed the suit to fight the City on behalf of the American taxpayers all alone—left him out there twisting in the wind.

This is not how I expect the Department to treat good-faith whistleblowers. They are patriotic people. They are people who probably destroyed their opportunity of livelihood because they know something is wrong and they want to report it, just as patriotic people ought to do. In fact, I believe it is contrary to the assurances Mr. West gave me during his confirmation hearing in 2009 when he indicated he would protect whistleblowers and vigorously enforce the False Claims Act.

Let everybody understand there is not a single individual subject to Senate confirmation in the Justice Department who comes before the committee or to my office for an interview that I don't ask them their view of the False Claims Act, because I don't want anyone serving in the Justice Department who doesn't support vigorous enforcement and use of the False Claims Act.

As I have said, ultimately Mr. Perez was the architect of this ill-advised quid pro quo that left Frederick Newell, a good-faith whistleblower, hanging out there to dry. In my view, Mr. Perez bears the most responsibility in this whole matter. He was the one who was manipulating the process and he did so at times behind the back of Mr. West.

Nonetheless, Mr. West was the individual in charge of the Civil Division, and as head of that division the decision regarding whether to join those False Claims cases fell to Mr. West.

It is troubling to me that Mr. Perez, who at the time was head of the Civil Rights Division, would be the one who was so clearly orchestrating the deal, and acting as de facto head of the Civil Division. Unfortunately, Mr. West let him get away with it. So that concerns me as it relates to the nomination of Mr. West to be the third highest ranking official at the Department of Justice.

We need individuals serving in these positions who are willing to stand up to those who are trying to advance a political agenda; and that is exactly what Mr. Perez was trying to advance. In this instance, at least, it doesn't appear that Mr. West stood up to Mr. Perez as he should have.

On the contrary, the record appears to indicate Mr. West allowed Mr. Perez to orchestrate this deal on behalf of the Civil Division even though Mr. Perez was head of the Civil Rights Division.

However, notwithstanding these concerns, I am willing to give Mr. West the

benefit of the doubt and vote for his nomination. Part of the reason I am willing to do so is because the Civil Division, under the leadership of Mr. West, has established a respectable record in utilizing the tools available under the False Claims Act amendments that I got passed in 1986 and that have brought back into the Treasury approximately \$40 billion.

And, as an instance of the use of the False Claims Act by Mr. West, the Civil Division secured approximately \$4.9 billion coming back into the Federal Treasury in the single year of 2012. Taken together over the last several years, the Civil Division has secured a total of approximately \$13.3 billion.

Obviously, this is not an insignificant amount of taxpayer dollars coming back. Although the Department's recovery of this money, on the one hand, does not excuse their behavior in the quid pro quo matter, I do believe Mr. West deserves a certain degree of credit for his leadership in this area.

So, as I said, I will support his nomination, and I expect he will be confirmed. It is my sincere hope he will perform his job well and not let somebody undercut him as he let Mr. Perez undercut him in regard to the quid pro quo and the False Claims cases involving St. Paul, MN. But I want him to know, and everybody else to know, that I plan to conduct aggressive oversight of the Department to ensure the mistakes that occurred as part of the quid pro quo that potentially cost the taxpayers nearly \$200 million lost to fraud are not repeated.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TESTER. I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Derek Anthony West, of California, to be Associate Attorney General?

Mr. TESTER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 186 Ex.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson
Baucus	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Harkin	Portman
Bennet	Hatch	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reid
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Boxer	Hirono	Roberts
Brown	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Cantwell	Isakson	Sanders
Cardin	Johanns	Schatz
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Chambliss	Kaine	Sessions
Chiesa	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Cochran	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Landrieu	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Thune
Corker	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	Levin	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cruz	Markey	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskey	Warren
Enzi	McConnell	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Fischer	Merkley	Wyden
Flake	Mikulski	

NAYS—1

Coburn

NOT VOTING—1

Moran

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1243 which the clerk will report by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1243) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Murray (for Cardin) amendment No. 1760, to require the Secretary of Transportation to submit to Congress a report relating to the condition of lane miles and highway bridge deck.

Coburn amendment No. 1750, to prohibit funds from being directed to federal employees with unpaid Federal tax liability.

Coburn amendment No. 1751, to prohibit Federal funding of union activities by Federal employees.

Coburn amendment No. 1754, to prohibit Federal funds from being used to meet the matching requirements of other Federal programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 1760, AS MODIFIED

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I call for the regular order with respect to Amendment No. 1760 and to modify it with the changes which are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 1760), as modified, is as follows:

On page 38, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 127. Funding made available under the heading "FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES" shall be made available to submit to Congress a report describing the percentages of lane miles and highway bridge deck in each State that are in good condition, fair condition, and poor condition, and the percentage of Federal amounts each State expends on the repair and maintenance of highway infrastructure and on new capacity construction.

Mrs. MURRAY. I understand my colleague is here to offer an amendment. I yield to him at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 1783.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Objection is heard.

Mrs. MURRAY. It is my understanding the Senator from Connecticut was going to call up an amendment. There was an objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1783

Mr. MURPHY. I call up amendment No. 1783 and ask that it be pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MURPHY] proposes an amendment numbered 1783.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Transportation to assess the impact on domestic employment of a waiver of the Buy America requirement for Federal-aid highway projects prior to issuing the waiver)

On page 34, line 23, after "shall" insert "assess the impact on domestic employment if such a waiver were issued and".

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, there is a broad consensus among the people of this country that when we spend dollars through the Federal Treasury, when we spend taxpayer dollars, they should be used to fund American jobs. In fact, that has been a law on the books since the early part of this century. For a long time the Buy American Act has required that when we buy things, whether it be through the military or through the Department of Transportation, we buy things from American contractors. That makes more sense today than ever before because as we struggle to try to get our economy back up and running, one of the sectors that is hurting more than others is the construction sector. Every time we violate the Buy American provisions of our law, we lose the opportunity to try to alleviate great stress that is currently upon our construction industry.

Thankfully, the DOT has been one of the best agencies, actually, when it comes to making sure American-made material goes into construction projects. The \$41 billion the Highway Administration receives in this bill to be spent on roads and bridges is an important engine of job growth throughout the country. I have to say they generally do a pretty good job, as opposed to some other agencies—the Department of Defense at the top of the list—in making sure those dollars go to American companies.

There are circumstances in which the Buy American provisions are waived. There are a number of ways you can waive those provisions, but it is important for us to have full transparency and disclosure when the Department of Transportation and FHWA are considering awarding a major project funded by American taxpayers to a foreign company.

When the Buy American statute is waived, the requirement that American-made material be used is null and void. What this bill says is that when the FHWA provides public notice that they are considering waiving the Buy American clause for a particular project, they include in that public notice a consideration of the impact on American jobs. It is worth knowing whether a waiver is simply going to result in the loss of 10 American jobs or the loss of 500 American jobs.

This amendment very simply says that when a waiver to the Buy American law is pending, we should know from the Department of Transportation and from the FHWA how many American jobs are at risk. That gives us the opportunity to weigh in and try

to make sure that waiver is not granted. This, frankly, gives American companies a little bit better information to use when they are trying to make the case that they can actually do the work that may be being considered for a foreign company.

We all know what is happening to jobs in the building trades. In some parts of the country unemployment is hitting 20 percent when it comes to carpenters, operating engineers, plumbers, and sheet metal workers.

I wish to applaud the DOT for being one of the models when it comes to trying to make sure taxpayer dollars are kept here at home. This amendment would make sure that in those limited cases where the DOT is sending work overseas, we get a chance to understand what the real impact will be.

We have a lot of work to do when it comes to tightening our Buy American laws. We are talking about the DOT, but the real problem is another agency we will hopefully have a chance to talk about later on the Senate floor; that is, the Department of Defense. Seventy percent of Federal purchasing comes through the Department of Defense. They have been expediting the offshoring of defense work at a rate that should make every single Senator on this floor shudder.

This is an important amendment that I hope will get bipartisan support. I thank Senator COLLINS for allowing it to become pending on the floor. I think it is just the beginning of a lot of work we have to do when it comes to enforcing a very simple principle. When our constituents send their hard-earned tax dollars to Washington, DC, and they are used to buy things or build things for the U.S. Government, we need to hire U.S. companies and American workers to do the job.

I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for debate only until 2:15 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to voice my concerns with the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

I do not take issue with the bill's specific spending provisions, and I believe my home State of Georgia needs a strong bill that recognizes the importance of ongoing infrastructure and housing and development projects. As

some of my colleagues have already noted, this bill includes many taxpayer protection provisions, specifically that extravagant conferences will be curtailed, an issue many of our constituents as well as Members of Congress were shocked to learn about. But my concern is with the overall spending level and the decision of the majority to write this and other appropriations bills to levels that exceed the Budget Control Act.

In 2011, Congress passed the Budget Control Act which placed caps on what the Federal Government could spend. I voted against that bill in August of 2011. Over the years I have served in both the House and the Senate and there have been too many times when I have seen both bodies come together to bust spending caps. For us to have no checks and balances on the ability of either the House or the Senate to bust the spending caps that were set in 2011, I thought, was wrong because they were going to get busted. Well, guess what. Here we are, and this is not the first time since 2011 we have had a vote in the Senate that will ultimately bust those spending caps.

The THUD appropriations bill the Senate is now debating completely disregards the 2011 Budget Control Act. THUD is the first of 12 appropriations bills the Senate will consider on the Senate floor. So my question to my colleagues is, What kind of precedent are we setting for the remaining spending bills?

While all Americans deserve for Congress to pass appropriations bills, we simply cannot afford to pass bills that spend more than our government can fund. This Senate bill alone costs \$5 billion more than is allowed under the Budget Control Act. How can we demand a cure to our fiscal woes if we cannot take our own medicine of fiscal restraint? We should focus our efforts on legislation that can pass both Chambers of Congress and be signed into law by the President, not create another political nightmare that negatively affects the country as well as our constituencies.

Right now, the Senate can correct this mistake and allocate spending in a manner that is consistent with the law we passed. Shortly, my colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator PAT TOOMEY, will come to the floor and offer a motion that would require the Appropriations Committee to change the spending levels of this bill to comply with the Budget Control Act or, in other words, to comply with current law. I urge my colleagues to follow Senator TOOMEY's lead and vote to recommit.

We should work toward a bill that adheres to the budget guidelines set by the Budget Control Act and provides the needed appropriations for the Department of Transportation, Department of Housing and Urban Development, as well as the independent agen-

cies. While I would like to see the Senate pass a Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill, the bill before us now does more harm than it does good.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEQUESTRATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the very real effects sequestration is having. I want to speak about the people of Virginia, but I am sure it is equally true of folks in New Mexico and for that matter folks all across the country. I remind folks, sequestration was set up so it would be so stupid, so draconian, so outside the realm of possibility that no rational people would ever let it happen. We are actually seeing now that we did not pass that bar. Sequestration is happening. It is actually stupidity on steroids.

Earlier this week a group of us heard from Dr. Francis Collins, the head of NIH. NIH, as we all know, is America's premier health research institution. Dr. Collins told us of the real world impacts of sequester cuts. He gave heart-breaking examples of lifesaving medical research that is being disrupted, perhaps irrevocably, due to budget cuts and employee furloughs.

Two days ago I had the opportunity to chair a Budget Committee hearing about the impact of sequestration on our Nation's security. We heard policymakers talk about what sequestration was doing to military readiness. But what drove home the point to me was Virginia business owner Mark Klett who had actually been named as the Small Businessman of the Year back in 2011, who said this start-and-stop environment, where you did not have any predictability of whether your funding was coming through, was completely wrecking his business model and it already had caused him to bench over a third of his 60 employees.

In the last 2 weeks alone, since sequestration has started, I have received over 500 letters, e-mails, phone calls from Virginians who are bearing the very real brunt of our failure to do our job, with real consequences on real people with potentially devastating impacts on a dedicated, experienced Federal workforce. This is no way to run a business. It is no way to run an enterprise as large as the Federal Government.

One letter is from Virginia Beach. Hampton Roads and Virginia Beach are

our most concentrated area of naval installations and Air Force and Army installations. This woman is from Virginia beach. Her husband is a retired Navy officer who is now furloughed once a week for the next 11 weeks. She writes that her husband came home with a letter about the furlough, that he felt his moral character and the oath he had taken to protect his Nation would not allow him to write, so she said she was going to write. She says:

It pains me to see what he has worked so hard to defend, you're working so hard to tear down. This country is deserving of good leadership and right now Congress is not providing it.

Another Navy employee from the Fredericksburg area writes:

Three years of pay freezes followed by a furlough seriously makes me question if this is where I want to spend the rest of my career.

Think about the hours and dollars that we as a public have invested in getting these individuals trained to provide these services. They are now saying they are not sure this is where they want to work.

A woman down at the Portsmouth Naval Hospital writes:

Both my husband and I are DOD employees and will be taking a 20 percent pay cut for 11 weeks.

She points out they may be able to get by but a lot of her coworkers do not know how they are going to make ends meet.

A Federal employee from Woodbridge, VA, down the road in Prince William County, says:

I want all my elected officials to know how disappointed I am that we have been abandoned and let down by our representatives in Congress.

I have three children in college, and I am paying for college loans of two children who have graduated. Eleven furlough days don't sound like much, but over the year a loss of over \$4,000 in income is crucial. If I ran my own budget like this, I would have to fire myself.

This employee I do not think is going to get a sequestration discount on repaying those student loans.

A West Point graduate and Iraq war veteran says:

The failure of Congress is having a tangible and real negative impact on people's lives and livelihood. I do not see leadership, I do not see accountability, and I do not see selfless service that rises above partisan politics.

Finally, a former Army officer who lives in Springfield, VA, says:

The morale in our agency is so poor that most workers who used to work 10 or 11 hours a day are planning to work their exact 8 hours [only].

So the 20 percent cut 1 day a week is actually cutting productivity in a much greater percentage.

I could stand here the rest of the afternoon and go through letter after letter that has the same theme. What

strikes me about these letters—I am sure, again, the Presiding Officer is hearing from New Mexicans what we are hearing from Virginians—is that none of these letters talk about the red team or the blue team. None of these letters say this is all the Democrats' fault or Republicans' fault. None of these letters say this is a House problem; the Senate has the solution.

They are saying, regardless of party, regardless of whether you are in the House or the Senate, your job is to get this fixed. It is appropriately targeted at the entire Congress and, while our dismal performance recently may be great fodder for late night comedians, I think having a 90-percent-plus disapproval rating candidly undermines Americans' basic faith in our democratic institutions.

Let me try to respond. Here is what I have done and will continue to do. I will keep fighting for the significant Federal workforce that lives in the Commonwealth of Virginia. In the 4½ years I have been in the Senate, I have come down to the floor on a regular basis to celebrate the great work of individual Federal employees. I will continue to come down to the floor and appeal to my colleagues and provide real examples of the real impacts that this funny name—sequestration—is actually having on people's livelihoods.

On a personal basis I am giving up 20 percent of my salary through the end of this budget year. I am donating it to the Federal Employee Education & Assistance Fund, which provides emergency loans as well as childcare assistance, scholarships, and other financial help for the families of Federal and postal workers.

I will continue to work with any colleague, Democrat, Republican, Independent, libertarian, vegetarian—it doesn't matter—who is willing to try to, yes, replace sequestration in a more rational way and get our debt and deficit under control.

I am proud of the fact that the 3½ years—I guess 4½ years I have been here, there is no issue on which I have tried to work harder. I am proud of the fact I was one of the founders of the so-called Gang of 6 that built on the very good work of the Simpson-Bowles plan. And I remind my colleagues, anyone who thinks there is any solution that is not going to involve raising additional revenues and starting to reform our entitlement programs either can't read a balance sheet or has not grasped the magnitude of this issue.

I will continue to advocate for a balanced bipartisan blueprint that will work on these issues: Raise the revenues, not to grow the size of government but to pay our bills, make sure the promise of Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security are here, not just for today's generation but for future generations, in a way that is responsible.

We are soon coming up on another series of important fiscal and budgetary deadlines. I know many of my colleagues and the American public probably got to budget fatigue after the end of the fiscal cliffs and supercommittees and debt ceilings and thought maybe we were past a little bit of that.

Well, the economy is recovering and the size of the deficit is decreasing but our challenge is still in front of us. We are soon set to come to the end of this fiscal year which will present these issues again at the end of September. The debt ceiling will be not far after that. I have heard there are only slightly more than 20 legislative days left before the new fiscal year starts. It is incumbent upon us to recognize, to reflect the voices of these Virginians who, again, don't call out red team, blue team or House or Senate, but say to us in Congress, implore us to do our jobs.

We have been joined by my colleague, the Senator from Maryland. I think we could debate whether Maryland or Virginia is more ground zero for the negative impacts of sequestration. But whether it is NIH workers in Bethesda or civilian Navy employees in Woodbridge, the stories are the same. This is not fair. It is not right. None of these folks are getting a 20-percent discount on daycare, rent or, as the one person said, repayment on their student loans.

It is incumbent upon us to get this problem fixed and that is going to require the kind of hard work on revenues and entitlement reform so many of us have tried to avoid; otherwise we will not see an America that will stay as competitive as it needs to be and we will disrespect the literally hundreds of thousands if not millions of workers who work directly or indirectly to protect our Nation and are trying to provide the services that are so essential to our people.

Let's not do any more harm. Let's not waste any more time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I have not been on the floor during the entire remarks of my friend from Virginia, but I did hear part of it. I first want to thank him for his extraordinary leadership on behalf of the people of Virginia and on behalf of a sensible way to resolve our budget problems. The Senator has been a leader in building bridges and recognizing how devastating sequestration is, not just to the Federal workers who live in his State, not just to the people who live in his State, but to our entire country.

This is dangerous, sequestration. The Senator has been a leader in pointing that out.

He has also made it very clear that sequestration is mindless across-the-board cuts and that we have a responsibility to make priority decisions. When

we use sequestration we are on automatic pilot but it is an automatic pilot that cannot carry out its current mission. It cannot safely navigate the air. That is where we are.

I applaud my colleague for taking on this issue of saying to our friends on both sides of the aisle: Let's listen to each other. We know we are divided. We have different views. But we need to sit down, work together, and come up with a sensible way to balance the Federal budget to give the predictability that is necessary and to eliminate these sequestration cuts.

It is particularly painful right now when we have so many Marylanders, so many Virginians, so many people in this country who are receiving paychecks with a 20-percent cut. Yet the work they have to do is the same.

Mr. WARNER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CARDIN. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his comments. Let me say no Senator has served with more distinction, both here in the Senate and prior to that in the House, in being a constant advocate for Federal employees and being willing to step up to protect them and rebut what we too often hear from some of our colleagues who, across the board, without distinction, demean and denigrate the extraordinary good work that so many countless unnamed Federal employees do.

I thank the Senator from Maryland for that work. I thank him for his continued willingness in conversations with me and others to talk about: Hey, we all have to stretch a little way to get things done. I know he is hearing the same thing in Maryland. People are not distinguishing red shirt, blue shirt. They want us to get this done. I thank the Senator for his good work and I look forward to working with him and folks on both sides of the aisle on this issue.

Mr. CARDIN. I thank my colleague for his comments. I understand he already mentioned what has happened at the National Institutes of Health and the fact that, because of the sequestration cuts, the number of grants being given out this year, contracts with young scientists to do research, is going to be cut by the hundreds.

We don't know which one of these researchers would have come up with an advancement, a major breakthrough, but there would have been some. And they are going to be denied. They may get discouraged, the people who would have received these grants, and they may go into other fields. We may lose them forever. They may go to other professions. They may go to other countries. But we know they are not doing the work they are trained to do and we know they had a proposal that went through the most difficult vetting process and was selected for funding

and should have been funded but is not being funded because of these sequestration cuts. That we know. That much we know for sure.

We also know it is not just that researcher who has been hurt by the sequestration cuts. It is the businesses that depend upon the basic research—many of which are small companies—in order to build upon that research to create the products that go into the marketplace and create the jobs that are necessary for our economy. There is a direct loss to the economy of our country as a result of these sequestration cuts. It is time we move forward and resolve the problems of our country.

I agree with my friend from Virginia that we have to find a way on both sides of the aisle to come together, but I must point out it has been extremely difficult, particularly with the climate in the other body. In the current issue of New York magazine, Jonathan Chait writes:

The chaos and dysfunction have set in so deeply that Washington now lurches from crisis to crisis, and once-dull, keep-the-lights-on rituals of government procedures are transformed into white-knuckle dramas that threaten national or even global catastrophe.

The Republican party has spent 30 years careering ever more deeply into ideological extremism, but one of the novel developments of the Obama years is its embrace of procedural extremism. The Republican fringe has evolved from being politically shrewd proponents of radical policy changes to a gang of saboteurs who would rather stop government from functioning at all.

This brinkmanship is preventing the economic recovery from gaining steam, it is preventing us from addressing urgent problems, and it is punishing all Americans, not just Federal workers.

If we come together on behalf of the American people, we can replace sequestration with a measured and balanced approach to deficit reduction. We can agree on a path forward to fiscal solvency that spreads the burden equitably. We can begin to solve our problems instead of compounding them, but I will tell you what we cannot do. We cannot balance the budget on the backs of Federal workers. It isn't feasible, and it isn't fair.

Increasingly, Federal workers are asked to do more with less. According to the Office of Management and Budget, the size of the civilian workforce relative to the country's population has declined dramatically over the last several decades, notwithstanding occasional upticks due to military conflicts or the taking of the census.

In the 1950s and 1960s, there were, on average, 92 Americans for every Federal worker. In the 1980s and 1990s, there were 106 Americans for every Federal worker. By 2011, the ratio had increased to 145 Americans for every Federal worker. Since the 1950s and 1960s, the U.S. population has increased

by 76 percent, and the private sector workforce has risen by 133 percent, but the size of the Federal workforce has risen by just 11 percent.

Relative to the private sector, the Federal workforce is less than half the size it was back in the 1950s and 1960s. The picture that emerges is one of a Federal civilian workforce whose size has significantly shrunk compared to the size of the U.S. population it serves, the private sector workforce, and the magnitude of Federal expenditures.

I previously talked about the adverse effect of sequestration on many of our domestic agencies. I have talked a little bit today about the circumstances at NIH. I have talked about the Food and Drug Administration, the Social Security Administration, and other domestic Federal agencies.

I will focus, if I might, for the next few minutes on the impacts of sequestration on a particular group of Federal workers: the Department of Defense civilian employees who are part of a Total Force team providing invaluable support to our men and women in uniform serving in harm's way. These proud individuals have in the past few weeks suffered unnecessary hardships due to sequestration.

The primary priority of our government is the defense of our Nation and sequestration adversely affects the civilian men and women who help provide that defense. DOD civilians serve our Nation by advancing scientific research, providing logistical support to our servicemembers while forward deployed, and ensuring institutional stability within DOD offices as servicemembers rotate to different duty stations.

Recently, some in the media have promoted the idea that the \$85 billion sequestration cut triggered on March 1 isn't causing drastic effects. CNN called the cuts "not as bad as advertised," and the Washington Post reported that the cuts are less "scary" than predicted. Tell that to the 46,000 DOD employees in Maryland and another 103,000 in the Capital region who are being furloughed, losing up to 20 percent of their weekly pay through the rest of this fiscal year.

Earlier this month, the Defense Department began furloughing 652,000 civilian employees nationwide, forcing them to take up to 11 unpaid days off through September. This is in addition to the furloughs at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Internal Revenue Service. These furloughs disrupt our national and economic security and put hundreds of thousands of Federal workers and their families in financial hardship. Our government cannot continue to provide for the defense of our Nation by maintaining such a harmful policy toward our civilian workers.

I have visited installations throughout Maryland. I have heard about and have seen the impact of furloughs of Defense Department employees and other Federal employees and the impact it will have on their ability to carry out their mission. These cuts and furloughs are affecting the ability of the agency to carry out its legal mission.

For instance, at Indian Head Naval Surface Warfare Center in Charles County, over 1,870 civilian employees—about 97 percent of the total government civilian workforce—are being forced to take leave without pay 1 day per week. It puts base police and fire protection, safety programs, air operations, air quality programs, and facilities at risk.

At Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, furloughs will hit 2,400 Defense Department civilians—94 percent of the civilian staff. Walter Reed is the country's top facility for wounded combat soldiers. Its Department of Orthopedics and Rehabilitation is the largest within the Department of Defense. Its seven specialty service clinics include one for traumatic brain injuries. Soldiers needing expert care might have to wait longer for appointments or be forced to nonmilitary facilities, both of which will drive up costs and compromise the quality of care.

I cannot say how many of us have taken the floor to talk about our commitment to make sure our service people—our wounded warriors—get the type of treatment they deserve. Many of us have visited the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, and we are proud of the services that are being provided. Sequestration is hurting our ability to meet the mission we promised to the heroes who have served our Nation and have now come home and expect that health care to be available to them.

At Fort Detrick 4,900 Defense Department civilians will be furloughed. Those civilians support a multigovernment community that conducts biomedical research and development as well as medical material management that includes everything from advanced bandages to vaccines for soldiers on the battlefield and in military hospitals. That mission is at risk. There is no other place that can carry out the type of advanced lab work that is done at Fort Detrick.

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Harford County's largest employer, home to 11 major commands and more than 80 agencies, has approximately 11,500 DOD civilian employees subject to furlough, which is about half of APG's workforce. Before sequestration, APG reported contributing more than \$400 million in payroll and \$500 million in contracts annually. I can assure everyone that community will be affected and many businesses will be affected, as well as the mission at APG itself.

Just a few miles away at Fort Meade, Maryland's largest employer, sequestration is affecting the entire region. Most of its 27,000 DOD civilian employees face furloughs. These furloughs have all sorts of unintended consequences. A furloughed worker, for instance, may have trouble making his or her mortgage or car payments. Reduced credit worthiness may affect a worker's ability to maintain or obtain a security clearance. Is that how we want to treat people who have helped defend us from terrorists?

Budgets cuts compounded by sequestration will lead to brain drain in the Defense Department, with some of the best and the brightest defense professionals in the Federal Government deciding to seek opportunities elsewhere.

The Federal workforce is better educated, older, and more experienced, on average, than its private sector counterparts. A significant number of Federal workers provide their services to the American people at a discount. They could command higher salaries in the private sector, but they choose to work for the Federal Government because they are patriots and they believe in public service.

The world is still a dangerous place. In such uncertain times, we cannot afford to let political dysfunction get in the way of ensuring our national security. Sequestration is harming our national security readiness.

Sequestration is not just about compromising the ability of Federal workers to carry out their critical missions on behalf of all Americans, and it isn't just hurting Federal workers and their families economically. Private sector businesses and communities across the country are being hurt by the reduced purchasing power of furloughed Federal workers.

Federal workers are similar to everyone else; they support the local businesses in their communities: auto dealers, restaurants, dry cleaners, you name it. They all suffer when Federal employees suffer. The local economy suffers and the recovery becomes that much harder and slower.

We need to stop demonizing and scapegoating and punishing Federal workers. We need to replace sequestration with a rational budget. One of the greatest attributes of the American character is pragmatism. Unlike what some other Federal employees are actually doing, in Congress, balancing a budget is not rocket science. We know the various options.

Former President Lyndon Johnson was fond of quoting the prophet Isaiah: "Come, let us reason together." That is what we need to do. We can acknowledge and respect our differences, but at the end of the day the American people have entrusted us with governing and with being pragmatic. Let us do our job so Federal workers can get back to doing their jobs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Arizona wishes to address the Chamber about an upcoming motion to recommit the bill.

I yield time to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, this is the first appropriations bill we are considering for fiscal year 2014. Unfortunately, in my view, it gets us off on the wrong foot because of the spending level. The bill spends more than \$54 billion, which is about \$5 billion above last year's spending level and more than \$10 billion over the House proposal for this coming fiscal year. Considering that our debt stands at over \$17 trillion, we ought to be spending less, not more this year.

This bill already takes a larger portion of the allowable spending compared to last year. People will point out that the budget agreement we agreed to in 2011 simply sets an aggregate number and that we can spend whatever we want in certain appropriations bills as long as the total doesn't go over \$967 billion. That is true, but it is impossible.

I can say that with experience in the House and now in the Senate; that if we overspend on the initial appropriations bills, we will somehow cut back in the bills that come later. Often the last bill to come up is the Defense bill. Nobody is going to undercut our troops or spend less on a defense bill, but that would be required if we were to stay under the budget control agreement number. When we overspend on the initial appropriations bills like this, it simply means one thing: that we are going to bust the budget.

I can tell my colleagues, to have any credibility with the taxpayers, we have to stick to the agreement that was agreed to in 2011. We passed so far. We even went through the sequester because we couldn't come up with an agreement to prioritize spending. But now, to go over the spending limit on the first appropriations bill would not set the right precedent moving ahead into the appropriations bills. We simply have to deal with this debt and deficit. This isn't the way to go.

That is why I support the upcoming motion to recommit that Senator TOOMEY will offer in a few minutes that will simply recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee and say: Come back with something that fits within the Budget Control Act that is similar to what was spent last year, not overspending by \$5 billion. I hope we will pass this motion to recommit. I hope it will start off the appropriations bills in the Senate on the right foot.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. I yield 5 minutes to Senator HOEVEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I wish to thank the Senator from Maine, as well as Senator TOOMEY from Pennsylvania. I wish to express comments in regard to the motion to recommit we will be voting on around 3 o'clock.

THUD is an important bill. It includes funding for things we consider absolute priorities, including, certainly, transportation, roads, bridges, funds for housing and for other purposes. So we very much want to fund the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill.

The problem we have is we haven't agreed, as far as the appropriations bills, as to an overall total of how much we will spend. That is really the problem we are confronting with this legislation.

Under the Budget Control Act, the total for all of the appropriations bills cannot exceed \$967 billion. That is the law. That is the law. But the majority party is appropriating to \$1.058 trillion. That is a problem. So as appropriators we want to go through prioritized spending, make sure we are funding the things that should be funded, and then for things that are lower priorities, not funding those so we can truly fund the priorities that are important to the American people.

The problem is we are not going to be able to do that unless we get an agreement on the total funding level, and that agreement is exactly what the BCA—the Budget Control Act—provides, and it says specifically \$967 billion. That is the law. That is the law.

We have a \$17 trillion debt. We have a deficit this year that CBO projects to be in the range of \$750 billion. That is a real problem for our country. That is a problem we have to address. We have to get the deficit and the debt under control. There are two ways to do that. One is to raise revenue that comes from economic growth, not higher taxes. It comes from economic growth and getting our economy going. Of course, the other way to reduce our deficit is to control spending, and that is what a budget is all about—and sticking to that budget. We ought to have a balanced budget amendment, which I very much support. But what we have right now is the Budget Control Act. It is the law.

So the question I ask is, Why is the majority party saying we are going to appropriate 12 appropriations bills that total \$1.058 trillion rather than \$967 billion? How are we going to get our deficit and our debt under control if we don't adhere to the budget guidelines that are set?

So the simple and very clear point I wish to make is this: As appropriators

and as Senators, I believe we all want to prioritize funding. We want to make sure we fund the things that are important, such as infrastructure, such as housing, and other priorities. For things that shouldn't be funded, we should say we are not going to fund those items. That is the difference between prioritizing and the so-called sequester—the across-the-board cuts.

We are headed down a trail right now, if we approve this bill as is and bring other appropriations bills to the floor and approve them as they are, the sequester automatically kicks in again. Under the law, the sequester comes right back in and will bring these bills down to a total of \$967 billion. So what have we gained? We haven't accomplished what we are trying to do, which is to prioritize the funding.

So let's find a way across the aisle to come to an agreement to make sure we prioritize funding and do so within the BCA limit of \$967 billion because that is what the law says. That is what the law says we have to do. We need to find a way to come to an agreement.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, later this afternoon, Senator TOOMEY will be offering a motion to recommit the Transportation-HUD appropriations bill back to the Appropriations Committee. While I commend Senator TOOMEY's goal of ensuring that the fiscal year 2014 spending levels comply with the Budget Control Act spending caps, I do not believe this is the right approach.

Let me be clear. I voted in the Appropriations Committee, as did every Republican member of that committee, for a top-line level of \$967 billion. That is the amount that is in the Budget Control Act. That is law. But this is the very first appropriations bill that has been brought to the Senate floor. We have no idea where we are going to be at the end of the process.

The two leaders of the Appropriations Committee have called for regular order, and I commend them for bringing appropriations bills to the floor starting with this one, one at a time, for debate, amendment, and full consideration. We have had many amendments filed to this bill. Several of them would reduce spending that is in this bill. One reduces spending by \$50 million for the HOME program that is

being offered by the Senator from Arizona. There is another that reduces spending by over \$1 billion for the Community Development Block Grant Program. That is not a cut I happen to believe should be made, but that is a legitimate amendment that, if it passes, would reduce spending in this bill by \$1 billion. There are other amendments that have been proposed to reduce spending in this bill.

So this is turning the process upside down. It is recommitting to committee a bill before we have had the opportunity to determine what the final spending level in the bill is even going to be as a result of the many amendments that have been filed. Furthermore, we are not going to know if we have reached the cap until we finish all of the appropriations bills.

I realize my Democratic colleagues want a far higher spending cap than I do and that the Budget Control Act provides, but I don't think we should short-circuit the process when there has been a good-faith effort to bring appropriations bills to the floor.

What I would propose in lieu of the approach offered by my friend and colleague Senator TOOMEY is an amendment which I am going to file this afternoon that says not later than October 1, the Committee on Appropriations shall revise the suballocations to the subcommittees for fiscal year 2014 such that the suballocations comply with the discretionary spending limits that are in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act—what we refer to as the Budget Control Act, the BCA.

To me, this is the proper way to do it. If, at the end of the fiscal year, we find that the appropriations bills that have been passed exceed the statutory cap in the BCA, then we should reopen the process and reallocate the funds—the ceilings, the caps—across each of the subcommittees and produce bills that comply with the law.

Frankly, since current law applies this cap anyway, if we don't do that, sequestration will take effect on January 1 of next year. I do not think that is a good approach because it treats all programs as if they are the same and does not allow us to set priorities.

So I think the approach of the Senator from Pennsylvania is premature, a blunt instrument, and there is a reasonable alternative. I think it discourages a return to regular order where we bring the appropriations bills to the floor and where Members are free to eliminate whole programs, to cut billions if they wish to do so. Indeed, Members have worthwhile amendments that would reduce spending, but to send the bill back to committee before we have even had a chance to consider those amendments and before we have allowed the Senate to work its will is, to me, completely upside down of the way the process should work.

Furthermore, I will make the point once again that this is the first appropriations bill. How can we say the cap is breached when it is the very first bill to be brought before the Senate? Frankly, having gone through this process where we did have a free-standing Transportation-HUD bill and Senator MURRAY and I went to conference with our House counterparts, we came back with a consensus bill that became law that was in between the amounts in the Senate bill and the House bill. So we ended up at a lower level, which we knew we would, and which I will not feel I am going out on a limb in predicting we would in this case as well, since the Senate bill is higher than the House bill.

Why can't we let the process work? Why can't we consider the amendments that have been offered, some of which may well pass and reduce spending? Why can't we go to conference with the House where I believe additional cuts are probably likely? And why can't we let the appropriations process unfold the way it should? Why should we short-circuit it now by saying, that is enough, let's return the bill to committee, we don't trust what is going to happen, when there are safeguards we can put in to ensure that at the end of the day we will be at the cap of \$967 billion?

As I said, I will file my amendment this afternoon to give us an actual mechanism to ensure that at the beginning of the fiscal year we are at those levels. That is one approach, and I think it is a far better approach.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1756, 1803, 1785, AND 1789 EN BLOC

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and the following amendments be called up en bloc: Coburn No. 1756, McCain No. 1803, Boozman No. 1785, and Udall of Colorado No. 1789; that the amendments be agreed to, en bloc, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1756

(Purpose: To require public disclosure of certain reports)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act and except as provided in subsection (b), any report required to be submitted by a Federal agency to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under this Act shall be posted on the public website of that agency upon receipt by the committee.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

- (1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or
- (2) the report contains proprietary information.

AMENDMENT NO. 1803

(Purpose: To prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds made available to the Department of Transportation for cyber security until the Secretary of Transportation submits to Congress a detailed plan describing how the funding will be allocated and for what purposes)

On page 12, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 1 _____. None of the funds made available under this Act to the Department of Transportation for cyber security may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Transportation submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed plan describing how the funding will be allocated and for what purposes, including a detailed description of—

- (1) how the cyber security funding will be obligated or expended;
- (2) the programs and activities that will receive cyber security funding;
- (3) if and how the use of the funding complies with the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) and any other applicable Federal law;
- (4) the performance metrics that will be used to measure and determine the effectiveness of cyber security plans and programs; and
- (5) the strategy that will be employed to procure goods and services associated with the cyber security objectives of the Department of Transportation.

AMENDMENT NO. 1785

(Purpose: To establish the Sense of the Congress that any vacancy in the position of Inspector General of the Federal Housing Finance Agency should be filled in compliance with the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Congress finds the following:

- (1) The Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 established an Office of Inspector General within the Federal Housing Finance Agency (in this section referred to as the "FHFA").
- (2) The President has nominated Steve A. Linick, the current FHFA Inspector General, to be the next Inspector General of the Department of State.

(3) The nomination of Steve A. Linick to be Inspector General of the Department of State occurred on June 27, 2013, following a 1,989 day vacancy that began on January 16, 2008.

(4) The Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998 (5 U.S.C. 3345 et seq.) prescribes requirements for filling, both permanently and temporarily, vacancies that are required to be filled by Presidential appointment with Senate confirmation, and generally provides a limit of 210 days for persons serving in an "acting" capacity.

(b) It is the Sense of Congress that should a vacancy occur in the position of Inspector General of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the President should act expeditiously to nominate a person to fill the position on a permanent basis and should wait no more than 210 days to nominate a person to serve in this position in the event of a vacancy.

AMENDMENT NO. 1789

(Purpose: To require the Federal Railroad Administration to evaluate regulations that govern the use of locomotive horns at highway-rail grade crossings)

On page 52, after line 24, add the following: SEC. 155. Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration, in consultation with appropriate local government representatives, shall—

(1) evaluate existing regulations governing the use of locomotive horns at highway-rail grade crossings to determine whether such regulations should be revised; and

(2) submit a report to Congress that contains the results of the evaluation conducted pursuant to paragraph (1).

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, it is my understanding we have a Republican Senator who is coming to the floor shortly to make a motion to recommit. For the information of all Members, at some point to be agreed upon, we will dispense with that motion this afternoon. We are hoping to do that. I know a number of Members have asked the timing on that. I will work with the Senators and our staffs to try and do that as soon as possible. I know many Members are waiting.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX CODE REFORM

Mr. BAUCUS. Just outside this Chamber are the likenesses of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and dozens of statesmen cast in bronze and marble. I often look to these individuals for inspiration and quotes when writing a speech.

On a recent walk across the Capitol to meet my colleague, Congressman DAVE CAMP, I passed a giant statue of Andrew Jackson, our Nation's seventh President.

It was Jackson who famously said—and I quote him

The wisdom of man never yet contrived a system of taxation that would operate with perfect equality.

Those words were spoken by Jackson in 1832. More than 180 years later, our Nation still struggles with a broken tax system.

Our Tax Code today is inequitable, inefficient, and incomprehensible to the overwhelming majority of Americans. It contains nearly 4 million words—4 million. If someone were to try to read the entire code out loud, it would take them more than 18 uninterrupted days.

Not only is the code long; it is maddeningly complex. There are 42 different definitions of a small business in the code—42. There are 15 different tax incentives for higher education—so

many that the IRS had to publish a booklet to explain and simplify the higher education tax incentives. And that book—I have it with me—is 90 pages long—just on the education tax incentives. Here it is. I defy anybody to read it, let alone somebody trying to go to college or a parent trying to help his or her child go to college.

The code is such a labyrinth that 90 percent of American taxpayers have to use an accountant or some kind of computer software to file their tax returns. Even with all this assistance, it still takes the average taxpayer 13 hours to gather and compile the receipts and forms to comply with the code.

The Tax Code today is also inefficient and unfair. It is riddled with loopholes and deductions that result in more than \$1 trillion in lost revenue each year.

This complexity in the code is eroding confidence in our economy and creating uncertainty for America's families and businesses. Many Americans think of the other guy, the fancy lawyer who can take advantage of the code and pay lower taxes, which means more tax burden on to me. It is not fair. Confidence is eroding.

It is also threatening to undermine the competitiveness of the United States in the global marketplace.

Harvard Business School did a survey last year asking 10,000 of its graduates who live and conduct business around the world about the challenges of doing business in America. These individuals—these 10,000—are leaders on the frontlines of the global economy, and they are pessimistic about America's economic future.

The vast majority of those surveyed—71 percent—expected U.S. competitiveness to deteriorate over the next several years.

And what did they identify as the root of America's competitiveness problem? Respondents pointed to America's Tax Code—to the code—as one of the greatest weaknesses in the U.S. business environment.

Dig deeper and you learn respondents were deterred from investing in the United States not simply by a higher statutory corporate tax rate, but also by the sheer complexity and uncertain future of the Tax Code. I might say, when I mention that report to people, to businesses, to Americans, they nod their heads in agreement. That is what they have found themselves too.

The survey concludes with a dire warning—and I quote the survey:

For the first time in decades, the business environment in the United States is in danger of falling behind the rest of the world.

That's bad news for everyone. A fundamentally weakened U.S. economy is not only an American problem but also a global risk.

Chairman CAMP and I have been working together for more than 2 years on comprehensive tax reform. Here in

the Senate I have been working on tax reform for the past 3 years with my good friend Senator HATCH, the ranking member of the Finance Committee. We have held more than 30 hearings and heard from hundreds of experts about how tax reform can simplify the system for families, help businesses innovate, and make the United States more competitive.

A lot of people talk about more jobs. There is a lot of talk about more jobs. This is one way to get more jobs. If we reform the Tax Code, it will unleash so much positive energy in this country. It would create a lot more jobs than any other plan I have recently heard of.

We held more than 30 hearings, heard from hundreds of experts on how reform can simplify the system, help businesses innovate, and make the United States more competitive. Last month Senator HATCH and I completed work with the Finance Committee on an extensive, 3-month, top-to-bottom review of the Tax Code. We met as a full committee every week to collect feedback on different topics in tax reform and issued a series of 10 discussion papers to kick off that conversation.

In an effort to include the entire Senate in our efforts, we recently called on all Senators to partner with us and provide their input and ideas for reforming the code. Starting with a blank slate, we called on every Senator to submit their proposals for what they want to see in a reformed code. This is an important exercise. Everyone needs to be involved. We need every Senator to weigh in on tax reform. I might say, the deadline is this Friday, tomorrow. I encourage all of my colleagues to submit their ideas and make their voices heard.

I might say, your constituents are certainly making their voices heard. We have received more than 10,000 comments and ideas so far through the Web site that Chairman CAMP and I created called taxreform.gov—actually, 10,258 responses, to be exact.

Overwhelmingly, Americans, from every corner of our country, are calling for a simplified Tax Code. People think they should not have to spend hours upon hours and hundreds of dollars to prepare their taxes, and I for one agree.

Let me share a couple of submissions we have received on our Web site.

Jennifer, from Hollywood, MD, writes:

I've been doing my family's taxes for 22 years. This year my husband suggested we use a tax service. Why? The tax code is too complicated and he was concerned we were missing deductions.

Mike, from Fort Collins, CO, provides an example of the complexity in the code, writing:

I have been a tax assistance volunteer for 19 years. It is difficult to tell someone who knows what a child is that there are actually

four different definitions for "a child" in the tax law. Make the same definition apply across the entire tax code. The best way is the simplest way.

Wendy from Irving, CA, writes:

I do not mind paying taxes—we need education, infrastructure, and a defense. What I do mind is that it is a complete mystery and a complete game to find every allowable deduction and that it is a significant burden as well as a significant expense to pay a qualified preparer. How has this come to be? My returns are 20–50 pages long. Why is it more than two? There must be a way to simplify the process.

You know what. Wendy is right. There must be a way to simplify the process.

That is the same message Chairman CAMP and I heard earlier this month in St. Paul, MN. We were in the Twin Cities for the first in a series of trips we are taking across the country to speak with people about tax reform.

We want to get out of Washington. We are doing it this summer. We are going to Philadelphia next Monday to get input and feedback from people on dealing with America's tax system.

St. Paul was a great trip. We met with leaders of two distinctly different types of American businesses—one a U.S.-based multinational corporation with more than 85,000 employees, the other a family-run bakery with 85 employees. While dramatically different in size and in industry, they face similar challenges when it comes to dealing with America's Tax Code. In conversation after conversation we heard the same thing: We need a simpler Tax Code.

St. Paul was just the first stop. As I mentioned, the next trip is Philadelphia. Then we plan to go to the west coast. We have other trips planned over the next couple of months. We are going to talk to groups about how we can make the tax system fairer and easier to deal with, and we want to learn how we can restore some confidence in the code.

Our efforts on reform have been ramping up. We are continuing to build momentum. Reform provides a historic opportunity to give families certainty, spark growth, create jobs, and make businesses more competitive to provide America a real shot in the arm.

I will conclude my remarks as I began them—with a quote. These words are from our Nation's sixth President, John Quincy Adams. President Adams:

Patience and perseverance have a magical effect before which difficulties disappear and obstacles vanish.

That is where we are. We are patient. We are persevering. We have a lot to do. The difficulties will disappear, obstacles will vanish, and the best result will be that the American people have a simpler, fairer code to provide more jobs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I rise to describe a motion to recommit that I am going to offer. Let me start by providing a little bit of context to why I am offering this motion to recommit. That has to start by reminding my colleagues about the Budget Control Act that was signed into law in 2011, about 2 years ago.

The Budget Control Act—which, again, is an act, not a bill—has been signed into law. It is the existing law of the land. It established spending caps—limits on discretionary spending—in a modest effort to try to bring out-of-control spending somewhat under control. So we have a statutory limit on how much the Federal Government is permitted to spend. It is a limit on both the defense side and the nondefense side, but it is a limit. It is an attempt to control that which has been so difficult to control in this town, which is Federal spending.

I should point out that even if we abide by the spending caps that are in the existing law, if we follow the law, we are still going to run a huge deficit. Next year the deficit will be about \$560 billion. That means that next year, if we have the spending discipline of living within the law, we will still increase our total outstanding debt by more than $\frac{1}{2}$ trillion and our debt as a percentage of our economy will rise to 76 percent—76 percent debt-to-GDP ratio. Our debt-to-GDP ratio is already higher than it should be. It is already costing us economic growth and jobs. It is going to rise further. That is assuming we stick to the spending cap.

I should point out that the way we got to this point is just spending on autopilot, just growing spending every year. I will give one example. Since 2000, total Federal spending has doubled. That is the scale of the increases in spending we have been experiencing. That is why we have been running huge deficits. We now have a massive debt. The accumulated debt is causing this big drag on our economy and preventing us from having the kind of job growth we ought to have.

Here is my big concern. The bill we are considering right now, the Transportation-HUD bill, puts us on a direct path to bust the caps, to break the law, to spend even more than the statutory limits we put in place just 2 years ago. Let me walk through how we get there.

The fact is that under the Budget Control Act the cap that is set on discretionary spending for the fiscal year we are currently debating, 2014, is \$967 billion. That is the number. If you add up the spending sums for all of the appropriations bills my Democratic friends want to pass, it adds up to \$1.058 trillion. It is \$91 billion more spending than is permitted under current law.

It busts the caps by almost \$100 billion. We cannot afford this kind of

spending. We cannot afford the spending we are currently contemplating, much less nearly another \$100 billion.

Now, I should be clear. Any single bill does not bust the caps all by itself. It is what they do in combination. But this bill is one of a series that in combination is designed to bust the caps. All you have to do is add up the total spending in each bill, and you get a number that is much greater than the cap. So it is very clear.

This particular bill, by the way, is a huge increase. The Transportation-HUD bill spends over \$54 billion in its current form, as currently contemplated. That is \$5 billion more than in 2013. That is a 10-percent increase in just 1 year. It is almost \$10 billion more than what the House proposed. It is even more money than what the President of the United States asked for in his own budget request. He did not ask for this much money. Yet here it is on the Senate floor, a bill that busts the cap, increases spending dramatically, and spends more money than the President even asked for, at a time when we are running huge deficits that are costing us economic growth.

I think this is a very bad idea, so I have a motion. I am grateful to have the support of many of my colleagues, including Senator SHELBY and Senator HOEVEN, both who are appropriators. I think Senator HOEVEN is intending to speak in support of this motion. Let me explain clearly what it will do. What my motion will do is send the bill back to committee with instructions to lower the spending in the bill to \$45.455 billion. That is the number that would be consistent with the spending caps. It would allocate an amount of money to this appropriations bill, the Transportation-HUD bill, in proportion to what the Transportation-HUD bill spends under the current fiscal year. It would do that for the next fiscal year.

I am not suggesting that I would go through and line by line make all of the individual adjustments within the bill. I would leave that to the committee that has the most expertise, the Appropriations Committee. Let them do their work, but let them do it in a way that ends with a product that is consistent with the law, consistent with the spending caps.

One point I should make about the spending caps in the Budget Control Act—I think there are some folks in this town who mistakenly think that since deficits have gotten a little smaller in recent years than they were in the past few years, somehow we do not have a deficit problem anymore and we can just crank up spending. I have to say I think that is a profoundly mistaken view. We still have a huge problem with the spending path. A $\frac{3}{2}$ trillion deficit is a devastatingly large deficit. As bad as that is, several years in the future, under current projections—again, this assumes that we live

within the law—within a few years these deficits start to explode again even beyond the current levels, which are already unacceptable.

So I think this is very important. This is the first appropriations bill the Senate is considering this year. This is the one that is going to determine whether we are going to go down a path of disregarding the bipartisan, Presidentially signed law of the land which is in existence right now. This bill is designed to be part of a process to bust that wide open so that we spend more money that we can't afford. That would be a huge mistake.

This is a motion to recommit back to the committee, report out a bill where they can establish the priorities and the allocation within the limit but set the limit at a level that is consistent with the caps.

I move to commit S. 1243 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back with such changes as may be necessary such that total budget authority for fiscal year 2014 is not greater than \$45.455 billion.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I rise to strongly oppose this motion that is now before the Senate. I urge all of my colleagues to vote against it as well. Senator COLLINS and I have worked very closely together to write a bipartisan transportation and housing bill that works for our families and our communities. We have been working here together on the floor to have an open debate and accept amendments from both sides of the aisle. We just accepted a number of them a few minutes ago.

In addition to six Republicans who explicitly supported this bill in committee, along with all of the Democrats, a total of 73 Senators voted to start debate on this bill. But now this motion that is now before us would take all of that bipartisan work we did on this bill in committee and it would take the strong bipartisan support coming out of committee and just throw it all away and ask us to simply now adopt the House Republican budget and start all over again. There is absolutely no reason for us to go back to the drawing board, especially not under the conditions that are laid out in this motion.

Back in March we had a very vigorous debate here in the Senate about our values and our priorities when it came to the Federal budget. We debated about the future of Medicare. We talked about how the wealthiest Americans should contribute their fair share. We debated what should be done with overall spending levels and the automatic cuts from sequestration that were put in place in the bipartisan

Budget Control Act in order to bring both sides to the table to replace them with more responsible deficit reduction.

Everyone will remember that we spent dozens of hours debating the budget on the Senate floor. Then my colleagues had a choice. We ran an open process. Any Senator could bring an amendment to the floor. We considered over 100 of them from Democrats and Republicans. One of my Republican colleagues even offered the House budget as an amendment, which locks in that overall sequestration level but actually ignores the Budget Control Act by simply pushing the entire burden onto seniors and families in our communities. But, as we all know, the House budget was rejected by the Senate. It got only 40 votes here, and 5 Republicans actually voted against it. The Senate budget we ended up passing replaces sequestration with an equal mix of responsible spending cuts and new revenue by closing tax loopholes that benefit the wealthiest Americans.

The House passed their budget that locks in sequestration on steroids. The Senate passed our budget that replaces sequestration with more responsible deficit reduction. I absolutely agree with my colleagues that we cannot finish that budget process until we find a way to bridge that divide between the House and Senate. But I want to be clear here. A motion to recommit on an appropriations bill is not the place to have the debate on the overall spending levels. That is what a budget conference is for. That is where the two sides need to go to work out a deal. But, as my colleagues all know, despite the efforts of many Republicans and Democrats alike, a few Senators—very few Senators—continue blocking a bipartisan budget conference. So far we have been unable to even get in a room to talk about that.

We are going to keep trying to start a budget conference and work toward a bipartisan deal. Until we do, the bipartisan work that is being done in the Appropriations Committee now, led by the chairwoman Senator MIKULSKI has to continue.

Now that my colleague has brought this motion to the floor that attempts to lock in sequestration and force the House budget onto our transportation and housing bill, let's talk about it for a few minutes.

The bill we are debating right now, the transportation and housing bill, could not exist at the worse-than-sequestration levels that are being pushed in this House. My partner on this bill, Senator COLLINS, has been clear, as I have, that the differences between the House and Senate transportation bills could not be more stark.

Our bipartisan bill here in the Senate continues to invest in our communities through the Community Development Block Grant Program, CDBG, while the

partisan House bill cut that in half to the lowest level ever, which would mean 40,000 fewer jobs in this country. Communities across the country would have to halt projects they are planning to help get their communities moving again.

Our bipartisan bill in the Senate invests in Essential Air Service and makes sure there is enough in the program to cover all the communities that currently participate in it.

The House partisan bill that this motion would recommit and put us back into the position of considering would shortchange the entire program and cut it more than one-third. It includes additional language that would kick out communities in States such as Montana and New Mexico that absolutely depend on this.

The bipartisan bill the Senate has invests in our families to make sure they have a roof over their heads when they need it most, to help them if they are disabled or seniors who need to stay off the streets. The partisan House bill would serve 132,000 fewer people, many of whom would end up homeless without this support.

Those are only a few examples. I could name many that are in this bill. If sequestration numbers were to be blocked in the way this motion that is before us envisions, we will continue seeing the impact across our entire Federal Government.

As Secretary Hagel has made very clear, the defense worker furloughs would continue and get worse. In my home State of Washington—I talked about it on the Senate floor this morning—we have seen the consequences of those cuts. Do you know where we are seeing them? In places such as Madigan Hospital where a young woman came and told me about being furloughed on Fridays and what it translated into in terms of people having their brain surgeries delayed because of the shutdowns on Friday. This is what we are talking about, doctors and nurses being furloughed in our Army hospitals as we have injured soldiers who need care.

This sequestration is going to impact funding for our firefighters who are protecting our homes and lands, civilian employees, and it will hit the law enforcement officials who are protecting our cities from the threat of terrorism. It will strip funds from cancer research at NIH. Our roads, bridges, and rails will continue to crumble, and small businesses will pay the price.

This would be happening while a lot of other countries that are our competitors in the global marketplace are doing the opposite. They are investing in themselves. They are setting themselves up to compete in the 21st century economy.

This is the reality of sequestration. It may not make the news every single day in every paper. We may not see all the impacts right away, but it is very

real, and it will truly be devastating. It will be devastating for our families. It will be devastating for our national security and our long-term economic growth if we don't replace it. By the way, it is not just Democrats who are saying this. Economists such as Ben Bernanke have said it is hurting the economy. Many of my Republican colleagues have spent a lot of time going around the country talking about how devastating it is on the defense side.

I am happy to have this debate. I don't think this bill, the appropriations bill, the transportation and housing bill, is the place to do it.

If the Senator from Pennsylvania and others wish to start a debate and a negotiation between the Senate budget and the House budget, they should stop objecting to us going to conference. That is where this should occur.

Until then, I urge my colleagues to reject this motion and allow us to continue working on the bipartisan bill we have worked so hard to bring to the Senate. Let's work in creating jobs, investing in communities, and lay down a foundation for long-term and broad-based growth.

I move to table the motion, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask that I be allowed to speak for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. I would ask the Senator if the Senator from Maryland could speak for 5 minutes. I would notify all of my colleagues that we intend to go to the motion to table once that debate occurs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I wish to thank my colleague Senator TOOMEY for raising this matter and asking to recommit the legislation so the Senate committee, the appropriate committee, would produce a THUD plan for spending that complies with the Budget Control Act, which is a law of the land.

Senator TOOMEY is one of our most knowledgeable Members on finance in the Senate. He is a member of the Budget Committee. He fully understands the significance of this matter.

If this legislation passes at the level it is moving forward today, then we are eviscerating the promises we made to the American public in August of 2011.

In August of 2011, everyone should remember quite well, that we said we would raise the debt ceiling by \$2.1 trillion. We will reach that by the end of this year. We will have used up and borrowed another \$2.1 trillion before the end of the year, but we said that we would reduce spending by \$2.1 trillion over 10 years to make it easy on ourselves and to spread out the spending cuts.

This was passed into law with bipartisan support and signed by President Obama. This is not some law that was made up out of thin air. It was a law that was debated and passed in both Houses of Congress. Republicans and Democrats agreed to it, and it improved our spending a little bit.

We were then spending at the rate of \$37 trillion over 10 years. We were projected to increase spending to \$47 trillion over 10 years. This bill reduced it to \$45 trillion.

Under the current spending limits we now have, as Senator TOOMEY has so ably pointed out, we are going to increase spending over next 10 years. We are going to increase it from \$37 trillion to \$45 trillion at a time when we have been running the largest deficits the Nation has ever seen, bar none. An absolutely irresponsible level of debt has been added to our country.

Even this modest proposal agreed to by the President, voted on by the majority party in the Senate, supported in a bipartisan way—is set to be demolished before 2 years is up: Oh, it is too tough. We can't reduce the growth of spending from \$47 trillion to \$45 trillion. Oh, this is going to destroy America.

Well, why don't we look for ways to spread out the cuts and distribute some to the departments and agencies that got zero reductions in spending, such as Medicaid and food stamps zero reduction. No, we can't touch those. They are sacrosanct, and other programs too.

We have some reductions in spending on the discretionary accounts that we can sustain, and it will be tough. That is what we are paid to do.

The bill should properly go back to the committee, and a vote in favor of the Toomey motion would instruct the committee to produce a bill that is consistent with the Budget Control Act.

May I inquire how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Essentially, the majority leader has already said that he intends to bring up the defense bill last, national security last. Why is he going to do that? He is going to do that because he is going to let all these other bills go over the budget limit, and then he is going to produce the defense bill and say: Oh, colleagues, we have to add more money to the defense

bill, putting us over the BCA limits that were agreed to and passed into law. We have to waive that and spend more.

This is how a Nation goes broke. This is how we lose credibility with the American people.

We looked them in the eye in August 2 years ago and we said we were going to reduce the growth of spending a little bit, \$2.1 trillion, in exchange for raising the debt ceiling \$2.1 trillion.

The majority party here is blithely walking in, pretending that never happened and saying: Oh, we didn't intend to pass a limit.

Why did you vote for it then, if you didn't intend to pass it? We did intend to pass it. We promised the American people \$2.1 trillion in reducing the growth of spending not a reduction in spending, just a reduction in the growth of spending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. We need to honor that promise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I wish to thank Senator MURRAY and Senator COLLINS returning us to regular order and bringing an appropriations bill to the floor that is consistent with the budget resolution passed by this body. I also wish to compliment my colleague from Maryland, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee Senator MIKULSKI.

We are returning to regular order in the Senate. I find it amazing. It was only a week ago my colleagues on the Republican side were saying we don't want to turn the Senate into the House. Now we have a motion to recommit that would take the House numbers. We didn't do that.

Should we only have a unicameral legislature? I thought we thought this body was important. Yet this motion to recommit will have the effect of saying that what we do in this body doesn't make any difference; let's just take the House's bill. I don't think that is what we want.

The House bill that has been reported I don't think it has yet been voted on was a partisan bill. What we did in this body is have Democrats and Republicans working together. That should be the model we use in this institution. The motion to recommit would destroy that, would take that away. That doesn't seem to make a lot of sense.

Let me talk on the merits, if I might, for one moment, and that is what this motion would mean as far as jobs in this country and responsible investments. Remember that we are operating under a budget resolution that will reduce the deficit. It gets us to actually stronger efforts to reduce the deficit.

I can't speak to every category of spending, but I do know something

about transportation. I serve on the Environment and Public Works Committee. There is bipartisan support on our committee to do more than what is in this budget. We have trillions of dollars' worth of roads and bridges that are falling down. We have to invest, to create jobs. We understand transportation creates jobs. The motion to recommit would take us to numbers that are lower than the sequestration numbers.

I was just on the floor a few minutes ago talking about how the sequestration is hurting this country—it is hurting job growth, hurting our economy, hurting Federal workers, and hurting ordinary Americans. Well, this motion makes it worse. It goes below the sequestration numbers. We need to invest in job growth, we need to do it in a balanced, responsible way, and that is exactly what Senator MURRAY did in wearing her hat as chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. She has now brought out an appropriations bill totally consistent with the action there.

Here is the real hypocrisy. What we have said on our side of the aisle is we understand there is a difference. Let's go to conference and resolve the differences. And the same people who are supporting this motion will not let us go to conference to resolve the differences. We should return to regular order. Reject this motion to recommit.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today in strong opposition to the Toomey motion to recommit. This motion to recommit would send the transportation-housing bill back to the committee with a new allocation of \$45.5 billion, a cut of \$8.5 billion from the Senate bill's current level of \$54 billion. The THUD subcommittee would then have to rewrite its bill to the new, lower allocation.

This motion is simply a backdoor approach to make sequester the new normal by slashing the THUD bill. This is a cut of the magnitude proposed in the Ryan budget. I remind my colleagues the Ryan budget puts a moat around defense spending, and cuts \$91 billion from domestic programs. I will not accept sequester, I will not accept the Ryan budget, as the new normal.

The allocation for the THUD bill is based on a topline of \$1.058 trillion. This is the presequester topline contained in the American Taxpayer Relief Act, a law that passed the Senate by a vote of 89 to 8 in January. The allocation for THUD proposed by the Toomey amendment is based on a topline of \$967 billion, the postsequester level.

Those who support \$967 billion want to make sequester the "new normal." They say: We must follow the law, and sequester is the law. First of all, the House is not following the law. The House ignores the law by taking all \$91 billion of cuts out of domestic discretionary programs.

This committee's spending allocations assert that sequester will be replaced with a balanced solution to the deficit problem that will be decided in a conference on the budget resolution. But guess what. Six Senators have objected to a conference on the budget resolution. And now this motion to recommit is further sand in the gears of the appropriations process. But I am determined that this committee will not be undermined by this obstructionism. While we wait for the Budget Committee to be able to do its job, we will continue to do our job.

Colleagues, this isn't a disagreement about whether we should have across-the-board cuts. Nobody thinks across-the-board cuts are smart. This is a disagreement about how much we will invest in America, in our infrastructure, our people, and our national security.

The Toomey motion to recommit would require huge cuts—in this case, \$8.5 billion in cuts—but it provides no specifics. The THUD bill keeps America moving on land, at sea, and in the air. This motion to recommit stops America in its tracks. If this motion passes, roads will not be resurfaced, bridges will not be replaced or repaired, air traffic controllers will not be hired, and airports will not be upgraded. And all these cuts mean one thing—fewer jobs—fewer good American jobs.

The FAA modernization program will be delayed—again. This delay will cause more congestion at our airports and leave America further behind in the global economy. And these cuts mean safety will be put at risk, with fewer resources for the agencies charged with keeping us safe on the roads and in the air. These cuts today have consequences for years to come. This is true for our physical infrastructure, and it is true for our human infrastructure.

This motion is irresponsible and should be rejected. It demands \$8.5 billion in unspecified cuts, which would have terrible impacts on America's infrastructure, and on our efforts to create good jobs right here at home.

I believe our government should meet compelling human needs. It should provide for the national defense. And our government should make smart investments today so our Nation will grow stronger tomorrow.

This motion to recommit puts all of these essential functions at risk and would have terrible near-term and long-term impacts. I strongly oppose the Toomey motion to recommit.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the motion to recommit, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 187 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Landrieu	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Cochran	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Udall (CO)
Coons	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murkowski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	

NAYS—42

Alexander	Enzi	McCain
Ayotte	Fischer	McConnell
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Chiesa	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johanns	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Kirk	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Hirono

Moran

The motion was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to let all Senators know that we have made tremendous progress on the transportation and housing bill. We intend to make more progress next week. We are going to stay in morning business this afternoon. We have a few issues we are working out through the weekend. We will be back at this next week.

I wish to thank all of the Members who have worked very hard with us this week, and I look forward to working with them again next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I too wish to comment on the progress we have made this week. We have been considering this appropriations bill under regular order. We have actually

cleared several amendments today. We have had some votes. We have defeated a motion to recommit the bill to committee so that we can proceed to go forward.

Senator MURRAY and I will be here on Monday, ready and open for business. We will start sequencing amendments. I hope Members on both sides of the aisle will approach this bill in a cooperative spirit with respect to further rights of Senators to offer their amendments and get votes, and that we will not see Members drawing lines in the sand or deciding that they are going to block action going forward because I think this bill could be a model of how we should operate.

Thank you, Mr. President.

AMENDMENT NO. 1744

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on Tuesday, the Senate adopted an amendment offered by the junior Senator from Louisiana, which effectively imposes a lifetime ban on individuals who have been convicted of certain serious crimes from obtaining Federal housing assistance. Today is a new legislative day, and many of us in this body may have already moved on to the next meeting, the next issue, the next vote. But as I have reflected on that amendment, I am concerned the direction these types of amendments are taking us.

I had significant concerns with the lack of notice given to Senators about the amendment offered by Senator VITTER, and the speed with which a vote was scheduled. In the span of roughly 90 minutes, the amendment was filed, made pending, and set for a rollcall vote. This amendment was never considered by the relevant subcommittee in the markup of the bill, nor vetted for unintended consequences.

I am deeply concerned about what the sort of amendment offered by the junior Senator from Louisiana says about us as a Senate, and as a Nation. Following on the heels of a similar amendment offered by Senator VITTER on the farm bill, I expect that similar amendments will be filed and offered on virtually every future bill. This has to stop.

In our system of justice, when someone is convicted of a crime and serves a sentence, I believe that person deserves a second chance and an opportunity to reintegrate as a productive member of society. That is a principle of fairness and justice that I know not only from my days as a prosecutor, but through my time as chairman of the Judiciary Committee. It is a basic notion instilled in me from an early age, and reinforced by my faith. As I have long heard from the faith community, it is our moral obligation to rehabilitate and restore people who have committed crimes. We all have made mistakes, and I challenge any Member to come to the floor and say that they haven't themselves sought forgiveness or a second chance.

We have to get past the point where we are scoring political points on the backs of those who have committed crimes but have served their sentence. We must find a way to reintegrate them into society. That is how we make our communities safer.

No one in this body should want a convicted felon to become a repeat offender. And I assume no Senator wants to punish the family members of an offender for crimes they did not commit. Yet that would be the effect of the Vitter amendments. Such measures have the effect of extending punishment beyond the original term; they would act as a lifetime ban and make it harder for ex-offenders and their families to get back on their feet. I reluctantly supported the amendment this week because Federal regulations already give housing officials the ability to keep dangerous criminals, sex offenders, and domestic abusers out of public housing. While this diminishes somewhat the overall impact of that amendment, the mandatory draconian nature of the Vitter amendment remains deeply troubling. As the senior Senator from Louisiana stated when Senator VITTER offered a similar amendment a few years ago, such an approach is simply “mean-spirited and counterproductive.”

I am concerned that this is just the first of a series of similarly mean-spirited and counterproductive amendments. Now that the Senate has moved to impose a lifetime ban on food and housing assistance for some who have served their criminal sentences, what will be next? Will we next decide to take away education or employment assistance? Should we ban ex-offenders from libraries or public parks? The aggregate effect of such efforts will be to relegate an ex-offender and perhaps his or her family to a lifetime of poverty, homelessness, and isolation. That does not make us safer. It just makes us meaner and less compassionate. I hope we will stop using this political tactic and work together to help give people a second chance.

I know many Senators here share this goal. This is a complicated issue that demands thoughtful solutions, and we must work together if we have any hope of achieving real change. Public safety is about more than lengthy prison sentences. It also requires efforts to reintegrate into our communities those who have served their time. We know that reentry efforts reduce recidivism and we must be thoughtful when we take options off the table like we did this week.

I praise groups like the Conference of Catholic Bishops, Prison Fellowship, and the Sentencing Project who have worked tirelessly to help provide opportunities for individuals who have committed crimes, and to work toward the rehabilitation and restoration of their families. At the core of their

work are fundamental notions of justice and compassion—the same principles that I hope will guide the work of the Senate as we go forward.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go to a period of morning business, with the time equally divided between the minority and majority, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida.

FUNDING LEVELS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, what we have seen is a recognition that these are tough times and we need some belt-tightening. But to go back to this level of sequestration is not the right thing to do because that is taking a meat cleaver approach, across-the-board, on cutting Federal programs. It is just not a responsible way of belt-tightening. Fortunately, this motion to recommit, to in essence go to the level of appropriations for Transportation and Housing and Urban Development that was to take it to the level of the House, which is considerably lower than what has come out of our Appropriations Committee in the Senate—fortunately, this motion to recommit was defeated.

Why do we want to cut funding, as the House bill does, to critical areas such as air traffic controllers?

It is dangerous, shortsighted, and we have been to this rodeo before. As a matter of fact, doesn't anyone remember that earlier in the year we had to fix the sequestration cuts that went into effect in the current fiscal year because it was cutting out all kinds of air traffic controllers and furloughed a number of them and closed the contract towers for the small airports? We had to reverse that. The public rose and said: This is not the right nor intelligent thing to do when it comes to the public safety.

In addition to compromising the safety of the traveling public, those air traffic cuts would have increased the flight delays by hours and hours and caused a lot of cancellations. Lo and behold, when the American traveling public saw that was exactly what was happening, they rose and they said: Enough. The body politic responded. Here was an attempt to repeat that. If we reduce the top line of funding for this next fiscal year on this bill, we are going to be right back in the same situation where we were last spring: scrambling to keep our aviation system functioning safely and again delaying the next generation of air traffic controllers which we are desperately trying to set up.

This House of Representatives sequestration budget—outside of avia-

tion—is going to mean more crumbling roads and bridges, more families unable to put a roof over their heads, and our infrastructure will continue to be falling into further disrepair. So it is our responsibility to keep our country safe and the economy moving. Thank goodness we rejected this attempt to go back to the Dark Ages, but we are going to have more and more of this.

We have a bill that is coming up next Tuesday in a markup in the Commerce Committee of the NASA authorization bill. Here is a bill that has never been partisan. It is not only bipartisan, it has been nonpartisan. We have never had a partisan vote on a NASA authorization bill. Three years ago on the NASA authorization bill that broke a lot of new ground, we passed it out of the committee and out of the whole Senate unanimously.

I am very saddened to report to the Senate that next Tuesday we are going to have a markup of the NASA authorization bill. There is not a disagreement as to the balance we have in the bill between the big rocket called the Space Launch System, its capsule, its spacecraft, Orion, or what we balance against commercial rockets trying to get cargo and crew to the International Space Station. There is not a disagreement on that.

There is not a disagreement on keeping up the programs on our weather satellites—all of the stuff we put up for NOAA so that, in fact, we can predict our weather, and in hurricane season that becomes especially important. There is not a disagreement about continuing the exploration program with the robotic spacecraft to Mars and to other planets as well as putting up a satellite, in part for the Department of Defense, to warn us against the solar nuclear explosions on the surface of the Sun so we can get ready to save our satellites by the time that nuclear radiation gets to Earth. There is no disagreement on that.

There is no disagreement on the future of the new space telescope called the James Webb Space Telescope that is going to replace the existing one when it goes on the blink. It has uncovered all of these secrets of the universe as we peer back into time on the universe.

There is no disagreement on the substance of this bill. The partisan vote that is going to occur on Tuesday in the Commerce Committee is going to be because of the funding level. The bill Senator ROCKEFELLER and I have offered that will be voted on will be, unfortunately, a partisan vote because it takes the level of funding of the budget resolution which is \$18.1 billion. The vote will be partisan because of those who want the sequester to apply, and as such they want \$16.8 billion instead of \$18.1 billion or even lower, as the House of Representatives has done, \$16.6 billion.

I can tell everyone that little agency, NASA, can't do all of these things I just mentioned that there is no disagreement we need to do. Getting humans back into space, preparing for the next major exploration with humans in the decade of the 2030s, going to the planet Mars—there is no disagreement with that. But we can't do it if we don't provide the funds now to develop the techniques, the technology, the procedures, and build our way like building blocks to ultimately where we can send humans multiples of millions of miles away from the home planet and bring them back safely.

Sadly, I am afraid we are going to have a partisan vote because of that disagreement on the level of funding. It will be the first time ever we are going to have that kind of vote recorded on that little agency called the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. So, just like today, here we go.

Down the road, this is going to have to be decided, and it probably will come very late in the year. It will probably come when we come to another crisis point of having to raise the debt ceiling. It will probably come to the point where we have all kinds of good and new ideas on tax reform that will be coming out—a major tax reform—of the Finance Committee. We are limping along on appropriations bills just to keep us funded and to keep the government functioning after October 1 in the new fiscal year. At some point, all of this is coming to a head, including what level of funding is it going to be.

I hope we will start using some common sense and act accordingly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Florida.

THE MIDDLE CLASS

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, even as I speak at this very moment—or maybe he has wrapped up—the President is in Jacksonville, FL, today. He is discussing the middle-class and how to get the middle class growing again in America, and it is a very worthy topic.

I wish the President would do less talking and more listening. If he listened to the middle class—and particularly those middle-class Americans who either work at a small business or own a small business—he would hear the No. 1 concern many of them now have is about ObamaCare.

Recently, I made the statement that I don't believe we should pass a short-term budget here that pays for ObamaCare. Since that time, I have heard the comments of some that that is an unreasonable request. I wish to outline one more reason why I think it is an unreasonable request to actually fund it. It is unreasonable because of the impact ObamaCare is having on real people—particularly those in the middle class in the United States.

I wish to focus on small businesses today because they truly are the backbone of the American economy. People here throw that term around all the time, “the backbone of the economy.” It truly is.

I live within a few blocks of 8th Street, the famed Calle Ocho, where literally every business is a small business, such as bakeries, sandwich shops, you name it. They are primarily run by immigrants who are here in search of a better life and the American dream. They own these small businesses. They will be impacted by the changes this law will have, and I wish to describe some of them.

Yesterday, we had a hearing in the Small Business Committee where the administration spoke first. Basically, their take on it is that ObamaCare will be good for small businesses for two reasons: One, we will set up these health exchanges small businesses can go to and offer health insurance to their employees on these exchanges.

Basically, the exchange is a one-stop shop. A company owner can go online—and there are theoretically 8 or 10 private insurers—and the owner of the business gets to pick a plan from one of those choices and their employees get insured from it. In theory that is not a bad idea. However, in a moment I will outline why that is not working out.

The second thing they brag about is the tax credit that small businesses will be able to use. I want to use the testimony—not just of them but of small businesses—to outline why, in fact, these things are not only not going to work, but ObamaCare is going to be deeply hurtful to small businesses and the middle class.

Let's talk first about the exchanges. The exchanges are not unfolding as they were planned. I asked the administration yesterday: Is it going to be ready about October 1? Are businesses going to be able to go on this exchange and find an insurance plan for their employees? They said they are sure it is going to happen. But the truth is it is not working out that way.

There are 17 States that have decided to go on to their own exchanges. All 17 of those States are behind schedule in one form or another. Maryland was one of the first States to embrace it. They asked for a delay in April because they couldn't get it going on time.

A recent report from the Government Accountability Office reported that all 17 States were behind schedule and that they were missing deadlines on 44 percent of the key things they had to do.

Here is the second problem: These exchanges only work if you have a lot of companies competing against each other, but that is not happening either. Insurers are not flooding to offer insurances on these exchanges.

Let me give an example. There are three States: Washington State, New

Hampshire, and North Carolina where only one company has responded. There is no competition, and that is what is supposed to drive down the rates. In another State, not a single company responded until very recently when Humana came in to save the day and actually decided to jump on board.

Here is what the vice president of a consulting firm that specializes in this—it is called Avalere Health. Caroline Pearson is the vice president and she said:

Humana may have a difficult time building competitive networks in [Mississippi], so we could see higher than average premiums in this region.

Again, another reason to doubt that these exchanges are going to work and the impact it is going to have is terrible.

What about the tax credits? That is a great idea, right? We are giving tax credits to small businesses that they can use to buy health insurance for their employees. That is not working out either.

Let me give an example: Only 14 percent of companies that are eligible for the tax credit are using it, and I will explain why.

I have a quote from Pat Thompson, a tax partner at Piccerelli, Gilstein & Company, in Providence, and chair of the American Institute for Certified Public Accountants, who said:

The definition of an eligible business is challenging because it is not based on [the number of] employees, but on full-time equivalents. For companies with a lot of part-timers . . . that is not very transparent.

He went on to say that the way to decide whether you are qualified for this tax credit is so complicated that most small companies can't figure it out. In fact, the companies that benefit the most from the tax credit are the ones that are least likely to get it because they cannot afford to hire a professional accounting firm to figure it out for them.

Here is another one from the Birmingham Business Journal. The manager at a health care consulting group, Warren Averett, LLC, said that only 20 percent of the small businesses they deal with even qualify for the credit. He said many businesses he worked with offered less than 50 percent, and bumping their coverage to meet the requirement would have cost them more than the credit saved them.

These are serious problems with this tax credit, not to mention that the General Accounting Office has already said the credit is so small that it is just not enough to change the equation for these small businesses to use it.

What is the bottom line? The bottom line is that two of the things we are being told are going to help small businesses with ObamaCare are not going to. One is an exchange that is relying upon there being competition among insurers. They are not signing up,

folks. The other is this tax credit that is being deeply underutilized and it is so complicated and so small that most small businesses will not benefit from it.

I say all that to my colleagues because yesterday we heard from a real small business owner—someone who is the epitome of what it means to own a small business in America. His name is Larry Katz. He owns some restaurants called Dots Diner. Here is what he said. His dream was to own his own company so he cashed in his whole life insurance policy, he calculated how much credit card availability he had, and emptied his life savings. With less than \$200,000, he opened his first diner. Within 12 months he had stopped sleeping. He was down to less than \$10,000 in savings. He considered two options: Either mortgage his home or declare bankruptcy. That is what he faced, but he made it through, as many small businesses make it through in America. Today he owns 6 diners, 85 employees, 65 of them are full-time.

Here is what he offers those employees today: paid holidays, vacation, dental, vision, term life, and health insurance. He offers those to them right now, but because of how much ObamaCare is going to cost him, here is what he is going to have to do. He said:

I have unfortunately made the decision to quit offering coverage as soon as the employer mandate kicks in, as the penalty, while huge, is less than the costs of offering the required coverage to all of our employees.

What he is basically saying is that there are employees today in his business in Louisiana who have health insurance, who are happy with their health insurance, but because of ObamaCare they are going to lose that health insurance.

One of the promises made to the American people was, if you are happy with your health insurance, you get to keep it. I know of at least one business in Louisiana where that is not true, and I promise it is not limited to just this business. In fact, the evidence keeps coming in from all over the country the impact this is going to have.

Here is a quote from Texas: At Lion & Rose pubs and Golden Chick SA restaurants, 1,000-plus employees saw their work schedules reduced to part-time shifts.

From the Wall Street Journal: Ken Adams has been turning to more part-time workers at his 10 Subway sandwich shops in Michigan to avoid possibly incurring higher health care costs.

From the same article: Rod Carstensen, owner of 11 Del Taco restaurants around Denver in Colorado, began in April converting his mostly full-time workforce into one comprised of mostly part-time to help minimize the health care costs.

This is the real impact.

Interestingly, I asked an administration official yesterday: Can you tell us whether anyone who has health insurance now and is happy with it will lose it?

The answer: I can't answer that.

I don't know if she meant she doesn't know or if she meant she can't tell me. But I can tell my colleagues, and small businesses will tell us, if we talk to them, the impact this is going to have is not only that people are going to lose their health care coverage, they are going to lose their hours and get moved from full time to part time.

Here is something: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce did a poll: 74 percent of small businesses plan to deduct the costly law of ObamaCare by either firing workers, reducing hours of full-time staff and moving them to part time or not offering any coverage at all.

This is the real-world impact of ObamaCare on the middle class and working class. This is terrible for our country.

This is no longer a Republican or Democratic issue. It doesn't matter if a person voted for Mitt Romney or Barack Obama. This is going to hurt everybody. There are working-class people in America who have existing insurance who are happy with their doctor, and they are going to lose all of that because of this experiment. There are people today who are struggling to make it just as it is, and they are going to lose their hours. They are going to get forced from full-time work to part-time work. That is the real-life impact of ObamaCare. That is the impact it is having on the working class and on the middle class.

How can we go forward with this? We have a chance to stop this. It may be our last best chance, and it comes in September when we have to pass a short-term budget in this Chamber. If we vote for a budget that funds this, this is going to move forward and hurt people terribly, and those who vote for it are going to have to answer for that.

To my Republican colleagues I would just say this: If we are not going to draw a line in the sand on ObamaCare, we have no lines in the sand. If this issue is not important enough for us to draw a line in the sand, what issue is? This is not a political issue. This is not a partisan issue.

Today I am giving this speech on behalf of the hard-working men and women of this country—working class, middle class, small business owners—who are going to be terribly impacted by this law. We cannot just stand by and allow it to go further. We have to do everything we can to keep this from happening to people, and in September we will have our last best chance to do that.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, America has a rich history of immigration. We are a nation of immigrants. There is hardly a person in America today who doesn't have an immigrant parent, grandparent, or at least someone in their lineage who came to this country from another place.

I have told this story many times on the floor: My mother was an immigrant. She was brought to America at the age of 2 from Lithuania. Her son now stands in the Senate. That is my story, that is my family's story, but it is America's story. It can be repeated over and over and over again.

We think about the Statue of Liberty and how it thrills so many people to see it for the first time and then to understand the message of the Statue of Liberty: To "lift my lamp beside that golden door" so that people are welcomed to this country. We knew it from the beginning: It was the key to our future.

So many times this issue of immigration is overlooked. It is such a critical part of who we are in America. Think back in your own family history—one generation, two or three generations—to a person in a foreign land who said one day, "We are going to America," who undoubtedly was questioned about that decision: You are going to a place you have never been, to a place where they don't speak our language, to a place where they eat different kinds of food? That will be quite a challenge. Well, it was. Millions of people made that trip and came to this country facing that challenge, and they made us who we are today.

In the DNA of most of us who live in America is some little chromosome that said there is a courage to move and a courage to come, and I think it makes us better.

I think immigration is one of the most important parts of America. Thank goodness immigration continues because it brings to our shores amazing people, new generations of leaders who found companies and worked hard so their children and their children's children will do better.

If that is a fact about America and our history of immigration, there is also another fact. There have always been haters—people who hate immigrants. I don't know when it started.

Maybe after the *Mayflower* landed, the folks got off and said: Please don't send us any more. But it has been part of American history and part of American political history and part of the Congress.

I was reading a book as we started to debate the question of immigration reform entitled "Coming To America" by Roger Daniels, and it is a history of immigration in America. It speaks of a Member of the House of Representatives in 1924 named Albert Johnson. He was a Republican from Washington State.

When I read this book on the history of immigration, I came up with some interesting quotes. It is in 1924. Albert Johnson, a Republican from Washington State, is chairing the House Committee on Immigration. This is what he said:

Today, instead of a well-knit homogeneous citizenry, we have a body politic made up of all and every diverse element. Today, instead of a nation descended from generations of free men bred to a knowledge of the principles and practice of self-government, of liberty under law, we have a heterogeneous population no small proportion of which is sprung from races that, throughout the centuries, have known no liberty at all. . . .

Congressman Johnson said:

Our capacity to maintain our cherished institutions stands diluted by a stream of alien blood with all its inherited misconceptions respecting the relationships of the governing power to the governed. It is no wonder, therefore, that the myth of the melting pot has been discredited.

He said:

The United States is our land. We intend to maintain it so. The day of unalloyed welcome to all peoples, the day of indiscriminate acceptance of all races, has definitely ended.

That was a statement made by a Member of Congress in 1924. You read it today and you think to yourself, how could anyone possibly be talking about racial purity in the United States of America, as he did? It draws so many terrifying parallels to a debate that happened not many years later in Europe over racial purity, but it happened. And it happened in the U.S. Congress. Sadly, that was not the end of hatred toward immigration in the U.S. Congress.

Twelve years ago I introduced a bill called the DREAM Act. The DREAM Act was a response to a constituent case in my office. A young woman, a Korean woman in Chicago, called our office. She had a story to tell. She said that she had brought her daughter at the age of 2 from Korea to the United States, to Chicago, on a visitor's visa, along with her husband. They envisioned that her husband would open a church. They looked forward to that day, and it never happened. Her husband continued to pray for that miracle for their family, but the mother said: I have to go to work. The mother went to work in a drycleaning establishment in Chicago.

If you have been to that wonderful city, you know that the majority of drycleaning establishments are run by Korean families—hard-working people who work 12 hours a day and do not think twice about doing it.

Well, this woman went to work, but she was not making much money, and her little girl, as well as the girl's brother and sister, grew up in deepest poverty. The little girl tells the story that when she went to middle school and high school, she would wait until the end of the lunch hour, when students were throwing away the part of their lunch they did not eat, and she would dig through the wastebasket to find food. That is how poor they were.

But something came along in her life that made all the difference in the world. In Chicago we have something called the MERIT Music Program. A woman decided 10 or 15 years ago to leave some money, and she said: Use this money to provide musical instruments to children, poor children in public schools, as well as the lessons they need so they can play the instruments. The MERIT Music Program is an amazing success. One hundred percent of the students who are enrolled in that MERIT Music Program go to college—100 percent.

Well, this little girl, this Korean immigrant girl, was brought into the program and introduced at the age of 12 to a piano for the first time. She fell in love with the piano, and she started working and practicing on it. She would stay at MERIT Music Program headquarters late into the night. They finally gave her a key because it was warm and she wanted to practice her piano.

She became such an accomplished pianist that by the time she was in high school she was accepted into the Juilliard School of Music and the Manhattan Conservatory of Music—amazing for this poor Korean girl. When she applied and went through filling out the application, she came to the line that said "nationality and citizenship," and she turned to her mother and said: What do I put here?

Her mom said: I don't know. We brought you here at the age of 2, and we never filed any papers.

The girl said: What are we going to do?

The mom said: Let's call Senator DURBIN.

So they called our office, and we checked on the law. The law in the United States is very clear and very cruel. The law in the United States said that little girl had to leave this country for 10 years and apply to come back—10 years. She had been brought here at the age of 2. She was only 17 or 18 at the time.

Well, that is when I decided to introduce the DREAM Act. The DREAM Act said that if you were brought here as a child to the United States, if you com-

plete high school, if you have no criminal record of any concern and you are prepared to either enlist in our military or finish at least 2 years of college, we will put you on a path to becoming a citizen of the United States of America. That was the DREAM Act, introduced 12 years ago, called on the floor many different times for passage. It finally passed just a few weeks ago as part of comprehensive immigration reform.

I might tell you the end of the story about this young girl. She did not qualify for any financial assistance because she was undocumented. Two families in Chicago and one woman who is an amazing friend of mine named Joan Harris said they would pay for her education. She went to the Manhattan Conservatory of Music. She excelled in the piano. She played at Carnegie Hall. She married an American jazz musician and became a citizen of the United States, and now she is working on her Ph.D. in music. She just sent me her tape for her Ph.D., and she is amazing.

Tereza Lee is her name. She is the first DREAMer, and it is because of her that I come to the floor today. You see, just yesterday it was disclosed that a Member of the House of Representatives, Congressman STEVEN KING of Iowa, spoke to the issue of the DREAMers. I do not know how many DREAMers—students who would qualify for the DREAM Act—Congressman KING has met. I have met hundreds of them. They are amazing, incredible, living their entire lives in the United States undocumented, fearing deportation any minute of any day, wondering what tomorrow will bring, standing up in the classrooms of America and pledging allegiance to the only flag they have ever known, singing the only national anthem they know, and being told by so many people: You don't belong here. You are not part of this country.

They are completely conflicted and worried and uncertain about their future, and they are nothing short of amazing. These young people have done things with their lives that are just incredible. They are the valedictorians of their classes in many cases. They have gone on to college and paid for it out of their pocket in many cases.

I have come to the floor on 54 different occasions with colored photos of these DREAMers from all over the United States, when they gave us the permission to disclose their identities, and told their stories. And every time I have told that story about that DREAMer, someone has stopped me in the hall and said: That is an amazing story about this young person who just wants to be part of the United States and its future.

So it was troubling yesterday to pick up and read the quote from STEVEN KING, who is a Congressman from Iowa. Mr. KING is no newcomer when it

comes to criticizing immigration. He introduced a bill 3 or 4 weeks ago in the House of Representatives that would have removed all of the Federal funds that are being used now to spare these DREAMers in the United States from deportation. In other words, the President has issued an Executive order so the young people who are eligible for the DREAM Act can stay. He wanted to remove all the funds so they would have to be deported immediately. He called that for a vote. It passed in the U.S. House of Representatives just a few weeks ago, overwhelmingly supported by his Republican side of the aisle. So STEVEN KING has a record of opposing immigration and doing it in a very forceful way.

But they found a quote he had made, a statement he had made on the issue of DREAMers, and that is why I come to the floor today.

In an interview with Radio Iowa, Mr. KING said yesterday, as reported in the Washington Post:

"It seems as though I have a few critics out there, but those who have been advocating for the DREAM Act have been trying to make it about valedictorians." King said in an interview with Radio Iowa. "I don't disagree that there are DREAMers that are valedictorians, but it also would legalize those that are smuggling drugs into the United States."

In his original comments, Congressman KING of Iowa said, "For everyone who's a valedictorian, there's another 100 out there who weigh 130 pounds—and they've got calves the size of cantaloupes because they're hauling 75 pounds of marijuana across the desert."

In his interview Tuesday evening, [Congressman King] doubled down on those comments—

According to the Washington Post—saying, "We have people that are mules, that are drug mules, that are hauling drugs across the border and you can tell by their physical characteristics what they've been doing it for months."

Mr. President, if you are going to be part of this political business, you better have a pretty tough spine and a pretty hard shell because people throw criticism around all the time, and if you cannot take it, this ain't beanbag, do something else.

But I deeply resent what was said by Congressman KING about these DREAMers. It is totally unfair. It is mean, and it is hateful. Do not take my word for it; take the words of the Republican leaders who responded to Mr. KING.

House Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, commenting on Congressman KING's comments, called them "wrong" and "hateful." That is from Speaker BOEHNER.

House majority leader ERIC CANTOR, Republican of Virginia, said they were "inexcusable."

During a House Judiciary Committee subcommittee hearing Tuesday, Representative JOSEPH GARCIA, Democrat

of Florida, described KING's words as "beneath the dignity of this body."

Representative RAUL LABRADOR, Republican of Idaho, who has been heavily involved in immigration reform, expressed hope Wednesday that KING regretted his remarks. "There's nobody in the conference who would say such a thing and I hope that he, if he thought about it, he wouldn't say such a thing again," LABRADOR said.

It is heartening to know that Members of Congressman KING's own political party—Republicans—have stated unequivocally how awful his statement was. It troubles me and it is heart-breaking to think that these DREAMers—these young people who are simply asking for a chance to be part of the United States—would be characterized as dope smugglers and drug smugglers.

Obviously, Congressman KING has never read the DREAM Act because if you have ever been convicted of a crime, you cannot be approved through the DREAM Act for citizenship—not a serious crime. That is part of the law. He should know better, but I am not sure that he cares.

I am glad Members of his own party have stepped up and branded these comments for what they are. What I have to say to him is, take a moment away from the media, meet some of these DREAMers, and hear their stories. Hear what they have been through, and hear about what they want to do with their lives for the future of the United States of America.

To the DREAMers themselves, this is not the first criticism they have run into. They have taken a lot. They are courageous young men and women.

When I started this trek, this 12-year trek on the DREAM Act, I used to give speeches in Chicago about the bill, and there would be audiences full of Hispanics usually. Nothing much would be said. I would go out to my car afterward, and in the darkness there would be a couple students waiting by the car. They would call me to the side, after they looked both ways to make sure no one was around, and they would say: Senator, we are DREAMers. We are counting on you to give us a chance. Over the years, these young people who waited to greet me in the darkness when no one was around have now stepped up. They are identifying who they are so America knows what is at stake.

When you meet the DREAMers, you will realize how awful and wrong these statements by Congressman KING are. There will always be critics of immigration in America. It is part of our national tradition. But I do believe the vast majority of Americans are fair people. They are people who believe in justice. They do not believe that a child—that a child—should be held responsible for any wrongdoing by their parent. If their parent brought them to the United States as a baby, they had

no voice in that decision. Why should they be penalized for that decision? They should be given their own chance to become part of this Nation's future.

I will close by saying that maybe Tereza Lee was not the first DREAMer in my life. My mother was brought here at the age of 2 and certainly did not have much of a voice in the decision to come to America. But thank goodness her mother and father decided to make that trip and that my grandparents located in Illinois and gave me a chance to grow up in a great place with a great family. That is my story, and that is America's story.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, Senator DURBIN is such an eloquent champion for righting injustice, and I am always impressed with him, and I do agree that the American people are good and decent people. They want the right thing. They want the right thing on immigration. Part of that is a lawful system of immigration that serves the national interests of our country. We disagree on how to get there sometimes, but you cannot dispute the passion of Senator DURBIN.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I want to share some thoughts about the President's tour today and the last couple of days talking about jobs.

Well, I have to say, first and foremost, this country is not doing well economically. It is just not.

You hear the stock market is up, and people try to translate that into substantial progress in the economy. But it is just not there, particularly with jobs. The fourth quarter of last year, our GDP growth was .4 percent. By the time the first half of this year concludes, we are not going to have 2 percent growth over that period.

You are not going to create jobs unless you have economic growth. We are not seeing it. Wages are down. Wages have declined since 1999 for working Americans by virtually any calculation. Wages have been declining. Unemployment is up. The number of people working today is 2.1 million fewer than in 2007. We have 2.1 million fewer people working today than in 2007.

This is the slowest economic recovery since the Great Depression, there is no doubt about that. But we have done all kinds of extraordinary things. We had the biggest stimulus—all borrowed—spent. They are going to stimulate the economy and create growth. Has it produced real growth or is it just a sugar high, as one of the Wall Street gurus referred to it? It appears quite clear that it is a sugar-type high.

We have more and more plans from our leadership here in the Senate. It is basically tax and spend. The American

people are hurting. Their wages are falling and so forth. They have unemployment problems. So we promise to tax more and we are going to spread more money around and borrow more. And this is somehow going to put us on a sound path to prosperity, job growth, and wage increases, which is what we need. Please note these facts.

I do not mind the President talking about the issue. I know he is using the words "middle class." Well, he should. Middle-class working Americans, struggling Americans—someone needs to be thinking about them. But you also have to have policies. A speech is not a policy. A speech is not tangible, something that creates growth, jobs, prosperity, and increased wages. GDP growth last quarter was only 1.8 percent and has averaged at or under 2 percent since the end of the recession in 2009.

There is a major corporation, a CEO—which is common throughout the business—he just said quite frankly: We are not hiring anybody if the GDP growth in America is not over 3 percent.

Well, we haven't had 3 percent growth—hardly had it—since 2009. He actually is not filling vacancies still even though we are having modest growth and people possibly are trying to oversell that.

I am just saying that the economy is struggling. It is not growing rapidly enough to create jobs. We have record unemployment.

The Wall Street Journal panel of economic experts expects slow growth for the rest of this year at 2 percent or less. They have revised their forecast down. The President and Congressional Budget Office a year or so ago were predicting higher numbers than this. They are not coming in. Now they are revising downward what they expect the economy to do in the second half of the year.

We need more than a speech, in my opinion. After 6 years since the beginning of the recession, we still have not created as many jobs as existed in December of 2007. Americans are working 5 billion less hours than in 2007. Think about that—5 billion less hours than in 2007.

Some say: Well, our immigration plan—my colleague recalled my attention to it—is somehow going to fix that. We will bring in more workers, and everyone is going to get pay raises, and unemployment is going to be reduced.

But that is not what the Congressional Budget Office told us.

At a time when we are struggling to find jobs for American workers, many of the unemployed are immigrants to the country, African Americans, poor people struggling to get by, and you continue to bring in a larger flow of labor than the country can absorb. As Mr. Peter Kirsanow from the U.S. Com-

mission on Civil Rights said, we do not have a shortage of workers in America, we have an excess of workers in America. We have more workers than we have jobs.

The fastest growing type of work today is part-time employment. Over 320,000 part-time jobs were created last month compared to 95,000 full-time jobs. They are counting these part-time employment jobs as employment. Well it is better than nothing, I suppose. We are having a surge of part-time employment, driven in large measure by the President's health care policies. It just is. Everybody knows that.

New unemployment claims, which came out this week, are up. In other words, the number of people who are filing for unemployment insurance has gone up, I hate to say. There were 7,000 more in July, to 343,000.

The average net worth of American households is down. Someone said recently that net worth was back to nearly what it was prior to the recession. That was something we heard based on, I guess, the stock market primarily. But another analysis looked at it and said: Well, what about the share of the debt of Americans? That has increased dramatically since 2007. Once you calculate the debt all of us owe as American citizens to the total debt of America, household net worth is 60 percent lower than it was in 2007.

It is time for this Nation to begin a serious discussion about what it is that is causing our economy to slide and what we can do realistically to create jobs, increase growth, get higher wages, and so forth. One of the things we should not do is bring in more labor than we have jobs for. That is pretty simple to me. One of the things we should do is try to bring down the cost of energy, not increase the cost of energy. One of the things we should do is eliminate the unnecessary regulations that drive up costs and produce nothing but a burden in exchange. We need a tax system that favors growth. We need to defend on the world stage the legitimate interests of America and our working people. We have not effectively fought back against unfair trade. We can do a better job of that. There are a lot of things we can do that do not revolve around taxing more, borrowing more, and spending more. That is what the policies are here.

We have a bill on the floor right now that busts the budget wide open. We agreed to these limits 2 years ago. Senator SHELBY, the ranking Republican on the Budget Committee, stood firm for the agreement levels we agreed to. It was not easy, but we agreed to it. Oh, no, the majority has to spend more than the amount that currently is limited by law.

So I guess what I would say is that President Obama is correct to at least talk about this issue, but we need to do

more than talk. About all we are hearing when the President talks is plans to invest more, to spend more, to tax more, and to borrow more. That will not change the debt course of America. We need real policies to put us on a path to prosperity that protects the American worker from unfair foreign competition, from excessive labor brought into the country, and from too high energy costs. There are a lot of other things we can do that would promote prosperity in the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Alabama.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, as we all know, we have a jobs crisis in America. High unemployment and weak economic growth have festered for nearly 5 years. American families are increasingly dependent upon government, and businesses are being suffocated by it all over this country.

I believe our ability to emerge from this jobs crisis stronger than before depends upon government performing its proper role in the economy. In my view, that role is to establish the conditions for job creation and economic growth in the private sector. Through stable fiscal policy, a simplified tax code, and streamlined regulation, the government can create an economic environment conducive to risk-taking and innovation that leads to real job creation in this country. Unfortunately, the same toxic combination of government overreach and inaction which has failed to produce a jobs recovery in this country thus far also threatens to prolong the jobs crisis, I believe, for years to come.

We learned in the last few days that President Obama is planning a PR blitz to gloss over his failed economic agenda. Over a series of speeches he will give around the country, he said he will discuss his vision for the future. But he will offer nothing new. According to the New York Times, his jobs plan is "largely repackaging economic proposals that the President has offered for years." We need a fresh free market approach to job creation. Stale Obama policy leftovers will not cut it. They are not new ideas. It is not a new beginning.

I will preface my remarks here on the fiscal, tax, regulatory, and monetary policy challenges we face in this country with a more detailed description of the current macro-economic conditions, starting with job numbers.

The official unemployment rate in the United States is 7.6 percent. That makes 54 straight months of unemployment above 7½ percent. However, as grim as those figures are, they do not tell the full story. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the real unemployment rate in this country—known

as U6—is 14.3 percent unemployment. U6 includes those who are unemployed, those who want to work but have stopped searching for a job, and those working part time because they cannot find full-time work. Some 22.6 million Americans fall under this category I have just described. That is the real unemployment. That is sad.

The real unemployment rate was 14.2 percent when President Obama took office in January of 2009. It peaked at 17.1 percent in late 2009 and early 2010 but has not fallen below 13.8 percent during his time in office. By all measures this has been a jobless Presidency thus far.

Digging further into the numbers reveals more troubling trends. The number of people working part time because their hours were cut back or because they cannot find full-time work increased by 322,000 people last month to 8.2 million people in this country. The percentage of the unemployed who have been without work for 27 weeks or more also remains dangerously high at 36.7 percent.

An analysis by the Hamilton Project in February of this year found that we will not get back to full employment for another 10 years based on recent job-creation numbers. Meanwhile, economic growth remains sluggish.

The most recent figures from the Bureau of Economic Analysis indicate that the U.S. real gross domestic product, GDP, grew at a tepid 1.8-percent annual rate in the first quarter of 2013—this year.

Average annual real GDP growth was just 0.8 percent over President Obama's first term in office, the full 4 years.

We are experiencing the weakest economic recovery since the Great Depression. As a consequence, government dependency in this country is on the rise. Under President Obama, the number of Americans on food stamps has increased by 47 percent to 47 million people; 8.9 million Americans collect disability pay, and that number is increasing by 70,000 people a month, unheard of in the past.

These are alarming figures. How did we get there? I will explain.

Overspending. The current job crisis, I believe, is a product of the 2008 financial meltdown we all went through. No one denies that President Obama was dealt a tough hand coming into office. He was. But the question is, What did he do about it?

President Obama's first act in office, if you will recall, was to ram a \$787 billion stimulus package through Congress. He promised the American people it would keep the unemployment rate from rising above 8 percent. Instead, the unemployment rate hit 10 percent in October of 2009 and remained above 8 percent for the next 43 consecutive months, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

But President Obama's spending binge was just getting started. Accord-

ing to the Congressional Budget Office, the congressional budget deficit in 2009 was \$1.413 trillion. In 2010, an additional \$1.294 trillion. In 2011 it was another \$1.3 trillion, and in 2012 \$1.087 trillion—not billion, trillion. Although the 2013 deficit we are in now is projected to get below \$1 trillion, it will still be \$183 billion higher than any pre-Obama deficit.

Looking at the big picture, the national public debt now stands at just under \$17 trillion, an increase of nearly 60 percent under President Obama.

What has been the result of this spending spree? Taxpayers got more debt, but job seekers didn't get more work.

Compounding our fiscal difficulties, Social Security and Medicare remain on an unstable long-term footing. These programs alone already account for 38 percent of Federal spending. But over the next 25 years, the Congressional Budget Office projects their share—that is Social Security and Medicare—of GDP to increase by 40 percent.

According to the trustees of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, Medicare is expected to run out of money in 13 years, and Social Security will go broke by 2033. Saving these essential programs requires Presidential leadership. Unfortunately, there has been none to speak of. President Obama's spending binges have precipitated multiple budget showdowns and, as a result, they have also presented many opportunities for spending and entitlement reform.

But President Obama has not risen to the occasion yet, despite broad consensus that we must take action to save Social Security and Medicare. President Obama used the power of his office to campaign pre- and post-election for one thing, tax increases.

Tax increases are not the solution to a spending problem. Tax hikes do not create jobs. Tax hikes will not generate growth. Tax hikes kill jobs and allow President Obama to spend more and for Congress and the President to borrow more. I believe what we need in this country is structural tax reform, not tax increases.

According to the most recent data from the Internal Revenue Service, the top 1 percent of taxpayers, those making \$369,000 or more, pay 37.38 percent of all income taxes. I wish to say it again. According to the IRS, 1 percent of the taxpayers paid 37 percent of all income taxes.

The top 5 percent of taxpayers, those making \$161,000 or more, paid 59 percent of all income taxes. Think about it. The top 10 percent of all taxpayers, those making \$116,000 or more, paid 70 percent of all income taxes.

The top 25 percent of taxpayers, those making \$69,000 or more, pay 87 percent of all income taxes.

The top 50 percent of taxpayers, those making \$34,000 or more, pay 97 percent of all income taxes.

Meanwhile, the other 50 percent, those making \$34,000 or less, pay 2.36 percent, a little over, not quite 2.5 percent of all income taxes. In addition, approximately half of U.S. households pay no income tax.

Despite these imbalances, President Obama increased taxes on the wealthiest Americans by \$617 billion in January of this year. Still, a Heritage Foundation analysis of Treasury Department data finds that President Obama's fiscal year 2014 budget contains an additional \$1.1 trillion in proposed tax increases. This is a tax-and-spend administration.

The size and complexity of the Tax Code adds to the tax burden on the economy. The code contains 55,600 pages, I am told. Taking into account all explanatory materials and IRS rulings, the CCH-Standard Federal Tax Reporter comprises 70,000 pages. Even the instructions for the easiest tax form, the 1040EZ, run 46 pages.

The total cost of complying with the individual and corporate tax requirement in this country was \$168 billion last year. According to the IRS Taxpayer Advocate Service, there has been approximately 4,680 changes to the Tax Code since 2001.

The Tax Code is filled with various credits, deductions, and corporate welfare. Analysis by the Joint Committee on Taxation finds that these so-called tax expenditures total \$1.3 trillion. We could drastically simplify the Tax Code and lower individuals' rates by eliminating these provisions alone.

Unfortunately, President Obama's approach to taxes is the same as his approach to spending: more, more, more—but no structural reforms that would help us establish the conditions for job creation and economic growth in this country, which we desperately need.

Overregulation of the economy further deteriorates the conditions necessary for job creation and economic growth. The aggregate regulatory burden on American families and businesses is staggering.

A study by the Competitive Enterprise Institute estimates that total costs for Americans to comply with Federal regulations reached \$1.806 trillion in 2012. This translates to nearly \$15,000 annually per family or 23 percent of average household income.

According to the American Action Forum, the Federal Government so far this year alone has published regulations that will result in \$61 billion in compliance costs and 80 million hours of paperwork.

Despite the failure of the stimulus package, President Obama put the unemployed on hold for more than a year while he forced government-run health care through Congress. He promised his plan would reduce health insurance premiums by \$2,500. Instead, premiums have already increased by that

amount, according to the Kaiser Family Foundation employee health benefits survey. A recent Wall Street Journal analysis finds that premiums could double or even triple for healthy consumers, even under ObamaCare.

All together, ObamaCare is 2,400 pages long and creates 159 new boards, commissions, and government offices. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the 10-year spending estimate for ObamaCare is \$1.88 trillion. Analysis by the Joint Committee on Taxation shows that the law creates or raises 21 taxes totaling \$1.1 trillion over the next 10 years.

The impact of ObamaCare on hiring is not surprising. According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Q2 2013 Small Business Survey, 71 percent of small businesses say the health care law makes it harder to hire people.

The same survey finds that one-half of small businesses say they will either cut hours, reduce full-time employees, or replace full-time employees with part-time workers to avoid the mandate. In addition, Gallup finds that 41 percent of small business owners say they have held off on hiring new employees in response to ObamaCare.

I welcome recent news that the Obama administration will temporarily delay the employer mandate. But in light of the evidence that ObamaCare is increasing health insurance costs and making it harder for the unemployed to find jobs, we should delay the whole law permanently for everyone. We should repeal it.

Congress should start over and craft legislation that will actually lower health care costs and preserve high-quality care without crushing businesses with unnecessary regulations.

President Obama's expansion of government did not end with ObamaCare. In 2010, he forced through Congress his purported response to the financial meltdown, the Dodd-Frank legislation.

We were told that the financial regulatory system needed to be streamlined to prevent future bailouts, and that is true. Instead, Dodd-Frank created more government agencies than it eliminated. Moreover, the law totals 2,300 pages and calls for 400 new rules.

A study by scholars at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University estimates that Dodd-Frank had already generated 2,109 restrictions in the Code of Federal Regulations by the end of 2011, and there is more to come.

At this rate, they project a 26-percent increase in restrictions in relevant sections of the code once all Dodd-Frank rulemakings are finalized in the future. Dodd-Frank will create jobs only for regulatory compliance officers, not for people working every day in the United States.

Earlier this year I introduced legislation that would require regulators to perform a rigorous cost-benefit analysis of new Dodd-Frank regulations.

Under the legislation, a regulation dies if its costs exceed its benefits to the economy.

Unfortunately, the Democratic majority in the Senate has not brought up this legislation for consideration. Some observers have subscribed to the cynical view that the legislation is nothing more than an effort to undercut financial reform.

I am the only current Member of the Senate who voted against both financial deregulation in 1999 and the Wall Street bailout in 2008. I subscribe to the view that regulations should protect taxpayers without harming job creators.

President Obama's regulatory zeal finds an outlet now in a war on coal in this country. Aware that it does not have the votes to jam his carbon tax agenda through Congress, he now will direct the Environmental Protection Agency to implement it by way of regulation. We all know his environmentalist crusade will kill jobs.

An analysis by the Heritage Foundation estimates that drastically reducing the percentage of coal in our Nation's energy portfolio would, by 2030, kill more than 500,000 jobs and increase electricity prices by 20 percent.

In contrast, a Wood Mackenzie study estimates 1.4 million American jobs could be created if the government adopted policies encouraging U.S. energy exploration and production.

I believe the Obama environmental agenda will do more to put family budgets in the red than it will to make the world green.

Instead of waging a war on coal jobs, I believe President Obama should approve and expedite the Keystone Pipeline. This would create tens of thousands of jobs and decrease energy bills for families and businesses. This is the type of clear-headed energy policy we should be pursuing in this country.

In light of the existing and increasing regulatory burden, it is not surprising the Federal Reserve estimates that manufacturers, domestic producers, and other nonfinancial American companies are sitting on a record \$1.78 trillion stockpile of cash. Why? If we are to create the conditions for real job creation in this country, we must start by streamlining the regulatory burden on the economy. The rules, restrictions, and mandates facing those who wish to undertake an entrepreneurial endeavor or expand their business through investment and innovation is mind-numbing.

MONETARY POLICY

I would also like to talk a few minutes on monetary policy—very dry, complicated, but very important to all of us.

On July 17, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke told members of the House Financial Services Committee “if we were to tighten policy, the economy would tank.”

What does he mean? He was referring to the Federal Reserve's aggressive use of nontraditional monetary policy to prop up markets since the financial meltdown of 2008. The implied message is striking: The Fed is taking big risks through monetary policy because administration policy is not helping the economy.

The Federal Reserve's balance sheet quantifies just how big a risk Chairman Bernanke feels he must take with so-called monetary stimulus. It currently stands—the Fed balance sheet—at \$3.5 trillion, and continues to grow at \$85 billion a month under the Fed's so-called quantitative easing program. Among the assets included in the Fed's balance sheet are \$2 trillion in U.S. Treasury securities and \$1.2 trillion in Federal agency mortgage-backed securities.

To put the acceleration of the Fed's balance sheet into perspective, it took 95 years from the Fed's creation 100 years ago—1913—to reach \$1 trillion. The Fed then added the second trillion in just 6 weeks, followed by the third trillion this past January. Under the current quantitative easing program, the Fed's balance sheet will reach \$4 trillion in less than 6 months. Where does it end—\$5 trillion, \$6 trillion, \$10 trillion?

As with fiscal policy, we are in uncharted monetary policy waters. The Fed's unprecedented measures carry substantial risk and uncertainty to every man, woman, and child in this country. Should inflation increase, and it will, the Fed would have to tighten monetary policy to contain it. However, should the Fed tighten monetary policy, it risks stalling an already weak economy here. As deep as our fundamental economic challenges already are, the thought that one wrong monetary policy move by the Fed could cripple our entire economy is deeply troubling.

In conclusion, I think we face a serious confluence of economic challenges in this country. It is obvious to me that President Obama's policies have not worked and they will not create work or jobs. Real job creation is a result of entrepreneurship and innovation and risk in the free market. I believe the government's role is to establish conditions for that to occur. We can do this by stabilizing our Nation's finances, simplifying our Tax Code, and streamlining our regulatory framework.

The more President Obama and this administration cling to the tired liberal ideology that more government is always the answer, the longer this job crisis will persist. America deserves better.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, tomorrow we celebrate the 23rd anniversary of the signing of the Americans With Disabilities Act, the ADA. This landmark civil rights legislation will always be the highlight of my almost 40 years here in the Congress.

The Americans With Disabilities Act is one of the landmark civil rights laws of the 20th century; as someone once said, a long overdue emancipation proclamation for people with disabilities. The ADA has played a huge role in making our country more accessible, in raising expectations of people with disabilities about what they can achieve at work and in life, and inspiring the world to view disability issues through the lenses of equality and opportunity.

In these times, it is valuable to remember passage of the original Americans With Disabilities Act was a robustly bipartisan effort. As the chief sponsor of the ADA here in the Senate, and as the chair of the Disability Policy Subcommittee at that time, I worked very closely with both Republicans and Democrats. At that time Senator Robert Dole was the minority leader of the Senate, and we received invaluable support from President George Herbert Walker Bush. Key members of his administration, such as White House Counsel Boyden Gray, worked so hard on this, as did Attorney General Dick Thornburgh, who was magnificent in his support for the Americans With Disabilities Act. Transportation Secretary Sam Skinner and other Members of Congress also played critical roles in passing the ADA.

First and foremost among those, I would have to say, was Senator Ted Kennedy, who was chair of the full committee at the time and who allowed me to take the bill through as the chair of the Disability Policy Subcommittee. Senator ORRIN HATCH played a key role at times, making sure we got the conservatives on the same page. Representatives Tony Coelho, STENY HOYER, Major Owens, Steve Bartlett, and I might also mention someone who is not mentioned a lot, because he was not here in the Senate at the time we passed it, but who put in a lot of his life's work and who was chairman of that subcommittee before I took it over, Senator Lowell Weicker from Connecticut. As a matter of fact, he was the first sponsor of a comprehensive disability policy bill here in the Senate. So he became a great supporter, a great personal friend of mine

through all these years, and Lowell Weicker deserves a lot of credit for actually getting us focused on the issue of a comprehensive civil rights bill addressing the issue of disability.

Before the ADA, life was very different for folks with disabilities in Iowa and across the country. Being an American with a disability meant you couldn't ride on a bus because there was no lift, not being able to attend a concert or a ballgame or a movie with your family or your friends or loved ones because there was no accessible seating, not even being able to cross the street in a wheelchair because there were no curb cuts. In short, being disabled in America before the ADA meant not being able to work or participate in community life. Discrimination was both commonplace and accepted.

Since then, we have seen amazing progress. The ADA literally transformed the American landscape by requiring architectural and communications barriers be removed and replaced with accessible features such as ramps, lifts, curb cuts, widened doorways, and—for anyone who is watching this on C-SPAN and put on the mute button—you get closed captioning for the deaf and hard of hearing.

More importantly, the ADA gave millions of Americans the opportunity to participate in their communities. We have made substantial progress in advancing the four goals of the ADA: equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency—the four pillars of the ADA.

But I stand here today to remind my colleagues that we have not yet kept the promise we made 23 years ago with strong bipartisan support. We still have too many Americans with disabilities living in poverty, oftentimes in isolation and without control over the supports and services in their lives.

For example, last week in my role as the chair of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, we concluded an investigation and issued a final report on the state of the implementation of the part of the ADA that provides for people to be able to live and receive services in integrated settings, and prohibits people from being unnecessarily separated and isolated from their family and friends and put in institutions or other segregated settings. What we found is disturbing. Twenty-three years after the 1999 Olmstead case decision by the Supreme Court, we found that more than 200,000 working-age Americans with disabilities—many in their late teens and early twenties—remain trapped in nursing homes and institutions, separated from their families and communities against their wishes—despite the 1999 Supreme Court decision in *Olmstead v. LC* that people with disabilities have the right to be integrated in the community.

Our committee investigators found that only 12 States devote more than half of their Medicaid long-term care dollars to home and community-based services. The number of working-age adults in nursing homes has actually increased by more than 30,000 over the last 5 years. It is shameful.

Unfortunately, many States continue to approach community living for people with disabilities as a social welfare issue and not as a civil rights issue. This is a failure of vision on the part of many State leaders.

So how can we correct this injustice? Well, we need to clarify that under the ADA, every individual who is eligible for long-term services and supports has a federally protected right to a real choice—their choice—in where they receive these services and supports, whether in an institution or in a community.

What that also means is, at long last, Congress needs to end the institutional bias in the Medicaid system. Right now, under Medicaid, States are required to pay for long-term services and supports if you are in a nursing home. But if you want to receive those supports and services in an integrated community-based setting, Medicaid has the option of covering you. That is the institutional bias that exists in Medicaid: They have to pay for you if you are in a nursing home, and they don't have to pay for supports and services if you are in a community or integrated setting. As long as it remains that way, the deck will continue to be stacked in favor of costly institutional settings. We know from our investigations that home-based, community-based integrated settings with support services for people with disabilities is more cost effective than putting people in an institution or a nursing home—not to mention the quality of life, and the fact that so many people with disabilities want to be in an integrated community setting and do not want to be housed in a nursing home.

In my remaining 17 months that I have as a Senator here in the Senate, I plan to hold hearings and introduce legislation that will accelerate the rate at which States move their long-term services and supports in the direction of home and community-based settings.

Another area where our work is incomplete is making sure people with disabilities take their rightful place in the American workforce. Twenty-three years after the passage of the ADA, it is shameful that two out of every three adults with a disability are not even in the workforce, not working. That is shameful. We may say, Well, the unemployment rate in America is now 8 or 9 percent. Think about if you are a disabled adult; it is 60 percent or more who are unemployed.

Next week in the HELP Committee, we will mark up the Workforce Investment Act, a critical law that has not

been reauthorized since 1998. The workforce has changed a lot since 1998, and a lot of the ADA generation have come of age during that period of time. So in the bipartisan draft Senators ALEXANDER, MURRAY, ISAKSON, and I filed with the committee yesterday, we include provisions that will improve how the vocational rehabilitation system partners with schools to deliver services that will result in more young people doing internships, part-time jobs, in competitive settings. The aim is to maximize the likelihood that young people with disabilities will leave school college and career ready—people such as Lily Siegel, who was my intern this summer from the American Association of People with Disabilities. They provide summer internships. Lily, and so many like her, have high expectations for themselves. They want to be challenged. They want to work in competitive, integrated employment. They don't want to be shunted into subminimum wage jobs with no future, no chance for advancement, no chance for challenging themselves to do better and to do more and to take more responsibility. We owe it to them to do everything in our power to help them transition to the kinds of jobs and higher education experiences that will help them build a career and maximize their economic self-sufficiency.

I can tell you from my work in this area that this generation of young people who have come of age under the umbrella of the ADA, who were born in 1990 through 1995, has been integrated into their schools. They weren't segregated as my brother was and sent halfway across the State to a State institution. They have higher expectations. They have had accessibility. They see what society has done to make sure that they can travel, they can go out with their friends and their family, they can go to school in integrated settings, they can get jobs and, under the ADA, employers have to provide reasonable accommodations for that job. They don't deserve now to be frustrated by not having the opportunity to get that competitive integrated employment.

That is what we are doing in the Workforce Investment Act, to provide for young people in high school who have disabilities, to let them know they expect more of themselves, and we do too. No longer will it be acceptable for them to leave school and go into some minimum wage covered employment where they are warehoused for the rest of their lives. They want to get out there and show what they can do. That is why we are changing the Workforce Investment Act, changing vocational rehab to focus on getting these young people internships, job shadowing, mentoring, so they know what their abilities are and what they can expect to do once they leave school.

When we passed the ADA, so many people came here from other countries—legislators, parliamentarians—how can we now do this? How can we get our laws changed?

About 11 years ago, the United Nations set up a committee to look at this. Out of this came the U.N. Convention on the Rights of People With Disabilities, the CRPD. That treaty was sent to our President, and under our system the President sends it out to all his Departments in the executive branch to report back, what things do they need to do to change to conform to the treaty? In other words, if the treaty is the supreme law of the land, what laws do we have to change in order to comply with that treaty?

Guess what. After about a whole year of circulating through all of our Departments of Justice, Labor, HHS, Agriculture, and everything else, it came back: We don't have to change one law because we are the best in the world when it comes to the civil rights protection of people with disabilities.

So last year, under the guidance of then-Senator John Kerry, who is now our Secretary of State, it went to the Foreign Relations Committee. They had hearings. Senator MCCAIN and I were the two leadoff witnesses. We brought that treaty to the floor of the Senate in December, fully expecting it would pass. Under the Constitution of the United States, it requires a two-thirds vote to approve the treaty and we thought we had the votes. We brought it on the floor. We fell 6 votes short of the 67 votes we need. We had a number of Republicans and Democrats on the bill.

Why did it fail? Right before we brought it up, former Senator Rick Santorum and others began to talk about how this was going to prevent people from homeschooling their kids. I thought I knew the treaty. I had read it. I had looked at it. I thought, Did I miss something? Is there something in there I didn't find?

I went back to my staff and said, Comb through this. I got ahold of people at the U.N. and said, What is in there that would prevent people from homeschooling their kids? Nothing. Absolutely nothing. That charge was made out of whole cloth somehow, but at that time in my office calls ran 50-1 against adopting the treaty on that issue. So people were misinformed because of a few people like Mr. Santorum and others who decided to whip this up—for whatever reason, I don't know.

There were also a lot of comments made on the Senate floor by my Republican colleagues at that time that we shouldn't be adopting a treaty in a lameduck session, even though we pointed out that many treaties in the past had been adopted in lameduck sessions. I review that history to tell my colleagues that under now the leader-

ship of Senator BOB MENENDEZ, who is the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—and I might add that the person who succeeded Senator Kerry in his position in the Senate, the present occupant of the chair, is also on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—there are going to be some more hearings. Under the leadership of Senator MENENDEZ, we intend to bring that back to the floor this fall. We need to get the 67 votes.

People ask: Why is that so important? It is important for the United States to take leadership on this issue around the globe. Over 100 nations have already signed the treaty. They are looking to us for leadership.

I have talked to some of my colleagues and they say: Why do we need to join that? We are OK. We are doing just fine. We are doing just fine with disability law in our country. We do not need to join this convention, sign this treaty.

It seems to me that is an inherently selfish way of looking at who we are and what we are about as a nation. We have provided, I think to the world, guidance and direction on disability issues. If we are a part of the Convention, we get a seat at the table. When countries come and say we want to conform our laws, we want to make sure we meet the guidelines of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, this commission that is set up will be there to both guide and direct countries but also to see whether they are fulfilling their obligations. If we are not a signatory to the treaty, we are not at the table.

There is another reason we should sign this Convention. I just spoke to a group of people yesterday, people with disabilities, and I said: There are a lot of people in this country who use a wheelchair. Guess what. They would like to travel overseas. They would like to go with their friends and their family. But in many of these countries they do not have curb cuts. They do not have lifts. They do not have accessibility for people with disabilities. Shouldn't people with disabilities in this country have the same right to travel and enjoy foreign travel as anybody else? If we are a signatory to the treaty, then we can work with those countries to help change their laws, change their structures.

I cannot tell you how many veterans I have talked to, people who have come back from Iraq and Afghanistan disabled, and do you know what they say. They want us to join the treaty too because they want to travel overseas, and they feel constricted because they will not have accessibility in other countries.

For the life of me I cannot understand why people are not supporting this treaty. I do not get it. I just don't get it. It is supported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It is supported

by every veterans group in this country. It is supported by, I think, every faith-based group in this country. It is supported by everyone in the disability community. It is supported by every former living President, from the two Bushes to Clinton, to Carter. It has broad-based support. You would think with that kind of support it would be a no-brainer to pass it in the Senate.

We are going to bring it up again this fall. I am hopeful we can do it. No one worked harder on a lot of these issues than Senator Bob Dole. We just had his 90th birthday party Tuesday in Statuary Hall. It was quite an event. So we fell just six votes short. I look forward to working with Senators MENENDEZ, MCCAIN, AYOTTE, BARRASSO, DURBIN, UDALL, and COONS to bring the treaty back to the floor and get the additional votes needed for it to pass.

I tell you, people with disabilities, their family members, supporters, the business community, the veterans community, faith-based and civil rights groups are mobilizing for this. They do not want to take another chance that this will not pass.

I urge my colleagues to take the time to look at the facts related to the disability treaty. It requires no changes in U.S. law. It has no budget impact. As I said, when we become a party to the Convention, we have a seat at the table with the rest of the world. We will be well positioned to accelerate progress for the 1 billion people with disabilities around the world. It is our chance to be that shining city on the hill for the rest of the world.

I might also add this is supported by the high-tech business community in America because their global leadership position on accessible products and services can be used by the rest of the world.

For all those reasons, we need to pass it. Let me just close with this one last thought. Again, I am struck by the fact that these days we are surrounded, as I said earlier, with a new generation of young adults with disabilities who grew up since passage of the ADA, including a number of wounded warriors back from Iraq and Afghanistan. I call these younger people the ADA generation. They see disability as a natural part of human diversity. They reject the prejudices and stereotypes of earlier generations. I can tell you this, they have high expectations for themselves. They want to be challenged and they want to challenge us to make sure our society is open and they have the opportunity to go as far as their talents can take them.

We cannot let these people down. If we passed the ADA, now we have to take steps to make sure it is not just a promise, but it is a promise we are keeping and that we will keep.

We in the Senate have a responsibility to keep fighting to ensure that they have an equal opportunity to be

independent, fully integrated, fully self-sufficient. That, at the heart, is what the Americans with Disabilities Act is all about. Twenty-three years later, we can look at it and say, without doubt, it truly is America at its very best.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, over the last few years, I have come to the floor many times to advocate for comprehensive tax reform. I share the belief of many in Congress that tax reform is a necessary step to ensuring economic growth and prosperity in the future. This is why, as the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, I have made tax reform my top priority.

We are now at a crossroads when it comes to tax reform. Before us there are two alternative paths. The first path is the one we took back in 1986. It is the path that former House Democratic Leader Dick Gephardt and former Treasury Secretary James Baker advised members of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to take.

As you will recall, they were two critical players in the last successful tax reform effort. In 2011, at one of our hearings, they advised us to not mix deficit reduction and tax reform. This was a joint Senate Finance and Ways and Means Committee hearing. To paraphrase these two former leaders: Each is a hard enough task by itself, but doing them together is nearly impossible. That is one path we can take. The path that separates our tax reform efforts from our deficit reduction efforts.

In 2011, they both advised us not to mix deficit reduction and tax reform. They just basically said that each is a hard enough task by itself, but doing them together is nearly impossible. That is one path we can take, the path that separates our tax reform efforts from our deficit reduction efforts.

The other path we can take is to condition tax reform on the raising of additional revenues. Sadly, that seems to be the preferred path of many of my friends on the other side of the aisle. I will never fully understand why, except their propensity to spend. According to many Democrats in the Senate, there can be no deal on tax reform unless they get a second significant tax increase this year. We heard just today from the Senate Democratic leadership that they want the Senate Finance Committee to use the Senate budget, which included nearly \$1 trillion in tax hikes, as the model for tax reform. Essentially, what they are saying is that unless they get a big tax hike, we have to keep the tax system as it is, with all

of its complexity, inequities, and distortions. Right now this position is held by many on the other side of the aisle, and it is the biggest barrier to fundamental tax reform.

Today, I would like to take a few minutes to examine this position and to discuss the merits of conditioning tax reform on yet another significant tax increase. Last October, one of my friends on the other side put it this way:

Tax reform 25 years ago was revenue neutral. It did not strive to cut the debt. Today we cannot afford for it not to. Our national debt today is approximately 73 percent of GDP. That is nearly double what it was in 1986.

At first glance, this argument may appear to be reasonable. However, it falls apart under further examination. If my friends on the other side of the aisle were serious about deficit reduction, they would not focus their efforts on tax hikes. If they wanted to get a handle on our Nation's debt problems, they would work with Republicans to address the main drivers of our debt and deficits, our unsustainable entitlement programs.

No one who has spent more than 5 minutes examining our Nation's finances seriously disputes that the main drivers of our current debt and deficits, and the source of the coming fiscal calamity, are Federal entitlement programs, especially our health care entitlements, Medicare and Medicaid.

I have a chart from the Bipartisan Policy Center that tracks the trend lines on Federal spending. As the chart shows, in the coming years, health care entitlement spending will overwhelm our Federal fiscal picture and consume an outsized share of our economy. That is represented by the top blue line on the chart.

All other categories of major Federal spending either increase at significantly lesser rates or decline and stabilize. As we can see, Social Security kind of levels off, discretionary spending—both defense and nondefense—we have seen that go down. This is other mandatory programs. As we can see, when it comes to deficit reduction, getting our debt under control, entitlement reform, that upper line, that is going off the charts. That is where the bodies are buried. Yet if you listen to my friends on the other side of the aisle, the problem is not our entitlement programs. The problem, they say, is that the American people simply are not being taxed enough.

Of course, the actual numbers tell a different story. Over the last 40 years, Federal revenues as a percentage of the gross domestic product have averaged roughly 17.9 percent. While in recent years that number has decreased due to the struggling economy, tax revenues are at a pace to rise over the historic average and settle around 19 percent of GDP.

Let me repeat that. Absent any changes in tax law, revenues are set to rise above historic levels relative to GDP, the gross domestic product. So despite my friends' claims to the contrary, the root of our current fiscal crisis is not the lack of revenues, it is unsustainable spending. More specifically, it is entitlement spending. That is just health care. That doesn't include some of the others. That is why all serious bipartisan deficit reduction discussions over the last few years have included structural reforms to our entitlement programs.

Without significant changes, programs such as Medicaid and Medicare and Social Security will remain unsustainable. In order to strengthen and preserve these programs for future generations, we need to reform them. If we do not reform them, we face a fiscal disaster for all of our young people living today who are going to have to foot this bill.

All of the major discussions seeking to reach a so-called "grand bargain" on deficit reduction have come down to a mix of different policies, but while they have all had different approaches, all of them have included structural entitlement reforms.

When I talk about deficit reduction discussions, I am referring to the Bowles-Simpson plan, the Domenici-Rivlin plan, the negotiations led by Vice President BIDEN, the G8 Senate talks, the negotiations between Speaker BOEHNER and President Obama, and the so-called supercommittee. Each of those grand bargain discussions divided deficit reduction policy issues into four categories. These categories are: No. 1, discretionary spending; No. 2, non-health mandatory spending; No. 3, health care entitlement programs; and, No. 4, revenue. Those have been the agreed-upon areas of focus in our deficit reduction efforts. Yet, if you listen to what my friends on the other side of the aisle have been saying recently, you will see that their focus is entirely one-dimensional. We don't hear much talk anymore about addressing discretionary spending. We certainly don't hear much in terms of reining in entitlement spending. No, their only focus is on raising taxes.

More precisely, their most recent argument has been that we have cut so much spending over the last few years that we are now at a point where tax hikes are the only viable deficit reduction option. Now, of course, with the exception of the sequester cuts that took effect this year, we have not really seen any real spending reductions as of yet, just promises, which future Congresses could easily undo.

Even though only a small portion of the promised spending cuts has actually taken place, my friends on the other side of the aisle like to claim they have all already happened. Still,

let's take a look at the record. Let's assume for a few minutes that all of the recently enacted deficit reduction is real and take a closer look at what has been done with respect to deficit reduction categories I referred to earlier.

In the last 2 years two bills have been enacted with the purpose of major deficit reduction. The first was the Budget Control Act of 2011. The second was the fiscal cliff deal or the American Tax Relief Act of 2012.

According to the Congressional Budget Office data and consultation with the Senate Budget Committee, here is what has been done so far: The category that has been tapped the most is discretionary spending, to the tune of \$1.36 trillion of promised spending reductions over 10 years. Remember, that is over 10 years. Once again, these are almost entirely promised spending cuts that have yet to be realized. If history has told us anything, it is that future promises to reduce spending aren't likely to be kept. They are very unlikely to be kept.

If you don't believe me, look at the efforts by my friends on the other side of the aisle to undo even the small amount of spending cuts that are actually in place this year. Indeed, Democrats in Congress have been actively looking for ways to eliminate the cuts for discretionary spending. If history is any indication, they may very well be successful in spite of the promises they made.

Those who argue against these cuts do not want to merely provide flexibility over how the cuts will occur. They don't want any cuts to occur even though they are spending cuts relative to a bloated baseline that was supposed to be only temporarily elevated. Still, if we assume that against all odds these spending cuts remain in place, we will have reduced discretionary spending by \$1.36 trillion relative to a baseline of bloated spending.

The next highest deficit reduction category is revenues. Revenues have been increased by roughly \$600 billion over 10 years—part of the fiscal cliff deal. This includes only the revenues generated by the fiscal cliff deal. It does not include the \$1 trillion of new taxes enacted as part of ObamaCare.

Unlike the promised discretionary spending cuts I cited earlier, this revenue number is very real and not just promises. While it may be a 10-year number that can theoretically be changed, history tells us that once tax hikes are in place, they always tend to stay there.

So of the four deficit reduction categories, we have already taken significant steps with regard to promised discretionary spending reductions and actual revenue hikes. Where are we with the other categories?

As I said, health care entitlement spending is the driver of future deficit

and debt. No one who looks at this seriously disputes this. The trust funds in Social Security, which are to finance retirement and disability payments, are on clear paths to exhaustion, with the disability insurance trust fund scheduled to dry up in 2016. Yet, to date, very little of our deficit reduction attention has been focused on entitlement spending. So far we have done absolutely nothing to deal with unsustainable Social Security promises, and we have done nothing to address the insolvency of the retirement and disability trust funds. So far we have reduced health care entitlements by a mere \$81 billion over the next 10 years. That amounts to roughly 4 percent of overall promised deficit reduction we have enacted. That amount is minuscule relative to the amount of scheduled spending entitlements over the next 10 years.

Take a look at this chart. We can barely see the red line on the right side of the chart. That red line stands for \$81 billion in entitlement cuts. If we look at the 10-year spending—as the chart behind me shows—over the next decade, we will spend roughly \$22 trillion on the three major entitlement programs. That is trillion with a "t."

Despite cutting spending and reducing deficits over the last couple of years, we have only been able to reduce entitlement spending by a mere \$81 billion. Look at that little red line compared to the 10-year spending on Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, which is unsustainable, and yet nothing is being done by the majority.

By the way, all of those spending reductions have come in the form of cuts to health care providers. They are cutting out doctors, hospitals, and health care providers, as if that is going to keep them on the job. There is a high percentage of doctors who are now ready to retire or quit and find other ways of living. All of those spending reductions have come in the form of cuts to health care providers, not structural entitlement reforms, and they know that is not sustainable. Just that little bit is not sustainable.

Once again, this approach is at odds with the grand-bargain efforts we have seen over the last few years. All of those efforts—every single one of them—put structural entitlement reform on the table. Yet, to date, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been unwilling to do the same.

As I said, my friends like to brag about all of the promised deficit reduction they have enacted thus far—even the deficit reduction they are actively trying to repeal—but they refuse to even entertain a serious conversation about the main sources of our future debt and deficit.

So where are we? The Senate Finance Committee is engaged in a bipartisan effort to reform our Nation's Tax Code and bring some sense of sanity to our

Nation's tax system. Chairman BAUCUS and I have asked our colleagues to assist us in this effort by sharing their views on what elements of the current Tax Code should be preserved. I would like to thank my Republican colleagues on the Finance Committee for their input thus far. I have met with every one of them individually on this issue except for one, and he is meeting with my staff. I really appreciated their thoughtful comments and advice.

While I remain hopeful that we will be able to move on tax reform this year, I am disheartened by comments I heard from my friends on the other side of the aisle. Indeed, many of my Democratic colleagues have stated that they are unwilling to engage in tax reform without assurances that it will have to include another massive tax increase.

Once again, their message to the American people is that we have to keep the current system—which virtually everyone in the country agrees is a problem—unless the Republicans agree to higher taxes. They want to hold simplicity in the Tax Code hostage to demands for even more taxes. They want to hold efficiency in the economy—which stimulates growth and creates jobs—hostage to demands for the second tax hike of the year in order to pay for more of their spending and more of their expansion of government even further. They want to hold competitiveness of our businesses at home and around the globe hostage to demands that flowthrough businesses face yet another tax hike—even after having been hit already at the start of this year.

My colleagues insist that their demands for higher taxes are all about deficit reduction. But let's face it. If deficit reduction was the real goal, entitlement reform would also be on the table. It would have to be on the table. After all, that is where the money is. That is where we have a chance to really reduce the deficit. That is where the future of our young people is going to be killed if we don't attack that problem now and do it in an intelligent way.

According to my friends on the other side of the aisle, entitlement reform is not on the table. Despite the stated desire of President Obama and a number of congressional Democrats for a grand bargain on deficit reduction, when the rubber meets the road they simply are not willing to engage in a real discussion about entitlement reform. Sure, they will talk about cuts to providers and other cosmetic changes to these programs, and they will talk about modifying cost-of-living adjustments in Social Security if they get hundreds of billions of dollars of new tax revenue in return. But at the end of the day structural entitlement reforms simply are not part of their deficit reduction equation.

Despite many claims to the contrary, Republicans are willing to engage, as they have in the past, in a bipartisan grand bargain for deficit reduction. Ask Senators CRAPO, COBURN, and former Senator Gregg. They voted for Bowles-Simpson. Oddly enough, the remaining sitting Democratic Senator who voted for Bowles-Simpson has walked away from the entitlement reform concessions he made and instead has focused on calls for more revenues and as a result tax reform is being held hostage.

Republicans and Democrats agree on the importance of tax reform. Our tax system is in dire need of reform. It is, quite frankly, one of the major obstacles standing between us and sustained economic growth. Most Democrats claim they agree with this sentiment, but their desire for more revenues apparently trumps this belief in the need for tax reform.

Something has to change. As I have said before, we have been counseled by some of our former leaders not to mix tax reform and deficit reduction. I think that is pretty good advice, and these are two of the leaders who helped to put through the 1986 bill. They are both highly regarded by people on both sides of the aisle here in the Senate.

Sadly, if Democrats in the Congress continue on their current course, neither tax reform nor deficit reduction will be possible. Indeed, if they continue to condition tax reform on additional tax hikes and if they continue to refuse to engage in a real discussion about entitlement reform, very little is going to be accomplished on either front.

This spending game has got to be over. We have to start living within our means. We on this side of the aisle—and I in particular—have seen every tax increase amount to more spending, not deficit reduction, so it is a phony argument. And that is what is going to happen if we are so dumb as to increase taxes in accordance with the comments of our leadership on the other side of the aisle that were made just today. It is unbelievable that they get away with it. It is unbelievable that after all of these years we have to put up with that type of argument when we know they are not going to use that money for the appropriate reasons, and they never have.

One Senator said to me the other day: I just live for the day where we reform the Tax Code and it is not changed 4 years later by our friends on the other side of the aisle for the worse. The 1986 bill was a good bill by any standard. It did a lot of good, but in about 4 years our friends started to change it. As a result, today we have the monstrosity we call the U.S. Tax Code that nobody really believes in and everybody knows is a detriment to our country.

I am very concerned. I think we are going to have to have some folks stand

up on the other side of the aisle. We are willing to stand with them, and we are willing to solve these problems in ways that will preserve the entitlement programs. They are not going to be preserved in their current form if we keep going the way we are. And tax increases aren't the answer either. We are spending so much, and it will not be long until we will be in a category with Greece if we don't watch it.

We have to overcome this because no other entity in the world is going to bail us out; we have to bail ourselves out. We have to do it by doing what is right, now, and not by increasing taxes. It means resolving these problems on a structural reform basis. It will take good people on both sides of the aisle to do it. I call on my friends on the other side to get with it. Get real. Quit the tax charade.

We know that is not going anywhere. We also know it is phony to begin with.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNSEEN DETROIT

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, when people across the country flip on the news tonight, they are probably going to see pictures of Detroit. They aren't going to be flattering pictures, and they are not going to tell the whole story.

There is no question that the Detroit city government is going through an extremely difficult financial crisis, and there are many causes for that.

There are more than 20,000 people—retired police officers and firefighters and teachers and city workers—who have been loyal and hard-working employees their entire lives, who are now worried about how they are going to pay the mortgage or put food on their tables.

The TV cameras are rolling when it comes time to show us bad news about Detroit, but what aren't we seeing?

On TV, they aren't showing us the city that is the No. 1 market in the country for tech jobs—No. 1. They aren't showing a city that is one of the fastest growing in the country for new manufacturing jobs. On TV, they aren't showing us the city that is undergoing a massive revitalization, with businesses and religious leaders and community leaders and neighborhoods working together every day. They aren't showing us the Quicken Loans headquarters with 7,000 jobs in downtown Detroit; a CEO so committed to

the city that he closed a beautiful building in the suburbs to bring people downtown; a CEO who is purchasing properties and investing in so many ways in Detroit, along with a wonderful coalition of business leaders committed to the revitalization of this great city. They aren't showing us the beautiful renovation of Campus Martius and the amazing things happening downtown on Woodward Avenue, where people can go on any day now and see people who are there— younger people, older people—enjoying the beautiful surroundings.

They aren't showing us the surge of innovative companies that are breaking new ground in creating opportunity in Detroit.

On TV, they aren't showing us the new Elijah McCoy Patent and Trademark Office—the very first and, so far, only satellite patent office in the country that was put in Detroit. Why? Because Michigan happens to be No. 1 in new, clean energy patents—new ideas on clean energy, coming from Detroit and the surrounding communities. They are not showing us TechTown and the venture capitalists and the 17 tech startups that are investing in technologies that are being developed in Detroit right now and that are going to change our lives in the years to come. On TV, they aren't showing us Michigan's world-class research universities and the incredible collaboration that is going on with Detroit businesses.

They are not showing us the rich depth of culture we are known for in Detroit. The city that gave the world Motown once again has an exploding arts and music scene. In fact, last weekend, in beautiful Traverse City, MI, I was speaking to someone who lives there who said his sister is coming back from Colorado who is an artist; she is moving to Detroit. When he asked her why, she said Detroit is where everybody is going because there are so many opportunities there in arts and culture. There are exciting things happening. We have the beautiful Detroit Institute of Arts, one of the largest and most important collections of artwork in the country.

Jack White, the founder of the band, the White Stripes, stepped up and paid off with his own money the back taxes owed on the Masonic Temple in Detroit, one of the most stunning theater and music venues in the world.

Story after story such as that can be told of people coming forward and saying: We are going to make sure that Detroit is coming back.

On TV, they are not showing us Eastern Market, the Nation's longest continuously operated farmers market, and all the great things that are happening there, with new test kitchens and local agriculture. In fact, as chair of the Agriculture Committee, I was so proud to learn that we in Detroit have the national leaders in urban agri-

culture who are now creating jobs working with small business to create food entrepreneurs and healthy foods for families and neighborhoods.

I am so proud of the work we have been able to do with the Detroit Public Schools. Not long ago I stood at a school garden in a neighborhood that was put together by the children of the school. We now have 46—46—gardens at schools in Detroit, and in the summer the neighborhood makes sure they can help get the work done for the gardens so the children can have fresh fruits and vegetables when they come back to school.

Last month Whole Foods opened their first grocery store in Detroit, where they are featuring local foods such as Avalon baked goods and McClure's pickles and Good People Popcorn and Garden Fresh salsa and so many other things that are made right in the metro Detroit area.

We might just see a shot of the bridge to Canada on TV, but what we will not see is the more than \$1 billion in trade that crosses that border every single day. Metro Detroit, in fact, is the fourth largest city in America for exports, and we have the largest, busiest northern border crossing in the country.

While the cameras are obsessed with showing us decay, we are seeing an auto industry that is roaring back. We are seeing the Chrysler plant that the New York Times called one of the most modern and successful auto plants in the world, in Detroit. That plant employs more than 4,000 people and added a third shift at the end of last year to build the Jeep Grand Cherokee.

Ford Motor Company reported record North American profits in the second quarter and growth in every sales region.

GM's global sales are up, and they too are making record profits again, hiring workers and investing in new plants and technologies.

So while it is true that the city government is going through a terrible time and a bankruptcy, and that process will be very painful and very difficult for many people in the city—many people who work very hard—it would be a mistake to count Detroit out. It would be a mistake to think there isn't opportunity in our great city of Detroit. It would be a mistake to think Detroit isn't coming back, because if a person is going to say anything about Detroit, a person has to say: Times may be tough, but so are the people of Detroit. Times may be tough, but the leaders, the businesses, the educators are tough. Our people, our businesses, are smart and talented and care deeply and are committed to making sure this great city called Detroit comes roaring back better than ever.

Thank you, Mr. President.

PRISON RAPE ELIMINATION ACT ANNIVERSARY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 10 years ago this week, Congress passed a watershed piece of legislation. The Prison Rape Elimination Act was the first comprehensive legislative effort to prevent something we had long been reluctant to even acknowledge existed—the incidence of rape in our Federal, State, and local corrections facilities.

Violence and victimization have no place in our society, including in our prisons, and we have an obligation to ensure these facilities are safe. The punishment of incarceration does not, and cannot, include a sentence of rape. And yet we know that all too often it does. A recent report by the Bureau of Justice Statistics estimated that nearly 1 in 10 inmates in America had been sexually assaulted in custody.

Too often the victims of such violence end up being the most vulnerable members of our population. Women, racial minorities, and those suffering from mental illness face increased rates of sexual violence while incarcerated.

Children in adult jails are at the greatest risk of being victimized. Juveniles housed with adults are 35% more likely than other inmates to be targeted for sexual assault, and that abuse is taking a terrible toll on this already vulnerable population. Youth under the age of 18 are 36 times more likely to commit suicide than if they were housed in a juvenile detention facility. With 100,000 youth held in adult jails and prisons every year, this is a problem we must address head on.

The Prison Rape Elimination Act gives us the tools to do that. Because of this law the Department of Justice now collects data about the incidence of sexual violence in our prisons so we can better understand the scope of the problem. We have adopted national standards and best practices to create safer environments, especially when it comes to juvenile detention and the dangers inherent in incarcerating our youth with adult prisoners. The law provides for increased training for prison staff, makes it easier for inmates to report violence, and requires prompt medical and mental health treatment for victims.

These protections make sense, and that is why we made sure that the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act that was signed into law earlier this year made clear that these protections also apply to every immigration detention facility operated by the Department of Homeland Security. We are making good progress, but more work lies ahead.

Sexual violence in our detention facilities compromises the health and safety of the inmates, staff, and the communities to which these prisoners will someday return. Although improvements have been made in the past

10 years, let us pause on this anniversary to reflect on the importance of ensuring that every American is safe from violence, and treated with the dignity and respect they deserve.

REMEMBERING VIVIAN MALONE JONES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last night, the National Museum of Women in the Arts hosted a screening of the documentary entitled, *Crisis: Behind a Presidential Commitment*. As we prepare to observe the 50th Anniversary of the March on Washington, this important film focuses on four individuals who will forever be connected with the battle for racial equality and the pursuit of Dr. Martin Luther King's dream. I want to recognize one of those individuals, Vivian Malone Jones.

Ms. Malone was one of two brave African-American students to enroll at the University of Alabama in 1963, despite the threat of Alabama Governor George C. Wallace to stop integration at "the schoolhouse door." The picture of Ms. Malone walking into the University of Alabama, flanked by National Guard troops, is an iconic image that is forever etched in our Nation's memory.

Ms. Malone grew up in the racially segregated city of Mobile, AL. She was just 12 years old when the Supreme Court ruled segregation unconstitutional in *Brown v. Board of Education*. The historic decision inspired Ms. Malone, who as a National Honor Society student in high school committed herself to efforts ending segregation. She went on to become one of the most important civil rights figures in our country's history.

In her lifetime, Ms. Malone personified dignity and strength. She also lived history. The day after she and classmate James Hood were escorted into the University's Foster Auditorium by the National Guard and Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, seeking to enroll in classes, civil rights leader Medgar Evers was shot and killed in Mississippi. This only made Ms. Malone more determined. She once said that she "decided not to show any fear and went to class that day." While an undergraduate student, she found a community of support and friendship among fellow members of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority—the Nation's largest predominately African-American women's organization. And in 1965, she became the first African American to graduate from the University of Alabama, earning a degree in Business Management.

Ms. Malone was not just a symbol of courage; she also set an example of forgiveness. In 1996 Governor Wallace, who 3 decades earlier stood in the entryway to the university's auditorium, flanked by State troopers, to prevent Ms. Malone from enrolling, awarded her with the first Lurleen B. Wal-

lace Award for Courage. Later recalling their conversation, Ms. Malone said that she simply spoke with Governor Wallace about forgiveness.

Throughout her life, Ms. Malone was dedicated to the preservation and enforcement of our civil rights laws. After graduation, she worked for the U.S. Department of Justice in the Civil Rights Division. In 1977, she took over as Executive Director for the Voter Education Project following the resignation of another civil rights legend, Congressman JOHN LEWIS. Eventually, Ms. Malone rose to become a Director of Civil Rights and Urban Affairs for the Environmental Protection Agency in Atlanta, GA, before retiring there in 1996.

In 2000, she gave the commencement address at the University of Alabama and advised the new graduates: "If there is any lesson for the graduates to take from my experience, it is that you must always be ready to seize the moment." Ms. Malone passed away on October 15, 2005, but her legacy continues. It lives on through her children, grandchildren, and siblings. It also lives on through the important work of her brother-in-law, Attorney General Eric Holder. He has done so much in the past 5 years to return the Civil Rights Division to its core mission. I have no doubt that his sense of purpose is informed by the proud history of the Malone family including his sister-in-law, Vivian, and his wife, Dr. Sharon Malone.

As we honor our Nation's civil rights heroes in preparation for next month's momentous anniversary of Dr. King's "I Have a Dream" speech and the historic March on Washington, let us honor another courageous icon who told those University of Alabama graduates in 2000, "You may not live in a time of great social change as I did, but you will just as certainly face moral choices." I hope Ms. Malone's courage, determination, and forgiveness will serve as a guiding light for generations to come, and to make the right moral choices in our own lives.

CRIME GUN TRACING ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a new bill I have introduced called the Crime Gun Tracing Act. This bill will create a strong incentive for police departments and sheriff's offices across the nation to trace every crime gun they recover. I am pleased that my colleagues Senators FEINSTEIN, WHITEHOUSE, BLUMENTHAL, LEVIN, BOXER, JACK REED and MURPHY have joined me as cosponsors of this legislation. I thank them for their support.

The issue of gun regulation is complicated, and people may not always agree on all aspects of it. But one thing we can all agree on is the need to reduce criminal gun violence. Far too

many violent shootings are taking place across America. We need to catch the criminals who commit violent gun crimes, and we need to identify and stop the people who are putting guns in criminals' hands.

Crime gun tracing is a powerful tool that helps law enforcement solve gun crimes and identify gun traffickers. Law enforcement agencies should be tracing 100 percent of guns they recover in criminal investigations, and the legislation I am introducing will help get us closer to that goal.

Here is how crime gun tracing works. When a gun is recovered in a criminal investigation, a police department or sheriff's office can send the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives—ATF—information about the gun's make, model and serial number. ATF can then trace the gun from its manufacturer to its first retail purchaser. This information can help generate leads in identifying the person who used the gun to commit a crime. Also, when all crime guns in an area are traced, it can help law enforcement identify broader crime gun trends and trafficking patterns.

ATF has described crime gun tracing as a "cornerstone" of its efforts to combat gun crime and illegal gun trafficking. And ATF has made it free and easy for local police departments and sheriff's offices to trace guns. ATF has created an online tracing program, called E-Trace, that it makes available for free to any law enforcement agency that signs up for it. E-Trace allows gun trace requests to be sent to ATF quickly over the internet. And it provides a searchable computer database that police departments and sheriffs can use to analyze all gun traces and gun crimes in their jurisdiction.

Let us be clear: This is only a database for crime guns. This is not a registry of law-abiding gun owners. ATF only traces guns that are part of criminal investigations by law enforcement.

E-Trace is a great law enforcement tool. I have been working for years to get every police department and sheriff's office in Illinois to sign up for E-Trace and to use it for every crime gun they recover.

We are about halfway there in Illinois—around 400 out of 800 law enforcement agencies in my state are using E-Trace, and I am reaching out to the rest to urge them to sign up. But we can do better, both in Illinois and nationally.

I am introducing my bill, the Crime Gun Tracing Act, to help move us toward 100 percent tracing of crime guns nationwide. There are about 18,000 law enforcement agencies in America, and right now about 4,700 have signed up to use E-Trace. All of these agencies should sign up to use E-Trace and should use it every time they recover a crime gun.

My bill will require law enforcement agencies that apply for Federal COPS

grants to report how many crime guns they recovered in the last year and how many they submitted for tracing. The bill will then give a preference in COPS grant awards to agencies that traced all the crime guns they recovered.

To be clear, police chiefs and sheriffs should not just wait for this legislation to pass before they start tracing. They should start tracing today, and I hope many will. But for those local agencies that need a push to start tracing their crime guns, my bill will give them a significant incentive.

Gun violence is a complicated problem, and there is no one solution that will stop all the tragic shootings in our nation. But comprehensive crime gun tracing will make a big difference when it comes to solving gun crimes and identifying gun traffickers. Crime gun tracing is free, it is easy, and law enforcement leaders will tell you that it is a powerful tool that helps them fight crime.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation. And I also urge my colleagues to call on law enforcement in their States to start tracing all their crime guns, as I have done in Illinois. Many police departments and sheriff's offices simply do not know about this free law enforcement resource called E-Trace, and once they learn how easy it is to sign up and use E-Trace, they are thrilled with it.

We can make important progress on the issue of crime gun tracing right now if we alert all our State and local agencies about this powerful investigative tool. Every additional crime gun that gets traced makes it harder for illegal gun traffickers to hide. If we can identify and root out these trafficking networks, it will help reduce gun violence in our communities. That is a goal we should pursue, and I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

SMARTER SOLUTIONS FOR STUDENTS ACT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the choice before the Senate yesterday was very difficult. If we had failed to pass the student loan bill, students and their families would be stuck with interest rates for student loans that are double what they were just last year. American students and parents who worry every single day about whether they can afford college cannot be burdened with such an enormous rate hike.

The cost of tuition at public 4-year colleges is up more than 15 percent since 2009. Student loan debt has reached historic proportions. Yet we allowed the rate on new federally subsidized student loans to double, to 6.8 percent, as of July 1. If we had allowed this rate increase to continue, we would have subtracted thousands of dollars from the wallets of American students and their families or, worse, be responsible for pushing college be-

yond the financial means of some families who already wonder whether they can afford to give their kids the education they need and deserve.

The bipartisan legislation we passed yesterday will temporarily resolve this crisis for American families, but it is far from perfect. It switches these interest rates for these critical student loans from fixed rates to floating rates, with caps that are far too high. This opens the door to rising interest rates 4 years from now that students and their families simply cannot afford.

The student debt problem which for many families is a student debt crisis requires a carefully considered long term solution. I am hopeful that such a solution will eventually emerge, but this legislation is not it.

That is why I supported an amendment offered by my colleagues, Senators REED and WARREN, and another amendment offered by Senator SANDERS, which would have mitigated some of the long-term damage of this legislation. Even though we did not adopt those amendments, I supported this bill for the simple reason that it removes the burdens facing America's students and their families in the next few years.

The chairman of the HELP Committee, my friend TOM HARKIN has pledged to try to fix the likely spiking interest rates facing students when the higher education reauthorization bill comes up next year. I will strongly support that effort.

Yesterday we in the Senate had a choice, but America's college students do not they have no choice but to pay the ever-rising cost of a college education, not if they want the skills and knowledge that hold the promise of a better life. They have no choice but to live with the decisions we make here in this Chamber.

REMEMBERING MICHAEL WINTER

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this week Americans are celebrating the 23rd anniversary of the landmark Americans with Disabilities Act. As chief Senate sponsor of that legislation, I know that we could not have prevailed without the tireless, passionate, never-give-up advocacy of disability rights advocates and leaders across America. One of those outstanding leaders, Michael Winter, cannot be with us to celebrate this year's anniversary. He passed away earlier this month. But I would like to take a few minutes today to celebrate the life of this wonderful person.

Michael was born with a disability, and grew up in Chicago at a far less enlightened time, when students and other young people with disabilities were excluded from the mainstream. Michael used a wheelchair, but he was not the kind of person to take discrimination sitting down. At an early age,

he began to speak up. He discovered the power of advocacy. He was determined to change the world for people with disabilities.

In 1969, Michael was enrolled in Southern Illinois University. Because the school president's wife used a wheelchair, the SIU had made a commitment 15 years earlier to become one of the first accessible colleges in the United States. But Michael was not satisfied. He believed that the university needed to be more inclusive for students with disabilities. So Michael and other students with disabilities took over the university president's office and chained a wheelchair to his desk. They did so to drive home the point that the campus needed to have accessible transportation for people with disabilities. The university, to its great credit, made improvements, and Michael had found a special focus for his advocacy. His passionate and highly effective advocacy for accessible transportation became a constant throughout his life.

In addition, Michael was one of the early leaders in the Independent Living movement. In 1977, after college and attending graduate school, he went to the fledgling Berkeley Center for Independent Living, where he completed an internship with Judy Heumann. He ended up staying on as a staff member for another 4 years. He then directed a Center for Independent Living in Hawaii before returning to the Berkeley as director of the Center for Independent Living for 12 years. During that period, Michael also served as president of the National Council on Independent Living.

As I said, Michael's special passion was to advocate for more accessible transportation. Later in his career, he held various positions at the U.S. Department of Transportation, and was responsible for helping enforce civil rights with respect to transportation under the ADA, the Rehabilitation Act, the Civil Rights Act, and other laws.

He also advocated for more accessible transportation internationally. Marca Bristo, CEO of Access Living in Chicago, recently shared a memory of Michael Winter, whom she considered a mentor on independent living. She wrote:

I'll never forget being in Seoul riding the most accessible subway I've ever been on with my son. Later I asked my host from Rehabilitation International, Dr. Il Yung Lee, how did it happen? He said: "The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and Michael Winter."

Many Americans got to know Michael in Eric Neudel's award-winning documentary, "Lives Worth Living," which chronicled the rise of the disability rights movement in the United States. The documentary recounts the historic day in 1990 when hundreds of disability rights advocates crawled and climbed up the steps of the Capitol

Building in Washington to protest the slow progress in passing the Americans with Disabilities Act. One person who was there recalled the scene as follows:

A young girl with cerebral palsy, fiercely determined to reach the top ("I'll take all NIGHT if I have to!"), inspired the admittedly out-of-shape Michael Winter to follow close behind. When the activists gathered en masse in the Capitol rotunda, Winter was approached by a young, able-bodied woman who was excited by the crowd. Turns out she was a tour guide, expecting to host a group of "handicapped" people on a tour through the capitol. "I have to tell you something," Winter wryly informed her. "I don't think these people are here for a tour."

Hundreds of disability rights activists are in Washington this week to celebrate the 23rd anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act. We also celebrate the contributions of leaders like Michael Winter, who are responsible for America's remarkable progress toward fulfilling the four great goals of the ADA—equal opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency. Despite this progress, we know that our journey is far from finished. We have not yet achieved the full promise of the ADA. But we go forward inspired by the memory and example of Michael Winter and other outstanding leaders in this movement.

Thank you, Michael Winter, for a job well done. Thank you for helping us to create a better, fairer, more inclusive and accessible world for people with disabilities.

OBSERVING TED STEVENS DAY

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, this upcoming Saturday marks the third time Alaskans from across my home State will join together to "get out and play" in memory of the life and legacy of Senator Ted Stevens.

Since Ted's passing nearly three years ago, we have followed his example by getting out and embracing Alaska's great outdoors on this fourth Saturday of July. On this day, as envisioned by Senator Stevens' family, we embody his passion for Alaska's unique wilderness, his love for fishing, and his immense affection for nature. We celebrate his life, one dedicated to public service—from his days as a pilot in World War II to his four decades in the United States Senate fighting for roads, buildings, and other infrastructure needs in a State as young as ours.

This year, Alaskans in communities across the State—from Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, and the Kenai Peninsula—are coming together for BBQ's, Potlucks, and fishing, while countless others take part in their own unique and special way.

We remember Ted Stevens, among many things, as one of Alaska's great leaders, the Alaskan of the 20th Century, and a tireless advocate for the 49th State. He was committed to our

people, our economy, and the role we played in the success of America—from national security to energy independence to our bountiful fisheries. As political as things get in our State and in Washington, DC, Uncle Ted had perspective: "The hell with politics, just do what's right for Alaska."

This weekend, however, is about Senator Stevens' deep love for the outdoors and adventure. It is as if this summer, one of the most gorgeous we have had back home in ages, Uncle Ted is looking down upon Alaskans and encouraging us to take up activities that require a little sweat, a little more effort than usual, maybe one that leaves us catching our breath afterwards. Whether one decides to walk or run, hike or climb, reel in a nice rainbow or salmon, take a spin on a bike or just play outside, I encourage Alaskans to spend some time this weekend getting out and enjoying our beautiful Alaskan Summer.

Mr. President, for Senator Stevens and the entire Stevens family: Let's get out and play.

Thank you Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO KEVIN COVERT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Kevin Covert, our human rights officer at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. Very shortly, he will move on to another assignment as is the usual practice at the Department of State. During his recent tour, Mr. Covert brought a remarkable level of initiative and leadership to his job. A diplomatic first responder to raids, attacks, and show trials, his was the face of American diplomacy there to listen to the stories of civil society leaders who found themselves branded foreign agents for simply working to better their own country. His handshake was there to remind those Russians who dared meet with him that the United States is committed to telling their story for the record and will not forget them—and Mr. Covert did just that as a lead drafter of the Russia section of the annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices as well as through objective and incisive reporting chronicling an assault on rights unprecedented in modern Russia. All the while, his composure, and likely a good sense of humor, enabled him to listen patiently to host government interlocutors as American concerns were disingenuously construed as so much meddling while he politely, and with good judgment and integrity, reminded his counterparts of their own freely undertaken commitments to the rule of law and democracy.

As chairman of the U.S. Helsinki Commission and a senior member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have the regular opportunity, and distinct honor, to interact with the

hard-working men and women of the Foreign Service. They do not wear uniforms, but they make numerous sacrifices, take significant risks, and serve our country honorably.

Our relations with Russia are at the heart of a truly comprehensive security and cooperation in Europe and I have paid close attention to this country in recent years. In that context, I am acutely aware of the challenges that our diplomats, serving in Russia under the leadership of Ambassador Mike McFaul, face. Over the past year, as a crackdown on fundamental freedoms gained scope and speed, professionals at our embassy in Russia never wavered in their support for the universal values that we as Americans hold especially dear. Our personnel, particularly those covering sensitive issues such as human rights, met adversity with poise and served our Nation with great dedication. They represent this country well and do us all proud.

Mr. Covert will be missed in Moscow by his colleagues at Post, as well as by countless Russians who got to know him in recent years. I salute Kevin Covert and all his State Department colleagues working the Russia beat during this difficult, but exciting, period of change.

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN JAMES T. LOEBLEIN

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a close friend of the Senate, CAPT James Loeblein. Over the past three years Captain Loeblein has served as the director of the Navy Senate liaison office.

Since Captain Loeblein arrived on the Senate deck he has escorted 37 codels to 42 countries. In addition to his travels, Captain Loeblein led his team of sailors with the highest degree of professionalism in support of every Member of the U.S. Senate.

Throughout his time serving in the Senate liaison office, I got to know Jim. Captain Loeblein is a native of Salisbury, NC. Jim received his commission as an ensign after he graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD, in May 1985. He went on to graduate from the Naval War College, Newport, RI, in 1997.

He has served as the executive officer aboard the USS *John S. McCain*, DDG 56. Captain Loeblein has also led sailors on multiple deployments commanding two strike group deployments and served as the sea combat commander for the Abraham Lincoln Carrier Strike Group all in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

Under Captain Loeblein's leadership and sharp instincts, his team has been instrumental in supporting the Senate's legislative responsibility to provide our sailors with the resources they

need to carry out their mission. The Senate and our Nation are indebted for his service.

Next week, Captain Loeblein will officially be promoted to rear admiral, lower half. We wish him well as he prepares to take over as deputy commander, U.S. Naval Forces Central Command in Manama, Bahrain. I want to thank Captain Loeblein for his service and congratulate him on this hard earned promotion.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD J. LODGE

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of myself and Senator CRAPO to give recognition to U.S. District Judge Edward J. Lodge, the longest serving jurist in the great State of Idaho. This month, Judge Lodge marked 50 years on the bench in combined State and Federal service.

His long and notable career on the bench began in 1963 when he was selected probate judge in Canyon County. Judge Lodge was then appointed by Governor Robert Smylie just 2 years later to serve on the Idaho State District Court. He was the youngest person to be appointed a district judge.

After 23 years there, his name was put forth by U.S. Senator James McClure for a seat on the U.S. District Court for the District of Idaho. President George H.W. Bush appointed him in 1989 and shortly thereafter, his nomination was confirmed in the U.S. Senate by unanimous consent.

Judge Lodge has earned the respect of his colleagues as a jurist who, no matter the pressure or how big the case, works to ensure a trial is fair. Throughout the years, he has consistently received high ratings from the Idaho State Bar.

Though it may say more about my State than I would like, Judge Lodge is believed to have presided over more murder cases than any other judge in Idaho. And, in fact, he may just be the only judge who presided over two such cases simultaneously. These cases and the many others upon which he has presided distinguish Judge Lodge as a lifelong student of the law and as someone wholly dedicated to serving the people in judicial matters.

A native of Caldwell, ID, Judge Lodge earned a bachelor's degree from the College of Idaho in nearby Nampa, where he graduated cum laude. He then went north to the University of Idaho in Moscow to earn his juris doctorate.

Many may not know that throughout his education—from high school through university—he was an outstanding athlete. He was named three times an All-American in football at Caldwell High School, Boise Junior College and the College of Idaho. In addition, he was a Golden Gloves champion and successfully participated in track-and-field. These accomplishments landed him a place in the Boise

State Athletic Hall of Fame and the College of Idaho Hall of Fame.

Judge Lodge is married to long serving Idaho State Senator Patti Anne Lodge. They have three grown children: Mary-Jeanne, Edward and Anne-Marie.

Idaho is proud to call Judge Lodge a native son.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE UNIVERSITY OF SCRANTON

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the University of Scranton on the occasion of the 125th anniversary of its founding. For more than a century, this esteemed institution of higher education has made invaluable contributions to the City of Scranton, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and, most importantly, the lives of its many alumni.

Founded in 1888 as Saint Thomas College by Most Reverend William G. O'Hara, the first Bishop of Scranton, the college was staffed by diocesan priests and seminarians until 1896, and then briefly by the Xaverian Brothers. From 1897 until the arrival of the school's first Jesuit administration in 1942, the college was administered for the Diocese by the Christian Brothers. Renamed the University of Scranton in 1938, it is today "a community dedicated to the freedom of inquiry and personal development fundamental to the growth in wisdom and integrity of all who share its life."

I am proud that my hometown is host to an academic institution of the caliber of the University of Scranton. An anchor of the city's Hill Section, the university has grown well beyond its roots as a commuter school into a nationally recognized and respected university with a total enrollment of over 6,000 students in undergraduate, graduate and nontraditional programs.

As a Senator representing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and a member of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, ensuring that our Nation's children and young adults have access to high quality educational opportunities is one of my highest priorities. I firmly believe that anyone with the drive, fortitude and desire to pursue the opportunities afforded by higher education should be able to realize that dream. Throughout its history, the University of Scranton has enabled countless students to further their education and become productive members of society.

It is with great pride, as both a Senator from Pennsylvania and as a native of Scranton, that I honor the University of Scranton today. The contributions that this institution has made to both our Commonwealth and to our Nation are commendable, and I wish them all the best.●

2013 STENNIS CONGRESSIONAL INTERNS

• Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, 2013 is the 11th year in which summer interns working in Congressional offices have benefitted from a program run by the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Leadership. This 6-week program is designed to enhance their internship experience by giving them an inside look at how Congress works and a deeper appreciation for the role that Congress plays in our democracy. Each week, the interns meet with senior congressional staff and other experts to discuss issues such as the legislative process, power of the purse, balancing governing and campaigning, political polarization, foreign affairs, and more.

Interns are selected for this program based on their college record, community service experience, and interest in a career in public service. This year, 29 outstanding interns, most of them juniors and seniors in college who are working in Republican and Democratic offices in both the House and Senate have taken part.

I congratulate the interns for their participation in this valuable program and I thank the Stennis Center and the Senior Stennis Fellows for providing such a meaningful experience for these interns and for encouraging them to consider a future career in public service.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of 2013 Stennis Congressional Interns and the offices in which they work be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Peter Aldrich, attending Grinnell College, interning in the office of U.S. Representative KEITH ELLISON; Jared Bierbach, attending University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee, interning in the office of U.S. Senator TAMMY BALDWIN; Becca Brukman, attending University of Arizona, interning in the office of U.S. Representative ALAN LOWENTHAL; Anthony Carli, attending University of Arizona, interning in the office of U.S. Representative KYRSTEN SINEMA; Jack Cartwright, attending Hamilton College, interning in the office of U.S. Representative KYRSTEN SINEMA; Julie Chen, attending Wellesley College, interning in the office of U.S. Representative CHARLES RANGEL; Steve Ciranna, attending Michigan State University, interning in the office of U.S. Representative BILL HUIZENGA; Rob Contreras, attending University of California at Los Angeles, interning in the office of U.S. Representative ANN KIRKPATRICK; Seth Coppe, attending American University, interning in the office of U.S. Senator JOE MANCHIN.

Florie Crump, attending Mississippi State University, interning in the office of U.S. Senator THAD COCHRAN; Nick Fickler, attending University of Southern California, interning in the office of U.S. Representative ED ROYCE; Jon Fox, attending Miami University, interning in the office of U.S. Representative JOYCE BEATTY; Caitlin Garn, attending University of Utah, interning in the office of U.S. Senator ORRIN HATCH; Jake Goodman, attending Temple University, interning in the Special Committee on Aging;

Haley Gray, attending University of Texas at Austin, interning in the Office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives; Shannon Grimes, attending Bowdoin College, interning in the office of U.S. Representative CHELLIE PINGREE; Molly Harris, attending University of Mississippi, interning in the office of U.S. Representative AARON SCHOCK; Austin Harrison, attending University of Mississippi, interning in the office of U.S. Senator THAD COCHRAN.

Brenna James, attending University of Delaware, interning in the Senate Committee on Homeland Security & Governmental Affairs; Bobby Kogan, attending College of William and Mary, interning in the House Committee on the Budget; Ben Lassiter, attending Clemson University, interning in the office of U.S. Representative TOM RICE; Will McIlwain, attending Pepperdine University, interning in the office of U.S. Representative CHARLES RANGEL; Viviana Molina, attending George Mason University, interning in the office of U.S. Representative AARON SCHOCK; Mary Moody, attending Samford University, interning in the office of U.S. Representative STEVE STOCKMAN; Eleanor Gray Mullen, attending University of Virginia, interning in the office of U.S. Representative DON YOUNG; Alicia Oken, attending Georgetown University, interning in the office of U.S. Representative CHERI BUSTOS; Melissa Shohet, attending McGill University, interning in the office of U.S. Senator MAZIE HIRONO; Austin Stannius, attending University of Utah, interning in the House Committee on Veterans Affairs; Sara Vance, attending Mississippi State University, interning in the Office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.●

REMEMBERING DAVID VANBUSKIRK

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, the State of Nevada mourns the loss of Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Search and Rescue Officer David Vanbuskirk. Officer Vanbuskirk was a true hero who lost his life during a search and rescue operation at Mt. Charleston. His inspiring legacy of public service will be long remembered.

Officer Vanbuskirk began his service with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department 13 years ago, and was one of only seven commissioned officers charged with conducting rescues for the department. On Monday, July 22, 2013, he responded to a call for help from a stranded hiker who needed emergency assistance. It was during this dangerous rescue mission that Officer Vanbuskirk nobly gave his life in the line of duty.

Officer Vanbuskirk represented the very best of Nevada, and his sacrifice is exemplary of the highest standards of public service. His commitment to service above self is the definition of heroic, as is his willingness to place the safety and welfare of others before his own. His actions remind us that there are brave and fearless Americans who put their lives on the line every day to keep us safe, and we owe them all a profound debt for their service.

While the State of Nevada will dearly miss this dedicated officer, his memory

and legacy of courage will continue to live on in our hearts. I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this fallen Nevadan, and I offer my deepest condolences to Officer Vanbuskirk's family and loved ones during this difficult time.●

KRAFT FOODS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I stand today to honor the Kraft Foods Group, Inc. plant and its dedicated employees in Champaign, IL, as they celebrate its 50th anniversary.

This Champaign plant has the unique distinction of being Kraft's flagship facility, employing more than 1,100 of my fellow citizens of Illinois, and proudly producing more than any other Kraft plant in the country. From the time it opened in 1963, this facility has grown in both size and production. For generations, millions of Americans have enjoyed the products made in Champaign, from Miracle Whip and Velveeta, to Kraft Singles and Cheese Whiz. The plant continues to expand its output, with new varieties of pasta, dressing and cheese being added to their production line in 2012, and earlier this year, Kraft chose to dedicate their entire Velveeta production to this single facility.

The Kraft Foods Group has called Illinois home since its founding in 1903, and Champaign has been a critical part of this company for more than half of that time. Kraft has so greatly contributed to Champaign's economic climate, helping to make the city this plant calls home a great place to live and work. Likewise, the people of Champaign helped make Kraft great. Our State is proud of all that Kraft produces, but we are especially proud of the ingenuity, industry, and drive that this plant's workers have embodied for 50 years. It is clear that because Kraft's Champaign employees have been dedicated to achieving success, this plant has continued to thrive after half a century.

In closing, I ask all my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Kraft Foods Group on reaching this incredible milestone and honoring the employees at their acclaimed flagship plant.●

REMEMBERING "AUNTY" MARY BOURDUKOFSKY

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to pay my respects to an Aleut elder and spiritual leader, "Auntie" Mary. It is with a heavy heart I say that Mary-Nicolai Bourdukofsky, age 90, passed away on June 2, 2013 in Anchorage, AK.

"Auntie" Mary was a dedicated leader and fought to preserve the Aleut culture, language and traditions by the formation of the Aleut Dancers, sharing her knowledge of Aleut songs and

stories, and native food preparation. She participated in educating youth and leaders in various venues including the Pribilof, Unalaska and Sand Point Aleut Culture Camp and the Anchorage Aleut culture camp. She worked with the Alaska Federation of Natives, AFN, Youth and Elders and served as an AFN delegate for many years. "Auntie" Mary also assisted with developing the Aleut culture exhibits at the Alaska Native Heritage Center and the Smithsonian Institution's Alaska Native Collections. Additionally she was honored as 2004 Aleut Corporation Elder of the Year. As a lifelong educator of traditional knowledge, she understood the importance of western education; she was one of the first women on the school board in St. Paul Island and later taught at the University of Alaska (both Fairbanks and Anchorage) and at Alaska Pacific University. "Auntie" Mary was a positive role model for all. She was the heart and soul of the family and the Aleut Community of St. Paul Island. She was also a proud shareholder of TDX, the St. Paul Village Corporation.

Mary Bourdukofsky was born January 9, 1923 on St. Paul Island to Nicolai and Olga Kozloff. Her role as natural leader began at an early age when she lost her own mother during childbirth and stepped up to help raise her three siblings. In 1939 she married George Bourdukofsky, and they had seven beautiful children. Despite being stricken by TB at birth and losing one of her sons to polio, she pressed on and grew into a well-respected community leader, advocating for equal rights and fair treatment of her fellow Aleut people.

During World War II, her family and the rest of the Aleut Community of St. Paul Island were forced from their homes and placed in internment at Funter Bay, AK. While all the Aleut men left as they volunteered to join the war effort, she led female advocates in filing a petition with the U.S. Government about the inhumane and unlivable conditions they were being forced to live in, knowing all the while that the Island managers had threatened them all with expulsion from their homes back on St. Paul forever if they complained. Some 50 years later she testified before the U.S. Congress, seeking an apology and retribution for how she and her fellow Aleut U.S. citizens were mistreated during WWII.

On behalf of the Senate I extend condolences to Mary's family, the Aleut community and every life she touched through her tireless advocacy. "Auntie" Mary was a truly remarkable individual, and I am proud to honor her as the outstanding leader that she was.●

HOME HELPERS OF EASTERN IDAHO

• Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, independence and self-sufficiency are two characteristics of adulthood that many of us simply take for granted. However, as we age, oftentimes we need a helping hand to accomplish daily tasks or deal with medical ailments. Teresa Nelson, owner of Home Helpers of Eastern Idaho and a certified senior adviser, recognizes the value of independent living and, through her hard work, has greatly contributed to the rich and full life of many Idahoans. I rise today to honor Home Helpers of Eastern Idaho located in Pocatello, ID.

Home Helpers of Eastern Idaho specializes in the at-home nonmedical care of our senior citizens and facilitates independent living. However, Home Helpers doesn't stop there. The over 50 employees and caregivers at Home Helpers also are available to assist new and expectant mothers, working parents, and individuals who are in need of recuperative home care with flexible schedules and cheerful attendants. The personal touch that accompanies each care plan makes each experience unique and maximizes the level of comfort and care available to those in need.

Conscious of the individual needs and distinct situation of each and every client, Teresa Nelson and her team at Home Helpers strive to deliver a custom-tailored plan for each circumstance. From treatment needs to payment plans, the caregivers at Home Helpers use their flexibility and expertise to increase the quality of life of all that they work with.

For over 3½ years, Home Helpers has assisted many families and individuals through challenging times. Therefore, it is only fitting that we celebrate this firm's growth and successes, as they have simultaneously helped support our loved ones and create health care jobs in Idaho. I am proud to extend my congratulations to Teresa Nelson and everyone at Home Helpers of Eastern Idaho for their tremendous efforts and offer my best wishes for their continued success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2424. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Department's activities during Calendar Year 2012 relative to the Equal Credit Opportunity Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2425. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to two determinations made by the Financial Stability Oversight Council on July 8, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2426. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2012 Report of Statistics Required by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2427. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mancozeb; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9393-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2428. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Imazosulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9390-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2429. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Hazard Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2012-0003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2430. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2012-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2431. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee: New Source Review-Prevention of Significant Deterioration" (FRL No. 9837-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2432. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Vir-

ginia; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 9828-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2433. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Disapproval of PM2.5 Permitting Requirements" (FRL No. 9838-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2434. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of North Dakota; Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS" (FRL No. 9839-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2435. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Administrative Revisions to EPAAR" (FRL No. 9837-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2436. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Disapproval of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Arizona; Regional Haze and Interstate Transport Requirements" (FRL No. 9838-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2437. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Prevention of Significant Deterioration Requirements for PM2.5 Increments and Major and Minor Source Baseline Dates; State Board Requirements; North Dakota" (FRL No. 9839-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2438. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Control Techniques Guidelines and Reasonably Available Control Technology" (FRL No. 9835-7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2439. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Atlanta, Georgia 1997 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area; Reasonable Further Progress Plan" (FRL No. 9837-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2440. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Inflation Adjustments to the Price-Anderson Act Financial Protection Regulations" (RIN3150-AJ25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2441. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interim Enforcement Policy for Permanent Implant Brachytherapy Medical Event Reporting" (NRC-2013-0114) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2442. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Effective Date for Temporary Pilot Program Setting the Time and Place for a Hearing Before an Administrative Law Judge" (RIN0960-AH58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2443. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Sunset Date for Attorney Advisor Program" (RIN0960-AH56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2444. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mailing of Tickets Under the Ticket to Work Program" (RIN0960-AH34) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2445. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Certification of Factual Information to Import Administration during Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Final Rule" (RIN0625-AA66) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2446. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the waiver of restrictions on U.S. assistance for several governments that were triggered by either the transfer of, or facilitation of the transfer of, lethal military equipment to state sponsor of terrorism (OSS-2013-1091); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2447. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13-079, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2448. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-

Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13-089, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2449. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-097); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2450. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-093); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2451. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-048); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2452. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2013-0127—2013-0135); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2453. A communication from the Program Manager, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Exclusion of Orphan Drugs for Certain Covered Entities Under 340B Program" (RIN0906-AA94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2454. A communication from the Program Manager, Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Distribution of Reference Biological Standards and Biological Preparations" (RIN0920-AA53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2455. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)—Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (RRTC) on Disability in Rural Areas" (CFDA No. 84.133B-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2456. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Community Services Block Grant (CCSBG) Program Report for Fiscal Year 2009"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2457. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Letter Report: Sufficiency Certification for the Washington Convention and Sports Authority's

(Trading As Events DC) Projected Revenues and Excess Reserve to Meet Projected Operating and Debt Service Expenditures and Reserve Requirements for Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2458. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's annual report on Federal agencies' use of the physicians' comparability allowance (PCA) program; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2459. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2460. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-107, "Extension of Time to Dispose of Justice Park Property Temporary Approval Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2461. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-108, "Poster Youth Transit Subsidy Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2462. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-110, "Better Prices, Better Quality, Better Choices for Health Coverage Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2463. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-109, "Heat Wave Safety Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2464. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-111, "YMCA Community Investment Initiative Real Property Tax Exemption Temporary Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1371. An original bill making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-80).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1372. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-81).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF
COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. STABENOW for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

*Robert Bonnie, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.

*Krysta L. Harden, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Agriculture.

By Mr. BAUCUS for the Committee on Finance.

*F. Scott Kieff, of Illinois, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the term expiring June 16, 2020.

*Joseph W. Nega, of Illinois, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

*Michael B. Thornton, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND
JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1362. A bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a permanent background check system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1363. A bill to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1,000,000,000 and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1364. A bill to promote neutrality, simplicity, and fairness in the taxation of digital goods and digital services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1365. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow for fair application of the exceptions process for drugs in tiers in formularies in prescription drug plans under Medicare part D; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1366. A bill to modify the appointment of Inspectors General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1367. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed

Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1368. A bill to facilitate nationwide availability of volunteer income tax assistance for low-income and underserved populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1369. A bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1370. A bill to establish partnerships to create or enhance educational and skills development pathways to 21st century careers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

S. 1371. An original bill making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 1372. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1373. A bill to increase access to refinancing for homeowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 1374. A bill to allow traditional foods to be served at public facilities; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1375. A bill to require a portion of closing costs to be paid by the enterprises with respect to certain refinanced mortgage loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1376. A bill to improve the Federal Housing Administration and to ensure the solvency of the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CORNYN, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 1377. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COATS, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. JOHANNIS):

S. 1378. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for investigative leave requirements with respect to Senior Executive Service employees, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND
SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COONS:

S. Res. 199. A resolution celebrating the 200th August Quarterly Festival taking place from August 18, 2013, through August 25, 2013, in Wilmington, Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BURR, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KING, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. COATS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COBURN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. Res. 200. A resolution designating July 26, 2013, as "United States Intelligence Professionals Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 201. A resolution designating the first Wednesday in September 2013 as "National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day" and raising awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. TESTER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DONNELLY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Con. Res. 20. A concurrent resolution encouraging peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 337

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 337, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 370

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to improve and expand geographic literacy among kindergarten through grade 12 students in the United States by improving professional development programs for kindergarten through grade 12 teachers offered through institutions of higher education.

S. 381

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 554

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 554, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 573

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 573, a bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 769

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 769, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 780

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 780, a bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for an exception from infringement for certain component parts of motor vehicles.

S. 813

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan

(Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 813, a bill to require that Peace Corps volunteers be subject to the same limitations regarding coverage of abortion services as employees of the Peace Corps with respect to coverage of such services, and for other purposes.

S. 892

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 892, a bill to amend the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 to impose sanctions with respect to certain transactions in foreign currencies, and for other purposes.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 966

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 966, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase participation in medical flexible spending arrangements.

S. 971

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 971, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 987, a bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media.

S. 1039

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1039, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry scholarship to include spouses of members of the Armed Forces who die in the line of duty, and for other purposes.

S. 1140

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1140, a bill to extend the authorization of the Highlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024.

S. 1254

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1254, a bill to amend the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998, and for other purposes.

S. 1313

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1313, a bill to promote transparency, accountability, and reform within the United Nations system, and for other purposes.

S. 1324

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1324, a bill to prohibit any regulations promulgated pursuant to a presidential memorandum relating to power sector carbon pollution standards from taking effect.

S. 1340

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1340, a bill to improve passenger vessel security and safety, and for other purposes.

S. 1343

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to protect the information of livestock producers, and for other purposes.

S. 1361

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1361, a bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept additional documentation when considering the application for veterans status of an individual who performed service as a coastwise merchant seaman during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 153

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 153, a resolution recognizing the 200th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie.

AMENDMENT NO. 1751

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1751 proposed to S. 1243, an original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1783

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1783 proposed to S. 1243, an original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1792

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1792 intended to be proposed to S. 1243, an original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 199—CELEBRATING THE 200TH AUGUST QUARTERLY FESTIVAL TAKING PLACE FROM AUGUST 18, 2013, THROUGH AUGUST 25, 2013, IN WILMINGTON, DELAWARE

Mr. COONS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 199

Whereas, 200 years before the date of agreement to this resolution, in 1813, Peter Spencer founded the African Union Church, 1 of the first African-American institutions legally incorporated within the United States;

Whereas, 1 year later, in 1814, Spencer and the African Union Church convened the first August Quarterly meeting and festival in Wilmington, Delaware, bringing thousands of African Americans together to celebrate their faith;

Whereas the August Quarterly (or "Big Quarterly") Festival became a meeting place for African Americans celebrating freedom, sharing in solidarity, and looking for relatives lost or sold in the institution of slavery, and a means through which Harriett Tubman and other conductors and station masters of the Underground Railroad met with those looking to escape the bonds of slavery;

Whereas the August Quarterly Festival is well recognized as the longest continuously celebrated African-American festival in the United States; and

Whereas, from August 18, 2013, through August 25, 2013, thousands of people will come together in Wilmington, Delaware to celebrate the 200th August Quarterly Festival: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 200th August Quarterly Festival taking place from August 18, 2013, through August 25, 2013;

(2) recognizes the historical significance of the August Quarterly Festival and the role the festival has played since 1814 in celebrating faith, community, culture, and freedom;

(3) honors the life of leadership, faith, and service of Peter Spencer, founder of the African Union Church and of the August Quarterly Festival; and

(4) recognizes the service volunteers and religious leaders who ensure that the legacy of Peter Spencer lives on through the continuation of the August Quarterly Festival.

SENATE RESOLUTION 200—DESIGNATING JULY 26, 2013, AS "UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE PROFESSIONALS DAY"

Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BURR, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KING, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. COATS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COBURN, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 200

Whereas on July 26, 1908, Attorney General Charles Bonaparte ordered newly-hired Federal investigators to report to the Office of the Chief Examiner of the Department of Justice, which subsequently was renamed the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

Whereas on July 26, 1947, President Truman signed the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), creating the Department of Defense, the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, thereby laying the foundation for today's intelligence community;

Whereas the National Security Act of 1947, which appears in title 50 of the United States Code, governs the definition, composition, responsibilities, authorities, and oversight of the intelligence community of the United States;

Whereas the intelligence community is defined by section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) to include the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, other offices within the Department of Defense for the collection of specialized national intelligence through reconnaissance programs, the intelligence elements of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Department of Energy, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of the Treasury, the elements of the Department of Homeland Security concerned with the analysis of intelligence information, and other elements as may be designated;

Whereas July 26, 2012, was the 65th anniversary of the signing of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.);

Whereas the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458; 118 Stat. 3638) created the position of the Director of National Intelligence to serve as the head of the intelligence community and to ensure that national intelligence be timely, objective, independent of political considerations, and based upon all sources available;

Whereas Congress has previously passed joint resolutions, signed by the President, to

designate Peace Officers Memorial Day on May 15, Patriot Day on September 11, and other commemorative occasions, to honor the sacrifices of law enforcement officers and of those who lost their lives on September 11, 2001;

Whereas the United States has increasingly relied upon the men and women of the intelligence community to protect and defend the security of the United States in the decade since the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas the men and women of the intelligence community, both civilian and military, have been increasingly called upon to deploy to theaters of war in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere since September 11, 2001;

Whereas numerous intelligence officers of the elements of the intelligence community have been injured or killed in the line of duty;

Whereas intelligence officers of the United States are routinely called upon to accept personal hardship and sacrifice in the furtherance of their mission to protect the United States, to undertake dangerous assignments in the defense of the interests of the United States, to collect reliable information within prescribed legal authorities upon which the leaders of the United States rely in life-and-death situations, and to "speak truth to power," by providing their best assessments to decision makers, regardless of political and policy considerations;

Whereas the men and women of the intelligence community have on numerous occasions succeeded in preventing attacks upon the United States and allies of the United States, saving numerous innocent lives; and

Whereas intelligence officers of the United States must of necessity often remain unknown and unrecognized for their substantial achievements and successes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 26, 2013, as "United States Intelligence Professionals Day";

(2) acknowledges the courage, fidelity, sacrifice, and professionalism of the men and women of the intelligence community of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 201—DESIGNATING THE FIRST WEDNESDAY IN SEPTEMBER 2013 AS "NATIONAL POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE AWARENESS DAY" AND RAISING AWARENESS AND UNDERSTANDING OF POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE

Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 201

Whereas National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day will raise public awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease, one of the most prevalent, life-threatening genetic kidney diseases;

Whereas National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day will also foster understanding of the impact polycystic kidney disease has on patients and their families;

Whereas polycystic kidney disease is a progressive, genetic disorder of the kidneys that

causes damage to the kidneys and the cardiovascular, endocrine, hepatic, and gastrointestinal organ systems;

Whereas polycystic kidney disease has a devastating impact on the health and finances of people of all ages, and equally affects people of all races, genders, nationalities, geographic locations, and income levels;

Whereas, of the people diagnosed with polycystic kidney disease, approximately 10 percent have no family history of the disease, with the disease developing as a spontaneous (or new) mutation;

Whereas there is no treatment or cure for polycystic kidney disease, which is one of the 4 leading causes of kidney failure in the United States;

Whereas the vast majority of patients with polycystic kidney disease reach kidney failure at an average age of 53, causing a severe strain on dialysis and kidney transplantation resources and on the delivery of health care in the United States as the largest segment of the population of the United States, the “baby boomers”, continues to age;

Whereas polycystic kidney disease instills in patients fear of an unknown future with a life-threatening genetic disease and apprehension over possible discrimination, including the risk of losing their health and life insurance, their jobs, and their chances for promotion;

Whereas countless friends, loved ones, spouses, and caregivers must shoulder the physical, emotional, and financial burdens that polycystic kidney disease causes;

Whereas the severity of the symptoms of polycystic kidney disease and the limited public awareness of the disease cause many patients to live in denial and forego regular visits to their physicians or avoid following good health management, which would help avoid more severe complications when kidney failure occurs;

Whereas people who have chronic, life-threatening diseases like polycystic kidney disease have a predisposition to depression and its resultant consequences of 7 times the national average because of their anxiety over pain, suffering, and premature death; and

Whereas the PKD Foundation and its more than 60 volunteer chapters around the United States are dedicated to conducting research to find treatments and a cure for polycystic kidney disease, fostering public awareness and understanding of the disease, educating patients and their families about the disease to improve their treatment and care, and providing support and encouraging people to become organ donors, including by sponsoring the annual “Walk for PKD” to raise funds for polycystic kidney disease research, education, advocacy, and awareness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the first Wednesday in September 2013 as “National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day”;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day to raise public awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease;

(3) recognizes the need for additional research to find a cure for polycystic kidney disease; and

(4) encourages all people in the United States and interested groups to support National Polycystic Kidney Awareness Day through appropriate ceremonies and activities to promote public awareness of polycystic kidney disease and to foster understanding of the impact of the disease on patients and their families.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 20—ENCOURAGING PEACE AND REUNIFICATION ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

Mr. Kaine (for himself, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Baucus, Mr. Wyden, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Tester, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Donnelly, and Ms. Warren) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 20

Whereas the Republic of Korea (in this resolution referred to as “South Korea”) and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (in this resolution referred to as “North Korea”) have never formally ended hostilities and have been technically in a state of war since the Armistice Agreement was signed on July 27, 1953;

Whereas the United States, as representing the United Nations Forces Command which was a signatory to the Armistice Agreement, and with 28,500 of its troops currently stationed in South Korea, has a stake in the progress towards peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula;

Whereas progress towards peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula would mean greater security and prosperity for the region and the world;

Whereas, at the end of World War II, Korea officially gained independence from Japanese rule, as agreed to at the Cairo Conference on November 22, 1943, through November 26, 1943;

Whereas, on August 10, 1945, the Korean Peninsula was temporarily divided along the 38th parallel into two military occupation zones commanded by the United States and the Soviet Union;

Whereas, on June 25, 1950, communist North Korea invaded the South, thereby initiating the Korean War and diminishing prospects for a peaceful unification of Korea;

Whereas, during the Korean War, approximately 1,789,000 members of the United States Armed Forces served in-theater along with the South Korean forces and 20 other members of the United Nations to secure peace on the Korean Peninsula and in the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas, since the end of the Korean War era, the United States Armed Forces have remained in South Korea to promote regional peace;

Whereas provocations by the Government of North Korea in recent years have escalated tension and instability in the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas one of the largest obstacles to peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula is the presence of nuclear weapons in North Korea;

Whereas the refusal of the Government of North Korea to denuclearize disrupts peace and security on the Korean Peninsula;

Whereas, beginning in 2003, the United States, along with the two Koreas, Japan, the People’s Republic of China, and the Russian Federation, have engaged in six rounds of Six-Party Talks aimed at the verifiable and irreversible denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and finding a peaceful resolution to the security concerns resulting from North Korea’s nuclear development;

Whereas the three-mile wide buffer zone between the two Koreas, known as the Demilitarized Zone, or DMZ, is the most heavily armed border in the world;

Whereas the Korean War separated more than 10,000,000 Korean family members, including 100,000 Korean Americans who, after 60 years of separation, are still waiting to see their families in North Korea;

Whereas reunification remains a long-term goal of South Korea;

Whereas South Korea and North Korea are both full members of the United Nations, whose stated purpose includes maintaining international peace and security, and to that end “take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace”;

Whereas the Governments and people of the United States and South Korea have continuously stood shoulder-to-shoulder to promote and defend international peace and security, economic prosperity, human rights, and the rule of law both on the Korean Peninsula and beyond, and the denuclearization of North Korea; and

Whereas July 27, 2013, marks the 60th anniversary of the Armistice Agreement of the Korean War: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the historical importance of the Korean War, which began on June 25, 1950;

(2) honors the noble service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces and the armed forces of allied countries that have served in Korea since 1950;

(3) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to its alliance with South Korea for the betterment of peace and prosperity on the Korean Peninsula; and

(4) calls on the Government of North Korea to abide by international law and cease its nuclear weapons program and denuclearize completely in order to resume talks that could eventually lead to peace and reunification.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1798. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1799. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1800. Mrs. McCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1801. Mrs. McCASKILL (for herself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1802. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1803. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra.

SA 1804. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1805. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

bill S. 1243, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1806. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1807. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1808. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1809. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1810. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1811. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1812. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1798. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE —TRANSPORTATION EMPOWERMENT ACT

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Transportation Empowerment Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the objective of the Federal highway program has been to facilitate the construction of a modern freeway system that promotes efficient interstate commerce by connecting all States;

(2) that objective has been attained, and the Interstate System connecting all States is near completion;

(3) each State has the responsibility of providing an efficient transportation network for the residents of the State;

(4) each State has the means to build and operate a network of transportation systems, including highways, that best serves the needs of the State;

(5) each State is best capable of determining the needs of the State and acting on those needs;

(6) the Federal role in highway transportation has, over time, usurped the role of the States by taxing motor fuels used in the States and then distributing the proceeds to the States based on the Federal Government's perceptions of what is best for the States;

(7) the Federal Government has used the Federal motor fuels tax revenues to force all States to take actions that are not necessarily appropriate for individual States;

(8) the Federal distribution, review, and enforcement process wastes billions of dollars on unproductive activities;

(9) Federal mandates that apply uniformly to all 50 States, regardless of the different circumstances of the States, cause the States to waste billions of hard-earned tax dollars on projects, programs, and activities that the States would not otherwise undertake; and

(10) Congress has expressed a strong interest in reducing the role of the Federal Government by allowing each State to manage its own affairs.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this title are—

(1) to return to the individual States maximum discretionary authority and fiscal responsibility for all elements of the national surface transportation systems that are not within the direct purview of the Federal Government;

(2) to preserve Federal responsibility for the Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways;

(3) to preserve the responsibility of the Department of Transportation for—

(A) design, construction, and preservation of transportation facilities on Federal public land;

(B) national programs of transportation research and development and transportation safety; and

(C) emergency assistance to the States in response to natural disasters;

(4) to eliminate to the maximum extent practicable Federal obstacles to the ability of each State to apply innovative solutions to the financing, design, construction, operation, and preservation of Federal and State transportation facilities; and

(5) with respect to transportation activities carried out by States, local governments, and the private sector, to encourage—

(A) competition among States, local governments, and the private sector; and

(B) innovation, energy efficiency, private sector participation, and productivity.

SEC. 3. FUNDING LIMITATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Secretary of Transportation determines for any of fiscal years 2015 through 2019 that the aggregate amount required to carry out transportation programs and projects under this title and amendments made by this title exceeds the estimated aggregate amount in the Highway Trust Fund available for those programs and projects for the fiscal year, each amount made available for such a program or project shall be reduced by the pro rata percentage required to reduce the aggregate amount required to carry out those programs and projects to an amount equal to that available for those programs and projects in the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year.

SEC. 4. FUNDING FOR CORE HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The following sums are authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account):

(A) FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM.—For the national highway performance program under section 119 of title 23, United States Code, the surface transportation program under section 133 of that title, the highway safety improvement program under section 148 of that title, the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program under section 149 of that title, and to carry out section 134 of that title—

(i) \$37,592,576,000 for fiscal year 2015;

(ii) \$19,720,696,000 for fiscal year 2016;

(iii) \$13,147,130,000 for fiscal year 2017;

(iv) \$10,271,196,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

(v) \$7,600,685,000 for fiscal year 2019.

(B) EMERGENCY RELIEF.—For emergency relief under section 125 of that title, \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.

(C) FEDERAL LANDS PROGRAMS.—

(i) FEDERAL LANDS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM.—For the Federal lands transportation program under section 203 of that title, \$300,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019, of which \$240,000,000 of the amount made available for each fiscal year shall be the amount for the National Park Service and \$30,000,000 of the amount made available for each fiscal year shall be the amount for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(ii) FEDERAL LANDS ACCESS PROGRAM.—For the Federal lands access program under section 204 of that title, \$250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.

(D) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 104(a)(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) to be made available to the Secretary for administrative expenses of the Federal Highway Administration—

“(A) \$437,600,000 for fiscal year 2015;

“(B) \$229,565,000 for fiscal year 2016;

“(C) \$153,043,000 for fiscal year 2017;

“(D) \$119,565,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

“(E) \$88,478,000 for fiscal year 2019.”.

(2) TRANSFERABILITY OF FUNDS.—Section 104 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

“(f) TRANSFERABILITY OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that a State determines that funds made available under this title to the State for a purpose are in excess of the needs of the State for that purpose, the State may transfer the excess funds to, and use the excess funds for, any surface transportation (including mass transit and rail) purpose in the State.

“(2) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a State has transferred funds under paragraph (1) to a purpose that is not a surface transportation purpose as described in paragraph (1), the amount of the improperly transferred funds shall be deducted from any amount the State would otherwise receive from the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year that begins after the date of the determination.”.

(3) FEDERAL-AID SYSTEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “the National Highway System, which includes”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in section 103 by striking the section designation and heading and inserting the following:

“§ 103. Federal-aid system”; and

(ii) in the analysis by striking the item relating to section 103 and inserting the following:

“103. Federal-aid system.”.

(4) CALCULATION OF STATE AMOUNTS.—Section 104(c) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the paragraph heading by striking “FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014” and inserting “THEREAFTER”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A) by striking “fiscal year 2014” and inserting “a fiscal year”

(5) NATIONAL BRIDGE AND TUNNEL INVENTORY AND INSPECTION STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 144 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in subsection (e)(1) by inserting “on the Federal-aid system” after “any bridge”; and

(ii) in subsection (f)(1) by inserting “on the Federal-aid system” after “construct any bridge”.

(B) REPEAL OF HISTORIC BRIDGES PROVISIONS.—Section 144(g) of title 23, United States Code, is repealed.

(6) REPEAL OF TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM.—The following provisions are repealed:

(A) Section 213 of title 23, United States Code.

(B) The item relating to section 213 in the analysis for chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code.

(7) NATIONAL DEFENSE HIGHWAYS.—Section 311 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “under subsection (a) of section 104 of this title” and inserting “to carry out this section”; and

(B) by striking the second sentence.

(8) FEDERALIZATION AND DEFEDERALIZATION OF PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning on October 1, 2014—

(A) a highway construction or improvement project shall not be considered to be a Federal highway construction or improvement project unless and until a State expends Federal funds for the construction portion of the project;

(B) a highway construction or improvement project shall not be considered to be a Federal highway construction or improvement project solely by reason of the expenditure of Federal funds by a State before the construction phase of the project to pay expenses relating to the project, including for any environmental document or design work required for the project; and

(C)(i) a State may, after having used Federal funds to pay all or a portion of the costs of a highway construction or improvement project, reimburse the Federal Government in an amount equal to the amount of Federal funds so expended; and

(ii) after completion of a reimbursement described in clause (i), a highway construction or improvement project described in that clause shall no longer be considered to be a Federal highway construction or improvement project.

(9) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—No reporting requirement, other than a reporting requirement in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act, shall apply on or after October 1, 2014, to the use of Federal funds for highway projects by a public-private partnership.

(b) EXPENDITURES FROM HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—

(1) EXPENDITURES FOR CORE PROGRAMS.—Section 9503(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “October 1, 2014” and inserting “October 1, 2020”; and

(ii) by striking “MAP-21” and inserting “Transportation Empowerment Act”;

(B) in paragraphs (3)(A)(i), (4)(A), and (5), by striking “October 1, 2016” each place it appears and inserting “October 1, 2022”; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking “July 1, 2017” and inserting “July 1, 2023”.

(2) AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR CORE PROGRAM EXPENDITURES.—Section 9503 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) CORE PROGRAMS FINANCING RATE.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2)—

“(A) in the case of gasoline and special motor fuels the tax rate of which is the rate specified in section 4081(a)(2)(A)(i), the core programs financing rate is—

“(i) after September 30, 2014, and before October 1, 2015, 18.3 cents per gallon,

“(ii) after September 30, 2015, and before October 1, 2016, 9.6 cents per gallon,

“(iii) after September 30, 2016, and before October 1, 2017, 6.4 cents per gallon,

“(iv) after September 30, 2017, and before October 1, 2018, 5.0 cents per gallon, and

“(v) after September 30, 2018, 3.7 cents per gallon, and

“(B) in the case of kerosene, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels the tax rate of which is the rate specified in section 4081(a)(2)(A)(iii), the core programs financing rate is—

“(i) after September 30, 2014, and before October 1, 2015, 24.3 cents per gallon,

“(ii) after September 30, 2015, and before October 1, 2016, 12.7 cents per gallon,

“(iii) after September 30, 2016, and before October 1, 2017, 8.5 cents per gallon,

“(iv) after September 30, 2017, and before October 1, 2018, 6.6 cents per gallon, and

“(v) after September 30, 2018, 5.0 cents per gallon.

“(2) APPLICATION OF RATE.—In the case of fuels used as described in paragraph (3)(C), (4)(B), and (5) of subsection (c), the core programs financing rate is zero.”

(c) TERMINATION OF MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT.—Section 9503(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by inserting “and before October 1, 2014” after “March 31, 1983”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) TRANSFER TO HIGHWAY ACCOUNT.—On October 1, 2014, the Secretary shall transfer all amounts in the Mass Transit Account to the Highway Account.”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments and repeals made by this section take effect on October 1, 2014.

SEC. 5. FUNDING FOR HIGHWAY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) to carry out sections 503(b), 503(d), and 509 of title 23, United States Code, \$115,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE.—Funds authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) shall—

(1) be available for obligation in the same manner as if those funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, except that the Federal share of the cost of a project or activity carried out using those funds shall be 80 percent, unless otherwise expressly provided by this Act (including the amendments by this Act) or otherwise determined by the Secretary; and

(2) remain available until expended and not be transferable.

SEC. 6. RETURN OF EXCESS TAX RECEIPTS TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9503(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) RETURN OF EXCESS TAX RECEIPTS TO STATES FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PURPOSES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—On the first day of each year of fiscal years 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall—

“(i) determine the excess (if any) of—

“(I) the amounts appropriated in such fiscal year to the Highway Trust Fund under subsection (b) which are attributable to the taxes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) thereof (after the application of paragraph (4) thereof) over the sum of—

“(II) the amounts so appropriated which are equivalent to—

“(aa) such amounts attributable to the core programs financing rate for such year, plus

“(bb) the taxes described in paragraphs (3)(C), (4)(B), and (5) of subsection (c), and

“(ii) allocate the amount determined under clause (i) among the States (as defined in section 101(a) of title 23, United States Code) for surface transportation (including mass transit and rail) purposes so that—

“(I) the percentage of that amount allocated to each State, is equal to

“(II) the percentage of the amount determined under clause (i)(I) paid into the Highway Trust Fund in the latest fiscal year for which such data are available which is attributable to highway users in the State.

“(B) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a State has used amounts under subparagraph (A) for a purpose which is not a surface transportation purpose as described in subparagraph (A), the improperly used amounts shall be deducted from any amount the State would otherwise receive from the Highway Trust Fund for the fiscal year which begins after the date of the determination.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section takes effect on October 1, 2014.

SEC. 7. REDUCTION IN TAXES ON GASOLINE, DIESEL FUEL, KEROSENE, AND SPECIAL FUELS FUNDING HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) REDUCTION IN TAX RATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4081(a)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “18.3 cents” and inserting “3.7 cents”; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking “24.3 cents” and inserting “5.0 cents”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 4081(a)(2)(D) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “19.7 cents” and inserting “4.1 cents”, and

(ii) by striking “24.3 cents” and inserting “5.0 cents”.

(B) Section 6427(b)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by striking “7.4 cents” and inserting “1.5 cents”.

(b) ADDITIONAL CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 4041(a)(1)(C)(iii)(I) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “7.3 cents per gallon (4.3 cents per gallon after September 30, 2016)” and inserting “1.4 cents per gallon (zero after September 30, 2021)”.

(2) Section 4041(a)(2)(B)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking “24.3 cents” and inserting “5.0 cents”.

(3) Section 4041(a)(3)(A) of such Code is amended by striking “18.3 cents” and inserting “3.7 cents”.

(4) Section 4041(m)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “2016” and inserting “2021”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “9.15 cents” and inserting “1.8 cents”;

(C) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “11.3 cents” and inserting “2.3 cents”; and

(D) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) zero after September 30, 2021.”.

(5) Section 4081(d)(1) of such Code is amended by striking “4.3 cents per gallon after September 30, 2016” and inserting “zero after September 30, 2021”.

(6) Section 9503(b) of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraphs (1) and (2), by striking “October 1, 2016” both places it appears and inserting “October 1, 2021”;

(B) in the heading of paragraph (2), by striking “OCTOBER 1, 2016” and inserting “OCTOBER 1, 2021”;

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking “after September 30, 2016, and before July 1, 2017” and inserting “after September 30, 2021, and before July 1, 2022”; and

(D) in paragraph (6)(B), by striking “October 1, 2014” and inserting “October 1, 2019”.

(c) FLOOR STOCK REFUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If—

(A) before October 1, 2019, tax has been imposed under section 4081 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 on any liquid; and

(B) on such date such liquid is held by a dealer and has not been used and is intended for sale;

there shall be credited or refunded (without interest) to the person who paid such tax (in this subsection referred to as the “taxpayer”) an amount equal to the excess of the tax paid by the taxpayer over the amount of such tax which would be imposed on such liquid had the taxable event occurred on such date.

(2) TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS.—No credit or refund shall be allowed or made under this subsection unless—

(A) claim therefor is filed with the Secretary of the Treasury before April 1, 2020; and

(B) in any case where liquid is held by a dealer (other than the taxpayer) on October 1, 2019—

(i) the dealer submits a request for refund or credit to the taxpayer before January 1, 2020; and

(ii) the taxpayer has repaid or agreed to repay the amount so claimed to such dealer or has obtained the written consent of such dealer to the allowance of the credit or the making of the refund.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR FUEL HELD IN RETAIL STOCKS.—No credit or refund shall be allowed under this subsection with respect to any liquid in retail stocks held at the place where intended to be sold at retail.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “dealer” and “held by a dealer” have the respective meanings given to such terms by section 6412 of such Code; except that the term “dealer” includes a producer.

(5) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (b) and (c) of section 6412 and sections 6206 and 6675 of such Code shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to fuel removed after September 30, 2019.

(2) CERTAIN CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by subsections (b)(4) and (b)(6) shall apply to fuel removed after September 30, 2016.

SEC. 8. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, after consultation

with the appropriate committees of Congress, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit a report to Congress describing such technical and conforming amendments to titles 23 and 49, United States Code, and such technical and conforming amendments to other laws, as are necessary to bring those titles and other laws into conformity with the policy embodied in this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 9. EFFECTIVE DATE CONTINGENT ON CERTIFICATION OF DEFICIT NEUTRALITY.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that—

(1) this Act will become effective only if the Director of the Office of Management and Budget certifies that this Act is deficit neutral;

(2) discretionary spending limits are reduced to capture the savings realized in devolving transportation functions to the State level pursuant to this Act; and

(3) the tax reduction made by this Act is not scored under pay-as-you-go and does not inadvertently trigger a sequestration.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE CONTINGENCY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect only if—

(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this section as the “Director”) submits the report as required in subsection (c); and

(2) the report contains a certification by the Director that, based on the required estimates, the reduction in discretionary outlays resulting from the reduction in contract authority is at least as great as the reduction in revenues for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2019.

(c) OMB ESTIMATES AND REPORT.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 5 calendar days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall—

(A) estimate the net change in revenues resulting from this Act for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2019;

(B) estimate the net change in discretionary outlays resulting from the reduction in contract authority under this Act for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2019;

(C) determine, based on those estimates, whether the reduction in discretionary outlays is at least as great as the reduction in revenues for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2019; and

(D) submit to Congress a report setting forth the estimates and determination.

(2) APPLICABLE ASSUMPTIONS AND GUIDELINES.—

(A) REVENUE ESTIMATES.—The revenue estimates required under paragraph (1)(A) shall be predicated on the same economic and technical assumptions and score keeping guidelines that would be used for estimates made pursuant to section 252(d) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902(d)).

(B) OUTLAY ESTIMATES.—The outlay estimates required under paragraph (1)(B) shall be determined by comparing the level of discretionary outlays resulting from this Act with the corresponding level of discretionary outlays projected in the baseline under section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907).

(c) CONFORMING ADJUSTMENT TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—On compliance with the requirements specified in subsection (b), the Director shall adjust the adjusted discretionary spending limits for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2019 under sec-

tion 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 665(a)(2)) by the estimated reductions in discretionary outlays under subsection (c)(1)(B).

(e) PAGO INTERACTION.—On compliance with the requirements specified in subsection (b), no changes in revenues estimated to result from the enactment of this Act shall be counted for the purposes of section 252(d) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902(d)).

SA 1799. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 46, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

(d) Section 32906(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “(except an electric automobile)” and inserting “(except an electric or natural gas automobile)”.

(e) The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration may not expend any amounts appropriated under this Act unless chapter 329 of title 49, United States Code, is being enforced in accordance with the amendments made by this section.

SA 1800. Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 24, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 119F. (a) The United States, acting through the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, shall release the City of St. Clair, Missouri, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the St. Clair Regional Airport, as described in the most recent airport layout plan approved by the Federal Aviation Administration, to the extent such restrictions, conditions, and limitations are enforceable by the Administrator.

(b) The release under subsection (a) shall not be executed until the City of St. Clair, or its designee, transfers to the Department of Transportation of the State of Missouri—

(1) the amounts described in subsection (c), to be used for capital improvements within the meaning of airport development (as defined in section 47102(3) of title 49, United States Code) and consistent with the obligations of the Department of Transportation of the State of Missouri under the State block grant program of the Federal Aviation Administration; and

(2) for no consideration, all airport and aviation-related equipment of the St. Clair Regional Airport owned by the City of St. Clair and determined by the Department of Transportation of the State of Missouri to be salvageable for use.

(c) The amounts described in this subsection are the following:

(1) An amount equal to the fair market value for the highest and best use of the St.

Clair Regional Airport property determined in good faith by an independent and qualified real estate appraiser on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) An amount equal to the unamortized portion of any Federal development grants other than land paid to the City of St. Clair for use at the St. Clair Regional Airport, which may be paid with and shall be an allowable use of airport revenue notwithstanding section 47107 or 47133 of title 49, United States Code.

(3) An amount equal to the airport revenues remaining in the airport account for the St. Clair Regional Airport as of the date of the enactment of this Act and otherwise due to or received by the City of St. Clair after such date of enactment pursuant to sections 47107(b) and 47133 of title 49, United States Code.

(d) The Federal Aviation Administration shall remove the runway end indicator lighting system at St. Clair Regional Airport.

(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the applicability of—

(1) the requirements and processes under section 46319 of title 49, United States Code;

(2) the requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(3) the requirements and processes under part 157 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(4) the public notice requirements under section 47107(h) of title 49, United States Code.

SA 1801. Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ PROHIBITION ON PERFORMANCE AWARDS IN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “agency” and “career appointee” have the meanings given such terms in section 5381 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) **PROHIBITION.**—An agency may not use amounts made available under this Act to pay an award under section 4507 or 5384 of title 5, United States Code, to a career appointee during fiscal year 2014.

SA 1802. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 26, line 4, insert “bridge” before “projects”.

On page 26, line 5, insert “and section 24402 of title 49” after “title 23”.

On page 26, line 14, strike “such title” and insert “title 23 or provided under section 24402 of title 49, United States Code, as applicable.”.

On page 26, line 15, after “112-141:” insert “*Provided further*, That the Secretary may transfer funds provided under this heading to the Federal Railroad Administration to carry out projects under title 49, United States Code:”.

On page 26, line 18, strike “such title” and insert “title 23, United States Code, or for projects under title 49, United States Code, not less than 80 percent”.

SA 1803. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 12, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 1 ____. None of the funds made available under this Act to the Department of Transportation for cyber security may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Transportation submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed plan describing how the funding will be allocated and for what purposes, including a detailed description of—

(1) how the cyber security funding will be obligated or expended;

(2) the programs and activities that will receive cyber security funding;

(3) if and how the use of the funding complies with the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) and any other applicable Federal law;

(4) the performance metrics that will be used to measure and determine the effectiveness of cyber security plans and programs; and

(5) the strategy that will be employed to procure goods and services associated with the cyber security objectives of the Department of Transportation.

SA 1804. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Not later than October 1, 2013, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall revise the suballocations to the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate for fiscal year 2014 under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(b)) such that the suballocations comply with the discretionary spending limits under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

SA 1805. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 169, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

SEC. 244. Funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this title for grants to be awarded by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) **AUDIT REQUIREMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this title, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Housing and Development shall conduct audits of recipients of any grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this title to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall ensure that at least 10 percent of all grantees receiving grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this title are audited each year.

(B) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term “unresolved audit finding” means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Housing and Urban Development that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(C) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this title that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this title during the following 2 fiscal years.

(D) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this title, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall give priority to eligible entities that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years prior to submitting an application for grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this title.

(E) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an entity is awarded grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this title during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (B), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall—

(i) deposit an amount equal to the grant amounts that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(F) **DISCLOSURE.**—A recipient of grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this title shall disclose to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in the application for the grant, if the recipient has ever requested that a departing employee or contractor of the recipient sign an agreement, for compensation, delaying or declining to cooperate with any audits or investigations performed by or on behalf of the United States Government relating to use of Federal housing grant amounts.

(2) **NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this paragraph and any grant programs described in this title, the term “nonprofit organization” means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) **PROHIBITION.**—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not award

any grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this title to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Each nonprofit organization that is a recipient of grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this title and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make the information disclosed under this paragraph available for public inspection.

SA 1806. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 24, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 119F. Section 41731 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) is located not less than 90 driving miles from the nearest—

“(i) medium hub airport or large hub airport; or

“(ii) small hub airport that was classified as a medium hub airport or large hub airport during the most recent 5-year period;”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E)”;

(3) by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (d), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “For fiscal year” and inserting the following:

“(1) **ENPLANEMENTS REQUIREMENT.**—For fiscal year”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **DISTANCE REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary may waive subsection (a)(1)(C) with respect to a location if the Secretary determines that without the waiver there would be undue difficulty accessing the nearest medium hub airport or large hub airport as a result of geographic characteristics unique to the location.”.

SA 1807. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending Sep-

tember 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 24, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 119F. It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Transportation should continue the process of drafting regulations on the integration of unmanned aerial systems into the national airspace system while developing the report required by section 119E.

SA 1808. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 188, after line 24, add the following:

SEC. 422. (a) Funds appropriated for assistance for the Government of Egypt for fiscal year 2014 may only be obligated in the following manner—

(1) 25 percent of such funds may be made available after enactment of this Act;

(2) 25 percent of such funds may be made available if the Secretary of State certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of Egypt is supporting inclusive political processes and institutions, including permitting pro-democracy and other civil society organizations to operate freely, has released political prisoners, and is not prosecuting political cases in military courts;

(3) 25 percent of such funds may be made available if the Secretary of State certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that credible elections have been conducted in Egypt and a democratically elected government is in place; and

(4) 25 percent of such funds may be made available if the Secretary of State certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the newly elected Government of Egypt is taking steps to govern democratically and protect human rights and the rule of law (including the rights of women and religious minorities).

(b) None of the funds appropriated for assistance for the Government of Egypt in fiscal year 2014 may be made available if such government is not abiding by the 1979 Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty.

(c) The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, concurrent with the fiscal year 2015 budget request, a comprehensive and strategic review of military and economic assistance for Egypt: *Provided*, That in conducting such review, the President shall consult with relevant Government of Egypt officials and representatives of civil society, and the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That such review shall include a detailed description of the purposes of such assistance, and the specific goals and objectives of furthering political, military, and economic reforms in Egypt, including—

(1) supporting democratic institutions (including an independent legislature and judiciary), an inclusive political process, and regular conduct of free and fair elections at all levels of government;

(2) promoting the rule of law (including equal access to justice, protection of the rights of women and religious minorities, and anti-corruption efforts);

(3) supporting economic reforms (including transparent and accountable governance, private sector-led growth and job creation, and trade expansion);

(4) fostering a vibrant civil society (including free and independent media);

(5) supporting security sector reform (including civilian police forces); and

(6) combating terrorism (including eliminating smuggling networks between Egypt and Gaza in the Sinai).

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State shall reduce the amount of assistance made available for assistance for Egypt in fiscal year 2014 by an amount the Secretary determines is equivalent to that expended by the United States Government for bail, and by nongovernmental organizations for legal and court fees, associated with democracy-related trials in Egypt.

(e)(1) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements of subsection (a)(2) not earlier than 3 months after enactment of this Act if the Secretary of State certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that to do so is important to the national security interests of the United States.

(2) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements of subsection (a)(3) not earlier than 6 months after enactment of this Act if the Secretary certifies to such committees that to do so is important to the national security interests of the United States.

(f) For purposes of this section, the term “appropriate congressional committee” means the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 1809. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 169, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

SEC. 244. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this title may be used by any recipient of such funds to discriminate against any person because that person is a member of the uniformed services.

(b) Any person or entity, acting in good faith, that has knowledge of any instance in which a recipient of funds under this title has discriminated or is discriminating against a member of the uniformed services may file a complaint against such recipient with the Office of Inspector General for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term “member of the uniformed services” means an individual who—

(1) is a member of—

(A) the uniformed services (as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code); or

(B) the National Guard in State status under title 32, United States Code; or

(2) was discharged or released from service in the uniformed services (as so defined) or the National Guard in such status under conditions other than dishonorable.

(d) Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit the use or availability of any funds appropriated or otherwise made

available under this title for programs, activities, or accounts that assist or provide housing to members of the uniformed services.

SA 1810. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 169, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

SEC. 244. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation may not, from any amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this title for fiscal year 2014, award any discretionary grant amounts to any nonprofit organization that, in any of fiscal years 2009 through 2013—

(1) provided a compensation package to one or more of its officers at a level exceeding, by at least 25 percent, the maximum basic rate of pay of the Senior Executive Service;

(2) utilized an average of 12 percent or more of the discretionary grant amounts it received from either the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for the organization's grant administration expenses (including salaries); and

(3) had a finding of a significant deficiency or material weakness in any audit of that organization furnished to or conducted on behalf of either the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation in connection with a Federal housing grant award.

(b) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation shall each submit a report to the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives—

(1) on the number of nonprofit organization grantees meeting the criteria established under subsection (a);

(2) that summarize the type and amount of Federal housing grants awarded to each such organization, including the percentage of each such grant that was utilized by the organization for grant administration expenses, in each of fiscal years 2009 through 2013; and

(3) that describe the steps to be taken by the Secretary or the Corporation, as the case may be, to achieve greater cost-savings and grant-administration efficiencies in the future, including a plan for requiring future grant recipients to limit their grant administration expenditures to 10 percent of grant funds received from the Secretary or the Corporation, as the case may be.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "nonprofit organization" means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

SEC. 245. Any amounts saved, reserved, remaining, or otherwise unobligated as a result of the prohibition set forth under sec-

tion 244, shall be transferred to and appropriated under the heading "Home Investment Partnerships Program": *Provided*, that such amounts shall only be used by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to rehabilitate substandard housing of children residing in rural counties with the highest poverty rates.

SA 1811. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 6, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

For grants to eligible applicants for eligible projects of national and regional significance (as such terms are defined in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 1301(c) of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 101 note)), \$500,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SA 1812. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, after line 24, add the following:

SEC. 155. (a) Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration shall—

(1) complete a study of the safety of movable railroad bridges and the transportation of hazardous materials over such bridges; and

(2) post a report on the Federal Railroad Administration's website that containing the results of such study.

(b) The study conducted under subsection (a) shall address—

(1) the adequacy of span locking and its relation to the practice of trains passing over bridges displaying a stop signal; and

(2) the adequacy of training received by train crews to inspect their route before passing over a bridge displaying a stop signal.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I submit the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule V of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend rule XVI, and rule XXII, Paragraph 2, for the purpose of proposing and considering Amendment No. 1739, including germaneness requirements.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, August 1, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the November 6, 2012 referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico and the Administration's response.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by e-mail to danielle_deraney@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Allen Stayman at (202) 224-7865 or Danielle Deraney at (202) 224-1219.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on National Parks has previously announced a hearing to be held on Wednesday, July 31, at 2:30 p.m. to consider several bills. In addition to the bills previously announced, the subcommittee will also hear testimony on:

S. 1328, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the archeological site and surrounding land of the New Philadelphia town site in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes, and

S. 1339, to reauthorize the Ohio & Erie Canal National Heritage Canalway.

For further information, please contact David Brooks at (202) 224-9863 or John Assini at (202) 224-9313.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 25, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 25, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and

Transportation be authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on July 25, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, "The Partnership Between NIST and the Private Sector: Improving Cybersecurity."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 25, 2013, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 25, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 25, 2013, at 10:30 a.m. in room SD-419 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 25, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 25, 2013, at 11 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 25, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 25, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 25, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS, TECHNOLOGY, AND THE INTERNET

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on July 25, 2013, at 10:15 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, "State of Wireline Communications."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Margaret Taylor, a detailee from the State Department to the Foreign Relations Committee, be granted floor privileges for the consideration of S. 1243.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and it be in order to file cloture on Executive Calendar Nos. 208, 223, 224, 104; further, that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived; finally, if this request is granted, the Senate resume legislative session after the final cloture motion is reported pursuant to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JAMES B. COMEY, JR., TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will proceed to executive session

and the clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James B. Comey, Jr., of Connecticut, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on Calendar No. 208.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of James B. Comey, Jr., of Connecticut, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Mark Begich, Christopher A. Coons, Thomas R. Carper, Bill Nelson, Patty Murray, Martin Heinrich, Jeanne Shaheen, Benjamin A. Cardin, Al Franken, Sherrod Brown, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Charles E. Schumer, Robert P. Casey, Jr.

NOMINATION OF KENT YOSHIHI HIROZAWA TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kent Yoshihiro Hirozawa, of New York, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Kent Yoshihiro Hirozawa, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Joe Manchin III, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Angus S. King, Jr., Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Amy Klobuchar, Richard Blumenthal.

NOMINATION OF NANCY JEAN SCHIFFER TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nancy Jean Schiffer, of

Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. It is my understanding there is a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Nancy Jean Schiffer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Joe Manchin III, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Angus S. King, Jr., Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Amy Klobuchar, Richard Blumenthal.

NOMINATION OF MARK GASTON PEARCE TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Joe Manchin III, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Angus S. King, Jr., Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Amy Klobuchar, Richard Blumenthal.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE PROFESSIONALS DAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to S. Res. 200.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 200) designating July 26, 2013, as "United States Intelligence Professionals Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 200) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE AWARENESS DAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to S. Res. 201.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 201) designating the first Wednesday in September 2013 as "National Polycystic Kidney Awareness Day" and raising awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 201) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 29, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., on Monday, July 29, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of Proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 4:15 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 1243, the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill; fur-

ther, that at 4:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 208, the nomination of James Comey to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided and controlled in the usual form; and, finally, that at 5:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Comey nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the next rollcall vote will be a cloture vote on the Comey nomination on Monday evening.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 29, 2013, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:57 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 29, 2013, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

VINCE GIRDHARI CHHABRIA, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE SUSAN Y. ILLSTON, RETIRED.

MATTHEW FREDERICK LEITMAN, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, VICE MARIANNE O. BATTANI, RETIRED.

JUDITH ELLEN LEVY, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, VICE NANCY G. EDMUNDS, RETIRED.

LAURIE J. MICHELSON, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, VICE GEORGE CARAM STEEH III, RETIRED.

JAMES MAXWELL MOODY, JR., OF ARKANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS, VICE SUSAN WEBBER WRIGHT, RETIRING.

LINDA VIVIENNE PARKER, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, VICE ROBERT H. CLELAND, RETIRED.

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION

LESLIE E. BAINS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2015, VICE WILLIAM S. JASSEN, TERM EXPIRED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

ROBERT MICHAEL SIMON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY, VICE SHERBURNE B. ABBOTT.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CAROLINE KENNEDY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO JAPAN.

DONALD LU, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ALBANIA.

ROBERT A. SHERMAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PORTUGUESE REPUBLIC.

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

TONY HAMMOND, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 14, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MARCEL J. LETTRE II, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE. (NEW POSITION)

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

DAVID M. ABEL
RODGER N. ACKLIN
IVAN A. ACOSTA
BERT W. ADAMS
BRIAN S. ADAMS
PAUL J. ADAMS
PAUL E. ADAMSON
NICHOLAS B. ADCOCK
JEREMY B. AHLSTROM
ARTHUR A. ALCANTARA
ROLANDO P. ALEJO
JAMES G. ALEXANDER
JEREMY B. ALEXANDER
MICHAEL J. ALEXANDER
BENJAMIN D. ALLEN
JASON D. ALLEN
RANDAL T. ALLEN
THOMAS G. ALLEN
GALEN R. ALSOP
JENNIFER A. AMATO
GREGORY A. AMIG
KEVIN G. AMSDEN
LANNY REY ANAYA
SERGIO E. ANAYA
MICHAEL L. ANDERSON
MICHAEL S. ANDERSON
SHANON E. ANDERSON
CHAD M. ANTHONY
ELIZABETH A. APTEKAR
RICARDO L. ARAGON
CHARLES C. ARMSTRONG
JASON M. ARMSTRONG
KIM M. ARNOLD
BEN J. ARONHIME
CHAD C. ASHCRAFT
MIKE D. ATCHLEY
RICHARD ALLEN ATWELL, JR.
CHANDLER P. ATWOOD
CHRISTOPHER M. AUGER
JOSEPH R. AUGUSTINE
JOSEPH E. BABONI
SEAN P. BAERMAN
BRENT R. BAK
BEVERLY A. BAKER
DARIAN W. BAKER
KYLE M. BALDASSARI
JOHN E. BALES
TIMOTHY J. BAMFORD
JOSEPH S. BARBARE
KRIS E. BARCOMBE
RYAN M. BARE
MICHELLE L. BARKER
KEVAN A. BARRY
SHAWN J. BARRY
PAUL R. BARTHEL
BENJAMIN A. BARTLETT
KEVIN S. BARTLETT
MATTHEW A. BARTLETT
ROBERT L. BARTLOW, JR.
PHILIP A. BARTOO
BRAD J. BASHORE
DARREN E. BATES
ARIEL G. BATUNGBACAL
JOHN J. BAUM
CASEY M. BEARD
HERBERT S. BEAUMONT
COREY A. BEAVERSON
JEFFERY D. BECKER
RICHARD R. BECKMAN
GABRIEL M. BEHR
TIFFANY L. BEHR
JONATHAN W. BEICH
ANDREW P. BEITZ
MICAH K. BELL
PAUL M. P. BELL
TRACY L. BELL
ANDREW J. BEMIS
BRAD A. BEMISH
ELIZABETH T. BENEDICT
JERRY W. BENNETT, JR.
LANCE R. BENSON
RICHARD S. BENTLEY
DEAN E. BERCK
DAVID M. BERGIN
JEREMY S. BERGIN
CLAUDIA E. BERMUDEZ
MATTHEW J. BERRIDGE
BRYAN L. BEST
RONALD L. BETTS
TODD G. BETZ
MATTHEW H. BEVERLY
GREGORY L. BEYER
JASON D. BIALON
DANIEL V. BIEHL
ROBERT M. BIGGERS
KEVIN M. BIGGS
MICHAEL P. BITTENBENDER
KEITH W. BITTLE
SCOTT T. BJORGE
JASON S. BLACKERBY
CAROL A. BLACKINGTON
CHRISTOPHER M. BLACKWELL
CODY L. BLAKE
ADAM L. BLANCHARD
JAMES M. BLANTON

JAROD P. BLECHER
JOHN W. BLOCHER
BRANDON D. BLY
RICHARD D. BOATMAN
JOHN A. BOEN
ROBERT L. BOLES
JONATHAN M. BOLING
JAMES M. BONO
CHANTEL M. BOOKER
MELISSA F. BOOKMAN
AARON M. BOSTON
JENNIFER U. BOUDREAU
KENNETH N. BOURQUE
CHRISTOPHER J. BRADLEY
DENOAH BRADLEY
PHILIP W. BRANDT
ALBERT J. BRASSEUR III
ALONZO C. BRAY, JR.
GEREMIAH J. BREKKE
JAMES A. BRENNING
KEVIN J. BREWER
JOHN H. BRINER
CHARLES P. BRISBOIS III
LATISHA R. BRISTOW
AARON D. BROOKS
DELEMESA MACK BROOKS
DARRYL P. BROOME
BRIAN L. BROWN
DAVID J. BROWN
DEMETRIUS O. BROWN
JASON P. BROWN
MATTHEW G. BROWN
MELISSA G. BROWN
ROBERT L. BROWN
DARREN L. BRUMFIELD
JAMES E. BRUNNER
GABRIELLE J. BRYANTBUTLER
ROBERT M. BRYANT
DAVID A. BUCHANAN
ERIC W. BUCHEIT
MARK W. BUCHHOLZ
SCOTT A. BUCHTEL
JONATHAN B. BURKE
SPENCER A. BURKHALTER
RUSSELL C. BURKS
AUSTIN F. BURRILL
STEVEN E. BURY
JAMES W. BUSCH
JONATHAN D. BUSCH
KEITH J. BUTLER
MARCINDA L. BUTTIE
WILLIAM L. BYERS
JONATHAN E. BYRNES
DONA L. BYRON
NICK D. CALLAWAY
LANCE G. CAMPBELL
SCOTT A. CAMPBELL
MICHAEL P. CAMPOS
DAVID M. CANADY, JR.
ASHLEY E. CANNON
GABRIEL A. CANTU
EHREN W. CARL
CHRISTOPHER LEE CARMICHAEL
CLINTON G. CARR III
TONY D. CARTWRIGHT
DAVID A. CASE
LUKE B. CASPER
KIRT J. CASSELL
MATTHEW J. P. CASTILLO
KENNETH P. CATES
MARK L. CAUDILL
JUSTIN T. CENZANO
TROY A. CERNY
CHARLES L. CHANDLER
CHRISTOPHER L. CHANDLER
JAMES J. CHAPA
JESSICA R. CHAPMAN
JOSEPH C. CHENNAULT
JOSEF P. CHESNEY
ERIC S. CHIN
ROBERT J. CHINNOCK
BENJAMIN B. CHRISTEN
CHAD C. CHRISTENSEN
NEIL E. CHRISTENSEN
DENNIS J. CLARK
STEVEN W. CLARK
ALLEN R. CLAY
CHARLES A. CLEGG
THOMAS M. CLOHESSY
BRIAN L. CLOUGH
BRETT S. CLUTTER
TAMEESHA P. COATNEY
ADAM S. COFFMAN
MACK R. COKER
KERRY MCARTHUR COLBURN
LEWIS B. COLLINS
FERNANDO COLON, JR.
MICHAEL J. CONTE
PAUL W. CONTOVEROS
MICHAEL T. COOK
AARON J. COOPER
KATHLEEN A. COOPER
WILLIE L. COOPER III
MICHAEL C. COPPOLA
STEVEN W. CORNELSON
BARBARA A. COSTA
JONATHAN S. COTTON
MATTHEW I. COTTRILL
KEITH E. COWELL
BENJAMIN G. COX
BRIAN V. CRAWFORD
KENDRA L. CRIDER

JEFFREY C. CRIVELLARO
KEVIN M. CROFTON
BENJAMIN L. CROSSLEY
MATTHEW C. CROWELL
GEORGE M. CROWLEY
BRIAN A. CROZIER
CHRISTOPHER P. M. CULLEN
KEVIN D. CUMMINGS
TIMOTHY J. CURRY
JEFF D. CURTIS
RICHARD A. CURTIS
PHILIP A. CURWEN
BENJAMIN A. DAHLKE
JASON R. DALESSIO
CHRISTOPHER J. DAMICO
JEFFREY T. DANIELSON
DEBORAH J. DANYLUK
JEFFREY B. DARDEN
KEVIN A. DAVIDSON
DONOVAN S. DAVIS
JASON M. DAVIS
MATTHEW S. DAVIS
SCOTT S. DAVIS
STEPHEN CHRISTOPHER DAVIS
TODD A. DAVIS
DONALD R. DAY
OLUF P. DAY
JAMES C. DEARMOND
BRIAN T. DEAS
JASON M. DEATON
JEFFERSON R. DEBERRY
JENNIFER S. DECATUR
KENNETH ROY DECEDUE, JR.
DAVID J. DECOURSEY
LAURA S. DEJONG
ALEJANDRO DELAMATA
JOSEPH D. DEPORTER
CHRISTOPHER E. DEPPE
RICARDO A. DIAZ
DANIEL C. DIEHL
JOSEPH M. DIETZ
ADAM R. DIGEROLAMO
SCOTT M. DIGIOIA
JOSEPH P. DILIBERTO IV
JASON L. DILLON
TRAVIS TYRCEE DILTZ
JOHN E. DINES
MARK E. DONOHUE
MATTHEW J. DOOLEY
SEAN P. DOREY
JAMES J. DORN
DANIEL J. DORSON
STEFANOS DOUMTSIS
JONATHAN C. DOWTY
DENNIS L. DRAKE
RUSSELL T. DRESSMAN
JOHN E. DRESS
BRYAN G. DRESSER
MICHAEL P. DRISCOLL
ALAN R. DRIVER
DAVID A. DUBOIS
KRISTINE J. DUBOIS
ERIC R. DUDAK
DENNIS J. DUFFY
TAMARA S. DUKE
MICHAEL R. DULSKI
KELVIN D. DUMAS
LOUIS D. DUNCAN
MICHAEL A. DUNLAVY
SCOTT M. DUNNING
NOEL J. DUPONT
JUSTIN M. DUPUIS
JASON W. EARLEY
DARIN S. EARNEST
RYAN P. EASTWOOD
MICHAEL A. EDMONDSON
MATTHEW S. EDMONSON
COLBY BRANDON EDWARDS
CHRISTIAN J. EGAN
BRIAN D. EGBERT
KRISTOFER D. EGELAND
CALLISTUS R. ELBOURNE
MITCHELL J. ELDER
PATRICK R. ELDRIDGE
THOMAS J. ELLER
MARY R. ELLINGTON
BUDDY R. ELLIOTT, JR.
ANDREW J. EMERY
STEVEN V. ENGBERG
RICHARD D. ENGELMAN
KENNETH N. ENGLESON III
STEPHEN JOHN ESPOSITO
MARK A. ESSLINGER
MICHAEL J. EVANS
LAWRENCE G. EVERT
MICHAEL J. FAILLA
JOHN B. FANN
MONIQUE L. FARNESS
KATRINA L. FELDER
ERIC A. FELLHAUER
JACK W. FERGUSON
LEANN J. FERGUSON
MARCUS G. FERGUSON
PAUL J. FERGUSON
KENNETH A. FERLAND
BRYAN A. FERRARI
JAMES E. FERRELL
TAYLOR T. FERRELL
AARON R. A. FFRENCH
JAMES D. FIELDER
KURT D. FIFE
LOREE J. FILIZER

WILLIAM S. FINLEY
 ROBERT A. FIRMAN
 MATTHEW A. FISHEL
 HEATHER FLEISHAUER
 CHRISTOPHER M. FLOYD
 ERICK G. FONSECA
 PAUL A. FONTAINE
 ROBERT M. FORD, JR.
 JOHN D. FORTENBERRY
 TIMOTHY J. FOSTER
 RICHARD M. FOURNIER
 STANLEY S. FOWLER
 HEATHER A. FOX
 ROSS P. FRANQUEMONT
 EDWIN B. FRAZIER III
 WILLIAM J. FREE
 ANGELA M. FREEMAN
 DOUGLAS FREEMAN
 JOSHUA E. FREY
 WILLIAM T. FRIAR
 DAVID A. FRIEDMAN
 WAYNE M. FROST
 WILLIAM G. FROST
 ERIC L. FRYAR
 JENNIFER D. FUJIMOTO
 JAMES S. FULLER
 JENNIFER J. FULLER
 JOHN D. FURR
 MATTHEW C. GAETKE
 MATT J. GAINES
 ADRIAN H. GALANG
 JOHNNY L. GALBERT
 BENJAMIN S. GALLAGHER
 JOHN D. GALLOWAY, JR.
 CATHERINE A. GAMBOLD
 CHRISTINE M. GANGAWARE
 RICHARD F. GANSKE
 CHRISTIAN D. GARBER
 ABRAHAM GARCIA
 CAESAR I. GARCIA
 CHRISTOPHER N. GARCIA
 MATTHEW T. GARRISON
 DAVID C. GARVIN
 RAFAEL H. GARZA, JR.
 KRISTOPHER M. GEELAN
 JEREMY S. GEIB
 RICHARD D. GERHARDT
 MICHAEL L. GETTE
 AARON M. GIBNEY
 GLEN R. GIBSON
 GREGORY R. GIBSON
 WILLIAM T. GIBSON
 CHARLES E. GILLIAM
 JOHN L. GLASS
 JOAQUIN D. GLOMSKI
 JASON J. GLYNN
 JASON M. GOLABOSKI
 KEVIN P. GOLART
 JON P. GOODMAN
 JEREMY S. GOODWIN
 JESSE W. GOOLSBY
 ANTHONY C. GRAHAM
 ERIC ENRIQUE GRAHAM
 JULIE A. GRAHAM
 JOSEPH J. GRANISTOSKY, JR.
 RYAN M. GRANT
 TOMMASINA GRANT
 CARLIN S. GRAY
 JUSTIN M. GRAY
 JAMES A. GREENFIELD
 JASON R. GREENLEAF
 DARIN M. GREGG
 JAMES A. GRIGSON
 GREGORY A. GRIMES
 JASON WARREN GRUBAUGH
 CLINTON L. GUENTHER
 VERNON GUENTHER
 EDUARDO N. GUEVARA, JR.
 JAMES R. GUMP
 MICHAEL D. GUNN
 RICHARD L. GUNN
 SCOTT A. GUNN
 DEIRDRE M. GURRY
 JOSE R. GUTIERREZ
 MICHAEL A. HAACK
 ERIC T. HAAS
 ANDREW S. HACKLEMAN
 MICHAEL C. HAGEE
 DAVID A. HAIGH
 CHRISTOPHER B. HAINES
 WESLEY R. HALES
 FREDERICK M. HALEY III
 CHRISTOPHER E. HALL
 JAMES A. HALL
 RYAN E. HALL
 MICHAEL D. HAMER
 SETH N. HAMILTON
 MICHAEL A. HAMMACK
 KIMBERLEY D. HAMMOND
 CHRISTOPHER V. HAND
 JOSEPH M. HANK
 SEAN P. HANLEN
 ERIC J. HANLEY
 KELLY M. HANNUM
 MICHAEL A. HANSEN
 JENNY M. HANSONBROWNFIELD
 JAY M. HANSON
 CHARLES B. HARDING
 DENNIS R. HARGIS
 MICHAEL A. HARMON
 MICHAEL M. HARMON
 BRENT NORMAN HARMS

DANIEL W. HARRIS
 VERONICA M. HARRIS
 TANYA R. HARRISON
 AMY S. HARSHNER
 ELIZABETH M. HARWOOD
 DANIEL M. HASLEY
 AARON M. HATCH
 BENJAMIN B. HATCH
 MARIA N. HATCHELL
 MARK A. HAUSER
 CHRIS M. HAUVER
 RONNIE D. HAWKINS
 RYAN T. HAYDE
 ERIK K. HAYNES
 DANIEL J. HAYS
 BRIAN D. HAYSLEY
 BRIAN C. HEALY
 JASON A. HEARD
 BRIAN R. HELTON
 JUSTIN P. HENDRICKS
 RYAN H. HENDRICKSON
 MATTHEW C. HENSLEY
 KRISTIN KOBARG HERDER
 JASON R. HERRING
 ANGELA K. HERRON
 STEVEN M. HERTENSTEIN
 BENJAMIN W. HESLIN
 DAVID F. HETZLER
 CHARLES E. HEWINS
 CHRISTOPHER A. HICKOK
 BRIAN D. HIDY
 SEAN M. HIGGINS
 THOMAS V. HIGGINS II
 SONNY J. HIGNITE
 GABRIEL S. HILEY
 ALMA E. HILL
 RYAN L. HILL
 CHAD J. HILLBERG
 VANESSA M. HILLMAN
 CODY M. HOAGLAND
 BRIAN T. HOBBS
 DONNIE LAYNE HODGES
 CHRIS E. HODGIN
 SHAWN V. HODGIN
 LANCE R. HOFER
 ANDREW L. HOFFMAN
 EDWARD T. HOGAN
 JASON M. HOLCOMB
 BENJAMIN C. HOLLAND
 CHARLES M. HOLLAND
 PATRICK S. HOLLAND
 JEREMY M. HOLMES
 MATTHEW EARL HOLSTON
 TIMOTHY N. HOOD
 PETER J. HORINE
 JEREMY F. HOUGH
 JAMES M. HOWARD
 MARK D. HOWARD
 RICHARD C. HOWARD
 JASON B. HOWELL
 MICHAEL S. HRECZKOSIJ
 JULIUS P. HUBBARD
 SCOTT E. HUDSON
 DANIEL P. HUFFMAN
 MATTHEW J. HUND
 JOHN F. HUNDLEY
 WILLIAM L. HUNT
 BARRY J. HUNTE
 MICHAEL S. HURT
 MORGAN P. HURT
 NATHANIEL R. HUSTON
 TODD T. INOUE
 EDWARD J. IRICK
 JEFFREY C. ISGETT
 JOSEPH C. IUNGERMAN
 CLINOS M. JACKSON
 BENJAMIN R. JACOBSON
 ERIK J. JACOBSON
 JASON S. JAEGER
 TOMAS JAIME
 KEITH D. JAMES
 NATHAN L. JAMES
 ANDREW S. JANSSEN
 MICHAEL L. JANSSEN
 CHRISTOPHER C. JARVIS
 JEREMY M. JARVIS
 DANIEL JAVORSEK
 PAUL C. JEFFORDS
 PAUL A. JELINEK
 JAKE R. JELINEO
 JOSEPH C. JENKINS
 JOSHUA S. JENKINS
 JOSHUA J. JENSEN
 MICHAEL J. JENSEN
 ROBERT T. JERTBERG
 ZACHERY B. JIRON
 JEFFREY D. JOHNS
 ALIDA M. JOHNSON
 BLAKE P. JOHNSON
 DANIEL H. JOHNSON
 ERIK W. JOHNSON
 THOMAS JOSEPH JOHNSON II
 ELIZABETH E. JOHNSTON
 JUSTIN L. JOINES
 DAVID A. JOKINEN
 NATALIE K. JOLLY
 DAVID A. JONES
 EUGENE P. JONES
 JIMMY A. JONES
 NATHANIEL P. JONES
 KENDALL D. JORDAN
 ADAM J. E. JUNG

DANIEL D. JURGENSEN
 INGRID C. KAAAT
 DANIEL J. KAERCHER
 KENNETH M. KALFAS
 RYAN D. KAPPEDAL
 WADE S. KARREN
 CHRISTINA D. KARVWNARIS
 MARK A. KASAYKA
 WILFORD L. KAUFFMAN
 TRAVIS D. KEENAN
 TAMARA MURPHEY KEENE
 DAVID A. KEGERREIS
 TERRANCE C. KEITHLEY
 COREY D. KELLETT
 KRISTOFOR D. KELLY
 DAVID M. KENDALL
 PATRICK J. KENDALL
 MICHAEL S. KENNEBRAE
 BRIDGETTE KENNEDY
 CHRISTOPHER A. KENNEDY
 KEVIN T. KENNEDY
 RYAN S. KENNEDY
 DAVID J. KERN
 JOHN J. KEYS
 STACY A. M. KIHARA
 SANG W. KIM
 MATTHEW B. KIMSAL
 WILLIAM R. KINCAID
 LAURA A. KING
 RICHARD R. KING
 OFAYO V. KINGSBERRY
 MEGAN A. KINNE
 KEVIN P. KIPPIE
 JASON R. KIRKLAND
 CHRISTOPHER J. KISER
 ERIK V. KISKER
 RANDALL W. KLEIN
 NEAL B. KLEINSCHMIDT
 CLINTON J. KLIETHERMES
 FRANK J. KLIMAS
 SEAN P. KLIMEK
 COREY J. KLOPSTEIN
 THOMAS M. KNAUST
 TIMOTHY F. KNEELAND
 JEFFREY P. KNOWLES
 JOHN M. KOEHLER II
 DEANE R. KONOWICZ
 ROBERT A. KOON
 MICHAEL S. KORBY
 JOSHUA KOSLOV
 DEVLIN A. KOSTAL
 JOHN S. KRELLNER
 CHRISTOPHER A. KRESKE
 CRISPIN D. KRETZMANN
 JEFFREY N. KRULICK
 DENNIS R. KRUSE
 JOSEPH S. KUBINSKY
 RUDOLF W. KUHNE, JR.
 DOUGLAS F. KUHN
 TODD J. KYSETH
 JONATHAN F. LAATSCH
 ALFREDO LABOY II
 DANA M. LACLAIR
 JOHN R. LADINO
 MICHAEL J. LAKE
 SCOTT W. LAMONT
 JEFFREY A. LAMPORT
 PHILIP D. LANCASTER
 ROBERT C. LANCE
 DONALD L. LANDGREBE
 ALAN C. LANDIS
 MONICA D. LANDRUM
 CORY T. LANE
 DAVID E. LANE
 JEREMY D. LANE
 CHRISTOPHER D. LANG
 DANIEL T. LANG
 ROGER A. LANG
 THEODORE A. LANGSTROTH
 MARK M. LANKOWSKI
 LAURIE AN LANPHER
 ERWIN A. LARIOS
 HANS J. LARSEN
 TODD M. LARSEN
 ADAM D. LARSON
 VINCENT W. LAU
 MATTHEW T. LAURENTZ
 JOSEPH S. LAWRENCE
 JOSEPH M. LAWS
 KIMBERLY K. LAYNE
 NATHAN J. LEAP
 JEREMY E. LEARNED
 GARY J. LEE
 DOUGLAS E. LEEDY
 STEPHEN D. LEGGIERO
 STEVEN R. LEHN
 DANIEL J. LEHOSKI
 DANIEL F. LEICHSSSENRING
 HAROLD A. LEMAIRE
 DAVID A. LEMERY
 ROBERT B. LEO
 DOUGLAS W. LEONARD
 WALTER J. LESINSKI
 CHARLES M. LEVER
 KENDRA L. LI
 MICHELLE M. LIBBEY
 DENNIS S. LINCOLN
 CRAIG D. LINDSTROM
 JOSEPH N. LIPPE
 FRANKLIN M. LIVINGSTON
 JEREMY E. LLOYD
 MEGAN E. LOGES

KRISTOPHER R. LONG
 KYLE A. LONG
 KEVIN M. LORD
 HOLLIE B. LOSEE
 JAMES T. LOTSPREICH
 CHRISTOPHER J. LOVEGREN
 ROOSEVELT LOVELESS, JR.
 MICHAEL S. LOWE
 ROBERT L. LOWE III
 DAVID M. LUCAS
 PAUL W. LUCYK
 WILLIAM T. LULAY
 JEREMY R. LUSHNAT
 BRIAN J. LUTZ
 ARTHUR J. LYNCH
 MICHAEL T. LYNCH
 SARAH R. LYNCH
 JENS D. LYNDROP
 GEORGE T. LYONS III
 LISA M. MABBUTT
 JOHN E. MACASEK
 TIMOTHY A. MACH
 ANITA T. MACK
 BRIAN C. MACK
 ALEXANDER S. MACLEAN
 ROBERT C. MAGNUSON
 MICHAEL P. MAHAN
 KEVIN L. MAHAR
 NICOLE R. MAKINDE
 SANJOY C. MALHOTRA
 WILLIAM H. MAMOURIEH
 GERARD C. MANGENOT
 JOSEPH MARK
 ERIC D. MARSH
 HEATHER C. MARSHALL
 JEFFREY M. MARSHALL
 ANDREW C. MARSIGLIA II
 CRAIG T. MARTIN
 SHAWN L. MARTIN
 STEVEN L. MARTINEZ
 RICHARD A. MARTINO
 JONATHAN D. MASON
 JOSEPH A. MASON, JR.
 ROBERT L. MASON, JR.
 JOHN C. MATTHEWS
 GREGORY C. MAYER
 TYRELL O. MAYFIELD
 CHAD D. MCADAMS
 MATTHEW J. MCALISTER
 JOSHUA L. MCALLISTER
 ROBERT D. MCALLISTER
 KYLE R. MCATEE
 BRANDON L. MCBRAYER
 TERRILL J. MCCALL
 DONALD L. MCCALLIE
 SCOTT A. MCCANDLESS
 TIMOTHY J. MCCANN
 COLIN E. MCCLASKEY
 WILLIAM A. MCCLELLAND
 CHRISTOPHER K. MCCLERNON
 RICHARD E. MCCLINTIC
 NATHAN A. MCCLURE
 JAMES B. MCCULLOUGH
 MICHAEL T. MCDANIEL
 SHANE M. MCDERMOTT
 BRANDON KEITH MCDONALD
 KENNETH A. MCDONALD
 WILLIAM C. MCDONALD
 CHARLES L. MCGEE
 CALLUM D. MCGOUGH
 SCOTT A. MCGOVERN
 TOBIN K. MCKEARIN
 JOSEPH W. MCKENNA
 GREG A. MCKENZIE
 WILLIAM H. MCKIBBAN
 SUZANNE G. MCCLAUGHLIN
 JASON R. MCMAHON
 DAVID A. MCMILLAN
 MICHAEL F. MCPHERSON
 RAY D. MCPHERSON
 STEVEN E. MEISSNER
 AMILCAR MELENDEZCRUZ
 CHAD W. MELONE
 STEVEN P. MELVIN
 DANA G. METZGER
 ANDREW J. MEYER
 KEVIN D. MICHAEL
 MILES T. MIDDLETON
 CHRISTINE A. MILLARD
 HEATH R. MILLER
 PAUL J. MILLER
 SAMUEL N. MILLER
 TRENT S. MILLER
 TY E. MILLER
 WILLIAM T. MILLER
 GINA ANN MILLS
 RAWLEY M. MIMS
 FRANCIS M. MINDRUP
 AARON R. MINER
 JOHN PAUL F. MINTZ
 CAROL J. MITCHELL
 GRANT A. MIZELL
 JONATHAN L. MIZELL
 NATALIE M. MOCK
 TODD A. MOENSTER
 JEFFREY D. MOFFITT
 JUSTIN P. MOKROVICH
 DANIEL J. MOLLIS
 MATTHEW J. MONEYMAKER
 TIMOTHY A. MONROE
 BENJAMIN B. MONTGOMERY
 JEFFREY M. MONTGOMERY

RYAN T. MOON
 MARIA A. MOORE
 MAURICE H. MOORE
 RICHARD M. MOORE
 MICHAEL MORALES
 MICHAEL J. MORALES
 KHIRAH MORGAN
 SCOTT C. MORGAN
 WILLIAM E. MORLAN
 THOMAS A. MORRIS
 JUSTIN W. MORRISON
 DARRICK MOSLEY
 GEORGE D. MOUNCE
 JEFF J. MRAZIK
 JEFFREY ALLEN MROZINSKI
 JAMES W. MULLINAX, JR.
 MICHAEL D. MULLINS
 JAMES J. MUNIZ
 RHETT B. MURPHY
 TIMOTHY B. MURPHY
 MARK J. MURRAY
 NICHOLAS A. MUSGROVE
 DARYL V. MYERS
 MICHAEL J. MYERS
 LANCE W. MYERSON
 ALAN W. MYRICK
 CORY J. NADDY
 NATHAN S. NAIDAS
 DAVID C. NANCE
 MICHAEL E. NAVICKY
 JOEL M. NEEB
 BRIAN J. NEFF
 MATTHEW E. NELMS
 DEXTER G. NELSON
 AMY M. NESBITT
 MATTHEW C. NEUMAN
 JON C. NEW
 MATTHEW R. NEWELL
 DEBORAH HUMMEL NEWMAN
 CHRISTOPHER H. NEWMAN
 MICHAEL B. NIELSEN
 JASON C. NORGAARD
 VIDET NORNG
 JARROD M. NORRIS
 CHRIS Y. NORTHAM
 MATTHEW A. NORTON
 WILLIAM E. NOTBOHM
 NATHAN E. NYSETHERR
 DEREK C. OAKLEY
 JASON C. OATLEY
 FREDRIC M. OBERSON
 RICHARD L. OBERT
 STEPHEN P. OBRIAN
 JAMES C. OBRIEN III
 MARTIN J. OBRIEN
 DAVID M. OCH
 ANGELA F. OCHOA
 JOHN P. ODELL III
 TAMARA L. O'DONNELL
 AARON J. OELRICH
 KEVIN M. OGLE
 ROBERT E. OKEEFE
 MARK M. OLGUIN
 MELANIE L. OLSON
 RYAN L. ONEAL
 RYAN J. ORFE
 JOE K. ORLANDI
 JOSEPH J. OROURKE
 PATRICK R. OROURKE
 DERRICK W. OSSMANN
 VICTOR P. OSWEILER
 LUIS G. OTERO
 DALE L. OVERHOLTS II
 ROBERT E. OVERSTREET
 ZACHARY D. OWEN
 SEBRINA L. PABON
 MIGUEL PAGAN
 JARED W. PAINE
 BENJAMIN M. PANCOAST
 BRADLEY C. PANTON
 DENIS J. PAQUETTE
 JILL L. PARKER
 WILLIAM J. PARKER III
 MATTHEW M. PARODA
 TRACY L. PARRISH
 CHRISTIAAN P. PASKVAN
 ERIK M. PATCHEN
 SAMVED S. PATEL
 TRENT D. PATTERSON
 JOEL E. PAULS
 ANTHONY B. PAULSON
 MARK R. PAULY
 SAMUEL F. PAYNE
 ABRAHAM M. PAYTON
 ZACHARY J. PEACOCK
 MICHAEL E. PECHER
 NICHOLAS J. PEDERSEN
 ALAN E. PENROD
 DONALD K. PERRY
 TIMOTHY W. PESEK
 ANTON C. PETERSON
 JAMES B. PETERSON
 JAMES S. PETERSON
 MIRIELE M. PETTITJEAN
 AUGUST L. PFLUGER
 CHRISTOPHER H. PICINNI
 MATTHEW J. PIGNATARO
 DUSTIN L. PITTMAN
 JEFFERY T. PLEINIS
 JAMES M. PODANY
 MATTHEW R. POISSON
 CHARLES B. POLOMSKY

TRAVIS W. POND
 RYAN D. PONTIUS
 JOHN W. PONTON
 CARLOS A. POVEDA, JR.
 MICHAEL J. POWER
 CRYSTAL D. POWERS
 JOHN R. POWERS
 ALEXANDRIA K. PRESTON
 DAX A. PRESUTO
 AARON J. PRINCE
 PATRICK J. PRUETT
 JOEL D. PURCELL
 JASON A. PURDY
 S. N. PUWALOWSKI
 JOSHUA B. PYERS
 RYAN J. QUAAL
 MARJORIE VIRGINIA QUANT
 ERIC A. QUEDDENG
 ADAM P. QUICK
 STEVEN A. QUILLMAN
 ANDREW M. QUINN
 JASON S. RABIDEAU
 MARK W. RADIO
 NATHAN E. RAGAN
 PETER J. RAKOVALIS
 LAURA C. RAMOS
 BRIAN M. RANAUDO
 STEVEN D. RANDLE
 CODY C. RASMUSSEN
 SPENCER T. RASMUSSEN
 MARK A. REDFERN
 JASON E. REDLIN
 DEEDRICK L. REESE
 NICHOLAS H. REGISTER
 DAVID J. REICHERT
 LAURINDA MARIA REIFSTECK
 DONEVAN A. REIN
 MARK G. REITH
 BRIAN S. RENDELL
 ANDREW C. RESCH
 DAVID J. RICE
 JOSHUA C. RICE
 DUSTIN C. RICHARDS
 ANGELA D. RICHARDSON
 CHRIS C. RICHARDSON
 RYAN E. RICHARDSON
 ALEXANDER RICHBURG
 MEGAN M. RILEY
 SCOTT T. RILEY
 JOSEPH E. RINGER
 MICHAEL S. RIORDAN
 ERIK A. RIPPLE
 SHARON C. RITCHIE
 ALFREDO RIVERA
 MATTHEW J. ROBBINS
 JOHN W. ROBERTS, JR.
 CHRISTINA S. ROBINSON
 CHRISTOPHER M. ROBINSON
 LAURA R. ROBINSON
 RYAN E. ROBINSON
 ROBERT P. ROBINSON
 ROJAN J. ROBOTHAM
 BARRY D. ROCHE
 ARMANDO RODRIGUEZ
 RENE A. RODRIGUEZ
 ROBUSTINO D. RODRIGUEZ
 ROBERT J. ROECKERS
 JOHN F. ROGERS
 ERIC D. ROOME
 LANGDON O. ROOT
 WILLIAM M. ROSCHEWSKI
 JOHN M. ROSS
 DOUGLAS WAYNE ROTTIER
 NELSON D. ROULEAU, JR.
 JARON H. ROUX
 KEVIN B. ROWLEY
 KELLY A. ROXBURGHMARTINEZ
 PAUL A. ROZUMSKI
 ERIC DUVAL RUCKER
 TRAVIS D. RUHL
 JOSEPH R. RUNCI
 FRANCIS X. RURKA IV
 MICHAEL C. RUSSELL
 SCOTT K. RUSSELL
 CHRISTOPHER T. RUST
 CHARLES M. RYAN
 JOSEPH B. RYTHER
 JACHIN SAKAMOTO
 MARTIN SALINAS II
 GERARDO SANCHEZ
 JASON K. SANDERSON
 BRIAN T. SANDIDGE
 GARY R. SANDT
 DANIEL J. SANTORO
 JENNIFER L. SARACENO
 PAUL E. SASKIEWICZ
 TORRENCE T. SAULSBERRY
 JOHN F. SAUNDERS
 STEPHEN R. SAVELL
 ALBERT F. SCAPEROTTO, JR.
 ROBERT J. SCHABRON
 JOSEPH V. SCHAEFER
 STEVEN J. SCHAEFER
 MEGAN A. SCHAFER
 STEVEN A. SCHEARER
 JAMES A. SCHEIDEMAN
 THOMAS PATRICK SCHILLING
 CHRISTOPHER E. SCHLACHTER
 KYLE W. SCHLAPPI
 TAMMY L. SCHLICHENMAIER
 CARL C. SCHLUCKEBIER
 JEFFREY C. SCHLUETER

JEFFREY D. SCHNAKENBERG
RONALD M. SCHOCH
MATTHEW D. SCHORR
BRANDON B. SCHRAEDER
JEREMY A. SCHROEDER
WILLIAM A. SCHROEDER
MARK W. SCHULENBERG
ADAM M. SCHULTZ
ERIC E. SCHULTZ
CHRISTOPHER S. SCHULZ
CURT A. SCHUMACHER
IRA A. SCHURIG
MARTIN G. SCHWEIM
BRIAN D. SCOTT
ELIZABETH H. SCOTT
NATHAN L. SCOTT
CHAD T. SEARLE
PAUL J. SEBOLD
KARL W. SEEKAMP
SCOTT M. SEIGFRIED
PATRICK C. SELF
DAMON P. SEVIER
MARTIN T. SHADLE
JEREMY D. SHADROUI
CHRISTOPHER J. SHANDERSKY
PAUL E. SHEETS
SUSAN M. SHEETS
CHRISTOPHER M. SHEFFIELD
SCOTT E. SHELTON
STEVEN G. SHEPAN
JASON J. SHEPHERD
RICHARD H. SHERTZER
ALLEN R. SHEW
JASON T. SHIBATA
CAMERON B. SHIRLEY
CAROL J. SHIRLEY
RALPH R. SHOUKRY
JEFFREY E. SHUCK
ROBERT W. SHULL
MACKENZIE R. SHULTZ
THEODORE J. SHULTZ
ROBERT A. SIDES
ANTHONY F. SIDOTT
JUAN SILVA, JR.
JEFF A. SIMMONS
DANIEL T. SIMPSON
MICHAEL R. SIMS
ANDREW L. SINCOCK
JAMES L. SIVILLE
DAVID M. SKALICKY
BRYAN E. SKARDA
ROBERT W. SLANGER
JEFFREY J. SLIWINSKI
DAVID A. SLOAT
JASON M. SMESNY
KYLE J. SMET
JAMIE R. SMICKLAS
ANDREW F. SMITH
CHAD A. SMITH
DAVID A. SMITH
JASON V. SMITH
JENNIFER L. SMITH
JOSHUA J. SMITH
NATHAN S. SMITH
ROBERT R. SMITH
STEVEN J. SMITH
TIMOTHY J. SMITH
PATRICK A. SNYDER
JAIME SONORA
JOSHUA DAVID SOULE
TIMOTHY J. SPAULDING
WINSTON L. SPEAR
STEVEN W. SPEARES
BARRY J. SPELLS
MATTHEW L. SPENCER
CANDICE M. SPERRY
ANDRE R. SPICER
JEREMIAH B. STAHR
PAUL M. STANIFER
DALE W. STANLEY III
MATTHEW C. STANLEY
MATTHEW L. STANLEY
GREGORY M. STEEGER
SIDNEY L. STEGALL, JR.
BRIAN R. STELMA
ANDREW C. STENGEL
ANSON B. STEPHENS
JOHN T. STEPHENS
GREG E. STEVENS
JAMES A. STEVENS
MARK R. STEVENS
CORETTA B. STEWART
LOUIS G. STEWART
MATTHEW W. STEWART
MICHAEL D. STODDARD
MICHELLE L. STOFFAMALLOY
MICHAEL R. STOLLEY
ROSE K. STOOR
JOSHUA K. STRAKOS
JEREMY P. STRINGER
RONALD K. STROBACH
CHARLES A. STSAUVER
CEDRICK L. STUBBLEFIELD
DANIEL W. STUPINSKI
JASON O. STUTZMAN
JOHN A. SULLIVAN
JOHN T. SULLIVAN
RYAN D. SULLIVAN
WILLIAM A. SULLIVAN
MARC W. SUMMERS
DAVID A. SUTTER
ERIC E. SUTTON

MATTHEW P. SUTTON
MATTHEW J. SWANSON
LYLE D. SWAPP
JUSTIN W. SWARTZMILLER
ROBERT J. SWEARINGEN
RYAN J. SWEAZEY
PATRICK J. SWEENEY
ROBERT J. SWEENEY
CRAIG M. SWIERZBIN
TOBIAS B. SWITZER
GARY B. SYMON
LOUIS M. SZCZUKOWSKI
TIMOTHY K. SZESZULSKI
BREANNE TABOR
KHALIM A. TAHA
MICHELLE A. TARKOWSKI
DONALD C. TASKER
DAVID L. TAYLOR
JASON E. TAYLOR
LELAND J. TAYLOR
MARLON TAYLOR
STEVEN C. TAYLOR
LUCAS J. TEEL
BRANDON J. TELLEZ
JASON LEE TERRY
CLIFFORD M. THEONY
LISA S. THIEM
KENNETH G. THILL
ANTHONY ALEXANDER THOMAS
BRIAN J. THOMAS
JEFFREY D. THOMAS
JOSEPH K. THOMAS IV
MATTHEW M. THOMAS
RYAN W. THOMAS
KRISTEN D. THOMPSON
NATHAN A. THOMPSON
SAMMIE L. THOMPSON, JR.
JOHN G. THORNE
CHARLES D. THROCKMORTON IV
ROBERT M. THWEATT
BILL T. TICE, JR.
SHAWN R. TIMPSON
SAMUEL M. TODD
KATHERINE ABOLD TODOROV
SACHA N. TOMLINSON
JERI D. TORRERO
GUILLERMO TORRES
CRAIG M. TOWELL
PAUL K. TOWER
PAUL P. TOWNSEND
ERIC A. TRAMEL
JASON L. TRANUM
BENJAMIN R. TRAVERS
JASON M. TREW
SETH W. TRIBETT
WILLIAM P. TRICHE
SONJA C. TRITSCH
SEAN E. TUCKER
APRIL L. TUNYAVONGS
ERICK A. TURASZ
CHRISTOPHER H. TURNER
JASON A. TURNER
JASON C. TURNER
ABIZER H. TYABJI
TERRY L. TYREE, JR.
MONYCA J. UECKER
HEATHER M. UHL
HORST K. UHL
L. WILLIAM UHL
ROSS G. UHLER
JOHN L. VALA
MATTHEW STEWART VAN HOOK
ROBERT M. VANDAWAKER
JAMES L. VANDROSS
NEAL ADAM VANHOUTEN
RICHARD L. VANSLYKE
MATTHEW J. VEDDER
ANDREW C. VENNE
ERNESTO VERGER
PHILLIP A. VERROCO
RYAN J. VETTER
BRUS E. VIDAL
BRIAN H. VILLAVASO
MICHELLE K. VILLAVASO
JOHN R. VINSON
JOHN R. VOLCHECK
RYAN M. VONEIDA
DANIEL J. VOORHIES
ALAN R. WADE
RICHARD J. WAGEMAN, JR.
MATTHEW T. WAGGONER
RICHARD H. WAGGONER
EDWARD R. WAGNER
TORREY J. WAGNER
RICHARD W. WALDROP
DIETER A. WALDVOGEL
KENNETH G. WALKER
BRIAN P. WALLACE
JASON R. WALLS
JENNIFER G. WALSTON
TIMOTHY M. WARNER
STEVEN W. WASHKO
MARK R. WASS
MATTHEW N. WASZAK
JOHN G. WEAVER
SHONRY O. WEBB
KEVIN M. WEBSTER
JAMES T. WEDEKIND
MARTIN W. WEEKS III
SCOTT M. WEHRLE
JAMES P. WEIR
TROY C. WELKER

MATTHEW D. WELLING
BRENT N. WELLS
MARION R. WENDALL
CHRISTOPHER W. WERNER
JEFFREY B. WESTPHAL
KEVIN J. WHALEY
DANIEL J. WHEELER
SCOTT A. WHINNERY
STEVEN S. WHISLER
MICHAEL S. WHITACRE
ALTON S. WHITE
DOUGLAS W. WHITEHEAD
RYE M. WHITEHEAD
SCOTT B. WHITEHURST
TYLER D. WICKHAM
NOEL M. W. WILDAUER
JOE F. WILDMAN
LISA M. WILDMAN
KEVIN M. WILEY
SAMUEL R. WILHELM
BRAD D. WILLIAMS
DOUGLAS A. WILLIAMS
EARL WILLIAMS III
JOSHUA J. WILLIAMS
JOSHUA P. WILLIAMS
MATTHEW K. WILLIAMS
SEAN M. WILLIAMS
TIMOTHY E. WILLIAMS
JAMES B. WILLS
SANDRA J. WILSON
SCOTT R. WILSON
APRIL L. WIMMER
WILLIAM H. WIMSATT III
GUY J. WINGENBACH
JOSEPH J. WINGO
MICHAEL J. WINTER
WALTER M. WINTER
CRAIG J. WINTERS
ANDREW IRVIN WISTRICILL
DONALD W. WITTENBERG
JOHN D. WODOCHEK
OLGIERD P. WOJNAR
WINSTON C. WOLCZAK
JAMES E. WOLFE
MARC E. WOLFE
JOHN D. WOOD
DOUGLAS A. WOODLEY
TAD W. WOOLFE
JUSTINE A. WOPAT
CHRISTOPHER WORKINGER
DAVID M. WRAZEN
MICHAEL L. WREY
ALEXANDER E. WRIGHT
JAMES A. WRIGHT
MICHAEL C. YARBROUGH
MICHAEL D. YARINA
NICHOLAS R. YATES
JULIAN J. YNIGUEZ
BRIAN K. YOSHIMOTO
DAVID A. YOUNG
GEOFFREY M. YOUNG
JASON E. YOUNG
STEPHEN R. ZAISER
JOSHUA J. ZAKER
PAMELLA J. ZANE
ERIC J. ZARYBNISKY
JEFFREY S. ZDENEK
THOMAS M. ZEFF
CHRISTOPHER J. ZEGAR
YAN C. ZHU
JOHN P. ZIELINSKI
ANTHONY J. ZILINSKY III
CHRISTOPHER J. ZILKA
DAVID L. ZIMMERMAN
MICHAEL P. ZINK
ANDREW W. ZINN
STEVEN M. ZOLLARS
JODY L. ZOLMAN
JOHNATHAN B. ZULAUF
MICHAEL M. ZWALVE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

VERONIQUE N. ANDERSON
DAVID A. BARGATZE
VICKI A. BELLEAU
JOHN WILLIAM BELLFLOWER, JR.
MICHAEL AARON BURNAT
MATTHEW D. BURRIS
MECHEL ALECIA CAMPBELL
MICHAEL DAVID CARSON
THOMAS PAUL CONDIE
GARRETT MICHAEL CONDON
TIMOTHY MICHAEL COX
SUANNE M. CROWLEY
JUSTIN R. DALTON
JEREMY K. DAVIS
COREY G. FULLMER
BRYON T. GLEISNER
JEFFREY L. GREEN
TROY D. HAMMON
JOHN CHRISTOPHER HARWOOD
TROY S. HEAVENER
CHRISTINA MARIA JIMENEZ
ERIC MICHAEL JOHNSON
ANDREW KALAVANOS
CYNTHIA T. KEARLEY
STEVEN GLADE LOERTSCHER
JEFFERSON E. MCBRIDE
ROGER A. MCILLECE

ERIC P. MERRIAM
 RYAN D. OAKLEY
 LYN T. PATYSKIWHITE
 TRINH W. PETERSON
 DERIC W. PRESCOTT
 ELIZABETH D. PULLIN
 THEODORE T. RICHARD
 ASHLEY K. RICHARDS
 RICHARD M. ROBERTSON
 JOSHUA DANIEL ROSEN
 POLLY K. SANDNESS
 STEVEN JON SMART
 MICHAEL R. SUBERLY
 SHAWN C. TABOR
 PATRICIA S. WIEGMANLENZ
 RICHARD A. WILLIAMS
 MATTHEW DAVID WINFREY
 AARON EUGENE WOODWARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
 FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ROBERT F. BOOTH
 TIFFANY A. DAWSON
 DARREN C. HUSKISSON
 DIANA L. JOHNSON
 WON KYU LEE
 MICHAEL A. LEWIS
 CHARLOTTE M. LIEGLPAUL
 TODD E. MCDOWELL
 MARTIN T. MITCHELL
 IRA PERKINS
 NATALIE D. RICHARDSON
 THOMAS A. ROGERS, JR.
 JOHN D. SMITH
 MATTHEW S. WARD
 BRYAN D. WATSON
 PATRICK J. WELLS
 ERIC J. WERNER
 CHARLES E. WIEDIE, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTOPHER M. ALLEN
 FRANCIS D. J. AMMATURO
 TRACEY M. APPEBY
 ROBERT T. ATIENZA
 MELISSA A. BARNES
 DONALD G. BARNETT
 JOSEPH J. BARTLEY, JR.
 KEVIN L. BATES
 FREDERICK BAYERLEIN
 SUSAN M. BECKMAN
 MICHAEL G. BELL
 JERRY N. BELMONTE
 TROY A. BERTRAN
 RONALD BETANCOURT
 BRIAN J. BLANKENSHIP
 ROBERT W. BOASE
 JENNIFER A. BOUCHARD
 CHRISTOPHER D. BRECKENRIDGE
 LONDON BRIDGET
 MARK R. BRYAN
 ALBERT A. BUDASZEWSKI
 ALVIN D. BURCHFIELD, JR.
 DAVID S. BUTLER
 WILLIS H. CAMPBELL
 GEORGE CANTU
 PHILIP J. CAREY
 JAMALL W. CARRETHEERS
 WILLIAM K. CASTLEBERRY
 EDWIN R. CATUBIG
 JEFFERY C. CHALK
 REZA A. CHEGINI
 JON C. CLARK
 ROBERT S. COLLETT
 TODD J. COLLIFLOWER
 SHAWN T. COLLINS
 ERIC A. COUNCIL
 STEPHEN M. CRONEY
 FRANK B. CROUSE
 HERIBERTO CRUZ, JR.
 ROBERT A. CURRAN, JR.
 BRADLEY A. DANDURAND
 KURT E. DAVIS
 BRIAN S. DEMBICKY
 PHILLIP L. DENNIS
 JEFFREY C. DENNISON
 DAVID E. DEREE, JR.
 JOHN M. DIAZ
 CHRISTIAN B. DILLARD
 WILLIAM D. DOUGHER
 HOWARD T. DOVE
 MICHAEL B. DUWEL
 JASON L. DYGERT
 JEREMY D. ELMER
 PATRICIO ESCALONA, JR.
 SHANON J. FALLON
 PHILIP A. FARLEY
 MICHAEL J. FELDHUES
 BALTAZAR FERNANDEZ III
 JAMES C. FISH
 OSCAR S. FLORES
 THOMAS M. FOEGELLE, JR.
 BOBBY L. FOREST
 JAMES W. FOSTER

ANTHONY K. FRANKLIN
 RONALD L. FREEMAN, JR.
 WARREN FREEMAN, JR.
 ANTHONY B. FRIES
 LEO P. FUNARI, JR.
 MICHAEL D. GANN
 RUBEN GARZA, JR.
 ROBERT P. GEORGE
 ANDREW D. GIANINO
 EDWARD GINDER
 PAUL K. GITZEN
 PETRONILO S. GOMEZ
 ANTONIO S. GONZALEZ, JR.
 JAIME GONZALEZ
 SCOTT R. GOODIN
 EDWARD R. GRADWELL
 SAMMIE D. GREEN
 STEVEN J. GREEN
 DAVID L. HALEY
 NATHAN A. HALL
 JOSEPH W. HAMMOND
 WAYNE T. HARDERS
 KELVIN HARKINS
 CHRISTOPHER M. HARPER
 ALTHEA HARRIS
 GEORGE HARRIS
 JOHN E. HARRIS
 ROBERT N. HARRIS
 STEPHEN J. HARTLEY, JR.
 JIMMY R. HARVEY
 ROBERT J. HERBSTREITH
 CHRISTOPHER S. HIMES
 DAVID J. HOGG
 ROBERT E. HORTON
 TERRY C. HOSKINS, JR.
 DEREK S. HOWARD
 JACK L. HURLEY
 JEVON C. JACKSON
 JEREMY L. JAMES
 DOUGLAS L. JENKINS II
 ADAM C. JENNINGS
 KENNETH D. JONES
 CRAIG T. JOYCE
 TODD A. KAMINS
 JOHN J. KANETZKY
 ROBB S. KELLBERG
 BRIAN S. KELLER
 MATTHEW K. KOKKELER
 BRIAN M. KRISTAN
 RUSSELL J. KUNTZ
 ALAN M. LABONTE
 EMMERICH V. LANGHAM
 JAMIE C. LATIOLAIS
 DAVID J. LATOUR
 MATTHEW G. LAWRENCE
 TROY R. LAWSON
 CHRISTOPHER P. LEFFAKIS
 DARYL B. LINHARDT
 HAROLD T. LITTLE
 JASON T. LOFTON
 TRACY J. LOPER
 GARY L. LOWE
 SEAN G. LYNCH
 MARCUS J. MACHART
 SCOTT R. MACMILLAN
 GREGORY P. MARTIN
 CHRISTOPHER A. MAY
 LEE O. MCCLOUD
 ERIC M. MCLAUGHLIN
 ROBERT W. MENDENHALL
 MICHAEL A. MERCADEL
 SHAWN D. MITCHELL
 ROBERT M. MOFFATT
 MARK R. MORGAN
 ROBERT J. MORRISON
 VAUGHN D. MORTON
 DARREN L. MULLEN
 BRIAN T. MUTSCH
 LOREN L. NICHOLS
 JIMMY M. NOLEN
 WILLIAM D. NORGAAARD II
 RICHARD J. NULL
 FRANCIS X. OEBERT III
 CURTIS C. ONEAL
 JASON B. OSBORNE
 TRACY A. OWENS
 ROBERT L. PAGE, JR.
 ERIC I. PALMER
 MICHAEL A. PALMER
 MICHAEL I. PECK
 JOHN W. QUINATA
 JOHN A. REDFORD
 JASON A. RINTO
 ROBERT RODRIGUEZ
 TODD C. RONEK
 GARY A. RONEY
 JASON A. ROSS
 CHAD A. SAMPLES
 MARC C. SCHUH
 SHAYNE J. SCHUMACHER
 TRAVIS L. SCOTT
 KEVIN P. SHAVER
 DAVID T. SHULTZ
 JAMES W. SIMMONS, JR.
 TRUITT M. SMITH
 DAVID M. SMITHERS
 JEFFREY R. SOMERS
 RALEIGH E. STAHL
 JACK B. STANLEY
 SCOTTIE D. STRONG
 TODD L. STUFLICK
 LORENZE B. TATE III

TIMOTHY J. THREADGOLD
 BRIAN L. TICHENOR
 JOE M. TOWLES
 JOHN G. VANOVER
 JESS A. VAUGHT
 CHRISTOPHER VERDELL
 KEVIN J. WALL
 MICHAEL C. WALTERS
 ADRIENNE M. WIGGINS
 ROBERT B. WILEY
 KYLE A. WILLIAMS
 LAWRENCE L. WILLIAMS
 ROBERT L. WINTERS
 SCOTT D. WOODS
 ANDREW R. WROBEL
 JEFFERY B. YANCEY
 KENNETH R. YATES
 RONALD R. YNIGUEZ
 BILLY W. YOUNG
 KEVIN C. YOUNGBLOOD
 WALTER J. ZAPP
 BRIAN S. ZELLNER
 STACEY E. ZIMMERMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

WAJAHAT ALI
 DAREN W. BABULA
 DOMINIC R. BAILEY
 KRISTINA M. BASTONE
 CHARLES F. BELL III
 PETER T. BEUTTENMULLER
 CHRISTOPHER R. BOLTON
 MICHAEL J. BONACORSA
 JAY E. BOYLES
 JOSEPH C. BYROM
 CHRISTOPHER J. CALLAHAN
 STEPHEN D. CURTAS
 ANDREW C. DAVIS
 CHRISTOPHER A. DUMAS
 DAVID J. ELLISON
 JOHN D. B. FINE
 AMANDA L. GILL
 ERICA F. GOODWIN
 RICHARD T. GRIFFIN
 AUSTIN J. GULLETT
 JOHANN A. GUZMAN
 ANDREW S. HAMILTON
 AARON P. HANTMAN
 PHILLIP K. HOGAN, JR.
 DANIEL J. HONEBEIN
 JOHN A. JAMISON
 JOSEPH A. JANKOLA
 NICHOLAS G. KALKAS
 GREGORY J. KNOTT
 MARK A. KNOX
 FRANK C. KOVACS
 JULIUS J. LIM
 BRIAN C. MOORE
 MATTHEW D. MYERS
 JASON Y. OSUGA
 JAREN R. PATTERSON
 WALTER PAULI
 ROBERT A. PIPKIN
 MICHAEL S. QUAN
 AMANDA B. RICHARDS
 PAUL S. ROGERS
 JUSTIN L. SCARBROUGH
 SANTINO M. SGAMBELLURI
 MINEL J. TASTET
 EMMANUEL M. THOMANN
 PACKARD C. TRENT
 KHALIA S. WARNER
 GREGGORY T. WASEMILLER
 JOSEPH R. WAY
 DREW J. WHITTING
 JACOB E. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

HANNAH L. BEALON
 NATHAN A. BOEGER
 JOHN M. CONNALLY
 JAMES L. FISHER
 ROBERT C. GRIFFITH
 BRIAN D. HACKNEY
 JEFFREY C. HAMILTON
 JAMES T. HERZOG
 RYAN H. KING
 RICHARD J. MASCOLO
 KYLE C. MOORE
 SEAN M. NELSON
 SCOTT V. PARKER
 JAMES H. PENSEL
 RYAN A. RIPPEON
 MALCOLM S. SIMIEN
 CALVIN T. STANFORD
 EDWARD M. VALDEZ
 JEFFREY P. WILCOX
 ALFRED S. WILLIAMS
 JERRY L. WOODS
 ALICIA R. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

BRIAN C. BAKER

DON E. BARBER, JR.
JASON R. BARDIN
BRIAN C. BROADWELL
RICHARD G. BUCKLEY
MATTHEW O. CAYLOR
BRIAN D. CUMMINGS
JOSEPH E. DUCHESNEAU
PAUL J. FELSING II
NEIL R. FLANDERS
DAMON P. GASS
KEITH A. GEHRKE
HENRY T. GILBERT IV
ERIC K. GRAEWERT
RYAN N. HAAG
JON H. HOPKINS
MICHAEL J. KNOOPS
MICHAEL R. KRUEGER
MIRANDA C. LABASH
MATTHEW L. LINDSAY
KEITH A. LUDWICK
JONATHAN C. MCCARTER
NEIL A. MYERS
KURT L. PODRAZIK
DANIEL A. REDDEG, JR.
DARREN C. SCHIERMEYER
MALCOLM C. SMITH
ROBERT S. STEWART
ROBERT W. THOMPSON
JOHN L. TOMAR
SEAN M. WHITT
KAN YANG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

KRISTIE M. COLPO
MATTHEW S. CUSHANICK
LAURAMICHEL DEHAAN
DOMINIC F. DIMAGGIO
CYNTHIA K. HENZE
CHRISTOPHER M. MORRIS
JEFFREY R. PORTELL
JAMES A. SCIANNA
ALLISON B. TERRAY
COLIN L. THORNTON
DAVID H. WATSON, JR.
MATTHEW N. WATTS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ONEGE BATEAGBORSANGAYA
MARTIN M. BATTCKOCK
JUSTIN D. DRAGON
KIMBERLY T. MANUEL
STEPHEN OSWALD
STEPHEN D. RITTERMANN
MICHAEL G. TOMSIK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ANTHONY J. FALVO IV
CALLIE D. FERRARI
MATTHEW S. GILL
AARON V. KAKIEL
KATHRYN E. KELLY
WILLIAM M. KNIGHT
AMBER J. LEWIS
RICHLYN C. NEAL
CLINTON E. PHILLIPS
NATHAN C. POTTER
GREG D. RAEALSON
SEAN P. RIORDAN
NICOLE R. SCHWEGMAN
NICHOLAS D. SHERROUSE
HAYLEY C. SIMS
MICHAEL L. SMITH
WILLIAM B. TISDALE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

TRENTON J. ARNOLD
VICTOR D. BALDONI
DAVID F. BELL
LESLIE O. BRANCH III
TZU H. CHEN
ARNOLD L. CORTEZ
LINCOLN S. ENDECOTT
IAN J. ESPICH
MICHAEL A. FREAS
WILFRED H. JUDD III
BRIAN J. LEETCH
MARK T. LOGAN
ADAM R. LYSENE
JASON T. MARTINSON
JARED M. MAULDIN
AARON L. MOELLER
NICHOLAS B. MULCAHEY
JEFFREY A. TOMASZEWSKI
ROBERT A. WAINSCOTT, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

BRIAN C. FREDRICK
JASON M. PETTTTT
CHRISTOPHER W. TAYLOR
ERNESTO R. VILLALBA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MATTHEW R. ARGENZIANO
TROY D. BAILEY
NATHAN V. BEACH
BRYAN M. BLAIR
ERIC D. BREGE
RICHARD A. COLE
JOHN E. DALTON
JONATHAN R. DERGES
TIMOTHY S. DUTTON
CAROLYN J. ENGLAND
CAROLE J. ETHERINGTON
DION G. FONTENOT
KEN G. FOOS
DANIEL L. HEMMINGER
GABRIEL D. HERNANDEZ
WENDELL R. HOLMES
JARED A. JOHNSON
MELISSA L. JOLLEY
RICHARD B. LEBEL
VIDAL C. LOZADA
ANDREW M. LUTERAN
CALEB W. MACDONALD
TIMOTHY R. MAYER
MATTHEW C. MCCULLLEY
ERIC P. MCDUGALL
CRYSTAL A. MILLER
SCOTT C. MILLHOUSE
PETER L. NORGAAARD
SETH J. PIERCE
SETH J. ROSENBERY
JUSTIN J. SALVIA
MARTA K. SAVAGE
DAMIAN J. SMITH
DANIEL SORIA
CHRISTOPHER M. SOVA
ERIC J. THURKINS, JR.
CHRISTOPHER A. TILLEY
DANIEL L. URBANCZYK
MATTHEW A. VANHORN
KEVIN A. WHITE
JAMES R. WILKINS IV
EVAN B. WILLIAMS
KATHLEEN M. WILLIAMS
CHRISTOPHER J. WING
KYLE L. WOERNER
MICHAEL A. WOODS
AARON A. ZIMMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

SHANE L. BEAVERS
MATTHEW J. BELLINA
ROMEO J. CLAYTON
WILLIAM M. CORLEY
AMANDA L. DZANANOVIC
JAMIE M. ERICKSON
MICHAEL J. GENTA
STEPHANIE K. HAYES
ALLISON M. HILLS
LESLIE A. HUFFMAN
JEREMY N. HYLER
ANDREW I. JOHNSON
JEANINE A. LANG
WILLIAM P. LEWIS
ROBERT V. LIBERATO
ROBERT A. LINN
KAITLIN M. MCLEOD
ENDIA T. MENDEZ
MICHAEL J. PYNE
STEVEN J. RANCOURT
NICOLE A. ROTUNDA
ALICIA M. SALERNO
PATRICK M. SALUKE
KRISTIN M. SHEPHERD
AMY M. SIMKE
LACEY M. SIZEMORE
MATTHEW C. SULLIVAN
JOHN J. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CHARLES B. ABBOTT
JAMES S. ACKERMAN
JASON M. AGOSTINELLI
MELANIE K. AHLE
NICHOLAS R. AHLEN
DARIUS V. AHMADI
ALEX W. ALDRICH
SAMUEL R. ALDRIDGE
MATTHEW P. ALLAN
DANIEL E. ALLEN
FREDRICK J. ALLEN
WILLIAM Y. ALLEN
TRAVIS R. ALLISON
DIEGO F. ALVARADO

ANDREA J. ALVORD
BEN L. ANDERSON
BRIAN C. ANDERSON
JAMES F. ANDERSON
MARK K. ANDERSON
TIMOTHY R. ANDERSON
HIRAM ANDREU
STEPHEN T. ANDROS
BRIAN S. ANTHONY
JAMES P. ANTONIONO
MICHAEL J. APONE
WADE C. ASHLEY
KURT C. ASTROTH
FREDERICK ATIENZA
DANIEL A. BAILEY
APRIL D. BAKKEN
THEALOS C. BALLAS
BRENT L. BANKS
JEREMY J. BARDIN
DREW R. BARKER
JOSIAH K. BARKER
JEREMY D. BARNES
EDWARD J. BARRY
JONATHAN R. BAUGH
STEPHEN E. BAUSERMAN
JONATHAN S. BEATON
CHARLES H. BECKER
JOSEPH K. BEHAN
KEVIN J. BEHM
CHRISTIAN A. BEISEL
THOMAS D. BELCHIK, JR.
SAMUEL D. BELL
DEVON M. BENBOW
WILLIAM M. BENCINI
CHRISTOPHER B. BENNETT
DARRICK M. BERENS
BRIAN J. BERG
DIANA L. BETZ
JESSICA F. BETZ
JOHN R. BLACKFORD
CHRISTOPHER E. BLAIS
BRIAN K. BLASCHKE
BRIAN C. BLAYDES
MATTHEW M. BLEVINS
PATRICK E. BLIND
MARK A. BLOMER
MARK E. BOAZ
NICHOLAS J. BOCCAGNA
NICOLAS T. BOGAARD
DANIEL B. BOND
PETER M. BORSZICH
TODD C. BOWERS
BRADLEY M. BOYD
BRIAN J. BRADACH
DAVID R. BRANDON
JAMES P. BRAUNREITER
DAVID M. BRENNAN
SCOTT A. BRESNAHAN
TIMOTHY S. BREWER
SCOTT E. BRICKNER
DAMON J. BRIDGES
ROBERT J. BRIGGS
JAMES V. BRISCOE
BRIAN BRONTE
JAMES R. BROOKS
JOSHUA J. BROOKS
CHRISTOPHER M. BROWN
JEFFREY K. BROWN, JR.
MICHAEL J. BROWN
RANDALL M. BROWN
THOMAS J. BROWNING
BENJAMIN M. BRUMM
MATTHEW J. BRUNELLE
JADE L. BUCKLER
JUSTIN M. BUMMARA
BRIAN C. BUNGAY
IAN M. BURGESS
JOSEPH C. BURGON
DAVID B. BURKE
ROBERT C. BURKE
NICHOLAS A. BURKLE
MATTHEW M. BUSSE
LINDSEY C. BUZZELL
CHARLES W. BYARS
CHRISTOPHER R. BYRNES
MARK B. CALLAGAN
BRYAN P. CALLAN
DAVID A. CAMP
CALVIN M. CAMPBELL, JR.
JOSEPH L. CAMPBELL
RENE CANO, JR.
ALAN J. CARLSON
BRETT A. CARSTENS
DONALD J. CARTER
PAUL M. CASE
CHRISTOPHER CAUSEE
BORYA I. CELENTANO
JULIAN M. CENTENERA
JOSEPH D. CHAMBERLIN
CHARLES E. CHAMBERS II
TARUS D. CHATMAN
DANIEL J. CHILTON
IN S. CHO
ADDAM D. CLARK
EARNEST F. CLARK, JR.
RANDALL J. CLEMONS
ANDREW F. COATES
RICHARD J. COLLOT
STEPHEN M. COL
NICHOLAS S. COLLIER
TREVOR J. CONGER
THOMAS R. CONKLIN

MICHAEL R. CONRAD
 WILLIAM J. COOPER
 AUSTIN W. COOVERT
 JAMES R. CORDONNIER
 MICHAEL CORNWELL
 DEVIN P. CORRIGAN
 JOSE B. CORTEZ
 BRADLEY T. COWDEN
 ANNE M. CRAWFORD
 EARL A. CRAWFORD
 JEFFREY J. CREIGHAN
 STUART L. CROCKFORD
 COLLIER C. CROUCH
 JOHN R. CRUMPACKER
 WILLIAM F. CUNNINGHAM
 JEREMIAH M. DALEY
 JAMES J. DALO
 MICHAEL S. DALRYMPLE
 JOHN F. DALY III
 LOUIS A. DANTONIO
 MATTHEW J. DATTOLO
 MICHAEL A. DAURO
 ANDREW B. DEAN
 JAMIE L. DECOSTER
 BRIAN A. DEIBIG
 VIDAL DEJESUS
 JASON DELANEUVILLE
 LUIS P. DELGADO
 KIRK T. DELPH
 SHANE R. DENNIS
 SHAUN E. DENNIS
 BROOKE H. DESROCHERS
 CHRISTOPHER S. DIAS
 JAMIE J. DIAZ
 PHILLIP S. DIPAOLO
 JOSHUA M. DISHMOM
 JASON D. DIVITO
 JAMES R. DOBBS
 ANDREW L. DOMINA
 JOSEPH DOMINGUEZ
 JOHN T. DONOHUE
 THOMAS J. DORAN
 JONATHAN D. DORSEY
 DAVID A. DOSTAL
 SEAN R. DOUGHERTY
 CODY A. DOWD
 PAUL S. DUENAS
 JOHN J. DUES, JR.
 DAVID E. DUFAULT
 JOSH W. DUGGAN
 CHRISTIAN F. DUMLAO
 RONALD D. DUNCAN
 STEPHEN A. DURAN
 NORM L. DURHAM
 STEVEN A. DYKSTRA
 JUSTIN P. ECKHOFF
 JOSEPH M. EDELEN
 ROBERT L. EDMONSON III
 DAVID F. EDWARDS
 GREGORY W. EDWARDS
 LLOYD R. EDWARDS
 TABITHA J. EDWARDS
 BRIAN J. EHRHARDT
 SETH R. EISENMENGER
 MICHAEL E. EK
 ANTONE B. ELIASEN
 DEREK J. ELLIOTT
 KIRK D. EMANUELSEN II
 NICHOLAS S. ENGELBRECHT
 GREGORY B. ENZINGER
 JAMIE M. EPPS
 CHRISTINA E. EVANS
 RICHARD C. EYTEL
 THOMAS C. FALCONER
 JOHN E. FALLON
 BRAD A. FANCHER
 DEAN B. FARMER II
 TARA A. FEHER
 JOSEPH C. FERRARI
 PETER A. FIELD
 ERIK S. FIGUEROA
 JEFFRY S. FINDLAY
 SPENCER M. FISHMAN
 WILLIAM F. FITZKEE
 ALLISON M. FLETCHER
 NEIL B. FLETCHER
 MIKHAEL A. FLOYD
 MARSHALL H. FOARD
 JOSHUA E. FOGARTY
 MICHAEL L. FOLEY
 JOSEPH A. FONTENOT
 DAVID J. FOOTE
 DANIEL R. FORD
 LARRY R. FORD, JR.
 SHANNYN W. FOWLER
 SHANE M. FOX
 JOSEPH W. FRANKS
 NATALIE R. FRANTZ
 ROBERT J. FRANTZ
 JOSEPH T. FREDI
 JAMIE L. FRENCH
 SCOTT B. FRENCH
 ROGER L. FRINGER
 MICHAEL L. FRISBY II
 WILLIAM J. FRY
 DANIEL R. FULTON
 NOA J. FUNK
 SCOTT J. FYOCK
 PETER A. GAAL
 COLIN M. GAINES
 JEFFREY S. GAMMON, JR.
 JEFFREY GARCIA

JASON R. GARIS
 FRANCISCO X. GARZA
 CHARLES C. GASTON
 FORREST D. GEER
 MATTHEW L. GEER
 DAVID B. GELESZYNSKI
 KIMBERLY J. GENTNER
 NICHOLAS D. GEORGE
 MATTHEW A. GERBER
 RYAN M. GERO
 THOMAS P. GILFILLAN
 TRAVIS J. GILL
 ROBERT B. GILLENWATER
 DAEHYUN J. GILLESPIE
 ANN K. GILSON
 AMY E. GIRALDI
 MICHELLE A. GIRE
 ROBERT R. GIVEN
 SEAN T. GLARNER
 JOHN E. GLOVER, JR.
 CURTIS J. GOBERT, JR.
 KEVIN C. GORECKE
 JOEL A. GOW
 CHRISTOPHER K. GRABILL
 ERIK A. GRAHAM
 MICHAEL C. GRAHAM
 GABRIEL R. GRAUKE
 JEFFREY M. GRECO
 CHRISTOPHER J. GREEN
 CULLEN M. GREENFIELD
 ANDREW J. GREENLEES
 MICHAEL J. GREGA
 BRANT P. GRESHAM
 MARY L. GRESKO
 JOHN M. GRIFFITH
 RODNEY A. GROGAN
 JONATHAN M. GUIDRY
 JOSEPH GUNTA
 DAVID M. HAFEMAN
 WILLIAM J. HAFER
 MATTHEW C. HAMM
 JEREMY M. HANSLER
 JOHN D. HARKINS
 JASON R. HARR
 STEPHEN C. HARRINGTON
 CLARENCE S. HARRIS II
 CHRISTOPHER M. HARRISON
 BRYAN P. HART
 KATHERINE R. HART
 MICHAEL S. HARTMANN
 PAUL M. HATFIELD
 TRAVIS A. HAVENHILL
 MATTHEW G. HAYS
 JUSTIN A. HAYWARD
 NEAL D. HEATON
 TODD W. HEIG
 JONATHAN R. HEIL
 MICHAEL J. HELLARD
 BENJAMIN B. HENDRICKS
 HARLAND A. HENDRICKS
 AMANDA M. HENRY
 EDMUND D. HENRY
 RYAN M. HERNANDEZ
 PHILLIP C. HERNDL
 JEFFREY W. HERZOG
 FREDERICK G. HETTLING
 CORY S. HICKS
 JASEN A. HICKS
 SAMUEL HIGGINBOTHAM
 ERICH R. HILL
 JOHN D. HILL
 BRANDON B. HILLIARD
 PHILIP J. HINTON
 NICHOLAS G. HOFFMAN
 JAMES F. HOPP
 JAMES H. HORA
 JOHN B. HORN
 ROBERT P. HORTMAN, JR.
 JOHN N. HOWARD
 ADAM HOWELL
 SCOTT C. HUDSON
 JERALD T. HUMPHREY III
 CHRISTOPHER P. HUSSEY
 ALDEBARAN K. IMPERATORE
 ANDREW M. IMPERATORE
 DANIEL D. INBODY
 RYAN C. INGRAM
 MARQUES D. JACKSON
 KATIE JACOBSON
 JASON G. JEANPIERRE
 JUSTIN W. JENNINGS
 AMEIAN JEREMIAH
 SCOTT T. JOHNS
 CALE W. JOHNSON
 DEVINE JOHNSON
 JOSHUA M. JOHNSON
 BRETT L. JONES
 JACOB A. JONES
 SCOTT A. JONES
 TIMOTHY B. JONES
 RICHARD S. KADLICK
 JEFFERY A. KAHN
 NATHAN D. KAHN
 VINCENT A. KAHNKE
 JOSEPH T. KARAFFA
 MICHAEL G. KEATING
 RYAN M. KEHOE
 JAMIE A. KELLY
 LANCE K. KELLY
 CHRISTI N. KENNEDY
 MARCUS A. KEPHART
 PATRICK N. KILCREASE

SI H. KIM
 RYAN M. KING
 JOHN A. KIRSCHKE III
 COMER T. KNIGHT
 JASON D. KNOX
 KYLE D. KOBOLD
 BENJAMIN C. KOHLMANN
 DOUGLAS R. KRAMER
 DANIEL J. KRAUSE
 KEVIN P. KREUTZ
 JOSHUA M. KRIEG
 JOSHUA D. KRISTENSON
 PHILLIP R. KRITES
 STEVEN N. KUEHN
 STEVEN H. KUKLA
 ERIN M. KURZ
 LUKIN C. LAIN
 JONATHAN G. LANCE
 WRENN E. LANDERS
 PETER D. LANGLEY
 EVAN A. LARSEN
 TRAVIS A. LARSON
 CHARLES A. LARWOOD III
 CONOR P. LATHAM
 ANDREW B. LEATHERWOOD
 CHESTER LEE III
 DONALD E. LEE II
 JON D. LEE
 KEVIN O. LEIVA
 TIMOTHY A. LEONARDI
 ERIC V. LEONHARDI
 JACOB A. LERNER
 PETER E. LESACA
 PATRICK M. LESLIE
 JEFFREY J. LESSARD
 MATTHEW D. LETCHER
 KRISTEN N. LEVASSEUR
 KORI L. LEVYMINZIE
 JAMES J. LIGHT
 MICHAEL A. LILLEBERG
 JENNIFER C. LIPSCOMB
 CARL S. LIPTAK
 BRYAN R. LITWIN
 THOMAS G. LITWIN
 SEAN J. LOCKE
 LACY N. LODMELL
 ISAAC R. LONG
 JONATHAN E. LONG
 CHRISTOPHER J. LONGABAUGH
 JUSTIN W. LONGO
 JESSE D. LORENZEN
 JASON D. LORIZ
 NICHOLAS J. LUNSFORD
 JOSHUA L. LUSK
 CODY C. LUTKE
 MICHAEL R. LYLE
 MICHAEL J. LYNCH
 JOHN D. MACK
 ERIC J. MADONIA
 NICHOLAS C. MADREN
 CHLOE D. MAILER
 DAWN T. MAKOWSKY
 JOHNPAUL S. MANTONE
 HECTOR MARIN
 MICHAEL R. MARKS
 PRESTON S. MARSHALL
 PATRICK R. MARTIN
 JOEL P. MARTINEZ
 DANIEL M. MARZLUFF
 ANDREW J. MASCOTTI
 JOHN K. MASTRIANI
 JOHN R. MATEIKAT
 ADAM M. MATTHEWS
 JOSHUA C. MATTINGLY
 MICHAEL R. MAZZONE
 DUSTIN R. MCCALLISTER
 THOMAS D. MCCANDLESS IV
 BRYAN R. MCCARTHY
 JOHN P. MCCARTHY
 JONATHAN I. MCCARVER
 LINDA H. MCCAULEY
 DARREN D. MCCORMICK
 MATTHEW A. MCCORMICK
 JOSHUA Q. MCCRIGHT
 MATTHEW J. MCCULLOUGH
 CHRISTOPHER G. MCCURRY
 JAMEEL MCDANIEL
 KYLE O. MCDANIEL
 MICHAEL R. MCDONALD
 CHRIS S. MCELROY
 JOSEPH L. MCGETTIGAN
 SEAN P. MCGLADE
 MICHAEL S. MCGUIRE
 PATRICK F. MCINERNEY
 PETER A. MCKEEVER
 PATRICK L. MCKELVEY
 DAVID J. MCCLAUGHLIN
 MICHAEL P. MCCLAUGHLIN
 JEFFREY J. MCLEAN
 ALEXANDER M. MCMAHON
 MICHAEL T. MCMAHON
 MEGAN A. MCWILLIAMS
 GILLIAN L. MEDINA
 JOHN W. MEISE
 TIMOTHY J. METCALF
 WILLIAM T. MIANTE
 CHRISTOPHER M. MILLER
 ERNEST L. MILLER III
 MICHAEL S. MILLER
 STEPHEN P. MILLOWAY
 COLLEEN M. MINIHAN
 JAMES M. MISSLER, JR.

DANIEL E. MITZNER
JONATHAN L. MOCKER
KEVIN M. MOELLER
MATTHEW C. MOESER
BRADLEY M. MONGER
MICHAEL R. MONTOYA
ALLISON L. MOON
JONATHAN D. MOONEYHAM
COLLEEN E. MOORE
THOMAS C. MOORE
FRANK J. MORALES
MELISSA A. A. MORAVAN
JOSHUA D. MORGAN
LARRY P. MORGAN
JASON P. MORTIMER
MATTHEW A. MRAVLJA
NOELLE R. MURPHY
ADAM C. MURRELL
JAMES C. MUSE
MICHAEL J. MYERS
KRISTOPHER J. NASTRO
ROBERT J. NEFF
BRENDAN O. NEGLE
BENJAMIN E. NEHRKE
JASON A. NELSON
ROBERT A. NEUERMAN
STEPHEN T. NEUMAN
BRIAN J. NEWGREN
SHAWN T. NEWMAN
WENDY S. NG
THANH T. NGUYEN, JR.
DAVID A. NICHOLS
KEITH S. NIELSEN
SHELBY M. NIKITIN
ERIK A. NYHEIM
JOSHUA D. OAKES
PATRICK J. OBRIEN
KRISTEL A. OCANAS
AARON M. OCHALEK
TOD F. OCONNELL
RYAN J. OGDEN
NATHANIEL I. OKELLY
STACEY L. ONEAL
NATHAN T. ONEIL
BRENDAN ONEILL
FRANK J. ORSINO
MARK A. OSWALT
ANNIE J. OTTEN
ERIC C. OVIATT
JOSEPH S. OWMBY III
JONATHAN D. PADGETT
GREG A. PAGE
WALTER J. PAK
MICHAEL R. PANGRAC
SAINATH P. PANJETI
STEVEN C. PARENTE
JEREMY J. PARM
ISAAC M. PELT
GARY L. PEMBLETON
JAYSON PEREZ
JOHN C. PERKINS
DANIEL W. PERSON
BRYAN A. PETERSON
KELSEY C. PETERSON III
SAMUEL P. A. PETERSON
STEPHEN R. PETRES
MICHAEL W. PFEIFFER
MATTHEW C. PIASECKI
ANTHONY J. POLO
MATTHEW B. POWELL
RICHARD J. PRESCOTT
ANDREW J. PRITCHETT
BRAD D. PRYOR
MICHAEL P. QUARG
JON B. QUIMBY
COLIN J. QUIRINO
ALEX S. RAFAL
JOSHUA N. RAGADIO
ROBERT RAMIREZ III
STEPHEN J. RAULLI
JENNA K. RAUNIG
RICHARD S. RAVENDO
CASSIDI A. REESE
MATTHEW M. REHBERG
DAVID P. REHNBERG
JOHN R. REINER
BRIAN G. REIZISS
JESSICA N. RENON
ERNE REYES
FERNANDO R. REYES
MATTHEW B. RHODES
CHRISTOPHER M. RIALS
CHRISTIAN P. RICHER
GLENN D. RICHESON
LOGAN T. RIDLEY
EDWARD Z. RIENDEAU

LOUIE RIVERA
ANTONIO RIZIO
ERIK S. ROBERTS
JAMES A. ROBERTS
JOSEPH A. ROBERTS
BRANT J. ROBINSON
TIMOTHY E. ROGERS
ALERON B. ROGNLIE
SUMNER J. ROLLINGS, JR.
DANIEL D. ROPP
MICHAEL G. ROSS
SAMUEL J. ROTH
BOBBY J. ROWDEN
MICHAEL D. RYAN
JONATHAN L. SABURN
NICHOLAS E. SAFLUND
ANTONIO L. SAMUEL
THOMAS SANECKI
MATTHEW H. SASS
DESTINY N. SAVAGE
MICHAEL A. SAYLOR
GRAHAM C. SCARBRO
CRYSTAL L. SCHAEFFER
KEVIN M. SCHAEFFER
JONATHAN P. SCHERMERHORN
CARLSON E. SCHINDLER
RICHARD G. SCHMIDT
BRADLEY V. SCHOULTZ
DUSTIN A. SCHRAUD
GORDON M. SCHRIEVER
ANDREW J. SCHWENKHOFF
KEITH E. SCOTT
JOSHUA D. SEAMOUNT
BENJAMIN L. SEBEK
BRETT R. SEELEY
CHRISTOPHER V. SEIVERS
ERNIQUE L. SESLER
CAROLINE A. SEVERSON
WILLIAM R. SHERIDAN II
ERIN E. SHERRY
MATTHEW L. SHETLER
KEVIN K. SHIKUMA
MICHAEL M. SHORT
WILLIAM J. SHULTZ IV
PETER J. SILVA, JR.
ANDREW SIMMONS
STEPHANIE M. SIMONI
ROSS W. SIMPSON
JORDON C. SIMS
RHEANNA M. SINNETT
JARED L. SLABICKI
JOHN T. SLAGLE
LESLIE A. SLOOTMAKER
DANIEL W. SMITH
JOHN C. SMITH
KELLIE J. SMITH
MARLIN R. SMITH III
MICHAEL R. SMITH
TYLER Y. SMITH
JOSEPH W. SNYDER
LAURIE A. SOLBERG
PHILIP D. SOSEBEE
SCOTT C. SOUTH
CHARLES C. SPIVEY III
JAMES M. STACHURA
SCOTT B. STAFFORD
MATTHEW G. STARR
JAMES B. STAUFFER
CHARLES E. STEELE II
MICHAEL T. STEFFENS
RONALD M. STEHLIN II
SHAUN M. STEINBARGER
CHRISTOPHER J. STEVENS
ERIC F. STILES
ROBERT T. STINSON
MICHAEL A. STOCK
MANUEL B. STRANGE
ANTHONY G. STRANGES
SCOTT A. STRATMAN
JARED J. STROUT
ERIK P. STRZEMPKA
AARON M. STUTZMAN
JAMES SULLEN, JR.
SEAN M. SUNDEY
JEFFREY R. SWEITZER
MICHAEL A. SWYERS
KARI A. SZEWczyk
DENNIS A. SZPARA
ALLISON W. TASSO
PATRICK E. TEMBREULL
KARI J. TEREICK
MICHAEL R. THERIOT
EMILE D. THERRIEN
MATTHEW C. THIEN
JOHN L. THIESSEN
DREW F. THOMAS

JARED B. THOMAS
JOSHUA C. THOMPSON
JAMES D. THORNTON
TIMOTHY J. THURSTON
ADAM S. TISDALL
MICHAEL J. TOZZI
GREGORY J. TRACH
TODD M. TRAGO
TIN T. TRAN
DAVID N. TRENHOLM
ERIC D. TURNER
JOSEPH S. TURNER
KEITH T. TURNER
SHAUN S. TURNER
STEPHEN M. VALERIO
VALERIE K. VANHO
JAMES S. VANNESST
KENNETH W. VAUGHN
THEODORE J. VERMEYCHUK
ANDREW J. VINCENT
DAVID R. VOGELGESANG
MATTHEW P. VOSS
JACOB N. VRBAS
BRENT C. WADSWORTH
CHAD C. WALKER
JONATHAN N. WALLACE
MATTHEW P. WALSH
TIMOTHY P. WALSH
BRYAN T. WALTHERS
CHARLES E. WALTMAN II
TRAVIS E. WANDELL
JEFFREY A. WARE
BRYAN P. WATSON
JEFFREY M. WEBB
MICHAEL R. WEBB
PATRICK A. WEED
GERALD V. WEERS
MICHAEL J. WELGAN
SCOTT E. WELLES
JOSHUA B. WELLS
JAMES V. WELSCH III
JAMES M. WENDLER
ELIOT A. WESTON
SAMUEL WHEELER
ALFONZA O. WHITE
THOMAS W. WHITE
CHRISTOPHER K. WHITEHOUSE
JASON D. WHITEMAN
ROBERT W. WHITMORE
BRETT A. WHORLEY
DANIEL T. WICKERSHAM
HENRY J. WICKS
JARED M. WILHELM
JULIEANNE K. WILKENING
JAMES M. WILLETTE
BRETT M. WILLIAMS
JOSHUA A. WILLITS
DANIEL M. WILTFANG
DAVID L. WILTSHIRE
MICHAEL L. WINDHAM
ERIC WINN
BRAD D. WOHLNHAUS
BRYAN T. WOLFE
YANCY M. WOODARD
BRANDEN K. WOODS
DUSTIN R. WORLEY
TIMOTHY V. WRITER
MARVIN L. WYNN II
ANDREW W. WYRICK
JAMES A. YACH
WESLEY W. YANCEY
ADAM D. YATES
JASSEN E. YATES
MICHAEL D. YEAGER
KEVIN R. S. YOST
KEITH D. YULL
JOHN M. ZAHODNE
ADAM I. ZAKER
AMANDA H. ZAWORA
NICHOLAS J. ZIMMERMAN
DAVID C. ZINKHON
GEORGE S. ZINTAK

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by
the Senate July 25, 2013:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DEREK ANTHONY WEST, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSO-
CIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 25, 2013

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Compassionate and merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As this House comes together at the end of a busy week, bless the work of its Members. May their legislative actions bring about positive results which redound to the benefit of all citizens of our Nation.

As the Members return to their home districts, fill their hearts with charity, their minds with energy, their wills with courage to listen well and reflect back, with the expertise and knowledge they possess, greater insight for American voters.

The work that they have is difficult work. May they rise together to accomplish what is best for our great Nation, and indeed for all the world.

May all that is done in the days to come be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MY POSSIBILITIES

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly recognize the fifth anniversary and expansion of My Possibilities, a nonprofit organization serving disabled young adults in north Texas.

My Possibilities began with the vision of three dedicated mothers of special needs children. These mothers dreamed of something more for their kids beyond a high school education. After 2 years of hard work, they created the first full-day, full-year continuing education program for disabled Texans. In fact, last week, they commemorated the grand opening of a new facility in Plano so even more Texans could become lifelong learners.

My Possibilities stands as a testament to the American spirit of freedom and free enterprise. Three moms took an idea to fill a need in our community and made it a reality. That's truly remarkable. The folks at My Possibilities live up to their motto: "Make every moment count."

To the staff, board of directors, and Chairman Charmaine Solomon, thank you for your tireless efforts and your dedication.

STOP GUN VIOLENCE

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as I have before, on behalf of the many families victimized daily by the persistent gun violence in their communities.

As a Nation, we shudder at tragedies like the Newtown shootings. The news coverage of Newtown left a mark on our collective conscience. Yet sadly, every day, equally devastating acts of gun violence occur in urban America, often without the same media coverage.

Since Newtown, over 6,000 Americans have lost their lives to gun violence. Still, Congress has yet to act on commonsense gun reforms that would save lives. Every life lost, regardless of ZIP code, is a tragedy. It's easy to get angry and frustrated over the relentless drumbeat of death in urban America, but instead we need to turn our anger and frustration into action.

In my 3 months in Congress, I've introduced three commonsense gun bills that will help make our communities safer. Though Federal legislation alone cannot solve the gun violence epidemic, it is a strong start and a step in the right direction.

So I urge my colleagues to cosponsor these bills and take a stand with me against gun violence.

ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER ACCOUNTABILITY

(Mr. GOSAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to shed light on Attorney General Eric Holder's less than glamorous tenure as Attorney General.

As the chief law enforcement officer of our Nation, Mr. Holder is expected to govern by the principle of seeking justice. As a sworn Federal official, he has one primary job: to enforce the laws of the United States fairly and impartially. It is for that reason that Lady Justice wears a blindfold. The blindfold represents objectivity and that justice should be dealt out without fear, favor, or impartiality.

How come Mr. Holder dispenses his version of justice impartially? How come the Attorney General overlooked injustices and with disregard for the rule of law?

As Supreme Court Justice Brandeis said:

In a government of laws, the existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. If government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself. It invites anarchy.

I ask you then, has the Attorney General invited anarchy?

I will continue to make my case here in the people's House at the people's pulpit. Folks, I will be back.

NATIONAL NIGHT OUT

(Mr. McNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the 30th anniversary of National Night Out. "America's Night Out Against Crime" began those 30 years ago to encourage community-based crime prevention.

I've participated in many National Night Out events throughout my district over the years, meeting people who are committed to reducing crime in their neighborhoods and promoting community spirit by building relationships with their local civic leaders and law enforcement officials.

This year, I look forward to celebrating National Night Out in Stockton, California, a city in my district. National Night Out has made a difference in my district by bringing people together and making them more aware of how to keep their neighborhoods safe.

National Night Out has grown to over 37 million Americans participating in 15,000 communities across North America. National Night Out illustrates how partnerships between community members and local law enforcement can prevent crime. I encourage my colleagues to participate in National Night Out events in their own districts.

PIONEER DAY

(Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, like you, as a fellow Utahn, this week my heart is back in my district and my State as we celebrate our great pioneer heritage.

On July 24, 1847, Brigham Young stood over the great Salt Lake Valley, which was nothing but a desert, devoid of any green meadows, and uttered those famous words, "This is the place."

After traveling more than 1,300 miles crossing the Great Plains and the Rocky Mountains, the pioneers settled to begin a new life. Throughout this, they suffered great hardships: hunger, fatigue, cold, disease, and exhaustion. During their journeys, they quickly called Utah home as they reached this great valley, where they planted their crops and went to work building beautiful communities that grew into the wonderful city and State that we now know.

Our State has much to be proud of. We have the greatest snow on Earth. Our National Parks are truly magnificent. Our State is consistently rated among the top in job creation, education, and quality of life. Utah truly has some of the most honest, hard-working, and friendly people in the country.

Pioneer Day is celebrated to honor everyone who immigrated west to Utah during this pioneer era and who aided in creating this great State, which I'm proud to call my home.

KEEP COLLEGE AFFORDABLE

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, just last week, I had the privilege of speaking to students who attend Florida International University in my district. These students included Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. But their message was clear: it is time for Congress to help keep college affordable.

That is why I have supported efforts to prevent and reverse the doubling of the Federal student loan rates that took effect on July 1. This issue is too important for us to delay any further.

I was very encouraged that the Senate yesterday passed a strong bipartisan compromise bill to lower these rates. I urge the House leadership, Mr. Speaker, to bring this bill to the floor and keep college rates affordable for our Nation's students.

RELEASE SAEED ABEDINI

(Mr. FRANKS of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to cochair the International Religious Freedom Caucus here in the Congress. In that capacity, it's also my privilege to participate in the Defending Freedoms Project, a bipartisan effort for Members of Congress to adopt a prisoner of conscience.

My office has adopted Saeed Abedini, a Christian pastor and an American citizen from Idaho who is currently imprisoned in Iran for his faith. Iran's tyrannical attempts to, in the words of Ronald Reagan, "stifle the freedom and muzzle the self-expression of the people" were again exposed to the world after the imprisonment of Pastor Abedini, who was sentenced to 8 years in prison while working to build an orphanage in Iran.

Mr. Speaker, Martin Luther King said:

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

Pastor Abedini's case is a demonstration to the world of the far-reaching implications of even a single instance of human rights abuse.

I would call again upon Iran to immediately release Pastor Abedini so he can return to Idaho to be with his family.

PRISON RAPE ELIMINATION ACT

(Mr. SCOTT of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago today, this body unani-

mously passed PREA, the Prison Rape Elimination Act, which my colleague from Virginia, FRANK WOLF, and I sponsored.

PREA is designed to end sexual violence in our Nation's prisons. One focus of PREA is on reducing assaults on children in our criminal justice system. Youthful inmates are more likely than their adult counterparts to be victimized by prison staff and adult inmates. Under PREA, no youth under 18 years of age can be placed in a housing unit where contact with adult inmates may occur.

Furthermore, children in adult jails and prison are often placed in solitary confinement for their own protection, which turns out to be detrimental to their mental health. Due to this type of confinement and exposure to abuse, youth have the highest rates of suicide amongst all inmates. PREA urges agencies to avoid subjecting children to solitary confinement.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the Department of Justice to redouble its efforts to ensure that every State implements PREA to protect all inmates from sexual violence. The type of sexual violence that has plagued our prisons and jails is cruel and unusual punishment and should not be part of an inmate's prison term.

NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

(Mrs. BLACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, over the July 4th holiday, the Obama administration updated the Federal Register. And buried in more than 600 pages of new regulations was a controversial decision to delay verification of eligibility for ObamaCare's subsidies and instead use the honor system, which more accurately should be described as an open invitation for fraud and abuse.

In a desperate attempt to try to save the President's failing health care law, the administration is willing to give out billions of dollars in fraudulent payments, racking up even more debt for current and future generations. This is indefensible.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 2775, the No Subsidies Without Verification Act. My bill would stop this irresponsible action by requiring verification systems be put in place before any subsidy is paid with taxpayer money.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this fight and support H.R. 2775.

□ 0915

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mr. WAXMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, every day a member of the Safe Climate Caucus has come to the floor to raise concern about climate change, and we know about climate change from hurricanes and tornadoes and droughts and all of the other things that we're seeing.

But yesterday, the prestigious science journal, *Nature*, published an analysis of the cost of the rapid warming in the Arctic. That analysis found that the cost could range from \$10 trillion to over \$200 trillion. The mean cost is \$60 trillion. I'm not misspeaking. It's not \$60 million, it's not \$60 billion, but it's \$60 trillion.

These enormous costs are the consequence of the release of 50 gigatons of methane now trapped in the Arctic ice shelves, which experts believe will be released into the air within the next 50 years, if not sooner, if we don't stop spewing carbon pollution into our atmosphere.

The Arctic is pivotal to the functioning of the Earth's systems, such as the oceans and the climate, but we're recklessly endangering it. We need to stop acting like members of the Flat Earth Society and start listening to the urgent warnings of the scientists.

RE-REFERRAL OF H.R. 2315, PRESERVING ACCESS TO ORPHAN DRUGS ACT OF 2013

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 2315, Preserving Access to Orphan Drugs Act of 2013, be re-referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COAL RESIDUALS REUSE AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 315 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2218.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0917

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2218) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the envi-

ronment, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have spent much time talking about the need for Congress to consider jobs legislation. This is a piece of pro-jobs legislation. This bill is unique because it is also a pro-states' rights legislation and pro-environment legislation.

But focusing on jobs for a minute, let me explain why a "no" vote is anti-jobs, placing anywhere from 39,000 to 316,000 jobs at risk at a time when we can least afford it.

We are here because over 3 years ago the EPA put out three proposals on coal ash, including regulating coal ash as a hazardous waste. This caused massive uncertainty in the marketplace and created an unnecessary stigma on legitimate recycling of this product, and I have a piece of shingle that's made and produced by coal ash.

And the States agree. As highlighted in a letter from the State of Michigan in support of H.R. 2218:

Enactment would end the regulatory uncertainty that has hindered our efforts to promote the beneficial use of coal combustion residuals.

EPA announced in litigation proceedings recently that it will not have a final coal ash rule before 2014. The fact that EPA continues to leave a "hazardous waste" designation on the table even though three decades of science and fact point the other way, that coal ash is not hazardous, it directly is contributing to the loss of current and future recycling.

Coal ash is not an abstract substance. It is used in important infrastructure in this country. The American Coal Ash Association informed us that uncertainty in the marketplace caused by EPA's proposal to regulate coal ash as hazardous waste is diminishing their economic prospects down to just 40 percent of eligible coal wastes—and they support this bill.

This bill establishes a solid framework for regulation of coal combustion residuals in a manner that is protective of human health and the environment, or the State environmental regulators—including the Environmental Council of States, ECOS, and the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management officials—would not be endorsing this bill.

Coal ash makes concrete stronger, more durable, and cheaper. A "no" vote against this bill means that you support less durable, more expensive

highways, schools, and green buildings. Don't take my word for it. The American Road and Transportation Builders Association and many other road and bridge builders, and also the Building and Construction Trades Union, want this bill because they want high-quality construction material for buildings, roads, and bridges.

For Members concerned about wall board from China, coal ash is a stable, domestic source for wall board and will control costs. Don't take my word for it. The American Forest and Paper Association supports this bill.

Mine workers across this country need a stable way of having America's energy future secured. This bill accomplishes that. Don't take my word for it. Ask the United Mine Workers, who supports this bill.

Coal ash is recycled and used as a raw material in making cement. Voting "no" means you choose to put coal ash in landfills rather than putting it back into roads and building projects. Don't take my word for it. Organizations like Portland Cement Association, the Phoenix Cement Company, the Wisconsin Ready Mix Concrete Association, and the Washington Aggregates and Concrete Association all support this bill.

A vote against this bill is a vote for prolonged regulatory uncertainty. A vote against this bill is a vote to increase costs on the Federal, State, and local governments and infrastructures. A vote against this bill is a vote to increase costs on all Americans and to dare unemployment to go even higher. A vote against this bill is a direct message to career State employees in States across this country that you do not trust them to do the right thing regarding regulation of coal ash.

This bill is a pro-jobs, pro-environment, anti-bureaucracy bill. If you want progress instead of process, protection instead of politics, and jobs instead of continued uncertainty, vote for this bill.

We find ourselves in this morass of regulatory uncertainty because of the existing approach to environmental regulation. This bill presents a new approach that will reduce the inefficiencies of the Federal rulemaking process by setting a national standard in the statute and charging the States with implementation.

If you support protecting jobs and preserving states' rights, and if you trust your State environmental regulators to protect your communities, you need to support this bill and vote "yes" on final passage.

With this, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, the House is considering legislation to block EPA from acting to ensure that toxic coal ash is safely disposed of. Coal ash is the result of the

coal that has been burned, and this coal ash needs to be disposed of.

Now, what the Republicans who are suggesting this bill be adopted are suggesting is that we remove public health protections in order to allow polluting disposal sites to continue with business as usual. That's a little tough to justify. As we led up to today's debate, we've heard some outlandish justifications, and I just want to set the record straight.

First of all, we've been told this is a states' rights bill because we need this legislation in order for the States to impose adequate regulation on dangerous coal ash disposal sites. Well, that's not true. The States can regulate coal ash disposal today and, in fact, many do. The problem is that many States are not doing a good job.

For example, in Ohio, four coal ash disposal sites have serious groundwater contamination problems. The coal ash at these sites has contaminated groundwater with arsenic, mercury, and radioactive levels of materials higher than allowed under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Well, in total, EPA has identified 133 cases of groundwater and surface water contamination at coal ash disposal sites. All of this has occurred under existing law, where State laws can be effective and States can act. The problem is they're not all acting.

Secondly, the proponents of this bill have argued that we have to pass this legislation to allow coal ash to be recycled. They argue that EPA wants to designate coal ash as "hazardous." Well, that isn't what EPA proposed at all.

They say that this designation would be a stigma on coal ash and would ensure there would no longer be any market for recycled coal ash, but that argument is just plain wrong. Hazardous labeling and restrictions on beneficial reuse are simply not at issue.

When EPA issued its proposed coal ash rule, the agency offered a couple of alternatives. Neither of these proposals would involve labeling coal ash as "hazardous." Quite frankly, even if it were designated "hazardous," that doesn't mean it can't be reused. It can be reused.

Third, we've been told that we must pass this legislation because it's a careful compromise from the version of the last Congress. Well, I'm not sure who was in that compromise because the bill is even worse than the bill from the last Congress. The Republicans have refused to work with the Democrats on the committee. There's no bipartisan coal ash bill in the Senate. And the administration has identified five problems with the bill that cause it to fall short of protecting human health and the environment.

Let's focus on reality. This debate is not about a "war on coal" or putting a stigma on coal ash. It's not about

whether State governments are inherently better than the Federal Government. It's not about job-killing regulations. This debate is about whether or not we're going to allow coal ash disposal sites to contaminate our water supplies and threaten human health.

If this bill is enacted, coal ash disposal sites will continue to pollute our groundwater; and once contamination is confirmed, well, this bill would allow it to continue for another 10 years—and do nothing. Then, after that, they might even continue it for another indefinite period of time. So it will continue to pollute groundwater, the water we drink, and our water supplies and our water sources.

This bill says that a dump site that is contaminating groundwater today can pollute for 10 years—more arsenic, more mercury, more lead. Is that what Members of the House want to vote for? If the owners of the polluting structure can't control their contamination within 10 years, this bill says States can give them even more time to keep polluting.

New information released yesterday reveals that three-quarters of existing unlined coal ash impoundments do not have the space at their existing location to construct an additional disposal facility. Those facts practically guarantee that if this legislation were to be enacted, communities across the country—many of them poor and minority—will simply have to endure contaminated water, polluted air, and the risk of catastrophic dam failure. And why? For states' rights, where the States already have the rights? It's really for polluter rights. And polluters do not have and should not have a right to pollute our water supplies.

This can be handled effectively through a serious piece of legislation that will make clear that public health protection must be enforced.

I urge my colleagues to tune out the special interest misinformation that seeks to weaken our laws and prolong pollution, and oppose this legislation.

No matter how you voted in the last Congress, this bill is worse; and I urge Members to vote against it today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleague to look at the 11 additional changes that have been made in this bill versus the last bill and realize how much we have moved in the direction that he speaks of.

I now yield 7 minutes to the author of the legislation from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2218.

For 33 years, Congress has wrestled unproductively with how to deal with coal ash, an unavoidable byproduct of burning coal.

with a solution. Over the past 2½ years, we've listened to environmental organizations, industry, Senators, the States, the EPA.

Now the bill has strong bipartisan support with Democrat cosponsors and a broad coalition of over 300 organizations and businesses, including State environmental officials, Governors, recyclers, manufacturers, coal miners, coal operators, and labor unions, just to name a few.

If we don't act decisively, Congress will once again kick the can down the road. That would mean the status quo continues.

At the Energy and Commerce subcommittee hearing on the draft legislation earlier this year, EPA Assistant Administrator Mathy Stanislaus testified that States have the ability to ensure proper management disposal of coal ash under this legislation. At that hearing, my good friend from Illinois, Mr. SHIMKUS, asked Mr. Stanislaus if the EPA was not opposed to this language in the bill. Stanislaus' response was, "That is right."

Even the President has become engaged in this debate. The statement from the administration this past week noted they appreciate the efforts of the House and issued no veto threat; no opposition was expressed. That ought to tell you something.

The opponents of this legislation should read the last sentence of the administration's statement:

The administration would like to work with Congress . . . to allow for development, implementation, and enforcement of appropriate standards for managing coal combustion residuals, while encouraging the beneficial use of this economically important material.

Let me show you what we are talking about here. This is a jar of fly ash. Every day, coal ash is produced in 48 of our 50 States across America. This is a national issue, not just one for coal States. Over 140 million tons of coal ash are produced annually. Approximately 40 percent of the material is recycled into everyday products used in households and the construction industry. The remaining 60 percent is disposed of in landfills.

Now, 2218 deals separately with both of these issues. The first part deals with recycling. Early in the Obama administration, the EPA proposed a rule to declare coal ash as a hazardous material, despite the fact that under the Bill Clinton administration the EPA had already determined in 1993 and 2000 that coal ash was not hazardous. Let me repeat that. They've already said it's not hazardous.

No industrialized nation in the world classifies fly ash as a hazardous material. Deeming it such would essentially destroy the ability to recycle coal ash, dramatically increase the cost of electricity, and crush hundreds of thousands of jobs across America.

The United States already has a much lower rate of recycling than other countries. Europe recycles over 90 percent of the fly ash; China over 65; and Japan, 95 percent of their coal ash is recycled. We should be encouraging recycling, not standing in the way.

The second part of the bill deals with processes for disposing of coal ash that is not recycled. This section has been significantly strengthened and provides for all new and existing landfills to be State-run, using the Federal law known as RCRA, which incorporates Federal standards and requirements for protecting "human health and the environment."

RCRA's primary goals are to "protect human health and the environment, to reduce the amount of waste generated, and to ensure that wastes are managed in an environmentally sound manner."

Consequently, under his bill, disposal requirements will require "composite liners, air quality and dust controls, groundwater protection standards, emergency action plans, corrective actions for deficiencies, inspections and structural stability."

Let me make it clear. If a landfill ever becomes deficient, it must be fixed—no ifs, ands, or buts. It is just that simple.

For example, under the corrective action under section 4011, subsection (C)(2)(b):

An owner/operator of a deficient facility is not relieved of their obligation to develop alternative disposal capability regardless of whether they have space available onsite.

For anyone to argue otherwise, per-haps they haven't read the bill.

For the first time, there will be a uniform, national standard for disposal. Or Congress can do nothing—it can—just as it has been for the last 33 years. But I don't think we should continue with the status quo. Working in this bipartisan fashion we've made progress.

After 30 years of debate, it is time for action. Our constituents deserve protection for their health and environment. This legislation makes it possible.

We often hear Congress isn't voting on a jobs bill. Mr. Chairman, there is not a clear jobs bill that we are going to deal with in this Congress protecting 316,000 jobs across America and preventing utility bills to increase. We must protect these jobs.

I encourage all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this pro-health, pro-environment, and pro-jobs legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the administration and I would like to work out a bill with the Republicans, but this bill has two problems. After all is said and done, there is no requirement that they protect public health and the environment. There's all sorts of language that says we want them to. But

if the States don't do that, the second problem is there's no enforcement; there's nothing to make them do it.

Now, if you have no real clear standard to protect public health and no enforcement to make sure public health is being protected, that's a bill that's asking for continuation of pollution of our groundwater supplies.

We can work together and get a bill, but this administration has said it does not adequately protect public health and the environment; it doesn't address the real problems. Even some of the changes that they have made have made this bill worse. It is a bill that we should reject and then go back to the negotiating table.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I wish to yield 5 minutes to the ranking member of the subcommittee on the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, here we go again with the Republicans spewing their shamelessly empty rhetoric concerning jobs. Jobs for the American people might be on their minds, jobs for the American people might be in their mouths, but jobs for the American people are not in their hearts.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are arguing that we need to weaken our environmental laws to create jobs. That's incredibly shortsighted. Do we really want to say to the American people that they must suffer contaminated groundwater, drink dirty water? Is that what we are saying?

A study from Tufts University shows just the opposite. It's not a fight between jobs and clean environment, clean water, clean drinking water. The Tufts study says that we can create tens of thousands of new jobs by requiring safe disposal of coal ash.

Ensuring that coal ash disposal sites protect human health and the environment will take work, will create jobs. It will take construction workers, equipment operators, and engineers to do this work. Let me add that this is not just makeshift work. These jobs will provide tremendous benefits to the communities in which they take place. But these jobs won't happen if we pass this atrocious bill. This bill simply preserves the status quo and keeps Americans out of work.

Mr. Chairman, when it comes to protecting the public health and ensuring that all Americans have unhindered access to clean air, land, and water, I am very sensitive to the issue of ensuring that there are, at the very least, minimum State or Federal standards and that the U.S. EPA has the full authority to enforce those standards.

Mr. Chairman, due to a case in my district of Crestwood, Illinois, where contaminated drinking water was piped into the homes of my constituents for

over 20 years between 1986 and 2007 and the State of Illinois refused to intervene, I cannot support legislation that bars the U.S. EPA from enforcing State or Federal standards, as this atrocious, shameful bill does.

Mr. Chairman, states' rights might mean States' inaction, as in the case of Crestwood, Illinois, where it was only the determined, courageous act of a citizen by the name of Tricia Krause, who had the courage to alert the media to this shameful act being committed by elected officials, those responsible for taking care of the public health and ensuring that the environment was safe and the water that in the morning and the evening during the day that they drank was safe. These officials, these local officials, had that responsibility, and they turned their backs on the people of the village of Crestwood.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. RUSH. Not only did they turn their backs, but the Illinois EPA, the State EPA, refused to even investigate this matter. I had to get the U.S. Justice Department and the U.S. EPA to end this atrocity.

If this bill is ever enacted, it will bar the Federal Government, at the very least, from serving as the last backstop for the American people against polluters who would seek to skirt the law without regard to the families and communities that they would harm.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the people who are Members of this Congress who have a heart and a mind to not only put the American people back to work, but also to protect the environment, to resist this effort and vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I remind my colleagues that the administration has not issued a veto threat on this bill.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his outstanding work on this legislation, and also to Mr. SHIMKUS, who is the chairman of the subcommittee, for his leadership on the issue.

I do rise today in support of the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act of 2013. I am an original cosponsor on that legislation.

Now, I think it comes as no surprise to anybody that this administration has declared their war on coal. You can listen to the comments that are coming out of the President and his advisers there at the White House. They've done everything in their power to shut down coal plants and to put American coal miners on the unemployment line.

The EPA has targeted everything from existing coal-fired plants to new

plants, coal mining operations, and has been looking at labeling coal ash as a hazardous waste since 2010.

□ 0945

Now, unbeknownst to so many individuals and to so many of my constituents is the fact that the same coal ash that has been used safely to make—and get this—bricks, cement, asphalt, plastics, and is used as a filler in wood products is, all of a sudden, a hazardous waste.

I would like the administration to explain to me if coal ash were a hazardous waste when they used TARP funding for shovel-ready projects to repair roads with asphalt containing—guess what—coal ash.

Was coal ash a hazardous waste last winter when it was used in snow and ice control products to keep roads and pedestrians in Chicago safe? Or was coal ash a hazardous waste when it was used to build the EPA's new headquarters?

While I am sure most of my constituents would like to label the EPA's headquarters as a Superfund site, I would say let's support this bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, if coal ash is reused, it is not a hazardous waste. If it is stored and leaks into our groundwater or into our drinking water, it can be very hazardous.

The problem with the Republican bill is that it doesn't clearly state that public health must be protected, and when they state it, there is no clear enforcement. The EPA cannot be sure that the job is being done, and even citizens cannot file lawsuits to require it to be done. This is a special interest bill that does not serve the interests of the American people.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman who is the ranking member of one of our energy subcommittees, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chair, once again, the House will consider a bill that will provide the States with what they already have—the authority to regulate the disposal of coal ash.

H.R. 2218 also virtually eliminates any regulatory role for the Environmental Protection Agency. Although the bill's title suggests that it is about the beneficial reuse of coal combustion residuals, it has little, if anything, to do with promulgating that worthy goal.

No one has disputed that it is preferable to reduce the amount of coal ash that ends up in disposal facilities. It saves money and lengthens the productive life of that disposal facility, and it means that a waste product is put to productive use in cement, in wallboard and in other products. All of those things happen now, and they will hap-

pen whether this bill passes or not. Actually, if the bill encouraged stronger standards for disposal, it would likely spur increased recycling—another opportunity squandered, in my opinion.

So, if it is not about recycling, what is this bill about?

It is about maintaining the status quo. The bill virtually ensures that deficient facilities will, indeed, remain deficient.

What does that mean?

It means that communities in States with weak programs and lax enforcement remain at risk.

This bill does not set credible standards to ensure that public health and the environment are protected. Communities whose groundwater sources are known today to be contaminated by toxins leaching from unlined disposal ponds will have to wait at least 10 years before a State would have to act, and even then there are provisions for granting additional time for an operator to upgrade or repair a leaking facility. We know from recent experience that some of these facilities are structurally unsound. A breach in the dam in Kingston, Tennessee, in 2008, in eastern Wisconsin in 2011, and in Martins Creek, Pennsylvania, in 2005 all sent coal ash spilling out into waterways and onto the land.

H.R. 2218 is not going to help us avoid adding accidents to this list. Very similar bills to this one passed the House several times in the last Congress. They failed to become law, and H.R. 2218, in my opinion, is going to follow that same path.

Communities living in the shadows of these facilities deserve to be protected. There is no reason to allow deficient facilities to pollute our water and our air and to jeopardize the health of people in communities across this great Nation. We can do better. We should do better. My colleagues and I will offer several amendments this morning that, if adopted, would improve this bill. A better legislative effort could resolve the uncertainty surrounding this issue and, more importantly, could ensure that our citizens' health and safety are protected.

We cannot afford more Kingstons. We do not have to. Without improvements, this legislation will proceed no further in the legislative process. Without improvements, it should not proceed any further. I oppose H.R. 2218 in its present form, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, let me remind my colleagues of some of the special interests: United Mine Workers of America, Building and Construction Trades, and the Transportation Workers of America.

I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2218, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act, an important and bipartisan jobs bill.

Mr. Chairman, today's vote is the culmination of over a 2-year pursuit of a thoughtful, sensible and transparent solution to a serious regulatory challenge; and while the coal ash bill has continued to improve since we first debated and passed the legislation back in 2011, we have stayed true to our original principles.

First, the bill sets out strict standards for coal ash management, but it leaves the permitting program to the States. This approach is important because it ensures consistent environmental protection but gives the day-to-day implementation to the States, which have the combination of expertise and dedication to get the job done right for their States.

Second, it takes EPA's 3-year-old proposal to regulate coal ash as a hazardous waste off the table. When EPA first published this proposal, it knew that it had overreached, but EPA faced a very tough dilemma. It wanted a permit program for coal ash, but, in fact, the Solid Waste Disposal Act did not give EPA the authority over coal ash unless it were labeled "hazardous." This legislation offers a solution.

The administration has stopped asking for the "hazardous" designation—and good thing. Beginning this year, EPA stopped seeking that the Agency, instead of the States, do the permitting. The administration has come a long way, and we certainly commend it for that, but, meanwhile, we've been listening to and working with EPA.

On April 11 of this year, EPA testified before our committee. By moving past the notion that EPA should write regulations for each State, the administration finally acknowledged that the States are in the best position to implement coal ash permit programs. After our hearing, we had additional meetings with EPA to discuss the bill, and we ultimately made changes that EPA recommended, including adding tough deadlines for State action.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. UPTON. This is how the legislative process is supposed to work. The bill reflects crucial input over the last 2 years from House and Senate Republicans, Democrats and the administration.

The time has come to put our pencils down and enact this law so that we can close the regulatory gap. States, utilities, and hundreds of thousands of workers in the recycling industry have been waiting in limbo for a resolution. This bill meets those needs, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is left on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WAXMAN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member who has been very helpful on this legislation, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today, Mr. Chairman, in support of the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act.

Designating coal ash as a hazardous waste, which the EPA proposed in June 2010, would not only raise energy prices for families and businesses, but it would also destroy a large coal ash recycling industry and all of the jobs that go with it. H.R. 2218 will protect these jobs by setting minimum Federal standards that the States will be charged with implementing and by providing regulatory certainty that has ceased to exist within the coal ash industry since 2009.

If this legislation is not signed into law, the EPA will overturn 30 years of precedent and designate coal ash a hazardous waste despite findings from the Department of Energy, the Federal Highway Administration, State regulatory authorities, and the EPA itself, that the toxicity levels in coal ash are well below the criteria that require a "hazardous waste" designation. In fact, in the EPA's May 2000 regulatory determination, the EPA concluded that coal ash does not warrant regulation as a hazardous waste and that doing so would be environmentally counterproductive.

It is estimated that meeting the regulatory disposal requirements under the EPA's proposal would cost between \$250 and \$450 per ton as opposed to about \$100 per ton under the current system. In 2008, 136 million tons of coal ash were generated. That means not passing this bill could put an additional \$20- to \$47 billion burden on the electricity generators that use coal.

Energy costs aside, about 45 percent of the coal ash generated is recycled, being used as an additive in cement, concrete, wallboard, roofing materials, road-based fill materials, and snow and ice control. Designating coal ash as a hazardous waste could halt these beneficial uses, which the EPA estimates will lead to \$16.7 billion in increased costs per year.

It will provide certainty in the coal ash industry, and it strikes the appropriate balance of strong environmental protection without all of the economic consequences of a "hazardous waste" designation. I urge support of the legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a very distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I would like to thank the ranking member for allowing me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 2218, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act.

Last Congress, this Chamber twice passed legislation on a bipartisan basis that was weaker than the bill before us today. Last Congress, the effort resulted in legislation that would create a State-run waste disposal program with minimal Federal requirements while assuring that coal ash can continue to be reused and recycled in everyday products.

The legislation before the House today continues that model but with even greater environmental protections, including: accelerated requirements for groundwater monitoring; fixed deadlines for when problems at an impoundment must be cured; and periodic inspections for the structural integrity of impoundments.

Currently, there is a patchwork of State programs to regulate the disposal of coal combustion waste with no Federal oversight.

H.R. 2218 would for the first time establish comprehensive, minimum Federal standards for coal ash management and disposal and give EPA the authority to enforce compliance if a State does not establish a coal residuals permit program or if a State's program does not conform to Federal requirements.

This legislation would assure that coal ash can continue to be reused beneficially, which puts billions of dollars in our economy annually and protects tens of thousands of jobs in the beneficial reuse industry. Encouraging the beneficial reuse of coal ash ensures that less of it ends up in landfills, which is good for the environment and good for our economy.

I know some Members have concerns about the legislation, but we have worked diligently with the majority and stakeholders to make improvements in the bill. The assertions by some of my colleagues that this legislation does nothing to protect the environment are making the perfect the enemy of the good. Part of legislating is moving the ball forward, and we cannot continue to work on legislation that simply will die in the Senate. This bill is a reasonable compromise and a win-win for the American people, as it will help protect the environment and create jobs. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, before I yield back my time, I want to point out to my colleagues that this bill will not make it into law. The Senate will not accept it, and the President will not support it in its present form because it doesn't protect public health.

Coal ash contains arsenic, barium, cadmium, lead, mercury, hexavalent chromium, and other toxic materials.

It's a threat, not when the coal ash is used for other purposes, but when it's in a disposal site and leaks into our drinking water, and that's what this issue is all about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I want to thank my colleague from Texas, who has helped us move the bill forward.

I would remind my colleagues that the President has not issued a veto signal on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

□ 1000

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act.

I want to thank Mr. MCKINLEY and his staff for their hard work on this very important issue.

This commonsense legislation will empower States to safely regulate coal combustion products by fixed standards without overwhelming State budgets or customers' wallets. The recycling and reuse of coal combustion products has great economic and environmental benefits—creating jobs, reducing emissions, extending the life and durability of the Nation's roads and bridges, and reducing deposits in landfills and surface impoundments.

This legislation will provide the certainty States, utilities, and businesses depend on, all while giving the EPA the authority to protect the public should a State fail to enforce these strong standards.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a neighbor to my congressional district.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this legislation.

Every single coal mine in the State of Indiana is in my congressional district. Coal not only provides thousands of jobs for Hoosiers, but provides over 90 percent of our State's energy. Coal is a vital part of Indiana's economy, helping to keep energy prices low and supporting a robust manufacturing sector.

I disagree with the EPA's position that coal ash should be treated as a hazardous material. Coal ash has been used in all kinds of other materials like concrete and has been proven safe when used correctly and when stored correctly. In fact, the EPA's own studies, as has also been mentioned, in 1993 and 2000 have stated that coal ash is not a hazardous material. This legislation allows States to establish their own regulations for managing coal ash as long as it meets minimum Federal standards.

Coal is necessary for an all-of-the-above energy plan and is vital to our Nation's energy production that sustains good-paying jobs, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management wrote a letter in support of this bill and its safety and protection.

Now I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2218.

I heard some comments today about coal ash. Let me be very clear: coal ash maybe at one point was energetic, but the coal ash we're discussing here today is inert. It's a lot like dirt, to be quite honest. As a cochair of the Congressional Cement Caucus, I have the largest cement producing district in America.

The cement and concrete folks, the industry, is by far the Nation's largest recycler of coal combustion residuals, or CCRs or coal ash as it's better known. Each year, more than 11 million tons of coal ash is recycled in the production of concrete. So this is essential to our manufacturing sector. Domestic manufacturers typically reuse an additional 3 million tons of coal ash annually as a raw material in cement production. The coal ash used in the process serves as a substitute for key ingredients in cement, which would otherwise be mined.

Without H.R. 2218, the EPA would be able to classify coal ash as a hazardous material, which in turn would put an end to this very useful recycling. Even the continued regulatory uncertainty generated by the stalled EPA rule-making would dramatically inhibit the recycling of coal ash in domestic cement and concrete production.

This recycling includes all kinds of infrastructure products, including our roads, bridges, homes, schools, and other critical structures. Coal ash continues to be recycled in a safe and responsible manner. Whatever issues there have been with coal ash, they have largely been related to storage. This bill thoroughly addresses coal ash storage issues, which is really where we should be focused.

Again, H.R. 2218 provides the clarity needed by top recyclers to continue their efforts and to potentially increase coal ash recycling. So, again, I ask my colleagues to support passage of this important piece of legislation that will ensure the beneficial reuse of coal ash. A "yes" vote is the right vote. It is pro-manufacturing. Vote for the legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When coal ash is recycled, it is not a waste; and, therefore, EPA has no ju-

risdiction. It is not a problem. When coal ash is put into a landfill or disposal site and leaches into the water, then it is a problem. This bill doesn't address that problem. It doesn't adequately ensure protection of the public health; or if they have a law at the State level that seems to talk about public health, there's no clear enforcement of it. That is our problem with the legislation.

Recycling coal ash for any purpose doesn't make it hazardous, doesn't make it toxic. It can be reused, and we want to encourage that. But we don't want public health threatened. That's what our concern is all about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, to my colleague from California, we're waiting for a few Members. I'm not sure they are going to get here. I'm willing to have you close, and then I'll close after you're finished.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Knowing that we want to wrap up this general debate, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I will just repeat that the EPA proposed to act, and that is what has caused this whole furor. Rather than to discuss what is the appropriate balance between the EPA and the States, the Republican bill would take this away from EPA, keep them from regulating, and turn it over to the States, where the States can already act and many have. They don't need us to give them the power to act. This bill says it's up to the States. It doesn't have a uniform standard of protecting public health. It doesn't require States to have the goal of protecting the public health. And if the States achieve the goal in their legislation to protect public health, there's no guarantee of it being enforced because EPA cannot come back in and enforce the State law and citizens cannot file lawsuits. That's one of the so-called "improvements" that has been made since the last time this bill was before us. It has weakened the ability to enforce protection of public health.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and in doing so tell us to go back and work on the problem and get a real, true bipartisan bill that can be supported by the majority of the Democrats and by the President of the United States.

I urge Members to vote against the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It's been a great debate. It's been a great process. I'll just summarize some of the issues. Yes, the issue is about beneficial reuse, like this shingle here; but it's also about the storage.

We were very close to passing this legislation the last Congress, as the ranking member knows. This bill is better, as my colleague from Texas

says. There are 12 additional changes made in this bill versus last year's bill that addresses many of the concerns that the minority asked and also concerns by the Environmental Protection Agency. We worked very closely with them. That is why—and I'll say it again—the administration has not issued a veto threat on this bill. That's a signal that they may have issues, but there's not an outright veto threat on this bill. That's a signal that we've worked with them to address some of the major concerns.

Again, I want to highlight some of the special interest groups that are forcing this legislation, like the United Mine Workers, the building and construction trades, the transportation workers. Those who are historically considered in the minority's coalition are now moving to the pro-job coalition of this bill and hopefully other bills in the future.

I want to reemphasize that the EPA in 1993 and 2000 stated that coal ash does not have the characteristics of hazardous waste, including toxicity, and should not be regulated under subtitle C. That's not us. That's the EPA, and that's the EPA making that ruling twice.

We believe that the Federal Government can set standards. We believe that the Federal Government can enforce that the State do certification, and we trust the States to be able to monitor and meet the standards. That's why I listed in support the Environmental Council of the States and Indiana's Department of Environmental Management, because what they want to do is get a handle on this. And let's not confuse the issue. If the EPA is able to label fly ash as toxic, it does depress the beneficial use. So the cheap concrete that's mixed with fly ash will not be put in. The road mitigation issues which we've done will not be put in. My colleague, MARSHA BLACKBURN, did a great job talking about how we use today coal ash and fly ash.

So I want to thank my colleague, Mr. MCKINLEY, for moving this bill and my colleagues on the subcommittee, who have made the changes and moved it forward. We look forward to the debates on the amendment, and we look forward to passing the bill and sending it to the other Chamber and eventually a signature by the President of the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2218, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act. This bipartisan legislation accomplishes the safe regulation of coal ash without jeopardizing job growth, raising energy costs, or burdening industry with costly rulemaking.

H.R. 2218 establishes minimum federal requirements for the disposal of coal combustion residuals, which would be enforced by state-based permit programs. Rigid and costly EPA

rulemaking will be avoided, tens of thousands of jobs will be saved, and health and environmental concerns will be addressed in a measurable, responsible way.

According to a recent nonpartisan study, the Environmental Protection Agency's latest attempt to regulate coal ash as hazardous waste could lead to net job losses of between 184,000 and 316,000. At a time of anemic economic growth, this is unacceptable.

Of course, this most recent push is part of a broader "War on Coal" by the Obama Administration, which adheres to a radical, dogmatic notion of environmentalism at the expense of American jobs. It also proves that the President's claim of an "all of the above" approach to energy policy is an empty promise to the American people.

Like my colleagues, I care deeply about the environment—Wisconsin has some of the most beautiful hills, lakes and farmland in the country. But I also believe we should be mindful of enacting environmental policies that will have an adverse effect on jobs and economic growth. Rather than rely on stale partisan talking points, which result in inflexible, overreaching policy prescriptions, the President should work with businesses and other affected stakeholders to craft workable solutions to climate change.

We owe it to the American people to offer viable alternatives to the President's agenda. The Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act is a tremendous starting point for a bipartisan discussion on environmental issues. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense alternative to the President's War on Coal.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, our country has 676 existing coal ash impoundments in 46 States, and an unknown number of "legacy sites" that continue to pose risk to our communities—risk of contaminating the groundwater with arsenic, lead, and mercury or of experiencing catastrophic failure like we saw in the 2008 Kingston disaster. That is why action must be taken to ensure that coal ash is either recycled responsibly or disposed of properly.

However, instead of taking steps to protect the public health and prevent groundwater contamination around storage sites, today's legislation authorizes each State to create its own coal waste management permitting program, with no legal standard to ensure a minimum level of public safety. Moreover, the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service has found that the bill would give EPA "no federal backstop authority" to ensure that States enforce their standards.

Mr. Chair, rather than addressing the real danger of improperly managed coal ash, this bill risks a regulatory race to the bottom, threatening the safety of all of our citizens. I urge a no vote.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, in December 2008 an impoundment holding disposed ash waste generated by the Tennessee Valley Authority broke open, creating a massive spill in Kingston, TN. The spill covered the surrounding land and Clinch River with one billion gallons of coal ash, displaced residents, and resulted in \$1.2 billion in cleanup costs.

The accident underscored the need for rules to ensure structural stability and safety of coal ash impoundments given that U.S. electric util-

ities generate 130 million tons of coal ash every year.

In response, the Environmental Protection Agency proposed the first-ever regulations to ensure the safe disposal and management of coal ash from coal-fired power plants under the Nation's primary law for regulating solid waste, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, RCRA.

In June 2010, the EPA presented two regulatory options: regulating coal ash as hazardous waste under Subtitle C or regulating coal ash as a non-hazardous waste under Subtitle D. The EPA has not established a deadline for the final rule.

I have serious concerns that designating coal ash as a hazardous material, the result of regulating coal ash under Subtitle C, could have major impacts on the recycling and reuse of coal ash to manufacture wallboard, roofing materials and bricks, and especially concrete.

In 2008 alone, the concrete industry used 15.8 million tons of coal ash in the manufacturing of ready mixed concrete making it the most widely used supplemental cementing material. When combined with cement, coal ash improves the durability, strength, constructability, and economy of concrete.

It also has huge environmental benefits. Using coal ash—an industrial byproduct—in concrete results in longer lasting structures and reduction in the amount of waste materials sent to landfills, raw materials extracted, energy required for production, and air emissions, including carbon dioxide.

A "hazardous" designation of coal ash could put these benefits in jeopardy. It could make coal ash storage and transportation more expensive, and create a legal environment that would deter cement manufacturers from recycling coal ash in cement production.

The result would not only be devastating for the cement manufacturing industry and American jobs, it could also divert millions of tons of coal ash from beneficial uses to surface impoundments like the one that broke open in Kingston, Tennessee.

For these reasons, my preference is for EPA to regulate coal ash under Subtitle D of the Resources Conservation and Recovery Act. This would ensure we have strong regulations for surface impoundments of coal ash needed to protect public health and the environment without inhibiting the recycling and reuse of coal ash.

To ensure EPA gets that message, I supported H.R. 2273 in 2011. The Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act was not a perfect bill. In fact, this bill could have been much simpler and likely noncontroversial if my Republican colleagues had just legislated Subtitle D of RCRA. It was my hope that the U.S. Senate would take this more targeted approach.

Thankfully, in June of 2013, the EPA published a Federal Register notice indicating a preference for regulating coal ash under subtitle D. I appreciate EPA's willingness to be pragmatic and balance the needs of recyclers to achieve greater environmental protection.

Today we are voting on H.R. 2218, the latest version of the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act. While the bill has been marginally improved, I believe it is no longer necessary. Assuming the EPA regulates coal ash

under Subtitle D, the recycling and reuse of coal ash will not be jeopardized, eliminating the need for legislation. By voting against H.R. 2218, I am thanking EPA for its pragmatic reconsideration of the June 2010 draft rule and for providing certainty for coal ash recyclers.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I oppose H.R. 2218, the so-called Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act. There are many problems with this legislation. It ignores the significant public health concerns around coal ash, which includes potent toxins such as mercury, lead, and sulfur. It does nothing to ensure the safe disposal of coal ash, and in fact allows a state-by-state race to the bottom. Finally, it preempts citizens from taking legal action to protect themselves in situations where public health is endangered.

I am particularly troubled by the fact that this legislation significantly restructures environmental regulatory authority by stripping the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, of its ability to enforce any regulations around coal ash disposal. Protecting public health is part of what the EPA was created to do and we must give them the tools to be able to fulfill their mission. I strongly oppose this legislation.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2218

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act of 2013".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Management and disposal of coal combustion residuals.
- Sec. 3. 2000 regulatory determination.
- Sec. 4. Technical assistance.
- Sec. 5. Federal Power Act.

SEC. 2. MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSAL OF COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUALS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6941 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 4011. MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSAL OF COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUALS.

"(a) STATE PERMIT PROGRAMS FOR COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUALS.—Each State may adopt, implement, and enforce a coal combustion residuals permit program if such State provides the notification required under subsection (b)(1), and the certification required under subsection (b)(2).

"(b) STATE ACTIONS.—

"(1) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this section (except as provided by the deadline identified under subsection (d)(3)(B)), the Governor of each State shall notify the Administrator, in writing, whether such State will adopt and implement a coal combustion residuals permit program.

“(2) CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 36 months after the date of enactment of this section (except as provided in subsection (f)(1)(A)), in the case of a State that has notified the Administrator that it will implement a coal combustion residuals permit program, the head of the lead State implementing agency shall submit to the Administrator a certification that such coal combustion residuals permit program meets the requirements described in subsection (c).

“(B) **CONTENTS.**—A certification submitted under this paragraph shall include—

“(i) a letter identifying the lead State implementing agency, signed by the head of such agency;

“(ii) identification of any other State agencies involved with the implementation of the coal combustion residuals permit program;

“(iii) an explanation of how the State coal combustion residuals permit program meets the requirements of this section, including a description of the State’s—

“(I) process to inspect or otherwise determine compliance with such permit program;

“(II) process to enforce the requirements of such permit program;

“(III) public participation process for the promulgation, amendment, or repeal of regulations for, and the issuance of permits under, such permit program;

“(IV) statutes, regulations, or policies pertaining to public access to information, such as groundwater monitoring data; and

“(V) statutes, regulations, or policies pertaining to structural integrity or dam safety that may be applied to structures through such permit program;

“(iv) a certification that the State has in effect, at the time of certification, statutes or regulations necessary to implement a coal combustion residuals permit program that meets the requirements described in subsection (c); and

“(v) copies of State statutes and regulations described in clause (iv).

“(C) **UPDATES.**—A State may update the certification as needed to reflect changes to the coal combustion residuals permit program.

“(3) **MAINTENANCE OF 4005(c) OR 3006 PROGRAM.**—In order to adopt or implement a coal combustion residuals permit program under this section (including pursuant to subsection (f)), the State implementing agency shall maintain an approved permit program or other system of prior approval and conditions under section 4005(c) or an authorized program under section 3006.

“(c) **REQUIREMENTS FOR A COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUALS PERMIT PROGRAM.**—A coal combustion residuals permit program shall consist of the following:

“(1) GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The implementing agency shall—

“(i) apply the subset of the revised criteria described in paragraph (2) to owners or operators of structures, including surface impoundments, that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section;

“(ii) with respect to structures that are receiving coal combustion residuals as of the date of enactment of this section, take the actions required under paragraph (3);

“(iii) impose requirements for surface impoundments that do not meet certain criteria pursuant to paragraph (4); and

“(iv) require that closure of structures occur in accordance with paragraph (5).

“(B) STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY.—

“(i) **ENGINEERING CERTIFICATION.**—The implementing agency shall require that an independent registered professional engineer certify that—

“(I) the design of each structure that receives coal combustion residuals on or after the date of

enactment of this section is in accordance with recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices for containment of the maximum volume of coal combustion residuals and liquids which can be impounded therein; and

“(II) the construction and maintenance of the structure will ensure structural stability.

“(ii) **EMERGENCY ACTION PLAN.**—The implementing agency shall require that the owner or operator of any structure that is a surface impoundment that receives coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section and that is classified by the State as posing a high hazard potential pursuant to the guidelines published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency entitled ‘Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety: Hazard Potential Classification System for Dams’ (FEMA Publication Number 333) prepare and maintain an emergency action plan that identifies responsible persons and actions to be taken in the event of a dam safety emergency.

“(iii) INSPECTION.—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—The implementing agency shall require that structures that are surface impoundments that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section be inspected not less than annually by an independent registered professional engineer to assure that the design, operation, and maintenance of the surface impoundment is in accordance with recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices for containment of the maximum volume of coal combustion residuals and liquids which can be impounded therein, so as to ensure dam stability.

“(II) **POTENTIALLY HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS.**—The implementing agency shall require that if an inspection under subclause (I), or a periodic evaluation under clause (iv), reveals a potentially hazardous condition, the owner or operator of the structure shall immediately take action to mitigate the potentially hazardous condition and notify appropriate State and local first responders.

“(iv) **PERIODIC EVALUATION.**—The implementing agency shall require that structures that are surface impoundments that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section be periodically evaluated for appearances of structural weakness.

“(v) DEFICIENCY.—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—If the head of the implementing agency determines that a structure is deficient with respect to the requirements in clause (i), (iii), or (iv), the head of the agency has the authority to require action to correct the deficiency according to a schedule determined by the agency.

“(II) **UNCORRECTED DEFICIENCIES.**—If a deficiency is not corrected according to the schedule, the head of the implementing agency has the authority to require that the structure close in accordance with paragraph (5).

“(III) **DAM SAFETY CONSULTATION.**—In the case of a structure that is a surface impoundment, the head of the implementing agency shall, in making a determination under subclause (I), consult with appropriate State dam safety officials.

“(C) **LOCATION.**—The implementing agency shall require that structures that first receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section shall be constructed with a base located a minimum of 2 feet above the upper limit of the water table, unless it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the implementing agency that—

“(i) the hydrogeologic characteristics of a structure and surrounding land would preclude such a requirement; and

“(ii) the function and integrity of the liner system will not be adversely impacted by contact with the water table.

“(D) WIND DISPERSAL.—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The implementing agency shall require that owners or operators of structures that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section address wind dispersal of dust by requiring cover, or by wetting coal combustion residuals with water to a moisture content that prevents wind dispersal, facilitates compaction, and does not result in free liquids.

“(ii) **ALTERNATIVE METHODS.**—Subject to the review and approval by the implementing agency, owners or operators of structures that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section may propose alternative methods to address wind dispersal of dust that will provide comparable or more effective control of dust.

“(E) **PERMITS.**—The implementing agency shall require that owners or operators of structures that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section apply for and obtain permits incorporating the requirements of the coal combustion residuals permit program.

“(F) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.**—Except for information with respect to which disclosure is prohibited under section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, the implementing agency shall ensure that—

“(i) documents for permit determinations are made available for public review and comment under the public participation process described in subsection (b)(2)(B)(iii)(III) or in subsection (e)(6), as applicable;

“(ii) final determinations on permit applications are made known to the public; and

“(iii) groundwater monitoring data collected under paragraph (2) is publicly available.

“(G) AGENCY AUTHORITY.—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The implementing agency has the authority to—

“(I) obtain information necessary to determine whether the owner or operator of a structure is in compliance with the requirements of this subsection;

“(II) conduct or require monitoring and testing to ensure that structures are in compliance with the requirements of this subsection; and

“(III) enter, at reasonable times, any site or premise subject to the coal combustion residuals permit program for the purpose of inspecting structures and reviewing records relevant to the design, operation, and maintenance of structures.

“(ii) **MONITORING AND TESTING.**—If monitoring or testing is conducted under clause (i)(II) by or for the implementing agency, the implementing agency shall, if requested, provide to the owner or operator—

“(I) a written description of the monitoring or testing completed;

“(II) at the time of sampling, a portion of each sample equal in volume or weight to the portion retained by or for the implementing agency; and

“(III) a copy of the results of any analysis of samples collected by or for the implementing agency.

“(2) **REVISED CRITERIA.**—The subset of the revised criteria referred to in paragraph (1)(A)(i) are as follows:

“(A) **DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.**—For new structures, and lateral expansions of existing structures, that first receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section, the revised criteria regarding design requirements described in section 258.40 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, except that the leachate collection system requirements described in section 258.40(a)(2) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, do not apply to structures that are surface impoundments.

“(B) **GROUNDWATER MONITORING AND CORRECTIVE ACTION.**—For all structures that receive

coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section, the revised criteria regarding groundwater monitoring and corrective action requirements described in subpart E of part 258 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, except that, for the purposes of this subparagraph, the revised criteria shall also include—

“(i) for the purposes of detection monitoring, the constituents boron, chloride, conductivity, fluoride, mercury, pH, sulfate, sulfide, and total dissolved solids; and

“(ii) for the purposes of assessment monitoring, establishing a groundwater protection standard, and assessment of corrective measures, the constituents aluminum, boron, chloride, fluoride, iron, manganese, molybdenum, pH, sulfate, and total dissolved solids.

“(C) CLOSURE.—For all structures that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section, in a manner consistent with paragraph (5), the revised criteria for closure described in subsections (a) through (c) and (h) through (j) of section 258.60 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(D) POST-CLOSURE.—For all structures that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section, the revised criteria for post-closure care described in section 258.61 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, except for the requirement described in subsection (a)(4) of that section.

“(E) LOCATION RESTRICTIONS.—The revised criteria for location restrictions described in—

“(i) for new structures, and lateral expansions of existing structures, that first receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section, sections 258.11 through 258.15 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(ii) for existing structures that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section, sections 258.11 and 258.15 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(F) AIR QUALITY.—For all structures that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section, the revised criteria for air quality described in section 258.24 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(G) FINANCIAL ASSURANCE.—For all structures that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section, the revised criteria for financial assurance described in subpart G of part 258 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(H) SURFACE WATER.—For all structures that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section, the revised criteria for surface water described in section 258.27 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(I) RECORDKEEPING.—For all structures that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section, the revised criteria for recordkeeping described in section 258.29 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(J) RUN-ON AND RUN-OFF CONTROL SYSTEMS FOR LAND-BASED UNITS.—For all landfills and other land-based units, other than surface impoundments, that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section, the revised criteria for run-on and run-off control systems described in section 258.26 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(K) RUN-OFF CONTROL SYSTEMS FOR SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS.—For all surface impoundments that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section, the revised criteria for run-off control systems described in section 258.26(a)(2) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(3) PERMIT PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION FOR EXISTING STRUCTURES.—

“(A) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than the date on which a State submits a certification under subsection (b)(2), not later than 30 months after

the Administrator receives notice under subsection (e)(1)(A), or not later than 36 months after the date of enactment of this section with respect to a coal combustion residuals permit program that is being implemented by the Administrator under subsection (e)(3), as applicable, the implementing agency shall notify owners or operators of structures that are receiving coal combustion residuals as of the date of enactment of this section within the State of—

“(i) the obligation to apply for and obtain a permit under subparagraph (C); and

“(ii) the requirements referred to in subparagraph (B).

“(B) COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 12 months after the date on which a State submits a certification under subsection (b)(2), not later than 42 months after the Administrator receives notice under subsection (e)(1)(A), or not later than 48 months after the date of enactment of this section with respect to a coal combustion residuals permit program that is being implemented by the Administrator under subsection (e)(3), as applicable, the implementing agency shall require owners or operators of structures that are receiving coal combustion residuals as of the date of enactment of this section to comply with—

“(i) the requirements under paragraphs (1)(B)(ii) and (iii), (1)(D), (2)(B), (2)(F), (2)(H), (2)(J), and (2)(K); and

“(ii) the groundwater recordkeeping requirement described in section 258.29(a)(5) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(C) PERMITS.—

“(i) PERMIT DEADLINE.—Not later than 48 months after the date on which a State submits a certification under subsection (b)(2), not later than 78 months after the Administrator receives notice under subsection (e)(1)(A), or not later than 84 months after the date of enactment of this section with respect to a coal combustion residuals permit program that is being implemented by the Administrator under subsection (e)(3), as applicable, the implementing agency shall issue, with respect to a structure that is receiving coal combustion residuals as of the date of enactment of this section, a final permit incorporating the requirements of the coal combustion residuals permit program, or a final denial for an application submitted requesting such a permit.

“(ii) APPLICATION DEADLINE.—The implementing agency shall identify, in collaboration with the owner or operator of a structure described in clause (i), a reasonable deadline by which the owner or operator shall submit a permit application under such clause.

“(D) INTERIM OPERATION.—

“(i) PRIOR TO DEADLINES.—With respect to any period of time on or after the date of enactment of this section but prior to the applicable deadline in subparagraph (B), the owner or operator of a structure that is receiving coal combustion residuals as of the date of enactment of this section may continue to operate such structure until such applicable deadline under the applicable authority in effect.

“(ii) PRIOR TO PERMIT.—Unless the implementing agency determines that the structure should close pursuant to paragraph (5), if the owner or operator of a structure that is receiving coal combustion residuals as of the date of enactment of this section meets the requirements referred to in subparagraph (B) by the applicable deadline in such subparagraph, the owner or operator may operate the structure until such time as the implementing agency issues, under subparagraph (C), a final permit incorporating the requirements of the coal combustion residuals permit program, or a final denial for an application submitted requesting such a permit.

“(4) REQUIREMENTS FOR SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS THAT DO NOT MEET CERTAIN CRITERIA.—

“(A) SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS THAT REQUIRE ASSESSMENT OF CORRECTIVE MEASURES WITHIN 10 YEARS OF THE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the groundwater monitoring and corrective action requirements described in paragraph (2)(B), the implementing agency shall require a surface impoundment that receives coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section to comply with the requirements in clause (ii) of this subparagraph and clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (D) if the surface impoundment—

“(I) does not—

“(aa) have a liner system described in section 258.40(b) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(bb) meet the design criteria described in section 258.40(a)(1) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(II) within 10 years after the date of enactment of this section, is required under section 258.56(a) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, to undergo an assessment of corrective measures for any constituent covered under subpart E of part 258 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, or otherwise identified in paragraph (2)(B)(ii) of this subsection, for which assessment groundwater monitoring is required.

“(ii) DEADLINE TO MEET GROUNDWATER PROTECTION STANDARD.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the implementing agency shall require that the groundwater protection standard, for surface impoundments identified in clause (i) of this subparagraph, established by the implementing agency under section 258.55(h) or 258.55(i) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, for any constituent for which corrective measures are required shall be met—

“(I) as soon as practicable at the relevant point of compliance, as described in section 258.40(d) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(II) not later than 10 years after the date of enactment of this section.

“(B) SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS SUBJECT TO A STATE CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUIREMENT AS OF THE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the groundwater monitoring and corrective action requirements described in paragraph (2)(B), the implementing agency shall require a surface impoundment that receives coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section to comply with the requirements in clause (ii) of this subparagraph and clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (D) if the surface impoundment—

“(I) does not—

“(aa) have a liner system described in section 258.40(b) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(bb) meet the design criteria described in section 258.40(a)(1) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(II) as of the date of enactment of this section, is subject to a State corrective action requirement.

“(ii) DEADLINE TO MEET GROUNDWATER PROTECTION STANDARD.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the implementing agency shall require that the groundwater protection standard, for surface impoundments identified in clause (i) of this subparagraph, established by the implementing agency under section 258.55(h) or 258.55(i) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, for any constituent for which corrective measures are required shall be met—

“(I) as soon as practicable at the relevant point of compliance, as described in section 258.40(d) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(II) not later than 8 years after the date of enactment of this section.

“(C) EXTENSION OF DEADLINE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii) of this subparagraph, the deadline for meeting a groundwater protection standard under subparagraph (A)(ii) or (B)(ii) may be extended by the implementing agency, after opportunity for public notice and comment under the public participation process described in subsection (b)(2)(B)(iii)(III), or in subsection (e)(6) based on—

“(I) the effectiveness of any interim measures implemented by the owner or operator of the facility under section 258.58(a)(3) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(II) the level of progress demonstrated in meeting the groundwater protection standard;

“(III) the potential for other adverse human health or environmental exposures attributable to the contamination from the surface impoundment undergoing corrective action; and

“(IV) the lack of available alternative management capacity for the coal combustion residuals and related materials managed in the impoundment at the facility at which the impoundment is located if the owner or operator has used best efforts, as necessary, to design, obtain any necessary permits, finance, construct, and render operational the alternative management capacity during the time period for meeting a groundwater protection standard in subparagraph (A)(ii) or (B)(ii).

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—The deadline under subparagraph (A)(ii) or (B)(ii) shall not be extended if there has been contamination of public or private drinking water systems attributable to a surface impoundment undergoing corrective action, unless the contamination has been addressed by providing a permanent replacement water system.

“(D) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) CLOSURE.—If the deadline under subparagraph (A)(ii), (B)(ii), or (C) is not satisfied, the surface impoundment shall cease receiving coal combustion residuals and initiate closure under paragraph (5).

“(ii) INTERIM MEASURES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subclause (II), not later than 90 days after the date on which the assessment of corrective measures is initiated, the owner or operator of a surface impoundment described in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall implement interim measures, as necessary, under the factors in section 258.58(a)(3) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(II) IMPOUNDMENTS SUBJECT TO STATE CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUIREMENT AS OF THE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—Subclause (I) shall only apply to surface impoundments subject to a State corrective action requirement as of the date of enactment of this section if the owner or operator has not implemented interim measures, as necessary, under the factors in section 258.58(a)(3) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(E) SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS THAT REQUIRE ASSESSMENT OF CORRECTIVE MEASURES MORE THAN 10 YEARS AFTER DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the groundwater monitoring and corrective action requirements described in paragraph (2)(B), the implementing agency shall require a surface impoundment that receives coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section to comply with the requirements in clause (ii) if the surface impoundment—

“(I) does not—

“(aa) have a liner system described in section 258.40(b) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(bb) meet the design criteria described in section 258.40(a)(1) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(II) more than 10 years after the date of enactment of this section, is required under section 258.56(a) title 40, Code of Federal Regulations,

to undergo an assessment of corrective measures for any constituent covered under subpart E of part 258 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, or otherwise identified in paragraph (2)(B)(ii) of this subsection, for which assessment groundwater monitoring is required.

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—

“(I) CLOSURE.—The surface impoundments identified in clause (i) shall cease receiving coal combustion residuals and initiate closure in accordance with paragraph (5) after alternative management capacity at the facility is available for the coal combustion residuals and related materials managed in the impoundment.

“(II) BEST EFFORTS.—The alternative management capacity shall be developed as soon as practicable with the owner or operator using best efforts to design, obtain necessary permits for, finance, construct, and render operational the alternative management capacity.

“(III) ALTERNATIVE CAPACITY MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The owner or operator shall, in collaboration with the implementing agency, prepare a written plan that describes the steps necessary to develop the alternative management capacity and includes a schedule for completion.

“(IV) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—The plan described in subclause (III) shall be subject to public notice and comment under the public participation process described in subsection (b)(2)(B)(iii)(III) or in subsection (e)(6), as applicable.

“(5) CLOSURE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If it is determined by the implementing agency that a structure should close because the requirements of a coal combustion residuals permit program are not being satisfied with respect to such structure, or if it is determined by the owner or operator that a structure should close, the time period and method for the closure of such structure shall be set forth in a closure plan that establishes a deadline for completion of closure as soon as practicable and that takes into account the nature and the site-specific characteristics of the structure to be closed.

“(B) SURFACE IMPOUNDMENT.—In the case of a surface impoundment, the closure plan under subparagraph (A) shall require, at a minimum, the removal of liquid and the stabilization of remaining waste, as necessary to support the final cover.

“(d) FEDERAL REVIEW OF STATE PERMIT PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall provide to a State written notice and an opportunity to remedy deficiencies in accordance with paragraph (3) if at any time the State—

“(A) does not satisfy the notification requirement under subsection (b)(1);

“(B) has not submitted a certification required under subsection (b)(2);

“(C) does not satisfy the maintenance requirement under subsection (b)(3);

“(D) is not implementing a coal combustion residuals permit program, with respect to which the State has submitted a certification under subsection (b)(2), that meets the requirements described in subsection (c);

“(E) is not implementing a coal combustion residuals permit program, with respect to which the State has submitted a certification under subsection (b)(2)—

“(i) that is consistent with such certification; and

“(ii) for which the State continues to have in effect statutes or regulations necessary to implement such program; or

“(F) does not make available to the Administrator, within 90 days of a written request, specific information necessary for the Administrator to ascertain whether the State has satisfied the requirements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E).

“(2) REQUEST.—If a request described in paragraph (1)(F) is proposed pursuant to a petition to the Administrator, the Administrator shall only make the request if the Administrator does not possess the information necessary to ascertain whether the State has satisfied the requirements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of such paragraph.

“(3) CONTENTS OF NOTICE; DEADLINE FOR RESPONSE.—A notice provided under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) include findings of the Administrator detailing any applicable deficiencies described in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of paragraph (1); and

“(B) identify, in collaboration with the State, a reasonable deadline by which the State shall remedy such applicable deficiencies, which shall be—

“(i) in the case of a deficiency described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (1), not earlier than 180 days after the date on which the State receives the notice; and

“(ii) in the case of a deficiency described in paragraph (1)(F), not later than 90 days after the date on which the State receives the notice.

“(4) CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING DEFICIENCY OF STATE PERMIT PROGRAM.—In making a determination whether a State has failed to satisfy the requirements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (1), or a determination under subsection (e)(1)(B), the Administrator shall consider, as appropriate—

“(A) whether the State's statutes or regulations to implement a coal combustion residuals permit program are not sufficient to meet the requirements described in subsection (c) because of—

“(i) failure of the State to promulgate or enact new statutes or regulations when necessary; or

“(ii) action by a State legislature or court striking down or limiting such State statutes or regulations;

“(B) whether the operation of the State coal combustion residuals permit program fails to comply with the requirements of subsection (c) because of—

“(i) failure of the State to issue permits as required in subsection (c)(1)(E);

“(ii) repeated issuance of permits by the State which do not meet the requirements of subsection (c);

“(iii) failure of the State to comply with the public participation requirements of this section; or

“(iv) failure of the State to implement corrective action requirements as described in subsection (c)(2)(B); and

“(C) whether the enforcement of a State coal combustion residuals permit program fails to comply with the requirements of this section because of—

“(i) failure to act on violations of permits, as identified by the State; or

“(ii) repeated failure by the State to inspect or otherwise determine compliance pursuant to the process identified in subsection (b)(2)(B)(iii)(I).

“(e) IMPLEMENTATION BY ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(1) FEDERAL BACKSTOP AUTHORITY.—The Administrator shall implement a coal combustion residuals permit program for a State only if—

“(A) the Governor of the State notifies the Administrator under subsection (b)(1) that the State will not adopt and implement a permit program;

“(B) the State has received a notice under subsection (d) and the Administrator determines, after providing a 30-day period for notice and public comment, that the State has failed, by the deadline identified in the notice under subsection (d)(3)(B), to remedy the deficiencies detailed in the notice under subsection (d)(3)(A); or

“(C) the State informs the Administrator, in writing, that such State will no longer implement such a permit program.

“(2) REVIEW.—A State may obtain a review of a determination by the Administrator under this subsection as if the determination was a final regulation for purposes of section 7006.

“(3) OTHER STRUCTURES.—For structures that receive coal combustion residuals on or after the date of enactment of this section located on property within the exterior boundaries of a State that the State does not have authority or jurisdiction to regulate, the Administrator shall implement a coal combustion residuals permit program only for those structures.

“(4) REQUIREMENTS.—If the Administrator implements a coal combustion residuals permit program for a State under paragraph (1) or (3), the permit program shall consist of the requirements described in subsection (c).

“(5) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator implements a coal combustion residuals permit program for a State under paragraph (1)—

“(i) the authorities referred to in section 4005(c)(2)(A) shall apply with respect to coal combustion residuals and structures for which the Administrator is implementing the coal combustion residuals permit program; and

“(ii) the Administrator may use those authorities to inspect, gather information, and enforce the requirements of this section in the State.

“(B) OTHER STRUCTURES.—If the Administrator implements a coal combustion residuals permit program under paragraph (3)—

“(i) the authorities referred to in section 4005(c)(2)(A) shall apply with respect to coal combustion residuals and structures for which the Administrator is implementing the coal combustion residuals permit program; and

“(ii) the Administrator may use those authorities to inspect, gather information, and enforce the requirements of this section for the structures for which the Administrator is implementing the coal combustion residuals permit program.

“(6) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS.—If the Administrator implements a coal combustion residuals permit program for a State under this subsection, the Administrator shall provide a 30-day period for the public participation process required in paragraphs (1)(F)(i), (4)(C)(i), and (4)(E)(ii)(IV) of subsection (c).

“(f) STATE CONTROL AFTER IMPLEMENTATION BY ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(1) STATE CONTROL.—

“(A) NEW ADOPTION, OR RESUMPTION OF, AND IMPLEMENTATION BY STATE.—For a State for which the Administrator is implementing a coal combustion residuals permit program under subsection (e)(1)(A), or subsection (e)(1)(C), the State may adopt and implement such a permit program by—

“(i) notifying the Administrator that the State will adopt and implement such a permit program;

“(ii) not later than 6 months after the date of such notification, submitting to the Administrator a certification under subsection (b)(2); and

“(iii) receiving from the Administrator—

“(I) a determination, after providing a 30-day period for notice and public comment, that the State coal combustion residuals permit program meets the requirements described in subsection (c); and

“(II) a timeline for transition of control of the coal combustion residuals permit program.

“(B) REMEDYING DEFICIENT PERMIT PROGRAM.—For a State for which the Administrator is implementing a coal combustion residuals permit program under subsection (e)(1)(B), the State may adopt and implement such a permit program by—

“(i) remedying only the deficiencies detailed in the notice pursuant to subsection (d)(3)(A); and

“(ii) receiving from the Administrator—

“(I) a determination, after providing a 30-day period for notice and public comment, that the deficiencies detailed in such notice have been remedied; and

“(II) a timeline for transition of control of the coal combustion residuals permit program.

“(2) REVIEW OF DETERMINATION.—

“(A) DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—The Administrator shall make a determination under paragraph (1) not later than 90 days after the date on which the State submits a certification under paragraph (1)(A)(ii), or notifies the Administrator that the deficiencies have been remedied pursuant to paragraph (1)(B)(i), as applicable.

“(B) REVIEW.—A State may obtain a review of a determination by the Administrator under paragraph (1) as if such determination was a final regulation for purposes of section 7006.

“(3) IMPLEMENTATION DURING TRANSITION.—

“(A) EFFECT ON ACTIONS AND ORDERS.—Program requirements of, and actions taken or orders issued pursuant to, a coal combustion residuals permit program shall remain in effect if—

“(i) a State takes control of its coal combustion residuals permit program from the Administrator under paragraph (1); or

“(ii) the Administrator takes control of a coal combustion residuals permit program from a State under subsection (e).

“(B) CHANGE IN REQUIREMENTS.—Subparagraph (A) shall apply to such program requirements, actions, and orders until such time as—

“(i) the implementing agency changes the requirements of the coal combustion residuals permit program with respect to the basis for the action or order; or

“(ii) the State or the Administrator, whichever took the action or issued the order, certifies the completion of a corrective action that is the subject of the action or order.

“(4) SINGLE PERMIT PROGRAM.—If a State adopts and implements a coal combustion residuals permit program under this subsection, the Administrator shall cease to implement the permit program implemented under subsection (e)(1) for such State.

“(g) EFFECT ON DETERMINATION UNDER 4005(c) OR 3006.—The Administrator shall not consider the implementation of a coal combustion residuals permit program by the Administrator under subsection (e) in making a determination of approval for a permit program or other system of prior approval and conditions under section 4005(c) or of authorization for a program under section 3006.

“(h) AUTHORITY.—

“(1) STATE AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section shall preclude or deny any right of any State to adopt or enforce any regulation or requirement respecting coal combustion residuals that is more stringent or broader in scope than a regulation or requirement under this section.

“(2) AUTHORITY OF THE ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (d) and (e) and section 6005, the Administrator shall, with respect to the regulation of coal combustion residuals, defer to the States pursuant to this section.

“(B) IMMINENT HAZARD.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the authority of the Administrator under section 7003 with respect to coal combustion residuals.

“(C) ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ONLY UPON REQUEST.—Upon request from the head of a lead State agency that is implementing a coal combustion residuals permit program, the Administrator may provide to such State agency only the enforcement assistance requested.

“(D) CONCURRENT ENFORCEMENT.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the Administrator shall not have concurrent enforcement authority when a State is implementing a coal

combustion residuals permit program, including during any period of interim operation described in subsection (c)(3)(D).

“(E) OTHER AUTHORITY.—The Administrator shall not have authority to finalize the proposed rule published at pages 35128 through 35264 of volume 75 of the Federal Register (June 21, 2010).

“(F) OTHER RESPONSE AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the authority of the Administrator under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) with respect to coal combustion residuals.

“(3) CITIZEN SUITS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the authority of a person to commence a civil action in accordance with section 7002.

“(i) MINE RECLAMATION ACTIVITIES.—A coal combustion residuals permit program implemented by the Administrator under subsection (e) shall not apply to the utilization, placement, and storage of coal combustion residuals at surface mining and reclamation operations.

“(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUALS.—The term ‘coal combustion residuals’ means—

“(A) the solid wastes listed in section 3001(b)(3)(A)(i), including recoverable materials from such wastes;

“(B) coal combustion wastes that are co-managed with wastes produced in conjunction with the combustion of coal, provided that such wastes are not segregated and disposed of separately from the coal combustion wastes and comprise a relatively small proportion of the total wastes being disposed in the structure;

“(C) fluidized bed combustion wastes;

“(D) wastes from the co-burning of coal with non-hazardous secondary materials, provided that coal makes up at least 50 percent of the total fuel burned; and

“(E) wastes from the co-burning of coal with materials described in subparagraph (A) that are recovered from monofills.

“(2) COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUALS PERMIT PROGRAM.—The term ‘coal combustion residuals permit program’ means all of the authorities, activities, and procedures that comprise the system of prior approval and conditions implemented by or for a State to regulate the management and disposal of coal combustion residuals.

“(3) CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS.—The term ‘Code of Federal Regulations’ means the Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this section) or any successor regulations.

“(4) IMPLEMENTING AGENCY.—The term ‘implementing agency’ means the agency responsible for implementing a coal combustion residuals permit program for a State, which shall either be the lead State implementing agency identified under subsection (b)(2)(B)(i) or the Administrator pursuant to subsection (e).

“(5) PERMIT; PRIOR APPROVAL AND CONDITIONS.—Except as provided in subsections (b)(3) and (g), the terms ‘permit’ and ‘prior approval and conditions’ mean any authorization, license, or equivalent control document that incorporates the requirements of subsection (c).

“(6) REVISED CRITERIA.—The term ‘revised criteria’ means the criteria promulgated for municipal solid waste landfill units under section 4004(a) and under section 1008(a)(3), as revised under section 4010(c).

“(7) STRUCTURE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘structure’ means a landfill, surface impoundment, or other land-based unit which receives, or is intended to receive, coal combustion residuals.

“(B) DE MINIMIS RECEIPT.—The term ‘structure’ does not include any land-based unit that

receives only de minimis quantities of coal combustion residuals if the presence of coal combustion residuals is incidental to the material managed in the unit.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in section 1001 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4010 the following:

“Sec. 4011. Management and disposal of coal combustion residuals.”.

SEC. 3. 2000 REGULATORY DETERMINATION.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed to alter in any manner the Environmental Protection Agency's regulatory determination entitled “Notice of Regulatory Determination on Wastes From the Combustion of Fossil Fuels”, published at 65 Fed. Reg. 32214 (May 22, 2000), that the fossil fuel combustion wastes addressed in that determination do not warrant regulation under subtitle C of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6921 et seq.).

SEC. 4. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed to affect the authority of a State to request, or the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to provide, technical assistance under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.).

SEC. 5. FEDERAL POWER ACT.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed to affect the obligations of an owner or operator of a structure (as defined in section 4011 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as added by this Act) under section 215(b)(1) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o(b)(1)).

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 113-174. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 113-174.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 4, strike “and”.

Page 6, line 6, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 6, after line 6, insert the following new clause:

“(vi) an emergency action plan for State response to a leak or spill at a structure that receives coal combustion residuals.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a commonsense amendment to

ensure that every State that chooses to allow coal ash impoundments as outlined in this bill has a strong emergency response plan in the unfortunate event of a leak or spill.

Sadly, the 2008 failure of a coal ash impoundment in Kingston, Tennessee, highlights the very devastation a spill can have on a community. As was widely reported at the time, a breach in a surface impoundment pond at the Tennessee Valley Authority's Kingston facility released more than 5 million cubic yards of coal ash, covering more than 300 acres in toxic sludge, damaging and destroying homes and property. As we speak, there is still a Federal Superfund cleanup site where the total cost could top more than \$1.2 billion. Absent a plan, what could go wrong?

Beyond that staggering price tag, let us not forget that the lasting economic and health impacts in the surrounding communities resulting from this spill are catastrophic. Families were displaced from their homes. Some residents still suffer from respiratory illnesses and other side effects. Arsenic levels where the Kingston coal ash runoff were disposed of are measured at 80 times higher than the amount legally allowed under the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the EPA already has said such exposure significantly increases a lifetime risk of cancer. These are just the impacts we know of today. Who knows what the unknown health consequences might be.

The Kingston incident is not an isolated event, sadly. According to Earthjustice, there have been more than 211 known cases of coal ash contamination and spills in 37 different States. According to the EPA, 45 impoundments are currently considered high hazard, meaning that a failure will probably cause loss of human life. Of course, this bill doesn't concern itself with those problems or apply the lessons learned.

In response to the Kingston incident, former Tennessee Governor Phil Bredesen even acknowledged that “the State's environmental regulations, mostly written in the 1970s, don't take into account a disaster such as the ash spill and need a top to bottom review.”

□ 1015

And he said we need a top-to-bottom review of those policies.

As we have already seen, the Federal Government is forced to step in when disasters such as these take place. Yet, rather than make the Federal Government a partner, or even a resource, this bill turns sole responsibility over to the States. There ought to be a clear minimum set of standards for EPA to identify and remedy State program deficiencies, stronger groundwater protection standards, and clear and appropriate authority for taking potential corrective action on unlined or leaking

impoundments. That seems common sense.

The original amendment would have ensured that States certify their coal ash permitting plans annually, including up-to-date emergency response plans. The House majority thought regular reporting was nothing more than a paperwork exercise, so I now offer this revised amendment in keeping with their concerns to ensure, at a minimum, that States have thorough and comprehensive emergency response plans to address a spill or a leak. We cannot simply count on private enterprise to be prepared for a spill. The State and local governments, who are the first responders, must be active partners. By requiring them to provide EPA simply their own emergency response plans, we are taking a modest step to ensure they are prepared to respond to an emergency.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I claim the time in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague for working with us and making some changes that we thought were appropriate.

We agree with my colleague from Virginia that States should identify what their emergency response procedures are in the certification process, and so we are prepared to accept the amendment. He's made it a better bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, and I look forward to working with him.

I yield to the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I support your amendment and urge all of our colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the gentleman.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 113-174.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, strike lines 22 and 23 and insert the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The implementing agency shall apply, and structures shall meet, requirements as necessary to protect human health and the environment.

“(B) CRITERIA.—The implementing agency shall—

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, under all of our environmental laws, the Federal Government sets a standard, and then the States implement the law looking at the different circumstances in their community. For example, the Clean Air Act says, in effect, everywhere in this country, we cannot have air pollution that exceeds the standard to protect the public health, but the States decide the implementation to achieve that standard.

Under this bill, we're not setting a national standard. We're telling the States to set a standard. If we're going to let the States set the standard, my amendment would require that the standard in every State be to protect the public health, to protect human health and the environment. That's the goal of these laws, and that should be the requirement under this law.

The standards are the yardsticks under which we determine whether a State's effort measures up and ensures a consistent level of protection throughout the Nation. If we're not going to have a national standard by EPA, let's require the State to set that standard. This is an approach that has worked well because it ensures that all Americans enjoy a minimum level of protection and residents of one State are not threatened by inadequate laws in a neighboring State.

For example, if one State has a good, strong law to protect the public health, another State, trying to get the business away from that State to locate in theirs, will drop their standards lower to try to entice that business to relocate. The laxest protection becomes the dumping ground for the neighboring States. We don't want to put States in a race to the bottom.

When Congress passed the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, we assigned EPA a simple mission: to protect human health and the environment from unsafe disposal of solid waste. Achieving that mission can be complex, but we have a clear goal. It provides direction for the Agency's technical work. But the bill we are considering today doesn't contain this standard.

Disposal of household garbage, for example, must be disposed of in a way that protects human health. But under this bill, coal ash would not be required to be disposed of in a way that protects human health.

My amendment would fix this serious problem by calling on the States to require measures necessary to protect human health and the environment. If we had the Republicans willing to ac-

cept the amendment that every State have an emergency plan, we're simply asking that every State have a goal, clearly stated, to achieve the protection of human health and the environment, otherwise a State's plan is not adequate; there would be no recourse as long as a State meets all of the other requirements of this law but still does not get to the goal.

The Congressional Research Service examined this legislation, and they told us that nothing in H.R. 2218 requires the States to establish programs that will achieve any specified level of Federal standard or protection. CRS concluded:

The degree to which a State program may protect human health from risks specific to coal ash disposal would not be known until individual States begin to interpret the bill.

That means the one thing we know for sure is that this bill will take EPA off the beat—take the EPA off the beat, like we took the SEC and other regulators off the beat, where Wall Street took huge risks and drove our economy over the cliff. It'll take EPA off the beat, and then we'll gamble on each State government doing a good job. That's a pretty risky gamble. And if it doesn't pay off, who's going to suffer? Well, the price will be borne by communities in Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Alabama and elsewhere whose water supplies will suffer from toxic contamination.

Members from some of those States come in here and argue we need those jobs. Well, of course we need the jobs, and we're going to keep those jobs. But why shouldn't we, in keeping jobs, have waste disposals be constructed in a way that will not pollute our drinking water and harm human health?

So I would urge that we set this standard in the bill and adopt this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. First, I want to just add a congratulations to my colleague from California whose position apparently has evolved over the last couple of years, because I remember back in 2011, he had a problem and voted against the recycling material. So to hear him today say how he favors, I appreciate that. That was on H.R. 1 in February of 2011.

But as for this amendment, this is not necessary because H.R. 2218 establishes a minimum standard of protection for coal ash permit programs. The standard of protection is the minimum requirements that are set out in this bill and includes protections such as groundwater monitoring; corrective action; financial assurance; specific cleanup and closure requirements for unlined, leaking impoundments; strin-

gent structural stability requirements; and fugitive dust controls.

Furthermore, H.R. 2218 establishes a minimum national standard that is based on the existing criteria for municipal solid waste landfills which were promulgated by EPA to “protect human health and the environment.”

This chart is a collection of some of the elements that are included in the bill already to deal with standards. Things like requiring that the structure be located above water tables. Groundwater monitoring is to be included in this. We have surface water controls under section 4011, controls for CCR landfills, control runoffs for CCR surface, accelerated corrective action for unlined surface impoundments.

We included in this bill, and if people would read the bill, they would see that under 4011, there are areas where the EPA can help to identify deficiencies, including specific criteria for undertaking a deficiency review. It has a backstop authority to enforce that these requirements are upheld and to correct any EPA-identified deficiency.

My colleague continues to use this “race to the bottom” among States, and they will compete with each other to become the dumping ground for neighbor States. That's a misguided assumption and, frankly, an insult to the hardworking State environmental regulators. It is unfortunate that he also does not trust the environmental regulators in his State, or any other State for that matter, to establish permit programs that are protective. My colleague ignores that the State regulators are tasked every day with protecting human health and the environment.

Another problem with this amendment is that, since it is not well defined, the EPA or a judge would have the sole discretion to determine what constitutes “protecting human health and the environment.” Any State failing to meet this subjective and ambiguous standard would have their permit program stripped from them to be run by the EPA.

This amendment diminishes the important role of the States and lets the EPA meddle in a program the States have proven that they are capable of handling. This amendment is not about protecting human health and the environment; it's about growing Federal control at the expense of the States. States have been tasked with implementing RCRA, and this bill allows them to continue to do just that.

If you support bigger government, support this amendment; but if you trust your State to take care of its own people, then we should oppose it. I urge opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 113-174.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 34, line 11, strike "program; or" and insert "program;".

Page 34, line 17, strike "(E)." and insert "(E); or".

Page 34, after line 17, insert the following subparagraph:

"(G) is subject to a determination under paragraph (5).

Page 35, line 6, insert "or in paragraph (5)" after "paragraph (1)".

Page 35, line 14, insert "or in paragraph (5)" after "paragraph (1)".

Page 36, line 1, after "(e)(1)(B)" insert "other than a determination with respect to a deficiency described in paragraph (1)(G)".

Page 37, after line 13, insert the following paragraph:

"(5) DEFICIENCY BASED ON INTERSTATE RISKS.—The Administrator shall determine a State coal combustion residuals permit program to be deficient if, at any time, the State permit program, or the implementation of the State permit program, threatens human health or the environment in another State. Any State may request that the Administrator review another State's coal combustion residuals permit program for deficiency under this paragraph.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, we are a Nation of 50 States, but we are bound together by common history, purpose, and laws.

Prior to the passage of national environmental laws, States had individual regulatory programs that offered a patchwork of protection. We tried this system for air, for water, for toxic waste, and for many other things. That is the system we have today for the disposal of coal combustion residuals that cannot be recycled. It did not work; it does not work.

H.R. 2218 will not correct the problems with coal ash disposal. We have a State-by-State program for coal ash disposal now. H.R. 2218 codifies that situation and goes further to prevent the EPA from exercising its authority to require that State programs provide a basic standard to ensure that all citizens are indeed protected.

□ 1030

My amendment authorizes a proper Federal role, a role of oversight for the EPA to ensure the actions of one State

do not result in negative impacts on a State with which it shares an important resource.

In addition, my amendment would enable a State to request that EPA review the permitting program of another State to ensure that the program offered sufficient protection of its citizens and its resources.

We do not allow northern States along the Mississippi River to dump toxic substances into the river for downstream States to clean up. We do not allow individual States to pollute the air and send the pollution well beyond their borders.

We need a better system for dealing with coal combustion waste, a system that applies fairly across our great country.

You might wonder how often the location of a coal ash facility is near enough to a shared resource or a State's border to cause a potential problem. Well, it turns out it is common.

The failure of a coal ash facility associated with the Martins Creek Power Plant in Pennsylvania affected communities in New Jersey when coal ash spilled into the Delaware River.

Residents of the State of Michigan were upset when the failure of an old coal ash impoundment in Wisconsin sent coal ash, mud, and machinery into Lake Michigan.

And several of the coal combustion disposal facilities on the high-hazard list in Ohio and West Virginia are located along the Ohio River, a shared border and resource of these two States.

Well, I could go on. It turns out that because these facilities are often located in close proximity to coal-fired utilities where the waste is generated, they are also close to water required for cooling and steam generation. A number are located near sizable water sources that serve multiple communities and often multiple States.

So, in order to ensure good relations between neighboring States, and to ensure that all our citizens are protected from exposure to the toxic substances contained in coal ash, I believe the EPA should have the authority to step in when necessary.

The system we have used successfully, based upon common standards that ensure the protection of human health and the environment, should be applied to this situation. We cannot afford another episode like the one in Kingston, Tennessee.

The choice is not about whether we can have a clean, healthy environment or a robust economy. We can have both. Part of the formula for ensuring a robust economy includes having a clean environment.

Pollution is not cost-free. It costs us lost work days, illness, and premature deaths. It devalues property and results in expensive, unnecessary cleanup costs. We can do better.

My amendment will improve this bill and protect all our citizens and their shared resources. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, the State permit program must incorporate minimum requirements which are based on regulations promulgated by the EPA to "protect human health and the environment," which include groundwater monitoring of all structures, fugitive dust control, structural stability requirements and closure of structures that cannot be corrected.

The premise of this is, if you have Federal standards, that they're not protective, and that the States will not do that.

We find this debate very curious, in that my colleagues on the other side have so much of a disrespect for the States and their environmental communities and the ability of States to ensure the protection of human health, the environment from a State position, Federal standards, State certification process, States.

Under RCRA, the States do this anyway. This is what the States do. Under the Municipal Solid Waste Disposal Act, the States are the ones who are enforcing this. All we're doing is saying we can do this now for fly ash and coal ash.

So while my colleague's amendment is well-intentioned, it really undercuts the purpose of the legislation and is unnecessary because the bill contains specific criteria by which the EPA will judge State permit programs, and I listed those earlier.

This is a politically appealing amendment, but it has many flaws, not the least of which is that any State can request that EPA review another State's coal combustion residual permit program, regardless of the location, and whether there is actually a cross-border impact.

As my colleague pointed out in the Rules Committee on Tuesday, there's no requirement in this amendment that a State that requests a review needs to even be impacted by the contamination allegedly coming from another State.

While my colleague has probably scoured the country to come up with an example or two of coal ash contamination crossing State lines, the fact of the matter is that cross boundary is not really an issue with respect to coal ash disposal because regulation of solid waste disposal is typically an issue that remains within the State.

This amendment attempts to create another hook for the EPA to measure State coal combustion residuals permit programs using the subjective yardstick of what is protective of human

health and the environment, which my colleague did a good job defending in the other amendment.

I understand that my colleague believes that the Federal Government must step in to save the day, but I trust that our State environmental regulators are up to the task of making sure that our communities are protected.

This amendment diminishes the important role of the States, and I urge opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I respect the work done by my colleague from Illinois, but respectfully disagree with his assessment. There's ample evidence that States have poorly regulated, in some cases, this waste stream, and it puts at risk innocent bystanders who are impacted by their actions.

And so I stand by the worthiness of this amendment, and again, encourage my colleagues to support it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 113-174 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. WAXMAN of California.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. TONKO of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 231, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 415]

AYES—185

Andrews	Grayson	Pastor (AZ)
Barrow (GA)	Green, Al	Payne
Bass	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Beatty	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Becerra	Gutiérrez	Peters (CA)
Bera (CA)	Hahn	Peters (MI)
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Pingree (ME)
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Bonamici	Higgins	Polis
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Braley (IA)	Honda	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Rahall
Bustos	Huffman	Rangel
Butterfield	Israel	Richmond
Capps	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Jeffries	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	T.
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clarke	Kuster	Schiff
Clay	Langevin	Schneider
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Levin	Scott, David
Conyers	Lewis	Serrano
Cooper	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Loeb sack	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Lofgren	Sherman
Cuellar	Lowenthal	Sires
Cummings	Lowe	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lujan Grisham	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
DeGette	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
DeLaney	Lynch	Takano
DeLauro	Maffei	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Carolyn	Tierney
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Doggett	Matheson	Tonko
Doyle	Matsui	Tsongas
Duckworth	McCollum	Van Hollen
Edwards	McDermott	Vargas
Ellison	McGovern	Veasey
Engel	McNerney	Vela
Enyart	Meeks	Velázquez
Eshoo	Meng	Visclosky
Esty	Michaud	Walz
Farr	Miller, George	Wasserman
Fattah	Moran	Schultz
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Waters
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Watt
Fudge	Napolitano	Waxman
Gabbard	Neal	Welch
Gallego	Negrete McLeod	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Nolan	Yarmuth
García	O'Rourke	
Gibson	Pascrell	

NOES—231

Aderholt	Camp	Duffy
Alexander	Cantor	Duncan (SC)
Amash	Capito	Duncan (TN)
Amodei	Carter	Ellmers
Bachmann	Chabot	Farenthold
Bachus	Chaffetz	Fincher
Barber	Coble	Fitzpatrick
Barr	Coffman	Fleischmann
Barton	Cole	Fleming
Benishek	Collins (GA)	Flores
Bentivoglio	Collins (NY)	Forbes
Bilirakis	Conaway	Fortenberry
Bishop (GA)	Cook	Fox
Bishop (UT)	Costa	Franks (AZ)
Black	Cotton	Frelinghuysen
Blackburn	Cramer	Gardner
Bonner	Crawford	Garrett
Boustany	Crenshaw	Gerlach
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Gibbs
Bridenstine	Daines	Gingrey (GA)
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Gohmert
Brooks (IN)	Denham	Goodlatte
Broun (GA)	Dent	Gosar
Buchanan	DeSantis	Gowdy
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Granger
Calvert	Diaz-Balart	Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)	McClintock	Royce
Griffin (AR)	McHenry	Runyan
Griffith (VA)	McKeon	Ryan (WI)
Grimm	McKinley	Salmon
Guthrie	McMorris	Sanford
Hall	Rodgers	Scalise
Hanna	Meadows	Schock
Harper	Meehan	Schweikert
Harris	Messer	Scott, Austin
Hartzler	Mica	Sensenbrenner
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Sessions
Heck (NV)	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Shuster
Holding	Mullin	Simpson
Hudson	Mulvaney	Sinema
Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)	Smith (MO)
Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)
Hultgren	Noem	Smith (TX)
Hunter	Nunes	Southerland
Hurt	Nunnelee	Stewart
Issa	Olson	Stivers
Jenkins	Owens	Stockman
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Stutzman
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Terry
Jones	Pearce	Thompson (PA)
Jordan	Perry	Thornberry
Joyce	Peterson	Tiberi
Kelly (PA)	Petri	Tipton
Kind	Pittenger	Turner
King (IA)	Pitts	Upton
King (NY)	Poe (TX)	Valadao
Kingston	Pompeo	Wagner
Kinzinger (IL)	Posey	Walberg
Kirkpatrick	Price (GA)	Walden
Kline	Radel	Walorski
Labrador	Reed	Weber (TX)
LaMalfa	Reichert	Webster (FL)
Lamborn	Renacci	Wenstrup
Lance	Ribble	Westmoreland
Lankford	Rice (SC)	Whitfield
Latham	Rigell	Williams
Latta	Roby	Wilson (SC)
LoBiondo	Roe (TN)	Wittman
Long	Rogers (AL)	Wolf
Lucas	Rogers (KY)	Womack
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (MI)	Woodall
Lummis	Rohrabacher	Yoder
Marchant	Rooney	Yoho
Marino	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Massie	Roskam	Young (IN)
McCarthy (CA)	Ross	
McCaul	Rothfus	

NOT VOTING—17

Barletta	Herrera Beutler	Moore
Brown (FL)	Himes	Nugent
Burgess	Holt	Pallone
Campbell	Horsford	Rokita
Cassidy	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Hanabusa	McIntyre	

□ 1106

Mr. TIPTON and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. COHEN, CUELLAR, and VELA changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 239, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 416]

AYES—176

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallo
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson

Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan

O'Rourke
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—239

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan

Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Diaz-Balart
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines

Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach

Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis

Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Barletta
Brown (FL)
Campbell
Hanabusa
Herrera Beutler
Himes

Holt
Horsford
Hudson
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Messer

Nugent
Pallone
Pelosi
Rokita
Smith (NJ)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1110

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chair, on rollcall Nos. 415 Waxman Amend, and 416 Tonko Amend, had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on both.

The CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Com-

mittee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2218) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment, and, pursuant to House Resolution 315, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1115

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. MCCOLLUM moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2218 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 7, after line 14, insert the following new clause:

"(i) PROTECTING DRINKING WATER AND THE GREAT LAKES.—The implementing agency shall require that all wet disposal structures meet criteria for design, construction, operation, and maintenance sufficient to prevent contamination of groundwater and sources of drinking water including the Great Lakes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which does not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, it will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

This bill is about coal ash. Coal ash is a toxic substance. It contains lead, selenium, mercury, cadmium, and arsenic. Coal ash is a deadly poison, and it must be kept out of America's drinking water.

This bill needlessly puts millions of Americans at risk by doing nothing to

prevent coal ash from contaminating groundwater, surface water, and the greatest supply of freshwater on the Earth—the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes provide drinking water to more than 30 million people. Over 1.5 million jobs are connected to the Great Lakes and more than \$60 billion in annual wages.

My amendment protects the Great Lakes from improper and dangerous storage of coal ash. This amendment “requires that all wet disposal structures meet criteria for design, construction, operation, and maintenance sufficient to prevent contamination of surface and groundwater.” This amendment recognizes that the Great Lakes are unique.

Mayors and Governors in eight States are working together to maintain this vital ecosystem and economy for families, businesses, and future generations—even while this House considers an 80 percent cut to the Great Lakes Restorative Initiative.

In addition, the Federal Government coordinates our efforts to protect, conserve, and restore the Great Lakes with our partner, Canada.

The great United States has both a national and international interest in keeping these lakes clean and safe. Protecting the Great Lakes should be a priority for this Congress. I am certain it's a priority for the 30 million people who drink Great Lakes water. Without this amendment, they will be at risk of drinking cancer-causing toxins. Right now, coal ash is placed in unlined ponds, some that are leaking, leaching, and spilling into our soils, lakes, rivers, and aquifers.

In 2011, near Milwaukee, a bluff collapsed, sending a utility company's coal ash directly into Lake Michigan. Residents could no longer drink their local water because of severe health threats imposed by the coal ash.

Should a utility company be able to store tons and tons of coal ash in an unregulated ravine? The answer is, simply, “no.”

Unless Congress changes how coal ash is stored, the Great Lakes and America's drinking water will continue to be at risk. Congress can do something right here, right now by passing this amendment.

If you want clean and safe drinking water, vote for this amendment. If you want to protect the Great Lakes, vote for this amendment. And if you want to protect recreation, manufacturing, and service jobs, vote for this amendment. If you have the courage to stand up to the polluters and say no longer will I allow coal ash to be inadvertently put in our drinking water, causing cancer for millions of Americans, vote for this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order, and I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, the basic premise of this bill is that the Federal Government can set safety standards and the States can enforce it, so reject the motion to instruct.

I am going to turn my comments to people who live in the coal areas of our country. Coal is just not a commodity product, it is, really, a way of lifestyle if you live in coal country.

I am a fourth-generation Lithuanian immigration family. My great-grandfather went directly into the coalfields. My grandfather went into the coal mines at age 10. He performed the job of a trapper.

In my hometown of Collinsville, Illinois, we have Miner's Theater; in a community up north, we have Miner's Park; and in Gillespie, Illinois, we have Black Diamond Days.

Coal is a culture. Coal is who we are. That is why I really appreciate my colleagues from West Virginia, DAVID MCKINLEY and SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO. There are some States in this Union that coal is their only job, and that's why they fight and they stand up for coal.

I remember being with the late Senator Byrd in a rally on The Mall to save coal jobs. He held up his hands and he said, “There's coal in these veins.” This was Senator Byrd—“There's coal in these veins.”

My colleagues and my friends, that's how we feel in coal-producing States in this country. It is part of who we are. It is our culture.

Now, don't think this is a *passe* debate. There's a young Iraqi vet named Jimmy Rose. You may have seen him. He's 32 years old. He's also a coal miner. He's competing on “America's Got Talent.” Do you know what his song is? His song is “Coal Keeps the Lights On.” He talks about feeding his family. He talks about putting coal in the family household. He talks about that's their livelihood, that's their culture. It's an impassioned ballad for areas of our country that feel under attack, left behind, attacked by this administration.

Mayor Dietz from McLeansboro, Illinois, is happy when new coal is opening up. Coal is keeping the lights on in the small communities and the shops and stores for a community that's kind of been left behind for 40 years. He's excited about the jobs and the tax base that's coming because of coal.

I'm asking you, my colleagues, to stand up for coal, because coal keeps the lights on. I request that you reject this amendment and support the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on the question on passage of the bill, if ordered, and the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 225, answered “present” 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

AYES—192

Andrews	Garamendi	Napolitano
Barber	Garcia	Neal
Barrow (GA)	Grayson	Negrete McLeod
Bass	Green, Al	Nolan
Beatty	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Becerra	Grijalva	Owens
Bera (CA)	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Bonamici	Higgins	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Peters (CA)
Braley (IA)	Honda	Peters (MI)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Peterson
Bustos	Huffman	Pingree (ME)
Butterfield	Israel	Pocan
Capps	Jackson Lee	Polis
Capuano	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rangel
Cartwright	Keating	Richmond
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruiz
Chu	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kilmer	Rush
Clarke	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver	Kuster	T.
Clyburn	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Schiff
Cooper	Levin	Schneider
Costa	Lewis	Schrader
Courtney	Lipinski	Schwartz
Crowley	Loeb sack	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	Lofgren	Scott, David
Cummings	Lowenthal	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham	Shea-Porter
DeFazio	(NM)	Sherman
DeGette	Luján, Ben Ray	Sinema
Delaney	(NM)	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lynch	Smith (WA)
DelBene	Maffei	Speier
Deutch	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
Dingell	Carolyn	Takano
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
Duckworth	Matsui	Tierney
Edwards	McCollum	Titus
Ellison	McDermott	Tonko
Engel	McGovern	Tsongas
Enyart	McIntyre	Van Hollen
Eshoo	McNerney	Vargas
Esty	Meeks	Veasey
Farr	Meng	Vela
Fattah	Michaud	Velázquez
Foster	Miller, George	Visclosky
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Walz
Fudge	Moran	Wasserman
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Schultz
Gallego	Nadler	

Waters	Waxman	Wilson (FL)
Watt	Welch	Yarmuth
NOES—225		
Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Petri
Alexander	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Pitts
Amodei	Griffith (VA)	Poe (TX)
Bachmann	Grimm	Pompeo
Bachus	Guthrie	Posey
Barr	Hall	Price (GA)
Barton	Hanna	Radel
Bentivolio	Harper	Reed
Billrakis	Harris	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Renacci
Black	Hastings (WA)	Ribble
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Rice (SC)
Bonner	Hensarling	Rigell
Boustany	Holding	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Brown (GA)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hurt	Rooney
Bucshon	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Jenkins	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Cantor	Jones	Royce
Capito	Jordan	Runyan
Carter	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Chabot	King (IA)	Sanford
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Scalise
Coble	Kingston	Schock
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Cole	Kline	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Sessions
Conaway	Lamborn	Shimkus
Cook	Lance	Shuster
Cotton	Lankford	Simpson
Cramer	Latham	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Latta	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Long	Smith (TX)
Daines	Lucas	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Denham	Lummis	Stivers
Dent	Marchant	Stockman
DeSantis	Marino	Stutzman
DesJarlais	Massie	Terry
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	McCaul	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Tipton
Ellmers	McKeon	Turner
Farenthold	McKinley	Upton
Fincher	McMorris	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Wagner
Fleischmann	Meadows	Walberg
Fleming	Meehan	Walden
Flores	Messer	Walorski
Forbes	Mica	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Fox	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Whitfield
Gardner	Mulvaney	Williams
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Womack
Gibbs	Noem	Woodall
Gibson	Nugent	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Yoho
Gohmert	Olson	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Gosar	Paulsen	
Gowdy	Pearce	
Granger	Perry	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Benishek

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta	Himes	Pallone
Brown (FL)	Holt	Rokita
Campbell	Horsford	Sires
Hanabusa	McCarthy (NY)	Wolf
Herrera Beutler	Nunes	Young (FL)

□ 1129

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 25, 2013, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 415, 416 and 417 on H.R. 2218. Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall vote 415, "yea" on rollcall vote 416, "yea" on rollcall vote 417.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 265, noes 155, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

AYES—265

Aderholt	Doyle	King (IA)
Alexander	Duffy	King (NY)
Amash	Duncan (SC)	Kingston
Amodei	Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger (IL)
Bachmann	Ellmers	Kirkpatrick
Bachus	Enyart	Kline
Barber	Farenthold	Labrador
Barr	Fincher	LaMalfa
Barrow (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Barton	Fleischmann	Lance
Beatty	Fleming	Lankford
Benishek	Flores	Latham
Bentivolio	Forbes	Latta
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Bishop (GA)	Fox	Loeb
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	Long
Black	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Blackburn	Fudge	Luetkemeyer
Bonner	Gallego	Lummis
Boustany	Gardner	Maloney, Sean
Brady (PA)	Garrett	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gerlach	Marino
Bridenstine	Gibbs	Massie
Brooks (AL)	Gibson	Matheson
Brooks (IN)	Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Brown (GA)	Gohmert	McCaul
Buchanan	Goodlatte	McClintock
Bucshon	Gosar	McHenry
Burgess	Gowdy	McIntyre
Bustos	Granger	McKeon
Calvert	Graves (GA)	McKinley
Camp	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Cantor	Green, Gene	Rodgers
Capito	Griffin (AR)	Meadows
Carter	Griffith (VA)	Duckworth
Cassidy	Grimm	Edwards
Chabot	Guthrie	Ellison
Chaffetz	Hall	Engel
Clay	Hanna	Miller (FL)
Clyburn	Harper	Miller (MI)
Coble	Harris	Miller, Gary
Coffman	Hartzler	Moore
Cole	Hastings (WA)	Mullin
Collins (GA)	Heck (NV)	Mulvaney
Collins (NY)	Hensarling	Murphy (PA)
Conaway	Holding	Neugebauer
Cook	Hudson	Noem
Costa	Huelskamp	Nolan
Cotton	Huizenga (MI)	Nugent
Cramer	Hultgren	Nunes
Crawford	Hunter	Nunnelee
Crenshaw	Hurt	Olson
Cuellar	Issa	Owens
Culberson	Jenkins	Palazzo
Daines	Johnson (OH)	Pastor (AZ)
Davis, Danny	Johnson, Sam	Paulsen
Davis, Rodney	Jones	Pearce
Denham	Jordan	Perlmutter
Dent	Joyce	Perry
DeSantis	Kaptur	Peterson
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Pittenger
Diaz-Balart	Kind	Pitts
		Poe (TX)

Pompeo	Salmon	Tipton
Posey	Sanford	Turner
Price (GA)	Scalise	Upton
Radel	Schock	Valadao
Rahall	Schrader	Vargas
Reed	Schweikert	Vela
Reichert	Scott, Austin	Visclosky
Renacci	Scott, David	Wagner
Ribble	Sensenbrenner	Walberg
Rice (SC)	Sessions	Walden
Richmond	Shimkus	Walorski
Rigell	Shuster	Walz
Roby	Simpson	Weber (TX)
Roe (TN)	Smith (MO)	Webster (FL)
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Wenstrup
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Westmoreland
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Rohrabacher	Southerland	Williams
Rooney	Stewart	Wilson (SC)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers	Wittman
Roskam	Stockman	Womack
Ross	Stutzman	Woodall
Rothfus	Terry	Yoder
Royce	Thompson (MS)	Yoho
Runyan	Thompson (PA)	Young (AK)
Ryan (OH)	Thornberry	Young (IN)
Ryan (WI)	Tiberi	

NOES—155

Andrews	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Bass	Hahn	Pascarell
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bera (CA)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Peters (CA)
Blumenauer	Himes	Peters (MI)
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Petri
Braley (IA)	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Pocan
Butterfield	Huffman	Polis
Capps	Israel	Price (NC)
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rangel
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Cartwright	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	Kildee	T.
Ciçilline	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kuster	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Langevin	Schakowsky
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Cooper	Levin	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Lofgren	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Sinema
DeFazio	Lowe	Slaughter
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
Delaney	(NM)	Speier
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	(NM)	Takano
Deutch	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Maffei	Tierney
Doggett	Maloney,	Titus
Duckworth	Carolyn	Tonko
Edwards	Matsui	Tsongas
Ellison	McCollum	Van Hollen
Engel	McDermott	Veasey
Eshoo	McGovern	Velázquez
Esty	McNerney	Wasserman
Farr	Meeks	Schultz
Fattah	Meng	Waters
Foster	Michaud	Watt
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Waxman
Gabbard	Moran	Welch
Garamendi	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Garcia	Nadler	Wolf
Grayson	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Neal	
Grijalva	Negrete McLeod	

NOT VOTING—13

Barletta	Holt	Serrano
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Sires
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Hanabusa	Pallone	
Herrera Beutler	Rokita	

□ 1139

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall 418 on final passage of H.R. 2218, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act of 2013, I incorrectly recorded my vote as "no." I intended to vote "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 415 on the Waxman amendment, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 416 on the Tonko amendment, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 417 on the Motion to Recommit, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 418 on final passage of H.R. 2218, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act of 2013, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following votes during this week:

On rollcall vote 375, on Passage of H.R. 1542, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 376, on Passage of H. Con. Res. 44, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 377, on Ordering the Previous Question to H. Res. 312, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 378, on Agreeing to H. Res. 312, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote 379, Gabbard amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall vote 380, Blumenauer amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 381, Polis amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 382, Blumenauer amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 383, Nugent amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall vote 384, Nadler amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 385, Moran amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 386, Poe amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 387, Walberg amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 388, Cicilline amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 389, Cohen amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 390, Coffman amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 391, Garamendi amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 392, Fleming amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall vote 393, Rigell amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 394, Flores amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall vote 395, DeLauro amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 396, Lee amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 397, Quigley amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 398, Denham amendment to H.R. 2397, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 415, on agreeing to the Waxman amendment, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 416, on agreeing to the Tonko amendment, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 417, on Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 2218, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote 418, on Passage of H.R. 2218, I would have voted "no."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2218.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1092. An act to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center".

□ 1145

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR of Virginia, for the purpose of inquiring as to the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the Democratic whip for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House is not in session.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of bills under suspension of

the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Senate acted on the student loan bill the House passed last month, and I expect the House to deal with it promptly next week. In addition, I expect to consider H.R. 2610, the Fiscal Year 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, authored by Representative TOM LATHAM.

Mr. Speaker, Members are advised that the House will begin consideration of this bill on Tuesday afternoon and should be prepared to offer amendments at the appropriate time in the reading of the bill. Members are further advised that the 6:30 p.m. vote series that day could be longer than normal.

For the remainder of the week, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of bills to restrain a runaway government and re-empower our citizens. To stop government abuse and protect the middle class, we will first bring a number of bipartisan bills to the floor under suspension of the rules on Wednesday. Following that, we will debate two bills pursuant to rules focusing again on stopping government abuse and protecting the middle class.

The first, H.R. 367, the REINS Act, sponsored by Representative TODD YOUNG, requires congressional approval of regulations that cost over \$100 million. The second, H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, sponsored by Representative TOM PRICE, prevents the IRS from implementing any portion of ObamaCare. When Federal bureaucrats abuse their power and waste taxpayer dollars, liberty is eroded, the economy is slowed, and the rule of law betrayed.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I don't see on the schedule, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to a budget conference. At least there's no notice from the majority leader of that fact. Mr. Speaker, as you know, we are facing a number of critical deadlines. It has now been 125 days since the House passed a budget and 123 days since the Senate passed a budget. On issue after issue, our Republican colleagues, Mr. Speaker, have passed bills and then refused to negotiate. Mr. Speaker, it's past time for action. We should go to conference and reach an agreement. I would urge my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, to go to conference.

One of his colleagues, Mr. Speaker, from Virginia said this: "I am proudly on record about this. I believe we need to go to conference," speaking of the budget. This Member went on to say, "I have listened carefully to the argument that we should not go to conference, and frankly I do not find it compelling."

Mr. Speaker, that was Representative SCOTT RIGELL of Virginia.

I would ask my friend, the majority leader, does the gentleman expect that we will go to conference at all on the budget?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his tenacity, as this is a weekly discussion between he and I, and I'm delighted to respond to say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that it is something that we should commit ourselves to working out. But as the gentleman knows, the position of the majority is that we don't want to enter into discussions if the prerequisite is you have to raise taxes.

The gentleman has heard me every week on this issue in that we believe strongly you fix the problem of overspending and you reform the programs needing reform to address unfunded liabilities first. Then, if the gentleman is insistent that the taxpayers need to pay more of their hard-earned dollars into Washington, that discussion, perhaps, is appropriate. But as a prerequisite for entering budget talks that we agree to raise taxes is not something, I think, that the American people want this body to engage in.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's premise is absolutely incorrect, and the American people ought to know that. The Senate hasn't voted to go to conference because the Republican Members of the United States Senate won't vote to go to conference. There was nothing in that motion, however, that said there was a prerequisite that the House agreed to anything, Mr. Speaker. Nothing.

Now, my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, has said repeatedly that we have a prerequisite. We have a difference of opinion. That's what democracy is about. There's no prerequisite. There's no precondition. There's no condition precedent, as we lawyers say, for going to conference. Number one, the Senate couldn't make us agree. That's what conferences are about, Mr. Speaker. They're about coming together and understanding there are differences. There would be no need for a conference if there weren't differences. There are differences.

We're \$91 billion apart, Mr. Speaker, on our budgets. We are 14 days away from the end of this fiscal year, Mr. Speaker, in terms of legislative days available to us to get to a compromise, to get to a number, to get to some understanding of how we are going to ensure that government operations continue. There's no prerequisite. There's no precondition. I don't know where that comes from, Mr. Speaker. I've heard it a lot. I have no idea where it comes from.

Nothing the Senate does can force this body, Republicans or Democrats,

to do something. What they have asked is come to the table and talk. There has been a refusal to do that, Mr. Speaker, and it's bad for the country.

A \$91 billion difference between us on budgets has to be resolved somehow, some way. And the way democracies do it and the way the legislature does it, Mr. Speaker is to meet and try to resolve those differences. Now, you can divide the differences in half. The Senate comes down 46, we go up 45. My own view is Mr. RYAN believes there's nothing he will agree to. I'll get to that a little later, Mr. Speaker. That's why we're not going to conference, and he said so in the paper. He didn't say it about the conference, but I'll get to his quote in just a second.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader mentioned that the T-HUD appropriation bill is on the floor next week. So far, Mr. Speaker, we are now essentially going to be at the end of the session before the August break coming next week on Friday, and we've done four appropriation bills. The House T-HUD bill of which the majority leader speaks, Mr. Speaker, is 17 percent below the Budget Control Act that we agreed on. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, it's 9 percent below the sequester level.

Now, we're not going to vote for it, Mr. Speaker. We believe it badly underfunds, transportation, housing, and infrastructure in this country, but this performance makes some sense considering the lack of regular order. We talk about regular order, but we don't follow it. Going to conference is regular order. It doesn't change the fact, however, that we just have 14 days left to go and that we need to reach agreement.

I will tell my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, that we are willing to work together. We have been willing to compromise. We have compromised. In every one of these agreements we've reached, we've compromised. My friend, the majority leader, would say, yes, and they have, as well. But you cannot compromise if you don't sit down.

I will tell you nobody has called me to ask me how I believe we can get to the end of this year with a continuing resolution. Nobody's asked me that. I talked to Mr. RYAN and Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. RYAN has not talked to Mr. VAN HOLLEN. With all due respect to this discussion about their talking, they're not talking. I talked to Senator MURRAY. No discussion of how we resolve the differences. I talked to the chair of the Appropriations Committee, both the ranking member here, Mrs. LOWEY, and the chair on the Senate side, Senator MIKULSKI. Nobody is talking to them about how we resolve the question at the end of next month. And we won't be here at the end of next month. We're in session 2 weeks in September.

I want to use a quote:

But we should not pass a continuing resolution, and I will not vote for a continuing resolution unless we talk about preconditions for going to conference.

Talk about preconditions. Talk about demands and ultimatums:

I will not vote for a continuing resolution unless it defunds ObamaCare for the period of time of the continuing resolution.

Nobody in America believes that's going to be done. A lot of people, I know the majority leader would tell me, want it done. But we had an election. The President won. He won't sign the defunding of ObamaCare because he believes it's in the best interest of the health of our people and the welfare of our country, and, yes, even job creation and economic growth. But MARCO RUBIO says he won't vote for a continuing resolution unless it does something that's not going to happen. The majority leader, Mr. Speaker, said they weren't going to go to conference—another ultimatum—unless the Senate abandoned its point of view. The Senate has a right to its point of view. We have a right to our point of view. We need to discuss it. That's the way you get things done in a democracy, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the majority leader, Does the gentleman expect that we will go to conference at all, at any time on the budget?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate his question.

I would note for the record that I believe, if I have my facts correct, that during the time that the gentleman was in the majority last, the last Congress, the 111th, 48 times there was an avoidance of going to conference. All of the sudden the gentleman says that that's the panacea.

So I would tell the gentleman, given his litany of examples of who's talking to whom around here, there is a lot of talk about how we resolve our differences. In fact, I do know that Chairman RYAN is talking to Chairman MURRAY across the Capitol of how we go forward. But I would underscore again to the gentleman that it is not our intention to discuss taking more hard-earned taxpayer dollars from Americans while we have not fixed the problem they expect us to fix.

I'd also say to the gentleman that as far as appropriation bills are concerned, he is correct that I did announce that the T-HUD bill would be coming to the floor next week, and it will be the fifth bill that we will do prior to the August work period. I would remind the gentleman that when he was last in the position of the majority, the appropriations bills did not come to the floor under an open process. In fact, there were structured rules on every one, if my memory serves me well. It's much easier that way to shut out diverse opinion. But instead, the

Speaker has this Congress insist that we have an open process and allow for robust debate on some of the very difficult issues. The gentleman knows we have been true to that word.

So I remind the gentleman that, yes, there is a commitment to open process; there is a commitment here to trying to resolve these challenges before us. The gentleman is correct, we're going to have a very busy fall trying to address the needs of this country, whether it is the spending and budget needs or whether it is the needs of the middle class families who are struggling out there every single day wondering when the economy is going to pick up, wondering what's going to happen to their health care.

□ 1200

We have a looming ObamaCare law that already the administration has admitted is threatening job growth. Therefore, they offer relief to businesses but refuse to do so for working people. We don't think that's too fair. We have Democratic union leaders who have said that this law is going to provide and has already created nightmare scenarios for millions of working Americans insofar as their health care and economic well-being are concerned. There are real issues to be resolved, Mr. Speaker, and I do hope that the gentleman will abide by what I know he has always been for, and that's solving problems. I do hope that he will work with us to do that in the coming months.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's recitation of history. Let me remind him, the first year I was majority leader, all 12 appropriations bills passed the House prior to the August break—all 12. That also happened the third year. It didn't happen the second year when we had a lot of political delays. And the reason we went to structured rules, as the gentleman I'm sure recalls, because we had filibuster by amendment. We had delay and obstruction in 2007, just as we have delay and obstruction today, just as there is a refusal today to go to conference. Over 120 days after both Houses have passed their budgets, we still have refusal to go to conference. That is why you can't get agreement.

The gentleman characterizes, I think Mr. RYAN has talked to Senator MURRAY, and I will tell you that Senator MURRAY does not believe it was a very long discussion or a very substantive discussion because—and you talk about Mr. RYAN. I've got a quote of his I know you'll like that I want to get to because it makes the point I'm making. I was going to make it a little later.

PAUL RYAN, when asked about Senate Republicans' plan to work with Democrats to address the debt ceiling, said:

It doesn't matter. We're not going to do what they want to do. It doesn't really mat-

ter what they do. It doesn't matter what JOHN MCCAIN and others do on the taxes and the rest. If they want to give up taxes for the sequester, we're not going to do that. So that doesn't really affect us.

But, oh, it does affect us because, Mr. Speaker, if we can't get agreement, those American folks of which the majority leader just spoke who are looking for jobs, who want to see this economy grow, who are suffering because of gridlock, who have a lack of confidence because this Congress does not work—the most dysfunctional Congress in which I have served, and I've been here 33 years, the least productive Congress in which I've served. Mr. Speaker, that's what we need to be doing.

MIKE LEE, another Republican in the Senate talking about trying to get to agreement: "If Republicans in both Houses simply refuse"—and this is their strategy, Mr. Speaker. "If Republicans in both Houses simply refuse to vote for any continuing resolution that contains further funding for further enforcement of ObamaCare"—and I understand the gentleman is opposed to it. He was opposed to it before the election. Mr. Romney was opposed to it. We had an election, and you didn't win that argument at the national level. I say that Mr. Obama won that argument. But Senator LEE says he will not vote for a CR if it includes "further funding for further enforcement of ObamaCare. We can stop it. We can stop the individual mandate from going into effect." How? By shutting down government.

That's their strategy. We don't think that's a good strategy, Mr. Speaker. We think that's a bad strategy. We don't want to see that. We're prepared to work together to compromise. Nobody believes, just as the gentleman has said he's not going to agree to tax increases—I understand what he's saying, so we'll have to compromise on that somewhere along the road when we sit down. But nobody believes that either we on this side are going to compromise or the President's going to compromise after an election, after being reelected on a health care program that is benefiting millions and millions of people right now, nobody believes we're going to compromise on that. Thirty-nine times they've tried to repeal it in one form or another. It's failed. We've got to come to grips on that.

Now, one of the House Members, MICK MULVANEY from South Carolina, said:

It is completely appropriate to use the debt ceiling or the CR to ask for some changes that reduce the burdens of this law on Americans.

Now, they've offered that 38, 39 times. It's not going to happen. But apparently their strategy is: We're prepared to shut down government unless they will be bludgeoned into agreeing by doing it our way; if we don't do it

our way, apparently we're not going to do it any way.

That's what the budget conference is about, and that's what this debate is about.

Now, PAT TOOMEY, Senator TOOMEY, on the other hand, said this, Mr. Speaker:

This has been the way we've been operating for a couple of years now.

This is Senator PAT TOOMEY, former chair of the Club for Growth, said:

It's a disaster. It's a terrible way to run government.

Senator TOOMEY and I don't always agree, but we agree very emphatically on that.

Congressman TOM COLE, former chairman of the Republican Committee, described the latest shutdown threat, which is what the previous three speakers had indicated—not PAT TOOMEY, but the three before that. TOM COLE described the latest shutdown threat as:

The political equivalent of throwing a temper tantrum.

That's TOM COLE, chairman of the Republican Campaign Committee, Mr. Speaker, not me.

We need to get past this "you won't do this; I won't do that" and figure out what we will do, I say to my friend, the majority leader, and we have 14 days to do it. We haven't gotten it done yet; and, frankly, we have nothing on the calendar for next week that shows that we're moving toward that end.

I would hope very sincerely that we could come to an agreement. And we're not going to come to an agreement on something that was so hard fought for the last 5 years, and we know that. We know you're probably not going to raise taxes, I tell my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker. But the fact of the matter is that we need to come to an agreement. Americans expect us to come to an agreement.

With so few legislative days remaining before the fiscal year ends and the fact that we must address it in mind, I hope the gentleman can give us some clarity as to what Members can expect on the floor in September for the 9 days we're here in September since we're so far off course from regular order on the budget and the appropriations schedule.

Can Members expect to see a CR? And if so, does the gentleman have any idea what the CR will look like, what it will encompass, and what we can expect?

I want to say to my friend that we Democrats are prepared to cooperate in that effort. We're not going to—and the gentleman clearly knows that we're not going to—repeal the health care act. The election, we think, decided it. As a matter of, Speaker BOEHNER said that it decided it after the election. He said, well, the health care law has been confirmed. But I want to make it clear that we are willing to do some things.

We are not willing, however, to see the sequester cripple policies that this Congress has adopted. We're not willing to defund the Affordable Care Act. We're not willing to sacrifice our economic recovery to push the cost of deficit reduction onto those who can least afford it. We are not willing to shift more of the tax burden onto the backs of the middle class. We're not willing to target Medicare or Medicaid and education, or the deep cuts that were in the Labor, Health bill which has now been pulled. Apparently, we're not going to consider the Labor, Health bill. It's not on the schedule. It was supposed to be marked up today. It was pulled.

So I say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that he and his colleagues should be willing to compromise on the few legislative days we have remaining; and if he is, he will have a willing partner in me and in Democrats because we believe we need to come to an agreement.

Now, lastly, let me speak on the debt ceiling. The majority leader, Mr. Speaker, has made it very clear he thinks not resolving the debt ceiling would be a bad policy for our country. In fact, I believe it would be disastrous for our country, for the economy, for every American, and for people around the world. We all know what happened last time; we were downgraded. It's the majority party's responsibility in each House to make sure that America's creditworthiness is not put at risk, that we pay our bills.

I'm hopeful, and I want to tell my friend that I'm prepared to work in tandem with the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, to pass a debt limit extension, and we will do so in an equal way so that whatever political consequences there are, we will take them together to do what the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, and the Speaker, and Mr. MCCONNELL, the leader in the Senate, have said is the responsible thing to do. We're prepared to take half of that responsibility with them. We would hope that they would join us in that effort.

Senator MCCAIN has said that some of my Republican colleagues are already saying we won't raise the debt limit again unless there is repeal of ObamaCare. Senator MCCAIN said, "I'd love to repeal ObamaCare." He agrees with the majority leader. He goes on to say, "But I promised you, that's not going to happen." That's on the debt limit.

The President has made it very clear it's not going to happen. We've made it very clear it's not going to happen.

Going on with Senator MCCAIN's quote:

So some would like to set up another one of these shut down the government threats, and most Americans are really tired of those kinds of shenanigans here in Washington.

That's Senator MCCAIN.

I've quoted Senator TOOMEY, Senator MCCAIN, who both believe we need to

come to agreement. I have also, unfortunately, quoted Congressman RYAN, who says he doesn't care what Senator MCCAIN thinks; who, of course, was a candidate for President on the Republican ticket just a few years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the majority leader whether he expects we will take an up-or-down vote on a clean debt limit extension when we return in September.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, the answer to that last question is no.

But I would say to the gentleman, the discussion the gentleman just had was so full of various and sundry issues, I don't know really where to begin, other than to say what I think is lost in the gentleman's comments is the focus on the hardworking families and businesses of middle class America. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman is full of "that's not going to happen" because Washington says that's not going to happen for political reasons.

And what we ought to be focused on is how we can act to solve the anxiety that seems to continue to grow on the part of the American public when they wonder about their job, they worry about their tuition costs, they worry about their children's education, they worry every night when they go to bed.

The gentleman is so sure that we can and can't do things for political reasons, the President is out giving campaign speeches, some of which we have heard dozens of times during the campaign season, that what all of us should be absolutely focused on is coming together not for political imperative, but to solve the problems to provide the relief to the middle class of this country that is asking us to do that.

So instead of the political demands and imperatives that the gentleman's list of issues was about, let's focus on the people that sent us here. Let's make sure that this body of any in Washington can begin to work for the people rather than the other way around.

Mr. HOYER. I have heard that answer, I think, more than the President has given the speeches that Mr. CANTOR refers to.

This party has always been, is now, and will be focused on the working people to which the majority leader refers.

□ 1215

The President asked us to pass a jobs bill. No jobs bill has been brought to this floor. I know that there are some bills that the Republican Party leader wants to say, Mr. Speaker, are jobs bills. But there's been no comprehensive jobs bill. There's none scheduled for next week.

But what the American people are really concerned about is their board of directors is not working. This isn't

about Washington. This is about people who voted all over America. And the leader and his party made their point, and we had an election, not here in Washington, all over America. And America voted. And it hasn't made any difference on this floor.

Politics as usual. Confrontation as usual. Refusal to compromise as usual. Talk about regular order, but not going to conference, not going to conference on a budget, not going to conference on a farm bill, not going to conference on a Violence Against Women Act. We finally passed that.

So when the majority leader repairs to the fact that we want to focus on working people, he's absolutely right. We do want to focus on that. And the working people of America voted. They didn't all vote for my side. But as I told the majority leader last week, 1,400,000 of them more voted for our side than voted for his side.

But his side's in charge. We understand that. And we know we need to compromise. We know we need to work together. But we haven't been doing so.

And he can talk as much as he wants. That's what the American people believe as well, I tell my friend, the majority leader.

I asked him about the debt limit and he said no.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I want to clarify what he said no on was that a clean debt limit extension was not coming to the floor.

Mr. CANTOR. In September, yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the majority leader's comment. Can he tell me whether there might be a possibility of having a clean debt limit extension after September?

Because I tell the gentleman again, I want to repeat so that he knows, his party knows, and America knows, we're prepared to work with the majority party to do, in a bipartisan way, what every leader believes is the responsible action to take.

One of his predecessors, Senator ROY BLUNT, in responding to whether we ought to risk default by not passing a debt limit, he said this: "No, I don't support that. I think holding the debt limit hostage"—in other words, if you don't do the debt limit, we're not going to do this, that or the other, or, said another way, if you don't repeal ObamaCare, we're going to let the country default. Senator BLUNT, again, one of his predecessors: "I don't support that. I think holding the debt limit hostage to any specific thing is probably not the best negotiating place."

Now, I thank my friend for his comment, Mr. Speaker, and I would again ask him, could we expect a clean debt limit extension at some point in time between September 30 and November 15?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I'd say to the gentleman that it is our hope that we can work together across the aisle to solve the problems, to come up with the answers as to how we are going to pay back the additional debt that we'll have to incur in this country.

And I think whatever budget you look at, their side or our side, Mr. Speaker, in any iteration, calls for the incurrence of additional debt. The object should be for us to reduce the need for us to incur that debt so we can relieve the American people of that contingent liability. And our side has said we would like to do so within the next 10 years, to bring the budget to balance.

I hope that the gentleman will join us in that spirit, rather than saying we should just continue to borrow into eternity, without some recognition that that just can't be a sustainable solution either.

So I would say to the gentleman, when he is off talking about the need to go to conference, and frankly, some of the statements he made about VAWA and the farm bill were inaccurate. But I do think that there were a lot of things that this House has done that the President nor the Senate seems willing to respond to.

And as I've said before, Mr. Speaker, what we're trying to do is to address the needs of the working people, the middle class of this country.

We passed the SKILLS Act. That was a bill designed to try and align the worker training programs at the Federal level with the employment opportunities out there across the different regions of the country so we could respond to the fact that there are hundreds of thousands of job openings in certain industries, simply because our workforce doesn't have the proper skills and training.

The President, if he wanted to help the middle class families, instead of off campaigning again, giving the speeches, he could come and call up HARRY REID and the Senate and say, Bring that bill to the floor, Mr. Leader; we can do something for the American people.

In the same vein, this House, last week, passed a bill which I believe—and I'm sure the gentleman shares my sentiment, that ultimately what we've got to do to grow our economy and secure our economic future is to provide for a quality education for our kids. We passed a landmark piece of legislation last week, without any bipartisan support, Mr. Speaker.

But again, if the gentleman is so intent on wanting to help and wanting to do something, not because of Washington's needs, but because of what we've got to do for the kids across this country and their families, then let's help try and forge an answer on reauthorizing the education bill.

We also, Mr. Speaker, passed a bill that made it easier for working families to spend time with their kids and hold down an hourly wage job. Is there any movement on that?

The President could certainly say, Let's do that; let's provide some relief to the middle class.

We also passed in the House, Mr. Speaker, several energy bills to help the families out there across this country who are on their vacations right now, choking when they see the price of gas at the pump.

We have bills. The President could go ahead and approve the Keystone pipeline. Where else in the world could you have an environmentally sensitive people, other than in America? We do it cleaner and better than anyone. And to sit here and deny us the opportunity to take advantage of our indigenous resources, all it does is cost our working families and businesses more money.

We also have passed bills to allow for safe and environmentally sensitive ways of going into our deep oceans, to go in and to tap into the resources that are there, things that technology has unleashed. But yet, neither the Senate nor the President seems interested in helping the middle class and the working families, because all we hear from the other side is what we can and can't do politically here in Washington.

I would say to the gentleman, there are plenty of things that we could get done together. Let's start to focus on the people of this country, not the political imperatives of this institution.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that response, which I took as a no, which didn't indicate that we could expect to see bipartisan work on making sure that the government pays its bills that have already been incurred. No, it was a lot of rhetoric.

And there was a lot of recitation, Mr. Speaker, about bills. All those bills have something in common: do it my way or no way.

Now, we had an election, I tell the gentleman again. He knows that. They thought they were going to take the Senate. They didn't. The majority in the Senate is Democrats. And the President of the United States was re-elected. And the House, Republican majority, was returned. But that didn't mean the American people didn't expect us to work together.

I tell the gentleman, I'm not sure what error he thought I made. We did not go to conference on the Violence Against Women Act. We did not go to conference yet on the farm bill.

Mr. CANTOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I will be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. There was no vehicle to go to conference on, Mr. Speaker. If the gentleman recalls, there was a blue slip on the Senate bill, Mr. Speaker, and so we took up the bill in the House

and went ahead and passed the bill. So, I don't even know why that is even pertinent to this discussion, Mr. Speaker.

I'd also say, the gentleman understands as well, there was a bipartisan farm bill that came to the floor. And if I recall, that bipartisanship faded away, which is what now then caused the House to bring up another farm bill. This time, trying to be transparent in the process, brought up the agricultural policy piece, which has passed the House without any bipartisan support, Mr. Speaker.

Then we are also, as the gentleman knows, engaged in discussions with the chairman of the Agriculture Committee as to forging a consensus on a nutrition piece so that we can, yes, act again on that.

So I'd say, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman, it is not accurate that we don't intend to eventually go to conference and iron out the differences between the House and the Senate on both of those issues, on the ag policy, as well as the nutrition policies.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I didn't talk about intentions. I talked about fact. I talked about fact.

PETE SESSIONS, chairman of the Rules Committee, Republican, said this when we passed the farm bill: "I believe that this is an honest attempt to get us to go by passing part of the farm bill, to go to conference."

I asked the gentleman last week, I asked him again, there's nothing on here about going to conference. The gentleman's told me we're not going to conference until we pass something on the nutrition part. We want to see something on the nutrition part passed.

PETE SESSIONS said, in addition to that, when talking about why they brought the farm bill to the floor in the condition it was, dropping all reference and provisions for poor people to have nutritional assistance, said this:

We're attempting to then separate, bifurcate, offer today a rule and the underlying legislation which hopefully will pass which would go to conference and the Senate, because they've passed their own farm bill, has included in its provisions where they discuss the nutrition program.

This is PETE SESSIONS, Republican chairman of the Rules Committee speaking, Mr. Speaker.

As a result of that, that should be in their bill on a conference measure. The House simply, at this point, if we pass this part, could go to conference.

So the gentleman is not accurate when he reflects there's nothing to go to conference on. The Senate has amended their bill into the House bill. We could clearly go to conference on that under the processes.

I think the gentleman must know that. And that was the expectation that PETE SESSIONS says was the purpose of passing the farm bill.

But let me go back to the point I was making before the gentleman wanted to correct me on what I think were accurate representations on all the pieces of legislation I mentioned. Certainly that's the case on the budget. My opinion, it's the case, certainly on the budget.

I don't know what the intentions are, but the fact is we haven't gone to conference on the farm bill and we didn't go to conference on the Violence Against Women bill.

The fact is, what those bills that he mentioned did have in common, Mr. Speaker, is—and he said, we've got no Democratic votes for it. There was no work to get Democratic votes. There was no work for compromise. That's, I tell my friend, why the polls reflect of working people such concern.

The majority, Mr. Speaker, talked a lot about confidence, talked a lot about building confidence if we were going to grow the economy. I agree with him. We need to have individuals confident.

And the gentleman knows, because he talks to a lot of business leaders, as I do, every one of them says that if they had confidence that we could work together and get things done, not put the debt limit at risk, not put the ongoing operations of government at risk, not continue to have fights—I talked to a major leader of one of the health insurers in this country and said, look, we may not like some of this bill, but we think it's the law, and we're going to work to try to make it work for all Americans.

We're not doing that, Mr. Speaker. We're trying to repeal. We're not conferencing. We're not cooperating. We're not trying to come to compromise.

And we can talk about working people, as is appropriate for us to do, and that's what the President is out doing, not here in Washington, not talking to all of us. He's talking to the people and saying, look, this is my program. This is what I want to do, and I'm not getting cooperation from the Congress of the United States.

I think he's absolutely right. And he's talking to the people, not to us, not here in Washington, but he's criticized for doing that by the majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I think that's what he ought to be doing because the American people ultimately are going to have to make a decision as to who is looking out for their interest and who is just simply confronting and not listening to the people in the last election, just a few months ago, or right now.

When the people are saying, board of directors, work together, stop obstructing, I would hope we could do that, Mr. Speaker.

Unless the majority leader has something further he wants to say, I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, July 30, 2013, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

□ 1230

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is the 31st anniversary of the creation of the National Council for Independent Living. NCIL is the leading organization for persons with disability.

Thirty-two years ago, I began my career and life passion serving individuals who were living with life-changing disabilities. I'm proud to be one of the 214 cosponsors of the Achieving a Better Life Experience Act. The ABLE Act will ease the financial strains for individuals with disabilities. I'm also proud to be the author of the Special Needs Trust Fairness Act of 2013. This legislation removes the current barriers that prevent individuals with disabilities from independently creating a special needs trust. What we're talking about is individual independence and making sure that public policy is a tool, not a barrier, in achieving this goal.

Once again, I want to thank the National Council for Independent Living for their leadership and service. Working with advocates such as the National Council for Independent Living, we will accomplish independence, dignity, and success for individuals living with disabilities.

CAUCUS ON BLACK BOYS AND MEN

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to thank Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for pulling together yesterday the first meeting of the Caucus on Black Men and Boys. Trayvon Martin's dad also participated with us yesterday. We need to do something about the violence that occurs all too often, particularly with many young African American boys, in our communities.

Black boys in our community face daily obstacles, including run-ins with the police, high rates of unemploy-

ment, racial profiling, and extreme prosecution that leads to over-incarceration in the community. As a black man, I can attest to what President Obama said in his recent speech:

Trayvon Martin could have been me.

African American men have lived an experience of being stereotyped and profiled in other ways that most people have never had to endure and can never understand.

Mr. Speaker, it is our job as legislators to create policies that create a level playing field so everyone can succeed.

PREVENTING DOD FURLOUGHS

(Mr. WITTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House passed important legislation: the Defense appropriations bill. This bill prohibits furloughs on employees serving our Department of Defense in fiscal year 2014. These employees are now in their third week of furloughs.

This week, we heard from Under Secretary of Defense Comptroller Bob Hale about the adverse impacts, which are expected to worsen if furloughs continue. His message made clear the harm furloughs already have on our force readiness. He echoed what I am hearing from my constituents that I talk to on a daily basis: these dedicated patriots employed by DOD are disappointed and frustrated they cannot support the warfighter and are fearful of an unknown future.

While it may be too late for the 11 days of furlough through September, Congress has the opportunity and I believe the obligation to get this important provision prohibiting furloughs signed into law as soon as possible.

I urge the Senate to join the House in passing this important measure.

ANNIVERSARY OF APOLOGY FOR SLAVERY AND JIM CROW LAWS

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Monday, July 29, will be the fifth anniversary of the passage in this House of the first and only apology for slavery and Jim Crow laws in this Nation's history. This Nation had 246 years of slavery and over 100 years of Jim Crow.

The resolution, which passed with only two Republican sponsors, Wayne Gilchrist and Phil English, said that we needed to rectify the lingering consequences of slavery and Jim Crow. Indeed, we still need to. There are many areas in the criminal justice system that show this, such as racial profiling, that the likelihood of being arrested

for marijuana is four times as much if you're African American than white, and stiffer sentencing if you are African American. The need for public health and public education, and for jobs, more significant, and a much lower net worth among African Americans, are all vestiges of Jim Crow and slavery.

As we look toward the fifth anniversary of that resolution and the 50th anniversary of the march on Washington, both sides of this aisle need to look toward the least of these—people who have been discriminated against and enslaved by our Nation's laws—and rectify those lingering consequences.

HONORING JUDGE MICHAEL WARREN

(Mr. BENTIVOLIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to take some time to recognize one of my constituents.

Last month, Oakland County Circuit Judge Michael Warren was honored with the Americanism Award from the Daughters of the American Revolution of Michigan. The award states that it was presented to Judge Warren "in recognition of outstanding accomplishments and contributions for his tireless work in promoting patriotism for the American people, especially through Patriot Week."

Our country is an exceptional Nation because of what happened in 1776. We need more people teaching the history of our founding and promoting patriotism. Judge Warren is doing a great job in Michigan, and he's a great example that should be followed nationwide.

39TH ANNIVERSARY OF ILLEGAL OCCUPATION OF CYPRUS

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in honor of July 20, which is a special day of remembrance for the families and loved ones of all those who have suffered so greatly as a result of one of the biggest national tragedies in modern Greek history: the 1974 illegal invasion and occupation of the island of Cyprus by Turkish soldiers. It happened 39 years ago this week.

The invasion forced nearly thousands of Greek Cypriots to leave their homes in the occupied area and become refugees in their own country. Their religious and cultural sites were damaged and destroyed, their religious freedoms restricted, and their rights disrespected. In violation of international law, the Turkish soldiers remain there

still, occupying more than one-third of the island. They ignore all the U.N. resolutions pertaining to Cyprus—and there have been many passed.

As the cochair and cofounder of the Congressional Hellenic Caucus, I have worked diligently with my colleagues in the Caucus out of our mutual concern for the continued division and occupation of Cyprus. We continue to work to raise awareness of the Cyprus problem and the role the U.S. can play to support the negotiations.

The people of Cyprus deserve a unified and democratic country—and we are working towards that end.

HELPING CHILDREN WITH DUCHENNE MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY

(Mr. BACHUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to talk about some courageous children who are changing the way that we think about Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy. It affects nearly 20,000 babies a year in the United States, robbing them of the muscle development they need to grow into a healthy childhood.

These children, like Gabe Griffin of Birmingham, who you see in this photo, are full of strength, spirit, and hope. They inspire all of us. As he grows into adulthood, his muscle development will be arrested if we don't make progress.

Thanks to research and advocacy by parents like Gabe's, Scott and Traci Griffin, as well as Joel and Dana Wood, here in Washington new treatments are being developed for Duchenne. But for families, the progress needs to come faster. The FDA is now considering whether to grant accelerated approval to a potential breakthrough therapy. It's a drug called Eteplirsen. While properly taking safety into account, it is important for the FDA to make a timely decision on this drug.

When you look at this picture, you know that we must do everything possible to help these amazing young people to enjoy the happy and healthy childhood that so many of us were blessed with. Let's do everything we can to urge the FDA to research this drug and make it available to the general public.

RECENT COLLEGE GRADUATES FAILED BY PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BIG-GOVERNMENT APPROACH

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, President Obama yesterday pivoted to jobs, or so it has been reported, during an-

other campaign-style speech at Knox College in Illinois. During his hour-long speech, we heard no new ideas. Instead, President Obama batted down the hatches on his economic policies. Meanwhile, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York recently reported that more than 50 percent of college graduates are either unemployed or underemployed.

Unfortunately, President Obama's economic policies have failed the class of 2013. Since he took office, President Obama has never really pivoted to jobs. Instead, he's always pivoted to Big Government. What's really grown over the last 4 years is President Obama's Washington. It's a Big Government boomtown.

In contrast, the House has passed several pieces of legislation that would enable job growth. Let me name just a few of those initiatives: the SKILLS Act, the Keystone pipeline, and expanded offshore domestic energy production.

If the President and the Senate would like to get serious about job creation, let me suggest they go to www.gop.gov/jobs. Unless the President truly pivots away from Big Government, we won't see real economic recovery until the class of 2017 graduates.

DEFENDING AMERICAN LIBERTIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to be here to speak.

At this time, I yield to my friend from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. I want to thank the gentleman very much.

Yesterday, the President made a speech at Knox College in Illinois. And in that speech, he categorized Republican Members of Congress in three groups. He said there was a group of Republicans who agreed with him on his policy but were afraid to vote for it and did not have the courage to vote with him. He also said that another category of Republicans are those who, because it was his idea, are opposed to it. And then the third group of Republicans, he said, were those who have a view of the world that inequality and injustice is inevitable.

I was a little bit offended by that categorization, and I wanted to take a few moments today to explain to the American people specifically why many in our Conference oppose the President on some of his economic and energy policies, particularly.

I want to preface my remarks by saying, when the President was elected, the first thing that he focused on was transforming America's electricity policy. His number one goal was to

produce more green energy through solar panels and wind energy. He spent billions of dollars on that through the stimulus package, much of the money going to venture capital friends of his, wealthy supporters of his, like Mr. Kaiser of Oklahoma, on the Solyndra project. And, in addition to that, the 1603 Treasury program that gives grants to certain green energy projects, the 1703 and 1705 programs at the Department of Energy.

□ 1245

Now, that was the focus of the President. That was the part of his stimulus package that was going to get the economy back on track. Well, I would like to remind people that in June—just this past June—we lost, in America, 240,000 full-time jobs. The last quarter of 2012 and the first quarter of 2013, our growth in gross domestic product was not even 2 percent; it was below 2 percent. And for the last 15 quarters, our gross domestic product has increased only a little over 2 percent—the weakest growth since World War II in America.

Now, for this year, 2013, we've created 750,000 new jobs, but 557,000 of those were part-time jobs. Now, why is that happening and why are we losing full-time jobs? Well, under the President's Affordable Care Act—or as some people call it, "ObamaCare"—any employer that has 50 or more employees and they work more than 30 hours a week, he is going to have to provide health coverage for them. If they do not do so, they will be penalized with a monetary penalty. So the reality is what's happening is that small business men and women in America are laying off their employees and making sure that they only work part-time. So the President, focusing on green energy, encouraging small business men and women to lay off workers, that's precisely why we have a sluggish economy today.

Now, the President says that he is for an all-of-the-above energy policy. And I would say to you that everyone on our side of the aisle supports an all-of-the-above energy policy. But after spending billions of dollars for renewables, the President has only been successful to a very limited degree. As a matter of fact, today, renewables in America are creating only 500 million kilowatts a day; coal is producing 4.5 billion a day; gas, 3 billion a day; nuclear, 2 billion a day. So the President has jeopardized and created obstacles to economic growth because of his sole commitment to renewable energy.

Now, like I said, we need renewable energy; but this President says one thing and does another. He says he is for an all-of-the-above energy policy; and yet because of his actions and his administration's regulations, America is the only country in the world where you cannot build a new coal power plant. As a result of that, we're losing jobs in that industry as well.

So I would just say to the President his priorities are wrong. He is so focused on fulfilling his political goals of changing the way electricity is produced in America and creating obstacles for economic growth that he is self-defeating our abilities to stimulate the economy.

And I would just emphasize once again, we do need an all-of-the-above energy policy. We need wind, we need solar, we need natural gas, nuclear and coal; and yet we cannot build a new coal power plant in America.

If we're going to get this economy growing, we have to have electricity at a rate that we can afford in order to compete in the global marketplace, in order to get people to build plants in America, create jobs in America, and move this country forward.

So I would just say to the President instead of focusing on categorizing Republicans and who they are and what they are, he needs to get his priorities right and start focusing on economic growth and stop using stimulus funds to reward his friends in the joint venture capital business and his wealthy supporters and start helping us build an energy policy that will work for America.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for giving me a few minutes to talk about that issue.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Kentucky. I just had seen an article that's really an exclamation point, really, of what the gentleman was saying. The headline is:

Two Americans Added to Food Stamp Rolls for Every Job the Administration Says It Created.

I mean, how tragic. What an exclamation point on those facts that were laid out by my friend, Mr. WHITFIELD. Thank you.

There's news being reported today that Attorney General Eric Holder has announced the opening of a new front in the battle for voting rights—at least so he says, his brand—which is rather ironic because this administration, and particularly the Attorney General, the Department of Justice, had talked about, in essence, how the Supreme Court had eviscerated the Voting Rights Act and just rendered it basically nothing by its terrible decision. Yet if you look at the words of the Supreme Court in that decision, the Supreme Court points out that the factual data does not bear out the attacks by this administration continuing on the States that had done wrong, if you will, sinned back 50 years ago.

There was racial discrimination in this country at the time of the Voting Rights Act, and there is racial discrimination today; but it has moved. The Voting Rights Act has accomplished a great deal in our efforts to move toward equality of opportunity around the country. And so it has accomplished something that is very

good and very important to the country.

But, amazingly, when the Voting Rights Act was extended—with support from people on both sides of the aisle—they decided that, gee, since some of us have districts where there is now racial discrimination, even though at least six of the States that were originally gone after in the South by the Department of Justice, they had better racial equality in voting than the average for the entire country.

Yet this administration decided our goal is to punish those States that did not vote for this President—we're going after these States; we're going to continue to punish them; we're going to continue to be punitive to them. We're going to ignore areas like Massachusetts, where there's now more racial disparity than in at least six of the States—maybe all of them—in the South. But as I understood it, Massachusetts, unfortunately, has moved into the arena of being a State that has significant—most significant racial disparity. And yet the Voting Rights Act did nothing to address those areas of the country where over the last 50 years discrimination has grown, it's raised its ugly head.

Yet this administration said, no, we're too busy punishing States who corrected their problems and are doing so much better than the rest of the country. Why? Because we can. Actually, that is the reason the Voting Rights Act was extended without the Gohmert amendment that would have made sure that the Voting Rights Act applied across the country in any area where there was racial discrimination. But in a bipartisan manner, a majority forced the extension for 25 more years, which would mean—now, I don't even recall who all was in office back then. I was a little kid. I didn't know who was discriminating and who wasn't. I had no part in it. And people who had no part of the discrimination that was going on back then—the discrimination that needed to be addressed, the discrimination that needed to be corrected—for some reason, have people in a majority of places that voted to extend it, keep punishing areas that are no longer committing wrongs, no longer sinning.

We want to keep punishing them because if we open it up and apply these same punitive things across the country and come up with a new formula, gee, we're not going to be able to keep punishing these areas for their sins of 50, 60 years ago. We may have to punish our own States because racial disparity has grown there.

So the Supreme Court did the proper thing—legally, fairly. Now we see this administration saying, oh, it turns out we can use the Voting Rights Act to continue to punish Texas. Why? Because we can; because we want to. So they're coming after Texas, as announced today, again.

At some point, I hope we get to the place that the President spoke of when he spoke at the Democratic Convention so eloquently, talking about there's not a red America and a blue America, we're just Americans. I loved that speech. I thought it was fantastic. It caused me to rise up and take notice, wow, this guy is saying the things I believe in. He's so right. And yet his policies have been diametrically opposed. They have racially divided us; continuing to go after political enemies; continuing to have this administration's Internal Revenue Service weaponized in a way that Richard Nixon and Lyndon Johnson could never have even dreamed they could have done.

So, hopefully, the court to which the administration has gone in Texas will do the right thing and say, you know, Mr. Attorney General, we remember your comments about how you don't have the power really to do this anymore since the Supreme Court struck section 4 down. And so either we believe what you're saying now, or we believe what you said out there after the Supreme Court decision. And that becomes a real problem when you have an Attorney General that says different things to different people, because the highest law enforcement officer in the country needs to be trusted. He needs to have respect and adherence for and to the law.

We have an Attorney General that's been held in contempt. He's been in contempt of Congress; he's been in contempt of the law; he's been in contempt of the actual facts—repeatedly. We need a different Attorney General.

I asked President Bush to appoint a new Attorney General when there was a scandal over national security letters. I thought it was the appropriate thing to do. When someone's credibility is hurt, even if they didn't even know what was going on, it's time to have new leadership and change what's going on. And we got a new Attorney General.

Yet I'm amazed at how my friends on the other side of the aisle keep clinging, as does the President, to an Attorney General who is in contempt of Congress, contempt of the law, and in contempt of facts; an Attorney General who would have the nerve to testify that he's never even heard of anyone attempting to prosecute a reporter, when he knew as he said it he had okayed and given his blessing to the persecution of James Rosen with Fox News. So he either lied to the Congress in his testimony, or he was a part of a fraud upon the court.

□ 1300

Because the allegations in the affidavit and the application for a warrant before the court going after James Rosen claimed he had violated the law, set out the law he had violated, that he

was a flight risk, that he was a risk to destroy evidence; so either he believed the things that he approved, which means he lied to Congress, or he spoke truthfully to Congress and committed a fraud upon the court. Either way, we need the highest law enforcement officer in the land to have more credibility than that, and yet here he is doing the same thing, saying one thing one place, claiming another in another place.

It is so critical that we be able to trust our government, which brings us back to the issue of NSA spying.

Now, I was a freshman in 2005–2006 in the 109th Congress. I was on the Judiciary Committee, and we had some very rancorous debate between our own party behind closed doors, out in the committee room, here on the floor, over the PATRIOT Act, over the extension of power over the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Courts. I was very concerned, even though we had a Republican administration and a President that I liked and respected, George W. Bush, smarter and wittier than people gave him credit for, a good, decent man.

But we have to consider the possibilities and we have to be specific in our laws. When we debated these changes before the Judiciary Committee back in the 109th Congress when I was a freshman, there were people, my Democratic friends across the other side of the aisle, that were very concerned about an abuse of power that might be occasioned if we don't tighten up the PATRIOT Act.

I am just anal enough, I read the bill as it existed. I read the law as it existed. I was pushing for some things to be changed, and it did cause me some concern that the title of what basically is section 215 of the PATRIOT Act as it was at that time before amended:

Access to records and other items under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

As amended, it would read:

Access to certain business records for foreign intelligence and international terrorism investigations.

So I knew those were the titles, so it really applied to foreign intelligence and international terrorism investigations.

My Democratic friends across the aisle that we would often consider way left had serious concerns. I understood their concerns, but I thought they were being way too fearful of government because the law, we could make it specific enough that it would not be abused by a Republican or Democratic administration.

As I read through, having been a judge and a chief justice and had to consider from a legal standpoint what do these words mean? what does this word mean? can this be considered vague, ambiguous? is this considered arbitrary and capricious? is there room for misunderstanding? I actually had some concerns behind closed doors. I

was asking people from the Bush administration, Justice Department, I'm a little uncomfortable about this; what does this mean?

One of the things I asked about was, in the reference to the proposal for the amendment, it says, "the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or a designee of the Director (whose rank shall be no lower than Assistant Special Agent in Charge) may make an application for an order requiring the production of any tangible things (including books, records, papers, documents, and other items) for an investigation to obtain foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person"—well, I was comfortable with that language. That seemed to protect U.S. citizens pretty well.

And then there's this disjunctive preposition "or," this disjunctive "or." Okay. Well, it can be that or it can be this.

The other aspect was "to protect against international terrorism." Well, I felt like at the time I was okay if we are really seriously to protect ourselves from international terrorism. Again, that doesn't involve an American citizen unless you can establish with probable cause that an American citizen is involved in international terrorism.

And then we get a second disjunctive "or"—"or clandestine intelligence activities."

And I raised the issues behind closed doors in our Republican meetings and when we met with justice officials: I'm uncomfortable with this because it doesn't say "international" in that part. You have the disjunctive "or," but you left out "international" there. I would really be more comfortable if it said, "to protect against international terrorism or clandestine international intelligence activities."

I was told: Congressman, we know you're a judge and you get caught up in words sometimes, but look at the title of the article. The article says, "Access to certain business records for foreign intelligence and international terrorism investigations." So you shouldn't have to be concerned. This is only about intelligence. It's only about foreign contacts.

And we were assured repeatedly behind closed doors and in debate that this amendment to the PATRIOT Act would make it more difficult for an administration to abuse it—Republican or Democrat. I was still a little uneasy, and I know that when there is a disparity between language within a law and the title of the law, the language within the law itself takes priority over the title, I know that, but it was somewhat comforting.

If you read on down—this was as we were trying to amend it and as the Justice Department under President Bush was pushing—it says, "An investigation conducted under this section

shall," and then it has, "(A) be conducted under guidelines . . . (B) not"—and there's an "and," so this is important; you can't go without (B)—"and (B) not be conducted of a United States person solely upon the basis of activities protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

There were some concerns during this debate over amending section 215 of the PATRIOT Act back in the 109th Congress that we don't want the administration gathering intel about someone if it is all having to do with their activity that is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

So, for example, if someone were burning a United States flag or burning a Holy Bible, the Supreme Court tells us those are protected activities protected by the First Amendment, and therefore you could not use those to go gather intelligence data about an American who was doing those things.

Now, of course, we have the U.N. and former Secretary Clinton and President Obama and others saying, We like what the U.N. is saying.

Basically, if we adopted what the U.N. said, it would still be true, our Supreme Court would allow you to burn a Bible and a flag, but you could never, ever do anything like that to a Koran, which then would allow our radical Islamist friends who want an international caliphate to check the box that they created and was discovered during a raid some years back, that one of their 10-year goals was to subjugate the United States Constitution to shari'a law; and as soon as we adopt a law that says you can destroy a Bible and a flag but not a Koran, they can check that box. But under the proposed amendment in 2005 to the PATRIOT Act, or the official title under title 50, War and National Defense, chapter 36, "Foreign Intelligence Surveillance"; chapter IV, section 1861, so paragraph (3) after (2), that says, "An investigation conducted under this section shall . . . (B) not be conducted of a United States person solely upon the basis of activities protected by the First Amendment"—we get to paragraph (3). And this was an issue that was very contentious. There were groups boycotting and demonstrating and saying, Hey, this is all about library books, we don't want the Bush administration being able to go in and get a list of books we've read.

Well, I contended then and still contend now that to do such a thing of an American citizen you should have to have probable cause that an American citizen has violated the law and get a warrant to do that. But this didn't require a warrant. This is allowed under the PATRIOT Act if it was for foreign intelligence purposes and for international terrorism investigations, according to the title. But unfortunately,

in the law itself, it said, "or to protect against international terrorism or clandestine terrorism activities."

And I told people at the time: I'm a little uncomfortable with that, because "clandestine intelligence activities," what is that? What if it's just somebody going somewhere asking questions, not doing it in public but going privately to individuals and saying, "I'm really concerned about what the administration is doing on this or that; what do you know about what this administration is doing? What have they done to you?" Would that be considered as somebody doing clandestine or private intelligence activities?

I was told: You're being paranoid here, GOHMERT. Look at the title again. It's "international terrorism." It's "foreign intelligence." This is not about American citizens. Look at the overall context.

But those words hanging out there after a disjunctive "or," it was a little uneasing. But I had enough people in the Justice Department, on my committee, with the administration at that time that said: No, gosh, no. You're looking for things where there aren't any. This is not an issue.

But this paragraph (3), "In the case of an application for an order requiring the production of library circulation records, library patron lists, book sales records, book customer lists, firearms sales records, tax return records, educational records, or medical records containing information that would identify a person"—wow, that's kind of scary when you consider that entire list of things that the Justice Department might be going after.

But it says, "the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may delegate the authority to make such application to either the Deputy Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Executive Assistant Director for National Security. The Deputy Director or the Executive Assistant Director may not further delegate such authority."

So they wanted to assure us that only people that were looking at foreign intelligence and foreign terrorism who had the big picture, not some low-level rogue agent, would be pursuing anything like this, and we were told repeatedly: But it's all tied to foreign terrorism.

□ 1315

When you go down under subparagraph (b)(2) under each application under this section, it says:

Shall include a statement of fact showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the tangible things sought are relevant to an authorized investigation, other than a threat assessment, conducted in accordance with (a)(2) of this section to obtain foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person or to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intel-

ligence activities, such things being presumptively relevant to an authorized investigation if the applicant shows in the statement of facts that they pertain to (i) a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power.

Now, that gave me comfort. Okay. All right. If it pertains to a foreign power or to an agent of a foreign power, okay. That's not an American citizen, and if it is, there is certainly an agent for a foreign power:

(ii) the activities of a suspected agent of a foreign power who is the subject of an authorized investigation or (iii) an individual in contact with or known to a suspected agent of a foreign power who is the subject of such authorized investigation.

It talks about minimization procedures. Then under (c)(2), it gives this order, this direction, to a judge who may be asked to issue an order:

An order under this subsection: (A) shall describe the tangible things that are ordered to be produced with—and get this—sufficient particularity to permit them to be fairly identified.

Now, that gave me comfort. The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court judges, who are judges nominated by the United States President and confirmed by the United States Senate, thoroughly investigated by the FBI, are the only people, when they're assigned to the FISA court, who could issue an order like this, and the law says that their orders have to be with sufficient particularity.

We know from the law under the Constitution that, if you want to go after specific private information about people, you have to have a warrant, and that warrant has to be based on probable cause, and the probable cause must be established by a sworn statement, and there must be sufficient specificity so that we don't just have blanket orders to go get information.

I know, when I was an assistant DA up in northeast Texas, that we had a deputy come in one time. It was the policy, if you wanted to get a warrant signed by the district judge, you needed to go through the DA's office first so that we could help you and make sure you had probable cause and make sure there was proper specificity. Bless his heart. He was a great gentleman, an older deputy, and he was always after this tiny, little community in our county.

He said, I know they're smoking dope out there. I just know it. I've sat out there and surveilled their house. I haven't seen them with dope, but I know they've got it.

So he came in one day, and he said, I've got them. I can get a warrant now.

What have you got, Deputy?

Well, you know our little convenience store out there in our community was broken into, and one of the things they stole was potato chips.

Okay. So what does that have to do with a warrant to go after marijuana?

Well, of the place I've been surveilling and watching, I found out

absolutely, for sure, that they're having a party Friday night, and they're going to have potato chips there. So all I need is a warrant to go look for potato chips, and while I'm there, I'll find the dope.

I said, Is there anything identifiable on the potato chip packages that would allow you to determine that these were the potato chips stolen from the convenience store?

He said, Well, no, no. These are just potato chips.

Deputy, I'm sorry, but that's not sufficient specificity.

I mean, I've known since law school, since I was a DA, since my years as a judge, and as a chief justice that you've got to have specificity. The Constitution requires it. So, basically, that's what this provision is requiring. You've got to describe with sufficient particularity that people can identify the specific items that you're demanding to be produced.

That's why, when we all looked and saw in public information sources that a FISA Court judge had granted an application for a warrant for every phone call made by anybody in America, whether outside the U.S. or inside the U.S., I couldn't believe they'd find a judge who would sign that. I mean, sure, you might find some judge in some jurisdiction in that location, in that court, who didn't have to go to law school and who really didn't understand the Constitution, but the justices of the peace I know would know you've got to have some specificity here. You can't just come in and ask for everybody's phone records in the country.

So I have to say about my friends on the far left of the political spectrum who were suspicious back when we were pushing—and being pushed, really—for an extension of the PATRIOT Act that they had concerns that somebody might come in and get library records without adequate probable cause. It turns out their concerns about library records didn't even come close to the danger that this act would pose for an administration that felt like it should have everybody's information.

I've talked to people on both sides of the aisle—and this may be one of the few rare issues. My sense is that everybody truly wants the same thing, but when you look at what is being gathered, this was never, ever anticipated. I can't remember if it were publicly or privately in our conversations when we were discussing this extension of the PATRIOT Act, and when I was demanding sunset so we could still have some accountability and demand answers when we wanted them, but either privately or publicly, we were told, Look, we don't even have the capability—this was in 2005—to gather the data for every single phone call that's made by everybody in the United States, and even if we did, we would never do that.

But anyway, that was one of those statements that was made either in private or in public, and that assuaged some of our concerns.

The truth is, I just couldn't imagine a judge who had been nominated by any President—liberal, conservative, confirmed by the Senate, a judge who had obviously gone to law school—who would sign an order saying, Yeah, go get every phone call made by every person everywhere.

I know the hearts of the people on both sides of the aisle who voted against and spoke against JUSTIN AMASH's amendment, and I know this is one of those issues—I can feel it, and I've talked to people on both sides of the aisle in depth and privately—where we really all want the same things here. We want to be safe, but we want to protect our liberty.

It seems that those who have dealt directly with the intelligence agencies and information—the classified information—have said, We really do need this because you don't know how much trouble we're really in if we don't have this. This stuff is critical. We need this information.

Unfortunately, it brings us back to other problems. One, for example, is: when you have open borders and when you know there are people coming in the country who want to harm us, hurt us, destroy our way of life, take away our liberties, then you need to, perhaps, give up some liberty in order to have security.

I don't want to give up liberty. I don't think we should have to, but when you have open borders—as open as ours are right now—and when people want to be secure and safe more than anything else, people are going to give up the very liberty that so many people gave their lives for us to have.

John Adams had that amazing quote. I don't have it verbatim, but it is in essence:

If people in future generations give up liberty, then I will regret from Heaven that I sacrificed so much for them to get it and have it.

We owe it to those who went before us not to so easily give up our liberties.

In one of our hearings, we were told, Oh, it's only the metadata; it's only the numbers. We don't get who has what number and then look at what calls they've made. It's the metadata so we can run the algorithms and look for patterns.

When you have the numbers—and I asked the question—our intelligence agencies, which are the NSA, the CIA, the FBI, are obviously entitled without a warrant to go to the public sector and gather information that any American could get. That means, if any American can get what someone's phone number is, then the CIA, the NSA, the FBI, the Secret Service—anybody—can get that, and then all you have to do is pull up those numbers and

say, Well, I wonder who this person called? and start looking.

I want to say this as respectfully as possible: for those who say we can justify this because it has probably saved us from some terrorist activities, don't forget John Adams and the thoughts of the Founders and of those who gave their lives, their fortunes—everything they had—for us to have liberty when they said, Don't give up your liberty.

I would humbly submit, back in those days of the Revolution, before the Revolution, that it would have been very easy for King George to have taken it a step even beyond what he did where he could quarter soldiers in people's homes without their permission. It was one of the things that frustrated our Founders, that the King, without anyone's permission, could send a soldier in to stay in your home—or more than one soldier.

That's why they wanted to be assured that nobody—no government in America—could ever do that kind of thing again, that they could send a soldier just to live in your house and watch everything and take notes on what you're doing. If they suspected, Gee, we don't have any hard evidence, but I don't trust that guy, so let's send a soldier to stay in that home, then they could do that, and the soldier, certainly, hypothetically, could have taken notes of every activity.

Then it would have been very easy for King George to say, Look, I know you're concerned about my putting a soldier in every home that we are concerned about even though there is no evidence you violated the law or no evidence you're a threat, but I want to point out to you—and this is hypothetical—that since we put soldiers in all of these homes to monitor everything going on in the home, we actually found a handful of terrorist plots by some of the revolutionaries, and we've been able to stop those, so we have actually saved American lives by having a soldier in every home of people we don't trust.

People could have said back at the time, Wow, the King is really thinking about us and our safety because he has saved people from being killed here in America because, by having soldiers in every home and by monitoring all this activity, they were actually able to find some people who were troublemakers who would have harmed Americans.

□ 1330

Yes, it's worth it. Okay, King George, you keep monitoring everything anybody is doing, even when you don't have probable cause. There's some similarity here.

When the government can put that big Orwellian eye in your home that you call your computer, your avenue, your network to the world, they can watch everything you're doing in your

home. They can watch every purchase you make. We find out now this Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that was created under Speaker PELOSI, well, they want to protect Americans from egregious credit card companies, and so they're gathering people's financial information.

I go back to 2002, when a CIA attorney at one of our judicial conferences said, Gee, banks have all your financial information. Why shouldn't the government? I was aghast and said because the banks can't come to your home, bust down the door, throw you to the ground, put a boot on your back, and put you in handcuffs and drag you off. But the government can and does. So we've got to be very careful to make sure that the government does not overreach what they're allowed to do.

Yes, banks and third parties may have financial information, but it does not mean the government is entitled to it. In fact, it's just the opposite. They're strictly forbidden to have that kind of information until Speaker PELOSI's House and HARRY REID's Senate passed a bill that said, Oh, yeah, we'll create this financial bureau, and now we're finding out they're gathering the financial information of people. Then we're assured you don't have to worry about ObamaCare, even though we're hiring all these investigators and we're not going to check their background, we're not going to make sure that they're not a problem or have a criminal record; but we'll make sure, or try to, that they finished high school, and they may need to review your medical records to see what kind of government-mandated insurance policy you need.

Where does this stop? The government under ObamaCare will have every American's medical records. The financial bureau thinks they can have everybody's financial information. That's the government having that. Then we find out the NSA has gotten orders so they can get every single call that we have made to somebody. There is no specificity in an order like that. This has to stop. This is an issue where both sides of the aisle have a kindred spirit. We want to protect people's liberty; but some that are so close to this issue have seen how much can be gleaned from people's complete phone records and they say, Look, this is really dangerous in America. I know how dangerous it is. I've been sounding the alarm for years now.

The Muslim Brotherhood has profound influence in this country and in this administration and in this government. As we've already seen, the largest demonstration in the history of the world in Egypt, they figured it out: we don't want the radical Islamists, the Muslim Brotherhood running our country. Well, I don't want them running ours either, but they're there. Secretary Napolitano couldn't even tell

me how many Muslim Brotherhood members she had giving her advice. She didn't even know. At least she said she didn't.

This is a dangerous situation. We are in danger. There are people who want to take our liberty and destroy our country, but that's no reason for us to voluntarily give up all our liberty, give up all our privacy in the hope that maybe we can stop others from taking it from us. When you give up liberty, you've given it up. We're supposed to have the government protecting us from these kinds of intrusions, not demanding all of the most private aspects of our lives. If somebody wants to disclose private information or private pictures about themselves, that's their business; but the government shouldn't be able to come in and get a picture of your most private information about your life and spread it around the government. That is happening, and there is so much more potential for it to continue to happen and to get worse.

The PATRIOT Act seemed like a good thing if we could have adequate oversight and make sure that the kinds of things we've now found out are going on, make sure they weren't going on. Now we know they are. I've been surprised. I've talked to some of my liberal friends across the aisle that expressed concerns about giving authority to the government to get this kind of information, and I was surprised some of them voted "no" against JUSTIN AMASH's amendment. But that's the thing: the NSA and CIA put pressure on Republicans. They say, Hey, you're conservative. We're with you. You've got to help us have these tools. We're preventing people from being killed. You've got to let us have all this private information about everybody. We promise that we're not abusing it. And it persuades people on our side and then on the other side. I talked to a friend who showed me a printout that he had been given, and it said, Well, no, I think exactly like you do. I don't want them having that much information. But, see, Louis, it says the law says that this can only be done—and it quoted—to protect against international terrorism and foreign intelligence information. I said that's right, that's what the law says, but that's not what they're doing. Really? I mean, it said this. I said, Right, that's what the law allows, but they're going so far beyond that. This is something we need to work on together. This is an issue where the left and the right can come together.

Look, we want to secure people's safety and security, but we can't keep giving up private liberty. Let those that want to tweet out their most intimate details do so. Fine. Go for it. Be a fool. But for those who just want to be Americans and live their private lives and be left alone, the government should not be watching everything

they do through their computers, through their debit and credit card purchases and transactions, through every phone call they make. I thought I was being rather cute when I told my colleagues across the aisle who were very concerned that the government might get more than just information about contacts with foreign terrorists because that's what we were told. Look, the only way we gather information about who you're calling, who's calling you, is if you make a call to a known foreign terrorist or you get a call from a known foreign terrorist or you make a call to a member of a known terrorist organization or you get a call from a member of a known terrorist organization. That comforted me. So I told my friends publicly that if you're worried about having the government gather information on who you're calling, who's calling you, then when you call your foreign terrorist friends, use somebody else's phone. It was amusing at the time, but now it turns out this government is gathering everybody's information and they're storing it and they'll have it and there's no indication they're ever going to get rid of it.

When I was in college, I was required to read Kafka's book "The Trial." I thought it was the silliest novel I had ever read because it was one circumstantial, just crazy event after another. The poor man never knew who was charging him, what he was charged with. I thought this is just somebody creating a nightmare scenario, but thank God we live in America and this can never happen here. Yet I see the seeds of a Kafka novel unfolding before us.

I hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that we will come together on both sides of the aisle and say let's secure our borders so only people that are legally coming in come in. Then once that's done, we can get an immigration bill done. Then, because we're doing that, we don't have to keep giving up liberty to have security. Then let's clean up this law so that some judge who's completely forgotten what the Constitution really means doesn't go off and sign an order to give the government every single phone call that's made to every single individual in and outside the United States. Otherwise, John Adams will look from Heaven, and he will be regretting that he sacrificed so much for us to have the liberty that we're squandering.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE SHINING CITY ON A HILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to be recognized by you

here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and it's my privilege to follow the gentleman from Texas as we close out this legislative week and a lot of the Members are on their way to the airport, or at the airport now, going back to serve their constituents. I'll be there myself, and I trust Mr. GOHMERT will be too.

I wanted to come to the floor and talk about this country that we have, this civilization that we have, the foundations of our civilization, and what's required to retain them and enhance them and move this country beyond the shining city on the hill and to a place beyond there onward and upward. Ronald Reagan often described the shining city on the hill. He described it as an America that is. An America that was and an America that is. We were always challenged by the dream, but he didn't actually articulate, that I recall, something beyond this shining city. But societies must progress, and those that progress the most effectively and those that can be sustained the longest need to be built upon solid pillars.

The shining city on the hill standing true and strong on a granite ridge was built on a solid foundation, and I argue that the foundation of it are the pillars of American exceptionalism, and those pillars are listed in the Bill of Rights. You add to that free enterprise capitalism, Judeo-Christian values, the foundation of our culture, which welcomes all religions, and on top of that the dream that inspired legal immigrants to come to America, and that dream embodied within the vision of the image of the Statue of Liberty. That's the American Dream. That's the American country that we are. And that's the foundation upon which we've got to build our American future.

How did we get here? What was the reason that these pieces came together? How was it that our Founding Fathers came to a conclusion that we would have freedom of speech, religion, assembly, the right to keep and bear arms, freedom of the press, that we would have property rights, that we would have Fourth Amendment rights against unreasonable search and seizure, that we would not have to face any kind of jury but a jury of our peers, and that we would not suffer double jeopardy and that justice would be blind and every person would stand before the law to be treated equally? The statue that we see of Lady Justice holding the scales of justice perfectly balanced is almost always shown to us blindfolded because justice is blind. But justice is not a feeling. Justice is something that has to be delivered by the law.

These are pillars of American exceptionalism, as are those rights that are not enumerated in the Constitution that devolve respectively to the States or the people, those enumer-

ated powers that we have for Congress or those delegated to the Presidency, the executive branch, and the judicial branch of government. All of this is laid out as foundations that have been—although they've been altered to some degree over the years, we have adapted to those principles more often than we've altered our constitutional principles because our Founding Fathers got it right.

Where did that come from? How could it happen that these Founding Fathers could come together on what was an obscure place on the planet and get these ideas so well articulated that they could be the foundation of the greatest Nation the world has seen, the strongest economy the world has seen, the most dominant culture and civilization that the world has seen, the furthest reach in our economy, the furthest reach in our influence strategically?

□ 1345

How did this all happen?

And I would take you back, Mr. Speaker, to think a little bit about the formation of, I'll say, modern history. I take you back to Mosaic law before the time of Christ when Moses, who looks down upon us right now, the only face that is looking directly at us from all of these faces of law providers in history, Moses looks down over this Chamber in full-face form, and he's looking back here and he sees, as we should see, "In God We Trust," our national motto.

How did that come together, Mr. Speaker?

It was when Moses came down from the Mount with the law, God's law, and the foundation of that law, the way it was separated out through the tribes and the way the law and the way justice was delivered, emerged out of Mosaic law and appeared also in Greek law. And as the Greeks, masterful people as they were, they were shaping the Age of Reason. So we had Mosaic law that informed the Greek Age of Reason, and the Age of Reason, where I imagine that Socrates and Plato and Aristotle and other philosophers sat around and challenged each other intellectually like gunslingers did in the West with guns, they did it with their brains. And young philosophers would go up to Socrates and challenge him with their philosophy, and Socrates would take it apart because he was the top guy and he informed others. But as they were proud and prideful of their ability to reason and the culture of Greece at the time, they had to infuse Mosaic law to uphold their rationale. And some of them, as they voiced Mosaic law, were teased by other Greeks that said, Well, you got that from Moses.

But my point in this is that as civilization was progressing, Mosaic law came down from the Mount, was hand-

ed to civilization. It emerged through the Greek civilization as the Greeks were developing their Age of Reason, and we're talking about the foundation of Western civilization. And almost concurrently with that, Roman law was emerging as well.

Now, I'll take you then to the time of Christ. Christ taught us our values, the very values of repentance and redemption that didn't exist in any form before then, and that's his gift to us. But I make this point in talking about the law, and it is this:

Think of Mosaic law coming down, being infused within the Greeks, transferred also to the Romans. Roman law ruled over that part of the world where Christ stood before the high priest Caiaphas. And if you remember, Mr. Speaker, the high priest said to Jesus: Did you really say those things? Did you really preach those things?

And Jesus responded to the high priest, as the Jews were watching, he said: Ask them. They were there. They can tell you.

That was, Mr. Speaker, the assertion by Jesus that he had a right to face his accusers. That principle remains today in our law, that we have a right to face our accusers. And when he said: Ask them. They were there. They can tell you, he's facing his accusers and demanding that they testify against him rather than make allegations behind his back.

And what happened when Jesus said that? They believed and the high priest believed that Jesus' answer was insolent and the guard struck Jesus.

Jesus said: If I speak wrongly, you must prove the wrong. If I speak rightly, why do you punish me?

He asserted his right to be innocent until proven guilty before a Roman court. Those two principles remain today in our law: a right to face your accuser; innocent until proven guilty. You face that jury of your peers, as I said. You need a quick and speedy trial. They didn't have to wonder about that in those days; it happened quickly. And the punishment came quickly as well, right or wrong.

This foundation of law was wrapped up in Roman law, and it was spread across Western Europe as the Romans occupied areas like Germany, England, as we know it today, on into Ireland. And when the Dark Ages came, when the Visigoths sacked Rome in 410 A.D., then we saw civilization itself tumble and crumble, and we saw the heathens break down anything that represented the old culture, anything that represented real civilization.

While that was going on—they were tearing buildings into rubble, they were burning anything that was written documents—while that was going on, the priests, and let me say the descendants of the disciples of Christ, began to gather up any papers and documents they could get their hands on.

Some went to Rome to be secured and replicated by the monks and the scribes there. A lot went to an island off of Ireland where the monks and the scribes replicated those documents there. That was the foundation of the relearning of a civilization, a civilization that had been lived for centuries, having lost the ability to reason.

That Age of Reason that they were so proud of in the time of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle was lost to civilization for centuries as people just lived by instinct and didn't leave much of a record of their rationale and didn't develop science, technology, or thought. And at a certain time, this information that was preserved in the documents of the classics, both Biblical and religious information, and any document that the monks and scribes could get their hands on, they preserved. And they analyzed it and they studied it, and they took a continent and taught that continent how to think.

As the church emerged from Rome and from the St. Patrick side of this thing out of Ireland, they built monasteries across the continent, and they were the centers of knowledge. They began to educate the classical information that they had preserved primarily from the Roman but also from the Greek era, and they reeducated an entire civilization and re-created civilization based on what, Judeo-Christian values, the Age of Reason, and that reason that tied the values of faith together with the values that will allow for science to be developed.

And that brings us to that year, let's say the years emerging from the Middle Ages, and Martin Luther stepped on to the scene in the 16th century and brought us, on top of that, the Reformation Period where he made the point that cast across the globe that you can honor God in a lot of ways. A mother changing a baby's diaper honors God more than a thousand rote prayers that you don't give meaning from your heart into.

And so the Protestant work ethic got added to all these values that have been added together. And the competition between the Protestant and Catholic Church within Christianity ended up, it was rough and it was brutal, but the effect of it on our civilization and on our society has been good because the competition that drove from that made us all better, and each religion drew from the other.

And, by the way, the Eastern Church was separated when the Turks sacked Constantinople. So the Eastern Orthodox and Russian Orthodox were separated, and they evolved in a little bit different way, but we're tied together. We're tied together culturally. We're tied together historically. We're tied together by our common humanity and our belief in, and this is the unique component, their belief in redemption.

These attributes that I've discussed now, they're embodied within Western

Europe as we emerge into, as we had emerged into the Age of Discovery, meaning Christopher Columbus and the explorers who came over here to the Western Hemisphere, that component, as well as a little bit later, the dawn of the Industrial Revolution.

Think about where we are here in America. We are the recipients of some of the wisest, most analytical people that the world has ever produced, our Founding Fathers. They are a product of a culture and a civilization that believed in Adam Smith's free enterprise and the rights to property, and they believed they were free men, that they were free. In fact, they said so in the Declaration of Independence when Jefferson wrote in the Declaration: A prince who exhibits the characteristics of a tyrant is unfit to be a ruler of a free people.

A free people. They saw themselves as a free people before the Declaration. They didn't become necessarily free people as a product of, although they certainly had to earn it. They declared their freedom from England, but they saw themselves as free people before they issued the Declaration of Independence.

But that brings us now to July 4, 1776. I brought this history around from a couple thousand years, or a little bit more, more than 2,000 years.

On this continent now we have the wisdom of the Founding Fathers. I believe they are inspired by God, and it was by Divine Guidance that the Declaration was written, but it arrives here this, with what, these rights that we have—freedom of speech, religion, the press, and assembly, the right to keep and bear arms. The balance of these rights from the judicial side of it, the property rights from the Fifth Amendment, the devolution of power down to the people or the States, all of this landed on a continent with unlimited natural resources, so we believed at the time. All of these rights, free enterprise, strong Judeo-Christian faith and values, the reason many came here, unlimited natural resources, and a concept of manifest destiny.

Now, who could create a giant petri dish that's so robust that it could settle a continent in the blink of a historical eye and leave such a foundation for the growth of population and the image and inspiration of faith and freedom, who could do that? Not man, but the entity that shaped their movements and their thoughts.

So here we are, the recipients, God-given liberty, defined in the Declaration. It should be inarguable. It should be unchallengeable. I think it is. But we're a Nation that cannot be reverse-engineered and come up with a better result. We're a Nation that has components of American exceptionalism, pillar after pillar of American exceptionalism, none of which can we pull out from underneath the edifice of

this shining city on the hill and expect that this shining city would not collapse. Yes, it would.

And so what is our charge here? It is not as hard as the charge of our Founding Fathers. It is not as hard as those who picked up their muskets and marched into the Red Coats' muskets and the Revolution. It is not as hard as the blue and the gray that clashed all over the battlefields here in this country and put an end to slavery and reunified this country. It's not as hard as the doughboys that marched off to war. It's not as hard, certainly, as those 16 million Americans who put on uniforms to defend our country in the Second World War. It is certainly not as hard for us as the 450,000 who gave their lives during that war. It's not as hard, either, as those who marched off to Korea and are honored down here in their memorial, the memorial that says on the slab in front of them:

Our Nation honors the men and women who answered the call to defend a country they never knew and a people they never met.

None of what we are charged with right now is that hard. And yet some despair and some think that we can create this new America that is not tied to the pillars of American exceptionalism; we can sacrifice some of those principles and we'll still be a country okay because we've got some political pressure that says we should sacrifice this principle or we should chisel away some pieces out of this beautiful marble pillar of American exceptionalism. Imagine what it would be like, which if this Congress and this culture that directs this Congress, what if we decided you're going to have limited speech. Certain things you can't say, and we'll give you the list of words you can't utter because if you do that, you're going to be violating somebody's sense of political correctness?

What if we said that you can assemble, but we're going to diminish your right to assemble because sometimes we disagree with what comes out of those meetings? You know, the Greeks did that. They had meetings in their city-states. Remember the Greek black ball system that they had. The demagogues would emerge, people that could step up before the masses in Greece and the city-state and issue a speech that was rhetorically so inspiring that the Greeks marched off in what turned out to be the wrong direction. And what would they do? They would label him a demagogue. They would bring the demagogue before the city-state and then they would excoriate him, and then they would have a vote.

It's like the Greek system today: two gourds, two marbles, one black and one white one. They called them balls, of course. As each of the Greeks walked through, they would drop their voting ball in one gourd and they would drop

their discard ball in another gourd, and if the demagogue got three black balls, he was banished from the city-state for 7 years. That's how they muzzled the people that led them in the wrong direction with emotional rhetoric.

But can you imagine if we did that, if America would banish people into the hinterlands for, let's say, giving a speech that was disagreed with by three people? That's all it took—three. They were restrained, of course, because they didn't want to be the next one banished. But that was the system.

We're not going to limit freedom of speech in this country, and we're not going to limit freedom of assembly. We're not going to say you cannot get together and talk about these things because we know that an open public discourse and dialogue, what emerges from that are—we believe in this reason that we have inherited from the Greeks and other civilizations, that what will emerge is the most logical, rational policy.

□ 1400

That's what I'm advocating for, Mr. Speaker. I want the most logical, rational policy. And I think we need a policy that's right for America.

I have an obligation to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and represent my constituents and represent my State and represent my country. And all of those things should be compatible with each other. And I believe they are. And I've not found myself in a conflict here between them.

So I suggest that we have open dialogue, we have open debate. I challenge this civilization to be reasonable, have reason, be analytical, be a critical thinker.

We send our kids off to school, and sometimes they're just taught a mantra, but they're not taught to take ideas apart and understand the components of them and put them back together. Well, I've just taken America apart and described some of its essential components, history apart, and put it back together, Mr. Speaker, and, hopefully, informed this body of some of the principal reasons why America is such a great Nation.

We're a great Nation because we have God-given liberty. We would not be a great Nation if we didn't exercise those God-given liberties. If we don't have access to those rights, if we don't put our positions out there in front of the public and challenge the people in this country to analyze those alternatives—what if we went down one path?

What if some leader from on high, let's just say King George, not Prince George today, but King George, what if he decided we're going to go down this path, and no one shall discuss anything outside of this line that I've described for you?

What kind of a country would we be?

Would we believe that one mortal individual can chart a path for this country superior to the collective wisdom of 316 million people?

I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. And I don't think thinking Americans will either.

But I know that this country's full of emotionalism. As I watched the reactions to the George Zimmerman trial and verdict, I saw a lot of people who simply denied the facts that had been proven in law, and seemed to be incapable of considering anything that didn't concur with their conclusion that they had drawn before they saw the facts.

Now, I engage in this debate. I challenge people to debate with me because I believe one of two things: if I can't sustain myself in debate, I need to go get some more information. I need to get better informed. Or could it be that I'm wrong?

Only two alternatives can come from not being able to sustain yourself in a debate, and I'll go back and get all the information that I can get, but I'll also reconsider, and anybody should. That's why I challenge people to debate. I'll take it up, and we will see who can sustain themselves. We may not get this all resolved in one discussion.

In fact, in this Congress it's been a very rare thing, over the last 10-plus years that I've been here, to see anybody stand up and admit, I was wrong. What you said changes my position. What I learned changes my position.

No, there are too many egos involved in this Congress for that to happen very often. It will happen a little bit privately, it will happen incrementally, but it doesn't happen publicly, unless there's some kind of leverage brought to bear.

So here's my point, Mr. Speaker, and that is this: Our southern border is porous. It's not as porous as it was 7 or 8 years ago, mainly because the economy has grown in Mexico at about twice the rate that it's grown in the United States over the last 4½ or 5 years. We don't have as much pressure on our border.

But I can tell you this: 80 to 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America come from or through Mexico. I can tell you that in Mexico they are recruiting kids to be drug smugglers. Between the ages of 11 and 18 they have arrested and, I believe, incarcerated, and the number of convictions is at least this: over 800 per year over the last couple of years at that ratio of those who are kids who are smuggling drugs into the United States.

We pick up some on our side of the border. That adds to that number, the ones that we catch. Many get away. Every night some come across the border smuggling drugs across the border. Increasingly, the higher value drugs, heroin, methamphetamine, cocaine in some form or another, are being strapped to the bodies sometimes of young girls, teenage girls.

The media is replete with this. Anybody that reads the paper should know, especially those that live on the border, should know that there are many, many young people coming across the border unlawfully who are smuggling drugs into the United States.

They should also know that now, the drug cartels, and I mean specifically, the Mexican drug cartels, have taken over drug distribution in most of the major cities in America. I think intel will tell you every major city in America. And the numbers that I've seen go from a little over 200 cities in this country to 2,000.

I don't know what population that dials it down to or what areas. I haven't seen the map. But it should be appalling to a country and a civilization to see that that's taken place.

When you understand that, according to the Drug Enforcement Agency, of every chain of illegal drug distribution we have in the country, they will tell you, at least privately, as they have to me on multiple occasions, that at least one link is illegal aliens that are smuggling drugs into the United States.

It's important that we know that as a Congress, as a country, as a civilization. If we deny those facts, if we deny the information that comes, even out of the Obama administration that certainly supports those, if you deny the information that comes out through the major media that's there, if you deny what we're told by our law enforcement officers on the border of the United States that are continually interdicting drugs at about the same rate that they did 6 or 7 or 8 years ago, when the population of illegals was flowing over the border at a faster rate than it is today, the illegal drugs coming across the border are roughly similar to that time.

That says there's still a high demand in the United States. A high demand means drugs are likely to come in. If we are enforcing our borders and tightening security the price of drugs should go up. If you look at the price of drugs, I think you're going to find that we haven't been very effective interdicting drugs coming across our southern border.

Part of that is they find new ways to smuggle, and some of those reasons are because kids are being used to smuggle drugs into the United States. That's appalling to me.

The death across the Arizona border, it's still there. It happens through the summer. And this debate taking place now in the middle of the summer is going to end up with more people being found out there on the desert, in the brush, who have lost their lives trying to get into the United States of America.

We need a secure border. We need to build a fence, a wall, and another fence, so we've got two patrolling zones. We need to put the sensory devices on top

of there. We need to use our boots on the ground in the most effective way possible.

No nation should have an open borders policy. No nation should have a blind-eye policy towards the enforcement of the laws. No nation can long remain a great nation if they decide to sacrifice the rule of law on the altar of political expediency.

No nation like the United States of America can continue to grow and be a strong nation if we are going to judge people because they disagree with our agenda, rather than the content of their statement.

We have to be critical thinkers. We have to be analytical. We should understand facts from emotion.

And let's pull together, let's understand that we do have compassion. We do have compassion, for every human person deserves dignity. We need to treat them with that warmth, treat them with that love, as the American people always have, just like the Korean War veterans did when they gave themselves for a country they never knew and a people they never met.

But we must not sacrifice the rule of law on the altar of political expediency.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HORSFORD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a medical-mandated recovery.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 26, 2013, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2342. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Clothes Dryers and Room Air Conditioners [Docket Number: EERE-2013-BT-STD-0020] (RIN: 1904-AC98) received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2343. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Indirect Food Additives: Adhesives and Components of Coatings [Docket No.: FDA-2012-F-

0728] received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2344. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Community Right-to-Know; Direct Final Rule to Adopt 2012 North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Codes for Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) Reporting; Direct Final Rule [EPA-HQ-OEI-2011-0979; FRL-9825-8] (RIN: 2025-AA36) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2345. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: The 2013 Critical Use Exemption from the Phaseout of Methyl Bromide [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0280; FRL-9809-7] (RIN: 2060-AR41) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2346. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Outer Banks Bluegrass Festival; Shallowbay Bay, Manteo, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0330] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2347. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Areas; Bars along the Coasts of Oregon and Washington [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0216] (RIN: 1625-AC01) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2348. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Tall Ships Celebration Bay City, Bay City, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0368] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2349. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Summer in the City Water Ski Show; Fox River, Green Bay, WI [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0541] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2350. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Sugar House Casino Fireworks Display, Delaware River; Philadelphia, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0495] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2351. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fifth Coast Guard District Fireworks Displays, Delaware River; Philadelphia, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0493] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2352. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Grand Haven 4th of July fireworks; Grand River; Grand Haven, MI [Docket No.:

USCG-2013-0547] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2353. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Margate Mother's Association Fireworks Display, Atlantic Ocean; Margate, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0494] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2354. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Dinghy Poker Run, Middle River; Baltimore County, Essex, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0489] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2355. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Feast of Lanterns Fireworks Display, Pacific Grove, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0238] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2356. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fairfield Estates Fireworks Display, Atlantic Ocean, Sagaponack, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0212] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2357. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fifth Coast Guard District Fireworks Display Cape Fear River; Wilmington, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0115] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2358. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Skagit River Bridge, Skagit River, Mount Vernon, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0449] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2359. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Venetian Fireworks; Kalamazoo Lake, Saugatuck, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0539] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2360. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marine Vapor Control Systems [USCG-1999-5150] (RIN: 1625-AB37) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2361. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbojet Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1331; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-44-AD; Amendment 39-17473; AD 2013-11-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2822. A bill to establish the United States comprehensive strategy for assistance to developing countries to achieve food and nutrition security, increase sustainable and equitable agricultural development, reduce hunger, improve nutrition, and develop rural infrastructure and stimulate rural economies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mr. LATTA, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 2823. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Energy to conduct a fuel system requirements harmonization study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 2824. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to stop the ongoing waste by the Department of the Interior of taxpayer resources and implement the final rule on excess spoil, mining waste, and buffers for perennial and intermittent streams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. FARR, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 2825. A bill to require regulation of wastes associated with the exploration, development, or production of crude oil, natural gas, or geothermal energy under the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 2826. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to prevent the payment of unemployment benefits to incarcerated individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa):

H.R. 2827. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow for fair application of the exceptions process for drugs in tiers in formularies in prescription drug

plans under Medicare part D; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2828. A bill to amend titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act to prevent fraud and abuse under the Medicare program and to require National Provider Identifiers for reimbursement of prescriptions under part D of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 2829. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require an applicant for voter registration for elections for Federal office to affirmatively state that the applicant meets the eligibility requirements for voting in such elections as a condition of completing the application, to require States to verify that an applicant for registering to vote in such elections meets the eligibility requirements for voting in such elections prior to registering the applicant to vote, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 2830. A bill to prohibit assistance to foreign countries whose governments hold more than \$500,000,000 in United States Treasury securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2831. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny any deduction for marketing directed at children to promote the consumption of food of poor nutritional quality; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2832. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate program-related investments by private foundations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2833. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act so as to eliminate the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to limit the ability of medical providers to conduct lawful business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 2834. A bill to include under Federal laws granting rights and responsibilities to married couples other couples in other legal unions similar to marriage, including domestic partnerships and civil unions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 2835. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 2836. A bill to strengthen the enforcement of background checks with respect to the use of explosive materials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BUSHON, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 2837. A bill to prohibit for a one-year period beginning September 30, 2013, the implementation, operation, and coordination of a Federal Data Services Hub or any similar database system for determining or verifying eligibility under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 2838. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to coastwise endorsements and Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of

Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 2839. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RADEL:

H.R. 2840. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to exclude raisins from agricultural marketing orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 2841. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that the Secretary of Defense affords each member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces with the opportunity for a physical examination before the member separates from the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. PETERS of California):

H.R. 2842. A bill to create competition in the Department of Agriculture's canned tuna purchasing program to strengthen the Department's buying power, increase the availability of canned tuna to school lunch, child nutrition, and other Federal nutrition programs, and create jobs in the domestic canning industry; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 2843. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for the public availability of Medicare claims data; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BASS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 318. A resolution expressing disapproval over the gun violence plaguing America's communities, and calling on the Congress to enact comprehensive gun reforms that reduce gun violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 2822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers."

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 2823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 2824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 2827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, which sets forth the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate interstate commerce.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 which states that "the Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States . . ."

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 2830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 2832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 2833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, as it is necessary and proper to protect patients and the doctor/ patient relationship.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 2834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 2835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 2837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 2838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce among the several States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 2839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RADEL:

H.R. 2840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 2841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 14 (relating to the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces), clause 16 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia), and clause 18 (relating to the power of Congress to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 2842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

or

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution which grants the power to Congress “to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 38: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 207: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 262: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 301: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 309: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 313: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 494: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. McINTYRE.
H.R. 495: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 525: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 526: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 647: Mr. DENT, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 698: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 713: Mr. NUNES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LONG, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 847: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 855: Mr. WELCH and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 900: Mr. O’ROURKE.
H.R. 901: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 911: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 920: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 924: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 938: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 940: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 946: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 961: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1000: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1024: Ms. MOORE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 1091: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. HURT.
H.R. 1176: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1201: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 1240: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1250: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1263: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 1288: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. SIREs.
H.R. 1318: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 1346: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1362: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 1414: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1428: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1449: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1473: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1563: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1667: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 1695: Mr. FARR, Mr. O’ROURKE, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1732: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1749: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1801: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1814: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 1816: Mr. GALLEG0.
H.R. 1845: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1891: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1918: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1980: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 2000: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2002: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2011: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 2026: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2036: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2058: Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2085: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2086: Mr. COBLE and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2116: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 2137: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2144: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2237: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2288: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2305: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2328: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 2368: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2369: Mr. WATT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2372: Mr. WATT, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2417: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2429: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 2445: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2453: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2468: Mr. GRIMM and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2475: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2484: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2495: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 2500: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 2511: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 2530: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 2531: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 2532: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 2533: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 2539: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2541: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 2575: Mr. PETRI, Mr. MICA, and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2590: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2663: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 2682: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2690: Mr. KEATING, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2692: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2717: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 2745: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2761: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2764: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 2768: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 2769: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2772: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MEEHAN, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2775: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. NUNES, Mr. REED, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARR, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 2780: Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HOLT, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. WATERS, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2805: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CARTER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 2807: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2812: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. CLAY.
H.J. Res. 24: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 75: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 101: Mr. WOLF.
H. Res. 109: Mr. ENGEL and Mrs. BEATTY.
H. Res. 111: Mr. POE of Texas.
H. Res. 236: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H. Res. 280: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. RADEL.
H. Res. 281: Mr. POLIS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H. Res. 284: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H. Res. 293: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. DENHAM, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H. Res. 304: Mr. MCGOVERN.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING SYSMEX AMERICA FOR ITS CONTINUED INNOVATION, COMMITMENT TO QUALITY AND POSITIVE IMPACT IN THE COMMUNITY

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sysmex America on the opening of its latest research and development laboratory, and to honor their contributions to global health care.

Headquartered in Lincolnshire, IL, Sysmex America distributes diagnostic analyzers, reagents and information systems all across North and South America, helping countless laboratories provide better services and countless patients receive better care.

Health care is increasingly dependent on new, innovative technologies, and Sysmex America is on the cutting edge of research and development. The opening of this new facility will only add to their capabilities and long-term success.

Illinois's Tenth Congressional District has a rich tradition of innovation in health care and manufacturing, and Sysmex America perfectly embodies the contribution of both industries, building some of the finest medical technology and information systems in the world.

With such dedication to core values like innovation, teamwork, unmatched quality and the advancement of health care, Sysmex America demonstrates remarkable responsibility not only to their clients and shareholders, but also to the community as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, our Tenth District is home to a number of excellent corporate citizens, and each enriches the community in its own way. I am proud of the companies that make our community strong, and I am honored that Sysmex America calls our district home. I congratulate them once again on the opening of this remarkable new lab, and I look forward to following their future innovations and success.

A TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE LIFE OF CARLA ANDERSON

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an extraordinary woman, Carla Anderson, who passed away on July 23, 2013, in Bismarck, North Dakota.

Carla Anderson was born on September 15, 1960, to Donald and Cecelia Albers in Bismarck. She never lost her love for her home town of Center, North Dakota and her rural

America roots. For the past eight years, Carla served as Deputy Executive Director of the Next Generation (NG) 9-1-1 Institute, a not-for-profit organization that works with the Congressional NextGen 9-1-1 Caucus to promote the deployment of advanced and effective NG 9-1-1 services across the nation.

Throughout the years, Carla worked tirelessly to help the Caucus raise awareness of 9-1-1, develop and pass legislation to support the transition to NG 9-1-1, and make 9-1-1 a national priority. No one in our country did more to promote 9-1-1 education. Carla was instrumental in creating a coalition of national public safety and industry organizations to come together to promote 9-1-1 education.

Carla's dedication and enthusiasm to advance 9-1-1 and promote public safety was unmatched. Her impact has been felt not only throughout the United States, but internationally as well. Her smile and positive demeanor brought cheer and enthusiasm to everyone she touched and she will be missed by all those who have had the privilege of working with her. The 9-1-1 community has lost one of its greatest and most prominent champions.

Carla will forever be remembered as a devoted wife to her husband Tracy Anderson and extraordinary mother to their two beautiful sons, Brandon and Andrew. Her memory will always be cherished by her parents and bring joy to her siblings Kurt Albers, Scott Albers, Jeff Albers and Karen Thomas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the extraordinary life and accomplishments of Carla Anderson. As Co-Chair of the Congressional NextGen 9-1-1 Caucus, I'm very proud and grateful to have had the opportunity to know and work with Carla. She took on every cause with a passion—whether it was cheering on the Center Wildcats basketball team, volunteering as the community photographer, or leading the charge on 9-1-1 education. Her untimely death is a loss not only for her family but to the entire Congress, the public safety community and our nation.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 TO H.R. 2397,
FY14 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT

HON. JIM BRIDENSTINE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, the House passed H.R. 2397, Fiscal Year 2014 Department of Defense Appropriations Act on July 24, 2013. My amendment, made in order as Amendment #77, was adopted by the House in En Bloc package number one offered by Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I want to be clear about the intent of this amendment. The amendment reduces the Defense-wide Operations and Maintenance account by \$11 million and re-

allocates \$10 million split evenly between Army and Air National O&M accounts for National Guard State Partnership Program (SPP) activities. Specifically, this amendment would reduce the lowest priority internal media activities within the Defense Media Activity (DMA) Operations and Maintenance account. The Department should not apply this reduction to DMA overseas media activities. My intent is that the increases in Army and Air National Guard O&M accounts specifically fund the National Guard State Partnership Program.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. WILSON, for co-sponsoring this amendment. These two members are champions of the National Guard and its security cooperation programs. The Bordallo-Wilson bill, H.R. 641, codified SPP in statute and became Section 1204 of this year's House-passed National Defense Authorization Act.

The State Partnership Program is a vital component of the DOD's security cooperation mission. In contrast, Defense Media Activity includes numerous "nice to have" activities such as the Pentagon Channel and all of those glossy brochures that fill our in-boxes during budget season. This very modest funding readjustment signals Congress's commitment to fully leveraging SPP as a security cooperation tool. SPP is particularly important given the budget cuts to active duty deployed forces that will be less able to fulfill these requirements.

SPP is a DOD security cooperation program run by the National Guard that links state and territorial National Guards to military and civilian personnel in 70 partner nations. Almost every state and territory participates in SPP. In my state of Oklahoma, our National Guard has developed a robust relationship with Azerbaijan, a country increasingly important to energy security in Europe and Israel.

Unlike some security cooperation programs, SPP is not a "talking shop" where nothing of substance takes place. Typical SPP missions include:

1. Subject matter expert exchanges
2. Demonstration and training of certain capabilities and technologies
3. Senior leader visits; and
4. Mentor and liaison teams in which National Guardsmen actually embed with partner personnel on operations.

In times of budget cuts and sequestration, regional combatant commanders will reduce active duty participation in theater security cooperation activities. SPP can help plug this hole in support of joint COCOM and Chief of Mission objectives. No activities can occur without the joint approval of the COCOM and Chief of Mission. The types of activities eligible for funding are limited to those within the National Guard's core competencies.

By using the National Guard, SPP adds value in ways that, frankly, active duty forces cannot match. SPP brings three unique attributes to the table. First, SPP creates enduring relationships between particular individuals

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

over the course of careers. Some National Guard and foreign military personnel have literally been training with each other for over two decades. As a Navy pilot, I can tell you that trust is indispensable in terms of fighting shoulder-to-shoulder with allied forces. Trust is built through constantly engaging with our allies and friends.

Second, the National Guard's dual-status gives it expertise in certain operations that partner nations must execute regularly. Our National Guardsmen are experts in disaster relief, border security, search and rescue, and civil disorder operations, among other operations. Finally, SPP brings our states and territories into security cooperation and provide conduits for developing non-security relationships such as strengthening economic or educational exchanges.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of the work the Oklahoma National Guard has done working with Azerbaijan. My amendment is a modest step toward properly funding this vital program.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF BOBBY & SHIRLEY STALLINGS

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate dear friends and neighbors of mine, Bobby and Shirley Stallings, and celebrate with them on a very special occasion. On June 20, 2013, Bobby and Shirley celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary.

Bobby and Shirley were married on June 20, 1963, by Chaplain Jolly at McCoy Air Force Base in Central Florida. They spent the beginning of their marriage in Salina, Kansas on Schilling Air Force Base where Bobby was stationed working on Atlas missiles in underground silos. While stationed in Kansas, Shirley went back to high school to earn her diploma and worked part time. Upon the completion of his service in the U.S. Air Force, Bobby went to work at Kennedy Space Center for North American Rockwell until 1969 when Mission Apollo 11 landed the first humans on the moon. Saving every penny possible in order to start their first business, Bobby and Shirley opened a child care center to help educate and prepare children for the future.

Bobby and Shirley have been abundantly blessed with a wonderful family and many friends. They are the parents of a son and daughter, and grandparents of two granddaughters. In addition, Bobby and Shirley remain in touch with many of the children they provided care for at their child care center.

Their dedicated service to their community and country is to be admired. I would like to congratulate them both for all of their accomplishments during their marriage, and in particular, thank them for all the sacrifices made while Bobby served in our nation's military.

Marriage and strong families are indispensable contributors to the prosperity of our nation. On behalf of the people of Central Flor-

ida, I am honored to recognize Bobby and Shirley for their testament of loyalty and faithfulness to one another and their family. I offer my sincerest congratulations to them for 50 years of marriage, and may God continue to bless them and their family in the years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, on the Legislative Day of July 24, 2013, a series of votes was held. Had I been present for these rollcall votes, I would have cast the following votes:

rollcall 399—I vote "nay."
rollcall 400—I vote "no."
rollcall 401—I vote "no."
rollcall 402—I vote "no."
rollcall 403—I vote "no."
rollcall 404—I vote "no."
rollcall 405—I vote "no."
rollcall 406—I vote "aye."
rollcall 407—I vote "aye."
rollcall 408—I vote "aye."
rollcall 409—I vote "aye."
rollcall 410—I vote "no."
rollcall 411—I vote "aye."
rollcall 412—I vote "no."
rollcall 413—I vote "aye."
rollcall 414—I vote "yea."

NORTH CAROLINA STATE REPRESENTATIVE JERRY CHARLES DOCKHAM

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, North Carolina state representative Jerry Dockham has been a public servant of Davidson County for 23 years. Appointed to the North Carolina House of Representatives in 1990, Representative Dockham was continuously elected to serve 12.5 terms to represent the 80th District in the NC House.

A business graduate of Wake Forest University, Jerry operated an insurance company in his hometown of Denton, North Carolina for 38 years.

During his time in the North Carolina House, Jerry served as Chairman of the Committee on Insurance, Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Banking and a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Commerce and Job Development. Representative Dockham was consistently ranked in the top 10% of House legislators by the North Carolina Free Enterprise Foundation. He has received numerous awards, such as, 'Legislator of the Year' by the North Carolina Society of Anesthesiologists and the 'Emergency Medicine Advocate of the Year Award' by the North Carolina College of Emergency Physicians.

The husband of a teacher assistant, Representative Dockham has served on the Da-

vidson County Community College Board of Trustees for 26 years. Jerry is an active member of his community, serving as a member of the Thomasville Chamber of Commerce and a member of the Denton Lions Club. He and his wife, Louise, are the proud parents of Andy and Matthew.

In his farewell speech on the floor of the North Carolina House, Representative Dockham left his colleagues with these words of advice: "I would just leave you with two requests. First of all, always honor this chamber. Always honor the House of Representatives and what it stands for. This is the People's House. And secondly, I would ask you this: always be kind to each other. We're down here, we're away from home, we're away from our family and we deserve to be kind to each other. Whether you agree or disagree with someone, it doesn't cost anything to be kind to that person."

Mr. Speaker, I rise to call his extraordinary service and devotion to North Carolina to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker on July 24, 2013, I missed rollcall vote No. 408. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 23, 2013, I inadvertently voted "no" on roll No. 394—An amendment to H.R. 2397—the Department of Defense, offered by Mr. FLORES, numbered 41 printed in House Report 113—170 to prohibit any funds from being used to enforce the selective fuel bans set forth in Sec. 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE NATION'S FIRST BALE OF COTTON

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize this country's first bale of cotton in 2013, which was delivered by the Rodriguez Brothers' Farm at 2:15 p.m. on Friday, June 21, 2013, to the La Feria Co-Op Gin. The cotton with seeds weighed 1,920 pounds.

Cotton is an important agricultural commodity to South Texas. Last year, in the 34th Congressional District of Texas, which is anchored in Cameron County, 217,106 bales of

cotton were produced, worth an estimated \$72,500,000.

The first bale, once ginned, will be delivered to the Harlingen Area Chamber of Commerce.

The First Bale contest dates back to the 1800s when producers were required to deliver their first bale of the growing season to Houston for certification. In 1953, the Harlingen Cotton Committee was authorized by the Houston Stock Exchange to hold the contest in Harlingen each year.

The Harlingen Cotton Committee of the Harlingen Area Chamber of Commerce has certified the nation's first bale of cotton for the past 60 years.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having this opportunity to honor the first bale of cotton in the nation. This annual competition continues to highlight the importance of South Texas in our country's agricultural industry.

URGING THE RELEASE OF U.S. MARINE CORPORAL ARMANDO TORRES

HON. JIM BRIDENSTINE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, the recent news of the kidnapping of a U.S. Marine Corporal Armando Torres in Mexico is an incredibly tragic story. Corporal Torres was kidnapped on May 14, 2013 while visiting his father's ranch in La Barranca, Tamaulipas, Mexico just across from the U.S. border. The Torres family believes the ranch was the target of drug cartels as transshipment for drugs. I strongly urge those holding Corporal Torres to release him immediately.

As a Navy pilot with combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, I believe that Congress must send a message to our government and Mexico's government that we do not turn our backs on our men and women in uniform. I urge the U.S. State Department to prioritize securing the release of Corporal Torres in terms of our foreign policy with Mexico. As a member of Congress, I will do everything in my power to bring attention to Corporal Torres's kidnapping.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SCRANTON CELEBRATING ITS 125TH ANNIVERSARY DURING THE 2013-2014 ACADEMIC YEAR

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the University of Scranton and congratulate its leadership and students as the university celebrates its 125th academic anniversary. Founded in 1888, the University of Scranton will commemorate this remarkable achievement through various events throughout the 2013-2014 school year.

The University of Scranton was originally founded as Saint Thomas College by the most

Reverend William G. O'Hara, D.D., the first Bishop of Scranton. In August 1888, the cornerstone was blessed by Bishop O'Hara, who sought to provide higher education for the Lackawanna Valley.

Prior to being administered by Jesuits, the university saw leadership by diocesan priests and seminarians, Xaverian Brothers, and the Christian Brothers, who changed the name of the school in 1938 from Saint Thomas College to the University of Scranton. In 1942, Reverend Coleman Nevils, S.J. led 19 Jesuits to administer the University of Scranton, an educational presence still felt today under Rev. Kevin P. Quinn, S.J., who continues to grow the range of academic offerings and advanced degrees offered by the institution.

Through the years, the University of Scranton has gone from less than 1,000 local commuter students, to more than 6,000 students who come from all over northeastern Pennsylvania and beyond. The university's strategy and modern initiatives aimed at bettering lives and academics of its students are based on core Ignatian values, such as Cura Personalis (treating others, especially students, as individuals, just as God treats us), Magis (a relentless desire for excellence grounded in gratitude), and Rei Sollicitudo (a commitment to careful stewardship of the resources entrusted to our care).

In recognition of the University of Scranton's storied success, it will celebrate the 125th anniversary of the blessing of the original cornerstone with a Mass and luncheon on August 12. The university is a gem in my district, and I offer my congratulations to the faculty, staff, administration, students and alumni on this momentous occasion.

RECOGNIZING DREAM IT. DO IT.

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dream It. Do It., Nebraska's new partnership with my alma mater, Omaha Northwest High School.

The Dream It. Do It. Initiative partners manufacturers with local schools and community organizations to promote manufacturing and educate students on careers in an industry that supports one in six jobs in the United States. According to the National Association of Manufacturers, the manufacturing industry employs nearly 10 percent of the workforce in Nebraska with annual average salaries of \$53,831. That's \$14,000 higher than other non-farm payrolls in my State. In addition to educating students on benefits of careers in manufacturing, Dream It. Do It. Nebraska helps students and their families understand the education paths necessary to obtain these jobs.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, I have heard repeatedly from over 40 witnesses in our Nation of Builders hearings that there are a lot of manufacturing jobs available. I've heard this from some manufacturers in

Omaha. The problem is that employers are finding there isn't a pool of potential employees with the necessary skills for these positions. Dream It. Do It. Nebraska makes sure that tomorrow's workers in my district have the education and skills required to fill these great, middle-class jobs. I am pleased that Dream It. Do It. Nebraska is working in my district to help prepare young people for these jobs.

With twenty-five programs nationwide, Dream It. Do It. is truly a grassroots program. Its grassroots nature allows local leaders to design programs to address the specific needs in their communities. Dream It. Do It. Nebraska is able to prepare Nebraska students for Nebraska jobs.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Dream It. Do It. Nebraska and Omaha Northwest High School on their new partnership. I know that my Northwest Huskies and Dream It. Do It. Nebraska's partnership will benefit Nebraskans for years to come.

HONORING MISS CALIFORNIA 2013, CRYSTAL LEE

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Miss California 2013, Crystal Lee, who will be competing in the prestigious Miss America pageant this September.

A lifelong Bay Area resident, Crystal competed as Miss Silicon Valley against 60 other outstanding young women at the Miss California Pageant earlier this year. Through five phases of competition, including interview, physical fitness in swimsuit, evening wear, on-stage question and talent, Crystal rose to the top. During preliminary competition nights, she even took top honors for her evening gown presentation and her ballet en pointe performance of "The Dying Swan." The latter should come as no surprise, since Crystal is an accomplished dancer who has been perfecting her technique for the last 13 years.

Winning the title of Miss California earned Crystal more than \$14,000 in scholarships. Over her four years of competing in the Miss America program, including in 2008 when she was Miss California's Outstanding Teen, Crystal has earned more than \$30,000 in scholarships. These awards were well spent, as Crystal graduated this past June from the venerable Stanford University. Proving that our Miss California has both beauty and brains, Crystal worked as a research assistant in the psychology, biology, virtual reality and drama departments and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts in Human Biology and a Master's Degree in Communications.

Crystal will put her Stanford education and Silicon Valley roots to good use through her Miss California platform Girls in S.T.E.M. (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math). She's been a steadfast advocate for women to study and choose careers in STEM after she experienced firsthand a gender imbalance in her own classes and multiple internships at male-dominated technology start-ups. She's worked hand-in-hand with the Girl Scouts of

America to help young girls understand engineering principles and earn their technology badges.

With perseverance, hard work and a little luck, Crystal will be able to continue her STEM platform at the national level as Miss America. California is fortunate to have such a strong and successful young woman representing us. This year's Miss America pageant will take on special meaning when it returns to its birthplace in Atlantic City after seven years away and no doubt it will be a memorable experience for all the young women participating. However, there is one I'll be cheering for most. To Miss California 2013, Crystal Lee, I wish nothing but the best of luck in her pursuit of the Miss America crown.

CONGRATULATING DR. ERDAG
GOKNAR

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Dr. Erdag Goknar of Duke University in Durham, North Carolina for being honored by the National Endowment for the Arts, NEA, and awarded a 2014 NEA Literature Translation Fellowship.

Dr. Goknar serves at Duke University as an Assistant Professor of Turkish Studies and concentrates on late Ottoman and modern Turkish works. He also specializes in politics and cultural translation on works from the Middle East, including Islam and Sufism as well as secular modernity, identity, and gender issues. He is a published author on Turkish literary culture and has produced three complete translations of important Turkish books. Dr. Goknar has an impressive list of national and international accomplishments, including receiving two Fulbright awards and the Dublin IMPAC literary award. He holds a PhD and Master's Degree from the University of Washington, Seattle.

Since 1981, the NEA has helped support the accessibility of priceless pieces of literature to all Americans by providing Literature Translation Fellowships to outstanding scholars to help translate those works into English. For 22 years the NEA has awarded 255 fellowships to help translate different pieces of literature in 62 languages from 78 countries. This year, after a rigorous review process, only 16 scholars are being awarded a total of \$250,000 to translate works in 13 languages from 15 countries into English.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Dr. Goknar on his commitment and contributions to helping more Americans access important literary works through translation. In an increasingly globalized society, it is critical to understand those from other places and walks of life. Literature provides perspective and context into important cultural trends and ideals, so we must invest in learning all we can through works in other languages and from other places.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring and congratulating Dr. Erdag Goknar and other 2014 NEA Literature Trans-

lation Fellowship recipients for their outstanding work and commitment to helping others access important pieces of literature.

RECOGNIZING MRS. ALLIE MUSE
PEEBLES AS RALEIGH-APEX
NAACP HUMANITARIAN OF THE
YEAR

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mrs. Allie Muse Peebles on being selected to receive the Humanitarian of the Year Award by the Raleigh-Apex chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP.

Mrs. Peebles has dedicated over twenty years of service to the Raleigh-Apex NAACP. As Life Membership Chairperson, she has encouraged more than half of the branch to become Life Members and secured needed funds for the branch's annual scholarship and other endeavors.

I first got to know Mrs. Peebles as I prepared to run for Congress some 28 years ago. I quickly learned how respected she was in Raleigh and Wake County, based on her commitment to community betterment and her ability to communicate and work with people of varying views and backgrounds. After retiring as an English teacher, she continued writing for the Carolinian, a biweekly African-American publication based in Raleigh, and she remains an active member of the Raleigh Alumna Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., the Voter Education Coalition, the Sertoma Club, the National Council of Negro Women, and the Raleigh Alumni Chapter of Hampton University.

I commend her remarkable service both to the community and the Raleigh-Apex NAACP. Mrs. Allie Muse Peebles is very deserving of the Humanitarian of the Year Award, and it is with great pleasure and pride that I congratulate her on receiving this honor.

HONORING BLAKE MCELMAN AND
JAY CAVANAUGH OF MAINE FOR
COURAGEOUS ACTIONS

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize two young men in my district whose courageous actions saved the lives of two fishermen this past New Year's Eve.

While attending a family gathering on Montsweag Bay in Woolwich, Maine, late that evening, Blake McElman and Jay Cavanaugh, both 21, heard yells coming from the water. Looking out, they saw that the incoming tide had quickly surrounded two men who had been digging for worms on mudflats far from shore. Standing on a rock, the men would quickly become immersed in the frigid water.

With time of the essence, McElman and Cavanaugh decided to attempt a rescue themselves. Hauling a canoe to open water over ice and snow, they paddled several hundred yards offshore and recovered the men, both showing early signs of hypothermia. Once ashore, they fed and warmed the men, who ultimately escaped from the incident unscathed.

This would not have been the outcome without the quick and courageous actions of McElman and Cavanaugh. Most likely they saved those men's lives that night. I'm relieved and thankful that all four men survived this very dangerous situation.

Mr. Speaker, many people in Maine make their living in jobs that involve braving the elements and even risking their lives in unfor-giving and swiftly changing environments. But what also characterizes our state is that our people look after each other and are willing to go a long way to help one another. McElman and Cavanaugh certainly showed that to be true, and then some. I'm very proud to have them in my district.

IN RECOGNITION OF PATTY SHAY

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to recognize Patty Shay, who is retiring after 34 years of distinguished service to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Patty is the Director of Constituent Services and Office Manager for my office, and will retire on August 31, 2013. Patty began her career in civil service in 1977 with the office of Assemblyman Bill Dannemeyer and remained on staff after he was elected to Congress in 1979. Fourteen years later, Patty continued her service by joining my office when I succeeded Dannemeyer as Representative of the 39th District. By this time, Patty knew that she preferred casework and that the U.S. Service Academy process was her specialty.

Patty has enjoyed the challenge of helping people. Her motto is always, "do the best that I can in the place where I am and be kind." Over her years of service, Patty has handled thousands of cases. And often, people will call after years have gone by and continue to say thank you.

Her favorite casework is the Department of Veterans Affairs, and in particular dealing with those who served in WWII. The stories told by these humble warriors left her forever grateful for the Greatest Generation.

Patty's true passion during her service was the U.S. Service Academy process. She developed a very structured nomination system in order to develop the young nominees, which has helped them to succeed at the academies. She became known as Mama Shay due to a Cadet from the 3rd class that attended West Point. Patty has worn this as a badge of honor. Many officers continue to write messages to Mom/Mama Shay today.

Through the years, the long line of Patty's kids that received appointments grew to 607.

Of that number, 414 graduated and are serving all over the world today. Many have accomplished fulfilling military careers while others have become lawyers, doctors, or dentists. She feels privileged to know so many bright, capable nominees, and has been happy to provide them with support, guidance, and direction throughout the years.

As a testament to her work, Patty has received numerous public service awards including; the "Duty Honor Country" award by the West Point Society of Orange County; "The Donald" which is an award selecting the legislative staffer of the year by fellow Orange County staffers; and the "Everyday Hero Award" from the Fullerton Rotary Club. Patty is extremely thankful and grateful for the years she has spent in public service.

Patty has always kept family close and of the highest priority. Having raised two active boys as a single parent, she was constantly running from one event to another. Who knew this would be the prologue to her duties handling the Academy Nominations. Her non-stop energy and attitude toward teaching and helping others has always translated into family. Now that her sons are grown, she continues that same philosophy with her three grandsons. She is constantly researching and providing pathways to higher learning for each of her grandsons. She does this by taking each one of their strengths individually and providing a specific learning goal for each one, which is very similar to the approach she uses to provide Military Academy Appointments each year. Patty loves sharing the accomplishments of her sons & grandsons to her many friends and extended family members. She stays in close contact with her sister, niece, and nephew who all live in Oregon and Washington.

So I ask all of my colleagues to join me in thanking Patty Shay for her service to Congress, and the Nation. I wish her all the best in her retirement.

TRIBUTE TO BERNARD M.
LUKETICH

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the long service of Mr. Bernard M. Luketich as National President of the Croatian Fraternal Union, which is headquartered in Pittsburgh.

Since its founding in 1894, the Croatian Fraternal Union has grown with the Croatian community in the United States. It is estimated that 30,000 Croatian Americans currently live in the Greater Pittsburgh area, and I am very happy to represent many of our local Croatian Americans in the U.S. Congress.

The Croatian Fraternal Union has provided much-needed insurance, investment, and social services for its members since its inception and has helped many Croatian Americans establish successful families and communities over the past 100+ years.

The Croatian Fraternal Union also ardently supported the Republic of Croatia's establish-

ment as a stable democratic and free market-oriented nation-state as a result of the devolution of the Soviet Union and the Balkan Wars in the 1990s. The CFU was instrumental in developing American support as a founding member of and in steady concert with the National Federation of Croatian Americans for the new Republic's full accession into western multilateral organizations. This includes full membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO, in early 2009 and the European Union on July 1, 2013.

This year, Mr. Luketich was re-elected to serve his 35th year as President of the CFU, the largest and oldest Croatian American organization in the United States. I would like to congratulate Bernie for his 35 years of strong leadership as President of the Croatian Fraternal Union.

As we all know, the president of any organization cannot do it alone. It is important to also to note the contributions of his long-time senior staff at the Pittsburgh headquarters—Executive Assistant/Editor Lorraine Turkall, Secretary/Treasurer Ed Pazo, VP Franjo Bertovic, VP George Pavlecic, Editor Ivan Begg, and CFU Board of Trustees President Bernadette Luketich Sikaras.

Mr. Speaker, I submit a June 5th article on Bernie Luketich's career that appeared in the Croatian American community's premier ethnic newspaper, the "Zajednicar."

Mr. Speaker, congratulations again to Bernie for his steady leadership and service to his diaspora community and to our United States.

[From the Zajednicar, June 5, 2013]

BERNARD M. LUKETICH—CELEBRATING 35 YEARS AS NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF THE CROATIAN FRATERNAL UNION OF AMERICA

A record-setting milestone was achieved on June 1, 2013 as CFU National President Bernard M. Luketich began his 35th anniversary year serving as National President at the helm of the Croatian Fraternal Union of America. Consecutively elected as National President since the 1979 CFU National Convention, President Luketich is currently serving his ninth full term as president of the Society.

Prior to becoming National President on June 1, 1978, Luketich had served as a Member of the Society's National Administration in various capacities, beginning with his election to the National Board of Trustees at the 1959 CFU National Convention held at Detroit, Michigan.

The son of Emma and Ivan Luketic, Bernard Luketich was born and raised in Cokeburg, Pennsylvania. His father, Ivan, emigrated from the village of Zagorje, Ogulin, Croatia and settled in Cokeburg where he found work in the Pennsylvania coal mines. A coal miner himself in his youth, Bernard Luketich carried his family values and love for his Croatian ancestry to become a leader of the largest Croatian fraternal organization outside of the old homeland.

Recognized as the "Founding Father" of the CFU Junior Cultural Federation, President Luketich counts this youth cultural program among his proudest achievements since it perpetuates Croatian identity and heritage among CFU children and young adults. In addition to the annual Junior Tamburitza Festivals, President Luketich was further instrumental in initiating the annual CFU Adult Tamburitza Festivals, both cultural events which have flourished

over the years to promote Croatian tamburitza music throughout the United States and Canada.

Interested in Croatian activities at a young age, Bernard Luketich became a member of the Croatian Fraternal Union in 1932. He was elected President of his local CFU Lodge 354 at Cokeburg, Pennsylvania at the age of 16 and has served in that capacity since that time. Luketich established the St. George Junior Tamburitza of Lodge 354 in 1950 and later organized the St. George Adult Tamburitza of Lodge 354 in which he currently participates as an active tamburitza.

President Luketich has been the recipient of numerous prestigious awards, including the Redom Danice Hrvatske s Likom Katarine Zrinske in 1998, both bestowed upon him by the late Croatian President Dr. Franjo Tudjman, and the Red Kneza Trpimira s Ogrlicom i Danicom in 2003, presented to him by former Croatian President Stjepan Mesic.

Without question, Bernard Luketich has been the driving force in promoting Fraternal Unity among the CFU Membership and is the identifiable face of the Croatian Fraternal Union who has been instrumental in making our Fraternal Organization what it is today.

Bernard Luketich, along with his wife, Martha, and their family, continue to make their home in the small mining town of Cokeburg, PA. The full legacy of National President Luketich is yet to be written but we can continue to expect great things from Bernard M. Luketich as he greets his 35th Presidential Year with the same pride that he has espoused since first becoming a member of our Fraternal Society. His lifelong passion remains the principles, programs and benefits of the CFU and the preservation of Croatian heritage, culture and identity.

"Zivio!", President Luketich!

OFFICIAL FAMILY—CROATIAN FRATERNAL
UNION OF AMERICA

100 Delaney Drive, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15235, Phone: (412) 843-0380 / Fax: (412) 823-1594

NATIONAL BOARD

Bernard M. Luketich, National President, 100 Delaney Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15235

Franjo Bertovic, Vice President/Member Services, 100 Delaney Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15235

Edward W. Pazo, National Secretary/Treasurer, 100 Delaney Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15235

George Pavlecic, Second Vice President, 3419 Eisenhower Drive, White Oak, PA 15131

Bernadette Luketich Sikaras, President, Board of Trustees, 1135 Thomas Eighty Four Road, Eight Four, PA 15330

Stan Blaz, Secretary, Board of Trustees, 809 East 3rd Street, Anaconda, MT 59711

Michael Loncarich, Member, Board of Trustees, 32 Leawood Drive, Grimsby, Ontario L3M 4E2

Michael Ricci, Member, Board of Trustees, 18 Cambria Point, Pittsburgh, PA 15209

Catherine Obenour, Member, Board of Trustees, 241 Homhead Road, Hickory, PA 15340

Ladislav Meze, Member, Board of Trustees, 177 Gatwick Drive, Oakville, Ontario L6H 6T7

Robert Novosel, Member, Board of Trustees, 3880 Los Angeles Avenue, Warren, MI 48091

ALTERNATES BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Charles Lesko, 748 Prince Street, North Versailles, PA 15137

Andrew Sepich, 32 Oak Ridge Point, Morton, IL 61550

Nikola Bilandzich, 46th Street, Sacramento, CA 95819

HIGH TRIAL BOARD

Richard Major, President, 3915 West Prosper Street, Seattle, WA 98199

Robert Luketic, Secretary, 902 Washington Boulevard, McKeesport, PA 15133

Maryann Bojkovac, Member, 22 Canerouth Drive, Etobicoke, Ontario M9C 3R5

Robert Panenic, Member, 12218 Rue James Morrice, Montreal, Quebec H3M 2H1

Donald Weakley, Member, 2242 Tenth Street, Waukegan, IL 60085

Frank M. Jerbich, Member, 6422 S. Kostner Avenue, Chicago, IL 60629

Stephen Vrkljan, Member, 185 Stephen Dr. #202, Etobicoke, Ontario M8Y 3N5

HIGH TRIAL BOARD ALTERNATES

Carolyn Banjavic, 336 Osler Street, Toronto, Ontario M6N 2Z5

Marsha Puz, 3955 Harvey Lake Road, Highland, MI 48356

Theresa Rocca, 2489 Elkridge Drive, Wexford, PA 15090

MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL

John Zupancic, Accountant, 100 Delaney Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15235

Ivan Begg, Associate Editor, 100 Delaney Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15235

Lorraine Turkall, Associate Editor, 100 Delaney Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15235

Catherine Brnich, Coordinator of Sales, 100 Delaney Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15235

ADVISORS

William R. Balaban, Esq. Legal, 27 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101-1606

Stephen J. Kruljac, Medical, 115 Cider Lane, McMurray, PA 15317

CHIEF AGENT IN CANADA

Doug Gray, F.C.A., Suite 1400 BCE Place, 181 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5J 2V1

HONORARY MEMBERS

Goldie Malone, Honorary Lifetime Member, 667 East 241 Street, Euclid, OH 44123

Elizabeth Morgavan, Honorary Lifetime Member, 419 Las Olas Drive, Crown Point, IN 46307

Mary Maki, Honorary Lifetime Member, 8020 Pine Drive, Eveleth, MN 55734

Gojko Markic, Honorary Lifetime Member, 1243 Cardinal Court, Sudbury, Ont., Canada P3A 3C2

Stephen W. Vukson, Honorary Lifetime Member, 508 Zone Street, Trafford, PA 15085

George J. Pavlic, M.D., Honorary Lifetime Member, 1943 Overland Court, Allison Park, PA 15101

Richard L. Major, Honorary Lifetime Member, 3915 West Prosper Street, Seattle, WA 98199

Ante Capin, Honorary Lifetime Member, 154 East 23rd, Hamilton, Ont., Canada L8V 2X1

Ivan Salamon, Honorary Lifetime Member, 343 Alexandra Street, Sault Ste Marie, Ont., Canada P6A 1J9

Steve Namesnik, Jr., Honorary Lifetime Member, P.O. Box 295, Newton Falls, OH 44444

Joseph M. Brigich, Honorary Lifetime Member, 121 Freedom Drive N., Bridgeville, PA 15017

Donald C. Langenfeld, Honorary Lifetime Member, 1020 Jerome Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15220

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,116,336,111.15. We've added \$6,111,239,287,178.07 to our debt in 4 and a half years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE JAMIE KOTULA FOUNDATION FOR OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTIONS

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Jamie Kotula Foundation, an organization set forth to enrich the lives of others in Northeastern Pennsylvania through "random acts of kindness," a strong value of Jamie Kotula. The Foundation will also host the third annual Kick-Off Classic on August 31 and September 1, 2013, marking the outset of the fall sports season at Marywood University in Scranton.

Jamie Kotula, who tragically passed in a car accident on the morning of January 14, 2011 at the age of sixteen, lived a life of service towards others. His selfless character was revealed as a student at Holy Cross High School in Dunmore, Pennsylvania, where he served as secretary of the Student Council and a member of the boys' varsity soccer, swim, and track teams. In addition to being a dedicated class leader and a skilled and energetic athlete, Jamie was extremely well-rounded as a member of the National Honor Society, the Pro-Life club, chess club, foreign language club, and the show choir.

In honor of Jamie Kotula, who lived his life in the present each and every day, the Jamie Kotula Foundation was created to support like-minded individuals and groups in Northeast Pennsylvania who enrich lives and communities through acts of kindness and selflessness. Since its creation in 2011, the Foundation has distributed more than \$100,000 in both scholarships and donations to charitable causes, such as helping out the victims of the school violence at Sandy Hook Elementary in Newtown, Connecticut.

In recognition of the community contributions of the Jamie Kotula Foundation's largest event, the Kick-Off Classic, I add my congratulations and best wishes for continued success and service.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PERMANENTLY ENDING RECEIPT BY PRISONERS ACT

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Permanently Ending Receipt by Prisoners Act, also known as the PERP Act. I am pleased to be joined by Representatives TODD YOUNG, MIKE KELLY, TIM GRIFFIN, JIM RENACCI, TOM REED, and CHARLES BOUSTANY, all Members of the Committee on Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee, which I chair. As a former sheriff and now Chairman of this Subcommittee that has jurisdiction over the Unemployment Insurance (UI) program, this bill blends the expertise I developed in my past career with my present committee responsibilities.

Under existing UI program rules that operate in all States, an individual must be able, available, and actively seeking work in order to be eligible to collect UI benefits, which are paid to those who are unemployed through no fault of their own. Individuals confined in jails, prisons, and other penal institutions are by definition not "able and available" to work and have historically been presumed to be not eligible for UI benefits.

Despite this fact, news articles in multiple States have revealed a nationwide epidemic of unemployment benefit payments to incarcerated individuals. Recent headlines include: Illinois: "State: More than \$2M in Unemployment Benefits Went to Inmates" (10/9/12); New Jersey: "Audit Says 20,000 Inmates Were Mistakenly Paid Nearly \$24M in State and Federal Benefits" (5/29/13); Pennsylvania: "Inmates Collect Millions in Unemployment Benefits in Philadelphia Jails" (2/20/13); and South Carolina: "Government Waste—Inmates Collecting Millions in Fraudulent Unemployment Checks" (2/21/13). The list unfortunately does not end there, and these and other articles make it clear that taxpayers are wasting millions of dollars each year on unemployment benefit payments to prisoners.

We must make it very clear that incarcerated individuals should not be receiving unemployment benefits, and that States need to make affirmative efforts to end this obvious abuse. Unemployment benefits are designed to support people who are able and trying to find work and provide for their families, but who have fallen on hard times. It is an injustice that the tax dollars of law-abiding citizens are being used to provide assistance to people who have broken the law and simply should not qualify for these benefits.

The PERP Act provides the solutions to this problem by taking the following steps:

Barring States from paying UI checks to local, state and federal prisoners, strengthening a current implied prohibition because prisoners are not "able and available" for work; and

Requiring State UI agencies to regularly compare UI rolls with currently available inmate rosters to ensure UI checks are not paid to current inmates. At a minimum, States must access and use prisoner information the Social Security Administration has collected and

used since the late-1990s to prevent the payment of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefit checks to currently incarcerated individuals. This current data match is simple, quick, and efficient, and can readily be replicated by States to ensure that UI benefit checks are not paid to prisoners.

During 2011, the UI program made a staggering \$10.3 billion in improper payments, some of which were to individuals in our nation's jails and prisons. Those payments were made because under current practice too many States rely on the inmate to report their change of residence to the jail so that their UI benefits would end. Not surprisingly, few inmates volunteer to stop collecting these checks, and no benefit program should rely on the honesty of inmates to ensure taxpayer funds are properly spent. This legislation ends the practice of relying on self-reported information by inmates to prevent this type of UI benefit misspending. It does so simply by expecting all State UI agencies to tap into an existing Federal database of prisoners, already used to ensure that inmates do not collect disability checks. This system is fast, efficient, and affordable.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues on the Human Resources Subcommittee, Representatives TODD YOUNG, MIKE KELLY, TIM GRIFFIN, JIM RENACCI, TOM REED, and CHARLES BOUSTANY, for their support as original cosponsors of this bill. I invite all Members to join me in supporting this important legislation and look forward to its speedy consideration so that we can ensure we put an end to the outrageous practice of prisoners collecting benefit payments intended for the truly unemployed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, last week, July 18, 2013, I was speaking with a documentary group about the civil rights movement, and I was unable to make it to the floor for rollcall votes 364, 365, and 366. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" for all three.

IN RECOGNITION OF BOBBY VASSAR AND HIS CAREER IN PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I, along with House Judiciary Committee Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, Jr. and Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigations Ranking Member ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT, would like to take this opportunity to thank Bobby Vassar for his work with the House Committee on the Judiciary and Congressman SCOTT's Congressional office for the past 19 and ½ years.

Bobby came to Representative SCOTT's Congressional office on February 1, 1994 to serve as Senior Counsel and Legislative Director. He joined the staff of the Crime Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary in March of 1999 as Minority Chief Counsel. From January 2007 to January 2012, Bobby served as Majority Chief Counsel for the Subcommittee.

Prior to joining Representative SCOTT's office in 1994, he worked for three Virginia governors, starting as Chairman of the Virginia Parole Board in 1982 and ending as Acting Secretary of Health and Human Resources in 1994. Prior to 1982, he worked as Executive Director of the Peninsula Legal Aid Center in Hampton, Virginia, for which Congressman Scott served as Chairman of the Board. He also held positions previously as Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, as a staff attorney with the Laborer's Pre-paid Legal Services Plan of Washington, D.C. and Vicinity, and as a Reginald Heber Smith Community Lawyer Fellow at the Roanoke Virginia legal Aid Society. Bobby is a graduate of Norfolk State University and the University of Virginia School of Law.

Bobby's ability to work well with his colleagues, especially across the aisle and across the Capitol, made him a valuable staff asset to passing many key pieces of legislation. He had the lead staff responsibility in the House for several significant bipartisan bills that were enacted into law including the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment, and Crime Reduction Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-416); the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-220); the Deaths in Custody Reporting Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-297); the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program (Public Law 107-273); the Second Chance Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-199); along with dozens of other bills enacted into law over the years. He also led the development of the Youth Prison Reduction through Opportunities, Mentoring, Intervention, Support and Education (PROMISE) Act which was introduced in the 110th Congress and has been reintroduced every subsequent Congress; H.R. 1695, the Justice Safety Valve Act of 2013; H.R. 2656, the Public Safety Enhancement Act of 2013; and many promising bipartisan bills pending in the House and Senate.

We are deeply appreciative of the service and contributions Bobby has provided the Crime Subcommittee, the Judiciary Committee and the Congress over the past two decades. Throughout that time, many people both on and off Capitol Hill have been fortunate to call him a colleague and friend. He will be missed. We wish him the best of fortunes and fulfillment in his future endeavors.

EIGHTH UNANSWERED QUESTION ON BENGHAZI ATTACKS

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I am raising the eighth in a series of critical, but un-

answered, questions about the terrorist attack on the U.S. consulate and annex in Benghazi last September 11.

My previous seven questions have focused on what happened in Benghazi that night.

Today, I would like to focus on what happened in Washington.

It has been well documented that official Washington started to get reports of the attack around 4 p.m. Eastern Standard Time. It also has been well documented that then-Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta and General Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made the decision to brief President Obama about what was happening at a previously scheduled 5 p.m. meeting, which is 11 p.m. in Libya.

Former AFRICOM commander General Carter Ham (ret.) told a paying audience at the Aspen Security Forum in Aspen, Colorado—where tickets started at \$1,200—last weekend that by the time a U.S. drone appeared over the consulate shortly after 11 p.m. the attack on the consulate was winding down. He also said it was clear this wasn't a protest and he understood it to be a terrorist attack—a direct conflict with repeated statements by the Obama Administration.

If the Pentagon immediately knew this to be a terrorist attack, why did the president go to the United Nations nearly two weeks later and blame the attack on protest in response to a controversial video? Why did then-UN Ambassador Susan Rice go on five Sunday shows and attribute the attack to the video? Why did former Secretary Clinton continue to reference the video as the cause of the protest when the Pentagon immediately attributed the attack to terrorism?

It is also worth asking what Gen. Ham thought of the waves of attacks against the CIA annex later that night. Trusted sources have told my office that in the weeks leading up to the attack, the annex had a notice on its bulletin board warning about imminent attacks on U.S. facilities and other foreign consulates in Benghazi. How does Gen. Ham reconcile his position that there was to send assistance after the consulate firefight ended when there was so many more attacks against Americans that night?

A U.S. consulate is under attack. A U.S. Ambassador is missing. A State Department Diplomatic Security Agent is dead. Are the American people to believe the president is briefed only once that entire night, at 5 p.m. Eastern Standard Time?

My question(s) today: Where was the president the rest of the night?

Did his national security team, including John Brennan, Sec. Panetta and Gen. Dempsey, ever go back and brief the president when the annex came under attack? If so, what steps did he direct at that time?

Did the president ever step foot in the White House Situation Room that night?

Did he ever see the footage from the unarmed drone stationed over Benghazi monitoring the attacks?

I field many of these questions from my constituents on a regular basis and I believe they are fair to ask, especially when the White House carefully orchestrates photo-ops and leaks of the president and other senior administration officials when the news is favorable,

like the now-famous picture of the president and his national security team watching a live video feed of the raid on Osama bin Laden's compound in 2011.

Last evening, Fox News' Catherine Herridge reported how Diplomatic Security Agent David Ubben is still recovering at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center—more than 10 months after the attack—for injuries he sustained while repeatedly risking his life to save others that night. Fox reported that it was Ubben who ran into the burning consulate building to retrieve Sean Smith's body. Fox reported it was Ubben who later that night climbed the roof of the annex compound with Ty Woods and Glen Doherty to try to defend the annex during the mortar rounds, where he sustained a very serious injury that is still being treated at Walter Reed.

Contrast David Ubben's valiant efforts—repeatedly putting his life on the line to try to save the lives of the other Americans at the consulate and annex—with what is currently known about what the White House national security team did to support him and the others in Benghazi.

As far as the American people know, after nearly a year of investigations, the White House took no additional efforts to come to the aid of those in Benghazi, nor, apparently, did the president take another briefing on what was happening.

Has the president ever called or met with David Ubben to thank him for his sacrifice? Has he ever called the others who were seriously wounded that night, including the former Navy SEAL on the security team who sustained significant injuries?

To Secretary Kerry's credit, I know that he has visited with Mr. Ubben at Walter Reed. But did former Secretary Clinton ever meet with him during the six months she was still in office after the attack?

Either way, the families of the four Americans—including a U.S. Ambassador—who lost their lives in Benghazi have a right to know where the Commander-in-Chief was on September 11, 2012 and what role he and his national security team played to provide support to those in Benghazi that night.

The State Department's own Web site asserts, "International rules do not allow representatives of the host country to enter an embassy without permission—even to put out a fire—and designate an attack on an embassy as an attack on the country it represents."

In this context, with an attack against America underway, it's fair to ask, did the president and his team ever even consider cancelling his political fundraiser in Las Vegas the next day to monitor the situation in Benghazi?

That night, when the ambassador was considered a potential hostage and nearly 30 Americans were under sustained attacks at the CIA annex, did the president's staff ever notify the campaign that he might not be leaving the White House the next day?

When he boarded Air Force One for Las Vegas, did the president know about the serious injuries that some of the survivors had sustained? Did he know what hospitals they were being taken to?

Is there a parallel in American history when the U.S. was under attack, Americans were

killed and a sitting U.S. ambassador was considered a potential terrorist hostage, but the president was not engaged with his national security team?

I think most Americans would agree that they are legitimate questions that deserve a straightforward and truthful answer.

With only four legislative days remaining before the Congress departs for August recess, I am increasingly concerned that this question, as well as the other questions I have raised in the last two weeks, will not be answered by the one-year anniversary of the Benghazi attacks.

That is deeply disappointing. Congress can—and should—do better.

I continue to believe the only way to get answers through a House Select Committee. H.R. Res 36 has 162 cosponsors, a majority of the Majority. Two new cosponsors joined in the past week alone. This is the way to go so the Congress and the American people know the truth, whatever it may be.

ADVANCE NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

HON. MIKE MCINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) issued by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) this week seeking comments from the general public as the Agency contemplates the future of menthol cigarettes.

As part of the agency's review process, the FDA released a report entitled "Preliminary Scientific Evaluation of the Possible Public Health Effects of Menthol Versus Nonmenthol Cigarettes," which documents the FDA's review of the currently available science on menthol. Disappointingly, the report relies heavily on social sciences while admitting that menthol cigarettes are no more harmful than their nonmenthol counterparts.

Specifically, the report states that "No studies found an increased risk of cancer or non-cancer diseases in menthol smokers compared to nonmenthol smokers. From the available studies, the weight of evidence supports the conclusion that menthol in cigarettes is not associated with an increase in disease risk to the user compared to non-menthol cigarette smokers."

In addition to the FDA's conclusion that menthol cigarettes pose no greater disease risk than nonmenthol cigarettes, it is insensible for the agency to conduct a review of perception of menthol products. While the review of this type of information may be useful to understanding adult consumer choice, it should not form the basis of any policy decision within FDA. Rulemaking should be rooted in science.

Finally, the real world health consequences of a potential ban are very alarming. Implementing a ban unfounded in science could lead to the creation of a black market for menthol products. Such an illegal market would result in an influx of illegal, unregulated, counterfeit products into the marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that these concerns will be addressed during the public comment period, and that the FDA will treat this issue fairly and with the scientific integrity it deserves.

A.L. STANBACK MIDDLE SCHOOL: SCHOOL TO WATCH

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the faculty, staff and students of A.L. Stanback Middle School in Hillsborough, North Carolina, on being designated one of 115 "Schools to Watch" by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform. The "School to Watch" designation signifies that A. L. Stanback's administrators and teachers have created one of the most academically excellent, developmentally responsive, and socially equitable middle schools in the nation.

I applaud A.L. Stanback's commitment to engaging students by challenging expectations and employing a variety of teaching methods. Reaching students during their middle school years is critically important, and A.L. Stanback truly takes this to heart, preparing its students not only for their high school education but their lives beyond by teaching critical thinking skills. By providing students with diverse opportunities in a supportive environment, A.L. Stanback is helping today's students become tomorrow's leaders.

The Research Triangle of North Carolina is considered one of the best places in the nation to live, work and raise a family, and the A.L. Stanback Middle School community's record of success will only contribute to that reputation. This is well-deserved recognition, and I hope it serves as a shining example of the positive impact that creative, committed teachers can have not only on our young people, but also on how we strive for excellence in education.

Congratulations again to the teachers, administrators, parents, and students that helped A.L. Stanback Middle School achieve this award.

HONORING STEVEN RYAN PALMER

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, every community needs a great champion who organizes, leads, and fights to leave an indelible mark. Those champions come in many forms. Some are teachers, some are public servants, and some are dedicated to noble causes. I rise today to honor one such champion, Steven Ryan Palmer, as he retires from 36 years of distinguished service to the American Cancer Society.

Palmer's three decades of service began in South Carolina as a worker in the field level of

the American Cancer Society. He went on to hold many leadership positions in the six-state Mid-South Division of the American Cancer Society. His work was instrumental in the success of many ACS initiatives which improved and saved lives in Middle Tennessee.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in honoring the outstanding work and dedication of Ryan Palmer. From the American Cancer Society to Brentwood Baptist Church, Ryan has certainly offered his time, talents, and treasures to his community. Along with his family and friends, I offer my thanks for his service to others.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE RULE GOVERNING DEBATE ON H.R. 2667, THE "AUTHORITY FOR MANDATE DELAY"

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Rule and the underlying legislation because this bill would delay the implementation of the employer mandate a key provision of the Affordable Care Act until 2014.

The House majority on May 16, 2013 placed before this body another bill in another attempt to end the Affordable Care Act also known as Obama Care. Their efforts to do anything and everything they can think of to stop millions of Americans from enjoying the security of health care enjoyed by all of my colleagues in this body is astounding. The Health care we enjoy is at the taxpayer expense so we do know what a federally supported health plan can do.

27.6 percent of Texans are without health care coverage

The Department of Health and Human Services announced over \$9 million in grants to fund community health centers all over the State of Texas. The funds will be used to enroll the uninsured in new health coverage options made available under the Affordable Care Act—or Obama Care Act.

The Affordable Care Act is needed and we should not pretend otherwise. The Administration announced that it would on its own allow a delay to work with the 5 percent of employers who are having difficulty meeting the mandate for providing health insurance for all of their employees. This means that 95 percent have met the obligation so the need for this change in law is not founded in fact.

In my district over the weekend, I held a press conference to congratulate Community Health Centers in the City of House who received part of \$9 million to the State by the Department of Health and Human Services. The Grants to Community Health Centers will fund work to enroll the uninsured in new health coverage options made available under the Affordable Care Act—or Obama Care Act.

Community Health Centers are non-profit, community focused health care providers who serve low-income and medically underserved communities.

Community Health Centers care for over 22 million people nationally.

In 2012, 50 million people in the United States had no health insurance coverage, with many losing insurance as a result of the recent recession.

The grants provided to Community Health Care Centers like Legacy Community Health Services located in my district will help millions of uninsured people in our nation get the medical care they need and deserve.

LIST OF COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS AWARDED FUNDS IN THE CITY OF HOUSTON

Fourth Ward Clinic—\$124,395
El Centro Del Corazon—\$144,525
Houston Community Health Care—\$90,691
South Central Houston Community—\$165,755
Asian American Health Coalition of the Greater Houston Area—\$90,867
Spring Branch Community Health Center—\$108,346
Houston Area Community Services—\$73,981
Legacy Community Health Services—\$267,747

Health Care for the Homeless—\$104,000
Harris County Hospital District—\$154,326
In 2012, Texas had 67 health centers operating in 388 sites providing services to over 1 million patients. Fifty-one percent of the 1 million people cared in my state for were uninsured.

STATISTICS ON THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT —Affordable Care Act Benefits to the 18th Congressional District:

11,400 young adults have insurance through their parents.

4,100 seniors received \$5.4 million in discounts for prescription medication and average of \$600 per person. This was a cost savings of \$650 on average and so far in 2013 the savings are \$1,040.

71,000 seniors are now eligible for Medicare prevention services without paying co-pays.

121,000 individuals, including 23,000 children and 50,000 women now have health insurance that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20 percent of their premium dollars on profits and administrative overhead.

46,000 children with pre-existing illnesses can no longer be denied insurance.

153,000 people in my district have health insurance that have no lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits.

Up to 193,000 people in the 18th Congressional District of Houston Texas will have access to quality health affordable health care without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of preexisting health conditions.

17,000 individuals who purchase insurance on the private health insurance market established for individuals or small groups will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will have access to financial assistance.

NATIONAL BENEFIT OF OBAMA CARE

13 million Americans received \$1.1 billion in rebates from their health insurance companies last year.

105 million Americans have free preventive services.

Millions of women now have free coverage for comprehensive women's preventive medical services.

100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on healthcare coverage.

17 million children with pre-existing conditions can no longer be denied coverage by insurers.

6.6 million young-adults up to age 26 can stay on their parents' health insurance plans.

6.3 million Seniors in the 'donut hole' have saved \$6.1 billion on their prescription drugs.

3.2 million Seniors have access to free annual wellness visits under Medicare.

360,000 Small Businesses are using the Health Care Tax Credit to help them provide health insurance to their workers.

STATISTICS ON TEXAS AND THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

3.8 million Texas residents receive preventative care services.

7 million Texans no longer have lifetime limits on their healthcare insurance.

300,731 young adults can remain on their parents' health insurance until age 26.

5 million Texas residents can receive a rebate check from their insurance company if it does not spend 80 percent of premium dollars on healthcare.

4,029 people with pre-existing conditions now have health insurance.

In 2014, Insurance companies will be banned from: discriminating against anyone with a preexisting condition; charging higher rates based on gender or health status; enforcing lifetime dollar limits; enforcing annual dollar limits on health benefits.

The healthcare law has many benefits.

For these reasons, I urge my Colleagues to join me in voting no on the rule for this bad bill.

The House and the Senate have real work to create jobs, strengthen the food security for our most vulnerable—children, elderly, disabled and low-wage workers. We need to address immigration reform and Border Security and we should be focused on the need to pass appropriations bills that eliminate Sequestration that is strangling the financial security of millions of Federal workers. Sequestration not only hurt Federal workers but the local economies that no longer have the incomes provided by Federal agencies to stimulate the recovery our Nation is now entering.

We should be about the business of the people sent us to Washington to work in their interest.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the rule for this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding my absence from the House for the first vote on July 25, 2013. I was unfortunately absent because I was detained in traffic, as I returned from an event. I would like to submit how I would have voted had I been in attendance for the following vote: Rollcall No. 415, on agreeing to the Waxman amendment, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVEN A. HORSFORD

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, on consideration of H.R. 2397, I am not recorded because I was absent due to medically mandated recovery. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on final passage of the bill (rollcall No. 414), and "aye" on the Amash Amendment to the bill (rollcall No. 412).

RECOGNIZING PLEASANTON
RELAY FOR LIFE**HON. ERIC SWALWELL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the American Cancer Society's Relay for Life, happening this weekend at Pleasanton Valley Middle School.

Cancer is expected to strike about 1.7 million Americans this year. As of January 2012, over 13.7 million people with a history of cancer were alive in this country. Sadly, about 580,000 will pass away from the disease in 2013.

While we are doing a lot better than we used to in terms of diagnosis and treatment, these numbers show the fight against cancer is far from over. That is why this weekend's Relay for Life is such a terrific event.

Participants work as part of relay teams and run or walk around the school track; someone from the team is always on the field, for the entire two-day event, reminding us that cancer never sleeps either.

The relay provides an opportunity to applaud those fighting cancer, honor people we have lost to the disease, recognize caregivers, and raise badly needed funds.

Relays like this occur worldwide, and over four billion dollars has been raised since the first one in May 1985. The dedication and fundraising efforts of participants play a critical role in helping reach our goal of a future without cancer.

Cancer is an issue that affects everyone. Through Relay for Life, communities around the world unite through the knowledge that they are working to help save and prolong lives.

Events like this show the best of the East Bay—a willingness to come together in common cause for a larger purpose. I want to thank the event organizers and group supporters: Florine Johnston, Pam Sanchez, Miriam Drummond, Stephanie DaVile, Nilo Bartolome, Larry Coy, Haddy Coy, Kaitlin Gallagher, Sue Schepers, Kimberly Haynes, Janis Wills, Lisa Lundquist, Randy Brown, Lisa Brown, John Swager, Julie Ochiro, the American Cancer Society, Valley Medical Oncology Consultants, and the Rotary Club of Pleasanton North.

I wish everyone the best of luck with the relay, and I am proud to join them in their battle against cancer.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, during an evening series of votes on July 24, 2013, on amendments to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act FY2014 (H.R. 2397), I intended to vote "yes" on the Amash/Conyers Amendment (rollcall No. 412), but inadvertently voted "no". This amendment would require the government to limit its collection of the records to those that actually pertain to the subject of a duly authorized investigation. The National Security Agency and other agencies would still retain their authority to collect specific records under Section 215, however, blanket collection of telephone records would end. I strongly support both protecting our country and preserving our civil liberties.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR.
DAVID MCCOURT**HON. JOE COURTNEY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, 2013, the State of Connecticut and our nation lost an extraordinary man, David McCourt. A New London native, David's life served as a beacon of hope and wisdom in our difficult times. David was a highly successful businessman who took over a family business, ABCO Welding Supply, in 1986 with his brother Bill. Through hard work and entrepreneurial skill, they grew the business and achieved a comfortable station in life.

Tragically on September 11, 2001, that idyllic story was violently upset when his wife Ruth and four-year-old daughter Juliana died aboard United Flight 175 that crashed into the Twin Towers in New York City. The horror and pain of that loss was devastating to David and any person would be forgiven for reacting to such a loss with anger and depression. David, however, responded differently. After a period of mourning he sought heal the division and conflict which are part of modern existence, rather than inflame violence and hate.

After a spiritual awakening, he helped found B.R.A.V.E. Juliana, a program of HELP USA. He devoted his time to teach children non-violence and conflict resolution. He said "what we have to do is start with the children in this country and teach them tolerance, compassion, and understanding." In 2002, he also founded the Juliana Valentine McCourt Children's Education Fund. Each year the fund gives out funding to local youth organizations.

Each year the New London Police Department and Fire Department host a benefit softball game to remember the events of 9/11 and raise donations for the McCourt Fund. The Juliana Valentine McCourt Memorial Softball game brings the whole community together in remembrance of the victims. New London was very pleased and excited when David attended the 2012 game, which raised over \$1,000 for the McCourt fund.

New London's Lyman Allyn Art museum established a garden to honor the memories of Juliana and Ruth. The McCourt memorial garden according to David serves as a "metaphor for seasons and renewal and healing for those who are left behind." David spoke powerfully at the 10 year commemorative event held at the McCourt memorial garden.

Mr. McCourt passed away on July 11 after a courageous battle with metastatic melanoma. He leaves behind his current wife, Mary Bryant McCourt, his four children, and nine grandchildren. Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of David McCourt, and sharing our condolences with the family he leaves behind.

HONORING BILL AND VERDA DAY

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Bill and Verda Day of Harrisonville, Missouri who are celebrating their 70th Wedding Anniversary. Bill and Verda are a tower of strength, support, understanding and love for their family—children Russ (Ann), Dave (Karen), Steve (Vicki), and Al (Dixie); nine grandchildren (one deceased); and 17 great-grandchildren.

Bill and Verda met while students at University of Missouri, and have always lived with great dignity and genuine grace, always demonstrating a deep and continuing concern for human values and ideals, and inspiring others to do the same. Verda was the Harrisonville City Clerk for 24 years, from 1963 to 1987. Bill taught high school vocational agriculture for 23 years and was a Farm Bureau Insurance agent in Harrisonville for 20 years. They have been wonderful leaders in the community and have made a tangible impact on Harrisonville through their involvement in church and civic organizations.

This meaningful occasion is the result of the love and hard work that this couple has invested in their marriage. Bill and Verda have touched the lives of their family and many friends through the shining example of their marriage, which is a testament to the devotion and admiration that they possess for one another.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring and congratulating Bill and Verda Day in the celebration of their 70th Wedding Anniversary, and extend to them best wishes for their future happiness.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE 60TH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOREAN
WAR ARMISTICE**HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 60th anniversary of the July 27, 1953

signing of the Armistice Agreement that temporarily halted the active combat of the Korean War. Today, the Korean War still continues in the form of threats, military exercises, periodic flare-ups, sanctions, and the build-up of armaments on both sides. Earlier this year, military tensions on the Korean peninsula dangerously escalated.

The preamble to the 1953 Armistice Agreement, which was signed by the United States, North Korea, and China, states that its ultimate purpose was to stop "the Korean conflict, with its great toil of suffering and bloodshed on both sides, and . . . [to] insure a complete cessation of hostilities and of all acts of armed force in Korea until a final peace settlement is achieved." Intended only as a temporary measure, the Armistice Agreement was meant to be replaced with a permanent peace accord.

Sixty years later, however, the United States spends billions of dollars per year to maintain its military presence in South Korea, one of the top ten global economies. At a time when many Americans struggle to pay their bills, vital U.S. dollars are directed into further militarizing the Korean peninsula. Moreover, the Korean peninsula remains tragically divided and millions of Korean and Korean American families remain separated from their loved ones. Korean Americans who were direct witness to the war's devastation are now reaching their seventies and eighties. It is high time to recognize the human costs of ongoing war and to offer genuine hope to Korean Americans who yearn for a long overdue end to this war. We must honor them and all those who fought in the war, including our own Korean War veterans, by replacing hostilities with genuine peace within their lifetimes.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that this somber milestone can serve as a call to action for us in Congress to do our part to de-escalate tensions and to work towards the establishment of a permanent and stable peace regime on the Korean peninsula. Peace negotiations between the United States, South Korea, North Korea, and all relevant parties are the only way forward.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE RULE GOVERNING DEBATE ON H.R. 2668, THE "FAIRNESS FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES ACT"

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Rule and the underlying legislation because this bill would delay the implementation of the individual mandate of the Affordable Care Act until 2014.

This bill is about avoiding personal responsibility for persons who could afford health insurance but decide not to purchase it. When people arrive at emergency rooms without health care insurance, they are not turned away, but receive treatment. The cost of this care is often much higher than if a patient visits a doctor early to address health issues rather than wait and go to an emergency room

for care. Persons with health insurance avoid going to the doctor out of fear of what it will cost that concern can be eliminated by getting health care insurance or coverage.

This bill is another attempt by the House Republican majority to frustrate the successful implementation of the Affordable Care Act. Their effort to increase the burden on individuals who take personal responsibility and exercise choice in purchasing their own health care insurance should not be encouraged by our actions. This bill will assure that those individuals who can pay for their health care insurance do so. If they do not purchase health insurance when they had the means to, then a fee will be assessed that they will be used to cover health care expenses.

Everyone must act responsibly in making the Affordable Health Care Act work and that includes every member of the Congress.

In my state:

27.6% of Texans are without health care coverage.

In my district over the weekend, I held a press conference to congratulate Community Health Centers in the City of Houston who received part of \$9 million awarded to the State by the Department of Health and Human Services. The Grants to Community Health Centers will work to enroll the uninsured in new health coverage options made available under the Affordable Care Act—or Obama Care Act.

Community Health Care Centers will ensure that even the poorest of our citizens take personal responsibility to acquire health insurance coverage as long as we as members of Congress do our jobs and let our constituents know about these health care options.

Today, Community Health Centers care for over 22 million people nationally. The funding provided by these Department of Health and Human Services grants will mean that millions more will have access to health care and health insurance.

In 2012, 50 million people in the United States had no health insurance coverage, with many losing insurance as a result of the recent recession. The grants provided to Community Health Care Centers will help millions of uninsured people in our nation get the medical care they need and deserve.

LIST OF COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS AWARDED FUNDS IN THE CITY OF HOUSTON

Fourth Ward Clinic, \$124,395;
El Centro Del Corazon, \$144,525;
Houston Community Health Care, \$90,691;
South Central Houston Community, \$165,755;
Asian American Health Coalition of the Greater Houston Area, \$90,867;
Spring Branch Community Health Center, \$108,346;
Houston Area Community Services, \$73,981;
Legacy Community Health Services, \$267,747;
Health Care for the Homeless, \$104,000;
Harris County Hospital District, \$154,326;

STATISTICS ON THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NATION AND STATE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Affordable Care Act Benefits to the 18th Congressional District:

11,400 young adults have insurance through their parents;

4,100 seniors received \$5.4 million in discounts for prescription medication and aver-

age of \$600 per person. This was a cost savings of \$650 on average and so far in 2013 the savings are \$1,040;

71,000 seniors are now eligible for Medicare prevention services without paying co-pays;

121,000 individuals, including 23,000 children and 50,000 women now have health insurance that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premium dollars on profits and administrative overhead;

46,000 children with pre-existing illnesses can no longer be denied insurance;

153,000 people in my district have health insurance that have no lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits;

Up to 193,000 people in the 18th Congressional District of Houston, Texas will have access to quality health affordable health care without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of preexisting health conditions;

17,000 individuals who purchase insurance on the private health insurance market established for individuals or small groups will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will have access to financial assistance.

NATIONAL BENEFIT OF OBAMA CARE

13 million Americans received \$1.1 billion in rebates from their health insurance companies last year;

105 million Americans have free preventive services;

Millions of women now have free coverage for comprehensive women's preventive medical services;

100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on healthcare coverage;

17 million children with pre-existing conditions can no longer be denied coverage by insurers;

6.6 million young-adults up to age 26 can stay on their parents' health insurance plans;

6.3 million Seniors in the "donut hole" have saved \$6.1 billion on their prescription drugs;

3.2 million Seniors have access to free annual wellness visits under Medicare; and

360,000 Small Businesses are using the Health Care Tax Credit to help them provide health insurance to their workers.

STATISTICS ON TEXAS AND THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

3.8 million Texas residents receive preventative care services;

7 million Texans no longer have lifetime limits on their healthcare insurance;

300,731 young adults can remain on their parents' health insurance until age 26;

5 million Texas residents can receive a rebate check from their insurance company if it does not spend 80 percent of premium dollars on healthcare;

4,029 people with pre-existing conditions now have health insurance;

In 2014, Insurance companies will be banned from:

discriminating against anyone with a pre-existing condition;

charging higher rates based on gender or health status;

enforcing lifetime dollar limits;

enforcing annual dollar limits on health benefits.

The healthcare law has many benefits.

For these reasons, I urge my Colleagues to join me in voting no on the rule for this bad bill.

The House and the Senate have real work to do such as creating jobs and strengthening food security for our most vulnerable—children, the elderly, the disabled and low-wage workers. We need to address immigration reform and Border Security, responsible gun

safety measures, equity in our judicial system and voting rights.

We should also focus on the need to pass appropriations bills that eliminate Sequestration that is strangling the financial security of millions of federal workers. Sequestration not

only hurts federal workers, but the local economies that no longer have the incomes provided by federal agencies to stimulate the recovery our nation is now entering are.

I urge the rejection of this rule.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, July 26, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

July 26, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

You have blessed us with all good gifts, and with thankful hearts we express our gratitude. You have created us with opportunities to serve other people in their need, to share together in respect and affection, and to be faithful in the responsibilities we have been given.

In this moment of prayer, please grant to the Members of this people's House, as they meet with their respective constituents, the gifts of wisdom and discernment, that in their words and actions they will do justice, love with mercy, and walk humbly with You.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned

until noon, Tuesday, July 30, 2013, for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 30, 2013, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2362. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fresh Citrus Fruit From Uruguay, Including Citrus Hybrids and Fortunella spp., Into the Continental United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0060] (RIN: 0579-AD59) received July 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2363. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Definition of "Predominantly Engaged in Activities That Are Financial in Nature or Incidental Thereto" (RIN: 3064-AD73) received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2364. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Retail Foreign Exchange Transactions [Release No.: 34-69964; File No. S7-30-11] (RIN: 3235-AL19) received July 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2365. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Eliminating the Prohibition Against General Solicitation and General Advertising in Rule 506 and Rule 144A Offerings [Release No.: 33-9415; No. 34-69959; No. IA-3624; File No. S7-07-12] (RIN: 3235-AL34) received July 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2366. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Disqualification of Felons and Other "Bad Actors" from Rule 506 Offerings [Release No.: 33-9414; File No. S7-21-11] (RIN: 3235-AK97) received July 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2367. A letter from the Director, Directorate of Construction, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Cranes and Derricks in Construction: Revising the Examination for Digger Derricks [Docket No.: OSHA-2012-0025] (RIN: 1218-AC75) received July 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2368. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Depart-

ment of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Ammonium Formate [Docket No.: FDA-2008-F-0151] received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2369. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Exchange Functions: Standards for Navigators and Non-Navigator Assistance Personnel; Consumer Assistance Tools and Programs of an Exchange and Certified Application Counselors [CMS-9955-F; CMS-2334-F2] (RIN: 0938-AR75; 0938-AR04) received July 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2370. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Matagorda, Texas) [MB Docket No.: 13-52] [RM-11693] received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2371. A letter from the Deputy Chief, CGB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Structure and Practices of the Video Relay Service Program; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities [CG Docket No.: 10-51] [CG Docket No.: 03-123] received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2372. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Management Directive 5.8, Proposed Section 274b Agreements with States received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2373. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations Based on the 2012 Missile Technology Control Regime Plenary Agreements [Docket No.: 130104008-3008-01] (RIN: 0694-AF81) received July 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2374. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to the Export Administration Regulations: Implementation of Limited Syria Waiver for Reconstruction Assistance [Docket No.: 130627574-3574-01] (RIN: 0694-AF94) received July 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2375. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Wyoming Regulatory Program [Stats No.: WY-043-FOR; Docket ID: OSM-2012-0020; S1D1SSS08011000SXDO66A0067F134S180110; S2D2SSS08011000SX066A0033F13XS501520] received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2376. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; South Park Bridge Construction, Lower Duwamish Waterway, Seattle, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0452] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2377. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Navigation and Navigable Waters; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments; Correction [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0397] (RIN: 1625-AC06) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2378. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Ohio River, Mile 469.4-470.0; Bellevue, KY [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0558] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2379. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pamlico River and Tar River; Washington, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0517] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2380. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fort Monroe Fireworks Display, Chesapeake Bay, Hampton, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0443] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2381. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Naval Exercise; Pacific Ocean, Coronado, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0482] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2382. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; National Cherry Festival Air Show and Fireworks Display, West Grand Traverse Bay, Traverse City, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0189] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2383. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Multiple Firework Displays in Captain of the Port, Puget Sound Zone [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0384] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2384. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Annual Independence Day Fireworks Displays, Skagway, Haines, and Wrangell, AK [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0078] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2385. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmit-

ting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; City of Menominee 4th of July Fireworks, Green Bay, Menominee, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0540] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2386. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; America's Cup Safety Zone and No Loitering Area, San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0551] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2387. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Northside Park Pier Fireworks Display, Assawoman Bay, Ocean City, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0439] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2388. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Big Bay Boom, San Diego Bay; San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0059] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2389. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Revision of 2013 America's Cup Regulated Area, San Francisco Bay; San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0551] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2390. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Marine Events in Captain of the Port Long Island Sound Zone [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0447] (RIN: 1625-AA08; 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2391. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Tennessee River, Mile 625.5 to 626.5 [USCG-2013-0408] (RIN: 1625-AA00) July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2392. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Fifth Coast Guard District Firework Display, Pagan River; Smithfield, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0473] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2393. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Navigation and Navigable Waters; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0397] (RIN: 1625-AC06) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2394. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: City of Vallejo Fourth of July Fire-

works Display, Mare Island Strait, Vallejo, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0355] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2395. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the 2012 Final Integrated Section 203 Navigation Study Report and Environmental Assessment for the Canaveral Harbor, Brevard County, Florida Project; (H. Doc. No. 113-49); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

2396. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2013-46] received July 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2397. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Expanded Eligibility for Temporary Housing for Individuals Displaced by Severe Storms, Flooding, and Tornadoes in Oklahoma [Notice 2013-47] received July 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2398. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — August 2013 (Rev. Rul. 2013-13) received July 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2399. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revised Timeline and Other Guidance Regarding the Implementation of FATCA [Notice 2013-43] received July 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2400. A letter from the Branch Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Media Space, Inc. v. Commissioner, 135 T.C. 424 (2010), vacated, 477 Fed. Appx. 857 (2d. Cir. 2012) (AOD 2012-08) received July 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2401. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning the extension of waiver authority for Turkmenistan, pursuant to Public Law 93-618, section 402(d)(1) and 409; (H. Doc. No. 113-50); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Ethics. In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Staff Travel Provided by the Turkish Coalition of America in August 2008 (Rept. 113-176). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 2844. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2845. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow retail community pharmacies to deliver diabetic testing supplies to Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2846. A bill to transfer to Jerusalem the United States Embassy located in Tel Aviv; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 2844.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2845.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof . . .

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 2846.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;), and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof).

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 301: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 503: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 508: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 647: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CARTER, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 721: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 746: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 892: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1276: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1696: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1726: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1732: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1771: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1775: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1890: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1962: Mr. DAINES and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 2094: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2119: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2273: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2530: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2633: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WATT, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2682: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 2703: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2768: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NUGENT, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2769: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NUGENT, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2776: Mr. DAINES, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2794: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WALZ, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. ESTY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LONG, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MICA, Mr. COOK, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2805: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 2825: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. FINCHER and Mr. STEWART.

H. Res. 188: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. LEVIN.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2610

OFFERED: BY MRS. WALORSKI

AMENDMENT No. 2: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 421. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for payment of any salary for any position at the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, including the Director and any personnel of such Council, in an amount that is greater than the salary in effect for such position as of January 1, 2013.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MRS. WALORSKI

AMENDMENT No. 3: Page 71, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$7,500,000)".

Page 80, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$7,500,000)".

Page 136, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,500,000)".

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT No. 4: Page 8, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING DETECTIVE SCOTT A.
GALESKI

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 2013

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Detective Scott A. Galeski of Wyandotte, Michigan, who was awarded the 2013 Presidential Volunteer Service Award for more than 4,000 hours of volunteer service over his lifetime.

Detective Galeski has tirelessly and selflessly dedicated himself to teaching, training, and mentoring the community's youth, as well as exhibiting a great love for his public service as a member of the police force.

Detective Galeski's biggest impact has been through his direct efforts guiding and shaping several generations of youth throughout the downriver communities. He has been a steadfast and selfless advocate of shaping and mentoring youth into what he calls "just good, solid kids" on occasions and hours too countless to measure accurately.

Detective Galeski elevated and added to his efforts with youth by founding the Downriver/Detroit Police Cadet Program in 2008 while at the same time coaching high school athletics. The Cadet Program was established for youth interested in careers in law enforcement, and thanks to Detective Galeski's efforts, it became the largest program in the state, boasting a roster of over 73 cadets and having the highest ranking cadet (Major) in the nation. To date the program has produced seven sworn law enforcement officers in various agencies.

Detective Galeski, aside from his countless hours of service to his community and youth, also is known for counseling youth with difficult life circumstances and problems. Detective Galeski is a tremendous asset to the community, and I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Detective Galeski on receiving the Presidential Volunteer Service Award, and for all of his efforts to make his community a better place.

OPPOSING H.R. 5, THE LETTING
OUR STUDENTS DOWN ACT

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I stridently oppose H.R. 5, the Letting our Students Down Act. This partisan proposal to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act dismantles critical civil rights protections for our most vulnerable learners, dramatically undermines federal investment in education, directs taxpayer funds away from

public schools to private entities, and restricts monies from the students who need it the most.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is a landmark civil rights bill given its purpose to ensure each and every child a quality education by closing achievement gaps due to poverty and inequity. Since 1965, we have learned that to fulfill this mission, we must ensure that schools and states have the resources available to meet their academic needs. We also have learned that there remains an important role for the federal government to encourage thoughtful accountability systems to help identify schools and districts needing assistance in educating all students. Accountability systems with clear performance targets serve as an essential tool for ensuring that all students, regardless of race, ethnicity, language status, national origin, income, ZIP code or disability are taught at high levels. Unfortunately, the 2002 reauthorization also included overly prescriptive penalties and interventions that decreased standards, overburdened schools, and pushed classroom instruction to "teaching to the test." Thus, the challenge facing policymakers during reauthorization is balancing federal oversight and decision making at the state level without abdicating federal responsibility for safeguarding equal educational opportunity regardless of race, ethnicity, language, country of origin, income or ability.

H.R. 5 undermines critical federal investment in education and eschews the federal responsibility to encourage states to improve the education of all children under the guise of state flexibility. Rather than investing in education, the Republican plan exacerbates school funding shortfalls by locking in draconian spending cuts, removing over a billion dollars from our classrooms and students. To further ensure the dismantling of the federal investment in education, H.R. 5 prohibits Congress from appropriating any money above the excessively-low spending levels set and even bans increasing federal investment with inflation. In addition to enacting harsh reductions in spending at the federal level, H.R. 5 eviscerates education investment by removing the federal maintenance of effort provisions, thereby licensing states to reduce state education funding and redirect these funds to non-education activities.

Further, H.R. 5 undercuts federal accountability and taxpayer investment by eliminating requirements that schools or districts take action when failing to improve academic achievement or graduation rates. Specifically, the 2002 law required states and districts to examine and address the performance of vulnerable students, including at-risk, migrant, racial/ethnic minority, English Language Learner, and low-income students as well as students with disabilities. H.R. 5 removes the requirement for intervention, relinquishing the federal responsibility to ensure that states provide

equal educational opportunity for our youngest citizens. The bill removes other safeguards for vulnerable students as well. For example, it removes the one percent cap on the use of alternative assessment scores for accountability purposes for students with significant cognitive disabilities, permitting schools to provide less rigorous curricula and assessments to an unlimited number of students with disabilities. This change is unnecessary, promotes lesser standards and assessments for students with disabilities, and incentivizes the over-identification of students with disabilities. Another illustration of weakened protections for vulnerable students is the lessening of funding and protections for homeless students. H.R. 5 reduces the McKinney-Vento authorization despite a 57 percent increase in homeless children since 2009. It strikes provisions improving access to educational services for homeless students championed by former Illinois Congresswoman Judy Biggert and included in prior Republican versions of this bill. H.R. 5 also eliminates critical supports for afterschool programs, STEM enrichment, physical education, the arts, music, as well as social and emotional programs that support positive behaviors.

Teachers, the dedicated stewards of our education system, are harmed by eliminating requirements for quality professional development, a critical component of advancing teacher content and pedagogical knowledge. Under this bill, proposed teacher evaluation systems are punitive, used to hire and fire rather than to encourage professional growth and improvement. H.R. 5 removes protections for collective bargaining and shamefully shifts funding away for teacher supports from the highest need schools and students.

One of the most important responsibilities of a nation is the education of her public. Federal oversight to ensure that each student is college and career ready upon high school graduation is a commonsense policy to strengthen the well-being of our citizens and the competitiveness of our country in a global economy. It is our moral imperative to ensure that each child has equal protections under the law. The Republicans bill reflects a disconnect with the realities facing our nation's schools and students, a disconnect underscored by the numerous organizations from all sectors of society that have publicly opposed the bill. In uncommon agreement, diverse groups such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Business Round Table, the National Center for Learning Disabilities, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, Easter Seals, and the American Federation of Teachers expressed concerns that underfunding schools without accountability fosters systemic inequities that have devastating economic consequences for all students and our country.

H.R. 5, the Letting Students Down Act is a false promise to reauthorize this critical law

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

enacted to fight the "war on poverty" by ensuring equal access to a free and public education. We cannot let our students down; we must lift them up. The Democratic substitute offered by Representative MILLER empowers states and school districts to set realistic achievement targets for improving student growth, achievement, and graduation rates while granting flexibility in determining appropriate interventions. I join with dozens of stakeholders in supporting the Miller Substitute and opposing H.R. 5.

IN HONOR AND MEMORY OF REV.
LANCE CHANEY OF ST. JOHN
MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and memory of Rev. Lance Chaney, who led St. John Missionary Baptist Church in Boynton Beach, Florida, as its pastor for many years. Words cannot express how deeply sorry I am to hear of his untimely passing at the age of 56, following a long battle with prostate cancer. As a pastor, civic leader, and anti-violence activist, Rev. Chaney leaves behind a legacy of service that reflects his true dedication to the church and community.

Before moving his family to Boynton Beach in 2002, Rev. Chaney served as the pastor of the Greater Antioch Baptist Church of Rock Island in Illinois. There, he helped establish a health clinic and a bookstore, which attracted hundreds of new worshippers. Rev. Chaney also served on the school board and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's (NAACP) board of directors.

After a nationwide search, Rev. Chaney became the seventh pastor of St. John Missionary Baptist Church on the occasion of its 94th anniversary. He was an active pastor who will be remembered not only for his passionate sermons from the pulpit, but for working to expand the 104-year-old church's services and outreach. Under his leadership, a teen Bible study and church newsletter were established. In addition, Rev. Chaney was also a mentor to other clergy in the area, helping them grow their congregations.

Rev. Chaney was a well-known and very popular figure in the Boynton Beach community. He helped thousands of families by opening and serving as the chairman of the Day Star Academy of Excellence, a K-5 public charter school, and Pathways to Prosperity, a non-profit rehabilitation center. He also hosted several back-to-school drives, parenting seminars, and health care screenings, and was known for giving out free bus passes and scholarships.

Furthermore, Rev. Chaney worked tirelessly to improve the quality of life in Boynton Beach, as well as make it safer and more inclusive. He was an influential member of Boynton United, a community organization that works to prevent violent crime, and served on the Correction Task Force for the Criminal Justice Commission of Palm Beach County and Boynton Beach's Community Redevelopment Agency board until 2007. Additionally, Rev. Chaney was a speaker and panelist for countless other causes, including the Roots Cultural Festival, Martin Luther King Community Celebration, Save Darfur Coalition, and Haiti relief efforts.

While battling cancer over the past five years, Rev. Chaney, who graduated from the University of Arkansas with a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration, continued to pursue a master's degree from Howard University's School of Divinity. And, during his chemotherapy treatment, he constantly urged men to get screened for prostate cancer.

Rev. Chaney is survived by his wife, Marilane, and his children, Lance Alexander, Ashley, and Allison. My thoughts and prayers go out to them, friends of the family, members of St. John Missionary Baptist Church, and the entire Boynton Beach community at this most difficult time.

In Lance Chaney, God Almighty gave us a man of vision, courage, wisdom, and understanding. Each of us knew him in a different way, but he knew each of us in the same way, with great compassion and love.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. Lance Chaney dedicated his life to serving his fellow man, and will be remembered for his tremendous ability to bring people together. It has been my great privilege to know his friendship. I now join all those whose lives he has touched in saying that he will be dearly missed.

NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY FEATURED IN THE US AIRWAYS MAGAZINE

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 2013

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to extend my personal congratulations to North Carolina Central University for being recognized in the August 2013 edition of the US Airways Magazine.

As a graduate of NCCU and its law school, I am excited to see NCCU featured in a magazine seen by thousands of travelers every day. It provides a great opportunity to feature the exciting things happening at our nation's historically minority serving institutions.

Founded by visionaries, our nation's HBCUs have given generations of students a sense of their heritage, history, and their valuable place in the American narrative. They have produced many of our nation's leaders in business, government, academia, and the military.

In this piece, US Airways recognized the legacy of learning that has contributed great minds to our country like Booker T. Washington, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Dr. George Washington Carver, and the Honorable Thurgood Marshall.

From the founding day in 1910, NCCU has helped lead the way in higher education for African Americans in the United States. NCCU has produced educators and professionals who went into rural communities across North Carolina and trained my generation. NCCU is now recognized for its increasing presence in

STEM-related research and recently introduced their new PhD program in integrated biosciences.

Again, I applaud US Airways in recognizing our HBCUs. My Alma Mater, NCCU, is an institution that is a crucible of learning, where Julius Chambers discovered his sense of purpose that drove him to lead the NAACP Legal Defense Fund; where Eva Clayton was called to public service and became the first African American woman in Congress from North Carolina since reconstruction; and where a talented painter and professional athlete, Ernie Barnes, Jr., was empowered to inspire the nation with his art.

Today and every day, I am proud to call myself an Eagle.

RECOGNIZING MR. JOHN ODOM

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 2013

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary courage and resilience of Mr. John Odom, a victim of the Boston Marathon bombings who has spent the last 100 days recovering from his life-threatening injuries.

Mr. Odom traveled from Redondo Beach, California to Boston to watch his daughter Nicole run her first marathon and he was standing near the finish line when the first explosion went off. Shrapnel from the explosion severed two of Mr. Odom's arteries and his sciatic nerve. His son-in-law, Matt Reis, was able to staunch the blood loss using his belt as a tourniquet and Mr. Odom's wife Karen applied pressure to the wound until help arrived.

Mr. Odom spent 5½ weeks at Boston Medical Center and underwent eleven surgeries. Afterwards, he was transferred to Spaulding Rehabilitation Hospital where he spent another 5½ weeks receiving therapy. He is currently undergoing outpatient therapy at Spaulding and is making great progress with the incredible support of his family. He hopes to return home to Southern California in September.

We have all heard about the extraordinary acts of bravery and heroism of the victims of the Boston bombings. Mr. Odom has had a long hard struggle since April 15, but he has persevered and is getting stronger as each day passes. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring him today and I hope you will keep him and his family in your thoughts as he continues to heal.

HONORING JACLYN SCHULTZ, MISS MICHIGAN USA 2013

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 2013

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jaclyn Schultz of Wyandotte, Michigan, who was crowned Miss Michigan USA in September 2012 and represented the great state of Michigan at the Miss USA pageant in Las Vegas, Nevada on June 16, 2013.

Miss Schultz is a graduate of Wyandotte Roosevelt High School and Central Michigan University. Not only is Jaclyn recognized as a successful competitor in the pageant community, but she has also established a successful career in public relations. She is currently exhibiting her great determination in her quest to obtain her Master's degree while continuing to compete in pageants, be an advocate for women's health issues, and work full time. Her hard work, determination, and drive for suc-

cess have allowed her to be a role model for young girls and bring a voice to women's health issues that are not well known to many people.

Jaclyn has done a tremendous job in her work with the Beautiful You MKRH Foundation to raise awareness of an infertility syndrome which affects 1 in 4,000 women who are born without a uterus. This is a personal issue for Jaclyn as she was diagnosed with this syndrome at the age of 15. It is with great cour-

age that Jaclyn has stepped forward to tell her story and be a voice for the scores of women around the world who are diagnosed with MKRH.

Jaclyn has proven herself as a role model to young girls and women across our country and I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jaclyn Schultz for all of her efforts and wish her great success on all of her future endeavors.

SENATE—Monday, July 29, 2013

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, today let Your favor rest upon the Members of our government's legislative branch. Establish the works of their hands and strengthen them to honor You by serving others. Lord, let Your life-giving spirit move them to feel greater compassion for those in need. Use them to remove barriers that divide us, to make suspicions disappear, and to cause hatred to cease. May they strive to be agents of healing and hope, as they help us all live in greater justice and peace.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks there will be a period of morning business until 4:15 today. Following that morning business the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1243, the Transportation bill.

At 4:30 the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of James Comey to be Director of the FBI. I am sorry to report there will be a cloture vote on him at 5:30 today. Our chief law enforcement officer and we had to file cloture.

THE SEQUESTER

Mr. REID. Every respectable economist has said that the shortsighted arbitrary cuts known as sequester will cost American jobs. Medical researchers say these painful cuts will set medical research in this country back decades, potentially costing the world a cure for cancer, flu, AIDS, and many other diseases against which we are on the cusp of making great headway. The

sequester we know will cost us investments in education that give children a shot at success and keep American workers competitive. We also know the sequester will slash the safety net that keeps millions of senior citizens, children and veterans and low-income families from descending into poverty.

I know the sequester is as bad for national security as it is for the economy. These cuts have grounded one-third of U.S. combat aircraft, slashed troop training budgets, and kept an aircraft carrier that should have been headed to the Persian Gulf and other places stranded in port instead. Meanwhile, hundreds of thousands of civilian employees of the Department of Defense, employees who support military missions carried out by servicemembers overseas, have been furloughed.

It is not too late to reverse these hard-hearted cuts, cuts that were never supposed to take effect in the first place. The sequester was designed to be so painful it would force Democrats and Republicans to compromise and find a smart, responsible way to reduce the deficit. There was compromise on one side with the Democrats and, of course, none, as usual, with Republicans on the other side.

But we have not given up on reversing these cuts and choosing that responsible path. We have cut the deficit in half over the last 3 years, by more than \$2.6 trillion. While there is more work to be done, we should be making targeted cuts while investing in that which makes America grow.

It is clear we have reduced the debt by \$2.6 trillion and the yearly deficit has been cut in half over the last 3 years.

The way to pursue this type of sound fiscal policy is through regular order—regular order of the budget process. While there is more work to be done in the cuts I have talked about, we should be making targeted cuts while investing in what makes America grow. The American economy is poised to grow. It is growing now—not strong enough, not fast enough, but it is growing. All we have to do is get out of the way.

According to a report released last week by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, reversing the sequester would create an additional 900,000 jobs. It would increase gross domestic product by one percentage point. That is 1 million jobs right there. The United States just dug its way out of the great recession. We have seen 40 straight months of job growth, with private sector employers adding more than 7.2 million jobs. But we cannot afford to

reject almost 1 million new jobs. Congress must reverse the sequester and stop manufacturing crises.

If Republicans force us to the brink of another shutdown for ideological reasons, the economy will suffer. I suggest to any of my Republican colleagues who have this idea, give a call to Newt Gingrich. He will return your phone calls. Ask him how it worked. It was disastrous for Newt Gingrich, the Republicans, and the country. It didn't work then and it will not work now. If Republicans threaten catastrophic default on the Nation's bills, the economy will suffer, and that is an understatement.

If Republicans refuse to work with Democrats to negotiate a reasonable budget to reverse these deep cuts, the economy will suffer. It is time to remove the stumbling blocks that are preventing the American economy from recovering and expanding.

It has been 129 days since the Senate passed its reasonable, progrowth budget.

Remember, the Republicans said: We want regular order. We want a budget.

We passed the budget. Now they will not follow regular order. They will not let us even go to conference. We have asked consent to go to conference with the House 17 different times. As long as Senate Republicans refuse to allow Budget Committee chairwoman PATTY MURRAY to negotiate a budget compromise with her House Republican counterparts, the economy is at risk. It is time to set aside partisan differences and work to find common ground.

Passing the Senate Transportation appropriations bill that is on the floor now would be a good step toward restoring regular order. This measure, the Transportation bill, would create jobs rebuilding America's deficient infrastructure and renew the Nation's commitment to make affordable housing available to low-income families.

I commend the appropriations committee, led by BARBARA MIKULSKI. The subcommittee, whose work is now before the Senate, is led by PATTY MURRAY. They have done wonderful work. I believe some of my Republican colleagues are as eager to return to regular order, passing an appropriations bill, as I am. I do believe that. They have to break away from the pack. I hope these reasonable Republicans will continue to work with us to advance this important bipartisan measure.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Will the Chair announce the business of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 4:15 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

REMEMBERING COLONEL GEORGE E. "BUD" DAY

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, Sunday brought the sad news that my dear friend Col. George E. "Bud" Day passed away. He was 88 years old. To say he lived a full life would be quite an understatement. His was filled with so many extraordinary experiences, adventures, challenges, accomplishments, and with such love, compassion, and courage that it could have supplied enough experiences, excitement, and satisfaction for 10 lifetimes.

Bud knew defeats and triumphs on a scale few will ever know. He lived in moments filled with every conceivable emotion. He knew terror and suffering. He knew joy and deliverance. He knew solidarity, self-respect, and dignity.

Knowing him as well as I did, I am certain he faced his end satisfied that he had made the most of his time on Earth. He will have faced it with courage as he faced all adversity. He will have faced it with gratitude for the love and companionship for his beloved wife and best friend Dorie, his sons Steve and George, and his twin girls, Sandra and Sonya. He will have faced it with humility for having had the honor to serve his country with distinction in three wars: World War II, the Korean war, and the Vietnam war.

I had the honor of being Bud's friend for almost five decades of his 88 years. We met in 1967 when the Vietnamese left me to die in the prison cell Bud shared with Maj. Norris Overly. Bud and Norris wouldn't let me die. They bathed me, fed me, nursed me, encouraged me, and ordered me back to life. Norris did much of the work, but Bud did all he could considering he too had recently been near death—shot, bombed, beaten savagely by his captors, and his arm broken in three places. He was a hard man to kill, and he expected the same from his subordinates. They saved my life—a big debt

to repay, obviously. But more than that, Bud showed me how to save my self-respect and my honor, and that is a debt I can never repay.

Bud was a fierce—and I mean really fierce—resister. He could not be broken in spirit no matter how broken he was in body. Those who knew Bud after the war could see how tough he was, but, my God, to have known him in prison—confronting our enemies day in and day out, never, ever yielding. He defied men who had the power of life and death over us. To witness him sing the national anthem in response to having a rifle pointed at his face—well, that was something to behold. Unforgettable. No one had more guts than Bud or greater determination to do his duty and then some, to keep faith with his country and his comrades whatever the cost. Bud was my commanding officer but more, he was my inspiration, as he was for all the men who were privileged to serve under him.

Nothing offers more compelling testimony to Bud's guts and determination and his patriotism than the account of his escape from captivity. In the entire war he was the only American who managed to escape from North Vietnam.

In 1967 then-major Bud Day commanded a squadron of F-100s that served as forward air controllers over North Vietnam and Laos. They were called the Mistys, named for Bud's favorite song. Theirs was probably the most dangerous combat duty in the Air Force, and they suffered high casualties.

On August 26 Bud Day was one of those casualties. Bud was shot down by a surface-to-air missile 20 miles inside of North Vietnam. He hit the fuselage of his F-100 when he ejected, breaking his arm, damaging his eye, and injuring his back. Bud was immediately captured by North Vietnamese militia. He was interrogated by his captors in an underground prison camp. When he refused to answer their questions, they staged a mock execution. Then they hung him by his feet for hours and beat him. Believing he was too badly injured to escape, they tied him up loosely and left him guarded by two green teenage soldiers. They misjudged him. On his fifth day of captivity he untied his ropes and escaped.

Bud stayed on the run for about 2 weeks. He wasn't certain how long he was free. He lost track of time. He made it across the DMZ and into South Vietnam. A bomb, however, had fallen near him his second night on the run, striking him with shrapnel, concussing him and rupturing his eardrums. Limping, bleeding, starving, and in great pain, Bud kept heading south across rivers, through dense jungles, over hills, crawling sometimes on his hands and knees, evading enemy patrols and surviving on berries, frogs, and rain-water.

On the last night of Bud's escape he arrived within 2 kilometers of a forward marine. Sensibly judging it more dangerous to approach the guarded base at night than to wait until morning when the marine guards could see he was an American, Bud slept one more night in the jungle.

Early the next morning he encountered a Viet Cong patrol. He was shot trying to hobble to the base, recaptured, and returned to the camp he had escaped, where he was tortured some more.

A few days later Bud's captors took him to the prison we called the Plantation, where I would meet him 2 months later. He was one of the most grievously injured pilots to arrive in Hanoi. Norris helped nurse him back to some semblance of health, although he would never fully recover from his wounds. Then Bud helped Norris nurse me.

Whenever I felt my spirits and resistance flag, I looked to Bud for the courage to continue and for the example of how to serve my country in difficult circumstances. Bud was the bravest man I ever knew, and I have known more than a few. He was great company too and made it possible to actually have fun in prison once in a while. He received the Medal of Honor when he came home—the highest of his many decorations for valor. Despite his injuries, he managed to regain flying status and commanded a flight wing at Eglin Air Force Base.

When Bud ultimately retired from the Air Force, he practiced law. After his service in World War II but before he deployed to the Korean war, he graduated from college and law school. He devoted his practice to defending the interests of his fellow veterans.

Bud and I stayed close through all the years that have passed since our war. We talked often. We saw each other regularly. He campaigned with me in all my campaigns and advised me always. We argued sometimes, agreed more often, laughed a lot, and always enjoyed each other's company. I am going to miss him terribly.

Even though Bud had reached advanced years, for some reason I could never imagine Bud yielding to anything—even, I thought, to the laws of nature. Tough old bird that he was, I always thought he would outlive us all. But he is gone now to a heaven I expect he imagined would look like an Iowa cornfield in early winter, filled with pheasants.

I will miss Bud every day for the rest of my life, but I will see him again. I know I will. I will hunt the field with him, and I look forward to it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise to eulogize a great American about whom Senator MCCAIN has just spoken. It has been said it is the soldier who has given us our most important freedoms over the course of our history. That is certainly a true statement in the case of Air Force Col. George "Bud" Day.

Colonel Day was a good friend of Senator MCCAIN's. He was a resident of Florida, living in the Fort Walton Beach area. Sadly, he passed away, but at the very extended life's age of 88.

I want to—in addition to Senator MCCAIN's comments—take a moment to honor and remember this American hero, who was one of the most highly decorated service members this country has ever seen. He was a Medal of Honor recipient. He was a veteran of three wars—World War II, the Korean war, and the war in Vietnam.

Because his F-100 fighter jet was shot down, he ended up being a prisoner of war in Vietnam for nearly 6 years, and there in Hanoi he and Senator MCCAIN became cellmates.

When asked about their experience together, Senator MCCAIN said:

I owe my life to Bud, and much of what I know about character and patriotism. He was the bravest man I ever knew.

Senator MCCAIN has just recounted a number of those things. I do not know, but I have heard it said, either from Colonel Day or Senator MCCAIN, that it was JOHN MCCAIN who was put into that cell nearly dead—after his arm was broken when he ejected from his aircraft, and after he had been beaten—and Bud Day nursed him back to health.

After the POWs were released from Vietnam, interestingly, Colonel Day returned to active duty, and he returned to active flying status. He retired in 1977 as the Air Force's most decorated officer.

It has also been said that a nation can be judged by how it treats those who have borne its battles. After he left the Air Force, Colonel Day—listen to this—continued public service. He went to law school. He practiced law and he championed veterans' issues.

So I wanted to take a moment, after an emotional speech by Senator MCCAIN, to say that I say, and many are saying, a little prayer of thanks that Colonel Bud Day helped preserve the freedoms of this country with his service to this country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

LANCE CORPORAL BENJAMIN W. TUTTLE

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to pay my respect to an American hero, LCpl Benjamin Tuttle, who sacrificed his life for this country in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Lance Corporal Tuttle graduated from Gentry High School in Gentry, AR, in 2012. His appreciation for athletics kept him active after school as a football player, wrestler, and track runner. As a student, he made his interest in serving in the Marines well known. He shared his love for his country and the corps during a trip back to his alma mater last fall.

His love of country was coupled with love for his family. In a Facebook post, he wrote he would be back home in October and was anxious to fish, go to dinner, and just hang out with family and friends.

Lance Corporal Tuttle was serving aboard the USS *Nimitz*. He was assigned to the Marine Fighter Attack Squadron 323, Marine Aircraft Group 11, 3rd Aircraft Wing, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar in California.

Lance Corporal Tuttle was only 19 when he gave his life for his country. Lance Corporal Tuttle is a true American hero who made the ultimate sacrifice. I ask my colleagues to keep his family and friends in their thoughts and prayers.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I humbly offer my sincerest gratitude for his patriotism and selfless service.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SILICON VALLEY IMMIGRATION

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, the need for economic growth remains one of the most pressing and challenging issues we face today in our country. Unfortunately, over the past decade economic growth has been stagnant, creating difficulties for small businesses, for working families, for recent college graduates, and for entrepreneurs.

If I have a goal here, it is to make certain every American has the opportunity to pursue what we all know is the American dream. For that to be possible, we need a growing economy that accomplishes many things, including creating the opportunity for people to go to work, to pay off their loans, to feed their families, to put food on their families' table, and to save for their future.

Last month the Senate had an opportunity to do something positive about our economy. We spent a significant amount of time addressing this issue of immigration, trying to fix our Nation's broken immigration system.

Sensible and overdue improvements to our Nation's immigration laws will spur economic growth and create American jobs. This is why I have been so interested to see how highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants create jobs and contribute to the U.S. economy. It is that aspect of our Nation's broken immigration system I wish to talk about today.

There is an economic imperative to improve our Nation's immigration laws. Many of our Nation's leading businesses struggle to find the talent they need to grow and compete in global markets. According to the Partnership for a New American Economy, American businesses are projected to need an estimated 800,000 workers with advanced STEM degrees by 2018 but will only find 550,000 American graduates with an advanced STEM education.

First and foremost, we must do more to prepare Americans for careers in science, technology, and engineering. I have been encouraged that several immigration proposals before Congress aim to improve STEM education for Americans so that one day we will no longer be required to seek outside labor to meet our country's needs.

In the short term, we must work to equip Americans with the skills of the 21st century. We also need to create a path for highly skilled foreign students to stay in the United States, where their ideas, talents, and intellect can fuel American economic growth.

Legislation I introduced with Senator WARNER of Virginia called Startup Act 3.0 creates visas for foreign students who graduate from an American university with a master's or Ph.D. in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics. These skilled workers would be granted conditional status contingent on them filling a needed gap in the U.S. workforce. This will help growing American companies secure the talent they need now for current job openings. Without this help companies will have to look elsewhere, will find it difficult to find the qualified workers they need, and will likely open locations overseas, taking the jobs with them.

When I was in Silicon Valley last year, I met with executives at Facebook. They told me they were ready to hire close to 80 foreign-born but U.S.-educated individuals in California, but their H-1B visas were not granted. Rather than forgo these skilled workers, the company hired them anyway. That caught my attention, but the story is that they placed them in Dublin, Ireland, not in the United States. Facebook was ultimately able to get visas for these

workers after training them in Ireland, but all too often companies end up housing the jobs permanently overseas. When this happens, it is not only those specific jobs that are lost. In this case we didn't just lose 80 jobs but also the many supporting jobs and economic activity associated with those jobs.

Even more damaging, more damning, more frustrating to me is that many of these highly skilled workers who are now employed in some other country will become entrepreneurs that will start successful businesses there, not in the United States. Of the 80 engineers working in Dublin, Ireland, for Facebook, I have no doubt but that one or more of them will be the next originator, the next innovator for companies such as Facebook. We want them in the United States creating that opportunity here for Americans.

Immigrants to the United States have a long history of creating businesses in our country. Today, 1 in every 10 Americans employed at a privately owned U.S. company works at an immigrant-owned firm. Immigrants are more than twice as likely as native-born Americans to start a business. Of the current Fortune 500 companies, more than 40 percent were founded by a first- or second-generation American. Ranked No. 73 on that list is Google, which was cofounded in 1998 by Sergey Brin, an immigrant from Russia. Sergey and his cofounder Larry Page developed Google as Ph.D. students while at Stanford University. Google is now the world's top search engine, generates more than \$50 billion in revenue annually, and employs tens of thousands. We need to create an immigration system that welcomes more immigrants like Sergey Brin.

Our bill, Startup Act 3.0, creates an entrepreneur's visa for foreign-born entrepreneurs currently in the United States. Those individuals with a good idea, capital, and a willingness to hire Americans would be able to stay in the United States and grow their businesses here. Each immigrant entrepreneur would be required to create jobs for Americans. Providing a way for an immigrant entrepreneur to stay in the United States and create American jobs makes economic sense.

Earlier this year the Kauffman Foundation, headquartered in Kansas City, studied the economic impact of the entrepreneur's visa in Startup Act 3.0. Using conservative estimates, the Kauffman Foundation predicts that the entrepreneur's visa alone could generate 500,000 to 1.6 million new jobs during the next 10 years. These are real jobs with real economic impact that could boost GDP, by their estimate, by 1.5 percent or more. When we talk about economic growth and creating opportunity, a boost in GDP by 1.5 percent is a major accomplishment.

Recognizing this potential, several bills create visas for immigrant entre-

preneurs. It is important that these visas be structured in a way to facilitate job creation. Unnecessarily high investment and revenue requirements and burdensome mandates, such as having to submit a business plan to Washington, DC, bureaucrats, threaten to diminish the impact these entrepreneurial visas could have.

Although well-intentioned, the INVEST visa created in the Senate immigration bill fell prey to some of these traps. To improve that idea, I developed an amendment with the help of entrepreneurs, investors, and startup policy experts. This amendment would reduce paperwork and reporting requirements so that entrepreneurs could spend more time building their businesses, allow entrepreneurs to secure initial investment from those closest to them, add flexibility to the way in which startup employees are compensated to account for geographic and industry differences, and clarify that the jobs created by immigrant entrepreneurs must be held by Americans. A list of more than 30 startup companies, investors, and business leaders and immigration attorneys supported this amendment.

Sadly, like many other amendments, it was blocked from even receiving consideration. But in the end, that may not matter. The Speaker of the House has said the Senate immigration bill is "dead on arrival." Instead of taking up Senate legislation, the House is pursuing, perhaps, a more thoughtful, methodical approach to immigration—writing several targeted bills that address aspects of our broken immigration system.

Congress crafts better policy when it is done in manageable bite sizes. In my view we do not have to look far in the past to see what happens when Congress bites off more than it can chew. Implementation of the Affordable Care Act and Dodd-Frank offer two examples of the unintended consequences of passing giant bills with multi-thousand pages that are poorly understood. In fact, it was the 1986 comprehensive immigration bill that left us with the many problems we are attempting to fix today. Passing a series of smaller more targeted immigration bills will result in better policy and achieve better results for the American people.

Moreover, there is broad agreement within Congress on many aspects of immigration policy. Last year the House of Representatives passed two immigration bills. One would have repurposed visas from the diversity lottery to STEM visas for some of our most talented foreign-born U.S. graduates. Another would have eliminated the employment-based, green card per-country cap allowing American employers to have access to the best talent regardless of where a potential employee was born.

This bill passed 389 to 15 in the House. Yet neither received a vote in

the Senate because of adherence to the approach that says we can't do anything unless we do everything. This line of thinking has prevented progress on important challenges facing our country for a long time.

Republicans and Democrats agree that creating opportunities for highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants to contribute to our economy is beneficial to America. I strongly hope Congress will finally come together and pass what we can agree upon now while continuing to work on the issues that divide us. In my view, we can no longer allow ourselves to be hostage to the all-or-nothing strategy or wait until after the next election.

Right now other countries are taking advantage of our inability to solve problems and are exploiting our broken immigration system. Since I arrived in the Senate in 2011, at least seven countries have changed their policies and laws to better attract highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants. One of those countries, Canada, even went so far as to buy a billboard in Silicon Valley in an attempt to poach the best and brightest.

We must address this problem, and the best way to do so is in a measured and incremental way. The benefits to our Nation's economy will be great and the goodwill produced by working in a bipartisan manner on targeted solutions will sow the seeds of trust necessary to solve the problems where disagreement remains.

So we will see what happens now in the immigration debate, but my hope is that if we are unable to pass so-called broad-based immigration reform, if we are unable to come up with sensible solutions in an understandable legislative package, let's at least work to accomplish those things on which there is broad agreement and continue to solve those problems where there remains disagreement today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH FUNDING

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an issue that is vital for the future health and well-being of citizens in our country; that is, funding for medical research for the National Institutes of Health. Unfortunately, NIH funding, like many other important Federal priorities, is being impacted by the across-the-board spending cuts. As we all know, we want

to see that budget go down, we want to see the debt reduced, but we have to do it in a sensible way, not with a hammer.

Sequestration was never intended to be implemented and was supposed to bring Democrats and Republicans together to focus on smart solutions to reducing our debt.

I am a supporter of the work of the debt commission. I believe there is a way we can bring down our debt in a significant way. But I do not think we meant to have sequestration implemented in the way it is being implemented and seeing the kind of cuts we are seeing. These cuts are creating headwinds against short-term economic growth, reducing access to important services, and threatening our Nation's leadership in areas such as medical research. Congress needs to take a broader, long-term view toward our debt and deficit. That is why I support the Senate budget which would replace the sequester with targeted spending cuts and additional revenue, reducing the deficit in a balanced way.

I know Senator MURRAY, who heads up the Budget Committee, has been trying valiantly to get this budget to a conference committee, which is supported by the Democrats in the Senate and supported by Republicans such as Senator MCCAIN and Senator COLLINS. We have been stopped every step of the way, but this should go through regular order, into a conference committee so we can work out these differences with the House and replace sequester with something that makes sense.

Today I want to focus on the impact of sequestration on this particular area of the Federal budget; that is, medical research. It may not be the first thing you think of when you think about these cuts and what they mean, but I hope when you listen to my stories it brings out a whole new significance.

In the last century we have made enormous strides through medical and scientific research to understand the world around us. This research has led to a greater understanding of the nature and cause of disease and spurred a new generation of therapies and intervention to treat diseases.

Our country has been a leader in this era of scientific discovery, and we are responsible for developing many of the innovative therapies and scientific advances that have changed the face of science and given hope to millions of patients across the world. These advancements have been made possible by our commitment to funding research through the National Institutes of Health.

Currently, the NIH is the largest source of medical research funding in the world. Through its 27 Institutes, NIH funds research to prevent, detect, better treat, and even cure fatal and debilitating diseases such as cancer,

heart disease, stroke, Alzheimer's, arthritis, diabetes, and mental health issues. The Institutes also fund basic science which provides the foundation for future breakthroughs in all fields of scientific discovery.

Researchers in my State tell me they cannot think of anything they do clinically that was not influenced by basic research made possible by NIH funding. Think of the advancements we have made. These clinical advancements are critical to improving health and saving the lives of millions of Americans.

To truly understand the importance of NIH, I think it is important to understand the impact on our own people, so I want to share some of the ways NIH funding has had influence in my State on people, on people such as Jim from Edina, MN.

Jim was 36 when he was diagnosed with an inoperable brain tumor in 1998. He was a professional engineer. He had an MBA from Northwestern Kellogg School of Management and worked in the family's 56-year-old air-conditioning and heating business, Owens Companies, Inc. He had everything to live for. But when Jim was diagnosed, there were almost no treatment options beyond radical surgery and radiation, so Jim looked for other options.

Over the course of the next 10 years he participated in multiple clinical trials and some seven treatments—all made possible by research grant funding. Jim passed away at age 46. But thanks to the clinical trials, he lived over 10 years, allowing his young son Max the chance to get to know his dad. He also was able to continue his lifelong athletic endeavors with a ride across the country with Livestrong in 2004 as part of the Tour of Hope, spreading the message of hope and survivorship.

The clinical trials, however, did not just help Jim. This is the key part, Mr. President, whether you are from Connecticut or from Minnesota. One of the trials in which Jim participated proved so effective that it is now the standard treatment regimen for people who are diagnosed with the same cancer as Jim. That would not have been possible if Jim had not been willing to go through those treatments and if they had not been funded by NIH.

Then there is Karen, a 48-year-old wife, mother of two teenagers, and a teacher. She was diagnosed with leukemia in August of 2005. With her type of leukemia, the prognosis is relatively good, and using the current treatments available she remained in remission until 2009. Then in the summer of 2009 she started feeling sick again and received news that the cancer had returned. Her only treatment option was a bone marrow transplant which had a 25-percent mortality rate. She and her husband visited with specialists and discovered that she had a mutation that did not respond to the current—at that time—frontline medication.

That is when she learned about clinical trials. In January 2010 she began her clinical trial journey and has now been involved in two clinical trials. She responded well to the second clinical trial and has been in remission for over 2 years. Her kids are now 17 and 13, and she and her husband are preparing to send their oldest daughter off to college in the fall of 2014.

NIH funding supports the research centers that make these stories like Jim's and Karen's possible. In Minnesota we have the Paul and Sheila Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Center, which is supported by NIH funding. This center has 46 faculty members in 7 University of Minnesota colleges and schools and receives \$6 million in annual funding from NIH.

Together, these scientists are conducting over 10 active clinical research studies that are giving hope to parents and patients with muscular dystrophy. This facility believes science is more than just about the research. The researchers here have volunteered hundreds of thousands of hours helping to educate the people they serve and ensuring these families have access to support networks. All of this is made possible in part because of Federal investment in the NIH.

These are inspiring stories, but supporting NIH is important for another reason—meeting the skyrocketing cost of treating chronic diseases. In total, today more than half of Americans are suffering from one or more chronic diseases. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, taken together these chronic diseases cause 7 in 10 deaths and account for about 75 percent of the \$2 trillion we spend on medical care. This year it is estimated that almost 1.7 million people will be diagnosed with cancer, and almost 600,000 are projected to die from this devastating disease. That is approximately 1,600 people a day.

Everyone in this room knows someone who had cancer or has cancer now, and 26 million Americans are living with diabetes, with a new case diagnosed every 30 seconds. An estimated 5.2 million Americans are living with Alzheimer's disease, and we know this number will escalate rapidly in the coming years as the baby boom generation ages.

The growing prevalence of chronic disease is having an impact not just on Americans' physical health but on our economy as well. In 2008 cancer cost our country over \$200 billion. A recent report on diabetes costs shows that the money spent on diabetes care has risen 41 percent, from \$174 billion to \$245 billion in the last 5 years, and Alzheimer's alone is expected to cost our country over \$1 trillion by 2050.

All of us as taxpayers help pay that bill because public programs such as Medicare and Medicaid cover a significant amount of the cost of care and treatment.

If we had earlier interventions and treatments that delayed the onset of these diseases, we would be able to reduce spending significantly. Take Alzheimer's as an example.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session and it be in order to file cloture on Executive Calendar Nos. 201 and 220; further, that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived; finally, that if this request is granted, the Senate resume legislative session after the final cloture motion is reported pursuant to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate will proceed to executive session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF BYRON TODD JONES TO BE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Byron Todd Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Byron Todd Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Mark Begich, Christopher A. Coons, Thomas R. Carper, Patty Murray, Martin Heinrich, Bernard Sanders, Jeanne Shaheen, Benjamin L. Cardin, Al Franken, Sherrod Brown, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Bill Nelson, Charles E. Schumer.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before I proceed, I would just note it is coincidental that the Senator from Minnesota is on the floor. I have heard her often speak about what a wonderful job this man has done as U.S. attorney in the State of Minnesota, in addition to his other duties. I am glad she is on the Senate floor to understand we are moving forward on this nomination.

Mr. President, there is another matter to be reported.

NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA POWER TO BE THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY, AND THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be the Representative of the United States to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and Representative of the United States America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk on Calendar No. 220.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Harry Reid, Robert Menendez, Patrick J. Leahy, Mark Begich, Christopher A. Coons, Martin Heinrich, Parry Murray, Bernard Sanders, Jeanne Shaheen, Benjamin L. Cardin, Al Franken, Sherrod Brown, Tom Harkin, Thomas R. Carper, Sheldon Whitehouse, Bill Nelson, Charles E. Schumer.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

JONES NOMINATION

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I thank the majority leader for his work and the Members of the Senate for allowing Todd Jones to get a vote to head the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Bureau. This is a job that has gone unfilled, as you know, for 7 years, since it became confirmable under law—7 years, under President Bush, under President Obama. These 2,400 agents have had no leader.

During that time they have investigated extensive crimes, including just this year the Boston Marathon bombing, as well as the explosion in Texas. These are just examples of what these agents are doing. They deserve a full-time leader.

Mr. Jones is a former marine. He has five children. He has been going back and forth in Minnesota between the U.S. attorney's job and doing the ATF job for 2 years.

Enough is enough. I am glad we are moving forward with this nomination. I am glad for Mr. Jones, who deserves it, and who has been willing to put his name forward, willing to come in, clean up this agency after Fast and Furious and all the concerns we all had with that effort. He was willing to come in, take over this very difficult job, and do two jobs at once. He deserves to be confirmed for this job.

I am pleased for the agents as well, those 2,400 hard-working people who simply go to work every day, immune from the politicians, immune from what Democrats think or what Republicans think. They just deserve a boss. That is what this vote is about.

NIH

Mr. President, I want to finish my remarks about NIH. It is incredibly important in my State. It is the home of the Mayo Clinic, the home of the University of Minnesota where they are now undertaking the simple task of mapping the brain. And talk about what these cuts mean—I focused before on the stories of individual Minnesotans, but I also spoke about the cost if we do not do anything, the cost of inaction, the cost of not doing the research, looking at Alzheimer's as an example. If we were able to delay the onset of Alzheimer's by just 5 years—this is not curing it; this is simply delaying the onset by 5 years—if we were able to delay the onset of Alzheimer's by 5 years, similar to the effect that anticholesterol drugs have on preventing heart disease, we would be able to cut the government spending on Alzheimer's care by almost half in 2050. We are talking about billions of dollars.

The answer, of course, to delay the onset of Alzheimer's by 5 years will not just drop from the sky. It needs dedicated scientists and doctors with the resources to conduct the experimentation and to move forward. I have seen what they are doing with mapping the brain. I met with those scientists afterward, and I asked them about the groundbreaking work.

They talked about the effect this is having on young scientists who are afraid to go into these fields. They don't know if their research will be funded because there is only enough money to fund the research that has been going on for years. So many innovative ideas can be lost if this continues.

At lunch last week we all heard from Francis Collins, who heads up the NIH. He talked about the hope and exciting developments that are going on in combating diseases. Yet our country—what a time to step back. This is not the time to step back when we are on the verge of delaying the onset of Alzheimer's, of helping so many people, and saving so much money. What we are spending on research is literally a drop in the bucket compared to the cost of the disease.

Investment in NIH is not just right to do from a public health perspective, it also makes good economic sense. NIH generates tens of billions of dollars in new economic activity across the country each year and supports hundreds of thousands of good jobs.

In 2012, NIH funding supported 8,800 jobs in my State alone. Unfortunately, Federal investment in medical research has stagnated in the last decade. As a result of sequestration, funding for NIH was slashed \$1.55 billion this year alone. This cut means 700 fewer competitive research grants will be funded and 750 fewer patients will be admitted to the NIH clinical center. This reduction comes at a time when we are funding only 18 percent of potential projects. That is a record low for the second year in a row.

In Minnesota, the University of Minnesota could lose \$50 million of its \$700 million Federal research budget in the next couple of years. This drop in support not only threatens research in the short term but could have devastating effects on innovation in the United States for many years to come.

I hear from countless students and researchers who are considering leaving the field or even the country because funding is not available here. If we are not going to have the funding, they are going to do their research in Canada or some other country. We can't allow the pipeline of future researchers to dry up or move overseas. Investing in medical research is the right thing to do. It is also the smart thing to do, and that is why support for this research is not a partisan issue in the Senate.

I thank Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman MIKULSKI and Ranking Member SHELBY and the Labor and Health and Human Services Subcommittee chairman, Senator HARKIN, and Ranking Member MORAN for their strong leadership on this issue. I applaud the work they have done prioritizing NIH funding by providing \$31 billion in 2014. This figure could again be cut by billions if we do not replace the sequester with sensible, targeted spending cuts similar to what we included in the Senate budget.

Why put the money aside if we are going to then slash it because of sequester, when we all know it should be replaced with more targeted spending cuts, something that makes more

sense, is a mix of revenue and spending cuts as suggested by the Simpson-Bowles Commission and every other economic commission that looked at this matter. It is time to replace sequestration with something that makes sense. Cutting research that saves and lengthens people's lives who have Alzheimer's, diabetes, and helps people who have autism is the wrong way to go.

We all agree about the importance of reining in wasteful spending and reducing the deficit and the need for the government to improve its fiscal discipline, but we cannot do this in a way that is penny wise and pound foolish. Fiscal responsibility is about values and priorities just as much as it is about dollars and cents. It is about spending smart as well as spending cuts.

I strongly support NIH and the hope it brings to people in my State and across the country. I look forward to working with my colleagues in a bipartisan fashion to replace the cuts imposed by the sequester and ensure our country maintains its leadership in medical innovation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I wish to thank and join my friend and colleague from Minnesota Senator KLOBUCHAR in her remarks about Todd Jones. He is one of two very distinguished law enforcement nominees who will come before this body for confirmation in the coming days.

I wish to join my friend in enthusiastically praising Acting Director Jones for his perseverance and courage in the past months, indeed years, he has served in this critical position.

When we recently went through the debate on sensible commonsense gun violence measures—which, unfortunately, did not pass this body—we often heard about the need for more prosecutions, more effective investigation and pursuit of cases against lawbreakers involving guns. Todd Jones is committed to that task. I believe—with many others—that there needs to be more prosecutions and more effective enforcement of these laws.

ATF needs more resources to do those prosecutions and it needs more leadership, which Todd Jones can provide if he is confirmed and given the mandate from the Senate that he needs and the agency deserves to do its work more effectively.

In just a few minutes, we will hear from my great friend and colleague from Connecticut about the continuing scourge of gun violence and how it continues to take a toll in the absence of effective measures from the Congress.

I join my colleague in urging that this body fulfill its obligation, man-

date, and responsibility from the American people to do more and do it more effectively. We need to adopt sensible measures, such as national background checks, a ban on illegal trafficking and straw purchases, a more effective mental health initiative, and school safety measures, which Todd Jones will bring to this office. He will address gun violence and all of the responsibilities within the important purview of the ATF.

The Alcohol, Traffic, and Firearms Bureau has a long, storied, and distinguished history, and Todd Jones will make it more so through his leadership.

Equally important, this afternoon we will vote on James Comey—I am proud to say he is a resident of Fairfield, CT—as the next Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I know this agency well because I worked with agents of the FBI day in and day out when I was U.S. attorney in Connecticut for 4½ years. I know it well because I have seen his work as attorney general of Connecticut. I know it well because over the years I have come to know the extraordinary men and women of the FBI.

They are extraordinary in their bravery, perseverance, and skill. They are extraordinary in their expertise, experience, and their respect for the law, which is so critical. They have a sense of balance and mission along with their dedication to making America safer. Their mandate and purview has expanded over the years from the days when car thefts and kidnapping comprised a major part of their caseload to now cybersecurity, terrorism, and computer hacking.

Jim Comey is a man for the modern FBI, an agency with a long and distinguished history that now faces new threats and new responsibilities. He is truly a prosecutor's prosecutor. His life's work has been about law enforcement.

He began in the U.S. Department of Justice as an assistant U.S. attorney in the Southern District of New York. He rose to become Deputy Chief of the Criminal Division. He soon moved to the job of managing assistant U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, where his superiors recognized his exceptional ability, his remarkable combination of scholarship, and practical sense of investigation.

When they assigned to him responsibility for the terrorist attack on the Khobar barracks in Saudi Arabia, he quickly delivered 14 indictments and earned another promotion. This time he was promoted to become the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York. His service there was recognized as remarkably distinguished and successful, especially in overseeing that office's terrorism investigations and prosecutions. He made a priority of corporate crime—white-collar crime.

He never feared to take on the toughest of challenges. He prosecuted big businesses but also terrorism. He received the Director's Award for superior performance and the Henry L. Stimson Medal from the New York City Bar Association.

He became Deputy Attorney General, the second highest ranking official at the Department of Justice. In that job—and much has been written about this incident in his professional life—he demonstrated unbelievable and passionate dedication to the rule of law by standing up to his own superiors and in speaking truth to power on a variety of issues but most especially when he stood up to some of the President's men, and his own superiors, in saying he would stand for personal constitutional rights at a time when they were threatened. He has been a person of integrity and dedication to the rule of law—bigger than any single person throughout his career—even in the face of that kind of tremendous pressure.

In my conversations with him, he has also committed himself to the vigorous and zealous pursuit of gun violence. I have spoken to him publicly and privately about this issue. He testified in response to my questions, and others, and clearly demonstrated his commitment to effective enforcement of existing and improved laws, such as background checks and a ban on straw purchases and illegal trafficking.

He has also committed himself publicly, and in his conversation with me, to a continued crackdown on human trafficking. I wish to thank and commend the FBI for its stunningly successful arrests of 150 pimps. They rescued 105 children in a nationwide crackdown—literally within the past 24 to 48 hours—including 6 children in New Haven, CT.

This stunning success shows dramatically—including the rescue of six children in Connecticut—how this invisible, pernicious scourge can hit close to home. It has hit home in Connecticut. I saw it, as attorney general of our State, as a crime, a predatory scourge that hits men and women and children—most searingly and heartbreakingly, children who are forced into labor or into sexual exploitation.

The FBI's crackdown shows that an effective partnership involving local police—like law enforcement in New Haven, CT, where six children were rescued—along with State and Federal law enforcement can effectively crack down on this scourge. The FBI is to be commended and so is Mr. Comey for his commitment to combat this problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. As I said, I commend the FBI and I thank them for this effective action and Mr. Comey for his commitment to continuing that crackdown on human trafficking.

I also thank his wife and his family, his five children, for their generosity in becoming an adoption family; that is, adopting children, through the licensed foster parents program in Connecticut. I thank them for becoming foster parents, I should say more accurately, and caring for infants and toddlers. They have also donated money to create a foundation to support children who age out of foster care.

He is truly a man dedicated to public service. We will be proud of him as an effective and able leader of the FBI in a challenging time.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1243, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1243) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Murray (for Cardin) modified amendment No. 1760, to require the Secretary of Transportation to submit to Congress a report relating to the condition of lane miles and highway bridge deck.

Coburn amendment No. 1750, to prohibit funds from being directed to Federal employees with unpaid Federal tax liability.

Coburn amendment No. 1751, to prohibit Federal funding of union activities by Federal employees.

Coburn amendment No. 1754, to prohibit Federal funds from being used to meet the matching requirements of other Federal programs.

Murphy amendment No. 1783, to require the Secretary of Transportation to assess the impact on domestic employment of a waiver of the Buy America requirement for Federal-aid highway projects prior to issuing the waiver.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, let me associate myself with the remarks

of my colleague from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL, as well as the majority leader, who was here earlier today, and Senator KLOBUCHAR—all speaking on behalf of our nominee to head the ATF, as well as Senator BLUMENTHAL's remarks on behalf of Fairfield, CT, resident James Comey to be the head of the FBI. Very few agencies, other than the ATF and the FBI, are more intricately involved in the preservation of the health and safety of the American public, and we deserve to have votes on those nominees tonight and this week.

But I also want to associate myself with the other remarks Senator KLOBUCHAR made. She talked about our obligation as a body to reverse these very damaging sequester cuts to NIH funding for medical research, and she listed some very compelling stories about men and women who have had their lives saved, preserved, lengthened because of discoveries made through medical research.

It is a reminder to the Senate and to the House—to anyone who treads upon these two floors—that we hold life and death in our hands with the decisions we make. We decide when we choose to fund or not fund the NIH as to whether we are going to give life to people who are waiting on those kinds of cures and treatments.

But, similarly, we make decisions about life and death when we choose not to act, when we choose to do nothing, to sit pat. In this case we make a decision to allow people to die in this country—specifically 6,633 people since December 14—when we make a choice to do nothing about the scourge of gun violence that continues to plague this Nation.

I have tried to come down here every single week—as Senator KLOBUCHAR did in speaking about the effects of funding medical research in very personal terms—to talk about the implications of doing nothing when it comes to the increasing levels of gun violence in this country, in similarly personal terms.

December 14, of course, for most people is easily recognized as the date when 20 6- and 7-year-olds were killed in Sandy Hook, CT, along with 6 adults who cared for them, as well as the gunman and his mother. Since that day, 6,633 people have been killed by guns at a rate of about 30 a day—the highest of any civilized nation in the world, and we do nothing.

One of those, on July 14, was Horsley Shorter, Jr. Horsley managed a Family Dollar store in Tampa, FL. Junior, as he was known, had some kids come in occasionally who would try to take things out of the store or try to steal. When he had to report them to the police, he would. But this was a very gentle man, and more often than not he would pull the kids aside and try to talk through things with them to try

to help them understand what they were doing and what the implications were.

He would never do anything to instigate a fight, his friend said. In fact, his last words to one of his coworkers was "the pen is mightier than the sword."

What happened that day was an armed robber came into the store and demanded money from the clerk. According to police, Shorter was inside the office, and he was shot when he ran out to try to help his coworker who was at the counter. The robber then forced the clerk at gunpoint into the parking lot, where he stole the clerk's car and used it to escape. According to one friend, Shorter was very close to that coworker, took him under his wing, which was the reason he ran out into harm's way to try to save him.

This friend said:

I believe that's why that young guy is alive [today]. Junior wasn't going to watch nobody die. He gave his life for him.

About 2 weeks earlier, on July 2, Chanice Reed, 22, and Annette Reed, her mother, as well as Eddie McCuin, a 10-year-old, were shot in a triple murder in Fort Worth, TX.

An hour after the shooter killed his pregnant girlfriend, her mother, and her little brother, he walked into the Forest Hill Police Department, telling officers to arrest him because he "did something bad." He was 22 years old. He had a history of domestic violence. He was sentenced to 1 year of deferred adjudication probation because of assault.

Because of a domestic dispute, and because of his easy access to guns, in order to resolve this disagreement, he shot his pregnant girlfriend, her mother, and her 10-year-old little brother.

Just a couple days ago, in Bridgeport, CT, Pablo Aquino died. He was 27 years old. He was described as a "humble man." He was always down at the baseball field helping kids because he had a son playing baseball there.

He spent his days at the Fairfield County Hunting Club in Westport, where he tended to horses.

He got into an argument—a simple argument—when the suspect decided that the best way to solve this argument was to turn a gun on Pablo, killing him.

The next day, the community had a vigil for him. The vigil was to remember him but also because they did not have enough money for a funeral. So as the vigil was going on, one of his friends stood out on the corner with an empty tin can of iced-tea mix, asking passersby to contribute a couple cents for a funeral that was expected to cost \$2,000.

Over the July 4 period, there were three shootings in New Haven, CT.

At around 10:30 on Wednesday night, police said somebody shot and killed 19-year-old Errol Marshal. His body was discovered on the front porch of a home, pronounced dead at the scene.

At the same time, investigators found Courtney Jackson, a 26-year-old, suffering from a gunshot wound to the stomach.

Brian Gibson, 23, of New Haven, was shot outside of a public housing complex shortly thereafter.

All three shootings were connected. All three shootings are due to the fact that too many kids and too many young adults today do not know how to resolve their disputes any other way than getting a gun, and also because in a city such as New Haven guns are like water; they are all over the place. They are all over the place because this body does not pass legislation to keep guns out of the hands of criminals. We refuse to pass a bill making it a Federal crime to illegally traffic guns.

All those seem very dissimilar from Newtown. But then there are ones you hear about that strike you as so similar to the reason why I am here today talking about this, because of the 26 people who died at the Sandy Hook Elementary School.

Not much more than a month after Newtown, the Griego family was killed, all in one fell swoop, in Albuquerque, NM—Greg, 51; Sarah, 40; Zephania, 9; Jael, 5; and Angelina, 2. The parents were killed by their son, the little girls and boy killed by their brother. Nehemiah was 15 years old when he took a semiautomatic weapon to kill his family. Like Adam Lanza, the shooter in Newtown, Nehemiah was a troubled teen—more troubled than anyone around could have realized. Like Adam Lanza, he took out his rage on his family, first killing his mother while she lay sleeping in her bed. Like Adam Lanza, he had plans to continue his killing spree. He was going to go to the local Wal-Mart before he was stopped. He was anticipating getting into a fire-fight with the police. And like Adam Lanza, he used an assault weapon that was readily available to him in his own home.

Greg, 51; Sarah, 40; Zephania, 9; Jael, 5; Angelina, 2—5 of the 6,633 people—30 or so a day—who have been killed by guns since December 14. We are not going to stop them all by passing a piece of legislation on the Senate floor. Background checks will not bring 6,600 people back, nor will a ban on human trafficking, nor will a ban on the sale of 30-round magazines or assault weapons. But they will absolutely bring some of those people back. They will absolutely lessen the rate below 30 a day.

I am going to continue to come down to the floor week after week to tell the stories of victims of gun violence, to give them a voice on the floor of the Senate, so that someday, some time, hopefully soon, this place will wake up to the fact that we do have responsibility over life and death on the floor of the Senate, and it is about time, when it comes to the rising incidents of

gun violence across this country, we do something about it.

I yield back the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JAMES B. COMEY, JR., TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of James B. Comey, Jr., of Connecticut, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. shall be equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be divided equally between the majority and minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I want to notify all of our colleagues that Senator COLLINS and I have been working together with many of our colleagues on amendments to the transportation and housing bill over the past week. I want to be very clear—that work is continuing. The majority leader has made clear that we are going to keep working on amendments on that bill, so everybody should be prepared for more votes.

I urge all of my colleagues to continue talking to me and to Senator COLLINS, and we will keep working to get as many amendments as possible.

Many of you have approached us already with your plans and thoughts. I urge the rest of you not to wait until the last minute. Senator COLLINS and I are working with the floor staff to line up votes.

I know everyone is anxious to have the August recess occur. We are as well. The sooner we can get the amendments and get this bill completed, the sooner all of us will be able to accomplish that.

I know a number of our colleagues on the floor have noted that this has been an open process. That is what Senator COLLINS and I set out to do, and we are going to make sure that continues.

This is a bipartisan bill. I will remind all of us that it got 6 Republican votes in committee and 73 votes to proceed to the open debate we have had this past week. That debate, again, is going to continue. I am hopeful we can move to a bipartisan finish on a good bill that reflects great ideas from both sides of the aisle.

I again want to thank Senator COLLINS for her work on this, and we are ready to move forward.

I yield the floor to her at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Madam President.

Colleagues, as the chairman of our subcommittee, Senator MURRAY, has pointed out, we are continuing to work through the amendments that have been filed on this bill.

I do not think I need to remind any of our colleagues on either side of the aisle that the August recess is fast approaching and the Senate will have to wrap up its work on this bill before we adjourn.

So I would say to my colleagues, if you have good ideas or even not so good ideas about this bill, we urge you to come to the floor and file your amendment and do so as soon as possible.

As Chairman MURRAY has pointed out, there has been an open amendment process. We have disposed of some amendments; a couple through rollcall votes, a few others through unanimous consent. But we could have done a lot more last week had people been willing to come to the floor and allow us to proceed to amendments that were filed.

I also want to highlight a letter the Appropriations Committee has received from more than 2,420 national, State, and local organizations, and State and local government officials in support of the funding that is in the programs that are included in this important bill. This is an important bill. It is a bill that will help us rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. It is a bill that helps us meet the housing needs of homeless veterans, of disabled senior citizens, of very low-income families. It is a bill that will help the private sector create thousands of new jobs at a time when our economy needs them—in fact, hundreds of thousands of new jobs.

It is not surprising to me that so many organizations are lending their

voices in support of this bill. I want to read one quote from the letter from these organizations. The letter notes that:

Through these investments, Congress supports small business job creation, expands our nation's infrastructure capacity, supports economic recovery and growth, reduces homelessness and housing hardships, and promotes lasting community and family economic success.

I think that is a very good description of the purpose and the programs in this bill.

One of the programs in this bill that is extremely popular and has been used very well to promote economic development and community reinvestment in my State is the funding for the Community Development Block Grant Program. That is an area where our bill differs greatly from the House bill.

I want to point out that tomorrow the House of Representatives is expected to consider its version of the fiscal year 2014 Transportation and Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill. Think about this. If we pass our bill, they pass their bill, we could actually proceed to a conference committee and work out the differences between our respective bills. The differences are marked. I do not minimize the differences in terms of priorities and funding, but that is what Congress is all about.

If we do pass our bill and the House proceeds to pass its version of the T-HUD appropriations bill, we will be the first but I hope not the only fiscal year 2014 spending bill that is ready for conference, goes to conference, and I hope becomes law.

Finally, let me say, I recognize the Senate bill is not perfect, despite the heroic efforts Senator MURRAY and I made in committee and the input and insight from our colleagues that are incorporated into this bill. But it is a good-faith bipartisan effort that attempts to strike the right balance between fiscal responsibility and our Nation's infrastructure and housing needs.

I am confident the bill that would come back from conference would be, frankly, at a lower spending level, which I and many on my side of the aisle want to see. But I was encouraged by the Senate's vote last week of 73 to 26 to allow the Senate to proceed to this bill. I know we can make improvements. That is what the amendment process is all about.

Again, I want to second what our chairman has said and encourage our colleagues to get their amendments filed and to work with both of us so we can proceed to wrap up this work session on a high note of passing, on time, an individual appropriations bill. I am willing to work hard over the recess to conference the two bills, to get going on that. I know the chairman is as well.

I want to thank the chairman and my staff and her staff also for working so hard.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination of Mr. Comey to be the FBI Director.

COMEY NOMINATION

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I wish to speak about the Comey nomination.

James Comey, Jr., should be confirmed to be our next Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I feel it should be done without delay. Director Mueller has served very well, but his term expires early September. It is imperative the Senate work quickly to confirm his successor.

I worked with Ranking Member GRASSLEY to schedule James Comey's confirmation hearing as soon as we returned from the Fourth of July recess. Earlier this month, with Senator GRASSLEY's cooperation, we in the Judiciary Committee unanimously reported the nomination of James Comey to the floor. However, in contrast with the treatment of previous FBI Director nominees—the FBI Director nominees of all preceding Presidents—who were all confirmed by the full Senate within a day or two of being reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, James Comey is the first FBI Director nominee to be filibustered in Senate history by either Republicans or Democrats.

In this case, of course, it is the Republicans who are filibustering a law enforcement position such as this, somebody who was voted out of the committee by every single Republican and Democratic Senator—and then to be filibustered by Republicans on his nomination?

We should be voting to confirm James Comey tonight. It has already taken twice as long to bring up this nomination for a vote in the full Senate as for any previous FBI Director. President Obama officially nominated James Comey on June 21, 38 days ago. No other FBI Director has waited longer than 20 days from nomination to confirmation. The FBI Director plays a very vital role in our national security, and the Senate must put an end to these routine delays.

Nearly 12 years ago, when the Senate considered President Bush's nomination of Robert Mueller to be Director of the FBI on the same day he had been reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, I spoke about how the rights of

all Americans were at stake in the selection of a new FBI Director and how the FBI has extraordinary power to affect the lives of ordinary Americans.

Contrast that with President Bush, Democrats were in the majority, and we Democrats worked to get President Bush's nominee confirmed the same day he came out of committee.

We Democrats made sure politics were not in play in the confirmation of the FBI Director. Republicans shouldn't allow politics to play in the confirmation of an FBI Director. I said at the time, with Robert Mueller, I noted the FBI's sweeping investigatory powers, when used properly, can protect all of us by combating crime, espionage, and terrorism. But I also warned that unchecked, these same powers could undermine our civil liberties and our right to privacy.

When I spoke those words, I didn't know that just 40 days later the world—and the FBI—would change dramatically in the wake of the terrorist attacks on September 11. It shook this area, including even the Senate because of the anthrax attack, which killed a number of individuals. One of the anthrax letters was addressed to me. As the full Senate considers the President's nomination of James Comey to be the seventh Director of the FBI, what I said in 2001 holds true today. With the increased counterterrorism role of the FBI and the expansion of the FBI's surveillance activities, it is even more imperative that the next FBI Director possesses an unflagging commitment to the Constitution and the rule of law.

James Comey is the right man to lead the FBI. He has had a long and outstanding career in law enforcement. He worked for years as a front-line prosecutor on a range of cases fighting violent crime, terrorism, and white-collar fraud, all of which are at the core of the FBI's mission. He also served as the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York. He served as the Deputy Attorney General under President George W. Bush.

In fact, Madam President, many of us remember, when he was Deputy Attorney General, the dramatic hospital bedside confrontation James Comey had with senior White House officials who tried to prod an ailing John Ashcroft to reauthorize an NSA surveillance program—a program that the Justice Department had concluded was illegal. Yet White House staff was over there trying, at his hospital bed, to get the Attorney General to agree to it. But the Deputy Attorney General stepped in, in his role as Acting Attorney General, and stood firm against this attempt to circumvent the rule of law, and I believe he will continue to show the same strength of character and principled leadership if confirmed as Director.

During his confirmation hearing before the Judiciary Committee, James

Comey proved that his reputation for unwavering integrity and professionalism is well-deserved. One area of great concern for me was his approval of a 2005 legal memo to authorize the use of various methods of torture, including waterboarding. I wanted to make sure that as FBI Director, James Comey would never condone or resort to waterboarding a prisoner—something for which we have prosecuted people in other countries. He answered my questions and stated directly, unequivocally, that waterboarding is not only personally abhorrent but that it is torture and illegal. He also testified that if confirmed he would continue the FBI's policy of not permitting the use of abusive interrogation techniques against prisoners, including sleep deprivation and cramped confinement.

Mr. Comey and I do not agree on all matters. I do not agree with him that the Authorization for the Use of Military Force permits the government to detain indefinitely an American citizen captured on American soil in military custody without charge or trial, and I will continue to oppose efforts to codify such an interpretation of the law. I was glad James Comey committed to adhering to the current administration policy of not indefinitely detaining Americans in such circumstances.

When he testified before us, I saw a man of integrity and honesty, competent in background, and so once he is confirmed—and I trust he will be confirmed once this filibuster has ended—I will continue to press him on the scope and legality of surveillance conducted by the government pursuant to the PATRIOT Act and other authorities under the Foreign Surveillance Intelligence Act. As I noted during his confirmation hearing, just because the FBI has the ability to collect huge amounts of data does not mean it should be collecting huge amounts of data. As the head of our premier law enforcement agency, the FBI Director bears a special responsibility to ensure that domestic government surveillance does not unduly infringe upon our freedoms. I have long said that protecting our national security and protecting Americans' fundamental rights are not mutually exclusive. We can and must do both. I fully expect that James Comey will work to achieve both goals.

After Director Mueller's distinguished tenure at the Bureau, James Comey has big shoes to fill. The next Director must face the growing challenge of how to sustain the FBI's increased focus on counterterrorism while at the same time upholding the FBI's commitment to its historic law enforcement functions. It is going to be particularly difficult to protect this country and protect our law enforcement functions because of sequestration and other fiscal constraints, but I think the FBI has to continue to play a key role in combating the crimes

that affect everyday Americans—from violent crimes, to bank robberies, to fraud and corruption cases.

If we learned nothing else since the September 11 attacks, we learned that it matters who leads our Nation at all levels of government. We need strong, principled, ethical leaders who steadfastly adhere to the law. I am confident that James Comey is such a leader. I am urging Senators on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting to overcome this filibuster in a vote to confirm him to be the next Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

As I said before—and I will put into the RECORD how long it has taken from nomination to confirmation—twice as long as President Bush's FBI nomination, more than twice as long as President Reagan's FBI nomination, and twice as long as President Nixon's FBI nomination. In every one of those cases, no Democrat filibustered President Bush, President Reagan, and President Nixon. We all worked to get the FBI Director in there. This filibuster by my friends on the other side of the aisle is unprecedented. I wish they would treat President Obama the same way we treated President Bush, President Reagan, and President Nixon and not make President Obama seem to be somehow different and interfere with law enforcement the way they have.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a chart showing how long it took previous Presidents.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FBI Director Nominee	Total # days from nomination to confirmation
JAMES B. COMEY, JR. (OBAMA)	38 days—as of 7/29/13.
ROBERT S. MUELLER, III (W. BUSH)	15 days.
LOUIS FREEH (CLINTON)	17 days.
WILLIAM SESSIONS (REAGAN)	16 days.
WILLIAM WEBSTER (CARTER)	20 days.
CLARENCE KELLEY (NIXON)	19 days.

THE BUDGET

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I see my friend from Iowa on the floor, but I want to express for the record my concern about this kind of unprecedented obstruction. And it is unprecedented. I have been here 38 years, and this has never happened before, this unprecedented obstruction of the FBI nominee.

In addition to the unprecedented obstruction on the FBI nominee, I want to mention another topic that my friends on the other side of the aisle are blocking. A small minority of Senators are objecting to moving forward with a budget conference. We have all heard a lot of talk in the last few years about getting our fiscal house in order—it makes for a great campaign slogan. But I am afraid that too many in this body are not following through on their responsibility to govern.

It has been over four months since the Senate passed its version of a budget resolution. We all remember being

here overnight voting on amendment after amendment. In the intervening months Senate Democrats have tried 17 times to move to a bipartisan budget conference with the House to work out a final budget agreement. Yet each time the perfunctory request is made—a request that normally is agreed to shortly after we finish our version of the budget—someone from the other side of the aisle, with the full support of their leadership, objects.

After years of crocodile tears from the other side of aisle about the lack of a budget from the Senate, we finally pass one and they object to moving forward.

After years of hearing how we need to get our fiscal house in order because the national debt is the single most pressing issue facing the country, we pass a responsible budget plan to pay down the debt and they object to moving forward.

When it comes time to turn all the politicking into governing, they get cold feet and object.

As the distinguished chairwoman of the Budget Committee has lamented over and over again, I am sorry to say that for some factions in the Republican Party today “compromise” is a dirty word and “distrust” is a political tactic. That may explain why Senate Republicans have offered up excuse after excuse for blocking the regular budget order they so desperately pled for just a short time ago. Republicans are denying the opportunity for members of this body to work with members of the other body on hammering out a final budget agreement.

I have been fortunate to serve in this chamber for 38 years. I was elected to the Senate in 1974, the same year the Congressional Budget Act passed into law. And I served here with Senator Edmund Muskie of Maine, the first chairman of the Budget Committee. In all those years—with all those budgets—I cannot recall one, single instance where political obstruction like this blocked the Senate from going to conference on a budget resolution. And just to be sure, I checked with the Congressional Research Service and they could not find another instance of obstruction like this on a budget conference either. Not from Democrats; not from the old GOP; not from anyone until now.

Some in this body have objected to the Senate considering any appropriations bills until a final budget agreement is reached. Let me see if I get this straight. The very same people who have been begging for a new budget plan are blocking the Senate from going to conference on the budget resolution and then saying we cannot possibly deal with any bills to fund the government next year until we have a final budget agreement, inching us even closer to a government shutdown or a government default that would

devastate our economy and ruin the very fiscal house they claim they are trying to get in order. Oh, the sweet irony here.

It is time for reason and sanity to return to the Senate—on this budget resolution, on nominations, and on a whole host of other issues. I think returning to regular order on the budget conference—and letting conference members from the House and the Senate work out a final agreement—would be a good first step to bringing some comity and order back to this body so we can serve the American people.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I rise today to speak regarding the nomination of James B. Comey, Jr., to serve as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Comey has a long record of service to the Department of Justice. Colleagues doubtless are familiar with Mr. Comey's role in the infamous scene at the side of Attorney General Ashcroft's hospital bed over the reauthorization of part of President Bush's warrantless wiretapping program. Mr. Comey, to his great credit, stood firm for the rule of law and for the Department he served.

Nonetheless, I believe Mr. Comey's role in the issuance of Justice Department legal opinions on torture deserves close examination by this body.

In August 2002, Assistant Attorney General Jay Bybee and John Yoo of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel used what are now acknowledged to be radical—some would say outlandish—legal arguments to authorize the use of torture. Jack Goldsmith, the subsequent head of the office, withdrew those opinions. His successor, Daniel Levin, issued a new opinion, dated December 30, 2004, that provided a new analysis of the Federal statute outlawing torture. The Office of Legal Counsel, under the leadership of Steven Bradbury, applied that analysis to a series of abusive interrogation techniques, as used individually and in combination. The resulting two opinions—the Individual Techniques Opinion and the Combined Techniques Opinion—were issued on May 10, 2005. Then Deputy Attorney General Comey concurred in the former and vigorously objected to the latter on both legal and policy grounds.

I strongly disagree with Mr. Comey's conclusion that the Individual Techniques Opinion was, as he put it at his confirmation hearing before the Judiciary Committee, a “serious and responsible interpretation” of the torture statute. Its legal analysis is inadequate in numerous ways, but for today I will focus on one of the most significant shortcomings.

As I have observed on other occasions, this opinion omits the 1984 Fifth Circuit case of *United States v. Lee*, which involved the prosecution by the Reagan Justice Department of a local

sheriff and deputies who had engaged in waterboarding. The Justice Department's brief on appeal described the technique in detail and described it as “water torture.” The opinion by the Fifth Circuit likewise repeatedly referred to “water torture” and “torture.” As Professor David Luban of Georgetown Law School explained at a hearing I chaired in May 2009, Lee is “perhaps the single most relevant case in American law on the legality of waterboarding.”

To give you an idea of how widely the Individual Techniques Opinion ranged, it evaluated the meaning of the terms “severe physical or mental pain or suffering;” it evaluated “[t]he common understanding of the term ‘torture’ and the context in which the statute was enacted” and it discussed “the historical understanding of torture.” Yet nowhere in this discussion of the “historical understanding of torture” and the “common understanding of the term ‘torture’” does this opinion mention that it was the view of the Department of Justice itself, confirmed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in 1984, that waterboarding is torture. The opinion likewise fails to consider the American prosecutions of Japanese soldiers for waterboarding our troops during the Second World War or the court-martials of American soldiers for using the technique in the Philippines after the Spanish-American war.

The shortcomings of the Individual Techniques Opinion go beyond the failings of its legal analysis. Lawyers cannot analyze the law without knowing the facts, and the record demonstrates that the CIA repeatedly gave the Office of Legal Counsel bad information about the use and effectiveness of the techniques. How willingly Yoo and Bybee accepted false representations by the CIA about their use of the techniques is a question for another day—and their consciences.

In 2004, however, the CIA's Inspector General explained that the CIA had used the techniques differently than they were described in the Yoo and Bybee opinions. Significant misrepresentations also made their way into Office of Legal Counsel opinions in 2005. As former FBI interrogator Ali Soufan testified at a hearing I held in 2009, a May 30, 2005, opinion claim about the effectiveness of waterboarding against Khalid Sheik Muhammad and the so-called Dirty Bomber, Jose Padilla, was demonstrably false. And although I cannot discuss the report of the Senate Intelligence Committee, which remains classified, it is my firm belief that when all the facts are finally made public, the judgment about the candor of the CIA will be harsh and the Individual Techniques Opinion will be further discredited.

As I pointed out at Mr. Comey's confirmation hearing, it is not enough to say that letting the Individual Techniques Opinion go was ok because the

techniques would likely only be used in combination. If Mr. Comey's view had prevailed and the Combined Techniques Opinion had not been issued, an interrogator could have waterboarded a detainee as long as that technique was used in isolation.

It also concerns me that Mr. Comey did not press for an analysis of legal prohibitions other than the torture statute. The Individual Techniques Opinion and the Combined Techniques Opinion did not consider, for example, the legality of abusive techniques under American treaty obligations, such as those imposed by the Convention Against Torture or even under the Constitution. It may be the practice of the Office of Legal Counsel to divide relevant legal questions among multiple opinions, but that does not justify failing to address all obvious and relevant legal questions. As a result, I believe that concurrence in the Individual Techniques Opinion should have been withheld until it was clear that the Office was evaluating all relevant treaty and constitutional questions.

Because I do not believe the Individual Techniques Opinion is reasonable or responsible, and because I believe the process for reviewing that opinion was flawed, I cannot hold Mr. Comey blameless for concurring in it. He should have done better.

This evaluation has the benefit of hindsight and is free from the pressurized atmosphere of early 2005, when Mr. Comey was forced to contend with a White House pulling the Justice Department in the wrong direction on a number of fronts.

I accept that it was not Mr. Comey's responsibility as the Deputy Attorney General to do his own research on the questions addressed by the Individual Techniques Opinion. I do think that the opinion had a bad enough odor to put a responsible, well-trained lawyer on alert.

Mr. Comey did take significant, affirmative steps to satisfy himself that the Individual Techniques Opinion was issued in good faith, seeing to it that the opinion was pressure-tested by exposing it to broad review within the Department of Justice and the executive branch. This fact distinguishes the Individual Techniques Opinion from the earlier opinions that had been crafted without adequate scrutiny within the executive branch—scrutiny they likely could not have survived; remember the use of the Medicare standard for a torture opinion.

In sum, while I believe that the Individual Techniques Opinion does not meet the standards expected of Justice Department attorneys, I ultimately have concluded that Mr. Comey performed his role reasonably.

One key fact corroborates this conclusion. As discussed above, the legality of waterboarding under American treaty obligations and the Constitution

was the obvious followup question. In fact, the Office of Legal Counsel was working on a separate opinion on those very questions and would publish it on May 30, 2005. Mr. Comey, however, was deliberately cut out. Though he already had submitted his resignation, Mr. Comey apparently was enough of a thorn in the side of the enablers of torture that they wanted to get around him.

It is my judgment, overall, that Mr. Comey was an opponent of torture and a defender of the best traditions of the Justice Department and our Nation. I think he could have done better, but Mr. Comey was on the right side. Add to this his clear statements to the committee, his long track record of public service, and his principled stands on other matters of national importance, and I conclude that Mr. Comey has the integrity, the capability, and the commitment to lead the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I will work to see his nomination confirmed and work with him as he undertakes this new chapter in his public service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, Shortly the Senate will be voting to invoke cloture on the nomination of James B. Comey to become the next Director of the FBI. I will vote to invoke cloture and expect many of my colleagues will do the same.

The confirmation of a new FBI Director is a serious decision for this Chamber to consider. As a large Federal law enforcement agency, the FBI has numerous responsibilities and tremendous power. Only with quality leadership and proper Congressional oversight will the FBI be best equipped to fight crime, terrorism, and espionage.

I think the President has made a fine choice in selecting Mr. Comey as the next leader of the FBI, and I plan to explain my support for him as we approach Mr. Comey's confirmation vote.

I recognize there is a level of concern associated with this nomination regarding the use of drones by the FBI. I have been at the forefront of this issue, raising it last year with the Attorney General. The Attorney General gave me an incomplete answer as to the FBI's use of drones.

Accordingly, after there was disclosure that the FBI was using drones on U.S. soil for surveillance, I questioned Mr. Comey about the extent of that policy. This needs to be addressed by the new director, and I have Mr. Comey's assurance he will review the policy. I will be monitoring this closely, but we need a director in place, and we need to confirm this nomination this week.

Excellent leadership is only one ingredient in the recipe for success at any Federal agency. Another critical element is proper congressional oversight. And it is this component I fear

too many of my colleagues have forgotten. Today, too many seem to believe that advice and consent really means rubberstamp and turn a blind eye. The American people deserve better than this approach to confirmations.

Over the last few months, I have observed an alarming pattern. Too often, this administration submits subpar nominees while simultaneously obstructing any legitimate oversight by this Congress. Sadly, many of my colleagues appear to be choosing to ignore any effort to correct it. Let me cite just a few examples.

We saw how Mr. Perez, an assistant attorney general, brokered an unwritten deal that cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. My colleagues on the other side largely ignored the shady deal. Mr. Perez tried to cover his tracks, but got caught leaving a voicemail that was recorded. Even then, my colleagues dismissed it. And when he was caught concealing evidence of the deal on his personal email accounts, he defied a lawfully issued congressional subpoena and refused to turn over the documentation. Incredibly, his defiance was ignored. Worse yet, for all this rotten behavior, the Senate rewarded him with a promotion by confirming him as Secretary of Labor.

We see the same thing occurring with the nomination of Mr. Mayorkas. The nominee for the No. 2 position at the Department of Homeland Security is the target of an open investigation by the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security. The IG is investigating allegations that the nominee procured a visa as a political favor, even though the visa was properly rejected.

Incredibly, the Senate Committee pressed on with the hearing despite unanimous objection from the minority for moving forward in the midst of an open investigation.

That is incredible to me—a Senate Committee would move forward with a nominee who has an open investigation into the nominee's conduct. I wish this were a unique occurrence, but based on recent experience in the Judiciary Committee, it is not an isolated event. This is exactly what happened recently in the Senate Judiciary Committee with respect to Mr. B. Todd Jones, the nominee to be Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms.

Earlier this year, I learned the Office of Special Counsel was investigating Mr. Jones in a complaint that he retaliated against a whistleblower in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Minnesota.

In the Judiciary Committee, it has been the Committee's practice when a nominee is the subject of an open investigation, the Committee generally does not move forward until the issues are resolved. Because of this practice, I objected to holding his hearing last

month and requested the hearing be postponed to allow the investigation to finish.

My request was denied. I then objected to putting him on the committee agenda until the non-partisan investigation was complete. Again, my request was rejected. And now, despite the fact there remains an open complaint of whistleblower retaliation against Mr. Jones before the Office of Special Counsel, his nomination will soon be considered by the full Senate.

I want all my colleagues to know what happened because I am quite concerned by the direction it has taken, especially in light of the fact this practice seems to be spreading into other Senate committees as well.

Over the past few months, there has been correspondence between my office and the Office of Special Counsel regarding the status of their proceedings.

I had previously received a copy of an anonymous letter to the Office of Special Counsel making various allegations against Mr. Jones. I sent a letter to OSC on April 8, asking for an update on those allegations. On April 12, the Office of Special Counsel responded that there were two pending matters involving the U.S. Attorney's Office, District of Minnesota, where Mr. Jones is the United States Attorney. The first matter was a prohibited personnel practice complaint alleging reprisal for whistleblowing and other protected activity. The second matter was a whistleblower disclosure, alleging gross mismanagement and abuses of authority.

The complaint, filed by an Assistant United States Attorney in the office, alleged that personnel actions, including a suspension and a lowered performance appraisal, were taken in retaliation for protected whistleblowing or other protected activity.

On June 5, OSC provided the committee with an update to the two pending cases. It reported the whistleblower disclosure case had been closed based on its determination that the information provided was insufficient to determine with a substantial likelihood that gross mismanagement, an abuse of authority, or a violation of a law, rule, or regulation had occurred. Accordingly, OSC closed that case file.

OSC's action to close the whistleblower disclosure case was not based on any investigation by that office. That action was merely a determination based on a technical review of the complaint document itself. It was not a finding on the merits of the complaint.

With regard to the other issue, the prohibited personnel practice, I was informed the complaint was referred for investigation. Subsequently the complainant and Justice Department agreed to mediation. I was told that if mediation was unsuccessful, the case would return to OSC's Investigation and Prosecution Division for further investigation.

My colleagues should understand that, of all the complaints received by OSC, only about 10 percent of them merit an investigation. This case was one of them. Why did the career, non-partisan staff at OSC forward the case for investigation? Presumably because they thought it needed to be investigated. That says something about the likely merits of the case.

Before the hearing, there was disagreement regarding the status of the Special Counsel's investigation. Accordingly, I contacted the Special Counsel, inquiring as to the status of the complaints. The Special Counsel confirmed for the second time that the investigation remains open. She stated, "The reassignment of the case for mediation did not result in the matter being closed."

Despite this, and over my objection, on June 11, the committee went forward with a hearing on the Jones nomination. We were told Mr. Jones' hearing needed to be held in order for him to have an opportunity to respond to the Office of Special Counsel complaints. I would note that a similar rationale was used to justify the Mayorcas hearing—to publicly address the allegations against the nominee. In Mr. Jones' case, in advance of the hearing, the Department of Justice sent a letter to me stating: "Mr. Jones looks forward to answering your questions about these matters during his nominations hearing. . . ."

Additionally, Mr. Jones was quoted in the Star Tribune as saying, "I am looking forward to meeting with the Committee and answering all their questions."

However, as I expected, the hearing provided no information to the committee with regard to the open Special Counsel investigation. At the hearing, Mr. Jones said he could not talk about the complaint. Of course, this negated the whole reason why the hearing had even been scheduled.

At his hearing, my first question to Mr. Jones was about the investigation. This is his reply:

Because those complaints are confidential as a matter of law, I have not seen the substance of the complaints, nor can I comment on them. I have learned more from your statement today than I knew before I came here this morning about the nature and substance of the complaint.

A few questions later, I inquired of Mr. Jones, "Will you answer the complaints about the Assistant U.S. Attorney—because that is why you are here today?"

He replied:

Well, quite frankly, Senator, I am at a disadvantage with the facts. There is a process in place. I have not seen the OSC complaint. I do know that our office, working with the Executive Office of U.S. Attorneys, is in the process of responding to the issues that you have talked about this morning, but I have not had the opportunity to either be interviewed or have any greater knowledge about what the OSC complaint is."

So there we were, left with an open investigation of serious allegations of whistleblower retaliation. We were told the hearing was the opportunity for us to question the nominee and get these questions answered, but the nominee couldn't even talk about them at all.

This put the Committee in the position of either allowing time for the Office of Special Counsel to do its job or looking into the matter for ourselves before proceeding.

Strangely, late in the day before the hearing, the Majority offered to conduct some interviews the Friday following the hearing. That was quite perplexing to me. We were going to begin the investigation after the hearing had concluded. I could not remember when the committee had ever conducted an investigation after a nominee's hearing.

The day after the hearing, the chairman's staff indicated to the media we were conducting a bipartisan probe. The media reported the majority staff had offered to conduct a bipartisan inquiry into the matters before the Office of Special Counsel.

However, I am disappointed to report there was no genuine effort to gather all the facts. The majority only agreed to jointly interview one witness, the whistleblower himself. However, the majority refused to look into the substance of the whistleblower's claims. Even more troubling, it quickly turned into an inquiry of the whistleblower rather than into the alleged retaliatory action done by the nominee.

The majority reached its own conclusion that it was not a whistleblower matter at all, but a personnel matter wherein management simply imposed discipline on a disruptive or insubordinate employee. However, there was never a factual record before the committee to support this conclusion.

The majority determined the whistleblower is an uncooperative witness for being "unwilling to provide documents"—meaning his personnel file.

The whistleblower in this instance is an Assistant U.S. Attorney with 30 years of Federal service, 24 years of which he has served in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Minnesota. He has extensive leadership experience and in 2012 received the Assistant Attorney General's Distinguished Achievement Award.

It should be quite alarming to us all that a staff investigation of a whistleblower's complaint would be twisted around into an apparent attempt to investigate the whistleblower.

I have worked with many Federal Government whistleblowers over the years and this is exactly the type of treatment that whistleblowers fear. It is one of the main reasons they are afraid to come forward. This type of treatment raises serious concerns.

Unfortunately, I have come to expect this out of the Federal Government

agencies—attacking the whistleblower rather than investigate the underlying problem. I have seen it over and over again. But this sort of inquiry shouldn't be the way the Senate deals with whistleblowers or others who come forward to testify.

The Senate cannot conduct itself this way. We cannot ignore ongoing investigations. In my opinion, we are neglecting our constitutional obligations. Eventually, one of these situations will embarrass the Senate, damage the reputation of the Federal Government, and, ultimately, probably cost the taxpayers, our constituents.

So I urge all of my colleagues to oppose taking further action at this time on the nomination of B. Todd Jones for Director of ATF, another nominee with an open investigation. I will vote no on cloture and encourage my colleagues to do likewise. This is about protecting the advice and consent function of the Senate.

The Senate should wait until the Office of Special Counsel has concluded its investigation and we know the truth about his retaliatory conduct against a protected whistleblower. There will be time to debate the other substantive concerns regarding this nomination. There may be additional reasons why my colleagues should oppose Mr. Jones's nomination. Other Senators may vote to confirm the nominee.

But as a starting point, we should all be in agreement that it is imprudent and unwise for the Senate to give final consideration to any nominee where there is an open investigation into that nominee's conduct. The Senate cannot abdicate its duty to advise and consent on these nominees and simply rubberstamp them.

As we consider this nomination, as well as a number of other nominations this week, I would urge my colleagues to ponder what a Federal agency needs in order to be best positioned to succeed. In my opinion, a Federal agency needs at least two things: a quality leader and proper congressional oversight. I think this is especially relevant as we consider the next Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is a powerful law enforcement agency facing numerous challenges today.

First and foremost, the FBI is still undergoing a transformation from a Federal law enforcement agency to a national security agency. Following 9/11, the FBI's mission changed. Director Mueller was immediately thrust into the role of reinventing a storied law enforcement agency into a national security agency.

While Director Mueller rose to the challenge and made tremendous strides in accomplishing this transformation, that job is not yet complete. It is still adjusting to prevent domestic terrorism. It must grow to combat the

growing threat of cybercrimes that threaten our national security, our economy, and our infrastructure. The FBI needs a Director to continue to guide it as it rises to counter these serious threats.

Second, the FBI must confront the growing concerns over the use of invasive methods of gathering information on American citizens. One example would be the proper use of drones by domestic law enforcement agencies. Last year I raised this issue with the Attorney General. It now appears his response was less than forthright. This year, I raised the issue with Director Mueller and again with Mr. Comey, today's nominee.

Frankly, it is going to require a Director who is knowledgeable on the subject, the law, and who is willing to work with Congress in order to craft the best policy with regard to this technology's potential use in domestic law enforcement.

Third, a host of legacy problems at the FBI remain unsolved. The FBI has struggled to develop a working case management computer system. Management concerns remain about the proper personnel balance between special agents and analysts. It has yet to effectively manage agent rotations to the Washington, DC headquarters. A real or perceived double standard of discipline between line agents and management must be repaired. Significant concerns about internal FBI policies dealing with whistleblower retaliation exist. Each of these matters must be addressed as they threaten to undermine the hard work of the employees at the FBI.

The position of FBI Director is unique in that it is a 10-year appointment subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. This 10-year term was extended 2 years ago on a one-time only basis. The extension allowed Director Mueller to serve an additional time period as the President failed to nominate a replacement. At the time, we held a special hearing to discuss the importance of a term limit for the FBI Director. One of the reasons Congress created a 10-year term was to ensure accountability of the FBI.

Today, we vote on the nomination of James B. Comey for Director. Mr. Comey has a distinguished legal career. After graduating from the University of Chicago Law School in 1985, Mr. Comey clerked for Hon. John M. Walker, Jr., U.S. district judge for the Southern District of New York.

In 1986, he began his legal career with Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, LLP, where he focused on civil litigation. In 1987, Mr. Comey became an assistant U.S. attorney in the Southern District of New York, eventually serving as deputy chief of the Criminal Division.

He left the Department of Justice to return to private practice in 1993, joining McGuireWoods, LLP. While at

McGuireWoods, he served as a deputy special counsel on the U.S. Senate Special Committee to Investigate White-water and Related Matters. During this time, he also served as an adjunct professor at the University of Richmond Law School.

In 1996, Mr. Comey returned to government service as Managing Assistant U.S. Attorney in the Office of the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia. By 2002, Mr. Comey was appointed U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York. And in December 2003, he was appointed Deputy Attorney General, a position he served with honor and distinction until 2005, when he left government service.

However, I would like to point out, and I think Mr. Comey would agree, that perhaps one of the best indicators about his judgment is that he had the smarts to marry an Iowan.

At his confirmation hearing, Mr. Comey addressed many concerns raised by Senators from both sides of the aisle. His answers were direct and thoughtful. On subjects with which he was familiar, he spoke intelligently and straightforward. If he didn't know enough, he said so. There was no trying to hide the ball or cover for his lack of expertise in a particular area. In short, it was a refreshing change from the many nominees who come up here and try to parrot to Senators what nominees think we want to hear.

Not so with Mr. Comey. In fact, several times when pressed on his views on a specific FBI policy, such as FBI whistleblower policies or domestic drone use, he confessed he had little or no knowledge of the current FBI policy but promised to thoroughly review the existing policies in place and the legal and moral issues surrounding the controversies. Furthermore, he pledged to work with Congress by being responsive to our inquiries for information.

Now, these promises are not unique to Mr. Comey. Almost every nominee promises the Senate that he or she will be responsive to our concerns and requests for information. Sadly, especially under this administration, once confirmed, we rarely get an adequate response until right before that individual has an oversight hearing before a Senate or House Committee. I can only hope that Mr. Comey's efforts to be more transparent will not be stymied by the Department of Justice.

As I said, I think that if any Federal agency, but especially the FBI, is to succeed, it needs quality leadership and proper congressional oversight. After examining his record, I think that Mr. Comey will prove to be that leader. Only time will tell, however, if this administration will allow Mr. Comey to engage the Congress and allow us to perform our constitutional duty of oversight to ensure that existing legislation and policies best serve this nation.

I thank Mr. Comey for his willingness to return to public service. And I urge my colleagues to support his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. With my friend's permission, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I need to talk to him about something that deals with the consent agreement I have here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that cloture on Calendar No. 208 be withdrawn and that the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination at 5:35 p.m.; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session and proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; further, that the vote on cloture on Calendar No. 223 occur on Tuesday, July 30, 2013, following leader remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield back all remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James. B. Comey, Jr., of Connecticut, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. LEAHY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY (When his name was called). Present.

Mr. WYDEN (When his name was called). Present.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Alaska (Mrs. MURKOWSKI).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 188 Ex.]

YEAS—93

Alexander	Fischer	Menendez
Ayotte	Flake	Mikulski
Baldwin	Franken	Moran
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baucus	Graham	Murray
Begich	Grassley	Nelson
Bennet	Hagan	Portman
Blumenthal	Harkin	Pryor
Blunt	Hatch	Reed
Boozman	Heinrich	Reid
Boxer	Heller	Risch
Brown	Hirono	Roberts
Burr	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sanders
Cardin	Isakson	Schatz
Carper	Johanns	Schumer
Casey	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Chambliss	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Coats	Kaine	Shaheen
Coburn	King	Shelby
Cochran	Kirk	Stabenow
Collins	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Landrieu	Thune
Corker	Leahy	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Levin	Udall (NM)
Cruz	Manchin	Vitter
Donnelly	Markey	Warner
Durbin	McCain	Warren
Enzi	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Feinstein	McConnell	Wicker

NAYS—1

Paul

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Merkley Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Chiesa Murkowski
Heitkamp Rubio

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume legislative session and proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. SCHUMER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUSTICE SAFETY VALVE ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week the Department of Justice announced that the total U.S. prison population declined 1.7 percent from 2011 to 2012. I was encouraged to see that sentencing reform at the State level continues to pay dividends by simultaneously reducing prison costs and crime rates.

I am troubled, however, that the entirety of the reduction in the U.S. prison population was attributable to the States. The number of Federal prisoners actually increased by almost 1,500 from 2011 to 2012. While this increase was smaller than in previous years, the Federal Government can no longer afford to continue on the course of ever-increasing prison costs. As of last week, the Federal prison population was over 219,000, with almost half of those men and women imprisoned on drug charges. This year, the Bureau of Prisons budget request was just below \$7 billion.

A major factor driving the increase in the incarceration rate has been the proliferation of Federal mandatory minimum sentences in the last 20 years. This one-size-fits-all approach to sentencing never made us safer, but it has cost us plenty. We must change course. In September, the Judiciary Committee will hold a hearing to examine the effects of Federal mandatory minimum sentences and measures to reform the system in order to combat injustice in sentencing and the waste of taxpayer dollars.

In March, I joined with Senator PAUL to introduce just such a measure. The Justice Safety Valve Act of 2013 will give judges greater flexibility in sentencing in cases where a mandatory minimum is unnecessary and counterproductive. Since its introduction, the Justice Safety Valve Act has received endorsements from a diverse group that spans the political spectrum, including articles written by George Will, Grover Norquist, David Keene, and the New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that these materials be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

In addition to driving up our prison population, mandatory minimum penalties can lead to terribly unjust results in individual cases. This is why a large majority of judges oppose mandatory minimum sentences. In a 2010 survey by the U.S. Sentencing Commission of more than 600 Federal district court judges, nearly 70 percent agreed that the existing safety valve provision should be extended to all Federal offenses. That is what our bill does.

Judges, who hand down sentences and can see close up when they are appropriate and just, overwhelmingly oppose mandatory minimum sentences.

States, including very conservative States like Texas, that have implemented sentencing reform have saved money and seen their crime rates drop. It is long past time that Congress follow their lead, and a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on Federal mandatory minimum sentences is an important place to start.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hill's Congress Blog, Mar. 20, 2013]

PAUL-LEAHY SENTENCING BILL WILL ENSURE
TIME FITS THE CRIME

(By Julie Stewart and Grover Norquist)

Even before the sequester took effect, the Obama administration's Department of Justice was warning that federal prison spending had become "unsustainable" and was forcing cuts in other anti-crime initiatives. Despite such warnings, we have seen little evidence of an administration strategy on how to control these costs. Fortunately, Senators Rand Paul (R-Ky.) and Patrick Leahy (D-Vt) today are stepping in to fill that void with the introduction of bipartisan legislation to restore common sense to our criminal sentencing laws.

The Justice Safety Valve Act of 2013 authorizes federal courts to depart below a statutory mandatory minimum sentence only after finding, among other things, that providing a particular defendant a shorter sentence—say, seven or eight years in prison for a drug offense rather than the 10-year mandatory minimum—will not jeopardize public safety. The bill does not require judges to impose shorter sentences, and for many crimes, the minimum established by Congress will be appropriate. But in cases where the mandatory minimum does not account for the offender's limited role in a crime or other relevant factors, the judge would be allowed to consider those factors and craft a more appropriate sentence.

This common sense bill comes at a critical time. The federal government simply cannot afford to continue to house so many non-violent prisoners for such lengthy sentences. According to a recent Congressional Research Service (CRS) report, the number of inmates under the Bureau of Prisons' (BOP) jurisdiction has increased from approximately 25,000 in FY1980 to nearly 219,000 in FY2012. BOP prisons are operating at 38 percent over capacity, endangering the safety of guards and inmates alike. Last week, the Inspector General for the Department of Justice testified that it's only going to get worse: the BOP projects system-wide crowding to exceed 45 percent over rated capacity through 2018. The economic cost of the prison population boom is staggering. Since FY2000, appropriations for the BOP have increased from just over \$3.5 billion to more than \$6.5 billion.

Locking everyone up costs a lot, but it doesn't always keep us safer. University of Chicago economist and Freakonomics author Steven D. Levitt was perhaps the most influential supporter of pro-prison policies in the 1990s. He later concluded that, as the crime rate continued to drop and the prison population continued to grow, the increase in public safety diminished. "We know that harsher punishments lead to less crime, but

we also know that the millionth prisoner we lock up is a lot less dangerous to society than the first guy we lock up," Dr. Levitt recently told The New York Times. "In the mid-1990s I concluded that the social benefits approximately equaled the costs of incarceration." Today, Dr. Levitt says, "I think we should be shrinking the prison population by at least one-third."

The head of the U.S. Justice Department's criminal division agrees that spending on federal prisons must be scrutinized. Assistant Attorney General Lanny Breuer recently wrote, "In an era of governmental austerity, maximizing public safety can only be achieved by finding a proper balance of outlays that allows, on the one hand, for sufficient numbers of police, investigative agents, prosecutors and judicial personnel to investigate, apprehend, prosecute and adjudicate those who commit federal crimes. And, on the other hand, a sentencing policy that achieves public safety, correctional goals and justice for victims, the community, and the offender." We are lacking that balance today as skyrocketing corrections spending, driven by increasing reliance on one-size-fits-all mandatory minimum sentencing laws, is now crowding out spending on investigators, police, and prosecutors.

In short, we are skimping on efforts to arrest and prosecute violent criminals so that we can keep nonviolent offenders behind bars for lengthy prison sentences. This is insanity. Passing the Paul-Leahy bill would enable courts to make sure the time fits the crime in every criminal case. While keeping us safe, it would also save money that could be returned to taxpayers or invested in more effective anti-crime strategies, such as putting more police on the street or expanding the use of proven recidivism-reducing programs in our prisons. We can still be tough on crime, but we do not have to be tough on taxpayers.

[From the New York Times, June 23, 2013]

NEEDED: A NEW SAFETY VALVE

(By The Editorial Board)

Congress's new bipartisan task force on overcriminalization in the justice system held its first hearing earlier this month. It was a timely meeting: national crime rates are at historic lows, yet the federal prison system is operating at close to 40 percent over capacity.

Representative Karen Bass, a California Democrat, asked a panel of experts about the problem of mandatory minimum sentences, which contribute to prison overcrowding and rising costs. In the 16-year period through fiscal 2011, the annual number of federal inmates increased from 37,091 to 76,216, with mandatory minimum sentences a driving factor. Almost half of them are in for drugs.

The problem starts with federal drug laws that focus heavily on the type and quantity of drugs involved in a crime rather than the role the defendant played. Federal prosecutors then seek mandatory sentences against defendants who are not leaders and managers of drug enterprises. The result is that 93 percent of those convicted of drug trafficking are low-level offenders.

Both the Senate and the House are considering a bipartisan bill to allow federal judges more flexibility in sentencing in the 195 federal crimes that carry mandatory minimums. The bill, called the Justice Safety Valve Act, deserves committee hearings and passage soon.

A 1994 federal sentencing law allows judges to reduce sentences for drug crimes if no one was harmed during the crime and if the of-

fender had little or no criminal history, was not a leader in organizing the crime and used neither violence nor a gun. But that law is far too narrow; all felony convictions are disqualifying for a reduction, as are some minor offenses, like passing a bad check.

The proposed bill would apply to all federal crimes with mandatory minimums, not just drug crimes, so it would include theft of food stamps and miscellaneous other lesser crimes. It would also let judges consider less-lengthy sentences for drug offenders who don't qualify for a reduction under the current law.

The case of Weldon Angelos has long stood for the injustice of mandatory minimums. Mr. Angelos received a 55-year prison sentence in 2004 for selling a few pounds of marijuana while having handguns in his possession, which he did not use or display. In an extraordinary opinion, the federal trial judge said he had no choice but to impose that "cruel, unjust, and irrational" sentence. The Justice Safety Valve Act would give courts more leeway to avoid that one-size-fits-all approach.

[From the Washington Post, June 5, 2013]

LEAHY AND PAUL PLAN ON MANDATORY
SENTENCING MAKES SENSE

(By George F. Will)

Libertarians believe government should have a compelling reason before it restricts an individual's liberty. Today's liberals believe almost any reason will do, because liberty is less important than equality, fraternity, fighting obesity and many other aspirations. Now, however, one of the most senior and liberal U. S. senators and one of the most junior and libertarian have a proposal that could slow and even repair some of the fraying of society.

Seven-term Democrat Pat Leahy's 38 Senate years have made him Judiciary Committee chairman. Republican Rand Paul is in his third Senate year. They hope to reduce the cruelty, irrationality and cost of the current regime of mandatory minimum sentences for federal crimes.

Such crimes are multiplying at a rate of more than 500 a decade, even though the Constitution explicitly authorizes Congress to criminalize only a few activities that are national in nature (e.g., counterfeiting, treason, crimes on the high seas). The federal government, having failed at core functions, such as fairly administering a rational revenue system, acts like a sheriff with attention-deficit disorder, haphazardly criminalizing this and that behavior in order to express righteous alarm about various wrongs that excite attention.

Approximately 80,000 people are sentenced in federal courts each year. There are an estimated 4,500 federal criminal statutes and tens of thousands of regulations backed by criminal penalties, including incarceration. There can be felony penalties for violating arcane regulations that do not give clear notice of behavior that is prescribed or proscribed. This violates the mens rea requirement—people deserve criminal punishment only if they intentionally engage in conduct that is inherently wrong or that they know to be illegal. No wonder that the federal prison population—currently approximately 219,000, about half serving drug sentences—has expanded 51 percent since 2000 and federal prisons are at 138 percent of their supposed capacity.

The Leahy-Paul measure would expand to all federal crimes the discretion federal judges have in many drug cases to impose sentences less than the mandatory minimums. This would, as Leahy says, allow

judges—most of whom oppose mandatory minimums—to judge. Paul says mandatory minimum sentences, in the context of the proliferation of federal crimes, undermine federalism, the separation of powers and “the bedrock principle that people should be treated as individuals.”

Almost everyone who enters the desensitizing world of U.S. prisons is going to return to society, and many will have been socially handicapped by the experience. Until the 1970s, about 100 per 100,000 Americans were in prison. Today 700 per 100,000 are. America has nearly 5 percent of the world's population but almost 25 percent of its prisoners. African Americans are 13 percent of the nation's population but 37 percent of the prison population, and one in three African American men spends time incarcerated. All this takes a staggering toll on shattered families and disordered neighborhoods.

The House Judiciary Committee has created an Over-Criminalization Task Force. Its members should read “Three Felonies a Day: How the Feds Target the Innocent,” by Harvey Silverglate, a libertarian lawyer whose book argues that prosecutors could indict most of us for three felonies a day. And the task force should read the short essay “Ham Sandwich Nation: Due Process When Everything Is a Crime” by Glenn Harlan Reynolds, a professor of law at the University of Tennessee. Given the axiom that a competent prosecutor can persuade a grand jury to indict a ham sandwich, and given the reality of prosecutorial abuse—particularly, compelling plea bargains by overcharging with “kitchen sink” indictments—Reynolds believes “the decision to charge a person criminally should itself undergo some degree of due process scrutiny.”

He also suggests banning plea bargains: “An understanding that every criminal charge filed would have to be either backed up in open court or ignominiously dropped would significantly reduce the incentive to overcharge. . . . Our criminal justice system, as presently practiced, is basically a plea-bargain system with actual trials of guilt or innocence a bit of showy froth floating on top.”

U.S. prosecutors win more than 90 percent of their cases, 97 percent of those without complete trials. British and Canadian prosecutors win significantly less, and for many offenses, the sentences in those nations are less severe.

Making mandatory minimums less severe would lessen the power of prosecutors to pressure defendants by overcharging them in order to expose them to draconian penalties. The Leahy-Paul measure is a way to begin reforming a criminal justice system in which justice is a diminishing component.

[From the National Review Online, May 24, 2013]

PRISON-SENTENCE REFORM (By David Keene)

Some liberal judges back in the 1970s and '80s enraged the public by allowing felons back on the street with little more than a slap on the wrist. In response, Congress and many state legislatures enacted mandatory-minimum-sentencing laws that essentially eliminated the discretion judges had always enjoyed to make the punishment fit the crime. These laws were incredibly popular when first enacted but have created more problems than they've solved.

Undoubtedly, the tough-on-crime sentiment these laws reflected has advanced our welcome, two-decade decline in drug-related and violent crime. But I have come to be-

lieve that the wholesale adoption of mandatory minimum sentencing hasn't worked as well as everyone had hoped.

Like many conservatives, I supported many of these laws when they were enacted and still believe that, in some narrow situations, mandatory minimums makes sense. But like other “one-size-fits-all” solutions to complicated problems, they should be reviewed in light of how they work in practice.

Fortunately, Senators Rand Paul (R., Ky.) and Patrick Leahy (D., Vt.) have crafted a smart and modest reform bill that will fine-tune these laws to eliminate many of the unforeseen and, frankly, unfair consequences of their application when the facts demand more flexibility. This bipartisan measure deserves conservative support.

The bill, the Justice Safety Valve Act of 2013, maintains existing federal mandatory-sentencing laws. It enables judges to depart from the minimums in certain cases, however, such as when the mandatory sentence is not necessary to protect public safety and seems blatantly unfair in light of the circumstances of the offense. In so doing, their proposal fulfills the primary objective of criminal-justice policy: protecting public safety, while promoting our constitutional separation of powers and saving taxpayers the expense of unnecessary and counterproductive incarceration.

Many people, conservatives as well as liberals, have come to believe that most mandatory-minimum-sentencing laws should be repealed. These laws give prosecutors nearly unchecked power to determine sentences, even though courts are in a better position to weigh important and relevant facts, such as an offender's culpability and likelihood of reoffending.

Federal mandatory-minimum-sentencing laws are especially problematic. Not only do they transfer power from independent courts to a political executive, they also perpetuate the harmful trend of federalizing criminal activity that can be better prosecuted at the state level.

For years, conservatives have wisely argued that the only government programs, rules, and regulations we should abide are those that can withstand cost-benefit analysis. Mandatory minimum sentences, by definition, fail this basic test because they apply a one-size-fits-all sentence to low-level offenders, even though the punishments were designed for more serious criminals.

Economists who once wholeheartedly supported simple pro-prison policies now believe they have reached the point of diminishing returns. One is University of Chicago economist Steven D. Levitt, best known for the best-selling *Freakonomics*, which he co-authored with Stephen J. Dubner. Levitt recently told the *New York Times*, “In the mid-1990s I concluded that the social benefits approximately equaled the costs of incarceration,” and, today, “I think we should be shrinking the prison population by at least one-third.”

In other words, the initial crackdown was a good thing, but we are now suffering the effects of too much of that good thing.

If Levitt's estimate is even close, right now we are wasting tens of billions of dollars locking people up without affecting the crime rate or enhancing public safety. In fact, spending too much on prisons skews state and federal budgetary priorities, taking funds away from things that are proven to drive crime even lower, such as increasing police presence in high-violence areas and providing drug-treatment services to addicts.

The Paul-Leahy bill will help restore needed balance to our anti-crime efforts. Repeat and violent criminals will continue to receive and serve lengthy prison sentences, but in cases involving lower-level offenders, judges will be given the flexibility to impose a shorter sentence when warranted.

The Paul-Leahy bill is a modest fix that will affect only 2 percent of all federal offenders, and even they won't be spared going to prison. They will simply receive slightly shorter sentences that are more in line with their actual offenses.

The bill will improve public safety, save taxpayers billions of dollars, and restore our constitutional separation of powers at the federal level while strengthening federalism. This is a reform conservatives should embrace.

NATIONAL JUDICIAL COLLEGE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise to honor the National Judicial College. Celebrating 50 years of service and education to the Nation's judiciary, the National Judicial College has dedicated itself to the advancement of justice, not only in our Nation, but throughout the world. It is with great pleasure that I recognize the National Judicial College's distinguished history of providing education and higher learning, especially in light of its recent anniversary.

More than 50 years ago, the Joint Committee for the Effective Administration of Justices came together and realized the need for an entity to provide judicial education. By 1963, under the leadership of Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark, the National Judicial College opened its doors at the University of Colorado, Boulder.

After attending the first course in Boulder, Judge Thomas Craven, from Reno, NV, enthusiastically brought his experience with the college to trustees of the Max C. Fleischmann Foundation located in Reno. In 1964, with the persistence of Judge Craven and the support of the Fleischmann Foundation, the college moved to the campus of the University of Nevada, Reno, where its permanent academic home still thrives today.

As the first institution to offer programs of its nature to judges nationwide, the National Judicial College has much to celebrate at this 50-year mark. What started out as a course serving 83 judges in 1963 has become a permanent institution that provides 90 courses and programs serving more than 3,000 judges every year from all 50 States, U.S. territories, and more than 150 countries. Since its inception, the college has awarded more than 95,000 professional judicial education certificates.

These judges come together in the college's own state-of-the-art facility on the campus of University of Nevada, Reno, comprised of 90,000 square feet including an auditorium, classrooms, model courtroom, multimedia room, computer lab, judge's resource room,

and discussion areas, all of which are equipped with the latest technology.

The college serves as the one place where judges from across the world can meet to improve the delivery of justice and advance the rule of law through professional study and collegial dialogue. The college's dedicated boards, faculty, and staff deliver innovative programs and services that improve productivity, challenge perceptions of justice, and inspire judicial excellence in the field.

The impact of the National Judicial College is immense. Its unique role in educating and developing our Nation's judiciary has improved the judicial system, and will continue to do so in the future.

I commend the National Judiciary College's dedication to education, innovation, and advancement of justice, and am honored to congratulate the college for 50 years of serving our Nation's judiciary.

MCCARTHY NOMINATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss my vote in opposition to the President's nomination of Gina McCarthy as the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. I praise Ms. McCarthy for her extensive experience and expertise in regulating air quality at the Federal level as well as at the State level. Throughout her career she has been able to be an effective regulator under Republican Governors as well as a Democratic President. Even with the opposition she faced during the months leading up to her confirmation, it was always clear to me that Ms. McCarthy would be approved.

My "nay" vote was not against Ms. McCarthy. My vote was against President Obama's overreaching environmental policies and against the EPA. The environmental policies of this administration are clearly a war on fossil fuel and a war on Western jobs.

The President's recent announcement of a Climate Change Action Plan will be implemented by EPA and will have a direct impact on jobs and the pocketbooks of the American people. This plan targets coal-fired powerplants by proposing Federal carbon emission standards that will cost billions of dollars nationwide to implement and will raise the price of electricity for private citizens as well as businesses.

The Western United States is rich in coal, oil, and natural gas. We need to make it easier, not harder, to develop those resources. The development of the abundant and affordable energy that we are blessed with as a nation is crucial.

The effort by this administration to quell the development of these resources is unacceptable. I cannot support them and, that being the case, I

am not able to support the nomination of Ms. McCarthy.

WEAPONS SALES

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, we recently marked 1 year since the tragic shooting in Aurora, CO. One year since our nation witnessed innocent men, women, and children streaming out of a movie theater, bloodied and in shock. One year since 12 people were murdered and 58 injured at the hands of an armed and mentally deranged individual who was able to channel his illness in the most dangerous way: through the barrel of an AR-15 military-style assault weapon.

Such weapons, according to the Congressional Research Service, were designed in the aftermath of the Second World War to give soldiers a weapon suited for the modern battlefield. They are designed to kill as many people as possible, as quickly as possible. And in Aurora, the AR-15 did just that.

Since that night, all around our country, the gun violence has continued. But still, we in Congress have done nothing to stem these gun tragedies. Today, just like this day 1 year ago, a convicted felon, a domestic abuser, or a dangerously mentally ill individual can go to a private seller and legally purchase a deadly military-style weapon just as easily as they can purchase a gallon of milk, no background check required.

Take, for example, a recent undercover investigation conducted by a team of National Geographic journalists who wanted to see just how easy it is for criminals to obtain guns. What the team found was deeply unnerving. Speaking to investigative journalist Mariana van Zeller, private investigator and former police officer Jesse Torrez put it bluntly: "We should be able to get you involved in a weapons transaction within 30 minutes . . . and that's travel time, too."

He was right. The investigators decided to attempt to purchase an AK-47, a military-style assault weapon. On the weapon-selling website [www.armslist.com], a posting selling a similar firearm for \$830 proudly describes it, among other things, as "the standard issue firearm in the Yugoslav People's Army in 1970." But compared to the investigation's findings, that weapon would have been overpriced. In just a few minutes, the National Geographic investigators found an online posting selling an AK-47 for \$750 in cash. They agreed to meet the seller in a fast food parking lot. Under Federal law, background checks are not required for "private" gun sales, so the transaction was completed quickly and legally. The vendor even offered to add "several" AR-15 assault rifles to the sale as a sort of impulse buy, like candy in a convenience store.

Upping the ante, the investigators then searched for a .50-caliber sniper

rifle, a weapon the team described as "so powerful that the U.S. military uses it to penetrate concrete and steel." Again, within minutes, they found an internet seller offering a .50-caliber rifle from a nearby garage. Without any form of background check, the National Geographic team purchased the weapon, along with 11 boxes of ammunition containing 12 rounds apiece. In the chilling words of the private seller, "You have a lot of firepower to start your own war."

Our society should not be a war zone. The purchasers in this case were undercover investigators, but next time, they might not be. They could be felons, domestic abusers, or a mentally deranged individual planning to use the weapon for harm.

We owe it to the survivors and the victims of Aurora to keep weapons designed for war off our streets. We owe it to the American people to listen to the 90 percent of them who support universal background checks on all gun sales. We owe it to our families, our neighbors, and our children to stop deadly weapons from getting into the wrong hands. We should take up and pass legislation such as the Assault Weapons Ban of 2013, which would stop the flood of military-style weapons into our neighborhoods. We should extend background checks to all gun sales by passing the Safe Communities, Safe Schools Act of 2013. We should, in short, turn common sense into law. But that will only happen if Congress acts.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT S. MUELLER

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Robert S. Mueller, III, and to thank him for his 12 years of service as the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI.

Director Mueller had just settled into his office just a week before the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. These attacks on the Nation affected us all, including in my home State of Maryland. In the terrible aftermath of the events of that day, we grieved together. On 9/11, we were caught unprepared, searching for answers and scrambling to find a way to prevent future attacks.

After 9/11, the FBI was charged with a heavy responsibility: disrupt terrorist plots before they happen by identifying, tracking, and dismantling terrorists on U.S. soil. During his term, Director Mueller has provided steadfast leadership, guiding the FBI as it transformed from a traditional domestic law enforcement agency into a global counterterrorism and crime-fighting force. His guidance has helped keep Americans safe from terrorist attacks here at home and abroad. But such leadership is nothing new to Director Mueller. Before he led the FBI, he served our Nation as a decorated marine in Vietnam,

and as a Federal prosecutor who tackled cases ranging from the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 to the prosecution of Panamanian dictator Manuel Noriega.

Director Mueller has shown unwavering commitment to the FBI and its mission. He is the only Director to serve a full 10-year term, and then serve another 2 years. From day one, he has fought to make sure the hard-working men and women at the FBI have the tools they need to carry out their extraordinary responsibilities. As chairwoman of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee that funds the FBI and as a member of the Intelligence Committee, I am proud to call Director Mueller my steadfast partner in that fight. Together, we have worked to provide the FBI with the capabilities to stop terrorists before they attack us here at home, go after schemers and scammers who prey on hardworking American families, prevent cyber terrorists from devastating our technology infrastructure, and catch sexual predators who seek to harm our children.

Lastly, Director Mueller has strong integrity. He speaks truth to power, even when the truth is unpopular or inconvenient. He is a straight talker—when he tells me that the FBI needs more tools to carry out its national security and crime-fighting duties, I find a way to help him get those tools because I trust his judgment, and I trust his leadership. He answered the call to service when President Bush asked him to serve as FBI Director in 2001. And he answered the call of President Obama when asked to serve 2 more years.

We live in extraordinarily critical times, and face threats from both within and outside our Nation. But over the past 12 years we knew that having Director Mueller at the FBI meant that one of the tested “nighthawks” was guarding our Nation’s national security. I speak for all Americans when I say that we have been privileged to have such a committed and dedicated public servant leading the FBI. I will miss my steadfast partner and friend and, above all, wish to send him a heartfelt thank you.

LEWISTON FIREFIGHTERS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in one terrifying week this spring, Lewiston, ME, my State’s second largest city, was attacked by arsonists who destroyed nine buildings and left hundreds of people homeless. I rise today in tribute to the firefighters of Lewiston who answered those cruel attacks with skill and courage and who saved their city with no loss of life or serious injury.

We have always had a deep respect and admiration for our firefighters and first responders. In recent years, however, the American people have been

reminded of the vital protections they provide to our communities. From the Twin Towers in 2001 to the Boston Marathon in 2013, we have seen these heroes rush into danger that others flee. We have seen them risk their lives to save the lives of others.

That is precisely what the people of Lewiston have seen since their first fire company was established in 1849. Through the years, fire has claimed textile and lumber mills, stores and schools, homes and even city hall. Yet never has a fire, no matter how fierce, been allowed to spiral out of control into a conflagration. The willingness of the people of Lewiston to always rebuild is testament to the confidence they have that their valiant firefighters will protect their property and their lives.

That protection comes at a high price. The Lewiston Firefighters Memorial bears the names of nine men who made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

Today, under the leadership of Fire Chief Paul LeClair and International Association of Firefighters Local 785 president Rick Cailler, the Lewiston Fire Department is recognized as one of the best in Maine, known for its professionalism, efficiency, and dedication. In the special language of the firefighter community, the Lewiston firefighters are considered “the toughest Jakes on the job.”

They are tough yet filled with community spirit and compassion. Through the generosity of its members, the Local 785 Community Fund sponsors youth sports teams, charities, and the arts, and provides children in need with Christmas toys. Their annual “Fill the Boot” campaign raises many thousands of dollars for the fight against Muscular Dystrophy.

America’s firefighters play a vital role in the security of our Nation and the safety of our people. Whether it is in response to a terrorist attack, a natural disaster, or a fire, Americans rely on our firefighters, and our firefighters always answer the call. The firefighters of Lewiston, ME, are a shining example of that commitment, and I join the people of their city in saluting them.

RECOGNIZING TONY PETKOVSEK

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Tony Petkovsek, who will be inducted into the International Polka Association Hall of Fame on August 3, 2013. Mr. Petkovsek has devoted his life’s work to cultivating Cleveland-Slovenian music and culture, most notably by hosting the longest running daily radio show in the world.

Growing up in Cleveland’s St. Clair neighborhood, Mr. Petkovsek was immersed in Slovenian culture from a young age. After completing college and broadcasting school, he began producing and broadcasting his own radio

shows on Cleveland’s WXEN, on November 23, 1961, which was Thanksgiving Day. Since 1962, his show has been broadcasted daily.

Mr. Petkovsek is one of the most prominent ambassadors of Cleveland-style polka both locally and nationally. In 1967, he originated the Polka Tour at Kollander World Travel, which has since taken thousands of polka fans all over the world. His annual Thanksgiving celebration evolved from a dance in 1963 to a national focal point of Cleveland-style polkas, attracting polka fans from all over America to join the festivities. Mr. Petkovsek was instrumental in founding the United Slovenian Society, the Cleveland-Slovenian Radio Club, the East 185th Street Business Association, and the American Slovenian Polka Foundation. Notably, Mr. Petkovsek served on the Ohio Arts Council under Gov. George Voinovich.

His contributions to Cleveland-style polka have been widely recognized over the years. Some of these honors have included the Federation of Slovenian Homes’ “Man of the Year” in 1966, his induction into the St. Joseph High School Hall of Fame in 1987 and his induction into the National Broadcasters Hall of Fame in 1991. Mr. Petkovsek was also recognized with a merit badge by the President of Slovenia, Danilo Turk, in 2012 for his service to the country of Slovenia and to Slovenians in Cleveland.

I would like to honor Tony Petkovsek for his contributions to Cleveland-style polka and to the Cleveland Slovenian community.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

UCLA BRUINS NCAA CHAMPIONSHIP

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the University of California, Los Angeles baseball team for winning the 2013 National Collegiate Athletics Association, NCAA, Division I College World Series. On June 25, the UCLA Bruins capped off a magical season and earned their first baseball national championship by sweeping the Mississippi State Bulldogs.

This victory wouldn’t have been possible without the determination and teamwork of the skilled and dedicated players and the devoted coaching and training staff, led by head coach John Savage. The 2013 Bruins showed these extraordinary qualities all season, finishing with a 49–17 record and matching a school record with 21 wins in the Pac-12 conference play.

During the NCAA Regionals and Super Regionals, the Bruins began their undefeated march through the postseason by defeating worthy and spirited opponents from San Diego

State, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, the University of San Diego, and Cal State Fullerton en route to earning their third trip in 4 years to the prestigious College World Series in Omaha, NE.

In the College World Series, the Bruins unleashed a historic display of overpowering pitching, steady defense, and timely hitting to defeat competition from Louisiana State, North Carolina State, the University of North Carolina, and Mississippi State to capture the first national championship in UCLA baseball history. The Bruins became the first championship team to allow one run or fewer in every College World Series game. In total, the Bruins allowed just 14 runs during their dominant 10-0 run through the NCAA tournament.

True to their reputation as a team of great resolve and determination, the Bruins were bolstered by contributions from every player on their roster. They worked together to ensure that the College World Series trophy will finally make its way to UCLA, a school with a rich baseball tradition that includes Jackie Robinson, who honed his prodigious skills before becoming a National Baseball Hall of Famer and national hero. With the addition of the College World Series trophy, the UCLA Hall of Champions will now boast an unmatched 109 NCAA team championships.

It is my pleasure to congratulate UCLA students, families, alumni, faculty, and Bruin fans, as they celebrate their 2013 National Collegiate Athletics Association Division I College World Series victory and their remarkable and memorable season.●

REMEMBERING LUKE SHEEHY

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Luke Sheehy, a loving son, devoted friend, and courageous firefighter. Luke Sheehy passed away on June 10, 2013, succumbing to injuries he sustained while heroically combating a wildfire in the Modoc National Forest. He was 28 years old.

Luke Sheehy was born in Susanville, CA, graduated from Susanville High School, and attended the Shasta College Fire Academy. After serving as a firefighter with the California Department of Forestry and the Bureau of Land Management's Diamond Mountain Hotshots, Luke became a U.S. Forest Service Smokejumper, parachuting from airplanes to fight fires in remote and hard-to-access areas, helping to train new smokejumpers and earning respect for his strong work ethic and leadership abilities.

Those who knew him best will remember Luke as a genuine friend who loved his family and enjoyed hunting, fishing, snowboarding and the piano, guitar and fiddle.

My heart goes out to Luke's family, loved ones, and colleagues, and my thoughts and prayers are with them.

Luke Sheehy, like all those who fight fires across California, put his life on the line to protect our families and communities. We are forever indebted to him for his courage, service and sacrifice, and he will be dearly missed.●

REMEMBERING GEORGE PERKINS

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the memory of George Perkins, a beloved community leader from Hammond, LA, who passed away suddenly in April of this year. George was born in 1942 and would have turned 71 on August 17.

George was born in Walker, LA, and relocated to Hammond in 1979. He immediately became a community leader in the Hammond area. He joined Greenfield Missionary Baptist Church where he served as a deacon, Sunday school teacher, and member of the male chorus. He cochaired the board of deacons and was in charge of the church's video recording.

George was an insurance sales representative and later a cable TV franchise owner by trade, but he was best known as one of the originators of the Tangipahoa Black Festival that began in 1984. In 1987, the name was changed to the Tangipahoa Parish Black Heritage Festival. With the new name, George and other leaders of the organization decided they needed a permanent facility and they contacted the parish school system to purchase a boarded-up school on 7.3 acres of land that was left over from integration. Over the years they have renovated the facility, which has become the Tangipahoa Parish African American Heritage Museum and Veterans Archive. George could be found there on most days working in whatever capacity in which he was needed—from acting as tour guide to researching records to taking on kitchen duty.

He also served his community in other ways. He was a member of the advisory board for North Oaks Hospital and served as the first Black councilman for District 3 in the city of Hammond. He later served as an assistant to State Representative Henry "Tank" Powell and was a founding member of the 2nd Saturday breakfast group—a group which invites members of the community to gather monthly regardless of racial and social divides to discuss issues of concern to the community. He was a member of the Masonic Order Prince Hall affiliation, the past worshipful master of Oak Grove Lodge #117 in Hammond and a grand officer of the Most Worshipful Prince Hall Lodge for the State of Louisiana.

George Perkins was a man of many talents and music was his passion. He wrote and produced many songs including "Cryin' in the Streets"—his No. 1

hit. It sold over 1 million copies and provided him the opportunity to perform at the Apollo Theater.

George will be lovingly remembered by his wife of 42 years, Eloise, 3 daughters, 3 sons, 19 grandchildren, 1 great-grandchild, 6 sisters, 2 brothers, and an entire community. I am pleased to join them in honoring George Perkins, a man who provided a great example of leadership through his service to others and his community.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2218. An act to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 2218. An act to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-59. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to codify into law a United States Department of Defense standard for religious freedom that would be applied to all uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 175

Whereas, the freedom to practice religion and to express religious thought is acknowledged as our first freedom, enshrined in the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution and is a freedom which belongs to all Americans; and

Whereas, our military has fought to preserve all rights and freedoms enumerated in the United States Constitution; and

Whereas, recent news reports and statements of high ranking military personnel reveal a growing intolerance and in some cases outright hostility toward religious expression and affiliation within segments of our nation's military; and

Whereas, in Section 533 of the United States National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2013, the United States Department of Defense is charged with developing regulations that would implement the conscience protections recently passed by the United States Congress; and

Whereas, the same protections have not been established throughout the Department of Defense for all service personnel; and

Whereas, individual branches of the military have adopted policies that are not in keeping with the spirit of Section 533 of the NDAA; and

Whereas, protection of religious freedom is fundamental to all freedoms as Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to codify into law a United States Department of Defense standard for religious freedom that would be applied to all uniformed services, ensuring that all members of the armed forces may engage in peaceable and noncombative religious speech, including noncoercive proselytizing, and that such speech is not in derogation of the good order and discipline of the armed forces; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-60. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts recognizing the valor and courage of the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE RESOLUTION

Whereas, military heroes who served so valiantly and honorably in wars in which this country's freedom was at stake should be recognized by the people of this great nation, who should never forget the courage with which these soldiers fought; and

Whereas, in full accord with its long standing traditions, it is the sense of this legislative body to memorialize the Congress of the United States to recognize the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers, and to request that Congress bestow the Congressional Gold Medal upon these war heroes; and

Whereas, this auspicious honor, considered the most distinguished, is an award bestowed by the United States Congress and is, along with the presidential medal of freedom, the highest civilian award in the United States, given to persons who have performed an achievement that has an impact on American history and culture that is likely to be recognized as a major achievement of the Borinqueneers now and in the future; and

Whereas, as mandated by Congress in 1899, the 65th Infantry Regiment, hailing from Puerto Rico, was the only Hispanic-segregated unit ever in the United States Armed Forces that played a prominent role in American military history, having participated in three wars in which the United States was engaged, World War I, World War II, and most notably, the Korean war; and

Whereas, the Borinqueneers were willing to shed their blood, sweat and tears for democracy by enlisting in the United States Armed Forces on their own accord to defend the freedoms of others; and

Whereas, these brave men were one of the first infantrymen of the "Rock of the Marine Division. (3rd Infantry Division) to meet the enemy on the battlefields of Korea, fighting with determination and efficiency; and

Whereas, the 65th Infantry Regiment served with distinction and valor, earning two Presidential Unit Citations, Army Unit Superior Award, Navy Unit Citation, two Re-

public of Korea Presidential Unit Citations and Bravery Gold Medal of Greece; and

Whereas, the congressional honor would affirm that they are recognized by the people of the United States as true American heroes who served their country with distinction, fighting bravely even while enduring the hardships of segregation and discrimination; and

Whereas, the Borinqueneers are veritable American heroes and deserve to be recognized, commended, acknowledged and remembered by the people of the State of Massachusetts, as well as by all of the citizens of this great Nation: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States hereby, respectfully memorialized by this legislative body, recognize the 65th Infantry Regiment known as the Borinqueneers, and request that these war heroes receive the Congressional Gold Medal; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the clerk of the House of Representatives to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Congressman Richard Neal, Senator Elizabeth Warren, Senator William Cowan and the Borinqueneers Congressional Gold Medal Alliance.

POM-61. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico requesting Congress to support and preserve the Navajo Code Talkers' legacy and substantial contribution to the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 41

Whereas, the few living Navajo Code Talkers are undertaking a multi-year project to build an educational, historical and humanitarian facility that will bring pride to Native American and non-Native American Communities alike, educate the young and old and conserve the instruments of freedom gifted to the American people by an awe-inspiring group of young Navajo men during World War II; and

Whereas, during World War II, these modest young Navajo men fashioned from the Navajo language the only unbreakable code in Military History; and

Whereas, these Navajo Radio Operators transmitted the code throughout the dense jungles and exposed beachheads of the Pacific Theater from 1942 to 1945, passing over eight hundred error-free messages in forty-eight hours at Iwo Jima alone; and

Whereas, the bravery and ingenuity of these young Navajo men gave the United States and the Allied Forces the upper hand they so desperately needed, finally hastening the war's end and assuring victory for the United States; and

Whereas, after being sworn to secrecy for twenty-three years after the war, these brave Navajo men eventually came to be known as Navajo Code Talkers and were honored by President George W. Bush more than fifty years after the war with Congressional Gold and Silver Medals in 2001; and

Whereas, the Navajo Code Talkers are now in their eighties, and with fewer than fifty remaining from the original four hundred, the urgency to capture and share their stories and memorabilia from their service in the war is now critical; and

Whereas, these American treasures and revered elders of the Navajo Nation have come together to tell their story, one that has never been heard, from their own hearts and in their own words; and

Whereas, the Navajo Code Talkers' heroic story of an ancient language, valiant people

and a decisive victory that changed the path of modern history is the greatest story never told; and

Whereas, the Navajo Code Talkers ultimately envision a lasting memorial, the Navajo Code Talkers Museum and Veterans Center, on donated private land; and

Whereas, the Navajo Code Talkers' mission is to create a place where their legacy of service will inspire others to achieve excellence and instill core values of pride, discipline and honor in all those who visit; and

Whereas, through the lead efforts of the Navajo Code Talkers' Foundation and many partners and individuals, the Navajo Code Talkers' Legacy, History, Language and Code will be preserved to benefit all future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the United States Congress, Department of the Interior, Department of Veterans Affairs, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, Department of State and Department of Energy be requested to support the preservation of the Navajo Code Talkers' remarkable legacy; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Energy and the New Mexico Congressional Delegation.

POM-62. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan memorializing the President and the United States Congress to support continued funding of the United States Department of Defense STARBASE youth science and technology program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 31

Whereas, Early childhood access to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education opportunities are critical to the future of the United States as an economic and technological leader of the global marketplace; and

Whereas, The STARBASE program utilizes military resources and technology not otherwise available to Michigan school districts to support STEM education; and

Whereas, The program strives to motivate children to explore STEM-related opportunities and provides vital exposure for traditionally underrepresented communities to technology professions; and

Whereas, Michigan is home to three successful STARBASE program locations based in Alpena, Battle Creek, and Mt. Clemens that annually serve more than 3,500 students; and

Whereas, The value of Michigan STARBASE education programs significantly exceeds the costs, as the fiscal year 2013 STARBASE budget requires as little as \$200 per student in spending; and

Whereas, The STARBASE concept and pilot program originated in Michigan and now has a presence in 40 states through 76 program locations, with a waiting list of more than 35 qualified facilities nationwide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge the President and the United States Congress to preserve full funding and support for the United States Department of Defense STARBASE youth science and technology program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Office of the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the United States Secretary of Defense, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-63. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to preclude or delay the increase in premium fees for the National Flood Insurance Program until further study can be done, in order to prevent unintended adverse consequences on the residents of St. Charles Parish and the value of their homes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 60

Whereas, the National Flood Insurance Program provides important and necessary property coverage in the event of flooding for homeowners in St. Charles Parish; and

Whereas, President Barack Obama signed the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act into law on July 6, 2012; and

Whereas, St. Charles Parish is currently in the process of adopting the revised version of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps; and

Whereas, many homeowners of St. Charles Parish constructed and purchased homes in areas based on the existing version of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps which met or exceeded current base flood elevation requirements; and

Whereas, many homeowners of St. Charles Parish have benefitted from locally built and maintained flood control features, including functional levees, which have protected the residents of these areas from flooding for decades; and

Whereas, the existing version of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps took into consideration the benefits provided by the locally built and maintained flood control features; and

Whereas, the proposed revised version of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps do not account for this important source of functional flood protection; and

Whereas, the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Act includes provisions that permit the National Flood Insurance Program to increase premium rates for certain policyholders; and

Whereas, the increase of such risk-based premium rates is anticipated to result in a total premium increase of between twenty percent to twenty-five percent per year for certain homeowners, during each of the next five years; and

Whereas, certain areas of St. Charles Parish will experience extreme, sudden, and unaffordable increases in flood insurance premiums that may lead to personal bankruptcy and foreclosure; and

Whereas, the effects of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act and the revised version of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps would have significant consequences on the housing market and economic health of St. Charles Parish; and

Whereas, the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act also includes provisions, located in Section 207 of such act, that eliminate the “grandfathering” of homes that were built after the existing Flood Insurance Rate Maps in accordance with then existing laws; and

Whereas, coverage by the National Flood Insurance Program is necessary for the affected homeowners; and

Whereas, the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act also includes provisions

which require the Federal Emergency Management Agency to conduct a study on ways to educate consumers about the National Flood Insurance Program and flood risks and to encourage consumer participation; and

Whereas, such study shall also research the effects of increased premiums on low-income homeowners and ways to assist such homeowners to afford the increased premiums; and

Whereas, the Act directs the Federal Emergency Management Agency to conclude its study and to issue a report by April 6, 2013; and

Whereas, such study is currently still in progress; and

Whereas, the Federal Emergency Management Agency has yet to create a report based upon the findings of such study; and

Whereas, increased premiums as a result of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act will have a significant effect on low-income homeowners; and

Whereas, congress should consider the amendment or repeal of Section 207 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act to take into account its effects on homes that were built after the adoption of existing Flood Insurance Rate Maps in accordance with then existing laws; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to direct the National Flood Insurance Program to delay increasing premium rates until such time as the Federal Emergency Management Agency has released its report and congress has had time to study such report, in order to prevent unintended consequences on the residents of St. Charles Parish and the value of their properties; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to consider the amendment or repeal of Section 207 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act in order to take into account its effects on homes that were built after the adoption of existing Flood Insurance Rate Maps in accordance with then existing laws; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-64. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to pass the Strengthen, Modernize and Reform the National Flood Insurance Program Act and the Flood Insurance Implementation Reform Act of 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 141

Whereas, the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 was enacted to provide previously unavailable flood insurance protection to property owners; and

Whereas, the National Flood Insurance Program continues to provide important and necessary property coverage for home and business owners throughout various Louisiana parishes, as well as counties and communities nationwide; and

Whereas, the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 was signed into law on July 6, 2012; and

Whereas, the act calls for a revision of the flood insurance rate maps; and

Whereas, such revised flood insurance rate maps do not include the discounts granted

by the current rate maps to property owners who have taken action to mitigate property damage by installing and maintaining flood control features, in conformity with the most current federal law available to them, and in conformity with current flood insurance rate maps; and

Whereas, countless Louisiana property owners have built and purchased homes and businesses in accordance with the current flood rate insurance maps which, under the provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, will soon enter obsolescence; and

Whereas, the act also includes provisions, located in Section 207 of such act, that eliminate the “grandfathering” of homes that were built after the existing flood insurance rate maps in accordance with then existing laws; and

Whereas, by purchasing homes and businesses in accordance with the provisions of the former flood rate insurance maps and by investing in previously owned property to install flood mitigation features, Louisiana property owners relied on their strict compliance with federal and state law to protect their purchases and investments; and

Whereas, in light of the provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, the reliance on existing flood insurance rate maps that those property owners demonstrated is now to their personal and financial detriment; and

Whereas, the passage of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act substantially and immediately devalued the investments made in all properties endowed with flood damage mitigation measures and to properties receiving subsidized insurance premium rates; and

Whereas, the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act also includes provisions that permit the National Flood Insurance Program to increase premium rates for many policyholders; and

Whereas, the elimination of these discounts combined with the certainty of general premium rate increases will result in a premium increase of up to twenty-five percent per year for certain Louisiana property owners over the next four years; and

Whereas, under the changes to the National Flood Insurance Program caused by the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act, Louisiana property owners will struggle to pay exorbitant amounts of money or will lose their flood insurance; and

Whereas, a change in the ability of Louisiana property owners to insure their homes from flood damage without bearing the burden of such a violent rise in cost may lead to financial distress for Louisiana residents and property owners and countless other property owners around this nation; and

Whereas, the premium increases to the National Flood Insurance Program, as mandated by the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act, will affect the entire nation's real estate market; and

Whereas, the premium increases to the National Flood Insurance Program, as mandated by the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act, will affect the nation's banking and mortgage industry; and

Whereas, the premium increases to communities and property owners who made their best efforts to comply with federal law by building property in accordance with soon to be outdated flood insurance rate maps will affect consumer confidence and the entire nation's economy; and

Whereas, on May 21, 2013, the Strengthen, Modernize and Reform the National Flood

Insurance Program Act (SMART NFIP) was introduced by Senator Mary Landrieu to address the flaws of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act; and

Whereas, SMART NFIP, if passed, would delay premium increases, repeal provisions preventing new owners of sold homes to continue subsidized rates, and allow the rebuilding of key community facilities destroyed in a disaster that lie in velocity zones; and

Whereas, on May 23, 2013, the Flood Insurance Implementation Reform Act of 2013 was introduced by Congressman Cedric Richmond in an effort to also address flaws of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act; and

Whereas, the Flood Insurance Implementation Reform Act is co-sponsored by Congressmen Bill Cassidy, Rodney Alexander, Charles Boustany, and Congresswomen Doris Matsui and Maxine Waters; and

Whereas, the Flood Insurance Implementation Reform Act, would, if passed, in some cases delay, up to five years, major components of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act, including delaying the increasing of rates previously “grandfathered”; and

Whereas, these instruments would address many of the concerns addressed herein; and

Whereas, the United States Congress should consider the passage of the Strengthen, Modernize and Reform and National Flood Insurance Program Act and the Flood Insurance Implementation Reform Act of 2013, or, should neither of these acts pass, the United States Congress should consider the amendment or the repeal of Section 205, Section 207, and all such sections of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act which provide for the increase of premium fees for policyholders of the National Flood Insurance Program, in order to prevent the unduly hazardous effects it will have on home and business owners who invested in property prior to the adoption of the new federal legislation and flood insurance rate maps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to undertake the amendment or repeal of all relevant provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, including passage of the Strengthen, Modernize and Reform the National Flood Insurance Program Act and the Flood Insurance Implementation Reform Act of 2013; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to, in the absence of the amendment or repeal of all relevant provisions of this Act, suspend adoption of new flood insurance rate maps in order to allow communities with a substantial percentage of participation in the National Flood Insurance Program to work with the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the National Flood Insurance Program to provide for the creation of new flood insurance rate maps which do not unjustly and inequitably dispose of the rights created under existing rate maps; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to, in the absence of the amendment or repeal of all relevant provisions of this Act, provide for a one-year period during which time property owners, in conjunction with the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the National Flood Insurance Program, may enter a special enrollment period wherein property owners may sign up or renew their current National Flood Insurance

Program policy using the current flood insurance rate maps on which they relied to purchase and build their homes and businesses; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-65. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the United States Congress to reinstitute the Glass-Steagall Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, an effective monetary and banking system is essential to the proper function of the economy; and

Whereas, an effective monetary and banking system must function in the public interest without bias; and

Whereas, the federal Banking Act of 1933, commonly referred to as the Glass-Steagall Act, protected the public interest in matters dealing with the regulation of commercial and investment banks, in addition to insurance companies and securities firms; and

Whereas, the Glass-Steagall Act was repealed in 1999, permitting members of the financial industry to exploit the financial system for their own gain in disregard of the public interest; and

Whereas, many financial industry entities were saved by the United States Treasury at a cost of billions of dollars to American taxpayers; and

Whereas, within the hundreds of pages of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act there are no prohibitions that prevent “too big to fail” financial services organizations from investing in or undertaking substantial risks involving trillions of dollars of derivative contracts; and

Whereas, the American taxpayers continue to be at risk for the next round of bank failures, as enormous risks are undertaken by financial services organizations; and

Whereas, Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur has introduced H.R. 129, known as the Return to Prudent Banking Act of 2013, to reinstate the provisions of the Glass-Steagall Act, which has gained major bipartisan support; and

Whereas, the Glass-Steagall Act has widespread national support from organizations such as the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of Teachers and the International Association of Machinists, as well as from prominent economic and business leaders, many of the major and respected national newspapers and many others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, respectfully urge and request that the President of the United States and the United States Congress enact legislation that would reinstate the separation of commercial and investment banking functions that was in effect under the Glass-Steagall Act, the Banking Act of 1933, to prohibit commercial banks and bank holding companies from investing in stocks, underwriting securities or investing in or acting as guarantors to derivative transactions, in order to prevent American taxpayers from being again called upon to bail out financial institutions; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary

of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Barack H. Obama, President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM-66. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to give “qualified mortgage” status to all balloon loans held in portfolio by a bank; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 143

Whereas, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau recently released its “ability-to-repay” rule as mandated by the federal Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010, which was passed by the United States Congress; and

Whereas, the “ability-to-repay” rule provides specific criteria for mortgage lenders to follow in order to make a good faith determination that a borrower has the ability to repay his mortgage loan; and

Whereas, as part of the rule, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau created “qualified mortgages” which are mortgages with characteristics that are presumed to be in compliance with the “ability-to-repay” rule; and

Whereas, loans designated as “qualified mortgage” loans give lenders important legal protections by deeming those loans to have complied, or giving them a presumption of compliance, with the borrower “ability-to-repay” requirements contained in the Dodd-Frank Act; and

Whereas, mortgage loans made that do not receive the “qualified mortgage” status will be subject to increased scrutiny and subject those lenders making them to increased potential liability, possibly causing many lenders to stop making nonqualified mortgage loans; and

Whereas, it is vitally important that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the United States Congress adopt proper criteria for qualified mortgage loans to ensure that lenders continue to make certain loans and to avoid a potential decrease in access to credit for some consumers that may already have few credit options and that want and need certain loan features; and

Whereas, Louisiana bankers, especially in rural areas, are very concerned with the narrow “qualified mortgage” designation provided by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau for balloon loans held in portfolio by the bank and the effect this narrow definition will have on customers; and

Whereas, for various reasons, many consumers do not qualify for loans that can be sold into the secondary market and a balloon loan made and held in portfolio by the local bank may be one of the only options for those consumers; and

Whereas, community banks have prudently, consistently, and historically made balloon loans in order to serve the specific needs of customers; and

Whereas, balloon loans held in portfolio by a bank are generally acknowledged as very safely underwritten loans with lower default rates than other loans because the bank making the loan retains all of the credit risk; and

Whereas, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau “ability-to-repay” rule provides that beginning January, 2014, only banks predominately in rural or underserved areas

can qualify for balloon loan qualified mortgages; and

Whereas, only nineteen parishes in Louisiana will likely be considered "rural" areas under the definition used by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau; and

Whereas, as provided in the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau definition, parishes excluded are those in metropolitan statistical areas, or micropolitan statistical areas adjacent to a metropolitan statistical area, as those terms are defined by the United States Office of Management and Budget; and

Whereas, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau commentary states that counties (parishes) included in the definition of "rural" will only result in nine and seven tenths percent of the United States population being included in the definition; and

Whereas, if the United States Congress and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau do not act to broaden the definition of "rural" currently being used in the rules, many bank customers in Louisiana could be negatively impacted by diminished access to credit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to give "qualified mortgage" status to all balloon loans held in portfolio by a bank and to urge and request the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to expand the definition of "rural" for balloon loan qualified mortgages; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation, and to the director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

POM-67. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the Congress of the United States to study the causes, effects, prevention, and treatment of early mortality syndrome in the national and international shrimp industry; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 120

Whereas, early mortality syndrome (EMS) has been identified in the shrimp stocks in China, Vietnam, Malaysia, and Thailand, causing large losses among the shrimp farms in those countries; and

Whereas, EMS is characterized by mass mortalities during the first twenty to thirty days of culture in growout ponds along with the clinical signs including slow growth, corkscrew swimming, loose shells, and pale coloration; and

Whereas, affected shrimp consistently show an abnormal shrunken, small, swollen, or discolored hepatopancreas resulting in mortality; and

Whereas, Congress should fully utilize and bring to bear all available means of research and study to determine the causes, effects, prevention, and treatment of early mortality syndrome in the shrimp industry and take all appropriate actions necessary to fully protect the shrimp industry in Louisiana and other states from this disease; and

Whereas, throughout the Gulf of Mexico the shrimp industry in Louisiana and other states is a multibillion dollar industry of vital importance to the economic well-being of the region, and is still threatened by and suffering from the enormous impacts of recent natural and manmade disasters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to study the causes, effects, prevention, and treatment of early mortality syndrome in the national and international shrimp industry and take all appropriate actions necessary to fully protect the shrimp industry in Louisiana and other states from this disease; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-68. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Carolina memorializing the United States Congress to enact legislation that gives the State of South Carolina authority to manage its stock of Black Sea Bass in both state and federal waters; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Public Trust Doctrine is a legal principal derived from English Common Law which has been affirmed repeatedly by state and federal courts interpreting the essence of the doctrine to mean that the waters of the state are a public resource owned by and available to all citizens equally for the purposes of navigation, conducting commerce, fishing, recreation, and similar uses; and

Whereas, the amendment to Article I of the Constitution of South Carolina, 1895, prepared under the terms of Joint Resolution 3483 of 2009, having been submitted to the qualified electors at the General Election of 2010 as prescribed in Section 1, Article XVI of the Constitution of South Carolina, 1895, and a favorable vote having been received on the amendment, added Section 25 which reads, "the traditions of hunting and fishing are valuable parts of the state's heritage, important for conservation, and a protected means of managing nonthreatened wildlife. The citizens of this State have the right to hunt, fish, and harvest wildlife traditionally pursued, subject to laws and regulations promoting sound wildlife conservation and management as prescribed by the General Assembly. Nothing in this section shall be construed to abrogate any private property rights, existing state laws or regulations, or the state's sovereignty over its natural resources"; and

Whereas, with regard to the management of the state's Black Sea Bass (*Centropomus striata*) population, South Carolina's Department of Natural Resources along with the state's commercial and recreational fishermen are prime examples of responsible resource stewards, as they place an extremely high value on the quality and existence of our nation's coastal waters and freshwater resources. The Department of Natural Resources, as well as commercial and recreational fishermen respect this species' marine and freshwater habitats because they know that in order for these ecosystems to sustain healthy populations of this species, these must be protected and carefully managed; and

Whereas, allowing the State of South Carolina to manage the state's Black Sea Bass (*Centropomus striata*) population would provide the best protection for this population so that it may remain a natural resource for current and future generations: Now, Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, That the members of the

General Assembly memorialize Congress to enact legislation that gives the State of South Carolina authority to manage its stock of Black Sea Bass (*Centropomus striata*) in both state and federal waters; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and each member of the South Carolina Congressional Delegation.

POM-69. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to adopt and enact the Fixing America's Inequities with Revenue Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 58

Whereas, offshore producing states face inequities in federal energy policies which allow onshore producing states to keep up to fifty percent of revenues generated from energy production generated within their states; and

Whereas, coastal energy producing states like Louisiana have a limited partnership with the federal government to keep revenues generated from their offshore energy production that is produced for the nation; and

Whereas, the FAIR Act shall address this inequity by authorizing a revenue percentage for all offshore energy producing states like Louisiana, regardless of the type of energy produced and gradually lift the congressionally mandated annual cap on revenue kept by Gulf Coast producing states; and

Whereas, offshore revenue sharing is an integral element to a comprehensive national energy plan, increasing revenue as well as creating additional jobs for the state of Louisiana: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to expedite such revenue sharing as outlined in the Fixing America's Inequities with Revenue (FAIR) Act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-70. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho urging the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture to declare the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and adjacent national forest lands to be a Natural Resources Disaster Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 1

We, your Memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Idaho assembled in the First Regular Session of the Sixty-second Idaho Legislature, do hereby respectfully represent that:

Whereas, the State of Idaho and the vast Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and contiguous national forests have suffered numerous and frequent large destructive forest and range fires, most recently in 2012; and

Whereas, the fires have not only incrementally expanded the total burned acreage but have also reburned huge areas one or more times; and

Whereas, the cumulative effect of numerous large fires has resulted in tremendous

damage and destruction to the watersheds, streams important to the recovery of anadromous fish, wildlife habitat, scenic values, recreational use, loss of native plant species, historic structures, public access and safety, air quality and public health, the trail network and other values and benefits for which the national forests and wilderness were established; and

Whereas, the cumulative and growing loss of wilderness values and attributes is also resulting in serious economic impact to surrounding communities, counties, the State of Idaho and the businesses dependent upon the natural resources inherent in wilderness and the national forests; and

Whereas, hundreds of miles of trails have been severely damaged, blocked, rendered unsafe for travel or simply wiped out by fire, and the continuing destructive aftermath of blowdown, washouts and landslides have not been opened, cleared, repaired or replaced. The backlog of critical restoration work is rapidly growing each year and far exceeds the work performed annually; and

Whereas, the cumulative impact of fires has resulted in the loss of soil and native vegetation and the replacement of native species with noxious and undesirable plants that will also prevent or retard reestablishment of desirable native plants; and

Whereas, the United States Forest Service has underestimated the huge cost of trail and resource restoration when making decisions on active fire strategies in the wilderness due to a decision bias toward minimizing suppression expenditures for wilderness fires at the expense of long-term restoration; and

Whereas, the United States Forest Service has not placed the necessary emphasis and priority on restoration of proper watershed and vegetative conditions within the wilderness, and has also not considered the negative effect of vegetative type conversion resulting from intense and/or repetitive burns; and

Whereas, the United States Forest Service has not placed emphasis and priority on training for forest supervisors, rangers and staff on the importance of safe and effective saddle and pack stock use and management, and the field conditions necessary for reasonable and safe public and employee access to and within the wilderness; and

Whereas, the United States Forest Service has not placed emphasis and priority on eliminating barriers to effective and streamlined contracting procedures and effective use of volunteers in order to respond to the crisis in the wilderness and maximize fieldwork accomplishment; and

Whereas, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the United States Forest Service have not placed the necessary emphasis and priority of the requirement of Section 5(b) of the Central Idaho Wilderness Act to clear obstructions from all trails within and adjacent to the wilderness on at least an annual basis; and

Whereas, the Chief of the United States Forest Service has not programmed on a continuing basis even normal repair, replacement and maintenance of the trail system and trail structures such as bridges, trail tread, drainage, associated signing and other essential actions to enable safe public use, full and unimpeded public access by foot and horseback and the public services that are vital to public use and enjoyment of the wilderness, in order to prevent cumulative deterioration of the system under even non-fire conditions; and

Whereas, the Chief of the United States Forest Service has not placed emphasis on

efficient and economical methods of trail restoration and maintenance, and has in fact aggressively limited methods and tools by Forest Service crews, contractors and volunteers that would greatly increase accomplishment and lower costs without adverse effect on wilderness values or visitors; and

Whereas, use of outfitter and guide permits, contractors and volunteers from various organizations to accomplish trail work is well below potential due to a lack of emphasis by the United States Forest Service on using innovative ways to offset permittee fees and streamline and simplify contracting procedures; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the members of the First Regular Session of the Sixty-second Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, That we urge the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture to declare the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and adjacent national forest lands to be a Natural Resources Disaster Area; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the United States Forest Service to recognize the dire conditions prevailing within and adjacent to the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and adjacent national forests, and further urge that the necessary priorities and emphasis be placed on prompt and practical actions to prevent further cumulative loss of the unique values of the wilderness; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge compliance with the specific requirements of the Central Idaho Wilderness Act mandating annual clearing of obstructions from the trail system; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Chief of the United States Forest Service.

POM-71. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support the continued and increased development and importation of oil derived from North American reserves; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas, The United States relies—and will continue to rely for many years—on gasoline, diesel, and jet fuel, as well as renewable and alternative sources of energy. In order to fuel our economy, the United States will need more oil and natural gas while also requiring additional alternative energy sources; and

Whereas, The United States accounts for 20 percent of world energy consumption and is the world's largest petroleum consumer. The U.S. consumes more than 18 million barrels of oil each day, and forecasts suggest this will not change for decades. Current imports amount to over 8 million barrels each day, approximately 50 percent of the United States' requirements. Even with new technology, oil discoveries, alternative fuels, and conservation efforts, the U.S. will remain dependent on imported energy for decades to come. A secure supply of crude oil is not only needed for Americans to continue to heat their homes, cook their food, and drive

their vehicles, but to allow the U.S. economy to thrive and grow free from the potential threats and disruptions of crude oil supply from less secure parts of the world; and

Whereas, The growing production of conflict-free oil from Canada's oil sands and the Bakken Formation in Saskatchewan, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota can replace crude imported from countries that do not share American values. However, additional pipeline capacity to refineries in the U.S. Midwest and Gulf Coast is required; and

Whereas, Increasing energy imports from Canada makes sense for the United States. Canada is a trusted neighbor with stable democratic government, strong environmental standards—equal to that of the U.S. and some of the most stringent human rights and worker protection legislation in the world; and

Whereas, Improvements in production technology have reduced the carbon footprint of Canadian oil sands development by 26 percent on a per-barrel basis since 1990. Oil sands production accounts for 6.9 percent of Canada's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and 0.1 percent, or one-thousandth, of global GHG emissions. Total emissions from Canada's oil sands sector was 48 megatons in 2010, equivalent to 0.5 percent of U.S. GHG emissions. Oil sands crude has similar carbon dioxide emissions to other heavy oils and is 9 percent more carbon-intensive than the average crude refined in the U.S. on a wells-to-wheels basis; and

Whereas, The 57 refineries in the Gulf Coast region provide a total refining capacity of approximately 8.7 million barrels per day (bpd), or half of U.S. refining capacity. In 2011, these refineries imported approximately 5 million bpd of crude oil from more than 30 countries, with the top four suppliers being Mexico (22 percent), Saudi Arabia (17 percent), Venezuela (16 percent), and Nigeria (9 percent). Imports from Mexico and Venezuela are declining as production from these countries decreases and supply contracts expire. Once completed, TransCanada's Keystone XL and Gulf Coast Expansion projects could displace roughly 40 percent of the oil the U.S. currently imports from the Persian Gulf and Venezuela; and

Whereas, The Keystone XL pipeline project has been subject to the most thorough public consultation process of any proposed U.S. pipeline. It has also been the focus of multiple environmental impact statements and several U.S. Department of State studies. These analyses have concluded that it poses the least impact to the environment and is much safer than other modes of transporting crude oil; and

Whereas, Pipelines are the safest method for the transportation of petroleum products when compared to other methods of transportation. The Keystone XL pipeline will replace the equivalent of 200 ocean tankers per year. This will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by as much as 19 million tons, or the equivalent of taking almost 4 million cars off the road; and

Whereas, The original Keystone pipeline, which spans across the northern part of Missouri, supplies over 435,000 barrels of North American crude oil to American refineries in the Midwest. The Keystone XL pipeline will, when completed, carry 700,000 barrels of North American crude oil to American refineries in the Gulf Coast region which will make its way back to Missouri in the form of gasoline, diesel, and jet fuel; and

Whereas, The Keystone XL project will create approximately 9,000 construction jobs. The Gulf Coast project is a \$2.3 billion

project that will create approximately 4,000 construction jobs. Combined, they support yet another 7,000 manufacturing jobs. Seventy-five percent of the pipe used to build the Keystone XL in the U.S. will come from North American mills, including half made by U.S. workers. Goods for the pipeline, valued at approximately \$800 million, have already been sourced from U.S. manufacturers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That we:

1. Support continued and increased development and delivery of oil derived from North American oil reserves to American refineries;

2. Urge the United States Congress to support continued and increased development and delivery of oil from Canada to the United States;

3. Urge the President of the United States to support the continued and increased importation of oil derived from the Bakken Formation in Saskatchewan, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota, as well as Canadian oil sands; and

4. Urge the U.S. Secretary of State to approve the newly-routed pipeline application from TransCanada to reduce dependence on unstable governments, create new jobs, improve our national security, and strengthen ties with an important ally; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the U.S. Secretary of State, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-72. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky urging the President of the United States to encourage oil and natural gas production off the northern coast of Alaska, and to approve the construction of the TransCanada Keystone XL pipeline project; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 122

A Resolution urging the President of the United States to encourage oil and natural gas production off the northern coast of Alaska, and to approve the construction of the TransCanada Keystone XL pipeline project.

Whereas, high oil prices are having a major detrimental impact on families, farms, and businesses in Kentucky and are likely to undercut the prospects for an economic recovery; and

Whereas, the United States currently imports almost half of its oil and petroleum products, making it dependent on foreign sources and subject to interruptions and price fluctuations stemming from geopolitical forces; and

Whereas, such instability has damaging consequences both for our economy and our national security; and

Whereas, the United States Geological Survey estimates a resource of up to 27 billion barrels of oil in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas of Alaska, providing a vast domestic oil reserve, but opposition and regulatory hurdles are keeping energy producers from accessing these resources; and

Whereas, the TransCanada Keystone XL pipeline project seeks to link expanded oil production from the Canadian oil sands to refineries in the United States and to facilitate the flow of oil from the Dakotas to the Gulf Coast, thereby decreasing our dependence on oil from outside of North America; and

Whereas, Canada is a close friend and ally, with whom we share links of infrastructure and energy networks and other ties, so that dollars spent on Canadian oil will likely contribute to the success of the American economy; and

Whereas, the TransCanada pipeline project is projected to create construction and manufacturing jobs in the United States, adding billions of dollars to our economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

Section 1. The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky calls upon President Barack Obama and administration officials to support the increased importation of oil from Canadian oil sands and to approve the newly routed TransCanada Keystone XL pipeline to reduce our oil dependency on unstable governments, strengthen ties with an important ally, and create jobs for American workers.

Section 2. The House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky calls upon President Barack Obama and administration officials to support and facilitate permitting for oil production off the northern coast of Alaska to decrease our dependence on foreign oil and spur investment in the American economy.

Section 3. A copy of this Resolution shall be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States of America, the Secretary of State of the United States of America, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and each member of the Kentucky delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-73. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands petitioning the United States Congress to pass and adopt H.R. 92, which would authorize a grant of \$100,000,000 to the Virgin Islands Water and Power Authority to alleviate the energy crisis in the Territory and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

RESOLUTION NO. 1794

Whereas, the Virgin Islands Water and Power Authority ("the Authority") generates electricity through the use of fossil fuel refined into diesel; and

Whereas, studies have shown that electricity generation accounts for approximately sixty eight percent of total energy usage in the Virgin Islands; and

Whereas, in the last decade the cost of fuel used by the Authority to produce electricity has risen from \$32.06 per barrel in October 2003 to \$138.50 per barrel in February 2013; and

Whereas, the current consumer cost of electrical power in the Virgin Islands, at \$.52 per kilowatt hour for residential customers and \$.58 per kilowatt hour for commercial customers, is the highest under the American flag; and

Whereas, the average monthly electricity bill for Virgin Islands households is \$254, five times the national average; and Whereas, residential and commercial consumers are particularly ill-placed to absorb the high and rising costs of electricity as the per capita income in the Virgin Islands is approximately fifty three percent of the national average; and

Whereas, the increasingly unsupportable cost of electricity has resulted in an exodus of residents and the closure of businesses, including the territory's last remaining dairy operation; and

Whereas, the Virgin Islands Public Services Commission which regulates public utilities in the territory, has publicly stated that the high rates of electricity are depriving the local economy of between \$150-250 million annually and that the current electrical rates cannot be sustained for a significant time without substantial harm to the economy of the Virgin Islands; and

Whereas, the Virgin Islands Water and Power Authority's ("the Authority") efforts to convert to alternate fuels and renewable energy sources cannot be effectuated immediately but will require some years to implement; and

Whereas, the conversion of equipment to burn alternative fuels will cost the Authority millions of dollars; and

Whereas, the major supplier of fuel to the Authority closed its doors and is not refining fossil fuels; and

Whereas, the planned conversion of the Authority's generating plants to utilize less expensive fuels including Liquefied Petroleum Gas and Liquefied Natural Gas are not expected to result in lower electricity rates until at least mid 2014; and

Whereas, the Virgin Islands Delegate to Congress, Donna Christian-Christensen, has introduced legislation, H.R. 92 in the House of Representatives that would authorize a grant of \$100,000,000 to the Authority should it apply and \$15,000,000 for fiscal years 2013 through 2017 for the conversion of fuel oil (diesel) to liquefied natural gas or liquefied petroleum gas; and

Whereas, the fiscal stability and survival of the territory, including hotels, gifts shops, restaurants, bars and the average business is dependent on cost effective electricity to generate a profit and pay taxes which in turn keep schools, hospitals and government department and agencies running; and

Whereas, the territory's efforts at economic recovery and industry recruitment are severely hampered by the high rate of electricity, which discourages new investment and business development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands:

Section 1. The Legislature, on behalf of the People of the Virgin Islands respectfully urges the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to adopt H.R. 92 to authorized a one hundred million dollar grant to the Virgin Islands Water and Power Authority and a grant of fifteen million dollars to convert from fuel oil to natural gas.

Section 2. A copy of this Resolution shall be forwarded to the Honorable John Boehner, Speaker of the House, each member of the U.S. Congress, and the U.S. Virgin Islands Delegate to Congress, Donna Christian-Christensen.

Thus passed by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands on April 16, 2013.

POM-74. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging Congress to enact the Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 14

Whereas, The Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act, H.R. 696, was recently introduced in the 113th Congress; and

Whereas, The intent of this proposed legislation is to promote the preservation of wilderness and develop a sustainable development plan to enable all persons to benefit from the use of land adjacent to the City of

Yerington for potential commercial and industrial development, mining activities, recreational opportunities and expansion of community and cultural events; and

Whereas, The provisions of the Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act propose to convey federal land to the City of Yerington for the purposes of sustainable economic and industrial development; and

Whereas, Commercial and industrial development of the federal land would enable the community to benefit from the transportation, power and water infrastructure that would be put in place with the concurrent development of commercial and industrial operations; and

Whereas, The federal land proposed for conveyance to the City under the Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act is adjacent to the boundaries of the City and would be used to enhance recreational, cultural, commercial and industrial development opportunities in the City; and

Whereas, The provisions of the Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act propose to designate federal land as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to be known as the "Wovoka Wilderness"; and

Whereas, The proposed Wovoka Wilderness is named in honor of the Northern Paiute spiritual leader and founder of the Ghost Dance, and contains landscapes and wildlife habitat that have been enjoyed by hunters, outdoor enthusiasts and explorers since John C. Fremont camped along the East Walker River in 1844; and

Whereas, The Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act will create an estimated 1,300 jobs and provide much needed economic development for the City of Yerington and Lyon County; and

Whereas, The designation of the proposed Wovoka Wilderness will preserve invaluable prehistoric cultural and natural resources, thereby preserving those resources for future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the members of the 77th Session of the Nevada Legislature hereby urge Congress to enact the Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

POM-75. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah declaring and asserting the jurisdictional right of the State of Utah and its political subdivisions to respond to and take action when conditions on federally managed land in the state adversely affect, or may adversely affect, the health, safety, or welfare of the people; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 15

Whereas, in its Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act decision, released June 2012, the United States Supreme Court reaffirmed the position of the states as "separate and independent sovereigns";

Whereas, the court made it clear that the federal government "must show that a constitutional grant of power authorizes each of its actions";

Whereas, in contrast, the Supreme Court further explained that "the same does not apply to the States, because the Constitution is not the source of their power. . . . The States thus can and do perform many of the vital functions of modern government . . . even though the Constitution's text does not authorize any government to do so";

Whereas, the Supreme Court added, "Our cases refer to this general power of governing, possessed by the States but not by the federal government, as the 'police power.' . . . Because the police power is controlled by 50 different states instead of one national sovereign, the facets of governing that touch on citizens' daily lives are normally administered by smaller governments closer to the governed. The Framers thus ensured that powers which 'in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people' were held by governments more local and more accountable than a distant bureaucracy";

Whereas, the Supreme Court also highlighted a vital role of states' authority in relation to the federal government, stating, "The independent power of the States also serves as a check on the power of the Federal Government: 'By denying any one government complete jurisdiction over all the concerns of public life, federalism protects the liberty of the individual from arbitrary power In the typical case we look to the States to defend their prerogatives by adopting 'the simple expedient of not yielding' to federal blandishments when they do not want to embrace the federal policies as their own";

Whereas, the Supreme Court, concluding this line of logic, declared, "The States are separate and independent sovereigns. Sometimes they have to act like it";

Whereas, in 1917, the Court, in *Utah Power and Light v. United States*, held that "The power of the United States to protect its property by its own legislation from private trespass and waste does not, and cannot, imply a general police power over the vacant public lands within a State. The section in the Constitution relating to the admission of new States, and the concomitant disposition of the public lands, excludes, by its express terms, any construction by which the United States may claim any additional governmental or police powers within the States in which such public land is situated";

Whereas, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, of the United States Constitution states that the federal government will "exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of Particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings";

Whereas, the domain of exclusive jurisdiction by the federal government is limited to the District of Columbia and other Places purchased by the Consent of the State Legislatures for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings incidental to the powers expressly granted within the Constitution;

Whereas, "other needful Buildings" did not include vast acres of undeveloped land;

Whereas, although Section 3 of the Utah Enabling Act states, in part, "That the people inhabiting said proposed State do agree

and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated public lands lying within the boundaries thereof," the state of Utah did not disclaim its jurisdiction;

Whereas, during the Eisenhower Administration, the United States government published a report entitled "Report of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States" in which four basic areas of federal jurisdiction were identified:

1. Exclusive Legislative Jurisdiction: This term is applied when the federal government possesses, by whichever method acquired, all of the authority of the State, and in which the State concerned has not reserved to itself the right to exercise any of the authority concurrently with the United States except to serve civil or criminal process in the area for activities that occurred outside the area;

2. Concurrent Legislative Jurisdiction: This term is applied in those instances wherein by granting to the United States authority—which would otherwise amount to exclusive legislative jurisdiction over an area—the State concerned has reserved to itself the right to exercise, concurrently with the United States, all of the same authority;

3. Partial Legislative Jurisdiction: This term is applied in those instances wherein a state has granted authority to the federal government to legislate over an area of the state but the State has reserved to itself the right to exercise, by itself or concurrently with the United States, other authority constituting more than merely the right to serve civil or criminal process in the area, or the right to tax private property;

4. Proprietary Interest Only: This term is applied to those instances wherein the federal government has acquired some right or title to an area in a state, but has not obtained any measure of the State's authority over the area. In applying this definition, recognition should be given to the fact that the United States, by virtue of its functions and authority under various provisions of the Constitution, has many powers and immunities not possessed by ordinary landholders with respect to areas in which it acquires an interest, and of the further fact that all its properties and functions are held or performed in a governmental, rather than proprietary, capacity;

Whereas, the report also stated, "It scarcely needs to be said that unless there has been a transfer of jurisdiction pursuant to clause 17 by a Federal acquisition of land with State consent, or by cession from the State to the Federal Government, or unless the Federal Government has reserved jurisdiction upon admission of the State, the Federal Government possesses no legislative jurisdiction over any area within a State, such jurisdiction being for exercise by the State, subject to non-interference by the State with Federal functions. . . . The consent requirement of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, was intended by the framers of the Constitution to preserve the State's jurisdictional integrity against federal encroachment. The Federal Government cannot, by unilateral action on its part, acquire legislative jurisdiction over any area within the exterior boundaries of a State";

Whereas, an Inventory Report On Jurisdictional Status of Federal Areas Within the States, compiled by the United States General Services Administration, categorizes all United States Forest Service (USFS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) land in the

state of Utah as #4, Proprietorial Interest Only;

Whereas, the USFS and the BLM have caused a public nuisance and safety issue for the people of the state of Utah and Utah's political subdivisions by not removing the condition, persistently in the National Forest and BLM system lands, of imminent fire and not mitigating the effects of recent fires;

Whereas, Utah's 2012 Shingle Creek Fire was human caused on USFS land;

Whereas, the fire was one-third contained by the operation of one bulldozer;

Whereas, four bulldozers were ready for use by 6 p.m. on the day of the fire, but since the fire was on USFS land, only one bulldozer was allowed to operate until 10 p.m. and was only allowed to operate one blade wide and to dig no deeper than two inches;

Whereas, as a result, the fire burned more than 8,000 acres, damaged and altered the local watershed, created future risks of debris and mudslides, and will require costly repairs;

Whereas, Utah's 2012 Seeley Fire, which was started by lightning, eventually destroyed over 48,000 acres, or 76 square miles;

Whereas, debris flow and sediment from the Seeley Fire will be a major issue in the surrounding watershed for the next two to five years, impacting local municipalities, power plants, local businesses, homes, roads, bridges, and farms;

Whereas, in one instance, the USFS chose to bulldoze a portion of private land, claiming it was the best place to fight the wildfire;

Whereas, these are just two examples of conditions at the community level that have been made worse by the federal government's mismanagement of federal lands;

Whereas, the jurisdictional right of states and their political subdivisions to mitigate potential risks to the health, safety, or welfare of the state or a political subdivision should not be fettered by the federal bureaucracy; and

Whereas, states should assert their rights to mitigate potential risks to the health, safety, or welfare of the state or a political subdivision and not allow their authority to be eroded by federal government claims of authority: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah declare and assert its jurisdictional right, and the right of its political subdivisions, to respond to and take action when conditions on federally managed land in the state adversely affect, or may adversely affect, the health, safety, or welfare of the people without the intrusion and interference of the federal government on its efforts to respond to the needs of their citizens; and be it further.

Resolved, That the Legislature urges the states to declare and assert their jurisdictional rights, and the rights of their political subdivisions, to respond to and take action when conditions on federally managed land in the states adversely affect, or may adversely affect, the health, safety, or welfare of the people without the intrusion and interference of the federal government on efforts to respond to the needs of their citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the United States Forest Service, the commissions of each county in the state of Utah, the Council of State Governments, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the members of Utah's congressional delegation.

POM-76. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah supporting the transfer of administration of the Utah Navajo oil and gas royalties to the Utah Diné Corporation; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 11

Whereas, in 1933, Congress enacted 47 Stat. 1418, which expanded the boundaries of the Navajo Reservation north of the San Juan River, in San Juan County, Utah, referred to as the "Aneth Extension," and directed that 37.5% of all royalties from oil and gas extracted from certain portions of the Aneth Extension "shall be expended by the State of Utah in the Tuition of Indian children in white schools and/or in the building or maintenance of roads across the [Aneth Extension], or for the benefit of the Indians residing therein";

Whereas, in 1968, Congress enacted Public Law 90-306, 82 Stat. 121, which expanded the beneficiary class to include all Navajo residing in San Juan County, Utah, (Utah Diné), and which redefined the purposes of the Utah Navajo Trust Fund (UNTF) to include the beneficiaries' "health, education and general welfare";

Whereas, the 1933 act and the 1968 expansion of the beneficiary (Federal Acts) class effectively created a common law discretionary trust whereby the United States is the settlor, Utah is the trustee, and all Utah Diné residing in San Juan County, Utah, are beneficiaries;

Whereas, pursuant to the Federal Acts, Utah is directed to administer the oil and gas royalties for the health, education, and general welfare of the Navajo Indians residing in San Juan County;

Whereas, oil and gas were first extracted in paying quantities from the Aneth Extension during or about the late 1950s;

Whereas, in 2008, the Legislature of the state of Utah enacted H.B. 352, Amendments Related to Monies Derived from Navajo Nation Reservation Lands in Utah, which in part declared, "It is the purpose of this chapter to provide for a transitional process until congressional action designates a new recipient of the Utah Navajo royalties";

Whereas, H.C.R. 4, Concurrent Resolution Encouraging Congressional Action to Designate a New Recipient of Royalties from Navajo Reservation Lands in Utah, also passed by the Utah Legislature in 2008, noted that "the state first received monies from the 37.5% of the oil and gas royalties in 1959 and litigation related to those royalties began almost immediately" and that "the litigious environment surrounding the state's administration of the oil and gas royalties harms the relationship between the state and the San Juan Navajos and complicates all parties' ability to meet the needs of the San Juan Navajos";

Whereas, H.B. 352 incrementally reduced expenditures under the trust duties;

Whereas, H.B. 352 resulted in the establishment of what became known as the Navajo Royalty Holding Fund (NRHF) no later than July 1, 2008, into which all oil and gas royalties monetary assets and future royalty payments would be placed;

Whereas, Utah law, established by H.B. 352, was amended in 2012 by S.B. 155, Transition for Repealed Navajo Trust Fund Act, to allow expenditures from the NRHF for the education of certain beneficiaries up to January 1, 2014;

Whereas, on June 30, 2010, net assets then being held by the state of Utah in the NRHF totaled \$51,352,590;

Whereas, this includes a \$33,000,000 court settlement, the final installment of which is to be paid by the state of Utah in 2013;

Whereas, litigation is now pending in United States District Court seeking to force the state of Utah to resume active administration of the oil and gas royalties for the health, education, and general welfare of the beneficiaries;

Whereas, the health, education, and general welfare of the beneficiaries would be improved by continuing projects previously funded, wholly or partially, with oil and gas royalties funds, including housing, water development, range improvement, delivery of education, healthcare, and other social services;

Whereas, beneficiaries seeking secondary education are currently unsure whether college financial aid will continue to be available through the NRHF;

Whereas, in certain carefully selected instances, and in partnership with other governmental and private financial institutions, the beneficiaries would benefit from the expenditure of oil and gas royalty money for economic development in San Juan County;

Whereas, the oil and gas royalties should be actively administered in these areas of need for the health, education, and general welfare of the beneficiaries;

Whereas, the Federal Acts provide no mechanism for the state of Utah to resign as trustee of the oil and gas royalties;

Whereas, legislation to amend the Federal Acts to name a successor trustee was introduced in the 111th and 112th Congress, but did not become law;

Whereas, no legislation to amend the Federal Acts to name a successor trustee has been introduced in the 113th Congress;

Whereas, the Legislature of the state of Utah and the Governor stated in H.C.R. 4 that the "removal of the state as a go-between provides an opportunity for Navajos";

Whereas, the Utah Diné Corporation (UDC) is a nonprofit organization formed under the Utah Revised Nonprofit Corporation Act;

Whereas, the UDC is organized exclusively for charitable, religious, educational, and scientific purposes, including the making of distributions to organizations that qualify as exempt organizations under IRC Section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code;

Whereas, UDC's proposed amended bylaws ensure transparency and accountability at every level of corporate administration and prohibits real and apparent conflicts of interest, including nepotism, at every level of corporate administration;

Whereas, the UDC's proposed amended bylaws position the Utah Diné to play important roles in oil and gas royalties administration and oversight, require that the overall value of the oil and gas royalties' assets, currently estimated at approximately \$55,000,000, be maintained and, if consistent with applicable law and oil and gas royalties' purposes, grown;

Whereas, the UDC's proposed amended bylaws require that any oil and gas royalties' assets made available for economic development be limited in amount, comprise only a minor portion of any single funding package, be partnered with loans from other chartered financial institutions, be offered only as loans at current market rates for any amount over \$300, and occur only after it is expressly determined that the expenditure will actually promote the beneficiaries' health, education, or general welfare;

Whereas, the UDC's proposed amended bylaws provide that if all oil and gas royalties administrative and fiduciary obligations are transferred to the Utah Diné Corporation, a Request For Proposals addressed to large,

chartered financial institutions will be issued immediately, and every three years thereafter, for performing fund management, investing, and auditing services;

Whereas, the members of each Utah chapter of the Navajo Nation have previously resolved to support the UDC's effort to become the trustee of the oil and gas royalties;

Whereas, this support will again be ensured by means deemed reasonable and reliable prior to any transfer of oil and gas royalties administration to the UDC;

Whereas, the San Juan County Board of Commissioners unanimously supports transfer of administrative and fiduciary obligations for the oil and gas royalties to the UDC;

Whereas, the UDC Board of Directors will include representatives elected from each Utah chapter of the Navajo Nation and from one chapter organized to represent Utah Diné that currently do not reside within Navajo Reservation boundaries;

Whereas, the UDC intends to administer the oil and gas royalties pursuant to all applicable laws and regulations, including the common law of Indian trusts that imposes strict and exacting fiduciary obligations upon any trustee administering the property of Native Americans; and

Whereas, any transfer of oil and gas royalties administrative and fiduciary obligations to the UDC must ensure that the state of Utah is indemnified and held harmless for any liability, damages, or litigation costs resulting from oil and gas royalties administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, expresses its support for the transfer of all oil and gas royalties administrative and fiduciary obligations to the Utah Diné Corporation conditioned on removal of the state as trustee, by an act of Congress or a federal court order that can then be used to encourage congressional action and that indemnifies and holds harmless the state of Utah from any and all legal and equitable claims; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor declare that any transfer of the oil and gas royalties administrative and fiduciary obligations to the Utah Diné Corporation by Congressional act or federal court order must also indemnify and hold harmless the state of Utah from any and all legal and equitable claims arising from future oil and gas royalties administration by the Utah Diné Corporation and for litigation costs related to any claims; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor declare that any transfer of oil and gas royalties administrative and fiduciary obligations to the Utah Diné Corporation should require that the value of fixed and monetary oil and gas royalties assets remain at least at current levels so that funds will be available to promote future generations of oil and gas royalties beneficiaries' health, education, and general welfare and that the Utah Diné Corporation should operate under bylaws that have the protections described in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor declare that, if the foregoing objectives are ensured, the Legislature and the Governor support action by Congress or federal court order to transfer the oil and gas royalties administrative and fiduciary obligations to the Utah Diné Corporation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Navajo Utah Commission, the President of the Navajo Nation, the Speaker

of the Navajo Nation Council, the elected secretary of each Utah Diné chapter, the San Juan County Board of Commissioners, the current administrator of the Navajo Royalty Holding Fund, the secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, the United States Attorney General, and the members of Utah's congressional delegation.

POM-77. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah expressing appreciation for the completion of the Provo Reservoir Canal Enclosure Project; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, the Provo Reservoir Canal Enclosure Project is substantially complete;

Whereas, the benefits of the Enclosure Project are vital and significant, including realizing environmental benefits by saving 8,000 acre-feet of water annually, improving the safety of thousands of people who live near the canal, and providing a significant public recreational benefit;

Whereas, due to the great work of the Utah Congressional Delegation, Congress passed the Provo River Project Transfer Act (P.L. 108-382) in October 2004 that authorized the transfer of title of the Provo Reservoir Canal to the local sponsor, the Provo River Water Users Association;

Whereas, much work has gone into planning the title transfer of the Provo Reservoir Canal and corridor to the local sponsor;

Whereas, one of the main purposes of seeking title transfer from the United States to the Provo River Water Users Association was to take advantage of the managerial benefits of private sector ownership and control; and

Whereas, enormous time and consideration have gone into the completion of the Enclosure Project in preparation for title transfer by the local sponsor, the other participating entities, including Central Utah Water Conservancy District, Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy, and Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District, as well as all the local communities, the Utah State Legislature, the Governor, and the many residents in the affected area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, recognizes that substantial completion of the Provo Reservoir Canal Enclosure Project is a tremendous accomplishment and expresses support for transfer of title to the Provo Reservoir Canal from the United States to the Provo River Water Users Association, as authorized by the Provo River Project Transfer Act (P.L. 108-382); and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor urge the United States Bureau of Reclamation to work with the parties to expeditiously complete the transfer of title; and be it further

Resolved That copies of this resolution be sent to Utah's Congressional Delegation, the Provo River Water Users Association, Central Utah Water Conservancy District, Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy, Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, and the Governor.

POM-78. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of West Virginia urging the United States Congress to update the Renewable Fuel Standard to allow a broader range of domestic fuel sources, such as natural gas and coal, to be used to make liquid ethanol; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 76

Whereas, The United States needs a balanced and sensible domestic energy policy; and

Whereas, Reducing dependence on foreign oil is not only a matter of national security, but a significant opportunity to enhance economic prosperity and job growth in West Virginia; and

Whereas, Today there are multiple routes to ethanol, including traditional fossil fuels such as natural gas and coal, which are plentiful in West Virginia and several other states in the country; and

Whereas, West Virginia is committed to being a leader in development of a sustainable national energy policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia:

That the Legislature hereby Urges Congress to update the Renewable Fuel Standard to allow a broader range of domestic fuel sources, such as natural gas and coal, to be used to make liquid ethanol; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of West Virginia urges Congress to pass legislation that promotes growth of domestic alternative fuel sources and reduces dependence on foreign oil; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the Senate is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to members of the United States Senate representing West Virginia; to members of the West Virginia Congressional delegation; to the President of the United States Senate; and to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

POM-79. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the President of the United States and the United States Congress to protect the Clean Air Act and fund the infrastructure that ensures healthy air for Maine families and businesses; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

JOINT RESOLUTION

We, your Memorialists, the Members of the One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Legislature of the State of Maine now assembled in the First Regular Session, most respectfully present and petition the President of the United States and the United States Congress as follows:

Whereas, Maine families and businesses need healthy air to grow and succeed because when people are healthy, children do better in school, workers are more productive and businesses can add jobs because their health care costs are lower; and

Whereas, air pollution does not respect state borders, and Maine's geographic location puts us on the receiving end of life-threatening air pollution produced in states to the south and west of us; and

Whereas, air pollution can lead to asthma attacks, heart attacks, strokes, diabetes, cancer, reproductive and developmental harm and even premature death; and

Whereas, dangerous air pollution levels can increase hospital admissions and emergency room visits as well as missed days of school and work; and

Whereas, unhealthy air can be particularly dangerous for children, the elderly and people with chronic diseases, including the more than 22,700 children and 92,700 adults with asthma and other lung diseases, who may require expensive medical care on unhealthy air days in the State; and

Whereas, air pollution can cause serious health effects at levels once deemed safe and almost half of the people in Maine live in counties with fair to poor air quality; and

Whereas, for more than 4 decades the federal Clean Air Act has protected public health by reducing levels of smog, soot and other air toxins; and

Whereas, the Clean Air Act is a Maine tradition, having been established and subsequently updated and improved under the leadership of Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Senator George J. Mitchell and Senator William S. Cohen; and

Whereas, nationally the Clean Air Act has prevented an estimated 160,000 premature deaths, more than 130,000 heart attacks and over 1.7 million asthma attacks in 2010 alone; and

Whereas, reducing air pollution through the Clean Air Act will provide the United States with \$2 trillion in benefits and prevent 230,000 deaths in 2020; and

Whereas, it is not necessary to choose between improving public health and helping our economy innovate and grow, as evidenced by data showing that between 1970 and 2009 total emissions of the 6 principal air pollutants fell by 63 percent, while private sector jobs and our nation's gross domestic product increased by 86 percent and 210 percent, respectively; and

Whereas, the United States Environmental Protection Agency has concluded that the Clean Air Act has produced economic benefits valued at 30 times the cost of regulation; and

Whereas, the Clean Air Act is continually threatened by attempts to weaken, block, delay or underfund its important public health safeguards: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, respectfully urge and request that the President of the United States and the United States Congress support the Clean Air Act and fund its enforcement and fund the infrastructure that reduces the dangerous air pollution that crosses into Maine and that ensures the it is safe to breathe for Maine children and adults; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Barack H. Obama, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM-80. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the President of the United States and the United States Congress to not require the use of E15 gasoline; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

JOINT RESOLUTION

We, your Memorialists, the Members of the One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Legislature of the State of Maine now assembled in the First Regular Session, most respectfully present and petition the President of the United States and the United States Congress, as follows:

Whereas, federal laws and regulations, including the Clean Air Act, the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and the national renewable fuel standard program, have contributed to changes in fuel standards, such as the removal of methyl tertiary butyl ether, or MTBE, as an oxygenate in fuel, leading to the use of ethanol as a replacement for MTBE; and

Whereas, only reformulated gasoline is now available for purchase at public fuel pumps and typically contains a 10 percent corn ethanol blend, known as E10, and in June 2012 the United States Environmental Protection Agency approved the sale of E15,

a mixture of 15 percent ethanol and 85 percent gasoline; and

Whereas, using the fuel blend has been promoted as a method of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and our Nation's dependence on foreign oil but these claims are disputed by several automakers and others, such as AAA, which also claims EIS will damage fuel lines and void vehicle warranties; and

Whereas, in addition, AAA claims that automotive engineering experts believe that sustained use of E15, both in newer and older vehicles, could cause accelerated engine wear and failure, fuel system damage and false "check engine" lights for vehicles not approved by manufacturers to use E15; and

Whereas, E15 also has 5 percent less energy than gasoline and about 2 percent less than E10 and therefore could ultimately cost consumers more as a result of reduced fuel economy; and

Whereas, the production of corn ethanol is wasteful of fossil fuel resources and does not increase energy security and with this production, which uses 10 percent of all arable land in the United States, we see increased degradation of vital land and water resources; and

Whereas, corn ethanol's impact on food prices is huge and corn is now trading at an all-time high and this affects food manufacturing and other industries such as animal feed businesses; and

Whereas, the burning of corn ethanol increases the emissions of gases and hazardous air pollutants that are probable carcinogens and are the causes of numerous health issues such as asthma, chronic bronchitis and other respiratory problems; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, respectfully urge and request that the President of the United States and members of the United States Congress realize the major problems of corn ethanol as a fuel additive and the numerous negative effects it has on not only Maine citizens but all Americans and we urge and request that the President of the United States and the United States Congress consider reversing the decision of the United States Environmental Protection Agency to move forward with the use of E15; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Barack H. Obama, President of the United States, to the Inspector General of the United States Department of Energy, to the United States Environmental Protection Agency, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM-81. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan urging the United States Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to fulfill their obligation to establish a permanent repository for high-level nuclear waste; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas, Over the past four decades, nuclear power has been a significant source for the nation's production of electricity. According to the U.S. Nuclear Energy Institute, nuclear power provided 19.2 percent of the electricity produced in the United States in 2011. The Michigan Public Service Commission estimates that 22 percent of the electricity generated for use in Michigan is from nuclear energy; and

Whereas, Since the earliest days of nuclear power, the great dilemma associated with this technology is how to deal with used nuclear fuel. This high-level radioactive waste demands exceptional care in all facets of its storage and disposal, including its transportation; and

Whereas, In 1982, Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. This legislation requires the federal government, through the Department of Energy, to build a repository for the permanent storage of high-level radioactive waste from nuclear power plants. This act, which was amended in 1987, includes a specific timetable to identify a suitable location and to establish the waste repository. The costs for this undertaking are paid from a fee that is assessed on all nuclear energy produced; and

Whereas, In accordance with the federal act, customers of Michigan electric utilities have paid \$763 million through September 30, 2010, into the federal Nuclear Waste Fund for construction of the federal nuclear waste repository. Every year, the total Nuclear Waste Fund balance grows by approximately \$750 million in direct ratepayer payments; and

Whereas, There are serious concerns that the federal government is not complying with the timetables set forth in federal law. Every delay places our country at greater risk for a catastrophe to occur. The large number of temporary storage sites at nuclear facilities across the country make us vulnerable to potential problems. The events since September 11, 2001, clearly illustrate the urgency of the need to establish a safe and permanent high-level nuclear waste repository as soon as possible. The Department of Energy, along with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, must work diligently to meet its obligation as provided by law. There is too much at stake; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That we urge the United States Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to fulfill their obligation to establish a permanent repository for high-level nuclear waste; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the United States Department of Energy, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-82. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to ensure that amounts credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are used solely for the dredging, infrastructure, operation, and maintenance of federally-authorized ports, harbors, and waterways; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 20

Whereas, Domestic shippers and importers using Great Lakes and coastal ports pay more than a billion dollars per year in federal harbor maintenance taxes. Congress established the tax to fund harbor operation and maintenance, particularly dredging, at these ports; and

Whereas, Despite a nearly \$6.4 billion balance in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, our nation's dredging needs are not being met. Throughout our nation and particularly in the Great Lakes region, the lack of dredging has forced shippers to operate inefficiently and carry lighter loads, costing them millions of dollars each year; and

Whereas, The Obama Administration has only budgeted about half of the revenue collected through the harbor maintenance tax for maintaining our nation's harbors. Last year, nearly \$1.6 billion were collected from shippers, but only \$860 million has been allocated for dredging harbors in Michigan and other coastal states; and

Whereas, During the current turbulent economic conditions, we must make every effort to support economic activity by maintaining the infrastructure necessary for commerce. In essentially using harbor maintenance taxes placed in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to finance and balance other portions of the federal budget, we are breaking our promise to the shippers paying the tax and hurting our nation's economic recovery; and

Whereas, Current congressional legislation (H.R. 335 and S. 218) would ensure that harbor maintenance taxes are only used for their intended purpose to maintain our nation's harbors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to ensure that amounts credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are used solely for the dredging, infrastructure, operation, and maintenance of federally-authorized ports, harbors, and waterways; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-83. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah urging the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to exempt or exclude private properties in San Juan County from designation as critical habitat in the proposed listing of the Gunnison sagegrouse under the Endangered Species Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has announced a proposal to add the Gunnison sagegrouse in the Gunnison Basin of southwest Colorado and southeastern Utah, specifically Grand and San Juan Counties in Utah, to the list of species that are candidates for Endangered Species Act Protection;

Whereas, following the USFWS's proposal to list the Gunnison sagegrouse as endangered under the Endangered Species Act, the agency will designate critical habitat for the species, which contains the physical and biological features essential to the conservation and recovery of the species;

Whereas, the USFWS has proposed that 1,704,227 acres be designated as critical habitat in Utah and Colorado;

Whereas, in the Monticello area of San Juan County, the USFWS is proposing that 145,500 acres be designated as critical habitat;

Whereas, of these proposed acres, 95% are private, 4% are Bureau of Land Management lands, and 1% are state lands;

Whereas, San Juan County has approximately 5.2 million acres, making it the largest county in the state of Utah;

Whereas, the federal government owns, controls, or manages approximately 84% of the land base within San Juan County, with 2.1 million acres or 41% of that land base being managed by the Bureau of Land Management;

Whereas, the Navajo Reservation makes up approximately 1.2 million acres, or 23% of

the county, while the National Park Service controls 587 acres, or 11% of the county, and the United States Forest Service manages 450,000 acres, or 9%, of San Juan County;

Whereas, the state of Utah has control over 406,000 acres, or 8%, and the Division of State Parks manages approximately 3,000 acres, or less than 1%, of the county;

Whereas, private ownership makes up a fraction of the 5.2 million acres cited above for a total of 406,000, or just under 8%, of county land ownership;

Whereas, according to the 2007 Census of Agriculture, San Juan County has 758 farms and ranches covering 1,546,914 acres, including private, state, and federal lands, for an average farm and ranch size of 2,041 acres;

Whereas, according to the same census, San Juan County farmers and ranchers raised and sold \$10,299,000 in crop and livestock commodities;

Whereas, the proposed area of critical habitat designation has a high potential for oil and gas development, and private landowners have leased their mineral rights for millions of dollars;

Whereas, the result of the proposed listing of the Gunnison sagegrouse and the accompanying designation of critical habitat will negatively impact approximately 35% of the private property base in the Monticello area of San Juan County, potentially jeopardizing these landowners' ability to generate millions of dollars in products and jobs critical to the survival of the residents of rural San Juan County;

Whereas, under Section 4 of the Endangered Species Act, the secretary of the United States Department of the Interior may exclude habitat from designation based on economic impact;

Whereas, under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the USFWS must prepare a regulator flexibility analysis describing the effects of the proposed rule on small entities, including small businesses, such as farm and ranch operations, and small government jurisdictions; and

Whereas, Executive Order 12630, titled Governmental actions and interference with constitutionally protected private property rights, states that the USFWS must analyze the potential implications of designating critical habitat in a takings assessment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, strongly urges the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to recognize and protect private landowner rights and their ability to make viable economic use of their land by exempting or excluding private properties in San Juan County from designation as critical habitat in the proposed listing of the Gunnison sagegrouse under the Endangered Species Act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the San Juan County Commission, the Grand County Commission, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the San Juan County Chamber of Commerce, the Grand County Chamber of Commerce, the secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Land Management, and the members of Utah's congressional delegation.

POM-84. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah declaring that claims of the United States Forest Service on state waters originating on public lands undermine state sovereignty; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 14

Whereas, water is essential to life, health, safety, and welfare, especially in Utah and throughout the West;

Whereas, in its Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act decision released June 28, 2012, the United States Supreme Court reaffirmed that jurisdiction over matters that "concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people" are "possessed by the States but not the Federal Government";

Whereas, in the exercise of its jurisdiction over water resources within the state, the state of Utah has long established the recognition of water rights to "first in time" users of the water who can demonstrate the ability to put the water to "beneficial use";

Whereas, in short, "beneficial use" means water use that includes domestic use, irrigation, stock watering, manufacturing, mining, hydropower, municipal use, aquaculture, recreation, and fish and wildlife, among others;

Whereas, in disregard for and disrespect of the long-established state jurisdiction over water resources, the federal government, principally by and through the United States Forest Service (USFS), has engaged in a persistent pattern and course of conduct to exert control and influence over water resources within the state and throughout the West;

Whereas, various federal agencies are acting to negatively impact the water resources of Utah and other western states by unilaterally and substantially reducing the number of grazing permits and severely restricting timber harvesting;

Whereas, these federal policies, which overly restrict timber harvesting and grazing, build up dangerous wildfire fuel loads and result in inordinate water absorption for unhealthy vegetation densities;

Whereas, these federal agencies are also threatening to not renew often long-held grazing permits unless the permittee signs a water right change application over to the federal agency, closing roads and access to water resources, diminishing water recreation opportunities, and imposing onerous permit requirements;

Whereas, some specific examples of the disregard for and disrespect of state jurisdiction over water resources by federal agencies include:

1. In the spring of 2012, agents of the USFS coerced Tooele County livestock producers to sign change applications on private livestock water rights under compulsion of prohibiting the livestock producers from turning out their cattle onto their Forest Service allotment if the producers did not comply with the federal agency demand.

2. Near Scipio, the USFS based its diligence claim filings on use by nineteenth century settlers and then used the filings, and the threat of protracted litigation, to dispossess direct descendants of the settlers from their legitimate water rights.

3. For many years, the United States Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management actively sought to reduce or eliminate the livestock and watering rights of a Nevada rancher. This action resulted in protracted litigation before United States District Court Judge Robert C. Jones, which concluded in the 2012 criminal convictions of two public servants employed by the USFS and the Bureau of Land Management. Both public servants were found guilty of contempt of court and witness intimidation charges. At trial, the regional forester in charge of Utah was found to have lied to the court when asked about the agency's

antigrazing plan, which sought to eliminate cattle grazing on public lands.

4. From 2011 to the present, federal agents have barred city of Tombstone officials from accessing their water resources established in the Huachuca Mountains as early as 1881, which were washed out by monsoon rains on the heels of devastating wildfires exacerbated by unmitigated fuel loads. Local officials were at first denied access to repair their water lines, but were then allowed by USFS agents to only use "horses and hand tools" to ascend the mountain on foot in an obviously futile attempt to restore their water services. In attempting to ascend the road they had used for decades to repair their water resources with modern machinery, Tombstone officials were met by armed Forest Service agents and turned back at the threat of arrest and confiscation of expensive, rented heavy machinery. The city of Tombstone is now engaged in protracted litigation with the federal government over its water resources and has been reduced to using arsenic-laced wells that lack the pressure and capacity to withstand any serious fire danger to the wooden town in the middle of a desert in the middle of a drought.

5. The United States Forest Service filed suit in Idaho against the Joyce Livestock Company, arguing the livestock water rights were the property of the United States, based on federal ownership and control of the public lands coupled with the Bureau of Land Management's oversight of the public lands under the Taylor Grazing Act. Through protracted litigation, the Joyce Livestock Company proved its water rights to have been in place since 1898. The district court found no evidence that the United States had appropriated any water by grazing livestock. Upon appeal, in *Joyce Livestock Company vs. United States*, the Idaho Supreme Court unanimously held that the United States did not actually apply the water to beneficial use under the constitutional method of appropriation and, therefore, had no water right.

6. USFS efforts to exert control over the water rights of Colorado's ski industry were recently delayed on procedural grounds in a lawsuit brought by the ski industry. The USFS, through a new policy clause in the land use permitting process, seeks to require ski industry interests to provide joint ownership of state water rights, relinquish water rights held jointly with the federal government if the use permit is terminated, and grant "limited" power of attorney to the United States to execute documents pertaining to jointly held water rights with the promise that the ski industry will waive any claim against the United States for compensation of water rights lost as a result of the new permit language.

Whereas, John Dickinson, one of the Founding Fathers of this nation, warned, "It will be their own faults, if the several states suffer the federal sovereignty to interfere in the things of their respective jurisdictions";

Whereas, the United States Supreme Court also highlighted a vital role of states' authority in relation to protecting the liberty and property of their citizens by curbing federal government overreach, stating, "The Independent power of the States also serves as a check on the power of the Federal Government: 'By denying any one government complete jurisdiction over all the concerns of public life, federalism protects the liberty of the individual from arbitrary power'";

Whereas, in its recent Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act decision, the United States Supreme Court further admonished

states of their jurisdiction to protect matters of health, safety, and welfare, such as the critical life-sustaining issue of water in the West, stating, "Our cases refer to this general power of governing, possessed by the States but not by the Federal Government, as the 'police power.' . . . Because the police power is controlled by 50 different states instead of one national sovereign, the facets of governing that touch on citizens' daily lives are normally administered by smaller governments closer to the governed. The Framers thus ensured that powers which 'in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people' were held by governments more local and more accountable than a distant federal bureaucracy";

Whereas, after recounting these fundamental principles and the states' inherent powers as "separate and independent sovereigns," the United States Supreme Court admonished, "In the typical case we look to the States to defend their prerogatives by adopting 'the simple expedient of not yielding' to federal blandishments when they do not want to embrace the federal policies as their own. The States are separate and independent sovereigns. Sometimes they have to act like it";

Whereas, the USFS Intermountain Region Guidance Document states that the federal government will not invest in livestock water improvements, "nor," according to the Intermountain Region Director, "will the agency authorize water improvements to be constructed or reconstructed with private funds where the right is held solely by the livestock owner";

Whereas, when the USFS allows improvements, including developing, redeveloping, and maintaining a livestock permittee's water rights, all improvements are claimed as the property of the United States, even when the investments are made by individual livestock permittees to allow the permittees to put their livestock watering rights to beneficial use as prescribed under state law;

Whereas, the USFS has used pressure tactics to gain control of livestock water rights by seeking change applications from the permittees or joint ownership in water with the federal agency;

Whereas, the USFS has threatened to not allow livestock permittees onto its Forest Service grazing allotments until permittees comply with the request;

Whereas, pre-existing water rights for livestock permittees on federal lands are protected in both the 1934 Taylor Grazing Act and the 1976 Federal Land Policy and Management Act;

Whereas, these actions by federal agencies infringe on recognized state jurisdiction and sovereignty, state law, and water rights established through historic livestock watering on public lands, and Utah's beneficial use doctrine;

Whereas, it is the apparent intention of the federal government to further expand its water holdings in the West, including Utah, through the USFS as provided in 16 U.S.C. Sec. 526, which states, "There are authorized to be appropriated for expenditure by the Forest Service such sums as may be necessary for the investigation and establishment of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the administration and public use of the national forests";

Whereas, the United States, by and through its various agencies and depart-

ments, appears intent upon undermining, or at the very least disregarding, state sovereignty and jurisdiction over water rights and resources, as outlined in the USFS Intermountain Region Guidance Document, which states, "until the court issues a decree accepting these claims, it is not known whether these claims will be recognized as water rights";

Whereas, in seeking to expand the federal government's interest in the Utah water rights portfolio and exert greater control over the natural resources of the state, the USFS has filed more than 16,000 water rights claims of ownership on livestock watering rights located across the state;

Whereas, water rights claimed by the United States, based on its control of public lands, coupled with the Bureau of Land Management's comprehensive management of public lands under the Taylor Grazing Act, do not constitute the application of the water right to beneficial use under Utah's constitutional method of water appropriation and beneficial use;

Whereas, these waters are the property of the citizens of the state of Utah under its constitution, and the control falls under the stewardship and jurisdiction of the Utah State Legislature;

Whereas, it is recognized and understood that the United States cannot obtain sovereign water rights, nor can it obtain historic livestock water rights established on public lands, through federal laws;

Whereas, the consequence of allowing the federal government to exceed its authority over water rights is clearly illustrated by the great difficulty in getting the federal government to acknowledge its encroachment and relinquish its hold on that which the states should have by right;

Whereas, it is the sovereign right of the state of Utah, the second most arid state in the nation, to exercise its obligation to protect the scarce water resources within its borders for the health, safety, and welfare of its citizens; and

Whereas, to do otherwise would be an abrogation of the Legislature's constitutional responsibility and obligation on behalf of the citizens of Utah, would weaken state authority, and would relinquish to the federal government more control over the water, natural resources, and lands contained within the borders of Utah: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah affirms the rights established in the Utah Constitution related to the citizens' water and Utah's sovereign ownership, jurisdiction, and control over its water; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah declares that 191 the actions related to United States Forest Service claims on state waters originating on public lands undermines state sovereignty and jurisdiction and demands action by the state of Utah to protect its sovereign, recognized water ownership and rights on behalf of the citizens of Utah; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah calls on state, county, and local governments to protect, preserve, and defend their jurisdiction and exercise their constitutional obligation to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of the state of Utah, particularly in defending and maintaining jurisdiction over the water resources of this state; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Department of the Interior, the United States Forest Service, the United States Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Land Management,

the Utah Department of Natural Resources, each county commission in the state of Utah, each municipality in the state of Utah, and the members of Utah's congressional delegation.

POM-85. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the ABLE Act; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 54

Whereas, the Achieving a Better Life Experience Act, also known as the ABLE Act, has been introduced as S. 313 and H.R. 647 in the One Hundred Thirteenth United States Congress; and

Whereas, the ABLE Act would create tax-advantaged savings accounts known as "ABLE accounts" for persons with disabilities and provide that funds may be withdrawn from such accounts to cover costs of health care, employment support, housing, transportation, assistive technology, and lifelong education for those persons; and

Whereas, ABLE accounts would be subject to the same tax treatment as the popular education savings accounts commonly called "529 plans", as they would be created in the same section (Section 529) of the Internal Revenue Code; and

Whereas, the ABLE Act would create a powerful incentive for individuals and families to save private funds for the purpose of supporting persons with disabilities in maintaining health, independence, and quality of life; and

Whereas, a vital component of the ABLE Act is a provision which stipulates that funds held in an ABLE account do not count toward any maximum limit on a person's assets upon which eligibility for a means-tested federal program may be contingent; and

Whereas, savings in an ABLE account would thereby not jeopardize a person's eligibility for programs such as Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (formerly known as food stamps), the asset limits of which currently force low-income persons into the difficult decision of whether to spend what resources they may have down to two thousand dollars in most cases in order to become eligible for needed assistance; and

Whereas, the ABLE Act includes a fiscal safeguard for states by providing that if the ABLE account beneficiary dies or their disability ceases and assets remain in the account, the assets will be distributed first to any state Medicaid plan that provided assistance to the person; and

Whereas, as evidenced by the party affiliations of its seventy-eight original cosponsors being almost perfectly balanced, the ABLE Act legislation enjoys broad bipartisan support; and

Whereas, the ABLE Act embodies sound economic policy by encouraging savings and asset building; and by providing that every citizen living with a disability has the opportunity to attain independence and an improved quality of life, promotes important values that our nation holds dear: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the ABLE Act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America

and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-86. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to repeal that portion of the federal health care reform legislation which imposes a health insurance tax; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 53

Whereas, beginning in 2014, Section 9010 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (P.L. 111-148), as amended by Section 10905 of that Act and Section 1406 of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act (P.L. 111-152), will impose an unprecedented new tax on health insurance that numerous policy experts agree will be passed on to individuals, working families, employers, and seniors, contradicting a primary goal of health care reform by making health care more expensive; and

Whereas, Congressman Charles Boustany (R-LA) and Congressman Jim Matheson (D-UT) have already sponsored bipartisan legislation, H.R. 763 of the First Session of the 113th Congress, in the United States House of Representatives, to repeal Section 9010 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which imposes an annual fee on health insurance providers; and

Whereas, similar legislation, S. 603 of the First Session of the 113th Congress, has also been introduced in the United States Senate by Senator John Barrasso (R-WY); and

Whereas, it has been estimated that the health insurance tax will cause premiums on the individual market to rise an average of two thousand one hundred fifty dollars for individuals and an average of five thousand eighty dollars for families nationally over a ten-year period; and

Whereas, it has also been estimated that, in Louisiana over the next ten years, an individual will pay an average of two thousand one hundred twenty-eight dollars more for single coverage and an average of four thousand five hundred twelve dollars more for family coverage, a small group employer will pay an average of two thousand five hundred eighty-nine dollars more for single coverage and an average of six thousand three hundred ninety-one dollars more for family coverage, and a large group employer will pay an average of two thousand eight hundred thirty dollars more for single coverage and an average of six thousand eight hundred thirty-six dollars more for family coverage; and

Whereas, it has been further estimated that a Medicare policyholder in Louisiana will pay on average four thousand one hundred eleven dollars more for coverage, all within the same time period; and

Whereas, estimates additionally indicate that the health insurance tax will also impact the national economy over the next ten years by reducing future private sector jobs by as much as one hundred twenty-five thousand, with approximately fifty-nine percent for small businesses, and reducing potential sales by at least eighteen billion dollars, with approximately fifty percent for small businesses; and

Whereas, higher premiums are a disincentive for everyone to obtain insurance coverage, particularly younger, healthier people, who are likely to drop their policies if they become too expensive, further eroding the risk pool and making coverage even less affordable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States

Congress to take such actions as are necessary to repeal Section 9010 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (P.L. 111-148), as amended by Section 10905 of that Act and Section 1406 of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act (P.L. 111-152), which imposes a health insurance tax, in order to make health care more affordable for working families, individuals, and businesses; and be it further.

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-87. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the Congress of the United States to review and consider eliminating provisions of federal law which reduce Social Security benefits for those receiving benefits from federal, state, or local government retirement or pension systems, plans, or funds; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 40

Whereas, the Congress of the United States of America has enacted both the Government Pension Offset (GPO), reducing the spousal and survivor Social Security benefit, and the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP), reducing the earned Social Security benefit for any person who also receives a public pension benefit; and

Whereas, Congress enacted these reduction provisions to provide a disincentive for public employees to receive two pensions; and

Whereas, the GPO negatively affects a spouse or survivor receiving a federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit who would also be entitled to a Social Security benefit earned by a spouse; and

Whereas, the GPO formula reduces the spousal or survivor Social Security benefit by two-thirds of the amount of the federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit received by the spouse or survivor, in many cases completely eliminating the Social Security benefit even though their spouses paid Social Security taxes for many years; and

Whereas, the GPO often reduces spousal benefits so significantly it makes the difference between self-sufficiency and poverty; and

Whereas, the GPO has a harsh effect on thousands of citizens and undermines the original purpose of the Social Security dependent/survivor benefit; and

Whereas, the WEP applies to those persons who have earned federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefits, in addition to working in employment covered under Social Security and paying into the Social Security system; and

Whereas, the WEP reduces the earned Social Security benefit using an averaged indexed monthly earnings formula and may reduce Social Security benefits for affected persons by as much as one-half of the retirement benefit earned as a public servant in employment not covered under Social Security; and

Whereas, the WEP causes hardworking individuals to lose a significant portion of the Social Security benefits that they earn themselves; and

Whereas, in certain circumstances both the WEP and GPO can be applied to a qualifying survivor's benefit, each independently reducing the available benefit and in combination eliminating a large portion of the total Social Security benefit available to the survivor; and

Whereas, because of the calculation characteristics of the GPO and the WEP, they have a disproportionately negative effect on employees working in lower-wage government jobs, like policemen, firefighters, teachers, and state employees; and

Whereas, Louisiana is making every effort to improve the quality of life of its citizens and to encourage them to live here lifelong, yet the current GPO and WEP provisions compromise their quality of life; and

Whereas, individuals drastically affected by the GPO or WEP may have no choice but to return to work after retirement in order to make ends meet, but the earnings accumulated during this return to work can further reduce the Social Security benefits the individual is entitled to; and

Whereas, retired individuals affected by both GPO and WEP have significantly less money to support their basic needs and sometimes have to turn to government assistance programs; and

Whereas, the GPO and the WEP penalize individuals who have dedicated their lives to public service by taking away benefits they have earned; and

Whereas, our nation should respect, not penalize, public servants; and

Whereas, the number of people affected by GPO and WEP is growing every day as more and more people reach retirement age; and

Whereas, the GPO and WEP are established in federal law, and repeal of the GPO and the WEP can only be enacted by Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize Congress, in the alternative, to repeal the Government Pension Offset and to consider applying the less stringent Windfall Elimination Provision to spousal and survivor benefits; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-88. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the President of the United States, the United States Congress and the United States Trade Representative regarding the use of trade promotion authority in international trade policy; to the Committee on Finance.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, the State strongly supports international trade when fair rules of trade are in place and seeks to be an active participant in the global economy, and the State seeks to maximize the benefits and minimize any negative effects of international trade; and

Whereas, existing trade agreements have effects that extend significantly beyond the bounds of traditional trade matters, such as tariffs and quotas, and can undermine Maine's constitutionally guaranteed authority to protect the public health, safety and welfare and its regulatory authority; and

Whereas, a succession of federal trade negotiators from both political parties over the years have failed to operate in a transparent manner and have failed to meaningfully con-

sult with the State on the far-reaching effect of trade agreements on state and local laws, even when obligating the State to comply with the terms of these agreements; and

Whereas, Article II, Section 2 of the United States Constitution empowers the President of the United States "... by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of Senators present concur . . ."; and

Whereas, the trade promotion authority implemented by the United States Congress and the President of the United States with regard to international trade and investment treaties and agreements entered into over the past several years, commonly known as fast-track negotiating authority, does not adequately provide for the constitutionally required review and approval of treaties; and

Whereas, the United States Trade Representative, at the direction of the President of the United States, is currently negotiating or planning to enter into negotiations for several multilateral trade and investment treaties, including the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement and the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership; and

Whereas, proposals are under consideration to review these and future trade and investment agreements pursuant to a fast-track model; and

Whereas, the current process of consultation with states by the Federal Government on trade policy fails to provide a way for states to meaningfully participate in the development of trade policy, despite the fact that trade rules could undermine state sovereignty; and

Whereas, under current trade rules, states have not had channels for meaningful communication with the United States Trade Representative, as both the Intergovernmental Policy Advisory Committee on Trade and the state point of contact system have proven insufficient to allow input from states, and states do not always seem to be considered as a partner in government; and

Whereas, the President of the United States, the United States Trade Representative and the Maine Congressional Delegation will have a role in shaping future trade policy legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, respectfully urge and request that future trade policy include reforms to improve the process of consultation both between the Executive Branch and Congress and between the Federal Government and the states; and be it further

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, respectfully urge and request that the fast-track model of consultation and approval of international treaties and agreements be rejected with respect to pending agreements and agreements not yet under negotiation; and be it further

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, respectfully urge and request that the President of the United States, the United States Congress and the United States Trade Representative seek to develop a new middle ground approach to consultation that meets the constitutional requirements for treaty review and approval while at the same time allowing the United States Trade Representative adequate flexibility to negotiate the increasingly complicated provisions of international trade treaties; and be it further

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, respectfully urge and request that the President of the United States, the United States Congress and the United States Trade Representative seek a meaningful consultation system that increases transparency, pro-

motes information sharing, allows for timely and frequent consultations, provides state-level trade data analysis, provides legal analysis for states on the effect of trade on state laws, increases public participation and acknowledges and respects each state's sovereignty; and be it further

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, respectfully urge and request that each instance in which trade promotion authority is authorized by the United States Congress be limited to a specific trade agreement to help ensure the adequate review and approval of each international trade treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Barack H. Obama, President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the United States Trade Representative and to each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM-89. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California urging the President and the Congress of the United States to exclude social security, Medicare, and Medicaid from being a part of any legislation to reduce the federal deficit; to the Committee on Finance.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, Social security and Medicare are the foundations of income and health security for older Californians and those with severe work disabilities, providing monthly cash benefits and health insurance to over 5 million Californians, including 3.4 million retirees and nearly 700,000 disabled workers; and

Whereas, Social security is the single most important source of life insurance protection for California's children and provides a vital guaranteed income to 370,000 children throughout the state; and

Whereas, Social security prevents more than 1.1 million Californians from living in poverty; and

Whereas, Social security provides benefits to more than 9 million veterans nationwide, which is roughly four out of 10 veterans; and

Whereas, Social security annually contributes nearly \$67 billion dollars to California's economy by paying benefits to over 5.1 million residents in the state; and

Whereas, Social security's funding is independent of that of the rest of the federal government, and has never contributed to, and by law can never contribute to, the federal deficit; and

Whereas, Social security in fact has a surplus of \$2.7 trillion dollars today that is expected to grow to \$3.1 trillion dollars by 2020; and

Whereas, Social security is not in crisis and has sufficient resources to meet all of its obligations through 2032 and has dedicated revenues that would—even in the absence of Congressional reforms—meet three-quarters of promised benefits thereafter; and

Whereas, Social security's funding shortfall after 2032 is modest: about one-half of the cost of the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003; and

Whereas, There are many policy options available to close social security's funding shortfall without cutting benefits, including eliminating the cap on earnings subject to the payroll tax, which would eliminate about 80 percent of the 75-year shortfall, or raising the payroll tax rate from 6.2 to 7.2 percent gradually over 20 years, which would eliminate one-half of the shortfall; and

Whereas, Americans prefer raising payroll taxes to cutting social security benefits by a margin of 53 percent to 36 percent; and

Whereas, Social security's modest but vital benefits, averaging just \$12,930 per year in California, are critical to the economic security of those who receive those benefits; and

Whereas, Losses of pensions, 401(k) balances, home equity, and earnings have greatly diminished the retirement income prospects of Californians; and

Whereas, The social security benefit cuts imposed in 1983 will, when fully phased in, cut benefits by roughly 25 percent; and

Whereas, Forty-seven percent of elderly Californians are struggling just to make ends meet and more than one-half of working Californians will not have saved enough to be able to maintain their standard of living in retirement; and

Whereas, Proposals to increase the social security retirement age to 69 would cut benefits by an additional 13 percent on top of the 13 percent cut that occurred when the retirement age increased from 65 to 67; and

Whereas, The physical demands of a job differ from industry to industry and, on average, the longevity of the lives of individuals differ significantly according to their level of income, education, race, and access to health care; and

Whereas, Social security belongs to the people who have worked hard all their lives and contributed to the program, and it is based on a promise that if you pay in, you and your family can collect your money when you retire, experience a severe disability, or die; and

Whereas, Medicare insures almost 4 million California seniors for health care at a fraction of the administrative costs of private plans; and

Whereas, Medicare has controlled its costs better than private insurance plans; and

Whereas, Although increasing the eligibility age for Medicare would save the federal government some money, it would add billions of dollars to what we as a country spend on health care and shift costs onto other governmental entities, businesses, and many individuals who cannot afford those costs; and

Whereas, Medicaid is a critical source of protection for over 11 million low-income children, adults, and elderly Californians, many of whom have severe disabilities or are in need of long-term care; and

Whereas, Our social security, Medicare, and Medicaid systems are fundamental to protecting against risks to which all Californians are subject; and

Whereas, Our social security, Medicare, and Medicaid systems give expression to widely held values, including caring for our families, our neighbors, and ourselves, personal responsibility, hard work, and dignity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the California State Legislature urges the President and the Congress of the United States to exclude social security, Medicare, and Medicaid from being a part of any legislation to reduce the federal deficit; and be it further

Resolved, That the California State Legislature opposes cuts to social security, Medicare and Medicaid, and calls on our state's representatives in Washington, D.C. to vote against any cuts and consider improving those systems in ways that will strengthen their protections; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the

United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, of South Dakota, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 534. A bill to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-82).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 783. A bill to amend the Helium Act to improve helium stewardship, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-83).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1379. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 1380. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to ensure that on-duty time does not include waiting time at a natural gas or oil well site for certain commercial motor vehicle operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1381. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1382. A bill to require the Federal Government to expedite the sale of underutilized Federal real property; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1383. A bill to provide subsidized employment for unemployed, low-income adults, provide summer employment and year-round employment opportunities for low-income youth, and carry out work-related and educational strategies and activities of demonstrated effectiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1384. A bill to help ensure that all items offered for sale in any gift shop of the National Park Service or of the National Archives and Records Administration are produced in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 314

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 360

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 360, a bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 425

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 425, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to improve the quality, health outcomes, and value of maternity care under the Medicaid and CHIP programs by developing maternity care quality measures and supporting maternity care quality collaboratives.

S. 429

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 488

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of

S. 488, a bill to provide for a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application in vehicle technologies at the Department of Energy.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 491

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify provisions relating to grants, and for other purposes.

S. 534

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 534, a bill to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 621

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 621, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to make any substance containing hydrocodone a schedule II drug.

S. 783

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to amend the Helium Act to improve helium stewardship, and for other purposes.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018.

S. 972

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 972, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services replacing ICD-9 with ICD-10 in implementing the HIPAA code set standards.

S. 1038

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1038, a bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1066

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1066, a bill to allow certain student loan borrowers to refinance Federal student loans.

S. 1072

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1072, a bill to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1181

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1181, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes.

S. 1195

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1195, a bill to repeal the renewable fuel standard.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1204, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1204, *supra*.

S. 1320

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S.

1320, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the armed forces.

S. 1341

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1341, a bill to modify the Forest Service Recreation Residence Program as the program applies to units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain by implementing a simple, equitable, and predictable procedure for determining cabin user fees, and for other purposes.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1360, a bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1378

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1378, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for investigative leave requirements with respect to Senior Executive Service employees, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1792

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1792 intended to be proposed to S. 1243, an original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1813. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1814. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1815. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1816. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1817. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1818. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1819. Mr. REID (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 167, reaffirming the strong support of the United States for the peaceful resolution of territorial, sovereignty, and jurisdictional disputes in the Asia-Pacific maritime domains.

SA 1820. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1821. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1822. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1813. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 108, line 10, after the colon insert the following: “*Provided further*, That no funds made available under this Act, or any other Act in any fiscal year, shall be available to performance-based contract administrators that have been selected after January 1, 2013, through a process other than the solicitation and award of procurement contracts subject to full and open competition among public housing agencies and their instrumentalities under the Competition in Contracting Act (41 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) and the Federal Acquisition Regulations.”

SA 1814. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 17, line 13, insert “, of which such sums as may be necessary shall be made available for the establishment, not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, of an academic center of excellence to conduct research related to the privacy, safety, policy, and technology challenges associated with integrating unmanned aerial systems into the national air space independent from the process established under section 332 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-95)” after “2016”.

SA 1815. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____.

(a) No funds made available for any fiscal year beginning before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, under this Act or any other Act, may be used by a covered agency to require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is in storage with the provider (other than a communication with respect to which the provider or an agent or employee of the provider is the originator, addressee, or intended recipient) unless the covered agency obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure by a court of competent jurisdiction directing the disclosure.

(b) For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms “court of competent jurisdiction” and “remote computing service” have the meaning given those terms in section 2711 of title 18, United States Code;

(2) the term “covered agency” means an Executive agency, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, to which funds are made available under this Act; and

(3) the terms “electronic communication”, “electronic communication service”, and “wire communication” have the meaning given those terms in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.

SA 1816. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____.

(a) No funds made available for any fiscal year beginning before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, under this Act or any other Act, may be used by the Internal Revenue Service or the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is in storage with the provider (other than a communication with respect to which the provider or an agent or employee of the provider is the originator, addressee, or intended recipient) unless the Internal Revenue Service or the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, respectively, obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure by a court of competent jurisdiction directing the disclosure.

(b) For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms “court of competent jurisdiction” and “remote computing service” have

the meaning given those terms in section 2711 of title 18, United States Code; and

(2) the terms “electronic communication”, “electronic communication service”, and “wire communication” have the meaning given those terms in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code.

SA 1817. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 25, line 14, after “2014”, insert “, of which up to \$100,000 shall be made available to the Secretary of Transportation to encourage States to prioritize vehicles defined in section 30D(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and vehicles that operate solely on compressed natural gas for purposes of section 166(b)(5)(B) of title 23, United States Code”.

SA 1818. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 38, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 1 _____. The Secretary of Transportation shall submit to Congress an annual report that lists the total amounts made available to carry out—

(1) section 213 of title 23, United States Code; and

(2) as applicable, each eligible project type under that section.

SA 1819. Mr. REID (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 167, reaffirming the strong support of the United States for the peaceful resolution of territorial, sovereignty, and jurisdictional disputes in the Asia-Pacific maritime domains; as follows:

Insert after the third whereas clause of the preamble the following:

Whereas although the United States does not take a position on competing territorial claims over land features and maritime boundaries, it does have a strong and longstanding interest in the manner in which disputes in the South China Sea are addressed and in the conduct of the parties;

Insert after the ninth whereas clause of the preamble the following:

Whereas, on June 21, 2013, the Governments of the People's Republic of China and Vietnam announced that they had agreed to set up and use an emergency fishery hotline to inform each other of any detainment involving fishermen or boats within 48 hours, to help quickly resolve disputes and as part of efforts to prevent future incidents from de-railing ties, and the Governments of the People's Republic of China and Indonesia on May 2, 2013, agreed to establish a hotline for incidents in their disputed waters;

In the thirteenth whereas clause of the preamble, strike “declaring the Senakaku Islands a ‘core interest’”.

Insert after the thirteenth whereas clause of the preamble the following:

Whereas, on April 27, 2013, Chinese Foreign Ministry spokeswoman, Hua Chunying, was quoted as saying, “The Diaoyu Islands are about sovereignty and territorial integrity. Of course it’s China’s core interest.”;

In the seventeenth whereas clause of the preamble, strike “; and” and insert a semicolon.

In the eighteenth whereas clause of the preamble, strike the colon at the end and insert a semicolon.

Insert after the eighteenth whereas clause of the preamble the following:

Whereas ASEAN and China announced on June 30, 2013, that official consultations on a Code of Conduct in the South China Sea will commence at the 6th Senior Officials’ Meeting and the 9th Joint Working Group on the Implementation of the Declaration of Conduct of the Parties in the SCS, to be held in China in September 2013; Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi reaffirmed that China was willing to advance talks on a code of conduct as part of a “continual, gradual and deepening process”; and Secretary of State John F. Kerry, participating in the ASEAN Regional Forum Ministerial Meeting on July 2, 2013, expressed the hope that announcement of official consultations between ASEAN and China would be the beginning of sustained and substantive official engagement between the two on developing the new Code of Conduct; and

Whereas, from June 17–20, 2013, the 10 ASEAN members and their dialogue partners Australia, China, India, Japan, New Zealand, Russia, South Korea, and the United States jointly participated in the First ASEAN Defense Ministers’ Meeting Plus Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief (HADR) and Military Medicine (MM) exercise, helping to establish a new pattern of cooperation among the militaries of the Asia-Pacific:

SA 1820. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 49, line 6, insert “and to make grants to States to offset a portion of the operating costs of passenger rail services,” after “Code.”.

SA 1821. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 75, line 19, strike “\$40,000,000” and insert “\$37,500,000”.

On page 84, line 10, strike “\$78,000,000” and insert “\$80,500,000”.

On page 85, line 21, after the semicolon insert “*Provided further*, That not less than \$2,500,000 of the amounts provided under this paragraph shall be used by the Secretary of

Housing and Urban Development, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to provide rental vouchers to veterans residing in States with a population of less than 1,000,000.”.

SA 1822. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 85, line 21, after the semicolon insert “*Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, in administering and distributing rental voucher assistance funded under this paragraph, give consideration to the unique challenges of identifying homeless veterans in rural areas during point in time counts, and adjust their rental voucher assistance allocations accordingly: *Provided further*, That in accord with the previous proviso that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall in distributing rental voucher allocations during any round of HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) vouchers that no State shall receive less than 0.5 percent of all such vouchers made available during such round:”

SUPPORTING PEACEFUL RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC MARITIME DOMAINS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 97, S. Res. 167.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 167) reaffirming the strong support of the United States for the peaceful resolution of territorial, sovereignty, and jurisdictional disputes in the Asia-Pacific maritime domains.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to; the Feinstein amendment to the preamble which is at the desk be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 167) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1819) was agreed to, as follows:

Insert after the third whereas clause of the preamble the following:

Whereas although the United States does not take a position on competing territorial claims over land features and maritime boundaries, it does have a strong and longstanding interest in the manner in which dis-

putes in the South China Sea are addressed and in the conduct of the parties;

Insert after the ninth whereas clause of the preamble the following:

Whereas, on June 21, 2013, the Governments of the People’s Republic of China and Vietnam announced that they had agreed to set up and use an emergency fishery hotline to inform each other of any detainment involving fishermen or boats within 48 hours, to help quickly resolve disputes and as part of efforts to prevent future incidents from derailing ties, and the Governments of the People’s Republic of China and Indonesia on May 2, 2013, agreed to establish a hotline for incidents in their disputed waters;

In the thirteenth whereas clause of the preamble, strike “declaring the Senakaku Islands a ‘core interest’”.

Insert after the thirteenth whereas clause of the preamble the following:

Whereas, on April 27, 2013, Chinese Foreign Ministry spokeswoman, Hua Chunying, was quoted as saying, “The Diaoyu Islands are about sovereignty and territorial integrity. Of course it’s China’s core interest.”;

In the seventeenth whereas clause of the preamble, strike “; and” and insert a semicolon.

In the eighteenth whereas clause of the preamble, strike the colon at the end and insert a semicolon.

Insert after the eighteenth whereas clause of the preamble the following:

Whereas ASEAN and China announced on June 30, 2013, that official consultations on a Code of Conduct in the South China Sea will commence at the 6th Senior Officials’ Meeting and the 9th Joint Working Group on the Implementation of the Declaration of Conduct of the Parties in the SCS, to be held in China in September 2013; Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi reaffirmed that China was willing to advance talks on a code of conduct as part of a “continual, gradual and deepening process”; and Secretary of State John F. Kerry, participating in the ASEAN Regional Forum Ministerial Meeting on July 2, 2013, expressed the hope that announcement of official consultations between ASEAN and China would be the beginning of sustained and substantive official engagement between the two on developing the new Code of Conduct; and

Whereas, from June 17–20, 2013, the 10 ASEAN members and their dialogue partners Australia, China, India, Japan, New Zealand, Russia, South Korea, and the United States jointly participated in the First ASEAN Defense Ministers’ Meeting Plus Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief (HADR) and Military Medicine (MM) exercise, helping to establish a new pattern of cooperation among the militaries of the Asia-Pacific:

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 167

Whereas the maritime domain of the Asia-Pacific region includes critical sea lines of communication and commerce between the Pacific and Indian oceans;

Whereas the United States has a national interest in freedom of navigation and overflight in the Asia-Pacific maritime domains, as provided for by universally recognized principles of international law;

Whereas the United States has a national interest in the maintenance of peace and stability, open access by all to maritime domains, respect for universally recognized principles of international law, prosperity

and economic growth, and unimpeded lawful commerce;

Whereas although the United States does not take a position on competing territorial claims over land features and maritime boundaries, it does have a strong and longstanding interest in the manner in which disputes in the South China Sea are addressed and in the conduct of the parties;

Whereas the United States has a clear interest in encouraging and supporting the nations of the region to work collaboratively and diplomatically to resolve disputes without coercion, without intimidation, without threats, and without the use of force;

Whereas the South China Sea contains great natural resources, and their stewardship and responsible use offers immense potential benefit for generations to come;

Whereas in recent years, there have been numerous dangerous and destabilizing incidents in this region, including Chinese vessels cutting the seismic survey cables of a Vietnamese oil exploration ship in May 2011; Chinese vessels barricading the entrance to the Scarborough Reef lagoon in April 2012; China issuing an official map that newly defines the contested “nine-dash line” as China’s national border; and, since May 8, 2013, Chinese naval and marine surveillance ships maintaining a regular presence in waters around the Second Thomas Shoal, located approximately 105 nautical miles northwest of the Philippine island of Palawan;

Whereas the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has promoted multilateral talks on disputed areas without settling the issue of sovereignty, and in 2002 joined with China in signing a Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea that committed all parties to those territorial disputes to “reaffirm their respect for and commitment to the freedom of navigation in and over flight above the South China Sea as provided for by the universally recognized principles of international law” and to “resolve their territorial and jurisdictional disputes by peaceful means, without resorting to the threat or use of force”;

Whereas Japan and Taiwan reached an agreement on April 10, 2013, to jointly share and administer the fishing resources in their overlapping claimed exclusive economic zones in the East China Sea, an important breakthrough after 17 years of negotiations and a model for other such agreements;

Whereas other incidences of the joint administrations of resources in disputed waters in the South China Sea have de-escalated tensions and promoted economic development, such as Malaysia and Brunei’s 2009 agreement to partner on exploring offshore Brunei waters, with drilling in offshore oil and gas fields off Brunei beginning in 2011; and Thailand and Vietnam’s agreement to jointly develop areas of the Gulf of Thailand for gas exports, despite ongoing territorial disputes;

Whereas, on June 21, 2013, the Governments of the People’s Republic of China and Vietnam announced that they had agreed to set up and use an emergency fishery hotline to inform each other of any detainment involving fishermen or boats within 48 hours, to help quickly resolve disputes and as part of efforts to prevent future incidents from derailing ties, and the Governments of the People’s Republic of China and Indonesia on May 2, 2013, agreed to establish a hotline for incidents in their disputed waters;

Whereas the Government of the Republic of the Philippines states that it “has exhausted almost all political and diplomatic avenues for a peaceful negotiated settlement

of its maritime dispute with China” and in his statement of January 23, 2013, Republic of Philippines Secretary of Foreign Affairs Del Rosario stated that therefore “the Philippines has taken the step of bringing China before the Arbitral Tribunal under Article 287 and Annex VII of the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea in order to achieve a peaceful and durable solution to the dispute”;

Whereas, in January 2013, a Chinese naval ship allegedly fixed its weapons-targeting radar on Japanese vessels in the vicinity of the Senkaku Islands, and, on April 23, 2013, eight Chinese marine surveillance ships entered the 12-nautical-mile territorial zone off the Senkaku Islands, further escalating regional tensions;

Whereas, on May 8, 2013, the Chinese Communist Party’s main newspaper, *The People’s Daily*, published an article by several Chinese scholars questioning Japan’s sovereignty over Okinawa, where key United States military installations are located which contribute to preserving security and stability in the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas the Government of the People’s Republic of China has recently taken other unilateral steps, including “improperly drawing” baselines around the Senkaku Islands in September 2012, which the 2013 Annual Report to Congress on Military and Security Developments Involving the People’s Republic of China found to be “inconsistent with international law”, and maintaining a continuous military and paramilitary presence around the Senkaku Islands;

Whereas, on April 27, 2013, Chinese Foreign Ministry spokeswoman, Hua Chunying, was quoted as saying, “The Diaoyu Islands are about sovereignty and territorial integrity. Of course it’s China’s core interest.”;

Whereas although the United States does not take a position on the ultimate sovereignty of the Senkaku Islands, the United States Government acknowledges that they are under the administration of Japan and opposes any unilateral actions that would seek to undermine such administration, affirms that the unilateral actions of a third party will not affect the United States acknowledgment of the administration of Japan over the Senkaku Islands, remains committed under the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security to respond to any armed attack in the territories under the administration of Japan, and has urged all parties to take steps to prevent incidents and manage disagreements through peaceful means;

Whereas, on August 3, 2012, a Department of State spokesperson expressed concern over “China’s upgrading of the administrative level of Sansha City and the establishment of a new military garrison there,” encouraged ASEAN and China “to make meaningful progress toward finalizing a comprehensive Code of Conduct,” and called upon claimants to “explore every diplomatic or other peaceful avenue for resolution, including the use of arbitration or other international legal mechanisms as needed”;

Whereas the United States recognizes the importance of strong, cohesive, and integrated regional institutions, including the East Asia Summit (EAS), ASEAN, and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, as foundation for effective regional frameworks to promote peace and security and economic growth, including in the maritime domain, and to ensure that the Asia-Pacific community develops rules-based regional norms which discourage coercion and the use of force;

Whereas the United States welcomes the development of a peaceful and prosperous China, the government of which respects international norms, international laws, international institutions, and international rules; enhances security and peace; and seeks to advance a “new model” of relations between the United States and China;

Whereas ASEAN plays an important role, in partnership with others in the regional and international community, in addressing maritime security issues in the Asia-Pacific region and into the Indian Ocean, including open access to the maritime domain of Asia;

Whereas ASEAN and China announced on June 30, 2013, that official consultations on a Code of Conduct in the South China Sea will commence at the 6th Senior Officials’ Meeting and the 9th Joint Working Group on the Implementation of the Declaration of Conduct of the Parties in the SCS, to be held in China in September 2013; Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi reaffirmed that China was willing to advance talks on a code of conduct as part of a “continual, gradual and deepening process”; and Secretary of State John F. Kerry, participating in the ASEAN Regional Forum Ministerial Meeting on July 2, 2013, expressed the hope that announcement of official consultations between ASEAN and China would be the beginning of sustained and substantive official engagement between the two on developing the new Code of Conduct; and

Whereas, from June 17–20, 2013, the 10 ASEAN members and their dialogue partners Australia, China, India, Japan, New Zealand, Russia, South Korea, and the United States jointly participated in the First ASEAN Defense Ministers’ Meeting Plus Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief (HADR) and Military Medicine (MM) exercise, helping to establish a new pattern of cooperation among the militaries of the Asia-Pacific: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the use of coercion, threats, or force by naval, maritime security, or fishing vessels and military or civilian aircraft in the South China Sea and the East China Sea to assert disputed maritime or territorial claims or alter the status quo;

(2) strongly urges that all parties to maritime and territorial disputes in the region exercise self-restraint in the conduct of activities that would undermine stability or complicate or escalate disputes, including refraining from inhabiting presently uninhabited islands, reefs, shoals, and other features and handle their differences in a constructive manner;

(3) reaffirms the strong support of the United States for the member states of ASEAN and the Government of the People’s Republic of China as they seek to develop a code of conduct of parties in the South China Sea, and urges all countries to substantively support ASEAN in its efforts in this regard;

(4) supports collaborative diplomatic processes by all claimants in the South China Sea for resolving outstanding maritime or territorial disputes, in a manner that maintains peace and security, adheres to international law, and protects unimpeded lawful commerce as well as freedom of navigation and overflight, and including through international arbitration, allowing parties to peacefully settle claims and disputes using universally recognized principles of international law;

(5) encourages the deepening of efforts by the United States Government to develop partnerships with other countries in the region for maritime domain awareness and capacity building; and

(6) supports the continuation of operations by the United States Armed Forces in the Western Pacific, including in partnership with the armed forces of other countries in the region, in support of freedom of navigation, the maintenance of peace and stability, and respect for universally recognized principles of international law, including the peaceful resolution of issues of sovereignty and unimpeded lawful commerce.

RECOGNIZING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 153.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 153) recognizing the 200th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 153) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 23, 2013, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 2218

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2218) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment.

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 30, 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, July 30, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader re-

marks, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 223, Kent Yoshiho Hirozawa, of New York, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board, under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at about 10:15 a.m. tomorrow, there will be a cloture vote on the Hirozawa nomination.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:47 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, July 30, 2013, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 29, 2013:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JAMES B. COMEY, JR., OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION FOR A TERM OF TEN YEARS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 30, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's record.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 31

9 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine strengthening privacy rights and national security, focusing on oversight of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) surveillance programs.

SH-216

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine strengthening public health protections by addressing toxic chemical threats.

SD-406

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine strengthening public health protections by addressing toxic chemical threats.

SD-406

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 1376, to improve the Federal Housing Administration and to ensure the solvency of the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund.

SD-538

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 1356, to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to strengthen the United States workforce development system through innovation in, and alignment and improvement of, employment, training, and education programs in the United States, and to promote individual and national economic growth, the nominations of Robert F. Cohen, Jr., of West

Virginia, and William Ira Althen, of Virginia, both to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, Catherine Elizabeth Lhamon, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Education for Civil Rights, and any pending nominations.

SD-608

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, "Federal Real Property Asset Management Reform Act", S. 1360, to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, S. 994, to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, S. 1276, to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management, strengthen the authority to terminate or debar employees and contractors involved in misconduct affecting the integrity of security clearance background investigations, enhance transparency regarding the criteria utilized by Federal departments and agencies to determine when a security clearance is required, H.R. 1162, to amend title 31, United States Code, to make improvements in the Government Accountability Office, S. 1348, to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act, H.R. 1171, to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property, S. 643, to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government, S. 1045, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that persons having seriously delinquent tax debts shall be ineligible for Federal employment, S. 233, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the "Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building", S. 668, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building", S. 796, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the "James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building", S. 885, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, as the "Thaddeus Stevens Post Office", S. 1093, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, as the "First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building", and the nominations of John H. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be Di-

rector of the Census, Department of Commerce, and Katherine Archuleta, of Colorado, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

SD-342

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine preserving the rights of servicemembers, veterans, and their families in the financial marketplace.

SR-418

2 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Relations, and the District of Columbia

To hold hearings to examine how prepared the National Capital Region is for the next disaster.

SD-342

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine implications for economic development in Central Asia, focusing on if the government can create the necessary conditions for more trade and exchange, including infrastructure development, efficient customs regimes and reliable transportation networks.

CHOB-340

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine how tax reform can boost economic growth, focusing on lessons from Reagan.

SD-G50

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine energy drinks, focusing on exploring concerns about marketing to youth.

SR-253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on National Parks

To hold hearings to examine S. 398, to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum, S. 524, to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Pike National Historic Trail, S. 618, to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain special resource studies, S. 702, to designate the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor as "The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor", S. 781, to modify the boundary of Yosemite National Park, S. 782, to amend Public Law 101-377 to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station, S. 869, to establish the Alabama Black Belt National Heritage Area, S. 925, to improve the Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site, S. 995, to authorize the National Desert Storm Memorial Association to establish the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, S. 974, to provide for certain

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

land conveyances in the State of Nevada, S. 1044, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on D-Day, June 6, 1944, S. 1071, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make improvements to support facilities for National Historic Sites operated by the National Park Service, S. 1138, to reauthorize the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area S. 1151, to reauthorize the America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership in the State of Iowa, S. 1157, to reauthorize the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area, the Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor, and the Schuylkill River Valley National Heritage Area, S. 1168, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to limit overbroad surveillance requests and expand reporting requirements, S. 1252, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Missisquoi River and the Trout River in the State of Vermont, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 1253, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, H.R. 674, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System, H.R. 885, to expand the boundary of the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, H.R. 1033 and S. 916, bills to authorize the acquisition and protection of nationally significant battlefields and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 under the American Battlefield Protection Program, and H.R. 1158, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area,

and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

SD-366

Committee on Finance

Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure

To hold hearings to examine principles for energy tax reform.

SD-215

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 235, to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, S. 920, to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land, and S. 1352, the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-determination Reauthorization Act of 2013.

SD-628

3 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on European Affairs

To hold hearings to examine where Turkey is headed, focusing on Gezi Park, Taksim Square, and the future of the Turkish model.

SD-419

AUGUST 1

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the November 6, 2012 referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico and the Administration's response.

SD-366

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 987, to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media, S. 933, to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018, and the nominations of Patricia Ann Millett, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Gregory Howard Woods, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Elizabeth A. Wolford, to be United States

District Judge for the Western District of New York, and Debra M. Brown, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Business meeting to mark up proposed legislation making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Defense.

SD-106

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, "Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, Tyrone Woods, and Glen Doherty Embassy Security, Threat Mitigation, and Personnel Protection Act of 2013".

SD-419

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight

To hold hearings to examine Prisoner of War (POW) and Missing in Action (MIA) accounting.

SD-342

2 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Oversight, Federal Rights and Agency Action

To hold hearings to examine the human cost of regulatory paralysis.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

AUGUST 2

9:30 a.m.

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the employment situation for July 2013.

SD-G50

SEPTEMBER 11

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2014 for the Federal Communications Commission.

SD-138

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 30, 2013

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 30, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

THE NAME OF NFL'S WASHINGTON FOOTBALL FRANCHISE SHOULD BE CHANGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, it's me again. I rise today on behalf of our Native American community to speak on a subject of great concern—the use of the term “redskins” by the National Football League's Washington franchise.

Recently, our nationally recognized commentator, Mr. Rush Limbaugh, attempted to wash away years of pain, suffering, and humiliation endured by our Nation's first inhabitants by questioning their motives in seeking to rid the NFL of this most racist, disparaging, and patently offensive word.

As with most of the non-Native American general public, Mr. Limbaugh does not appear to know the violent and abusive history behind this racial epithet. I would like to take this opportunity to provide Mr. Limbaugh and the American people some much-needed clarity on the subject.

You see, Mr. Speaker, much of the outcry over the name of the NFL's

football franchise is due, in large part, to the Federal Government's protection of disparaging trademarks granted to the franchise for the Redskins. Governing Federal law established since 1946 requires that the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office deny registration for any such words.

The origin of the term “redskins,” Mr. Speaker, is commonly attributed to the historical act of not only killing Native Americans, but also cutting off certain body parts and scalping the heads of even women and children as evidence and are then paid by the colonial officials. These scalps, Mr. Speaker, were described as redskins.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, Native Americans are human beings; they are not animals. Despite this most despicable act of genocide against the Native American people, the U.S. Patent Office in 1967 granted the NFL's Washington football franchise a federally registered trademark for the same word. Mr. Speaker, this should never have happened. Native American nations have treaty and trust relations with the Federal Government as is clearly recognized by the Supreme Court of the U.S. Constitution.

Sixty-six years after the law was established, the word “redskins” continues to enjoy such protections. In fact, the NFL's Washington football franchise has six federally registered trademarks for the same word. This was not the work of the Native American community, which Mr. Limbaugh calls “a bunch of PC jerks.” It was the work of a Federal agency that ignored the law and its duty to shield our Native peoples from degrading trademark registration.

Mr. Limbaugh asks: “Why does the Federal Government have to get involved?” With due respect, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is part of the problem. After years of pleading with the NFL, with the Washington franchise owner Mr. Dan Snyder, with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board, with the D.C. District Court, and with the D.C. Court of Appeals, the Native American community is left right where they started—with a \$1.6 billion football franchise freely exploiting the shameful memory of the ethnic cleansing that was forced upon the Native American people.

Mr. Limbaugh also states: “So the Redskins may not be a popular name with some people.” Mr. Speaker, I submit this is not a popularity contest. It is not even about sports. This is a moral issue that reaches far back to

the time when Native Americans were not only considered outcasts, but deemed “enemies, rebels, and traitors” by the colonial government. The only sporting involved was the game of hunting and killing Indians like animals for money.

To Mr. Limbaugh, to Mr. Snyder, to Mr. Goodell, and all NFL club owners, I ask: Haven't American Indians suffered enough? Have they not paid the price placed on their heads, their scalps, their skins? Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is clear. Enough is enough.

NINTH UNANSWERED BENGHAZI QUESTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, there are only 3 more days until the August recess. Given that no new public hearings are scheduled on Benghazi, it's apparent that the questions I've been asking for the past two weeks—and the American people have been asking for more than 10 months—will not be answered by the 1-year anniversary of the Benghazi attack, if ever.

After a year of investigations in five different committees, we still do not know what happened and no one's been held responsible. The House and the Senate have failed. Is it any wonder that the American people are losing confidence in their government?

This is even more remarkable given that over 2 months ago, senior administration officials admitted to the media that they failed to properly respond to the attack in Benghazi; yet the Congress never pressed the matter further.

In a little-noticed article published on Friday, May 17, CBS News' Sharyl Attkisson reported that:

Obama administration officials who were in key positions on September 11, 2012, acknowledged that a range of mistakes were made the night of the attacks on the U.S. missions in Benghazi.

Attkisson continued:

The list of mea culpas by Obama administration officials involved in the Benghazi response and aftermath include standing down the counterterrorism Foreign Emergency Support Team and failing to convene the Counterterrorism Security Group, among others.

One of the key revelations from anonymous senior administration officials is the admission that it refused to deploy the Foreign Emergency Support Team, FEST. According to the article:

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

The FEST's own mission statement describes a seasoned team of counterterrorism professionals who can respond "quickly and effectively to terror attacks, providing the fastest assistance possible" including "hostage negotiating expertise" and "time-sensitive information and intelligence." In fact, FEST leader Mark Thompson says Benghazi was precisely the sort of crisis to which his team is trained to respond.

The article continued:

As soon as word of the Benghazi attack reached Washington, FEST members "instinctively started packing," said an official involved in the response. "They were told they were not deploying by Patrick Kennedy's front office. In hindsight, I probably would've pushed the button."

It's particularly notable that administration sources pin the decision not just on the State Department leadership, but also on the White House.

While it was the State Department that's said to have taken FEST off the table, the team is directed by the White House National Security Council.

Speaking of the White House role in directing the response, Attkisson reported that the National Security Council also failed to convene the interagency Counterterrorism Security Group, CSG, that evening.

The article noted:

According to a public military document, it's part of a plan to "synchronize the efforts of all the government agencies that have a role to play in the global war on terrorism." But on September 11, 2012, the Obama administration did not convene this body of terrorism expert advisers.

Given the number of agencies involved in the response, including the State Department, CIA, and Defense Department, it's hard to understand why the NSC's interagency terrorism response group wouldn't be convened.

As Attkisson noted, because the CSG wasn't assembled:

There's evidence that some high-level decision-makers were unaware of all available resources. In October, on a phone call that included then-Deputy National Security Adviser Dennis McDonough, now White House Chief of Staff, NSC spokesman Tommy Vietor initially told CBS News: "I don't know what FEST is. It sounds antiquated."

Who are the anonymous senior administration officials who admitted these mistakes to CBS? Why haven't they testified to Congress about these mistakes? Why wasn't the FEST team deployed immediately?

Last week, General Ham admitted that he believed Ambassador Stevens may have been taken hostage by terrorists. Given the FEST's team terrorism and hostage negotiation expertise, who made the decision not to deploy them? Why didn't the White House convene the CSG that night to coordinate the interagency response to the attack? And if that group wasn't responsible for coordination, who was?

Which agency was leading the response that night? Was the State Department directing the Pentagon not

to deploy its planes or response teams, while also not sending the FEST team?

Mr. Speaker, I conclude with an important quote in the CBS article from NSC spokesman Tommy Vietor:

From the moment President Obama was briefed on the Benghazi attack, the response effort was handled by the most senior national security officials in government.

The mistakes these anonymous senior officials admit to mattered. Lives were on the line, and ultimately, lives were lost. The Congress must compel these "most senior national security officials" responsible for the response team that night to testify publicly.

We need a bipartisan select committee. If we do not do it, the Congress and the House will have failed.

MEDICARE ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago today, Lyndon Johnson, in Independence, Missouri, signed into law the Medicare program in the presence of former President Harry S. Truman.

It's important when you think about that event, which I would argue transformed our country, to go back in time and remember that seniors in 1965, only half had health insurance of any sort; 30 percent of America's seniors lived in poverty; and life expectancy for America's seniors was age 70. If you fast forward today, 48 years later, we have universal health insurance coverage for all seniors, life expectancy is now age 79, and only 7 percent of seniors live below the poverty line.

The decision by Congress earlier that year—it was April of 1965 when our colleague, Congressman JOHN DINGELL, was sitting in the Speaker's Chair and brought the gavel down when the Medicare law was passed—has, again, paid off huge dividends in terms of transforming America's health care system.

Back then, Medicare only covered doctor visits and hospital visits. Today, it covers a broad range of services for seniors—dialysis, medical equipment, outpatient services, such as prescription drug coverage—and as a result, the health care sector of our country has grown. For many, it has created literally careers and opportunities to pursue a system which, again, has produced great results for the folks who live in our country over age 65 and people on disability.

Today, we have challenges that Medicare faces, but there is good news. The Trustees for Medicare recently issued their annual report, and it showed that the solvency of the Medicare trust fund this year was extended out an additional 2 years to 2026. And beyond that date, Medicare does not go bankrupt to zero. There is a shortfall, in terms of

the projections by the Trustees, of roughly about 10 percent—a serious problem, but one that we can manage using smart changes to the system. And the Trustees, in their reports, pointed to the Affordable Care Act, when it was signed into law by President Obama in 2010, as extending by 9 years the solvency of the Medicare system.

For seniors, under the Affordable Care Act, they are now getting more help with prescription drug assistance. They were stranded in the doughnut hole prior to 2010. Now they get over half of the cost of those prescription drugs while they're in the doughnut hole discounted. They are also getting free preventive care services—whether it's colonoscopies, annual checkups, smoking cessation programs. All of those essential services for primary care now carry no out-of-pocket costs because of the Affordable Care Act.

The fact is that those changes have extended the solvency of the Affordable Care Act. We have not cut benefits for seniors. We have not made unwise choices, such as the Ryan budget, which proposed raising the eligibility age for seniors to qualify for Medicare to age 67 and would butcher the program into private health insurance for people under age 55, in other words, turning the clock back to where we were 48 years ago when President Johnson signed that measure into law.

The best way to celebrate Medicare's birthday—which, again, has transformed the lives of every American family since it was enacted in 1965—is to make smart changes to the system, to build on the progress of the Affordable Care Act, to make sure that it's going to be there for our children and our grandchildren, just like the people who had the wisdom to vote for that program 48 years ago and signed it into law—again, with the vision and prophesy of Harry S. Truman, who, as a Senator representing the State of Missouri, had proposed Medicare as a law and then saw, before his time on Earth ended, it actually come to fruition.

□ 1215

Medicare is a wonderful program. It is a program which every family is touched by and has experienced and benefited from. Our best way to celebrate its birthday today is to redouble our efforts to extend its solvency and to make sure that all American families, today and in the future, are able to enjoy its wonderful benefits.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, last week, as we debated the Defense appropriations bill for the upcoming year, my

good friend, JIM MCGOVERN, a Democrat from Massachusetts, joined me in a measure that would guarantee that Congress would vote on funding the Enduring Strategic Partisanship Agreement with Afghanistan. This agreement with Afghanistan is a 10-year agreement that will start after 2014. It has been negotiated and will soon be signed by President Obama and President Karzai.

During the debate, I quoted the former Commandant of the Marine Corps with regard to this agreement. I called him and asked him what he thought about the agreement. He sent me a paragraph back. I used one sentence that I will use again today, Mr. Speaker:

Simply put, I am not in favor of this agreement signed. It basically keeps the United States in Afghanistan to prop up a corrupt regime. It continues to place our troops at risk.

The amendment failed. I want to thank the 76 Republicans who joined me in that vote, along with 100 Democrats, but it failed.

The problem is we really have no oversight in Afghanistan. It is a joke at best. The joke is, though, it is not really a joke because of the young men and women who are dying in Afghanistan, even today. The waste, fraud, and abuse in Afghanistan goes unchecked. We sent inspectors general over there. They do their best, but it is a no-win situation in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, according to a Washington Post-ABC News poll just last week, only 28 percent of the American people believe the war in Afghanistan has been worth fighting. I believe that that number would be even lower if they knew that we are going to sign a 10-year agreement with Afghanistan after 2014. If they were polled on that, I believe that the 28 percent would go down to about 8 percent.

The American people are just finding out that we have this 10-year agreement with Afghanistan where we keep spending billions of dollars per month and have a presence of at least 10,000 to 15,000 military.

During this same week last week, a poll was done of Congress, and 12 percent of the American people approve of Congress. If it gets much lower, we will be right at zero. And I'm not sure the American people will be wrong if they give us a zero, quite frankly, especially when I look at the fact that we continue to spend money in Afghanistan; we continue to cut programs right here in America for our young, our old, and our infrastructure.

The American people are frustrated and fed up because they don't think we in Congress are listening to them. When it comes back to Afghanistan and the fact that we would allow a 10-year agreement to go on with a corrupt leader in Afghanistan, it makes no sense to the American people; it makes

no sense to many of us in Congress in both parties.

Mr. Speaker, during that debate, I made the statement on the floor 10 minutes after 11 p.m. that night that probably no one on the floor—and in fairness to that statement, there were only about 10 or 12 people on the floor—that they probably did not realize, but from March 1 until July 1 we had lost 78 of our soldiers and marines in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I brought this poster down today. It is a family. It happens to be the Army. They are prepared to walk behind a caisson, probably at Arlington, to bury an American hero. The sad part about it, Mr. Speaker, is there's a wife, I'm assuming—it looks like probably the wife. She has sunglasses on and a black dress. She's holding the hand of her little girl, who appears to be 6, 7, maybe 8. The little girl is holding her mother's hand and the little girl has her finger in her mouth.

How many more families in this country have to go through a sadness and a tragedy like this family while we sit here in Congress and we never debate the war? We debate the funding that we did last week. It was a 10-minute debate—5 for my amendment and 5 against. Mr. MCGOVERN and I had 5 minutes. Yet we do not debate the policy that continues to send troops, continues to send money, and all we do is continue to let this war go on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, it's not fair to the families who have loved ones in the military. Again, I will continue to come to the floor one time a week and rail about the policy in Afghanistan. It is a failed policy. History has said no nation has ever changed Afghanistan, and we are not going to change Afghanistan no matter how much money we spend or how much blood we spend. It is not fair to our military.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I will ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I will ask God to bless the House and the Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people.

I will ask God to please bless the President, that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people today and God's people tomorrow.

And three times I will say, God, please, God, please, God, please, continue to bless America.

GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, in the world's poorest countries, nearly 1 billion people struggle with hunger every day. Chronic food insecurity limits a child's ability to grow and to learn.

Across Africa and Asia, hardworking farmers need help producing enough food to feed their families throughout the year. Many of these farmers are women. In fact, it is estimated 80 percent of the agricultural workers are women.

Earlier this year, I traveled to Tanzania and South Sudan where women farmers told me that they needed access to better seeds, tools, and training. With assistance from the United States and with our support, they can grow enough food to feed their families and have extra to sell as produce.

Last week, I introduced the Global Food Security Act, along with Representatives AARON SCHOCK and JIM MCGOVERN. This bill directs the President to develop a strategy to improve global nutrition, food security, and agricultural development. More than 35 NGOs and faith-based groups also support this bill.

This bill will improve food security for millions around the world, which is the right thing to do, but it will also make America more secure and protect our own national interest.

I urge my colleagues to support the Global Food Security Act.

HONORING WALTER DURHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Walter Thomas Durham, a man who did great things for Tennessee and for the future generations of Tennesseans.

Tennessee has one of the great histories of our United States. Tennesseans fought and tipped the balance of the Revolutionary War at the Battle of Kings Mountain. Tennessee produced three of the first 17 Presidents. Tennessee had more Civil War battles than any other State, except Virginia.

Tennessee is proud of its history, and Walter Durham is a giant in the world of Tennessee history. Like so many brave members of his generation, Mr. Durham served in the U.S. Army in World War II, seeing action in north Africa and Italy with the U.S. Army Air Corps. He went to Vanderbilt University and, after he graduated, started a building supply company in Gallatin called Durham Building Supply. He went on to launch another business, Gallatin Aluminum Products Company, which he and his partners later sold.

Then, in the early 1970s, he was encouraged by his doctor to establish a hobby that would reduce his stress. So,

at the suggestion of a friend, Mr. Durham started a book on the history of Sumner County. As Sumner County's history goes, the county has a pretty amazing one. Some of middle Tennessee's early forts and settlements were in Sumner County. Sumner County had characters such as Kasper Mansker and Thomas "Big Foot" Spencer, a man of legendary size and strength who once spent a cold winter alone, living in a hollow sycamore tree. Sumner County was a place where there were violent raids made on early forts and cabins by Creek and Chickamauga Indians. In fact, his book on Sumner County's history would be the first of 24 that he wrote on the local and State history.

He wrote books about the history of thoroughbred racing in Tennessee; Tennessee Governor William Trousdale, who fought in the War of 1812; James Winchester, another veteran of the War of 1812 and a man who cofounded the city of Memphis with Andrew Jackson; and a book about General Daniel Smith, a U.S. Senator and the surveyor who created the first map of Tennessee. He wrote a very detailed two-volume history of Nashville during the Civil War, and these two books were the ones he later said he was the most proud of. He also wrote a book called "Volunteer Forty-Niners," about people who left Tennessee to take part in the California Gold Rush. In fact, Tennesseans were some of the first people to hold public office in California.

In short, Walter Durham created an entire shelf of books that people interested in Tennessee's history should have in their libraries, and he generously gave the book rights and proceeds to various entities across the State.

In addition to writing, he was a long-time member of the Tennessee Historical Society and served as its President from 1973 to 1975. He was also the chairman of the Tennessee Historical Commission and the founding president of the Tennessee Historical Alliance, now known as the Tennessee Preservation Trust.

In 2002, Tennessee Governor Don Sundquist appointed him to the official post of the Tennessee State Historian. He was appointed by Governor Phil Bredesen in 2008 to continue to hold his title until his death.

Two years ago, he was awarded the honorary doctorate from Tusculum College to commemorate his work on behalf of Tennessee's historical significance.

Mr. Durham also took time to encourage others. Ten years ago, a young man in Tennessee decided to start an organization to help public school-teachers teach Tennessee history and civics using the Internet. His very first endorsement letter was from Walter Durham, a man who handwrote every one of his books in pencil. These hand-

written manuscripts now reside at the Vanderbilt Library Archives.

He was also a devoted Sunday school teacher at the First United Methodist Church in Gallatin.

Mr. Durham passed away on May 24, 2013. He is survived by Anna Armstrong Coile Durham, his wife of 64 years, and his four children and four grandchildren. Tennessee and the Durham family will miss this great man.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

Bless now the men and women of the people's House. Call forth leaders from their number, who understand that courage exercised in the fulfillment of their legislative responsibilities might cost them popularity now, but reap them praise in the future from our American descendants.

May they take solace in knowing that it has always been this way with great leaders.

We thank You for their hard work. Give them the consolation of knowing, in finding difficult but necessary solutions to America's challenges, they will have done their best work for all of our Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TAKANO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ALERT ACT

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, in North Carolina, small businesses are a primary driver of the economy. These businesses, like many across the country, are harmed by excessive regulation.

Over the past 4 years, our Nation's cumulative regulatory cost burden has increased by \$520 billion. What's worse is this administration has failed to disclose, as required by law, the effects of new regulations in a timely manner. The administration is required to submit a regulatory agenda twice a year, but they have consistently failed to do so.

Madam Speaker, small businesses are not given enough notice of how new regulations will affect their tough decisions, whether to cut a worker's hours or wages or adjust their business plan otherwise. That is why I introduced, Madam Speaker, the ALERT Act, H.R. 2804, the All Economic Regulations are Transparent Act, to ensure that the administration publishes its regulatory agenda in a timely manner.

Madam Speaker, the least this administration can do for small businesses is follow the law and provide notice as to what regulations are coming down the pipeline.

MEDICARE ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate an important accomplishment for our Nation, as it was 48 years ago today that President Johnson signed Medicare into law, thus cementing a promise to our Nation's seniors.

Before Medicare, nearly 30 percent of seniors lived below the poverty line and American life expectancy was 70 years old. Since then, the poverty rate has plummeted all the way down to 7.5 percent and life expectancy has risen to 78-1/2 years.

Madam Speaker, Medicare is a sacred promise that we made, and it is a sacred promise that we must keep, despite the House Republicans' addiction

to slash-and-burn policies. If the House Republicans got their way, they would replace Medicare with a voucher system, removing the certainty of what seniors will receive. These are benefits that have been earned and paid for, but turning Medicare into a voucher system will result in reduced benefits and increased health care costs.

The Democratic Party, however, believes that working families should not lose their life savings in their golden years to pay for health care, and they should not suffer without treatment due to an inability to pay for medical services. The Democratic Party believes that seniors deserve the certainty of Medicare.

Madam Speaker, on this day, the 48th anniversary of Medicare, I pledge to uphold the promises we made to seniors and to never turn my back on working families.

HONORING COLONEL GEORGE E. "BUD" DAY

(Mr. MILLER of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would like to dedicate my time to one of America's greatest warriors, Colonel George E. "Bud" Day, who passed away this past weekend.

A veteran of three wars, a POW at the infamous Hanoi Hilton, and a Medal of Honor recipient, Colonel Day set the standard for service to country. A patriot in the truest sense of the word, Colonel Day never stopped working and looking out for his brothers in arms. After the military, he spent 40 years as an advocate for his fellow veterans.

Colonel Day was a loving husband, a father, a grandfather, and someone I was honored and very humbled to represent here in Congress. Our community and countless others will miss his unwavering perseverance and optimism.

Colonel Day's legacy will endure for years to come. I ask that we keep him and the entire Day family in our prayers.

48TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon to celebrate the 48th anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid and the security they provide for seniors and persons with disabilities, half of whom live on less than \$22,000, total, a year. Half of all seniors before Medicare had no insurance at all.

Listen to my constituent, Nan Anderson from Evanston:

It was a tremendous relief to become eligible for Medicare. Basically, I am a well per-

son but have had some costly procedures, all of which have been covered. Currently, I am recovering from a spinal fusion. If it weren't for Medicare, I would never have reached this point. Without the surgery, I would likely have been reduced to a dependent person. Now I know that I will be able to walk normally and unaided for several years.

We made improvements in Medicare in ObamaCare—lower drug costs, free preventive services, fraud-cutting, and improved quality. Medicaid pays for 40 percent of all long-term care costs.

Today, I voice my support for Medicare and Medicaid and my vigorous opposition to benefit cuts that will harm those who depend on them.

PHONEY SCANDALS—"I THINK NOT"

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the President says the country is being distracted by phoney scandals. A more accurate statement would be the President is using phoney distractions to cover up the administration's scandals. Here are two of them:

Fast and Furious. The ATF, with Justice Department knowledge, smuggles 2,000 automatic weapons to Mexican drug cartels. Americans are killed. Two hundred Mexican nationals killed, including two police chiefs and even a beauty queen. No one is held accountable. Nobody goes to jail. Lower-level operatives blamed. Eric "Withholder" held in contempt for withholding evidence from Congress. The administration wants us to forget their fiasco.

Benghazi, Libya. Four Americans killed by terrorists. The United States refuses to send help during the fire-fight. Four Americans left behind. No killer is ever captured. The administration misleads the American public and blames the attack on a video, not the terrorists. No one goes to jail. No accountability. Lower-level operatives blamed. The administration wants us to forget their fiasco.

Are these distractions and phoney scandals the President is talking about? Well, tell that to the families of the murdered Americans and Mexican nationals. A Navy SEAL put it best: "Phoney scandals don't come home in body bags."

So, Mr. Speaker, the next time you visit with the President, tell him these "distractions"—these "phoney scandals"—are not going away. The American people are going to get the truth, whether the President likes it or not.

And that's just the way it is.

WOUNDED WARRIOR SERVICE DOG ACT OF 2013

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, today, I am introducing the bipartisan Wounded Warrior Service Dog Act of 2013. This important bill aims to address a demonstrated need among our veteran population. With so many veterans returning from war, bearing both physical and emotional scars, we must do all we can to provide treatment that works.

On a recent visit to the National Education for Assistance Dog Services, or NEADS, located in Princeton, Massachusetts, I heard amazing stories about how service dogs are helping to treat veterans with physical disabilities, as well as those suffering from posttraumatic stress. This nonprofit organization has connected many deserving veterans with service dogs over the past few years with incredible results.

In recent years, the demand for service dogs has grown significantly, and organizations like NEADS are having trouble meeting high levels of demand. To address this shortage, the Wounded Warrior Service Dog Act of 2013 would create a competitive grant program for nonprofits that train service dogs for use by veterans. It is my sincere hope that through this program we can better connect our veterans with service dogs in an effort to ease their transition into civilian life.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

JOBS AREN'T MADE WITH RED TAPE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that many Americans think the Federal Government is out of touch. Washington is filled with unelected regulators who have never owned a small business or created a job. These regulators are disconnected from the costs their rules impose on small businesses, which amount to roughly \$8,000 per employee each year.

Regulators fail to see that each unnecessary, duplicative, or contradictory rule they impose forces American entrepreneurs to waste time and money satisfying government instead of hiring new employees or investing in their families.

The American people are asking, "Where are the jobs?" and they are asking for a government that makes sense. No one is asking for more red-tape.

House Republicans don't just talk about jobs. We defend them, and we take action to make it easier for job creators to grow and hire. Cutting back Washington's red tape is part of that work.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus, I want to applaud President Obama's commitment to address global climate change.

As the concentration of carbon in the atmosphere climbed past 400 parts per million this past spring, which is a level not seen since before the dawn of humans when sea levels were 75 feet higher than they are today, we are facing the potential for irreversible climatic consequences that could trigger mass extinctions and endanger the future of humanity. So, it would be irresponsible for the President not to address this clear and present danger.

With the powers the President has been granted under existing laws, he has taken the responsible course, insisting upon limiting carbon emissions at existing major sources like coal-fired power plants, promoting renewable energy development on public lands, squeezing greater efficiencies out of household and commercial appliances, motor vehicles, and government facilities and operations, and working with other nations on a global strategy to address climate change.

For the sake of future generations, I do hope that the Republican majority will take a more responsible role in helping us to preserve the future of a more livable world.

OBAMACARE FRAUD INVESTIGATIONS

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, many of us were surprised on July 2 when the administration unilaterally suspended the employer mandate in the Affordable Care Act. Since there were going to be no reporting requirements under the employer mandate, how were people going to be judged as eligible for benefits under the Affordable Care Act? Well, we would simply take their word for it. "Self-attestation" became the watchword and buzzword in the administration.

Last Thursday, again, people were surprised that the Department of Health and Human Services' Inspector General's Office is going to lose 20 percent of its staff between now and 2015.

Well, wait a minute. We are going to a system of self-reporting, self-attestation, but we are cutting the staff of the office who is going to see that the funds are properly spent. Oh, by the way, all the while, we are going to be increasing the funding for the so-called navigators, people who are going to sign people up for the Affordable Care Act under their own self-attestation.

It seems like we are going in the wrong direction here. We do need to keep an eye on these funds. They could go out the door inappropriately. We owe it to the taxpayer to be more vigilant.

□ 1415

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY

(Ms. DELBENE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on the importance of college affordability.

This is very personal for me. Growing up, my parents struggled financially, but with student loans and financial aid, I was able to go to college and get a great education. I would not be standing in this Chamber today otherwise.

I am pleased that we will be voting on a bipartisan bill this week that will reverse the doubling of student loan rates that took place on July 1. The bill is a compromise, so it's not perfect. It doesn't include all of the protections that I believe our students need, like lower interest rate caps to keep costs down over the long term, but it does reduce interest rates for over 7 million undergraduates taking out loans this year, and it will save a college student with Stafford loans \$3,300 compared to today's rates.

This bill is a start, but it isn't enough. I call on my colleagues to continue working together on ways to bring down the costs of college for working families. Doing so will expand opportunity for all, spur long-term economic growth, and strengthen our middle class.

48TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise in celebration of the birthday of Medicare and Medicaid.

Forty-eight years ago today, President Johnson solidified our historic promise to all Americans. This is what he said:

No longer will older Americans be denied the healing miracle of modern medicine. No longer will illness crush and destroy the savings that they have so carefully put away over a lifetime so that they might enjoy dignity in their later years. No longer will young families see their incomes and their own hopes eaten away simply because they are carrying out their deep moral obligations to their parents and to their uncles and their aunts—and no longer will this Nation refuse the hand of justice to those who have given a lifetime of service and wisdom and labor to the progress of this progressive country.

Madam Speaker, let us honor this promise to our parents, to our neighbors, and to our children by protecting Medicare and Medicaid and making sure the care it offers is there when it's needed the most.

48TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Madam Speaker, 118 million Americans—seniors, low-income families, the disabled—all rely on Medicare and Medicaid services in one way or another. These services guarantee benefits that give our Nation's most vulnerable peace of mind and an increased quality of life.

Today, we proudly acknowledge almost five decades of Medicare and Medicaid services. While most service providers are honest and law-abiding, it has recently come to my attention that there are a few that have affected the delivery and integrity of services to the people who rely on these programs. Congress has the power to change that.

Today, on the 48th anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid being signed into law, Congress must recommit itself to the safeguarding and strengthening of America's Medicare and Medicaid service systems. The promise of Medicare and the morality of Medicaid must never be compromised no matter how hard the political battles are.

48TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEG0. Madam Speaker, today marks the 48th anniversary of the Medicare program, which has had a tremendous impact on the American public and on the quality of life of our seniors and our kids.

On July 30 of 1965, a fellow Texan, President Lyndon B. Johnson, signed Medicare into law—a program that at the time was considered incredibly controversial. At that time, about half of our Nation's seniors didn't have health coverage. Today, in Texas, more than 3 million seniors, including our parents and our grandparents, rely on this program for crucial medical care.

The law has allowed our seniors to live with the peace of mind that health coverage will be available to them in their golden years. It is now just as vital to the long-term health and security of Americans as it was in 1965. We need to continue to demonstrate our commitment to those who have built this country by strengthening Medicare for future generations. I am very

glad that we have done things like starting to close the Medicare doughnut hole so that seniors are starting to save money on their prescriptions. In the first 6 months of 2013, more than a million seniors with Medicare have received at least one free preventative service—and our seniors have earned this through a lifetime of work.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1504

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOLF) at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2610.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 312 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2610.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1505

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2610) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related

agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. MESSER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today I present H.R. 2610, a bill providing fiscal year 2014 appropriations for the Department of Transportation, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies.

The T-HUD bill conforms with the 302(b) allocation of \$44.1 billion in budget authority, and is in line with the House budget of \$967 billion. Under such an allocation, we prioritized programs and spending and were able to achieve three very important funding goals: first, meet the "ob lim" funding levels for the MAP-21, the highway authorization bill; keep the commercial airspace running smoothly; and preserve and renew the housing option for all HUD-assisted families under lease in fiscal year 2014.

Mr. Chairman, I imagine today we're going to hear a lot about the budget and the sequester, and I'll tell you, I agree. We need a deal. We need a deal that resolves the irresponsible meat-ax approach to the sequester and provides a top-line budget number that addresses concerns about taxes and spending.

But the Budget Control Act is the law, and no matter what number we'd like to write this to, the law gives us \$967 billion to fund the government. You get there either by across-the-board cuts or by prioritizing the funds available. I think we all agree that continuing across-the-board cuts is not the answer. We've seen examples why.

Earlier this year, across-the-board cuts caused air traffic controllers to be furloughed, consumer convenience to be sacrificed, and air safety to be endangered. In April, the House voted on a strongly bipartisan basis 361-41 to tap unspent FAA funds and put these air traffic controllers back to work.

Mr. Chairman, we know that across-the-board cutting is no way to run a

government. Considering there still isn't an agreement on the sequester or a top-line budget number, it's imperative that we realign the funds we have available to ensure DOT and HUD have the resources they need to care for the population and infrastructure of this Nation. This is a chance to make sure the "must-do" priorities are addressed.

I assume we're going to hear a lot about infrastructure investment, and I will tell you we fund the authorized programs at the authorized program levels.

I assume we're going to hear a lot about housing needs, and I will tell you, we retain the housing option for HUD families currently receiving assistance, protecting the most vulnerable.

We are operating under an open rule, and I hope we can keep the debate and amendment process moving along today. We will be taking points of order against amendments that would increase our allocations or authorize on an appropriations act. Let me reemphasize to people who are going to be offering amendments that we will enforce points of order.

I'd like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), the T-HUD ranking member, for his comity and willingness to discuss what would be possible under a \$44.1 billion allocation.

I'd also like to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY, plus the members of the committee, and especially the subcommittee, for their hard work and commitment to this bill.

And speaking of subcommittee members, I'd like to give a special word of congratulations to a new and valued member of the Appropriations Committee. The gentlewoman from Washington, Ms. JAMIE HERRERA BEUTLER, and her husband, Daniel, recently welcomed their first child, a beautiful baby girl, into their family. This sweet girl is a miracle and a testament to the faith and hope that her parents have carried over recent months. We offer our continued praise for their strength, the wisdom of their doctors, and the joy of this new family.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses.....	102,481	113,108	102,481	---	-10,627
Immediate Office of the Secretary.....	(2,618)	---	(2,618)	---	(+2,618)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary.....	(984)	---	(984)	---	(+984)
Office of the General Counsel.....	(19,515)	---	(19,867)	(+352)	(+19,867)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.....	(10,107)	---	(10,107)	---	(+10,107)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs.....	(10,538)	---	(11,572)	(+1,034)	(+11,572)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs.....	(2,500)	---	(2,500)	---	(+2,500)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	(25,469)	---	(23,376)	(-2,093)	(+23,376)
Office of Public Affairs.....	(2,020)	---	(2,020)	---	(+2,020)
Office of the Executive Secretariat.....	(1,595)	---	(1,595)	---	(+1,595)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization.....	(1,369)	---	(1,369)	---	(+1,369)
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response.....	(10,778)	---	(10,778)	---	(+10,778)
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	(14,988)	---	(15,695)	(+707)	(+15,695)
Research and Development.....	---	14,765	14,220	+14,220	-545
National Infrastructure Investments.....	500,000	500,000	---	-500,000	-500,000
Rescission.....	---	---	-237,000	-237,000	-237,000
Aviation Consumer Call Center (legislative proposal)...	---	7,500	---	---	-7,500
Financial Management Capital.....	4,990	10,000	4,990	---	-5,010
Cyber Security Initiatives.....	10,000	6,000	2,000	-8,000	-4,000
Office of Civil Rights.....	9,384	9,551	9,384	---	-167
Transportation Planning, Research, and Development....	9,000	9,750	6,000	-3,000	-3,750
Rescission of unobligated balances.....	---	-2,750	-2,750	-2,750	---
Subtotal.....	9,000	7,000	3,250	-5,750	-3,750
Working Capital Fund.....	(172,000)	---	(172,000)	---	(+172,000)
Minority Business Resource Center Program.....	922	925	922	---	-3
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(18,367)	(18,367)	(18,367)	---	---
Minority Business Outreach.....	3,068	3,088	3,068	---	-20
Payments to Air Carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	143,000	146,000	100,000	-43,000	-46,000
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	782,845	817,937	3,315	-779,530	-814,622
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations.....	9,653,395	9,707,000	9,521,784	-131,611	-185,216
Air traffic organization.....	(7,442,738)	(7,311,790)	(7,182,664)	(-260,074)	(-129,126)
Aviation safety.....	(1,252,991)	(1,204,777)	(1,199,777)	(-53,214)	(-5,000)
Commercial space transportation.....	(16,271)	(16,011)	(14,160)	(-2,111)	(-1,851)
Finance and management.....	(582,117)	(807,646)	(777,198)	(+195,081)	(-30,448)
Human resources programs.....	(98,858)	---	---	(-98,858)	---
Staff offices.....	(200,286)	(306,994)	(291,348)	(+91,062)	(-15,646)
NextGen.....	(60,134)	(59,782)	(56,637)	(-3,497)	(-3,145)
Facilities and Equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,730,731	2,777,798	2,155,000	-575,731	-622,798
Research, Engineering, and Development (Airport & Airway Trust Fund).....	167,556	166,000	145,000	-22,556	-21,000
Rescission of unobligated balances.....	---	---	-26,184	-26,184	-26,184
Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(3,435,000)	(3,200,000)	(3,200,000)	(-235,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(3,350,000)	(2,900,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+450,000)
Administration.....	(101,000)	(106,600)	(106,600)	(+5,600)	---
Airport cooperative research program.....	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	---	---
Airport technology research.....	(29,250)	(29,500)	(29,500)	(+250)	---
Small community air service development program...	(6,000)	---	---	(-6,000)	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)
(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rescission of contract authority.....	---	-450,000	---	---	+450,000
Total, Federal Aviation Administration.....	12,551,682	12,200,798	11,795,600	-756,082	-405,198
Limitations on obligations.....	(3,350,000)	(2,900,000)	(3,350,000)	---	(+450,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(15,901,682)	(15,100,798)	(15,145,600)	(-756,082)	(+44,802)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on Administrative Expenses.....	(412,000)	(429,855)	(417,000)	(+5,000)	(-12,855)
Federal-Aid Highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(39,699,000)	(40,995,000)	(40,995,000)	(+1,296,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(39,699,000)	(40,256,000)	(40,256,000)	(+557,000)	---
(Exempt contract authority).....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Total, Federal Highway Administration.....	---	---	---	---	---
Limitations on obligations.....	(39,699,000)	(40,256,000)	(40,256,000)	(+557,000)	---
Exempt contract authority.....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Total budgetary resources.....	(40,438,000)	(40,995,000)	(40,995,000)	(+557,000)	---
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs (Highway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)..	(251,000)	(259,000)	(259,000)	(+8,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(251,000)	(259,000)	(259,000)	(+8,000)	---
Motor Carrier Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(310,000)	(313,000)	(313,000)	(+3,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(310,000)	(313,000)	(313,000)	(+3,000)	---
Rescission of contract authority.....	---	---	-95,957	-95,957	-95,957
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.....	---	---	-95,957	-95,957	-95,957
Limitations on obligations.....	(561,000)	(572,000)	(572,000)	(+11,000)	---
Total budgetary resources.....	(561,000)	(572,000)	(476,043)	(-84,957)	(-95,957)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and Research (general fund).....	140,146	148,343	117,000	-23,146	-31,343
Operations and Research (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(115,500)	(118,500)	(139,175)	(+23,675)	(+20,675)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(115,500)	(118,500)	(139,175)	(+23,675)	(+20,675)
Subtotal, Operations and Research.....	255,646	266,843	256,175	+529	-10,668
Highway Traffic Safety Grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(554,500)	(561,500)	(561,500)	(+7,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(554,500)	(561,500)	(561,500)	(+7,000)	---
Highway safety programs (23 USC 402).....	(235,000)	(235,000)	(235,000)	---	---
National priority safety programs (23 USC 405)..	(265,000)	(272,000)	(272,000)	(+7,000)	---
High visibility enforcement.....	(29,000)	(29,000)	(29,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	(25,500)	(25,500)	(25,500)	---	---
Rescission of contract authority	---	---	-152,281	-152,281	-152,281
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.....	140,146	148,343	-35,281	-175,427	-183,624
Limitations on obligations.....	(670,000)	(680,000)	(700,675)	(+30,675)	(+20,675)
Total budgetary resources.....	(810,146)	(828,343)	(665,394)	(-144,752)	(-162,949)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and Operations.....	178,596	184,500	184,500	+5,904	---
Railroad Research and Development.....	35,000	35,250	35,250	+250	---
Research Development and Technology.....	---	54,750	---	---	-54,750
Rail Service Improvement Program.....	---	3,660,000	---	---	-3,660,000
Northeast Corridor Improvement Program (rescission)...	---	---	-4,419	-4,419	-4,419
Next Generation High-Speed Rail (rescission).....	---	---	-1,973	-1,973	-1,973
National Railroad Passenger Corporation:					
Operating Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	466,000	---	350,000	-116,000	+350,000
Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	952,000	---	600,000	-352,000	+600,000
Current Rail Passenger Service.....	---	2,700,000	---	---	-2,700,000
Subtotal.....	1,418,000	2,700,000	950,000	-468,000	-1,750,000
Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	1,631,596	6,634,500	1,163,358	-468,238	-5,471,142
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative Expenses.....	102,713	109,888	102,713	---	-7,175
Formula and Bus Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization).... (Limitation on obligations).....	(9,400,000) (8,478,000)	---	---	(-9,400,000) (-8,478,000)	---
Public Transportation Emergency Relief Program.....	---	25,000	---	---	-25,000
Transit Formula Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization).... (Limitation on obligations).....	---	(9,500,000) (8,595,000)	(9,500,000) (8,595,000)	(+9,500,000) (+8,595,000)	---
Research and University Research Centers.....	44,000	---	---	-44,000	---
Research, Development, Demonstration, and Deployment Program.....	---	30,000	20,000	+20,000	-10,000
Transit Cooperative Research.....	---	7,000	4,000	+4,000	-3,000
Technical Assistance and Standards Development.....	---	7,000	4,000	+4,000	-3,000
Human Resources and Training.....	---	5,000	2,000	+2,000	-3,000
Capital Investment Grants.....	1,955,000	1,981,472	1,815,655	-139,345	-165,817
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Capital and Preventive Maintenance.....	150,000	150,000	125,000	-25,000	-25,000
Rescission (H. Sec. 163)(S. Sec. 167).....	---	---	-81,338	-81,338	-81,338
Rescission of contract authority (H. Sec. 163).....	---	---	-70,000	-70,000	-70,000
Total, Federal Transit Administration.....	2,251,713	2,315,360	1,922,030	-329,683	-393,330
Limitations on obligations.....	(8,478,000)	(8,595,000)	(8,595,000)	(+117,000)	---
Total budgetary resources.....	(10,729,713)	(10,910,360)	(10,517,030)	(-212,683)	(-393,330)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and Maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund).....	32,259	32,855	30,582	-1,677	-2,273
Maritime Administration					
Maritime Security Program.....	174,000	208,000	174,000	---	-34,000
Operations and Training.....	156,258	152,168	143,768	-12,490	-8,400
Ship Disposal.....	5,500	2,000	4,000	-1,500	+2,000
Assistance to Small Shipyards.....	9,980	---	---	-9,980	---
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account: Administrative expenses.....	3,740	2,655	2,655	-1,085	---
Total, Maritime Administration.....	349,478	364,823	324,423	-25,055	-40,400

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)
(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration					
Operational Expenses:					
General Fund.....	20,721	21,015	20,528	-193	-487
Pipeline Safety Fund.....	639	639	639	---	---
Pipeline Safety information grants to communities.....	(1,000)	(1,500)	(1,000)	---	(-500)
Subtotal.....	21,360	21,654	21,167	-193	-487
Hazardous Materials Safety:					
General Fund.....	42,338	45,801	42,762	+424	-3,039
Special Permit and Approval Fees.....	---	-6,000	---	---	+6,000
Subtotal.....	42,338	39,801	42,762	+424	+2,961
Pipeline Safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund.....	90,679	133,000	90,679	---	-42,321
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.....	18,573	18,573	18,573	---	---
Pipeline Safety Design Review Fund.....	---	2,000	2,000	+2,000	---
Subtotal.....	109,252	153,573	111,252	+2,000	-42,321
Subtotal, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.....	172,950	215,028	175,181	+2,231	-39,847
Pipeline safety user fees.....	-91,318	-133,639	-91,318	---	+42,321
Pipeline Safety Design Review fee.....	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	---
Emergency Preparedness Grants:					
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund.....	(28,318)	(28,318)	(28,318)	---	---
(Emergency preparedness fund).....	(188)	(188)	(188)	---	---
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.....	81,632	79,389	81,863	+231	+2,474
Research and Innovative Technology Administration					
Research and Development.....	15,981	---	---	-15,981	---
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and Expenses.....	79,624	85,605	79,624	---	-5,981
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and Expenses.....	29,310	30,775	29,310	---	-1,465
Offsetting collections.....	-1,250	-1,250	-1,250	---	---
Total, Surface Transportation Board.....	28,060	29,525	28,060	---	-1,465
General Provisions, this Title					
Section 193:					
(a) Deployment of MagLev Projects (rescission)....	---	---	-80,000	-80,000	-80,000
(b) Rail crossing safety and planning programs....	---	---	80,000	+80,000	+80,000
Total, title I, Department of Transportation..					
Appropriations.....	17,945,016	22,709,135	15,297,617	-2,647,399	-7,411,518
Rescissions.....	(17,946,266)	(23,169,135)	(16,050,769)	(-1,895,497)	(-7,118,366)
Rescissions of contract authority.....	---	(-2,750)	(-433,664)	(-433,664)	(-430,914)
Offsetting collections.....	(-1,250)	(-450,000)	(-318,238)	(-318,238)	(+131,762)
Limitations on obligations.....	(52,758,000)	(-7,250)	(-1,250)	---	(+6,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(70,703,016)	(53,003,000)	(53,473,675)	(+715,675)	(+470,675)
	(70,703,016)	(75,712,135)	(68,771,292)	(-1,931,724)	(-6,940,843)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Management and Administration					
Executive Offices.....	---	14,540	12,000	+12,000	-2,540
Administration, Operations and Management.....	537,789	---	---	-537,789	---
Administration Support Offices.....	---	505,313	479,000	+479,000	-26,313
Program Office Salaries and Expenses:					
Public and Indian Housing.....	200,000	220,299	197,000	-3,000	-23,299
Community Planning and Development.....	100,000	109,740	99,000	-1,000	-10,740
Housing.....	391,500	383,375	377,000	-14,500	-6,375
Policy Development and Research.....	22,211	21,687	21,000	-1,211	-687
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.....	72,600	76,504	71,000	-1,600	-5,504
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control....	7,400	7,642	7,000	-400	-642
Subtotal.....	793,711	819,247	772,000	-21,711	-47,247
Total, Management and Administration.....	1,331,500	1,339,100	1,263,000	-68,500	-76,100
Public and Indian Housing					
Tenant-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals.....	17,242,351	17,968,278	17,000,000	-242,351	-968,278
Tenant protection vouchers.....	75,000	150,000	75,000	---	-75,000
Administrative fees.....	1,375,000	1,685,374	1,350,000	-25,000	-335,374
Family self-sufficiency coordinators.....	60,000	---	---	-60,000	---
Veterans affairs supportive housing.....	75,000	75,000	75,000	---	---
Sec. 811 mainstream voucher renewals.....	112,018	110,564	110,564	-1,454	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-15,000)	---	---	(+15,000)
Subtotal (available this fiscal year).....	18,939,369	19,989,216	18,610,564	-328,805	-1,378,652
Advance appropriations.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances.....	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	---	---
Total, Tenant-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill.....	18,939,369	19,989,216	18,610,564	-328,805	-1,378,652
Rental Assistance Demonstration.....	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Public Housing Capital Fund.....	1,875,000	2,000,000	1,500,000	-375,000	-500,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-10,000)	---	---	(+10,000)
Public Housing Operating Fund.....	4,262,010	4,600,000	4,262,010	---	-337,990
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-8,000)	---	---	(+8,000)
Choice neighborhoods.....	120,000	400,000	---	-120,000	-400,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-2,000)	---	---	(+2,000)
Rescission.....	---	---	-120,000	-120,000	-120,000
Family Self-Sufficiency.....	---	75,000	60,000	+60,000	-15,000
Native American Housing Block Grants.....	650,000	650,000	600,000	-50,000	-50,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-3,000)	---	---	(+3,000)
Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant.....	13,000	13,000	---	-13,000	-13,000
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account....	12,200	6,000	6,000	-6,200	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(976,000)	(1,818,000)	(1,818,000)	(+842,000)	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Native Hawaiian Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account...	386	---	---	-386	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(41,504)	---	---	(-41,504)	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing.....	25,871,965	27,743,216	24,918,574	-953,391	-2,824,642
Community Planning and Development					
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS.....	332,000	332,000	303,000	-29,000	-29,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-2,000)	---	---	(+2,000)
Community Development Fund:					
CDBG formula.....	2,948,090	2,798,100	1,636,813	-1,311,277	-1,161,287
Indian CDBG.....	60,000	70,000	60,000	---	-10,000
Integrated planning and investment grants.....	---	75,000	---	---	-75,000
Neighborhood stabilization program.....	---	200,000	---	---	-200,000
Disaster relief.....	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---
Subtotal.....	3,308,090	3,143,100	1,696,813	-1,611,277	-1,446,287
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-15,000)	---	---	(+15,000)
Community Development Loan Guarantees (Section 108):					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(240,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(+260,000)	---
Credit subsidy.....	5,952	---	---	-5,952	---
Rescission.....	---	---	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000
HOME Investment Partnerships Program.....	1,000,000	950,000	700,000	-300,000	-250,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-5,000)	---	---	(+5,000)
Self-help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program.....	53,500	---	30,000	-23,500	+30,000
Capacity Building.....	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Homeless Assistance Grants.....	2,033,000	2,381,000	2,088,000	+55,000	-293,000
Total, Community Planning and Development.....	6,732,542	6,826,100	4,814,813	-1,917,729	-2,011,287
Housing Programs					
Project-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals.....	9,050,672	10,007,000	9,050,672	---	-956,328
Contract administrators.....	289,000	265,000	---	-289,000	-265,000
Subtotal (available this fiscal year).....	9,339,672	10,272,000	9,050,672	-289,000	-1,221,328
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-15,000)	---	---	(+15,000)
Advance appropriations.....	400,000	400,000	400,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances.....	-400,000	-400,000	-400,000	---	---
Total, Project-based Rental Assistance appropriated in this bill.....	9,339,672	10,272,000	9,050,672	-289,000	-1,221,328
Housing for the Elderly.....	374,627	400,000	374,627	---	-25,373
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-2,000)	---	---	(+2,000)
Housing for Persons with Disabilities.....	165,000	126,000	126,000	-39,000	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Housing Counseling Assistance.....	45,000	55,000	35,000	-10,000	-20,000
Rental Housing Assistance.....	1,300	21,000	21,000	+19,700	---
Rent Supplement (rescission).....	---	-3,500	-3,500	-3,500	---
Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund.....	6,500	7,530	6,530	+30	-1,000
Offsetting collections.....	-4,000	-6,530	-6,530	-2,530	---
Total, Housing Programs.....	9,928,099	10,871,500	9,603,799	-324,300	-1,267,701
Federal Housing Administration					
Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	---	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)

(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(50,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(-30,000)	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-9,676,000	-10,841,000	-10,841,000	-1,165,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM).....	-170,000	-57,000	-57,000	+113,000	---
Administrative contract expenses.....	207,000	127,000	127,000	-80,000	---
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
General and Special Risk Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(25,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-588,000	-926,000	-926,000	-338,000	---
Total, Federal Housing Administration.....	-10,227,000	-11,697,000	-11,697,000	-1,470,000	---
Government National Mortgage Association					
Guarantees of Mortgage-backed Securities Loan					
Guarantee Program Account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	19,500	21,200	19,000	-500	-2,200
Offsetting receipts.....	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-647,000	-707,000	-707,000	-60,000	---
Proposed offsetting receipts (HECM) (Sec. 210)....	-23,000	-12,000	-12,000	+11,000	---
Additional contract expenses.....	---	1,000	1,000	+1,000	---
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association....	-750,500	-796,800	-799,000	-48,500	-2,200
Policy Development and Research					
Research and Technology.....	46,000	50,000	21,000	-25,000	-29,000
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair Housing Activities.....	70,847	71,000	55,847	-15,000	-15,153
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control					
Lead Hazard Reduction.....	120,000	120,000	50,000	-70,000	-70,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out).....	---	(-1,000)	---	---	(+1,000)
Management and Administration					
Information Technology Portfolio.....	---	285,100	100,000	+100,000	-185,100
Working Capital Fund.....	199,035	---	---	-199,035	---
Office of Inspector General.....	124,000	127,672	124,000	---	-3,672
Transformation Initiative.....	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
(By transfer).....	---	(80,000)	---	---	(-80,000)
Total, Management and Administration.....	373,035	412,772	224,000	-149,035	-188,772
(Grand total, Management and Administration)...	(1,704,535)	(1,751,872)	(1,487,000)	(-217,535)	(-264,872)
=====					
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	33,496,488	34,939,888	28,455,033	-5,041,455	-6,484,855
Appropriations.....	(40,304,488)	(43,192,918)	(36,831,063)	(-3,473,425)	(-6,361,855)
Rescissions.....	---	(-3,500)	(-126,500)	(-126,500)	(-123,000)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-11,204,000)	(-12,643,000)	(-12,643,000)	(-1,439,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-4,000)	(-6,530)	(-6,530)	(-2,530)	---
(by transfer).....	---	80,000	---	---	-80,000
(transfer out).....	---	-80,000	---	---	+80,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(70,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(-30,000)	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(926,257,504)	(932,318,000)	(932,318,000)	(+6,060,496)	---
=====					

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)
(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

TITLE III - OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Access Board.....	7,400	7,448	7,400	---	-48
Federal Housing Finance Agency, Office of Inspector General (legislative proposal).....	---	48,000	38,000	+38,000	-10,000
Offsetting collections (legislative proposal)....	---	-48,000	-38,000	-38,000	+10,000
Federal Maritime Commission.....	24,100	25,000	24,200	+100	-800
National Passenger Rail Corporation Inspector General.	20,500	25,300	25,300	+4,800	---
National Transportation Safety Board.....	102,400	103,027	102,400	---	-627
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.....	215,300	204,100	185,100	-30,200	-19,000
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness....	3,300	3,595	3,000	-300	-595
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, title III, Other Independent Agencies....	373,000	368,470	347,400	-25,600	-21,070
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-2)					
Department of Transportation					
Federal Aviation Administration					
Facilities and Equipment (emergency).....	29,600	---	---	-29,600	---
Federal Highway Administration					
Emergency Relief Program (emergency).....	2,022,000	---	---	-2,022,000	---
Federal Railroad Administration					
Operating Subsidy Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (emergency).....	32,000	---	---	-32,000	---
Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (emergency).....	86,000	---	---	-86,000	---
Federal Transit Administration					
Public Transportation Emergency Relief Program (emerg)	10,900,000	---	---	-10,900,000	---
Total, Department of Transportation.....	13,069,600	---	---	-13,069,600	---
Department of Housing and Urban Development					
Community Planning and Development					
Community Development Fund (emergency).....	16,000,000	---	---	-16,000,000	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, Other Appropriations.....	29,069,600	---	---	-29,069,600	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014 (H.R. 2610)
(Amounts in thousands)

*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Grand total.....	80,884,104	58,017,493	44,100,050	-36,784,054	-13,917,443
Appropriations.....	(58,623,754)	(66,778,523)	(53,267,232)	(-5,356,522)	(-13,511,291)
Rescissions.....	---	(-6,250)	(-560,164)	(-560,164)	(-553,914)
Rescissions of contract authority.....	---	(-450,000)	(-318,238)	(-318,238)	(+131,762)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(29,069,600)	---	---	(-29,069,600)	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-11,204,000)	(-12,643,000)	(-12,643,000)	(-1,439,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-5,250)	(-61,780)	(-45,780)	(-40,530)	(+16,000)
(by transfer).....	---	80,000	---	---	-80,000
(transfer out).....	---	-80,000	---	---	+80,000
(Limitation on obligations).....	(52,758,000)	(53,003,000)	(53,473,675)	(+715,675)	(+470,675)
Total budgetary resources.....	(133,642,104)	(111,020,493)	(97,573,725)	(-36,068,379)	(-13,446,768)

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The devastating impacts of the Ryan budget are on full display in the fiscal year 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies bill.

My good friend, Chairman TOM LATHAM, was given an impossible allocation of \$44.1 billion. This is \$4.4 billion below the fiscal year 2013 sequestration level and \$10 billion below the level included in the Senate bill. As a result, the FY 2014 bill makes deep cuts to a number of critical transportation and housing programs.

Within the Department of Transportation, the bill cuts the programs and activities of the Federal Aviation Administration by \$756 million below the FY 2013 CR level. While the bill provides enough funds to avoid additional furloughs, it is unclear whether FAA will be able to completely lift the hiring freeze that has been in place during this fiscal year.

The FAA's NextGen program will also be impacted by delaying the important developmental work on many of the program's emerging technologies.

Amtrak's capital program is cut by more than \$350 million, which will jeopardize long distance service and some short haul routes. At these funding levels, Amtrak will have to suspend mechanical overhauls on equipment, which will result in slow orders and furloughs of hundreds of mechanical employees and engineers.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development sustained even deeper cuts. The bill reduces funding for the CDBG, the Community Development Block Grant, program to \$1.6 billion, which is the lowest level since the program was created in 1975. The HOME program is funded at \$700 million, which is the lowest level since the program began in 1992.

The bill funds the Public Housing Capital Fund at its lowest level since 1987, adding more than \$1 billion in deferred capital maintenance to an existing \$26 billion maintenance backlog.

In closing, I do want to commend the chairman, TOM LATHAM, for funding the critical safety missions of the Department of Transportation and for honoring the obligation limitations in the surface and aviation bills. The chairman has also included sufficient funding to move 10,000 more homeless veterans off the street and into housing.

Despite the chairman's efforts, I have great concerns with the bill as it is currently written. I remain hopeful that we can achieve a more realistic allocation as the appropriations process moves forward this year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a great member of the committee.

Mr. COLE. Thank you for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fiscal Year 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act. I want to commend my good friend, Chairman LATHAM, for making some tough choices, but making those choices in a manner that was fair, transparent, and rational. I also want to thank my good friend, Mr. PASTOR, the ranking member on the other side of the aisle. He's always a pleasure to work with. He's always a delightful Member and he always contributes. I know while this bill may not be everything that he would like, he certainly added a great deal in the course of our deliberations.

The reality is that because of sequestration, the allocation this subcommittee was given is meager. The bill provides \$44.1 billion in discretionary spending—a reduction of many billions below the fiscal year 2013 enacted level. But let's be clear: that reduction is due to the Budget Control Act and the mechanism of sequestration, not the Ryan budget, which simply recognizes the realities that have been agreed upon and passed into law. It's worth noting that our friend, the President of the United States, recommended the sequester, which we're trying to enact in this budget.

At the same time, even with these cuts, the bill has maintained funding for the FAA Contract Tower Program, a program which is vitally important to maintaining safe national airspace.

The bill also provides funding to continue assistance to all families anticipated to hold section 8 and public housing vouchers at the beginning of fiscal year 2014. I know that was a tough mark to make, Mr. Chairman, and one that I appreciate that you did make because you put people first.

Additionally, this bill fully funds the President's request for veterans housing vouchers at \$75 million, a point that my friend, Mr. PASTOR, made.

Mr. Chairman, I know Mr. LATHAM and every member of this committee would like to spend more money on infrastructure; but because of our \$17 trillion crushing debt and because of unrestrained growth and entitlement spending, this is where we are and this is where we will be until we confront out-of-control entitlement spending.

Many of my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to reject this hard reality. Some believe we will never have to balance our budget. Some believe that trillions of dollars in additional tax increases are the solution. And some think that we don't need to make any changes in our entitlement programs. That approach, in my view, simply won't work.

The deficit we have is far too high, but it is less than half of what it was

when Republicans retook the House in 2010. That's progress. But more progress will need to be made until America actually balances its books. And that, I believe, will set the stage for faster, more robust economic growth.

I pledge to work with my friends on both sides of the aisle to find a compromise that will allow us to make vitally important investments while still lowering the deficit, but that compromise must involve entitlement reform. Until then, we frequently will continue to see important programs, such as the ones in this bill, starved for investments that they need.

So we need to get on to that bigger deal that my friend, Mr. LATHAM, talked about. I think the product of that deal will be much more robust appropriations for this particular subcommittee.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I want to commend both the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work on this bill. But no amount of hard work could redeem this bill, and I am rising in strong opposition. We call it the THUD bill. Well, the bill makes about the same sound as it spells—thud.

The majority's bill says of our transportation and infrastructure commitments, We don't care if the wheels fall off. It says of our housing and development commitments, We don't care if the roof caves in. Thud.

While I appreciate the hard work of the members of this subcommittee and of the dedicated staff on both sides of the aisle, the funding levels included in this bill are just unacceptable. They're impossible. The 302(b) allocation received by this subcommittee is 15 percent lower than it was last year. And that was already low. It's 19 percent below the Budget Control Act. It's nearly \$10 billion below the level that the Senate is considering in the same bill.

This funding level reflects the reckless discretionary spending caps adopted by the House majority in the Ryan budget resolution, which not only locked in sequestration; it doubled down on sequestration in order to shelter defense and homeland security bills from some of the cuts. This made allocations for our domestic investments even worse—far, far beyond the usual zone of political disagreement. The Transportation and Housing bill we're considering today is a prime example of this impossible tradeoff.

On the transportation side, the bill makes deep cuts to the capital programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, Amtrak, and the Federal

Transit Administration's New Starts program. It zeroes out funding for the TIGER program, which has been enormously successful at advancing critical surface transportation projects in communities across the country, and yet has had to leave thousands of meritorious proposals unfunded. Once again, the bill includes no funding for the development of high speed rail.

Funding for our housing needs is even worse. The bill reduces funding for the Community Development Block Grant program, a program that over the years has been known for its bipartisan support, to \$1.6 billion. That's the lowest level since this program was created in 1975. The HOME program is funded at \$700 million, the lowest level since that program began in 1992. And the bill rescinds funding for the Choice Neighborhoods program, the successor program of Hope VI. That means the bill lacks funding for any comprehensive revitalization program whatsoever.

During the Appropriations Committee markup of this bill, Democrats offered a series of amendments to restore these damaging cuts and produce a bill that more adequately meets our Nation's critical housing and infrastructure needs. All of those amendments were rejected on party-line votes.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the most tragic and disappointing fact about this bill is that the cuts it imposes could be avoided if the Republican leadership would only appoint budget conferees to go negotiate, with their Senate counterparts, a long-term deficit reduction deal that would lift sequestration and preserve vital investments in our future.

Alternatively, Republican leaders could reconsider their refusal to talk with the President. That offer from December still stands. They should work with him to address the real drivers of the deficit—tax expenditures and entitlements—thus, lifting sequestration, along with the drag it represents on our economy and the mockery it makes of the appropriations process.

The bill before us is exhibit A of this travesty. I urge my colleagues to raise their voices and their votes against it.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished friend from Chicago (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I became a member of the Appropriations Committee this Congress to make the tough funding choices that determine our national priorities, but this year's budget allocations have taken those choices away from us.

This bill is being touted as a budgetary tradeoff, but there are no tradeoffs in this bill. There are only cuts. Investments in our infrastructure are

needed more than ever. Yet this bill makes some of the most significant cuts to vital transportation programs in decades.

We all remember the Recovery Act. An interesting fact about the Recovery Act is about 6 or 7 percent of that bill dealt with infrastructure, but that 6 or 7 percent of that bill created about two-thirds of the jobs that the act created.

Unfortunately, in this bill there's no funding for TIGER grants, which fund infrastructure projects like the Elgin-O'Hare Western Access Project in my district, and no funding for Core Capacity Grants to fund desperately needed improvements to transit systems like the Chicago Transit Authority. Instead of increasing safety and capacity in air travel, we're slashing funding to the FAA's air traffic control modernization program. Instead of expanding rail service, we're cutting Amtrak's capital program by 37 percent.

The housing numbers are even worse. This bill cuts funding to housing programs that not only work but have a proven track record of saving the taxpayer money. There's no funding for the Choice Neighborhoods program, which helps communities revitalize distressed neighborhoods. There are significant cuts to the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, which is used to house some of the most vulnerable among us, and also another program which saves money. Community Development Block Grants, used by communities across the country, have been cut in half and are at their lowest levels since the Ford administration.

We're cutting investments in our future and essential services to those in need to pay for bloated defense spending the Pentagon often itself says it doesn't need. In the final analysis, countries that succeed invest in research, education, and infrastructure. Mr. Chairman, we're cutting all three.

I joined this committee to make the smart funding choices that will propel our Nation forward, but this bill does just the opposite. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. LATHAM. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I, first of all, want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking member, and all of the members of the subcommittee for their very good work. Given the allocation they have, they have done their very best.

I would follow up on a number of remarks by my colleagues, including the chairman, and that is we need a deal. And my plea to the membership is we cannot continue to go on like this.

This process no longer is on time. Our year starts October 1. In 2007, we finished in February. In 2008, we finished in December. In 2009, we finished in March. In 2010, we finished in December. In fiscal year 2011, we finished in April. In 2012, we finished in December. This year, we finished on March 26.

Since 2007, we should have enacted 84 individual appropriation bills. We have enacted nine individually—about 10 percent of our work. Unfortunately, the body has made the work of this subcommittee, the full committee, and the other 11 subcommittees very difficult.

For fiscal year 2013, our committee was given a target in the summer of 2011, under the Budget Control Act. The target was changed under a resolution passed by the House for the budget in the spring of 2012. The target was changed again on January 1, 2013. Subsequently, we have sequestration. My plea to the general membership is, please, just give this exceptional committee one target and let us do our work.

I also am fearful because we are operating most agencies, including the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, under a continuing resolution that, for the vast majority of my colleagues, makes no difference. You wouldn't run your house or your business exactly the way you did last year.

□ 1530

We made these agencies wait 7 months to tell them they can keep doing the same thing for another 5 months, and on October 1 of this year we're going to do it again.

Some people say we're spending too much money. I agree, which is why I have actually brought a chart to the floor. We balanced a budget under President Nixon in 1969 for 1 year. We balanced a budget for 4 years under President Clinton. During those years, Federal spending was about 18.9 percent of GDP. For fiscal years 2011, 2012 and 2013, it was about 22.7. The response of this body is: we will do the Budget Control Act, and we will have mindless sequestration and treat all discretionary accounts the same.

Some people say we don't have enough revenue. They're absolutely right. When President Nixon and President Clinton balanced a budget for those 5 years, revenue was 20.1 percent of GDP. Today, it is 16.2.

We had a bill passed on January 1 that effectively now has limited us as far as any future revenue. I would point out 204 Members of this body voted for that bill in a bipartisan fashion, and 219 Members of this body today, in a bipartisan fashion, voted for the Budget Control Act, even though most of them complain about sequestration.

Today, we have the allocations this great subcommittee is faced with, and

we are pounding our discretionary accounts. The fact is, in 1963 over 67 percent of what we spent as a national government was an investment in the future, in our children's future. In fiscal year 2012, that was down to 26 percent.

For those who want to continue this madness of going after discretionary spending, and particularly domestic discretionary spending—Department of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development—I would point out that year, if we had eliminated the Government of the United States, eliminated the Congress and the Presidency and every agency except the Department of Defense and the entitlement programs, and did nothing on taxes, our deficit last year was \$472 billion. It is estimated this year, if we got rid of the Department of Transportation—which I think some people are trying to do with this allocation—if we got rid of HUD, if we got rid of the government, except for defense, except for entitlements, and did nothing on taxes, this year's deficit would be \$153 billion.

The American Society of Civil Engineers this year gave our country—the United States of America, the greatest country on Earth—a D-plus for our infrastructure. I have a bridge that was blown up in my district next to ArcelorMittal and BP. That's not helping create jobs.

They claim we are about \$1.6 trillion short between now and 2020 investing in infrastructure. That's what this bill is about, investing in the future.

We do need a deal; and the chairman mentioned it, the ranking member mentioned it. We do have to talk about entitlements for the sake of our children. What about our children when Social Security is insolvent in 2033? What about our children when Medicare is insolvent in 2024? We need to address those issues; and we need to address the issue of revenue to make sure we have enough to invest in those highways, in those classrooms, in those research institutes so that we can have a full and vibrant economy going forward.

For those who want to balance the budget and are about this madness of sequestration and crushing domestic discretionary spending, hurting defense discretionary spending, I would also point out that the Congressional Budget Office indicated in October of 2011 that for fiscal year 2012, one-third of the deficit would have gone away if we simply were at full employment.

So it is time to talk to each other. It is time to put everything on the table. It is time to invest in this country. And I would hope we do that sooner rather than later.

I appreciate very much the gentleman yielding me time.

Mr. LATHAM. I would inquire of the gentleman from Arizona if he has any more speakers.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, we're waiting for the ranking member of the full committee. She is on her way. So I will fill in the best I can.

Mr. LATHAM. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. First of all, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, who is the ranking member on the Defense Appropriations, for his excellent presentation. Also, I join him in making that request to our leadership, both the majority and the minority, that we begin the conversation. We only have a few days before September 30 rolls around. So I would hope that we take his comments seriously and get to work and continue the process of the appropriation and lift the sequestration.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the full committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, what a difference a year makes. Last year, Chairman LATHAM put forward a responsible bill that invested in our Nation's infrastructure and the housing needs of our most vulnerable citizens. The bill we consider today, which is \$7.7 billion below the FY 2013 CR level and \$13.9 billion below the President's request, is a stark contrast. For example, last year's bill funded Amtrak's capital program at the highest level ever. This year's bill funds Amtrak at the lowest level in a decade, which will likely cause furloughs of mechanical employees and slower service.

Last year, the chairman spoke out against an amendment offered by Mr. CHAFFETZ to cut the CDBG program to \$2.95 billion—still \$1.3 billion higher than the level in this bill. Member after Member on the majority side spoke out against the cut, noting how important CDBG was to economic development in cities and States across the country. In fact, 17 Republican appropriators, including Chairman ROGERS and Chairman LATHAM, helped to defeat this wrong-headed cut by a vote of 157–267.

What changed? Have these programs become ineffective? Have local infrastructure needs and homelessness disappeared? Or do House Republicans simply support raising local taxes to fund affordable housing and infrastructure investments? Because that will be the result.

Unfortunately, what has changed is that the reckless Republican Ryan budget guts investments in domestic priorities that increase American prosperity. In fact, this bill alone would mean the loss of between 125,000 and 140,000 Tenant-Based Rental Vouchers, cause 146,000 people who are now housed to become homeless, and result in 7,110 fewer jobs created, and \$1.4 billion in lost economic output due to the

\$237 million recision to the TIGER program.

Instead of investing in affordable housing to help people make the transition from dependency to independence and investing in infrastructure to fix deficient transportation systems and create jobs, Republicans would rather defund the Affordable Care Act, block-grant Medicaid, privatize Medicare, while protecting subsidies for Big Oil and tax breaks for the very wealthiest Americans.

The Senate is currently marking up bills at the level to which Democrats and Republicans agreed in the bipartisan Budget Control Act. The Senate T-HUD bill provides a more responsible path that invests in job creation and assistance to families suffering in this economy. For example, the Senate provides nearly \$10 billion more than the bill we consider today for infrastructure investments that have received strong bipartisan support and would create jobs, including \$1.45 billion to fund Amtrak, more than \$3 billion for the Community Development Block Grant program, \$550 million for the TIGER grant program, and \$1 billion for the HOME program.

If we are to avert a developing crisis and make progress on long-term fiscal challenges, Senate Democrats need a partner in the House majority to conference the budget. The American people, local governments, and small business owners want this budget standoff to end so that we can avoid shutting down the government in October and help them build a stronger economy.

When will Republicans stop holding their livelihoods hostage to the Ryan budget? House Democrats are ready to work with our Republican colleagues to responsibly address our fiscal challenges. However, if they continue to move farther away from consensus by turning once bipartisan bills like this one, T-HUD, into red meat messaging bills for their base, Congress will have a difficult time reaching a balanced agreement before the CR expires in 2 months.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, before I yield back my time, as we start this amendment process, I want to thank and commend the staff of the subcommittee. These are the individuals who worked very hard to bring this bill forward. They worked many hours and put in a lot of time and effort, so before we start the amendment process I want to recognize their hard work.

So I'd like to thank, from the minority staff, Kate Hallahan and Joe Carlile; from the majority staff, Dena Baron, Doug Disrud, Carl Barrick, Cheryle Tucker, and Brian Bernard because they spent countless hours bringing this bill to us.

Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman LATHAM for doing what he could with

this bad allocation, and I look forward to the amendment process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I intend to yield back here, but let me associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) about commending the staff. He named everyone. I just wanted to, again, associate myself with that and thank him for being such a great partner through all this. It has been difficult, but the product we have is, I think, as good as we could possibly have with our allocation this year.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, the base bill contains divisive policy riders that would pointlessly prohibit federal investment in high-speed rail in California.

Rail has a long history in CA going back to 1869. Prior to "the last spike" joining Central Pacific and Union Pacific railroads, CA was isolated from the rest of the country.

Once the transcontinental railroad was completed, CA started to develop into the urbanized, industrialized economic and political powerhouse that it is today—the 12th largest economy in the world.

What we're talking about here is jobs. Connecting LA and San Francisco will generate 66,000 jobs annually for 15 years and 2,900 permanent operations jobs for Phase 1. In the Central Valley, initial construction will produce 20,000 jobs annually for five years.

If you want to talk about Return on Investment, the initial state investment of \$2.6 billion from state bond funds will produce a net economic impact of \$8.3 to \$8.8 billion—a 3 to 1 return.

Every year, auto congestion drains \$18.7 billion in lost time and wasteful fuel from the state's economy.

Our auto congestion is not something we can build ourselves out of . . . travel on CA's interstate system is increasing at a rate 5 times faster than capacity is added.

Now is the time to invest in High Speed Rail in CA. This bill prohibits federal investment in high-speed rail in California, and fails to make other critically needed investments in our nation's failing infrastructure: a 37% cut in Amtrak capital funds which will result in deferred maintenance; and a \$139 million cut to Federal Trust Transit Administration capital investment grants that will cancel scheduled projects in California and other states.

America's sense of itself as an exceptional nation was true when we were investing in our national infrastructure, whether it was: electrification of our rural communities, building our interstate highway system, or connecting the East Coast to the West Coast by rail.

We need to dream big again and not be afraid to make those same kinds of investments in our national infrastructure, like high speed rail, and NextGen for a 21st century air traffic control system.

The American Society of Civil Engineers recently issued their report card for our nation's infrastructure and the United States got a grade of D+.

This bill should be increasing our grade from a D+ to an A+.

We just need the political will.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, to build a vibrant economy, we must invest in building our nation's infrastructure in a strategic and cost-effective way. Our businesses and communities need efficient transportation and goods movement; our aging neighborhoods need help to eliminate blight and to encourage additional private investment and business growth; and, our country needs to invest in job creation.

H.R. 2610 does not meet any of these needs. The uncompromising austerity of this bill strips our economy of its footing and imparts damage that will be felt for generations.

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) programs—critical investments in our infrastructure—will be cut in half by H.R. 2610. These grants are used to stabilize low income neighborhoods with tools that support and stimulate economic vitality. For every federal dollar spent in CDBG funds another \$3 in private and public investment is leveraged.

In Long Beach, CA last year, these grants provided services for 384 new and existing small businesses, creating many new jobs; provided comprehensive services to 18,000 Long Beach community members, promoting progress towards permanent housing and self-sufficiency—lifting people out of poverty and off government assistance; and, completed exterior repairs and upgrades at 115 business sites revitalizing Long Beach neighborhoods.

Unfortunately, H.R. 2610 eliminates TIGER (Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery Program) grants and it eliminates all funding for the Sustainable Communities Initiative—both are models of collaborative and efficient government. These two models support sustainable regional transportation systems and land use planning to promote economic health and workable communities, respectively.

America cannot afford to divest in its infrastructure. I ask for a "no" vote on H.R. 2610.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the Fiscal Year 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, THUD, appropriations bill being considered before the House. This bill fails in almost every regard to prioritize our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, expand affordable housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income Americans, and strengthen local economies through direct investment and job creation.

The House bill cuts \$7.7 billion from the enacted level for FY2013, slashing funds for vital community development programs, TIGER grants and high-speed rail projects, and even key assistance grants for our most vulnerable segment of the population: homeless individuals and families. This bill already cuts more than \$4 billion below the post-sequester amounts for FY2013, consistent with the terrible assumptions included in the Ryan Budget that the Defense Department will be spared from this shared sacrifice. Simply put, this bill will place the burden of these cuts squarely on the backs of low- and moderate-income Americans.

The FY2014 THUD appropriations bill is just another example of House Republicans' refusal to work across the aisle to develop a sensible and bipartisan budget agreement that

does not threaten our economic growth and competitiveness. Instead, my Republican colleagues have deliberately chosen to ignore the demands of the American people by developing a budget that makes drastic cuts to public programs without any deliberation on the basis of need or the public good.

Mr. Chair, the FY2014 THUD appropriations bill is simply unworkable in its current form. The drastic and indiscriminate cuts found in this bill will undermine critical investments in our Nation's infrastructure, hollow out vital housing programs, and destroy jobs.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of Amtrak passenger rail service, which carried 31.2 million riders in 2012 and provides a vital transportation alternative for commuters and travelers in our Nation's busiest corridors.

More people are taking Amtrak today than ever before, a sign that passenger rail is making a comeback. Ridership has grown substantially during the last decade, with another 3.5 percent gain last year. This year, Amtrak had the highest monthly ridership of its 43-year history with 2.9 million riders in March. Amtrak now covers 88 percent of its operating expenses with ticket sales and other revenue, with government funding needed mostly for capital projects.

I represent the southwest side of Chicago and neighboring suburbs where passenger and commuter rail boost our economy. Chicago's Union Station is Amtrak's fourth-busiest station. In Illinois, 56 Amtrak trains run each day carrying 5 million passengers. In addition, the Illinois Department of Transportation has partnered with Amtrak on three corridors between Chicago and downstate Illinois, and has teamed with Wisconsin to support service between Chicago and Milwaukee. Total ridership on these routes has increased 85 percent since the State doubled its investment in Amtrak service in 2006.

In the bustling Northeast Corridor from Washington, DC up to Boston, Amtrak carried a record 11.4 million passengers in fiscal year 2012. That helps keep vehicles off our congested highways and relieves some of the pressure at our busy airports.

Investment in passenger rail also benefits our economy. In 2012, Amtrak spent more than \$1.3 billion on domestically-manufactured goods and services in 48 states and the District of Columbia. The vast majority of Amtrak's spending is right here in the U.S.; less than one percent of Amtrak's procurement money is spent to purchase products from foreign countries. In Illinois, Amtrak employs nearly 1,500 residents.

I am encouraged to see Amtrak ridership growing, and I think maintaining our only national intercity passenger rail network will be critical as fuel prices rise and Americans demand more transportation options. I look forward to finding smart ways to improve passenger rail service for my constituents and others.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting Amtrak and opposing the proposed deep cuts to passenger rail funding in the current transportation appropriations bill that was pulled from the floor Wednesday.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the devastating funding cuts to the

Transportation and Housing initiatives in this appropriations bill, and particularly the cuts to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG).

Established nearly forty years ago, the CDBG program provides State and local governments across the country with the funding and flexibility to most effectively target resources to local community development needs.

The only Federal program of its kind, since 1974, the CDBG program has invested \$135 billion in local communities.

And, in addition to being a critical factor in national economic growth, this program has assisted States and local governments in achieving the kinds of infrastructure projects, job creation and poverty elimination that our communities so desperately need.

In this Chamber, there is often talk of the need to make government more efficient, and reduce wasting taxpayer dollars.

Well, I'm happy to report that this program does just that—it continues to be one of HUD's most efficient programs—with grantees devoting on average 94 percent of CDBG funds directly to efforts that provide benefits to low- to moderate-income families.

Within my district in Franklin County Ohio, CDBG funding has been used for housing rehabilitation, micro-enterprise assistance, ADA compliance, and revitalization of downtown Columbus. These developments have made a real difference in my community.

The City of Whitehall has removed and replaced about thirty-three-hundred feet of curb and gutter along Bernhard Road, enhancing water runoff management in the area—preventing pooling water and possible disease or outbreak.

Recent projects have provided 650 households with access to public transit—public transit that many families use to get to and from work and stores all of which improves the local economy as a whole.

And CDBG funds have given 1400 families in Franklin County, Ohio access to clean, safe drinking water—a project that would have been nearly impossible otherwise because local revenues were just not available.

I'm proud to say that Franklin County continues to leverage \$5.30 for infrastructure development for every dollar of CDBG funding it receives, but with the draconian cuts to CDBG contained in this bill, there's simply no way that we can make up the difference.

That's why the National Low-Income Housing Coalition, the National Housing Trust, the Community Development Finance Authority, the National Association of Counties, the National Association of Development Organizations, the YWCA, Rebuilding Together, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the American Planning Association, and the Council of State Community Development Agencies have all written in strong support of CDBG funding and the programs it sustains.

And yet, here we are considering an appropriations bill that would literally cut the program in half.

The proposed funding level would be less than when CDBG was first authorized in 1974.

This would tip many low- to moderate-income Americans over the brink into poverty

and would negatively impact our communities and our country.

So I stand here today—with my colleagues—strongly opposed to the funding level cuts contained in this appropriations bill.

The Chairman of the T-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, Representative LATHAM, has said “cutting over \$7 billion in programs was very challenging.”

I say this to my Republican colleagues, if cutting these programs was hard—I can assure you, the children, seniors, and families directly helped by CDBG programs will have a much more challenging time dealing with the effects of over \$7 billion in cuts.

I urge opposition to this bill.

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in opposition to the proposed cuts to Amtrak in the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development (THUD) Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2014.

Amtrak is a vital need for constituents from my home state of New Jersey and to people all along the eastern seaboard. Each day, thousands of passengers take to the railways and ridership on Amtrak has continued to grow over the past several years. Now is not the time to cut their funding.

These proposed cuts in THUD could cripple the railroad system, requiring cuts to maintenance and equipment replacement, which could jeopardize the safety of the thousands of Amtrak riders each day.

Once again, I would like to reiterate how heavily my constituents rely on Amtrak for their traveling needs and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together and oppose the cuts included in this legislation.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment who has caused it to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2610

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, \$102,481,000, of which not to exceed \$2,618,000 shall be available for the Immediate Office of the Secretary; not to exceed \$984,000 shall be available for the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary; not to exceed \$19,867,000 shall be available for the Office of the General Counsel; not to exceed \$10,107,000 shall be available for the Office of

the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy; not to exceed \$11,572,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs; not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs; not to exceed \$23,376,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration; not to exceed \$2,020,000 shall be available for the Office of Public Affairs; not to exceed \$1,595,000 shall be available for the Office of the Executive Secretariat; not to exceed \$1,369,000 shall be available for the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization; not to exceed \$10,778,000 for the Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response; and not to exceed \$15,695,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Information Officer: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to transfer funds appropriated for any office of the Office of the Secretary to any other office of the Office of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no appropriation for any office shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent by all such transfers: *Provided further*, That notice of any change in funding greater than 5 percent shall be submitted for approval to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$60,000 shall be for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, excluding fees authorized in Public Law 107-71, there may be credited to this appropriation up to \$2,500,000 in funds received in user fees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for the position of Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Today's bill is part of the House majority's irresponsible charade of a budget process. The sequester cuts affecting 2013 spending levels are having a tangible impact on American families and hurting our economy: 70,000 children losing access to Head Start; 4 million fewer Meals on Wheels delivered; \$1.5 billion in cuts to the National Institutes of Health's lifesaving medical research and jobs; degraded military readiness; furloughs and reduced paychecks for hundreds of thousands of Federal employees; and delayed safety modernization at airports.

□ 1545

My friends on the other side of the aisle want it both ways. They adopted a budget resolution that endorses the sequester levels for next year, locking in a top-line figure \$92 billion below the Senate's and the President's budget levels, while they pretend they fixed the sequester for defense. They cut more than required on the domestic side and did nothing to shield defense programs from legally mandated cuts under sequestration. If the House bills are enacted, defense will be cut \$48 billion in January as a result of the sequester because the majority has not enacted legislation to stop it—\$48 billion when General Dempsey has made

it very clear to those of us who have had recent talks with him that our readiness is at stake.

The Republicans allocated more adequate funding to the initial bills to fund military construction, veterans affairs, defense, and homeland security. The remaining bills have quickly revealed the Republicans' thoroughly inadequate investments to sustain job creation and invest in America's future prosperity.

Perhaps no other bill's programs mean as much to the communities in our districts as the bill we are considering today, yet it guts affordable housing and community development and underfunds rail, air, and road transportation networks.

The same majority wrote a very different bill last year that reflected an understanding of the impact these programs have on our economy and Americans' livelihoods.

Compare the House bill to the Senate version, which is almost \$10 billion higher. Seventy-three Senators, including 19 Republicans, voted to proceed to floor debate. The House bill, on the other hand, was reported from committee on a straight party-line vote.

I would be hard-pressed to find a better example of fiddling while Rome burns than the House majority's budget and appropriations process this year. They continue to trot out bills despite White House veto threats and despite even worse sequestration cuts right around the corner.

I have asked at our committee to suspend our markup until we conference a budget resolution with the Senate so that we can negotiate a reasonable top line for the appropriations process. There is no sense in the House proceeding alone with levels totally unacceptable to the White House and the Senate, yet we will be here late into the evening again considering amendments to a bill that is going nowhere.

When the House returns after the August recess, we will have only 9 legislative days until the end of the fiscal year: 9 days to negotiate a path forward, 9 days to avert a government shutdown, 9 days to do the jobs we were sent here to do—work together to invest in America and build up our economy.

I genuinely hope our majority will be prepared in the fall for the necessary compromise these negotiations require, because this bill shows they are not prepared for responsible governance today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the report for this year's Transportation, Housing and Urban De-

velopment bill, the "THUD" bill, as I noted earlier, states:

The Nation is in desperate need for infrastructure and investment.

I am glad we can agree on that. We are indeed in desperate need, yet the bill before us hardly reflects that. It chooses to prioritize spending cuts over putting Americans back to work. It is part of a budget process that places antitax ideology above all and refuses to address the main drivers of the deficit. Instead, it simply doubles down on sequestration, making sequestration even worse with respect to the domestic bills so as to give some measure of protection to defense. It is an atrocious process, and this bill is Exhibit A for this travesty.

We all know America's surface transportation network is essential for moving goods and services, as well as people, in an efficient manner. Unfortunately, that transportation system is becoming increasingly outdated and ineffective. The American Society of Civil Engineers recently gave America's infrastructure a cumulative grade of "D."

Congestion, aging trains and roads, and thousands of structurally deficient bridges are imposing real costs on the American people and on the American economy. It is estimated that Americans spend 4.2 billion hours a year stuck in traffic. I can testify to sharing that experience last Sunday. This costs the economy \$78.2 billion annually. The poor condition of our roads costs motorists another \$67 billion a year in repairs and operating expenses.

The civil engineers stated that "current spending amounts to only about half of the needed investment." Instead, similar to the proposed Ryan budget, this Republican fiscal year 2014 THUD bill would underfund programs that provide critical investments in transportation alternatives and smart growth, providing about \$2 billion in total for transit programs, which is about a 17 percent cut from last year.

The bill would completely eliminate funding for the overwhelmingly popular and successful TIGER grant program, which invests in multimodal projects, including roads and bridges, transit, high-speed and intercity passenger rail, freight rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and ports—these things that promise to achieve critical national objectives and make our communities more livable and sustainable. On top of that, the bill would even rescind funding for the fiscal year 2013 TIGER grant process that is already under way.

The bill also decreases funding for the Federal Transit Administration's New Starts and Small Starts program, which is the primary source of Federal support for major transit capital projects that are locally planned, implemented, and operated. They are critical for leveraging local investment to implement transit alternatives.

And then for yet another year, the bill provides zero dollars for development of high-speed rail corridor development. I speak as a representative of a State where high-speed rail development between Raleigh and Charlotte is well under way and holds great promise. Yet this bill denies further resources, denies that kind of support for other parts of the country. Our Nation has a major competitiveness gap in this area. These investments make sense. Sometimes you have to spend some money to make some money, and high-speed rail investments have a synergistic impact. They upgrade our rail infrastructure, they improve the mobility of goods and people, and they create jobs.

Finally, Amtrak. This bill is pathetic with respect to Amtrak—only \$950 million total. Of this, only \$600 million goes to the capital account. That is a 37 percent reduction from last year and more than \$1 billion less than the administration's request for capital.

You can figure out how this is going to work. You subtract from that amount Amtrak's required mandatory debt service, that is \$200 million; safety-critical work and inspections and maintenance mandated by Federal law, that is another \$200 million; and new equipment expected to be delivered this year that will add capacity and improve returns on long-distance trains, that is \$100 million. So you see where that money is going. It leaves almost nothing for capital investment in the national system, including improving accessibility for passengers with disabilities.

When you are cutting things this closely, it means the work you are going to do is going to be done less efficiently. Amtrak will have to fix problems only as they occur. It will defer major work. That is bad policy. It is bad economics. If Amtrak deteriorates, service will suffer, revenue will suffer, Amtrak's costs will go up, and that will eventually be reflected in higher appropriations needs in the future.

Mr. Chairman, transportation investments help improve the mobility of millions of Americans and provide alternatives to congested roadways. They foster the development of more livable communities and are proven job-creators. It is absolutely penny wise and pound foolish to shortchange these investments. I urge defeat of this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, by gutting investments in transportation and housing, the majority is proposing to bring our Nation backward at a time when we must be building the infrastructure needed to compete and win in a competitive global economy.

For example, with today's legislation, the majority is proposing to slash the Community Development Block Grant program by almost half. These cuts would be devastating to the working poor in communities like Rochester, New York, which I represent, where block grants provide housing assistance and investments in neighborhoods that are woefully underserved.

Furthermore, the majority is proposing to gut investments in infrastructure projects, and particularly passenger rail. They do so at a time when rail ridership continues to grow across the country.

In Rochester, the Amtrak ridership has been increased by 89 percent since 2008, despite the fact that decades of underinvestment have resulted in aging rails, delayed trains we have to sidetrack to let the freight go by, and a crumbling train station.

I want to say something about this train station. It was built over 45 years ago as a temporary train station. It has not, in all these years, been ADA compliant. You cannot imagine what it is like to get somebody in a wheelchair from the station up onto the train, or to watch a mother with a stroller struggle to get up there because it is impossible to do. 144,000 people went through that railroad station last year, and they deserve something more like the 21st century.

I have fought years to improve train travel; and we are finally getting to build, with a TIGER grant, a new intermodal station in the heart of the city. Like countless other cities and towns, our work has been supported by Federal TIGER grants, which have provided vital support in modernizing our city's infrastructure. The funding is allowing Rochester and countless other communities to build the roads, rails, and runways we need to compete for the jobs of the future. But we cannot allow that to happen if we cut out the very means by which we fund them.

Ridership, as I have said, on Amtrak's high-speed Acela, which I wish we had—we only have one sort-of-high-speed rail in New York—continues to reach record highs, and states like California and Illinois and North Carolina are already building high-speed rail lines. That is terribly important.

As cochair of the bicameral Congressional High-Speed Passenger Rail Caucus, I will soon be joined today by fellow members who realize the incredible value of Amtrak and nationwide passenger rail to our country.

The truth is that our rail system reaches throughout our economy and supports tens of thousands of jobs. The bill before us today endangers these jobs, including the jobs of 20,000 Amtrak employees and the private businesses who sold \$1.3 billion worth of domestic goods and services to Amtrak last year.

As my colleagues will tell you, endangering jobs today and our economy

is a recipe for failure, especially at a time when our infrastructure really needs to be upgraded. As we rebuild places like Afghanistan, it always makes me so angry. If they are going to be building high-speed rail there, I want to build it in New York, in America somewhere.

Let me tell you this story, which I think will bring it home to all of you.

In 1893, the president of New York Central Railroad, for reasons I'm not really clear, lived way out in upstate New York. He had to commute to New York City every day during the week and spent the weekends at home. In 1893, they decided they would have a race with steam engines, so they raced the few miles between Buffalo and Rochester to see which one of those engines were the fastest. Mr. Chair, they set a world record by traveling at 112½ miles an hour between Rochester and Buffalo.

Today, we are on the same track. It hasn't been improved any, but we can't go anywhere near like that. There is no way we can get even close to 80 miles an hour. We can't do that. Mostly it is about 40. It takes a lot longer now to travel from Rochester to Buffalo than it did in 1893.

□ 1600

Crumbling infrastructure like this is not only harmful to our economy but is an embarrassment to a Nation that has never been scared to dream big, and while it is true that our Nation has faced challenges over the past few years, we need big answers.

The proposed bill fails our country now and into the future. Now is not the moment to stop investing in our country nor is it the time to resign ourselves to a future of diminished success. Instead, it is a time to roll up our sleeves and to put our country back to work.

We can answer the call of a generation by investing in the future, and we can build a better, more prosperous America one road, one runway, and one rail line at a time. So I urge my colleagues to reject the cynical and backwards-looking legislation that is before us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

[From the New York Times, May 12, 1893]

GREAT SPEED ON THE CENTRAL

EMPIRE STATE EXPRESS ENGINE TRAVELS AT
THE RATE OF 112½ MILES AN HOUR

BUFFALO, NY, May 11.—If the New-York Central officials wanted a record for their new engine, No. 999, preparatory to exhibiting her at the World's Fair, they have got one now that beats the world. It is 112½ miles an hour.

On Tuesday the Empire State Express, drawn by this marvelous machine, made 102 miles an hour, a great record in itself, but Engineer Charles Hogan said she was not feeling well that day and could do better. She was given a night's rest here, and yesterday morning was brought out, looking ponderous, trim, and stately, and sent down to Syracuse for another trial.

The Empire State Express arrived in Syracuse on time, and Hogan and No. 999 were ready to take her. The engine was coupled on and the train left Syracuse on time. Hogan let her out a few times on the way to Rochester, just to see if she was feeling good, and finding that she responded to every touch of the throttle he contentedly bided his time. He did not want to get ahead of his schedule and he brought her into the Rochester depot at just the right moment. The test of speed was to come between Rochester and this city. Soon after leaving Rochester Hogan slowed her down a little, for he intended to make up the time at the western end of the trip. Passing Batavia, the train was rushing along at an easy gait of a mile a minute. Then Hogan let her out. The speed increased as the engine flew along, and just before reaching Crittenden the record of Tuesday of a mile in thirty-five seconds was equaled. But this was exceeded just this side of that station, when the new world's record of a mile in thirty-two seconds was made.

This is equivalent to 112½ miles an hour. A speed nearly as great was kept up until Forks Station was reached, and then Hogan slowed her down and allowed her to enter Buffalo at her customary speed, arriving on time.

The passengers on board said that the train flew along with the same steadiness that would have accompanied a slower rate of speed. There was no unusual swaying or jolting, and only persons who were looking out for manifestations of extraordinary speed would have noticed that the clickety-click of the rails sounded like the roar of musketry, and the telegraph poles along the track seemed like pickets in a fence.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the New-York Central Railroad yesterday the determination was reached to begin the running of the twenty-hour train to Chicago on the 28th inst. The train will be known as the "Exposition Flier." The question of fare has not yet been definitely settled. Doubtless the action of the Trunk Line Presidents today will have some effect on the rate. An advance of from \$5 to \$10 on the regular fare will probably be charged. The speed of this fast train will be about fifty miles an hour.

Mr. NADLER. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the FY14 Transportation-HUD appropriations bill.

This bill is the perfect illustration of the majority's cruel and misguided priorities. We hear a lot from the other side about how we need to cut the budget, reduce the deficit and rein in spending, but, clearly, that's just rhetoric. Last week, the majority put a bill on the floor that increased defense spending substantially, including extra funding for programs the administration and the military didn't want and have no intention of using. The reality is that the majority in this House is perfectly willing to increase spending for things they care about, like military contracts, but not for ensuring adequate housing, investing in economic and community development or even in transportation infrastructure.

The bill before us today is so bad that it's hard to imagine how it can be fixed. The House bill is fully \$10 billion

less than the Senate bill, and it's virtually impossible to find offsets for amendments to improve the bill, but it's important for us to highlight some of the egregious cuts, such as the drastic cuts to the Amtrak capital and operating budget. Just a few years ago, Congress passed the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act, PRIIA, which authorized a total of \$9.8 billion for Amtrak for the fiscal years 2009 through 2013, but the actual appropriations for Amtrak over this time period was \$2.5 billion below the authorized amount.

There is no question we need to invest more in our railroads. A working group for the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission reported that the total capital cost estimate of establishing a national intercity passenger rail network between now and 2050 would be about \$357 billion, or a little over \$8 billion annually. We are nowhere near that, and the bill before us today takes us in exactly the wrong direction. This bill slashes Amtrak's capital program by 37 percent and Amtrak's operations by 25 percent from last year's enacted level.

These funding levels would have a drastic impact on Amtrak's ability to maintain service. Once you take into account Amtrak's financial obligations, such as contract payments and federally mandated safety work, Amtrak would have only \$100 million to cover the investment needs of the entire system. The Northeast corridor alone requires about \$780 million per year to address longstanding state of good repair needs, and Amtrak will have to defer maintenance, which will cause service delays and interruptions, and increased costs in the long run.

This is idiotic. I know some people are Amtrak haters no matter the facts, but here are a few more facts that are noteworthy.

Commuter lines on the Northeast corridor carry 235 million passengers every year. These are mostly business travelers who rely on the reliability of Amtrak's rail in order for them to get to work and foster economic growth. If Amtrak cannot maintain the rails adequately, all of these commuter rail systems around all of our major cities will stop being efficient, will stop being able to transport their people.

Amtrak employs nearly 20,000 people in 46 States. Amtrak employees paid more than \$64 million in State and local taxes last year. Amtrak did business for suppliers equaling about \$1.3 billion last year. Cutting funding for Amtrak jeopardizes all of this economic activity and all of the good-paying jobs associated with it. It will ultimately cost taxpayers a lot of money in the long run.

Amtrak provides a vital service for communities all around the country. We should be increasing investments in

Amtrak and developing intercity and high-speed rail. This bill includes no funds whatsoever for the TIGER grant program. In fact, it rescinds \$237 million in previous TIGER funds. The bill also includes no funding for the Projects of National and Regional Significance account, which is authorized under the MAP-21 bill that we passed last year but that is now subject to general fund appropriations. The New Starts program will fund some new transit programs, but that account is cut as well, and there is only enough funding to maintain commitments to projects currently in the pipeline. So there are, essentially, no programs to fund any new construction of major transportation projects.

The majority has offered no solutions for how to invest in future economic growth, to facilitate interstate commerce and to maintain our global competitiveness. I urge my colleagues to reject these disastrous cuts to Amtrak, these disastrous cuts to TIGER and to general infrastructure, and to support moving us back toward an intelligent transportation policy. I have to urge a "no" vote on the FY14 Transportation-HUD appropriations bill.

Later in this debate, I will discuss the equally disastrous cuts in Community Development Block Grants. It's just another example of how this bill is dismantling the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I come to address the House, the Congress of the United States.

We are the wealthiest country in the world. We are the most powerful country in the world. We have one program that focuses on improving the lives and life chances of people in our lower-income communities across our country. It's called the Community Development Block Grant. It was created under Republican President Richard Nixon in 1974.

Since its inception, we have invested about \$132 billion in some 1,209 communities across our country. Over the life of this program, we have invested about the same amount as we took to build the International Space Station. In 1 year, we spent approximately the same amount in Afghanistan. This year, we are spending \$3.3 billion on the Community Development Block Grant, which is the lowest amount in the history of our Nation.

What the majority, my friends on the other side, are proposing in this appropriations bill is to spend the least amount ever on this effort. They want to slash it from \$3.3 billion to \$1.6 billion. Now, it's not that they are mean-spirited. It is because the allocation for this bill is fatally deficient. It is too

low to meet the needs of the greatest country on Earth in so many respects that we could be here all day in pointing out the deficiencies, but I want to focus on just this one program.

Because it was created by a Republican President, it operates in the most, I think, approving way for those on the other team. That is to say that these are grants for which all of the decisions are made at the local level by Republican and Democratic Governors, by Republican and Democratic local officials. They decide what the priorities are going to be to help uplift these communities. So it's unfortunate that they would single out this particular program—the only program that we have to help the neediest communities across our country. I've seen it. It has worked in local business districts, encouraging small business development. I've seen its work in helping seniors put in major systems repair and heating and windows or roofing so that they can be protected in the winter.

This is a great program, even though it was developed by a President of the other party. It operates through local decisionmaking. It's already at the lowest level ever, and if you added up what we've invested in it in all of these years, it wouldn't add up to what we've spent in building the International Space Station. If we added up all that we've spent on it in all of these years, it barely gets to the number we spend in 1 year in Afghanistan, but we still think somehow we should cut it in half.

It's a wrongheaded decision. I would ask that we reconsider it. I know the allocation is tough, but it's going to be a lot tougher on so many more Americans who live in communities, in being reminded of what Jay-Z said, that have their shades on and are just waiting on the Sun to shine their way. I would ask my colleagues to think about that as we go forward. Think about the wrongheadedness of this and how unworthy it is for the greatest country on Earth to say to its citizens who need our help that somehow we can spend money in Afghanistan—in some far off place—or that we can build a great International Space Station, which I support, but that we can't do anything about the challenges in these neighborhoods. I ask the entire House to live up to our responsibilities in a much different way than we are doing now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFIN OF ARKANSAS

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

Page 56, line 25, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, on March 29, 2013, the ExxonMobil Pegasus pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas, spilled thousands of gallons of oil into the homes and onto the properties surrounding the ruptured pipelines. I am committed to making things right for the people of Mayflower by ensuring that another spill like this doesn't occur again in Arkansas.

The U.S. Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, PHMSA, is responsible for regulating and ensuring the safe and secure movement of oil and petroleum products to industry and consumers through our Nation's interstate pipelines. As an interstate pipeline, the inspection of the Pegasus pipeline was PHMSA's responsibility.

Pipelines move nearly two-thirds of the oil and petroleum products transported annually. Interstate pipelines deliver over 11.3 billion barrels of petroleum each year. The cost to transport a barrel of petroleum products from Houston to the New York Harbor is about a dollar. American pipelines are indisputably the safest way to move oil, and I remain supportive of the pipeline infrastructure as it will provide important jobs and energy to Americans, but we've got to make sure these pipelines are safe. Every year, pipelines transport more than 11 billion barrels of oil, and last year, less than five ten-thousandths of 1 percent of it was lost to spills.

We've got to do what we can to make sure spills that did occur don't happen again. Although the number of spills is a minimal fraction of what we safely transport throughout the country, I know that we can still make more certain the safety of our Nation's pipelines. I continue to support the safe transport of our Nation's oil and petroleum products, and I have introduced my amendment to increase the budget for PHMSA's operational expenses by \$500,000 to further ensure the safety of our Nation's pipelines.

This appropriation finances the operational support costs for PHMSA, including agency-wide functions of administration, management, policy development, legal counsel, budget, financial management, civil rights, human resources, acquisition services, information technology, and governmental and public affairs.

I ask that the House support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I think it is very well thought out. The gentleman does have it offset, so the committee position on this side would be to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McGOVERN. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), who talked about the underfunding of so many important programs in this bill but, in particular, of the Community Development Block Grant program.

When we talk about our national security, it means more than the number of missiles that we possess, and it means more than the number of military bases we have overseas. It means as well—and just as importantly—many of the priorities that are contained in the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

That is why it pains me to come to the floor today to lament about how woefully underfunded key transportation, infrastructure and housing programs are in this bill—programs that revitalize our communities, help our neighbors secure affordable housing, and support smart economic development.

□ 1615

The bill, as it is before us today, simply put, is unfixable at its current allocation level. There are programs like the HOME program, which is at its lowest funding level in its history. Just so my colleagues understand, the HOME program is a critical Federal investment utilized by States and localities to provide affordable rental and homeownership opportunities for low-income households. As we recover from a damaging recession, these cuts in this program will put further strain on affordable housing opportunities.

This bill also severely underfunds tenant-based rental assistance, project-based rental assistance, and the Public Housing Capital Fund. I continue to hear from housing advocates in my home State of Massachusetts, and their message is consistent and clear: we need more funding in these accounts to ensure that all families have access to affordable, comfortable, and stable housing.

The families that we're talking about aren't losing sleep overnight wondering whether they're going to be attacked from some country overseas. They're losing sleep overnight because they don't know whether they're going to have shelter to protect their own families. They're worried about their own security in this country, and yet we are underfunding these programs so significantly.

I'm especially concerned, as my colleague from Pennsylvania stated, about the proposed reduction in Community Development Block Grant funding. This bill cuts CDBG formula grants by nearly 50 percent and funds this program at its lowest level since its creation in the 1970s.

In April, I joined with 143 bipartisan Members on a programmatic request letter to appropriators in support of \$3.3 billion for this program. In July, after the subcommittee's legislation was released, 101 bipartisan Members wrote to the Appropriations Committee again expressing support for effective funding levels. There is demonstrated bipartisan support for Community Development Block Grants, Mr. Chairman, because these dollars are at work in communities in each of our districts.

Last week, Governor Deval Patrick of Massachusetts announced that 38 communities in Massachusetts will receive over \$31 million in CDBG funding. These dollars will fund housing rehabilitation, child care centers, cityscape improvements, and social services, just to name a few. I also want to point out that every \$1 in Community Development Block Grants leverages an additional \$3.55 in funding to revitalize our communities. Investing these Federal dollars in our cities and in our towns spurs redevelopment efforts and provides a high return on our investment. These funds also create and save jobs. Since fiscal year 2005, these funds have created or retained over 300,000 jobs. If my friends on the other side of the aisle are serious about job creation, CDBG is not the place to cut.

Realizing the need for effective funding, the Senate appropriations bill funds the program at \$3.15 billion. So, should this bill go to conference, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject these cuts in the House bill and support robust funding for Community Development Block Grants, a program with a proven record of supporting community development efforts across our country.

Let's stop these reckless and harmful cuts to our communities. We ought to be on the floor today fixing sequestration. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle should be on the floor today appointing conferees on the budget so that we can negotiate more reasonable allocations on these appropriations bills.

I would remind my colleagues that this is not some abstract debate that we're having here today on the floor. These cuts will hurt real people. They will pave the way for more deterioration of our cities and towns. They will cost jobs and they will hurt our economy. Enough is enough. We're supposed to be helping people, not hurting people. It's time for Congress to get its priorities straight.

I urge my colleagues to support the CDBG program, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy with my colleague, Mr. LATHAM, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. LATHAM. I would be happy to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I know that you know that our Nation suffers from a spending-driven debt crisis and the only real remedy is to quit spending money that we don't have. But because the President would not work with us to enact meaningful, targeted spending discipline, his sequester has been enacted.

Mr. Chairman, we are stewards of the taxpayers' dollars; and with the President's sequester in place, I believe that it's more critical than ever that our Nation's transportation funding be spent wisely, including funding for the FAA's Contract Tower Program because, Mr. Chairman, in Washington, it's not always how much money you spend that counts; it's how you spend the money.

I would ask the distinguished chairman to work with me and other Members to ensure that this critical funding is allocated to the facilities that represent the greatest cost benefit to the taxpayer.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I appreciate the gentleman's attention to this issue. I look forward to working with him and the FAA to ensure that our limited Federal dollars go to towers that provide the greatest benefit to the taxpayer.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2610. This bill, which was crafted to conform to the strangling and senseless limits of the Ryan budget, would cut the total discretionary funding for the Transportation-HUD appropriations measure by \$7.7 billion below the enacted fiscal year 2013 appropriation and by more than \$4 billion below the level of funding provided after sequestration took effect.

These cuts would devastate programs like the Community Development Block Grant program and the HOME

program, which are essential to supporting development in cities throughout our Nation and to providing housing and other services to our most vulnerable citizens.

This bill would also be devastating to our national passenger rail service, Amtrak; and that is the specific issue I will address today.

The bill before us would cut the capital grant provided to Amtrak by some \$352 million and cut the operating grant by \$119 million below the enacted fiscal year 2013 levels. Such cuts would likely force Amtrak to reduce its maintenance levels and furlough maintenance personnel. Such cuts may even lead to reduced service on the Northeast corridor, the critical link on the eastern seaboard among Washington, D.C., Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston.

In their views on the Transportation-HUD appropriations measure, the minority noted that this bill is out of touch with reality and that it is nowhere more evident than in the proposed funding level for Amtrak.

While the House majority has undertaken a relentless effort to destroy Amtrak, the traveling public has made it clear they consider Amtrak to be an essential part of our Nation's transportation network.

Amtrak finished fiscal year 2012 having carried more than 31 million passengers—the highest number of passengers in any year since Amtrak was created. This total included more than 11 million passengers who traveled on the Northeast corridor. Together, the long-distance routes had their highest passenger volumes in 19 years and Amtrak set 12 consecutive monthly ridership records in fiscal year 2012. To put this number in perspective, if Amtrak were an airline, it would be the sixth largest in the country.

Americans have voted with their ticket purchases, and they are choosing to ride Amtrak in greater numbers. In fact, record ridership growth is continuing in fiscal year 2013. Rather than seeking to destroy a service critical to our Nation's mobility, we should be investing in this system to ensure it can continue to meet increased passenger demand with increased speed and efficiency.

Significant infrastructure improvements are needed all along the Northeast corridor to create truly high-speed rail service. In Maryland, for example, the B&P tunnel, which carries every train traveling into Washington, D.C., from all points north of the city, must be replaced. This tunnel was opened in 1873 and its design limits train speeds to 30 miles per hour. We would not think of relying on technology from the 1870s in other aspects of our lives. We wouldn't want medical technology or communications technology from the 1870s. And we should not be content to rely on transportation infrastructure from the 1870s.

The President has rightly threatened to veto this bill; and rather than waste the House's time on legislation like this that threatens to degrade our transportation networks and delay passengers and commerce, we should be considering bills that will make long overdue investments to expand our mobility and support our economic growth. Rather than cutting investments in Amtrak, we should be investing in the development of truly high-speed rail on the Northeast corridor and throughout the northeastern United States.

And before we consider this or any other appropriations measures, the House and Senate should follow regular order by appointing conferees who can resolve a budget that can be adopted by both bodies and that can then guide the development of appropriations measures for fiscal year 2014.

I urge Members to oppose this misguided legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAULO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAULO. Mr. Chairman, this Transportation-Housing and Urban Development bill before us today is the latest in a long series of appropriations bills from the House majority that grossly underfunds the fundamental priorities of American families. Every time we see a new appropriations bill come from this majority, the vital national needs that are meant to be covered in that legislation have been cut to the bone.

In this case, this bill makes deep cuts in everything from the upkeep of the traffic control system to Amtrak to Community Development Block Grants and HOME grants. This bill endangers our infrastructure, our public safety, and our communities. It is yet another example of the problems created by the majority's obsessive fixation on slashing all nondefense spending programs to the detriment of the priorities we were elected to uphold.

Let's step back for a moment and look at the big picture. The Budget Control Act of 2011 placed strict limits on appropriations—defense as well as domestic—that are scheduled to remain in place through 2021. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office has estimated that these caps will reduce spending by a total of \$840 billion over 10 years, compared to the policies previously in place.

Now, on top of these Budget Control Act caps, we also have the deep and indiscriminate across-the-board cuts caused by sequestration. Despite claims to the contrary by this majority, the effects of the sequester cuts are real. They're real and they are damaging. We are talking about children losing access to Head Start and

the opportunities for their growth and development that early childhood education provides. Low-income women will lose access to the cancer screenings that could save their lives. Seniors will be hungry because Meals on Wheels distribution has been pared back.

When the new school year starts in September, school districts already struggling to make ends meet will face an additional across-the-board 5 percent cut in Federal aid. And in terms of medical research, the National Institutes of Health will be supporting the smallest number of research project grants this year in more than a decade.

These cuts will have profound and lasting consequences for families, for students, for the pace of scientific research. But despite that, the majority apparently thinks that the problem with sequestration, at least when it comes to domestic spending, is that the cuts were too small. They have been assembling a series of bills for 2014 that cut the resources for nondefense programs by a total of almost \$47 billion below the 2013 postsequester level. That is not the right direction for this country. That's not what we ought to be doing.

In total, the majority's 2014 budget bills will bring funding for nondefense appropriations to their lowest level on record as a share of GDP, with records on this basis going back to 1976. In other words, the majority proposes to spend less, relative to the economy, on things like infrastructure, scientific research, education, environmental protection—the key investments that grow our economy—than at any time in nearly the last 40 years.

Within the total, some bills are targeted for larger cuts than others. Sequestration already cuts the transportation, housing, and infrastructure programs covered in today's bill by more than \$3 billion, and this legislation would slash another \$4.4 billion.

□ 1630

That's bad enough, but the largest cuts of all come in the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education bill, which the majority seems to consider the very lowest priority. The allocation to that bill starts with this year's \$7 billion in sequestration cuts, and then cuts \$28 billion more. Think about it for a moment. For programs like education, medical research, job training, public health, the majority does not just want to double down on sequestration; they want to quadruple down.

This is not about saving money or reducing the deficit. This is about ideology, pure and simple. The majority's approach is not required by the Budget Control Act. On the contrary, in total, their bills are \$47.7 billion below the Budget Control Act cap on non-defense spending, and that is the cap with sequestration in place.

Because this bill is already far leaner than even the BCA and sequestration require, there are no offsets to be had to ameliorate the deep and dangerous cuts to Community Development Block Grants, housing, Amtrak, or mass transit. The bottom line is the majority is very explicitly trying to underfund the priorities in this legislation. They have put forward a budget that sets our government and our Nation up to fail.

This is not the right choice for America, for our kids or our future. Responsible budgeting means making key investments that grow the economy and improve American families' quality of life. This is just not a responsible budget. I urge defeat of this grossly inadequate bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleagues in strong support of the Community Development Block Grant program and the tremendous benefits that this program has afforded millions of low- and moderate-income Americans since its inception in 1974 under Republican leadership. The Community Development Block Grant is a vital tool that the Department of Housing and Urban Development uses to provide for new developments and affordable housing in local communities all across the country.

The fiscal year 2014 House Transportation-Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill indiscriminately slashes the grants by almost half, or \$1.6 billion less than the current \$3.3 billion for fiscal year 2013. These cuts do not reflect a change in need or have any basis in reality, and they would do incredible harm to local communities across the entire Nation.

The House version of this bill is simply unworkable in its current form, and it plainly ignores many of the benefits that the CDBG program provides for the 1,209 State and local governments that receive these grants. Since 1974, CDBG has invested over \$135 billion in local economies. Every dollar that has been invested leverages an additional \$3.55 in non-CDBG funding, which can go toward improving existing infrastructure, new jobs, and housing repairs, as well as homeownership assistance. By slashing CDBG funding, the House majority will invariably bring harm to countless low- and moderate-income Americans. I'm not prepared to do that, and neither are many of us, even many Republican colleagues.

Cuts from years prior have already had devastating consequences. The city of Dallas, for example, is considering another round of cuts or eliminating certain programs entirely in light of

projected budget reductions. For Dallas, this could mean eliminating grants for affordable housing developers, shrinking the Mortgage Assistance Program, and decimating new home construction in areas targeted by CDBG revitalization.

Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 2014 Transportation-Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill will bring considerable harm, and considering it this week is just another example of the misguided policies of the current Republican majority. As long as the current majority Republicans refuse to work together with House Democrats to develop a sensible budget framework, the American people will continue to suffer the consequences of draconian cuts to invaluable social programs.

When we shut down everything, it does not help us economically. It shuts us down. It moves us backwards. There is a right way and a wrong way, and we cannot continue to do it the way this current Republican majority is pushing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to join my colleagues today in advocating for critical investments to rebuild our Nation's transportation infrastructure. The bill we are considering this week makes devastating cuts that will have serious consequences on our ability to compete in the global economy and ensure the stability and well-being of local communities.

The fact of the matter is that our infrastructure is crumbling, with the American Society of Civil Engineers grading the United States with a D-plus on their annual report card assessing the condition of America's infrastructure. In my home State of Rhode Island, 21 percent of our 757 bridges are structurally deficient and in need of repairs.

In the short-term, supporting our Nation's roads, rails, and airports will generate job growth in a construction sector that remains hard hit from the recession—employing the talented, capable men and women of the building trades to rebuild America.

In a rapidly changing global economy, the ability to quickly and safely transport goods, services, and information is a real advantage. To compete successfully, every American business, from energy companies and manufacturers to technology companies and farmers, must have access to a world-class connected transportation system.

But to maintain this edge, virtually every expert has said we must continue to invest in rebuilding America. If you don't believe me, look at the strategic

decisions being made by competing nations. Just last week, China's Ministry of Rails announced plans to invest another \$32 billion to upgrade their rail system. In June, President Putin proposed investing \$43 billion to build a new superhighway in Moscow, modernize the Trans-Siberian Railway, and construct a brand-new 500-mile high-speed rail line.

While Russia and China are betting on their economic future, my friends on the other side of the aisle have offered a bill that would unquestionably set us back. This bill guts investments in our railroads, cutting more than \$468 million in funding for Amtrak compared to fiscal year 2013 enacted levels and eliminates all funding for high-speed rail.

This bill cuts intercity passenger rail despite recent reports demonstrating how rail has been an area of growth. According to a report from the Brookings Institution last year, Amtrak was our Nation's fastest growing mode of transportation in the last 15 years.

My local train station in Providence, Rhode Island, has seen ridership totals increase by more than 137 percent, and Amtrak is not just used by tourists.

So, demand for intercity passenger rail service has grown exponentially in the last decade and our competitors abroad have noticed, investing billions in their rail systems. But here, some of my colleagues have decided to slash funding and put our rail system at risk. This is clearly the wrong approach.

Of course, this legislation does not only jeopardize our Nation's rail system; it also slashes funding for municipal and State governments hoping to invest in critical local projects.

This bill eliminates all funding for the TIGER grant program in fiscal year 2014, and it rescinds \$237 million of the \$500 million appropriated for the current fiscal year.

The TIGER program invests in innovative, multimodal transportation projects, providing for upgrades of bridges, roads, ports, and other transportation infrastructure that are critical to regional economies. But perhaps most importantly, this is a program that encourages local stakeholders to plan for their future and think about innovations to local transportation infrastructure that will spur growth and create jobs. This is exactly how Federal investments are supposed to work.

Unfortunately, this bill once again leaves our State and local partners without the resources needed to help strengthen local communities. Sadly, it gets worse. This bill also jeopardizes the still-fragile recovery of our housing market and communities at risk.

For example, this bill decimates funding for the Community Development Block Grant program, which was signed into law by a Republican President who recognized the importance of

assisting communities by providing flexibility to invest in everything from wastewater treatment facilities to housing and economic development. This critical program is a lifeline for families facing difficult economic challenges and provides critical resources to promote economic development and improve quality of life.

Today, this bill cuts CDBG funding levels almost in half compared to current enacted levels, the lowest level of funding since it began, and a billion dollars less than President Ford requested for the program in 1975. Let that sink in. This bill cuts our investments in local projects so drastically that we have reduced programs to less than 60 percent of what they were nearly four decades ago.

Mr. Chairman, this bill clearly does not reflect our values and priorities as a Nation. I urge my colleagues to reject this reckless and shortsighted bill, and to work together on a plan to respond to our urgent transportation and infrastructure needs and a plan that dedicates resources to strengthening local communities. Our ability to promote growth, create jobs, and compete in a global economy depends on it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chairman, I am in strong opposition of the underlying bill, as it makes damaging cuts to Community Development Block Grants. A cut of \$1.6 billion—a nearly 50 percent reduction from the previous year—is not smart policymaking. These draconian cuts will no doubt have lasting harmful effects on our communities throughout the country.

Since 1974, over 1,200 communities relied on CDBG funds to support development projects and make other important improvements. These funds are used in providing social services for the poor and senior citizens, improving dilapidated housing facilities, supporting local food banks, and maintaining local parks. CDBG funds are critical investments made by the Federal Government to bring important benefits to local communities.

My district, for example, stands to lose almost \$2.2 million next year if these cuts go into effect. That's nearly half of what they got last year. And it's on top of hundreds of thousands of cities in my district have already lost due to the poorly designed automatic cuts known as sequestration. The city of Pasadena will see their funding drop from \$1.7 million to under \$1 million. The city of Alhambra will see their funding drop from around \$800,000 down to only \$430,000.

These cuts are more than lines on a piece of paper. They will have real impacts on my neighbors and my commu-

nity. Take People for People, a food bank run by the West San Gabriel Valley Church Council for the last 25 years. People for People provides the homeless and needy families with clothes and boxes of food. During the recession, they saw a 20 percent spike in the numbers of families who came to them for help. Last year, they were able to support hundreds of families that are suffering right now. Hundreds of families stay afloat with local donations and a \$27,000 grant through CDBG. But this year, because of Federal Government cuts, they will receive 75 percent less, merely \$7,000.

But People for People isn't the only program that will get hit. Countless other nonprofit service organizations around the San Gabriel Valley will be forced to serve fewer low-income residents at a time when they need it the most. CDBG funds have helped fund tutoring, health services, small business assistance, senior services, food assistance, and fair housing services. Cities will have to cut back on home rehabilitation programs that improve blighted neighborhoods and public facilities, improvements that make cities safer and more accessible. And fewer construction projects mean fewer construction jobs, too.

During this time of economic recovery, we cannot pull out the rug from programs that are vital to helping our constituents. Our cities, our communities, and our constituents cannot afford these drastic cuts to CDBG funding. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this terrible bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1645

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I rise today because our Transportation-HUD Appropriations Act is insufficient to maintain our national transportation infrastructure and invest properly in community development and safe, affordable housing.

This Transportation-HUD Appropriations Act really guts investments critical to strong, sustainable communities. And, in particular, it decimates the Community Development Block Grants program, slashing it in half to the lowest level since the program began in 1975.

This isn't just something that hurts Democrats. It hurts Republicans, it hurts everybody. It's across the board. And so, for the Community Development Block Grant program to work and ensure access to decent, affordable housing, to provide services to the most vulnerable in our communities, and to create jobs through the expansion and retention of businesses, we've got to reject this proposal before us.

Communities across the country rely on the Community Development Block Grant to provide critical services for low-income people and their families, as well as economic development assistance to small businesses and infrastructure improvements.

To this day, the Community Development Block Grant remains the principal source of revenue for localities to use in devising flexible solutions to prevent economic and social deterioration in lower-income neighborhoods and communities throughout the Nation.

These grants are an important tool for helping local governments tackle serious challenges facing their communities, making a difference in the lives of millions of people and their communities across the Nation.

Now, Detroit is a longstanding Community Development Block Grant grantee, receiving an average of \$33 million in annual funding, while Wayne County, which Detroit is in, receives an additional \$5.3 million. Yet, this proposal in the appropriations bill would drastically cut these funds.

The CDBG program in Detroit and Wayne County, includes preserving low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, offering a range of housing choices, constructing urban infrastructure, improving the appearance of urban and rural communities, increasing the quality of neighborhood-based living, and decreasing negative environmental impacts.

For my conservative friends to continue to focus solely on reducing the deficit, in particular doing so on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans, is unnecessary and not appreciated. Although deficit reduction is an important task, Congress can't balance the budget on the backs of working families. And sharply reducing programs like the Community Development Block Grant and HOME is going the wrong direction.

I would say, this is the second major cut for the Community Development Block Grant funding since the Great Recession. The CDBG Coalition, consisting of national organizations representing local elected officials, State and local government practitioners, development organizations, and nonprofit organizations, all strongly oppose these cuts.

These are individuals working daily in their communities, with the most acute awareness of what their communities need. So, in support of them and our constituents, we must fund CDBG formula grants at no less than the \$3.3 billion in FY14.

So, Mr. Chairman, once again I ask the Congress to stop trying to balance the budget on the backs of working families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, during the appropriation process, over 100 Members and I expressed our concern about the low funding level for Community Development Block Grants.

These grants are one of the most successful, cost-effective Federal programs that encourage economic growth in our cities and communities across the country. According to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, every \$1 of CDBG investment leads to an additional \$3.55 of investment from outside sources.

In California's 35th Congressional District, the cities of Pomona, Chino, Ontario, Fontana, and Rialto, where people of all parties reside, currently receive Community Development Block Grant funding. This funding is used to build affordable housing, construct sidewalks, and invest in energy efficiency, water conservation, gang prevention, and after-school programs.

These programs maintain strong neighborhoods and promote a higher quality of life for residents in the district. With the proposed cuts in this bill, it is estimated that they will lose 50 percent of funding for next year.

I strongly oppose these devastating cuts. I ask that other Members consider their communities and oppose these cuts too.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Let me start with the fact that I choose to believe that Mr. LATHAM does not like this bill. Mr. LATHAM's not listening to me. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say that I start my debate, that I choose to believe that you do not like this bill. I know you. I've worked with you over a long period of time.

This bill is insufficient to meet the obligations of this subcommittee. It is unworthy of the support of this House.

Mr. Chairman, there are many things wrong with the 2014 Transportation-Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill, but perhaps none more egregious than its severely painful cuts to the Community Development Block Grants.

Now, let me start with this observation. This is not about a poor people's program. It helps some poor people, but it helps communities—rich, moderate, and poor.

This is not about the 47 percent. This is about the 100 percent.

The Community Development Block Grant program was enacted on a bipartisan basis in 1974 and signed into law by the President, Gerald Ford, former minority leader of this House, Presi-

dent of the United States. From its beginning, it has served as a model of how bipartisan compromise in Congress can help tackle important challenges on the local level.

For nearly 40 years, these grants have been awarded on a formula basis to State and local governments for infrastructure development, the creation and maintenance of affordable housing units, anti-poverty initiatives.

It makes communities better. It empowers Members of Congress to be able to help their local communities who elect them. These grants save lives in our largest cities and in our smallest towns, in Alaska, in Hawaii, and in Maryland.

The cuts in this bill would reduce Community Development Block Grants by more than half. America is not bankrupt. America need not claim defeat and retreat. America has the resources, if it has the will, to grow our economies, to grow our communities, and to make them better.

We appropriated around \$3.8 billion for these grants in fiscal year 2012, while this bill would cut that figure to just \$1.6 billion. To put this into perspective, in 2001 we spent \$4.7 billion under George Bush II on Community Development Block Grants.

After years of whittling away at those critical grants which empower our States, counties, and cities to help the most vulnerable have a chance at finding jobs and putting roofs over their heads, it would be devastating to communities whose budgets are already pushed to the limit and rely on these grants to serve all of their residents.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle talk a great deal about fiscal responsibility. But what about social responsibility?

Now I'm a strong proponent of fiscal responsibility. But if fiscal responsibility is not coupled with social responsibility, it is not worthy of this House or this country.

Community Development Block Grants are an instrument of our common citizenship and, yes, our common humanity. In this case, however, they are a poignant example of the Republican strategy of disinvestment in America and abandonment of our communities and their people. Surely we're better than that, Mr. Chairman.

When we considered the Veterans Affairs, military construction, and Defense appropriations bills that included robust funding, we knew those funds had to come from somewhere. Here it comes.

Like our Republican friends, we believe we must invest in a strong, national defense, as Chairwoman MIKULSKI has been doing on the Senate Appropriations Committee. But we do not share the Republican majority's view that we ought to abandon our domestic priorities in the process. We're better than that.

None of us are surprised that their strategy to deal with the sequester is to ignore its consequences and impose cuts even deeper, even deeper, even deeper than the sequester calls for. In fact, I know of a number of our colleagues on the Republican side who see the folly in such strategy but cannot or will not speak up, for fear of the political consequences from the radical right. This bill is proof that such a strategy is underway.

It's not only an abdication of responsible leadership, it is a recipe for gridlock, as Democrats in the House and Senate could never agree to it. Reject this bill. We can and must do better.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, this is a slash-and-burn budget. I don't know why we bother.

Whether you're looking at the community block grant or the section I'm going to say a few words about, the Amtrak section, you can see what we're about—we're supposed to reauthorize a highway bill this year and a railway bill this year. That certainly won't matter if the Transportation and HUD appropriations bill simply ignores authorized infrastructure spending and building.

The federal government has Amtrak because the private sector insisted that we take it. They showed, they proved that you can't run a railroad without public subsidy.

Amtrak has done an amazing job considering how little public subsidy it has gotten. The private sector gave it to us because they couldn't handle the operating expenses, and they couldn't handle the capital costs.

Now, Amtrak, by the ticket, is basically handling the operating expenses. Shame on us that we will not come forward to do our part with the capital expenses. With a 37 percent cut in capital expenses, that is the way, Mr. Chairman, to run a railroad into the ground that otherwise is doing very well on its own dime.

There is a thirty-five percent difference between the House and Senate bills. The Republican bill is bipartisan. Yet, we're about to pass a bill here that nobody would consider in the Senate, and that the President would have to veto.

Why are we going through these appropriations exercises that amount to nothing?

□ 1700

Amtrak is more than sustaining itself. Virtually each month this year, it has had record ridership. Amtrak actually recovers almost 80 percent of its operating costs out of ticket revenue. That's amazing. It seems to me Am-

trak ought to be rewarded rather than, as this bill does, be punished.

Amtrak carries 31 million passengers every year, and it keeps increasing. Travellers are preferring rail and 20,000 people across 47 states work for Amtrak. Yes, we know about it best here in the East, where Amtrak also has 1 million daily commuters.

This is our national railroad. It's unbelievable that we would be content to see every single nation in the world that considers itself an advanced nation be generations ahead of us on railroad development. We are two generations behind, for example, on high-speed rail. Yet there are zero dollars in this bill for high-speed rail.

Amtrak is very well managed. In the committee we have heard what they have done and how they have done it. But they can't manage without at least some recognition from the Congress that we, too, have a role to play in the railroad. No railroad in the world is unsubsidized. This one is subsidized very little. It is still able to run most of its trains over 100 miles an hour.

We ought to understand who we're talking about. We're not just talking about the Acela from the District of Columbia to New York. Among the 25 busiest Amtrak stations are Seattle, Harrisburg, and Bakersfield, California.

At a time when the airlines are in trouble and have reduced their operations, Amtrak keeps growing in ridership each month. I have a winning operation here. But this bill sends it back into losing for us. We don't need to do that. We have a railroad that offers middle class jobs to 20,000 people, 200 of them in the District of Columbia. Let's do what we need to do in the T-HUD bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEG0

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 5, strike "not to exceed".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple amendment. It simply strikes three words, "not to exceed," with respect to the budget of an office that I consider to be pretty important, and that is the Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response.

As you look through the bill, every single part of the Office of the Secretary has a separate line item, and in looking at the bill, I noticed, for example, that for emergency response and security we have budgeted a little over \$10 million. On the other hand, we have budgeted about twice as much for the lawyers for the Office of General Counsel. The lawyers somehow get twice as much as emergency response and security. Frankly, as I look at the list and

how the money is divided, we spend \$24 million roughly, which is nearly more than two times as much for the Assistant Secretary for Policy—all of that being more important than security.

For me, as a Member of Congress who represents some 59,000 square miles, including five ports of entry and 800 miles of the Texas border with Mexico, an area, frankly, where we have seen emergencies and emergency response before, frankly, where the Congress is consistently and rightfully concerned about security, it seems to me that we would give the Department of Transportation some additional flexibility.

This doesn't raise per se the amount of money that's available to them. What it does is give them additional flexibility so that in the event they don't spend the line items from the other items like the Office of Public Affairs or the Office of General Counsel, it gives them the flexibility to spend more money for intelligence, security, and emergency response.

I think if you ask every single individual Member of Congress what is more important, the lawyers or the Department of Transportation Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response; what is more important, the lawyers at the Department of Transportation or the Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response, all of these kinds of things, especially for a Member from the border, I think security is more important.

Again, it doesn't cost more money. It doesn't appropriate any more money, per se. What it does is gives the agency the ability to move money around and the flexibility to provide additional money, should it become necessary. Frankly, one never knows what kind of emergency is going to come up. One never knows what is going to happen, whether it's going to be a natural disaster or a terrorist attack. It always pays to have the emergency response folks have the level of flexibility that they need in order to understand that regardless of what happens, they have the opportunity to do their jobs and to do their jobs well.

Additional budget flexibility in times of limited dollars and limited budgets, I think, is very key. So what this amendment would propose to do is simply strike those three words, "not to exceed," so that there would potentially be an opportunity for the Department of Transportation to spend more money on emergency response and security than the little over \$10 million that's allotted to them for the whole year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say that I am not opposed to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment. It ensures that the Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response would receive no less than \$10.778 million. This office performs important security functions of the Department of Transportation.

I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGOS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the draconian cuts to the Community Development Block Grant, or CDBG, program in this legislation.

The CDBG program has a proven record of success in stabilizing and revitalizing communities across the country by directly providing funds to local communities and giving them the flexibility to decide where the funding will have the greatest impact. In the last 7 years, CDBG has assisted over a million low- and moderate-income homeowners to rehabilitate their homes, keeping neighborhoods and communities safe and stable.

More than 30 million people have benefited from CDBG-funded public improvement programs, including senior and child care centers, homes for persons with disabilities, safe streets, and shelters for victims of domestic violence. Funds have also been used to provide public services to millions of low- and moderate-income households, including employment training, meals to seniors, and services for abused children.

But the real impact of CDBG is not seen on the national scale. It is seen on the streets and in the neighborhoods of the communities that receive these funds. In my district, CDBG funds have established adult literacy programs, legal support for immigrant victims of domestic violence, and youth summer employment opportunities. It has preserved public housing and addressed vacant housing and lots in at-risk neighborhoods, providing support and guidance for small, locally owned businesses.

Because of the flexibility CDBG provides, the city government has been able to identify the most pressing needs and the most at-risk communities and allocate funds as they are needed. When we invest CDBG funds in our cities, we see an immediate impact in the neighborhoods as nonprofit and private entities follow, bringing new development and opportunities for residents.

Mr. Chairman, CDBG was a change from the old way in which specific programs were specifically funded. People in this House—mostly Republicans, I must say—said, Give more flexibility to local governments; instead of giving to 20 categorical-specific programs, fund them into one or two Community Development Block Grants so they can be used more efficiently. We have done that. We have combined a lot of categorical programs into CDBG, and now we want to tear it to pieces.

Despite the success that CDBG has had, the bill we are debating on the floor today would cut funding to \$1.6 billion, which is a 50 percent cut from this year, and the lowest funding level in the 40-year history of the program—lower than when President Ford supported it, even without inflation adjustments.

In New York, CDBG funding would fall from \$164 million to \$82 million. These funding levels will leave hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers and millions of Americans without access to the vital services and support that CDBG provides.

How did we get here? Why are we voting to gut this proven, efficient, flexible program? Why are we voting for a 50 percent cut in an already much too small allotment? The answer is simple: the slash-and-burn Republican budget. The same budget that provides tax breaks for the wealthy and large corporations and unneeded increases in defense spending while slashing funding for Medicaid, food stamps, and WIC has left appropriators with such small funding allocations that this bill was unworkable and unrealistic from the start.

So here we are, slashing programs that serve and protect the most vulnerable among us—programs that are proven to save us money in the long run and programs that support flexibility and accountability in our communities.

We may disagree, Mr. Chairman, on how to keep our economy strong, but we should all agree that we must stop piling these cuts on the backs of seniors and the working poor, women, kids, and the middle class. Stop these cuts to our communities. We should reject this bill unless it's grossly increased in the aggregate, which it won't be, as we know. So we should reject this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague from New York. This bill has too many cuts, and I will oppose final passage. But it does have comparable funding levels between the House and Senate for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, which administers distracted driving prevention grants to the States. This is an area where we need to do more.

Every year thousands of accidents, many fatal, result from people texting or talking on their phones while driving. I'm not just talking about using a hands-free device. I'm talking about someone driving with one hand while talking on a cell phone or texting with the other hand.

In 2011, 3,331 people in the U.S. were killed in crashes involving a distracted driver—up from 3,267 in 2010. And in 2011, more than 387,000 people were injured in an accident involving a distracted driver, and 416,000 were injured in 2010. In 2012, the last year of updated data, 10 percent of injury crashes resulted from distracted driving. It's clear that we must use every opportunity available to push for strong distracted driving laws, much the same as we did for drunk driving, which worked.

So I encourage my colleagues to renew their commitment to address the deadly issue of distracted driving. My Districted Driving Prevention Act, H.R. 1664, withholds funding from States that do not make both texting and talking on a phone while driving a primary offense, and goes further than the U.S. Department of Transportation's efforts to raise awareness and provide grants. These are important efforts, and they should be funded adequately; but they don't go far enough.

To date, only nine States make both texting and talking on a phone while driving a primary offense: my home State of New York, followed by California, Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Nevada, New Jersey, Washington, and West Virginia. That's a start, but it falls short of establishing a national highway safety baseline that saves lives.

□ 1715

In conclusion, let me say, when study after study shows us that distracted driving is just as dangerous as drunk driving, Congress cannot continue to ignore the problem when only nine States have taken action that meets a reasonable standard of safety. Anything less leaves our roads unsafe, our constituents in danger, and more unnecessary deaths as a result.

I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses related to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, \$14,220,000, of which \$8,218,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the powers and duties, functions, authorities and personnel of the Research and Innovative Technology Administration are hereby transferred to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology in the Office of the Secretary, including the authority to accept funding from modal administrations for support of Global Positioning System activities pursuant to reimbursable agreements with the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology in the Office of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 102 and 5 U.S.C. 5315, there shall be an Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology within the Office of the Secretary, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, to lead such office: *Provided further*, That any reference in law, regulation, judicial proceedings, or elsewhere to the Research and Innovative Technology Administration shall be deemed to be a reference to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology of the Department of Transportation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATHAM

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, No. 19.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, beginning on line 4, strike all through page 5, line 6 and insert the following:

For necessary expenses of the Research and Innovative Technology Administration, \$14,220,000, of which \$8,218,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training.

Mr. LATHAM (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment that provides the existing \$14.7 million in DOT funding to the Research and Innovative Technology Administration, rather than a new Assistant Secretary.

This amendment is noncontroversial and addresses concerns of the Science and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committees. It does not affect the scoring of the bill.

I urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in division F of Public Law 113-6, \$237,000,000 are permanently rescinded.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT CAPITAL

For necessary expenses for upgrading and enhancing the Department of Transportation's financial systems and re-engineering business processes, \$4,990,000, to remain available through September 30, 2015.

CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVES

For necessary expenses for cyber security initiatives, including necessary upgrades to wide area network and information technology infrastructure, improvement of network perimeter controls and identity management, testing and assessment of information technology against business, security, and other requirements, implementation of Federal cyber security initiatives and information infrastructure enhancements, implementation of enhanced security controls on network devices, and enhancement of cyber security workforce training tools, \$2,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2015.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, \$9,384,000.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for conducting transportation planning and research, \$6,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That of the unobligated balances made available by Public Law 111-117 and designated for a single project in the accompanying conference report, \$750,000 are hereby permanently rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances made available by Section 195 of Public Law 111-117, \$2,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Working Capital Fund, not to exceed \$172,000,000 shall be paid from appropriations made available to the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That such services shall be provided on a competitive basis to entities within the Department of Transportation: *Provided further*, That the above limitation on operating expenses shall not apply to non-DOT entities: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated in this Act to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without majority approval of the Working Capital Fund Steering Committee and approval of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no assessments may be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity or project funded by this Act unless notice of such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such Committees.

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM

For the cost of guaranteed loans, \$333,000, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 332: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$18,367,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, \$589,000.

MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH

For necessary expenses of Minority Business Resource Center outreach activities, \$3,068,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 332, these funds may be used for business opportunities related to any mode of transportation.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

In addition to funds made available from any other source to carry out the essential air service program under 49 U.S.C. 41731 through 41742, \$100,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That in determining between or among carriers competing to provide service to a community, the Secretary may consider the relative subsidy requirements of the carriers: *Provided further*, That no funds made available under section 41742 of title 49, United States Code, and no funds made available in this Act or any other Act in any fiscal year, shall be available to carry out the essential air service program under sections 41731 through 41742 of such title 49 in communities in the 48 contiguous States unless the community received subsidized essential air service or received a 90-day notice of intent to terminate service and the Secretary required the air carrier to continue to provide service to the community at any time between September 30, 2010, and September 30, 2011, inclusive: *Provided further*, That basic essential air service minimum requirements shall not include the 15-passenger capacity requirement under subsection 41732(b)(3) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act or any other Act shall be used to provide essential air service to communities that require a rate of subsidy per passenger in excess of \$500.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after "communities" insert "in the 48 contiguous States".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I want to thank Chairman LATHAM for his leadership on this bill. It's difficult times.

This is a very simple amendment. In 1978, when Congress deregulated the airline industry, it also provided a means to protect rural communities. The Essential Air Service program ensures the continuation of service to communities that would have lost all air service through deregulation. While

this is a vital program, I respect the efforts of the chairman to find cost savings.

The bill excludes communities from participating in the program if they receive a per-passenger subsidy of greater than \$500. Current law excludes communities if they receive over \$1,000 per passenger, with the exception of communities in Alaska and Hawaii. This recognizes that communities in Alaska and Hawaii are completely dependent on air travel.

Alaska has limited road infrastructure. Eighty-two percent of Alaskan communities do not have a road system. In many of these communities, everything has to come in by air. My amendment clarifies that the proposed reforms will not alter the longstanding recognition of the realities in Alaska and Hawaii—no roads, no alternatives, complete dependence on aviation.

My amendment has no score per CBO and does not impact funding levels of the program. My amendment provides a no-cost solution to ensure the most remote areas of our Nation are not excluded from participating in this program. I'd just like to remind my colleagues if you take all the land east of the Mississippi River to the Atlantic Ocean, from Maine to Florida, that's Alaska. And you think about it, in that area, there's 253 Congressmen and 52 Senators. That's really different. Hawaii has the same problem—not quite as large, but we have only one way to communicate, and that's with air service.

I urge the passage of this amendment. It is a very simple amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I just will stand up in favor of the amendment and I will be calling a recorded vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Young amendment. This amendment will continue the administration of the Essential Air Service program, recognizing the unique characteristics of both Hawaii and Alaska.

The Essential Air Service program was put into place to guarantee that small communities, like the communities in our States, will continue to maintain a minimal level of scheduled air service with access to the national air transportation system. Especially in times of medical emergencies or natural disasters, this literally is the difference between life and death for the people in our communities.

In a State like Hawaii, where I'm from, where island communities are separated by the Pacific Ocean, access to air service is oftentimes the only transportation option available if service needs to be provided with any regularity or within specific time constraints.

One example is Kalaupapa, a community on an isolated peninsula on the north shore of Molokai. When Hansen's disease was first introduced to the Hawaiian Islands, all people afflicted with this disease were sent to this rural community, Kalaupapa. Today, it is a refuge for the remaining residents and patients who, now cured, would still like to live there. If not for the assistance of the Essential Air Service program, the only way to get in and out of that community is a 3.5 mile trail down a 1,700-foot sea cliff used by mule riders and hikers. This trail is extremely steep and challenging and has been made impassable in the past because of heavy rains. This is just one example of why this continued air service is critical to the people who continue to live in this community.

Hawaii and Alaska, as illustrated, have unique geographical limitations and challenges. Whereas other communities are generally accessible by vehicle, that's not always the case in the noncontiguous States; 3½ miles doesn't sound very far until you're looking up the side of a steep cliff from the back of a mule.

The amendment being offered by Representative YOUNG would continue this program's recognition of our exceptional geographic challenges. This amendment maintains the current practice of Alaska and Hawaii being exempt from restrictions on what communities are eligible for the Essential Air Service program.

Currently, only two communities in Hawaii qualify—Kalaupapa and Kamuela—but maintaining this air service is critically important for all people who live in these areas.

I would also just like to take a moment to recognize my colleague from Hawaii, Congresswoman COLLEEN HANABUSA. She has worked very closely with Congressman YOUNG on this amendment and would have liked to have been here to speak in strong support of it today were it not for Tropical Storm Flossie, where she is stuck in Hawaii, across the Pacific Ocean away.

I would like to thank Representative YOUNG for offering this amendment and for his leadership, and strongly urge my colleagues to support the Young amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I want to make sure that my

friends who live far, far away from where I live do understand that many of us understand the dynamics that they've presented. Arguably, their argument is unassailable, and I rise in support of their amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$250)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, the Essential Air Service program is an expensive government handout. It is, in effect, welfare for airplanes.

Page 9 of the bill expressly states that the per passenger subsidy extended to rural communities—and by the way, we're not talking about Hawaii and Alaska here; we're talking about places like Muscle Shoals—for a flight that would not otherwise exist is capped at \$500. I think that's too high. I don't know why we should be, in effect, paying people \$500 to fly to Muscle Shoals. I don't see the sense of that at a time when we're cutting food stamps and cutting block grants to communities. I think it's a poor way to spend taxpayer funds. My amendment would reduce this subsidy to a still-very-high \$250 per passenger because \$500 per passenger is simply outrageous.

If passengers don't want to pay for aviation routes, then they simply shouldn't exist. For 500 bucks per passenger, we could literally rent a limousine for every single person aboard each flight and drive them to the single nearest commercial airport.

I understand the need for rural services in necessary aspects of life, like Postal Services, telephones, and even the Internet; but I cannot understand the need to subsidize regular airline flights that would otherwise not exist to the tune of \$500 per passenger.

The bill before us today would cut community development funds in half—to the lowest level since the program began in 1975. It would cut HOME Investment Partnerships to the lowest level since that program began in 1992. And it would drastically reduce the amount of section 8 rental assistance

and increase homelessness. Under these circumstances, I cannot stand by in good conscience and allow a subsidy like this to continue.

I offer this amendment today because it's more important to put a roof over the heads of the poor than it is to hand out corporate welfare to United Airlines and to support aviation routes that simply should not exist.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

We have, in the bill, restrained the growth of this program, keeping the total amount at \$216 million—\$116 million of which is from fees and \$100 million provided in discretionary appropriation for the fiscal year 2012 program level. So it's at the same level as it was before; we don't have any increase.

Mr. Chairman, I really urge the administration, the authorizers, if they want to reform this program, to actually get to work, do it—not on an appropriation bill where we have had no discussion, no debate. It is an issue that should be handled by the authorizers rather than on this appropriation bill.

We need the comprehensive reform so that isolated communities can be served while restraining growth in this program. But I do urge a “no” vote, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I would agree with Chairman LATHAM that this reform needs to come about, and it shouldn't be in an appropriation bill. Hopefully, the T&I authorizing committee will look at this issue and come to a decision.

It was interesting that the amendment before this amendment, we basically waived Hawaii and Alaska. And here we are now limiting the Essential Air Service to \$250. I would tell you, as we tried to explain to my colleague from Florida, that this would probably cause 100—maybe a little more—smaller communities not to be able to link to the national air service. So this is not the time to do it.

So I would rise in opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$100,000,000)”.

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$100,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1730

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply continues the good work started by the amendment of the gentleman from Florida and pulls the plug on this tired old program.

Recently, the much-maligned sequester required a 4 percent cut in the FAA budget, which its leadership then immediately translated into a 40 percent flight delay until the public rebelled.

The total sequester cut to the FAA was roughly \$636 million, and they took that out on the traveling public; yet they had \$243 million to pay for empty and near-empty flights from selected airports in tiny communities under this program that is laughingly called “Essential Air Service.” It is, in fact, the least essential air service imaginable.

Since we last visited this issue, the FAA reauthorization bill made some minor reforms to the program. For example, we are no longer subsidizing air travel from communities that are within a 90-mile radius of a major airport, and the per passenger subsidy has been capped at \$1,000 per passenger.

These minor reforms mean that one airport in Ely, Nevada, has been dropped from the program and two more are about to be. That's a start. But still, it is no excuse for shoveling, as this appropriation does, a total of \$216 million at this program between direct taxpayer subsidies and fees into next year.

In other words, in this austere age of sequestration, when the White House is shuttered to the public and soldiers are being told to pay for their own Internet access, the House of Representatives proposes at best a token reduction in this wasteful, unfair, and outdated program while cutting real essential air services like air traffic control. With all due respect, what in the world are we thinking?

Remember, this was supposed to be a temporary program when we deregulated commercial aviation. It was supposed to last for just a few years to give rural communities a chance to adjust. That was 35 years ago.

It is true there are over a few tiny communities in Alaska—like Kake's

700 hearty souls—who have no highway connections to hub airports, but they have plenty of alternatives. In the case of Kake, they enjoy year-round ferry service to Juneau. In addition, Alaska is well served by a thriving general aviation market and the ubiquitous bush pilot. Rural life has great advantages and great disadvantages, and it is not the job of hardworking taxpayers who choose to live elsewhere to level out these differences.

Apologists for this wasteful spending tell us it is an important economic driver for these small towns, and I'm sure that's so. Whenever you give away money, the folks you are giving it to are always going to be better off. But the folks you are taking it from are always going to be worse off to exactly the same extent. Indeed, it is economic drivers like this that have driven Europe's economy right off a cliff.

Last year, one Member rushed to the microphones to suggest this was essential for emergency medical evacuations. We heard an echo of that a moment ago. It has nothing to do with medical evacuations. This program subsidizes regular, scheduled, commercial service that practically nobody uses. If it actually had a passenger base, we wouldn't need, in effect, to hand out \$1,000 bills to the few passengers who use it, would we? An airline so reckless with its funds would quickly bankrupt itself. The same principle holds true for governments.

The Washington Post is not known as a bastion of fiscal conservatism, but I cannot improve upon the Post's recent editorial when it said:

Ideally, Essential Air Service would be zeroed out, and the \$200 million we waste on it devoted to a truly national purpose: perhaps deficit reduction, military readiness, or the social safety net. Alas, if Congress and the White House were capable of making such choices, we probably never would have had sequestration in the first place.

There are many tough calls in setting fiscal priorities, but this isn't one of them. If the House of Representatives—where all appropriations begin, with a Republican majority pledged to stop wasting money—cannot even agree to cut this useless program off from the trough, how does it expect to be taken seriously on the much tougher choices that lie ahead?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

The Essential Air Service program ensures that small and rural communities have access to the national air transportation system. The program plays a key role in the economic development of many rural communities by ensuring that air service continues.

Does the program need reform? Absolutely, it does, yes. That is why we cap

the per passenger subsidy at \$500, which is down from the current \$1,000 cap per passenger.

We have also cut the discretionary funding in this bill by \$46 million, leaving a total program level of \$216 million—\$100 million in discretionary funding and \$116 million from fees. This is an 18 percent reduction. We already have imposed a significant cut to this program.

We will continue to push the administration to reform the program and work with the Transportation Infrastructure Committee, but an outright elimination of the funding in this bill is a hit to rural communities that I cannot support.

I urge defeat of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to speak in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. The Essential Air Service program was designed to continue air service for small communities that had scheduled air service prior to airline deregulation. It is funded through annual appropriations and overflight fees that are collected when foreign air carriers traverse through U.S. airspace.

This amendment cuts the overall program in half. Many small communities would lose their air service, including, we believe, four communities in the State of California: Crescent City, El Centro, Merced, and Visalia.

This is not the way to reform this program. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of this amendment, I rise to speak in support of eliminating the Essential Air Service program.

I thank my colleague from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for his work on this amendment.

Another Californian once said, "There's nothing more permanent than a temporary government program." Mr. Chairman, I'm sure all my colleagues recognize that famous line from former President Ronald Reagan. His statement was accurate then, just as it is accurate now, regarding the Essential Air Service program.

This program was intended to be temporary. It was created as a transition program in the seventies after airline deregulation to help rural airports adjust to a free market system. We are now more than 25 years after the intended end date of 1988, and the taxpayers are still footing the bill.

This is yet another example of Washington's spending problem, Mr. Chairman. It has to stop.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I certainly understand all Federal programs should be prepared and subjected to cost-saving measures, and Essential Air Service is actually no different. That is why we passed reforms during the FAA reauthorization last year to improve efficiency and save taxpayer dollars.

Additionally, the underlying bill today already includes a reduction in funding for the EAS program. While there is room for savings in all programs, totally eliminating EAS outright would be counterproductive.

The Essential Air Service program serves an important purpose in rural and remote areas. Businesses in rural America actually compete more effectively with even the limited air service that might be available.

Last year, the House rejected this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do so once again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 101. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Transportation may be obligated for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation to approve assessments or reimbursable agreements pertaining to funds appropriated to the modal administrations in this Act, except for activities underway on the date of enactment of this Act, unless such assessments or agreements have completed the normal reprogramming process for Congressional notification.

SEC. 102. The Secretary or his designee may engage in activities with States and State legislators to consider proposals related to the reduction of motorcycle fatalities.

SEC. 103. Notwithstanding section 3324 of title 31, United States Code, in addition to authority provided by section 327 of title 49, United States Code, the Department's Working Capital Fund is hereby authorized to provide payments in advance to vendors that are necessary to carry out the Federal transit pass transportation fringe benefit program under Executive Order 13150 and section 3049 of Public Law 109-59: *Provided*, That

the Department shall include adequate safeguards in the contract with the vendors to ensure timely and high-quality performance under the contract.

SEC. 104. The Secretary shall post on the Web site of the Department of Transportation a schedule of all meetings of the Credit Council, including the agenda for each meeting, and require the Credit Council to record the decisions and actions of each meeting.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
OPERATIONS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration, not otherwise provided for, including operations and research activities related to commercial space transportation, administrative expenses for research and development, establishment of air navigation facilities, the operation (including leasing) and maintenance of aircraft, subsidizing the cost of aeronautical charts and maps sold to the public, lease or purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, in addition to amounts made available by Public Law 108-176, \$9,521,784,000, of which \$6,484,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, of which not to exceed \$7,182,664,000 shall be available for air traffic organization activities; not to exceed \$1,199,777,000 shall be available for aviation safety activities; not to exceed \$14,160,000 shall be available for commercial space transportation activities; not to exceed \$777,198,000 shall be available for finance and management activities; not to exceed \$56,637,000 shall be available for NextGen and operations planning activities; and not to exceed \$291,348,000 shall be available for staff offices: *Provided*, That not to exceed 2 percent of any budget activity, except for aviation safety budget activity, may be transferred to any budget activity under this heading: *Provided further*, That no transfer may increase or decrease any appropriation by more than 2 percent: *Provided further*, That any transfer in excess of 2 percent shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 404 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section: *Provided further*, That not later than March 31 of each fiscal year hereafter, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall transmit to Congress an annual update to the report submitted to Congress in December 2004 pursuant to section 221 of Public Law 108-176: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by \$100,000 for each day after March 31 that such report has not been submitted to the Congress: *Provided further*, That not later than March 31 of each fiscal year hereafter, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress a companion report that describes a comprehensive strategy for staffing, hiring, and training flight standards and aircraft certification staff in a format similar to the one utilized for the controller staffing plan, including stated attrition estimates and numerical hiring goals by fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by \$100,000 per day for each day after March 31 that such report has not been submitted to Congress: *Provided further*, That funds may be used to enter into a grant agreement with a non-profit standard-setting organization to assist in the development of aviation safety standards: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for new applicants for the second career training program: *Provided further*, That none of the

funds in this Act shall be available for the Federal Aviation Administration to finalize or implement any regulation that would promulgate new aviation user fees not specifically authorized by law after the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections funds received from States, counties, municipalities, foreign authorities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred in the provision of agency services, including receipts for the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities, and for issuance, renewal or modification of certificates, including airman, aircraft, and repair station certificates, or for tests related thereto, or for processing major repair or alteration forms: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$140,000,000 shall be for the contract tower program, of which \$10,350,000 is for the contract tower cost share program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act for aeronautical charting and cartography are available for activities conducted by, or coordinated through, the Working Capital Fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000)”.

Page 11, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$500,000)”.

Ms. SPEIER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, on July 6 of this year, Asiana Airlines Flight 214 from Incheon, South Korea, crashed on its final approach to San Francisco International Airport, which is in my district. Initial reports made clear that low airspeed was a crucial factor in that crash. It was a horrible accident. Three Chinese 16-year-old girls on their way to a summer camp in southern California lost their lives. It could have been an absolute catastrophe, because there were over 300 people, including crew, that survived that horrific day.

Low airspeed has been a concern for air safety for almost 20 years. In 1996, the FAA's Human Factors Team concluded that flight crews needed better warnings that the aircraft was reaching low airspeeds. In 2003, following the crash that killed our congressional colleague Senator Paul Wellstone, the National Transportation Safety Board recommended the FAA study whether to require installation of low airspeed audible and visual alert systems. Following the Colgan Air crash in Buffalo, New York, a recommendation was re-

issued in 2010 on installation of redundant audible and visual warnings of impending hazardous low speed conditions.

Now, after almost two decades since the initial recommendation and over 3 years since the recommendation after Colgan, the FAA has not addressed this question of whether existing commercial aircraft should be required to install low airspeed warning systems. I fear that without direction from Congress, the FAA could take years to complete this study. That is why I am offering this amendment, which provides the FAA \$500,000 to conduct and complete a study on this important question within 1 year.

Low airspeed alert systems that cry out “airspeed low” are available and require a simple software change. These differ from the tonal alerts that sound similar to other pilot alerts. The FAA should investigate whether existing low airspeed tonal warnings, such as those in a Boeing 777, provide a sufficient level of pilot warning or if, instead, a verbal warning, such as those in the newer 737s, provides a higher level of safety.

When the alert signals to a pilot that they are traveling at too low of an airspeed, they have at best a few seconds to react. It is vital that planes have alerts that are instantly recognizable, clear, and unambiguous.

Airline safety advocates argue that verbal alerts are more effective at alerting a pilot that they are flying at too low of an airspeed because they are instantly recognizable to a pilot. If a verbal warning is found to be more effective, the FAA should take expedient action to require both new aircraft and existing aircraft to incorporate a verbal warning.

Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure just last week to talk to Sully Sullenberger, the pilot of the “Miracle of Hudson River,” and he said something very compelling to me. He said that when a pilot is in a position of reacting during a crash, they need every one of their senses being alert: the senses when you are holding the throttle, the senses when you hear low speed alert, and the senses when you see “stall.” I thought that was very compelling.

We have a number of cases that suggest now that low airspeed alerts that are verbal should be incorporated. The FAA has dragged its feet. I believe that this particular amendment would be very helpful and save many lives in the future.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment. It is a good amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, we believe that these moneys would expedite the study to see if better warnings could be given at low speeds, so we approve the amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1745

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 9, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$3,497,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, to echo the words of my colleagues, Ranking Members NITA LOWEY and ED PASTOR, my good friend, the allocation provided for T-HUD appropriations under the Ryan budget, which was “deemed passed” by my Republican colleagues, is simply unworkable.

From funding for the Federal Aviation Administration, TIGER grants, public transit programs, Amtrak, high-speed rail, Community Development Block Grants, and the HOME affordable housing program, House Republicans are offering a bill that not only makes devastating cuts to our Nation's transportation infrastructure but to vital programs in housing, health care, education, labor, and other services that millions of Americans rely on, in order to spare defense spending from sequestration.

In particular, this bill makes detrimental cuts to aviation programs and investments in our national air system. It cuts FAA operations by \$185 million below the President's budget request. It slashes \$575 million, 21 percent, from the FAA's Facilities and Equipment account, and it casts doubt on the future hiring of air traffic controllers and inspectors.

NextGen is a full, multiyear effort to modernize our Nation's air traffic control system by transitioning from a ground-based navigation system to a satellite-based navigation system. As it is implemented, NextGen will help reduce delays, expand air traffic system capacity, and mitigate aviation's impact on the environment while ensuring the highest levels of safety. Currently, the FAA is moving from NextGen program development into baseline and operational programs, and passengers and operators are beginning to experience the benefits of these investments. However, while the bill preserves funding for the NextGen programs currently under deployment, it forces the FAA to greatly slow down its NextGen modernization of the air traffic control system.

My amendment restores funding for NextGen programs to the fiscal year 2013 level within the Operations Planning account. It really does represent a small amount, approximately \$3.5 million, over the FY 2014 House funding level of \$56.6 million for a total of \$60.1 million. The increased funding would help ensure that the FAA remains on schedule with regard to NextGen implementation while giving it the flexibility to decide how best to move forward in this challenging budget environment.

I do recognize that the chairman and ranking member were given a difficult task, and I respect that, but we cannot fail to recognize the future of our NextGen implementation, so I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The committee shares the gentleman's support of NextGen programs. However, this amendment increases one activity in the operations account and makes no other further adjustments. The result is individual program levels that exceed the account level, which one cannot do.

To meet our allocation, the subcommittee looked closely at all accounts and at all programs. The subcommittee placed a high priority on FAA operations with just a 2 percent cut below the budget request. Within the operations account, the subcommittee balanced the number of high priority areas, including NextGen, aviation safety and air traffic control. This amendment throws this account off balance. The programs within the account would no longer add up to the top line, and the FAA could simply ignore the subcommittee's direction on other program levels in the account. So, therefore, we urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. The amendment increases funding for the FAA's NextGen office by \$3.5 million. As stated by my colleague from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), it is for future development. I would agree with him that it is something that we need to invest in and that this would accelerate the implementation of NextGen, which is greatly needed. Our air traffic control system is aging and needs modernization. Yet, as Mr. WOLF has pointed out, the allocation is so tight that moving money in the account will cause some problems.

My hope would be that if there is a reconciliation with the Senate that

this would be given a higher priority in the funding levels as we work in conference with the Senate.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for acquisition, establishment, technical support services, improvement by contract or purchase, and hire of national airspace systems and experimental facilities and equipment, as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; engineering and service testing, including construction of test facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Administration stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available; and the purchase, lease, or transfer of aircraft from funds available under this heading, including aircraft for aviation regulation and certification; to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, \$2,155,000,000, of which \$458,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014; \$1,697,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment, improvement, and modernization of national air space systems: *Provided further*, That upon initial submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2015 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to the Congress a comprehensive capital investment plan for the Federal Aviation Administration which includes funding for each budget line item for fiscal years 2015 through 2019, with total funding for each year of the plan constrained to the funding targets for those years as estimated and approved by the Office of Management and Budget.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF
FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 9, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$870,031,000) (increased by \$870,031,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do wish to point out that the bill before us today makes deep cuts to FAA facilities and equipment. Make no

mistake that these reductions will directly impact and delay the implementation of NextGen. I've spoken to this issue. This particular amendment makes available approximately \$870 million for NextGen capital programs, which is at the FY 2013 enacted level. This increased funding would help ensure that the FAA remains on schedule with regard to NextGen implementation.

Let me make it very clear. I fought very hard, along with my colleagues, both current and former—Republican and Democrat—to bring the NextGen facilities to the West Palm Beach airport. We were very successful in that regard, but I am troubled that we might not get to full implementation if we continue the reductions that I see that are set forth.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise once again to offer an additional amendment to H.R. 2610, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies (T-HUD) Appropriations Act for FY 2014.

According to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), by the end of the NextGen mid-term in 2020, NextGen improvements will:

Reduce delays by 41 percent;

Cumulatively save 1.6 billion gallons of fuel and reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 16 million metric tons; and

Provide \$38 billion in cumulative benefits to aircraft operators, the traveling public, and the FAA through delay reduction, fuel savings, and other efficiency improvements.

However, the bill before us today makes deep cuts to the FAA's Facilities and Equipment account in the amount of \$575 million, or 21 percent.

Make no mistake. These reductions will directly impact and delay the implementation of NextGen.

Certain NextGen activities currently underway face significant reductions in this bill.

One example is the Optimization of Airspace and Procedures in the Metroplex (OAPM) program, which is the FAA's fast-track initiative to implement new navigation procedures and airspace improvements to reduce fuel consumption and aircraft emissions in some of the United States' busiest airspace.

This could delay the completion of their designs and the beginning of the implementation phase.

My amendment makes available approximately \$870 million for NextGen capital programs, which is the FY 2013 enacted level.

This increased funding would help ensure that the FAA remains on schedule with regard to NextGen implementation, while giving it the flexibility to decide how best to move forward in this challenging budget environment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for research, engineering, and development, as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, \$145,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, which shall be available for expenses incurred for research, engineering, and development: *Provided further*, That, of the unobligated balances from prior year appropriations available under this heading, \$26,183,998 are rescinded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 16, strike "That," and insert "That \$61,960,000 shall be available for NextGen research and development, as authorized by section 48102(a) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*,".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in Switzerland yesterday, there was a collision of trains—one moving north and the other moving south. A good friend of Mr. WOLF's and of Mr. PASTOR's and mine served as chairman and ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, James Oberstar. In addition to the many things that Jim suggested during his tenure here, I think back to some of the things that would have put us in a better position than we are today, particularly with regard to overall infrastructure, roads and rail.

I can't understand—and I was saying to the young staffer working with me—what it is that causes the rail industry, both abroad and here, to not have the necessary equipment that would allow one train on the same track to let the other train coming from the opposite direction, and vice versa, know that they are both on the same track. There just seems to be something wrong with that when we have the kind of sophisticated equipment that we do.

NextGen, in the air area of the world, allows for us to avoid those kinds of problems and to increase efficiency and safety. It ultimately reduces delays and saves fuel, particularly if we get on with what I'm asking for, which is \$62 million for NextGen research and de-

velopment activities from the FAA's Research, Engineering and Development account.

Again, I am not asking for anything that I think would do anything less than help all of us. We don't just live in these places. We fly there. The aviation industry contributes nearly \$1.3 trillion to the United States economy. Furthermore, the FAA's air traffic controllers manage nearly 70,000 flights per day, which, on an annual basis, carry more than 730 million passengers.

With such a vital role in our economy, now is not the time to underfund our Nation's air traffic control system. I urge my colleagues to make a real investment in our Nation's transportation infrastructure by supporting this NextGen amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we share the gentleman's support of the NextGen programs. However, fencing off this amount for NextGen could have the unintended consequences of forcing cuts to other priorities, such as to aviation safety research and programs to improve air traffic control in the near term, including programs to reduce noise and carbon emissions.

I, therefore, urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development, and noise compatibility planning and programs as authorized under subchapter I of chapter 471 and subchapter I of chapter 475 of title 49, United States Code, and under other law authorizing such obligations; for procurement, installation, and commissioning of runway incursion prevention devices and systems at airports of such title; for grants authorized under section 41743 of title 49, United States Code; and for inspection activities and administration of airport safety programs, including those related to airport operating certificates under section 44706 of title 49, United States Code, \$3,200,000,000 to be derived from the Airport

and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$3,350,000,000 in fiscal year 2014, notwithstanding section 47117(g) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for the replacement of baggage conveyor systems, reconfiguration of terminal baggage areas, or other airport improvements that are necessary to install bulk explosive detection systems: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of funds limited under this heading, not more than \$106,600,000 shall be obligated for administration, not less than \$15,000,000 shall be available for the Airport Cooperative Research Program, and not less than \$29,500,000 shall be available for Airport Technology Research.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 110. None of the funds in this Act may be used to compensate in excess of 600 technical staff-years under the federally funded research and development center contract between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Center for Advanced Aviation Systems Development during fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 111. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to pursue or adopt guidelines or regulations requiring airport sponsors to provide to the Federal Aviation Administration without cost building construction, maintenance, utilities and expenses, or space in airport sponsor-owned buildings for services relating to air traffic control, air navigation, or weather reporting: *Provided*, That the prohibition of funds in this section does not apply to negotiations between the agency and airport sponsors to achieve agreement on "below-market" rates for these items or to grant assurances that require airport sponsors to provide land without cost to the FAA for air traffic control facilities.

SEC. 112. The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration may reimburse amounts made available to satisfy 49 U.S.C. 41742(a)(1) from fees credited under 49 U.S.C. 45303, and any amount remaining in such account at the close of that fiscal year may be made available to satisfy section 41742(a)(1) for the subsequent fiscal year.

SEC. 113. Amounts collected under section 40113(e) of title 49, United States Code, shall be credited to the appropriation current at the time of collection, to be merged with and available for the same purposes of such appropriation.

SEC. 114. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for paying premium pay under subsection 5546(a) of title 5, United States Code, to any Federal Aviation Administration employee unless such employee actually performed work during the time corresponding to such premium pay.

SEC. 115. None of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended for an employee of the Federal Aviation Administration to purchase a store gift card or gift certificate through use of a Government-issued credit card.

SEC. 116. None of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended for retention bonuses for an employee of the Federal Aviation Administration without the prior written approval of the Assistant Secretary for Administration of the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available

under this Act or any prior Act may be used to implement or to continue to implement any limitation on the ability of any owner or operator of a private aircraft to obtain, upon a request to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, a blocking of that owner's or operator's aircraft registration number from any display of the Federal Aviation Administration's Aircraft Situational Display to Industry data that is made available to the public, except data made available to a Government agency, for the noncommercial flights of that owner or operator.

SEC. 118. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of more than 7 political and Presidential appointees in the Federal Aviation Administration.

SEC. 119. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to increase fees pursuant to section 44721 of title 49, United States Code, until the FAA conducts a public outreach that is designed to elicit feedback from aviation stakeholders, and until the FAA has reported the justification of its fees on paper and digital products to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 119A. None of the funds appropriated or limited by this Act may be used to change weight restrictions or prior permission rules at Teterboro airport in Teterboro, New Jersey.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Not to exceed \$417,000,000, together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Highway Administration, shall be paid in accordance with law from appropriations made available by this Act to the Federal Highway Administration for necessary expenses for administration and operation. In addition, not to exceed \$3,248,000 shall be paid from appropriations made available by this Act and transferred to the Appalachian Regional Commission in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 104.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Funds available for the implementation or execution of programs of Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs authorized under titles 23 and 49, United States Code, and the provisions of Public Law 112-141 shall not exceed total obligations of \$40,256,000,000 for fiscal year 2014: *Provided*, That the Secretary may collect and spend fees, as authorized by title 23, United States Code, to cover the costs of services of expert firms, including counsel, in the field of municipal and project finance to assist in the underwriting and servicing of Federal credit instruments and all or a portion of the costs to the Federal Government of servicing such credit instruments: *Provided further*, That such fees are available until expended to pay for such costs: *Provided further*, That such amounts are in addition to administrative expenses that are also available for such purpose, and are not subject to any obligation limitation or the limitation on administrative expenses under 23 U.S.C. 608.

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For the payment of obligations incurred in carrying out Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs authorized under title 23, United States Code,

\$40,995,000,000 derived from the Highway account of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account), to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL
HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 120. (a) For fiscal year 2014, the Secretary of Transportation shall—

(1) not distribute from the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways—

(A) amounts authorized for administrative expenses and programs by section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code; and

(B) amounts authorized for the Bureau of Transportation Statistics;

(2) not distribute an amount from the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways that is equal to the unobligated balance of amounts—

(A) made available from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs for previous fiscal years the funds for which are allocated by the Secretary (or apportioned by the Secretary under sections 202 or 204 of title 23, United States Code); and

(B) for which obligation limitation was provided in a previous fiscal year;

(3) determine the proportion that—

(A) the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate of amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2), bears to

(B) the total of the sums authorized to be appropriated for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs (other than sums authorized to be appropriated for provisions of law described in paragraphs (1) through (11) of subsection (b) and sums authorized to be appropriated for section 119 of title 23, United States Code, equal to the amount referred to in subsection (b)(12) for such fiscal year), less the aggregate of the amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection;

(4) distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2), for each of the programs (other than programs to which paragraph (1) applies) that are allocated by the Secretary under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act and title 23, United States Code, or apportioned by the Secretary under sections 202 or 204 of that title, by multiplying—

(A) the proportion determined under paragraph (3); by

(B) the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each such program for such fiscal year; and

(5) distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2) and the amounts distributed under paragraph (4), for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs that are apportioned by the Secretary under title 23, United States Code (other than the amounts apportioned for the national highway performance program in section 119 of title 23, United States Code, that are exempt from the limitation under subsection (b)(12) and the amounts apportioned under sections 202 and 204 of that title) in the proportion that—

(A) amounts authorized to be appropriated for the programs that are apportioned under title 23, United States Code, to each State for such fiscal year; bears to

(B) the total of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the programs that are

apportioned under title 23, United States Code, to all States for such fiscal year.

(b) EXCEPTIONS FROM OBLIGATION LIMITATION.—The obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways shall not apply to obligations under or for—

(1) section 125 of title 23, United States Code;

(2) section 147 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978 (23 U.S.C. 144 note; 92 Stat. 2714);

(3) section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1981 (95 Stat. 1701);

(4) subsections (b) and (j) of section 131 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 2119);

(5) subsections (b) and (c) of section 149 of the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987 (101 Stat. 198);

(6) sections 1103 through 1108 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2027);

(7) section 157 of title 23, United States Code (as in effect on June 8, 1998);

(8) section 105 of title 23, United States Code (as in effect for fiscal years 1998 through 2004, but only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000 for each of those fiscal years);

(9) Federal-aid highway programs for which obligation authority was made available under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 107) or subsequent Acts for multiple years or to remain available until expended, but only to the extent that the obligation authority has not lapsed or been used;

(10) section 105 of title 23, United States Code (but, for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2012, only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000 for each of those fiscal years);

(11) section 1603 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 118 note; 119 Stat. 1248), to the extent that funds obligated in accordance with that section were not subject to a limitation on obligations at the time at which the funds were initially made available for obligation;

(12) section 119 of title 23, United States Code (but, for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014, only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000 for each of those fiscal years).

(c) REDISTRIBUTION OF UNUSED OBLIGATION AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary shall, after August 1 of such fiscal year—

(1) revise a distribution of the obligation limitation made available under subsection (a) if an amount distributed cannot be obligated during that fiscal year; and

(2) redistribute sufficient amounts to those States able to obligate amounts in addition to those previously distributed during that fiscal year, giving priority to those States having large unobligated balances of funds apportioned under sections 144 (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act) and 104 of title 23, United States Code.

(d) APPLICABILITY OF OBLIGATION LIMITATIONS TO TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways shall apply to contract authority for transportation research programs carried out under—

(A) chapter 5 of title 23, United States Code; and

(B) division E of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Obligation authority made available under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) remain available for a period of 4 fiscal years; and

(B) be in addition to the amount of any limitation imposed on obligations for Federal aid highway and highway safety construction programs for future fiscal years.

(e) REDISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN AUTHORIZED FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the distribution of obligation limitation under subsection (a), the Secretary shall distribute to the States any funds (excluding funds authorized for the program under section 202 of title 23, United States Code) that—

(A) are authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year for Federal-aid highway programs; and

(B) the Secretary determines will not be allocated to the States (or will not be apportioned to the States under section 204 of title 23, United States Code), and will not be available for obligation, in such fiscal year due to the imposition of any obligation limitation for such fiscal year.

(2) RATIO.—Funds shall be distributed under paragraph (1) in the same ratio as the distribution of obligation authority under subsection (a)(5).

(3) AVAILABILITY.—Funds distributed to each State under paragraph (1) shall be available for any purpose described in section 133(b) of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, funds received by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics from the sale of data products, for necessary expenses incurred pursuant to chapter 63 of title 49, United States Code, may be credited to the Federal-aid highways account for the purpose of reimbursing the Bureau for such expenses: *Provided*, That such funds shall be subject to the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

SEC. 122. Not less than 15 days prior to waiving, under his statutory authority, any Buy America requirement for Federal-aid highway projects, the Secretary of Transportation shall make an informal public notice and comment opportunity on the intent to issue such waiver and the reasons therefor: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall provide an annual report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on any waivers granted under the Buy America requirements.

SEC. 123. From the unobligated balances of funds apportioned among the States prior to October 1, 2012, under sections 104(b) and 144 of title 23, United States Code (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 112-141), the amount of \$13,248,000 shall be made available in fiscal year 2014 for the administrative expenses of the Federal Highway Administration: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to funds distributed in accordance with section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 109-59); and the first sentence of section 133(d)(3)(A) of such title (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 112-141): *Provided further*, That such amount shall be derived on a proportional basis from the unobligated balances of apportioned funds to which this provision applies: *Provided further*, That the amount made available by this provision in fiscal year 2014 for the administrative expenses of the Federal Highway Administration shall be in addition to the amount made available in fiscal year 2014 for such purposes under section 104(a) of title 23, United States

Code: *Provided further*, That the amount made available by this provision in fiscal year 2014 for the administrative expenses of the Federal Highway Administration shall have the same period of availability and characteristics of the contract authority made available under section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code.

□ 1800

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, beginning on line 23, strike section 123.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Per an agreement with the authorizing committee, this amendment strikes section 123 under the administrative provision of the Federal Highway Administration. This section made certain unobligated balances of contract authority available in 2014.

This amendment is noncontroversial and will have no budgetary scoring effect.

I respectfully ask for a “yes” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. The amendment strikes \$13.25 million in additional funds for the administrative expenses for the Federal Highway Administration.

While I will not object to my friend’s amendment, I do have concerns that the more we cut on the administrative expenses, the agency’s ability to do proper oversight will suffer.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 124. (a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available, limited, or otherwise affected by this Act shall be used to approve or otherwise authorize the imposition of any toll on any segment of highway located on the Federal-aid system in the State of Texas that—(1) as of the date of enactment of this Act, is not tolled; (2) is constructed with Federal assistance provided under title 23, United States Code; and (3) is in actual operation as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) NUMBER OF TOLL LANES.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any segment of highway on the Federal-aid system described in that subsection that, as of the date on which a toll is imposed on the segment, will have the same number of nontoll lanes as were in existence prior to that date.

(2) HIGH-OCCUPANCY VEHICLE LANES.—A high-occupancy vehicle lane that is con-

verted to a toll lane shall not be subject to this section, and shall not be considered to be a nontoll lane for purposes of determining whether a highway will have fewer nontoll lanes than prior to the date of imposition of the toll, if—(A) high-occupancy vehicles occupied by the number of passengers specified by the entity operating the toll lane may use the toll lane without paying a toll, unless otherwise specified by the appropriate county, town, municipal or other local government entity, or public toll road or transit authority; or (B) each high-occupancy vehicle lane that was converted to a toll lane was constructed as a temporary lane to be replaced by a toll lane under a plan approved by the appropriate county, town, municipal or other local government entity, or public toll road or transit authority.

FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY
ADMINISTRATION

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY OPERATIONS AND
PROGRAMS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in the implementation, execution and administration of motor carrier safety operations and programs pursuant to section 31104(i) of title 49, United States Code, and sections 4127 and 4134 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, \$259,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, the sum of which shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for implementation, execution, or administration of motor carrier safety operations and programs authorized under title 49, United States Code, shall not exceed total obligations of \$259,000,000 for “Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs” for fiscal year 2014, of which \$9,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016, is for the Research and Technology program, and of which \$1,000,000 shall be available for commercial motor vehicle operator’s grants to carry out section 4134 of Public Law 109-59: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 4127(e) of Public Law 109-59, none of the funds under this heading for outreach and education shall be available for transfer.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out sections 31102, 31104(a), 31106, 31107, 31109, 31309, 31313 of title 49, United States Code, and sections 4126 and 4128 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-41, \$313,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for the implementation or execution of motor carrier safety programs shall not exceed total obligations of \$313,000,000 in fiscal year 2014 for “Motor Carrier Safety Grants”; of which \$218,000,000 shall be available for the motor carrier safety assistance program, \$30,000,000 shall be available for the commercial driver’s license improvements program, \$32,000,000 shall be available for border enforcement grants, \$5,000,000 shall be available for the performance and registration information system management program,

\$25,000,000 shall be available for the commercial vehicle information systems and networks deployment program, and \$3,000,000 shall be available for the safety data improvement program: *Provided further*, That, of the funds made available herein for the motor carrier safety assistance program, \$32,000,000 shall be available for audits of new entrant motor carriers: *Provided further*, That \$95,956,883 in unobligated balances are permanently rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION—FEDERAL MOTOR
CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 130. Funds appropriated or limited in this Act shall be subject to the terms and conditions stipulated in section 350 of Public Law 107-87 and section 6901 of Public Law 110-28.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY
ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary, with respect to traffic and highway safety authorized under chapter 301 and part C of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code, \$117,000,000, of which \$20,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 403, and chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, \$139,175,088, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2014, are in excess of \$139,175,088, of which \$133,801,093 shall be for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 403, and of which \$5,373,995 shall be for the National Driver Register authorized under chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That within the \$133,801,093 obligation limitation for operations and research, \$20,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015 and shall be in addition to the amount of any limitation imposed on obligations for future years: *Provided further*, That \$20,675,088 of the total obligation limitation for operations and research in fiscal year 2014 shall be applied toward unobligated balances of contract authority provided in prior Acts for carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 403, and chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out provisions of 23 U.S.C. 402 and 405, section 2009 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112-141, to remain available until expended, \$561,500,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account): *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2014, are in excess of \$561,500,000 for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402 and 405, section 2009 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and section

31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112-141, of which \$235,000,000 shall be for "Highway Safety Programs" under 23 U.S.C. 402; \$272,000,000 shall be for "National Priority Safety Programs" under 23 U.S.C. 405; \$29,000,000 shall be for "High Visibility Enforcement Program" under section 2009 of Public Law 109-59, as amended by Public Law 112-141; \$25,500,000 shall be for "Administrative Expenses" under section 31101(a)(6) of Public Law 112-141: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used for construction, rehabilitation, or remodeling costs, or for office furnishings and fixtures for State, local or private buildings or structures: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500,000 of the funds made available for "National Priority Safety Programs" under 23 U.S.C. 405 for "Impaired Driving Countermeasures" (as described in subsection (d) of that section) shall be available for technical assistance to the States: *Provided further*, That with respect to the "Transfers" provision under 23 U.S.C. 405(a)(1)(G), any amounts remaining available to carry out any activities described in subsection (b) through (g) to increase the amount made available under section 402, shall include the obligational authority for such amounts: *Provided further*, That of the prior year unobligated balances of contract authority for "Highway Traffic Safety Grants", \$152,281,282 is rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—NATIONAL
HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 140. An additional \$130,000 shall be made available to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, out of the amount limited for section 402 of title 23, United States Code, to pay for travel and related expenses for State management reviews and to pay for core competency development training and related expenses for highway safety staff.

SEC. 141. The limitations on obligations for the programs of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration set in this Act shall not apply to obligations for which obligation authority was made available in previous public laws but only to the extent that the obligation authority has not lapsed or been used.

SEC. 142. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to implement section 404 of title 23, United States Code.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION
SAFETY AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Railroad Administration, not otherwise provided for, \$184,500,000, of which \$12,400,000 shall remain available until expended.

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for railroad research and development, \$35,250,000, to remain available until expended.

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT
FINANCING PROGRAM

The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue direct loans and loan guarantees pursuant to sections 502 through 504 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-210), as amended, such authority to exist as long as any such direct loan or loan guarantee is outstanding: *Provided*, That, pursuant to section 502 of such Act, as amended, no new direct loans or loan guarantee commitments shall be made using Federal funds for the credit risk premium during fiscal year 2014.

OPERATING GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL
RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make quarterly grants to the National

Railroad Passenger Corporation for the operation of intercity passenger rail, as authorized by section 101 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (division B of Public Law 110-432), \$350,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amounts available under this paragraph shall be available for the Secretary to approve funding to cover operating losses for the Corporation only after receiving and reviewing a grant request for each specific train route: *Provided further*, That each such grant request shall be accompanied by a detailed financial analysis, revenue projection, and capital expenditure projection justifying the Federal support to the Secretary's satisfaction: *Provided further*, That not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Corporation shall transmit, in electronic format, to the Secretary, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation the annual budget and business plan and the 5-Year Financial Plan for fiscal year 2014 required under section 204 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008: *Provided further*, That the budget, business plan, monthly performance reports, and the 5-Year Financial Plan shall also include a separate accounting of ridership, revenues, and capital and operating expenses for the Northeast Corridor; commuter service; long-distance Amtrak service; State-supported service; each intercity train route, including Autotrain; and commercial activities including contract operations: *Provided further*, That the budget, business plan and the 5-Year Financial Plan shall include a description of work to be funded, along with cost estimates and an estimated timetable for completion of the projects covered by these plans: *Provided further*, That the budget, business plan and the 5-Year Financial Plan shall include annual information on the maintenance, refurbishment, replacement, and expansion for all Amtrak rolling stock consistent with the comprehensive fleet plan: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall provide semiannual reports in electronic format regarding the pending business plan, which shall describe the work completed to date, any changes to the business plan, and the reasons for such changes, and shall identify all sole-source contract awards which shall be accompanied by a justification as to why said contract was awarded on a sole-source basis, as well as progress against the milestones and target dates of the 2012 performance improvement plan: *Provided further*, That the Corporation's budget, business plan, 5-Year Financial Plan, semiannual reports, and all subsequent supplemental plans shall be displayed on the Corporation's Web site within a reasonable timeframe following their submission to the appropriate entities: *Provided further*, That these plans shall be accompanied by a comprehensive fleet plan for all Amtrak rolling stock which shall address the Corporation's detailed plans and timeframes for the maintenance, refurbishment, replacement, and expansion of the Amtrak fleet: *Provided further*, That said fleet plan shall establish year-specific goals and milestones and discuss potential, current, and preferred financing options for all such activities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading may be obligated or expended until the Corporation agrees to continue abiding by the provisions of paragraphs 1, 2, 5, 9, and 11 of the summary of conditions for the direct loan agreement of June 28, 2002, in the

same manner as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used to support any route on which Amtrak offers a discounted fare of more than 50 percent off the normal peak fare: *Provided further*, That the preceding proviso does not apply to routes where the operating loss as a result of the discount is covered by a State and the State participates in the setting of fares: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a budget request for fiscal year 2015 in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies of the Federal Government.

CAPITAL AND DEBT SERVICE GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for capital investments as authorized by section 101(c), 102, and 219(b) of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (division B of Public Law 110-432), \$600,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That after an initial distribution of up to \$50,000,000, which shall be used by the Corporation as a working capital account, all remaining funds shall be provided to the Corporation only on a reimbursable basis: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may retain up to one-half of 1 percent of the funds provided under this heading to fund the costs of project management oversight of capital projects funded by grants provided under this heading, as authorized by subsection 101(d) of division B of Public Law 110-432: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall approve funding for capital expenditures, including advance purchase orders of materials, for the Corporation only after receiving and reviewing a grant request for each specific capital project justifying the Federal support to the Secretary's satisfaction: *Provided further*, That except as otherwise provided herein, none of the funds under this heading may be used to subsidize operating losses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading may be used for capital projects not approved by the Secretary of Transportation or on the Corporation's fiscal year 2014 business plan: *Provided further*, That in addition to the project management oversight funds authorized under section 101(d) of division B of Public Law 110-432, the Secretary may retain up to an additional \$3,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading to fund expenses associated with implementing section 212 of division B of Public Law 110-432, including the amendments made by section 212 to section 24905 of title 49, United States Code.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$600,000,000)".

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$600,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase the appropriations for Amtrak's capital and debt service grants by \$600 million and increase the spending reduc-

tion amount by the same amount. It would have the effect of entirely defunding this account.

Amtrak was created by Congress in 1970 to provide nationwide passenger rail service. It currently operates more than 40 routes across the United States. Unfortunately, the majority of these routes operate at a huge loss to taxpayers. The committee report for the underlying bill details just how big that loss is. In fiscal year 2011, Amtrak's long-distance routes ran a deficit of \$554 million. By next year, that amount is projected to grow to \$610 million in losses.

Mr. Chairman, the committee also takes note of Amtrak's troubled food and beverage service, which has lost a total of \$313 million just over the last 3 years. This year alone, Amtrak is projected to lose nearly \$75 million on its food and beverage service, reflecting just a return of only 64 percent on its expenses. Despite these losses, Amtrak pays the attendants who serve on board food and beverages between \$24 and \$27 per hour. The committee itself points out that this wage is more than 20 percent higher than that of flight attendants, and these employees' current labor agreement calls for another 3 percent increase each year for the next 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, this isn't the first time I've come to the floor to talk about Amtrak, and I can say with some confidence that this probably won't be the last.

We as a country are broke; yet we continue to offer hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars each year to a passenger rail line which refuses to make meaningful reforms. The waste here is rampant, and we just cannot afford it anywhere. Our Nation is broke. We've got to stop spending money we don't have. We have to live within our means.

I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment as it would shut down Amtrak.

I can see that Amtrak could be more efficient. There is no doubt about that. However, it has made significant improvements in this area recently, and it is moving in the right direction.

The bill does not include arbitrary funding decisions. We held hearings and scrubbed each. This committee worked very hard to achieve a balanced bill within our limited funding.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. This amendment is just another example of how the Republican majority is limiting transportation options for the American people.

Last year, more than 31 million Americans chose Amtrak as the means of transportation to get to business meetings, family gatherings, and vacations. They chose Amtrak to avoid crowded airplanes, congested highways, and for the opportunity to view the wonderful and majestic scenery of this great Nation. Americans deserve a passenger rail system that is safe and reliable.

This amendment also demonstrates how many Members on the other side of the aisle will blindly cut funding without any idea of the real ramifications. For instance, I sincerely doubt that the gentlelady from Tennessee understands that in addition to handing out 20,000 pink slips, her amendment would cost the government \$4.5 billion over the next 5 years due to the violation of labor agreements.

This is a shortsighted amendment. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEXT GENERATION HIGH-SPEED RAIL (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available for Next Generation High Speed Rail, as authorized by sections 1103 and 7201 of Public Law 105-178, \$1,973,000 are hereby permanently rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be cancelled from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available for the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program, as authorized by Public Law 94-210, \$4,419,000 are hereby permanently rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be cancelled from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 150. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds provided in this Act for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation shall immediately cease to be available to said Corporation in the event that the Corporation contracts to have services provided at or from any location outside the United States. For purposes of this section, the word "services" shall mean any service that was, as of July 1, 2006, performed by a full-time or part-time Amtrak employee whose base of employment is located within the United States.

SEC. 151. The Secretary of Transportation may receive and expend cash, or receive and

utilize spare parts and similar items, from non-United States Government sources to repair damages to or replace United States Government owned automated track inspection cars and equipment as a result of third-party liability for such damages, and any amounts collected under this section shall be credited directly to the Safety and Operations account of the Federal Railroad Administration, and shall remain available until expended for the repair, operation and maintenance of automated track inspection cars and equipment in connection with the automated track inspection program.

SEC. 152. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, rule or regulation, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to allow the issuer of any preferred stock heretofore sold to the Department to redeem or repurchase such stock upon the payment to the Department of an amount determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 153. None of the funds provided to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation may be used to fund any overtime costs in excess of \$35,000 for any individual employee: *Provided*, That the president of Amtrak may waive the cap set in the previous proviso for specific employees when the president of Amtrak determines such a cap poses a risk to the safety and operational efficiency of the system: *Provided further*, That Amtrak shall notify House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 30 days of granting waivers and delineate the reasons for granting such waiver in the Corporation's monthly report: *Provided further*, That Amtrak shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on November 1, 2013, a summary of the total number of employees that received such waivers, the total overtime payments the Corporation paid to employees receiving waivers, the total the Corporation paid in overtime payments in the prior three fiscal years, and a description of the factors that contributed to an increase or decrease from the prior year.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of the Federal Transit Administration's programs authorized by chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, \$102,713,000, of which up to \$3,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5329 and not less than \$1,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5326: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided or limited in this Act may be used to create a permanent office of transit security under this heading: *Provided further*, That upon submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2015 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to Congress the annual report on New Starts, including proposed allocations for fiscal year 2015.

TRANSIT FORMULA GRANTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY) (LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in the Federal Public Transportation Assistance Program in this account, and for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5329(e)(6), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340, as amended by Public Law 112-141; and section 20005(b) of Public Law 112-141, \$9,500,000,000, to be derived from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for the implementation or

execution of programs authorized under 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5310, 5311, 5318, 5322(d), 5329(e)(6), 5335, 5337, 5339, and 5340, as amended by Public Law 112-141, and section 20005(b) of Public Law 112-141, shall not exceed total obligations of \$8,595,000,000 in fiscal year 2014.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION, AND DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5312, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TRANSIT COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5313, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5314, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

HUMAN RESOURCES AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5322(a), (b), and (e), \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5309, \$1,815,655,000, to remain available until expended.

□ 1815

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$127,283,000)".

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to increase transit funding for Capital Investment Grants, also known as the New Starts program, by \$127 million, which would bring it to the same level as the bill currently being considered in the Senate.

Earlier this year, almost 100 Members joined me in sending a letter to the Appropriations Committee requesting funding for transit, at a minimum, at the levels authorized in MAP-21 and in the President's request. In one of the few bright spots in this bill, transit formula grants are funded at the MAP-21 authorized level, in large part because the formula grants are funded out of the mass transit account of the highway trust fund. Unfortunately, the New Starts and Small Starts program, which comes out of general revenue and funds the construction of new fixed guideway systems, such as new subway lines, bus rapid transit, and light rail is cut 7 percent below the enacted level and 8 percent below the President's request. This shows how important it is that the provision in last year's Republican bill that would have cut regular

mass transit funds out of the highway trust fund and subject it to appropriations was defeated because otherwise we would have a drastic cut there, too.

This bill is out of step with the demands of the American people. According to the American Public Transportation Association, a record 10.5 billion trips were taken last year, the second highest annual ridership since 1957. This increase in ridership is occurring all over the country, in places like Michigan, Ohio, South Carolina, Texas, Tennessee, Florida, Arizona, and Utah, to name just a few. Despite the increase in ridership, Federal transportation funding is not keeping up with demand. Public transportation agencies all across the country are facing possible job cuts, maintenance backlogs, service reductions, and fare hikes.

The funding levels in this bill provide barely enough to meet our existing commitments to projects currently under construction, and there is a small amount of money for only a few new Small Starts. The funding level is too low to adequately finance planning and development of additional transit projects. The policy framework in this bill is one of attrition and contraction: to provide just enough money to close out the old projects, with no plans to invest in major new transit systems in any meaningful way in the future. We are not adequately investing in building new capacity and expanding transit service around this country, but I suppose that is the point—to slowly starve these programs to the point that they cease to be effective and then argue that they are not necessary.

But I am optimistic that we will ultimately provide greater funding for transit. This is an issue that historically has had bipartisan support. Many of my Republican friends joined me in protecting the transit funding guarantees during consideration of surface transportation legislation last year and in defeating the leadership's attempt to eliminate it. The business community and the real estate industry support funding for public transportation, along with a wide range of labor, civil rights, environmental, and civic organizations. Public transportation has broad support all over the country because people understand that investing in transit is one of the smartest things we can do to create jobs right here in America, reduce congestion and dependence on foreign oil, and spur economic growth.

My amendment would increase the New Starts program by \$127 million, which is a modest amount considering how much we should be investing in our infrastructure, but at least it would put the House bill on equal footing with the Senate. Unfortunately, there is no account to use as an offset that wouldn't cause significant harm to other important programs, and, therefore, I have offered none. I understand the chairman may insist upon

raising a point of order, and this just shows the limitations under which we are working in this impossible bill in which there is grossly inadequate funding all around so that you can't responsibly ask for an offset without destroying mass transit or something else that is of great import in order to support adequate expenditures.

I urge my colleagues to support increasing transit funding in whatever final product for FY14 appropriations becomes law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5, 113th Congress, which states:

It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in the budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2 (f) of rule XXI.

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of such section. It would increase budget authority by \$127,383,000.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair will rule.

The gentleman from Iowa makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Iowa, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS TO THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

For grants to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority as authorized under section 601 of division B of Public Law 110-432, \$125,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall approve grants for capital and preventive maintenance expenditures for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority only after receiving and reviewing a request for each specific project: *Provided further*, That prior to approving such grants, the Secretary shall determine that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority has placed the highest priority on those investments that will improve the safety of the

system: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, in order to ensure safety throughout the rail system, may waive the requirements of section 601(e)(1) of title VI of Public Law 110-432 (112 Stat. 4968).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert (reduced by \$125,000,000).

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert (increased by \$125,000,000).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, it was my impression that this House had put an end to earmarks, and yet the Transportation-HUD appropriations bill contains \$125 million solely for the benefit of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, also known as WMATA.

This is just a fraction, mind you, of the \$1.5 billion that Congress intends to give the D.C. Metro system over a 10-year period. This is not just your everyday average earmark. The Heritage Foundation has dubbed this subsidy "the largest earmark in American history."

So I have an amendment here at the desk, and it is very simple. It simply eliminates this earmark that has received subsidies since 2008.

At a time of record budget deficits and debt, the American people cannot afford to provide yet again another earmark, another special subsidy, especially when you take into consideration the fact that the D.C. Metro already receives funds from a variety of other Federal sources, from other Federal Transit Administration grants and programs.

Also, you add to that, given the performance of this agency, I find it absolutely astounding that the American people should want to give even more of their hard-earned cash to this agency. In addition to daily service interruptions, lax management, and poor general performance, Metro has a significant record of wasting money. Right here in The Washington Post, it was reported that Metro spent \$382 million to rebuild cars, only to have them break down even more often than the cars that they didn't overhaul. The Post also pointed out that when senior agency attorneys wanted new offices for themselves, they spent over a quarter of a million dollars to accommodate them. And why not? It's simply our money, taxpayer money being used.

Last year, it was reported that the Office of Inspector General uncovered several personal and unwarranted expenses on Metro's credit cards, such as \$2,000 worth of gift cards, things like camcorders valued at \$730, and even

\$180 for headphones. So even when they spend this money on things it should be spending on, the facts are really disturbing. The Federal Government pays, mind you, over half—specifically, 56 percent—of their capital costs already.

Now, I understand that we'll hear others who say, D.C., the Nation's Capital, it's a tourist destination and it has a large population that utilizes it as transportation to get to work, but this is nothing unique. The same can be said for cities back in my neck of the woods like New York City or over in Chicago or Philadelphia, Boston, and Los Angeles. Should they get the same earmarks as well? What is it that is unique about Washington, D.C., that they are the only ones that get this type of earmark?

Congress should not be forced to make the taxpayers use their hard-earned money to subsidize a transportation system that has failed over the years to get its fiscal house in order. We owe it to the American people to be better than that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I understand our friend from New Jersey apparently doesn't like Metro or the clientele it serves. So much of what he said I think is, in fact, distorted.

The Metro system in metropolitan Washington is one of the great success stories of regional cooperation in the United States of America. In less than 40 years, this system has created the second highest transit utilization in the United States. New York's is well over 120 years old; we're less than 40.

In addition, my friend talked about taxpayer money. Not a dime of Federal money sustains or subsidizes Metro's operating costs. That's a problem because 40 percent of the Federal workforce uses Metro every day; and it is subsidized not by the Federal Government, I say to my friend from New Jersey, but by local governments in the metropolitan area. And I know because I was chairman of one of them, and I had to write that check every year for the subsidy for Metro—not the Federal Government, the government of Fairfax County. And we were happy to write the check because we saw the value in Metro.

Metro also has the highest fare box recovery rate in the United States of any transit system. Subsidies, we recover 80 percent through the fare box. It's the most efficient recovery in the

United States. It lacks a dedicated source of revenue. It's the only major transit system in the United States that lacks a dedicated source of revenue.

That's why I say to my friend from New Jersey, my Republican predecessor introduced this legislation you want to cut. Tom Davis was the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. He was a Republican Congressman from Virginia, from the 11th District of Virginia I now am privileged to represent, and he and I saw eye to eye on this subject. We needed Federal help, and the Federal Government has a special responsibility because this is the Nation's Capital.

Twelve million visitors use that Metro system at some point or another during the course of a year, unsubsidized by the Federal Government. In fact, the only subsidy we ever get is every 4 years when there's an inauguration, there's some consideration made. Other than that, we're kind of on our own.

And so Tom Davis, my Republican predecessor felt, as did all of us in the region, that there was a special obligation to at least help on capital improvements because it's an aging system. And with that aging system, elevators need to be replaced, escalators need to be improved, canopies need to be replaced.

□ 1830

And so we came up with a capital improvement idea. The deal was this: in a Republican Congress, that if the local governments would come up with a match, dollar for dollar, we, the Federal Government, would provide \$150 million a year for that capital improvement, to get new cars that are safer so we can avoid the kind of tragedy that occurred a few years ago in the system, because we have original cars still in the system from almost 40 years ago.

So the local governments came up with that match, \$150 million, 50 for Maryland, 50 for D.C., 50 for Virginia, and we amended the compact, the contract that created Metro, to put Federal representatives on the board for the first time with voting privileges.

If we adopt this amendment today, we turn our back on that Republican idea, that Republican legislation, and we turn our back on the faith that the local jurisdictions have expressed in keeping their commitment as part of this bargain.

Metro is a very important part of our Nation's Capital, and it is wrong to disinvest in it, and it's even wronger to break a contract, a commitment we made several years ago when my Republican predecessor introduced this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman first begins his comments by attacking my motives in this matter, saying that—what did he say? I do not care about lines such as Metro or the people it serves.

I would ask the gentleman, who's not paying any attention to me, exactly what is it in my statement would say that I do not care about the people that it serves? Because I do care about them, as much as I care about the subway system or the metro system in my metro area, such as New York City or in my metro area, such as down in Newark, New Jersey. I care about them as well.

But you know, when I go back and I talk to those people who use those services, whether they be residents of New Jersey or residents of New York, or maybe they're residents from Virginia, from your neck of the woods up here, who come to visit the financial capital of the world, New York City, or the Garden State of New Jersey, who want to use our metro systems, they ask me why it is that D.C. gets a special deal, why D.C. gets \$1.5 billion over 10 years for their system.

Let's get the facts straight as far as the subsidy for the capital cost of 65 percent, and why our cities in our area, what is it that's so unique and special about this area and not about Chicago or Philadelphia or the other areas.

So I go to my first question. What is it in my statement that you said, you could slander me, sir, by saying that I do not care about the people who ride on these systems?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I would say to my friend from New Jersey, I do not question his motivation; I question his action. His action suggests, just as he just said, we're no different than any other transit system.

Well, we are different. This is the Nation's Capital, and we bear the full responsibility of moving the Federal workforce, the bulk of the Federal workforce to work every single day. That is not a responsibility the New York subway system bears. It's not the responsibility Boston bears, or the BART system in San Francisco bears. It is unique.

And we bear the responsibility in this region of welcoming 10 to 12 million fellow Americans every year to visit the Nation's Capital, many of whom use that Metro system, again, something that is subsidized on an operating basis, by the local taxpayer. That is unique to this area.

Mr. GARRETT. If I had some of the charts showing where some of the

wealthiest districts are in the Nation, where, despite the turmoil of '08 and the financial crisis, where prices of real estate continue to rise, where revenues continue to go up, it would be in this section of the country, not in Boston, not in Philly, not in New York or Newark. But this is one of the wealthiest portions of the country.

And you're right, sir. If this is an area that should look for subsidies, it should look for subsidies from some of the wealthiest people in America that live right here, not under the underlying bill.

It's not asking for people from your district to pay their fair share, or the people from Maryland or Virginia to pay their fair share. It's asking for people from all across the country to chip in to pay for here, when you're not allowing the people from New York, Newark, Philadelphia, Chicago, out in California—those other areas have subway systems and metro systems. You're not willing to help them out.

But, Mr. Speaker, you want everyone else in America to help the residents who live here and subsidize their costs, but you're not willing to help out the people who live in my neck of the woods.

And that, sir, is unfair to my constituents. That's unfair to all the constituents in all those cities that are looking for a fair deal and for efficiency and economy from our government, and not for special deals.

I'll end where I began. I thought Washington had done away with earmarks but, obviously, with this legislation and the special interests that are being catered to here, we have not done so.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. GALLEGOS of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGOS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGOS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 317, noes 92, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

AYES—317

Aderholt	Deutch	Levin
Alexander	Diaz-Balart	Lewis
Amodel	Doggett	Lipinski
Andrews	Doyle	LoBiondo
Bachus	Duckworth	Loeb sack
Barber	Edwards	Lofgren
Barletta	Ellison	Lowenthal
Barrow (GA)	Engel	Lowey
Barton	Enyart	Luetkemeyer
Bass	Eshoo	Lujan Grisham
Beatty	Esty	(NM)
Becerra	Farenthold	Lujan, Ben Ray
Benishek	Fattah	(NM)
Bentivolio	Fitzpatrick	Lynch
Bera (CA)	Forbes	Maffei
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Maloney,
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Carolyn
Bishop (NY)	Fox	Maloney, Sean
Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	Marino
Bonamici	Fudge	Matheson
Bonner	Gabbard	Matsui
Boustany	Gallago	McCarthy (CA)
Brady (PA)	Garamendi	McCaul
Braley (IA)	Garcia	McCollum
Brooks (AL)	Gerlach	McDermott
Brooks (IN)	Gibbs	McGovern
Brown (FL)	Gibson	McHenry
Brownley (CA)	Gohmert	McIntyre
Buchanan	Gowdy	McKeon
Bustos	Grayson	McKinley
Butterfield	Green, Al	McMorris
Calvert	Green, Gene	Rodgers
Camp	Griffin (AR)	McNerney
Capito	Grijalva	Meehan
Capps	Grimm	Meeks
Capuano	Guthrie	Meng
Cárdenas	Hahn	Messer
Carney	Hanna	Michaud
Carson (IN)	Hartzler	Miller, George
Carter	Hastings (WA)	Moore
Cartwright	Heck (NV)	Moran
Cassidy	Heck (WA)	Mullin
Castor (FL)	Higgins	Murphy (FL)
Castro (TX)	Himes	Nadler
Chaffetz	Honda	Napolitano
Chu	Hoyer	Neal
CiCilline	Huffman	Negrete McLeod
Clay	Hunter	Nolan
Cleaver	Israel	Nunes
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Nunnelee
Cohen	Jeffries	O'Rourke
Collins (GA)	Johnson (GA)	Owens
Collins (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Pascarell
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)
Conyers	Jordan	Paulsen
Cook	Joyce	Payne
Cooper	Kaptur	Pearce
Costa	Keating	Pelosi
Cotton	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter
Courtney	Kelly (PA)	Peters (CA)
Crawford	Kennedy	Peters (MI)
Crenshaw	Kildee	Peterson
Crowley	Kilmer	Petri
Cuellar	Kind	Pocan
Culberson	King (IA)	Poe (TX)
Cummings	King (NY)	Polis
Daines	Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo
Davis (CA)	Kirkpatrick	Posey
Davis, Danny	Kline	Price (GA)
Davis, Rodney	Kuster	Price (NC)
DeFazio	Lamborn	Quigley
DeGette	Lance	Rahall
Delaney	Langevin	Reed
DeLauro	Lankford	Reichert
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Renacci
Denham	Larson (CT)	Rice (SC)
Dent	Latham	Richmond
DeSantis	Lee (CA)	Rigell

Roby	Sewell (AL)
Roe (TN)	Shea-Porter
Rogers (AL)	Sherman
Rogers (KY)	Shimkus
Rogers (MI)	Shuster
Rooney	Simpson
Ros-Lehtinen	Sinema
Roskam	Sires
Ross	Slaughter
Rothfus	Smith (NE)
Roybal-Allard	Smith (NJ)
Ruiz	Smith (TX)
Ruppersberger	Smith (WA)
Rush	Speier
Ryan (OH)	Stewart
Ryan (WI)	Stivers
Sánchez, Linda	Swalwell (CA)
T.	Takano
Sanchez, Loretta	Terry
Sarbanes	Thompson (CA)
Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)
Schiff	Thompson (PA)
Schneider	Thornberry
Schock	Tiberi
Schwartz	Tierney
Scott (VA)	Tipton
Scott, David	Titus
Sensenbrenner	Tonko
Serrano	Tsongas
Sessions	Turner

NOES—92

Amash	Goodlatte
Bachmann	Gosar
Barr	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)
Black	Griffith (VA)
Blackburn	Hall
Brady (TX)	Harper
Bridenstine	Harris
Broun (GA)	Hensarling
Bucshon	Holding
Burgess	Hudson
Cantor	Huelskamp
Chabot	Huizenga (MI)
Coble	Hultgren
Coffman	Hurt
Cole	Issa
Conaway	Jenkins
DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam
Duffy	Jones
Duncan (SC)	Kingston
Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa
Elmers	Latta
Fincher	Long
Fleischmann	Lucas
Fleming	Lummis
Flores	Marchant
Franks (AZ)	Massie
Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Gardner	Mica
Garrett	Miller (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)

NOT VOTING—24

Campbell	Hastings (FL)
Clarke	Herrera Beutler
Cramer	Hinojosa
Dingell	Holt
Farr	Horsford
Graves (MO)	Labrador
Gutiérrez	McCarthy (NY)
Hanabusa	Meadows

□ 1901

Messrs. COFFMAN, AMASH, ROKITA, SMITH of Missouri, STOCKMAN, FRANKS of Arizona, BURGESS, and HALL changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. CICILLINE, MCKINLEY, RYAN of Wisconsin, BENTIVOLIO, LEVIN, SHUSTER, RICE of South Carolina, VALADAO, TERRY, MAF-FEI, RUSH and RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mrs. ROBY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 175, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

AYES—239

Aderholt	Duckworth	Lowenthal
Amodel	Edwards	Lowey
Andrews	Ellison	Luetkemeyer
Bachus	Ellmers	Lujan Grisham
Barletta	Engel	(NM)
Bass	Enyart	Lujan, Ben Ray
Beatty	Eshoo	(NM)
Becerra	Esty	Lummis
Benishek	Farr	Lynch
Bera (CA)	Fattah	Maloney,
Bishop (GA)	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
Bishop (NY)	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Bishop (UT)	Gabbard	Marino
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Matsui
Bonamici	Gerlach	McCollum
Bonner	Gibbs	McDermott
Brady (PA)	Gibson	McGovern
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	McIntyre
Braley (IA)	Green, Al	McKeon
Brown (FL)	Green, Gene	McMorris
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Rodgers
Bustos	Guthrie	McNerney
Butterfield	Hahn	Meeks
Calvert	Hall	Meng
Capito	Hanna	Mica
Capps	Harper	Michaud
Capuano	Hartzler	Miller (FL)
Cárdenas	Hastings (FL)	Miller (MI)
Carney	Hastings (WA)	Miller, George
Carson (IN)	Heck (WA)	Moore
Cartwright	Higgins	Moran
Castor (FL)	Honda	Mullin
Castro (TX)	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)
Chu	Huffman	Nadler
CiCilline	Hultgren	Neal
Clarke	Jackson Lee	Negrete McLeod
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Owens
Cleaver	Johnson (OH)	Pascarell
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)
Coble	Jones	Payne
Cohen	Jordan	Pearce
Cole	Joyce	Pelosi
Conyers	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Cook	Keating	Perry
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Peters (CA)
Costa	Kelly (PA)	Peters (MI)
Courtney	Kennedy	Peterson
Cramer	Kildee	Pocan
Crenshaw	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kind	Quigley
Cullerson	King (IA)	Rahall
Davis (CA)	King (NY)	Reed
Davis, Danny	Kinzinger (IL)	Richmond
Davis, Rodney	Kirkpatrick	Roby
DeFazio	Kline	Rogers (KY)
DeGette	Langevin	Rogers (MI)
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Rooney
DeLauro	Latham	Rothfus
DelBene	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Denham	Levin	Runyan
Dent	Lewis	Ruppersberger
Deutch	Lipinski	Rush
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Ryan (OH)
Doyle	Loeb sack	Ryan (WI)

Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema

Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Stewart
 Stockman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko

Tsongas
 Valadao
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Visclosky
 Walberg
 Walden
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Welch
 Whitfield
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Yarmuth
 Young (AK)

NOES—175

Alexander
 Amash
 Bachmann
 Barber
 Barr
 Barrow (GA)
 Barton
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Black
 Blackburn
 Boustany
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Camp
 Cantor
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coffman
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Connolly
 Cotton
 Crawford
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Daines
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Doggett
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallego
 Garcia
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gosar

Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Grayson
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Harris
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Himes
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Israel
 Issa
 Jeffries
 Jenkins
 Johnson, Sam
 Kingston
 Kuster
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Lankford
 Larson (CT)
 Latta
 Lofgren
 Long
 Lucas
 Maffei
 Marchant
 Massie
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Napolitano
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Petri
 Pittenger

Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Radel
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Royce
 Ruiz
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sherman
 Smith (MO)
 Southerland
 Speier
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Wagner
 Walorski
 Walz
 Waxman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Williams
 Wittman
 Doggett
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Campbell
 Dingell
 Gohmert
 Graves (MO)
 Gutierrez
 Hanabusa
 Herrera Beutler

Hinojosa
 Holt
 Horsford
 Labrador
 McCarthy (NY)
 Meadows
 Miller, Gary

Pallone
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Rangel
 Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1905

Mr. COLE changed his vote from
 “no” to “aye.”
 So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the noes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 191, noes 224,
 not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 421]

AYES—191

Amash
 Bachmann
 Barber
 Barr
 Barrow (GA)
 Barton
 Bilirakis
 Black
 Blackburn
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (FL)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Camp
 Cantor
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Castor (FL)
 Chaffetz
 Chu
 Cleaver
 Coffman
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Connolly
 Cooper
 Cotton
 Crawford
 Cummings
 DeGette
 DeSantis
 Doggett
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Garcia
 Gardner

Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Grayson
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grijalva
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Himes
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Israel
 Jeffries
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Kind
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Lankford
 Lee (CA)
 Lofgren
 Long
 Luetkemeyer
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Marchant
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McClintock
 McHenry
 Messer

Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller, George
 Moran
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Napolitano
 Neugebauer
 Nugent
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Peters (CA)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pittenger
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Radel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Rogers (AL)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Royce
 Ruiz
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schiff
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (TX)
 Speier
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Thompson (CA)

Thornberry
 Titus
 Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Wagner

Walberg
 Walorski
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)

Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Wilson (SC)
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoho
 Young (IN)

NOES—224

Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amodei
 Andrews
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bera (CA)
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brooks (AL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Cartwright
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Clay
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Cohen
 Cole
 Conyers
 Cook
 Costa
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Daines
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Ellmers
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Forbes
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi

Gerlach
 Gibson
 Green, Al
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Hahn
 Harper
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huelskamp
 Huffman
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Latta
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Maloney, Sean
 Marino
 McCaul
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNerney
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Miller (MI)
 Moore
 Mullin
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nunes
 Owens

Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters (MI)
 Pocan
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Richmond
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rooney
 Rothfus
 Roybal-Allard
 Runyan
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schneider
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Lowenthal
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Valadao
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Visclosky
 Walden
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Welch
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—18

Campbell
 Dingell
 Graves (MO)
 Gutierrez
 Hanabusa
 Herrera Beutler

Hinojosa
 Holt
 Horsford
 Labrador
 McCarthy (NY)
 Meadows

Miller, Gary
 Pallone
 Pingree (ME)
 Pitts
 Rangel
 Young (FL)

□ 1910

Messrs. ROKITA and CRAWFORD changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 248, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 422]

AYES—166

Amash	Graves (GA)	Pittenger
Bachmann	Grayson	Poe (TX)
Bachus	Green, Gene	Polis
Barber	Griffith (VA)	Pompeo
Barr	Grimm	Posey
Barrow (GA)	Hall	Price (GA)
Barton	Hanna	Radel
Bentivolio	Harris	Reed
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Renacci
Black	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Himes	Rigell
Boustany	Holding	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Roskam
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Ross
Buchanan	Hurt	Royce
Bucshon	Issa	Ruiz
Burgess	Jenkins	Ryan (WI)
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Cantor	Jordan	Sanford
Cassidy	Kingston	Scalise
Castor (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Chabot	Kline	Scott, Austin
Chaffetz	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Coffman	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Collins (GA)	Lance	Smith (NJ)
Collins (NY)	Lankford	Smith (TX)
Conaway	Latta	Southerland
Connolly	Long	Speier
Cook	Maffei	Stewart
Cotton	Marchant	Stivers
Culberson	Massie	Stockman
Denham	McCarthy (CA)	Stutzman
DeSantis	McCaul	Terry
DesJarlais	McClintock	Thornberry
Doggett	McHenry	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	Meehan	Upton
Duncan (TN)	Messer	Velázquez
Ellmers	Mica	Wagner
Fincher	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Fleischmann	Miller (MI)	Walden
Fleming	Mulvaney	Walorski
Flores	Murphy (PA)	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Neugebauer	Webster (FL)
Fox	Nugent	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Nunes	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Nunnelee	Williams
Gardner	O'Rourke	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Olson	Wittman
Gibbs	Palazzo	Woodall
Gingrey (GA)	Paulsen	Yoho
Gohmert	Payne	Young (IN)
Goodlatte	Perry	
Gowdy	Petri	

NOES—248

Aderholt	Gibson	Noem
Alexander	Gosar	Nolan
Amodei	Granger	Owens
Andrews	Green, Al	Pascrell
Barletta	Griffin (AR)	Pastor (AZ)
Bass	Grijalva	Pearce
Beatty	Guthrie	Pelosi
Becerra	Hahn	Perlmutter
Benishek	Harper	Peters (CA)
Bera (CA)	Hartzler	Peters (MI)
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Peterson
Bishop (NY)	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Blumenauer	Higgins	Price (NC)
Bonamici	Honda	Quigley
Bonner	Hoyer	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Huelskamp	Ribble
Braley (IA)	Huffman	Richmond
Brooks (AL)	Israel	Roby
Brown (FL)	Jackson Lee	Rogers (KY)
Brownley (CA)	Jeffries	Rogers (MI)
Bustos	Johnson (GA)	Rooney
Butterfield	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson, E. B.	Rothfus
Capito	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Joyce	Runyan
Capuano	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Keating	Rush
Carney	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Kelly (PA)	Sánchez, Linda
Carter	Kennedy	T.
Cartwright	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Chu	Kind	Schakowsky
Cicilline	King (IA)	Schiff
Clarke	King (NY)	Schneider
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schock
Cleaver	Kuster	Schrader
Clyburn	Langevin	Schwartz
Coble	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Cole	Latham	Serrano
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Sessions
Cooper	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lewis	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lipinski	Sherman
Cramer	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Crawford	Loeb sack	Shuster
Crenshaw	Lofgren	Simpson
Crowley	Lowenthal	Sinema
Cuellar	Lucas	Sires
Cummings	Luetkemeyer	Slaughter
Daines	Lujan Grisham	Smith (NE)
Davis (CA)	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Rodney	(NM)	Takano
DeFazio	Lummis	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Maloney,	Thompson (PA)
DeLauro	Carolyn	Tierney
DelBene	Maloney, Sean	Tipton
Dent	Marino	Titus
Deutch	Matheson	Tonko
Diaz-Balart	Matsui	Tsongas
Doyle	McCollum	Turner
Duckworth	McDermott	Valadao
Duffy	McGovern	Van Hollen
Edwards	McIntyre	Vargas
Ellison	McKeon	Veasey
Engel	McKinley	Vela
Enyart	McMorris	Visclosky
Eshoo	Esty	Walz
Farr	Farenthold	Wasserman
Fattah	Farr	Schultz
Fitzpatrick	Fattah	Waters
Forbes	Miller, George	Watt
Foster	Moore	Waxman
Frankel (FL)	Moran	Welch
Fudge	Mullin	Whitfield
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Gallego	Nadler	Wolf
Garamendi	Napolitano	Womack
Garcia	Neal	Yarmuth
Gerlach	Negrete McLeod	Yoder
		Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—19

Campbell	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Dingell	Horsford	Pitts
Graves (MO)	Labrador	Rangel
Gutiérrez	McCarthy (NY)	Rokita
Hanabusa	Meadows	Young (FL)
Herrera Beutler	Miller, Gary	
Hinojosa	Pallone	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1913

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 154, noes 258, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 423]

AYES—154

Andrews	Frankel (FL)	Moran
Barrow (GA)	Fudge	Murphy (FL)
Barton	Garamendi	Nadler
Bass	Garcia	Napolitano
Beatty	Gibson	Neal
Becerra	Grayson	Nolan
Bera (CA)	Green, Al	Owens
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Hahn	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Peters (MI)
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Peterson
Braley (IA)	Himes	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Honda	Polis
Buchanan	Huffman	Posey
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Butterfield	Jeffries	Richmond
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Keating	Runyan
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Clarke	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kilmer	Sánchez, Loretta
Cleaver	King (NY)	Schwartz
Clyburn	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lewis	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Lipinski	Sherman
Cummings	LoBiondo	Sires
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Davis, Rodney	Lowenthal	Speier
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	(NM)	Takano
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lynch	Tierney
Deutch	Maffei	Titus
Doggett	Maloney,	Tonko
Doyle	Carolyn	Tsongas
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Edwards	Matheson	Vela
Ellison	Matsui	Velázquez
Engel	McDermott	Visclosky
Enyart	McGovern	Wasserman
Eshoo	McNerney	Schultz
Esty	Meeks	Waters
Farr	Meng	Watt
Fattah	Michaud	Welch
Fitzpatrick	Miller, George	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Moore	

NOES—258

Alexander Griffith (VA)
 Amash Grimm
 Amodi Guthrie
 Bachmann Hall
 Bachus Hanna
 Barber Harper
 Barletta Harris
 Barr Hartzler
 Benishek Hastings (WA)
 Bentivolio Heck (NV)
 Bilirakis Hensarling
 Bishop (UT) Holding
 Black Hoyer
 Blackburn Hudson
 Bonner Huelskamp
 Boustany Huizenga (MI)
 Brady (TX) Hultgren
 Bridenstine Hunter
 Brooks (AL) Hurt
 Brooks (IN) Israel
 Broun (GA) Issa
 Brownley (CA) Jenkins
 Buschson Johnson (OH)
 Burgess Johnson, Sam
 Calvert Jones
 Camp Jordan
 Cantor Joyce
 Capito Kaptur
 Capps Kelly (PA)
 Capuano Kildee
 Cárdenas Kind
 Carney King (IA)
 Carson (IN) Kingston
 Carter Kinzinger (IL)
 Cassidy Kirkpatrick
 Chabot Kline
 Chaffetz LaMalfa
 Cicilline Lamborn
 Coble Lance
 Coffman Langevin
 Cole Lankford
 Collins (GA) Latham
 Collins (NY) Latta
 Conaway Levin
 Conyers Long
 Cook Lowey
 Costa Lucas
 Cotton Luetkemeyer
 Crawford Lummis
 Crenshaw Marchant
 Cuellar Marino
 Culberson Massie
 Daines McCarthy (CA)
 Denham McCaul
 Dent McClintock
 DeSantis McCollum
 DesJarlais McHenry
 Diaz-Balart McIntyre
 Duffy McKeon
 Duncan (SC) McKinley
 Duncan (TN) McMorris
 Ellmers Rodgers
 Farenthold Meehan
 Fincher Messer
 Fleischmann Mica
 Fleming Miller (FL)
 Flores Miller (MI)
 Forbes Mullin
 Fortenberry Mulvaney
 Foxx Murphy (PA)
 Franks (AZ) Negrete McLeod
 Frelinghuysen Neugebauer
 Gabbard Noem
 Gallego Nugent
 Gardner Nunes
 Garrett Nunnelee
 Gerlach O'Rourke
 Gibbs Olson
 Gingrey (GA) Palazzo
 Gohmert Pascrell
 Goodlatte Pastor (AZ)
 Gosar Paulsen
 Gowdy Pearce
 Granger Pelosi
 Graves (GA) Perry
 Green, Gene Petri
 Griffin (AR) Pittenger

NOT VOTING—21

Aderholt Gutiérrez
 Campbell Hanabusa
 Cramer Herrera Beutler
 Dingell Hinojosa
 Graves (MO) Holt

Poe (TX) Pompeo
 Price (GA) Price (NC)
 Radel Rahall
 Reed Reichert
 Renacci Renacci
 Ribble Ribble
 Rice (SC) Rice (SC)
 Rigell Rigell
 Roby Roby
 Roe (TN) Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL) Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY) Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI) Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher Rohrabacher
 Rokita Rokita
 Rooney Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam Roskam
 Ross Ross
 Rothfus Rothfus
 Royce Royce
 Rush Rush
 Ryan (OH) Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI) Ryan (WI)
 Salmon Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sanford Sanford
 Sarbanes Sarbanes
 Scalise Scalise
 Schiff Schiff
 Schneider Schneider
 Schock Schock
 Schrader Schrader
 Schweikert Schweikert
 Scott, Austin Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner Sensenbrenner
 Sessions Sessions
 Shimkus Shimkus
 Shuster Shuster
 Sinema Sinema
 Smith (MO) Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE) Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX) Smith (TX)
 Southerland Southerland
 Stewart Stewart
 Stivers Stivers
 Stockman Stockman
 Stutzman Stutzman
 Terry Terry
 Thompson (PA) Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry Thornberry
 Tiberi Tiberi
 Tipton Tipton
 Turner Turner
 Upton Upton
 Valadao Valadao
 Van Hollen Van Hollen
 Vargas Vargas
 Wagner Wagner
 Walberg Walberg
 Walden Walden
 Walorski Walorski
 Walz Walz
 Waxman Waxman
 Weber (TX) Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL) Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup Wenstrup
 Westmoreland Westmoreland
 Whitfield Whitfield
 Williams Williams
 Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
 Wittman Wittman
 Wolf Wolf
 Womack Womack
 Woodall Woodall
 Yarmuth Yarmuth
 Yoder Yoder
 Yoho Yoho
 Young (AK) Young (AK)
 Young (IN) Young (IN)

Pallone
 Pingree (ME)

Pitts
 Rangel

Simpson
 Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1917

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF
 FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the noes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 109, noes 300,
 not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

AYES—109

Andrews Gallego
 Bass Garamendi
 Beatty Gibson
 Becerra Grayson
 Bishop (GA) Grijalva
 Bishop (NY) Grimm
 Brady (PA) Hastings (FL)
 Braley (IA) Higgins
 Brown (FL) Himes
 Buchanan Honda
 Bustos Huffman
 Carney Jeffries
 Carson (IN) Johnson (GA)
 Castro (TX) Johnson, E. B.
 Clarke T.
 Clay Kaptur
 Cleaver Kelly (IL)
 Clyburn Kennedy
 Cohen Kind
 Connolly King (NY)
 Cooper Kirkpatrick
 Courtney Kuster
 Crowley Larson (CT)
 Davis, Danny Lee (CA)
 Davis, Rodney Lewis
 DeGette Lipinski
 Delaney LoBiondo
 DeLauro Loebsack
 Deutch Lowenthal
 Edwards Lynch
 Ellison Maffei
 Engel Maloney, Sean
 Eshoo McDermott
 Williams McGovern
 Wilson (SC) Fattah
 Wittman Frankel (FL)
 Fudge Moore

NOES—300

Aderholt Bentivolio
 Alexander Bera (CA)
 Amash Billirakis
 Amodi Bishop (UT)
 Bachmann Black
 Bachus Blackburn
 Barber Blumenauer
 Barletta Bonamici
 Barr Bonner
 Barrow (GA) Boustany
 Barton Brady (TX)
 Benishek Bridenstine

Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carter
 Cartwright
 Cassidy
 Castor (FL)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Coble
 Coffman
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Conyers
 Cook
 Costa
 Cotton
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Daines
 Davis (CA)
 DeFazio
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Enyart
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gabbard
 Garcia
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Guthrie
 Hahn
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Hensarling
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson Lee

Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kelly (PA)
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 King (IA)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larsen (WA)
 Latham
 Latta
 Levin
 Lofgren
 Long
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 Meehan
 Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, George
 Moran
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Napolitano
 Negrete McLeod
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pittenger
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Radel

NOT VOTING—24

Campbell
 Cole
 Cramer

Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Graves (MO)

Gutiérrez
 Hall
 Hanabusa

Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)

Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradner
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton

Turner	Walz	Wolf
Upton	Waxman	Womack
Valadao	Weber (TX)	Woodall
Vargas	Webster (FL)	Yarmuth
Vela	Wenstrup	Yoder
Visclosky	Westmoreland	Yoho
Wagner	Whitfield	Young (AK)
Walberg	Williams	Young (IN)
Walden	Wilson (SC)	
Walorski	Wittman	

NOT VOTING—22

Campbell	Herrera Beutler	Miller, Gary
Carney	Hinojosa	Pallone
Cramer	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Dingell	Horsford	Pitts
Graves (MO)	Labrador	Rangel
Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Gutiérrez	McIntyre	
Hanabusa	Meadows	

□ 1929

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONTINUATION OF AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOODALL). The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank my close friend from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who not only called the House to order but who has been an extraordinary champion of transit systems for years, especially of Washington's metropolitan transit system, because he gets it. He understands how important this transit system is.

There was a previous discussion, a dialogue, between Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. GARRETT. The outcome of it was a suggestion that Washington's Metro system is somehow extraordinarily subsidized. The fact is that it's subsidized but that it's subsidized primarily by local governments. We have been trying on our side to provide subsidies to transit systems all over the country, including in the New York-New Jersey area—apparently, given the results of some of the votes, without much success on this bill.

The point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that Metro is our Nation's transit system. It was created largely to serve the needs of the Federal Government. Forty percent of Metro's peak ridership are Federal employees, so a Federal role is both necessary and appropriate. WMATA is also the primary means of transportation for visitors to our Nation's Capital. Whether they come to experience our historical legacy, to participate in rallies on The Mall or to meet with their Members of Congress, they use our Nation's Metro system.

Now, in recognition of this special relationship and of WMATA's urgent need for additional capital funds, the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 authorized \$1.5 billion over 10 years for WMATA's capital and preventative maintenance projects. It was bipartisan. As Mr. CON-

NOLLY suggested, his predecessor, Mr. DAVIS, largely led much of the effort, and it was to be matched dollar for dollar by the jurisdictions that WMATA serves—the District of Columbia, the State of Maryland and the Commonwealth of Virginia.

That bill represented a compact between WMATA and the Federal Government, which was granted representation on the WMATA board. That was part of the legislation, that you've got to put Federal representation on the board in return for the funding. Up to this point, the Federal Government has upheld its end of this compact. That's why we object so strongly to the Garrett amendment. Currently, this appropriations bill on the floor today provides \$125 million, which is consistent with this compact in its funding for the Metro system. It's a 16 percent cut already below the authorized level, which, in fact, has been fully funded in previous fiscal years, but Mr. GARRETT's amendment would eliminate even that reduced funding level.

The elimination of WMATA funding would be deeply detrimental to the system and would diminish the ability of thousands of employees to get to work—two-fifths of them Federal employees. Critically, the further cuts mandated by Mr. GARRETT's amendment would limit WMATA's ability to continue improving the safety of the system and fully implement the recommendations of the National Transportation Safety Board that resulted from the 2009 Red Line crash. That's what we need to implement. We wouldn't be able to do it with this amendment. Eliminating Federal funding would also jeopardize State capital funding for the Metro system by breaking the matching compact that has been agreed to by all the parties.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this unnecessary amendment, which would irreparably harm America's most critical transit system.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I just want to speak briefly in support of what Mr. MORAN said.

Mr. Chairman, this law that we are drastically changing was really the result of a bipartisan agreement with regard to the Congress, and it was authored by former Congressman Tom Davis from northern Virginia. We voted on this one other time. A similar amendment was offered by Mr. GARRETT last year. It failed by a vote of 160-243.

In 2008, the Congress made a 10-year commitment as the Federal partner to provide capital funds for the needs of the Metro system. It was a commit-

ment. It's in the law. We voted on it. We worked on it. It was bipartisan. Now we come up with the Garrett amendment. These funds are matched, as said by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), by WMATA's regional partners—Virginia, Maryland and Washington, D.C. Again, it was voted on before, in the last Congress, and it failed overwhelmingly by a vote of 160-243.

Eliminating this funding means that Congress would be choosing to go back on its commitment to provide the money needed to maintain a safe and reliable system used by many of your constituents—the people who visit. Metro is currently using Federal funds to improve a 30-year-old system to address the critical safety recommendations made by the National Transportation Safety Board. People died on the Metro. This money is being used to make the Metro safe. As the other Member said, many Members have constituents who come from all over the country to use it. More than half of the Metro rail system serves Federal facilities like the Pentagon, the Department of Homeland Security and many others.

I would ask Members to keep the commitment that was made in a bipartisan way and to vote down the Garrett amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

He and I spent literally a decade working together, shoulder to shoulder, in a bipartisan way because this is America's subway. This is a subway that is used by almost all of the visitors who come to visit their capital. It is for that reason that the Federal Government has participated in building this extraordinary system.

The gentleman is correct. We have an agreement. There is a compact that has been signed by Republican Governors and Democratic Governors, by Republican Members of the House and Democratic Members of the House, by Republican members of the Senate and Democratic members of the Senate. I would hope that the House would reject this amendment.

I adopt the remarks of the gentlemen from Virginia. My colleagues Mr. MORAN and Mr. WOLF, I think, speak for all of us, and, of course, Mr. CONNOLLY has spoken very strongly for himself, but I would hope that the House would continue to keep the faith with the agreement that has been made for what is America's subway, used by all of our people when they come here to their Nation's Capital.

I want to thank the chairman, and I want to thank the ranking member for their efforts on behalf of the Metro as well as for keeping the faith of the

agreement that we have reached. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and his remarks.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

I also want to thank Mr. LATHAM and Mr. PASTOR for their opposition to this amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

THUD APPROPRIATIONS

In 2008, the Congress made a 10-year commitment, as the federal partner, to provide capital funds for the needs of the Metro system.

These funds are matched by WMATA's regional partners, Virginia, Maryland and Washington, D.C.

This amendment would eliminate \$125 million in capital funds for Metro, which has already been cut from \$150 million last year.

A similar amendment offered to last year's THUD bill failed by a vote of 160–243.

Eliminating this funding means Congress is choosing to go back on its commitment to provide money needed to maintain a safe and reliable system used by many of your constituents.

Metro is currently using federal funds to improve its 30-year-old system to address the critical safety recommendations made by the National Transportation Safety Board, which Metro has made its highest priority.

WMATA operates the second largest rail system and sixth largest bus system in the U.S.

It provides 1.3 million trips a day—many of these trips carry employees to and from work every day.

More than half of the Metrorail stations serve federal facilities, like the Pentagon and the Department of Homeland Security.

Metro is critical to the economic growth of this region.

It has spurred \$37 billion in economic development at or near to Metro's property.

I represent the Dulles airport and Loudoun County and since 1999, I have supported extending metro rail to Dulles.

The funding provided in this bill for Metro is critical to the success and safety of the rail project along the Dulles Corridor, which is the single greatest economic engine for Northern Virginia.

Congress must continue to uphold its commitment to provide a safe and reliable metro experience for the American people that we serve.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we may take advantage of revisiting this yet again to have a teachable moment here.

My good friend from New Jersey talked about some of the problems of the Metro system. As a practical matter, many of those problems are the result of 40 years of an accumulated maintenance deficit and a lack of a long-term, reliable partnership with the Federal Government, exemplified by the irresponsibility of this amendment that is being proposed.

The Federal Government is the primary beneficiary of Metro. Bear in mind these 68 square miles that represent the District of Columbia: 21 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government, and a much larger percentage of the valuable land is tax-exempt; 30 percent of the jobs are Federal jobs even in these difficult times, and they're not paying taxes to the District of Columbia or to Metro; 40 percent of the rush-hour traffic is of Federal employees, and we suffer some of the worst traffic congestion in the United States in this region.

We have a serious accumulated deficit for maintenance, and this was part of a bipartisan, long-term agreement to solve this problem and improve service and meet the Federal responsibilities. I appreciate the advocacy and the eloquence of my friends from Virginia and Maryland who have come to the floor and pointed out this responsibility. I speak as somebody who represents a district 2,300 miles away, but I, too, have an interest in the Federal Government's being a responsible partner in helping Metro function properly.

Many of us were on the floor of the House during 9/11. That was a horrible week in our Nation's Capital. But for the Metro system, the area would have been paralyzed.

□ 1945

I suggest that this is, I hope, well intentioned; but I think it's shortsighted, and it underscores the problems we have had in the district to deal with long-term capital investments. As has been pointed out, the local governments surrounding are part of the partnership and are contributing money.

I would hope that the Federal Government understands its responsibility and not only do we reject this misguided amendment, but hopefully we can use this as an opportunity to reaffirm the partnership, the role that the Federal Government plays, the benefit that the Federal Government obtains for our employees, for our visitors, for the land that is located here that occupies Federal activities.

Mr. Chairman, these are tea leaves that people read. I am sad that this bill underfunds infrastructure across the country on the very day that the American Society of Civil Engineers puts out their report that gives us a D-plus rating for infrastructure in this country, that we need increased private investment, local government funding. We have \$2.2 trillion over the next 10 years. It will be necessary just to bring our infrastructure up to standard. And this will be the quickest way to put Americans to work at family-wage jobs from coast to coast. I would hope at some point we get back to our responsibilities overall for infrastructure, but in the meantime we should reject this effort to undermine the partnership and the Federal responsibility.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, when we're in session, I have the opportunity—and I take it—to ride the metro. That's the way I get around in this great city. I have to tell you that in the late sixties, early seventies when I first came to Washington on other business, I saw where Connecticut Avenue was being dug up, the beginning of the Red Line. So I can attest, Mr. Chairman, that every morning at the South Capitol stop, people who work in this complex on Capitol Hill, that there are lines of workers that are coming into work.

So when the proposition came before the House, the compact that the Federal Government agreed with Maryland, Virginia, and the District, to maintain the metro and the particular States and District had the matching funds, I was very supportive because I knew of the benefit that Metro brought to our employees here on Capitol Hill, as well as to the Federal employees throughout this metro area. So I have to tell you that I support the Metro system, and I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, this appropriations measure fails at every level to meet our Nation's transportation infrastructure needs, support our States' housing initiatives, or further our community development goals.

I would like to take a moment to highlight a few of the most egregious cuts in the Transportation-Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill before us today because it's important for my constituents in Rhode Island to hear exactly what's being proposed here today.

We all recognize clearly that some cuts in Federal spending are unavoidable. In certain cases, they're even desirable in the current budgetary environment. But this bill goes far beyond what's reasonable by reneging on the

spirit of the agreed-to spending levels in the Budget Control Act. The cuts in this bill to the Community Development Block Grant program, the HOME grant, and transportation investments endanger the well-being of America's cities and towns, as well as our residents.

Expanding economic opportunities and creating jobs continue to be my top priorities in Congress. It's exactly what this Nation needs right now. It's certainly what we need in Rhode Island, given the fact we have the fourth highest unemployment rate in the Nation. Regrettably, this bill achieves neither of these goals. The Congressional Budget Office estimated just last week the sequestration would result in 1.6 million fewer American jobs by the end of September 2014. Yet my Republican colleagues have decided to double down on this reckless policy by crafting the T-HUD bill with the assumption that sequestration remains in effect.

These cuts translate into real jobs and real benefits to our communities. Just 2 weeks ago, I celebrated a \$10 million Federal TIGER grant award that will be used to help Rhode Island replace the aging Providence Viaduct. It's part of the I-95 corridor that goes right through the center of Providence. This bill eliminates the TIGER grant program.

In April, our State Department of Transportation unveiled plans to improve the Providence Amtrak station. The station serves over 1 million Amtrak and commuter rail passengers each year, benefiting our entire State, as well as neighboring ones with multimodal connections from Providence to the Boston metropolitan area. This bill cuts Amtrak funding by 33 percent, endangering further improvements to important interstate transportation infrastructure.

In June, Rhode Islanders celebrated the 100th anniversary of the Amalgamated Transit Union Local 618. Their 1,000 members take us to school, work, to the doctor, and to the grocery store quickly and safely every day. Public transportation decreases congestion, pollution, and individual fuel costs; it connects us to recreation, family, and community; and it creates jobs in the short term, while supporting careers over the long term. This bill cuts transit funding by 17 percent from last year.

It also delivers a 25 percent cut to the Housing Counseling Assistance Fund, which helped over 2,000 Rhode Island families last year stay in their homes, avoid foreclosure, or refinance their mortgage. This bill would cut the HOME program by \$300 million, a 30 percent reduction from pre-sequestration levels. HOME is a critical resource that's used to develop affordable housing for those who need it most. It has resulted in over 4,200 units in Rhode Island alone being created.

Meanwhile, homeless families, the most vulnerable among us, once again will feel the full brunt of the majority's misplaced priorities. In 2012, over 4,800 Rhode Islanders found themselves homeless, one-quarter of them children. The State homeless assistance programs depend on Federal support to operate shelters to help move people to a permanent housing solution; yet H.R. 2610 does not come close to adequately funding these programs, placing thousands of Rhode Island families in even further jeopardy.

By cutting the administrative fund for section 8, this bill seeks to undermine the very integrity of that program. Those seeking housing assistance vouchers will find agencies understaffed, underfunded, and unable to serve the millions who depend on section 8 to stay in affordable housing. This is outrageous.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill cuts the CDBG program by almost 50 percent, an unacceptable and draconian move that will cripple the neighborhoods that need the most help. These grants are the cornerstone of local investment opportunities. For every dollar spent on CDBG grants, \$3 is leveraged from private, nonprofit, and other non-Federal funding sources. The organizations working with CDBG funds use them for employment services, homeless assistance, child care, senior care, mental health outreach, and countless other services. I'm sad to see that the committee has decided that this is not worth the investment.

This bill is misguided, and I hope we will rethink this. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOODALL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2610) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 2855, STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

Ms. GRANGER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-185) on the bill making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to

the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 693

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 693.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

SCHOOL ACCESS TO EMERGENCY EPINEPHRINE ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2094) to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2094

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL PREFERENCE TO CERTAIN STATES THAT ALLOW TRAINED SCHOOL PERSONNEL TO ADMINISTER EPINEPHRINE.

Section 399L(d) of part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

“(F) SCHOOL PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION OF EPINEPHRINE.—In determining the preference (if any) to be given to a State under this subsection, the Secretary shall give additional preference to a State that provides to the Secretary the certification described in subparagraph (G) and that requires that each public elementary school and secondary school in the State—

“(i) permits trained personnel of the school to administer epinephrine to any student of the school reasonably believed to be having an anaphylactic reaction;

“(ii) maintains a supply of epinephrine in a secure location that is easily accessible to

trained personnel of the school for the purpose of administration to any student of the school reasonably believed to be having an anaphylactic reaction; and

“(iii) has in place a plan for having on the premises of the school during all operating hours of the school one or more individuals who are trained personnel of the school.

“(G) CIVIL LIABILITY PROTECTION LAW.—The certification required in subparagraph (F) shall be a certification made by the State attorney general that the State has reviewed any applicable civil liability protection law to determine the application of such law with regard to elementary and secondary school trained personnel who may administer epinephrine to a student reasonably believed to be having an anaphylactic reaction and has concluded that such law provides adequate civil liability protection applicable to such trained personnel. For purposes of the previous sentence, the term ‘civil liability protection law’ means a State law offering legal protection to individuals who give aid on a voluntary basis in an emergency to an individual who is ill, in peril, or otherwise incapacitated.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

“(E) The term ‘trained personnel’ means, with respect to an elementary or secondary school, an individual—

“(i) who has been designated by the principal (or other appropriate administrative staff) of the school to administer epinephrine on a voluntary basis outside their scope of employment;

“(ii) who has received training in the administration of epinephrine; and

“(iii) whose training in the administration of epinephrine meets appropriate medical standards and has been documented by appropriate administrative staff of the school.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support and urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2094, the School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act.

Mr. Speaker, according to the CDC, one out of every 13 children has a food allergy and that rate is rising. Some of these children can experience a severe allergic reaction known as anaphylaxis that can be deadly unless a medication called “epinephrine” is promptly administered. Studies also show that 16 percent to 18 percent of children with food allergies have had allergic reactions while in school. If those reactions

are severe, school personnel should be ready to effectively manage students with known allergies and to be prepared for emergencies.

In 2004, Congress passed legislation to encourage States to allow children with known food allergies to bring their medication to school; however, there are many children who do not know that they have a serious food allergy, and they continue to be at risk.

Currently, less than half of the States have legislation concerning the stocking of epinephrine in schools. Even in these States with legislation, there is a broad range of different provisions about who can administer the epinephrine. Keeping a stock of nonstudent-specific epinephrine in schools is a lifesaving measure and should be implemented nationwide. H.R. 2094, the School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act, is an important step to protect children who do not know that they are at risk for anaphylaxis. The bill would amend the Public Health Service Act to allow a preference in awarding asthma grants to States that prevent school personnel to administer epinephrine to a student in an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2000

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of H.R. 2094, the School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act. I am a cosponsor of this bill and urge its passage in the House.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides incentives for schools to stock the lifesaving medicine that is critical for students and school staff who experience an anaphylactic emergency. Anaphylaxis is serious and life threatening. It is often caused by bee stings, bug bites, latex, and some medications, and can take just a few minutes to cause serious harm and even death.

Epinephrine is used to treat the symptoms of anaphylaxis and comes in the form of an EpiPen that is injected into the body and provides almost instant relief. Nearly 30 States across the country are working on legislation that would permit schools to keep a stock of EpiPens that aren't designated for particular individuals but, rather, available to students and staff who experience an allergic reaction that can be treated with epinephrine. H.R. 2094 that we are considering tonight would encourage the remaining States to work on enacting similar legislation.

This bill creates a preference in the existing Children's Asthma Treatment Grants Program, administered by the Department of Health and Human Services, for States that meet certain requirements that are enumerated in the bill.

Food allergies affect 5.9 million children. That's one in 13. This legislation is especially important because about 25 percent of individuals who are injected with an EpiPen for the first time don't know they have allergies that warrant the use of epinephrine. No student experiencing a severe allergic reaction at school should lose their life because there was no medicine prescribed to them.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, the passage and enactment of this bill will save the lives of countless students across our country who live with severe allergies. So I want to take a moment to commend the bill's author, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who has worked on this legislation for at least 3 years, and also Congressman PHIL ROE, for their bipartisan work on behalf of all Americans with allergies.

At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the Democratic whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Dr. BURGESS and Mr. BUTTERFIELD for their leadership on this bill, but I certainly want to thank my friend, Dr. PHIL ROE, who has been a delight to work with. It has taken us a little bit of time, but we stayed after it. We stayed after it because, as Dr. BURGESS and Judge BUTTERFIELD have observed, this will save lives. This will save the lives of children. This will save the lives of children who do not know that they have an allergy which is life threatening.

I'm the grandfather of an 11-year-old little girl. I've been with her twice in the emergency room when she was but an infant and when she was slightly older than an infant. I want to tell my colleagues a story about my daughter who took Alexa to Disney World.

They were walking down the pathway, one of the walkways at Disney World, and all of a sudden my granddaughter started wheezing heavily and stated having an allergic reaction. She is extraordinarily allergic to peanut butter and peanuts. But she'd had no peanut butter and she'd had no peanuts. As a matter of fact, this little girl is extraordinarily careful about what she eats. She comes to my house, she makes sure that I read the labels and she reads the labels. She brings with her her EpiPen in the little case that is always with her.

But as they were walking down that pathway, she started to wheeze heavily, and they had no idea why. My daughter turned around and retraced a few of their steps, and they saw popcorn being made—popcorn being made with peanut oil. And the mere breathing in of that peanut oil air caused her to start wheezing heavily. Now, she didn't have anaphylactic shock at that point in time, and she did not need to go to an emergency room at that time,

but it shows how extraordinarily vulnerable people can be to these food allergies.

So I'm very pleased to stand here in support of this bill. I'm very pleased to stand here as a cosponsor of this legislation with my friend, Dr. ROE from Tennessee, and I want to thank him. I want to thank him for his work. I want to thank him as a doctor and as a Member of Congress and as a parent. He shared my concern and we worked together.

There were some difficulties to overcome, but he and I together, working together with FRED UPTON—and I want to thank FRED UPTON and HENRY WAXMAN, the chair and ranking member of the committee, as well as Dr. BURGESS and Mr. BUTTERFIELD for their help. They have both said, and I'm sure Dr. ROE will say, this will save lives. It is not a mandate, but it is a suggestion. It is an urging to make sure that, given the fact that we have this lifesaving capability, that that capability be deployed and be present so that no child will have to die because of a reaction to one of these allergies.

So I thank them again and thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentleman for those words, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. PHIL ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank Dr. BURGESS, and, Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act.

This bill will encourage States and schools to take small but meaningful steps to protect schoolchildren from anaphylaxis, a severe and potentially fatal allergic reaction that can be triggered by a food allergy, or even an insect sting. According to Food Allergy Research and Education, one in 13 children has a food allergy—roughly two in every classroom.

The bipartisan bill I introduced with Congressman HOYER—and I want to thank Congressman HOYER profusely today. His staff and my staff worked diligently on this bill to bring it to the floor. This bill provides a preference for asthma-related grants to States that adopt laws to permit properly trained school personnel to administer epinephrine to a student reasonably believed to have an anaphylactic reaction. To obtain preference, schools would have to maintain a supply of epinephrine and ensure trained personnel are present to administer.

This legislation has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office at no cost to the taxpayer. Our bill simply builds on an existing preference system signed into law in 2004 that helped make student self-administration of epinephrine a reality in 49 States.

Anaphylaxis, however, is not always predictable. An individual—adult or child—could have a severe allergic reaction even with no prior history of a food allergy, and I've seen this many times in my practice. Because anaphylaxis can cause deaths in just minutes, it is essential that epinephrine, the best treatment for anaphylaxis, be readily available for treatment. In most States, however, schools are not required to keep epinephrine stocked in case of emergencies. The result is needless tragedies, like that of Amarria Johnson.

Amarria was a 7-year-old girl—the same age of my granddaughter—who lived in Chesterfield County, Virginia. On January 2, 2012, she died from cardiac arrest and anaphylaxis as a result of eating a peanut. I had an opportunity to meet Amarria's mother, Laura Pendleton, at a briefing that Mr. HOYER and I hosted on our bill. Her story is absolutely heartbreaking.

As a father and a grandfather, I can't begin to imagine what she had to go through. In response to her death, the Virginia Legislature passed what has become known as "Amarria's law," which required public schools in the State to keep epinephrine on hand. But while 28 States have laws allowing schools to stock epinephrine, the States requiring the same remain in the minority.

A set of two epinephrine autoinjectors costs about \$150 and are good for a year. With new competition in the marketplace to produce what are commonly known as EpiPens, I'm confident the price will come down even further. The training required to use an EpiPen is minimal. School personnel could be trained by an EMT or a school nurse in a brief session. The autoinjectors themselves are safe and very easy to use. The needle is covered by a protective sheath and only comes out when the EpiPen is pressed against the leg.

To make sure that teachers and other adults working at the school don't have to worry about a lawsuit for doing the right thing, our bill requires, as a condition of receiving preference for asthma-related grants, that the State attorney general reviews existing civil liability protection laws and certifies that they provide adequate protection to the trained school personnel.

I thank the minority whip, Mr. HOYER, who worked tirelessly on this, for being an outstanding partner in this process. His story with his granddaughter is a compelling one. This has become a bipartisan process every step of the way.

I would also like to thank Chairman UPTON and Mr. WAXMAN and his staff for helping advance this proposal. My hope is that this bill gives the States a little encouragement to ensure that what happened to Amarria doesn't ever happen to another child.

I thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and I thank Dr. BURGESS for allowing me to be here this evening, and I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I don't have any other speakers, and with that I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, as a physician, a parent and grandparent, I share the same fears that we have heard discussed this evening. I am worried that schools may not be prepared to act quickly in an emergency. I am pleased to support this legislation. I urge everyone on the floor to vote in favor of H.R. 2094.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2094.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLLECTIBLE COIN PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2754) to amend the Hobby Protection Act to make unlawful the provision of assistance or support in violation of that Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2754

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Collectible Coin Protection Act".

SEC. 2. PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE OR SUPPORT.

The Hobby Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2—

(A) in subsection (b), by inserting ", or the sale in commerce" after "distribution in commerce";

(B) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and inserting after subsection (c) the following:

"(d) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE OR SUPPORT.—It shall be a violation of subsection (a) or (b) for a person to provide substantial assistance or support to any manufacturer, importer, or seller if that person knows or should have known that the manufacturer, importer, or seller is engaged in any act or practice that violates subsection (a) or (b)."; and

(C) in subsection (e) (as so redesignated), by striking "and (b)" and inserting "(b), and (d)";

(2) in section 3—

(A) by striking "If any person" and inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—If any person";

(B) by striking "or has an agent" and inserting ", has an agent, transacts business, or wherever venue is proper under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) TRADEMARK VIOLATIONS.—If the violation of section 2 (a) or (b) or a rule under section 2(c) also involves unauthorized use of registered trademarks belonging to a collectibles certification service, the owner of such trademarks shall have, in addition to the remedies provided in subsection (a), all rights provided under sections 34, 35, and 36 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1116, 1117, and 1118) for violations of such Act.”; and

(3) in section 7, by adding at the end the following:

“(8) The term ‘collectibles certification service’ means a person recognized by collectors for providing independent certification that collectible items are genuine.

“(9) The term ‘Trademark Act of 1946’ means the Act entitled ‘An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes’, approved July 5, 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2754, the Collectible Coin Protection Act, is a simple bill with a simple purpose: to equip honest merchants and collectors as well as the Federal Government with the tools needed to fight a new wave of counterfeit coins and currency.

In recent years, the United States Government has taken extraordinary steps to make it difficult to counterfeit U.S. currency. Think how the \$20 bill and other denominations have been redesigned over the last decade. As new bills become more difficult to counterfeit, some criminals have turned to counterfeiting rare specimens of older currency, which have none of the security features that we now recognize. Others have invested in counterfeiting rare coins. Some people have gone to great lengths to create realistic fakes—using modern design software and 3-D laser printers to make extremely close replicas, and even purchasing the old equipment used by the mint to strike the original coins.

As you might have guessed, most of the counterfeits are coming from China—where else?

The criminals have also cleverly taken advantage of the certification system used by collectors to assure au-

thenticity, and they’ve turned it on its head.

Grading services, also called collectibles certification services, evaluate the authenticity and condition of a rare coin and then put it into a special holder called a slab, encapsulating it together with a description of the coin and its condition. The slab is designed to protect the coin, but it also protects the integrity of the grading. If the slab is tampered with, the grading is voided.

Some counterfeiters have now realized they can counterfeit the slab and the certificate as well. This has the advantage of making it harder to examine the coin since dealers are reluctant to break open the slab to examine the coin more closely unless they are absolutely certain that it is a fake.

□ 2015

H.R. 2754, the Collectible Coin Protection Act, amends the Hobby Protection Act to deal with these new problems. Under existing law, it is unlawful to make in the United States or to import into the United States an imitation coin or other numismatic item unless it is plainly and permanently marked with the word “copy.”

The Federal Trade Commission has the authority to enforce the Act, and there is also a provision allowing private individuals to enjoin violations or to recover damages for violations that affect them.

H.R. 2754 extends the current law in three ways. It makes it unlawful to sell, as well as manufacture or import, the counterfeit coin that is not marked with the word “copy.”

Second, the bill makes it unlawful to provide substantial support or assistance to a manufacturer, importer or seller if the person providing assistance knows or should have known that the manufacturer, importer or seller is engaged in any act or practice that violates the Hobby Protection Act.

Third, the bill provides additional remedies for violations that involve unauthorized use of registered trademarks belonging to a grading service. The additional remedies are the same that are usually provided for under the Trademark Act.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has no cost to the taxpayer. It should deter some of the counterfeiting practices that are now rampant in the marketplace and provide additional tools to deal with unrepentant dealers who go ahead with their schemes to defraud consumers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of H.R. 2754, the Collectible Coin Protection Act. I introduced this bill with the bipartisan support of Energy and Commerce full committee Ranking Member Mr. HENRY WAXMAN and Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade Sub-

committee Chairman Mr. LEE TERRY, as well as three other colleagues, because the manufacture and sale of counterfeit coins is rapidly increasing across the country.

Manufacturing and selling imitation coins is a little-known black market industry here in the United States. With the invention of 3-D printers, anyone with a computer can now create a fake coin with relative ease that, for all intents and purposes, appears genuine in size and in color and in weight.

Unloading these imitation coins off on unsuspecting collectors has become big business and cuts to the very core of our ability to control and regulate the currency. By the time the collector realizes that he has been scammed, it is absolutely too late.

Current law, Mr. Speaker, makes it illegal to manufacture or import imitation coins meant for sale unless that coin is plainly and permanently marked with the word “copy.” Mr. BURGESS made reference to that a moment ago.

My bill would extend current law and make it illegal to sell an imitation coin that is not conspicuously marked with the word “copy.”

My bill would also make it unlawful for an individual to provide substantial support or assistance to anyone who manufactures or imports or sells counterfeit imitation coins in violation of the law.

And this bill would also extend trademark infringement protections available under the Trademark Act of 1946 for unauthorized use of a registered trademark in connection with an unlawful sale or other violation involving an imitation coin.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents in North Carolina and Americans across the country deserve to have the peace of mind to know that they will receive what they believe they are purchasing.

Individuals who sell fake products have a real and significant impact on our economy. The manufacture and sale of counterfeit imitation currency cannot be permitted to continue.

I’m confident my bill will provide greater protection for our Nation’s currency and for those who collect it.

And so I thank Mr. BURGESS, and I thank all of my colleagues. I ask my colleagues to support this piece of legislation and vote “aye.”

Again, I ask my colleagues to look at this and work with us, and let’s get it passed and let’s stop this black market that’s emerging in our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “aye” on H.R. 2754.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2754.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM PROGRAMS

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1300) to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer programs and community partnerships for the benefit of national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1300

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM VOLUNTEER, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP, AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Section 7(g) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742f(g)) is amended by striking “2011 through 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2017”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUNYAN. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the legislation that I have, H.R. 1300, which would reauthorize the volunteer programs and community partnerships at National Wildlife Refuges from FY15 to FY17.

Volunteers are the backbone of our National Wildlife Refuge system. In fact, in FY12, volunteers contributed 1,594,246 hours of work at the wildlife refuges across the country. The value of this work, estimated at \$21.79 per hour, has an overall value contribution to FY12 estimated to be over \$34 million.

With this annual authorized appropriation of just \$2 million, we have received a value of return on investment of over 17 times. This kind of return on investment sets an example of how to effectively leverage a limited government investment.

The simple fact of the matter is that refuges cannot remain open without the contribution of volunteers and community groups. Volunteers currently contribute more than 20 percent of all refuge work, an equivalent to 766 full-time employees.

Volunteers have also allowed visitors centers to remain open during sequestration. As a result of volunteer work, the Fish and Wildlife Service has recently stated, “There are no immediate plans to close volunteer and education centers for sustained periods of time because of sequestration.”

My home district in New Jersey is home to the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge, which benefits from one of the best community volunteer programs in the country, The Friends of Forsythe. I have seen firsthand the invaluable contribution these volunteers make at Forsythe, and know that the refuge cannot continue to operate without the contributions of these volunteers.

I urge passage of H.R. 1300.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join Mr. RUNYAN in support of H.R. 1300, a bill that will reauthorize volunteer and community partnerships for the National Wildlife Refuge System.

The National Wildlife Refuge System is an incredible asset to our country. In addition to protecting habitat that is essential to the survival of many bird and mammal and fish species, the system provides recreational opportunities that translate into jobs for Americans.

The 45 million people who visit a wildlife refuge each year to hunt and to fish and paddle, or simply watch wildlife, generate \$1.7 billion in sales for local economies. They support more than 34,000 jobs and contribute \$185 million in much-needed tax revenue.

My State of North Carolina has 10 National Wildlife Refuges, and there are 516 of them across the country.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1300 would reauthorize valuable volunteer and community partnership programs that benefit the refuge system.

Sequestration has tightened even more the scarce resources we have to keep the National Wildlife Refuge System open and operational. The system depends on refuge volunteers, and we thank those volunteers, 56,000 of them, in fact, who contributed more than 2.15 million hours, valued at almost \$47 million in just 2012 alone. Generations of Americans would not be able to enjoy these national treasures if not for gracious volunteers.

Therefore, I commend my colleague, Mr. RUNYAN of New Jersey, for his work on this bill. I thank him for his work on the Natural Resources Com-

mittee, even thank him for his work on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and for all that he does in introducing H.R. 1300, along with Natural Resources Committee Ranking Member SABLAN.

I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1300, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014—Continued

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 312 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2610.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) kindly resume the chair.

□ 2028

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2610) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOODALL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 50, line 6.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

SEC. 160. The limitations on obligations for the programs of the Federal Transit Administration shall not apply to any authority under 49 U.S.C. 5338, previously made available for obligation, or to any other authority previously made available for obligation.

SEC. 161. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or limited by

this Act under the Federal Transit Administration's discretionary program appropriations headings for projects specified in this Act or identified in reports accompanying this Act not obligated by September 30, 2015, and other recoveries, shall be directed to projects eligible to use the funds for the purposes for which they were originally provided.

SEC. 162. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated before October 1, 2012, under any section of chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, that remain available for expenditure, may be transferred to and administered under the most recent appropriation heading for any such section.

SEC. 163. Of the funds made available for the discretionary bus and bus facilities program under 49 U.S.C. 5309 in fiscal years 1999 through 2007, 2009 and 2010, \$88,047,709 shall be rescinded: *Provided*, That of the funds made available to carry out new fixed guideways and extensions to existing fixed guideways under 49 U.S.C. 5309 in fiscal years 1998 through 2000 and 2005 through 2006, \$38,290,300 shall be rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for the alternatives analysis program under 49 U.S.C. 5339 in fiscal year 2012, \$25,000,000 shall be rescinded.

SEC. 164. For purposes of applying the project justification and local financial commitment criteria of 49 U.S.C. 5309(d) to a New Starts project, the Secretary may consider the costs and ridership of any connected project in an instance in which private parties are making significant financial contributions to the construction of the connected project; additionally, the Secretary may consider the significant financial contributions of private parties to the connected project in calculating the non-Federal share of net capital project costs for the New Starts project.

SEC. 165. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to enter into a full funding grant agreement for a project with a New Starts share greater than 50 percent.

SEC. 166. None of the funds in this Act may be available to advance in any way a new fixed guideway capital project towards a full funding grant agreement as defined by 49 U.S.C. 5309 for the Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County, Texas if the proposed capital project is constructed on or planned to be constructed on Richmond Avenue west of South Shepherd Drive or on Post Oak Boulevard north of Richmond Avenue in Houston, Texas.

□ 2030

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. I wish to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Houston is the fourth most populous city in the country; but unlike other large cities, we have struggled to have an effective mass transit system. Ten years ago, Houston had only buses. Wider highways were always the solution for transportation.

Over the past decade, Houston has but one light rail that averages 36,000 weekly boardings. I have never been a strong champion of light rail; but my congressional district includes a significant portion of the proposed rail

line in section 166, the University rail line, which would go from downtown Houston toward the Hillcroft Transit Center.

A majority of my constituents in the affected area that would be served support the light rail. I am concerned about section 166 of the bill that would prohibit Federal funds from going toward a part of the University line that falls in the neighboring 7th Congressional District, Mr. CULBERSON's district. This language, although affecting his district primarily, indirectly affects my constituents because it has the effect of killing the whole project. Federal funds are needed to build the University line in Houston.

To be clear, section 166 really doesn't save any Federal money. It just sends those funds somewhere else—maybe to New York City. If we're going to spend the money, let's keep the money in Texas and put Texans to work.

I've recently surveyed the constituents who live in the affected area in my congressional district. My office went door-to-door meeting with local businesses over the last few days, speaking with organizations and talking to constituents. Those in the affected area want light rail. On Facebook alone in the last 2 days, 604 people supported light rail and 340 opposed it.

One Houstonian commented:

Houston needs a viable east-west transit corridor to connect to the Main Street line. As a 23-year-old young Houstonian, I strongly support the Richmond rail and project for Houston's future.

At least 26 community and civic organizations support the University line.

At this time I will yield to the gentleman sponsoring section 166 in the bill, Mr. CULBERSON, for a colloquy.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Judge POE.

Of course, I will continue to work with you and the committee, as I always have. I'll continue to support the will of the voters, as I have always supported Federal funding for those rail lines. It's been approved by the voters. And I look forward to continuing to work with you and my colleagues with the eastern area, as I have with Congressmen GENE GREEN and SHEILA JACKSON LEE, to support those lines in their districts that were on the ballot and were approved by voters.

Mr. POE of Texas. I understand the gentleman's position and the concerns from my colleague and his constituents who really don't want the rail in your congressional district. I respect that representation. The gentleman understands that we have a disagreement as to what constituents want in the affected area. Your constituents don't want the rail. That small section in mine do want the rail. I hope we can work together with Metro productively to get something built that is in the interest of all concerned.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you. I look forward to working with the gentleman.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his offer to work together. I certainly respect his position. It's my hope we can move forward and work productively and not block Federal funds that are coming to the Houston area that would go somewhere else. Let's work together with Metro, the City of Houston, the mayor's office, and the residents along the entire proposed line and see if we can find a solution that we all agree on, and hopefully we can keep this money in Texas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SUPPORT FOR UNIVERSITY RAIL LINE

Greater Houston Partnership; Houston Citizen's Transportation Coalition; Houston Tomorrow; Richmond Rail.org; Montrose Management District; Claude Wynn Interests; Museum District Business Alliance; Neartown/Montrose Super Neighborhood; East Montrose Civic Association; Cherryhurst Civic Association; Board of Directors of the University Place Association; University Place Super Neighborhood Council; and Boulevard Oaks Civic Association.

Morningside Place Civic Association; Old Braeswood Property Owners Associations; Southgate Civic Club; Southampton Civic Club; Museum Area Municipal Association; Rice Village Alliance; Brays Bayou Association; Greater Houston Preservation Alliance; Uptown Management District; Menil Foundation; Museum of Fine Arts Houston; Friends of Mandell Park; and Former City Councilman Peter Brown, Director of BetterHouston.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to the Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Corporation's budget for the current fiscal year.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

(HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses to conduct the operations, maintenance, and capital asset renewal activities of those portions of the St. Lawrence Seaway owned, operated, and maintained by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, \$30,582,000, to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

MARITIME SECURITY PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, \$174,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses of operations and training activities authorized by law, \$143,768,000, of which \$11,500,000 shall remain

available until expended for maintenance and repair of training ships at State Maritime Academies, and of which \$2,400,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2015 for Student Incentive Program payments at State Maritime Academies, and of which \$10,000,000 shall remain available until expended for facilities maintenance and repair, equipment, and capital improvements at the United States Merchant Marine Academy: *Provided*, That amounts apportioned for the United States Merchant Marine Academy shall be available only upon allotments made personally by the Secretary of Transportation or the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs: *Provided further*, That the Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent and the Director of the Office of Resource Management of the United States Merchant Marine Academy may not be allotment holders for the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and the Administrator of the Maritime Administration shall hold all allotments made by the Secretary of Transportation or the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs under the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That 50 percent of the funding made available for the United States Merchant Marine Academy under this heading shall be available only after the Secretary, in consultation with the Superintendent and the Maritime Administrator, completes a plan detailing by program or activity how such funding will be expended at the Academy, and this plan is submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SHIP DISPOSAL

For necessary expenses related to the disposal of obsolete vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet of the Maritime Administration, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MARITIME GUARANTEED LOAN (TITLE XI) PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative expenses of the maritime guaranteed loan program, \$2,655,000 shall be paid to the appropriation for "Operations and Training", Maritime Administration.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 170. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Maritime Administration is authorized to furnish utilities and services and make necessary repairs in connection with any lease, contract, or occupancy involving Government property under control of the Maritime Administration: *Provided*, That payments received therefor shall be credited to the appropriation charged with the cost thereof and shall be available until expended: *Provided further*, That rental payments under any such lease, contract, or occupancy for items other than such utilities, services, or repairs shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 171. None of the funds available or appropriated in this Act shall be used by the United States Department of Transportation or the United States Maritime Administration to negotiate or otherwise execute, enter into, facilitate or perform fee-for-service contracts for vessel disposal, scrapping or recycling, unless there is no qualified domestic ship recycler that will pay any sum of money to purchase and scrap or recycle a vessel owned, operated or managed by the Maritime Administration or that is part of the National Defense Reserve Fleet. Such sales offers must be consistent with the solicitation and provide that the work will be performed

in a timely manner at a facility qualified within the meaning of section 3502 of Public Law 106-398. Nothing contained herein shall affect the Maritime Administration's authority to award contracts at least cost to the Federal Government and consistent with the requirements of 16 U.S.C. 5405(c), section 3502, or otherwise authorized under the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONAL EXPENSES

(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary operational expenses of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, \$21,167,000, of which \$639,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund: *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 shall be transferred to "Pipeline Safety" in order to fund "Pipeline Safety Information Grants to Communities" as authorized under section 60130 of title 49, United States Code.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY

For expenses necessary to discharge the hazardous materials safety functions of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, \$42,762,000, of which \$1,725,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That up to \$800,000 in fees collected under 49 U.S.C. 5108(g) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, for reports publication and dissemination, and for travel expenses incurred in performance of hazardous materials exemptions and approvals functions.

PIPELINE SAFETY

(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

(OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND)

(PIPELINE SAFETY DESIGN REVIEW FUND)

For expenses necessary to conduct the functions of the pipeline safety program, for grants-in-aid to carry out a pipeline safety program, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 60107, and to discharge the pipeline program responsibilities of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, \$111,252,000, of which \$18,573,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and shall remain available until September 30, 2016; and of which \$90,679,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, of which \$52,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016; and of which \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Design Review Fund, as authorized in 49 U.S.C. 60117(n): *Provided*, That not less than \$1,058,000 of the funds provided under this heading shall be for the One-Call state grant program.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS

(EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5128(b), \$188,000, to be derived from the Emergency Preparedness Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That not more than \$28,318,000 shall be made available for obligation in fiscal year 2014 from amounts made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(i) and 5128(b)-(c): *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(i), 5128(b), or 5128(c) shall be made available for obligation by individuals other than the Secretary of Transportation, or his designee.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$79,624,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3), to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or entity that is subject to regulation by the Department: *Provided further*, That the funds made available under this heading may be used to investigate, pursuant to section 41712 of title 49, United States Code: (1) unfair or deceptive practices and unfair methods of competition by domestic and foreign air carriers and ticket agents; and (2) the compliance of domestic and foreign air carriers with respect to item (1) of this proviso: *Provided further*, That: (1) the Inspector General shall have the authority to audit and investigate the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA); (2) in carrying out these audits and investigations the Inspector General shall have all the authorities described under section 6 of the Inspector General Act (5 U.S.C. App.); (3) MWAA Board Members, employees, contractors, and subcontractors shall cooperate and comply with requests from the Inspector General, including providing testimony and other information; (4) The Inspector General shall be permitted to observe closed executive sessions of the MWAA Board of Directors; (5) MWAA shall pay the expenses of the Inspector General, including staff salaries and benefits and associated operating costs, which shall be credited to this appropriation and remain available until expended; and (6) if MWAA fails to make funds available to the Inspector General within 30 days after a request for such funds is received, then the Inspector General shall notify the Secretary of Transportation who shall not approve a grant for MWAA under section 47107(b) of title 49, United States Code, until such funding is made available for the Inspector General.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Surface Transportation Board, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$29,310,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$1,250,000 from fees established by the Chairman of the Surface Transportation Board shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and used for necessary and authorized expenses under this heading: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2014, to result in a final appropriation from the general fund estimated at no more than \$28,060,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 180. During the current fiscal year, applicable appropriations to the Department of Transportation shall be available for maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of liability insurance for motor vehicles operating in foreign countries on official department business; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902).

SEC. 181. Appropriations contained in this Act for the Department of Transportation shall be available for services as authorized

by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for an Executive Level IV.

SEC. 182. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of more than 110 political and Presidential appointees in the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That none of the personnel covered by this provision may be assigned on temporary detail outside the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 183. (a) No recipient of funds made available in this Act shall disseminate personal information (as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2725(3)) obtained by a State department of motor vehicles in connection with a motor vehicle record as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2725(1), except as provided in 18 U.S.C. 2721 for a use permitted under 18 U.S.C. 2721.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary shall not withhold funds provided in this Act for any grantee if a State is in noncompliance with this provision.

SEC. 184. Funds received by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and Federal Railroad Administration from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training may be credited respectively to the Federal Highway Administration's "Federal-Aid Highways" account, the Federal Transit Administration's "Research and University Research Centers" account, and to the Federal Railroad Administration's "Safety and Operations" account, except for State rail safety inspectors participating in training pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 20105.

SEC. 185. None of the funds in this Act to the Department of Transportation may be used to make a grant unless the Secretary of Transportation notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not less than 3 full business days before any project competitively selected to receive a discretionary grant award, any discretionary grant award, letter of intent, or full funding grant agreement totaling \$500,000 or more is announced by the department or its modal administrations from:

(1) any discretionary grant program of the Federal Highway Administration including the emergency relief program;

(2) the airport improvement program of the Federal Aviation Administration;

(3) any program of the Federal Railroad Administration; or

(4) any program of the Federal Transit Administration other than the formula grants and fixed guideway modernization programs: *Provided*, That the Secretary gives concurrent notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for any "quick release" of funds from the emergency relief program: *Provided further*, That no notification shall involve funds that are not available for obligation.

SEC. 186. Rebates, refunds, incentive payments, minor fees and other funds received by the Department of Transportation from travel management centers, charge card programs, the subleasing of building space, and miscellaneous sources are to be credited to appropriations of the Department of Transportation and allocated to elements of the Department of Transportation using fair and equitable criteria and such funds shall be available until expended.

SEC. 187. Amounts made available in this or any other Act that the Secretary determines represent improper payments by the Department of Transportation to a third-party contractor under a financial assistance award, which are recovered pursuant to law, shall be available—

(1) to reimburse the actual expenses incurred by the Department of Transportation in recovering improper payments; and

(2) to pay contractors for services provided in recovering improper payments or contractor support in the implementation of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002: *Provided*, That amounts in excess of that required for paragraphs (1) and (2)—

(A) shall be credited to and merged with the appropriation from which the improper payments were made, and shall be available for the purposes and period for which such appropriations are available; or

(B) if no such appropriation remains available, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That prior to the transfer of any such recovery to an appropriations account, the Secretary shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations of the amount and reasons for such transfer: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section, the term "improper payments", has the same meaning as that provided in section 2(d)(2) of Public Law 107-300.

SEC. 188. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if any funds provided in or limited by this Act are subject to a reprogramming action that requires notice to be provided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, said reprogramming action shall be approved or denied solely by the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That the Secretary may provide notice to other congressional committees of the action of the Committees on Appropriations on such reprogramming but not sooner than 30 days following the date on which the reprogramming action has been approved or denied by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 189. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used by the Surface Transportation Board of the Department of Transportation to charge or collect any filing fee for rate complaints filed with the Board in an amount in excess of the amount authorized for district court civil suit filing fees under section 1914 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 190. Funds appropriated in this Act to the modal administrations may be obligated for the Office of the Secretary for the costs related to assessments or reimbursable agreements only when such amounts are for the costs of goods and services that are purchased to provide a direct benefit to the applicable modal administration or administrations.

SEC. 191. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to carry out a program that establishes uniform standards for developing and supporting agency transit pass and transit benefits authorized under section 7905 of title 5, United States Code, including distribution of transit benefits by various paper and electronic media.

SEC. 192. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the California High-Speed Rail Program of the California High-Speed Rail Authority.

SEC. 193. (a) Unobligated balances of funds made available for section 1307(d) of Public Law 109-59 are hereby permanently rescinded.

(b) For an additional amount to be made available on September 30, 2014 from savings made available from subsection (a), the Secretary of Transportation shall make grants for grade crossing safety as described in section 148(a)(4)(B)(vi) of title 23, United States Code, and corridor planning improvements as described in section 26101(b) of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 194. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Surface Transportation Board to take any actions with respect to construction of a high-speed rail project in California unless the Board has jurisdiction over the entire project and the permit is or was issued by the Board with respect to the project in its entirety.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 2014".

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

For necessary salaries and expenses for Executive Offices, which shall be comprised of the offices of the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Hearings and Appeals, Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Public Affairs, and Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, \$12,000,000, of which \$500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$25,000 of the amount made available under this heading shall be available to the Secretary for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 68, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

Page 69, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment moves \$3 million from the executive offices of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, including the Deputy Secretary's office, to the Office of Field Policy and Management, for a very good reason. The leadership at the Department of Housing and Urban Development has failed my neighbors in Florida under its unsubstantiated plan to remove the on-the-ground, community-based personnel from our local communities and transfer these positions to a single bureaucratic behemoth.

On September 30 of this year, HUD executives plan to move our local community-based HUD professionals to other offices hundreds of miles away. Yet the housing and homeless challenges in my community will remain. Mr. Chairman, Congress was not consulted on HUD's plan. After HUD's plan was leaked, a number of Members of Congress inquired.

So what is HUD's plan? The Deputy Secretary said HUD plans to remove its representatives from the Tampa Bay and Orlando areas, a region of over 6 million Americans, larger than 30 States, and from other communities across the country. I asked HUD's Deputy Secretary, Is this a cost-saving

measure? He said, No. I asked HUD's Deputy Secretary, Have you done a workforce analysis so that the HUD workforce is devoted to the areas that need help and the appropriate places at the appropriate numbers? No.

HUD executives have failed to provide any reasonable justification to Congress regarding the closing of 16 field offices, including two in Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest it is not appropriate to concentrate HUD personnel in offices hundreds of miles away from where they're needed. HUD is just asking for higher travel costs and an agency that will be more disconnected from communities.

Today, my amendment cuts the executive office budget of HUD by 25 percent and moves those dollars away from Washington and back to the Office of Field Policy and Management to restore some of the HUD field offices that are being shuttered in 2 months. In moving the dollars out of Washington, my intent is to directly help our homeless veterans and those on the ground working for multifamily housing, Choice Neighborhoods grants, neighborhood stabilization, Hardest Hit, housing counseling, and more.

My State and local communities cannot be served effectively under HUD's plan to stovepipe its personnel hundreds of miles away. Florida has a population of 19 million, and 1.5 million veterans live in Florida, of which about 8,000 are homeless. We have 57,000 people in Florida that are battling homelessness and our foreclosure rate is still too high. Over the last year, Florida has had the most homes—over 103,000—foreclosed upon. California is a distant second. Nearly 9 percent of all Florida homes with mortgages were in some stage of foreclosure.

Communities throughout Tampa Bay have been hit hard by the housing crisis, and the reliable and informed HUD professionals in the Tampa Bay field office have been on the ground helping our neighbors daily. Earlier this year, more than 5,000 notices of mortgage default, foreclosure auction, or repossession were sent across Tampa Bay. Florida continues to have a very high foreclosure rate—and Tampa is no exception.

HUD professionals in my community have been there to help. They have helped us weather the economic crisis. The Tampa Bay HUD office has been critical for many of my neighbors and for community-based nonprofits working to solve the housing and homeless problems.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply says that bureaucrats in Washington will have a little bit less to ensure that our communities, including my home of Tampa, Orlando, and other communities across the country, have the professionals in the field that we need to help our neighbors, our veterans, and others with housing challenges.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. COSTA for joining me in cosponsoring this amendment.

I urge a "yes" vote on the Castor amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2045

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by my colleague from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), and I want to thank Ms. CASTOR for working on this amendment.

The housing crisis has hit countless districts across the country—Florida, California, and other States—but especially including my own district.

I represent some of the hardest hit areas in the United States of America, including the San Joaquin Valley. Although the housing sector has improved in recent months, there is still much work to be done. We must ensure hardworking individuals and families have the best information possible when making important life decisions, and HUD field offices and officers play a critical role in this process.

Whether it's through foreclosure assistance or for first-time homebuyers, HUD help is needed. Unfortunately, HUD wants to close various offices throughout the country. We must focus on providing HUD with the appropriate resources to adequately assist areas like the San Joaquin Valley that have been disproportionately affected by the housing crisis. Reducing access to services is not the answer.

Mr. Chairman, we've held countless foreclosure summits and workshops in our district. I've seen individuals in front of me that are losing their homes—young men, young women—tears in their eyes. They're getting excellent information from the HUD service officers, and to take that resource away from these individuals is a travesty. This commonsense amendment by my colleague from Florida aims to address this issue by removing 25 percent from HUD's executive account and moving it toward the field offices and policy management account. I know that the people in my district need and deserve these services. Ensuring HUD has the funding to keep offices open is a step in the right direction.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the gentlelady for bringing this issue to

our attention. I know it not only affects her district, but others across the country.

I have to tell you that other Members have come to me, and their great concern is that in many cases the stakeholders at the local offices where there will be closure have not been consulted or have not had adequate input into the negative effects that the closures will have. So for this reason, Mr. Chairman, I support my colleague's amendment and I support the gentlelady, and I ask for an "aye" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OFFICES

For necessary salaries and expenses for administration, management and operations of offices of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, \$479,000,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 shall be available for claims and indemnities and shall remain available until expended; not to exceed \$44,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer; not to exceed \$90,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the General Counsel; not to exceed \$186,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Administration; not to exceed \$49,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer; not to exceed \$50,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Field Policy and Management; not to exceed \$17,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Procurement Officer; not to exceed \$3,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity; not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Strategic Planning and Management; and not to exceed \$34,000,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Information Officer: *Provided further*, That funds provided under this heading may be used for necessary administrative and non-administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefore, as authorized by U.S.C. 5901-5902; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated under this heading may be used for advertising and promotional activities that support the housing mission area: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide the Committees on Appropriations quarterly written notification regarding the status of pending congressional reports: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide all signed reports required by Congress electronically.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CAPITO

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$75,000,000)".

Page 69, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$40,000,000)".

Page 69, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$25,000,000)”.

Page 69, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 70, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$50,000,000)”.

Page 70, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$25,000,000)”.

Page 70, line 17, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$100,000,000)”.

Page 89, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$350,000,000)”.

Page 89, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$350,000,000)”.

Page 91, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$100,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer this amendment with my colleagues, Mr. KELLY from Pennsylvania, Mr. MCKINLEY of West Virginia, and Mr. BARLETTA of Pennsylvania. Our amendment puts \$350 million back into the Community Development Block Grant program. The CDBG's budget has been reduced by \$1.3 billion from last year, and these reductions we believe will deeply affect our local communities.

With our national debt approaching \$17 trillion, it is critical that Congress tighten its belt and direct limited resources to the most important priorities. I believe that funding for CDBG is a high priority.

This amendment has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office, and it will not increase the budget authority proposed in this bill. In fact, it will actually reduce the outlays for fiscal year 2014 by \$129 million.

The Community Development Block Grant program plays a critical role for the many communities who are trying to find funds to improve lower-income and under-utilized areas. It helps tremendously in the rural areas.

In my home State of West Virginia, unfortunately, there are still some West Virginians who have to drive to fill up a water tank because they don't have access to safe drinking water. The CDBG program has been critical in funding these safe drinking water and sewer projects to many areas in West Virginia. Through the small cities CDBG fund, West Virginia has invested \$80 million over the last 5 years to improve access to clean water and to develop water and wastewater systems. These projects include a safe drinking water project in Buffalo, West Virginia, which provided clean drinking water to over 100 residents.

In my home town of Charleston, West Virginia, this program has provided much-needed help for our senior citizens, for road repairs, and our homeless shelters. The program has produced results, and our local governments need this funding to be reinstated so they can continue helping the communities because they need our support.

It was very difficult to find an offset for this. The HOME program has helped

a lot of low-income individuals find affordable housing over the past 20 years. However, there have been grave concerns regarding oversight of the program, and HUD has been slow to adapt to many of the recommendations proposed by various auditors, including a GAO audit performed last February. I'm hopeful that HUD will view these cuts in their budget as proof that Congress is serious about oversight and will increase the oversight of the HOME program.

The CDBG program is a vital one, essential to States like mine and those of my colleagues who introduced this amendment. So I ask all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentlewoman from West Virginia. Obviously, we've got a very difficult allocation, and we understand the importance of the program. So with that, I would ask for an “aye” vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I join Chairman LATHAM and the gentlelady from West Virginia. CDBG is a great program.

When I was a county supervisor, we used the moneys to do infrastructure development and helped the communities and allowed other local officials to decide how those moneys were going to be used. But I have concerns about this amendment. It cuts HUD's salaries and expenses by \$250 million. This level will likely mean staff layoffs, especially in the office that administers the CDBG program. It also cuts the HOME program by \$100 million, even while it is at a record low level in this bill.

The amendment makes these draconian cuts to other programs, and the CDBG levels would still be well below the 1975 level. Robbing Peter to pay Paul is a direct result of the Ryan budget and the inadequate 302(b) allocation.

For that reason, I would oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 69, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$7,000,000)”.

Page 69, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 101, line 14, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, families that receive housing counseling and home inspections make better decisions when it comes to purchasing or refinancing a home. They understand the financial burdens they can reasonably assume and what future costs they may incur due to homeownership, reducing their individual risk of foreclosure in the future. Fewer individual foreclosures also benefit surrounding communities; home prices remain stable, blight is reduced, and more families remain in place. That is why I have been relentless in urging HUD to improve the educational resources available to borrowers when purchasing or refinancing a home.

Currently, HUD is working to improve its certified housing counselor training for potential and existing homebuyers, as well as develop home inspection educational materials for consumers when purchasing a home. Unfortunately, the issuance of these resources has been delayed. To date, only a few of the housing counseling documents have been released for public comment, including the application for the Housing Counseling Federal Advisory Committee and certification for HUD housing counseling.

The legislation before us today, H.R. 2610, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, would reduce funding to finalize these resources at the time they are most needed.

Many low-to-moderate-income homeowners are still struggling to afford their homes. My amendment would provide the additional \$10 million necessary to restore housing counseling assistance funding to its FY 2013 level. Funding from HUD's administrative supportive offices account would be used to offset the amendment.

It would not impact any of the transportation or housing programs funding amounts. The net impact is zero on the budget authority, and it would reduce 2014 outlays by \$4 million—actually saving the government money over time.

This increased funding would help HUD complete its statutory obligations and start providing housing counseling information to FHA-insured borrowers and other interested families. These resources are essential for educating families about the financial burdens of owning a home, the importance of conducting a home inspection prior to purchase, and informing underwater homeowners of their options to avoid

foreclosure. We cannot allow these families to wait any longer for these critical homeownership information resources.

I urge the House to protect families' interests when purchasing a home by voting "yes" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Our bill had already taken steps to reduce HUD's salary and expenses budget in the interest of fiscal responsibility. In addition to these reductions, we just passed an amendment that reduced that account. We also have several more amendments at the desk that further eat at the administrative expenses to offset increases in higher priority programs—again, like the Community Development Block Grants. At some point, however, we cannot continue to take cut after cut into these accounts without jeopardizing HUD's ability to responsibly carry out its mission.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I would ask for a "no" vote and oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, as described by my colleague, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, counseling is very important to current homeowners, prospective homeowners; and with it, we ensure that someone who is going into an FHA-backed home is able to have all the information in order to be a good homeowner. Obviously home inspection is very important. To those people who are still underwater, they still need the counseling and the information from HUD.

So for those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2100

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARBER

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".

Page 69, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".

Page 71, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 80, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to request approval of an amendment that will support citizens of our great Nation who desperately need and deserve our assistance.

I am talking about our Nation's homeless veterans. At a time when our country needed them, they answered the call, personally sacrificing for the greater good—for our greater good.

My amendment will increase funding for housing vouchers by \$1 million, and it is offset by a reduction in the Administrative Support Office's budget.

We owe these men and women more than just a debt of gratitude. We owe them our unflagging support commensurate with their level of service, equal to their sacrifice for you and for me and for all Americans who enjoy the freedoms that these veterans have protected.

Unfortunately, too many veterans still lack the necessary resources to keep a permanent roof over their heads. This, I hope we all agree, is completely unacceptable.

The Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that approximately 62,000 veterans remain homeless. That is 62,000 members of our Armed Forces who made an unwavering commitment to stand in the breach for this Nation, for freedom, for democracy, and the values that are the foundation of the United States of America.

According to the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, nearly one-third of chronically homeless people are veterans. The men and women who put on the uniform of our Armed Forces took a solemn oath to do what we asked them to do, and they should not go without in their time of need.

When our soldiers came home from Vietnam they were subject to despicable insults and, even worse, did not receive the supports we promised them. Thousands of them make up the homeless population in our country today. This was a national disgrace, and we must do better for them and for the new veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan who are coming home every day. We must not allow them to become yet another homeless veteran.

While the Department of Veterans Affairs has a commendable goal to end veteran homelessness by 2015, it is shameful to even let one single veteran become homeless.

In my home district in Tucson, the city is working to ensure that veteran

homelessness is eradicated permanently. I applaud and support those efforts, but more can and must be done across my district and the Nation.

If my amendment is adopted, it would increase by \$1 million the amount available to veterans for housing vouchers. It is offset by a reduction of \$1.5 million from the HUD Administrative Support Offices.

While this amendment will not solve the issue of veteran homelessness, it is a small and important first step that we can take to show our commitment to our veterans.

We cannot continue to fail these men and women who have so bravely served this Nation. It is not a Democratic or a Republican issue; it is an American issue. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. Foxx). The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Unfortunately, this, once again, is a political amendment. If you remember last year, the motion to recommit the gentleman had, that was purely political after Mr. Dicks from Washington and I had made sure that we had every dime in the bill to make sure that every veteran was taken care of. And now to play politics with veterans I think is extraordinarily offensive because, in this bill, we fully fund the President's request. Everything that HUD says that we must do, every dollar is here for the veterans. Now to raise an issue like this I think is something that is not becoming to the House of Representatives.

We have, like I said, Madam Chairman, fully funded \$75 million for 10,000 new vouchers for our veterans. These vouchers are labor intensive, involving both the Veterans Administration and HUD officials in an intensive process moving veterans out of homelessness. The program also provides veterans with supportive services so that they receive job training and other services so that they can move toward a path of independence.

We have heard repeatedly from HUD that 10,000 new veterans' vouchers is the maximum number that can be processed. Let me say it again. From the administration, from President Obama, from Secretary Donovan and HUD, they are saying that they cannot handle any more capacity than the money that we have.

Again, Madam Chairman, I would ask a "no" vote for this only political vote. This is the second year in a row that we have had this. I find it very, very offensive that anyone in this House believes that we are not funding this to the full extent of what is asked for and

what is required for our veterans that have served this country so well.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. First of all, I want to commend Chairman LATHAM for including the \$75 million in the base bill. As he said, that will deal with 10,000 veterans who are homeless. I commend him and President Obama for honoring their commitment to service the veterans.

To speak about amendments having political motives or having political connotations, several amendments ago I think we did CDBG, and I'm sure it had a few political connotations, but that's the way some of these amendments come forward.

To Mr. BARBER's amendment, I do have concerns that the offset may impede HUD's ability to carry out its mission, but I look forward to working with the gentleman to continue this important work. Hopefully, as we work for the Senate, we'll be able to increase the allocation for this bill.

I support the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BARBER. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROGRAM OFFICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES
PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Public and Indian Housing, \$197,000,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Community Planning and Development, \$99,000,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

HOUSING

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Housing, \$377,000,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall appoint an administrator of the Office of Manufactured Housing within 120 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the funds made available under this heading shall be reduced by \$50,000 for each day that the Department is in violation of the previous proviso.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Policy Development and Research, \$21,000,000, of which \$500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, \$71,000,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

OFFICE OF HEALTHY HOMES AND LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control, \$7,000,000, of which \$500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For activities and assistance for the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) ("the Act" herein), not otherwise provided for, \$14,610,564,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2013 (in addition to the \$4,000,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available on October 1, 2013), and \$4,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2014: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading are provided as follows:

(1) \$17,000,000,000 shall be available for renewals of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts (including renewals of enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act) and including renewal of other special purpose incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, from amounts provided under this paragraph and any carryover, the Secretary for the calendar year 2014 funding cycle shall provide renewal funding for each public housing agency based on validated voucher management system (VMS) leasing and cost data for the prior calendar year and by applying an inflation factor as established by the Secretary, by notice published in the Federal Register, and by making any necessary adjustments for the costs associated with the first-time renewal of vouchers under this paragraph, including tenant protection and HOPE VI vouchers: *Provided further*, That in determining calendar year 2014 funding allocation under this heading for public housing agencies, including agencies participating in the Moving To Work (MTW) demonstration, the Secretary may take into account the anticipated impact of changes in targeting, medical expense thresholds, and utility allowances, to public housing agencies' contract renewal needs: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, to the extent necessary to stay within the amount specified under this paragraph (except as otherwise modified under this Act), pro rate each public housing agency's allocation otherwise established pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That except as provided in the following provisos, the entire amount specified under this paragraph (except as otherwise modified under this Act) shall be obligated to the public housing agencies based on the allocation and pro rata method described above, and the Secretary shall notify public housing agencies of their annual budget by the latter of 60 days after enactment of this Act or March 1, 2014: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the notification period, with the prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall be funded pursuant to their MTW agreements and shall be subject to the same pro rata adjustments under the previous pro-

visos: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may offset public housing agencies' calendar year 2014 allocations by the excess amount of agencies' reserves as established by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall also be subject to the offset, as determined by the Secretary, from the agencies' calendar year 2014 MTW funding allocation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall use any offset referred to in the previous two provisos throughout the calendar year to prevent the termination of rental assistance for families as the result of insufficient funding, as determined by the Secretary, and to avoid or reduce the proration of renewal funding allocations: *Provided further*, That up to \$50,000,000 shall be available only: (1) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies, after application for an adjustment by a public housing agency, that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs of vouchers resulting from unforeseen circumstances or from portability under section 8(r) of the Act; (2) for vouchers that were not in use during the 12-month period in order to be available to meet a commitment pursuant to section 8(o)(13) of the Act; (3) for adjustments for costs associated with HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) vouchers; (4) for adjustments in the allocations for public housing agencies that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs as a result of participation in the Small Area Fair Market Rent demonstration: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall allocate amounts under the previous proviso based on need as determined by the Secretary; and (5) for public housing agencies that despite taking reasonable cost savings measures, as determined by the Secretary, would otherwise be required to terminate rental assistance for families as the result of insufficient funding;

(2) \$75,000,000 shall be for section 8 rental assistance for relocation and replacement of housing units that are demolished or disposed of pursuant to section 18 of the Act, conversion of section 23 projects to assistance under section 8, the family unification program under section 8(x) of the Act, relocation of witnesses in connection with efforts to combat crime in public and assisted housing pursuant to a request from a law enforcement or prosecution agency, enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act, HOPE VI vouchers, mandatory and voluntary conversions, and tenant protection assistance including replacement and relocation assistance or for project-based assistance to prevent the displacement of unassisted elderly tenants currently residing in section 202 properties financed between 1959 and 1974 that are refinanced pursuant to Public Law 106-569, as amended, or under the authority as provided under this Act: *Provided*, That when a public housing development is submitted for demolition or disposition under section 18 of the Act, the Secretary may provide section 8 rental assistance when the units pose an imminent health and safety risk to residents: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may only provide replacement vouchers for units that were occupied within the previous 24 months that cease to be available as assisted housing, subject only to the availability of funds: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this paragraph, \$5,000,000 may be available to provide tenant protection assistance, not otherwise provided under this paragraph, to

residents residing in low vacancy areas and who may have to pay rents greater than 30 percent of household income, as the result of (1) the maturity of a HUD-insured, HUD held or section 202 loan that requires the permission of the Secretary prior to loan prepayment; (2) the expiration of a rental assistance contract for which the tenants are not eligible for enhanced voucher or tenant protection assistance under existing law; or (3) the expiration of affordability restrictions accompanying a mortgage or preservation program administered by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That such tenant protection assistance made available under the previous proviso may be provided under the authority of section 8(t) or section 8(o)(13) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(t)): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall issue guidance to implement the previous provisos, including, but not limited to, requirements for defining eligible at-risk households within 120 days of the enactment of this Act, for the purposes under this paragraph, may use unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryovers, remaining from amounts appropriated in prior fiscal years under this heading for voucher assistance for nonelderly disabled families and for disaster assistance made available under Public Law 110-329;

(3) \$1,350,000,000 shall be for administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program, of which up to \$15,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary to allocate to public housing agencies that need additional funds to administer their section 8 programs, including fees associated with section 8 tenant protection rental assistance, the administration of disaster-related vouchers, Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers, and other special purpose incremental vouchers: *Provided*, That no less than \$1,335,000,000 of the amount provided in this paragraph shall be allocated to public housing agencies for the calendar year 2014 funding cycle based on section 8(q) of the Act (and related Appropriation Act provisions) as in effect immediately before the enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-276): *Provided further*, That if the amounts made available under this paragraph are insufficient to pay the amounts determined under the previous proviso, the Secretary may decrease the amounts allocated to agencies by a uniform percentage applicable to all agencies receiving funding under this paragraph or may, to the extent necessary to provide full payment of amounts determined under the previous proviso, utilize unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryovers, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading from prior fiscal years, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That all public housing agencies participating in the MTW demonstration shall be funded pursuant to their MTW agreements, and shall be subject to the same uniform percentage decrease as under the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That amounts provided under this paragraph shall be only for activities related to the provision of tenant-based rental assistance authorized under section 8, including related development activities;

(4) \$110,564,000 for the renewal of tenant-based assistance contracts under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), including necessary administrative expenses: *Provided*,

That administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the special purpose vouchers in this paragraph shall be funded under the same terms and be subject to the same pro rata reduction as the percent decrease for administrative and other expenses to public housing agencies under paragraph (3) of this heading;

(5) \$75,000,000 for incremental rental voucher assistance for use through a supported housing program administered in conjunction with the Department of Veterans Affairs as authorized under section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make such funding available, notwithstanding section 204 (competition provision) of this title, to public housing agencies that partner with eligible VA Medical Centers or other entities as designated by the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, based on geographical need for such assistance as identified by the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, public housing agency administrative performance, and other factors as specified by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive, or specify alternative requirements for (in consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs), any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development administers in connection with the use of funds made available under this paragraph (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment), upon a finding by the Secretary that any such waivers or alternative requirements are necessary for the effective delivery and administration of such voucher assistance: *Provided further*, That assistance made available under this paragraph shall continue to remain available for homeless veterans upon turn-over; and

(6) The Secretary shall separately track all special purpose vouchers funded under this heading.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 71, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000,000)".

Page 72, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, much of the debate today on this bill has focused on tough choices—accepting cuts to one program to make sure another program stays afloat. But the reality is that these so-called tough choices are nothing compared to the choices this bill would force on hundreds of thousands of low-income families: whether to buy food for their children, to fill their necessary prescriptions, or to pay their rent.

Today, the Housing Choice Voucher program, commonly known as section 8, ensures that many fewer families have to make such choices by providing rental assistance to 2.2 million households with incomes well below the poverty line. Half of these households are headed by seniors or people with disabilities, and the rest are typically families with children. Study after study by HUD, GAO, and independent researchers have demonstrated that the section 8 voucher program is a cost-effective means of providing very low-income families secure housing and preventing homelessness.

Typically, Congress has provided State and local housing agencies the funds necessary to renew every housing voucher used in the previous fiscal year, thereby ensuring that families have stable housing, kids stay in school, and parents stay in the workforce. This year, however, for only the third time in the program's 40-year history, this bill would fail to provide sufficient, or even close to sufficient, funding to renew all existing housing vouchers.

Because of sequestration, nearly 100,000 fewer families, and maybe as many as 150,000 fewer families, will receive housing assistance this year. I have already heard from housing agencies across New York State who are turning away families on waiting lists and pulling back issued vouchers for families who have not yet signed a lease agreement. If the bill becomes law as written, thousands of low-income families will lose their existing vouchers, will be evicted from their homes, and will end up living on the streets.

Despite the risks for these families, the bill before us today provides only \$17 billion for housing choice voucher renewals, locking in sequestration cuts, and cutting off 100,000 families from housing assistance. To protect these families, I am offering this amendment to increase funding for section 8 voucher renewals by \$1 billion.

These additional funds will ensure that housing agencies can renew existing eligible vouchers this year and that no additional families will have to face the choice between putting food on the table and paying their rent, between filling their prescriptions and living on the street. I say no additional families will have to face this choice because the current allocation of section 8 is far too meager and there are hundreds of thousands of families on the waiting list. But at least with this amendment, no additional families will be thrown out on the street because we will renew existing vouchers.

□ 2115

Under the bill as written, upwards of 100,000 or so families will not have their vouchers renewed and will be forced to be evicted. This amendment

will ensure not additional section 8 vouchers but simply that existing vouchers will be maintained for people who are living on section 8 vouchers now.

Madam Chairperson, our first objective must be to prevent further hardship to the poorest among us and to prevent the evictions of people currently receiving section 8 vouchers.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. The amendment is not in order under section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5, the 113th Congress, which states:

It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriations bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI.

The amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill in violation of this section. This amendment would increase net budget authority by \$1 billion.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairwoman, I think we can all agree the amendment is necessary. We are talking about evicting 100,000 to 150,000 families from an efficient, cost-effective program that keeps families together and that lowers our costs over the long term. Without this amendment, you will see a spike in homelessness, a spike in medical costs and a spike in hungry kids.

I understand the chairman's point of order, and I understand that the rules demand an offset for any funding increase in the bill. However, when funding levels are as restrictive across the board as they are in this bill and when the rules require that a majority in the House cannot increase the total funds allocated by the Appropriations Committee to this bill, it is impossible to—

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. NADLER. I am very much on the point.

When the rules require that a majority in the House cannot increase the total funds allocated by the Appropriations Committee to this bill, it is impossible to remedy such a drastic cut without hurting other people in need. I hope, as we go forward, that we can find a way to provide these funds so

that hundreds of thousands of very low-income working families and seniors are not put out on the street. I hope we will recognize that the Senate bill is less brutal than the bill now before us.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Iowa makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York violates section 3(d)(3) of House Resolution 5.

Section 3(d)(3) establishes a point of order against an amendment proposing a net increase in budget authority in the pending bill.

As persuasively asserted by the gentleman from Iowa, the amendment proposes a net increase in budget authority in the bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND

(INCLUDES RESCISSIONS)

Unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading, the heading "Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing", and the heading "Project-Based Rental Assistance", for fiscal year 2014 and prior years may be used for renewal of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts and for performance-based contract administrators, notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds were appropriated: *Provided*, That any obligated balances of contract authority from fiscal year 1974 and prior that have been terminated shall be rescinded: *Provided further*, That amounts previously recaptured, or recaptured during the current fiscal year, from section 8 project-based contracts from source years fiscal year 1975 through fiscal year 1987 are hereby permanently rescinded, and an amount of additional new budget authority, equivalent to the amount permanently rescinded is hereby appropriated, to remain available until expended, for the purposes set forth under this heading, in addition to amounts otherwise available.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g) (the "Act"), \$1,500,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, during fiscal year 2014 the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not delegate to any Department official other than the Deputy Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing any authority under paragraph (2) of section 9(j) regarding the extension of the time periods under such section: *Provided further*, That for purposes of such section 9(j), the term "obligate" means, with respect to amounts, that the amounts are subject to a binding agreement that will result in outlays, immediately or in the future: *Provided further*, That up to \$8,000,000 shall be to support ongoing Public Housing Financial and Physical Assessment activities: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided

under this heading, not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary to make grants, notwithstanding section 204 of this Act, to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs including safety and security measures necessary to address crime and drug-related activity as well as needs resulting from unforeseen or unpreventable emergencies and natural disasters excluding Presidentially declared emergencies and natural disasters under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) occurring in fiscal year 2014: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary shall provide bonus awards in fiscal year 2014 to public housing agencies that are designated high performers: *Provided further*, That up to \$15,000,000 of funds made available under this heading shall be used for a Jobs-Plus Pilot initiative modeled after the Jobs-Plus demonstration: *Provided further*, That the Jobs-Plus Pilot initiative shall provide competitive grants to partnerships between public housing authorities, local workforce investment boards established under section 117 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, and other agencies and organizations that provide support to help public housing residents obtain employment and increase earnings: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive or specify alternative requirements for any provision of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment) upon a finding by the Secretary that any such waivers or alternative requirements are necessary for the effective implementation of the Jobs-Plus Pilot initiative: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish by notice in the Federal Register any waivers or alternative requirements pursuant to the preceding proviso no later than 10 days before the effective date of such notice.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

For 2014 payments to public housing agencies for the operation and management of public housing, as authorized by section 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)), \$4,262,010,000: *Provided*, That in determining public housing agencies', including Moving to Work agencies', calendar year 2014 funding allocations under this heading, the Secretary shall take into account the impact of changes in flat rents and medical expense thresholds on public housing agencies' formula income levels.

CHOICE NEIGHBORHOODS INITIATIVE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available for "Department of Housing and Urban Development-Public and Indian Housing - Choice Neighborhoods Initiative" by division F of Public Law 113-6, \$120,000,000 is rescinded.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY

For the Family Self-Sufficiency program to support family self-sufficiency coordinators under section 23 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, to promote the development of local strategies to coordinate the use of assistance under sections 8(o) and 9 of such Act with public and private resources, and enable eligible families to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency, \$60,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary may, by Federal Register notice, waive or specify alternative requirements (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment) for any provision of section 23 of such Act in order to better fulfill the purposes of section 23 of such Act, as determined by the Secretary.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

For the Native American Housing Block Grants program, as authorized under title I of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (25 U.S.C. 4111 et seq.), \$600,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, to determine the amount of the allocation under title I of such Act for each Indian tribe, the Secretary shall apply the formula under section 302 of such Act with the need component based on single-race census data and with the need component based on multi-race census data, and the amount of the allocation for each Indian tribe shall be the greater of the two resulting allocation amounts: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$2,000,000 shall be contracted for assistance for national or regional organizations representing Native American housing interests for providing training and technical assistance to Indian housing authorities and tribally designated housing entities as authorized under NAHASDA; and \$2,000,000 shall be to support the inspection of Indian housing units, contract expertise, training, and technical assistance in the training, oversight, and management of such Indian housing and tenant-based assistance, including up to \$300,000 for related travel: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$2,000,000 shall be made available for the cost of guaranteed notes and other obligations, as authorized by title VI of NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such notes and other obligations, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize the total principal amount of any notes and other obligations, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$16,530,000.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a), \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, up to \$1,818,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That up to \$750,000 of this amount may be used for administrative contract expenses including management processes and systems to carry out the loan guarantee program.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH
AIDS

For carrying out the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, as authorized by the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.), \$303,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, except that amounts allocated pursuant to section 854(c)(3) of such Act shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall renew all expiring contracts for permanent supportive housing that initially were funded under section 854(c)(3) of such Act from funds made available under this heading in fiscal year 2010 and prior fiscal years that meet all program

requirements before awarding funds for new contracts under each section, and if amounts provided under this heading pursuant to such section are insufficient to fund renewals for all such expiring contracts, then amounts made available under this heading for formula grants pursuant to section 854(c)(1) shall be used to provide the balance of such renewal funding before awarding funds for such formula grants: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 88, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$29,000,000)".

Page 110, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$29,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, since 1992, the Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS, or HOPWA, has provided a vital housing safety net for people battling HIV-AIDS. Nearly 1.2 million Americans are living with HIV-AIDS. More than 145,000 currently lack stable housing, and 500,000 will need some form of housing assistance during the course of their illnesses. Research consistently shows that a lack of stable housing is a major barrier to effective treatment for people living with AIDS and puts them at significant risk of premature death from poor nutrition, exposure to other diseases and a lack of medical care.

HOPWA fills this gap by providing secure housing through one of the most effective programs in HUD's portfolio, and it is the only one that addresses the intersection of housing and health. Within 1 year, 96 percent of HOPWA participants achieve disease stabilization and reduced viral loads. Because housing stability plays a key role in preventing the spread of the virus, HOPWA contributes to better individual and community health outcomes. Further, for every \$1 of HOPWA funding spent, \$3.35 is leveraged from other Federal, State and local programs, and every \$1 million in HOPWA funding provides housing and support for 171 families. For that reason, HOPWA has enjoyed broad, bipartisan support since its first authorization more than 20 years ago.

Despite HOPWA's proven track record in improving health and housing outcomes for communities, this year's Transportation-HUD appropriations bill would cut \$29 million in HOPWA funding. The committee's recommendation of \$303 million brings the

allocation for HOPWA back to FY 2008 funding levels despite the fact that there are 100,000 individuals more who are infected with HIV-AIDS than in 2008.

I recognize that \$29 million may sound small by Federal budgeting standards, but to the individuals and families who rely on HOPWA for stable housing and access to support services, these cuts are anything but small. If this funding level becomes law, nearly 5,000 families and individuals will lose access to HOPWA housing and all the health benefits that go with it. For those families, this cut is a matter of life and death.

For that reason, I am offering this amendment to restore the \$29 million cut from HOPWA this year and return it to the same funding level it has received for the last 2 fiscal years. This amendment would ensure that those 5,000 families and individuals who rely on HOPWA for secure, stable housing will not suddenly find themselves back on the street with no access to life-saving medical treatment.

To protect those 5,000 households and stay within the House rules, I would have to cut \$29 million from another account, but at the funding levels included in this bill, any offset would fundamentally undermine HUD's ability to provide services to hundreds of millions of families every day.

HOPWA provides life-saving, efficient services to thousands of families and individuals impacted by HIV-AIDS. Will you work in conference to reach a workable funding level that ensures families and individuals currently served by HOPWA do not lose access to their housing?

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I will be more than happy to work with the gentleman on this issue as we move through the process.

Mr. NADLER. Thank you.

Madam Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's willingness to work on this issue in conference and to find a funding level that maintains this highly effective life-saving program, and I am, therefore, looking forward to those efforts.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

For assistance to units of State and local government, and to other entities, for economic and community development activities, and for other purposes, \$1,696,813,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016,

unless otherwise specified: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided, \$1,636,813,000 is for carrying out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (the “Act” herein) (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.); *Provided further*, That unless explicitly provided for under this heading, not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading shall be expended for planning and management development and administration: *Provided further*, That \$60,000,000 shall be for grants to Indian tribes notwithstanding section 106(a)(1) of such Act, of which, notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 204 of this Act), up to \$3,960,000 may be used for emergencies that constitute imminent threats to health and safety: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for grants for the Economic Development Initiative (“EDI”) or Neighborhood Initiatives activities, Rural Innovation Fund, or for grants pursuant to section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5307): *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

EMPOWERMENT ZONES/ENTERPRISE
COMMUNITIES/RENEWAL COMMUNITIES
(RESCISSION)

Unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading are hereby permanently rescinded.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES
PROGRAM ACCOUNT
(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Subject to section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, during fiscal year 2014 commitments to guarantee loans under section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, any part of which is guaranteed, shall not exceed a total principal amount of \$500,000,000, notwithstanding any aggregate limitation on outstanding obligations guaranteed in subsection (k) of such section 108: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall collect fees from borrowers, notwithstanding subsection (m) of such section 108, to result in a credit subsidy cost of zero, and such fees shall be collected in accordance with section 502(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That all unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading are hereby permanently rescinded.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

For the HOME Investment Partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, \$700,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the amount made available under this heading, the threshold reduction requirements in sections 216(10) and 217(b)(4) of such Act shall not apply to allocation of such amount: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading used for projects not completed within 4 years of the commitment date, as determined by a signature of each party to the agreement, shall be repaid: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the deadline by 1 year if the Secretary determines that the failure to complete the project is beyond the control of the partici-

pating jurisdiction: *Provided further*, That no funds provided under this heading may be committed to any project included as part of a participating jurisdiction's plan under section 105(b), unless each participating jurisdiction certifies that it has conducted an underwriting review, assessed developer capacity and fiscal soundness, and examined neighborhood market conditions to ensure adequate need for each project: *Provided further*, That any homeownership units funded under this heading which cannot be sold to an eligible homeowner within 6 months of project completion shall be rented to an eligible tenant: *Provided further*, That no funds provided under this heading may be awarded for development activities to a community housing development organization that cannot demonstrate that it has staff with demonstrated development experience: *Provided further*, That the preceding provisos, except the first proviso, shall not be effective during any period in which the Final Rule titled “Home Investment Partnerships Program; Improving Performance and Accountability; Updating Property Standards” is published and effective: *Provided further*, That funds provided in prior appropriations Acts for technical assistance, and that still remain available, may be used for HOME technical assistance notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocations within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

SELF-HELP AND ASSISTED HOMEOWNERSHIP
OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program, as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended, \$30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be made available to the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program as authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$15,000,000 shall be made available for the second, third, and fourth capacity building activities authorized under section 4(a) of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note), of which not less than \$5,000,000 shall be made available for rural capacity-building activities: *Provided further*, That \$5,000,000 shall be made available for capacity building by national rural housing organizations with experience assessing national rural conditions and providing financing, training, technical assistance, information, and research to local non-profits, local governments and Indian Tribes serving high need rural communities.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For the emergency solutions grants program as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended; and the continuum of care program as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act; and the rural housing stability assistance program as authorized under subtitle D of title IV of such Act, \$2,088,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That any rental assistance amounts that are recaptured under such continuum of care program shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That not less than \$200,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for such emergency solutions grants program: *Provided further*, That not less than \$1,882,000,000 of the funds appro-

priated under this heading shall be available for such continuum of care and rural housing stability assistance program: *Provided further*, That up to \$6,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the national homeless data analysis project: *Provided further*, That all funds awarded for supportive services under the continuum of care program and the rural housing stability assistance program shall be matched by not less than 25 percent in cash or in kind by each grantee: *Provided further*, That for all match requirements applicable to funds made available under this heading for this fiscal year and prior years, a grantee may use (or could have used) as a source of match funds other funds administered by the Secretary and other Federal agencies unless there is (or was) a specific statutory prohibition on any such use of any such funds: *Provided further*, That all awards of assistance under this heading shall be required to coordinate and integrate homeless programs with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs for which homeless populations may be eligible, including Medicaid, State Children's Health Insurance Program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food Stamps, and services funding through the Mental Health and Substance Abuse Block Grant, Workforce Investment Act, and the Welfare-to-Work grant program: *Provided further*, That all balances for Shelter Plus Care renewals previously funded from the Shelter Plus Care Renewal account and transferred to this account shall be available, if recaptured, for continuum of care renewals in fiscal year 2014: *Provided further*, That the Department shall notify grantees of their formula allocation from amounts allocated (which may represent initial or final amounts allocated) for the emergency solutions grant program within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF
GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 94, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “reduced by \$55,000,000”.

Page 94, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “reduced by \$55,000,000”.

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “increased by \$55,000,000”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, this amendment would remove the \$55 million increase—and only the increase—from the Homeless Assistance Grant Program and transfer that same amount into the Spending Reduction account.

I understand that times are tough nationwide—that they are tough for families, that they are tough for businesses and that everyone has to cut back. We have to live within our means, but the fact remains that we are broke as a country. Our Federal Government is in massive, massive debt. According to the committee report, the \$55 million increase proposed for this program would be used to increase funding for the Continuum of Care Projects and Emergency Solutions Grants.

Madam Chairman, these are worthy programs. They help a lot of people who are transitioning out of homelessness, but I'm not asking that we cut their funding. Not at all. I'm simply asking that we hold the line—fund what we have been funding and put the rest of this large increase towards fixing our Nation's debt crisis.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I must rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I think everyone needs to understand that we already cut \$7.7 billion from what was provided in 2013 and that this is actually \$4.4 billion less than the current rate of spending under sequestration. So everybody talks about sequestration when, in this bill, we are actually \$4.4 billion less than that already. To deliver this fiscally responsible reduction, we carefully prioritized programs to preserve housing options for families that are already counting on HUD for support in 2014.

The funding level provided reflects what is required to renew commitments by HUD to State and local programs that serve the homeless. With less funding, homeless shelters and other service providers will operate at a lower capacity or, Madam Chairman, many of them will close, putting people who currently need help at risk.

For those reasons, Madam Chairwoman, I urge a "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, I listened carefully to the gentleman from Georgia, who talks about the fiscal crisis—that this country is broke and that we have to cut spending drastically. This country is not broke. This country is the wealthiest country in the world, but we are breaking ourselves, and we are breaking ourselves by cutting too much and by following a silly economic policy.

When President Obama took office, this country had a deficit in the first fiscal year of \$1.6 trillion. That was the last Bush budget, because, in the first year of any President, he is living under the former budget. The budget passed just before he took office.

□ 2130

We had a \$1.6 trillion budget deficit, and we were losing 800,000 jobs a month. The President and the Democratic Congress decided that to reduce the deficit and to reduce unemploy-

ment, we had to spend some money to stimulate the economy. We had to put money into infrastructure, into jobs; and we did it. Congress passed it. It didn't do enough. But the fact is, within a year, we were gaining 250,000 jobs a month instead of losing 800,000 a month. We turned the economy around by a million jobs a month, and the deficit started falling.

The deficit has fallen like a rock. It's been reduced by 60 percent since the 2009 fiscal year. We've had the fastest deficit reduction in the last 3 years since the demobilization after World War II; and, frankly, it's going too fast. Any economist will tell you that the too-rapid reduction in Federal spending is hindering the economy and hurting jobs.

The sequester has probably cut about one point off the gross domestic product. We have done what we have to do on the deficit for now. We have to do more in the long term. For now, it's still dropping like a rock. It's been cut by 60 percent. And now we ought to pivot and create jobs, even if that means spending money, but certainly not by cutting so much more. When we create jobs, that creates tax revenues; it reduces expenditures on things like unemployment and food stamps and reduces the deficit.

If you want to see exactly what happened—it's rare in life that you get a controlled experiment. The economies in the United States and Europe tracked. They collapsed in 2007 until 2009. In 2009, they started going up slowly, and they kept going up until 2010. In 2010, the U.S. economy kept going up slowly, and the European economies went into a double-dip recession and tanked and unemployment went way up. Why? Because in Europe in 2010, they did what the American voters wisely refused to do, they elected conservative governments which cut spending much more and which endorsed austerity policies. What did they get? Higher unemployment and higher deficits.

When I hear this rhetoric, it's just backwards. We've done enough on the deficit for now. We have more to do later, but for now we ought to create jobs. That will reduce the deficit by increasing employment, by increasing tax revenues from people who are employed, and by decreasing expenditures that go up when there's unemployment, mainly food stamps and unemployment insurance.

I just had to say that this rhetoric is just wrong. The policies that we keep hearing about from that side of the aisle are driving us more and more into debt and more and more into unemployment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment as this is one of the few accounts in this bill which reached an increase; yet it is still nearly \$3 million below the President's request and actual need.

As it is, HUD and homeless providers are skeptical that the amount provided in the bill is sufficient to provide the same level of services that we provided last year. Reducing this account would further jeopardize our Nation's ability to provide housing for the homeless.

I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING PROGRAMS

PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For activities and assistance for the provision of project-based subsidy contracts under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) ("the Act"), not otherwise provided for, \$9,050,672,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2013 (in addition to the \$400,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available October 1, 2013), and \$400,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available on October 1, 2014: *Provided*, That the amounts made available under this heading shall be available for expiring or terminating section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for amendments to section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11401), for renewal of section 8 contracts for units in projects that are subject to approved plans of action under the Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987 or the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990, and for administrative and other expenses associated with project-based activities and assistance funded under this paragraph: *Provided further*, That of the total amounts provided under this heading, up to \$200,000,000 may be transferred to the Office of Housing for the administration of contracts funded under this heading: *Provided further*, That amounts recaptured under this heading, the heading "Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing", or the heading "Housing Certificate Fund" may be used for renewals of or amendments to section 8 project-based contracts, notwithstanding the purposes for which such amounts were appropriated: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon

the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 8 project-based Housing Assistance Payments contract that authorizes HUD to require that surplus project funds be deposited in an interest-bearing residual receipts account and that are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary, shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until expended: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amount otherwise provided by this heading for uses authorized under this heading.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

For amendments to capital advance contracts for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of such Act, including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, and for senior preservation rental assistance contracts, as authorized by section 811(e) of the American Housing and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000, as amended, and for supportive services associated with the housing, \$374,627,000 to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, up to \$70,000,000 shall be for service coordinators and the continuation of existing congregate service grants for residents of assisted housing projects: *Provided further*, That amounts under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 202 projects: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the provisions of section 202 governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance, except that the initial contract term for such assistance shall not exceed 5 years in duration: *Provided further*, That upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 202 project rental assistance contract and that upon termination of such contract are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until September 30, 2017: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited in this account pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available, in addition to the amounts otherwise provided by this heading, for the purposes authorized under this heading, and such funds, together with such other funds, may be used by the Secretary for demonstration programs to test housing with services models for the elderly: *Provided further*, That unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds transferred to or appropriated under this heading may be used for the current purposes authorized under this heading, notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds were originally appropriated.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATHAM

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 96, line 9, strike “(in addition to the \$400,000,000 previously appropriated under this heading that became available October 1, 2013), and” and insert “, of which

\$400,000,000 was previously appropriated under this heading to be available October 1, 2013; and in addition,”.

Mr. LATHAM (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, this is purely a technical amendment clarifying the funds available for the project-based rental assistance account.

It was our intention to provide the same amount for the rental contracts in FY 14 as was provided in FY 13. However, because of a clerical error that was carried forward in the CBO scoring, we need this amendment to keep the bill within our 302(b) allocation. This amendment does not change the committee's intention of level-funding the project-based rental contracts.

I urge the adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairwoman, the gentleman has cleared this amendment with our side, and it makes technical corrections to the section of the bill.

We have no objection to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Chairwoman, I would like to thank Chairman LATHAM for his work in crafting this appropriation bill to fund our Federal transportation and housing programs. This already difficult task was made more difficult because of the House's adherence to the sequestration cuts, and I applaud the entire committee for working within these parameters.

I'd also like to rise in support of a provision to strengthen the safety net for our veterans in need by making some changes to the HUD Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing or HUD-VASH program. The HUD-VASH program is an example of a program worthy of Federal funding. It helps our homeless veterans who served and defended our Nation to obtain viable housing assistance. I believe that we can all agree that supporting our vet-

erans, particularly our homeless veterans, is a worthy and worthwhile initiative. Veterans and their families sacrifice tremendously to fight to preserve the freedoms you and I enjoy.

After discussing the program with communities in Kansas, I believe there are several changes that can be made in order to improve delivery of the program from local housing authorities to veterans. The changes would direct that the Department of Housing and Urban Development track HUD-VASH vouchers after they've been awarded to public housing agencies to ensure these funds are able to be fully utilized to help homeless veterans. This will aid housing agencies in differentiating VASH vouchers from other section 9 vouchers in the same pool. The suggested changes would also require the Department of Housing and Urban Development to work with public agencies to adopt a simple process for reporting HUD-VASH vouchers from one community to another based on need by a community's homeless veterans. Streamlining this process would give flexibility to our communities to ensure that VASH vouchers are utilized by as many qualified veterans as possible.

Finally, my proposal would require HUD to implement a guidance recognizing the delay that public housing authorities sometimes face in distributing a HUD-VASH voucher while a veteran is in a drug or alcohol rehabilitation program. This will continue to allow housing agencies to reserve HUD-VASH vouchers for these homeless veterans without it affecting their administrative performance in the eyes of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I want to thank the gentlelady for her concern about housing for our Nation's most vulnerable veterans. I agree with her that we should do everything in our power to ensure that the HUD-VASH program works and serves homeless veterans in the most efficient manner possible.

I look forward to working with the gentlelady on her concerns and would encourage the authorizers to look at this issue as they consider reforms across the housing programs.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Chair, reclaiming my time, again I would like to thank the chairman for his commitment to our Nation's veterans. I believe that he and I recognize that, just as it is critical to support our troops in the midst of combat, we must also ensure that our veterans receive the highest quality of care and service upon their return home.

I would thank him again, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

For amendments to capital advance contracts for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013), for project rental assistance for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of such Act and for project assistance contracts pursuant to section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 (Public Law 86-372; 73 Stat. 667), including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, for project rental assistance to State housing finance agencies and other appropriate entities as authorized under section 811(b)(3) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Housing Act, and for supportive services associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811(b)(1) of such Act, \$126,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading shall be available for Real Estate Assessment Center inspections and inspection-related activities associated with section 811 Projects: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, project funds that are held in residual receipts accounts for any project subject to a section 811 project rental assistance contract and that upon termination of such contract are in excess of an amount to be determined by the Secretary shall be remitted to the Department and deposited in this account, to be available until expended: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited in this account pursuant to the previous proviso shall be available in addition to the amounts otherwise provided by this heading for the purposes authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds transferred to or appropriated under this heading may be used for the current purposes authorized under this heading notwithstanding the purposes for which such funds originally were appropriated.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE

For contracts, grants, and other assistance excluding loans, as authorized under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, \$35,000,000, including up to \$4,500,000 for administrative contract services, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That grants made available from amounts provided under this heading shall be awarded within 120 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That funds shall be used for providing counseling and advice to tenants and homeowners, both current and prospective, with respect to property maintenance, financial management/literacy, and such other matters as may be appropriate to assist them in improving their housing conditions, meeting their financial needs, and fulfilling the responsibilities of tenancy or homeownership; for program administration; and for housing counselor training.

OTHER ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAMS

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

For amendments to contracts under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s) and section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act (12

U.S.C. 1715z-1) in State-aided, noninsured rental housing projects, \$21,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount, together with unobligated balances from recaptured amounts appropriated prior to fiscal year 2006 from terminated contracts under such sections of law, and any unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryover, remaining from funds appropriated under this heading after fiscal year 2005, shall also be available for extensions of up to one year for expiring contracts under such sections of law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 102, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "reduced by \$5,000,000".

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "increased by \$5,000,000".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, this amendment would simply reduce the \$19.7 million increase proposed for the rental housing assistance program under HUD by \$5 million, putting this amount in the spending reduction account.

As before, this would not be a cut to this program. It wouldn't even bring funding back to the 2013 levels like many amendments that I've offered today would have done. Instead, it would allow for a \$14.7 million increase to this program instead of the \$19.7 million increase.

I'm not arguing the merits of this program, Madam Chairman; but as I've said before, and I'll say it again, this country is broke.

I commend the subcommittee and the chairman, my friend, Mr. LATHAM, for making some tough choices in this bill. He's done a great job in doing so, and I applaud his efforts. But if we want to solve our current fiscal crisis, we must continue to make very careful decisions. This is a small reduction, and it will just help in the process of getting our government to living within its means.

I urge support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The gentleman said there's a big difference as far as an increase in funding in this account from last year. The fact of the matter is that what was actually spent was not increased and will not be increased this year. We recaptured a great deal of money from accounts previously to fund our bill last year. So the funding level is actually the same as what it was last year.

The bill funds the rental housing assistance at \$21 million, which is the amount with the recapture from last year that was spent, and this amount is necessary to fund 18,000 existing long-term project-based rental assistance contracts. This will ensure that these units remain available for low-income families.

The bill funding levels are not arbitrary, Madam Chairwoman. We have scrubbed these accounts. We've held hearings on them and made recommendations on what must be funded. Again, although it appears a sizeable increase, in fact, it is not because of the recapture we had from last year.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 2145

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This account renews long-term assistance contracts, and the number varies from year to year. The amount needed to renew these contracts depends on how many agreements HUD entered into years ago, not the number we renewed last year. Reducing the funding in this account will threaten the viability of these units if the funding is not preserved.

I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RENT SUPPLEMENT (RESCISSION)

Of the amounts recaptured from terminated contracts under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s) and section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1) \$3,500,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

PAYMENT TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses as authorized by the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.), up to \$6,530,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the

Fund pursuant to section 620 of such Act: *Provided further*, That the amount made available under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced as such collections are received during fiscal year 2014 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation from the general fund estimated at zero and fees pursuant to such section 620 shall be modified as necessary to ensure such a final fiscal year 2014 appropriation: *Provided further*, That for the dispute resolution and installation programs, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may assess and collect fees from any program participant: *Provided further*, That such collections shall be deposited into the Fund, and the Secretary, as provided herein, may use such collections, as well as fees collected under section 620, for necessary expenses of such Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the requirements of section 620 of such Act, the Secretary may carry out responsibilities of the Secretary under such Act through the use of approved service providers that are paid directly by the recipients of their services.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION
MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM
ACCOUNT

New commitments to guarantee single family loans insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund shall not exceed \$400,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2014, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed \$20,000,000: *Provided further*, That the foregoing amount in the previous proviso shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund. For administrative contract expenses of the Federal Housing Administration, \$127,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided further*, That to the extent guaranteed loan commitments exceed \$200,000,000,000 on or before April 1, 2013, an additional \$1,400 for administrative contract expenses shall be available for each \$1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments (including a pro rata amount for any amount below \$1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed \$30,000,000.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to guarantee loans insured under the General and Special Risk Insurance Funds, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-3 and 1735c), shall not exceed \$30,000,000,000 in total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2014, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(1), 238, and 519(a) of the National Housing Act, shall not exceed \$20,000,000, which shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE
ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES
LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

New commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C.

1721(g)), shall not exceed \$500,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That \$19,000,000 shall be available for necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Government National Mortgage Association: *Provided further*, That to the extent that guaranteed loan commitments will and do exceed \$155,000,000,000 on or before April 1, 2014, an additional \$100 for necessary salaries and expenses shall be available until expended for each \$1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments (including a pro rata amount for any amount below \$1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed \$3,000,000: *Provided further*, That receipts from Commitment and Multiclass fees collected pursuant to title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH
RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (12 U.S.C. 1701z-1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 1(a)(1)(i) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, \$21,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That with respect to amounts made available under this heading, notwithstanding section 204 of this title, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements funded with philanthropic entities, other Federal agencies, or State or local governments and their agencies for research projects: *Provided further*, That with respect to the previous proviso, such partners to the cooperative agreements must contribute at least a 50 percent match toward the cost of the project: *Provided further*, That for non-competitive agreements entered into in accordance with the previous two provisos, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall comply with section 2(b) of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282, 31 U.S.C. note) in lieu of compliance with section 102(a)(4)(C) with respect to documentation of award decisions.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, \$55,847,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Secretary may assess and collect fees to cover the costs of the Fair Housing Training Academy, and may use such funds to provide such training: *Provided further*, That no funds made available under this heading shall be used to lobby the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant or loan: *Provided further*, That, of the funds made available under this heading, \$300,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the creation and promotion of translated materials and other programs that support the assistance of persons with limited English proficiency in utilizing the services provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AL GREEN OF
TEXAS

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 108, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$12,500,000)”.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member and I thank the chair. I would like to, if I may, compliment you and thank you for what you did with the HUD-VASH vouchers, the \$75 million which is what was requested. I did join in that request, serving on Financial Services, and we share some jurisdiction with reference to the VASH vouchers. So I am appreciative, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member, for what was done. And, of course, I respect anyone who wants to increase the amount that we accord our veterans. They have gone to distant places; and many times when they return, they don't return home to circumstances that we enjoy, and I'm eager to do all that I can to make sure that they have a place to call home when they return.

With reference to this amendment, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member, this amendment deals with the Fair Housing Initiative Program and the Fair Housing Assistance Program. The Fair Housing Assistance Program was started in 1968, the Fair Housing Initiatives Program in 1987. They have enjoyed bipartisan support here in Congress, and the purpose of these two programs happens to be that of elimination of invidious discrimination.

Invidious discrimination does not know the boundaries that many of us assume it is limited to. We find right now that a good many of our persons who have gone to war and who are returning home have been injured. A good many of them don't return the way they left. And the truth be told, the greatest number of complaints that we have in this area of discrimination are related to persons who have disabilities. Evidence shows us we had 27,092 complaints in 2011 and 28,519 complaints in 2012. That's a 1,427 complaint increase; and disability are the greatest percentage of these complaints, with 47.1 to 55.6 percent going against persons who have disabilities.

This piece of legislation seeks to make sure that all persons—this would include our veterans who may have disabilities—have a place to call home and that they are not discriminated against. I know “discrimination” is not a word that we like to use. I, quite

frankly, don't find favor with the word, but for making our point, we have to mention it because there are people who are suffering from it.

I would hope that we can restore FHIP to the amount that was in the original bill from the Senate, and FHAP as well. This is the Fair Housing Initiatives Program, FHIP, and the Fair Housing Assistance Program, FHAP, as they are commonly called. The bill reduces FHIP to \$32.2 million, and this amendment restores it to \$44.1 million, which is an \$11.9 million increase. The bill reduces the Fair Housing Assistance Program to \$23.4 million, and the amendment restores it to \$24 million. That's a \$600,000 increase, making a total of a \$12.5 million increase.

It is my hope that we can find a way to accord these programs the losses they are suffering because the losses go beyond just the numbers. They impact people, and a good many of these people are our veterans.

With that, I ask the chairman if he would engage me in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, my assumption is that you have a point of order on this piece of legislation, the amendment, and I understand why; but I wanted to make sure that I emphasized the need to protect all persons, and I wanted to focus on our veterans tonight. My hope is that as we move forward, you and I and the ranking member can work together so that we can make sure that veterans are not the victims of invidious discrimination.

Mr. LATHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman for his most sincere concern for these folks who need help, and I would pledge, if possible, if we can find ways. But under our allocation, you understand we have a very difficult situation, so I would have to insist on the point of order; but I appreciate the gentleman's efforts, and I look forward to working with him.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. With that, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment. I hope that we can find that common ground that you mentioned, and I look forward to working with the ranking member who has always done whatever he can to help our veterans as well.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 108, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$150,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, this is an amendment that relates to fair housing programs, and specifically the part of the program regarding the Limited English Proficiency Initiative.

This is a small program that is capped in the bill presently at \$300,000. The President had asked that this be increased to \$500,000. We now offer an amendment that would increase it to \$450,000, still less than what the President offered, but nowhere near what a program like this actually justifies. I want to point out we're not taking away from any other programs. We are just slightly lifting the cap on this particular program to allow the purpose of this program to be carried out.

This initiative is vital to ensuring that individuals who are not proficient in English are aware of their rights, able to understand the terms of leases and other housing-related documents, and able to receive important announcements that affect the health and safety of their households.

In addition, the initiative educates the HUD-assisted housing providers on their responsibilities under Federal law and HUD regulations to ensure that their housing programs and activities are fully accessible to all, regardless of national origin or English proficiency.

Finally, the initiative saves HUD staff time as it helps HUD to more efficiently communicate with and, thereby, serve the needs of people who are not proficient in English.

Madam Chair, I have heard from time to time that the folks on the other side of the aisle are looking for some way to reach out to the Hispanic community and make their party more appealing to the Hispanic community here in America. We have to realize that there are over 40 million Americans who do not speak English as their first language. This is a tiny program that is meant to allow for people who do not have English proficiency to have some of the same benefits and benefit from the same programs as those who do. Certainly it would be a very small and minor concession on the part of the folks on the other side of the aisle to give this little nod to the Hispanic community and show their concern that we have equal protection under the law for all, regardless of whether they are English speaking or Spanish speaking or speak some other language.

Since Congress initiated this program in fiscal year 2008, the Department has used this funding to translate vital HUD documents, such as model leases, fair housing complaint forms, statements of residents' rights and responsibilities, information on how to become a first-time homeowner, how to avoid loan fraud and foreclosure, and fair housing information for disaster housing providers and survivors.

This request will not only fund translation of HUD documents and printing,

but also oral interpretation services at HUD events, oral interpretation for persons seeking access to HUD services by telephone, acquisition of technology that conducts simultaneous oral translation, marketing of HUD's language access services to populations that need them, and public education on the availability of and the right to obtain information regarding HUD-funded services in multiple languages.

Given the tiny amount of money that's involved here, this program has been extraordinarily effective. In the last year for which we have statistics, almost 30,000 people benefited from a program that cost the Federal Government only \$300,000. This program has been incredibly cost effective. It is very much needed by Hispanics throughout America and other minorities who do not have English as their first language. I ask the majority, my friends across the aisle, to consider the value of this program to the Hispanic community and everyone else in America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This account that he is taking the money from is already stretched extremely thin. His amendment seeks to take funds away from the investigations and adjudication for fair housing claims. So the exact people that he's talking about being concerned about, he is going to take away enforcement for fair housing. I don't understand the trade-off.

I think that fair housing is extraordinarily important, and we have \$300,000 in this account already; and to rob an account that enforces the law to make housing available so there is no discrimination, whether it be Hispanic or any nationality in their housing, you don't want to have cases where people, because of race, are not allowed in their housing.

So I think it is ill thought out, something that certainly when you're taking away enforcement, fair housing is simply the wrong account. Again, we have \$300,000 in this account for this purpose.

Madam Chair, I ask for a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. It is his and my effort to help the majority with Republican outreach to Hispanic voters. This amendment would increase by \$150,000 the amount of funding HUD shall spend on translating documents for people who are not proficient English speakers.

Because of our record to help the outreach program, we support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL AND
HEALTHY HOMES

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

For the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, as authorized by section 1011 of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, \$50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That up to \$5,000,000 of that amount shall be for the Healthy Homes Initiative, pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 that shall include research, studies, testing, and demonstration efforts, including education and outreach concerning lead-based paint poisoning and other housing-related diseases and hazards: *Provided further*, That for purposes of environmental review, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other provisions of the law that further the purposes of such Act, a grant under the Healthy Homes Initiative or the Lead Technical Studies program under this heading or under prior appropriations Acts for such purposes under this heading, shall be considered to be funds for a special project for purposes of section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading in this or prior appropriations Acts, and that still remain available, may be used for any purpose under this heading notwithstanding the purpose for which such amounts were appropriated if a program competition is undersubscribed and there are other program competitions under this heading that are oversubscribed.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FUND

For the development of, modifications to, and infrastructure for Department-wide and program-specific information technology systems, for the continuing operation and maintenance of both Department-wide and program-specific information systems, and for program-related maintenance activities, \$100,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That up to \$25,000,000 may be used for Development Modernization and Enhancement: *Provided further*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund under this Act shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 percent of the funds made available under this heading for Development, Modernization and Enhancement, including development and deployment of a Next Generation Management System and development and deployment of modernized Federal Housing Administration systems may be obligated until the Secretary submits to the Committees on Appropriations and the Comptroller General of the United States a plan for expenditure that—(A) provides for all information technology investments: (i) the cost and schedule baselines with explanations for each associated variance, (ii) the status of functional and performance capabilities delivered or planned to be delivered, and (iii) mitigation strategies to address identified risks; (B) outlines ac-

tivities to ensure strategic, consistent, and effective application of information technology management controls: (i) enterprise architecture, (ii) project management, (iii) investment management, and (iv) human capital management.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$124,000,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have independent authority over all personnel issues within this office.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF
HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 201. Fifty percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 50 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1437 note) shall be cancelled or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury, and such amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not cancelled or remitted to the Treasury shall be used by State housing finance agencies or local governments or local housing agencies with projects approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for which settlement occurred after January 1, 1992, in accordance with such section. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Secretary may award up to 15 percent of the budget authority or cash recaptured and not cancelled or remitted to the Treasury to provide project owners with incentives to refinance their project at a lower interest rate.

SEC. 202. None of the amounts made available under this Act may be used during fiscal year 2014 to investigate or prosecute under the Fair Housing Act any otherwise lawful activity engaged in by one or more persons, including the filing or maintaining of a non-frivolous legal action, that is engaged in solely for the purpose of achieving or preventing action by a Government official or entity, or a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 203. Sections 203 and 209 of division C of Public Law 112-55 (125 Stat. 693-694) shall apply during fiscal year 2014 as if such sections were included in this title, except that during such fiscal year such sections shall be applied by substituting “fiscal year 2014” for “fiscal year 2011” and “fiscal year 2012”, each place such terms appear.

SEC. 204. Except as explicitly provided in law, any grant, cooperative agreement or other assistance made pursuant to title II of this Act shall be made on a competitive basis and in accordance with section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 3545).

SEC. 205. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811-1).

SEC. 206. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or through a reprogramming of

funds, no part of any appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be available for any program, project or activity in excess of amounts set forth in the budget estimates submitted to Congress.

SEC. 207. Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of such Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 2014 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

SEC. 208. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall provide quarterly reports to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations regarding all uncommitted, unobligated, recaptured and excess funds in each program and activity within the jurisdiction of the Department and shall submit additional, updated budget information to these Committees upon request.

SEC. 209. The President's formal budget request for fiscal year 2015, as well as the Department of Housing and Urban Development's congressional budget justifications to be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall use the identical account and sub-account structure provided under this Act.

SEC. 210. A public housing agency or such other entity that administers Federal housing assistance for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California, the States of Alaska, Iowa, and Mississippi shall not be required to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of assistance provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 on the board of directors or a similar governing board of such agency or entity as required under section (2)(b) of such Act. Each public housing agency or other entity that administers Federal housing assistance under section 8 for the Housing Authority of the county of Los Angeles, California and the States of Alaska, Iowa and Mississippi that chooses not to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of section 8 assistance on the board of directors or a similar governing board shall establish an advisory board of not less than six residents of public housing or recipients of section 8 assistance to provide advice and comment to the public housing agency or other administering entity on issues related to public housing and section 8. Such advisory board shall meet not less than quarterly.

SEC. 211. No funds provided under this title may be used for an audit of the Government National Mortgage Association that makes applicable requirements under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.).

SEC. 212. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to the conditions

listed in subsection (b), for fiscal years 2014 and 2015, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may authorize the transfer of some or all project-based assistance, debt and statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions, associated with one or more multifamily housing project to another multifamily housing project or projects.

(b) **PHASED TRANSFERS.**—Transfers of project-based assistance under this section may be done in phases to accommodate the financing and other requirements related to rehabilitating or constructing the project or projects to which the assistance is transferred, to ensure that such project or projects meet the standards under section (c).

(c) The transfer authorized in subsection (a) is subject to the following conditions:

(1) **NUMBER AND BEDROOM SIZE OF UNITS.**—

(A) For occupied units in the transferring project: the number of low-income and very low-income units and the configuration (i.e. bedroom size) provided by the transferring project shall be no less than when transferred to the receiving project or projects and the net dollar amount of Federal assistance provided by the transferring project shall remain the same in the receiving project or projects.

(B) For unoccupied units in the transferring project: the Secretary may authorize a reduction in the number of dwelling units in the receiving project or projects to allow for a reconfiguration of bedroom sizes to meet current market demands, as determined by the Secretary and provided there is no increase in the project-based section 8 budget authority.

(2) The net dollar amount of Federal assistance provided to the transferring project shall remain the same as the receiving project or projects.

(3) The transferring project shall, as determined by the Secretary, be either physically obsolete or economically nonviable.

(4) The receiving project or projects shall meet or exceed applicable physical standards established by the Secretary.

(5) The owner or mortgagor of the transferring project shall notify and consult with the tenants residing in the transferring project and provide a certification of approval by all appropriate local governmental officials.

(6) The tenants of the transferring project who remain eligible for assistance to be provided by the receiving project or projects shall not be required to vacate their units in the transferring project or projects until new units in the receiving project are available for occupancy.

(7) The Secretary determines that this transfer is in the best interest of the tenants.

(8) If either the transferring project or the receiving project or projects meets the condition specified in subsection (d)(2)(A), any lien on the receiving project resulting from additional financing obtained by the owner shall be subordinate to any FHA-insured mortgage lien transferred to, or placed on, such project by the Secretary, except that the Secretary may waive this requirement upon determination that such a waiver is necessary to facilitate the financing of acquisition, construction, and/or rehabilitation of the receiving project or projects.

(9) If the transferring project meets the requirements of subsection (c)(2)(E), the owner or mortgagor of the receiving project or projects shall execute and record either a continuation of the existing use agreement or a new use agreement for the project where, in either case, any use restrictions in

such agreement are of no lesser duration than the existing use restrictions.

(10) The transfer does not increase the cost (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended) of any FHA-insured mortgage, except to the extent that appropriations are provided in advance for the amount of any such increased cost.

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms “low-income” and “very low-income” shall have the meanings provided by the statute and/or regulations governing the program under which the project is insured or assisted;

(2) the term “multifamily housing project” means housing that meets one of the following conditions—

(A) housing that is subject to a mortgage insured under the National Housing Act;

(B) housing that has project-based assistance attached to the structure including projects undergoing mark to market debt restructuring under the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Housing Act;

(C) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 as amended by section 801 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(D) housing that is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as such section existed before the enactment of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act;

(E) housing that is assisted under section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act; or

(F) housing or vacant land that is subject to a use agreement;

(3) the term “project-based assistance” means—

(A) assistance provided under section 8(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937;

(B) assistance for housing constructed or substantially rehabilitated pursuant to assistance provided under section 8(b)(2) of such Act (as such section existed immediately before October 1, 1983);

(C) rent supplement payments under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965;

(D) interest reduction payments under section 236 and/or additional assistance payments under section 236(f)(2) of the National Housing Act;

(E) assistance payments made under section 202(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959; and

(F) assistance payments made under section 811(d)(2) of the Housing Act of 1959;

(4) the term “receiving project or projects” means the multifamily housing project or projects to which some or all of the project-based assistance, debt, and statutorily required use low-income and very low-income restrictions are to be transferred;

(5) the term “transferring project” means the multifamily housing project which is transferring some or all of the project-based assistance, debt and the statutorily required low-income and very low-income use restrictions to the receiving project or projects; and

(6) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(e) The Secretary shall publish by notice in the Federal Register the terms and conditions, including criteria for HUD approval, of transfers pursuant to this section no later than 30 days before the effective date of such notice.

SEC. 213. (a) No assistance shall be provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) to any individual who—

(1) is enrolled as a student at an institution of higher education (as defined under section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002));

(2) is under 24 years of age;

(3) is not a veteran;

(4) is unmarried;

(5) does not have a dependent child;

(6) is not a person with disabilities, as such term is defined in section 3(b)(3)(E) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(3)(E)) and was not receiving assistance under such section 8 as of November 30, 2005; and

(7) is not otherwise individually eligible, or has parents who, individually or jointly, are not eligible, to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

(b) For purposes of determining the eligibility of a person to receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), any financial assistance (in excess of amounts received for tuition and any other required fees and charges) that an individual receives under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), from private sources, or an institution of higher education (as defined under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)), shall be considered income to that individual, except for a person over the age of 23 with dependent children.

SEC. 214. The funds made available for Native Alaskans under the heading “Native American Housing Block Grants” in title II of this Act shall be allocated to the same Native Alaskan housing block grant recipients that received funds in fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 215. Notwithstanding the limitation in the first sentence of section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1725z–20(g)), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may, until September 30, 2014, insure and enter into commitments to insure mortgages under such section 255.

SEC. 216. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 2014, in managing and disposing of any multifamily property that is owned or has a mortgage held by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and during the process of foreclosure on any property with a contract for rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 or other Federal programs, the Secretary shall maintain any rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and other programs that are attached to any dwelling units in the property. To the extent the Secretary determines, in consultation with the tenants and the local government, that such a multifamily property owned or held by the Secretary is not feasible for continued rental assistance payments under such section 8 or other programs, based on consideration of (1) the costs of rehabilitating and operating the property and all available Federal, State, and local resources, including rent adjustments under section 524 of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (“MAHRAA”) and (2) environmental conditions that cannot be remedied in a cost-effective fashion, the Secretary may, in consultation with the tenants of that property, contract for project-based rental assistance payments with an owner or owners of other existing housing properties, or provide other rental assistance. The Secretary shall also take appropriate steps to ensure that project-based contracts remain in effect prior to foreclosure, subject to the exercise of contractual abatement remedies to assist

relocation of tenants for imminent major threats to health and safety after written notice to and informed consent of the affected tenants and use of other available remedies, such as partial abatements or receivership. After disposition of any multifamily property described under this section, the contract and allowable rent levels on such properties shall be subject to the requirements under section 524 of MAHRAA.

SEC. 217. During fiscal year 2014, in the provision of rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) in connection with a program to demonstrate the economy and effectiveness of providing such assistance for use in assisted living facilities that is carried out in the counties of the State of Michigan notwithstanding paragraphs (3) and (18)(B)(iii) of such section 8(o), a family residing in an assisted living facility in any such county, on behalf of which a public housing agency provides assistance pursuant to section 8(o)(18) of such Act, may be required, at the time the family initially receives such assistance, to pay rent in an amount exceeding 40 percent of the monthly adjusted income of the family by such a percentage or amount as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 218. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the recipient of a grant under section 202b of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q) after December 26, 2000, in accordance with the unnumbered paragraph at the end of section 202(b) of such Act, may, at its option, establish a single-asset nonprofit entity to own the project and may lend the grant funds to such entity, which may be a private nonprofit organization described in section 831 of the American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000.

SEC. 219. The commitment authority funded by fees as provided under the heading “Community Development Loan Guarantees Program Account” may be used to guarantee, or make commitments to guarantee, notes, or other obligations issued by any State on behalf of non-entitlement communities in the State in accordance with the requirements of section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided*, That any State receiving such a guarantee or commitment shall distribute all funds subject to such guarantee to the units of general local government in non-entitlement areas that received the commitment.

SEC. 220. Public housing agencies that own and operate 400 or fewer public housing units may elect to be exempt from any asset management requirement imposed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in connection with the operating fund rule: *Provided*, That an agency seeking a discontinuance of a reduction of subsidy under the operating fund formula shall not be exempt from asset management requirements.

SEC. 221. With respect to the use of amounts provided in this Act and in future Acts for the operation, capital improvement and management of public housing as authorized by sections 9(d) and 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(d) and (e)), the Secretary shall not impose any requirement or guideline relating to asset management that restricts or limits in any way the use of capital funds for central office costs pursuant to section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(g)(1), (2)): *Provided*, That a public housing agency may not use capital funds authorized under section 9(d) for activities that are eligible under section 9(e) for assistance with amounts from the oper-

ating fund in excess of the amounts permitted under section 9(g)(1) or 9(g)(2).

SEC. 222. No official or employee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be designated as an allotment holder unless the Office of the Chief Financial Officer has determined that such allotment holder has implemented an adequate system of funds control and has received training in funds control procedures and directives. The Chief Financial Officer shall ensure that there is a trained allotment holder for each HUD sub-office under the accounts “Executive Offices” and “Administrative Support Offices,” as well as each account receiving appropriations for “Program Office Salaries and Expenses” within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 223. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall report annually to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the status of all section 8 project-based housing, including the number of all project-based units by region as well as an analysis of all federally subsidized housing being refinanced under the Mark-to-Market program. The Secretary shall in the report identify all existing units maintained by region as section 8 project-based units and all project-based units that have opted out of section 8 or have otherwise been eliminated as section 8 project-based units. The Secretary shall identify in detail and by project all the efforts made by the Department to preserve all section 8 project-based housing units and all the reasons for any units which opted out or otherwise were lost as section 8 project-based units. Such analysis shall include a review of the impact of the loss of any subsidized units in that housing marketplace, such as the impact of cost and the loss of available subsidized, low-income housing in areas with scarce housing resources for low-income families.

SEC. 224. The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall, for fiscal year 2014 and subsequent fiscal years, notify the public through the Federal Register and other means, as determined appropriate, of the issuance of a notice of the availability of assistance or notice of funding availability (NOFA) for any program or discretionary fund administered by the Secretary that is to be competitively awarded. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2014 and subsequent fiscal years, the Secretary may make the NOFA available only on the Internet at the appropriate Government Web site or through other electronic media, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 225. Payment of attorney fees in program-related litigation must be paid from individual program office personnel benefits and compensation funding. The annual budget submission for program office personnel benefit and compensation funding must include program-related litigation costs for attorney fees as a separate line item request.

SEC. 226. Except for funds provided for claims and indemnities, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to transfer up to 5 percent or \$5,000,000, whichever is less, of the funds appropriated for any office funded under the headings “Management and Administration” and “Program Office Salaries and Expenses”, to any other office funded under such headings: *Provided*, That no appropriation for any office funded under such headings shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent or \$5,000,000, whichever is less, without prior written approval from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 227. The Disaster Housing Assistance Programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, shall be considered a “program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development” under section 904 of the McKinney Act for the purpose of income verifications and matching.

SEC. 228. None of the funds made available by this Act, or any other Act, for purposes authorized under section 8 (only with respect to the tenant-based rental assistance program) and section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) may be used by any public housing agency for any amount of salary, for the chief executive officer of which, or any other official or employee of which, that exceeds the annual rate of basic pay payable for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule at any time during any public housing agency fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 229. Title II of Division K of Public Law 110-161 is amended by striking the entire item relating to “Flexible Subsidy Fund”.

SEC. 230. Paragraph (1) of section 242(i) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-7(i)(1)) is amended by striking “July 31, 2011” and inserting “July 31, 2016”.

SEC. 231. Subsection (d) of section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) GUARANTEE FEE.—The Secretary shall establish and collect, at the time of issuance of the guarantee, a fee for the guarantee of loans under this section, in an amount not exceeding 3 percent of the principal obligation of the loan. The Secretary may also establish and collect annual premium payments in an amount not exceeding 1 percent of the remaining guaranteed balance (excluding the portion of the remaining balance attributable to the fee collected at the time of issuance of the guarantee). The Secretary shall establish the amount of the fees and premiums by publishing a notice in the Federal Register. The Secretary shall deposit any fees and premiums collected under this subsection in the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund established under subsection (i).”.

SEC. 232. Notwithstanding Section 24(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437v(o)), amounts made available in prior appropriations Acts under the heading “Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI)” may continue to be provided as assistance pursuant to such section 24.

SEC. 233. The proviso under the “Community Development Fund” heading in Public Laws 109-148, 109-234, 110-252, and 110-329 which requires the Secretary to establish procedures to prevent duplication of benefits and to report to the Committees on Appropriations on all steps to prevent fraud and abuse is amended by striking “quarterly” and inserting “annually”.

SEC. 234. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require or enforce the Green Physical Needs Assessment (GPNA).

SEC. 235. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the doctoral dissertation research grant program at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This title may be cited as the “Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2014”.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

ACCESS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Access Board, as authorized by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended,

\$7,400,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation funds received for publications and training expenses.

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$38,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, to be derived from the Federal National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, and the Federal Home Loan Banks under section 1106 of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008: *Provided*, That concurrent with the President's budget request for fiscal year 2015, the Inspector General shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a budget request for fiscal year 2015 in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies of the Federal Government.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission as authorized by section 201(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 307), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); and uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902, \$24,200,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

□ 2200

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 134, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$100,000)”.

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$100,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, this amendment would reduce funding in the bill for the Federal Maritime Commission's Salaries and Expenses by \$100,000, and transfer that same amount to the Spending Reduction Account.

This amendment would have the effect of bringing the appropriations for this purpose back to the current levels, what we have right now. I offered a similar amendment to this bill last year, which would have eliminated a proposed \$900,000 increase to this same account. Unfortunately, that amendment failed by a 172-249 vote, a pretty strong margin.

So this year, I bring you a request to hold the line, to eliminate this very small increase of \$100,000, an amount which is less than many bureaucrats here in Washington take home as their yearly salary.

Perhaps more than any of my amendments that I've offered tonight, I hope that this one passes, Madam Chair, be-

cause if this amendment to strike a \$100,000 increase to Federal employee salaries fails, it means that we are in serious, serious trouble when it comes to solving our spending problem.

I urge my colleagues to prove me wrong and to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I'm not going to oppose this amendment. It is an account that the maritime industry, with the concerns that we've had and some of the incidents on cruise ships, it's an account that is much needed. But with a very small reduction here, bringing it back to last year's funding level, that would be acceptable to me and we would accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$25,300,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3), to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or entity that is subject to regulation by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern the obtaining of such services within the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General may select, appoint, and employ such officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Office of Inspector General, subject to the applicable laws and regulations that govern such selections, appointments, and employment within Amtrak: *Provided further*, That concurrent with the President's budget request for fiscal year 2015, the Inspector General shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a budget request for fiscal year 2015 in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies of the Federal Government.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 134, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,800,000)”.

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$4,800,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I've got good news for my friends from Arizona and from Iowa. This is the last amendment that I plan to offer on this bill.

It would reduce the proposed funding for the Amtrak Office of Inspector General's Salaries and Expenses by \$4,800,000 and transfer that same amount to the Spending Reduction Account.

Like many of the amendments that I've offered today, it would simply remove a proposed increase, returning the final amendment back to current spending levels.

The Amtrak IG's role is to root out waste, fraud and abuse within the corporation. As I detailed during consideration of my earlier amendment related to Amtrak, I am of the opinion that the IG still has a ways to go in this regard.

Yet, the committee report includes an interesting statement which appears to serve as a pat on the back for the OIG, and perhaps even as a justification for this large proposed increase.

The line simply says: “The Committee appreciates that the Amtrak OIG submitted a separate budget request to the Committees on Appropriations and directs it to do so in Fiscal Year 2015.”

Now, to my read, this means that simply because the OIG did his job, it will receive nearly \$5 million in extra Federal dollars for salaries and expenses. I think that's preposterous.

Madam Chairman, I talked a lot about Amtrak's failings earlier, and I'm not going to rehash the same arguments. I only ask that my colleagues support my amendment. Let's hold the spending to the current levels, and hold the line on wasteful spending. Let's live within our means, and let's roll back this increase.

I encourage acceptance of my amendment, and I recommended an “aye” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chair, I must rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Madam Chair, as you know, one of the very important functions of this committee is oversight, ensuring agencies under our purview are efficiently and effectively managed.

This bill provides Amtrak, the OIG, with \$25.3 million for oversight studies and investigations into fraud, waste and abuse at Amtrak. Through these investigations, the Amtrak OIG has helped improve the economy, efficiency

and effectiveness of Amtrak programs and operations.

Amtrak OIG runs a program that has identified improper and overpayments to the tune of \$85 million. Amtrak has collected some of this back, which has saved the taxpayer money.

The bill's funding levels are not arbitrary, Madam Chair. We have scrubbed these accounts. We have held hearings and made recommendations on what must be funded.

□ 2215

I think this is an extremely important function that we have so that we can look at Amtrak. We're spending an awful lot of money with Amtrak. We need to have a strong Office of Inspector General to keep tabs on it. I think this is money well spent.

I would certainly urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 150, line 2 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS-15; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), \$102,400,000, of which not to exceed \$2,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses. The amounts made available to the National Transportation Safety Board in this Act include amounts necessary to make lease payments on an obligation incurred in fiscal year 2001 for a capital lease.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION
PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD
REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101-8107), \$127,100,000: *Provided*, That in addition, \$58,000,000 shall be made available until expended to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for mort-

gage foreclosure mitigation activities, under the following terms and conditions:

(1) The Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation ("NRC") shall make grants to counseling intermediaries approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (with match to be determined by the NRC based on affordability and the economic conditions of an area; a match also may be waived by the NRC based on the aforementioned conditions) to provide mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance primarily to States and areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures to help eliminate the default and foreclosure of mortgages of owner-occupied single-family homes that are at risk of such foreclosure. Other than areas with high rates of defaults and foreclosures, grants may also be provided to approved counseling intermediaries based on a geographic analysis of the Nation by the NRC which determines where there is a prevalence of mortgages that are risky and likely to fail, including any trends for mortgages that are likely to default and face foreclosure. A State Housing Finance Agency may also be eligible where the State Housing Finance Agency meets all the requirements under this paragraph. A HUD-approved counseling intermediary shall meet certain mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance counseling requirements, as determined by the NRC, and shall be approved by HUD or the NRC as meeting these requirements.

(2) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance shall only be made available to homeowners of owner-occupied homes with mortgages in default or in danger of default. These mortgages shall likely be subject to a foreclosure action and homeowners will be provided such assistance that shall consist of activities that are likely to prevent foreclosures and result in the long-term affordability of the mortgage retained pursuant to such activity or another positive outcome for the homeowner. No funds made available under this paragraph may be provided directly to lenders or homeowners to discharge outstanding mortgage balances or for any other direct debt reduction payments.

(3) The use of Mortgage Foreclosure Mitigation Assistance by approved counseling intermediaries and State Housing Finance Agencies shall involve a reasonable analysis of the borrower's financial situation, an evaluation of the current value of the property that is subject to the mortgage, counseling regarding the assumption of the mortgage by another non-Federal party, counseling regarding the possible purchase of the mortgage by a non-Federal third party, counseling and advice of all likely restructuring and refinancing strategies or the approval of a work-out strategy by all interested parties.

(4) NRC may provide up to 15 percent of the total funds under this paragraph to its own charter members with expertise in foreclosure prevention counseling, subject to a certification by the NRC that the procedures for selection do not consist of any procedures or activities that could be construed as an unacceptable conflict of interest or have the appearance of impropriety.

(5) HUD-approved counseling entities and State Housing Finance Agencies receiving funds under this paragraph shall have demonstrated experience in successfully working with financial institutions as well as borrowers facing default, delinquency and foreclosure as well as documented counseling capacity, outreach capacity, past successful performance and positive outcomes with documented counseling plans (including post

mortgage foreclosure mitigation counseling), loan workout agreements and loan modification agreements. NRC may use other criteria to demonstrate capacity in underserved areas.

(6) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to \$3,000,000 may be made available to build the mortgage foreclosure and default mitigation counseling capacity of counseling intermediaries through NRC training courses with HUD-approved counseling intermediaries and their partners, except that private financial institutions that participate in NRC training shall pay market rates for such training.

(7) Of the total amount made available under this paragraph, up to 6 percent may be used for associated administrative expenses for the NRC to carry out activities provided under this section.

(8) Mortgage foreclosure mitigation assistance grants may include a budget for outreach and advertising, and training, as determined by the NRC.

(9) The NRC shall continue to report bi-annually to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations as well as the Senate Banking Committee and House Financial Services Committee on its efforts to mitigate mortgage default.

UNITED STATES INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON
HOMELESSNESS
OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses (including payment of salaries, authorized travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of conference rooms, and the employment of experts and consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code) of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness in carrying out the functions pursuant to title II of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, \$3,000,000.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 401. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 402. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 403. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 404. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies or entities funded in this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2014, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury derived by the collection of fees and available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that:

- (1) creates a new program;
- (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;
- (3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;

(4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either the House or Senate Committees on Appropriations for a different purpose;

(5) augments existing programs, projects, or activities in excess of \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less;

(6) reduces existing programs, projects, or activities by \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or

(7) creates, reorganizes, or restructures a branch, division, office, bureau, board, commission, agency, administration, or department different from the budget justifications submitted to the Committees on Appropriations or the table accompanying the explanatory statement accompanying this Act, whichever is more detailed, unless prior approval is received from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency funded by this Act shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the report shall include:

(A) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(B) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by object class and program, project, and activity as detailed in the budget appendix for the respective appropriation; and

(C) an identification of items of special congressional interest: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated or limited for salaries and expenses for an agency shall be reduced by \$100,000 per day for each day after the required date that the report has not been submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 405. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2014 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2014 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2015, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines under section 404 of this Act.

SEC. 406. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training that—

(1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;

(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;

(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;

(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or "new age" belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N-915.022, dated September 2, 1988; or

(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants' personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict, or otherwise preclude an agency from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.

SEC. 407. No funds in this Act may be used to support any Federal, State, or local projects that seek to use the power of eminent domain, unless eminent domain is employed only for a public use: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, public use shall not be construed to include economic development that primarily benefits private entities: *Provided further*, That any use of funds for mass transit, railroad, airport, seaport or highway projects as well as utility projects which benefit or serve the general public (including energy-related, communication-related, water-related and wastewater-related infrastructure), other structures designated for use by the general public or which have other common-carrier or public-utility functions that serve the general public and are subject to regulation and oversight by the government, and projects for the removal of an immediate threat to public health and safety or brownfields as defined in the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (Public Law 107-118) shall be considered a public use for purposes of eminent domain.

SEC. 408. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to pay the salary for any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his or her period of active military or naval service, and has within 90 days after his or her release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year, made application for restoration to his or her former position and has been certified by the Office of Personnel Management as still qualified to perform the duties of his or her former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 410. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

SEC. 411. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity that has been convicted of violating the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c).

SEC. 412. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for first-class airline accommodations in contravention of sections 301-10.122 and 301-10.123 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 413. None of the funds made available under this Act or any prior Act may be provided to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, or allied organizations.

SEC. 414. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law

within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 415. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in furtherance of the implementation of the European Union greenhouse gas emissions trading scheme for aviation activities established by European Union Directive 2008/101/EC.

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 417. None of the budget authority made available by this Act may be used to reduce funding or otherwise alter the implementation of a program, project or activity as proposed for elimination in the President's fiscal year 2015 budget request until the proposed change is enacted in an appropriation Act, or unless such change is made pursuant to the reprogramming and transfer provisions of this Act or in accordance with sunset or termination dates previously enacted in law.

SEC. 418. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Transportation shall each submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a comprehensive report compiled in conjunction with the Government Accountability Office that details updated missions, goals, strategies, and priorities, along with performance metrics that are measurable, repeatable, and directly linked to requests for funding, as described in the accompanying report.

SEC. 419. It is the sense of the Congress that the Congress should not pass any legislation that authorizes spending cuts that would increase poverty in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that section of the bill?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 420. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the

Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2610) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2027

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be removed as a cosponsor to H.R. 2027.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151), as amended by section 1601 of Pub L. 111-68, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center:

Mr. MORAN, Virginia

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 491 of the Higher Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1098(c)), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, and upon the recommendation of the minority leader, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for a term of 4 years:

Mr. Fred Hurst, Flagstaff, AZ

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913 and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Ms. KAPTUR, Ohio

Mr. HONDA, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE JAPAN-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2903, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission:

Mr. McDERMOTT, Washington

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 501(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members to the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards:

Mrs. DAVIS, California

Mr. RICHMOND, Louisiana

Mr. SHERMAN, California

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of bronchitis.

Mr. HORSFORD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of medically mandated recovery.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1092. An act to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 31, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2402. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Colonel James E. McClain to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2403. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of six officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2404. A letter from the Secretary, Army, Department of Defense, transmitting notification to Congress of the Permanent Reduction of Sizable Numbers of Members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2405. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a supplemental update of the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(a); (H. Doc. No. 113-52); to the Committee on the Budget and ordered to be printed.

2406. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priority—National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers [CFDA Number: 84.133B-8] received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2407. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act (RIN: 1210-AB44) received July 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2408. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products; Test Procedures for Residential Furnaces and Boilers [Docket No.: EERE-2013-BT-TP-0008] (RIN: 1904-AC96) received July 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2409. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Strategic Integrated Management Plan for the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER), the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER), and the Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2410. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Exclusion of Orphan Drugs for Certain Covered Entities under 340B Program (RIN: 0906-AA94) received July 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2411. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Distribution of Reference Biological Standards and Biological Preparations [Docket No.: CDC-2013-0013] (RIN: 0920-AA53) received July 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2412. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act [CMS-9968-F] (RIN: 0938-AR42) received June 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2413. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final

rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Summit, Mississippi) [MB Docket No.: 12-84] (RM-11627) received July 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2414. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Sections 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Roaring Springs, Texas) [MB Docket No.: 12-236] [RM-11671] received July 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2415. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Closed Captioning of Internet Protocol-Delivered Video Programming: Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010 [MB Docket No.: 11-154] received July 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2416. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Inflation Adjustments to the Price-Anderson Act Financial Protection Regulations [NRC-2013-0072] (RIN: 3150-AJ25) received July 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2417. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency declared with respect to the actions of certain persons to undermine the sovereignty of Lebanon is to continue in effect beyond August 1, 2013, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 113-51); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2418. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a Report on Proposed Obligations for the Cooperative Threat Reduction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2419. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2420. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2421. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Advancing Freedom and Democracy"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2422. A letter from the President, House of Representatives of Morocco, transmitting a strategic plan for upgrading and enhancing the work of the House of Representatives of Morocco; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2423. A letter from the Chairman and Vice Chairman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, transmitting notification of a public hearing held on "Macau and Hong Kong"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2424. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2425. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2426. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2427. A letter from the Clerk, Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, *United States of America v. John Natale*, No. 12-3231, (June 11, 2013); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2428. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Transition Relief for Employees and Related Individuals Eligible to Enroll in Eligible Employer-Sponsored Health Plans for Non-Calendar Plan Years that Begin in 2013 and End in 2014 [Notice 2013-42] received July 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2429. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Application of Section 108(i) to Partnerships and S Corporations [TD 9623] (RIN: 1545-B199) received July 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2430. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Mailing of Tickets Under the Ticket to Work Program [Docket No.: SSA-2011-0034] (RIN: 0960-AH34) received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2431. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Sunset Date for Attorney Advisor Program [Docket No.: SSA-2013-0006] (RIN: 0960-AH56) received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2432. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Effective Date for Temporary Pilot Program Setting the Time and Place for a Hearing Before and Administrative Law Judge [Docket No.: SSA-2013-0016] (RIN: 0960-AH58) received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROYCE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 850. A bill to impose additional human rights and economic and financial

sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-177, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2226. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to State consultation on removal and remedial actions, State concurrence with listing on the National Priorities List, and State credit for contributions to the removal or remedial action, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-178, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2279. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities; with an amendment (Rept. 113-179, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2318. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 with respect to the applicability of the Act to Federal facilities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-180, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 698. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish safeguards and standards of quality for research and transplantation of organs infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) (Rept. 113-181, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2094. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements) (Rept. 113-182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 313. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to institute spending limits and transparency requirements for Federal conference and travel expenditures, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 2711. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-184, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. GRANGER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2855. A bill making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 698 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 850 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2711 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILLS

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following actions were taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2226. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than November 1, 2013.

H.R. 2279. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than November 1, 2013.

H.R. 2318. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than November 1, 2013.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2847. A bill to establish a grant program to encourage the use of assistance dogs by certain members of the Armed Forces and veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2848. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2849. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish an Office of the Privacy Advocate General; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. STEWART, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 2850. A bill to require certain procedures in the conduct by the Environmental Protection Agency of its study of the potential impacts of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water resources; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 2851. A bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 2852. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2853. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the public disclosure of charges for certain hospital and ambulatory surgical center treatment episodes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FINCHER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HALL, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. RADEL, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction of State and local general sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FARR, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2856. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2857. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide the interest rate for certain disaster related loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2858. A bill to implement reforms to the Federal land management agency fire

programs in order to address the complexities of 21st century wildfires in a more cost-effective and efficient manner; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 2859. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend the interest rate limitation on debt entered into during military service to debt incurred during military service to consolidate or refinance student loans incurred before military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 2860. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management may use amounts in the revolving fund of the Office to fund audits, investigations, and oversight activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2861. A bill to require the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to retain and redistribute certain amounts collected as fines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2862. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a temporary dividends received deduction for 2013 or 2014; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 2863. A bill to amend the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 to provide assistance to small businesses providing low-income individuals with green jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2864. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to improve oversight of nursing facilities under the Medicare and Medicaid programs by preventing inappropriate influence over surveyors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CHU, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WATT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COHEN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2865. A bill to provide safeguards with respect to the Federal Bureau of Investigation criminal background checks prepared for employment purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MICA, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 2866. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 2867. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the recognition of attending physician assistants as attending physicians to serve hospice patients; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2868. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to provide guidance and limitations regarding the integration of unmanned aircraft systems into United States airspace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution urging the Government of Taiwan to grant former President Chen Shui-bian medical parole to ensure that he receives the highest level of medical attention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution calling for a democratically elected government for the people of the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. WATT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H. Res. 319. A resolution recognizing Bayard Rustin for his lifelong leadership in the civil rights, labor, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) rights movements and for his exemplary dedication to realizing true equality and freedom in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H. Res. 320. A resolution celebrating the West Linn Centennial; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H. Res. 321. A resolution celebrating the Molalla Centennial; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers

granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 2847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 13: To provide and maintain a Navy.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 2848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, Congress shall have the power to enact appropriate laws protecting the civil rights of all Americans.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 2852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 2854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7: "All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives . . ."

Article I, Section 8: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, . . ."

Amendment XVI (16th Amendment): "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 2855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law" In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Con-

gress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States" Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2856.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution Clause 18. This is the necessary and proper clause, which allows Congress to enact laws pursuant to the Constitution that will benefit the nation as a whole.

By Ms. DeGETTE:

H.R. 2858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 2859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority to enact this legislation can be found in:

General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 1)
Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

Constitutional analysis is a rigorous discipline which goes far beyond the text of the Constitution, and requires knowledge of case law, history, and the tools of constitutional interpretation. While the scope of Congress' powers is an appropriate matter for House debate, the listing of specific textual authorities for routine Congressional legislation about which there is no legitimate constitutional concern is a diminishment of the majesty of our Founding Fathers' vision for our national legislature.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 2860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 & Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 2866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 5, which provides, "To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;"

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 2867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority comes from Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 1, the "tax and spend clause." This clause provides, "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; . . ."

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 107: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 129: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 198: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 241: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 280: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 281: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 301: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 313: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 352: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 419: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 494: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 495: Mr. TERRY, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 523: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 594: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 647: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 676: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 683: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

R. 685: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 688: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 708: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 713: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 719: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 733: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 741: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 755: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 792: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 794: Mr. POCAN and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 809: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 818: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 845: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 846: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 850: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 924: Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico.

H.R. 938: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 946: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 961: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 975: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 984: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 997: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 1000: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1020: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1024: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1027: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1074: Mr. FORBES and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1077: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1091: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1125: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1146: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1179: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1199: Mr. WELCH, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1217: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1250: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LATTA, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1252: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1278: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1281: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1339: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1346: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1354: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 1395: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1416: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1427: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1428: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1431: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1461: Mr. BARTON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1518: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1528: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HURT, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1541: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 1563: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 1590: Mr. HECK of Washington and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1616: Mr. COOPER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1620: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1634: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1660: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 1666: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1690: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 1692: Mr. CROWLEY and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1699: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1717: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1721: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1726: Mr. NADLER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1727: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1728: Mr. FARR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HOYER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LANDEVIN, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 1731: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1756: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1761: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1763: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1764: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1771: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1775: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1779: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1812: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 1814: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1816: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1827: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1830: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1843: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1861: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1869: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 1875: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1882: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1887: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1892: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1893: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 1920: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1957: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1991: Mr. SALMON, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1999: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2000: Mr. RIBBLE and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2009: Mr. COOK, Mrs. BLACK, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 2016: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2019: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 2037: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2044: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2053: Mr. HURT.

H.R. 2079: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2086: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 2099: Mr. BROWN of Georgia and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 2101: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2110: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2111: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2116: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2128: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2137: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2138: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 2149: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2151: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 2153: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2178: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 2182: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2194: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2195: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 2249: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2278: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 2295: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 2300: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 2309: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2315: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2328: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 2352: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2358: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2368: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2387: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2408: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 2415: Mr. BONNER, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 2434: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2440: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2456: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 2457: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 2458: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 2464: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2465: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2468: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2480: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 2485: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2500: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2502: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2504: Mr. TITUS, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2509: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 2520: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2527: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2530: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2531: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2532: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2533: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2535: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2536: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 2542: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 2548: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2559: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2565: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2575: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 2579: Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. ROKITA, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 2581: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 2591: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 2633: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2638: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 2646: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2647: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2648: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2663: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 2679: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 2682: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 2692: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2711: Mr. LONG and Mr. REED.

H.R. 2717: Mr. DENT, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 2720: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2730: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2743: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2745: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 2765: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 2768: Mr. STEWART, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. REED, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2769: Mr. STEWART, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. REED, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2770: Ms. TITUS and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2772: Ms. HAHN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2773: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2775: Mr. LONG, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. LATTI.

H.R. 2776: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 2789: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2794: Mr. LANCE and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2802: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 2805: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 2807: Mr. LATTI and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2809: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 2810: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. OLSON, and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 2812: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2820: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 2821: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 2824: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 2825: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2826: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2837: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2839: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SIREN, Mr. MEEKS, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 2840: Mr. LATTI.

H.R. 2844: Mr. HARPER.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.J. Res. 34: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.J. Res. 41: Mr. HUDSON.

H.J. Res. 43: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. KIND.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. HURT.

H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 30: Mr. BARLETTA.

H. Res. 86: Mr. DESANTIS.

H. Res. 97: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Res. 104: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H. Res. 112: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. GRIMM.

H. Res. 208: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 222: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Res. 227: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 250: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H. Res. 254: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 280: Mr. PERRY.

H. Res. 281: Mr. COTTON, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. TITUS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. STIVERS.

H. Res. 284: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H. Res. 293: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COOK, and Mr. CRAMER.

H. Res. 302: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H. Res. 307: Mr. BARBER and Mr. JOYCE.

H. Res. 308: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. SIREN.

H. Res. 318: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 2009, "Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act of 2013," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 693: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2027: Ms. SINEMA.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. HANNA

AMENDMENT No. 5: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule published by the Department of Transportation in the Federal Register on December 27, 2011, titled "Hours of Service of Drivers" (76 Fed. Reg. 81134).

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. BARBER

AMENDMENT No. 6: Page 68, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".

Page 69, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".

Page 71, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 80, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 7: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 421. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 8: Page 9, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$250)”.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 9: Page 2, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$500,000)”.

Page 3, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$500,000)”.

Page 10, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000)”.

Page 11, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000)”.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to establish or collect tolls on Interstate 4 in the State of Florida.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 11: Page 9, line 7, before the period, insert “or that are located within 50 miles of a commercial service airport”.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 12: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be made available to any airline that reduces the benefits of its frequent flyer program without 180 days prior notice.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT No. 13: Page 68, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 68, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 69, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT No. 14: Page 8, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$100,000,000)”.

Page 150, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$100,000,000)”.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MS. NORTON

AMENDMENT No. 15: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce subpart V of part 93 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, regarding special air traffic rules for aircraft operating in the Washington, DC metropolitan area.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. TURNER

AMENDMENT No. 16: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to establish, issue, implement, administer, or enforce any prohibition or restriction on the establishment or effectiveness of any occupancy preference for veterans in supportive housing for the elder-

ly that (1) is provided assistance by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and (2)(A) is or would be located on property of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or (B) is subject to an enhanced use lease with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

AMENDMENT No. 17: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 129(c)(3) of title 23, United States Code.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: LIMITATION RELATING TO USE OF OFFICIAL TIME

SEC. 421. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay a Federal employee for any period of time during which such employee is using official time under section 7131 of title 5, United States Code.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT No. 19: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 421. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to close or consolidate any offices in the Office of Field Policy and Management of the Department of Housing and Urban Development that were in existence as of June 1, 2013, or any field offices of the Office of Multifamily Housing Programs of such Department that were in existence as of such date.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. AL GREEN OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 20: Page 108, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$12,500,000)”.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 21: Page 108, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$150,000)”.

SENATE—Tuesday, July 30, 2013

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Sovereign Master of the Universe, Your kingdom cannot be shaken for You are King of kings and Lord of lords. We praise You that more things are wrought by prayer than this world can imagine.

Lord, thank You for inviting us to ask and receive, to seek and find, and to knock for doors to open. Forgive us when we have forfeited Your blessings because of our failure to ask. Forgive us also when we have lacked the humility to turn from evil, to seek Your face, and to pursue Your paths. May this prayer that opens today's session be a springboard for intercession throughout this day. Help our Senators to pause repeatedly during their challenging work to ask You for wisdom and guidance.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following the remarks of Senator MCCONNELL and me, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 223, the nomination of Kent Yoshiho Hirozawa, of New York, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board and immediately have a cloture vote on that nomination.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 2218

Mr. REID. I am told H.R. 2218 is at the desk and is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for a second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2218) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment.

Mr. REID. I now object to any further proceedings at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for the first time in 3 years the Senate is poised to confirm members of the National Labor Relations Board. Although too few Americans are aware of the important job this Board does, the NLRB looks out for rights of millions of U.S. workers every day and remedies unfair practices by private companies. This Board is an important safeguard for workers in America, regardless of whether the employees are union or nonunion. Without the work of the NLRB, employees who have been cheated and treated unfairly would have no entity to address the wrongs. Union elections would be meaningless to employers and employees. Labor abuses and unfair employment practices could go unchallenged.

I am glad the Senate is moving forward as agreed under this process, set forth at the beginning of this Congress, to confirm five nominees to the NLRB, two Republicans and three Democrats.

The Senate will consider three Democratic nominees and two Republican nominees for the NLRB today. Once they are confirmed, the NLRB will have five Senate-confirmed members for the first time in a decade.

The five nominees are all eminently qualified.

For example, Mark Pearce has served on the National Labor Relations Board for 3 years, since 2010. He has served as chairman since 2011.

Mr. Pearce was a founding partner of a Buffalo, NY law firm, where he practiced employment law.

He previously worked in the Buffalo, NY regional office of the NLRB.

Mr. Pearce received his Bachelor's degree from Cornell University and his law degree from SUNY Buffalo.

Kent Hirozawa, whose nomination we will also consider today, is currently chief counsel for the National Labor Relations Board.

Before joining the NLRB staff in 2010, Mr. Hirozawa was a partner at a New

York law firm, where he worked on Federal and State and labor and employment law.

Mr. Hirozawa also served as a field attorney for the NLRB from for 3 years prior to entering private practice.

He received a Bachelor's degree from Yale and his law degree from NYU.

Nancy Schiffer, the third Democratic NLRB nominee we will consider today, served as associate general counsel for the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

She has also worked for the United Auto Workers and served as a staff attorney in the NLRB's Detroit regional office.

Ms. Schiffer received her Bachelor's from Michigan State University and her law degree from the University of Michigan.

Once we vote on the 3 Democratic nominees, I expect we will consider the 2 Republican nominees by consent.

The first Republican nominee, Harry Johnson, is a partner at a Los Angeles law firm and practices labor and employment law.

Mr. Johnson received his Bachelor's degree from Johns Hopkins University and his law degree from Harvard.

The other Republican nominee, Philip Miscimarra, is a partner in a Chicago law firm, where he also practices labor and employment law.

Mr. Miscimarra received his Bachelor's degree from Duquesne University, and his M.B.A and J.D. from the University of Pennsylvania.

These nominees will be responsible for ensuring fair compensation and working conditions for American workers.

Look at the résumés of these people. They are pretty impressive.

They are experienced and dedicated public servants, and I have no doubt that they will perform their duties on this crucial board with distinction.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Republican leader is recognized.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today, the President will continue his campaign road tour in Chattanooga. We hear he plans to make an announcement about corporate taxes. And while I understand he is looking for headlines here, reports indicate that the policy he intends to announce doesn't exactly qualify as news. It is just a further-left

version of a widely panned plan he already proposed 2 years ago—this time with extra goodies for tax-and-spend liberals.

The plan, which I just learned about last night, lacks meaningful bipartisan input, and the tax hike it includes is going to dampen any boost businesses might otherwise get to help our economy. In fact, it could actually hurt small businesses. And it represents an unmistakable signal that the President has literally backed away from his campaign-era promise to corporate America that tax reform would be revenue neutral to them.

Not only is this a rebuke to one of his party's most senior Senators—the Finance Committee Chairman—it also represents a serious blow to one of the best chances for true bipartisan action in Washington. I truly hope the President reconsiders this plan and consults with Congress before moving any further.

Two summers ago, Republicans and Democrats came together to agree on a set of spending caps for the following decade. President Obama agreed to it, as did the leaders of both parties in the Senate and the House.

It was essentially a promise made to the American people that Washington would reduce spending by \$2.1 trillion, and I was happy to help lead the effort.

Well, 2 years later Democrats are now trying to find ways to walk away from it.

They are pressing to abandon the 2011 agreement in favor of higher spending, as evidenced by appropriations bills like the one we're considering this week—which hikes up spending by double digits. And the President is now actually threatening to veto bills that live up to that commitment we all made.

Let me repeat that: The President of the United States who, during the campaign, took credit for the very savings Democrats now want to walk away from, is threatening to veto spending bills that would actually follow the law and live up to the commitment he himself signed.

This represents a stunning shift for Democrats, who just recently were warning against breaking the agreement. The Chairwoman of the Budget Committee said last year that we have to be able to count on agreements that have been made, instead of threatening a Government shutdown. Yet that is just what she and her party are now threatening to do—to shut down the Government unless an agreement we all made is torn up and thrown away.

So if Democrats want to shut down the Government because they can't wiggle their way out of a deal they agreed to, I guess there is not much we can do to stop them. But Republicans intend to stick by the commitments made to our constituents.

That said, there is also this to remember: Republicans have always said

that there may be more effective ways to achieve comparable spending reductions. If Democrats want to propose smarter spending cuts that achieve the same kind of savings they committed to in 2011, we are ready to listen. Comprehensive Government spending reforms would be a good place to start.

Because Republicans understand that America's largest fiscal challenges stem from the fact that programs our fellow Americans hope to rely on in their most vulnerable years are going bankrupt. And Republicans are saying that the only way to avert the kind of panicked, poorly thought out spending cuts and tax increases we have seen in Europe is to implement forward-looking reforms today. That is why it is always so amusing when the President and his allies try to brand the kind of innovative government spending reforms we favor as "European-style austerity," as he implied again this weekend.

Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, what the Europeans are doing in response to the threats from their creditors is essentially the opposite of the approach favored by Republicans. The type of long-term spending reforms we envision are often the only antidote against the kind of austerity we see in Europe. Because European austerity is not about protecting future generations from spending cuts, it is about staying afloat today. And the tax increases Europeans enact under duress—and the kind of pain Detroiters experience under bankruptcy—these are exactly the things Republicans aim to avoid. And we aim to avoid those things by acting intelligently today, while we still have time.

Unlike Democrats, Republicans are not looking for some colorless discussion about raising taxes here or snipping there or moving numbers around on a budget chart. We would rather have a more holistic, forward-looking conversation, one about modernizing Government to meet the challenges of the 21st Century.

Where we ask questions like:

How do we modernize entitlement programs so they'll actually be accessible to Americans when they need them?

Which government programs should be reformed, updated, or no longer make sense in a 21st Century economy? How can services be delivered in the most efficient and technologically savvy way?

And what structural reforms can we implement to ensure the most robust economic growth and job creation for this generation and those to come?

By addressing the big questions now—by identifying and implementing forward-looking reforms today—we can do a lot more than just reduce the deficit in the short term. We can also create jobs now, grow the economy now, make Government work better now,

and eliminate the threat of a debt crisis everyone knows is coming, a debt crisis that would usher in the very kind of European-style austerity Democrats claim not to like, but keep accelerating towards.

But in order for this to happen, Democrats need to work with us.

As a first step, they should step back from the brink with their plan to shut down the Government. And they need to stop threatening to tear up agreements we all previously assented to. The Budget Control Act might not be perfect, but at least we were able to secure important spending control for the American people. And if Democrats want to trade some savings for innovative reforms that can serve our country even better over the long term, then there are policymakers ready to talk.

But Republicans are not going to just give up on the commitments made to our constituents. Not only would that be a betrayal of a promise we all made, but we have already seen where the Democrats' left-leaning policies and European-inspired ideas lead.

More of that is the last thing our country needs right now.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF KENT YOSHIHO HIROZAWA TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Nomination of Kent Yoshiho Hirozawa, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Kent Yoshiho Hirozawa, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Joe Manchin III, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Angus S. King, Jr., Richard J. Durbin, Charles E. Schumer, Amy Klobuchar, Richard Blumenthal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Kent Yoshiho Hirozawa, of New York, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years, expiring August 27, 2016, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 64, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 189 Ex.]

YEAS—64

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Hagan	Nelson
Baucus	Harkin	Pryor
Begich	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Reid
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Blunt	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Landrieu	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Levin	Tester
Casey	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Collins	Markey	Udall (NM)
Coons	McCain	Warner
Corker	McCaskill	Warren
Donnelly	McConnell	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Flake	Mikulski	
Franken	Murkowski	

NAYS—34

Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Crapo	Kirk	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—2

Chiesa
Heitkamp

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 64, the nays are 34. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Cloture having been invoked, pursuant to S. Res. 15 of the 113th Congress, there will now be up to 8 hours of postcloture consideration of the nomination equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand we are now in postcloture debate on this nominee. I understand there is up to 8 hours that can be consumed for that purpose, if I am not mistaken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I certainly hope we don't have to take that much time. For this nominee and the other four to follow, I am hopeful we can get through them today and get the nominees to the President before we leave here this evening.

Today is a day that I and many of my colleagues have long waited for. Because of the bipartisan deal reached on the President's nominees, it looks as though we finally have a path forward to confirm a full slate of nominees to the National Labor Relations Board. A fully confirmed, fully functional board will be a huge step forward for workers and employers in our country, and this will be the first time in over a decade this has happened.

Over 75 years ago Congress enacted the National Labor Relations Act, guaranteeing American workers the right to form and join a union and to bargain for a better life. For both union and nonunion workers alike, the act provides for essential protections. It gives workers a voice in the workplace, allowing them to join together and speak out for fair wages, good benefits, and safe working conditions. These rights ensure that the people who do the real work in this country see the benefits when our economy grows and aren't mistreated or put at risk on the job.

The National Labor Relations Board is the guardian of these fundamental rights. Workers themselves cannot enforce the National Labor Relations Act; the Board is the only place where people can go if they have been treated unfairly and denied the basic protections the law provides. Thus, the Board plays a vital role in vindicating workers' rights. In the past 10 years the NLRB has secured opportunities for reinstatement for 22,544 employees who were unjustly fired. It has also recovered more than \$1 billion on behalf of workers whose rights were violated in the last decade.

The Board does not just protect the rights of workers and unions; it also provides relief and remedies to our Nation's employers. The Board is an employer's only recourse if a union commences a wildcat strike or refuses to bargain in good faith during negotiations. The NLRB also helps numerous businesses resolve disputes efficiently. For example, when two unions picketed Walmart in 2012, Walmart filed a claim with the NLRB, and the NLRB negotiated a settlement. So by preventing labor disputes that could disrupt our economy, the work that the Board does is vital to every worker and every business across the Nation.

Earlier this year I received a letter from 32 management-side and 15 union-side labor attorneys from across the country who made this point particularly well. It urged the swift confirma-

tion of a full package of five NLRB nominees and said:

While we differ in our views over the decisions and actions of the NLRB over the years, we do agree that our clients' interests are best served by the stability and certainty a full, confirmed Board will bring to the field of labor-management relations.

I could not agree more. Confirming these nominees swiftly is vitally important because the National Labor Relations Board must have a quorum of three Board members to act. If there are less than three Board members at any time, the Board cannot issue decisions and essentially must shut down. Although the Board currently has three members, Chairman Pearce's term expires on August 27—next month. At that point the Labor Board would be unable to function unless we confirm additional members. Now, that is more than just an administrative headache. It would be a tragedy that denies justice to working men and women across the country. So it is imperative that we act to avoid this and keep the Board open for work.

Up until recent times, all of us in Congress agreed that the Board should function for the good of our country and our economy, but in the last few years that understanding has broken down. As I said, it has been a decade since the Board has had five Senate-confirmed members. It is not that qualified people have not been nominated, because they have. The problem is that a few of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—I am not saying everyone, but a very vocal minority—have been trying to use the nominations process to undermine the mission of the National Labor Relations Board.

They, first of all, do not like the National Labor Relations Act, but they know they could never repeal it outright. So what is their solution, this vocal minority on the Republican side? Keep the NLRB inoperable by refusing to confirm nominees regardless of their qualifications. In this case, one of my Republican colleagues announced his intention to filibuster the NLRB nominees 6 days before the nominations were announced, and he openly admitted his intention was to shut down the agency.

We have seen lots of nominees deemed unacceptable simply because they have worked on behalf of workers or unions and they support our system of collective bargaining. These nominees have been accused of being biased and called unfit to serve because they worked for labor unions or were lawyers for labor unions. But I would like to point out what the National Labor Relations Act—the law—actually says. I have often quoted from the National Labor Relations Act on this point, and I will do so again right now. Here is what the law says:

It is declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain

substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection.

That is what the law says. The purpose is, again, to encourage "the practice and procedure of collective bargaining" for the good of our workers, for the good of our economy, and for the good of our Nation.

So if we have a nominee who comes up for the Board who supports collective bargaining, I would think that nominee would be more qualified, not less qualified, to serve on the Board because that nominee understands what the law says. So we should be seeking nominees who are, in the words of one of the nominees before us today, not pro-union, not pro-worker or pro-management, but "pro-Act"—"pro-Act." If you are pro-act, the act says that we should be "encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing." That is what the law says.

I am optimistic that the nominees before us today will bring this perspective to their work at the Board. All five nominees have diverse backgrounds and are deeply steeped in labor and employment law. While I certainly do not agree with the politics or perhaps the ideology of each nominee, it cannot be disputed that this is a competent and experienced group of lawyers. Given their diverse backgrounds and qualifications, there is no reason this package of nominees should not be confirmed with strong bipartisan support.

All five of these nominees have been thoroughly vetted. For the two most recent nominees—Kent Hirozawa and Nancy Schiffer—the vetting process has been quick, but it has been thorough. They have submitted all of the paperwork that we receive for our nominees. They have appeared before our committee in a hearing, answered any questions. They have met with staff for both sides, and they have answered all the written questions posed by members of my committee. They have demonstrated themselves to be impressively qualified and capable, and I look forward to their future service on the Board.

So I believe the time has come to start a new chapter for the NLRB. It is time to ratchet down the political rhetoric that has recently haunted this agency and let the dedicated public servants who work there do their jobs. Indeed, I hope today's votes mark a new beginning for the Board, with a

new energy and vitality, a new spirit of collaboration. A revitalized NLRB is a critical part of our continued efforts to build a strong economy and a strong middle class. It is long past time to put the Board back in business and to tone down the rhetoric.

I say to my friends on the other side—again, a vocal minority—certainly they can vote against the nominees. That is their right. That is their privilege. But do not use the nomination process to try to shut down the Board or to thwart the implementation of the National Labor Relations Act.

I am sure there were times when a majority of the Board was appointed by Republican Presidents and they were probably more promanagement. I cannot think of one right now, but I am sure they probably made some decisions that I would not be in favor of. But they did it openly. There are also times under a Democratic President when the Board would probably have three members who would be more from the labor side than management side. But that is the ebb and flow.

Quite frankly, for most of the times in the past, even though Republican Presidents had put nominees on the Board who were probably more promanagement or came from the management side—they would have three of those and then two from the worker or labor side—they still ran the Board in a nonpartisan fashion and reached agreements in an open fashion that were implementing the National Labor Relations Act. I would be hard pressed to think of a time when the Board acted in contradiction to what the act actually says.

Until recently—and this has just broken down in the last few years when President Obama's nominees to the Board, in the first instance, were filibustered when the President had to give recess appointments to nominees. Of course, a recess appointment can only last so long, and then that person has to leave the Board. As I said, there was a threat by a Member on the Republican side to filibuster nominees before they were even sent down. That means the Board would have been unable to operate. So the President then gave a recess appointment to two nominees to keep the Board functioning. That then found its way into the courts.

We have a couple of courts that decided the President did not have the power to do a recess appointment the way he did it. Other courts have taken different pathways. So that set of facts in that case is winding its way to the Supreme Court. It probably will be decided some time next year. But that is what happens when people do not let nominees who are fully qualified—fully qualified—come to the floor to get an up-or-down vote.

So I am very pleased this agreement that was reached a couple weeks ago to

not filibuster nominees included the National Labor Relations Board. So we have an agreement from the Republican side that they will not filibuster these nominees. We have five of them. This is the first, Mr. Hirozawa. I am hopeful that, again, since they have been thoroughly vetted, we can move ahead expeditiously to vote on them and that we will not take the full 8 hours to debate these nominees and that each one of them—each one would have 8 hours. But, hopefully, we can collapse that and have the votes on the nominees at some time later this afternoon, and, as I said, turn a new chapter in the NLRB. Put them down there on the Board and let them do their work, and tone down the political rhetoric a little bit on the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that time during all postcloture quorum calls on the Hirozawa nomination be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHANNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHANNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUDGET CONTROL ACT

Mr. JOHANNES. Mr. President, as we begin our final week of legislative activity prior to the August work period, I rise today to discuss the fiscal challenges that will await us on our return. When the Senate gavels back into session on September 9, we will be only 3 short weeks away from the end of the fiscal year. We will have only 15 business days to reach an agreement on all 12 appropriations bills and avoid a government shutdown.

Unfortunately, our progress toward reaching this goal has been less than stellar. The transportation-housing appropriations bill we are currently considering is the first of 12 bills that has even been brought to the Senate floor. Consider this: We cannot even agree to comply with the spending limits mandated under current law. We are headed for a big multitrain pileup.

Last Congress, the Senate and the House made a promise to the American people—made a promise about a basic level of fiscal constraint on our appropriations process; not enough, but a step in the right direction. As a part of the Budget Control Act, which passed with bipartisan support and was signed

by the President, we committed to capping appropriations spending at certain levels for each of the next 10 years.

Less than a year ago, the majority leader emphatically proclaimed them binding when he said:

We passed the Budget Control Act. We have agreed to all of those numbers. They are done. They are agreed to.

In only the second year of this 10-year schedule, the 12 appropriation bills are mandated to spend no more than \$967 billion. That is a huge number to almost everyone. It is simply a whole lot of spending, almost \$3 billion a day. But my colleagues on the other side want to spend even more. In fact, they want to spend well over \$1 trillion this year.

You see, they want to pretend the Budget Control Act never passed and was never signed into law. They want to keep on spending as if there is some kind of alternative reality. But sadly that is not the case. Our Nation's deficit is still too large. We are still miles away from a balanced budget. The national debt continues on a course toward disaster. Yet, apparently, we are going to ignore the appropriations caps we all agreed to 2 years ago—not by an insignificant amount, an additional \$91 billion above the legal limit in the next fiscal year alone.

As a new member of the Appropriations Committee, I have been surprised to watch week after week bills being advanced that simply ignore current law. With a \$17 trillion national debt, we cannot simply imagine our way out of this crisis. But by ignoring the Budget Control Act, that is exactly what we are attempting to do.

I continue to believe very strongly that we should be preparing bills that are consistent with current law, abiding by the spending caps we voted for and were signed by the President. I think we should even do more than that, but complying with the current law is the bare minimum.

What does all of this mean? Who gets hurt if we ignore the BCA caps? Well, ignoring the BCA spending levels is not free money we can print down at the Treasury Department. Spending over the BCA caps simply sets the stage for yet another round of sequester cuts. We all remember how popular that was beginning this year. The administration officials claimed our health, our safety, our well-being, were in the balance as they traveled the country, threatening services such as Head Start, food safety inspectors, and massive delays at airports because of the indiscriminate, across-the-board spending cuts.

That is exactly what we are going to see in a few weeks because the majority would rather wash their hands of the responsibility to honor the caps and continue spending as though actions do not matter. But that is exactly the Senate's plan, spend \$91 bil-

lion over what the law allows. When \$91 billion worth of across-the-board cuts kick in, they hope the outcry from the American people is loud enough to convince us here in Congress to add the additional spending to our national debt. In my judgment, that is no way to run a railroad, but that seems to be the plan: keep spending us right into another sequester, ignore the consequences, and hope for the best.

It simply boggles the mind, especially when you consider all but two Senate Democrats on the Appropriations Committee supported—I emphasize supported—the increased level of spending restraint in the BCA.

Instead, we should have been using this time as an opportunity to more thoughtfully reduce spending before the end of the fiscal year. That is exactly what President Obama says he wants, when he says Congress should use a scalpel to tame our budget problems, not an axe, in across-the-board spending cuts. We can responsibly meet the \$967 billion spending target in current law, but we have to try. But instead of seizing the opportunity, we are once again shirking our responsibility in the hopes that no one will notice. That is disappointing to the American people. By exceeding the caps, we are violating yet another commitment we have made to them to get our fiscal house in order. You see, the American people figured this out long ago. Washington simply spends too much and, most importantly, spends too much of their own money. As their elected representatives, we should not ignore this. I am hopeful we can change course, take this opportunity and ensure that our spending bills total no more than what we promised months ago.

Come October 1, the American people will have the opportunity to see whether we have met that challenge. I hope for the sake of the country they get better news than what appears today.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, this week the Senate is voting on five of the President's nominations for membership on the National Labor Relations Board. I expect all five to receive up-or-down votes, as they generally do, and I expect all five to be confirmed. The Board will then have a

full complement, with a Democratic majority of three and two Republican members.

I would like to review for a moment what has happened and how we got to this spot because it is an important moment in the history of our ability as a country to maintain the checks and balances and certain separations of power among the various branches of government and especially to restrain the Executive, which has been an important part of our country's history.

In January 2012 the President nominated two individuals to be members of the National Labor Relations Board using his recess-appointment power. He has that power in the Constitution. The only problem was that the Senate wasn't in recess—at least that was our view. The Senate was in a 3-day pro forma session. A 3-day pro forma session is a device that was employed by Senator REID, the distinguished majority leader, when Bush was President, and he did it to keep President Bush from using his recess-appointment power when the Senate was in recess.

Most of our Presidents have chafed under the restraints we have placed upon our Executive. President Bush didn't like that, but he respected it, and President Bush never made recess appointments while the Senate was in session. But President Obama did—on January 4, 2012. Senate Republicans objected strongly to that. After a great deal of discussion, we decided to support a lawsuit challenging the appointments. That lawsuit went before the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, and the Circuit Court of Appeals agreed with our position and said in effect that the President could not make a recess appointment when the Senate itself had determined it was in session.

Since then there have been two other decisions by other federal courts of appeals that have said what the President did on January 4, 2012, was unconstitutional. The case will come before the Supreme Court this next term. No one knows what decision the Supreme Court will make, but my sense would be that the Supreme Court will say to this President or to any President that, Mr. President, you can't use your constitutional power to make a recess appointment at a time when the Senate is not in recess.

I said earlier that Presidents have chafed under these restraints on the executive branch. That has been true ever since the days of George Washington. George Washington imposed his own modesty and restraint upon the American character when he resigned his commission after the Revolutionary War, when he stepped down after two terms as President and went back to Mount Vernon, when he asked to be called Mr. President instead of Your Excellency. Ever since then we have had many strong Presidents. They haven't all liked the idea that Washington also helped write a constitution

that created a congress and a bill of rights, and the whole purpose of that was to restrain the Executive. After all, our revolution was against a king, and most of our Founders—not all of them, but the majority of the drafters of the Constitution didn't want a king of the United States, they wanted a president of the United States.

One of the most important checks upon the power of the Executive is the Senate's power to advise and consent, the power to review. About 1,000 Presidential nominations come to us, and it takes a while to confirm them. Sometimes it takes longer than the nominees think it should. I have repeated many times on this floor that when the first President Bush nominated me to be Education Secretary and the Senator from Ohio held up my nomination for 3 months, I didn't think that was such a good idea, but the Senate had the power to do it because the Constitution restrains the Executive. Unfortunately, this President didn't seem to read that chapter in American history because we have seen during this President's time repeated efforts to circumvent the constitutional checks on the Executive.

This administration has appointed more czars than the Romanovs had. That is the way you get around the nomination process. This administration's excellent Education Secretary has used a simple waiver authority in effect to create a national school board. When Congress says we don't want to appropriate money to implement ObamaCare, the Health and Human Services Secretary says: Well, if Congress won't do it, I will do it anyway; I will just go out and raise private money and do it. Then we have recess appointments being made when the Senate is not in recess. That is unconstitutional. If that could happen, the Senate could adjourn for lunch and come back and we would have a new Supreme Court Justice because the President said we were in recess.

So what is happening this week with these National Labor Relations Board nominees has a special significance in our constitutional history because not only did Republicans support a lawsuit challenging the appointments, which we are winning and the case has been won in two other Federal courts—but the President, after much discussion, has withdrawn his two unconstitutionally appointed nominees.

I suggested that he do this in May when we had a markup of the five nominees the President sent. I voted for three—the Democratic Chairman and the two Republicans—and I voted against the two who were unconstitutionally appointed. They were well-qualified people. That wasn't the issue. The issue was that the Senate needed a way to express its objection to this unconstitutional action by the Executive.

I suggested that what the President should do is withdraw those two nomi-

nees and send us two new ones in the normal process—people who had not stayed on after a Federal court decided they were unconstitutionally there. These two unconstitutionally appointed nominees have participated in more than 1,000 cases. These cases are all subject to being vacated because there was no constitutional quorum.

It leaves quite a mess in our labor laws. But the President withdrew those two and now we are, this week, doing what the Senate normally does. We are considering in the normal process his new nominees.

I am voting, as I said, for the two Republicans and the Chairman. The Chairman was not unconstitutionally appointed. He did not continue to serve as an unconstitutionally appointed person, since he was not so appointed, so I voted for him in committee. I do not agree with the Chairman and his view of labor laws, but I will have to take that up during the next election. Elections have consequences, and when we elect the President of the United States, he normally appoints people who agree with him.

I am also voting for having an up-or-down vote. We almost always do that with the President's nominees. There have only been a few times in our history when we have not. We have never failed to have an up-or-down vote on a Supreme Court Justice after they have come to the floor. We have never failed to have an up-or-down vote on a district court judge after they have come to the floor; the same in terms of circuit courts. We never did, until Democrats started filibustering President Bush's judges about 10 years ago when I came to the Senate. We all know that story.

But normally we have an up-or-down vote, and we will be doing that this week on the President's five nominees. I am voting against two of the nominees when that up-or-down vote comes, and I wish to explain why.

One is Mr. Hirozawa and the other is Ms. Schiffer. Both of them have excellent legal backgrounds. But the problem is I am not persuaded—I hope I will be proven wrong—that they will be able to transfer their positions of advocacy to positions of adjudication; that they can be impartial when employers come before them.

Employers as well as employees have a right, when they come before the National Labor Relations Board, to expect that all five members, whether Republicans or Democrats, from whatever background they might have, will look at the case and decide it in an impartial way. It may be possible that Mr. Hirozawa and Ms. Schiffer can do that, but I am not persuaded that is true, and so while I am voting that they have up-or-down votes, I am not voting for them.

The President has nominated for the Board three different individuals who

were employed directly by major labor unions. The first was Craig Becker, who was counsel for two unions, and whose nomination was rejected by a bipartisan vote in 2010. The second was Mr. Griffin. The third is Ms. Schiffer.

I asked Ms. Schiffer at her hearing if she could remember other examples of an administration stocking the National Labor Relations Board with organized labor employees and she could not think of examples and I could not either. Over the last several years, the National Labor Relations Board seems to have veered away from impartiality. Instead of preserving a level playing field and protecting the carefully balanced rights of all parties, it has shown favoritism toward organized labor leadership and very little interest in the rights of individual employers or individual employees who want to exercise their rights not to join a union.

In fairness, I have to admit this politicization of the National Labor Relations Board has occurred both under Republican and Democratic administrations, but I think appointing a person directly from a high level job within a major labor union is not an example of trying to move away from that trend.

The trend is causing confusion. One labor law professor at a nationally recognized law school recently said she cannot even use her labor law textbook anymore. She has to resort to handing out NLRB decisions to explain the law because they are changing it so much. The NLRB has ventured into rule-making with two new efforts, both of which have been stalled by the Federal courts.

In August 2011, the Board issued a new rule requiring employers to post a biased employee rights poster in the workplace and making it an unfair labor practice to fail to do so. Two separate Federal courts have struck down the rule because it exceeded statutory authority.

In December 2011, the Board issued a new rule shortening the time in which a union election is held, otherwise known as the ambush elections rule. The D.C. Circuit Court struck down this rule on the grounds it lacked a quorum, and the NLRB is appealing the decision.

So far, this administration's NLRB has sought to change the rules for determining bargaining units, the process for certifying a representation election, the legal obligation of employers to withhold dues from employees' paychecks, even when there is no valid collective bargaining agreement in place, the validity of arbitration provisions in employment contracts, the legality of numerous well-intentioned employee handbook provisions, the rules governing employee discipline when there is no valid collective bargaining agreement in place, the rules governing the confidentiality of employee witness

statements given during a legitimate investigation, the policy against forcing nonunion member employees to pay for union lobbying expenses, the rules governing employers' rights to limit access to their property, and attempting to create an entirely new employer obligation and unfair labor practice through the poster requirement struck down by multiple Federal appellate courts.

The effect of all of these changes seems to me to tilt the playing field in favor of organized labor instead of impartiality, which is the directive of the statute. So fairness and impartiality is what I am looking for in any NLRB nominee. These two nominees do not pass this test. That is why I plan to oppose their nominations.

But the most important message from this week's debate is this: The Senate is saying, not just to this President but to any President, Republican and Democrat, that you may not abuse your constitutional power of recess appointments by making appointments when the Senate itself determines it is not in recess. To do so is an affront to the separation of powers. It undermines checks and balances that were placed upon the Executive at the beginning of our country as a way of preserving our liberties. That is an important step in the history of constitutional law in this country, and I am glad to see it has been done in this way.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP PROGRAM

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, over the last few years, I have spoken on the floor about how the Department of Defense procures major weapons systems—a system that is, to a large degree, broken, unfortunately. It is now even more important. With defense funding likely to be constrained to reduced levels in the coming years, our role as legislators overseeing major defense acquisition programs to make sure they are efficient and effective is as important today as it has ever been—indeed, even more so.

A recently released Government Accountability Office—GAO—report that is highly critical of the Navy's Littoral Combat Ship Program brings me to the floor today. On that program, the Navy plans to spend over \$40 billion to buy a total of 52 seaframes and 64 so-called

“plug-and-play” mission modules. These are modules that would be moved on and off, depending on the mission in which the Littoral Combat Ship is engaged. The combined capability of those modules with the seaframes is supposed to give these ships their intended lethality.

Until recently, my main concern with this program has been the unbridled growth in the cost to build the seaframes of the lead ships: the *Freedom*—the steel hull version—and the *Independence*, which is an aluminum trimaran version. The Navy appears to have addressed that problem. While the cost to build the seaframes for the follow-ships is still about double the program's original, overly optimistic cost estimate—which is not unusual—the cost to complete the construction appears to have stabilized at about \$450 million each.

Today I am concerned about another very serious problem: that the Navy will buy too many of these ships before the combination of their seaframes, with their interchangeable mission modules, has been proven capable of performing the missions these ships are supposed to perform. In other words, the Navy will not know whether this Littoral Combat Ship meets the combatant commanders' operational requirements until after it has procured more than half of the 52 planned ships. This is particularly troubling inasmuch as the Littoral Combat Ship fleet will comprise more than one-third of the Navy's surface combatant ships.

The Littoral Combat Ships' stated primary missions are antisubmarine warfare, mine countermeasures, and surface warfare against small boats, especially in the littorals. These three primary missions appear oriented toward countering, among other things, some of the littoral or coastal anti-access/area-denial capabilities that have been fielded in recent years by potential adversaries.

The Navy took delivery of the first of two ships—the *Freedom* and *Independence*—more than 3 years ago. But the ship called *Freedom* actually deployed, albeit with limited capability, to Singapore in March and has experienced many of the technical challenges normally associated with a prototype ship. The decision to deploy the ship *Freedom* prior to the completion of critical developmental and operational testing may be good salesmanship on the part of the Navy, but the current plan to buy more than half of the total Littoral Combat Ship fleet prior to the completion of operational testing plainly contradicts defense acquisition guidelines and best procurement practices—and amounts to a case of “buy before you fly,” to borrow a phrase from aircraft acquisitions.

It also increases the risk that the program will incur additional costs to backfit already built Littoral Combat

Ships with expensive design changes identified through late testing and evaluation or, worse, operational use.

As is the case in several other major defense acquisition programs, the problem here is “excessive concurrency”—that is, an overlap between development and production that exposes the program to a high risk of costly retrofits to earlier units in the production run. It sounds simple, but this is the problem that for years rendered the Joint Strike Fighter Program effectively unexecutable and that led to the terminations of the Army's multibillion-dollar Future Combat Systems Program and the Air Force's Expeditionary Combat Support System Program.

As to the Littoral Combat Ship, the General Accountability Office spelled out this problem in the report it released just a few days ago. According to the GAO:

There are significant unknowns related to key LCS operations and support concepts and the relative advantages and disadvantages of the two variants. The potential effect of these unknowns on the program is compounded by the Navy's aggressive acquisition strategy. By the time key tests of integrated LCS capability are completed in several years, the Navy will have procured or have under contract more than half of the planned number of ships. Almost half of the planned ships are already under contract, and the Navy plans to award further contracts in 2016, before the Department of Defense makes a decision about full rate production of the ships. The Navy will not be able to demonstrate that mission packages integrated with the seaframes can meet the minimum performance requirements until operational testing for both variants [the *Freedom* and the *Independence*] is completed, currently planned for 2019.

I repeat: 2019.

I again voice my concern that the Navy plans to purchase many, if not most, of the Littoral Combat Ships in the program before knowing whether the ships will work as advertised and as needed.

The GAO report's bottom line recommendation is to limit future seaframe and mission module purchases until the LCS Program achieves key acquisition and testing milestones that would help make sure that the program delivers required combat capability. I agree completely with the GAO. GAO's concerns are shared by the Pentagon's independent chief tester and even the Navy itself, in an internal report called the “OPNAV Report” or “Perez Report.” I highly recommend that anyone who has an interest in the Littoral Combat Ship read these reports.

In terms of the costs to national security and to the taxpayer, we simply cannot afford to continue committing unlimited resources to an unproven program that may eventually account for more than one-third of the surface combatant fleet. The LCS seaframe and mission modules are at different

points along the acquisition life cycle. We need to put a pause on additional ship purchases and synchronize the plans for testing the seaframes and the mission modules to make sure the Navy is executing a coherent acquisition strategy that will deliver combat capability responsive to what our operational commanders actually need.

Also, the Navy has to lay out a clear top-level plan on how these ships will be used in response to reasonably foreseeable, relevant threats around the world. In other words, it needs to decide the concept of operation—or CONOPS—that this ship class will support. According to a declassified internal Navy report released last Tuesday, “There are two options: Building a CONOPS”—that means concept of operations—“to match LCS’ current capabilities or modifying the ship to better meet the needs of the Theater Commanders.”

The report goes on to say: “The ship’s current characteristics limit operations to a greater extent than envisioned by the CONOPS. . . .” The second option is to “modify the ship to support the warfighting requirements. Our review identified opportunities to modify several of the ships’ characteristics to more closely align with the intent of the original CONOPS.”

Right now, it seems as though whatever combat capability LCS can muster is driving its mission, not the other way around, as in most ships. In other words, the Littoral Combat Ship appears to be a ship looking for a mission. But just to perform its three currently intended primary missions, the Navy is looking at significant design changes and increasing Littoral Combat Ships’ crew size, even though it has already bought about 30 percent of all of the LCS ships it intends to buy. That could increase its procurement and life cycle operation and support costs well beyond current estimates and strain its affordability. Given how many frigates, minesweepers, and patrol crafts the Navy currently plans to retire over the next 5 years in favor of Littoral Combat Ships, this is particularly troubling.

Notably, the Government Accountability Office also reports: “Current LCS weapon systems are underperforming and offer little chance of survival in a combat scenario.”

In this regard, the Government Accountability Office appears to agree with the Pentagon’s chief independent weapons tester. As this top Pentagon official has noted, before proceeding beyond early production, this program should complete initial operational testing and evaluation to determine that it is effective, suitable, and survivable. But LCS is not doing so. Why not? We need an answer to that. If, for whatever reason, the Navy believes it must deviate from that practice, what plan will it put in place to mitigate the resulting concurrency risk?

Let me be clear. To justify the purchase of the remaining 32 ships in the program, the Navy must first provide credible evidence based on rigorous, operationally relevant and realistic testing and evaluation, that this ship will in fact be able to adequately perform its primary stated missions and meet combatant commander requirements. Congress must, at a minimum, thoroughly review this program before authorizing funding in fiscal year 2015 to buy the next four LCS’s and require the Secretary of the Navy to certify, on the basis of sound written justification arising from sufficient initial operational testing and evaluation, that the LCS ships will be able to adequately perform their intended missions and provide our operational commanders with the combat capability they need.

The American people are—quite rightly—tired of seeing their taxpayer dollars wasted on disastrous defense programs such as the Air Force’s failed ECSS Program or the Army’s Future Combat System Program or the Navy’s VH-71 Presidential Helicopter Replacement Program. LCS must not be allowed to become yet another failed program in an already unacceptably long list of amorphous acronyms that—after squandering literally billions of taxpayer dollars—have long since lost meaning.

On the LCS program, the Navy must right its course—today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings and that the time during the recess be counted postcloture, with the time charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:40 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

NOMINATION OF KENT YOSHIHO HIROZAWA TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I would like to be recognized for the purpose of making brief remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I am pleased to come to the floor—and I will be joined shortly by Senator MURRAY from the State of Washington—to announce that tomorrow in the HELP Committee—the Health, Education, Labor & Pensions Committee—we will be introducing the reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act.

Quite honestly, the Workforce Investment Act was passed in 1998 and has not been reauthorized in the last 15 years. During that period of time, our country—particularly in the last 6 years—has gone through a sustained period of high unemployment. We also have periods where employers cannot find the match of workers who are actually trained for the jobs they have.

Workforce investment and training is important for those with disabilities, those without jobs, those with skill sets that need to be improved, and this bill addresses all of those areas.

Senator MURRAY has been a tireless Senator in working to find common ground on issues that have been critical to both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party but, more important, to the workers of the United States of America.

I wish to pay tribute to her staff who has worked tirelessly with my staff, and I wish to thank Tommy Nguyen on my staff, in particular, for his dedication and hard work.

This bill represents a real step forward, and I am pleased that this morning the Business Roundtable issued a release of their endorsement of the base bill we are putting forward tomorrow in the committee. Hopefully, it will be on the floor this fall when we return from the summer recess and we can move forward on job training, job opportunity, and lowering the unemployment rate in the United States of America.

In particular, I am very pleased this bill provides flexibility to our Governors in terms of transferability of funds. It provides for business majorities on the board and a business member to be a board chairman and the State chairman could also be a businessperson, which means those who are doing the employing will be those who will be guiding the Workforce Investment Act in their State.

I am also particularly proud of the fact that we focus on a regional approach to workforce investment. So often times, you get so many workforce investment boards in one metropolitan area that you have a very individualized focus and not a regional focus. A regional focus is important for workers. It is important for all of us.

So I am pleased to announce today on my behalf—Senator ISAKSON on the HELP Committee—that along with Senator MURRAY, today we are introducing and tomorrow we will mark up

in committee the reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act.

I look forward to the support of all Members of the Senate to help us do a better job providing jobs for working Americans.

I yield back my time and—no, I do not yield back my time. I can brag about Senator MURRAY while she is here now because I have been saying nice things while she was on her way.

I thank Senator MURRAY for her cooperation, the spirit of cooperation she has given us, and the fact that we are finally reaching an agreement between ourselves and our staffs. I met with my side this morning. I know the Senator has done the same. We have a good platform to move forward on the first reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act since 1998.

I defer to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I thank the Senator. Senator ISAKSON has been absolutely great to work with. We have been spending a lot of time on this.

Let me make a few remarks.

Over the past several weeks and months, we have spent a lot of time in the Senate debating everything from the Federal budget to separate spending bills, and throughout those debates Members of both parties have agreed it is absolutely critical that we are working to write laws and policies that put hardworking Americans back to work, help our businesses grow and invest, and position our economy to compete and win in the 21st century.

We have had some disagreement on how to achieve those goals, but as our Nation now recovers from the recession, our first priority has to be getting Americans back on the job. So I wish to join with Senator ISAKSON to talk about the tremendous progress we have made in the HELP Committee; that is, the work to reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act—and to do just that: put Americans back to work.

Before I get to the importance of the bill itself, I do wish to take some time to talk about the bipartisan process we have had at the committee level to move this forward.

From the very beginning of this process I have worked very closely with my Republican cosponsor Senator ISAKSON, whom you just heard from, and though I know we represent very different States with different industries and different issues, we have each remained very committed to writing a bill that works for all American businesses and workers.

This process has never been about scoring political points or pitting interests against each other. I think it has been a rare and needed example of true bipartisan legislating, and I thank my friend Senator ISAKSON, again, for

his hard work and commitment throughout this process.

I also wish to thank our committee chairman and ranking member—Senator HARKIN and Senator ALEXANDER—who have both worked extensively on this legislation and have now signed on as cosponsors as well.

It has been 15 years since we first passed the Workforce Investment Act or WIA. But perhaps more important, it has been a full decade since the legislation was due to be reauthorized. So this law—which was first written in the late 1990s—was designed to be changed and updated back in 2003. Since then, as we all know, our country and our economy have changed a lot.

In the late 1990s, the Internet was changing the way we do business and driving our economy, and the housing sector was as strong as ever. But as we all know, unfortunately, both of these industries went bust.

But back then, we in Congress were willing to take the long view and make meaningful commitments to and investments in our workforce development systems. So back in 1998, we wrote and passed the Workforce Investment Act to help our workers and educators and businesses respond to an economy that was changing faster than ever before.

Lately, we have not done much of that, but I am very optimistic that by improving and reauthorizing WIA, we can get back on track. This is the very law that was written to help us respond to a changing economy and provide the framework for our Nation's workforce development system. But it is still written to address the issues we faced more than 10 years ago.

So working with Senators from both sides of the aisle and the business, labor, and education communities, we are bringing to our committee tomorrow a very strong reauthorization bill that brings WIA into the 21st century.

This bill puts more than a decade of experience and data to use by doing a few things. It requires a single unified workforce plan in each State and replaces all the overlap and confusion between separate State agencies.

It recognizes that we need data and analysis to understand which workforce programs are working well, what makes them work well and how to improve them and, just as important, which programs are underperforming, why, and how to fix them. It makes changes to align our workforce systems with regional economic development and labor markets.

This bill is focused on using real-world data to measure the returns we get on our workforce investments, and getting good return on the Federal dollars we invest is exactly what Americans are calling for today.

So while we are making important changes to the existing version of WIA, I wish to finish my remarks with an ex-

ample of the incredible success this law has already had in helping our economy.

Last year, the WIA adult and dislocated worker programs produced some remarkable statistics. Over 1 million adults and dislocated workers were placed in jobs. Those workers earned more than \$12 billion over just the first 6 months of their employment. In that same period, WIA funds spent on those programs came to about \$2 billion.

Let me say that again. In just 6 months, an investment of \$2 billion yielded a return of more than \$12 billion. So the investments we make through WIA programs are having an incredible impact on our economy. The important point is we can do more.

That is why a lot of organizations across the country have called for a modernized 21st century version of the Workforce Investment Act—organizations such as the National Business Roundtable, the National Metropolitan Business Alliance, labor and education leaders, and the Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce in my home State. All of these organizations are supporting the efforts we have put together.

We are here today to announce to our colleagues that tomorrow we are going to begin marking up our reauthorization bill in committee, and I look forward to continuing working with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

In a time when bipartisan legislation has become difficult to achieve, I hope we can set an example of what we are still capable of doing together to strengthen our country and our economy.

I again want to thank Senator ISAKSON and all those who have worked very hard to put this bill together. I am proud of what we have accomplished and look forward to working with him as we move through this process.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today to talk about an epidemic in the American workforce that has wreaked havoc on our labor markets and caused undue hardship for millions of our Nation's workers. I am talking, of course, about the eradication of the 40-hour workweek wrought by the so-called "Affordable Care Act."

As a result of this poorly named law, businesses around the country are instituting hiring freezes, downsizing their workforces or reducing worker

hours. The President's health law requires employers with 50 or more full-time employees to offer health coverage of a minimum value or pay a penalty. One of the unintended but not unforeseen consequences of the law is that a number of employers are opting to unilaterally limit the number of full-time employees in order to escape this burdensome mandate.

The Affordable Care Act defines "full-time employees" as those working at least 30 hours a week. As a result of this odd definition, not every employer seeking to avoid paying penalties is laying off workers. Instead, an increasing number of businesses have opted to simply cap workers' hours. This is happening everywhere. For example, a recent Reuters survey of 52 Walmart stores found that half of the stores were only hiring temporary workers—something the stores typically only do during the holiday shopping season. According to a recent article in the Washington Times, Walmart has overall increased the share of its temporary staff from between 1 and 2 percent last year to 10 percent this year. Keep in mind that Walmart is our Nation's largest employer. Although the company has denied that this change in policy is as a result of ObamaCare, it is hard to believe this is all just a coincidence.

Small businesses are also being impacted. For instance, there is the example cited recently in the Wall Street Journal where Rod Carstensen, an owner of several Del Taco restaurants in the Denver area, was forced to shift the majority of his workforce from full time to part time as a result of ObamaCare. Mr. Carstensen previously had 180 full-time employees and only 40 part-time workers. But providing benefits for those workers would have imposed as much as \$400,000 a year in additional costs. As a result, he is now in the process of switching to 80 full-time and 320 part-time workers, none of whom will work more than 28 hours per week.

As I said, this is happening everywhere. It is stupid. According to a survey conducted by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 71 percent of small businesses say the President's health law makes it harder to hire new employees. Among small businesses that would be impacted by ObamaCare's employer mandate, 50 percent say they will either have to cut the hours of workers currently employed full time or replace their full-time employees with part-timers in order to avoid this vicious mandate.

But it is not just happening in the private sector. Public schools, States, and municipalities are also limiting employees to part-time work in order to avoid paying costly benefits. For example, the second largest school district in my home State of Utah recently implemented a policy limiting

part-timers to 29 hours a week. According to the Washington Post, this impacted roughly 1,200 employees—mostly substitute teachers. That is 1,200 employees in a single school district who will see their hours and their wages capped as a result of ObamaCare. Likewise, the State of Virginia recently enacted a policy reducing the hours for as many as 10,000—10,000—part-time employees who until recently worked more than 30 hours a week. Offering coverage to these workers would have cost the State as much as \$110 million a year. Understandably, rather than paying those crippling costs, Virginia was forced to reduce workers' hours and therefore their pay thanks to the demands and the viciousness of ObamaCare.

As I stated, this is reaching epidemic levels. It makes you wonder what is in the brains of those who support ObamaCare.

Nationwide, employers have added far more part-time employees in 2013—averaging 93,000 a month—than full-time workers, which have averaged 22,000. Last year the reverse was true.

It is not just businesses that are noticing this epidemic. Labor unions—some of the largest supporters of the law when it was originally drafted—have also weighed in on the matter. As was widely reported earlier this month, the leaders of three prominent labor unions sent a letter to the Democratic leaders in both the House and the Senate expressing their concerns about some of the unintended consequences of the "Affordable Care Act." One of their major concerns was that, in their own words:

The law creates an incentive for employers to keep employees' hours below 30 hours a week. Numerous employers have begun to cut workers' hours to avoid this obligation, and many of them are doing so openly. The impact is two-fold: fewer hours means less pay while also losing our current health benefits.

According to these union leaders, ObamaCare threatens to "destroy the foundation of the 40-hour work week that is the back bone of the American middle class." I could not agree more with that.

President Obama is apparently starting to feel some of this pressure. Indeed, despite his recent efforts to paint a rosy picture of the impact of the health care law, I think President Obama knows full well that the "Affordable Care Act" is not living up to its name. Why else would he decide to delay the implementation of the employer mandate, as he did earlier this month? Obviously, there are political considerations. The recently announced 1-year delay on the employer mandate conveniently puts the implementation of the mandate past the 2014 midterm elections, so from that perspective I guess it makes perfect sense.

Setting aside the politics, this delay also makes some sense in terms of pol-

icy. The epidemic of employers reducing workers' hours is taking a huge toll on the American workforce. Indeed, the policies established under the health law are killing jobs, reducing wages, and stagnating growth. That being the case, the bigger question is, Why is the President only delaying the employer mandate for a single year? Does he really believe these problems will simply go away if businesses have 1 additional year to prepare or is he just thinking to get to the next election and getting his people through who have voted for this?

Regardless of when this mandate goes into effect, it is going to send shock waves throughout the business community. It is going to eliminate jobs. It is going to weaken our recovery—weak though it is today. That is why, despite the announcement of the 1-year delay, employers throughout the country are refusing to reverse course when it comes to downsizing their workforces and limiting employees' hours. Most news reports surrounding this issue are showing that this is precisely the case. That is likely the case for the State of Virginia. It is definitely the case for my home State of Utah and Utah's Granite School District, just to mention one aspect of our problems in Utah.

If the President is serious about getting our economy back on track, he should work with Congress to ensure that this mandate never goes into effect. While we are at it, we should also permanently delay the individual mandate. For the life of me, I cannot see why President Obama would extend his limited lifeline to the business community and at the same time leave individuals and their families out in the cold. This is from a President who claims he is for the families and for the individuals and for the poor and for those who are middle class. They are being left out in the cold.

If businesses are currently facing enough difficulties to necessitate delaying the employer mandate, shouldn't we assume individuals are going to face similar difficulties complying with the individual mandate? Isn't it only fair that we extend the same benefits to individuals and families that are being offered to businesses and employers? Why not get that beyond the next year's election too? Not according to the Obama administration. As it stands today, American businesses will get a 1-year reprieve from the job-killing employer mandate—American businesses. But the American people are still squarely in the sights of ObamaCare, as the individual mandate for them remains in place. This is the height of unfairness. It needs to be rectified.

The House of Representatives for its part has acted responsibly. Two weeks ago the House passed two pieces of legislation—two pieces relating to

ObamaCare. The first bill would simply codify President Obama's 1-year delay of the employer mandate. The second would provide similar relief to individuals and families struggling to comply with the individual mandate. Not surprisingly, President Obama has threatened to veto both bills—even the one that would simply put his own administration's policy into statutory form.

Still, that should not stop us in the Senate. If we are serious about helping the business community as well as individuals and families, we should work to delay permanently this catastrophic law. If President Obama wants to officially deny the American people the same type of relief he has given to the business community by not working with Congress, then so be it. The Senate needs to act responsibly. If the President is refusing to do the same, we ought to at least act responsibly.

Make no mistake—I do not think a 1-year delay on the employer and individual mandates is enough. We ought to get rid of them both. I am the author of two Senate bills that would repeal both of these egregious provisions of ObamaCare. In light of the President's recent recognition that the employer mandate should be delayed, I have publicly called for a permanent delay of the implementation of the entire law.

Given what we know about the problems associated with ObamaCare and, quite frankly, given what we do not know, the sensible approach is to delay it permanently and to work together on reform that will actually lower health care costs—not just promise to do it but actually do it. I believe we can fix these problems for everyone, for employers and for individuals alike, but only if the law is permanently delayed to give us a chance to do so. It would give us a chance to be bipartisan for a change around here and work together for the good of this country. That is what makes sense. That is what fairness dictates. If we are serious about avoiding what even some of my Democratic colleagues have called a train wreck, that is the least we can do.

I am really concerned about our country. We have increased taxes \$1 trillion in ObamaCare. We have increased taxes \$600 billion in the fiscal cliff legislation. Last week the majority leader and others—the President, Senator SCHUMER, and others—called for almost \$1 trillion more in tax increases. It would be one thing if all of that money would go to reduce spending or if all of that money would go to balance our budget. But no, they are going to spend every dime of it. Here we are, headed toward problems that we have plenty of illustrative information on, problems like Greece has gone through and is going through and other countries as well that just are profligate when it comes to their economic wherewithal.

I like the President personally, but for the life of me, as bright as he is, I do not see why he does not see all of this.

I don't see why my colleagues on the other side don't see it—or should I say they ought to see it. They ought to know this is not what the American people want. They would like to have health care, there is no question, but this is going to diminish health care all over the country. We can see the high percentage of doctors who are giving up on Medicaid patients. They will not take them anymore. Only this week a high percentage of doctors are giving up on Medicare patients. They don't wish to take them anymore.

What is the administration's answer to all of these spending programs? They are going to cut the providers. Already the providers—the doctors, the hospitals, and the health care providers—are complaining they can't deliver the services that ObamaCare requires at the low-level costs that ObamaCare gives.

We have to come up with a better system. We have to work together. We can't keep going down this pathway.

I hope my friends on the other side will wake up and realize: Hey, this game is over.

We have to find some way to solve these problems because they are just too large. They are going to wreck our country if we don't.

What is worse, they are going to hurt the health care of millions and millions of people who will not be able to afford it.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, sitting here listening to the distinguished senior Senator from Utah Mr. HATCH, who in many ways I consider my mentor in the Senate, I couldn't help but reflect on what we were all doing on Christmas Eve at 7 o'clock in the morning of 2009.

We were on the floor of the Senate casting a historic vote on the President's Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare. Sadly, that piece of legislation became a partisan exercise in power. All the Democrats voted for it and all the Republicans voted against it. It was an inauspicious way to start such an important part of reform of our health care system.

The President pretty well got what he wanted. The 2,700-page piece of legislation was made into law with \$1 trillion-plus tax increases, with promises that if you like what you have, you can keep it, and he promised that even families of four could see a reduction in their health care costs of roughly \$2,500 a year.

Whether you were against ObamaCare from the beginning, as I was, because you never believed it would actually work, or you were for it

and you actually believed that it would perform as advertised and as promised, I think everyone has to now acknowledge it has not turned out the way that even some of its most ardent supporters had hoped it would.

The first indication, perhaps, was when the Secretary of Health and Human Services began to issue waivers, in excess of 1,000 waivers, from having to comply with the law itself. There were many questions about the basis upon which these waivers were issued. Were they given to friends of the administration and denied to adversaries of the administration?

This is what happens when you pass a sweeping piece of legislation such as this and then cherry-pick who it applies to and who it does not apply to. This started with the granting of waivers.

We found that most recently even the President of the United States has determined the employer mandate—the mandate on employers with more than 50 employees, that they provide this government-designed insurance policy or else they get fined—that even the President has acknowledged by his action that delaying the implementation of the employer mandate for a year is having a devastating effect on unemployment in America. The reason we know this is because many employers are simply shedding jobs so they can get beneath the 50-person threshold for the employer mandate or they are taking full-time jobs and making them into part-time jobs. This is causing a lot of people who wish to work and want to provide for their families—it is creating an inability for them to do so according to their needs.

We know the individual mandate—the House of Representatives has passed a piece of legislation that says: If you are going to delay the employer mandate for businesses, shouldn't you show the same consideration for individual Americans who, unless they buy this government-approved insurance, will have to pay a penalty? The President hasn't accepted that delay in the implementation of the law.

There is another important piece of legislation that I filed in the Senate that the House is also considering this week; that is, given the scandals associated with the Internal Revenue Service, the fact that clearly the IRS has more on its plate than it is capable of adequately performing, we ought to get the Internal Revenue Service out of the implementation of ObamaCare.

With everything else it has to do, especially given the scandals that are currently under investigation in both Houses of Congress, we ought to be delaying the implementation of that individual mandate. We ought to be delaying the implementation of the employer mandate. We ought to be cutting the IRS out of the implementation process for ObamaCare.

I confess, I voted against ObamaCare from the very beginning. I voted to repeal it every chance we could possibly have, and I voted to cosponsor legislation that would defund it.

I wish to echo some of the words of the distinguished senior Senator from Utah. At some point those of us who were against it from the very beginning, who would like to repeal it and defund it, have to work together with our colleagues—who perhaps hoped that it would actually work as advertised—realizing now that even organized labor is writing letters to us saying: Please protect us from the provisions of this law because it is hurting our jobs. It is making it impossible for us to keep the insurance we have.

We need to work together to try to come up with a solution at some point. As the distinguished ranking member and the distinguished Finance Committee chairman said: The implementation of ObamaCare is clearly becoming a train wreck. We don't want to visit the pain of that train wreck and that failure on the American people but provide them a reasonable alternative which will provide people access to high-quality care at a lower cost. There are plenty of great ideas out there.

THUD APPROPRIATIONS

I wish to turn to the appropriations bill that is pending before us. Last week, in one of the President's much publicized pivots, the President turned his attention back to the economy. Of course, most Americans don't have the luxury of pivoting to or from this sluggish economy, which is growing at the most sluggish rate in the history of the American economy since the last depression, the Great Depression. The American people don't have a luxury of pivots. They have to live with this sluggish economy and high unemployment day after day.

We should welcome the President back to this conversation. He has talked a lot about middle-class families, who, as we all would agree, are the backbone of our country and a source of immeasurable strength. That said, the President hasn't been a member of the middle class for some time, and I think he, along with some of our colleagues, could use a refresher.

American families set their budgets, and they have to stick with them. In lean times they trim their budgets, and in times of plenty they set money aside for the future should they need it. Astonishingly, this basic principle seems to have been lost on both the President and the author of this legislation.

This bill, this underlying appropriations bill, takes the first step toward violating the Budget Control Act, which President Obama himself signed into law in 2011. That law sets very clear limits on spending levels, which the Democratic majority, by bringing this bill to the floor, has chosen to ignore.

They ignored it when they wrote their budget earlier this year, and they are ignoring it today with this proposed appropriations bill, which is 11 percent above the Budget Control Act numbers and 4 percent above the President's own proposed budget itself. That is \$54 billion. That is how much this bill would appropriate in discretionary spending and is more than \$5 billion above the current level of spending for this particular appropriations bill.

As I said, it is more than the President himself has requested. It is more than \$10 billion above the House bill which, unlike this bill, was written in accordance with the existing law.

I understand, as a negotiating tactic, why our Democratic friends might think highballing the House bill is a good negotiating tactic, but it is a total charade. It violates the Budget Control Act, and the American people simply will not go along with it.

The American people can't understand why Congress and the Federal Government are having such a difficult time doing with 2.4 percent less than we spent before the Budget Control Act went into place—2.4 percent. Yet here inside the beltway you will hear people talk about the so-called sequester and the Budget Control Act as if it were the end of the world.

It is not. It is called living within your means, and that is what we tried to do when the law was passed and when President Obama signed it. I think it is also telling that the majority leader, who basically controls the agenda on the Senate floor, chose to bring this particular bill to the floor before the August recess. We could have passed any one of a number of other appropriations bills to fund our veterans hospitals or to pay our Border Patrol agents.

The House and Senate aren't very far apart on the appropriations bills that would do that. Conceivably, we could have had them on the President's desk by the end of this week. Instead, the majority leader would rather leave them in limbo while attempting to pass this bloated bill which has zero chance of becoming law.

My hope is that as we proceed through this next round of fiscal debate, our friends on the other side of the aisle would demonstrate a willingness to operate within the law and the Budget Control Act. Unfortunately, they are not off to a very good start with this particular appropriations bill.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Jennifer Kerr was a single mom who wanted to improve her family's future. In 2009, she signed up at Vatterott College. She thought that was the best way to improve her skills and training and do a better job for her family.

She went to the local campus. She told the admissions representative that she wanted to study to become a nurse. The admissions official told her that although the school did not offer a nursing degree, it did offer a medical assistant's degree that would allow her to earn \$15 to \$17 an hour and put her on a fast track to becoming a nurse.

After securing more than \$27,000 in loans and being in the program for more than a year, Jennifer Kerr learned she wasn't even enrolled in the medical assistant's program—she was in the preliminary medical office assistant's program. If she wanted to continue and pursue the medical assistant's degree, she would need another 30 weeks of study and another \$10,000 to be paid in tuition.

In a gutsy move, Jennifer Kerr sued Vatterott Education Centers for misleading her, even though there was a clause in her contract with the school that said if she ever sued the school and lost, she would be responsible for Vatterott's legal costs.

A jury in Missouri decided the school did deceive Jennifer Kerr and ordered the company to pay back the \$27,000 she borrowed for tuition and fees. The jury then ordered the company to pay Kerr an additional \$13 million in punitive damages. The punitive amount the jury awarded far exceeded the maximum under Missouri law, but it showed the sympathy of the jury for situations like Jennifer Kerr's. She borrowed tens of thousands of dollars to earn a certificate—not even a degree—at a for-profit school that turned out to be virtually worthless.

After she left Vatterott, she tried for 6 months to find full-time employment. Earning her medical office assistant's diploma not only put her in debt, but it couldn't land her a job anywhere.

Taking away the court victory, Jennifer Kerr's story is common to an industry—the for-profit school industry—that frequently uses unscrupulous tactics to deceive people who are trying to get an education.

Some trade schools provide quality training for reasonable prices. I acknowledge that. But throughout the for-profit college industry, abuses are well documented. Admissions offices at for-profit schools are often a guise for aggressive sales operations targeting students from low-income families. They end up enrolling, with inflated

expectations for their employment and salary prospects upon graduating from for-profit colleges.

Because 96 percent of the students who enroll in for-profit colleges take Federal student loans, nearly all the students who leave these for-profit schools have student debt even when they don't have a degree or a diploma that can lead to a job. Most for-profit colleges charge significantly more in tuition and expenses than similar programs at community colleges or even State universities.

In 2008 and 2009, more than 1 million students started at schools owned by for-profit companies that were examined in an investigation by Senator TOM HARKIN in the Senate HELP Committee. By mid-2010, 54 percent of those students who started at these for-profit schools had left school, without a degree or a certificate. Among associate degree students, 63 percent dropped out without a degree.

Vatterott made national news itself in 2009 and early 2010 when three of the top employees of this for-profit school in the Midwest, including Kevin Earl Woods, the former director of the Kansas City campus, pleaded guilty to a conspiracy to fraudulently obtain Federal student grants and loans for students who were ineligible for these loans.

The Senate HELP Committee looked at Vatterott in the course of Chairman HARKIN's investigation of the for-profit industry. What they found was discouraging. In 2009, 88 percent of the revenue going to this for-profit school was Federal money. Of the money it took in, Vatterott spent 12.5 percent on advertising and marketing and took out 19 percent of this Federal money in profit.

Here is another way to look at it: Vatterott, a for-profit school, spent \$2,400 per student on instruction in 2009, but it spent \$1,343 on marketing, and \$2,000 it took out in profit for each student.

In contrast, public and nonprofit schools generally spend a higher amount per student on actual instruction. By comparison, St. Louis Community College spent \$5,000 per student on instruction; Vatterott, \$2,400.

Jennifer attended the Vatterott campus in Independence, MO, which is now closed, but the company continues to operate a Kansas City campus. The default rate on loan repayment for students who attended Vatterott in Kansas City is 25 percent. One out of four students who went to this for-profit school defaults on their student loans. The national average is 15 percent.

Jennifer Kerr fought back and won, but the for-profit college industry won't be cleaned up in the courtroom. Not every student with a bad experience has a strong legal case. Most are victims of a system that allows unscrupulous schools to collect Federal loan and grant money from students regard-

less of outcomes, heaping debt on these students. Many of those students will carry that debt for a lifetime.

When the programs and the schools don't deliver and jobs don't materialize, the student gets the debt, the Federal Government bears the risk, and the school takes the money and runs. The for-profit sector took in \$31 billion in U.S. Department of Education money in 2011. About one-fourth of all the Federal aid went to these for-profit schools, even though they only enroll 12 percent of all the students coming out of high school.

I might add one other statistic. The for-profit schools account for 47 percent of all the student loan defaults in America—12 percent of the students, 25 percent of the Federal aid to education, 47 percent of the student loan defaults.

Federal U.S. Department of Education regulations state that schools that engage in substantial misrepresentation about a program, its fees, or its job placements can be denied Federal money, and yet Vatterott is not the first or the only school to substantially mislead these students.

Abuses in the for-profit college industry will continue until Congress steps up and does something. It is about time for us to establish some standards of accreditation that apply to all schools across the board. How can you expect a student or a student's family to know whether this school that is advertising on the Internet or in the buses or on the billboards is a real school or a phony operation to lure kids into debt, have them drop out or end up with a worthless diploma?

I have worked with my colleagues who feel as I do on this issue. Senators TOM HARKIN and JACK REED, among others, will continue to tell these stories here on the floor of the Senate in the hopes that when the Senate has its higher ed reauthorization bill we will finally tackle this for-profit school industry.

Last Congress, Senator TOM HARKIN joined me in introducing a bill that would include military education benefits in the calculation that limits how much of a school's revenue is derived from Federal funding. Today I announced the VA and Defense appropriations bill for the next fiscal year. It was reported out of my subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. We called in the representatives of the major services and asked them what is going on with the training of our active servicemembers and their families. What they told us is more than half of those active servicemembers and their families are going to these same for-profit schools. Some are good. Most are awful.

These military men and women and their families are not only wasting their time, they are wasting a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity we give them for the proper training and education

to prepare them to be even better in the military or to have success in civilian life. Because they are lured into these for-profit schools, they end up wasting their time, wasting their money, many of them deeply in debt.

Senator HAGAN of North Carolina has proposed banning schools for using Federal education dollars for marketing. She is right. Many for-profit schools literally take the Federal money to bombard students with messages that entice them to enroll, bringing the schools more Federal money.

I also want to take a look at the system of accreditation. Our current system provides a seal of approval for too many schools, many of them for-profit colleges, that is little more than a license to rake in the Federal dollars as opposed to truly educating and training students. I hope Jennifer Kerr's court victory can serve as a wake-up call to Congress so we can work together to correct the worst abuses of this system. On behalf of the taxpayers, we need to be better stewards of Federal education money. On behalf of the students, we have to improve a system that may or may not prepare them for a career and may or may not lead to a degree, but almost in every case leads to debt.

DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. President, last week USA Today published an article that highlights the stories of people and families hurt by taking a dietary supplement containing the chemical DNP. It is a hazardous pesticide that was used as a weight-loss drug before 1938. Then the FDA declared it to be toxic for humans—in 1938, 75 years ago.

The article in USA Today featured Matt Cahill, a dietary supplement manufacturer with a high school education and no chemistry training, who illegally added this toxic pesticide, DNP, to exercise and weight-loss supplements. Some people who used his product suffered liver failure; some died. Cahill was arrested, criminally prosecuted, and served time in prison, but he is back selling dietary supplements that raise more health concerns.

The article in USA Today raises serious questions about whether we can do better to protect the American public. Dietary supplements have become a common health aid in medicine cabinets. More than half of Americans use dietary supplements, and you may be one of them. Most supplement makers are ethical and responsible. I take a multivitamin every day and believe it is safe. But most people assume that supplements on the shelves in stores have been tested by the Federal Government. How could they get on the shelf without a test? Most people think, like drugs that are prescribed, these supplements are tested for safety and effectiveness. That is not true.

Unlike more traditional supplements such as calcium and vitamin C, there

are now many new and complex supplements on the market promising to help people lose weight, find energy, bulk up, prevent disease—you name it. Consumers need to be careful. If a product is promising something too good to be true, they need to make sure the product and its ingredients are safe. We need to know the information on the label is not misleading. The FDA, the Federal Drug Administration, needs to know more about these products.

This week Senator RICHARD BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut and I are reintroducing the Dietary Supplement Labeling Act. Listen to what this bill would require. This bill would require more information on labels of dietary supplements and it would help ensure that the FDA has the information it needs if it turns out any of these products are dangerous.

Many people would be surprised to learn that the FDA does not know—does not even know—how many dietary supplements are being sold in this country. The USA Today article clearly states that when this Cahill character first sold his harmful dietary supplement tainted with DNP, he sold it on line. The FDA had no idea it was even on the market.

How does FDA learn when a product is on the market? People get sick and they die.

Another example is kava, a root whose extract people take to alleviate anxiety. But now that we know that kava is associated with severe liver damage and death, it would be useful for the FDA to have information readily available about the products on the market in America today containing kava. Our bill would require dietary supplement makers to give the FDA the name of each supplement they produce, along with a description of the product, a list of ingredients, and a copy of the label. Is that too much to ask? If you are going to sell this dietary supplement in stores across America, shouldn't the Food and Drug Administration at least have a copy of the label and ingredients? With this information, the FDA would know what products are on the market, what ingredients are in them, and be able to work with supplement manufacturers to address any problems.

This is a commonsense provision. It is supported by the Consumers Union and already practiced by many responsible supplement makers. Let's ask all the companies to provide FDA this basic information.

In addition to asking manufacturers to tell the FDA when a product goes on the market, this bill would require more information on the label of these products. Some ingredients may be safe for the general population but not for kids or pregnant women or perhaps those who have a compromised health condition.

St. John's wort is used safely by many people, but it can cause serious

side effects in people who have ADHD or people who are bipolar, or people who are undergoing surgery. Information like that should be clearly listed on the label. This bill would help to ensure the information necessary to make an informed decision by consumers.

We have all seen claims in supplement stores. I was in Olney train station Saturday night with my wife and went into one of these dietary supplement stores and the shelves were packed with all of these products claiming all of these things. Some of them promised they will boost your immunity, enhance your athletic performance or make you a better husband. This bill would give the FDA the authority to require the manufacturer to provide upon request the evidence to support claims such as "promotes weight loss."

Consumers should be skeptical of any product making big claims and they should take the time to learn if the product is safe and effective. But we need to give the FDA the authority to request evidence to support any claims made on these labels.

The bill would also help curb the growing practice of foods and beverages with potentially unsafe ingredients masquerading as dietary supplements by directing the FDA to establish a definition for "conventional foods."

I will challenge you, whether it is West Virginia or Illinois or Washington, DC, or your home State, go to the cash register at a gas station. What is the first thing you see next to the cash register? Energy supplements, those little red bottles. They are everywhere. Products such as energy drinks, the huge one in 24- and 32-ounce cans, and baked goods, such as Mellow Munchies brownies, that contain unapproved food additive melatonin are marketed as dietary supplements that are safe ways to get a boost of energy or to relax. In reality, they are foods and beverages taking advantage of the more relaxed regulatory standard for dietary supplements.

Here is a quiz. Did you know the Federal Drug Administration regulates a food product known as cola? You pick it, Pepsi, Coca-Cola, you name it. Did you know the Food and Drug Administration, in regulating that product, regulates how much caffeine they can put in each bottle? They do. But when it comes to the monster energy drinks. And you ask what are the limitations on caffeine in monster energy drinks? None, nada.

A sad case here, recently, in Virginia, a girl, 15 or 16 years old, two 24-ounce high-powered energy drinks in a 24-hour period of time, and she died. She died from two energy drinks. Way too much caffeine for a person her age and her size.

I am working with Senator BLUMENTHAL to try to get the FDA to

establish some standards here. These are not benign products. They are certainly not benign products for young people. If they are consumed in quantity, they are dangerous. People get sick and people die. I have had press conferences in Chicago with emergency room physicians. You would be shocked to know how many people show up having taken these energy drinks, consumed too much caffeine, and are worried they are about to die. That is a reality. It is time for us to establish some standards to protect consumers and families.

Most dietary supplements available today are safe and are used by millions of Americans as part of a healthy lifestyle. As I said, and will repeatedly, I take my fish oil, I take my multivitamin. I do not believe I should have to get a prescription to buy them. But we also need to recognize how the regulation of supplements can be improved to protect the public in America. In the USA article, a representative from the U.S. Antidoping Agency, a nonprofit designated by Congress to oversee testing of those who participate in the Olympics, said that companies like Matt Cahill's "... are not fringe players. These are mainstream dietary supplement companies and products that are in your mainstream health and nutrition stores. ... It's not there are a few bad actors. There are a lot of bad actors."

Ensuring the health of consumers from these bad actors will take cooperation from the responsible people in the dietary supplement industry, the Federal Drug Administration, and Congress in both political parties.

Senator BLUMENTHAL and I have put in a bill which includes commonsense steps to make sure risks for supplements are on the label, products are registered with the FDA, and manufacturers can be forced to back up their big claims. I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact that legislation.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

I also ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business and to be permitted to engage in a colloquy with my Republican colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I don't intend to object, I would like to modify his unanimous consent request and ask that I be permitted to speak for 15 minutes after his colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise in support of parents, families, students, employees, taxpayers, and other hard-working Americans, who, as of January 1, 2014, will find themselves unfairly impacted by ObamaCare. ObamaCare is an ill-conceived, poorly crafted, and economically damaging piece of legislation.

We have known for some time now that ObamaCare would create a set of circumstances that would make health care unaffordable. It is unaffordable from several standpoints: No. 1, for the country and for the U.S. Government. The Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan entity, recently reported that this law is likely to cost the U.S. Government about \$1.8 trillion over the next 10 years. That is significantly more—some would say roughly double—than the initial estimates given to Congress when this law was passed.

This is an enormous amount of money. It is an especially enormous amount of money for a government that is now \$17 trillion in debt and is adding to that debt at a rate of about \$1 trillion every single year. It is not as though we have an overabundance of money within the Federal Government. It is not as though we can afford to take on newer, more expensive programs, such as this one, especially when they run pricetags that are substantially above and beyond what was presented to us.

It is also proving to be unaffordable for American families. There are a number of studies that have been conducted in recent months which tell us that premiums are going to become more expensive. The name of the law, of course, was the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. This implies, of course, this would protect patients and make health care more affordable, not less. What we found is that this is a misnomer. What we have found through the studies that have been released recently is that it is going to make health care less affordable for American families, not more affordable.

The interesting thing about these studies is that they are all over the map. We don't know exactly how much health care is going to cost us. We don't know exactly how much less affordable health care will become under the Affordable Care Act because there are so many uncertainties created by this law. The 2,700-page bill that became ObamaCare has been modified and will continue to be modified by countless pages—tens of thousands of pages of regulations.

This act has also been modified in significant ways on a couple of occasions, which we will get to in a minute. All of these modifications have created additional uncertainty that is a source of a lot of concern to a lot of Americans. What we do know is that it is likely to result in premium increases.

One study concluded that even on the low end, the increased premiums families would be paying in a small group premium context would go up between 13 and 23 percent, on average. Other studies—including one that was conducted in the State of Indiana—suggested that premiums would go up in that State by 72 percent for those with individual plans. I am told Maryland's biggest health insurance provider has proposed raising premiums for individual policies by an average of 25 percent next year.

In many instances, these numbers are even worse for young people. There are also numbers which suggest that there is a lot of uncertainty, and we truly don't know. It is almost impossible to know. An analysis of more than 30 studies has shown that premiums are likely to increase between 145 and 189 percent for young people seeking health insurance. In Utah, my State, there is a study suggesting that for young people seeking health insurance, their premiums are likely to increase between 56 and 90 percent with respect to individual policies.

This law is also bad for America's workers. Businesses are cutting hours, moving workers to part-time, and in many cases they are not hiring at all.

According to a recent U.S. Chamber of Commerce survey, 74 percent of businesses will fire employees or cut hours; 61 percent will not hire next year.

Daniel Kessler, who is a professor of law and business at Stanford University, has predicted that 30 to 40 million Americans will be directly harmed by ObamaCare through higher premiums, stiff penalties, cutbacks in hours, and job losses.

We have known for some time—as a result of these studies—that ObamaCare was going to make health care unaffordable. We now know it is also going to be fundamentally unfair. The President recently admitted the law is not ready for prime time. He admitted he is not ready to implement the law as it has been written. Because ObamaCare was so poorly crafted, he simply is not going to enforce it the way it was crafted. He is going to selectively enforce its provisions.

Most important, the President of the United States has said that while he is going to require hard-working Americans, individuals, to comply with the law's individual mandate. According to one recent study, only 12 percent of the American people actually support that provision today. However, he is going to implement and enforce that provision, but at least for the first year of the law's full effect next year, he will not be implementing or enforcing the employer mandate. So hard-working Americans have to comply but big business does not have to comply.

This is significant because the law doesn't give the President of the United States the power to rewrite the

law. The law sets forth a specific set of timelines, a specific set of deadlines that cause the law's various provisions to kick in. This did not give the President the authority or the discretion to decide which among the law's several provisions could be favored or disfavored by the President of the United States.

So we have hard-working Americans, individuals, and families on the hook, and we have big business being thrown a big bone. This is not fair. This is not something that is consistent with the rule of law. This is not something the American people ought to tolerate.

The Affordable Care Act, as it is called, will shatter not only our hard-earned health benefits, but in many instances it will destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that has become the backbone of the American middle class. It will do all of this in a way that will contribute to or be part of a system of selective unfair enforcement.

The American people deserve better. The American people demand better. The American people deserve not to have this law implemented and enforced if, as the President of the United States has told us, it is not ready for prime time. Then it is not ready to be implemented.

I ask of my friend and colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Florida, how he feels about this and how the people in the State of Florida feel about the selective implementation and enforcement of a law that Americans already knew would be unaffordable and a law they know will also be unfair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah for organizing this effort.

Let me answer that question by coming up with a couple of things we can find consensus on. First of all, I think all of us agree the American middle class is one of the things that make us exceptional. All the countries in the world have rich people. Unfortunately, every country in the world has people who are struggling. But what has made America unique and different from all of these other countries is that we have a vibrant middle class. We have people who work hard, make enough money to own a home, take their kids on vacations, save for college expenses, and kind of fulfill many of their dreams.

I grew up in that environment. I tell people all the time I didn't have everything I wanted, but we always had everything we needed. Through hard work and sacrifice my parents became part of that great American middle class—working-class Americans who had the opportunity to give us the life they never had.

I think we can all agree the middle class is very important for America because it is one of the things that makes

us exceptional, unique, and sets us apart from the rest of the world. Quite frankly, one of the reasons why people want to live here and love being in America is because it creates those opportunities.

What strengthens the middle class? We are having a debate about that in this country. Is it a bunch of government spending? Is it a bunch of government programs? Is it the Senators? Is it the President of the United States? The answer is no. What rationally makes the middle class possible and vibrant is jobs that pay middle-class salaries. What makes it possible is that we have jobs that pay that kind of money so people can join the middle class and give their kids a better life.

Where do those jobs come from? Do they come from the government? Do they come from the White House? Do they come from the Senate or from our laws? They don't. They come from a vibrant private economy that is creating those jobs. How those jobs are created is not that complicated. People have to start new businesses or grow a business that already exists. Those are the two primary ways in which middle-class jobs—in fact, most jobs—are created outside of government. That is the only place where we will find the kind of growth we need for a vibrant middle class. We should analyze every issue before this body through the lens of the middle class and through the lens of whether it makes it easier or harder for someone to start a business or grow an existing one.

Let's examine what the Senator from Utah just asked about ObamaCare in the context of what I just explained. The answer is that it is clear ObamaCare makes it harder for people to start a business or grow an existing business for a number of reasons the Senator has pointed out. No. 1, it has an incentive for businesses not to grow. It tells a business owner that if they have more than 50 full-time employees, they will have to meet a set of rules which will make it very expensive for them to start a business or grow an existing business.

The other thing it creates is a tremendous amount of uncertainty. It goes back to the point the Senator from Utah raised. These laws are being canceled on a whim. The President is deciding to enforce one part of it but not another part of it. That creates confusion.

Imagine if a person has a business and some money set aside to grow, that business owner doesn't know how much it is going to cost to grow. You know what they do? They don't grow the business. As a result, those jobs are not created.

How about the cost of that insurance, which is an issue the Senator from Utah talked about a moment ago. Yesterday in Florida the commissioner of insurance said that in the individual

marketplace in Florida next year—because of ObamaCare—rates are going up 30 to 40 percent. Ask yourself: Does that make it easier to start a new business or does it make it harder? Does it make it easier to grow an existing business or does it make it harder?

Think about the impact all of this uncertainty is going to have on middle-class workers. Add to that the following: Right now there is an incentive to have part-time workers. That is why we are reading everyday in the newspapers that company X is moving people from full-time to part-time. Companies are moving employees to less than 30 hours so they can avoid the penalties in this bill.

How about insurance? Let's say a person works somewhere that has insurance and they are happy with it. This law might require the employer to put that person on a new insurance or move that person to a government exchange, which means that doctor that worker has been dealing with for 10 years who knows their case history might not be their doctor next year because of ObamaCare. The result is we have a holding pattern.

Businesses in America, the people who create the middle-class jobs, are in a holding pattern and waiting to see which direction this goes, but they are all headed in a poor direction because of this.

So when the Senator from Utah talked about this and asked the question: What impact is the Senator hearing, that is what I am hearing. I am hearing that this law makes it harder for people to create jobs. This bill is going to make it harder on the middle-class jobs. It is going to make it harder for middle-class jobs to be created because it makes it harder to start a business and makes it harder to grow an existing business.

I imagine the Senator from Utah has heard similar concerns in his own State. The Senator from Texas has joined us, and he is from a State even larger than mine. I am sure he will share his input on what he is hearing from his home State and from people across the country.

I say to my colleague that is what I have been hearing from my constituents everywhere I have been going in Florida for the last 6 months.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request? I understand the Senator has the floor until 4:30 p.m.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized at 4:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand the leader is going to make a request.

I wonder if the Senator would withhold his request for a couple of minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I withdraw my request. I am willing to use time perhaps tomorrow.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I see we have been joined by my friend and colleague, the Senator from Texas. I wish to ask him if his observations from his interactions with his constituents in Texas have been similar to those that have been shared today by the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Utah for his leadership on this issue.

I am proud to stand with Senator LEE, Senator RUBIO, and with so many others. I can tell my colleagues that in the State of Texas, Texans overwhelmingly understand that ObamaCare isn't working, that this legislation is failing and it is hurting the American people.

When we look at jobs, there is no legislation currently in effect that is damaging the economy more or damaging jobs more than ObamaCare. In direct response to the law, 41 percent of small business owners have held off plans to hire new employees. Thirty-eight percent said they pulled back on plans to grow their businesses. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce reports that 71 percent of small businesses say ObamaCare makes it harder to hire workers.

Beyond that, one of the most pernicious aspects of this law is that it is forcing more and more employees to be moved to part-time employment, to be moved to working 29 hours a week or less to get out of the ObamaCare 30-hour threshold.

In 2013, employers have added more part-time employees, averaging 93,000 a month, seasonally adjusted, than full-time workers. And it is important to understand who it is that is moved to part-time work, who it is that is hurt by ObamaCare. It is the most vulnerable among us. It is not the CEOs. It is not the wealthy. It is young people, Hispanics, African Americans, single moms. According to the most recent census data, in 2011 the poverty rate for those who worked full-time was only 2.8 percent. The poverty rate for those working less than full-time year-round was 16.3 percent.

I am reminded of earlier this year when we were debating the issue of ObamaCare and I read from a newspaper article out of the State of Oklahoma that quoted a single mom who is working in a fast food restaurant. She and all of her coworkers had their hours forcibly reduced to 29 hours a week or less. This single mom said: I have two little kids at home. I can't feed my kids on 29 hours a week, and neither can the other single moms who are struggling to make ends meet.

Beyond the impact on jobs, on the economy, and beyond those being forced into part-time work, we also have the compliance costs. According

to Federal agency estimates, ObamaCare will add paperwork burdens totaling nearly 190 million hours or more every year. To put that in perspective, Mount Rushmore, which took 14 years to build, could be constructed 1,547 times with the paperwork ObamaCare requires in 1 year.

Not only do we see jobs being hurt, the economy being hurt, workers being hurt, hours being reduced, paperwork going up, but we are seeing premiums going up—premiums going up far too high—and it is hitting those who are suffering the most.

On Monday, Florida's insurance commissioner told the Palm Beach Post that insurance rates will rise by 5 to 20 percent in the small-group market and by 30 to 40 percent in the individual market. As those who are at home in Florida watching what is happening, as they are seeing their insurance rates go up—they are going up because of the impact of this failed law.

The Ohio Department of Insurance announced that ObamaCare in Ohio will increase the individual market health premiums by 88 percent. If a person in Ohio right now is seeing their premiums go up, they can thank the men and women of the U.S. Congress.

According to the Wyman Firm, looking at young people, young people in particular are hurt by ObamaCare. The Wyman Firm estimates that 80 percent of Americans age 21 to 29 earning more than \$16,000 will pay more out-of-pocket for coverage under ObamaCare than they pay today. If young people at home are watching this today and wondering how they are going to get a job, how they are going to climb the economic ladder, how they are going to achieve the American dream, ObamaCare is driving up their health care premiums right now.

We all know that at the time ObamaCare was being debated, the President promised the American people: If you like your health care plan, you can keep it. The facts have conclusively proven that wrong. According to a February 2013 report by the Congressional Budget Office, 7 million people will lose their employer-sponsored insurance. McKinsey & Company, a very well-regarded consulting firm, found that 30 percent of employers will definitely or probably stop offering health insurance in the years after 2014.

This bill isn't working, and I would note there is growing bipartisan consensus on that front. As the facts have come in, the American people have kept an open mind, have looked at this bill, and have seen that as it is being implemented, it is not working, it is hurting the economy, and it is hurting jobs. According to an ABC-Washington Post poll, in 2010, 74 percent of moderate conservative Democrats—there are a significant number of Democrats who describe themselves as moderate or conservative—in 2010, 70 percent of

them supported ObamaCare. Yet, in July, just 46 percent supported ObamaCare.

Not only that, we have seen the lead Senate author of ObamaCare—a senior Democrat in this body—describe ObamaCare as headed toward a “huge train wreck.” We have seen unions—which initially supported ObamaCare—over and over turning as they realize the consequences. In April the United Union of Roofers, Waterproofers and Allied Workers called for “repeal or complete reform of the Affordable Care Act to protect our employers, our industry, and our most important assets, our members and their families.” If we listen to the voices of unions, unions are saying ObamaCare is failing; it is not working. The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers released a white paper in July explaining that ObamaCare “threatens to harm our members by dismantling multiemployer health plans.” And then—really quite striking—James Hoffa, Jr., the president of the Teamsters Union, wrote a letter to HARRY REID and NANCY PELOSI stating that ObamaCare “will destroy the very health and well-being of our members along with millions of other hard-working Americans.” Why? Well, Mr. Hoffa explained that ObamaCare is destroying the 40-hour workweek that has been the backbone of the American middle class.

If we trust the voices of unions, if we have a concern for the American middle class, then listen to the bipartisan voices that are rising up saying that ObamaCare isn't working.

Most strikingly, we have President Obama himself, who just a few weeks ago was forced to unilaterally and without legal authority delay implementation of ObamaCare for large corporations, for companies with more than 50 employees—he unilaterally moved the employer mandate until after the next election. I would suggest there are at least two things we can derive from President Obama's decision to do that:

No. 1, if ObamaCare were a good thing, if it were working, we can be sure President Obama would want it to go into full effect before the next election. He would want to take credit with the American people for the benefits of this signature bill. The fact that the President was forced to concede that the wheels are coming off and to move the employer mandate until after the next election I would suggest is highly revealing.

No. 2, it raises the obvious followup question: Why is President Obama willing to grant a waiver for giant corporations but not for hard-working American families, not for the men and women who are struggling to make ends meet, who are climbing the economic ladder, who want, like their parents and grandparents before them, to achieve the American dream? ObamaCare is standing in their way.

So what are we to do about it? Well, the most important constitutional check and balance that Congress has on an overreaching Executive is the power of the purse. The Framers of the Constitution wisely gave authority over expenditures of money to the Congress, and that is why the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Florida, and I, among many others, are standing together and saying: This isn't working, and Congress should defund it.

In 62 days the continuing resolution that funds the Federal Government will expire. Each of the three of us, along with a number of others, has publicly stated that under no circumstances will we support a continuing resolution that funds one penny of ObamaCare. If 41 Members of this body stand together and make that same statement or if 218 Members in the House of Representatives stand together and take that same position, we can do something different than we have seen this year.

Over the past couple of years we have seen 39, 40, 41 votes to repeal ObamaCare, all of which have been effectively symbolic because none of them had a real chance of passage. With the continuing resolution, we have a chance to successfully defund ObamaCare. Right now we don't have the votes in this institution. If the vote were held today, we would not hold 41 Senators to defund ObamaCare. But we have 62 days until September 30, and every one of us takes very seriously our obligation to represent our constituents. If in the next 62 days we see what I believe we are going to see, which is the American people rising up en masse—hundreds of thousands, millions of Americans standing up and saying: It isn't working, it is hurting our jobs, it is hurting our economy, it is hurting our health care, it is making our lives worse, and we need to defund it—if enough Americans speak out and demand of their elected officials that we do the right thing, I am confident we will. I am confident that Republicans will, and I am hopeful that Members of the Democratic Party will as well, that every one of us will.

I believe the American people should hold their elected officials accountable, and that most assuredly includes me. It includes all of us. We should be held accountable by our constituents. The American people know this bill isn't working. There is bipartisan agreement on it. We have the potential in the next 62 days to show real leadership—not to give a speech, not to give a meaningless, symbolic vote, but, if we stand together, to actually defund it.

Let me make one final point. Those who disagree with the position that is being taken by Senator LEE and Senator RUBIO and me and say that taking this stand will mean Republicans will be blamed for a government shutdown, let me be clear on what I think should

happen. I believe the House of Representatives should pass a continuing resolution to fund the entirety of the Federal Government except for ObamaCare and should explicitly prohibit further funding of ObamaCare and should adopt the legislation I have introduced as a condition to the continuing resolution.

Now, the next step. There will be partisan critics who immediately charge Republicans with threatening to shut down the government. I would suggest that we then take the argument to the American people. The American people should decide. If there are Members of this body who are willing to shut down the Federal Government in order to force ObamaCare down the throats of the American people, in order to say President Obama will grant a waiver to giant corporations but not to hard-working American families, let's take that argument to the American people because I think the American people want economic growth back. That should be our top priority. Nothing is killing jobs more. Nothing is hurting the American economy more than ObamaCare. There is bipartisan agreement on that.

I am hopeful that Members of this body will stand and lead. I thank the Senator from Utah for taking the lead on what I believe is the most important battle this Congress will confront.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, those of us who share this position feel strongly that it is indisputably, constitutionally the prerogative of the Congress to exercise the power of the purse. This means we don't have to vote to fund something with which we fundamentally disagree.

Some have suggested that because this was passed by Congress 3 years ago, we somehow have an obligation to fund it. Well, I would remind my colleagues who might make that statement that the Congress as it existed then is not the same Congress as it exists today. That was two Congresses ago. The Congress that enacted that law was fundamentally changed in part because it enacted that law.

The law has not been popular. It has not been good to those who voted to enact it. Ever since the majority party in the House of Representatives changed hands after the 2010 election—due in large part to ObamaCare—there have been a lot of people who have suggested that the Republicans in Congress need to defund ObamaCare's implementation and enforcement. For a variety of reasons, that has not happened.

We have continued to pass continuing resolutions with no restrictions on ObamaCare's implementation and enforcement, at least as it relates to the ultimate implementation and enforcement of the exchanges, of the

individual mandate, and so forth. Republicans have had reasons for doing this. Some of those reasons have included the statement to the effect that, well, the Supreme Court is going to knock it down. It will strike it down. It will invalidate ObamaCare because it is unconstitutional. Of course it is, and a majority of the Supreme Court concluded that it was unconstitutional as written. But the Supreme Court, rather than invalidating it, instead rewrote the law not just once but twice in order to save it. Some Republicans have also justified continuing to vote for funding bills that contain ObamaCare implementation funding because they believed a Republican would be elected President in 2012 and would stop ObamaCare. Well, that did not happen either.

We have one last opportunity to defund the implementation of this law before these provisions I just mentioned kick in on January 1—one last opportunity—and that is in connection with our current spending bill, our current continuing resolution that is set to expire on September 30—just 62 days from right now.

So what we are saying is that if you agree with us, if you agree with the President that this law is not ready to be implemented as it was written, as it was enacted by Congress, if the President is not going to follow the law, then the American people should not have to fund it. If you do not like it, if you agree it is not ready, do not fund it. We can and we should and we must fund government but not ObamaCare.

So I would ask the Senator from Florida if these are sentiments that are consistent with what he has been thinking, sentiments that are consistent with what he has been hearing from his constituents in Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, in response to the Senator from Utah, I would say I have because I think there is a pretty clear understanding growing every day, as evidenced by the Senator from Texas a moment ago, who went through all these groups out there, including labor unions that have now turned on ObamaCare because of what it means to their members. So it is increasingly established how much damage this law is doing.

The question I get, I say to the Senator from Utah, is, What can we do about it? There is almost this resignation by people that, well, what can we do about it? It is already in place. Is there anything we can do?

So I think there are three things we should be able to do, and I will summarize those fairly quickly.

The first thing we should do is not continue to double and triple down on these things.

I think both the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Utah grew up at

the same time as I did, so they will remember something that a lot of the younger people here probably do not remember. There was a time when Coca-Cola came out with something called New Coke. It was a new Coca-Cola formula. After about 100-some years, they changed the formula of Coca-Cola and they came out with something called New Coke. It was a disaster. Everybody hated it. In fact, they hated it because—they said: If we want to drink something that has that kind of sweetener, there are other options on the market. We like old Coke.

What did Coca-Cola do when New Coke began to flounder? They did not say: Well, we are just going to continue to make more of it. They backed away from it. They went back to the original formula. They learned from their mistake, and they did not double down. That is the way it is in the real world. That is the way it is in our lives, and that is the way it is in the private sector—but not government, not Washington. In Washington, if something is going wrong, here they double and triple down. It is like an invitation to move forward. We should not do that. That is the first thing I would say.

The second thing I would say is that we have to stop this from moving forward. The implications of this law are already being felt, but the regulations around this law—the mandates in this law, the fees and the costs and the new rate increases in this law, those things, you are only going to start to feel that right now. In the next few months you are going to really start to feel what this new law means to your life, to your business, to the place where you work.

Now is the time to act. People ask me: What can we do about it? Let me tell you what is probably not going to work in the short term. You are probably not going to get President Obama to sign a bill that repeals ObamaCare, and you are not going to get the votes in the Senate to do that. So these repeal votes—I will vote for every single one of them, but the problem is that our chances of getting that accomplished are probably minimal so long as President Obama is the President of the United States. So truly our last option is to stop paying for this thing. Why would we continue to pour billions and hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars into a disaster? Why would we double down with your hard-earned money on a program that is going to hurt you?

We will have a chance to do that in September because in September, in order for the government to continue to function, we have to pass something called a short-term budget. I wish it were a permanent budget, but it is supposed to be a short-term budget. All we are saying is, in that short-term budget, fund the government, keep the lights on, pay the military, make sure

Social Security checks go out. The only thing you should not do is you should not fund and pay for ObamaCare.

The pushback we get from that from some people is, well, that is crazy because that means you are willing to shut down the government over ObamaCare. That is not the way I see it. The way I see it is that if we pass a budget that pays for everything except for ObamaCare and the President says he will veto that, it is he who wants to shut down the government, it is he who is basically saying: I will shut down the government unless it pays for ObamaCare. That is an unreasonable position. It is unreasonable because this law is so bad. His own allies are coming to him and saying: Please stop this from moving forward. Well, we are going to give you a chance, Mr. President, by refusing to fund it.

Here is my last point: To my colleagues in the Republican Party—I know every single one of the Senate Members here in the Republican Party is against ObamaCare—this is our last chance, our last best chance to do something about this. When this thing starts to kick in and starts to take root, it is going to be very difficult to undo major portions of this despite the damage it is going to create.

Now, I only speak for myself, although I think I can speak for the other two Senators who have joined me here today in this effort. I want to be able to go back to Florida, no matter how this thing turns out, and say to the men and women who sent me here in 2010: I did everything I could to keep this from happening to you.

When someone comes to me and says: I just got moved to part time because of ObamaCare, I want to be able to look them in the eye and say that I did everything I could.

When someone says to me: I just lost the insurance I was happy with; I now have this new insurance plan I am not that familiar with, and my doctor, whom I have had for 30 years, is not on that plan, I want to be able to say to them that I did everything I could.

When someone comes to me and says: I have a pretty successful business; I have set some money aside; I was going to open a new business or grow this one, but I am not because of ObamaCare, I want to be able to say that I did everything I could.

If we pass a budget in September that funds ObamaCare, you did not do everything you could. You paid for this. You doubled down on it in ways that will have irreparable harm to our economy and to our country.

This is our last best chance.

To those who say they are against ObamaCare, I believe you. But let me tell you something. If we are not willing to draw a line in the sand on this issue, then on what issue are we willing to draw a line in the sand? If we are not

willing to go to the limit on this issue, then what issue is there? Is there an issue on which we are prepared to say: We will not move forward because of this? Is there an issue on which we are willing to do everything we can and lay it all on the line? Is there such an issue? And if it is not this one, which one is it?

That is the choice before us. I truly believe you cannot go back home and say you did everything you could to stop ObamaCare if you vote for a budget that funds it.

I would ask the Senator from Texas if he too shares those thoughts and those feelings?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I do indeed share those thoughts and feelings and the obligation we owe to our constituents to honor our word and put action behind our words.

I would ask the Senator from Utah if he would yield for a series of three short questions?

Mr. LEE. Surely.

Mr. CRUZ. The first question is, There has been much talk of a shutdown. Am I correct that we do not have to hypothesize what a shutdown would look like, that we, in fact, saw that in 1995 with two temporary, partial shutdowns that occurred when Republicans in the House stood up to President Clinton?

When that occurred in 1995, we saw several things. No. 1, we saw that the parade of horrors that was brought out did not occur. Social Security checks continued to flow, the military continued to be funded, interest on the debt continued to be paid, planes did not fall out of the sky.

Indeed, what occurs—if Democrats decide to block a continuing resolution and force a temporary shutdown in order to force ObamaCare on the American people—is a partial, temporary shutdown where nonessential government services get suspended for a period of time, not a shutdown of essential services, such as paying for the men and women who are fighting in the military and providing Social Security checks. We have seen that in the past; is that correct?

Mr. LEE. That is correct. That is correct, and it is how it has happened in the past. This is not something we want. This is not something we have threatened. This is something we think can and should be avoided and we want to avoid. In the unfortunate, completely avoidable event that did happen, it would be largely as the Senator described it.

Mr. CRUZ. A second question I would ask is this: This week we saw the rather stunning news that the IRS employees union—the men and women at the IRS charged with enforcing ObamaCare are asking not to be made subject to ObamaCare. Indeed, the union leaders

have said to their union members: Draft letters to send to Members of this body, saying that we, the IRS employees union, do not want to be subject to ObamaCare.

Likewise, ObamaCare subjects Members of this body and their staffs to ObamaCare. I am not aware of a single Senate office that is not deeply concerned about that, that is not facing the prospect of staff quitting the congressional offices because the arms of ObamaCare are so significant, and there have been many a panicked discussion among Democrats and Republicans about what to do about subjecting Members and their staff to ObamaCare.

My second question of three short questions is, What does it say to the Senator that the IRS employees union is asking: Let us out from ObamaCare, and that Members and congressional staff are deeply concerned about the harms ObamaCare is going to do to them?

Mr. LEE. Well, first of all, that tells me that those who are part of that union do not want to be subject to the same provisions of the same law they will be enforcing.

What it also tells me in the bigger picture is that above all, this law creates uncertainty. That is why we see so much angst among people right here on Capitol Hill who are facing the very real prospect, the very real future in the next few months of going onto these exchanges because nobody knows what this is going to look like. Nobody has any idea.

One thing Americans really do not like, in this world of a lot of unavoidable uncertainties, is more uncertainties heaped upon them by dictate of the Federal Government. We have enough uncertainties in life. We do not know when somebody is going to get sick. We do not know when accidents are going to happen. So we should be able to avoid those things that government thrusts upon us.

This is one of the many reasons why there is so much angst within the IRS and within the ranks of the Capitol Hill workforce. People do not want to go onto these exchanges because they have absolutely no idea what this is going to look like.

Mr. CRUZ. My third brief question is, For those in this body who have campaigned at home, who have told their constituents they are opposed to ObamaCare, on January 1 the exchanges go up and running, the subsidies begin. And the history of the modern entitlement state is that anytime a subsidy has been put in place, it has proven to be politically virtually impossible to undo. Indeed, no major entitlement that has been implemented in modern times has ever been undone.

For those who say they oppose ObamaCare, what is the alternative to

defunding ObamaCare with a continuing resolution? Let me ask it a separate way. If we do not defund it, am I correct that come January 1, Republicans will essentially be surrendering that in all likelihood ObamaCare will be a permanent feature of the economy, hurting the economy, hurting jobs, hurting low-income workers, hurting our health care system? And if that is correct, has any reasonable alternative been proffered by anyone on this side of the Senate to stop that harm other than what you and Senator RUBIO and I and others are trying to do?

Mr. LEE. Based on historical precedent, we have every reason to believe that once this new entitlement program kicks in, it is not going away. It is a one-way ratchet. You have death, taxes, and entitlements. Once created, they do not go away.

To answer the second part of that question, I am not aware of any plan among any Republicans—aside from this one; aside from the plan that says: Do not fund ObamaCare, fund government but not ObamaCare—that would address this issue. I am not aware of any plan. The only other plan I am aware of would be one that says: Let's just wait and see what happens. Let's wait and see what a horrible disaster this will be. Let's wait and see how awful this will be for the American people, how utterly intolerable they will find it. And let's just hope that will provide enough political momentum for us perhaps to win elections at some unknown point in the future. This is not a good way to run a government. This is not a kind thing to do to an unsuspecting public who hopes and expects that we have their best interests at heart.

So to all those in this body who support ObamaCare, this argument might not be all that persuasive to you, although you ought to look at the fact that the President, who signed this into law, has said he himself is not ready, is not willing, is not able to enforce and implement the law evenhandedly as it was written. So maybe that ought to give you pause as to whether you should fund it.

But for those of you in this body who are, in fact, opposed to ObamaCare, I ask you: How can you oppose it, be against it, and yet fund it? So I would invite you to consider the possibility that what you are doing in thinking about funding it is not really where you want to go. Consider what might be said about this. Defund it or own it. If you fund it, you are for it.

This law was enacted without a meaningful opportunity for the Members voting on it to read it. It is 2,700 pages long. After it was enacted into law, it was rewritten a total of four times: twice by the Supreme Court of the United States, twice more by the President of the United States. The

President's rewrite came just a few weeks ago, the Supreme Court's rewrite was over a year ago.

But what the President did was acknowledge that this law is not ready for prime time. This law is not ready to implement. This law is not one that he is willing to implement as written. He is going to implement and enforce it selectively, holding hard-working Americans, individuals and families to the fire, while throwing a big bone to big business.

This is not acceptable. This is un-American. This is not something that those of us who purport to be against ObamaCare can support by funding it. So I invite my colleagues to join me in this cause to vote to fund government but not ObamaCare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, even though I disagree with my three friends, I appreciate their sincerity, their advocacy. They are all three very intelligent men, good Senators. But I am going to move on to another subject.

I ask unanimous consent that following Senator COBURN's remarks, which are 15 minutes as I understand it, that all postcloture time on Calendar No. 223 be yielded back, and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate; further that following disposition of Calendar No. 223, the Senate proceed to consider the following nominations en bloc: 224, 104, 102, and 103; further that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to cloture votes on Calendar Nos. 224 and 104; that if cloture is invoked on the nominations, all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate; further that if Calendar Nos. 223, 224, and 104 are confirmed, the Senate proceed to vote with no intervening action or debate on Calendar No. 102 and 103, in that order; that if cloture is not invoked on Calendar Nos. 224 or 104, Calendar Nos. 102 and 103 be returned to the calendar; further, that if a nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate and no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; further, that upon confirmation of Calendar No. 103, the Senate resume legislative session and that all after the first vote be 10 minutes in duration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1243

Mr. REID. Mr. President, finally one last unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate re-

sumes its consideration of S. 1243 on Wednesday, July 31, the pending amendments be set aside and Senator PAUL be recognized to offer amendment No. 1739; that there be 60 minutes of debate equally divided between the proponents and opponents; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Paul amendment; further, that no points of order or second-degree amendments be in order to the Paul amendment prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Reserving the right to object, I am not going to object, but I wanted to ask the majority leader, as you know, we have lost a great American, Ambassador Lindy Boggs. Senator BEGICH and I just wanted 10 minutes on the floor sometime today or tomorrow to honor her. Could we include that in some agreement for tomorrow?

Mr. REID. If we are not able to get it done today, we will do it in wrap-up tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I appreciate having the opportunity to talk about this subject. I also appreciate my colleagues. They are absolutely right in everything they said in terms of the effect of ObamaCare. I was here when that debate took place. But there are two contentions on which I disagree with them. I thought I would voice them on the floor.

One is one of the quotes from the Senator from Texas: You can thank the men and women of the Congress for ObamaCare.

I would just say you can thank the Democrats for ObamaCare because there was not one Republican who voted for it. So it is not the Congress that did this; it is the President and his allies who created this mess that we are about to experience.

The other thing I disagree with is the fact that you can design a piece of legislation that will defund ObamaCare, because the vast majority of it is mandatory spending. So no matter what we did in terms of a continuing resolution, and according to the CRS—which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD after I finish what I am talking about—all of the things would continue in terms of the implementation of the Affordable Care Act if we carried out the strategy that is outlined by my colleagues.

Now, their motivations are absolutely pure. I have never voted for a continuing resolution since I have been in the Senate. My American Conservative Union rating is 99 percent. I would love to defund it. I want somebody to show me a mechanism where we can do that because the vast majority of the money being spent today is

mandatory spending that does not come under a spending bill associated with appropriations. It was passed by a law. So the only effective way to truly stop ObamaCare—and I think we ought to do it. To stop it would be to totally reverse it. We do not have the votes to do that, but we do have the votes to delay it.

When you go out and talk about the fact that they are not going to implement the employer mandate but implement the individual mandate, we can have a vote on that in the Senate. Then we can have our colleagues go home and say why they think it is fair to do that. We can actually add that.

The fact that they are not going to do a check on the claims for eligibility under the exchanges, 88 percent of Americans think that is wrong. Why do they think it is wrong? Because they know right now, with the earned-income tax credit, between 25 and 34 percent of it is fraud. On the child tax credit it is the same thing. They know exactly the same thing will happen when it comes to credits and payments in the exchanges.

They also know the Independent Payment Advisory Board is going to ration care for the vast majority of the Americans. We can have a vote on that again. A good portion of my colleagues on the other side would like to get rid of that. So we can have a strategic method of delaying ObamaCare by putting the votes up. But there is no way, according to the Congressional Research Service, that the vast majority of funding can be stopped unless you totally reverse the whole bill.

As my colleague said, they did not think President Obama would sign that. So you would have to have 67 votes to let that happen. I spent hours on this floor trying to defeat the Affordable Care Act. Many of my colleagues on this side came around to other proposals, the Patient's Choice Act, which accomplished many of the same things without large government, without tremendous cost, and without the government getting in between a patient and their doctor.

I do have a little bit of experience on that side of the ledger in terms of caring for people for the last 25 years as a practicing physician. So I would think it would be important that we have a way. I do not disagree with the intent of what my colleagues want to do. I want to defund this bill, but I also want to do it in a way that kills it. There is not a legislative method that we have that is capable of defunding it short of 67 votes in the Senate, short of two-thirds votes in the U.S. House.

Now, can we put some riders on it to say you will not implement a certain section of it? Yes, as long as it is associated with discretionary spending. So what I would ask is that my colleagues look at what the Congressional Research Service has said and what the

approach will be based on their analysis of a plan.

I believe the vast majority of Americans want us to get rid of this bill, this law. They want it reversed. There is a dissonance between what Americans want and what Congress is willing to give them, much as my colleague said. It is different. But to claim the fact—and I will be with them on not voting for a CR. However, it will not necessarily be for the same right reasons. There are good reasons. I think that is a terrible way to fund the government, but the fact is, there are a lot of ways that we can delay this bill and accomplish what we need to accomplish.

I don't think we can do the other. I don't believe we can accomplish that. So my colleagues will remember, it was actually 1996 when we had the government shutdown. Everybody was all for it until they were not. I voted against reopening the government. Had we held, much like our colleagues want us to hold today, we would not be \$17 trillion in debt. We would not have a budget deficit of \$800 billion this year. We would not be borrowing \$34,000 a second—a second—in this government.

But I also know human nature. The very people who say they will do things today, when it gets tough, do not do it. So I praise my colleagues for what they are trying to do. They are right in wanting to try to kill the Affordable Care Act: the costs, the lack of effectiveness, the long-term diminution of the doctor-patient relationship, government involved in every aspect of your health care.

To have a litmus test of, if I do not agree with the process then I do not really want to defund the Affordable Care Act, that is not a claim that settles very well with me, especially spending the last 4 years trying to fight this bill. I would say that the administration is lawless in its implementation of this bill, the fact that they are going to pick and choose—regardless of what the law says, they are going to pick and choose what they will implement and what they will not.

I think it is unacceptable. I think it is unfair to the average American. It is certainly unfair to the middle class. It is certainly unfair to those people who are trying to get a job today and cannot get full-time employment. We had 334,000 part-time jobs created last year. At this time in the economy, we should be creating 800,000 full-time jobs a year.

They are correct in terms of what it is doing to job creation. They are correct in terms of the negatives that it is having on our economy. They are correct about every part of this except whether it will actually solve the problem. In contrast to that is what it is that we have done that we can talk about with the American people that has been positive? We have actually shrunk the size of the Federal Govern-

ment. For the first time since 1995, the discredited spending of the Federal Government is going to decline—for the first time.

We ought to use the continuing resolution, in my mind, to accentuate that one positive thing, which is that the reach and impact of the Federal Government in everybody's lives should be downgraded, as well as with the Affordable Care Act.

There is no one perfect way to do this. There will be disagreements, but the fact is we have accomplished some great things with the Budget Control Act and with the sequester. What we need to do is improve on that.

When I first came to the Senate, the average individual's debt was \$23,000. It is at \$54,000 today. Every man, woman, and child in this country, if you are born today, by the time you are 20 years of age—if you count unfunded liabilities—you will be responsible for in excess of \$1 million of debt and unfunded liabilities.

Let me say that again. If you are born today, by the time you become a majority citizen, you will be responsible for debt and unfunded liabilities in excess of \$1 million. The Affordable Care Act adds to that, but it doesn't add much compared to everything else we have done.

We need to rein in this President. I agree. We need to rein in spending. We need to rein in the Affordable Care Act. If we could end it, I would be for ending it tomorrow. What we need to do is delay it to where we can get to the point where we can kill it. It does need to be terminated.

There are positive things we need to be doing. There is no question that we ought to make available, without discrimination, health care for people who have preexisting illnesses. Those are positive things. We can do that. There are ways to do it other than the inefficient, ineffective way this bill does it. They weren't even ever considered for a vote when we had this. There wasn't any real debate on alternatives because we weren't allowed to offer them in the Senate.

My time has expired. I commend to my colleagues the CRS, Congressional Research Study, "Potential Effects of a Government Shutdown on Implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA)."

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Kent Yoshiho Hirozawa, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. VITTER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA) would have voted “nay.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 190 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Hirono	Pryor
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reid
Boxer	King	Rockefeller
Brown	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cantwell	Landrieu	Schatz
Cardin	Leahy	Schumer
Carper	Levin	Shaheen
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (CO)
Durbin	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Merkley	Warner
Franken	Mikulski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—44

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Coburn	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Chiesa	Heitkamp
--------	----------

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF NANCY JEAN SCHIFFER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

NOMINATION OF MARK GASTON PEARCE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

NOMINATION OF HARRY I. JOHNSON III, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

NOMINATION OF PHILIP ANDREW MISCIMARRA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to consider the following nominations en bloc, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Nancy Jean Schiffer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry I. Johnson III, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Philip Andrew Miscimarra, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Nancy Jean Schiffer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Joe Manchin III, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Angus S. King, Jr., Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Amy Klobuchar, Richard Blumenthal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By unanimous consent the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Nancy Jean Schiffer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 191 Ex.]

YEAS—65

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Ayotte	Graham	Murphy
Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Blunt	Kaine	Rockefeller
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Kirk	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Corker	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Flake	Merkley	Wyden
Franken	Mikulski	

NAYS—33

Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Cornyn	Johanns	Shelby
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Vitter

NOT VOTING—2

Chiesa	Heitkamp
--------	----------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 65, the nays are 33. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have three 10-minute votes. We have a 5-minute penalty time, and we need to start wrapping up these votes. The first vote took 30 minutes, so let's try to stick to what we said we would do. There are Senators who wait around here, so it is not fair to them. As soon as we get enough votes, we will move on. We are moving on whether everyone is here or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time

is yielded back and the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Nancy Jean Schiffer, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA) would have voted "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 192 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Hirono	Pryor
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reid
Boxer	King	Rockefeller
Brown	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cantwell	Landrieu	Schatz
Cardin	Leahy	Schumer
Carper	Levin	Shaheen
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (CO)
Durbin	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Merkley	Warner
Franken	Mikulski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—44

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Coburn	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Chiesa Heitkamp

The nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, and pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Joe Manchin III, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Angus S. King, Jr., Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Amy Klobuchar, Richard Blumenthal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Pearce nomination.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call is waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring August 27, 2018, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 69, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 193 Ex.]

YEAS—69

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Hagan	Nelson
Baucus	Harkin	Portman
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Isakson	Reid
Blunt	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Kirk	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Chambliss	Levin	Thune
Collins	Manchin	Toomey
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Corker	McCain	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Flake	Mikulski	Wicker
Franken	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—29

Barrasso	Cruz	Johanns
Boozman	Enzi	Johnson (WI)
Burr	Fischer	Lee
Coats	Grassley	McConnell
Coburn	Hatch	Moran
Cochran	Heller	Paul
Cornyn	Hoeven	Risch
Crapo	Inhofe	

Roberts	Scott	Shelby
Rubio	Sessions	Vitter

NOT VOTING—2

Chiesa Heitkamp

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 69, the nays are 29. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is yielded back and the question occurs on the Pearce nomination.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA) would have voted "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 194 Ex.]

YEAS—59

Alexander	Hagan	Murphy
Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Hirono	Portman
Bennet	Isakson	Pryor
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Landrieu	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Chambliss	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Udall (CO)
Coons	McCain	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murkowski	

NAYS—38

Ayotte	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Coats	Heller	Scott
Coburn	Hoeven	Sessions
Cochran	Inhofe	Shelby
Corker	Johanns	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Kirk	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—3

Chiesa Heitkamp Reid

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON NOMINATION OF HARRY I. JOHNSON III

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Harry I. Johnson III, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON NOMINATION OF PHILIP ANDREW MISCIMARRA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Philip Andrew Miscimarra, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Washington.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014—Resumed

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the title of the bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1243) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Murray (for Cardin) modified amendment No. 1760, to require the Secretary of Transportation to submit to Congress a report relating to the condition of lane miles and highway bridge deck.

Coburn amendment No. 1750, to prohibit funds from being directed to Federal employees with unpaid Federal tax liability.

Coburn amendment No. 1751, to prohibit Federal funding of union activities by Federal employees.

Coburn amendment No. 1754, to prohibit Federal funds from being used to meet the matching requirements of other Federal programs.

Murphy amendment No. 1783, to require the Secretary of Transportation to assess the impact on domestic employment of a waiver of the Buy America requirement for Federal-aid highway projects prior to issuing the waiver.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent the following amendments be made in order and the Senate proceed to their consideration en bloc: Flake amendment No. 1818, Flake amendment

No. 1772, McCaskill-Blunt amendment No. 1800, Blumenthal amendment No. 1809, Menendez amendment No. 1812, and Cochran amendment No. 1814.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, it is with great regret that on behalf of Senator COBURN, I am objecting.

I wish to point out that we have worked very hard to clear this list of amendments, and they include amendments from Members on both sides of the aisle. It is a fair list, and I had hoped we would be able to proceed tonight.

Regrettably, there is an objection on our side from Senator COBURN.

I am, however, optimistic that with further work we will be able to deal with that objection. My hope is that in the morning we will have an agreement that will allow me to agree, as the manager on our side, to this list. Unfortunately, at this time, I do need to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, S. 1243 is now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion which is at the desk. With the Chair's permission, I ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1243, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Patty Murray, Barbara A. Mikulski, Jon Tester, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Dianne Feinstein, Tim Johnson, Tom Udall, Mark Begich, Christopher Murphy, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Bill Nelson, Christopher A. Coons, Amy Klobuchar, Mazie Hirono, Richard Blumenthal.

Mr. REID. Madam President, before I go further, I want the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Maine to hear what I am saying; that

is, I wish to process amendments. We are going to do one in the morning, which has held up things for some time.

There are other amendments pending. We are going to be voting on those. I have no problem with that. This is a piece of legislation we should pass.

I heard the ranking member speak on the floor yesterday, but I was so impressed because she said what is true. This is what we are, legislators. When we pass this, everyone knows what the number is if we pass it.

We go to conference. What happens in conference? The numbers change. This is the way things should happen around here.

I would hope we don't have these lines drawn in the sand and we can start being appropriators again. When I came here many years ago, I was so fortunate, only two freshmen were on the Appropriations Committee. I was on it and also Senator MIKULSKI.

I loved that committee all these years. It was so much fun.

It hasn't been much fun lately because we haven't had an Appropriations Committee that has been functioning decently. Senator MIKULSKI and Senator SHELBY are legislators. They wish to do legislation as the two managers of this bill do. I would hope we could move forward.

I have no problem with the Coburn amendments and Paul amendment. Let's vote on them and move on.

The time has come when we have to try to get it passed. The week is coming to a close. We have other nominations. We have to move to things when we get back. We know all the problems we have when we get back. I wish to do some more work on appropriations bills when we get back.

I ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion be withdrawn and that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, notwithstanding rule XXII, in consultation with Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 220; that there be 2 hours for debate equally divided between the proponents and opponents; that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote, with no intervening action or debate on the nomination; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that

President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

ENDING BULK COLLECTION OF PHONE RECORDS

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I welcome this opportunity to speak on the floor about the National Security Agency surveillance programs, their effectiveness, and their future.

I am proud to be joined by my colleague from Oregon, Senator WYDEN, who will comment as well after my remarks. He has been a stalwart leader on these issues, and it has been my honor to join forces with him and to draw attention to this very important discussion President Obama recently welcomed.

He called for a public debate on finding the right balance between national security and privacy in the context of NSA's surveillance programs.

His call is long overdue, and it is an opportunity we should not squander. As I have said time and time again to Coloradans and as they have said back to me as well, we owe it to the American people to have an open, transparent debate about the limits of the Federal Government's surveillance powers and how we reconcile the need to keep our families safe while still respecting our hard-won constitutional rights to privacy.

Although I would have preferred that this debate would have been kicked off by more transparent actions by the White House instead of by unauthorized leaks, we are nonetheless presented with a unique opportunity—an opportunity to finally have an open dialog about the limits of our government's surveillance powers, particularly those relating to the vast dragnet of Americans' phone records under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

This is a debate in which I feel privileged to take part. It is a debate that Senator WYDEN has been a part of since before I was elected to the Congress and one that I have been engaged in for a number of years now.

I want to be clear. I have acted in every possible way that I could within the confines of our rules that protect classified information to oppose these practices and bring them to light for

the American people. I have fought against overly intrusive sections of the PATRIOT Act and the FISA Amendments Act and registered objections repeatedly with the administration. I believe these efforts are critical for protecting our privacy and also ensuring our national security.

I serve on both the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Intelligence Committee, and in those assignments I focus every day on keeping Americans safe, at home and abroad. I recognize that we still live in a world where terrorism is a serious threat to our country, to our economy, and to American lives. Make no mistake, our government needs the appropriate surveillance and antiterrorism tools to combat the serious threats to our Nation. But it is up to the White House and Congress to ensure that these tools strike the right balance between keeping us safe and protecting our constitutional right to privacy. This is a balance I know we can achieve, but, in my view, the PATRIOT Act's bulk phone records collection program does not achieve that balance. That is why I am here on the Senate floor with my colleague Senator WYDEN to call for an end to the bulk phone records collection program, as we know it today.

Two years ago we were here on the Senate floor considering extending certain PATRIOT Act provisions. At that time I argued that the sweeping surveillance powers we were debating did not contain sufficient safeguards to preserve the privacy rights of Americans. In particular, I argued that the PATRIOT Act's business records provision—or section 215—permits the collection of records on law-abiding Americans who have no connection to terrorism or espionage. As I said at that time, we ought to be able to at least agree that an investigation under PATRIOT Act powers should have a terrorist- or espionage-related focus.

We all agree that the intelligence community needs effective tools to combat terrorism, but we must provide those tools in a way that also protects the constitutional freedoms of our people and that lives up to the standard of transparency our democracy demands. The Bill of Rights is the strongest document we have. Another way to put it: It is the biggest, baddest weapon we have. We need to stand with the Bill of Rights and in this case the Fourth Amendment.

Following Mr. Snowden's actions and the subsequent declassification of information concerning the NSA's surveillance programs, Americans in recent weeks are coming to understand what it means when section 215 of the PATRIOT Act says the government can obtain "any tangible thing" relevant to a national security investigation. That is the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court's way of saying that section 215 permits the collection of

millions of Americans' phone records on a daily, ongoing basis. As a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I have repeatedly expressed concern that the FISA Court's secret interpretation of this provision of the PATRIOT Act is at odds with the plain meaning of the law. This secrecy has prevented Americans from understanding how this law is being implemented in their name.

In my view and the view of many Americans, this large-scale collection of information by the government has very significant privacy implications for all of us. What do I mean by that? Information about our phone calls—or, as it is known, "metadata"—may sound pretty simple and innocuous, but I believe that when law-abiding Americans call up their friends, family, doctors, religious leaders, or anyone else, the information on whom they call, when they call, and where they call is private information and should be subject to strong privacy protections.

I have heard it said that the bulk phone records program collects nothing beyond what you could find in a phone book. But let's be clear about exactly what this program does. It collects the very personal details of our phone calls—the who, where, when, and how long—and stores them in a database. This doesn't just happen for those who are suspected of having some connection to terrorism; this program collects the phone records of literally millions of Americans. This is a far greater intrusion into our privacy than being voluntarily listed in the Yellow Pages, and it is the reason why I am calling on the White House and Congress to immediately reform this program.

Let me reiterate that it is absolutely possible to have both privacy and security. Yet, in the case of the bulk phone records collection program, Senator WYDEN and I believe we aren't getting enough of either. Not only does this program unreasonably intrude on Americans' privacy, but it also does so without achieving the alleged security gains. For instance, in recent weeks the intelligence community has made new assertions about the value of recently declassified NSA surveillance programs, but in doing so they have conflated two programs: section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act regarding foreigners' Internet communications and section 215 of the PATRIOT Act regarding bulk phone records. It appears, however, that the bulk phone records collection program alone played little or no role in disrupting terrorist plots—I say this as someone who has been fully briefed on these terror-related events—nor has it been demonstrated that this program even provides any uniquely valuable intelligence. Therefore, saying, as the intelligence community has, that "these programs" together have disrupted "dozens of potential terrorist plots" is misleading.

While the intelligence community has been conflating these two programs, some of my colleagues in Congress in recent days have been going even further to say that the phone records program alone has been greatly successful. They have said it has saved lives and prevented dozens of terrorist plots. As someone who has been presented with the same information as my colleagues on the much-discussed 54 terror-related events, I have to say I disagree. Again, I have seen no evidence that the bulk phone records collection program alone has played a meaningful role, if any, in disrupting terrorist plots.

I have yet to see any convincing reason why agencies investigating terrorism cannot simply obtain information directly from phone companies using a regular court order. It may be more convenient for the NSA to collect phone records in bulk rather than asking phone companies to search for specific phone numbers, but convenience alone cannot justify the collection of the personal information of millions of innocent, ordinary, law-abiding Americans, especially when the same or more information can be obtained using less intrusive methods. A few hundred court orders per year would clearly not overwhelm the FISA Court, and the law already allows for emergency authorizations to get these records quickly in urgent circumstances.

Senator WYDEN and I are not alone in believing there is a more effective and less intrusive way to collect this information. Even before the nature of the bulk phone records collection program was declassified, there was support for narrowing the language of section 215 from many Members of Congress of both political parties. In fact, when the PATRIOT Act reauthorization passed the Senate in 2005 by unanimous consent, it included commonsense language that would have limited the government's ability to collect Americans' personal information unless there is a demonstrated link to terrorism or espionage. That language was designed to, among other things, protect our Fourth Amendment constitutional rights and put a check on government power. While that language did not make it into the final conference bill, it demonstrated that bipartisan agreement on reforms to section 215 is possible.

Let's fast forward to 2011, when the Senate again took up the extension of a number of expiring provisions of the PATRIOT Act. I offered an amendment drawn directly from language in the 2005 Senate-passed bill to narrow the application of this provision. That amendment, unfortunately, did not receive a vote. But this Congress I introduced bipartisan legislation with Senator WYDEN based on that same language and principles, and we are now joined by a strong bipartisan group of

our colleagues from across the country and all along the political spectrum, including Senators DURBIN, MURKOWSKI, BEGICH, TOM UDALL, MERKLEY, LEE, and HEINRICH. Our bill will responsibly narrow the PATRIOT Act's section 215 collection authority to make it less intrusive on the privacy of law-abiding Americans. Our legislation would still allow law enforcement and intelligence agencies to use the PATRIOT Act to obtain a wide range of records in the course of terrorism- and espionage-related investigations, but it would require them to demonstrate that the records are in some way connected to terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities—which is not the case today.

This past week there was a strong bipartisan vote in the U.S. House of Representatives to curtail NSA's bulk phone records collection. Although the legislation didn't pass, the American people are demanding action and those who share our concerns are on the march. It is time to take action.

It is common sense that our law enforcement agencies should have reason to suspect a connection between the records they are seeking and a terrorism or espionage investigation before using these broad authorities to collect the private information of Americans. If the government can use these powers to collect information on people who have no connection to terrorism, then where does it end? Is there no amount of information that our government can collect that would be off limits? What is next—our medical records?

We must be able to put in place reasonable measures that allow our law enforcement agencies to pursue enemies who would try to harm us, while protecting our rights as Americans.

That is why I believe if an investigation cannot assert some nexus to terrorism or espionage, then the Government should keep its hands off the phone records of law-abiding Americans. These are the kinds of reasonable, commonsense limits on the Government's powers that Coloradoans tell me are necessary to keep us safe while also respecting our privacy.

That takes me back to the statement I made at the outset. I believe it is time to end the bulk collection program as we know it. Tonight I am calling on the White House to begin to make the administrative changes to end the bulk collection of Americans' phone records and to conduct the program instead through direct queries to phone companies where there is a connection to terrorism or espionage. Under this targeted approach, our Government would retain its broad authorities to investigate terrorism while ordinary Americans will be protected from overly intrusive surveillance activities.

Congress should support the administration's move in this direction by

passing our legislation to end bulk collection. Passage of our bipartisan bill would prevent unwarranted future breaches of Americans' privacy rights and focus on the real threats to our national security.

Taking into account the serious privacy concerns raised by the bulk collection program, the lack of demonstrated unique value of the program, and our ability through direct queries to the phone companies to collect the data in the same but less intrusive way, I believe the administration—I hope the administration will see the value in working with Congress to end the bulk collection of phone records conducted under the PATRIOT Act's section 215 authorities. I pledge to work with the administration and all of my colleagues to see this through.

Let me end on this note. We need to strike a better balance between protecting our country against the threat of terrorism and defending our constitutional rights. The bulk records collection program as we know it today does not meet this balance test, and that is why I believe it must end.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, before he leaves the floor, I want to tell Senator UDALL how much I have appreciated having him in that intelligence room, because he has been a strong advocate for making sure our country can have security and liberty in those classified meetings, just as he has done tonight. It is great to have him on the committee and to have him as a partner in these efforts.

He is so right when he stated tonight that this is a debate that should have begun long ago. It is a debate that should have been started by elected officials and not by a government contractor. I very much appreciate the Senator's remarks. I think he made it clear that we are going to stay at this until we get it fixed, and I very much appreciate his leadership.

As Senator UDALL has made clear, these issues are about as important as it gets. When you are talking about how you can secure these bedrock American values—security and liberty—this is right at the heart of what Americans care about most. For too long, my view is the American people have essentially been presented with false choices. Americans have been told they can have one or the other: They can have security or they can have liberty, but they cannot have both. Suffice it to say, in the last 8 weeks, as this debate has evolved, I think Americans have come to understand that this set of false choices is not what this debate is all about, and they deserve better.

As this debate has unfolded, whether you are in a lunchroom at work or a senior citizens center or you are looking at a political opinion poll, the polls

have changed something like 20 points just in the last few weeks, with Americans saying, particularly, that the bulk phone records collection program is an intrusion on the rights of law-abiding Americans. Whether it is what citizens say at townhall meetings or what they say in the company lunchroom or in senior citizens centers, Americans have come to understand that these false choices are not what the discussion is all about. Americans have come to figure it out.

Frankly, a big part of the problem in the past—and I documented it last week—is leaders in the intelligence community have made misleading statements, repeatedly. It is not just a question of keeping the American people in the dark—which was true—but the American people were actively misled on a number of occasions.

Senator UDALL and I have been walking everyone through that. The bulk phone records collection program is often compared to a grand jury subpoena approach. That is about as far-fetched as it gets. Even national security lawyers have made fun of that kind of argument in publications such as the *Wall Street Journal*.

Very often when I talk to lawyers—the distinguished Presiding Officer is, of course, a particularly illustrious lawyer and has taught in the field. I often say when I am visiting with lawyers, or I ask for a show of hands: Does anybody know of a grand jury subpoena where you can have the bulk collection of millions of phone records of law-abiding Americans? Come on up to me and tell me after the meeting is over.

I do not exactly get swarmed. The reason is there are not any.

One of the reasons I wanted to touch on these misleading statements is that, just in the last few days—Senator UDALL touched on this—there has been an effort to commingle the two programs. One of them is called the FISA 702 Program, the PRISM Program, which targets foreigners and has useful value. We have made that clear. It can be improved. I came to that conclusion when I was finally able to get declassified a finding from the FISA Court that on at least one occasion the Fourth Amendment had been violated in connection with the use of the 702 Program. But even with that, I am of the view that provides useful value.

But what a number of the leaders of the intelligence community have done is essentially commingled their advocacy of these programs so that 702 and the bulk collection program essentially ride together, when in reality, 702—which Senator UDALL and I have supported—I think we can improve it with these privacy reforms—in effect, 702 does all the work. The bulk collection program, which does intrude on the rights of millions of law-abiding Americans, is essentially along for the ride.

But you would not know that when you hear these statements from a number of the leaders in the intelligence community, when they just say “these programs,” of course, are what keeps us safe.

In addition, I thought it was important to briefly start this evening by mentioning that over the last few days there have been a number of comments about whether the PATRIOT Act has violated the rights of Americans with respect to this bulk collection program. A number of commentators and others have said: “Where are the violations? I haven’t seen any violations.”

The Director of National Intelligence said last Friday, in a letter to you and me and Senator UDALL and 23 other of our colleagues: Yes, there have been violations of the PATRIOT Act—when he said specifically that the Government had violated court orders on the bulk collection of those phone records.

I am not allowed to discuss the classified nature of that, but I want to make sure those who are following this debate know that from my vantage point, reading those documents that are classified, these violations are more serious than have been stated by the intelligence community, and in my view that is very troubling. So I do hope Senators will go to the Intelligence Committee and ask to see those classified documents because I think when they read them—I think they will come to the conclusion to which I have come that, not only is what was stated by the Director of National Intelligence in that letter that was sent to you and me and Senator UDALL and 23 other Senators—not only was that correct, but I think Senators who read those classified documents will also come to the conclusion that the violations are more serious than they thought—than the intelligence community portrayed.

Let me, if I might, talk a little bit more about why we spent several years examining this bulk phone records program. First, I think it is important for citizens to know that the ability to conduct this secret surveillance that lays bare the personal lives of millions of law-abiding Americans, coupled with the ability to conjure up these legal theories as to why this is acceptable, and then have such limited oversight through this one-sided adversarial FISA Court, in my view, is an opportunity for unprecedented control over the private lives of Americans. That is why Senator UDALL and I have spent all this time focused on this issue.

I thought also tonight, and having done this before, I will provide a little more history as to how we got to this particular place. When I came to the Senate early on I had a chance to work with a number of colleagues who saw the extent of these problems—early on. One of them was our former colleague, Senator Russ Feingold.

Senator Feingold saw the problems that the PATRIOT Act posed before they were apparent to many Senators. He and his staff took the responsibility to protect both American security and American liberties very seriously. In 2007, the two of us came to understand that the PATRIOT Act was being secretly interpreted to justify the bulk collection of Americans’ records, and we made it clear that we thought, first of all, that was something very different from what Americans thought was going on.

We thought it was very different, for example, from the plain reading of section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, and we thought that the language of the PATRIOT Act had been stretched beyond recognition because the language in the PATRIOT Act spoke to relevance and a sense that it was relevant to suspected terror activity, rather than something that created this enormous leap from what was in the statute that called for relevance to collecting millions and millions of records on law-abiding people.

So Senator Feingold and I dutifully set about to write classified letters to senior officials urging them to make their official interpretation of the PATRIOT Act public. We said at the time that for intelligence activities to be sustainable and effective, they have to be based on publicly understood laws and be consistent with Americans’ understanding of their own privacy rights. This, in our view, was clearly not the case with the bulk records collection because, of course, the government’s official interpretation of the PATRIOT Act was a tightly guarded secret.

Back then in those early days we were rebuffed when we made repeated requests that the intelligence community inform the public what the government had secretly decided the law actually meant. In fact, there was a secret court opinion that authorized massive dragnet domestic surveillance, and the American people, by that point, were essentially in the dark about what their government was doing with respect to interpreting an important law.

In 2009, as the expiration of the date for the PATRIOT Act approached, Senator Feingold and I began to caution our colleagues and the public that our people were not getting the full story about the PATRIOT Act. At that time, we’d had the good fortune of having our colleague, Senator DURBIN, on the committee, and we all wrote public letters. We authored various articles. We wrote editorial pages for the newspapers and made statements for the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*. We raised issues about this to the extent we could at public hearings. But, of course, the Senate rules regarding the protection of classified information limited what we could say.

One point I have tried to make clear is the intelligence rules—the classification rules don't let a member of the committee tap the truth out in Morse Code. We have to comply with the rules, and they are very laborious. If we don't comply with the rules, we cannot serve on the Intelligence Committee and be a watchdog for some of these efforts that we think goes right to the heart of protecting American security and American liberty.

So we decided—a small group of us who shared these views—if we wanted to have the opportunity to play that watchdog rule, we needed to work within the rules. So we did everything we could—recognizing that we can't tap out classified information in Morse Code—to alert the public about what was going on.

After a series of short-term extensions, the PATRIOT Act came up for a long-term reauthorization in the spring of 2011. By that time, Senator Feingold had been replaced on the committee by Senator UDALL. He, as my colleagues know, shares these concerns about the bulk collection of phone records on millions of law-abiding Americans, and we are lucky he has been a prominent leader in the cause of protecting, security, and liberty.

During the 2011 reauthorization, Senator UDALL and I spoke to colleagues. We invited colleagues to secure settings so we could lay out what was actually happening, and many of those colleagues joined us on the floor to oppose the extension of the PATRIOT Act for 4 more years.

During that debate, I came to the floor and said:

When the American people find out how their government has secretly interpreted the PATRIOT Act, they will be stunned and they will be angry.

That week the Senate voted to extend the PATRIOT Act until 2015, but those of us who opposed the extension continued the fight in the months that followed.

At that time the NSA was also conducting a bulk e-mail records program in addition to the bulk phone records program that is ongoing today. Senator UDALL and I were concerned about this program's impact on our liberties and our privacy rights, and back in the Intelligence Committee, we spent a big chunk of 2011 pressing intelligence officials to provide evidence of its effectiveness. It turned out that the intelligence community was unable to provide any such evidence. Intelligence agencies have made statements to both Congress and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court that—they had significantly exaggerated the effectiveness of the bulk e-mail program. When Senator UDALL and I pressed them to back up these statements, they couldn't do it. The bulk e-mail records program was shut down that year.

Our experience with the bulk e-mail records program showed us that the In-

telligence Agency's assessments about the usefulness of a number of these particular programs, even big ones, are not always accurate. Now, that doesn't mean that intelligence officials were deliberately lying. In a number of instances—as far as I could tell—they believed their claims that the bulk e-mail surveillance program was effective, even though it was actually close to worthless. This was an important reminder that even if intelligence officials are well intentioned, they can be dead wrong, and that any policymaker who simply defers to intelligence officials' conclusions without asking to see their evidence is making a mistake.

As we looked at that evidence, Senator UDALL and I found that the claims about the effectiveness of the bulk phone records program also did not seem well supported by the facts. So in March of 2012, we wrote to the Attorney General expressly with this concern. In our letter we said:

In recent months we have grown increasingly skeptical about the actual value of [this] "intelligence collection operation."

And we added:

This has come as a surprise to us, as we were initially inclined to take the executive branch's assertions about the importance of this "operation" at face value.

The Department of Justice, unfortunately, decided not to respond to our letter, but we continued our efforts to educate the public and to call out senior officials from intelligence agencies and the Department of Justice as they repeatedly made misleading statements about domestic surveillance.

In June of this year, disclosures by the Washington Post and the Guardian newspaper revealed the fact of bulk collection to the American people. This sparked the debate that is now ongoing about whether offering up the personal records of ordinary Americans is the best way to protect our security and our liberty. This debate—as I indicated when Senator UDALL was on the floor—should have started a long time ago, but I am sure glad it is finally happening now.

The fact is that Americans' phone records can reveal a lot of private information. If you know, for example, that somebody called a psychiatrist three times in a week and twice after midnight, you know a lot about that person. If you are vacuuming up information on whom Americans call, when they call, and how long they talked, you are collecting an astounding amount of information about a huge number of law-abiding Americans.

The intelligence agencies try to emphasize that they have rules about who can look at these bulk phone records and when. There has been a lot said on cable by the talking heads on TV, and I want to emphasize, none of these rules require the NSA to go back to a court to look at Americans' phone records. None of these rules erase the

privacy impact of scooping up all of these records in the first place. On top of that, as I indicated in the beginning, there have been a number of serious violations of those rules.

The Senators who got the letter last Friday know that, and I want to tell all the other Senators on both sides of the aisle that the violations—as I have touched on tonight—were a lot more serious than the public has been told. I believe the American people deserve to know more details about these violations that were described last Friday by Director Clapper.

I am going to keep pressing to make more of these details public. It is my view that the information about the details of the violations of the court orders with respect to the bulk phone record collection program—the admission that the court orders have been violated—has not been, I think, fully fleshed out by the intelligence community. I think a considerable amount of additional information can be offered without in any way compromising our national security.

If the impact on America's liberties wasn't bad enough, it is made even worse by the fact that this program—when we asked and asked—does not seem to have any unique value. I will explain briefly what it means.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 7 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will see if I can beat the clock because I know colleagues are waiting. In fact, Senator BALDWIN has been a great advocate for liberties and showing that liberty and security are compatible, both when she was a Member of the other body and here when she was part of our group, and I thank her for it.

Intelligence officials can only point to two cases where this program—the bulk phone records collection program—actually provided useful information about an individual involved in terrorist activity. In both of these cases, the government had all the information it needed to go to the phone company and get an individual court order and emergency authorization for the phone records they needed.

In both of these cases, the individuals who were identified using these phone records were arrested months or years after they were first identified, but if government agents believed that the situation was urgent, they could have used emergency authorizations to obtain their phone records more quickly. I am glad both of these cases resolved the way they did. I am proud that our intelligence agencies and law enforcement individuals were able to identify and arrest those who were involved in terrorist acts.

In one case four men in California were arrested for sending money to a

militant group in Somalia. In the other case they arrested a co-conspirator of Mr. Zazi a few months after Zazi's plot was disrupted. These men committed serious crimes. They are now being punished with the full weight of the justice system.

What I don't see, however, is any evidence that the U.S. Government needed to operate a giant domestic phone records surveillance program in order to catch these individuals. I have seen no evidence—none—that this dragnet phone records program has provided any actual unique value for the American people. In every instance in which the NSA has searched through these bulk phone records, it had enough evidence to get a court order for the information it was searching for.

Getting a few hundred additional court orders every year would clearly not overwhelm the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. The intelligence agencies may argue that collecting Americans' phone records in bulk is more convenient than getting individual court orders, but convenience alone does not justify the massive intrusion on the privacy of ordinary Americans. I believe it is vitally important to protect the safety and liberty of our people. I don't see any evidence that this program helps protect either. That ought to be the standard of any domestic surveillance program. If the bulk collection program doesn't protect privacy or security, then it ought to end—plain and simple.

The executive branch simply has not shown anything close to an adequate justification for this massive dragnet surveillance that has compromised the civil liberties of millions of Americans. I am not sure they ever could, but I am confident that I have not seen it as yet.

Now, let me close by way of saying that over the last few weeks we have seen extraordinary support for reform. Last week over 200 Members of the other body voted to end the bulk phone records collection program, and a number of the Members who voted against ending it at that time made it clear they have serious concerns they want to address. So there are going to be more votes. Make no mistake about it, there are going to be more votes on whether to end the bulk collection of phone records on law-abiding Americans in the 113th Congress. And there are going to be efforts to reform how the entire U.S. surveillance system works.

One of the most important reforms will be to make the significant rulings of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court public, which is a goal I have been pursuing for several years.

Additionally, I believe Congress needs to reform the process for arguing cases before the court. Right now the government lawyers walk in with an argument for why the government should be allowed to do something, and

there is no one to argue the other side. That is not unusual if the court is considering a routine warrant request, but it is very unusual when a court is doing major legal or constitutional analysis.

I believe Congress needs to create a way to advocate for the public—a public advocate to argue cases before the court, because making this court more transparent and more adversarial is a way to ensure that Americans can have security and liberty. Of course, the relevant provisions of the PATRIOT Act itself will be expiring in 2015. I don't think there is any reason for the administration to wait for Congress to act.

The executive branch can take action right now. They can and should continue to obtain the records of anyone suspected of connections to terror or other nefarious activity, and at the same time they can restore protections for Americans' Fourth Amendment rights. I am very interested in working with the administration on these issues, but they can move of their own volition.

One way or another, we are going to stay at this until, at this unique time in our constitutional history, we have revised our surveillance laws so we can have security and liberty. Colleagues are coming to this cause. Senator BLUMENTHAL has particularly recommended a number of constructive FISA Court changes over the last few months. I hope colleagues will support that, and I hope they will see this unique time in our history when it is critically important that these surveillance laws that I and Senator UDALL have talked about tonight can be reformed and we do it so as to protect the bedrock of American values, both security and liberty.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and Senator BLUMENTHAL from Connecticut and Senator BALDWIN from Wisconsin and, if he is able to join us, Senator MURPHY from Connecticut be allowed to engage in a colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, my colleagues and I have come to the floor to talk about an issue that is at the heart of the discussion of our national debt and deficit; that is, health care spending.

These days around Washington, there is a regular refrain echoing through the hallways: In order to fix our deficit, we must cut Medicare and Medicaid benefits. That is wrong. That idea is, according to the former CEO of Kaiser Permanente—somebody who knows a little something about health care—and I will quote him:

... so wrong it's almost criminal. It's an inept way of thinking about health care.

I could not agree more.

It was put this way by Froma Harrop, who is a columnist for my hometown paper, the Providence Journal. I will quote her: "The dagger pointed at America's economic viability hasn't been the existence of government programs like Medicare, it's been the relentless rise in health care costs that plagues not only Medicare and Medicaid, but everyone who uses health care."

Attacking Medicare and Medicaid ignores the fact that our health care spending problem is systemwide and not just unique to Federal programs. Our colleague Senator ANGUS KING has used the colorful metaphor that to go after Medicare and Medicaid when the problem is our health care system would be like attacking Brazil after Pearl Harbor—wrong target. It ignores the fact that we operate a widely inefficient health care system: 18 percent of our GDP compared to only 12 percent for our least efficient international competitors.

So how can we continue to stem the rise in costs and improve our wildly inefficient health care system?

Thankfully, many of the tools necessary to drive down costs have an interesting collateral benefit. They actually improve the quality of care for patients. The Affordable Care Act included 45 different provisions dedicated to redesigning how health care is delivered for the benefit of patients and taxpayers. These reforms support and encourage an ongoing delivery system reform movement—and there truly is a movement out there—driven by dedicated providers, payers, employers, and even some States that have worked for years to improve the quality and the safety and the effectiveness of health care.

We are not discussing hypothetical improvements. We are not discussing theoretical cost savings. Today I am joined on the floor by colleagues who have seen how delivery system innovators in their States have achieved real improvements to quality, real improvements in patient outcomes, and real cost savings. In Congress, we can't get over yesterday's quarrels about repealing or defunding ObamaCare, but out there in the real world health care leaders across the country are innovating forward, places such as the Cleveland Clinic in Ohio, Intermountain Healthcare in Utah, Geisinger Health System in Pennsylvania, Gundersen Lutheran in Wisconsin, Palmetto Health in the Carolinas, and in Rhode Island, among other places, our own Coastal Medical.

One Rhode Island practical example: When intensive care unit staff follow a checklist of basic instructions—washing their hands with soap, cleaning a patient's skin with antiseptic, placing

sterile drapes over the patient and so forth—rates of infection plummet, and the costs of treating those infections disappear—no infection, no cost.

These reforms have the triple benefit of protecting Medicare and Medicaid, improving patient outcomes, and dialing back health care spending for all Americans. How big is it? The President's Council of Economic Advisers has estimated that we could save approximately \$700 billion—that is billion with a "b"—\$700 billion every year—every year—in our health care system without compromising health outcomes. The Institute of Medicine took a look at the same question. They put the savings number at \$750 billion.

Other groups are even more optimistic. The New England Health Care Institute has reported that \$850 billion could be saved annually. The Lewin Group and former Bush Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill—who as the CEO of Alcoa is deeply involved in the reform efforts in Pennsylvania that have been very successful and knows a fair amount about this—they estimate an annual savings of a staggering \$1 trillion.

Whatever the exact number is, what is clear is there is huge potential for savings in our health care system while improving or maintaining the quality of care. Since the Federal Government does 40 percent of America's health care spending, when we get that right, taxpayers as well as patients become big winners from these reforms.

I will close with two points: First, many of us are asking the Obama administration to set a hard cost savings target for these delivery system reform efforts. It may be \$750 billion. Pick a number that will be a target to be actually achieved. A target—a measurable goal—will focus and guide and spur the administration's reform efforts in a manner that vague intentions to "bend the health care cost curve" simply cannot.

Second, we need to put the full force of American innovation and ingenuity into achieving that serious cost savings target for our Nation's health care system. It is hard to do that without that target to strive toward.

This is an issue where our Republican colleagues should be able to join us to accelerate these reforms in our health care delivery system and to move forward beyond tired-out calls to repeal ObamaCare so we can deal with the ongoing reality of health care reform.

Let's give American families the health care system they deserve. Instead of waste and inefficiency, poor outcomes and missed opportunities, let's give them a health care system that is the envy of the world.

I yield for my colleague, Senator BALDWIN.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for convening us and for giving us an opportunity to dis-

cuss the important topic of delivery system reform and to highlight some of the innovations that are occurring in our own States.

I heard Senator WHITEHOUSE talking about moving forward. It is actually the motto of the State of Wisconsin. One simple word: "Forward." Throughout our State's history, that motto has well represented our leadership in extending high-quality and affordable health care.

Our health care providers and payers have pioneered forward-looking reforms that improve the quality of care and lower costs for families and for businesses. We are home to world-class, highly integrated health care systems. We make quality and outcomes data widely accessible to providers so they can measure their success against their peers. We stand at the forefront of using and advancing health care information technology. All of this affords some of the highest quality care in the country at a competitive cost.

Congress has a lot to learn from Wisconsin's health care delivery systems. A recent Institute of Medicine report reinforced what we have known for a long time: that geographic variation in health care spending and utilization is real and that variations in health care spending are not consistently related to health care quality. For every State such as Wisconsin with higher quality outcomes and lower costs, there are five other States faring worse. Even within States, the regional variation in health care spending and quality is troublesome.

Unfortunately, instead of advancing and fostering forward-thinking innovations such as those working in Wisconsin, far too many of my fellow lawmakers are looking backward when it comes to health care. In the House of Representatives, the Republican leadership has scheduled votes to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act almost 40 times. Some State governments—including, unfortunately, my own—have refused to move forward with America's new health care law and are undermining its effectiveness at every chance possible. Now some of my colleagues in the Senate are threatening to shut down the government if investments in our health care system are not stripped out of our budget entirely.

Families and businesses in Wisconsin and across the country are tired of these political games. For as long as some of my colleagues and some of the Governors across this country remain glued to the past, waging political fights based on pure ideology, we lose golden opportunities to move health care reforms in our country forward. We should all be focused on building a smarter and more affordable health care system, not trying to tear down the law of the land.

That is why I am so proud to stand on the floor with my colleagues to-

night, committed to moving our Nation's health care system forward. By building on the best reforms to our health care delivery system that are embedded within the Affordable Care Act and making new improvements to how we deliver care in our country, we will lower health care costs, improve quality and strengthen our economic security and reduce the deficit. Better yet, we will have more States with health care systems such as Wisconsin's, and Wisconsin's system will be improved as well.

The possibilities are exciting. I think one of the things Senator WHITEHOUSE just mentioned bears repeating: There is widespread agreement that significant savings can be achieved in our health care system without compromising the quality of care. The figures he cited bear repeating: The Lewin Group and the former Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill have estimated that we could save \$1 trillion per year without affecting health care outcomes by enacting smart, targeted health care delivery reforms. The New England Health Care Institute pegged that number at \$850 billion annually, the Institute of Medicine estimated this number to be \$750 billion, and the President's Council of Economic Advisers foresees savings at \$700 billion a year. No matter the exact figure, these are impressive savings that would strengthen our entire Nation.

The Affordable Care Act has sparked this hard work of transforming health care delivery. The law provides health care practitioners with incentives to better integrate care, increase quality, and lower costs. These efforts are producing impressive results in Wisconsin. For example, the Pioneer Accountable Care Organization Program has offered financial incentives to meet quality and Medicare savings benchmarks. Bellin-ThedaCare Healthcare Partners in northeast Wisconsin has excelled with this program. In its first year of participation, Bellin-ThedaCare earned \$5.3 million in shared savings and lowered costs for its 20,000 Medicare patients by an average of 4.6 percent. While not every pioneer ACO has been as successful, the CMS Office of the Actuary believes this program could save Medicare up to \$1.1 billion over 5 years by simply better coordinating care.

Wisconsin boasts six additional health care providers participating in the law's traditional Accountable Care Organization Program which the Department of Health and Human Services estimates could save up to \$940 million over 4 years. Wisconsin health care providers are also taking part in the Affordable Care Act's Partnership for Patients to improve health care quality. This public-private partnership engages hospitals, businesses, and consumer groups with the goal of preventing injuries and complications in patient care—including hospital-acquired conditions. The administration

estimates that reducing medical errors and preventing conditions will save up to \$35 billion in health care costs.

Another public-private partnership—the Affordable Care Act's Million Hearts Initiative—is preventing heart attack and stroke. Cardiovascular disease costs this country \$440 billion per year in medical costs and lost productivity. The initiative seeks to deliver better preventive care to stop 1 million strokes and heart attacks by the year 2017—in part by utilizing innovative technology. Wisconsin's own Marshfield Clinic designed a winning mobile application for the initiative. The app will encourage patients to get their blood pressure and cholesterol checked and to work with their health care providers to improve their heart health.

Finally, the Affordable Care Act has empowered the CMS Innovation Center to develop new ideas to improve health care quality and lower costs for people enrolled in Medicare, Medicaid, and the Children's Health Insurance Program. A number of the center's projects are currently underway in Wisconsin. For example, the Children's Hospital of Wisconsin, Aurora HealthCare, and the Wheaton Franciscan Healthcare system have created a model to decrease emergency room visits for children. The estimated 3-year savings of that project is almost \$3 million. In addition, the Pharmacy Society of Wisconsin is utilizing a provision in the Affordable Care Act to better integrate pharmacists into clinical care teams. That initiative is set to save over \$20 million in 3 years.

This represents a small sampling of the delivery innovations being promoted through the Affordable Care Act that are saving us money right now. These parts of the law are empowering Wisconsin health care providers to provide higher quality care at reduced costs. Public officials who advocate for repealing the Affordable Care Act would end these impressive initiatives as well. Instead, we must build on these delivery reforms, as so much more can be done.

To name two priorities, Wisconsin cardiologists have developed an innovative integrated network called SMARTCare to deliver better more efficient care for a vulnerable patient population. The Department of Health and Human Services should encourage this coordinated care model by investing in it and measuring its results.

We should improve the law to increase access to Medicare claims data. The Wisconsin Health Information Organization currently holds over 65 percent of health insurance claims data in the State—from private insurers and from Medicaid. The organization shares that data with health care providers so doctors can compare their performance—in terms of quality and cost—against their peers. This data-sharing

promotes competition and it lowers cost. But due to current law, the organization cannot access Medicare data. If we open Medicare claims data, we will further improve quality and we will lower costs.

Lawmakers have a clear choice: Go backward and try for the 40th time to repeal the Affordable Care Act or put progress in our country ahead of politics. We welcome our colleagues to join us in moving our country and our health care delivery system forward.

I now yield for Senator MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank very much Senator BALDWIN and thank the State of Wisconsin for, in a lot of ways, leading the way and showing us what is possible when it comes to delivery system reform.

It is pretty amazing some of those statistics Senator BALDWIN used when she talked about how much waste there is in the system today. The estimates are from the Council of Economic Advisers, \$700 billion; from the New England Healthcare Institute, \$850 billion. To put that in context, even if the median of the two is right—somewhere in the high \$700 billion range—that is \$100 billion more than we spend every year on the military. That is enough money to provide coverage for 150 million more Americans. That is enough to pay the salaries of every single first responder personnel in the country, including firefighters, police officers, and EMTs for over a decade.

It is an enormous amount of money that we are wasting today because we have a reimbursement system, as Senator WHITEHOUSE said as well, that essentially rewards providers and hospitals and health care systems for providing volume rather than providing quality.

We understand there is not a single health care provider in the country that does not get into this if not for their desire to provide quality health care. There is no malevolent motive involved here. But, ultimately, when you have to keep your doors open—as a medical practice, as a hospital, as a nursing home—and you get paid more the more medicine you practice and the more treatments you order and the more tests you have your patients undergo, then you are going to follow the money. It is time we reorient our reimbursement model under Medicare and Medicaid, and in partnership with our private insurers, so we are reimbursing based on the quality of medicine and the quality of the outcomes you provide rather than on how much stuff you order or prescribe.

Let me talk about three examples of how we have succeeded already when it comes to changing the model of reimbursement.

First, the issue of readmission rates. When you go into a hospital for a surgery, that hospital is going to get a set fee for the surgery and for the amount

of time you spend in the hospital afterwards. It is called a bundle payment. Bundle payments are good because what it does is it encourages you to essentially use your resources wisely because you are not going to get paid more if you keep the person in the hospital for 10 days than if you keep the person in the hospital for 5 days.

But here is the problem when it comes to the care people were getting after a particular surgery. Because the hospital got a set payment for that period of time, they had an incentive to push the person out of the hospital as quickly as possible. That was an incentive not only because the payment itself did not get bigger the more amount of time you were in the hospital, but it also was incented that way because if the person went home too early and then they came back again to the hospital, the hospital got a second bundle payment when they came back. And if they came back a third time and a fourth time, they got another payment.

So what was happening is there was an incentive to send people home before they were ready because not only would that save you money on the first bundled payment, but it actually made the hospital or the health system money in the long run because the person came back a second or a third or a fourth time.

I do not think there was a single hospital in the Nation that was deliberately misaligning their care so they would have people coming back to the hospital a second or a third or a fourth time. I am not suggesting people were trying to game the system in that way. But what certainly was happening was that without an incentive that pulls you the other way—get the care right the first time—there was, unfortunately, insufficient care being provided.

So the health care bill says: Listen, we will pay you for maybe the first readmission, maybe for really complicated procedures we will pay you for a second readmission, but at some point there has to be an end to this model. At some point it has to be up to you as the hospital or as the health care provider to get the care right the first or the second time so we are not on the hook for readmissions occurring times three or times four. That is a pretty simple change, but it can save hundreds of millions of dollars.

The second example is accountable care organizations. We set up a bunch of Pioneer accountable care organizations. These are bigger systems of care, where you have primary care doctors networked with specialty care providers, working under one umbrella to coordinate the care of the sickest patients. There are different numbers, but they all tell the same thing, which is that the sickest 5 or 10 percent of patients in the country are taking up

about 50 percent of annual medical expenditures. So if you do a better job of coordinating the care of that small percentage of the medical population, you are going to save a lot of money.

Accountable care organizations can do that. Instead of having siloed care, where a co-morbid patient goes to a primary care doctor over here, then a specialist here, then a specialist there, if they are all under one roof and they are talking to each other, then you can save a lot of money just by coordination. That is the theory. So the health care reform act put that theory into practice. It set up a pilot program by which Pioneer accountable care organizations—essentially, a beginning set of accountable care organizations—would be set up under a model through which Medicare would say: If you save money, we are going to deliver back to you some of those savings so that, in fact, there is not a disincentive to practice less medicine because if you practice less medicine, Medicare will take some of the savings and it will share with you some of the savings.

Well, we have only had a year or so of returns from this model, but the results are pretty stunning. The average increase in costs per beneficiary has been—in the Pioneer ACOs—less than 50 percent of that for non-Pioneer ACO models. That is a pretty significant savings.

In addition, go back to this question of readmissions. In 25 of the 32 Pioneer ACOs, there was a lower risk-adjusted readmission rate than in non-Pioneer ACOs. Coordinated care where you are reimbursing an organization as opposed to just the individual physicians actually saves you a lot of money.

Then third, the issue of outliers. What you find when you look at the data—and it may be that Senator WHITEHOUSE talked about this—is that sometimes 60, 70, 80 percent of the system is practicing good medicine at the right cost, and it is really only a small handful of providers that are way outside of the median and all you have to do, when it comes to some subsets of reimbursement, is bring those outliers back into the median.

Home care was a great example. In the Accountable Care Act, we said that for home care providers that had utilization rates that were far outside the median, we were going to stop reimbursing for those episodes that were far outside the median. CBO was not sure how to score it because they did not really know that was going to change people's practice. But it did. And it is estimated that single change, in controlling for the handful of outliers when it comes to high utilization rates in the home care line item, is going to get us almost \$1 billion in savings over a 10-year period of time.

When you look at home care, actually it is only a handful of areas in which you have these outpaced utiliza-

tion rates compared to the rest of the country. It is places in Texas, it is places in certain counties in Florida. Most of the country is right where you should be. So part of reforming our delivery system is also taking care of these outliers.

We have seen savings, whether it be in controlling readmission rates, setting up accountable care organizations, or taking on outliers within our home care system.

Now it is time to do more because, before I turn it over to my good friend Senator BLUMENTHAL, here is where the rubber hits the road.

In about 10 years, Medicare starts taking in less money than it sends out. It does not go bankrupt all of a sudden, but it starts to become fiscally insolvent. There are only a handful of ways to stop that reality from happening. You can either ask beneficiaries to pay more out of pocket; you can cut their benefits, give them less; you can ask people to pay more into the system while they are working or you can make the system more efficient.

It may be that we have to do a mix of those. But clearly the first three are not that palatable: reducing benefits, increasing copays, or increasing taxes. This is not a partisan issue. Both sides agree that in 10 years we have an accounting problem in Medicare. Both sides agree that we have to make changes today in order to stop that crisis from occurring.

It strikes me that if the most conservative Republican and the most liberal Democratic sat down at a table and looked at those four options—increased copays, reduced benefits, increased taxes, or increased efficiencies—we would all agree. The conservative Republican and the liberal Democrat would agree, along with probably every other Member of this body, that is the first place you should go is to reduce inefficiencies. That is what the delivery system provides. So we have set up a working group here in the Senate which is beginning its work this week, that Senator BALDWIN, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator BLUMENTHAL, I, and others will be building over the course of the late summer and fall. We hope it will draw interest from both sides of the aisle so we can start to put some meat on the bones when it comes to the changes in our delivery system that can be made to increase efficiencies so as to forestall the need to balance the Medicare books on the backs of taxpayers, workers, or beneficiaries.

With that, let me yield the floor to my great friend from Connecticut, someone who both as a Senator and our State's attorney general has been fighting for health care consumers for a long time, Senator BLUMENTHAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague, CHRIS

MURPHY. Senator MURPHY has been a long-time champion on this issue. My colleagues may wonder why two Senators from Connecticut, both of our Senators, are here on the floor and part of this working group seeking to lead on this critically important issue of health care delivery.

The answer is we come from a State where it is working. We have seen the future in Connecticut's health care delivery system. It is still a work in progress, a lot of work still to be done, but Connecticut hospitals and providers and insurers and patients know it has to be our future, that cutting cost is essential to preserving and enhancing quality. Let me emphasize how important that basic principle is, because a lot of our colleagues believe there is a choice here between cutting costs and quality, that quality cannot be enhanced if we cut costs.

In fact, the opposite is true. Cutting the cost of health care is key to enhancing and improving quality. It is the way we will reduce premature discharges from hospitals, that we will diminish the number of discharges from hospitals without proper rehabilitation plans, and cut the number of hospital-acquired infections. It is not only possible to do but it is essential. It is a way we avoid the false choice—and it is a false choice—between preserving Medicare on the one hand and avoiding increasing copays, decreasing benefits, or increasing taxes, as my colleague from Connecticut has said.

I reject every one of those options as necessary to preserving Medicare. Increasing copays, decreasing benefits, or increasing taxes is not the way. In fact, increasing efficiencies and avoiding unnecessary wasteful and indeed harmful costs are necessary to preserve Medicare.

My mother taught me a number of things. She said, No. 1, if you don't have something nice to say about someone, don't say anything. So I am not here to say not-so-nice things about the folks who say we ought to cut Medicare benefits. But I would oppose those kinds of cuts as unnecessary and harmful.

She also said an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. In fact, that basic truth is what will help save our health care system. Prevention of costs, prevention of illness, prevention of obesity and smoking, and other kinds of diseases and conditions that lead to increased health care costs are essential to this effort.

My mother said also listen to your younger brother. My brother, Dr. David Blumenthal, has been a pioneer and an expert in this area. As much as it pains me to acknowledge that my younger brother knows a lot more about this subject than I do, in fact, he has been able to enlighten me and many of our colleagues here on this point. I mention him and the others who are experts and pioneers in this effort. He is

one of many who have advised and provided that kind of enlightenment.

Because there is no more kind of guesswork as to whether advances can be made in this area by cutting costs and raising quality. It has been documented. There are projections. It can be costed out. It can be scored, in my view. It can be the basis for action by my colleagues here in seeking to cut costs that are skyrocketing out of control.

I have seen these reforms at work throughout the State of Connecticut. This issue is of national importance, but it hits hospitals and providers in every one of our States. I have seen it and listened to folks who work at places such as St. Vincent's and Bridgeport Hospital, in Bridgeport; St. Mary's Hospital in Waterbury; Yale-New Haven and Greenwich Hospital, Middlesex Hospital. All around the State of Connecticut, I have seen the checklists at work, the protocols for hand washing, the increased attention to quality care that has helped reduce costs. They have helped improve patient care while reducing cost. They reject this false choice between quality and cost cutting. Both are possible. Both are essential.

We hear so much rhetoric about the Affordable Care Act in Washington. But in Connecticut, we see tangible examples of how it is working and making a difference. The implementation of the Affordable Care Act is a historic opportunity for continuing this work and expanding it nationwide. We need to continue our dedication to health care reform.

My colleagues and I have come to the floor today to call for smart reform that helps patients and avoids harm to them, and does not discourage providers from being a part of a Federal health care program. In fact, we need to identify areas of reforms within the health care system that we can address that will strengthen health care in this country and address the serious concerns about the skyrocketing costs of health care.

We have seen a slowdown in the growth of national health care expenditures over the past year. But slow growth certainly does not mean a decrease in overall expenditures. Smart policy decisions require that we address the ongoing problem of health care spending in this country, and turn a corner for the good by reducing the current costs.

I am concerned that there are short-sighted strategies, such as taking money from the Prevention and Public Health Care Fund established under the ACA, which has been a tactic unfortunately used by both parties in financing programs. That tactic will undermine our long-term efforts at reducing health care spending. The Prevention and Public Health Fund is used in Connecticut for programs such as men-

tal health services and substance abuse prevention, as well as public health research and surveillance.

These measures will ultimately result in lower health care spending through prevention and preventive health care. But we need to stay committed and stay the course. What we need to do now is to continue to work toward developing a sustainable health care system, through structural reforms such as the accountable care organizations, health maintenance organizations, patient-centered medical homes that have provided advances in this area, and have created provider organizations that lead to greater provider acceptance of responsibility for health care outcomes in their patients.

Measuring the success of those organizations requires taking a closer look at whether the savings and outcome improvements actually materialize. We have to be hard-headed and clear-eyed about whether they are working. The metrics must be applied. We need to measure success. Measurements are possible; as I said at the outset, no longer a matter of guesswork. There are scientific-based measurements.

The success of these organizations will have more to do with how they are run than with how they are structured. As sophisticated as many of our health systems are, the development of process goals has only recently become a consideration. The Association of American Medical Colleges recommends, for example, the use of surgery checklists through their best practices program.

Peer-reviewed studies have shown that the use of comprehensive checklists is associated with reductions in complications and mortality during surgery. But they are most successful when health care organizations subscribe to a culture of safety. That culture of safety and prevention is essential.

Some hospitals in Connecticut have been rewarded through the Medicare Program for their commitment to improving quality through the use of process measures: Bridgeport Hospital, St. Mary's Hospital in Waterbury, Middlesex Hospital have all seen increases in reimbursement rates through the Value Based Purchasing Program.

Again, the Federal Government can provide incentives and encourage and support this effort. Manchester Memorial Hospital, Hartford Hospital, and Rockville General Hospital all have avoided Medicare penalties by lowering their readmission rates. While payment differences for these programs represent a small portion of the overall Medicare payment, hospitals should continue to be rewarded for addressing these issues.

I want to conclude by drawing attention to some of the innovative work being done in my State of Connecticut around delivery reform and data collec-

tion. I have mentioned the importance of measurements and metrics. Much of the work is supported by grants that were made available through the Affordable Care Act. But it has been the State itself that has decided how exactly to use these funds. While Connecticut has established a working group around innovative reforms which continues to work on specific proposals and recommendations for reforming the health care system, one of the areas of focus has been to ensure integrated clinical data exchange between health care providers.

Connecticut has invested in interoperable health information technology systems and developing an all payers claims data base to create comparable, transparent information that can be better used to understand utilization patterns and enhance care access.

One of the most basic aspects of reforming any system should be a clear understanding of where the biggest problems lie, and yet we still lack the data necessary in many systems to truly understand where the unnecessary spending is taking place. It is like a diagnosis of any kind of medical condition. Facts are essential. Data is key, and I believe an investment in information technology and data collection activities will help inform payers and consumers about where our health care dollars are being spent, where they are being spent most effectively, and where we can reduce spending that will ultimately enhance health care outcomes.

Connecticut is taking a considered and insightful approach to obtaining and utilizing data while considering the needs of consumers and looking toward developing stronger programs for telemedicine and provider coordination. Technology is advancing. Data collection can help implement technology where it does the most good.

We need tangible goals for long-term reform, and that is part of the work that we have described and we are undertaking as part of our task force.

I know my colleagues this evening all agree with me that we need to continue this work and take advantage of advancing technology, the metrics that are now being sampled, of good practices, leadership of providers, the medical community, and good ideas wherever they are and whoever is willing to offer them.

I wish to thank my colleagues for joining in this effort, and I look forward to returning on this subject.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support for the Transportation-HUD appropriations bill and take a moment to explain an amendment that I have filed to this bill that ensures that men and women who have bravely served our

country cannot be discriminated against in the housing assistance these appropriations provide.

I wish to thank Senator MURRAY and Senator COLLINS for their leadership, as well as other colleagues.

One of the problems I have heard described to me by veterans relates to discrimination when they return home after serving our country abroad and they become a civilian. One of the first things they often try to do is find a new home, often in a location far from their original home where they may not be known, where they enlisted but now have left. It may also be far from the military installation where they used to call home.

Fortunately, almost all Americans across our country rightly welcome our heroes home, and they welcome them with open arms. Unfortunately, I have seen reports, and I have heard descriptions of instances where landlords would not rent to veterans simply because they served our country in uniform, and I find this practice absolutely unconscionable.

I wish to tell you about the case of SGT Joel Morgan, a combat veteran who bravely served our country in Iraq. Sergeant Morgan, upon leaving the military, wished to rent an apartment in Boston. He found one that he liked.

Unfortunately, after hearing about Sergeant Morgan's service to our country, the landlord said she wouldn't feel comfortable renting the apartment to Sergeant Morgan because she opposed the war in which he fought.

According to Sergeant Morgan, the landlord said:

I would suggest you do the right thing and look for a place less politically active or controversial.

The place where he wanted to live was Boston. This kind of treatment is simply unacceptable to our veterans who have sacrificed so much.

It is a matter of common knowledge that veterans of these recent wars have high unemployment rates, higher than we should accept, higher than is conscionable for this country to accept. Among younger veterans, that unemployment rate is intolerably high, and many landlords may believe that an unemployed veteran simply isn't a good prospect for paying the rent.

My amendment would prohibit any funding in this bill from going to people or organizations that discriminate against veterans in housing. It would allow anyone who sees a discriminatory practice to report it to the Department of Housing and Urban Development and directly to that agency's inspector general. It also allows HUD to continue its existing programs to support veterans and servicemembers.

This amendment will ensure that those who fight for our freedoms will not have to find or fight for a place to call home. Discrimination against anyone, including men and women who

have valiantly served, has no place in our Nation.

I look forward to working with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which has done so much to protect Americans from discriminatory housing practices, on ways we can ensure that servicemembers and veterans are not the victims of discrimination. As we work for a permanent solution on so many of these difficult problems—providing veterans with counseling, health care, jobs counseling, training, and education that they need and keeping faith with them so that we leave no veteran behind—we should make sure we leave no veteran out of housing because of discrimination.

One of the solutions will be amending the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to ensure that housing protections are extended to all who have served in uniform. I believe this amendment is an important step forward. Simply put, it will protect all who have protected our country. Protecting them is a matter of keeping faith and making sure that we leave no veteran behind.

I know the Veterans' Affairs Committee is hard at work on many of these issues. I am proud to serve on that committee and thank Chairman SANDERS for his profoundly important leadership on this issue, along with Ranking Member BURR.

I look forward to extending and expanding these protections for our bravest and finest men and women who have helped to protect our Nation.

I yield the floor.

FEDERAL FUNDING PROHIBITIONS OBJECTION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, consistent with Senate standing orders and my policy of publishing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement whenever I place a hold on legislation, I am announcing my intention to object to any unanimous consent request to pass S. 101 Federal funding prohibitions unless it clarifies that it will not prohibit payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act.

This legislation, as currently drafted, has the potential to impede critical payments to over 700 rural and forested counties all across the United States. Those payments are paid to counties with Federal forest lands under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act, and they are part of the Federal Government's guarantee to share funding from the Federal forests with the counties in which those forests are located. Declining receipts spurred the creation of this program to compensate for the loss of receipts from Federal forests. Many counties depend on this funding to pay for schools, roads, and other important county services—including funding search and rescue operations on Fed-

eral lands. Particularly in tough economic times, these payments have been a lifeline to many counties. It is not an exaggeration to say that some of these counties might face bankruptcy without these payments. Because of the importance of these payments to many county budgets and the fact that many of them might be in a very vulnerable financial situation without those payments—including several counties in my home State of Oregon—this legislation might very well impact them and prohibit these critical payments. I simply cannot let that happen. This program has consistently received bipartisan support, and it should not be arbitrarily be limited by S. 101.

Therefore, I must object to this legislation moving forward until it is explicitly clarified that it will not block any of these critical payments. Until that occurs, I will object to a unanimous consent request to pass the legislation.

TRIBUTE TO ERNEST CARY BRACE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I honor a man whose bravery and sacrifice for this country have had no bounds; a fellow prisoner of war who I am proud to call my friend. This great American hero is Ernest C. Brace, and he was just authorized to be awarded the Purple Heart and Prisoner of War Medal.

Mr. Brace was the longest held civilian prisoner of war in Vietnam, held captive for nearly 8 years. He was captured while serving as a civilian pilot for USAID and assisting Lao Special Forces United, who were organizing the civic action teams for hospitals and supply bases. He was captured by communist forces in Laos in 1965 and held prisoner in the jungle under some of the most horrific conditions imaginable for 3 years until he was moved to a prison camp in North Vietnam. It was there that Ernie and I shared neighboring cells for over a year. Amidst the pain and cruelty of our time together, I also vividly remember our conversations, Sunday night storytelling sessions, and how we kept each other's spirits up during those dark days when our hope never wavered.

After his release, Mr. Brace married a nurse, Nancy, that he met at Naval Medical Center in San Diego, moved to Klamath Falls, OR, and resumed his career as professional aviator. Preceding the Purple Heart and Prisoner of War Medal, Mr. Brace earned the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal, with 3 stars, Navy Unit Commendation, a Distinguished Public Service Medal, a National Defense Service Medal, a Korean Service Medal, with 2 stars, a United Nations Korea Medal, and the Korean Presidential Unit Citation.

I ask you all to join me in congratulating this incredibly brave man and

American patriot, my friend Ernie Brace, on this long overdue recognition.

CONSENT TO DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, last week the leadership sought unanimous consent to discharge S. 1294, a bill to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, from the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and to rerefer the bill to the Agriculture Committee. I am consenting to this discharge and referral because the wilderness in this bill would be created out of public lands in the Cherokee National Forest, a national forest created from lands acquired under the Weeks Act. The Agriculture Committee has primary jurisdiction for acquired lands forests. However, I am not conceding the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee jurisdiction over national forests created from the public domain or its jurisdiction over our Nation's wilderness system.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, due to a family commitment, I was unable to cast a vote on Monday evening regarding the nomination of James Comey to be the next director of the Federal Bureau of Investigations, FBI. I would have voted yes because all Presidents are entitled to nominate whomever they want to key positions, and I believe Mr. Comey is well qualified to lead this important agency and the brave men and women who dedicate their lives to protecting our people and enforcing our laws domestically. In this new position, Mr. Comey should expect Congress to maintain its strong oversight role in ensuring that the FBI effectively executes its mission to keep Americans safe, while protecting the rule of law and our constitutional rights.

FRYEBURG, MAINE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the Town of Fryeburg, ME, the first town established in the beautiful White Mountains of Maine and New Hampshire. The same spirit of determination and resiliency that carved a community out of the wilderness two and a half centuries ago still guides Fryeburg today.

In 1763, the Seven Years' War between France and Great Britain for control of North America ended with a resounding British victory. In recognition of his courageous service, GEN Joseph Frye, an American-born militia commander, was rewarded with a

homestead grant in the White Mountains region. He chose the place where the great Saco River tumbles from the mountains on its journey to the sea, a place of vast forests and fertile farmland. That first settlement of seven lots soon grew into a thriving town, incorporated in 1777 and named in General Frye's honor.

That first settlement was built on the foundation laid a half century before by another early American hero, CPT John Lovewell. His valiant deeds to secure the colonies' northern frontier—including the legendary Battle of the Pond in 1725—were celebrated by such authors as Longfellow, Hawthorne, and Thoreau. From those long ago days to the present, the Veterans Honor Roll in Bradley Park memorializes the more than 1,200 patriots from Fryeburg who have served our Nation in times of peril.

As the town of Fryeburg became a bustling center of industry with lumber and grain mills, the townspeople invested their prosperity in education and in 1792 established Fryeburg Academy, one of America's oldest preparatory schools. Among the academy's first teachers was Daniel Webster, before he began his remarkable career as a statesman in the U.S. Senate and as America's Secretary of State. Fryeburg's connection to the world of ideas was strengthened in 1997 when the International Musical Arts Institute was established, bringing world-class musicians and conservatory students together every summer for concerts that enrich the community.

The coming of the railroads in the mid-19th century made Fryeburg, with its spectacular scenery, mountain breezes, and pristine waters, a favorite destination for city dwellers escaping the summer heat. Among those who found their way to Fryeburg during that era was the legendary Arctic explorer Robert Peary, who sharpened his navigation skills while surveying the town as a young civil engineer. Today, visitors and residents alike enjoy Fryeburg's many quiet parks, beautifully maintained historic buildings, and exciting outdoor recreation opportunities. The annual Fryeburg Fair, Maine's largest agricultural exhibition, keeps the town's origins and traditions alive.

The celebration of Fryeburg's 250th anniversary is not merely about the passing of time. It is about human accomplishment. We celebrate the people who, for longer than America has been a nation, have pulled together, cared for one another, and built a great community. Thanks to those who came before, Fryeburg, ME, has a wonderful history. Thanks to those there today, it has a bright future.

RECOGNIZING DICK LOPER

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to speak on behalf of Dick Loper, who will be inducted into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame at the 101st Wyoming State Fair in August. Since 1992, Wyoming has recognized individuals each year who have made substantial contributions to agriculture in our State. This year I have the honor of presenting this award to Dick with my colleague, Senator BARRASSO.

Dick Loper is known across Wyoming for his rangeland consulting, Federal agency cooperation, and community involvement. As a rangeland consultant, Dick has served Wyoming's farmers, ranchers, and agricultural organizations throughout his entire career. He has also worked as a range consultant to the Wyoming State Grazing Board and has been involved in the organization since its creation. Rawlins Rancher and 2011 Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame inductee Niels Hansen commented,

Since his time in the Reagan Administration, Dick has made his home in Wyoming working as a range consultant and helping and teaching many ranchers about the benefits of range monitoring and good range stewardship.

Dick is best known for his commitment to the health of Wyoming's rangelands. For over 30 years, he has worked with Bureau of Land Management, BLM, permittees and other parties to advance livestock management and oversee the implementation of range improvements. As a member of the Committee on Rangeland Classification, his efforts were crucial in gaining national attention for rangeland health, which led to the establishment of standards of healthy rangelands. These standards now give public land users and managers clear goals for grazing.

Dick Loper is also active in a variety of community organizations important to Wyoming agriculture. He served on the Society for Range Management Select Task Force on Unity in Concepts and the Sustainable Rangelands Roundtable. For his service, Dick has been honored with the Guardian of the Grasslands Award.

On a personal note, it seems I can't go very long without visiting with Dick Loper in Washington. In addition to seeing him in Wyoming, Dick is regularly in DC for meetings with Federal agencies and other partners. It is always helpful receiving the latest on public lands during his visits. I am proud to have the opportunity to recognize Dick Loper's achievements with Senator BARRASSO as a 2013 inductee into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame. Wyoming and its public lands are well served by his lasting and continuing contributions to our State.

RECOGNIZING JW AND THEA NUCKOLLS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I will soon be attending the 101st Wyoming State Fair. During the Ag Hall of Fame Picnic, Senator ENZI and I will have the honor of recognizing JW and Thea Nuckolls as they are inducted into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame for 2013. I cannot think of two people more deserving of this recognition.

The Nuckolls family came to Wyoming from Virginia in the early 1900s. JW's parents sold 100 horses in order to purchase the original ranch in 1917. In 1943, the family entered the sheep business by purchasing 500 head of sheep to stock the ranch. JW was only 12 years old when he began trailing ewes from Moorcroft, where the sheep were bought, to the family ranch 26 miles away.

JW returned to the ranch after graduating from the University of Wyoming. He was in the market for more sheep when he met his future wife, Thea. He purchased part of her family's Corriedale flock. The future couple subsequently ran into each other again at the Wyoming State Fair in 1958 and were married the following year. How fitting it is for them to be honored together in the same place where their lives with one another began 55 years ago.

Over the past five decades, JW and Thea have built a strong, diversified ranching operation. Thea brought registered Angus cows into the family and together she and JW have built herds of high quality cattle and sheep. Their contributions to agriculture go far beyond their own operation, however. JW and Thea helped to start the Mountain States Lamb Cooperative and Center of the Nation Wool Cooperative which serves 1,700 participants and markets approximately 5 million pounds of wool each year, resulting in gross sales of nearly \$10 million. JW continues to serve as a board member to this day. In addition to the cooperative, JW has also been active in Wyoming Stock Growers Association, Wyoming Farm Bureau, and the Wyoming Wool Growers Association. Thea has served many years as a 4-H club leader, serves on the Wyoming Cattle Women's Association, Wyoming Wool Growers Auxiliary, and Crook County Farm Bureau.

JW and Thea have been stalwart representatives of the agriculture industry in every way. Wyoming Stock Growers Association executive vice president Jim Magagna has said that the sheep industry is stronger because of JW and Thea's involvement. This couple embodies what Wyoming is all about. Honesty, integrity, and hard work are second nature to them. Their willingness to share their knowledge and experience with others ensures that the sheep industry and agriculture in general will continue to be strong in both Wyoming and America for years

to come. I would like to extend my congratulations to JW and Thea and thank them for their dedication to the Wyoming way of life.

TRIBUTE TO BRIAN SCOTT GAMROTH

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I come to the floor to tell you about one of Wyoming's own, Brian Scott Gamroth. On the radio, television, or at any number of events, folks all over Wyoming are familiar with his deep, resonating voice. Brian is more than a radio personality; he is an enthusiastic advocate for Wyoming and her people.

Brian spent his youth first at a ranch near Medicine Bow and then at a ranch near Saratoga. His family finally settled in Casper in the mid-1970s. In the early 1980s, Brian had a chance to take on Chicago. He worked for CBS Records, PolyGram, and Geffen Records before the call of Wyoming brought him home to Casper. Brian took over the K2 Radio morning show almost 20 years ago. It remains one of the top rated morning shows anywhere.

Brian is always first to lend his voice to efforts raising awareness for veterans, children, and the needs of the community. No cause is too big or too small for him to show his support. Whether it is the Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation, the Wyoming Down Syndrome Association, Special Olympics, or many other organizations, Brian generously supports causes that make Wyoming a better place to call home.

Given his impressive resume of generous service, Brian has been selected by the Boys & Girls Clubs of Central Wyoming as the recipient of the Distinguished Service Award. Through his talents as an entertainer, master of ceremonies, and a community leader, Brian has raised millions of dollars for local and State charities. Last year alone, he was the master of ceremonies at 38 events in four States. Brian has the reputation of being the first to donate his talents, time and treasure for causes that enhance the lives of folks in Wyoming and the region. He joins a distinguished group of alumni who have been recognized with this award, including former U.S. Senator Alan Simpson, Vice President Dick Cheney and his wife Lynne, former U.S. Ambassador to Guatemala Tom Stroock, and Governor Mike Sullivan.

This year marks the 15th annual Boys & Girls Clubs Recognition Breakfast event. For the last 12 years, Brian served as the master of ceremonies. It is fitting that Brian has been chosen to receive the prestigious award this year. On behalf of the children he has helped, the families he has embraced, and friends he has made, I offer my heartfelt congratulations. I am honored to know him and call him my friend. Casper and Wyoming is a better place to

live and work because of Brian Scott Gamroth.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES E. HARMAN, JR.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a man who has been an invaluable member of my team for 6 unforgettable years, my friend and chief of staff, Charlie Harman.

Charlie first came to Washington in 1970. He took an internship with Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia, to be near his then-girlfriend Carol, now his wife of 40 years.

This internship sparked a passion for public policy, politics, and the United States Senate Charlie could never extinguish.

After his internship with Senator Russell, the Atlanta, GA native graduated from my alma mater UGA, and took a job as a savings and loan officer with Fulton Federal Savings.

However by 1980, Charlie longed to return to politics and began working for Senator Sam Nunn in Georgia. He finally fulfilled his dream of returning to Washington, D.C. when he was asked to serve as Senator Nunn's chief of staff in 1987. He did so until 1992.

He then returned to the private sector as president of the Georgia Chamber of Commerce. In 1996, he left the Chamber and was named vice president of public affairs for Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Georgia.

Seven years later, after Senator Paul Coverdell died tragically and unexpectedly, Zell Miller was appointed to fill the unexpired seat. Charlie stepped in to be his chief of staff—organizing his office and hiring his staff.

Miller ran for the seat in November 2000 and was elected to serve the final 4 years of Coverdell's term. Charlie returned to Georgia and his job at Blue Cross/Blue Shield.

As you can see, Charlie has been an integral part of Georgia's U.S. Senate history, and his was a name that came up often when I found myself in need of a chief of staff in 2007.

When I interviewed Charlie, I remember asking him what his hobbies were. He replied, 'I don't have a hobby, I just like to work.' That turned out to be true.

I remember telling him my personal policy is to hire good people and then leave them alone to do their job.

In this respect, there are never days when I worry my chief of staff would not be in the office, or a task will not be done. He is passionate and dedicated, and I am better able to focus on my tasks knowing he is there.

Ralph Waldo Emerson once said that "Big jobs usually go to the men who prove their ability to outgrow small ones."

I do not see that in Charlie. He places emphasis on all aspects of the job—big and small.

He walks away from a room full of CEOs to answer the front office phones, so the staff assistants can have a break.

He makes constituent mail a number one priority, ensuring all Georgians receive a quality response by week's end.

And he is never too busy to talk to folks visiting from Georgia, or staffers who are having personal troubles.

Anyone would be amazed to see how he manages such a high-pressure environment with efficiency, focus, and vision. Charlie inspires confidence in the staff and he inspires loyalty.

In my 19 years in Congress, I have had the good fortune of having many talented staffers. You never forget the work they have done for you.

On August 5, Charlie will be leaving my office to join Emory University as its Vice President for Government Relations. I congratulate Charlie and wish him well in his new position.

Charlie has made a difference in thousands of lives around the Hill, around this town, and around Georgia. I will never forget all he has accomplished, and he will be sorely missed.

TRIBUTE TO GERALDINE "JERRIE" MOCK

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Newark, OH native Jerrie Mock, the first woman to fly solo around the world. On September 14, 2013, a bronze statue will be dedicated in honor of her accomplishments at The Works: Ohio Center for History, Art & Technology, a science and history museum for children in Newark, OH.

On March 19, 1964, at the age of 38, the Ohio native and self-described "flying housewife" set off from Columbus, OH on her solo flight around the world in a 1953 Cessna 180 single-engine monoplane named the "Spirit of Columbus." She made the flight in 29 days, including 21 stopovers, covering 22,860 miles.

Jerrie has received numerous awards, including the FAA Gold Medal for Exceptional Service. She made her mark in the aviation world as the first woman to fly solo around the world and also completed other feats worthy of recognition. Her contributions have helped to shape the future of American aviation for our children and grandchildren.

Today, I would like to commend Jerrie Mock for her accomplishments and thank all those who contributed to enshrining her legacy for all Ohioans.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HAMPTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Hampton, NH—an historic Granite State community that is

also one of the most popular vacation destinations in New England.

A crown jewel of New Hampshire's seacoast, Hampton was one of four original New Hampshire towns and was located in an area originally known as Winnacunnet. According to a town history, it was settled in the autumn of 1638. Incorporated as Hampton in 1639, the current day high school is named Winnacunnet High School—home of the Warriors.

With the arrival of the railroad in the mid 1800s, Hampton became a summertime favorite of travelers from near and far—starting the town's long tradition of providing welcoming hospitality. On a hot summer day, Hampton Beach can expect to see around 100,000 visitors on its beautiful beaches and boardwalk. Generations of New Hampshire families have spent their summer vacation on the shores of Hampton Beach—eating fresh seafood in its restaurants, splashing in the surf, enjoying beachside concerts, and playing in the arcades.

Hampton has been the home of many historical and famous figures. First Lady of the United States, Jane Pierce, called Hampton home, as did former Governor Stephen E. Merrill and former Congressman Tristram Shaw.

Whether it is scenic Hampton Beach, the Tuck Museum or the historic James House historic site—which is described as what may be the earliest surviving example of the two-room deep, center chimney colonial in New Hampshire—the proud people of Hampton have contributed conspicuously to the spirit and heritage of New Hampshire during the town's first 375 years.

Hampton holds a special place in the hearts of citizens across New Hampshire. On this day, I am pleased to recognize the 375th anniversary of Hampton—saluting its citizens and recognizing their accomplishments, their love of country, their warm hospitality, and their spirit of independence.●

LISBON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Lisbon, NH—a town in Grafton County that is celebrating the 250th anniversary of its founding. I am proud to join citizens across the Granite State in recognizing this historic event.

Famous for its annual Lilac Festival, Lisbon is located along the Ammonoosuc and Gale rivers in the shadow of Babbitt Hill.

The land that would become Lisbon was granted in a charter as Concord by Gov. Benning Wentworth in 1763. Renamed Chiswick, the name was subsequently changed to Gunthwaite. At a town meeting in 1824, it was renamed Lisbon in honor of Lisbon, Portugal.

The population has grown to include over 1,500 residents. The patriotism and

commitment of the people of Lisbon is reflected in part by their record of service in defense of our Nation.

Among those patriots were Revolutionary War veterans Samuel Young and MAJ Benjamin Whitcomb. Young and members of his family fought in the Battle of Bunker Hill, while Whitcomb, also known as the "Dreaded Scout," was the leader of Whitcomb's Independent Corps of Rangers.

New England Wire Technologies first opened in 1899, and it has grown to become a leader in the design and manufacture of multiconductor cables, custom braids, and strands. Today the company has over 330 employees and is one of the larger employers in the area.

According to a town history, "Three of the five peg mills in the United States were located in Lisbon. Parker Young Company was at one time the largest manufacturer of piano sounding boards in the world. There were two railroad stations, a library, a gold rush, a small airport and the first rope ski tow in New Hampshire."

Lisbon is a place that has contributed much to the life and spirit of the State of New Hampshire. I am pleased to extend my warm regards to the people of Lisbon as they celebrate the town's 250th anniversary.●

RECOGNIZING HALLIE BELL

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Hallie Bell for her hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Hallie is a native of Cody, WY, and is a graduate of Cody High School. She currently attends the University of Wyoming, where she is an art and English major. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Hallie for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING OMAR ETMAN

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Omar Etman for his hard work as an intern in my Rock Springs office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Omar is from Rock Springs, WY, and a graduate of Rock Springs High School. He plans to attend New York University beginning this fall as a journalism major. He has demonstrated a

strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Omar for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING KIP FAIRCLOTH

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Kip Faircloth for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Kip is a native of Buffalo, WY, and a graduate of Buffalo High School. He currently attends the University of Montana, where he is a political science major. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Kip for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING SHELBY JORGENSEN

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Shelby Jorgensen for her hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Shelby is a native of Casper, WY, and is a graduate of Natrona County High School. She currently attends the University of Wyoming where she is an elementary education major. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Shelby for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING TESS KERSENBROCK

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Tess

Kersensbrock for her hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Tess is a native of Casper, WY, and is a graduate of Kelly Walsh High School. She currently attends Colorado State University, where she is a political science major. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Tess for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING KIRBY LAWRENCE

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Kirby Lawrence for her hard work as an intern in my Republican policy committee office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Kirby is from Wheatland, WY, and a graduate of Wheatland High School. She currently attends the University of Wyoming, where she is an economics major. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Kirby for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING MADELEINE LEWIS

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Madeleine Lewis for her hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Madeleine is a native of Cheyenne, WY, and is a graduate of Cheyenne Central High School. She currently attends the Carleton College, where she is a political science major. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Madeleine for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING HAL LIBBY

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Hal Libby for his continued hard work as an intern in my Republican policy committee office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Hal is a native of McLean, VA, and a graduate of Thomas Jefferson High School. He currently attends Yale University, where he is a history major. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Hal for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING JOSH MESSER

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Josh Messer for his hard work as an intern in my U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Josh is a native of Cheyenne, WY, and a graduate of Cheyenne East High School. He currently attends the University of Wyoming, where he is a molecular biology and chemistry major. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Josh for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING BRANDON ROSTY

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Brandon Rosty for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Brandon is a native of Casper, WY, and graduated from Natrona County High School. He currently attends Georgetown University, where he is a government and history major. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Brandon for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING MIKE STOPP

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Mike Stopp for his hard work as an intern in my U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Mike is from Tahlequah, OK. He currently attends Northeastern State University, where he is a business administration/finance major. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Mike for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING ASHLEY TRUE

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Ashley True for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Ashley is a native of Casper, WY, and is a graduate of Natrona County High School. She currently attends Black Hills State University, where she is a corporate communication major. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Ashley for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING SONYA JOHNSON

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Sonya Johnson of Fallon, NV, and congratulate her on receiving this year's Ag Advocate Award from the National Agriculture in the Classroom Organization. This award recognizes efforts to promote agriculture literacy in the classroom, and I am immensely proud that Sonya has been se-

lected from a nationwide group of nominees to receive this prestigious award.

As a mother of five daughters and past president of the Churchill County Farm Bureau, Sonya has demonstrated an exceptional commitment to education, volunteerism, and community service. For more than 30 years, she has given of her time by volunteering to educate Nevada's students about the importance of agriculture, as well as agriculture-related higher education and career opportunities that are available to them. Whether in a classroom, at a farm festival in Las Vegas, or at a community workshop, Sonya has helped countless Nevadans understand the critical role agriculture plays in our State and national heritage. Not only has she used creative methods in her educational efforts, but she also often reaches out to students in remote locations, including Indian reservations, and she has volunteered with children of mine workers as well. Her efforts were recognized in 2010 by the Nevada Agriculture Foundation, which named Sonya the Outstanding Nevada Ag in the Classroom Volunteer.

Sonya's commitment to educating Nevadans about agriculture is truly admirable. She has made an invaluable investment in the lives and futures of Nevada's students. I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Sonya on this well-deserved recognition, and I thank her for her many efforts as a volunteer and educator.●

2013 AROOSTOOK ENTREPRENEUR OF THE YEAR

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to commend David A. Harbison, Jr., and his company, Bison Pumps, for being named the 2013 Aroostook Entrepreneur of the Year. Bison Pumps, located in Houlton, ME, both designs and manufactures hand-powered water pumps. These impressive and elegant devices provide reliable access to well water without the need for any electricity.

The first Bison pump was born out of necessity during Maine's Great Ice Storm of 1998, which crippled parts of Maine for several weeks. Over half of our State lost power, some areas for more than 2 weeks. Like many Mainers faced with adversity, Mr. Harbison and his team of plumbers responded to disaster with resilience and innovation. They designed and built what would be the first Bison hand pump, which allowed people whose electric pumps were inoperable in the aftermath of the storm to access the water in their wells. Since 1998, this timely and resourceful design has gained international appeal and application.

Now a strong and growing business with 12 employees, Bison Pumps sells its polished stainless steel products around the country and all over the

world. From the woods of northern Maine to the hustle and bustle of Singapore, these pumps are making a difference by allowing people to access well water without electricity. Just recently, a ministry organization bought one of the pumps, which is now helping them provide much needed clean water to people in Haiti.

We have many great small businesses in Maine, and the 2013 Aroostook Entrepreneur of the Year Award winner, Mr. Harbison and Bison Pumps, is certainly one of them. Bison Pumps represents the bold, free-thinking spirit that defines the State of Maine. I am proud to join in recognizing their ingenuity, and I expect they will continue to impress us—both in Maine and around the world with their superb products.●

REMEMBERING VERNON AND MARIE NELSON

● Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, there are many things I admire about folks from my home State of Kansas but especially how Kansans carry on the traditions of previous generations. No tradition runs deeper in Kansas than the tradition of working on a family farm.

Across our Nation, 98 percent of our country's 2 million farms are family owned. For many Kansas children, growing up on a farm is a way of life. By working alongside their parents, grandparents, and neighbors, young people learn important life skills and values like hard work, personal responsibility, and perseverance.

Gary Nelson of Falun, KS learned many of these life skills on the farm by working alongside his parents, Vernon and Marie Nelson. The Nelson family farm has been in his family for 144 years. It was originally homesteaded by Gary's great-grandfather Lars Frederick Nelson, in 1869. Nineteen years ago, Gary's father Vernon passed away, leaving the management of the farm in his hands. In the years that followed, Gary took over the farm operations with the help of his mother. But just a few weeks ago, Marie passed away. The community of Falun lost two special people when Vernon and Marie passed away.

Both of Gary's parents came from a strong Swedish heritage and were well known in the small rural community of Falun in Saline County. They were married in 1952 and spent the next 42 years together, raising their son, managing the farm, and investing in the local community. A strong work ethic and an abiding care for others were defining attributes of both Vernon and Marie. They were also both skilled craftsmen—Vernon once made a walnut box that contained a bronze sculpture for President Ronald Reagan, and Marie had a love for quilting and once worked on a special quilt that was given to Nancy Reagan.

Vernon and Marie were also very proud of their son and came to visit Gary while he was working as an intern for former Senator Bob Dole in the summer of 1983. One of their special memories was enjoying lunch together in the Senate dining room at the invitation of Senator Dole.

In small rural towns across Kansas, people work hard, take pride in their communities and care for one another. Vernon and Marie were two such people. Gary recently said this about his parents: "They are part of the fabric that is our community now and that of the future." Individuals like Vernon and Marie also make up the fabric of our country, and their contributions have made our Nation what it is today. Vernon and Marie lived each day to its fullest, and their devotion to those around them stands as an inspiration to us all.

I extend my heartfelt sympathies to Gary and the Nelson family and friends. I ask my colleagues and all Kansans to remember the Nelson family in your thoughts and prayers in the days ahead.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:37 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2397. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 8:06 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1092. An act to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center".

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2397. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2218. An act to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1392. A bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2465. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Navigation and Navigable Waters; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments; Correction" (RIN1625-AC06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2466. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Ohio River, Mile 469.4-470.0; Bellevue, KY" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0558)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2467. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Pamlico River and Tar River; Washington, NC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0517)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2468. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Skagit River Bridge, Skagit River, Mount Vernon, WA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2012-0449)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2469. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Fifth Coast Guard District Fireworks Display Cape Fear River; Wilmington, NC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0115)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2470. A communication from the Deputy Administrator, Research and Innovative Technology Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Transportation Statistics Annual Report 2012"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2471. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations: Military Vehicles; Vessels of War; Submersible Vessels; Oceanographic Equipment; Related Items; and Auxiliary and Miscellaneous Items that the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control under the United States Munitions List" (RIN0694-AF39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2472. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to the Export Administration Regulations: Implementation of Limited Syria Waiver for Reconstruction Assistance" (RIN0694-AF94) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2473. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 37; Correction" (RIN0648-BC66) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2474. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2013 Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Quota Specifications" (RIN0648-XC513) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2475. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Enhanced Document Requirements To Support Use of the Dolphin Safe Label on Tuna Products" (RIN0648-BC78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2476. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Materials: Revision of Requirements for Fireworks Approval (RRR)" (RIN2137-AE70) received during adjournment of the Senate

in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2477. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Final Listing of 2014 Light Duty Truck Lines Subject to the Requirements of This Standard and Exempted Vehicle Lines for Model Year 2014" (RIN2127-AL42) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2478. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael C. Gould, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2479. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Walter E. Gaskin, Sr., United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2480. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Robert S. Harward, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2481. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13441 with respect to Lebanon; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2482. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Presidential 1 Dollar Coin Program"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2483. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sale and Issue of Marketable Book-Entry Treasury Bills, Notes, and Bonds" (31 CFR Part 356) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2484. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to the President and Congress Medicaid Home and Community-Based Alternatives to Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities Demonstration"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2485. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Medicare and Medicaid Integrity Programs Report for Fiscal Year 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2486. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule

entitled "Change in Terminology: 'Mental Retardation' to 'Intellectual Disability'" (RIN0960-AH52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2487. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Exchange Functions: Standards for Navigators and Non-Navigator Assistance Personnel; Consumer Assistance Tools and Programs of an Exchange and Certified Application Counselors" (RIN0938-AR75; 0938-AR04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2488. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Department of Justice Report to Congress Concerning the International Marriage Broker Regulation Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2489. A communication from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Office of Violence Against Women, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removing Unnecessary Office on Violence Against Women Regulations" (RIN1105-AB40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Jon T. Rymer, of Tennessee, to be Inspector General, Department of Defense.

*Stephen Woolman Preston, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

*Susan J. Rabern, of Kansas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

*Dennis V. McGinn, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

*Army nomination of Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, to be General.

*Navy nomination of Adm. James A. Winnefeld, Jr., to be Admiral.

*Navy nomination of Adm. Cecil E.D. Haney, to be Admiral.

*Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Curtis M. Scaparrotti, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Stephen W. Wilson, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Robin Rand, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Russell J. Handy, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Roger L. Nye, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. David L. Mann, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Raymond A. Thomas III, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Marion Garcia, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. John W. Lathrop, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Edward C. Cardon, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Thomas E. Ayres, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Flora D. Darpino, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Michael S. Tucker, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Charles N. Pede, to be Brigadier General, Judge Advocate General's Corps.

Army nominations beginning with Colonel Carl A. Alex and ending with Colonel Eric J. Wesley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013. (minus 2 nominees: Colonel David W. Riggins; Colonel Robert J. Ulises)

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Kenneth E. Tovo, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Robert B. Abrams, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Kevin L. McNeely, to be Major General.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. Thomas D. Waldhauser, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Capt. Deborah P. Haven, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Frank C. Pandolfo, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Harry B. Harris, Jr., to be Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. William F. Moran, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. James F. Caldwell, Jr., to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) David F. Baucom and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Vincent L. Griffith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Colin G. Chinn and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Elaine C. Wagner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Paul B. Becker and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Jan E. Tighe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) David H. Lewis and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) James D. Syring, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) John C. Aquilino and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Michael S. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Russell E. Allen and ending with Capt. Thomas W. Marotta, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Kurt W. Tidd, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Kenneth J. Iverson, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, It is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Wendy J. Beal and ending with Jared K. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 9, 2013.

Air Force nomination of Peter C. Rhee, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Joseph M. Markusfeld, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Deondra P. Asike and ending with Gregory C. Trolley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 24, 2013.

Army nomination of Ronald E. Beresky, to be Major.

Army nomination of James B. Collins, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Jonathan H. Cody and ending with Justin M. Marchesi, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 20, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph L. Biehler and ending with Bienvenido Serranocastro, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2013.

Army nomination of Dean C. Anderson, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Christopher D. Perrin, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Sheena L. Allen and ending with Miao X. Zhou, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Courtney L. Abraham and ending with XXXXXXXX, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher L. Aaron and ending with Nathan P. Zwintscher, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Richard R. Abelkis and ending with XXXXXXXX, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph H. Albrecht and ending with XXXXXXXX, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Army nomination of Karl F. Meyer, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Stephanie M. Price, to be Major.

Army nomination of Gregory C. Pedro, to be Major.

Army nomination of John H. Seok, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Frederick C. Lough, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Admirado A. Luzuriaga and ending with Jon Kiev, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 24, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with William G. Huber and ending with Mark L. Leitschuh, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 24, 2013.

Army nomination of Curtis J. Alitz, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Guy R. Beaudoin and ending with Rebecca A. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 24, 2013.

Navy nomination of Jackie S. Fantes, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Doran T. Kelvington, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Orental G. Adderson and ending with John F. Warner III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 27, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Philip B. Bagrow and ending with David M. Todd, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Tanya Cruz and ending with Jeanine B. Womble, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Rene J. Alova and ending with Joyce Y. Turner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with James Alger and ending with Jason N. Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher W. Abbott and ending with Lorenzo Tarpley, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Mary R. Anker and ending with Georgina L. Zuniga, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Lillian A. Abuan and ending with Christopher R. Zegley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Erin G. Adams and ending with Luke A. Zabrocki, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2013.

Navy nomination of Timothy C. Moore, Jr., to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Pierre A. Pelletier, to be Captain.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Jannette Lake Dates, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2016.

*Bruce M. Ramer, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2018.

*Brent Franklin Nelsen, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2016.

*Howard Abel Husock, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2018.

*Loretta Cheryl Sutliff, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2018.

*Thomas Edgar Wheeler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2013.

*Thomas Edgar Wheeler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2013.

*Mark E. Schaefer, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

*Thomas C. Carper, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Bruce D. Baffer and ending with Joseph A. Servidio, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 15, 2013.

*Coast Guard nomination of Kurt B. Hinrichs, to be Rear Admiral.

*Coast Guard nomination of Richard T. Gromlich, to be Rear Admiral.

By Mrs. BOXER for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Avi Garbow, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

*James J. Jones, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances of the Environmental Protection Agency.

*Kenneth J. Kopocis, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

James Walter Brewster, Jr., of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

*Morrell John Berry, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

Nominee: Morrell John Berry.

Post: AMB to Australia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

1. Self: \$1,000, 6/2/09, Hoyer for Congress; Hoyer for Congress: \$1,000, 10/8/10, Hoyer for Congress; \$1,000, 4/24/12, Hoyer for Congress; \$1,000, 6/15/13, Hoyer for Congress; \$250, 10/28/10, Tammy Baldwin for Senate; \$500, 6/30/11, Tammy Baldwin for Senate; \$1,000, 10/4/12, Ben Cardin for Senate; \$250, 3/30/12, Krysten Sinema for Congress; \$2,500, 8/13/12, Obama Victory Fund; \$2,500, 10/23/12, Obama for America.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: deceased.

5. Grandparents: deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: none.

*Patricia Marie Haslach, of Oregon, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.

Nominee: Patricia Marie Haslach.

Post: Ethiopia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: divorced.

3. Children and Spouses: Shereen Herbert: none; Kiran Herbert: none.

4. Parents: Patricia M. Haslach: none.

5. Grandparents: deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Timothy Haslach: none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Mary Powers: none; Matt Powers: none; Margaret Haslach: none; Maureen Rankin: none; Mark Rankin: none.

*Reuben Earl Brigety, II, of Florida, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Nominee: Reuben Earl Brigety, II.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the AU.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

1. Self: \$1200, 8/27/08, Obama for America; \$1100, 8/27/08, Obama for America; \$2300, 8/16/08, Obama Victory Fund; \$500, 2/08/08, Obama for America; \$250, 11/27/07, Obama for America.

2. Spouse: \$200, 10/20/08, Obama for America; \$800, 10/16/08, Obama for America; \$800, 10/12/08, Obama Victory Fund; \$200, 10/25/08, Obama for America; \$200, 10/25/08, Obama for America.

3. Children and Spouses: none.

4. Parents: none.

5. Grandparents: none.

6. Brothers and Spouses: none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: none.

*Daniel A. Clune, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

Nominee: Daniel A. Clune.

Post: Lao People's Democratic Republic.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Margaret Clune Giblin: \$55, Sep 2013, Barack Obama. Bryan Giblin: None. Sarah Clune Hartman: None. Robert Hartman: None. Kathryn Clune: \$35, Nov 2012, Barack Obama.

4. Parents: William H. Clune, Jr.: Deceased. Helen Clune: Deceased.

5. Grandparents: James Hadley: Deceased. Ethel Hadley: Deceased. William H. Clune: Deceased. Gatel Clune: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: William H. Clune III: \$250, May 2012, Tammy Baldwin; Less than \$250, 2012, Barack Obama. Constance Clune: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Sheila Fariel: Deceased. Susan Lorenz Aiken: Deceased. Sarah Clune: \$20, 2012, Barack Obama. Michael Long, None.

*Patrick Hubert Gaspard, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

Nominee: Patrick Hubert Gaspard.

Post: South Africa.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: \$100, 2012, Obama for America.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Father—Deceased. Mother—None.

5. Grandparents: N/A—Deceased

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

*Stephanie Sanders Sullivan, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo.

Nominee: Stephanie S. Sullivan.

Post: Brazzaville, Republic of Congo.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:

1. Self: None.

2. John H. Sullivan (spouse): None.

3. Daniel W. Sullivan (son): None.

4. Scott W. Sullivan (son): None.

5. John E. Sanders and Barbara W. Sanders (parents, deceased) None.

6. Roger and Gladys Wood (grandparents, deceased): None.

7. Alice H. Sanders (grandmother, deceased): None.

8. William L. Sanders (grandfather, deceased): None.

9. Thomas H. Sanders (brother) and Janice Sanders (sister-in-law): None.

10. Philip E. Sanders (brother): None.

*Joseph Y. Yun, of Oregon, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malaysia.

Nominee: Joseph Y. Yun.

Post: Ambassador to Malaysia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:

1. Self: \$100, 2013, Korean Americans for Obama.

2. Spouse: \$100, 2012, Emily's List, \$250, 2012, Obama for America.

3. Children and Spouses: Matthew and Amy Yun: None.

4. Parents: Chunja Kim: None. Sukwoo Yun: Deceased.

5. Grandparents: Hyung-Joong Yun: Deceased. Yuk-sung Ryu: Deceased. Chan-Ho-Kim: Deceased. Bong-Ja Kim: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Yuojin Yun: None. Sookwon Kim: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Haechin Priestly: None. Richard Priestly: None. Haesun Yun: None. Chulho Lieu: None.

*Linda Thomas-Greenfield, of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (African Affairs).

*James F. Entwistle, of Virginia, a career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

Nominee: James F. Entwistle.

Post: Abuja.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: Pamela G. Schmoll: none.

3. Children and Spouses: Jennifer B.S. Entwistle (Daughter, not married): none; Jeffrey W.S. Entwistle (Son, not married): none.

4. Parents: Oliver H. Entwistle, Jr. (Father—deceased); Barbara G. Entwistle (Mother): \$100, 11/9/11, Obama for America; \$50, 11/15/11, Obama for America; \$100, 1/12/12, Obama for America; \$100, 3/4/12, Obama for America; \$100, 7/13/12, Obama for America; \$200, 8/20/12, Obama for America; \$50.75, 3/4/12, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC); \$50, 7/13/12, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC).

5. Grandparents: Geraldine Gaskill—deceased; Loren B. Gaskill—deceased; Emily G. Entwistle—deceased; Oliver H. Entwistle—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Steven D. Entwistle (only sibling): none; Sharon B. Entwistle (his wife): none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

*David D. Pearce, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece.

Nominee: David D. Pearce.

Post: Greece.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Jennifer Eva Pearce: none; Joseph Alan Pearce: none.

4. Parents: D. Duane Pearce: none; Mary Jean Pearce: none.

5. Grandparents: Howard A. Pearce—deceased; Muriel Pearce—deceased; Joseph Little—deceased; Urania Little—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Michael Pearce: none; Kathleen Pearce: none; Jonathan Pearce—deceased; Robyn Pearce: none; Christopher Pearce—deceased.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Elizabeth Hunt: none. (NB: My sister was divorced this past year from David Hunt, who was reported as her spouse on the 2008 Federal Campaign Contribution Report that I filed in connection with my nomination as Ambassador to Algeria).

*John B. Emerson, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Nominee: John Bonnell Emerson.

Post: Ambassador to Germany.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amounts, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$1,500, 02/05/2013, Capital Group Inc. PAC; \$2,500, 02/2013, Shaheen, Jeanne; \$1,000, 03/2013, Markey, Ed; \$1,000, 03/2013, Hagen, Kay; \$1,000, 04/2013, Franklin, Al; \$1,000, 04/2013, Begich, Mark; \$-5,000, 12/21/2012, OfftheSidelinesPAC; \$1,000, 11/06/2012, Waxman, Henry; \$500, 10/07/2012, Nevada Senate Victory Fund; \$2,500, 10/02/2012, Feinstein, Dianne, \$5,000, 09/28/2012, OfftheSidelinesPAC; \$1,000, 09/15/2012, Garamendi, John; \$1,000, 09/14/2012, Carmona, Richard; \$1,000, 08/27/2012, Brown, Sherrod; \$2,500; 08/09/2012, Carper, Tom; \$-100, 07/20/2012, DSCCmte/California; \$200, 07/08/2012, DSCCmte/California; \$250, 06/28/2012, Bysiewicz, Susan; \$30,800, 05/31/2012; DNC; \$1,000, 2012, Kloubachar, Amy; \$1,000, 05/15/2012, Donnelly, Joe; \$1,000, 04/11/2012, McCaskill, Claire; \$2,500, 03/28/2012, Kennedy III, Joe; \$2,000, 03/13/2012, Nelson, Bill; \$500, 03/13/2012, Nelson, Bill; \$1,000, 03/06/2012, Hahn, Janice; \$1,000, 02/22/2012, Ruiz, Raul; \$1,000, 02/15/2012, Cherny, Andrei; \$1,000, 01/10/2012, Wasserman Schultz, Debbie; \$2,500, 10/28/2011, Warren, Elizabeth, \$500, 10/07/2011, Bass, Karen; \$250, 09/30/2011, Bass, Karen; \$1,000, 09/30/2011, Berman, Howard; \$1,000, 09/23/2011, Gillibrand, Kirsten; \$500, 09/21/2010, DCCC; \$500, 09/14/2010, Coons, Chris; \$1,000, 06/23/2010, Hodes, Paul; \$500, 06/07/2010, Blumenauer, Earl; \$1,000, 05/29/2010, Gillibrand, Kirsten; \$500, 08/17/2011, Nelson, Bill; \$1,000, 07/13/2011, Khazei, Alan; \$500, 06/15/2011, Brown, Sherrod; \$5,000, 06/09/2011, Obama Victory Fund; \$5,000, 06/09/2011, DNC; \$2,500, 05/23/2011, Kaine, Tim; \$500, 03/30/2011, Sherman, Brad; \$2,500, 03/07/011, Feinstein, Dianne; \$1,000, 03/03/2011; McCaskill, Claire; \$1,000, 10/27/2010, Dingell, John; \$500, 10/06/2010, Harman, Jane; \$500, 09/21/2010, Gillibrand, Kirsten; \$500, 09/21/2010, DCCC; \$500, 09/14/2010, Coons, Chris; \$1,000, 06/23/2010, Hodes, Paul; \$500, 06/07/2010, Blumenauer, Earl; \$1,000, 05/29/2010, Boxer, Barbara; \$1,000, 01/11/2010, Fisher, Lee; \$500, 12/17/2009, Meek, Kendrick; \$1,000, 11/02/2009, Khazei, Alan; \$1,000, 09/29/2009, Bennet, Michael; \$1,000, 09/23/2009, Berman, Howard; \$500, 06/30/2009, Dorgan, Byron; \$500, 06/26/2009, Obey, David; \$1,000, 06/18/2009, Garamendi, John; \$-500, 05/13/2009, Chu, Judy; \$500, 05/05/2009, Chu, Judy.

2. Spouse: Kimberly Marteau: \$5,000, 09/17/2012, Off The Sidelines PAC; \$2,500, 09/19/2011, DNC; \$1,000, 02/10/2010, Carnahan, Robin; \$5,000, 06/21/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$500, 09/30/2011, Brown, Sherrod.

3. Children and spouses: none.

4. Parents: James Emerson (Father): \$250, 10/10/2012, Obama Victory Fund, subsequently disbursed in full to Obama for America; \$200, 09/21/2012, DCCC; \$312, 07/18/2012, DCCC; \$50, 2012, DCCC; \$125, 2012, DCCC; \$150, 2012, DCCC; \$200, 2011, DCCC; \$100, 2011, DCCC; \$200, 11/13/2009, DSCC; \$85, 2012, DLCC.

5. Grandparents: none.

6. Brother: James Emerson: \$250, 10/10/2012, Obama Victory Fund.

*John Rufus Gifford, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark.

Nominee: John Rufus Gifford.
Post: Ambassador to Denmark.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$500, 8/19/10, Friends of Barb. Boxer; \$500, 9/14/11, Kaine for VA; \$5000, 11/22/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$500, 11/29/11, Tammy Baldwin for Senate; \$1000, 6/25/12, Cicilline Committee.

2. Children and Spouses: N/A.

3. Parents: Charles Gifford: \$2500, 7/27/09, DNC; \$2400, 1/16/10, Coakley for Senate; \$15200, 3/15/10, DNC; \$2400 6/30/10 Bennett for CO; \$2400, 10/21/10, Bennett for CO; \$2460, 2/14/11, McCaskill for MO; \$1500, 6/30/11, Khazei for MA; \$17,500, 9/28/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$2000, 10/29/11, Bill Keating Committee; \$2000, 11/15/11, Barney Frank for Congress; \$7500, 12/09/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$2500, 12/31/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$2500, 3/14/12, Joe Kennedy for Congress; \$2500, 7/19/12, Kaine for VA; \$40000 8/1/12, Obama Victory Fund; \$1000, 8/23/12, Joe Kennedy for Congress; \$1500, 8/26/12, Andrei for AZ; \$1500, 8/27/12, Win VA 2012; \$2000, 9/26/12, Angus King for Senate. Anne Gifford: \$30000, 6/12/09, DNC; \$2000, 10/27/09, Citizens for Alan Khazei; \$2400, 1/16/10, Coakley for Senate; \$15200, 3/15/12, DNC; \$2400, 5/17/10, Barney Frank for Congress; \$1000, 12/1/10, Friends of Sherrod Brown; \$1000, 6/26/11, Khazei for MA; \$1000, 6/30/11, Obama for America; \$17500, 9/28/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$1500, 9/30/11, Khazei for MA; \$15000, 12/18/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$20000, 4/18/12, Obama Victory Fund; \$2500, 7/19/12, Kaine for VA; \$1000, 8/23/12, Joe Kennedy for Congress; \$1000, 8/27/12, Win VA 2012; \$2000, 9/13/12, Tisei Congressional Cmte.

4. Grandparents: N/A.

5. Brothers and Spouses: Charles Gifford, Jr.: \$3500, 9/20/11, Khazei for MA. Betsey Gifford: None.

6. Sisters and Spouses: Ramsay Trussell: None. Geoffrey Trussell: None. Jessica Nigrelli (most made under Jessica Gifford): \$1000, 10/20/09, Coakley for Senate; \$500, 11/05/09, Capuano Committee; \$15200, 3/16/10, DNC; \$2000, 6/11/12, Obama Victory Fund; \$400, 6/30/11, Obama for America; \$500, 7/26/11, Obama Victory Fund; \$1500, 10/31/11, Obama Victory Fund. Andrew Nigrelli: None.

*Denise Campbell Bauer, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

Nominee: Denise Campbell Bauer.

Post: Belgium.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$7600, 01/12/2011, DNC; \$500, 06/12/2009, DNC; \$250, 04/16/2011, OVF; \$300, 06/21/2012, OVF; \$300, 06/12/2012, OVF; \$1000, 03/27/2012, OVF; \$1000, 12/13/2011, OVF; \$250, 05/31/2012, OVF; \$250, 09/17/2012, OVF; \$500, 09/25/2012, OVF; \$1000, 09/30/2012, OVF; \$600, 08/23/2012, OVF; \$250, 04/16/2011, OFA; \$1000, 03/27/2012, OFA; \$1000, 12/13/2011, OFA; \$205, 05/31/2012, OFA; \$300, 06/21/2012, OFA; \$300, 06/21/2012 OFA; \$645, 09/30/2012, DNC; \$250, 09/17/2012, OFA; \$500, 09/25/2012, OFA; \$355, 09/30/2012, OFA; \$250, 09/09/2011, Kaine for Virginia; \$500, 01/31/2012, Kaine for Virginia; \$200, 10/17/2010, Friends of Barbara Boxer.

2. Spouse: Steven Bauer: \$355, 10/10/2012, OFA.

3. Children and Spouses: Katherine Bauer: None. Natalie Bauer: None.

4. Parents: Charlotte Campbell: \$200, 10/04/2012, OVF; \$100, 09/14/2012, OVF; \$25, 08/31/2012, OVF; \$100, 05/31/2012, OVF.

Dennis R. Elston: None. Gaylo Elston: None.

5. Grandparents: Elizabeth Tharp: None. Vernon Tharp: None. Evelyn Elston: None. Charles Elston: None.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Dennis A. Elston: None. Erin Elston: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Jessica Campbell: None. Michael Reget: None. Mary Elston: None. Elizabeth Williams: None.

*James Costos, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

Nominee: James Costos.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Spain, U.S. Ambassador to Andorra.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: 09.16.2009, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$500; 09.30.2012, Collins for Senate, \$2,500; 04.14.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$5,000; 06.04.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$1,250; 07.02.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$15,000; 08.07.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$5,000; 10.22.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$5,000; 12.16.2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$35,800; 04.30.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$5,000; 06.21.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$1,250; 07.31.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$15,000; 09.04.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$5,000; 10.22.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$4,550; 12.31.2011, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$30,800; 12.16.2011, Obama for America, \$2,495; 12.16.2011, Obama for America, \$2,500; 9.27.2012, Lon Johnson, \$500; 1.1.2013 (est.), Christine Quinn for Mayor, \$2,950; 1.15.2013, Corey Booker for Senate (Primary), \$2,600; 1.15.2013, Corey Booker for Senate (General), \$2,400; 3.19.2013, Kay Hagan for Senate, \$2,600; TOTAL, \$142,695.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Katherine Costos & Charles Costos—no donations.

5. Grandparents: Achilleas Kostopoulos & Kyriakitsa Kostopoulos—no donations. James Dardas & Theopoula Dardas—no donations.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Maria Shahum & Peter Shahum—no donations. Elaine Scott & Jack Scott—no donations.

*James Costos, of California, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Andorra.

Nominee: James Costos.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Spain, U.S. Ambassador to Andorra

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: 9.16.2009, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$500; 9.30.2012, Collins For Senate, \$2,500; 04.14.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$5,000; 06.04.2012,

Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$1,250; 07.02.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$15,000; 08.07.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$5,000; 10.22.2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$5,000; 12.16.2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012, \$35,800; 04.30.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$5,000; 06.21.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$15,000; 09.04.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$5,000; 10.22.2012, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$4,550; 12.31.2011, DNC Services Corporation/Democratic National Committee, \$30,800; 12.16.2011, Obama for America, \$2,495; 12.16.2011, Obama for America, \$2,500; 9.27.2012, Lon Johnson, \$500; 1.1.2013, (est.) Christine Quinn for Mayor, \$2,950; 1.15.2013, Corey Booker for Senate (Primary), \$2,600; 1.15.2013, Corey Booker for Senate (General), \$2,400; 3.19.2013, Kay Hagan for Senate, \$2,600; TOTAL, \$142,695.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Katherine Costos & Charles Costos—no donations.

5. Grandparents: Achilleas Kostopoulos & Kyriakitsa Kostopoulos—no donations. James Dardas & Theopoula Dardas—no donations.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Maria Shahum & Peter Shahum—no donations. Elaine Scott & Jack Scott—no donations.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1385. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. CORKER):

S. 1386. A bill to provide for enhanced embassy security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. JOHANNES):

S. 1387. A bill to establish a pilot program to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to nonprofit organizations to rehabilitate and modify homes of disabled and low-income veterans; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1388. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Energy, to conduct a study on the public health and environmental impacts of the production, transportation, storage, and use

of petroleum coke, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1389. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Prison Ship Martyrs' Monument in Fort Greene Park, in the New York City borough of Brooklyn, as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1390. A bill to establish an independent advisory committee to review certain regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1391. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1392. A bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REID, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1393. A bill to ensure that the courts of the United States may provide an impartial forum for claims brought by United States citizens and others against any railroad organized as a separate legal entity, arising from the deportation of United States citizens and others to Nazi concentration camps on trains owned or operated by such railroad, and by the heirs and survivors of such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 1394. A bill to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Fort Belknap Indian Community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1396. A bill to authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency to award mitigation financial assistance in certain areas affected by wildfire; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 1397. A bill to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1398. A bill to require the Federal Government to expedite the sale of underutilized Federal real property; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1399. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend the interest rate limitation on debt entered into during military service to debt incurred during military service to consolidate or refinance student loans incurred before military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1400. A bill to increase access to adult education to provide for economic growth; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. Res. 202. A resolution designating July 30, 2013, as "National Whistleblower Appreciation Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. Res. 203. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding efforts by the United States to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 204. A resolution designating August 7, 2013, as "National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. HAGAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. VITTER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 205. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2013 as National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SHELBY, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. KING):

S. Res. 206. A resolution designating September 2013 as "National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 154

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 154, a bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to ensure that the coverage offered under multi-State qualified health plans offered in Exchanges is consistent with the Federal abortion funding ban.

S. 204

At the request of Mr. ENZI, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 204, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 240

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 240, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for non-regular service.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. REED, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to add Vietnam Veterans Day as a patriotic and national observance.

S. 554

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 554, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 675

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 675, a bill to prohibit contracting with the enemy.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi

(Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 790

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 790, a bill to require the United States International Trade Commission to recommend temporary duty suspensions and reductions to Congress, and for other purposes.

S. 907

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 907, a bill to provide grants to better understand and reduce gestational diabetes, and for other purposes.

S. 1033

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1033, a bill to authorize a grant program to promote physical education, activity, and fitness and nutrition, and to ensure healthy students, and for other purposes.

S. 1053

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1053, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen and protect Medicare hospice programs.

S. 1140

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1140, a bill to extend the authorization of the Highlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1195

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1195, a bill to repeal the renewable fuel standard.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1204, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in

governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1208

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1208, a bill to require meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide certain substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes.

S. 1215

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1215, a bill to strengthen privacy protections, accountability, and oversight related to domestic surveillance conducted pursuant to the USA PATRIOT Act and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

S. 1218

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1218, a bill to establish a State Energy Race to the Top Initiative to assist energy policy innovation in the States to promote the goal of doubling electric and thermal energy productivity by January 1, 2030.

S. 1228

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1228, a bill to establish a program to provide incentive payments to participating Medicare beneficiaries who voluntarily establish and maintain better health.

S. 1254

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1254, a bill to amend the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998, and for other purposes.

S. 1271

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1271, a bill to direct the President to establish guidelines for the United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1279

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1279, a bill to prohibit the revocation or withholding of Federal funds to programs whose participants carry out voluntary religious activities.

S. 1335

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1335, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting,

fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 1342

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1342, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit expensing of certain depreciable business assets for small businesses.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1360, a bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1378

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1378, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for investigative leave requirements with respect to Senior Executive Service employees, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 69

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 69, a resolution calling for the protections of religious minority rights and freedoms in the Arab world.

S. RES. 164

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 164, a resolution designating October 30, 2013, as a national day of remembrance for nuclear weapons program workers.

S. RES. 165

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 165, a resolution calling for the release from prison of former Prime Minister of Ukraine Yulia Tymoshenko in light of the recent European Court of Human Rights ruling.

S. RES. 199

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 199, a resolution celebrating the 200th August Quarterly Festival taking place from August 18, 2013, through August 25, 2013, in Wilmington, Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 1814

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1814 intended to be proposed to S. 1243, an original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. JOHANNIS):

S. 1387. A bill to establish a pilot program to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to nonprofit organizations to rehabilitate and modify homes of disabled and low-income veterans; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am proud to be once again reintroducing the Housing Assistance for Veterans Act, HAVEN Act, with my colleague, Senator JOHANNIS.

Last year, we joined forces to successfully pass this legislation as an amendment during the Senate's consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act, NDAA. Unfortunately, due to concerns by some on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, it was not included in the final version of the NDAA. Those concerns have been addressed in this version of the HAVEN Act, and I would like to thank the Veterans' Affairs Committee for working cooperatively with us to strengthen the legislation.

Our veterans have made many personal sacrifices in service to our Nation, and we must honor our commitment to provide them with the care they have earned and deserve. One such way is to ensure that they have access to adequate housing.

According to Rebuilding Together, 5.5 million of our veterans are disabled, and one and a half million are at risk of homelessness. In my home State of Rhode Island, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, there are more than 19,000 veterans with disabilities, each of whom face their own unique challenges in terms of their housing needs.

The Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, has programs that assist veterans in adapting and improving their homes, but unfortunately, these programs do not extend assistance to all veterans with disabilities. It is clear we must do more, and with this legislation, we are seeking to serve all veterans with disabilities, regardless of the severity of the disability and whether the disability is service-connected.

The HAVEN Act will give veterans the opportunity to renovate and modify their existing homes by installing

wheelchair ramps, widening doors, re-equipping rooms, and making necessary additions and adjustments to existing structures—all so that these homes are safer and more suitable for our veterans.

Our legislation encourages key stakeholders, such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the VA, housing non-profits, and veterans service organizations, to work together to serve our veterans. In order to extend the reach of this Federal funding, grant recipients would be expected to either match Federal funding or make in-kind contributions, through encouraging volunteers to help make repairs or engaging businesses to donate needed supplies.

This bill is supported by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Vietnam Veterans of America, Paralyzed Veterans of America, VetsFirst, a program of United Spinal Association, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Habitat for Humanity, and Rebuilding Together. I thank Senator JOHANNIS for working with me on this important bill, and I look forward to working with him and the rest of our colleagues to pass this legislation.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1388. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Energy, to conduct a study on the public health and environmental impacts of the production, transportation, storage, and use of petroleum coke, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am introducing today, with my colleagues Senators DURBIN, STABENOW, and BROWN, the Petroleum Coke Transparency and Public Health Study Act, which would require the Department of Health and Human Services to conduct a study on the health and environmental impacts of petroleum coke. This bill, which is a companion to a bill introduced by Representative PETERS on June 6, 2013, was motivated by a situation in Detroit.

In March 2013, large piles of uncontained petroleum coke stored along the banks of the Detroit River became publicly visible, raising questions about the potential environmental and public health impacts. Sitting just feet from the Detroit River, the piles have grown to nearly three stories high over the past several months. I want to make sure that this low-grade fuel does not pose a threat to the people of Detroit or impair our waterways. The Detroit River is a valued resource that must be preserved and protected.

Petroleum coke is a byproduct of refining crude oil into liquid fuels such

as gasoline and diesel. It is a commodity that can be cofired with coal to produce low-cost energy. In recent years, a number of U.S. refineries have undergone expansions in order to accommodate increases in processing crude oil, including the Marathon refinery in Detroit, MI; the Cenovus refinery in Wood River, IL; and the BP refinery in Whiting, IN.

With increases in crude oil processing in the United States and Canada, petroleum coke production is expected to rise. However, the impacts of petroleum coke on public health and the environment have not been fully assessed. Further, each State has different regulations for managing, storing, and transporting it. It is important that we understand the market projections for petroleum coke, how to properly manage it, and its potential impacts on public health and the environment.

This bill would address these key knowledge gaps by requiring a comprehensive study on petroleum coke. The study would include an analysis of the public health and environmental impacts of the production, transportation, storage, and use of petroleum coke; an assessment of best practices for storing, transporting, and managing petroleum coke; and a quantitative analysis of current and projected domestic petroleum coke production and utilization locations.

We should ensure that energy production occurs in a diligent and responsible manner and does not harm public health or our environment. With a changing energy market and limited dollars, we must have a comprehensive understanding of how to effectively and efficiently manage our future energy supply. This bill would give us the tools to properly manage petroleum coke production with good environmental and public stewardship.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1390. A bill to establish an independent advisory committee to review certain regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would like to offer a few words on a bill that I am introducing today with my colleague and friend, Senator ROY BLUNT of Missouri. Upon my arrival to the Senate, Senator BLUNT and I shared a conversation in which we discovered our interest in proposing pragmatic legislation that would go about easing the ever-growing regulatory burden borne by businesses across the country. Since then, we have worked together to craft a bill that takes a reasonable approach toward thinning out older regulations that have outlived their utility, all while retaining essential congressional oversight. Today we introduce the Regulatory Improvement Act of

2013, which I believe will achieve this goal.

The Regulatory Improvement Act will create an independent Regulatory Improvement Commission that will be tasked with reviewing outdated regulations with the goals of modifying, consolidating, or repealing regulations in order to reduce compliance costs, encourage growth and innovation, and improve competitiveness. The composition of the commission will be determined by congressional leadership and the President, and the commission will be tasked with identifying a single sector or area of regulations for consideration. After extensive review involving broad public and stakeholder input, the commission will submit to Congress a report containing regulations in need of streamlining, consolidation, or repeal. This report will enjoy expedited legislative procedures and will be subject to an up-or-down vote in both houses of Congress without amendment.

Let me be clear: the intent of this bill is not to engage in a wholesale dismantling of the existing regulatory regime. In particular, I share some of my colleagues concerns that “regulatory reform” can be employed as a euphemism to disguise an undercurrent of efforts to completely undo significant legislation—from the Clean Air Act to the Affordable Care Act. I do not support such efforts. That said, I believe there is broad bipartisan consensus that regulations have a cumulative effect and that Congress has neither the expertise nor formal mechanisms through which it can effectively and expeditiously conduct retrospective analyses. A Regulatory Improvement Commission would provide a vehicle for the review of older regulations and provided much-needed relief to businesses struggling to comply with layers of competing or even duplicative regulations.

In a larger sense, this bill seeks to reclaim some of the ground that Congress has ceded to executive agencies in recent years. From my vantage point, the current regulatory structure has become akin to a fourth, unchecked branch of government. As an institution, we must find ways to reverse this disturbing trend and reestablish an appropriate role of congressional oversight. Therefore, I am glad to introduce this bipartisan bill that offers a reasonable way to revisit older regulations, and I thank Senator BLUNT for his interest and support of the proposal.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1391. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; to the Com-

mittee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today I join with my senior colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, and with the distinguished chair of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, in reintroducing the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

The need for this legislation was vividly demonstrated by the experience of an Iowan—Jack Gross. Mr. Gross gave the prime of his life, a quarter century of loyal service, to one company. Despite Mr. Gross’s stellar work record, FBL Financial demoted him and other employees over the age of 50 and gave his job to a younger employee.

Expressly to prevent this kind of discrimination, in 1967 Congress passed the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, ADEA. Modeled from and using the same language as Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—which prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of race, sex, national origin and religion—the ADEA makes it unlawful to discriminate on the basis of age.

When Mr. Gross sought to enforce his rights under this law, a jury of Iowans heard the facts and found that his employer discriminated against him because of his age. That jury awarded him almost \$47,000 in lost compensation.

The case was ultimately appealed to the Supreme Court. In June 2009, in *Gross v. FBL Financial, Inc.*, the Court ruled against Mr. Gross, and in doing so made it harder for those with legitimate age discrimination claims to prevail under the ADEA. In fact, on remand, despite the fact Mr. Gross had established that age discrimination was a factor in his demotion, he lost his retrial.

For decades, the law was clear. In 1989, in *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*, the Court ruled that if a plaintiff seeking relief under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act demonstrated that discrimination was a “motivating” or “substantial” factor behind the employer’s action, the burden shifted to the employer to show it would have taken the same action regardless of the plaintiff’s membership in a protected class. As part of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, Congress codified the “motivating factor” standard with respect to Title VII discrimination claims.

Since the ADEA uses the same language as Title VII, was modeled from it, and had been interpreted consistent with the Civil Rights Act, courts rightly and consistently held that, like a plaintiff claiming discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion and national origin, a victim bringing suit under the ADEA need only show that membership in a protected class was a “motivating factor” in an employer’s action. If an employee showed that age was one factor in an employment decision, the burden was on the employer

to show it had acted for a legitimate reason other than age.

In *Gross*, the Court, addressing a question on which it did not grant certiorari, tore up this decades' old standard. In its place, the Court imposed a standard that makes it prohibitively difficult for a victim to prove age discrimination. According to the Court, a plaintiff bears the full burden of proving that age was not only a "motivating" factor but the "but for" factor, or decisive factor. And, unfortunately, just last month the Supreme Court, in *University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Nassar*, extended *Gross* to retaliation cases under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. Moreover, lower courts have extended *Gross* to other civil rights claims, including cases arising under the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act.

The extremely high burden *Gross* imposes radically undermines workers' ability to hold employers accountable. As Professor Helen Norton testified to the HELP Committee, "*Gross* entirely insulates from liability even an employer who confesses discrimination so long as that employer had another reason for its decision. By permitting employers to escape liability altogether even for a workplace admittedly infected by discrimination, with no incentive to refrain from similar discrimination in the future, the *Gross* rule thus undermines Congress's efforts to stop and deter workplace discrimination."

Bear in mind, unlawful discrimination is often difficult to detect. Obviously, those who discriminate do not often admit they are acting for discriminatory reasons. Employers rarely post signs saying, for example, "older workers need not apply." To the contrary, they go out of their way to conceal their true intent. The employer is in the best position to offer an explanation of why a decision that involves discrimination or retaliation was actually motivated by legitimate reasons. As Professor Norton testified, "[s]uch burden shifting appropriately recognizes and responds to employers' greater access to information that is key to proving or disproving an element of a particular claim . . ." By putting the entire burden on the worker to demonstrate the absence or insignificance of other factors, the court in effect has freed employers to discriminate or retaliate.

Unfortunately, as Mr. *Gross* and his colleagues know all too well, age discrimination does indeed occur. Countless thousands of American workers who are not yet ready to voluntarily retire find themselves jobless or passed over for promotions because of age discrimination. Older workers often face stereotypes: That they are not as productive as younger workers; that they cannot learn new skills; that they

somehow have a lesser need for income to provide for their families.

Indeed, according to an AARP study, 60% of older workers have reported that they or someone they know has faced age discrimination in the workplace. According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, in Fiscal Year 2012, over 2,800 age discrimination complaints were filed, a more than 20 percent increase from just five years ago. Given the stereotypes that older workers face, it is no surprise that on average they remain unemployed for more than twice as long as all unemployed workers.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act reiterates the principle that Congress established when it passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act—when making employment decisions it is illegal for race, sex, national origin, religion, age or disability to be a factor.

The bill repudiates the Supreme Court's *Gross v. FBL Financial* decision and will restore the law to what it was for decades. It makes clear that when an employee shows discrimination was a "motivating factor" behind a decision, the burden is properly on the employer to show the same decision would have been made regardless of discrimination or retaliation. And, like the Civil Rights Act of 1991 with respect to discrimination cases under Title VII, if the employer meets that burden, the employer remains liable, but remedies are limited.

This is a common sense, bipartisan bill. In fact, the Civil Rights Act of 1991, key provisions of which served as a model for this legislation, passed the Senate on a bipartisan basis 93-5. Further, we are introducing this bill only after countless hours of consultation with civil rights stakeholders and representatives of the business community. Moreover, this bill addresses the concerns that were raised about an earlier version of the bill at a hearing held before the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee in March 2010.

In fact, I want to comment on two changes from that earlier version of this bill introduced in the last Congress. Since October 2009, when Senator LEAHY and I first introduced the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, we have had the benefit of nearly three and a half years of lower court application of the *Gross* decision.

The 2009 bill would have expressly amended the ADEA to make clear that the analytical framework set out in *McDonnell Douglas v. Green* applied to that statute. Even though, before *Gross*, every Court of Appeals had held that *McDonnell Douglas* had applied to age claims, this clarification was meant to address a footnote in *Gross* in

which the Court arguably questioned the applicability of *McDonnell Douglas* to the ADEA. Since the bill was first introduced, however, every lower court that has examined the issue has continued to apply *McDonnell Douglas* to the ADEA. As a result, because *McDonnell Douglas* applies to the ADEA already, we deem it unnecessary to amend the statute.

Second, the initial bill expressly amended only the ADEA. Since *Gross*, however, lower courts have applied the Court's reasoning in that decision to other statutes. Because the most notable application has been to the ADA, Rehabilitation Act and Title VII retaliation claims, those statutes are expressly amended here too.

Finally, in *Gross*, the Court defended the Court's departure from well-established law by noting that it "cannot ignore Congress' decision to amend Title VII's relevant provisions but not make similar changes to the ADEA." In other words, the Court found that because Congress, in the Civil Rights Act of 1991, codified the "motivating factor" framework for discrimination claims under Title VII, but not for the ADEA, Congress somehow must have intended *Price Waterhouse* not to apply to any statute but Title VII.

Because of the Court's reasoning, I want to emphasize that this bill in no way questions the motivating factor framework for other anti-discrimination and anti-retaliation statutes that are not expressly covered by the legislation. As the bill's findings make clear, not only does this bill repudiate the *Gross* decision itself, but it expressly repudiates the reasoning underlying the decision, including the argument that Congress's failure to amend any statute other than Title VII means that Congress intended to disallow mixed motive claims under other statutes. It would be an error for a court to apply similar reasoning following passage of this bill to other statutes. The fact that other statutes are not expressly amended in this bill does not mean that Congress endorses *Gross*'s application to any other statute.

In conclusion, this bill is very straightforward. It reiterates what Congress said in 1967 when it passed the ADEA—when making employment decisions it is illegal for age to be a factor. A person should not be judged arbitrarily because he or she was born in a certain year or earlier when he or she still has the ability to contribute as much, or more, as the next person. This bill will help ensure that all our citizens will have an equal opportunity, commensurate with their abilities, for productive employment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1391

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In enacting section 107 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 (adding section 703(m) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964), Congress reaffirmed its understanding that unlawful discrimination is often difficult to detect and prove because discriminators do not usually admit their discrimination and often try to conceal their true motives. Section 703(m) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 expressly approved so-called “mixed motive” claims, providing that an unlawful employment practice is established when a protected characteristic was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.

(2) Congress enacted amendments to other civil rights statutes, including the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (referred to in this section as the “ADEA”), the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, but Congress did not expressly amend those statutes to address mixed motive discrimination.

(3) In the case of *Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc.*, 557 U.S. 167 (2009), the Supreme Court held that, because Congress did not expressly amend the ADEA to address mixed motive claims, such claims were unavailable under the ADEA, and instead the complainant bears the burden of proving that a protected characteristic or protected activity was the “but for” cause of an unlawful employment practice. This decision has significantly narrowed the scope of protections afforded by the statutes that were not expressly amended in 1991 to address mixed motive claims.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to clarify congressional intent that mixed motive claims shall be available, and that a complaining party need not prove that a protected characteristic or protected activity was the “but for” cause of an unlawful employment practice, under the ADEA and similar civil rights provisions;

(2) to reject the Supreme Court’s reasoning in the *Gross* decision that Congress’ failure to amend any statute other than title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (with respect to discrimination claims), in enacting section 107 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, suggests that Congress intended to disallow mixed motive claims under other statutes; and

(3) to clarify that complaining parties—

(A) may rely on any type or form of admissible evidence to establish their claims of an unlawful employment practice;

(B) are not required to demonstrate that the protected characteristic or activity was the sole cause of the employment practice; and

(C) may demonstrate an unlawful employment practice through any available method of proof or analytical framework.

SEC. 3. STANDARDS OF PROOF.

(a) AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967.—

(1) CLARIFYING PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF AGE IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Section 4 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 623) is amended by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g)(1) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, an unlawful practice is established under this Act when the complaining party demonstrates that age or an activity protected by subsection (d) was a motivating factor for any practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.

“(2) In establishing an unlawful practice under this Act, including under paragraph (1) or by any other method of proof, a complaining party—

“(A) may rely on any type or form of admissible evidence and need only produce evidence sufficient for a reasonable trier of fact to find that an unlawful practice occurred under this Act; and

“(B) shall not be required to demonstrate that age or an activity protected by subsection (d) was the sole cause of a practice.”.

(2) REMEDIES.—Section 7 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 626) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “The” and inserting “(1) The”;

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking “Amounts” and inserting the following: “(2) Amounts”;

(iii) in the fifth sentence, by striking “Before” and inserting the following:

“(4) Before”; and

(iv) by inserting before paragraph (4), as designated by clause (iii) of this subparagraph, the following:

“(3) On a claim in which an individual demonstrates that age was a motivating factor for any employment practice, under section 4(g)(1), and a respondent demonstrates that the respondent would have taken the same action in the absence of the impermissible motivating factor, the court—

“(A) may grant declaratory relief, injunctive relief (except as provided in subparagraph (B)), and attorney’s fees and costs demonstrated to be directly attributable only to the pursuit of a claim under section 4(g)(1); and

“(B) shall not award damages or issue an order requiring any admission, reinstatement, hiring, promotion, or payment.”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “Any” and inserting “Subject to subsection (b)(3), any”.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—Section 11 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 630) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) The term ‘demonstrates’ means meets the burdens of production and persuasion.”.

(4) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Section 15 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 633a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) Sections 4(g) and 7(b)(3) shall apply to mixed motive claims (involving practices described in section 4(g)(1)) under this section.”.

(b) TITLE VII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.—

(1) CLARIFYING PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Section 703 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-2) is amended by striking subsection (m) and inserting the following:

“(m) Except as otherwise provided in this title, an unlawful employment practice is established under this title when the complaining party demonstrates that race, color, religion, sex, or national origin or an activity protected by section 704(a) was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.”.

(2) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Section 717 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) Sections 703(m) and 706(g)(2)(B) shall apply to mixed motive cases (involving practices described in section 703(m)) under this section.”.

(c) AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 101 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12111) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(11) DEMONSTRATES.—The term ‘demonstrates’ means meets the burdens of production and persuasion.”.

(2) CLARIFYING PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF DISABILITY IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Section 102 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12112) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PROOF.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, a discriminatory practice is established under this Act when the complaining party demonstrates that disability or an activity protected by subsection (a) or (b) of section 503 was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.

“(2) DEMONSTRATION.—In establishing a discriminatory practice under paragraph (1) or by any other method of proof, a complaining party—

“(A) may rely on any type or form of admissible evidence and need only produce evidence sufficient for a reasonable trier of fact to find that a discriminatory practice occurred under this Act; and

“(B) shall not be required to demonstrate that disability or an activity protected by subsection (a) or (b) of section 503 was the sole cause of an employment practice.”.

(3) CERTAIN ANTIRETALIATION CLAIMS.—Section 503(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12203(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking “The remedies” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the remedies”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) CERTAIN ANTIRETALIATION CLAIMS.—Section 107(c) shall apply to claims under section 102(e)(1) with respect to title I.”.

(4) REMEDIES.—Section 107 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12117) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) DISCRIMINATORY MOTIVATING FACTOR.—On a claim in which an individual demonstrates that disability was a motivating factor for any employment practice, under section 102(e)(1), and a respondent demonstrates that the respondent would have taken the same action in the absence of the impermissible motivating factor, the court—

“(1) may grant declaratory relief, injunctive relief (except as provided in paragraph (2)), and attorney’s fees and costs demonstrated to be directly attributable only to the pursuit of a claim under section 102(e)(1); and

“(2) shall not award damages or issue an order requiring any admission, reinstatement, hiring, promotion, or payment.”.

(d) REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sections 501(g), 503(d), and 504(d) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791(g), 793(d), and 794(d)), are each amended by adding after the words “title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12111 et seq.)” the following: “, including the standards of causation or methods of proof applied under section 102(e) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 12112(e)).”.

(2) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) to section 501(g) shall

be construed to apply to all employees covered by section 501.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall apply to all claims pending on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce the Good Samaritan Hunger Relief Tax Incentive Act along with Senators COCHRAN, CASEY, and MORAN. This bill is an effort I have worked on with former Senator Richard Lugar for many years and I am happy to continue the effort on behalf of hungry families nationwide this Congress.

In the wake of our Nation's economic recession, the demand on food banks, church food pantries, and soup kitchens has increased significantly. According to a study by the United States Department of Agriculture, over 50 million Americans lived in food insecure households in 2011. The same study found that households with children reported food insecurity at a much higher rate than households without children. In fact, in Vermont alone, over 12,000 children rely on food from food shelves each month.

Despite the increased demand for donated food, it is estimated that between 25 and 40 percent of the food that is produced, grown, and transported in the United States will never be consumed. This contributes to the 70 billion pounds of fit and wholesome food that are sent to landfills in the United States each year.

This bill would address this troubling trend by giving greater incentives to all businesses to donate food to non-profit organizations that feed the hungry. The current tax code allows corporations to receive a special deduction for donations to food banks, but it excludes many other small businesses such as farmers, ranchers, and restaurant owners from the same tax incentive. Unfortunately, these businesses often find it more cost effective to throw away food than to donate it to those in need.

I am pleased beginning in 2006, Congress temporarily extended this tax incentive to most businesses, and most recently extended the provision through the end of 2013. After the provision was enacted, in the restaurant industry alone we saw a 137 percent increase in the pounds of food donated. The Good Samaritan Hunger Relief Tax Incentive Act would make this provision permanent, and would extend the deduction to farmers who often have large amounts of fresh food to donate.

This bipartisan legislation is supported by numerous organizations in-

cluding Feeding America, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Food Marketing Institute, Grocery Manufacturers Association, the National Restaurant Association, the Vermont Food Bank, and Hunger Free Vermont. I hope as this Congress considers comprehensive tax legislation in the future this measure is included. We must do more to ensure that no one in America goes hungry, and increasing the amount of food available to food banks is a critical step toward meeting that goal.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1399. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend the interest rate limitation on debt entered into during military service to debt incurred during military service to consolidate or refinance student loans incurred before military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1399

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. INTEREST RATE LIMITATION ON DEBT ENTERED INTO DURING MILITARY SERVICE TO CONSOLIDATE OR REFINANCE STUDENT LOANS INCURRED BEFORE MILITARY SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 207 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 527) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “ON DEBT INCURRED BEFORE SERVICE” after “LIMITATION TO 6 PERCENT”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) LIMITATION TO 6 PERCENT ON DEBT INCURRED DURING SERVICE TO CONSOLIDATE OR REFINANCE STUDENT LOANS INCURRED BEFORE SERVICE.—An obligation or liability bearing interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year that is incurred by a servicemember, or the servicemember and the servicemember's spouse jointly, during military service to consolidate or refinance one or more student loans incurred by the servicemember before such military service shall not bear an interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent during the period of military service.”;

(4) in paragraph (3), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by inserting “or (2)” after “paragraph (1)”;

(5) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “the interest rate limitation in subsection (a)” and inserting “an interest rate limitation in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “AS OF DATE OF ORDER TO ACTIVE DUTY”;

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “in the case of an obliga-

tion or liability covered by subsection (a)(1), or as of the date the servicemember (or servicemember and spouse jointly) incurs the obligation or liability concerned under subsection (a)(2)”.

(c) STUDENT LOAN DEFINED.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) STUDENT LOAN.—The term ‘student loan’ means the following:

“(A) A Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

“(B) A private student loan as that term is defined section 140(a) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)).”.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1400. A bill to increase access to adult education to provide for economic growth; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, our economy will not work for individuals or for our nation unless we create and support avenues for adults to continue their education and build their skills. These are longstanding issues that I have worked on for many years, including the last attempt to reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act. I was pleased to work with Senator Webb in the 112th Congress on the Adult Education and Economic Growth Act, and I am proud to reintroduce it today with Senator BROWN. I thank Congressman RUBÉN HINOJOSA for introducing the companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

The Adult Education and Economic Growth Act increases the investment in adult education programs; ensures better coordination among adult education programs, workforce development programs, and higher education; strengthens professional development for adult education providers; expands the use of technology in adult education programs; and provides incentives for employers to support their workers who need adult education services.

In Rhode Island, roughly 41 percent of working age adults have a college degree. By 2018, it is estimated that 61 percent of Rhode Island jobs will require some postsecondary education. We have an estimated 91,000 individuals without a high school diploma—the basic ticket to accessing postsecondary education and training.

Nationally, the numbers make a similar case for the need to invest in adult education. According to the National Commission on Adult Literacy, 80 to 90 million U.S. adults today, about half of the adult workforce, do not have the basic education and communication skills required to obtain jobs that pay a family-sustaining wage. These individuals continue to struggle in the recovering economy, with unemployment rates above 10 percent for individuals who do not have a high school diploma, compared to 7.6 percent for high school graduates and less

than 4 percent for workers with bachelor's degrees.

Simply put, we will not be able to close the skills gap without a robust investment in adult education. Unfortunately, we have not been making this kind of investment. Funding has been anemic, and as a result, services reach fewer than 3 million adults annually—a fraction of the need.

The Adult Education and Economic Growth will help turn around this dire situation by increasing the authorization for adult education programs authorized under Title II of the Workforce Investment Act to \$850 million and establishing a new state technology grant for adult education to upgrade the delivery system and assist adults in attaining critical digital literacy skills. This legislation requires state and local workforce investment boards to address adult education in their plans for using funds authorized under Title I of the Workforce Investment Act, including incorporating adult education into career pathways programs and offering integrated education and training programs. It also strengthens programs and services for English learners, including authorizing the Integrated English Literacy and Civics Program, and for adults with disabilities. The legislation will also build the knowledge base on what works for adult learners through a National Center for Adult Education, Literacy, and Workplace Skills. Finally, the Adult Education and Economic Growth Act will provide employers with tax incentives to invest in developing the basic skills of their employees.

In sum, the Adult Education and Economic Growth Act offers a comprehensive approach to reaching the millions of adults who need basic skills, English literacy instruction, or a secondary school diploma so that they can embark on a career pathway that leads to economic stability and success. I am pleased to have worked with the National Commission on Adult Literacy in developing this legislation. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill and work with me to include its provisions in the pending reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 202—DESIGNATING JULY 30, 2013, AS “NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY”

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEVIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 202

Whereas, in 1777, before the passage of the Bill of Rights, 10 sailors and marines blew

the whistle on fraud and misconduct harmful to the United States;

Whereas the Founding Fathers unanimously supported the whistleblowers in words and deeds, including releasing government records and providing monetary assistance for reasonable legal expenses necessary to prevent retaliation;

Whereas, on July 30, 1778, in demonstration of their full support for whistleblowers, the members of the Continental Congress unanimously enacted the first whistleblower legislation in the United States that read: “Resolved, That it is the duty of all persons in the service of the United States, as well as all other the inhabitants thereof, to give the earliest information to Congress or other proper authority of any misconduct, frauds or misdemeanors committed by any officers or persons in the service of these states, which may come to their knowledge” (legislation of July 30, 1778, reprinted in *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774–1789*, ed. Government Printing Office (Washington, DC, 1908), 11:732);

Whereas whistleblowers risk their careers, jobs, and reputations by reporting waste, fraud, and abuse to the proper authorities;

Whereas, when providing proper authorities with lawful disclosures, whistleblowers save taxpayers in the United States billions of dollars each year and serve the public interest by ensuring that the United States remains an ethical and safe place; and

Whereas it is the public policy of the United States to encourage, in accordance with Federal law (including the Constitution, rules, and regulations) and consistent with the protection of classified information (including sources and methods of detection), honest and good faith reporting of misconduct, fraud, misdemeanors, and other crimes to the appropriate authority at the earliest time possible: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 30, 2013, as “National Whistleblower Appreciation Day”; and

(2) ensures that the Federal Government implements the intent of the Founding Fathers, as reflected in the legislation enacted on July 30, 1778, by encouraging each executive agency to recognize National Whistleblower Appreciation Day by—

(A) informing employees, contractors working on behalf of United States taxpayers, and members of the public about the legal rights of citizens of the United States to blow the whistle; and

(B) acknowledging the contributions of whistleblowers to combating waste, fraud, abuse, and violations of laws and regulations in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 203—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING EFFORTS BY THE UNITED STATES TO RESOLVE THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT THROUGH A NEGOTIATED TWO-STATE SOLUTION

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 203

Whereas the special relationship between the United States and Israel is rooted in shared interests and shared values of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law;

Whereas the United States has worked for decades to strengthen Israel's security through assistance and cooperation on defense and intelligence matters in order to enhance the safety of Americans and Israelis;

Whereas the United States remains unwavering in its commitment to help Israel address the myriad challenges our ally faces, including threats from anti-Israel terrorist organizations, regional instability, horrifying violence in neighboring states, and the prospect of a nuclear-armed Iran;

Whereas, the United States continues to seek a permanent, two-state solution to resolve the conflict between Israel and Palestine as a fundamental component of our Nation's commitment to the security of Israel;

Whereas, for 20 years, Presidents of the United States from both political parties and Israeli Prime Ministers have supported a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict;

Whereas ending the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is vital to the interests of all parties and to peace and stability in the Middle East;

Whereas a peace agreement that establishes a Palestinian state, coexisting side-by-side with Israel in peace and security, is necessary to ensure that Israel remains a Jewish, democratic state;

Whereas, recognizing the urgency of the situation, Secretary John Kerry made 6 trips to the Middle East in his first 6 months as Secretary of State in an effort to resume negotiations toward a two-state solution;

Whereas, on July 29, 2013 representatives of Israel and Palestine engaged in face-to-face talks in order to move toward a resumption of formal negotiations on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict's final status issues:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) a two-state solution is the only outcome to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict which can—

(A) ensure the State of Israel's survival as a secure, democratic homeland for the Jewish people; and

(B) fulfill the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people for a state of their own;

(2) achievement of a two-state solution that would enhance stability and security in the Middle East is a fundamental United States security interest;

(3) while only Israel and Palestine can make the difficult choices necessary to end their conflict, the United States remains indispensable to any viable effort to achieve that goal;

(4) Secretary of State John Kerry is to be commended for his tireless efforts to urgently advance a negotiated two-state solution; and

(5) the Senate pledges its support for a sustained United States diplomatic initiative to help Israel and Palestine conclude an agreement to end their conflict.

SENATE RESOLUTION 204—DESIGNATING AUGUST 7, 2013, AS “NATIONAL LIGHTHOUSE AND LIGHTHOUSE PRESERVATION DAY”

Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 204

Whereas August 7, 2013, marks the 224th anniversary of the signing by President George Washington of the Act entitled “An Act for the establishment and support of lighthouses, beacons, buoys, and public piers”, approved August 7, 1789 (commonly known as the “Lighthouse Act of 1789”) (1 Stat. 53, chapter 9);

Whereas that Act, the ninth act of the 1st Congress, established a Federal role in the support, maintenance, and repair of all lighthouses, beacon buoys, and public piers necessary for safe navigation, commissioned the first Federal lighthouse, and represents the first public works act in the young United States;

Whereas the establishment of the United States system of navigational aids set the United States on a path to the forefront of international maritime prominence and established lighthouses that played an integral role in the rich maritime history of the United States, as that history spread from the Atlantic coast, through the Great Lakes and the Gulf coast, to the Pacific States;

Whereas those iconic structures, standing at land’s end through 2 centuries, have symbolized safety, security, heroism, duty, and faithfulness;

Whereas architects, designers, engineers, builders, and keepers devoted, and in some cases jeopardized, their lives for the safety of others during centuries of light tending by the United States Lighthouse Service and the United States Coast Guard;

Whereas the automation of the light system exposed the historic lighthouse towers to the ravages of time and vandalism and yet, at the same time, opened an opportunity for citizen involvement in efforts to save and restore those beacons that mark the evolving maritime history of the United States and its coastal communities;

Whereas the national lighthouse preservation movement has gained momentum over the past half century and is making major contributions to the preservation of maritime history and heritage and, through the development and enhancement of cultural tourism, to the economies of coastal communities in the United States;

Whereas the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-355; 114 Stat. 1385), enacted on October 24, 2000, and with the aid of the lighthouse preservation community, provides an effective process administered by the General Services Administration and the National Park Service for transferring lighthouses to the best possible stewardship groups;

Whereas, for the past several decades, regional and national groups have formed within the lighthouse preservation community to promote lighthouse heritage through research, education, tourism, and publications;

Whereas the earliest and largest regional preservation group, the Great Lakes Lighthouse Keepers Association, headquartered in Michigan, marks its 30th anniversary in 2013, and the largest and oldest national group, the United States Lighthouse Society, which relocated from San Francisco, California, to the State of Washington in 2008, marks its 30th anniversary in 2014;

Whereas other groups have also been formed to promote lighthouse preservation and history, many with regional chapters, including—

(1) a national leadership council and forum named the American Lighthouse Council (formerly the American Lighthouse Coordi-

nating Committee), currently headquartered in Illinois;

(2) the American Lighthouse Foundation in Maine;

(3) the Michigan Lighthouse Alliance and Michigan Lighthouse Conservancy;

(4) the Maine Lights Program;

(5) the Outer Banks Lighthouse Society in North Carolina;

(6) the New Jersey Lighthouse Society;

(7) the Florida Lighthouse Association; and

(8) the Lighthouse Preservation Society in Massachusetts;

Whereas major lighthouse publications, including the United States Lighthouse Society’s Keeper’s Log and the Lighthouse Digest, contribute greatly to the promotion of lighthouse heritage and preservation;

Whereas single-lighthouse preservation efforts by individuals or organizations, including historical societies and governments, have even longer histories, including preservation efforts in—

(1) Grosse Point, Illinois, established in 1935;

(2) Buffalo, New York, established in 1962;

(3) Navesink Twin Lights, New Jersey, established in 1962;

(4) Point Fermin, California, established in 1970;

(5) Charlotte-Genesee near Rochester, New York, established in 1965;

(6) Key West, Florida, established in 1969;

(7) Split Rock Lighthouse, Minnesota, established in 1971;

(8) Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida, established in 1972;

(9) St. Augustine, Florida, established in 1981; and

(10) Fire Island, New York, established in 1982;

Whereas, despite progress, many lighthouses in the United States remain threatened by erosion, neglect, vandalism, and deterioration by the elements;

Whereas Congress passed, and President Ronald Reagan signed, a Joint Resolution entitled “Joint Resolution designating the day of August 7, 1989, as ‘National Lighthouse Day’”, approved November 5, 1988 (Public Law 100-622; 102 Stat. 3201), in honor of the bicentennial of the United States Lighthouse Service; and

Whereas the many completed, ongoing, or planned private and public efforts to preserve lighthouses demonstrate the public support for those historic structures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates August 7, 2013, as “National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day”;

(2) encourages lighthouse grounds to be made open to the general public to the extent feasible; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 205—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 2013 AS NATIONAL OVARIAN CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. HAGAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. VITTER, Ms.

WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 205

Whereas ovarian cancer is the deadliest of all gynecologic cancers;

Whereas ovarian cancer is the fifth leading cause of cancer deaths among women in the United States;

Whereas, in 2013, approximately 22,000 new cases of ovarian cancer will be diagnosed, and 14,400 women will die of ovarian cancer in the United States;

Whereas the mortality rate for ovarian cancer has not significantly decreased since the “War on Cancer” was declared more than 40 years ago;

Whereas all women are at risk for ovarian cancer, and 90 percent of women diagnosed with ovarian cancer do not have a family history that puts them at a higher risk;

Whereas some women, such as those with a family history of breast or ovarian cancer, are at higher risk for developing the disease;

Whereas the Pap test is sensitive and specific to the early detection of cervical cancer, but not ovarian cancer;

Whereas there is currently no reliable early detection test for ovarian cancer;

Whereas many people are unaware that the symptoms of ovarian cancer often include bloating, pelvic or abdominal pain, difficulty eating or feeling full quickly, urinary symptoms, and several other symptoms that are easily confused with other diseases;

Whereas, in June 2007, the first national consensus statement on ovarian cancer symptoms was developed to provide consistency in describing symptoms to make it easier for women to learn and remember the symptoms;

Whereas there are known methods to reduce the risk of ovarian cancer, including prophylactic surgery, oral contraceptives, and breastfeeding;

Whereas due to the lack of a reliable early detection test, 75 percent of cases of ovarian cancer are detected at an advanced stage, making the overall 5-year survival rate only 46 percent;

Whereas there are factors that are known to reduce the risk for ovarian cancer and that play an important role in the prevention of the disease;

Whereas awareness of the symptoms of ovarian cancer by women and health care providers can lead to a quicker diagnosis;

Whereas, each year during the month of September, the Ovarian Cancer National Alliance and its partner members hold a number of events to increase public awareness of ovarian cancer; and

Whereas September 2013 should be designated as “National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month” to increase public awareness of ovarian cancer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month.

SENATE RESOLUTION 206—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2013 AS “NATIONAL PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SHELBY, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. KING) submitted the following

resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 206

Whereas 2,500,000 families in the United States live with prostate cancer;

Whereas 1 in 6 males in the United States will be diagnosed with prostate cancer in their lifetimes;

Whereas prostate cancer is the most commonly diagnosed non-skin cancer and the second most common cause of cancer-related deaths among males in the United States;

Whereas the National Cancer Institute estimates that, in 2013, nearly 240,000 men will be diagnosed with, and more than 29,000 men will die of, prostate cancer;

Whereas 40 percent of newly diagnosed prostate cancer cases occur in males under the age of 65;

Whereas approximately every 14 seconds, a male in the United States turns 50 years old and increases his odds of developing cancer, including prostate cancer;

Whereas African-American males suffer from a prostate cancer incidence rate that is up to 65 percent higher than that for white males and have double the prostate cancer mortality rate than that of white males;

Whereas obesity is a significant predictor of the severity of prostate cancer;

Whereas the probability that obesity will lead to death and high cholesterol levels is strongly associated with advanced prostate cancer;

Whereas males in the United States with 1 family member diagnosed with prostate cancer have a 33 percent chance of being diagnosed with the disease, males with 2 close family members diagnosed have an 83 percent chance, and males with 3 family members diagnosed have a 97 percent chance;

Whereas only 33 percent of males survive more than 5 years if diagnosed with prostate cancer after the cancer has metastasized;

Whereas there are no noticeable symptoms of prostate cancer while in the early stages, making screening critical;

Whereas screening by a digital rectal examination and a prostate-specific antigen blood test can detect the disease in the early stages, increasing the chances of survival for more than 5 years to nearly 100 percent;

Whereas ongoing research promises further improvements in prostate cancer prevention, early detection, and treatment; and

Whereas educating people in the United States, including health care providers, about prostate cancer and early detection strategies is crucial to saving the lives of males and preserving and protecting families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2013 as “National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month”;

(2) declares that steps should be taken—

(A) to raise awareness about the importance of screening methods for, and treatment of, prostate cancer;

(B) to increase research funding to a level that is commensurate with the burden of prostate cancer, so that—

(i) screening and treatment for prostate cancer may be improved;

(ii) the causes of prostate cancer may be discovered; and

(iii) a cure for prostate cancer may be developed; and

(C) to continue to consider ways for improving access to, and the quality of, health care services for detecting and treating prostate cancer; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States, interest groups, and affected persons—

(A) to promote awareness of prostate cancer;

(B) to take an active role in the fight to end the devastating effects of prostate cancer on individuals, families, and the economy; and

(C) to observe National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1823. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1824. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1825. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1826. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to compounding drugs; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1827. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1828. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1829. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1830. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1831. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1823. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, line 16, strike the period and insert the following: “: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall expend amounts appropriated under this heading to pay for the costs of all air traffic and safety support services required when general aviation traf-

fic increases and the need for such services is significant and anticipated.”.

SA 1824. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 25, line 14, after “2014”, insert “, of which \$100,000 shall be made available to the Secretary of Transportation to encourage States to prioritize vehicles defined in section 30D(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and vehicles that operate solely on compressed natural gas for purposes of section 166(b)(5)(B) of title 23, United States Code”.

SA 1825. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . HOURS OF SERVICE STUDY

In carrying out the requirements of Section 32301 of PL 112-141 (MAP-21), the Secretary shall evaluate impacts on small business operators, and consider a low-cost option to address any adverse impacts and report back to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate no later than December 31, 2013.

SA 1826. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to compounding drugs; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 37, strike lines 6 through 10.

SA 1827. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to compounding drugs; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 37, strike lines 11 through 18.

SA 1828. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to compounding drugs; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 38, strike lines 4 through 9.

SA 1829. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 959, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to compounding drugs;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 39, strike line 24 and all that follows through line 7 on page 42 and insert the following:

“(2) NON-APPLICABILITY TO NON-STERILE DRUGS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the requirements of this section shall not apply to a non-sterile drug (a drug that does not meet the definition of a sterile drug under subsection (b)(9)), or to a traditional compounder or compounding manufacturer with respect to such a drug.”.

SA 1830. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the royalties collected pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) that are required to be paid, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, to the State from which the minerals were located, may be deposited into the Highway Trust Fund.

SA 1831. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 188, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 4 _____. (a) Section 411(h) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1240a(h)) is amended by striking paragraph (5).

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) takes effect on July 6, 2012.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in executive session on Wednesday, July 31, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 608 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to mark-up S. 1356, Workforce Investment Act of 2013, the nominations of Robert F. Cohen, Jr., of West Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, William I. Althen, of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health review Commission, Catherine E. Lhamon, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Education as well as any additional nominations cleared for action.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224-5375.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Mitigating Systemic Risk in Financial Markets Through Wall Street Reforms.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2013, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select

Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY, AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Compensation Policy, and Consumer Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 30, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Standard Essential Patent Disputes and Antitrust Law.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINING

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in order to conduct a hearing on July 30, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a legal fellow in Senator BLUMENTHAL's office, Afton Cissell, be granted floor privileges for the duration of July 30, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the privilege of the floor be granted to the following member of my staff: Chris Jacob.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DOUGLAS A. MUNRO COAST GUARD HEADQUARTERS BUILDING

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2611, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2611) to designate the headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia as the “Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building,” and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I further ask that the bill be read three times and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2611) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

IMPROVING THE HOME EQUITY CONVERSION MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent the Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2167, and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2167) to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish additional requirements to improve the fiscal safety and soundness of the home equity conversion mortgage insurance program.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2167) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZING USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 44, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 44) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 44) was agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration en bloc of the following resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 202, S. Res. 204, S. Res. 205, and S. Res. 206.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1392

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I understand that S. 1392, introduced earlier today by Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1392) to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 31, 2013

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 31, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the

time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 1243, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill, under the previous order; further, that upon disposition of the Paul amendment, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 201, the nomination of Byron Todd Jones to be Director of the ATF, and that the Senate proceed to the cloture vote on the Jones nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. There will be two rollcall votes at approximately 10:45 a.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:13 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 31, 2013 at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

NICHOLAS CHRISTOPHER GEALE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2016. (REAPPOINTMENT)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 30, 2013:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

HARRY I. JOHNSON III, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 27, 2015.

PHILIP ANDREW MISCIMARRA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2017.

MARK GASTON PEARCE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 27, 2018.

KENT YOSHIHO HIROZAWA, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 27, 2016.

NANCY JEAN SCHIFFER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2014.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING THE TOWN OF
SPRUCE PINE FOR REACHING
THEIR 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the town of Spruce Pine for reaching their 100th anniversary. Nestled between the majestic peaks of Mt. Mitchell and Roan Mountain, the flourishing Appalachian town of Spruce Pine boasts all the natural beauty of the North Carolina Blue Ridge Mountains.

Spruce Pine's story began at the turn of the century when a single house was erected near the Carolina, Clinchfield, and Ohio Railroad Depot. Situated between river and mountain-side, the town grew quickly, became chartered in 1913, quadrupled in population, and soon became the commercial center of the Toe River Valley.

Growth continued as mining emerged in the economic anchor of the Spruce Pine community. Best known for its incredibly rich mineral deposits, Spruce Pine boasts the most concentrated feldspar deposits on earth. This geological wonder is responsible for 60 percent of the total United States feldspar, which is used in ceramics, paints, electrical wiring devices, tile, fiberglass insulation, and glass containers.

In a way, most everyone east of the Mississippi has been impacted by goods originated from Spruce Pine. In addition, Spruce Pine is home to the entire world supply of the pure quartz used in manufacturing fused quartz apparatuses. This fused quartz is used to manufacture the semiconductors found in every computer. To own a computer is to have a connection to Spruce Pine.

Spruce Pine is also home to a proud farming population and one of the world's largest art communities. The Toe River Arts Council, which has worked in Spruce Pine for the last 37 years, ensures a legacy of handmade mountain artwork that will continue for many future generations.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great satisfaction that I recognize the town of Spruce Pine and congratulate a truly exceptional 100 years. Its contributions to our culture and industry have been remarkable. I couldn't be more proud to represent such an exemplary town, such warm people, and such a beautiful part of North Carolina.

HONORING ABILITYONE CENTERS
OF SOUTH CENTRAL INDIANA

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the great work of the AbilityOne Program. As the largest single provider of employment for people who are blind or have significant disabilities, the AbilityOne Program puts more than 47,000 Americans to work by providing products and services to federal and commercial customers. In my home State of Indiana, I am pleased to have two AbilityOne centers, Bosma Enterprises and the First Chance Center, who help bring Hoosiers with disabilities into the workforce.

Since 1915, Bosma Enterprises has been providing Hoosiers who are blind or visually impaired with job training, employment services, rehabilitation, and outreach programs, empowering Hoosiers to reach their own personal goals while giving them to tools to live independently. In the past year, Bosma has been able to change the lives of many blind and disabled Hoosiers as they navigated the complexities of finding meaningful employment. One of those individuals is Ray Montgomery who, at the age of 17, lost his sight as a victim of a violent crime. After rehabilitation, Mr. Montgomery graduated college and began searching for a job without much success. He then came to Bosma Enterprises where they looked beyond his disability and focused on his skills and potential. Ray now works in Bosma's production facility and is learning new skills to develop personally and professionally.

The First Chance Center in Paoli, Indiana, has helped to provide sustainable gainful employment for Hoosiers with disabilities for the past 13 years. They promote the abilities of Hoosiers with disabilities and provide opportunities for these individuals to fully participate in their community. It is through these meaningful job opportunities that these Hoosiers have been able to gain marketable skills and confidence. The First Chance Center also provides a multitude of other support services, including day services for persons with intellectual or developmental disabilities and Tot-to-Tot playgroup for children with special needs.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the efforts of Bosma Enterprises, the First Chance Center, and other AbilityOne organizations and am grateful for the work they do each day to open the doors of opportunity for Americans who are blind or have significant disabilities.

RECOGNIZING DR. JANICE IZLAR,
CRNA, DNAP

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my constituent Janice Izlar, CRNA, DNAP, of Savannah, Georgia. Dr. Izlar will soon complete her year as national president of the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists (AANA). I am proud that Dr. Izlar was elected as the 2012–2013 president of this prestigious national organization.

Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetists (CRNAs) are advanced practice registered nurses who treat approximately 34 million patients each year. They work in every setting in which anesthesia is delivered including hospital surgical suites, obstetrical delivery rooms, ambulatory surgical centers, and the offices of dentists, podiatrists, and specialty surgeons. They also provide acute and chronic pain management services to patients in need of such care. CRNAs provide anesthesia for all types of surgical cases and are the sole anesthesia providers in many rural hospitals.

As a CRNA, Dr. Izlar has contributed greatly to the healthcare community in southeast Georgia, serving as a self-employed CRNA and as Chief Nurse Anesthetist and Administrator for Anesthesia Services at the Georgia Institute for Plastic Surgery since 1996. Dr. Izlar was awarded her Doctorate in Nurse Anesthesia Practice by Virginia Commonwealth University, her Master of Science in Nursing by Columbia University, her Bachelor's in Nursing, cum laude, by the University of Tulsa, and her Diploma in Nurse Anesthesia by the North Carolina Baptist Hospital School of Nurse Anesthesia. In addition to her service as AANA President, Dr. Izlar has held various leadership positions in the AANA, including President-elect, Vice President, and Region 2 Director, and has served on numerous committees. She is a former president of the Georgia Association of Nurse Anesthetists and is a distinguished speaker on anesthesia topics, lecturing nationwide on the safety, value and cost-effectiveness of CRNA care.

During her AANA Presidency, Dr. Izlar has been a prominent advocate for the patients and practice of nurse anesthesia before federal agencies and members of Congress. She has worked tirelessly to promote anesthesia patient safety and the value of CRNAs to our healthcare system. I am proud to have worked with Janice for years as well as during her time as President and am happy to call her a friend and a loyal advocate for CRNA priorities in Washington and beyond. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Janice on a successful term.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HONORING IRMA LOPEZ

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize Irma J. Lopez, a community leader and activist, who is a tireless champion of women's and social justice issues in Ventura County. Irma is a remarkable role model, and a woman who never stops striving to improve and strengthen her community.

Irma was born and raised in Ventura County. As a graduate of Camarillo High School and the University of California, Santa Barbara, Irma has been a longstanding citizen of the area. Her career in public service began in the State of California Employment Development Department, where she worked for more than 20 years. Additionally, Irma also worked for California State Senator Gary Hart.

Irma's leadership is a testament to her invigorating commitment to Ventura County. She is the founder, former chair and a current board member of Ventura County's Rebozo Festival. Every year, this festival promotes the cultural richness and diversity of the Latino community and philanthropy in Ventura County.

Irma is also a founding member of the Women's Legacy Fund and the Destino Hispanic Legacy Fund. She is a former City of Oxnard Woman of the Year and has been recognized for her humanitarian achievements on both the local and national level.

Irma's passion for public service and dedication to the community is one that I commend. Throughout her life, Irma's tireless efforts have always focused on helping those who are underrepresented and unheard. She is an exemplary model of the great achievements a devoted citizen can make.

I have personally known Irma for many years and am most pleased to join the Ventura County Women's Political Council in honoring Irma Lopez for her contributions, dedication and engagement in Ventura County.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE
OF FORMER GUAM SENATOR
JAMES H. UNDERWOOD**HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO**

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of James Holland Underwood, who served five consecutive terms as a member of the Guam Legislature from 1975 to 1984. He passed away on July 24, 2013, at the age of 67.

Jim was born on May 4, 1946, to former Senator Raymond Ferdinand Underwood and Ana Eclavea Torres Underwood, owners of Mariana Sales and Tendan Nene in Hagåtña.

As a senator, Jim authored legislation that led to the development of the Guam Environmental Protection Agency and the Port Authority of Guam. He also worked on the capital financing project with Duty Free Shoppers for

the construction and expansion of the Guam International Airport Authority. In 1977, Jim also served as a delegate to Guam's Constitutional Convention.

Additionally, Jim held many leadership positions in several Government of Guam agencies. He served as the Executive Director of the Commission on Decolonization; General Manager of the Guam Mass Transit Authority; Director of the Guam Departments of Labor, Public Works, Public Health and Social Services, and Integrated Services for Individuals with Disabilities. He also was a Director for the Guam Telephone Authority.

Beyond his clear passion for public service, Jim made significant contributions to the local community, where he spearheaded numerous projects such as the Guam-Karuizawa Student Exchange and construction of crosses atop Mt. Jumulong Manglo. He also was an active member of the Young Men's League of Guam and Past-President of the Rotary Club of Guam.

Together with his family, Jim was a devout Catholic and an active parishioner of the Dulce Nombre de Maria Cathedral-Basilica in Hagåtña, where he served as a lector and commentator for the December 8 procession in honor of Santa Marian Kamalen. For many years, Jim and his family were also responsible for erecting the "Lanchon Kotpus" on the Feast of Corpus Christi.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife Alma, his son James III, his stepdaughters Lisa and Theresa, grandchildren, friends and loved ones. I join the people of Guam in remembering Jim's leadership and contributions to our community. He will be dearly missed.

IN TRIBUTE TO THE FIRST RESPONDERS
OF THE PROPHETS-
TOWN FIRE**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the brave first responders who rushed to help put out the recent devastating fire that demolished much of downtown Prophetstown, Illinois.

The massive fire destroyed eight buildings and damaged two others in a blaze that took hours to put out. An estimated two dozen firefighters and EMTs responded quickly in the early morning hours to battle the flames that were destroying the town.

As Prophetstown begins the healing process, I salute all the first responders from across my region of Illinois for their courageous and selfless service. Because of their valiant efforts, the blaze did not spread to more buildings and no major injuries occurred.

I am proud to once again recognize the heroic efforts of our firefighters and EMTs, and thank them again for their service.

COMMUNITY PHARMACIES

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the important role that community pharmacies play in Iowa's Second Congressional District and throughout the country. They are the front-line health care providers and counselors for many patients who consistently depend on their training and expertise to stay informed, healthy, and out of the hospital. They also play an incredibly important role in strengthening the economies of the areas they serve, particularly in rural counties like many of those I represent.

Like most small business owners, community pharmacists face many challenges and compete and negotiate on a day-to-day basis with large entities in their business transactions. However, small pharmacy owners face an even larger disadvantage than most because of their clear lack of leverage they have when negotiating the amount they will be reimbursed for filling prescriptions when dealing with pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs). PBMs serve as the middleman between the health plans and pharmacies, but they also own large mail-order pharmacies themselves. As a result, they are in direct competition with the small pharmacies with whom they also are called upon to negotiate contracts. Also as a note, the largest PBM in the country had nearly \$94 billion in revenue in 2012.

PBMs also are charged with auditing pharmacies to detect fraud and abuse. This is an important role to ensure that Medicare beneficiaries are not taken advantage of, but problems arise when audits are conducted over clerical, administrative errors rather than targeted toward bad actors who willfully game the system. I have heard from several upstanding small business owners in my district who have been subject to these unnecessary audits and I think the process needs to be reformed so that these audits are as fair and transparent as possible.

As the federal government is business partners with PBMs in Medicare Part D, FEHBP, TRICARE and Medicaid Managed Care, I believe it is our duty to take a close look at these practices to ensure our small pharmacies have a fair working relationship with these large PBMs and that the needs of seniors and all those that depend on community pharmacists are met.

I look forward to continuing to work with the community pharmacies throughout Iowa's Second Congressional District to ensure they can continue to provide individual, high quality services to Iowans.

RECOGNIZING THE 38TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE
ISLAND OF CYPRUS**HON. STEVE COHEN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 38th anniversary of the division

of the island of Cyprus, and to encourage all parties in this longstanding dispute to reason together and work to achieve a final settlement that will bring about a united Cyprus.

Over 50 years ago, the Republic of Cyprus was established by Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots who were to have hands in the administration of the government and participation in national life. As a result of steps counter to that spirit through the 1960s and early 1970s, the two communities are now isolated from each other. The Greek Cypriot community, as the Republic of Cyprus, enjoys full membership in the European Union while Turkish Cypriots remain largely isolated from the global community. Nevertheless, Turkish Cypriots have demonstrated, time and again, their support for a solution where a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation is secured.

A continuation of the status quo serves no purpose, and prevents all Cypriots from living to their full potential. I ask my colleagues to join me in encouraging both parties to set a timeline of tangible steps to achieve a final agreement, and for the Obama Administration to work with both parties and European partners in securing these steps. Any solution must respect the human rights and freedoms of all Cypriots, and this must be enshrined in the work of the parties.

Let us redouble our efforts so that we do not have to observe the beginning of yet another decade in the life of the division of this island, in the hope that all Cypriots will be able to live and work together in peace.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREEK CYPRIOTS AND TURKISH CYPRIOTS

HON. TREY RADEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address some of the statements conveyed in this House concerning the continuing division of the island of Cyprus, a division that has now, unfortunately, approaching four decades.

I believe that the time is long overdue for a final agreement between the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots—one which is arrived at together by both parties, with the support of the international community, which respects the human rights of all Cypriots. I call upon the Administration to reenergize its engagement on this issue, one that has largely been tolerated through Administrations and Congresses of both parties, and unfortunately by many Cypriots themselves.

While I do not wish to revisit the history that has led to this division, I would ask my colleagues to note that Turkish Cypriots voted overwhelmingly in favor of the "UN Plan for a Comprehensive Settlement of the Cyprus Problem" in the simultaneous referenda held on both sides of the island, conveying to their Greek Cypriot neighbors, and the wider world, its desire to solve the Cyprus problem, and become integrated into the life of Europe and the international community. Additionally, Turkey has been stating that it would welcome a resolution of the Cyprus issue, as long as the

rights of the Turkish Cypriot community are guaranteed. I do not believe this is an unreasonable request. Indeed, it should apply to all Cypriots.

The Greek Cypriot community, as the Republic of Cyprus, enjoys all of the rights and privileges of European Union membership, and participates freely in the international community. Turkish Cypriots continue to endure international isolation and embargoes—a status quo that can never be considered a long-term, permanent solution. The time has come for both parties to work together to secure a political settlement, and to put this long, sorry chapter behind them. I ask my colleagues to recommit themselves to supporting a just and comprehensive solution to the division of Cyprus.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of July 8, 2013. If I were present, I would have voted on the following.

Monday, July 8, 2013: rollcall No. 305: Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1341, "yea"; rollcall No. 306: Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1564, "yea"; rollcall No. 307: Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1171, "yea".

Tuesday, July 9, 2013: rollcall No. 308: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 2609, "nay"; rollcall No. 309: Motion on Agreeing to the Resolution on the Rule H.R. 2609, "nay"; rollcall No. 310: Motion on Approving the Journal, "nay"; rollcall No. 311: Moran of Virginia Amendment No. 1, "aye"; rollcall No. 312: Moran of Virginia Amendment No. 2, "aye"; rollcall No. 313: Takano of California Amendment No. 2, "aye"; rollcall No. 314: Perry of Pennsylvania Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 315: Broun of Georgia Amendment, "no"; rollcall No. 316: Cohen of Tennessee Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 317: Broun of Georgia Amendment, "no"; rollcall No. 318: Swalwell of California Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 319: McClintock of California Amendment, "no"; rollcall No. 320: Peters of California Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 321: Perlmutter of Colorado Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 322: Connolly of Virginia Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 323: First Takano of California Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 324: Second Takano of California Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 325: Heck of Nevada Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 326: Butterfield of North Carolina Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 327: Foster of Illinois Amendment, "aye".

Wednesday, July 10, 2013: rollcall No. 328: Hastings of Florida Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 329: Garamendi of California Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 330: Broun of Georgia Amendment, "no"; rollcall No. 331: Jackson Lee of Texas Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 332: Quigley of Illinois Amendment, "no"; rollcall No. 333: Heck of Nevada Amendment, "no"; rollcall No. 334: Polis of Colorado

Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 335: First Burgess of Texas Amendment, "no"; rollcall No. 336: Second Burgess of Texas Amendment, "no"; rollcall No. 337: Titus of Nevada Amendment, "no"; rollcall No. 338: Lynch of Massachusetts Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 339: Whitfield of Kentucky Amendment, "no"; rollcall No. 340: Fleming of Louisiana Amendment, "no"; rollcall No. 341: Garamendi of California Amendment No. 28, "aye"; rollcall No. 342: Speier of California Amendment, "aye"; rollcall No. 343: Chabot of Ohio Amendment, "no"; rollcall No. 344: Motion to Recommit with Instructions for H.R. 2609, "aye"; rollcall No. 345: Final Passage of H.R. 2609—Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014, "nay".

Thursday, July 11, 2013: rollcall No. 346: Motion to Adjourn, "yea"; rollcall No. 347: Table Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair for H. Res. 295, "no"; rollcall No. 348: Motion to Adjourn, "yea"; rollcall No. 349: Motion on Agreeing to the Resolution for H. Res. 295, "no"; rollcall No. 350: Table Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair for H.R. 2642, "nay"; rollcall No. 351: Table Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair for H.R. 2642, "no"; rollcall No. 352: Motion to Recommit with Instructions for H.R. 2642, "aye"; rollcall No. 353: Final Passage of H.R. 2642—Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, "nay".

RECOGNIZING THE 39TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKEY'S INVASION AND OCCUPATION OF CYPRUS

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, June 20, 2013 marks the 39th anniversary of Turkey's invasion and occupation of the small island Republic of Cyprus. Over time, Turkey's forced division of Cyprus has become its signature failing—a senseless act of defiance against the family of nations.

For more than 60 years, the United States and our European allies have given unyielding and steadfast economic, military and moral support to Turkey. Today, Turkey reaps great benefit from its relationship with the West. Its economy has grown tremendously. Its homeland is secure against enemies who know that NATO stands sentinel over Turkey.

Turkey's rulers have long promised the people of Turkey that theirs is a nation on a journey to full democratic liberties, a powerful nation confident and secure in its place on the world stage, a country that pursues "zero problems with its neighbors." As it seeks to join the European Union, Turkey has given repeated assurances to its allies that its principal ambition is to embrace democracy and the rule of law.

How then to explain the continued stationing of 45,000 Turkish troops on Cyprus? How to explain a myriad of other conduct that so glaringly belies Turkey's stated aspirations. The truth is that an authoritarian impulse still pervades the Turkish ruling establishment and keeps it from democracy's full embrace. This

was most recently illustrated in Turkey's treatment of the burgeoning relationship between Cyprus and Israel. Rather than join those two nations in a peaceful and democratic dialogue for the future development of the Eastern Mediterranean, Prime Minister Erdogan has set Turkish warships to sail in Cypriot waters and threatens the use of force against both Israel and Cyprus.

The United States and our European allies must no longer tolerate Turkey's provocative and antidemocratic conduct. To that end, it is eminently fair to view Cyprus as the yard stick by which Turkey is to be judged. As long as Turkey maintains its occupation of the island, it cannot pretend to have rid itself of the utterly destructive colonial and authoritarian ideologies of a bygone era. To demonstrate a readiness to take up its responsibilities as a NATO ally and candidate country of the European Union, Cyprus is the test that Turkey must pass.

RECOGNIZING SRC ELECTRICAL

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor SRC Electrical on their induction into the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Voluntary Protection Program (VPP).

Founded in 1991 under the Springfield Remanufacturing Company umbrella, SRC Electrical has been a market leader in providing new and remanufactured rotating electrical components that include starters, alternators, and generators. For over twenty years, SRC Electrical has remained an employee-owned company based on the desire to redefine the art of remanufacturing and operates under Founder, President, and CEO Jack Stack's world-renowned open-book management business philosophy.

Through hard work and dedication, SRC Electrical was awarded its Voluntary Protection Program approval in April 2013. SRC Electrical should be extremely proud of this achievement as worksites under the VPP boast some very impressive statistics. Working cooperatively between management, labor, and OSHA, companies under VPP work to prevent and reduce the chances of worksite fatalities, injuries, and illnesses through a rigorous onsite evaluation by a team of safety and health professionals. In fact, companies included in the program have an average Days Away, Restricted, or Transferred (DART) case rate 52 percent below the industry average. As of July 1, 2013, SRC Electrical reached 1.2 million safe hours without a lost time incident.

Our nation needs strong and robust manufacturing companies like SRC Electrical. The hard working men and women who make up SRC Electrical are the backbone of our nation's manufacturing sector. I am honored to recognize SRC Electrical on its outstanding achievement and look forward to following its continued success.

CONGRATULATING PRIME MINISTER NAJIB OF MALAYSIA ON HIS RE-ELECTION

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Prime Minister Mohd Najib Bin Tun Haji Abdul Razak of Malaysia on his re-election in May 2013.

Dato' Sri Najib is the eldest son of the second Prime Minister, Tun Abdul Razak Hussein. He received his primary and secondary education at St. John's Institution. For secondary education, he attended the Malvern Boys' College in Worcestershire, England. In 1974, he graduated from the University of Nottingham with a degree in Industrial Economics.

At the very young age of 23, Dato' Sri Najib was elected a Member of Parliament following the sudden passing of his father in 1976. Dato' Sri Najib later served as Deputy Minister of Energy, Telecommunication and Post, Deputy Minister of Education, Deputy Minister of Finance, Minister of Culture, Minister of Defense, Minister of Education, and Minister of Finance.

In service to his country, Prime Minister Najib has built a world-class education system in Malaysia and modernized the armed forces, making it a leaner fighting force capable of handling any conventional threats. He has also improved the quality of public services, introduced a new cabinet position in charge of unity and performance management, and implemented a New Economic Model with reforms to create a business environment conducive to economic growth, development and investment.

Due to his extraordinary leadership, Prime Minister Najib is driving the nation forward. I commend Prime Minister Najib for rolling back race-based policies and obligating \$2.6 billion in spending programs benefitting poor families. I also commend him for bringing about peace, prosperity and stability in a country that others seek to undermine for their own political purposes and gain.

Because Malaysia is a significant regional and global partner of the United States, I pay special tribute to Prime Minister Najib for winning the people's mandate. Malaysians turned out in record numbers to vote and the will of the Malaysian people is reflected in the results. Consequently, U.S.-Malaysia relations will remain strong. In fact, to reaffirm the strong bonds of friendship between the United States and Malaysia, President Obama made a surprise phone call to Prime Minister Najib to congratulate him on his victory. President Obama is also expected to participate in the two-day Global Entrepreneurship Summit to be held in Kuala Lumpur in October of this year.

I acknowledge Malaysian Parliament Member and Special Envoy to the United States, Dr. Jamaluddin Jarjis, for the exemplary service he continues to render in bolstering the U.S.-Malaysia partnership for and on behalf of Prime Minister Najib and the people of Malaysia. Prime Minister Najib has earned the respect of many at home and abroad, and I am

pleased that he has the full and unwavering support of the United States as he enters his second term as Prime Minister.

SOLVING THE CYPRUS PROBLEM

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the ongoing Cyprus problem.

Another year has passed, and yet again Members of Congress are speaking out in support of resolving this problem. As co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on US-Turkish Relations and Turkish-Americans, I wish to join my colleagues in these efforts. A positive resolution of this matter would enhance the stability, security, and economic integration in the Eastern Mediterranean region and ensure the equitable and effective sharing of natural resources.

Many of my colleagues have grown frustrated over the years by the lack of progress toward a negotiated political settlement. Perhaps the greatest frustration was caused by the failure of the UN peace initiative in 2004, when—despite the strong approval of the Turkish Cypriots—Greek Cypriots overwhelmingly rejected the Peace Plan and defeated the initiative.

If it had been approved by the both sides, the UN Peace Plan of 2004, which was strongly supported by the United States and the international community, would have established a bi-zonal and bi-communal state, demilitarized the island and settled the very issues that many of my colleagues have raised in recent weeks in conjunction with Cyprus.

In a report issued in May 2004, the UN Secretary General stated: "In the aftermath of the vote, the situation of the Turkish Cypriots calls for the attention of the international community as a whole, including the Security Council." The report also noted that "[t]he Turkish Cypriot vote has undone any rationale for pressuring and isolating them."

Meanwhile, on April 26, the General Affairs Council of the European Union declared that: "The Turkish Cypriot community has expressed their clear desire for a future within the European Union. The Council is determined to put an end to the isolation of the Turkish Cypriot community and to facilitate the reunification of Cyprus by encouraging the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community."

Yet we cannot let frustration deter us from moving forward.

I applaud The Turkish Cypriots for their willingness to move forward and their continued commitment to a negotiated political settlement. I am also encouraged by the newly elected Greek Cypriot President's previous support of the 2004 Peace Plan. Mr. Anastasiades now has a genuine opportunity to not only support a comprehensive settlement, but to achieve it.

The economic difficulties that have gripped Southern Cyprus this year should not be an obstacle to peace. On the contrary, as many

experts say, they offer a good reason to take the path of cooperation. A united Cyprus would increase economic growth and provide stability in an important region—for the United States and our allies.

And while it will be up to the Greek and Turkish Cypriots to decide on their common or separate futures, the United States' interests in the region require an active involvement and engagement in the process. The U.S. should use its best influence to encourage all relevant parties in Cyprus to launch comprehensive peace talks without any further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this time next year we will be able to applaud the ultimate resolution of the 40-year-old Cyprus problem.

HONORING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOREAN WAR ARMISTICE

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 60th Anniversary of the armistice that ended the Korean War on July 27, 1953 and honor the Korean War Veterans and their families, who have taught us about strength, duty, service, and resolve. I am proud to represent hundreds of Korean War Veterans. Their service has been selfless and their accomplishments have been extraordinary.

The 60th Anniversary of the end of the Korean War calls us to reflect on the immeasurable burdens of war that have been borne by our veterans and their families. We pay tribute to our wounded, our missing, our fallen, and their families. They know the true costs of conflict and deserve our deepest respect.

On June 25, 1950, the Korean War began when approximately 75,000 soldiers from the North Korean People's Army poured across the 38th parallel, the boundary between the Soviet-backed Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the north and the pro-Western Republic of Korea to the south. This invasion was the first military action of the Cold War. By July, American troops had entered the war on South Korea's behalf.

Nearly 5 million people died as a result of the Korean War. More than half of these—about 10 percent of Korea's prewar population—were civilians, a rate higher than either World War II or Vietnam. Nearly 40,000 Americans died in action in Korea, and more than 100,000 were wounded.

289,000 Texans served in the Korean War. 1,916 were killed in action and 440 are still missing in action. 169 El Pasoans gave their lives in Korean War and 23 are missing in action. The President of the United States awarded the highest of military honors to 11 Texans, including one El Pasoan Modesto Cartagena, for their acts of valor during the war.

Today we remember our commitments to those who served in Korea. As we do so, let us reaffirm our promise that when our troops finish their tours of duty, they come home to an America that gives them the benefits they

have earned, the care they deserve, and the fullest opportunity to keep their families strong and our country moving forward.

FELLOWSHIP GENERAL BAPTIST CHURCH CELEBRATES ITS FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Fellowship General Baptist Church is commemorating the milestone occasion of its Fortieth Anniversary in 2013, having served the community of Poplar Bluff for four decades since its official organization on July 15, 1973. The church traces its beginnings to April 5, 1973, when a group of faithful Baptists met for the first time at the Town and Country Restaurant in Poplar Bluff. On May 2, 1973, Fellowship General Baptist Church was organized into a mission with a charter membership of eighty-one individuals under the pastoral leadership of Kenneth Kennedy, Leland Duncan, Ernie Rogers, John Clanton, and Riley Mathias. The congregation broke ground for a permanent house of worship on July 21, 1974, and celebrated their first meeting in the complete church building on January 5, 1975 and over the years, the congregation at Fellowship General Baptist has been blessed with the leadership of three pastors: Dr. Onis Chapman (1976–79), Dr. Kenneth Kennedy (1978–87), and the Reverend Byron Beck (1987–present).

Members of the Fellowship General Baptist Church have consistently been the top financial supporter of the General Baptist Denomination, while successfully participating in outreach programs including Fellowship of Acceptance, Divorce Care, Salt and Light Sundays, Salvation Army, Living Water International and Grief Share. The congregation of Fellowship General Baptist Church, now 781 members strong, prepares to minister to the community for a fifth decade.

CELEBRATING THE FORT ROSS FESTIVAL AND DIALOGUE

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to recognize the 201st anniversary of Fort Ross, a California State Park and the site of an early Russian colony established on the North Coast of California in 1812. The annual Fort Ross Festival and Dialogue will take place on July 27–29, 2013 to celebrate the history and cultural significance of the site, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending best wishes for the event.

Fort Ross is located in the home region of the Kashaya Pomo people of Northern California. In the early 1800s, the Russian-American Company founded Fort Ross as an early agricultural and fur-trading outpost to support their operations from San Francisco to Alaska.

Russian colonists developed farms, ranches, and hunting operations in concert with local Kashaya and Alaska Native employees, playing an early role in establishing the agricultural character of the North Coast.

Today, Fort Ross is a national historic landmark, and an important piece of the shared history of the Russian and American people. Through cultural events, archeological study, and efforts to preserve the historical structures at the site, Fort Ross has become a hub for the Russian-American community and a destination for visitors from all over the world. The Fort Ross Festival will offer historical re-enactments and celebrations of Russian influence in the region while the Dialogue will enable Russian and American leaders to discuss Russian-American relations and trade in the modern era.

As we reflect on this unique landmark of California's history, I thank both the Fort Ross Conservancy and California State Parks for their commitment to restoring and preserving the park's historic buildings and features. This beautiful 3,400 acre park is a jewel of Sonoma County's coastline and offers visitors both outdoor recreation and historical significance.

I ask my colleagues to join me in marking this historic occasion and sending them our best wishes for a successful festival.

A TRIBUTE TO THE TYREE AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute today of the Tyree A.M.E. Church to celebrate its Centennial Anniversary. Over the past 100 years, the Tyree A.M.E. Church has endured as the spiritual home for countless numbers of Philadelphia's citizens.

This past century, eighteen pastors have led the church successfully, relying on the steadfast faith and fellowship of its members to improve the church and surrounding community. The church's resolute determination to continue their noble work has set a great example for congregations across the country.

I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues help me in honoring the Centennial Anniversary of the founding of the Tyree A.M.E. Church. May it continue to grow and prosper for another 100 years and beyond.

HONORING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOREAN WAR ARMISTICE

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of our brave veterans of the Korean War on the eve of the 60th Anniversary of the

end of combat operations in that region. These heroes fought so valiantly to protect our country and they rightfully deserve our recognition and admiration.

I am proud to represent a district that is home to such a large number of veterans, and I feel tremendous gratitude to the heroes of World War II, Korea, Vietnam and to the new generation of veterans from the Gulf War, Iraq and Afghanistan. My father, Bernard Deutch, volunteered to fight in World War II as a teenager where he earned a Purple Heart at the Battle of the Bulge. It was his example of service to our nation that motivated me to serve in Congress.

The veterans of the Korean War endured unique hardships in order to ensure the ideals of freedom and democracy lived on, both at home and abroad. Their selfless dedication to these values is a testament to true character of the men and women who fought in this conflict. With the bar set, I am confident their patriotic spirit lives on in those in the armed forces who serve our nation today.

In this era of partisan vitriol and gridlock in Washington, our leaders can always look to veterans as an example of how individuals from all walks of life can put their differences aside in order to accomplish great things. So long as I am in Congress, I promise to do everything in my power to ensure the well-being of our Nation's veterans. I join today with my family in wishing the veterans of the Korean War many more years of good health and urge all citizens of this great country to live by their example.

HONORING JAMES "JAY" EARL
ALEXANDER FOR HIS SERVICE
AS A EULESS POLICE OFFICER

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Corporal James "Jay" Earl Alexander for his 36 years of public service as a police officer, 30 of which for the City of Euless, Texas.

Corporal Alexander began his career in law enforcement with several police departments in Texas, starting in 1970 at the age of 19 as a dispatcher for the Commerce Police Department. Two years later, he was a jailer and deputy for Hunt County. In 1976, Alexander took the step of becoming an officer for the Lakeworth Police Department then, in 1977, he went to work for the Bedford Police Department and went on to receive his Basic Police Certification as a police officer a few months later. In 1982, he worked for the Grapevine and then Azle police departments.

In January 1983, Alexander joined the Euless Police Department as a police officer. In October of 1985 he earned his Intermediate Certification and, with Office Haywood, became the department's first Field Training Officer. That same year he received his Intoxilyzer Certification and, the following year, his Instructor's Certification. In 1987, Alexander was assigned to the Tactical Team as a sniper. He received his Advanced Certifi-

cation in 1989 and, in 1991, his years of hard work were rewarded with a promotion to the rank of corporal.

Upon request, Corporal Alexander was assigned to be a School Resource Officer at Euless Junior High School in 1995, where he remained for the rest of his career. In 1997 he earned the Master Police Officer Certification. Over his outstanding and honorable career, Corporal Alexander has received eleven commendations, one of which was for his capturing of a Fort Worth murder suspect. He earned two years of credit from Tarrant County College and Texas Christian University, and accumulated 1,800 hours of continuing education as an officer.

Alexander was raised in Weatherford, Texas, and worked for a veterinarian and then moved to the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex where he worked for a delivery service before getting involved with law enforcement. He is an avid student of local history and knows much of the pioneering families who settled the area. He is married and he and his wife Teresa have four children—Michael, Cody, Ashley, and Chris.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in thanking Corporal James Alexander for his many years of public service as an officer of the Euless Police Department.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF
PAMELA KALLSEN

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pamela Kallsen as she retires as Executive Director from the Marjaree Mason Center. Pam has dedicated her life to empowering domestic violence victims and advocating for their well-being. Her efforts have been paramount in ensuring the safety of hundreds of families in Fresno County.

Pam grew up in Fresno, California. After completing high school, she moved to Tennessee and attended the University of Memphis. Pam obtained her degree in Vocational Education and returned back to Fresno to receive an additional degree in Home Economics from California State University, Fresno.

Prior to her position as Executive Director at the Marjaree Mason Center, Pam worked extensively in the health care arena. While pursuing her career in the medical field she served as Vice President of executive services at Fresno Community Medical Centers. In addition, she held various positions at the California Eye Institute, St. Agnes Medical Center, and the Fresno Hospital Council.

Pam is a true advocate for those in need. She is past chair of the Fresno Continuum of Care, which is an initiative that is devoted to housing and supporting the local homeless population. Pam serves as a critical component to the Fresno County Ten-Year plan to abolish homelessness. She is also a dynamic participant in the Fresno County Domestic Violence Roundtable and the California Domestic Violence Advisory Council.

Under Pam's leadership, the Marjaree Mason Center has gone above and beyond, providing victims with resources to help them thrive in a safe environment. In addition to providing victims with shelter, the center offers legal assistance, counseling, and education for victims as well as for individuals throughout the entire community. During Pam's tenure, the center has expanded, so the Marjaree Mason Center reaches out to more women and children than ever before.

Pam has proven to be a successful change agent because she fights for what she believes is right. In 2001, Pam was recognized as one of the Top Ten Professional Women of Fresno, and in 2006, she was selected as Woman of the Year by the California State Assembly. Pam's efforts to make the Central Valley a better place are observed throughout the entire state and nation.

In addition to being a victims' advocate, Pam is also a wife and mother. It is my hope that Pam enjoys her retirement with her husband, Gene, and daughters, Laura and Leslie.

As co-chair of the Victims' Rights Caucus and a passionate supporter of the Violence Against Women Act, it is truly an honor to recognize Pam. Her years of tireless work on the behalf of some of the nation's most vulnerable is exceptionally admirable.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the service of Pamela Kallsen. Pam will undoubtedly be missed as she retires from the Marjaree Mason Center, but we can expect that she will continue to be a strong voice and advocate for victims and their families.

INTRODUCTION OF END RACIAL
PROFILING ACT OF 2013

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the End Racial Profiling Act of 2013, along with additional cosponsors. This legislation represents a comprehensive federal commitment to healing the rift caused by racial profiling and restoring public confidence in the criminal justice system at-large. This legislation is designed to enforce the constitutional right to equal protection of the laws by changing the policies and procedures underlying the practice of profiling.

This legislation can be traced back to the data collection efforts of the late 1990's that were designed to determine whether racial profiling was a fact versus an urban legend. Based upon the work around that legislation, by September 11, 2001, there was significant empirical evidence and wide agreement among Americans, including President Bush and Attorney General Ashcroft, that racial profiling was a tragic fact of life in the minority community and that the Federal government should take action to end the practice.

Moreover, many in the law enforcement community have acknowledged that singling out people for heightened scrutiny based on their race, ethnicity, religion, or national origin had eroded the trust in law enforcement necessary to appropriately serve and protect our communities.

During our 112th Congress Judiciary Committee hearing on racial profiling, we approached the issue from the perspective of "smart policing" and what makes sense in a time of austerity for protecting public safety. I believe that it became clear during the hearing that enough agreement exists to allow us to re-open the bipartisan dialogue on racial profiling commenced by President Bush and Attorney General Ashcroft.

Despite the fact that the majority of law enforcement officers perform their duties professionally and without bias—and we value their service highly—the specter of racial profiling has contaminated the relationship between the police and minority communities to such a degree that federal action is justified to begin addressing the issue.

While the Department of Justice promulgated a series of guidelines in 2003 which were designed to end the practice of racial profiling by federal law enforcement agencies, these measures do not reach the vast majority of racial profiling complaints arising from the routine activities of state and local law enforcement agencies. Further, the guidelines provide no enforcement mechanism or methods for identifying law enforcement agencies not in compliance and, therefore, fail to resolve the racial profiling problem nationwide. In this instance, there is no substitute for comprehensive federal anti-profiling legislation.

The End Racial Profiling Act is designed to eliminate the well documented problem of racial, ethnic, religious, and national origin profiling. First, the bill provides a prohibition on racial profiling, enforceable by declaratory or injunctive relief. Second, the bill mandates that training on racial profiling issues as part of Federal law enforcement training, the collection of data on all routine or spontaneous investigatory activities that is to be submitted through a standardized form to the Department of Justice.

Third, the Justice Department is authorized to provide grants for the development and implementation of best policing practices, such as early warning systems, technology integration, and other management protocols that discourage profiling. Finally, the Attorney General is required to provide periodic reports to assess the nature of any ongoing discriminatory profiling practices.

Recent events demonstrate that racial profiling remains a divisive issue that strikes at the very foundation of our democracy. Though the death of Trayvon Martin was not the result of a law enforcement encounter, the issues of race and reasonable suspicion of criminal conduct are so closely linked in the minds of the public that his death cannot be separated from the law enforcement profiling debate.

Ultimately, he is one of too many individuals across the country who have been victimized by a perception of criminality simply because of their race, ethnicity, religion or national origin. These individuals are denied the basic respect and equal treatment that is the right of every American.

Decades ago, in the face of shocking violence, the passage of sweeping civil rights legislation made it clear that race should not affect the treatment of an individual American under the law. I believe that thousands of pedestrian and traffic stops of innocent minorities

and the killing of innocent teen calls for a similar federal response. The practice of using race as a criterion in law enforcement undermines the progress we have made toward racial equality. Please join me in supporting this legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of July 15, 2013. If I were present, I would have voted on the following.

Tuesday, July 16, 2013: rollcall No. 354: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, "yea;" rollcall No. 355: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, "yea;" rollcall No. 356: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, "yea."

Wednesday, July 17, 2013: rollcall No. 357: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 2667, "nay;" rollcall No. 358: Motion on Agreeing to the Resolution providing the Rule on H.R. 2667 and H.R. 2668, "nay;" rollcall No. 359: Motion to Adjourn, "nay;" rollcall No. 360: On Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 2667, "yea;" rollcall No. 361: On passage of H.R. 2667, "nay;" rollcall No. 362: On Motion to Recommit with Instruction H.R. 2668, "yea;" rollcall No. 363: On Passage of H.R. 2668, "nay."

Thursday, July 18, 2013: rollcall No. 364: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 5, "nay;" rollcall No. 365: On Agreeing to the Resolution providing the Rule on H.R. 5, "nay;" rollcall No. 366: On passage of the Journal, "yea;" rollcall No. 367: On Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 5 offered by YOUNG of Alaska, "yea;" rollcall No. 368: On Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 5 offered by LUETKEMEYER of Missouri, "nay;" rollcall No. 369: On Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 5 offered by MEEHAN of Pennsylvania, "nay."

Friday, July 19, 2013: rollcall No. 370: On Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 5 offered by CULBERSON of Texas, "nay;" rollcall No. 371: On Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 5 offered by JACKSON LEE of Texas, "yea;" rollcall No. 372: On Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 5 offered by MILLER of California, "yea;" rollcall No. 373: On the Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 5, "yea;" rollcall No. 374: On Passage of H.R. 5, "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, due to airplane mechanical difficulties, I missed two recorded votes on July 30. I would like to indicate how I would have voted had I been present for those votes.

On Rollcall No. 375, H.R. 21542, the WMD Intelligence and Information Sharing Act, I

would have voted "yea" to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish weapons of mass destruction intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security.

On Rollcall No. 376, H. Con. Res. 44, I would have voted "yea" to authorize the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

HONORING MR. DAN CALLOWAY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Dan Calloway. Mr. Calloway attended Roosevelt Senior High School in West Palm Beach, from which he was graduated in 1956. A veteran of the U.S. Army, he was in charge of special services, rising to the rank of Captain of Special Services. Dan was the first black captain of the Army baseball team in 1963. For his accomplishments in that sport, he was inducted into the German Hall of Fame.

Following his successful time in the military, he embarked on a career in law enforcement. He retired as a Detective Sergeant with the Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office, where he also served as sports coordinator. In 1965, Dan founded the Youth Recreation Association (YRA) of Palm Beach County, which helps young people through scholarships and mentoring in sports and recreational activities. Numerous National Football League (NFL) stars and other professional athletes credit the YRA as an invaluable resource that helped them toward successful careers in sports. All have returned to Palm Beach County to "pay it forward," helping other young people with scholarships, skills camps and various other events.

Continuing his involvement in sports, Dan was honored as a torch bearer in Palm Beach County for the 1996 Olympics. In recognition of his many important contributions to sports, he was inducted into the Palm Beach County Sports Hall of Fame by the Palm Beach County Sports Commission in 1993. The Dan Calloway Recreation Center in Riviera Beach was dedicated in May 2010. In February 2011, Dan was inducted into the Roosevelt Senior High School Sports Hall of Fame for his contributions in baseball and basketball.

He married Delores Oliver in 1981. He calls her "the love of my life, and my eyes if I ever go blind." He is a member of the Singer Island Civic Association and Palm Beach County Community Relations Board. He is among more than a dozen local professionals who have issued a call to black men to step-up as mentors and role models for young people in the community.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pride to recognize Dan Calloway, for everything that he has done for Palm Beach County, and our nation. He has accomplished so many wonderful

things for the community, and I am proud to call him my friend.

RECOGNIZING KAREN KRAUSE,
PROGRESS OHIO'S BARBARA
KLASS SOKOL AWARD WINNER

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a woman of remarkable achievement, Karen Krause, of Toledo Ohio. This weekend I was privileged to join Karen as a 2013 honoree of Progress Ohio, from which she received the Barbara Klass Sokol Award. The award is given to a person who embodies the Columbus, Ohio activist's "high level of energy, humanitarianism, love of the arts, concern for the environment; who cared deeply about good government and spent a great deal of time and effort working to get good people elected at the state and local level, who was a champion for a fair and just society for all." Though this description is of the activist herself, it could just as easily have been written in describing Karen Krause, a woman who has spent her life defining public service.

After graduating from Toledo's Whitmer High School, Karen received her nursing training from the Maumee Valley Hospital School of Nursing. She went on to obtain her undergraduate degree from the University of Toledo and a Masters of Public Health Degree from the University of Michigan. She also attended the University of Toledo Law School.

Karen began her public service on the front lines, as a public health nurse with the Lucas County Health Department. Though her jobs changed, Karen never left the front lines in service to Ohio's vulnerable people. Karen became the Director of Nursing for the Lucas County Health Department in 1967 and remained at the helm until 1993. During part of those years she also served as a consultant to the Ohio Department of Health. Her advice and counsel was sought by many as an expert on matters of health care.

Following her "retirement" from the health department, Karen became the principal consultant at Community Health Consulting. She also served as Executive Director of the Mildred Bayer Clinic for two years. Rounding out her public service, Karen lent herself as Executive Director of Toledo District Nurses Association, Ohio AFL-CIO NWO Retiree Coordinator, Ohio Health Policy Consultant in the 2004 Presidential Campaign, Social Justice Chair of Toledo Area Jobs with Justice, and as President of AFSCME Retirees in Wood & Lucas Counties. All the while she has served 32 different organizations in various ways. She has been wise counsel to myself and many others, sharing her knowledge of health care and the need for affordable, available coverage. As if that isn't enough, Karen has also given to our community as one of the most capable and caring elected officials, having served on the Lucas County Educational Service Center since election in 1999 and on which she has served four terms as Board President.

Throughout, Karen has opened her heart and home to others. Those young people are now grown with children of their own, and Karen is now a proud grandma. We share with her family our pride in her accomplishments and in the receipt of the honor most recently bestowed. The Barbara Klass Sokol Award is a special award and this year it has been given to a very special woman.

Karen Krause's legacy in our community runs deep. As was noted when the presentation was made this weekend, Karen is truly "a champion of the people," a mantle she wears most humbly. She has travelled a path of her own and brought up many others along the way. Her servant's heart is her true gift, and one she has shared willingly in more than fifty years of public service. She has truly practiced Christ's Word that "Whatsoever you do to the least among you, that you do unto me." Her efforts have earned her the respect of those of us lucky enough to call her friend. This weekend's recognition was a chance for all of us to say, most heartfelt, "Thank you Karen."

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, CARSON WILLIAMS

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish Carson Williams a Happy Birthday.

Carson was born on July 30, 1999 in Chattanooga, Tennessee. He is the son of Carlton Williams and Gretchen Richards.

Carson attends Signal Mountain Middle High School—home of the Eagles—located in Signal Mountain, Tennessee. From the time he could swing a bat, Carson played t-ball and Dixie Youth baseball. Today, Carson plays baseball for the Signal Mountain Middle High School varsity team. He is one of the best ball players on Signal Mountain.

As well as baseball, Carson loves to wake board, snow board, and play basketball. He kayaks, fishes and camps with his dad. Sometimes they go to the Nantahala River. They are best friends forever.

Carson and his mom are best friends forever, too. Carson and his mom do school projects together and cook. Carson also spends time on the lake with his mom and stepdad Mike. At 13 years old, Carson earned his boating license. He now drives a pontoon. Carson and Mike also like to hunt together. They hunt in Alabama, and anywhere else with lots of woods.

Carson loves Funyuns, Dr. Pepper, sea food, rare prime rib, and his family. He is proud to be from Tennessee.

Carson's sister is Margot Clark, married happily ever after to Justin.

Carson's grandparents on his paternal side are the late Thomas "Papa" Williams, a graduate of Texas A&M (Class of '60), and Mildred "Mimi" Williams, a retired school teacher who graduated from the University of South Carolina Aiken where she was a Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and

Universities. Carson says no one makes chicken and dumplings better than his Mimi. Carson misses his Papa.

On his maternal side, Carson's grandparents are Albert and Betty Jones, and Mike and Sue Richards. Albert is a graduate of Sewanee: The University of the South. Betty graduated from the University of Tennessee and was a tennis coach at Chattanooga State. She is teaching Carson to play tennis. Mike is a graduate of Auburn University, and Sue graduated from Troy State and earned a Master's degree from the University of Alabama. Grandma Sue is one of the best cooks Carson knows.

Carson's aunts are Lisa Williams, Cindy Jones, and Lynn Civitts.

Carson wants a truck one day soon. For now, he has to make do with happy birthday wishes from his family.

LONG BEACH CENTRAL AREA ASSOCIATION

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following.

Whereas, the Long Beach Central Area Association (LBCAA) is a 22 year old non-profit organization; and

Whereas, MusicUNTOLD is the program and event production arm of the LBCAA, dedicated to educational art programs that promote diversity and human dignity; and

Whereas, all of MusicUNTOLD events and programs are free to the public, except annual signature/ticketed concerts; and

Whereas, the signature concert for 2013, is the 50th anniversary of the "Martin Luther King, Jr. Symphony of Brotherhood" Concert, on August 18 at the Zipper Hall-Colburn; and

Whereas, the chamber music concert is celebrating the 50th Anniversary "March on Washington for Freedom and Jobs" and Dr. King's "I Have A Dream" speech, featuring national and local classical and opera artists; and

Whereas, the concert will present MLK Jr.'s little known appreciation of classical and opera music, a correlation between Beethoven and MLK Jr., and the historical footprint of MLK Jr. in Los Angeles; and

Whereas, the world premiere of "Candlelight" for soprano by South Korean educator and composer Dr. Joopong Kim.

More information can be found <http://www.brownpapertickets.com/event/385424> and www.musicuntold.com.

CELEBRATING 28 YEARS OF SERVICE: PEGGY LYNCH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, FRIENDS OF THE PARKS AND TRAILS OF SAINT PAUL AND RAMSEY COUNTY

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the inspiring career of Ms. Peggy

Lynch, a leader in preservation of parks and green space, on the occasion of her retirement as Executive Director from Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County.

The Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County has its origins in a group of citizens who banded together to protect Hidden Falls-Crosby Lake Regional Park in 1984 from developers proposing to build housing within the park. After the housing proposal was defeated, the group continued to meet, and a permanent organization was established in 1985 with a grant from the Saint Paul Foundation. Peggy Lynch co-founded the organization and served as Executive Director for the next 28 years. Today, because of Peggy's extraordinary persistence and advocacy for the outdoors, the organization has led development and preservation of parks across the east metro region and earned her the title the "Conscience of the Parks."

Thanks to Peggy Lynch's vision, the organization achieved foundational work to protect public access to green space. In 1985 the group initiated a study of parks in Saint Paul and Ramsey County during a period of intense developer interest in prime park land. At the time, there were few local park commissions and developers had no obligation to contribute to the park system. Cities such as Saint Paul sold park land for a dollar per parcel. As a result of a study by the Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County, Park Commissions in Saint Paul and Ramsey County were established. The amendment of the City of Saint Paul and Ramsey County charters for "no net loss" of park land were approved. These actions built a system to preserve and add park land for public use.

Additionally, Peggy and Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County have helped develop and support the environment by promoting appreciation for parks and open space through quality parks, trails, and bikeways. Through educational, community, and corporate outreach programs, they have provided access to recreational opportunities to communities who otherwise may not have the opportunity to experience it.

Peggy's influence brought increased recognition and elevated the importance of preserving the great outdoors for present and future generations to come. Her work along with the Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County are legacies that will live on in the organization's work advocating for the environment in the Twin Cities.

HONORING JOHN R. LASSEN, JR.

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and passing of Mr. John R. Lassen, Jr., a lifelong teacher in Tempe, Arizona, and a nationally distinguished innovator in secondary education.

A native fourth generation Arizonan, John served his country in the United States Air Force after graduating from high school in

Tempe. Following his distinguished service to his country, John returned home to attend Arizona State University on a basketball scholarship, where he earned both a bachelor and a master's degree in mathematics.

John's heart never left Tempe—his passion was mathematics. He loved teaching in his hometown at Marcos De Niza and Mountain Pointe High Schools for nearly forty years, eventually serving as Mathematics Department Chairman for the Tempe Unified School District.

Under the administration of President George H. W. Bush, Mr. Lassen earned the Presidential Award for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Teaching, for which he was honored at the White House Rose Garden and the U.S. State Department. Mr. Lassen also initiated a dual-credit collaboration between Tempe public schools and Rio Salado College, offered first at Mr. Lassen's own Mountain Pointe High School and later throughout the greater Phoenix area. For this, he was given the President's Award for dedication and commitment to education in Arizona from the President of Rio Salado College.

It was to the great benefit of Tempe, his community, and the state of Arizona that Mr. Lassen served so dutifully and lived so well. I ask that my colleagues join me in posthumously recognizing Mr. Lassen and extending our condolences to his family.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,094,608,381.03. We've added \$6,111,217,559,467.95 to our debt in 4 and a half years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING JONATHAN "TIG" WILLARD

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Jonathan "Tig" Willard from Loris, South Carolina today for his commendable bravery and act of selflessness. While driving to training camp for the Tennessee Titans this past Tuesday, he noticed a car with black smoke billowing out of it. Jonathan signaled for the car to pull over and helped to rescue the driver, her three children, and her dog as the car was engulfed in flames.

A native of the Seventh District of South Carolina, Jonathan is an exemplary football

player who led Clemson University's defense in tackles last season and now plays at the professional level. However, it is an act like this—one that puts the safety of others before the safety of self—that demonstrates Jonathan's compassion and character. I commend his efforts, as this is a reminder that we should all keep our eyes open for ways to be a Good Samaritan and help our fellow neighbors.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HANDLEY REGIONAL LIBRARY

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of Handley Regional Library in Winchester, Virginia.

The original Handley Library building has long been an important architectural and historical site in Winchester. It first opened in 1913 and was designed by architects J. Stewart Barney and Henry Otis Chapman.

The growth and change the library has gone through over the past 100 years has been extraordinary. In 1915, the library's annual attendance was 52,902. Today, more than 357,000 guests visit the facility each year. The collection of books and periodicals has expanded significantly as well. The library's collection totaled 6,000 in 1915; today, the collection contains over 302,000 books, magazines and digital materials, including audio books, e-books, CDs and DVDs.

The library's growth over the years is due in part to the growth in the Shenandoah Valley region. Today, the population served by the library is 120,000, an increase of nearly 100,000 since 1915.

Additionally, Handley Library is unique because it is one of three libraries in the regional system. It became regional when Frederick County joined the system in 1979 and Clarke County joined in 1981. Regional systems ensure the libraries can all provide excellent services without duplicating administrative costs. This has saved taxpayers money, which is crucial during these economically challenging times.

Handley Regional Library is a treasure for the northern Shenandoah Valley community. From computer literacy programs, to youth and adult programs, to the vast collection of regional history and genealogy located in its outstanding archives section, the library provides exceptional facilities and services for area residents.

The success of the library today is due to director Trish Ridgeway and the entire library staff, as well as the generous support of the Friends of Handley Library and its many volunteers.

I would like to particularly recognize the efforts of Trish Ridgeway, who during her 20 years as its director has overseen several of the regional library system's construction projects, including the major renovation of the original library building in Winchester. As she prepares to retire at the end of September, I want to thank Trish for her leadership and wish her all the best for retirement.

There will be a gala celebration in honor of the 100th anniversary at Handley Library on August 24, 2013. Congratulations to the library, its staff and the volunteers as they celebrate this very important milestone.

DIVISION IN CYPRUS

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in mid-May, twenty-three of my colleagues joined me in sending a letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations to encourage the newly elected Greek Cypriot leader and his Turkish Cypriot counterpart to resume talks aimed at expediently resolving the ongoing dispute over a divided Cyprus. A negotiated and mutually acceptable comprehensive settlement, based on a bi-zonal and bi-communal federation is vital to the region. I support international and domestic efforts to achieve such a resolution and urge the House of Representatives to encourage constructive dialogue between the two sides. In 2003, the House unanimously adopted H. Res. 165 in support of the Annan Plan, which would have approved the creation of a reunified Partnership State in Cyprus as a loose federation of two component states—the Greek Cypriot State and the Turkish Cypriot State. Unfortunately, this historic opportunity was rejected by Greek Cypriots through a referendum on the island.

Although a majority of Turkish Cypriots approved the peace plan also by referendum, an opportunity of historic proportions was missed. Many would attribute the Greek Cypriots rejection of the Annan Plan and pro-division choice to becoming European Union (EU) members, which followed this move. At that time, it was believed that EU accession was predicated on solving this division after the fact. Subsequently, there has been no progress in this regard, further indicating a pro-division State. While the Greek Cypriots enjoy recognition as a sovereign state, there has been no imputes for them to solve the problem. Despite promises made to Turkish Cypriots over and over again, they still remain isolated.

Over ten years have gone by without any progress on this issue. This year may once again be a year of opportunity to put an end to the status quo. We should be courageous enough to encourage a solution in Cyprus, and creative enough to promote a more secure, stable and prosperous Eastern Mediterranean where Greece, Turkey, a unified Cyprus, together with their allies and partners in the region, work together to build a better future.

With the firm belief that such an outcome is not only achievable, but will also set an invaluable example of peace and cooperation in the region and beyond, I urge the Administration to encourage the United Nations Secretary General to enhance his efforts in reaching a comprehensive and just solution in Cyprus.

EDWARD R. MURROW HIGH SCHOOL'S NATIONAL CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP TITLE

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to congratulate my alma mater Edward R. Murrow High School for winning the 2013 National High School Chess Championship. This is the eighth time that my alma mater has won this prestigious title.

Edward R. Murrow's chess team, along with more than 5000 students from across the country, vied for the national title in Nashville, Tennessee. Murrow trumped the competition and came away with the top prize.

Murrow's championship chess team hails from a diverse background reflective of the multicultural and vibrant communities that call Brooklyn, New York home.

I am tremendously proud of the team's talented young men and women, who worked hard to perfect their skills. I also want to acknowledge their coach, Mr. Eliot Weiss, who helped the students hone their talents, while offering guidance and mentorship throughout the year.

This victory was no easy feat. It was only through hard work, tenacity, and long hours spent perfecting the craft that they were able to claim the title.

Through judicious choice and astute strategy, Murrow's chess team has again proven that they are some of the most proficient and accomplished in the sport.

I feel honored to call myself an alumna of such a distinguished institution, which has a long history of shaping the sharp and analytic minds of New York's most promising youth.

Once again, I say congratulations to Edward R. Murrow's Chess Team for a job well done!

HONORING THE LIFE OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S BLUFORD WARD

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Mr. Bluford Ward, who passed away on July 25, 2013. During his life, Bluford made it his mission to engage with his neighbors, reaching out to hear their concerns and assist them in any way he could. The loss of this great man is felt across the entire Northwest Florida community.

Bluford was born on August 18, 1939 and was raised in the small and historic Coon Hill community of Santa Rosa County, Florida. He attended Allentown High School where he met and married his beloved companion of fifty-four years, Betty Crutchfield.

In his lifetime, Bluford was a trusted and valuable employee for many local companies. In his earlier years, he worked for American Cyanamid. He also worked as a car salesman

for several dealerships in both Florida and Alabama. It was a position that suited him well, providing him an opportunity to talk with his "neighbors" about the concerns of the day, as well as helping them find the best deal possible. An avid hunter, Bluford served as a hunting guide in Colorado and Wyoming. He built a reputation on working and tooling hunting rifles and scopes and worked at a variety of sporting stores, including Mike's Outdoor Sports, Scott's Outdoor Sports, and most recently Owen's Outfitters. Outside of the workplace, Bluford loved tinkering around the house and maintaining a vegetable garden.

Bluford will always be remembered as a good neighbor, outdoorsman, and one of Central High School Jaguars biggest fans. But above all, he was a dedicated family man and a devoted Christian. Bluford is survived by the love of his life, Betty; their three daughters: Sherry (Reed) Compton of Auburn, Alabama; Jennifer (Lee) Langham of Jay, Florida; and Terry (Bart) Bray of Jay, Florida; four granddaughters: Chloe Compton, Arissa Bray, Paige Bray and Kolby Bray; five sisters, and one brother, numerous nieces, nephews, and man's best friend, Hope.

Family, friends, and neighbors mourn the loss of a man with a genuine smile, loving heart, and unwavering compassion.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to honor the life of Bluford Ward. My wife Vicki and I offer our prayers and sincerest condolences to his wife, Betty, his family, and friends. He will be truly missed.

CONGRATULATING UZBEKISTAN ON ITS INDEPENDENCE

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVEAGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. FALEOMAVEAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Uzbekistan on 22 years of independence. The United States has supported Uzbekistan's sovereignty following its independence from the Soviet Union in 1991.

Uzbekistan is a key partner in supporting international efforts in Afghanistan. Uzbekistan has supported North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) troops in Afghanistan through provision of electricity, development of rail infrastructures and the Northern Distribution Network. Uzbekistan was the United States' main regional partner in the war on terrorism.

But our relationship with Uzbekistan has developed beyond Afghanistan. I commend President Islam Karimov for strengthening U.S.-Uzbekistan relations and for providing stability in one of the world's tougher neighborhoods. Under his leadership, the United States and Uzbekistan are cooperating on security, economic relations, political and civil society issues, agricultural development, transnational crime, and the threat of infectious disease.

As a result of strong bilateral relations between our countries, Uzbekistan is becoming an attractive investment location for United States companies including Coca-Cola, Case New Holland, Lockheed Martin, Boeing, Caterpillar, and others. Just last year, 50 executives

from top United States companies took part in the annual Uzbekistan-U.S. Business Forum.

With the largest population in Central Asia and a fast-growing economy, Uzbekistan is also a major producer of energy and minerals. Uranium is one of Uzbekistan's largest exports to the United States.

Uzbekistan's history spans more than 2,500 years. Samarkand is the second largest city in Uzbekistan and is as old as Rome, Athens and Babylon. Samarkand is one of the most important cities in Central Asia. It is the city of legends. Registan Square is considered an architectural gem representing the finest in Islamic art. The Mausoleum of Tamerlane houses a massive slab of green jade under which Tamerlane the conqueror is buried, and is thought to be the largest such stone in the world. Today, Samarkand is included in the UNESCO World Heritage List.

Once an important trading center at the crossroads of the Great Silk Road connecting Asia and Europe, Uzbekistan is, again, emerging as a regional and global leader. And so, it is my honor to congratulate President Karimov and the people of Uzbekistan on their Independence Day and to extend to them my best wishes for a bright and prosperous future.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES MUST 'INTERFERE' IN U.S.-CHINA RE- LATIONS

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this week the U.S. and China will hold its annual human rights dialogue—a dialogue that began after the brutal Tiananmen Square crackdown 24 years ago.

Nearly a quarter of a century later the Chinese government remains frightened by the spirit that animated that protest. A June 23 Washington Post article reported that, "In the 2½ decades since the protests' violent end, China's government has largely scrubbed Tiananmen from history."

Try as they might the Chinese government's "Orwellian" efforts to erase this unpleasant event from its history books are incomplete. There are those still living with the scars of that day—both emotional and physical. In 1991, Congressman CHRIS SMITH and I traveled to China. We visited Beijing Prison Number One, which at the time housed approximately 40 Tiananmen Square protesters. While our request to visit the demonstrators was denied, we left with a pair of socks, made by the prisoners, for export to the West.

The abuses of Tiananmen are not simply the stuff of history. The State Department's most recent human rights report found that, "Repression and coercion, particularly against organizations and individuals involved in rights advocacy and public interest issues, were routine. Individuals and groups seen as politically sensitive by authorities continued to face tight restrictions on their freedom to assemble, practice religion, and travel. Efforts to silence and intimidate political activists and public interest lawyers continued to increase. Authori-

ties resorted to extralegal measures such as enforced disappearance, 'soft detention,' and strict house arrest, including house arrest of family members, to prevent the public voicing of independent opinions."

In the face of these and other abuses, it is striking that the human rights dialogue with the Chinese government rarely produces real results or changes. The content of these discussions is cloaked in secrecy, even with other policy makers, including Congress, and the broader human rights community. We are assured that behind closed doors the administration gave an impassioned defense of basic freedoms and human dignity. We are told that, privately, specific cases were raised. This approach has, time and again, failed to produce meaningful results. The imprisoned Catholic bishop, the detained blogger and the beleaguered human rights lawyer deserve far more than this administration has given them.

Human Rights Watch summed it up this way in a press release issued before last year's human rights dialogue: "Many of the United States' and other governments' past human rights dialogues with China have been largely a rhetorical shell, lacking in accountability, transparency, and clear benchmarks for progress. The Chinese government often points to these dialogues as a human rights 'deliverable,' an end in itself, or insists that human rights issues can only be discussed in the context of a dialogue. None of the governments that pursue these dialogues with the Chinese government have established benchmarks to ensure meaningful progress."

Will the same hold true this week? Will we find simply another rhetorical shell and no discernible progress on the part of one of the world's worse human rights abusers?

If history is to be our guide, I fear the answer is yes.

Early in her tenure as Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, during a visit to Asia, famously said that U.S. concern with human rights issues in China "can't interfere with the global economic crisis, the global climate change crisis, and the security crisis." Her statement garnered shock and dismay from human rights activists at home, and I would venture, abroad—the very people who historically have looked to America to champion their cause, rather than relegate it to the backburner. Further, it effectively showed this administration's hand to everyone, including Beijing. Any mention of human rights was just that—an obligatory mention. Human rights were an interference to be managed, a pesky deterrent to bilateral collaboration on more pressing issues.

This notion has been born out in reality. Only when events literally force a response from the U.S. government do human rights garner the attention they rightly deserve.

In April 2012, Chinese activist and legal advocate Chen Guangcheng sought refuge in the U.S. embassy. All of a sudden human rights were sure to "interfere" with the Strategic and Economic Dialogue, which was bringing secretaries Clinton and Geithner to Beijing for high level talks the following week.

Several months earlier, in February 2012 I was one of several Members of Congress—including Rep. CHRIS SMITH, who for years championed Chen's case—who wrote a letter

to President Obama on the eve of Chinese Vice President Xi Jinping's visit to the U.S. We encouraged President Obama to follow the time-tested model of President Ronald Reagan during the height of the Cold War, when Reagan spoke out on behalf of specific dissidents by name, linking human rights and religious freedom to every other facet of U.S.-Soviet relations rather than sidelining the very principles that make this country unique. Chen Guangcheng was among the cases we featured and pressed him to raise.

But it was only with Chen's heroic escape from house arrest that he guaranteed that he was a diplomatic priority.

Too often, it seems that this administration's posture vis-a-vis human rights is one of caution to the point of silence.

Silence in the face of China's abysmal human rights record is indefensible.

The government is an equal opportunity oppressor of people of faith—Catholic bishops, Protestant house church leaders, Tibetan monks and nuns, Uyghur Muslims and Falun Gong practitioners to name a few. Harassments, intimidation and imprisonment are the order of the day.

According to the Congressional Executive Commission on China, at least 40 Roman Catholic bishops remain imprisoned or detained, or were forcibly disappeared including the elderly Bishop Su Zhimin, whose current whereabouts are unknown and who had been under strict surveillance since the 1970s.

Protestant house church pastors are routinely intimidated, imprisoned and tortured. Writing in Christianity Today on February 27, 2013, ChinaAid's Bob Fu declared, "... the number of incidents of 'persecution' increased in 2012 from the previous years, including a number of arrests, sentencing to labor camps, short term detentions, rape and torture in police custody, destruction and confiscation of property, beatings, fines, the loss of jobs or business licenses, and police intimidation."

Over the last two years, a growing number of peace-loving Tibetan Buddhist monks and nuns have set themselves aflame in desperation at the abuses suffered by their people. Human Rights Watch reports that, "The Chinese government, under the rationale of a campaign to improve rural living standards, has sent more than 20,000 officials and communist party cadres to Tibetan villages to undertake intrusive surveillance of people, carry out widespread political re-education, and establish partisan security units . . ."

Uyghur Muslims are unable to freely associate and have been subject to forced confessions and persecution. I repeatedly requested, to no avail, that Secretary Clinton meet with Uyghur human rights activist Rebiya Kadeer who has long been at the forefront of this issue having suffered in prison for five years, including two years of solitary confinement, before she was exiled to the U.S. in 2005. In addition to being a leading human rights activist she is a mother. Her own children have been harassed and wrongly imprisoned as a direct result of her advocacy efforts.

The annual report of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF) found that, "poor religious freedom conditions in China have deteriorated significantly, particularly for Tibetan Buddhists and Uighur

Muslims. To stem the growth of independent Catholic and Protestant groups, the government has detained and arrested leaders, forcibly closed churches, and selected Catholic bishops without the approval of the Vatican. The Falun Gong and other groups deemed 'evil cults' face long-term imprisonments, forced renunciations of faith, and torture in detention."

In November 2009 I wrote a series of high-ranking Obama Administration officials, including U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk, urging that when they have the opportunity to travel to China, that they take time to attend a service at one of China's underground house churches.

I noted that it is not uncommon for U.S. government officials to attend one of the state-sanctioned Three-Self Patriotic Movement churches but that officials rarely if ever visit any of China's house churches which constitute a significant segment of China's faith community and consistently face persecution and repression at the hands of their own government.

I further noted that, perhaps counter-intuitively, many house churches welcome visits by high-profile government officials from the West. Not only do such visits give decision-makers a clearer sense of the repression that the church in China faces but in some cases it actually affords them protection from future harassment and lends credibility to the church themselves. Few administration officials bothered to respond to my letter and, to my knowledge, not a single one has attended a service since the request was made a year and a half ago. In several meetings I personally raised the issue with Mr. Kirk. He seemed to view the request as bothersome—a distraction from more important things.

In its annual report, the bipartisan U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF) pointed to the administration's so-called "Asia Pivot," and observed that the "security and economic pillars of the Asia Pivot remain more developed, and no new democracy, human rights, or humanitarian policy proposals have been offered." The commission further noted that human rights are not an integrated part of U.S.-China bilateral relations.

The Chinese government maintains a brutal system of slave labor camps on the order of the Soviet gulags. Common criminals languish behind bars with Nobel laureates who dare to question the regime's authority.

China has a thriving business of harvesting and selling for transplant kidneys, corneas and other human organs from executed prisoners, including political prisoners.

Earlier this month, just weeks before the human rights dialogue, the New York Times reported that "The police in Beijing have detained one of China's most prominent rights advocates, the latest in a series of arrests that critics said showed the Communist Party's determination to silence campaigners who have challenged the party to act on its vows to expose official corruption and respect rule of law." The advocate's name is Xu Zhiyong.

The Times continued, "supporters said that his case was likely to attract wider attention as a test of China's beleaguered 'rights defense' movement, which he helped build. That loose

network of lawyers, scholars and advocates has sought to use litigation, publicity and petitions to secure political and social rights." The Christian Science Monitor reported that, "Xu is renowned for his public interest legal work on behalf of victims of official injustice, such as children sickened by melamine-tainted formula, and for the care he takes not to demand more than the Chinese Constitution provides for."

All of these examples are symptomatic of a broken system in China. A system infused with corruption and threatened by dissent.

Despite explosive economic growth, China remains a "closed society" when it comes to information. The Chinese government recognizes that ideas have consequence and they go to great lengths to restrict Chinese citizens' access to information through the "Great Firewall" which censors so-called "offensive" speech.

It is estimated that China employs between 30,000 and 50,000 special Internet police. These police were notably active in the aftermath of the "Arab Spring" as the government blocked Internet search requests for key words like "Egypt" and "Jasmine."

As far back as 2008, Amnesty International rightly noted that "In China the Internet has become a new frontier in the fight for human rights."

And yet the Obama Administration has paid mere lip-service to Internet freedom boasting in speeches of the priority it places on the issue when in fact nearly all of the money they've spent on Internet circumvention has been as a result of congressionally-mandated funding targeting closed societies and the State Department has actually sought to redirect the funding toward less threatening research initiatives as opposed to actual hard-hitting circumvention which poses a real threat to authoritarian regimes.

This is not surprising given that this administration seems less concerned with bringing about reform and change on the part of the Chinese government than it does with embracing the current leadership.

On January 19, 2011, I spoke at a Capitol Hill press conference regarding the visit of then-Chinese president Hu Jintao to the U.S. in which I strongly criticized the administration for granting the Chinese president the distinction of an official state dinner—something which had not happened for 13 years—given that the regime had done nothing to deserve such an honor.

We were joined at the press conference by the wife of Gao Zhisheng. Gao is one of the most respected human rights lawyers in China. He has defended activists and religious minorities and documented human rights abuses in China, including a number of high-profile human rights cases, involving Christians in Xinjiang and Falun Gong practitioners. He has been disbarred and subjected to forced disappearance, torture, illegal house arrest and detention as a result of his work. Currently he is imprisoned in Shaya County Prison in the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region in northwest China, after being incarcerated in December 2011 for allegedly violating the conditions of his suspended three-year sentence. Prior to this, his whereabouts had been unknown for almost 20 months. He has been tor-

tured repeatedly since 2006 and continues to be at high risk of further torture. Nearly eight months ago his older brother was able to visit him in prison. Prior to that it had been nine months since anyone had had confirmation he was even alive. He has not been seen or heard from since.

I have "adopted" Gao as part of a recently launched initiative, the Defending Freedoms Project, led by the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission which seeks to draw attention to the plight of persecuted prisoners of conscience and I am committed to pressing for his release and ultimately his freedom.

Gao is but one of many high profile dissidents presently languishing in prison. In December 2009, the government sentenced human rights and democracy activist Liu Xiaobo to 11 years in prison due to his involvement in drafting Charter '08, a historic manifesto advocating for democracy and a greater respect for human rights in China. Liu's courage was recognized by the Norwegian Nobel Committee when they awarded him the 2010 Nobel Peace Prize. However, the award ceremony was held with an empty chair as a solemn reminder that the 2010 Nobel Laureate remains behind bars.

Many have predicted that the 21st century will be the Chinese century, but absent dramatic reform at the heart of the Chinese government, such Chinese ascendancy is deeply problematic and America must be clear-eyed about its implications.

This administration has been anything but.

Last year, Chinese dissident Yu Jie wrote an unsettling piece in the Washington Post where he stated, "China is a far greater threat than the former Soviet Union ever was," and "unfortunately, the West lacks visionary politicians, such as Ronald Reagan, to stand up to this threat."

While this administration and this president lack vision, the Chinese people do not.

Before President Obama's recent meeting with Chinese President Xi Jinping, I joined a leading group of human rights organizations and activists in pressing him to raise the fate of a group of Chinese prisoners of conscience dubbed the "China 16," and to call for their immediate and unconditional release. Each has suffered for courageously challenging "the status quo at great cost and peril to themselves and their families."

As is characteristic, their names were never publicly uttered by the president. And we can only guess what happened privately.

Are their names being raised this week in Kunming, China? Are they being quietly whispered in closed door meetings? Will a single person's life change for the better as a result of the human rights dialogue?

Today, in China, there are men and women whose names we do not yet know but who stand shoulder to shoulder with the likes of Sharansky and Solzhenitsyn and other famed dissidents throughout history who have dared to question the tyranny which enslaved them.

Does the Obama Administration stand with them?

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 90TH
BIRTHDAY OF LILLIA ALINE
HARRIS

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for the House's attention today to recognize Lillia Aline Harris who will celebrate her 90th birthday on August 28th.

Lillia Aline Harris was born to Chester and Estella Warren on August 28, 1923. She was the firstborn of six children, and had three sisters and two brothers. Mrs. Harris worked on her parents' farm while still attending school. She graduated from Heflin High School in 1942.

In May of 1945, Aline married Robert Freeman Harris. Together, Aline and Robert had 3 children, 8 grandchildren and 20 great-grandchildren.

Aline has been an active member of Coldwater United Methodist Church for over 60 years. She is a loving mother, grandmother and great-grandmother, and all who know her speak of her kindness.

Mr. Speaker, please join Mrs. Harris's family, friends, and myself in wishing Aline a Happy Birthday.

48TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, for the past 48 years, Medicare has provided seniors and the disabled with the quality health care, economic security and peace of mind they deserve. Because of Medicare, millions of Americans have been able to grow old with respect and dignity instead of mounting medical debt and uncertainty.

Let's not forget: Medicare is a family benefit. As a caregiver for my mother, I know firsthand just how important this benefit is to families all over New Mexico and America. Without Medicare, my mother would not be able to get the health care she needs, and there is absolutely no way I would be able to take care of her. Medicare has always been personal to me. It's personal to this day.

This week, House Republicans will vote for the 40th time to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Every vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act is a vote to undermine Medicare. The Affordable Care Act has already strengthened Medicare and saved seniors money by eliminating co-pays for preventive care services, closing the prescription drug 'donut hole' and extending the life of the Medicare Trust Fund by nearly a decade.

Mr. Speaker, on this day and every day, we must remain committed to protecting and strengthening Medicare for today's seniors and for future generations.

HONORING AMBASSADOR LINDY
BOGGS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Ambassador Lindy Boggs. I was profoundly saddened to learn of her recent passing. Ambassador Boggs was deeply respected for her civility, dignity, and political acumen by those across the political spectrum.

A nine-term Member of Congress and champion of women's rights, Congresswoman Boggs spent much of her time working for civil rights and to address poverty. She and her husband, Congressman Hale Boggs, welcomed civil rights activists into their New Orleans. I personally worked with Congresswoman Boggs on the successful Head Start program when she was a Member of the House of Representatives. I am pleased to recall that I was in consultation with her back when she was working on her Head Start legislation. Congresswoman Boggs was also responsible for successfully amending the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to protect women from lending discrimination.

After retiring from Congress in 1990, Ambassador Boggs worked with civic and cultural institutions in New Orleans and nationally. More recently, Ambassador Boggs was appointed by President Clinton to serve as U.S. Ambassador to the Holy See at the Vatican. She continued her record of excellence in this role, and I was honored to have had the opportunity to visit her in Rome during her service.

Ambassador Boggs is survived by two children, Thomas Hale Boggs, Jr. and Cokie Roberts, whom I have had the privilege of meeting, as well as eight grandchildren and eighteen great-grandchildren. She will always be remembered in Washington for her extraordinary service and dedication.

IN SUPPORT OF THE NUCLEAR
IRAN PREVENTION ACT

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act. As the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran looms over the security of the international community, it is essential that the U.S. prevent Iran from realizing its dangerous ambitions. This legislation will broaden economic sanctions, target human rights violators and increase pressure on the Iranian regime to abandon its dangerous pursuits. I am proud to cosponsor this legislation.

Despite existing sanctions, Iran continues to advance its nuclear program with determination. Since 2011, Iran's number of installed centrifuges has doubled and it continues to obstruct international inspectors. The country continues to evade sanctions to profit from its

oil production, which in turn funds its nuclear program and state-sponsored terrorism organizations like Hezbollah. In fact, Iran remains the number one state-sponsor of terrorism around the world.

If Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons goes unchecked, the security of our crucial allies like Israel, the United States and the global community will be in grave danger. With this bill, Congress is sending a clear message to Tehran to abandon its nuclear weapons program, or face the economic consequences. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

HAPPY ANNIVERSARY MEDICARE
AND MEDICAID

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on the 48th anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid, I rise to voice my strong support for these national treasures and to share with my colleagues the voices of older Americans from around the nation who rely on them.

Before 1965, nearly half of all seniors were uninsured. If they became sick or injured, they were forced to use their savings, rely on their family, or go without needed medical care. Today, Medicare serves over 50 million seniors and persons with disabilities, providing them with the guaranteed benefits that they have earned over their working lives.

Medicare is literally a life-saver. It can be improved—and we did so in Obamacare by lowering drug costs, eliminating cost-sharing for preventive services like colonoscopies and cancer screenings, and coordinating care to improve quality.

Unfortunately, there are some who want to change Medicare not by making it better, but by shifting costs to those who cannot afford it. Some of those proposals involve increased premiums, deductibles and new cost-sharing requirements for home health services. Others—like those in the Republican-passed budget resolution—would radically change Medicare's very structure by turning it into a voucher program and leaving seniors and people with disabilities to bear dramatically higher costs.

I urge my colleagues to consider the critical importance of Medicare and to join me in opposing proposals that would add to the financial burden of seniors and persons with disabilities who are already struggling. Here are some of the voices of those who need Medicare's guaranteed benefits.

Michelle Adams, from Fallston Maryland, has been on Medicare for the past 13 years because she is disabled. If she didn't have Medicare, she says, "I would be in bad shape without my prescription and possibly homeless because I wouldn't be able to afford both my medication and rent."

Madeline Levine from Evergreen, Illinois was diagnosed with breast cancer shortly after she became eligible for Medicare. "Without Medicare, I could not have afforded my treatment," she says. "This gives me a peace of mind that I have protection."

Juandra Drumgold from Dorchester, Massachusetts, depends on her family for a roof over her head and to pay for basic necessities. She says that not being able to work at such an elderly age and having to maintain her health care can be quite costly. If she did not have Medicare, she says, she would have to cut her living expenses even more, making a choice between medication and food.

B. Peter Brandt-Sorheim from Mt. Morris, New York, saw his medical expenses drop by nearly two-thirds once he became eligible for Medicare last year. Before, he had to pay about \$1,625 for a three-month supply of medication, he currently pays \$135. If it weren't for Medicare, he says, "I would be walking on the edge, crossing my fingers, and praying that someone would donate my Insulin medication to me."

Toni Rosenberg of Boca Raton, Florida relies on Medicare for services related to high-blood pressure, lymphedema, and kidney disease. She says, "If it was not for Medicare, I would be dead. If my Medicare benefits were cut or became more expensive, I would have to stop eating. By being single, Medicare has provided me with a safety net. Medicare is not an entitlement—it is something that we've paid into and should have when we 65. Medicare has provided me with not having to choose between eating healthy foods or being able to get my prescriptions. I do not have to worry about my health because I know I have coverage to take care of me. I am a voice for the people who cannot speak for themselves, please keep your hands off Medicare. My parents and family all fought to have Medicare in our golden years so that my children and grandchildren will have what I have to keep them going in their senior years."

Harlan Lang from La Plata, Maryland, has been on Medicare for twelve years. He says, "If I did not have Medicare coverage, the quality of my life would change terribly, because if I was in a crisis, I would not be able to make it without the coverage. I believe so strongly in Medicare, it is so important to me. I cannot afford to be without the coverage. Healthcare is so expensive; I wish it was even better."

Rosie Woods lives in Richmond Virginia. "I have been enrolled in Medicare for twenty

years. Medicare has helped me to save on my prescriptions," she says. "My health issues for which I am receiving treatment covered through Medicare is for cholesterol and I had a stroke in 2012. If I did not have Medicare my quality of life would change because I would have to go on the soup line. If my Medicare benefits were cut or if I was charged more, I would have to give up a whole lot. It would be a lot of stress that I would have to go through. Taking care of my home will be hard with the expenses. We work very hard for them to take money out of our checks expecting the benefits to be there when we retire."

Barbara Bonfield of Birmingham, Alabama has been enrolled in Medicare for eleven years. She says, "Medicare has helped me on most of my expenses. My husband died of a heart attack at the age of 64. At the age of 65, I was diagnosed with breast cancer and I am a survivor, Medicare was my primary insurer. Medicare has kept me well and it is a vital part of my community; without Medicare coverage I probably would not be alive today, it has kept me alive. If my Medicare benefits were cut or if I was charged more, I would be spending a lot of money to obtain my health care. I would have to re-adjust to everything (travel, food etc.). The last thing that I would have to reduce is my medications. I am very aware of the rising cost of medical care in this country and it is good to know that the Affordable Care Act will reduce the medical cost."

Cynthia Ochs Saur from Melbourne, Florida says, "I reside in Florida and have been enrolled in Medicare for four years. I have had two wellness exams for breast cancer and a lot of health issues which were treated thanks to Medicare. If I did not have Medicare coverage my quality of life would change quite a bit. If my Medicare benefits were cut or if I were charged more, I would have to give up other necessities in order to pay for the help for my medical problems. I would not be able to survive in many ways and would suffer greatly."

Bruce Russell, Sr. is from Missoula, Montana and has been enrolled in Medicare for five years. He says, "Two weeks ago I was

operated on for a growth on my neck, had a colonoscopy test done and one growth was removed—neither one was cancerous. If I did not have Medicare coverage I would die young. My sister had severe arthritis and shingles, she put up with the pain for three years until she was enrolled in Medicare. People who retire on fixed incomes without medical insurance face serious quality of life issues daily when they do not have the benefits of Medicare which they worked for."

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 2013
MONTGOMERY AMERICAN ANGELS

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to pay special tribute to a group of young people in my Congressional district from Montgomery, Alabama. These girls, the Montgomery American Angels All Star Team, will be traveling to Alexandria, Louisiana, this week to play in the Dixie Youth Softball World Series.

Although they are ages nine and 10, these girls have shown tremendous maturity and skill both on and off the field. They currently hold the titles of Dixie Youth Softball Angel Division X-Play District Runner-ups and Dixie Youth Softball Angel Division X-Play State Champs. By winning both their Division and State titles, they will now represent the great state of Alabama in the World Series.

These 12 girls and their three coaches have become the first Angels team from Montgomery American to ever advance to the World Series. They will be traveling over 500 miles from home in the hopes of winning a World Series Title.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating this team and wishing them the best of luck as they travel to the Dixie Youth Softball World Series.

SENATE—Wednesday, July 31, 2013

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of grace, glory, and power, the battle belongs to You. Forgive us for fearing the future, forgetting how You have led us in the past. Forgive us also for our haste to paint a caricature of the many because of the mistakes of the few. Lord, remind us that fierce winds bring no anxiety to those who keep their eyes on You.

Lord, today, imbue our lawmakers and the members of their staffs with Your wisdom, that they may know the road to take. Sustain those who courageously bear the burdens of the marginalized.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 31, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

RECOGNIZING SENATOR MARKEY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, just a brief word or two about the Presiding Offi-

cer. When he took the oath to become a Senator, we had a lot of things going on here. I did not have the opportunity to say as much about him as I would have liked because we were in the thralls of a real battle that we seem to have resolved.

I do not know if there is anyone in my 31 years of Congress who has been better prepared to be a Senator than the Senator from Massachusetts who now is the Presiding Officer. His stunning record has already been established with his work in the Senate. I have, from afar, admired this good man and for 4 years up close when I served in the House with him. His work for the environment has been unparalleled. His is one of the rare voices that have for many years understood the dangers of nuclear waste. He has been aware of the benefits of nuclear power but also the dangers.

There is a long résumé the Presiding Officer has. I want the record to reflect that I am terribly impressed with the work he has already done in the House and will be even more impressed with the work he will do here in the Senate. The people of Massachusetts are very fortunate in having the Presiding Officer from Massachusetts.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following leader remarks the Senate will resume consideration of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill. At about 10:45 there will be a roll-call vote in relation to the Paul amendment. As I have indicated to him and others, we will probably move to table that. That will be up to the two managers of the bill, but I understand that is what they are going to do—or someone will do.

Following disposition of the Paul amendment, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the Jones nomination to be Director of the ATF. We will do this vote just as quickly as I can work out an appropriate time with the Republican leader.

Yesterday I filed cloture on the THUD bill. As a result, the filing deadline for all first-degree amendments on that bill is 1 p.m. today.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1392

Mr. REID. I am told S. 1392 is at the desk and due for a second reading. If that is true, I ask the clerk to report the same.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1392) to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings on this bill at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

THE TAX CODE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, when President Obama proposed a plan yesterday to simplify our corporate Tax Code and lower rates for businesses, I expected Republicans all over the country but especially here in Congress to jump for joy. I think there are many people around the country who were satisfied and happy, but the Republican leadership in the Congress surprised me and I think a lot of people by their reaction. Just a few months ago Leader McCONNELL signaled he would be open to a plan to reform the Tax Code. This is what he said:

I'm told President Obama is going to come out for lowering the corporate tax rate. To the extent he wants to do some of these things, our answer is going to be yes.

It is amazing how quickly his answer went from yes to no, no. Republicans have favored corporate tax reform for decades. We have heard them say so. This was one of the mantras during the Presidential campaign. But now that President Obama is proposing it, Republicans are opposing it.

The President's thoughtful approach would couple lower tax rates, corporate tax rates, with investments in job-creating measures, such as roads and bridges and dams, worker training programs, and manufacturing incentives.

He was in the State of Tennessee when he made this announcement. They are a picture book as to how corporate interests there can really move on. They have done a great job in Tennessee, and I would bet that at every corporation in Tennessee they were elated to hear what President Obama had to say yesterday.

It is going to take a balanced approach and include smart spending cuts, closing wasteful loopholes and asking corporations that will benefit from lower tax rates to contribute their fair share. Even Speaker BOEHNER supported this approach in the past. This is what he said just a short time ago:

If we want to put Americans back to work, I think lowering the corporate tax rate is critically important. And to do that, I think

we have to look at the tax-expenditure side, the deductions, credits, and other gimmicks that may be in the tax code and that have accumulated over the last 30 years.

I do not say this very often, but Speaker BOEHNER was right.

This is the kind of balanced approach to deficit reduction the American people favor—a simpler tax code that lowers rates, makes our businesses more competitive, but also raises new revenue to invest in job creation. We have learned that the sequestration has already cut 1.6 million jobs, so we need job creation. We need to help the middle class by creating jobs. As President Obama said, if we are going to give businesses a better deal, we need to give workers a better deal also. We can use the money we save by simplifying the Tax Code to create jobs now, right away, jobs that can never be outsourced. Both Democrats and Republicans can get something they want, and the economy gets the shot in the arm it needs.

We have already cut the deficit in half over the last 3 years—that is the yearly deficit—and we have already saved \$2.6 trillion from the accumulated debt. Democrats know there is more to be done. We certainly do. But we will not agree to any plan that balances the budget by killing jobs even more than already and whacking the middle class, and that is while holding the richest individuals and corporations harmless.

Democrats believe we must offset the harsh spending cuts of the last few years with job creation that puts the middle class back on track. To get the economy back to full steam, we should be making targeted investments in areas such as infrastructure and education—things that have always helped America grow and succeed.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, you know there is not much to say about the President's speech yesterday other than that he actually retreated from previous commitments to a more bipartisan, revenue-neutral corporate tax reform and then tried to sell that rejection of bipartisanship as some "grand bargain"—I mean, only in Washington. But let me say this: It really would be nice to see the President work with Congress for a change to get some important work done for the American people. Republicans have been eager to do this all along, but, really, it is almost as if there is a "Gone Campaignin'" sign outside the Oval Office—a "Gone Campaignin'" sign out-

side the Oval Office. On the rarest of occasions when he does come to the Hill, as he will today, you find out it is basically just for another internal campaign rally with Democrats.

I hope he will finally get serious and make one of his famous pivots—this time in a new direction toward effective policy and away from the never-ending political sideshow. But it is hard to see, especially when you consider that the President's party is now attempting to blow up one of the most genuinely bipartisan accomplishments of the Obama era.

The Budget Control Act that was agreed upon two summers ago represented a commitment from Washington to America, a bipartisan promise to enact \$2.1 trillion in spending control. Last year the slightest hint of fiddling with the spending caps led to a furious response from senior Washington Democrats. It even led to a veto threat from the White House. But now Washington Democrats are tired of bipartisanship. The commitments they made have become an inconvenience to their special interest agenda, so now they are threatening to shut the government down if they are not allowed to break their word. That is what this appropriations debate we are having is all about. It is about an attempt to blow up an important bipartisan achievement by busting the spending caps to which both parties already agreed.

Republicans do not believe we should be breaking our commitments to the American people, and breaking commitments in order to overspend, as Democrats propose, seems like an even worse reason for them to shut down the government. So I hope they will not. I hope they will think about the "third way" offer we have made to them too—that we would happily discuss exchanging some of the particular cuts they do not like for government reforms, the kinds of innovative ideas that can get our economy back on track and our government back in the black not just in the immediate term but over the long haul. This policy discussion has never been more relevant, especially when we look at what is happening in Detroit and what is happening in Europe, when we realize that the real-world consequences of putting off reform are no longer just abstract or hypothetical, they are here, they are real, and they are now.

The experts tell us that the United States is already on a completely unsustainable fiscal trajectory and that we need to make some big changes today if we want to avoid a similar fate. They also tell us that, unlike Detroit or Greece, America still has some time to chart its own future—but not long. That is why the choices we make today are so important. We can follow the Democratic path to austerity—the path of breaking spending caps wide

open and borrowing more money we do not have, of callously rejecting reform and blissfully denying the future. That path inevitably leads to European-style austerity, to the decimation of the middle class, to desperation for the least among us, or we can follow the Republican path to reform and growth, a path of smart choices, innovative reforms, and orienting our economy toward the future. The Republican path not only prevents austerity tomorrow but leads to more jobs and a better economy today. The Democratic path to austerity or a Republican path to reform and growth, these are the choices.

Voting for appropriations legislation that blatantly violates budget reforms already agreed to by both parties moves our country in exactly the wrong direction. It puts us on the Democratic path to austerity. That is one of the many reasons I will be voting against this spending bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. It is time to get serious about the challenges we face. It is time to work together to reposition America for growth and prosperity and sustainability in the 21st century.

If the President is willing to get off the campaign trail and show some leadership with his party—convince them of the positive reforms and the need to actually stick to them—I am confident we can create a better economy today and leave a better future for our children tomorrow. But it is up to him, and his visit today offers a great chance to convey this message to his fellow Democrats.

TRIBUTE TO ROHIT KUMAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words about my departing deputy chief of staff Rohit Kumar, who announced a few weeks back he would be leaving the Senate at the end of this week.

Many of the Members of the Senate know Rohit pretty well. He has been trolling the floor out here for a long time, telling us on the Republican side what to do and how to do it. He has been a constant presence at my side at just about every legislative battle we have had here in the Senate for the past 6½ years; actually, even before that, when he was working for Leader Frist, and I was over in the whip's office.

So many of us could recount Rohit's many talents, but as his boss it falls on me to do it, and I am happy to do it because we have been through a lot. The first thing to say about Rohit is that his mind is like a trap. He has the answer to literally every question the moment you ask him, and he has usually thought through the politics of it too. That might not sound terribly unusual, but I assure you it is rare in this business to come across somebody who combines a brilliant mind for policy

and a brilliant mind for politics in one package, but that is Rohit. He is remarkable that way. It is one of the reasons he has been indispensable to me, not only in the day-to-day stuff but especially on the three major deals I helped broker with Vice President BIDEN, starting with the 2-year extension of the Bush tax cuts in late 2010, the debt limit deal we arrived at in the summer of 2011, and then, of course, the fiscal cliff agreement at the end of last year in which we locked in the Bush tax rates permanently for 99 percent of Americans. That is something we couldn't even do, by the way, when we had a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and a Republican President.

Every one of those agreements involved a lot of work, a lot of nights and weekends, and tremendous focus. We couldn't have done any of them without Rohit. Anything that ever came up in those discussions, Rohit can tell us the upsides and the downsides, where the other side was willing to go and where they weren't. He knew where all the tripwires were, and it is because of these same skills as well as his grasp of Senate rules and procedure that he has become sort of an informal adviser to the entire Republican conference over the years.

It is not at all unusual for me to walk back to Rohit's desk and see him talking to another Senator in my office—either in person or on the phone. He knows how things work, and folks who are smart know they can call him or swing by if they want to know what is going on or what is possible or what is not on absolutely anything. A lot of other Senators will miss him every bit as much as I will.

Rohit says he was drawn to public service by the example of his parents, both of whom are doctors, and viewed their work as more of a calling than a source of income. His dad is a widely respected and well-known teacher at the university level, and his mom worked at a VA hospital.

Rohit wasn't drawn to medicine, but like his folks he wanted to make a difference, and that is what drew him to politics. He got his start by answering phones for the mayor of Dallas, and then translated that into an internship for Phil Gramm's State office after his sophomore year at Duke. After graduating in just 3 years, he took a job in Senator Gramm's Washington office as an LA, and did that for a couple of years before heading off to law school.

The plan was to become a Federal prosecutor. So he moved down to Charlottesville, stayed there for a clerkship on the Fourth Circuit, and then saw his plan go up in smoke when he called Senator Gramm for career advice. Rohit told him what he was thinking, and Senator Gramm listened. Senator Gramm then told him he thought it would be a much better idea if he came

back to the Senate and worked for him instead. Senator Gramm can be pretty persuasive. Rohit agreed, and he has been here ever since.

It wasn't a straight line. About a month after Rohit got here, Gramm announced he wasn't running for reelection. Over the year that followed, Rohit impressed a lot of folks. It wasn't long before Senator Lott picked up the phone and asked him if he would join him in the leader's office. Rohit accepted, and then spent pretty much his entire time there figuring out how to get the Department of Homeland Security up and running in such a way that it wouldn't be hamstrung by union rules.

Over a holiday weekend in late 2002, he got a taste of things to come. President Bush wanted DHS approved, so Rohit and a few other key staffers had a holiday weekend to do it. They started writing the bill on a Thursday night and wrapped it up by Tuesday morning.

Rohit stuck around during the Frist years, gaining even more experience and impressing even more people—including me. When Leader Frist left at the end of 2006, I brought him onto my leadership team, and it has been one of the best hiring decisions I have ever made. As I said, he has been an extraordinary help to me and a great guy to have around. He is not only whip smart, but he has a fantastic sense of humor and work ethic like I have never seen.

I thank Rohit for his dedication and service to me and to the Senate. Since this is the only opportunity I have ever had to do this, I want to thank Hilary for letting us have him for this long. I think she is here today. I know how supportive she has been of Rohit staying here for so long, and so I want to thank her for that and apologize for all the canceled trips and lost weekends. I know it wasn't always easy to see it in the moment, but he has made an enormous difference not just to me but our country.

I can't promise the transition will be easy. He might want to find a good 10-step BlackBerry recovery program when we finally take it away from him, but I am sure he will figure it out.

With that, I wish Rohit all the best in the future. I know he has a bright one. I understand he will be unemployed after the weekend, but I expect that won't last long.

Rohit, if you ever want to come back, we always have a place for you. Thanks, buddy.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1243. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1243) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Murray (for Cardin) modified amendment No. 1760, to require the Secretary of Transportation to submit to Congress a report relating to the condition of lane miles and highway bridge deck.

Coburn amendment No. 1750, to prohibit funds from being directed to Federal employees with unpaid Federal tax liability.

Coburn amendment No. 1751, to prohibit Federal funding of union activities by Federal employees.

Coburn amendment No. 1754, to prohibit Federal funds from being used to meet the matching requirements of other Federal programs.

Murphy amendment No. 1783, to require the Secretary of Transportation to assess the impact on domestic employment of a waiver of the Buy America requirement for Federal-aid highway projects prior to issuing the waiver.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 1739

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 1739.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 1739.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To redirect certain foreign assistance to the Government of Egypt as a result of the July 3, 2013, military coup d'état)

At the end of title I, insert the following: SEC. _____. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On June 30, 2012, Mohamed Morsi was elected President of Egypt in elections that were certified as free and fair by the Egyptian Presidential Election Commission and the United Nations.

(2) On July 3, 2013, the military of Egypt removed the democratically elected President of Egypt, arrested his supporters, and suspended the Constitution of Egypt. These actions fit the definition of a military coup d'état.

(3) Pursuant to section 7008 of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Act, 2012 (division I of Public

Law 112-74; 125 Stat. 1195), the United States is legally prohibited from providing foreign assistance to any country whose duly elected head of government is deposed by a military coup d'état, or removed in such a way that the military plays a decisive role.

(4) The United States has suspended aid to countries that have undergone military coups d'état in the past, including the Ivory Coast, the Central African Republic, Thailand, Mali, Fiji, and Honduras.

(b)(1) In accordance with section 7008 of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Act, 2012 (division I of Public Law 112-74; 125 Stat. 1195), the United States Government, including the Department of State, shall refrain from providing to the Government of Egypt the assistance restricted under such section.

(2) In addition to the restrictions referred to in paragraph (1), the following restrictions shall be in effect with respect to United States assistance to the Government of Egypt:

(A) Deliveries of defense articles currently slated for transfer to Egyptian Ministry of Defense (MOD) and Ministry of Interior (MOI) shall be suspended until the President certifies to Congress that democratic national elections have taken place in Egypt followed by a peaceful transfer of power.

(B) Provision of defense services to Egyptian MOD and MOI shall be halted immediately until the President certifies to Congress that democratic national elections have taken place in Egypt followed by a peaceful transfer of power.

(C) Processing of draft Letters of Offer and Acceptance (LOAs) for future arms sales to Egyptian MOD and MOI entities shall be halted until the President certifies to Congress that democratic national elections have taken place in Egypt followed by a peaceful transfer of power.

(D) All costs associated with the delays in deliveries and provision of services required under subparagraphs (A) through (C) shall be borne by the Government of Egypt.

(c) Any amounts retained by the United States as a result of implementing subsection (b) shall be made available to the Secretary of Transportation to carry out activities under the heading "BRIDGES IN CRITICAL CORRIDORS".

Mr. PAUL. A once great city, Detroit, lies in ruins with 50,000 feral dogs roaming the city, and abandoned houses litter the landscape. It is a bleak and forlorn future that awaits Detroit. Creditors clamor for nearly \$20 billion in debt. City employees wonder if they will be paid. There is not enough money to even replace the street lights in Detroit. God forbid that a major fire should break out.

At some level I think the President does care about Detroit, but today all I can see is the billions of dollars—the billions of American tax dollars—that he chooses to send overseas. I see the shiny new technology, America's best, going to arm people who are indifferent to us, and, at worst, hate us. The President sends billions of dollars to Egypt in the form of advanced fighter planes and tanks. Meanwhile, Detroit crumbles.

Chicago is a war zone. More people died in Chicago this year than in Afghanistan. Yet the President insists on building a \$34 million fort in Afghani-

stan. Hillary Clinton insists on spending \$80 million on a consulate in Afghanistan that will never be used. As Detroit decays, Chicago is a maelstrom of violence, yet no one questions sending billions of the taxpayers' dollars to Egypt, to despots, to dictators in foreign countries.

Our Nation's bridges are crumbling and few politicians from either party will question the billions of dollars that are being sent overseas while our Nation's infrastructure is crumbling. The law is very clear. Everyone here in Congress can read. They recognize that the law says when there is a military coup, the aid must end.

Today we will vote on whether they will obey the law or whether they will openly flout the law and disobey. When a military coup overturns a democratically elected government, all military aid must end; that is the law. There is no Presidential waiver. The law states unequivocally that the aid must end.

When the military coup occurred in Egypt, how did the President respond? How did Congress respond? The President and his cohorts in Congress responded by shoveling good money after bad into the failed state of Egypt. The President is intent on building nations abroad and not taking care of our Nation here at home. I propose that we take the billion dollars that is now being illegally given to Egypt and spend it at home.

We have bridges crumbling at home. Can't we fix some of our problems at home? We have had a bridge collapse this year in Washington State. We had one collapse in Minnesota a few years ago. We have a bridge in northern Kentucky that is becoming increasingly unsafe. Yet there is not enough money to repair our bridges because our politicians are sending the money overseas. It is unwise, and right now it is illegal.

Countries such as Egypt are getting billions of dollars in aid. Meanwhile, they recently let a mob advance and climb atop our Embassy and then burn our flag. I say not one penny more to these countries that allow mobs to burn our flag.

In between cashing our checks, Egypt finds time to convict 16 Americans on trumped-up political charges. Fortunately, the Americans were able to escape. If they hadn't left the country, we would have 16 Americans in prison in Egypt. Luckily these Americans were able to get out of the country.

How do these establishment politicians respond? How will the other side respond today when they get up and plead we should break the law? What will they say about Detroit? What will they say about Chicago? What will they say about the bridges in northern Kentucky that will not be built because we are sending the money to countries that are burning our flag?

I think it is unwise to send arms—particularly advanced arms—into the

chaos of Egypt. I fear one day someone may arise in Egypt who says: Let's attack Israel with these planes. Let's attack Israel with these tanks. I fear these weapons we are giving to Egypt may someday be used against America and our allies.

Even the Egyptians don't want our aid. There was a Gallup poll last year which showed that 70 percent of Egyptians don't even want the money we are sending them. To understand why we have to understand that American aid doesn't go to the Egyptian people; it goes to the despots and the dictators who run the place. We have to realize that when protesters gather in Tahrir Square in Cairo by the hundreds of thousands—and even millions—why they are unhappy with America. They are unhappy with America because they are being sprayed with tear gas bought with American tax dollars, manufactured in Pennsylvania, and given to the Mubarak family or given to the military. Why are they unhappy? Foreign aid doesn't go to foreign people; it goes to foreign despots and foreign dictators. Foreign aid is more likely to buy a lavish chateau in Paris than it is to buy bread in Egypt.

We send money to Egypt and it buys private jets for the Mubarak family to fly to Europe. The Mubarak family is said to have stolen billions of dollars of American aid. Over the past 30 years, Americans have been forced to finance the Mubarak family living large. So when we see pictures of depression in Detroit, when we see abandoned housing in Detroit, when we see boarded up housing, when we see 50,000 feral dogs running through the streets of Detroit, when we see a once great country, a once great nation, a once great city lying in decay, we think of our politicians who chose to send that money to Egypt and not keep it here at home.

As the money is stolen and squandered around the world and as Detroit decays, as Chicago is overrun with violence, as Americans struggle to put food on the table, Mubarak and his family dine on caviar and champagne. As Mubarak flew to Europe for weekends on his jet and lived the life of a king, his people rotted in jail indefinitely, without charge, without trial. They have been living under martial law for 30 years. We wonder why they are unhappy with us. We have been financing the guy who has been giving them martial law and indefinite detention without trial for 30 years. To add insult to injury, when they protest against their government, they are doused with tear gas made in our country.

Foreign aid doesn't go to foreign people; it goes to foreign despots and dictators.

The President claims he feels our pain. The President says he can feel the pain and he wants to help the middle class. But it seems as though he

wants and intends to help foreign people, foreign countries more than he wants to help America. The President promised us hope and change, but the more he claims that things change, I think the more they stay the same.

I wanted to believe the President would be different. I wanted to believe he would bring change. I wanted to believe he would stand up to the arms race, to the military industrial complex; that he would stop the flow of arms to despots and dictators across the planet. But hope and change just turned out to be a slogan. In Detroit and in Chicago and in the once great cities of America, no change came. Hope and change was just a slogan. The poverty, the murders, the abysmal schools, they continue.

Where are you, Mr. President? In our hour of need in our country, why are you sending our money to people who hate us? Why are you sending arms to countries that don't like us or our allies? Why would we do that?

The President maintains he will end the war in Afghanistan, and I support him. But he insists on fighting new wars, secretly, without congressional approval, in Libya and Syria. While Detroit decays and descends into bankruptcy, the President, as did so many Republicans before him, continues to send American tax dollars overseas to countries that persecute and kill Christians. Hope and change—I guess it was just a slogan.

The law clearly states that when there is a military coup overturning elected government, the military aid must end. Even the President doesn't dispute the law. He doesn't even dispute it is a coup. He just says, I am not going to say it is not a coup or it is a coup; you can't make me. It is ridiculous to any intelligent person or country—and I wonder if anyone on the other side will stand and say it is not a coup. How do we say, when the military takes over a country and boots out a government, that it is not a coup? Only a fool or a demagog would attempt to argue that the military junta in Egypt is not a coup; that the military takeover that actually installed the lead general as Deputy Primary Minister is somehow not a coup.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. PAUL. Not yet.

In a remarkable bit of sophistry, the President admits the law does not mandate an end to military aid when a coup takes place—he says it does, but he says it can't make him decide, so he is not going to decide whether there was a coup. What it is, is brazen and open flouting of the law.

The President's argument reminds me of a third grader at recess. A third grader says he will not call it a coup and you can't make him. That is absurd. We passed a law. It is the law of

the land. It says if a coup happens, if the military takes over or participates in a substantial way in removing an elected government, the military aid ends. We are either a nation of laws or we are not.

When the President refuses to acknowledge it is a coup or that it is not yet an acknowledged coup, he says the aid is going on indefinitely and he will go on indefinitely flouting the law.

Americans should be outraged and insulted by such blatant shirking of the law. Either we are a nation of laws or we are not. Will we obey the law?

We have the presumption to tell the world how to behave, to criticize Egypt for not obeying the rule of law—all legitimate concerns. Yet the President blithely ignores our own law. If we choose to ignore our own laws, can we, with a straight face, preach to the rest of the world about the rule of law? I think by openly flouting our own laws we take away from our ability to lead the world, we take away from our moral authority to show the right way. America has always been the leader by example. But how do we lead by example when we are not willing to obey our own laws?

There is a question: Are we a monarchy or a republic? Are we to be ruled by caprice? If we pick and choose which laws to obey, what message does that send?

I say to all Americans—Democrats, Independents, and Republicans—enough is enough. We aren't going to take it anymore. We should call our representatives and tell them enough already. Tell them to take care of our country. Tell them not one penny more to countries that are burning our flag.

I suggest today we do something historic and listen to the American people. The American people don't want good money after bad shoveled and sent overseas; they want to fix some of the problems we have at home. They want to do some Nation building here at home.

My amendment will give our representatives a chance to vote. We are going to say: Yes, we will obey the law. We are not sending any more weapons to Egypt and we are going to take the money and we are going to build some bridges in our country. We are going to repair some roads. We are going to work on some infrastructure here at home.

Everybody seems to say they are for it. In fact, the President has now come out and said he wants some grand bargain to take some new money and actually work on infrastructure. Mr. President, it is right here. I am offering it today.

I have another amendment that would say all foreign profit can come home at 5 percent. We can take that revenue and build new bridges. They will not even let me vote on that one. So the President's grand bargain to in-

crease infrastructure spending—I have it. It is on the floor.

Mr. President, call the leadership of the Senate. Tell them it is on the floor and you support this; that you want infrastructure spending. I have a bill that would do precisely that. This amendment will do a little bit in that direction. Take the \$1 billion we spend in Egypt and spend it in America.

When we see the pictures on the news of what is going on in Detroit—if you live in Detroit and you are suffering through the bankruptcy of your city; if you see around you the chaos and poverty of Detroit, you call the President and say: Mr. President, why are you sending that money to Egypt? Why are you sending money overseas when our Nation is crumbling, our cities are crumbling, our infrastructure is crumbling, our bridges are crumbling? The President says: I am going to send that to Egypt. I am going to send that overseas.

This amendment will give everyone a chance to put their money where their mouth is, to say: Do you care about America? Do you care about repairing American infrastructure or do you care more about sending money to a dictatorship in Egypt? I think the choice is clear. I think, if we ask the American people, three-fourths or more of them—I think maybe nearly 100 percent of the American people—are with me. Let's spend that money at home. Let's not send that money overseas to people who hate us, to people who burn our flag. Keep it at home.

There is a finite amount of money. We can't do everything. We can't fix everything if we have to fix everybody else's problems first. Let's address some of the needs we have at home.

I encourage a "yes" vote, to vote to keep the money at home and not to send it overseas.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, regretfully, I am going to oppose this amendment. I am going to have to cover some points which my good friend from Kentucky made that I think are totally wrong.

First of all, I don't agree we need to be going up there with Federal dollars bailing out cities that are having problems. Of course, that is a decision that is going to be made, I suppose, by a lot of people.

Also, the Senator from Kentucky talks about sending billions of dollars overseas. I agree with my colleague from Kentucky about some of the foreign aid and I would join with him but certainly not in this case. Before I tell my colleagues why, let me clarify something. There are Members of this body and people outside this body who are conservatives believing this is some kind of a conservative program to defund the military in Egypt. Let me

assure my colleagues it is not. This is coming from a person who is probably—in fact, I am certain of it. I have been ranked as the most conservative Member of this body more than any other single person. So this is coming from a conservative, not from a liberal and not from a Democrat.

We have a unique situation. I wish to respond to a couple of things my friend from Kentucky said. First of all, yes, it probably fits the description of a coup. I know what the law is. The law says we can't send foreign aid after a coup. I have a bill drawn up right now that if this is determined to be a coup, it could pass the House and the Senate and be signed by the President in 1 day. So that is something that can be done. I have the best of intentions of obeying the law to the letter.

As far as the situation in Egypt, Morsi is gone. Let's face that reality. There are a lot of things we don't like about this. But I will say this: If you have any feelings at all toward our good friends, our best friends in the Middle East—that is Israel—then you cannot consider this amendment. Israel has all of the interests at stake.

It goes back to 1979, the Camp David accords. I remember that very well. The Camp David accords put together something between Israel and Egypt. But keep in mind, it is not Egypt. It is the military, the Egyptian military. They have been our friends. They have been Israel's friends for years and years and years—since 1979. If we turn our backs on the military now, there are others who would love to fill that vacuum.

Should they have F-16s? I am glad they have F-16s. They ought to have more F-16s. Some have been purchased and not delivered yet. They should be delivered. But if it is not going to be F-16s, if we should pass an amendment like this, you are going to find yourself with a bunch of MiG-29s coming over from Russia instead of our F-16s.

If this were 10 years ago, if this were 15 years ago, I might agree with my friend from Kentucky. But that was before we realized the threats we have in the Middle East. We have some friends in the Middle East. We have Israel. We have Jordan. We have Kuwait, U.A.E., Qatar, Saudi Arabia. If that coalition of friends in the Middle East breaks up, what can happen to us here in America? Our intelligence has said—and it is unclassified since 2007—that Iran will have the capability of a weapon and a delivery system by 2015. If we do not have our friends in the Middle East to keep that from happening, we could pass an amendment like this, turn our backs on Israel, and that is exactly the thing that could happen.

I know a lot of people want to talk on this who are a lot more articulate than I am. But I can say from a conservative—from this conservative—we cannot do this to our friends in Israel and our other allies in the Middle East.

Mr. CORKER addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee is—

Mr. CORKER. I want to go in the appropriate order. I see the chairman of the committee. I would like 5 minutes at some point. But does the Senator want to go ahead?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation? I understand the opponents of this amendment have 30 minutes; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Oklahoma has used 5 minutes of the time in opposition.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Then I ask unanimous consent that as the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee I control the remainder of the time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I—

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator respond to a question? How is the time going to be allocated?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Yes. It is my intention to consume about 8 minutes approximately, to yield Senator MCCAIN 6 minutes, Senator GRAHAM 6 minutes, and Senator CORKER 5 minutes.

Mr. CORKER. Perfect.

Mr. MENENDEZ. That should take the remainder of our time.

Mr. President, this amendment may be good politics but it is bad policy. I appreciate the concern of the Senator from Kentucky for Detroit. He and others in this Chamber have had plenty of times to vote for America's cities, but I have not seen those votes be there.

Nothing in this amendment, notwithstanding what we heard, suggests that cutting all aid to Egypt ultimately means putting that money into the cities of America, such as Detroit. So let's not be mistaken about that.

I share many of the concerns that have been raised by my colleague today about the situation in Egypt. I believe, however, halting all military assistance to Egypt at this time is misguided and it is shortsighted. It would drastically reduce U.S. influence with both the interim government of Egypt and the military at an incredibly delicate time for Egypt and its people. And in so doing, it may in fact undermine our shared goals and desire to see elections and a democratically elected government reestablished in Egypt as quickly as possible.

It has been just a little more than 2 years since the onset of the Arab spring and a revolution in Egypt that unseated Hosni Mubarak after two decades in power. During these tumultuous 2 years, Egypt has struggled as a society with the transition to democracy that its people clearly want, and with efforts to create the economic op-

portunities that its people clearly need. That struggle is real and ongoing.

The demonstrations that ousted Mubarak in a clear military coup were unprecedented—until they were eclipsed by demonstrations this summer which drew as much as a third of Egypt's population of 83 million people onto its streets. That is more than 30 million people who have been emboldened by the revolution, who are united in their call for reform and democracy, and who have embraced their ability and right to peaceful protests and to demand change.

If you think about it, a comparable protest in the United States involving a third of our Nation would mean that 100 million Americans would be on the streets of the cities of America. That is the equivalent of what has been happening in Egypt.

So my point is that Egypt is changing but perhaps not as quickly as we would like and with a process that has been, not surprisingly, pretty chaotic.

Abandoning our diplomacy and engagement with Egypt—a country that sits at the heart of the Middle East—because the road that leads to change is not straight or certain would be naive. It might make us feel good, at least for a moment, but in the long run it would threaten to undermine vital national security interests and set back our values.

Making such a significant change to U.S. foreign policy—with all the potential implications for U.S. national security and for our ally Israel—should not be done in haste. It should not be done carelessly or thoughtlessly. It should not be done without a full understanding of all of the ramifications of such a change. And it certainly should not be tacked onto the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill. It is far too important a decision to be an afterthought to an appropriations bill. In my view, it is ill-advised to make foreign policy on the fly without due consideration of all of the consequences.

I would point out that my friend from Kentucky has introduced an identical bill that has been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. Last Thursday the committee held its first extensive hearing on the crisis in Egypt. I can assure my friend from Kentucky that the committee will continue to work on this issue and to look at appropriate policy options through a deliberative process.

We need time to determine whether the process underway in Egypt will meet the demands of the Egyptian people and lead back to democracy or if the military leadership will dig in further and thereby invoke restrictions in U.S. law with respect to assistance. Our patience is not unlimited and our assistance is not without limitations. The administration is already actively reviewing U.S. assistance.

The delivery of four new F-16 aircraft that was to occur last week was halted by the administration, clearly sensitive to the situation. At the end of the day we should allow for flexibility to deal with this delicate situation as events dictate, not precipitate an unwanted response with a knee-jerk reaction rather than deliberative reflection. The administration has a process to make its decisions.

I would say this is about—as I listen to the Senator from Kentucky—far more than Egypt. He basically opposes all foreign assistance abroad. The reality is that foreign assistance abroad has worked for the national interests and security of the United States. It has saved millions of lives through PEPFAR against AIDS and HIV. It has helped strengthen democracies. It has helped create democracies. It has helped create open markets for American products and services. As a matter of fact, these sales to Egypt—about \$1.2 billion—are largely from the manufacture of equipment here in the United States that creates jobs here at home and then ultimately gets used in Egypt.

We need a more nuanced approach, one that speaks to both our values and our interests, and one which provides the President with the flexibility needed to conduct delicate and discriminating policy in a challenging and chaotic environment.

A quick end to aid at this time—meat-clever approach, when a scalpel is needed—is simply ill-advised.

Last week Ambassador Dennis Ross, whose reputation and experience as a diplomat, Presidential adviser on the Middle East, and author, has made him one of the Nation's most respected foreign policy minds on both sides of the aisle, told the Foreign Relations Committee it is imperative that America “stay in the game.” We cannot and should not pull out now. Ending aid to Egypt would only cause Egyptians to shut the United States out of discussions and disregard our advice. Ambassador Ross also said that such an action could be the only thing to unite all Egyptians across the entire political spectrum against the United States—against the United States. In fact, that opinion was shared by the majority panelists who feared our inability to influence events in Egypt if we were to step out of the game.

In the interim, as we further assess the situation, our response and our policy must be carefully calibrated to press for the democratic reforms that the Egyptian people have demanded and—simultaneously—support U.S. national security interests in the region.

U.S. assistance to Egypt has, for decades, helped support the Camp David Accords. It also supports our security interests in countering trafficking of weapons and people into the Sinai, and in antiterrorism cooperation with the United States.

In recent weeks, Egypt's military has launched a major crackdown on terrorist activity and extremists in the Sinai Peninsula, carrying out arrests and attempting to seal smuggling tunnels connecting the Sinai to Gaza. U.S. cooperation is essential to the continuation of these activities.

Let me conclude by saying, at the end of the day, Egyptian leaders and the Egyptian military must show that they are committed to an inclusive political process, credible democratic elections, and democratic governance that protects the rights of religious minorities, women, civil society leaders, and a diversity of political parties.

That includes, from my perspective, vacating the June 4 verdicts for the 43 individuals convicted in the politically motivated trial of nongovernmental organization workers, including 16 Americans, and permitting civil society organizations to reopen their offices and operate freely. It also clearly means an immediate cessation of arrests and use of force against peaceful protestors.

Steps that exacerbate the divide in Egyptian society, including the use of force against protestors and arrests and harassment of pro-Morsi and Muslim Brotherhood leaders, serve only to deepen the chasm and forestall reconciliation.

The only way forward to a pluralistic, vibrant, and stable democracy lies in the inclusion of all political parties and groups, as long as they are committed to a democratic process and to peaceful change.

The United States has to move cautiously, not precipitously, in this delicate situation. The Paul amendment is not the answer when it comes to our future relationship with Egypt. The future of that relationship will be determined by our actions in the coming weeks.

Whether we will have a stable and willing partner on crucial matters of security, combating terrorism, trafficking of weapons and persons into the Sinai, and support for peace in the Middle East is up to us or we can stand aside and hope for the best. I think abandoning Egypt is a particularly poor choice. That is why I oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a couple unanimous consent requests. I would also say this: This is an important debate, and I ask unanimous consent that—on the floor now we have CORKER, we have MCCAIN and GRHAM—I ask unanimous consent that if they use more than the allotted time here they be allowed to use that, and whatever time goes over that allotted time we have in the existing order would also be given to Senator PAUL.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 201, Todd Jones, to be Director of ATF; that there be 1 hour for debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on cloture on the nomination; that if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be deemed expired and the Senate proceed to vote on the confirmation, with no intervening action or debate, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of the Paul amendment, the Senate recess until 1 p.m. today; further, that the filing deadline for first-degree amendments to S. 1243, the transportation bill, be 1:30 p.m. today; finally, that when the Senate resumes legislative session following consideration of the Jones nomination, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for 1 hour equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the exception of Senator INHOFE, who is to be recognized for up to 30 minutes; that following the period of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the Power nomination under the previous order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what this means is we will vote on the Paul amendment, give or take, in a half-hour, at around 11 o'clock, or shortly thereafter, whatever time the order allows, and we will then recess until 1 p.m. Then we will have the debate on the Jones nomination from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m., then the cloture vote at 2 p.m. If cloture is invoked, we will immediately vote on confirmation. We could have two votes at 2 p.m. We will have morning business from around 2:45 p.m. to 3:45 p.m., and then the Power nomination—to be U.N. Ambassador—debate from about 3:45 p.m. to 5:45 p.m., and then the vote on confirmation at around 5:45 p.m.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield to the distinguished ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CORKER.

Mr. CORKER. I will be brief. I know that time may be extended. But let me start by saying I understand how citizens across our country are frustrated. Our country has gone through financial distress. We have economic issues that are impacting people of all walks of life. I know as they look at what is happening around the world, there is frustration, generally speaking, with issues relative to foreign aid. I understand that.

I also understand we are a nation of laws. We have had an event in Egypt which is going to cause us to have to deal with that. I think we can deal with that in due time and live up to the laws of this Nation. I also understand, though, that we are the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth. One of the reasons we are the greatest Nation is because of the values we extend around the world and the fact that we have been a voice of calm.

We have been a country that has tried to continue to engender peace. I know the Senator from Kentucky and I share Fort Campbell, a place where some of our most outstanding fighting men and women are based. I know the Senator understands that much of what we do with foreign aid is to try to keep those men and women off the battlefield and in training. We do that to try to keep peace and to keep those men and women who protect our country from having to go to war.

The distinguished Senator from New Jersey just talked about the importance of Egypt. From the very beginning, when this all began just within the last month or 6 weeks, I have believed that the administration, candidly, has handled this well; that our Nation should be the voice of calmness. We should try to be the steady hand that allows this transition to occur in the right way.

At the same time, we should push them toward democracy. I think that is exactly what we are doing. We have had a debate throughout this week in our lunch sessions among Republicans. I know the Senator from Kentucky has made it clear that the poll numbers indicate we should cut off foreign aid. I want to say that we have tremendous responsibilities as Senators. One of the responsibilities we have, no doubt, is to represent our citizens.

On the other hand, we know that sometimes we understand that we should sell to the citizens the reasons that we do the things we do on this floor. I think most people in this body understand that just on a THUD bill, having an amendment that cuts off aid to Egypt is not a thoughtful process as it relates to foreign aid.

My appeal today is really not to my friends on the other side of the aisle, although I am sure some of them are contemplating what to do. But my appeal is to my friends on this side of the aisle. I have talked to many of them in

private. I think many of them know this is terrible public policy.

No doubt, without us explaining to the American people why we should not jerk the rug out from under Egypt as they go through this transition; no doubt, without us sharing the importance of that, the American people are going to look at aid to Egypt and see what is happening there and say: No, let's take that money and let's do something else. I think most people on this side of the aisle understand that is terrible public policy. I think most people on this side of the aisle want to stand and to be thoughtful Senators and do not want to have a poll-tested foreign policy.

We are going to have plenty of time to debate this issue in September. I think all of us know a lot is going to be happening during the recess. We have two Senators who are traveling to Egypt over the weekend to look at what is occurring there. I am going to be in the area in a few weeks.

It seems to me, as the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth, instead of having some poll-tested amendment that may play well in the short term, what we should do as Senators is be thoughtful, understand the greatness of this Nation, understand the millions of lives and livelihoods that are at stake in us being a calm hand in Egypt, understanding the impact that this is going to have on people all around the world and certainly our standing in the world, but our continued ability to help promote human rights, promote democracy, promote peace, promote calm.

So I would just urge the Senators on our side of the aisle, we have these things that come up, and we certainly have groups who come forth. I think all of us understand that is a big vote. This is a vote that says a lot about who we are as Senators. This is a vote that gives us an opportunity to step away from those short-term, hot, poll-tested amendments that have nothing to do with furthering the greatness of this Nation.

I would urge everybody in this body to stand, to be Senators, and to do what we know is the right thing to do; that is, to be calm, to address this issue as we should in the right way this September when all of us have more information to deal with this issue.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the opportunity to speak. I hope this body will rise and conduct themselves as the Senate should on issues of this importance. I thank the chairman for the time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, let me just say briefly that I have gotten a lot of calls about Egypt as well. Look, I

understand it. We look at what is happening over there, we look at some of the wild things that are happening in the streets, certainly tragedies as well. We see the oppression of religious minorities, and we wonder: Why do we continue to give aid to a country that does that? I think that is a very important question.

I think the problem we face is we in this place are sometimes put into a position between two absolutes, when there are other options available to us. The choice before us is not to cut off aid to Egypt or to continue aid to Egypt. I think the opportunity we have now is to restructure aid to Egypt in a way that furthers our national interest.

What is our national interest in Egypt? Our national interest is to have a secular, stable, democratic government that provides security so their economy can grow, a government that lives up to the Camp David Accords, that cooperates in counterterrorism, that prevents discrimination to religious minorities. Our foreign aid should be restructured—not simply canceled but restructured—so that it fits and fills that aim that we have for that country and for our national security interests in that country. That means we should restructure our foreign aid, not simply eliminate it but go back to the Egyptians and say: If you want to continue to get foreign aid from the United States, you are going to have to show measurable improvement on these four things: You are going to show us how you are protecting religious minorities; you are going to have to show us how you are advancing toward democracy and stability. You are going to have to show how you are doing these things. That needs to be measured. If they stop doing it, the aid stops coming.

I would also say regarding restructuring the aid that the aid should be geared toward what they need. They probably do not need that many for more F-16s. What they need is more capacity building for internal security. What they need is more capacity building to live up to the Camp David Accords. That is what they need. Our aid should be aimed toward that.

I also think it is a mistake to just say we are eliminating aid completely because if we eliminate aid completely, we lose leverage. They are still going to buy weapons. They will just not get them from us and our influence will be diminished.

So I think there is a third way. I think what has happened in Egypt is a unique opportunity to restructure—not to cancel but to restructure—and reframe our relationship with Egypt. If they do certain things, they will continue to get aid. If they move toward certain goals that are in our national interest, they will continue to get aid. They will continue to get aid that

helps them meet these goals, not simply anything they ask for.

This is the opportunity we have now. This should be done in a thoughtful and careful way. I hope that is the direction the body will move. I think to simply cancel aid without putting these other conditions in place is a missed opportunity from which we should not walk away.

So I would say to our colleagues, let's not simply cut off aid. Let's take the time to work so that we can restructure aid with Egypt in a way that furthers our national security interests: a secular, democratic government that lives up to the Camp David Accords, that cooperates in counterterrorism, that respects religious minorities, and that provides the internal security they need to create the economic growth they need so that they can be stable now and in the future and be a partner of ours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business following the consideration of the Jones nomination be extended by 40 minutes, with the additional time being equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the exception of Senator INHOFE for 30 minutes and Senator MCCAIN for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. First, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Florida. Now is the time to be creative with our assistance to Egypt to try to change things while there is still hope of things changing in a positive direction.

I certainly understand. Why should we be selling F-16s to people who behave this way? The administration has put on hold the four F-16s that were due to be delivered to Egypt, trying to find out what is going to happen next. That makes sense to me. But why are we selling weapons to Egypt? It is because if we do not, someone else will. I want them to have F-16s and come to our pilot training bases. I want Egyptian officers to come to our military training academies. I want a relationship with the Egyptian military that can be beneficial to our national security interests. I want the people who build F-16s in America to get the business from Egypt to get some of our money back.

If they buy MIGs or Mirages we lose that. It is not a question of if they are

going to buy fighter planes; it is a question of who they are going to buy them from. We have every right to withhold sales. We have every right to put them on hold temporarily. But to just sever this relationship now would be a huge mistake.

In fairness to Senator PAUL, he says we would resume aid once they get their act together and move back toward democracy. I think that is something worth noting. That is an understanding on his part that he is looking for an outcome that we can be more supportive of. The difference I have is that if we cut off aid now, then I cannot tell you the consequences of what that would mean in terms of moving in the direction we would all like.

Unintended consequences to the decision jump out pretty clearly in my mind, and most of them are bad. Is it a coup? It certainly looks like one. It certainly sounds like one. But at the end of the day, if we are moving toward democracy and the military steps back and democratically elected leaders take over, I think that is the goal for all of us.

I wish we did not live in a world like we do. I wish things were easier. I wish the Arab Spring had been more successful. But the one thing I can say is that what happens in Egypt really does matter to us. If the largest country in the Arab world, the heart of the Arab world, Egypt, becomes a failed state, I promise you it will affect our national security interests for decades to come. It would be a nightmare for Israel, and it would take the whole region down a path that would be at best chaotic.

Can we prevent a failed state in Egypt? I think we can. I don't know for sure what is going to happen, but I do know this: If America does not try, if we do not stay engaged and shape history rather than observe it, we will pay a heavy price as a nation. So part of this amendment takes money that would be going to the Egyptian military and puts it on projects in the United States. I think one is a bridge in Kentucky. I have no doubt that there is a need for bridges in Kentucky and South Carolina. I would love to get my port deepened.

But to the people of Kentucky and to the people of South Carolina, if we stop the 1 percent of our budget—it is \$50 billion. That is no small sum. But if we cancelled it all out and just left \$3 billion for Israel—it seems everybody likes that idea. If we had \$3 billion to spend on affecting the world, is that smart?

How much of the debt would be retired if we canceled all foreign aid and brought it back into the United States? Not a whole lot. But here is what I believe would happen. If America withdrew our foreign assistance, a lot of bad things would happen to us. Having a say, having influence in a world that is increasingly dangerous seems to me

to be a good idea. I am tired of having to resort to the military as the only solution to affect things.

The people in Egypt, the government particularly, wants a relationship with us. They have to earn it, as Senator RUBIO said. But to cut off our relationship with Egypt at this critical time, I think, would be extremely ill-advised, and the consequences to the people of Kentucky and South Carolina and every other State in the Union would be significant.

To my colleagues, when you cast your vote today about pausing, not terminating aid, but trying to reconstruct aid, I don't know how that fits in a 30-second sound bite. It is probably easier to explain the "no" vote than it is a "yes" vote. But I do know this: Your country would be well served if you decide today to pause and wait to find out the right answer in Egypt.

I do know this: If Egypt goes, the entire region blows up. The biggest fear I have is radical Islamists are closer to getting nuclear weapons and chemical weapons than any time in my lifetime. If Egypt becomes a failed state, that is one more problem for us to have to deal with, rather than focusing on the Iranian efforts to march toward a nuclear weapon.

Radical Islam has not forgotten about us. The question for us is have we forgotten about radical Islam. If we wish to stop this march in the Middle East of radical Islam getting stronger and stronger and stronger, let's try to hang on to our relationship with Egypt. If it becomes a failed state, and the Sinai becomes one of the great safe havens for terrorist groups—and the Egyptian Army, to their credit, is now involved with the Sinai—the cataclysmic effect of a failed state in Egypt would be the biggest boost to radical Islam I could think of. It would do a lot of damage to our national security and our best friend in the region, Israel.

I have a letter from our APAC. I asked them to comment on this. They state:

Dear Senators Menendez and Corker:

We are writing to express our concerns over the Paul amendment to the Transportation/HUD Appropriations bill that would eliminate military assistance and sales to Egypt. We do not support cutting off all assistance to Egypt at this time, as we believe it could increase the instability in Egypt and undermine important U.S. interests and negatively impact our Israeli ally.

As you know, Egypt is the largest Arab state in the Middle East and has played a vital role in advancing key U.S. interests in that region. Citing just two examples, the government of Egypt has maintained the peace with Israel and is taking important steps to address the instability in the Sinai. Events in Egypt are rapidly evolving, and we believe that for now the United States should avoid taking any precipitous actions against Egypt such as cutting off all assistance. We look forward to continuing to work with you on these critical issues.

One final thought: Maybe one day I will agree with Senator PAUL in saying

we have to sever our ties with the Egyptian military and the Egyptian people. Maybe one day I will come and cosponsor the Senator's amendment or maybe come up with one of my own.

I can tell you if that day ever comes, it will be one of the saddest days of my life because that would mean Egypt is gone. If Egypt is gone, all hell is going to break loose.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, a member of the committee, Mr. MCCAIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Arizona has unlimited time.

Mr. MCCAIN. Does the Senator from Kentucky wish to respond?

Mr. PAUL. Go ahead.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I think it is important in the context of this amendment on the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill that we put into focus what this amendment is really affecting. It is affecting the most important nation in the Arab world, the heart and soul of the Arab world, Egypt. All countries in the Middle East are important, but Egypt is the most important.

In Egypt today there are demonstrations, there are scores of people being killed, hundreds being wounded. This Friday, only 2 days from now, after prayers, there are predictions that there could be even more carnage that will take place as a result of the pro-Morsi people taking to the streets of Cairo and other cities throughout Egypt.

I think we ought to consider this amendment in the context of what is happening in arguably the most important nation in the Arab world. Should we ask ourselves that at this point without adequate hearings, without adequate discussion, without input from the administration, as well as the oversight responsibilities by the Foreign Relations Committee, the Appropriations Committee, the Armed Services Committee, all of whom, chairmen and ranking members, are opposed to this amendment?

First, I caution against a rush to judgment on this issue. It requires, frankly, more than 1 hour equally divided of debate on the floor of the Senate.

I would also like to point out this amendment is part of a larger debate that has been going on in the Republican Party for well over a century. Prior to World War I, there was the isolationist wing of our party. After World War I in the 1930s, there were the America Firsters. After World War II, there was the Eisenhower wing of our party and the Taft wing. The debate has gone on for the heart and soul of the Republican Party.

This debate and this amendment that is posed by my friend from Kentucky is part of that overall debate as to what the role of the United States should be in the world. Should we take our money from Egypt and give it to build a bridge in Kentucky? Should we take our foreign aid and cut it to the point to where we no longer have influence in these countries throughout the world and spend it on much needed projects that are the result of a very ailing and still serious recession in which we still remain?

I think the vote on this amendment has even larger implications than that of whether we should cut off all assistance to Egypt. By the way, my friends, I don't think it is an accident that APAC, our friends there who represent the interests of the State of Israel, have opposed this amendment. If there is further upheaval in the Sinai, and if there is a collapse of the rule of law in Egypt, I don't think there is any doubt that the threat to Israel is dramatically increased.

I made it clear, and so has my friend from South Carolina, that it was a coup. It was a coup and our law calls for that. But that is an implementation of a law that needs to be done in a way that is in consultation with the Foreign Relations Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and, in fact, all Members of the Senate.

I think it is important for us to send a message to Egypt that we are not abandoning them, but what we are doing is trying to caution them to try to modify their behavior, to tell General Aziz that he has to have an inclusive government, he has to allow the Muslim Brotherhood to partake in the upcoming elections, and the Muslim Brotherhood has to be told that they have to renounce violence.

Right now Egypt is spiraling down into a situation of chaos, which I can promise my colleagues will sooner or later pose a threat to our vital national security interests. The most important nation in the Arab world descending into chaos is going to be a threat to the United States of America.

I urge my colleagues—and I urge my friend from Kentucky, with respect—to realize this amendment would send the wrong message at the wrong time. It may be coincidental, but this Friday is going to be an important day in Egypt. Should we be sending the message to the Egyptians: OK, you are on your own?

Yes, other countries in the region are contributing enormously to the Egyptians without conditions. But the support or condemnation of the United States of America, the best, most free, and still most influential Nation in the world, is of vital importance. At this time, I think it would be a terrific mistake for the United States to send the message to Egypt: You are on your own.

I hope we understand that it is not about U.S. foreign assistance; it is about what serves our interests and our values. This, my friends, is a debate that we need to have over the weeks, months, and years ahead in, probably, one of the best places to have that debate.

I urge my colleagues, no matter how they feel about assistance to Egypt, that we are committed. I urge them to appreciate that we are committed to a long debate about this issue.

I have confidence in the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that we will be addressing this issue seriously. The Senator from Kentucky is a member and would certainly take part.

I urge my colleagues to understand that an amendment on the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development-led appropriations bill is not the venue. We need to have this debate not only about Egypt but America's role in the world. I look forward to joining him, but today is not the day to take a step that could have repercussions over time that will damage the vital national security interests of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to vote to table the Paul amendment.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. PAUL. This is exactly, precisely the time it should come up because on the infrastructure bill that we are looking at, this gives Americans the chance to show great contrast. Do you want to do nation building overseas or do you want to do nation building at home? Do you want to spend billions of dollars in Egypt or would you rather build some roads at home?

I think it provides a perfect contrast. In fact, there couldn't be a better place to have a discussion on this issue.

We always hear a lot of empty thoughts and empty promises: Oh, we will do this in committee. We will do this.

They don't want this debate. I have been fighting tooth and nail against Members of my own party to get to this debate, to bring it to the floor, to bring it to the American people.

Let's be very clear about what the amendment does. It halts military aid until they have an election. It is just obeying the law.

Let's be very clear. Maybe we should do a summary of what their arguments are. This is a summary of their arguments: They love sending American money overseas so much that they don't mind breaking the law. I didn't hear one of them explain how they are going to adhere to the law. The law says military aid ends when there is a coup. The President says you can't make him say there is a coup. There probably is a coup, but he is never going to say it, and he is never going to adjudicate it. Who is going to adjudicate whether there is a coup?

This is about temporarily halting aid. Some people rise and say: Oh, we will be closed out, and they will buy their weapons someplace else. They don't have any money. We give them the money to buy our weapons.

Some have said they want to promote democracy. Well, there is an exemption. You can spend as much money on democracy promotion.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PAUL. Not now.

The thing is, we have to understand what this is about. We have to understand this is about a temporary halting of buying weapons. People say: Well, if we don't give them planes, we don't pay them to buy our planes, they will think we don't like them. They will go to war with Israel and everything will be so much worse.

They have hundreds of F-16s. They have thousands of tanks. I am precisely worried about them using them against Israel when there is chaos and blood running in the streets, when there are millions of people protesting.

Do you think it is a good time to send more weapons? Do you think it is a good time to send more weapons when millions of people are in the streets?

What happens if these weapons are used against Israel? The canard of bringing the letter—it always happens. Someone brings in a letter. I have spoken to many people who love, respect, and have a great deal of admiration for Israel. I admire our relationship and alliance and am very proud of the fact that we stand together on so many issues. To bring it up and say the people who are against this don't care about Israel is just a canard.

I think this precisely—continuing to arm an unstable government in Egypt—could well be to Israel's harm. This is precisely why I bring this amendment forward.

Also, it needs to be clear for the record that everyone who has come forward together to send more of your money overseas, to send good money after bad, every one of them was for sending it to the Muslim Brotherhood. We hear them talking about Islamic jihadists and how they are worried about them. No, they are not. They were for funding the Islamic jihadists. They were for funding the Muslim Brotherhood just months ago.

I have had this vote before. I voted to cut off aid to the Muslim Brotherhood also. I have produced an amendment. They all voted against it then because we were going to do this on a more rational, reasonable pace someday, somewhere, in some fictitious committee. No, we are not. They want the money to continue. It doesn't go to the Egyptian people. It doesn't buy good will. It buys ill will. Do you know what the money is spent on? Tanks. Tanks roll over people in protest.

I have no love lost for the Muslim Brotherhood, but they have disappeared them. We are going to be giving money to the military that is disappearing people. No one has heard from President Morsi. Most people think he was actually elected in a fair election. I don't agree with radical Islam. I don't think he would be a good President for any country. I wouldn't give him any money. But we are going to give money to people who make people disappear?

Does anybody remember the Soviet Union? These same people stand and say how bad it is the Soviet Union makes someone disappear. I am absolutely with them. I support that. It is terrible. That is what the military in Egypt is doing—making people disappear. Most of the members of the government haven't been seen in days, maybe weeks. We have no idea where they are.

Once again, let me be clear. I have no sympathy for them. I don't want to give them money either. But all these people who want to fund the military, they all want to fund the Muslim Brotherhood. The only thing consistent about their argument is sending your money to other people.

There is a finite amount of money. Detroit lays in ruins, Chicago is full of violence, and there are bridges everywhere. Don't let them paint this that I have some special thing in Kentucky. There are no earmarks. There is no special money going to Kentucky. This is going into the Transportation bill for the whole country.

There is actually nothing in here special for Chicago or Detroit, but I point it out that we have problems at home. Maybe we should do some nation building here at home.

The other side will falsely say: Oh, you want isolationism. You want to disengage from the world. Hogwash. I want to be involved. I am for being involved with Egypt. I am for trade. I am for international and global interaction and diplomacy and all those things. But do you think you are making the world a better place by sending a few more F-16s and tanks and tear gas to Egypt? Do you think that is somehow making the world a safer place? No.

If I thought the foreign aid was going to do something good, I might be for it. Mubarak and his family fly on private jets, dine on caviar and champagne. Your money is more likely to buy a chateau in Paris for the Mubarak family than it is to buy bread for the people of Egypt.

They say: Oh, well, the Egyptian people will not like us anymore if we don't give them money. Seventy percent of the Egyptian people have said they do not want our money. It doesn't go to them. The people, by the millions, are rioting in Cairo. By the hundreds of thousands they are rioting in Tahrir

Square. They are not rioting for American aid. They are rioting for us to quit giving aid to the despots who rule them.

Mubarak ruled for 30-some-odd years. He ruled by martial law. He made people disappear also. What about human rights? What about dignity? What about trials they just recently—the Muslim Brotherhood—tried 16 Americans in absentia. If they were there, they would have put them in jail. Yet all these same people are afraid to take away money.

How do you think leverage would best work? How would we have leverage? Maybe if we withheld some aid, we would have leverage. But if you give them everything they want all the time, any time, do you think they are going to do something differently? They say the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different response. We have given the aid for 30-some-odd years.

We gave a dictator in the Congo—Mobutu—aid for years and years. They called his wife Gucci Mobutu. Why? Because she would take a Louis Vuitton bag, full of about \$1 million in cash, to Paris and spend it in a weekend—your money, our money, spent on lavish homes. Mobutu had seven palaces. I think Mubarak has six or seven palaces. They steal the money. It doesn't buy the good will of the people. It actually buys ill will. It does completely the opposite of everything they say it does. It does completely the opposite.

So there is a disagreement on this. But the one thing there is not a disagreement on is that it is against the law. The Republican Party maintains: Oh, we are for the rule of law, and we proudly beat our chest all the time and say to Democrats: Oh, you don't want the rule of law; the President disobeys the rule of law. Guess what. This time many Democrats and Republicans will flout the rule of law because the rule of law says military aid ends when you have a coup. It doesn't say you can wait around until it is convenient for you and maybe you can parcel out the aid in different ways. It doesn't say that. It says military aid ends until there is an election. It is very clear about this.

So the argument is about whether you believe in the rule of law. If you do, there is no question you have to vote for this amendment because this amendment simply restates the law. I am not even creating the law. I am just restating the law that says aid ends and it resumes when there is an election.

So those who say he is against all aid, don't listen to him, he is against all aid, that is not what this amendment does. This amendment enforces the law that actually every one of these men and women voted for. They voted for this law. It has been on the books 30-some-odd years, and the law

says that aid ends when you have a military coup. So they are all going to vote to bypass a law they have all supported. Every one of them supported this law.

This isn't some extreme position of no aid; this is a position of temporarily halting it. It is their plan, but it is not convenient now to obey the law they passed.

This is an important debate. It is not about doing things to harm Israel; it is about doing things that, actually, I think would be beneficial to Israel. It is not about ending all aid; it is about obeying the law. It shouldn't be about whether aid is good or bad. I think there are a lot of bad things and unintended consequences that come from the aid, but it is not about that. It is about whether we are going to obey the law.

I say think long and hard about this. Some say they are going to do something more important than what their people at home want, and they are very proud they are going to stand against the will of the people. Three-fourths of Republicans, three-fourths of Democrats, and three-fourths of Independents or higher think it is a bad idea to be sending good money after bad overseas. We do have problems at home and this could go toward fixing them.

Some say it is only 1 percent. Foreign aid is only 1 percent. Guess what. If you cut 1 percent of the budget each year, the budget balances within about 5 years. It is called the penny plan. Many on my side have actually endorsed this plan. So 1 percent isn't an insignificant amount of money, and it is not working. It is doing the wrong thing.

So I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

I retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, this has been a robust debate. Listening to my friend and colleague from Kentucky, I appreciate his views, but I strongly disagree with him. Above all, let's say what it is and what it is not about. This is not about Mubarak and chateaus. Mubarak is gone. The Egyptian people decided that. He is gone. It is not about Mobutu or anybody else. You can conflate anything you want and throw it up against the wall, but this is a question of whether we will continue to pursue our own national interest and national security in Egypt, in the Middle East.

This is, in fact, about democracy. It is about the 30 million who were protesting in the streets of Egypt, whom Senator PAUL referred to. But their call is not for us to leave; their call is for us to engage with them. As the ex-

perts in this field who gave testimony before the committee said, the one uniting thing among all elements of Egyptian society we could do is cut off all aid. It would unite in what? Against us.

This is about making sure we have a stable Middle East. It is not a canard to suggest that Israel's security is at stake, because when you have hundreds of tunnels in the Sinai being used by extremists to send weapons into Gaza to attack Israel, it is about their security. I think no one knows better about their security than the State of Israel itself knows about their security.

It is not a canard. It is a fundamental element of whether we are going to have an ally that can be safe and secure. It is a fundamental element of whether we are going to have the ability to affect the outcome in Egypt in a way that will create stability and peace. It is a fundamental element of whether we have to send soldiers abroad versus keeping them here at home. Because when there is peace and stability, we ultimately do not have to engage with our military in pursuit of our national interest and security.

When terrorists cannot organize in Egypt, we are safer at home in the United States. So let's not cut off all aid to Egypt in a transportation, housing, and urban development bill when, in fact, our vital national interests are at stake. There is plenty of opportunity to help America's cities. I was a mayor. No one wants to help America's cities more. You will get to do that if you vote for the THUD bill, if you put your vote up. But this is not a way to achieve that.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Ronald Reagan used to say facts are stubborn things. The Senator from Kentucky just said Egypt has no money. Isn't it a fact the Gulf countries and the Saudis have just given them \$13 billion?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Absolutely.

Mr. MCCAIN. Again, isn't the question whether the Senator from Kentucky knows what is better for Israel or Israel knows what is better for Israel? The fact is, AIPAC and the Israelis are adamantly opposed to this amendment; isn't that correct?

Mr. MENENDEZ. It is true they are opposed, and I would assume Israel, a sovereign state, knows what its security interests are better than anybody else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. What is the status of time right now? I think we should bring this to a close soon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time remaining is under the control of the

Senator from Kentucky, and he has 2 minutes remaining.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, several points have been made about whether we should engage with Egypt. Absolutely, we should. But the Egyptian people don't see it as engagement when the engagement is at the end of a truncheon, when the engagement is tear gas bought with American money and then sprayed on them. They do not quite understand that as engagement. So buying arms—American tanks and American tear gas—to be used for crowd control isn't exactly what the Egyptian people have in mind as far as engagement.

With regard to Israel, there is no unified statement from the nation of Israel saying they are for this. I have had both private and public discussions with the leaders of Israel, and to tell you the truth, without naming individuals, I can tell you they are not too excited about sending more arms to Egypt. So for someone to come to the floor and say they speak for the nation of Israel, they speak for all people who love Israel in our country, is false.

There are probably 20 different groups in our country that support the nation of Israel and support them as our ally. I speak to them all the time. I visit with them daily and weekly in our office. So what I can tell you is if you talk to the people, to the grassroots and not to the so-called leadership, you will find a much different story. Because I would promise you—let me speak to the entire crowd at an AIPAC meeting and we will see whether they like sending more weapons to the Muslim Brotherhood or more weapons to Egypt. I think you will find a resounding no.

This amendment is ultimately about the law, and I hope my colleagues will remember that if they vote against this amendment they are flouting the law, they are voting to disobey the law, they are voting against the rule of law, and they are actually voting against a law they have all voted for.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I think most Members of the body realize the THUD bill is not the place to address major foreign policy. I think all understand that in September it is the plan of this body to deal with the legal issues regarding foreign aid to Egypt, so I move to table the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 195 Leg.]

YEAS—86

Alexander	Franken	Murphy
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Graham	Nelson
Baucus	Hagan	Portman
Begich	Harkin	Pryor
Bennet	Hatch	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reid
Blunt	Hirono	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Boxer	Inhofe	Rubio
Brown	Isakson	Sanders
Burr	Johanns	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Carper	Kaine	Sessions
Casey	King	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kirk	Shelby
Chiesa	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coats	Landrieu	Tester
Cochran	Leahy	Toomey
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Corker	Markey	Vitter
Cornyn	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Mikulski	Wyden
Flake	Murkowski	

NAYS—13

Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Coburn	Heller	Risch
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	
Enzi	Moran	

NOT VOTING—1

Heitkamp

The motion was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 1 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:39 a.m., recessed until 1 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF BYRON TODD JONES TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Nomination of Byron Todd Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director of the Bureau of Tobacco, Alcohol, Firearms, and Explosives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour of debate on the nomination equally divided in the usual form. If no one yields time, time will be charged equally to both sides.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. HOEVEN pertaining to the submission of S. Con. Res. 21 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. HOEVEN. With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

NASA AUTHORIZATION

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, we passed the NASA authorization bill out of the Commerce Committee yesterday. Sadly, I must report that it is the first time the NASA bill has been a partisan vote that I can ever remember. NASA—this little program that is such a can-do agency—has always been not only bipartisan, but it has been nonpartisan.

There was actually no real disagreement with the content, the policies set in the NASA authorization bill. It is very similar to what the Appropriations Committee indeed has already passed out of the full Appropriations Committee. But, sadly, there is an insistence that this artificial budget limitation, which is like a meat cleaver cutting across the board—some would describe it as a guillotine coming down across programs willy-nilly—cutting programs such as the National Institutes of Health and all of the medical research that is going on and, indeed, a broadly embraced bipartisan program such as our space program.

So the vote was 13 to 12—specifically along partisan lines—not because of the content, not because of the policy, but because of the funding level. In the bill that passed, we had the NASA authorization for appropriations at the level provided in the budget resolution that passed the Senate—\$18.1 billion. That is about level funding for NASA, this little agency that is trying to do so much. However, our Republican friends wanted it cut to \$16.8 billion, and some spoke favorably toward the House bill that has it cut back to \$16.6 billion.

If we cut \$1.5 billion out of this little agency, it can't do what it is attempting to do to get us ready to go to Mars in the decade of the 2030s and in the meantime to get our human-rated

rockets in the commercial sector so we can send our astronauts to and from the international space station where six human beings are doing research right now. The multiplicity of science projects, the planetary exploration that is going on, and the aeronautics research that is going on—all of that is within this little agency.

My hope is that as we get further along in the fiscal year, we are going to hit some grand design, some grand bargain, some great bipartisan agreement on funding that maybe will include tax reform but that will then allow us to operate with common sense instead of some artificial budgetary mechanism called sequester.

Yesterday it was stated that indeed the NASA authorization bill violated the Budget Control Act of 2011. I tried to explain in the committee that it did not. As a matter of fact, the Budget Control Act is an overall level on compressing appropriations. It has no effect on the authorization for appropriations. That is where we set policy, and then we leave it up to the Appropriations Committee to set the actual funding.

So I am happy to say that we made the step that we needed to make. We have the bill proceeding now out of the committee. I am sad to say that for the first time ever this broadly based, wildly popular, not only bipartisan but nonpartisan program, called America's space program, has come out of the committee with a partisan vote.

Let's turn this around, and let's not have this excessive partisanship and this ideological rigidity that is gripping this country's politics. Let's not have that infect our Nation's space program.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes on the Todd nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I come to the floor to ask my colleagues to vote against cloture on the nomination, and here are my reasons for asking that of my colleagues.

Earlier this week I outlined my general objection to the Senate proceeding to a final vote on the confirmation of Mr. B. Todd Jones, the nominee to be Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. As I explained, the Senate should not be voting on a nomination when there is an open investigation.

In this case the Office of Special Counsel is investigating Mr. Jones in a complaint that he retaliated against a whistleblower in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Minnesota.

Because of the way this nomination was handled in committee, I was able to conduct only a limited investigation. But what I found should give all

of us pause—real pause—on this nomination because it gives me concern about Mr. Jones's leadership ability and raises doubts about whether he should be promoted to head this office.

According to both the whistleblowing assistant U.S. attorney and the former head of the FBI in Minnesota, relationships with Federal, State, and local authorities deteriorated significantly under Jones's leadership. The problems primarily involved agencies that worked drug cases and violent crime.

Mr. Jones addressed the issue in a meeting with criminal prosecutors in his office. According to the whistleblower, following that meeting, Mr. Jones came to the whistleblower's office and asked for his candid opinion of what could be done about the problem.

The whistleblower gave Jones his candid opinion, and a few weeks later he put it in writing what he had told Jones during this meeting. His e-mail to Jones included allegations of mismanagement by one of his supervisors, the head of the Narcotics and Violent Crime Unit.

The very next day, that supervisor called that whistleblower on the carpet and, according to the whistleblower, interrogated him about his work in search of a pretext to discipline him.

Failing to find a substantive reason to discipline him, his supervisors then suspended him for 5 days for his demeanor during the meeting. Now, based on what we know at this point, it certainly looks like retaliation, and it helps explain why the Office of Special Counsel believed these allegations merited further investigation. Remember, only about 10 percent, 1 in 10 of these types of allegations is selected for investigation by the Special Counsel.

To be fair, we do not know the full story. The Office of Special Counsel has not finished its investigation into the matter. But this fact remains: There is an open investigation of serious allegations of whistleblower retaliation, and because that investigation remains open, this body—the Senate of the United States—should have the full information about the nominee, and it does not have it, and it should have it before voting on that nomination.

These are serious charges. The public interest demands resolution of these issues. Members of the Senate are entitled to know if these charges have merit. Members of the Senate are entitled to the complete record.

So everyone should ask, Why then are we voting on a nomination on which there is an open investigation and on a nominee where we do not have the complete information? To me, the answer is obvious: We should not be conducting this vote until this matter is resolved.

I would like to highlight a few comments contained in a recent letter from the National Whistleblowers Center. That organization, since 1988, has been supporting whistleblowers.

The center opposes a vote on this nomination “until there is a complete and thorough investigation into his treatment of employee-whistleblowers.” This is exactly what I am requesting today: a “no” vote to give the time to complete this investigation.

The National Whistleblowers Center notes that the Office of Special Counsel's investigation remains open. Again, I agree with their contention; namely, “that office should be able to complete its inquiry in due course, without any pressure triggered by the nomination process.”

I am surprised to hear rumblings about my opposition to this nominee based on this particular matter. It seems some are asking the question, What does this whistleblower retaliation have to do with the ATF? Why is this investigation even relevant?

I sincerely hope my colleagues have not forgotten about the disaster of Operation Fast and Furious—an absolute failure by the former leadership of the ATF. In that case, the former ATF leadership and the ex-U.S. attorney retaliated against the brave whistleblowers who alerted authorities about this botched operation of Fast and Furious. A U.S. attorney in Arizona had to resign because of his retaliatory conduct against whistleblowers.

Based in part on that history, I am extremely hesitant to place at the head of that agency this individual who has been accused of retaliation against a whistleblower and, as Acting Director of ATF, Mr. Jones sends a very chilling message to all the employees of that organization.

Mr. Jones was caught on video, so we know exactly what he said. He was caught on video making very disturbing statements specifically targeted at discouraging ATF agents from blowing the whistle.

Let me remind you, whistleblowers are patriotic Americans who think the law ought to be followed and the government do what the law says.

He told these whistleblowers:

[If you don't respect the chain of command, if you don't find the appropriate way to raise your concerns to your leadership, there will be consequences.

Wouldn't that scare anybody who worked in that organization?

Of course, blowing the whistle requires going outside the chain of command to report wrongdoing. If you do not get the benefit of people listening to you within, then it is your constitutional responsibility to go outside and report violation of law. So telling employees there will be consequences for going outside the chain of command is the same thing as telling them there will be consequences for whistleblowing.

This video was seen by several employees in the U.S. Attorney's Office of Minnesota, also headed by Mr. Jones in his other capacity. These employees

wrote to the Office of Special Counsel referencing the video, stating that they had “felt for the employees of ATF as we too have had the same types of statements made to us.”

They then said Mr. Jones “ha[d] instituted a climate of fear, ha[d] pushed employees out of the office, dismissed employees wrongly, violated the hiring practices of the EEOC, and put in place an Orwellian style of management that continues to polarize the office.”

As I mentioned, the former head of the FBI in Minnesota also wrote to the committee about Mr. Jones. In that letter, he wrote:

As a retired FBI senior executive, I am one of the few voices able to publicly express our complete discontent with Mr. Jones' ineffective leadership and poor service provided to the federal law enforcement community without fear of retaliation or retribution from him.

Meaning from Mr. Jones.

Those are chilling words, as I have said twice. They corroborate what members of his staff have said and are consistent with the whistleblower retaliation complaint.

The former FBI Special Agent in Charge continued with this report:

[Mr. Jones] was, and still remains, a significant impediment for federal law enforcement to effectively protect the citizens of Minnesota. . . .

As the Minneapolis Star Tribune reported on December 31, 2012:

Criminal prosecutions have dropped dramatically at the U.S. Attorney's office in Minneapolis under the leadership of B. Todd Jones, ranking some in law enforcement.

But then the article continued:

Several federal and state law enforcement sources said that the U.S. Attorney's office refused to prosecute drug and violent crime cases that would have been snapped up by Jones' predecessors. None agreed to be quoted, saying they must maintain a relationship with the U.S. Attorney's Office.

My investigation revealed that during Mr. Jones's tenure as U.S. attorney, several people allege that relationships with other Federal law enforcement agencies deteriorated also. Now, why would we want to confirm as Director of the ATF someone who has a poor track record working with Federal law enforcement?

Since the majority insisted on moving forward without waiting for the Office of Special Counsel to complete its work, on July 2 I wrote to the FBI, the DEA, and ICE seeking information about the deteriorating relationship between Federal law enforcement and the U.S. Attorney's Office under Mr. Jones's leadership. I have received no replies to that request.

In addition to his record as U.S. attorney for the District of Minnesota, what about Mr. Jones's record as Acting Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms? It is no secret that there have been a number of controversial events that Mr. Jones has been involved in to one degree or another. I have sent numerous letters to

the department requesting information from and about Mr. Jones. In many cases, I have received no response or an incomplete response. Here is a sampling:

On *Fast and Furious*—on October 12, 2011, the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee subpoenaed records of the Attorney General's advisory committee relating to Operation *Fast and Furious* during a period Jones was committee chair. I reiterated that request on April 10, 2013.

No. 2, ATF's accountability for *Fast and Furious*. On October 19, 2012, and January 15, 2013, I requested information on which ATF employees would be disciplined for their role in *Fast and Furious*.

No. 3, *Fast and Furious* interview request. From October 7, 2011, through January 2012, I requested a staff interview with Jones regarding *Fast and Furious*. I reiterated that request to Mr. Jones on April 10, 2013.

No. 4, interview request on Reno, NV, ATF office. My April 10, 2013, letter also indicated that Mr. Jones's failure to act on Reno management issues was another area of questions to be covered in a staff interview.

No. 5, interview request on Operation *Fearless*. My April 10, 2013, letter indicated that the botched Operation *Fearless* in Milwaukee was another area of questions to be covered in a staff interview.

No. 6, document request on Operation *Fearless*. On May 10 of this year, I sent Mr. Jones a letter requesting a copy of the Office of Professional Responsibility and Security Operations report on the botched Milwaukee storefront operation.

No. 7, on the St. Paul and quid pro quo matter, I was able to have a staff interview with Mr. Jones. Just to remind my colleagues about the issue I will tell you, briefly, on February 3, 2012, the Department of Justice and the City of St. Paul struck a deal. The terms of the quid pro quo were as follows: The Department declined to intervene in two False Claims Act cases that were pending against St. Paul, and St. Paul withdrew its petition before the U.S. Supreme Court on the *Magner* case, a case that observers believed would invalidate the use of disparate impact theory under the Fair Housing Act.

But this was no ordinary settlement. Instead of furthering the ends of justice, this settlement prevented the courts from reviewing potentially meritorious claims and the recovery of hundreds of millions of dollars for the U.S. Treasury.

The U.S. attorney in Minnesota at the time of the quid pro quo, Mr. Jones, was serving both as U.S. attorney and Acting Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. Mr. Jones was interviewed by the committee staff as part of the in-

vestigation on March 8, 2013. However, before agreeing to the interview, the department demanded that staff not be permitted to ask Mr. Jones any further questions other than those involving quid pro quo.

Questions remain about whether he was effectively managing both jobs as the U.S. attorney and Acting Director. For example, when asked by committee staff about his failure to attend a seminal meeting between the department's civil division and representatives from the City of St. Paul, which occurred in December 2011, he stated that he did not attend because he had an event at ATF that precluded his attendance. When pressed further, Mr. Jones indicated the important event at ATF was a holiday party called "sweet treats."

He felt it was more important that he attend that event than it was to attend his crucial meeting—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. It was more important that he go to sweet treats than worry about collecting \$200 million under False Claims Act cases pending. I raised many of these issues with Mr. Jones at his hearing and in written questions for the record. But in too many instances Mr. Jones was unable or unwilling to provide an adequate response. Unfortunately, I have a lingering concern about his candor during his testimony. With this record before us, it should be apparent to all of my colleagues that the Senate should not move forward with Mr. Jones' nomination.

First, the Senate has yet to learn the results from the investigations of Office of Special Counsel; two, the Senate has not had an opportunity to hear Mr. Jones address those allegations himself. Point blank he told the committee he could not speak about them because of the open investigation; third, the Senate should recognize a troubling pattern indicating the nominee's inability to work with Federal law enforcement and whistleblowers; four, his involvement in a number of botched operations showing unacceptable management style or capability.

Elevating an individual with such a record is not how you rehabilitate the reputation, image, and culture of Federal law enforcement agencies still recovering from the disastrous scandal of *Fast and Furious*. I do not believe we should simply rubberstamp this nomination and sweep the alarming allegations under the rug.

I would hope that further action on the nomination pause until these matters are resolved. Before I close, I wish to address one additional matter. I have heard it argued from the majority

that there is an urgency to get this nomination confirmed because ATF has not had a confirmed Director for 7 years. President Bush made a nomination in March 2007. That nomination was held up in the Senate based on concerns regarding ATF's hostility to small gun dealers and the nominee's apparent indifference to their concerns.

President Obama did not nominate a Director until November 17, 2010. That is 2 years into his first term. That individual's nomination stalled because neither the White House nor the nominee responded to our requests for additional information. Rather than respond to our requests so that nomination might move forward or withdraw that nomination and send up another, the White House did nothing for 2 years.

The nomination of Mr. Jones was not sent up to the Senate until the beginning of this year. So for the past 4½ years, the vacancy is the responsibility of the White House. I do not think that supports their contention that there is a crisis because of a lack of a Senate-confirmed nominee.

In any event, the prudent course for the Senate, and what I support, is to wait a short while, until the open complaint is resolved. I urge my colleagues to vote against cloture.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

POWER NOMINATION

Mr. COONS. Madam President, this week the Senate will consider the nomination of Samantha Power to serve as our next Ambassador to the United Nations. In fact, I hope we will take it up later today. This is a critical position to our President's national and foreign policy team, and I believe Ms. Power's experience, values, and wise approach to foreign policy will make her a terrific Ambassador.

Throughout her career, she has displayed a passion for human rights and worked tirelessly to prevent atrocities abroad. From her early days as a journalist, to her work in the White House, she has shown a pragmatic idealism and a deep and nuanced understanding of the foreign policy and security challenges facing this country around the globe.

I met with Ms. Power a few weeks ago. I came away confident that she is the right choice to represent our country at the U.N. She understands the critical importance of democratic values and human rights to global stability. Ours is a complex time and a complex world. The fabric of global stability is woven with many threads of democracy, good governance, economic development, health, education, national security and, of course, diplomacy.

The global challenges of our generation require leaders, leaders capable of

seeing each of these threads and appreciating how they connect and how we can weave them together to make a stronger more vibrant world.

As chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on African Affairs, I am excited to work with Ambassador Power to strengthen our friendship and strategic partnerships on that vital continent. On Israel, it is clear she believes in our Nation's unbreakable bond with the Jewish State. She has shown us, in her words and actions, especially when she played an underreported and underappreciated role defending Israel at the U.N. during the Palestinian statehood vote.

In closing, it is clear that in Samantha Power we have a nominee with a keen intellect and a grasp of the complex foreign policy challenges we face in the world. She combines a dedication to American values and principles with the pragmatism that will serve us well at the U.N. I am proud to vote for her confirmation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise in support of the nomination of Todd Jones to be Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. I wish to first thank Senator COONS for his remarks about Samantha Power. I am also looking forward to the vote on her confirmation. I am looking forward to her service.

This is a very important job. As the Presiding Officer knows, the ATF has an incredibly important role in investigating crimes and terrorist incidents such as the Boston Marathon. They recently investigated the explosion in Texas that took so many innocent lives. This must be a top priority for the United States of America.

Yet this is a position where there are 2,400 agents—2,400 ATF agents—and they have gone without a permanent Director for 7 years, ever since this became a confirmable position. This happened under President Bush. There was not a confirmed Director. It is happening now up until today under President Obama. It is time to change that. It is simply time to change it.

I know Todd Jones. For 2 years he has served as the U.S. attorney of Minnesota at the same time he is serving as the ATF Director. That is not an easy job. He has five children. He is a former marine. He was willing to take on the ATF job after the Fast and Furious debacle. He was willing to come in after that and help to clean up that agency and make some very tough decisions. He took on that job while still remaining the U.S. attorney in Minnesota.

I would note he served as the U.S. attorney of Minnesota under President Clinton and again was appointed to

serve under President Obama. Then, 2 years ago, he was asked to be the Acting Director of ATF, never knowing if this day would ever come when actually there would be a vote on his confirmation.

He literally has never turned down a tough assignment. Todd Jones has an impressive background that makes him well prepared to lead the ATF. After law school at the University of Minnesota, he entered the U.S. Marine Corps, as I noted, where he served on Active Duty as a judge advocate and infantry officer from 1983 until 1989. Two years later, he was called back to Active Duty during the first Iraq war.

In addition to his military career and having the rare distinction of serving as U.S. attorney under two different Presidents, Todd Jones also has a strong record as a line prosecutor in the Minnesota U.S. Attorney's Office. When Jones was U.S. attorney in Minnesota from 1998 to 2001, the violent crime rate decreased by 15 percent. So far during his second tenure as the U.S. attorney, the violent crime rate in Minnesota has already decreased by 9 percent.

We all know there are a lot of factors that go into that, including the great work of our local police officers, including work of our police chiefs, including the work of community groups, including the economy. There are a number of things at hand. But when I hear attacks against Mr. Jones, I believe it is important to set the record straight.

One other thing—I did want to set the record straight on one other thing. I so appreciate the leadership Senator GRASSLEY has shown when it comes to whistleblowers. But everyone should know, regarding this complaint within the office, an internal complaint within the U.S. Attorney's Office in Minnesota, it was investigated by the Judiciary Committee. In this place, to set the record straight, the complainant voluntarily agreed to mediate his concerns. The Office of Special Counsel is no longer investigating. I wish to make that straight for all of my colleagues so they understand the outcome of that and that there is a mediation going on. It is not being investigated.

As an assistant U.S. attorney, Todd Jones was the lead prosecutor in a number of cases involving drug conspiracies, money laundering, financial fraud, and violent crime in the early 1990s. In the private sector, he became a partner at two very well regarded Minnesota law firms, Robins Kaplan and Greene Espel. He has led a number of very important prosecutions in his capacity as U.S. attorney: Operation Rhino, which involved the criminal prosecution of Omer Abdi Mohamed, who recruited young Somali Americans to fight for terrorist groups in Somalia. To date, this investigation has resulted in charges filed against 22 other

individuals and Operation Brother's Keeper, a major RICO case, the second biggest Ponzi scheme in the history of America, second only to the Bernie Madoff Ponzi scheme, prosecuted by the U.S. Attorney's Office, by a fine prosecutor named Joe Dixon and many others under Todd Jones's leadership.

This gives us a sense—and I would end with this as I see Senator LEAHY, our great chairman is here. Jones's confirmation is supported by the Fraternal Order of Police, the International Chiefs of Police, 81 U.S. attorneys, the National District Attorneys Association, Minnesota's former FBI Special Agent in Charge, Ralph Boelter, the former U.S. attorney Tom Hefflefinger, who served under both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush in Minnesota, and dozens of others who have worked with Mr. Jones over his many years of public service.

I would end with this: The ATF has people on the frontlines every day. They do not ask if the work they have done is ordered by a Republican or a Democrat. When they go to investigate a bombing, they do not ask the police officers what their political affiliation is or who the FBI is. They do not care. They just do their job. Now it is time for the Senate to do its job and confirm an ATF Director for the first time in 7 years. I thank the chairman for his leadership.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, when the 113th Congress convened following the terrible tragedy in Newtown, CT, the Judiciary Committee focused its attention on commonsense gun violence prevention legislation. The American people made their voices heard in favor of effective reforms, and many Senators went to work to find common ground.

Although the Senate Judiciary Committee approved four pieces of legislation to address gun violence, two of which were reported on bipartisan votes, the Senate was unable to pass any of these measures. Like many Americans, I was disappointed at the Senate's inability to come together to make sensible changes to our laws to reduce gun violence.

Today we have another chance to make progress in our efforts to reduce gun violence with the confirmation of B. Todd Jones to lead the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives. Todd Jones has served as the Acting Director since September 2011. Under his leadership, the ATF has been called on to analyze the bombs left near the finish line at the Boston Marathon, to sift through burned debris in the West, TX, explosion and to trace the weapons used by the shooters in the Newtown and Aurora massacres. The ATF has played a major role in investigating some of our Nation's worst tragedies.

In addition to the ATF's enforcement responsibilities, the agency is central to firearms commerce. The ATF issues permits for companies that import firearms and provide firearms to law enforcement agencies. Without a confirmed Director, the ATF's job of supporting and regulating Americans who make their living in the business of firearms is much more difficult. Yet we continue to hamper the ATF's ability to do its job. No nominee to lead the ATF has been confirmed since that position was made subject to the Senate's consent.

I hope the Senate will vote to change this unfortunate pattern of obstruction. Mr. Jones is a dedicated public servant and law enforcement official. He volunteered for the U.S. Marine Corps in 1983, serving on Active Duty as a Judge Advocate and Infantry officer until 1989. In 1991, he was recalled to Active Duty to command the 4th Marine Division's Military Police Company in Iraq. He also served as commanding officer of the Twin Cities Marine Reserve Unit. When Todd Jones was confirmed by this body in 1998, he became the first African-American U.S. attorney in Minnesota's history. Todd Jones has served this country honorably as a marine, a U.S. attorney, and the ATF's Acting Director.

Unfortunately, there is opposition to Mr. Jones's confirmation. But in my view this opposition has little to do with his ability to lead this important Federal agency. Every nominee to lead the ATF has been met with unreasonable opposition. And the consistent opposition all nominees to this post have faced is less about those nominees' qualifications than about weakening a Federal law enforcement agency that some disfavor.

Some Senate Republicans would prefer not to have anyone leading the ATF, no matter who the nominee is. They would not allow President Bush to have a confirmed Director, and they do not want President Obama to have one either.

Opposition to confirming an ATF Director is just another piece of the overall effort by some in Congress to make it more difficult for the ATF to carry out its important mission. For example, when the ATF proposed and implemented a rule intended to provide investigative leads on straw purchasing rings in the Southwest that were fueling drug cartel violence by trafficking firearms across the border, some Members of Congress immediately objected, and the agency was sued to block implementation of the rule. The rule, which has now been upheld unanimously by two Federal Circuit Courts of Appeal, including the Fifth Circuit, was simple—it required federally licensed firearms dealers to report sales of multiple semiautomatic rifles to the ATF, just as all licensed dealers are required to report multiple sales of hand-

guns. Yet some spent significant energy and resources to block the agency's action.

And in recent years, some Members of Congress spent months and untold public resources investigating misguided investigative tactics in the ATF's Phoenix field office associated with an ATF criminal investigation called Fast and Furious. The Fast and Furious investigation concerned a significant firearms trafficking organization in Arizona. This trafficking organization was systematically purchasing hundreds of firearms using straw buyers and transferring them to members of Mexican drug cartels. They operated with ease and virtual impunity as the result of weak Federal laws concerning straw purchasing and firearms trafficking. Investigators and prosecutors were hobbled by weak laws. Some took unacceptable risks to combat a very serious problem on both sides of our border with Mexico.

When the investigative tactics at issue came to light, they were widely criticized, and Attorney General Holder acted swiftly to put an end to them. The Attorney General also directed the Department of Justice inspector general to conduct a thorough investigation. As a result of the inspector general's investigation, those responsible for these tactics were disciplined. And the ATF's procedures were revised to set out clear guidelines for firearms trafficking investigations.

While some Members of Congress were content to merely heap blame on the Attorney General and other dedicated law enforcement officials following the Fast and Furious investigation, I and other Senators chose a different path and worked with law enforcement experts and advocates on both sides of the firearms policy debate to come up with an effective, sensible approach to put an end to the straw purchasing and firearms trafficking.

Unfortunately, the same Senators who were so critical of the ATF's investigative tactics in Arizona and its approach to dealing with a very serious law enforcement issue declined to support the bipartisan legislation Senator COLLINS and I developed to give law enforcement the tools they need to fight gun trafficking.

I hope the same Senators that were so critical of the ATF and the Department of Justice for the breakdown in leadership and management at the agency will not obstruct this nominee and the opportunity to give the agency the solid footing it needs. If the Fast and Furious investigation revealed anything, it was that the ATF faces very significant law enforcement challenges, and that our current laws are inadequate to provide the tools investigators and prosecutors need to confront these problems. Let us not compound these difficulties with continued obstruction of this nominee.

Todd Jones was nominated in January. It is now the last day of July. For months, I accommodated the ranking member on requests for further information and delay on the nomination of Todd Jones. He insisted on the production of documents from the Department of Justice that his staff had already had access to for months. He insisted that his staff be able to interview Todd Jones in his capacity as U.S. attorney for the District of Minnesota, as well as two other Justice Department officials, in order to try to build a case against another nomination, that of Tom Perez to be Labor Secretary.

Senator GRASSLEY requested additional background information from the administration not usually required by the committee for an executive nomination and he was provided that information. When he sought information about an ATF operation in Milwaukee, I arranged a bipartisan briefing from the agency.

Then a member of the ranking member's staff disclosed a private Office of Special Counsel, OSC, complaint against Todd Jones to the press. I thought it unfair that the nominee could not publicly defend his reputation.

An employee complained of "gross mismanagement and abuse of authority" but the OSC closed the file based on lack of evidence. The other allegation involved alleged retaliation for making the mismanagement claim, and that subsidiary claim has been referred to mediation. In deference to the complaining party and at the request of the investigating agency that the complaint not be made public, it has not been. I wish it were. It is not substantial or directly related to Todd Jones. It is certainly not a reason to oppose his confirmation.

I know Senator GRASSLEY has the right to raise concerns, but he has made it very clear he does not approve of Todd Jones under any circumstances. I had asked his staff to work with us to get a clearer understanding of the retaliation complaint. But when we talked to the complainant, he was willing only to repeat his own allegations, allegations that are not aimed directly at Mr. Jones but at somebody else, a mid-level manager.

We asked the complainant to provide the committee access to the contemporaneous files so we could determine whether this instance was retaliation or one in a series of disciplinary actions against an employee spanning several years. We offered to take the information in confidence, not for the Justice Department but just for members of our committee. The complainant refused and his lawyer refused to provide that to us, so I would ask all members to read the complaint themselves. We have bent over backwards to allow the complainant to come forward, and he has chosen not to do so.

I would also note for all Senators that we have moved forward on nominees in the past when there have been pending complaints. For example, last year a civil suit was filed against a judicial nominee from Iowa alleging age discrimination and retaliation for raising management issues against the nominee in her capacity as the U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Iowa. We conducted a bipartisan staff investigation into the claims. I listened to the Senators from Iowa, and we determined we could move forward despite the civil suit that was pending against the nominee. The nominee was overwhelmingly confirmed to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.

Earlier this year, when a defense counsel filed a motion against the U.S. attorney for the District of New Mexico making allegations of improper activity, we independently examined the matter. The committee proceeded with that nomination instead of delaying it.

Todd Jones is the ATF's fifth Acting Director since 2006. During that time 80,000 Americans have been killed with guns. The ATF helps protect our communities from dangerous criminals, gun violence, and acts of terror. It is a central piece of our Federal law enforcement strategy. For too long the position of Director at the ATF has been held hostage to partisan politics at the expense of public safety. It is time to make real progress in our efforts to reduce gun violence and protect the citizens of this great Nation. Today, I encourage all Senators to take the opportunity to move toward that goal together with the confirmation of B. Todd Jones to lead the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Byron Todd Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Mark Begich, Christopher A. Coons, Thomas R. Carper, Patty Murray, Martin Heinrich, Bernard Sanders, Jeanne Shaheen, Benjamin L. Cardin, Al Franken, Sherrod Brown, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Bill Nelson, Charles E. Schumer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Byron Todd Jones of Minnesota to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, To-

bacco, Firearms, and Explosives, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 196 Ex.]

YEAS—60

Ayotte	Hagan	Murkowski
Baldwin	Harkin	Murphy
Baucus	Heinrich	Murray
Begich	Heitkamp	Nelson
Bennet	Hirono	Pryor
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Reid
Brown	King	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kirk	Sanders
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schatz
Carper	Landrieu	Schumer
Casey	Leahy	Shaheen
Collins	Levin	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCain	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	McCaskey	Warner
Franken	Menendez	Warren
Gillibrand	Merkley	Whitehouse
Graham	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—40

Alexander	Enzi	Paul
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Flake	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Chambliss	Heller	Scott
Chiesa	Hoeven	Sessions
Coats	Inhofe	Shelby
Coburn	Isakson	Thune
Cochran	Johanns	Toomey
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Vitter
Cornyn	Lee	Wicker
Crapo	McConnell	
Cruz	Moran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 40. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Byron Todd Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 197 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Baucus	Heitkamp	Pryor
Begich	Hirono	Reed
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rockefeller
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Kirk	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskey	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden
Hagan	Murray	

NAYS—42

Alexander	Cruz	Moran
Ayotte	Enzi	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Boozman	Flake	Portman
Burr	Graham	Risch
Chambliss	Grassley	Roberts
Chiesa	Hatch	Rubio
Coats	Heller	Scott
Coburn	Hoeven	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	McConnell	Wicker

NOT VOTING—5

Blunt	Inhofe	McCain
Harkin	Landrieu	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11 a.m., Thursday, August 1, the Senate proceed to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 96; that there be 60 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote with no intervening action or debate on the nomination; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the

Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, August 1, 2013, at 2 p.m. the Senate consider Executive Calendar No. 220, the Samantha Power nomination under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, August 1, upon disposition of the Chen nomination and the resumption of legislative session, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 1243, the THUD appropriations bill; further, that following the cloture vote, the Senate recess until 2 p.m. for the bipartisan caucus meeting we are having tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 12 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FIXING AMERICA'S WELCOME MAT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President they say history has a way of repeating itself. That certainly came true in June when the Senate approved a sweeping reform bill to revamp the nation's immigration laws. Unfortunately, the U.S. Senate failed to learn from the mistakes created by the 1986 overhaul.

In the 1980s, about 3 million people who were living in the country illegally were granted legal status. Today, 27 years later, the U.S. estimates 11 million undocumented immigrants are living here.

What should that tell us? It says that the 1986 law failed to stem the flow of illegal immigration. It sent the wrong signal by granting legal status to millions while ignoring the need to secure the border.

I do not need a crystal ball to tell me what would happen on the road ahead if we repeat the mistakes of the past. I saw how legalizing before securing our borders turned out. It turned America's time-honored welcome mat into a timeworn doormat.

America's immigration system is broken. It is time to fix it so that a legal flow of immigration can help the economy and bolster areas of the workforce that are short of workers, from low-skilled to high-tech workers.

But immigration laws should not come at the expense of American workers or cause them to be disadvantaged, displaced or underpaid. Rooting out

fraud and abuse from many of our visa programs should be a priority.

Unfortunately, the bill passed by the U.S. Senate would not fix what is broken and is chock-full of loopholes that make the legalization system far from ideal.

Thankfully our system of self-government protects representation of, by and for the people with a bicameral Congress. Now the U.S. House of Representatives has a chance to get it right.

The House is moving on a number of bills. They are having very thoughtful discussions on how to improve the legal system while adhering to the rule of law. They also know that passing one sweeping bill is a recipe for disaster—one that inevitably creates loopholes and allows special interest provisions to override good policy.

I would like to discuss a few of their good ideas.

First, the House Judiciary Committee approved the SAFE ACT, a bill that beefs up our interior enforcement efforts. It provides tools to State and local law enforcement agencies to help the government enforce immigration laws.

It enhances the 287(g) program, which I helped author. It gives the States and localities the power to enact and enforce their own immigration laws as long as they are consistent with Federal law. The bill would improve our country's ability to remove criminal aliens. Dangerous individuals would be detained, sex offenders would be made inadmissible, and gang members would be both inadmissible and deportable.

These are provisions that are omitted from the Senate bill. Dangerous criminals are ignored in the Senate bill, and it was apparent that the other side of the aisle did not want to have votes that would bar these dangerous criminals from receiving legal status.

Securing the border is very important, but so is focusing on individuals who violate our laws and violate the terms of their stay in the U.S. If we are serious about being tough on sex offenders, domestic abusers, drunk drivers, and other criminals, then the SAFE Act needs to be passed by the Senate and sent to the President.

Second, the House Judiciary Committee approved a bill that improves the existing E-VERIFY program. This program is a valuable tool and should be made mandatory for all businesses. While the Senate bill does make it mandatory, it does so over 6 years and provides exceptions for certain employers. The House bill would implement the program on a faster timetable, for which I have advocated.

Third, the House Judiciary Committee approved bills that improve the legal system for people who want to live and work in the United States. The committee approved a bill that focuses on high-skilled workers that are need-

ed in the country, and another bill that improves the legal channels for people who want to work in agriculture. If we want to ensure that we do not deal with millions of people here illegally in the future, then we have to focus on getting our legal immigration system in order.

Now, I would like to talk about the border bill that was approved by the Committee on Homeland Security. This is a bill I am not ready to endorse. Let me explain why.

The bill, known as the Border Security Results Act, is not a serious and comprehensive approach to border security. While it takes a good first step in requiring metrics to assess whether the borders are secured, there is nothing that ensures that results are achieved.

The bill requires the Department of Homeland Security, within 6 months of enactment, to develop a strategy on how to secure our borders. The strategy includes an assessment of threats along the border. It will take into consideration the coordination of departments and the cooperation of foreign countries. The strategy calls for an assessment of technology needed. But, it does not actually do anything to give agents the resources they need. It does nothing to require fencing to be built.

After the strategy is submitted to Congress, the Secretary develops an implementation plan and provides that to Congress and the Government Accountability Office.

But like the Senate bill, there is no repercussions if the Secretary does not actually submit a strategy. And, there is no verification or approval of the strategy by Congress. Instead, it relies on this or a future administration to make promises they will not keep. It relies on them to fulfill the law, but we have seen time and again that they thumb their nose at bills we send them. They not only refuse to implement laws they like—such as ObamaCare—but they will refuse to carry this one out as well.

The bill requires the Secretary to develop metrics to measure the "effectiveness" of security at ports and between ports of entry. That is a good start. But, there are no consequences if the Secretary does not develop such metrics. The GAO would evaluate the metrics, but again, there is no real consequence if they are flawed metrics. The border still will not be secured.

The Secretary then certifies that her department has achieved "operational control." The definition of "operational control" is weakened from current law. The bill defines it as a "condition in which there is a not lower than 90 percent illegal border crossing effectiveness rate, informed by situational awareness, and a significant reduction in the movement of illicit drugs and other contraband through such areas is being achieved."

The GAO would attest if the certification for operational control is truly done. What if the Secretary never certifies this? What if the GAO says the Secretary's certification is not accurate? If the Department fails to achieve control of the border, then they have to issue a report to explain why. Again, it lacks any true accountability for this or any future administration to secure the border.

Finally, I want to mention one part of the House border bill that is most concerning to me. During committee mark-up, an amendment was accepted that would require a plan on the exit tracking system, but unfortunately there is no beef to it. Implementation of a biometric exit system was a key point when the Senate considered immigration.

The Congress has passed several laws that require the executive branch to track the entry and exit of foreign nationals. Those mandates have been ignored. The airline industry has resisted. Instead of building upon current law and finding a way to make it happen, the House bill provides a way out if the exit system is not deemed feasible by the Secretary—the same Secretary that has made no progress on the system.

Border security is not only putting manpower and technology along the southern border. It is also about tracking people that enter this country. Given that 40 percent of our undocumented population consists of visa overstays, we must address this problem immediately.

This problem is highlighted by a GAO report that was issued on Tuesday. GAO found that the Department has lost track of more than 1 million people. We know they arrived in the United States, but we do not have departure records.

By statute, the Department is required to report overstays. They claim they do not report the estimates because of lack of confidence that the data is reliable. After 17 years, the law has been ignored. The government is not sophisticated enough to match incoming and outgoing travel records, and that is a serious risk to our national security.

Over the years, the GAO has highlighted the challenges that the Department faces in putting the entry and exit system in place. Their new report casts more doubt on the Department's competency.

When the Senate passed the immigration bill in June, I was very clear in suggesting that the bill would have to be fixed by a conference committee with the House, if it ever goes to a conference. With the exception of the border security bill, the House has presented some valuable ideas.

While I want an immigration reform bill sent to the President, I want it done right. We can take our time to get it right.

Over the August recess, the American people will get their opportunity to inform members of Congress how they feel about the immigration proposals on the table.

But I can predict what many will say. I know from previous townhall meetings in my State, the people do not want more laws that will go ignored. They want the laws we have in place to be enforced.

We need legislation that upholds American values of hope, freedom and opportunity. We need immigration laws in place that welcome law-abiding immigrants to share their entrepreneurial spirit, build better lives for themselves, and help make America a better place for generations to come.

But we need legislation that upholds the rule of law and ensures that we do not saddle future generations with the same problems we are faced with today.

It is my hope that Congress, over the August break, will listen to the American people and work to enact true reform that achieves real results and makes good on the promises made in Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise again for the 41st time to ask my colleagues to wake up to the threat of climate change. Today I come to discuss the serious risks that climate change poses to our energy sector.

It is no controversial idea that our climate affects our energy infrastructure. In the Northeast, when we think about what causes power outages, we naturally think of bad weather. In fact, the American Society of Civil Engineers reports that between 2007 and 2012, weather-related events were the main cause of electrical outages in the United States.

That same report said: "The average cost of a one-hour power outage is just over \$1000 for a commercial business," just for 1 hour. This takes a serious toll on our economy.

A recent Department of Energy report has highlighted how sensitive our energy sector is to climate change and to extreme weather.

In September 2011, the Department of Energy reports:

High temperatures and high electricity demand-related loading tripped a transformer and transmission line near Yuma, Arizona, starting a chain of events that led to shutting down the San Onofre nuclear power plant with power lost to the entire San Diego County distribution system, totaling approximately 2.7 million power customers, with outages as long as 12 hours.

Earlier that summer:

Consecutive days of triple-digit heat and record drought in Texas resulted in the Electric Reliability Council of Texas declaring power emergencies due to a large number of

unplanned power plant outages and at least one power plant reducing its output.

The report says the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant in Athens, AL, "had to reduce power output because the temperature of the Tennessee River, the body of water into which the plant discharges, was too high to discharge heated cooling water from the reactor without risking ecological harm to the river."

This happened in 2007, 2010, in 2011, and, in some cases, the power production was reduced for nearly 2 months. The Department of Energy reports that "the cost of replacement power was estimated at \$50 million."

It is not just power generation, energy exploration has been affected too. The DOE report explains that last July: "In the midst of one of the worst droughts in American history, certain companies that extract natural gas and oil via hydraulic fracturing faced higher water costs or were denied access to water for six weeks or more in several States, including Kansas, Texas, Pennsylvania, and North Dakota."

It was a similar story in the fall of 2011:

Due to extreme drought conditions, the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, became the first municipality to ban the use of city water for hydraulic fracturing. Other local water districts in Texas followed suit by implementing similar restrictions limiting city water use during drought conditions.

In July of 2011, the report recounts that:

ExxonMobil's Silvertip pipeline, buried beneath the Yellowstone River in Montana, was torn apart by flood-caused debris, spilling oil into the river and disrupting crude oil transport in the region. The property damage cost was \$135 million.

Senator VITTER, our ranking member on the Environment and Public Works Committee, has told us that 18 percent of the Nation's oil supply passes through his home State of Louisiana at Port Fourchon. A recent Government Accountability Office report found that the only access road to that port is closed 3½ days a year on average because of flooding, effectively shutting down that port. With sea level rise climbing due to climate change, NOAA is now projecting that within 15 years portions of that highway will flood an average of 30 times each year—again shutting down access to that port 30 times a year.

Vital infrastructure such as powerplants, power lines, roads, and pipelines are all designed to stand up to historical weather patterns. What happens when the weather stops following historical patterns?

According to the draft National Climate Assessment:

U.S. average temperature has increased by about 1.5 degrees Fahrenheit since 1895; more than 80% of this increase has occurred since 1980. The most recent decade was the nation's hottest on record.

Oceans and other bodies of water are warming right along with the atmosphere.

The seasons are shifting. Research shows that in the last two decades the frost-free season has increased in every region of the contiguous United States compared to the average between 1901 and 1960.

In the Southwest, the record shows the frost-free season has increased 3 weeks and the western wildfire season has expanded by more than 2 months since the 1970s. Precipitation patterns and the availability of water are changing throughout the Nation. One study concluded that snow in the western mountains is melting, on average, 1 to 4 weeks earlier now compared to the 1950s.

The draft National Climate Assessment shows that the amount of rain falling in what we call heavy precipitation events or, more colloquially, downpours is up in every region of the Nation. It is up 45 percent in the Midwest and 74 percent in the Northeast.

Sea level is rising about 8 inches, on average, globally, but in some parts of the country it is much higher. NOAA reports that mean waters off the Galveston, TX, coast are rising more than 2 feet per century. At Grand Isle, LA, the rate is nearly 3 feet per century.

These aren't just projections of what is to come, these are actual measurements of changes that have already happened or are happening around us. The result is that we have an energy infrastructure built for a different climate than the one which now exists and the one which is to come. Conditions are only predicted to get worse.

The threat to our energy sector from changes in the climate should be neither controversial nor partisan. There are a lot of commonsense solutions here. Adapting our infrastructure for climate change is smart, and it will save us from costly repairs.

Investing in energy efficiency by reducing the demand for power will relieve pressure on the burdened systems. Investing in a diverse energy sector will protect against the unique vulnerabilities of specific types of power sources.

Rhode Island is part of the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, nicknamed Reggie, along with eight other Northern States. Our region caps carbon emissions and sells permits to powerplants to emit greenhouse gases, which creates economic incentives for both States and utilities to invest in energy efficiency and renewable energy development. These efforts also reduce load demand on the region's electrical grid.

We are proud of the effort we are making in New England. I know a lot of States are working just as hard. I say to my colleagues, our home States are hampered by the inaction in Congress.

We have received credible and convincing warnings. We have received

compelling calls to act. The overwhelming majority of the scientific community recognizes climate change is real and we are causing it.

Our national security and intelligence community, our faith leaders, major American corporations, including the insurance and reinsurance industry and most Americans all agree we need to act. It is time for Congress to wake up, do its work to slow the onslaught of climate change, and to prepare for what are now unavoidable, inevitable effects. Yet here in Congress we sleepwalk on.

This is an issue I know hits home in your home State in very different ways than it hits home in my State. But in each of our own ways, our States are already experiencing the hit from climate change. It is caused by carbon pollution that we are putting into the air, that our companies, our smokestacks are launching into the atmosphere. It changes our weather, changes our temperature, changes our seasons, changes our oceans, changes our waterways, changes our weather, and changes our lives.

The tragedy is that we sleepwalk on because we are unwilling to address the special interests that are preventing us from taking the action that all Americans need. This is the archetypical fight between the public good, between an important public security issue and a private special interest that is defending itself, that is defending its right to pollute, that is defending its ability to compromise our atmosphere, compromise our health, and compromise our great oceans and waters. This should be an easy struggle. This should be an easy struggle, but it is not. And it will be a mark of shame on this generation, and it will be a mark of shame on this building that given the choice between the clear information from the scientists, the clear experience of what is happening in all of our States and the power of the special interests, we ignored the first and yielded to the power of those special interests.

I yield the floor.

“PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT”

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senators HARKIN and GRASSLEY in reintroducing the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act. This bipartisan bill seeks to restore crucial worker protections that were cast aside by five justices of the Supreme Court in the 2009 case *Gross v. FBL Financial, Inc.* The bill reaffirms the contributions made by older Americans in the workforce and ensures that employees will be evaluated based on their performance and not by arbitrary criteria such as age.

Congress has long worked to enact civil rights laws to eliminate discrimi-

nation in the workplace. In 1967, Congress passed the Age Discrimination and Employment Act, ADEA, extending protections against workplace discrimination to older workers. We strengthened and codified these protections in the Civil Rights Act of 1991, which passed the Senate with an overwhelming, bipartisan vote of 93-5. These statutes established not only our clear congressional intent, but also a clear legal standard: an employer's decision to fire or demote an employee may not be motivated in whole or in part by the employee's age.

However, the Supreme Court's *Gross* decision unilaterally erased that longstanding standard. A narrow 5-4 majority threw out a jury verdict in favor of Jack Gross, a 32-year employee of a major financial company, who had sued his employer under the ADEA. That jury concluded that age was a motivating factor in the company's decision to demote Mr. Gross and to reassign a younger, significantly less-qualified worker to take his place. But the Supreme Court ignored the fact finder, its own precedent, and congressional intent to overturn the jury verdict.

Five justices shifted the burden from the discriminators to the discriminated, deciding that workers like Mr. Gross must now prove that age was the only motivating factor in a demotion or termination. The court's decision required workers to essentially introduce a “smoking gun” in order to prove discrimination. By imposing such high standards, the Court sided with big business and made it easier for employers to discriminate on the basis of age as long as they could cloak it with another reason. The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act rejects the Supreme Court's reasoning in the *Gross* decision, not only in those cases under the ADEA but also under similar civil rights provisions.

The Supreme Court's holding has created uncertainty in our civil rights laws, making it incumbent on Congress to clarify our intent and the statutory protections that all hardworking Americans deserve. The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act restores the original intent of the ADEA and three other Federal anti-discrimination statutes. The bill reestablishes Congress' intent that age discrimination is unlawful even if it is only part of the reason to demote or terminate a worker. It makes it clear that employers cannot get away with age discrimination by simply coming up with a reason to terminate an employee that sounds less controversial. Under the bill, a worker would also be able to introduce any relevant admissible form of evidence to show discrimination, whether the evidence is direct or circumstantial.

I commend Senator HARKIN for his efforts over the past 4 years to negotiate a bipartisan bill to restore the civil

rights protections that all Americans deserve in the workplace. I also thank Senator GRASSLEY, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, for his commitment to this issue. I once again urge my fellow Senators to join this bipartisan effort and show their commitment to ending age discrimination in the workplace.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, nearly 50 years ago, Martin Luther King, Jr., gave his historic "I Have a Dream" speech in front of hundreds of thousands of people on the National Mall. At the time, I was entering my last year of law school. I was inspired by the March on Washington and knew that history was being made before my very eyes. The youngest speaker at the March was a compelling man by the name of JOHN LEWIS. Many spoke of their unyielding support for civil rights legislation, but JOHN LEWIS demanded more. He demanded that the civil rights bill protect the right of every American to vote free from discrimination. With his strong and forceful voice, he proclaimed that "One man, one vote is the African cry. It is ours too. It must be ours."

A year and a half later, JOHN LEWIS would lead another march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, AL. There, State troopers brutally beat, bloodied, and trampled JOHN LEWIS and the group of peaceful marchers he led. Those powerful images from "Bloody Sunday" were captured on television and in vivid photographs, and would become a catalyst for the passage of the Voting Rights Act. When President Lyndon Johnson signed the act into law several months later, he fittingly gave one of the pens to JOHN LEWIS.

The Voting Rights Act has become the most successful piece of civil rights legislation in this Nation's history. It has worked to protect the Constitution's guarantees against racial discrimination in voting for nearly five decades. It has helped minorities of all races overcome major barriers to participation in the political process, through the use of such devices as poll taxes, intimidation by voting officials, registration and language barriers, and systematic vote dilution.

Despite the continuing evidence of racial discrimination in voting that Congress amassed in 2006, the Supreme Court recently issued a ruling that makes it more difficult to protect all Americans in exercising their sacred right to vote. In *Shelby County v. Holder*, a narrow majority of the Supreme Court held that the coverage formula for section 5 of the Voting Rights Act was unconstitutional. Section 5 provides a remedy for unconstitutional discrimination in voting by requiring certain jurisdictions with a history of discrimination to "pre-

clear" all voting changes before they can take effect. This remedy is both necessary and important because it stops the discriminatory voting practice before our fellow Americans' rights are violated. By striking down the coverage formula for section 5, the Court's ruling leaves this effective protection unenforceable.

Two weeks ago, I began a bipartisan conversation to restore the protections of the Voting Rights Act when I chaired a hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee. The hearing included meaningful testimony from JOHN LEWIS and JIM SENSENBRENNER. Both agreed that protecting the right to vote from discriminatory practices is neither a Democratic issue nor a Republican issue. It is an American issue.

At this hearing, Republican City Commissioner Luz Urbáez Weinberg of Aventura, FL, also testified to the need to restore the protections of section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. She urged Congress to demonstrate a "clear and principled commitment to equal voting rights for all Americans regardless of race, language spoken, and to also act swiftly to restore the protections." Moreover, she made clear that maintaining the Voting Rights Act "is not a partisan issue. It is a nonpartisan issue. It is an issue for all Americans. Whether Republicans or Democrats, all Americans strongly believe in fair and equal electoral opportunities."

It is true that America has made a lot of progress since the Voting Rights Act was first enacted. Nobody denies this. But we are far from achieving the dream that Dr. King spoke of on that magnificent day in August of 1963. Although the Supreme Court struck down the coverage formula in the *Shelby County* case, the Justices acknowledged, as they must and as the American people recognize, that discrimination in voting continues to be a problem. As the Chief Justice rightly noted in the majority opinion, "voting discrimination still exists; no one doubts that." The question only remains how best to protect Americans against this discrimination.

This is an issue on which Republicans and Democrats have always come together on. Every reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, including its initial passage, has been marked by the overwhelming support of lawmakers of both parties. In the last few weeks, I have heard people say that Congress is too gridlocked and will not act on voting rights. That is wrong and it is unsupported by our tradition of leadership on this issue. As my friend Senator GRASSLEY said at the Senate Judiciary Committee voting rights hearing I chaired 2 weeks ago, "Cynicism and defeatism have never before characterized reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act." Senator GRASSLEY is right. History shows that we have reauthorized the act time and again because it is a nonpartisan issue.

Those who forecast failure also underestimate what a person like JOHN LEWIS can accomplish. I, for one, would never underestimate JOHN LEWIS's tenacity and ability to bring people together.

The Supreme Court's ruling last month was a setback to the cause of equality. However, we should see it as a calling for Congress to come together to meet the voting discrimination which persists with a steadfast resolve. It is up to us to meet this challenge. We must work together as a Congress—not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans—to ensure that we protect against racial discrimination in voting. We can only do that with a strong Voting Rights Act.

Earlier today, at the bipartisan and bicameral event marking the 50th Anniversary of the March on Washington in Statuary Hall, JOHN LEWIS said, "We have come a great distance but we are not finished yet." I could not agree more. Let us continue to work to protect the fundamental right to vote for all Americans.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on an important anniversary in our country. In just a few weeks, we will commemorate the 50th anniversary of the famous March on Washington. On August 28, 1963, we marched. We marched for jobs, for justice, for the economy, and for freedom.

I remember that march. I was getting ready to go back to school. Baltimore was a staging location, and many social workers helped as marchers came down from New York and Pennsylvania. These determined individuals—a diverse group—all with a story and a cause, made up the nearly 250,000 people who marched that day. It was an important testament to the power of a collective voice, one in support of equal rights and treatment of all. And it was this collective voice that helped lead to the passage of the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act.

We have had many victories, and made much progress in ensuring equality for all. We have elected a Black President to the White House, passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, repealed DOMA and Don't Ask Don't Tell. We have accomplished so much, but we still have so far to go. The fight for civil rights is far from over. Racial, religious and gender violence continues in our streets and in our homes. Voters rights have been threatened by the recent Supreme Court decision, leaving Americans vulnerable to prejudice and intimidation. And so we find ourselves, 50 years later, fighting many of the same fights.

We need to reclaim that bill of rights, and not let any court decision take it away from us. They are chopping away at the Voting Rights Act, but let's change the law if we have to. Let us march for our liberties and the people who were there, and said "ain't

I a man", later calling on the words "ain't I a woman".

So it is important now more than ever to hold that dream of Dr. King in our hearts. Let's remember the history that was written here 50 years ago. And just as we marched then, we need to march today. Together we can end injustice. Together we can break down barriers to equality, so that all people regardless of race, faith or gender can live in a country that never promised anything less than their undeniable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

SERVICEMEMBER STUDENT LOAN AFFORDABILITY ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we've made a lot of progress over the past couple weeks helping our Nation's students borrow at reasonable costs for their higher education needs. This year alone, students are projected to borrow \$21 million in federal student loans. Borrowers currently carry about \$1.1 trillion in student loan debt.

Several Federal programs help borrowers having trouble keeping up with student loan debt. Two programs in particular are designed to recognize the sacrifice made by those who serve our country—whether it's in the military or through public service.

The Servicemember Civil Relief Act protects our servicemembers from interest rates above 6% on all loans—including student loans taken out preservice—while they are on active duty. The Public Service Loan Forgiveness program encourages people to become public servants by forgiving student loan debt after 10 years of public service—including military service. Under this program borrowers must enroll in a qualifying repayment plan and make 10 years of payments while working in public service before the loan is forgiven.

To be eligible, borrowers with Perkins or Federal Family Education Loans must consolidate their loans into a Direct Consolidation Loan to be eligible for the Public Service Loan Forgiveness program. However, there's an unintended consequence at play here.

Once a servicemember consolidates his or her preservice loans to qualify for the Loan Forgiveness program, those loans no longer qualify for the 6 percent rate cap under the Servicemember Civil Relief Act. This is because consolidation or refinancing of old debt is considered a new loan under the Servicemember Civil Relief Act.

Unfortunately, this forces servicemembers to choose between the 6 percent rate cap now while they are on active duty and enrolling in a program that will forgive their loans after 10 years of service and steady payments. Furthermore, this quirk in the law prevents servicemembers from taking ad-

vantage of historically low interest rates by refinancing. A lower interest rate could save borrowers thousands of dollars over the life of the loan.

Congress' intent was to help servicemembers burdened with student loan debt, and the Servicemember Civil Relief Act and the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Programs have done that. But forcing servicemembers to give up the rate cap today for a chance to earn loan forgiveness in the future is not what Congress intended, and we should fix it.

This week I introduced the Servicemember Student Loan Affordability Act. This bill would allow preservice private or Federal student loan debt to be consolidated or refinanced while retaining the 6 percent rate cap. This tweak to the law would allow servicemembers to participate in both beneficial programs. My bill is supported by the:

Center for Responsible Lending, National Consumer Law Center, National Guard Association of the United States, NGAUS, the Retired Enlisted Association, TREA, Veterans of Foreign Wars VFW, and Woodstock Institute.

We have made substantial progress for students in recent weeks, and more work is ahead as we address the rising student loan debt. This is a small change to the law, but it will have a big impact on servicemembers with large student loan debt. Congress continues to try to address the financial challenges facing our nation's middle class, working families, and students. This fix is one of many steps toward that effort.

I urge my colleagues to consider a simple solution to help servicemembers, and I hope they will support the Servicemember Student Loan Affordability Act.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID F. VITE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am honored today to pay tribute to my friend David Vite on his retirement from the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, IRMA. He spent 35 years with the Illinois retailers, helping businesses across the State of Illinois engage with government and better serve their communities.

David has a long history of service. After serving in the Army, he went to college in Wisconsin and graduated from the University of Wisconsin at LaCrosse. This must be where he developed his affinity for the Green Bay Packers. In all of the time David spent in Illinois, he never adopted our very own Chicago Bears. He remains to this day a loyal Packers fan.

Early in his career, David became the Executive Director of the Woodstock Chamber of Commerce and oversaw community developments in Woodstock, IL. By 1978, David had joined the

Illinois Retail Merchants Association as a field representative. Within 3 years, the Association had promoted him to Vice President of Government Affairs and not long after that, David Vite took over as President.

As President, David was determined to help resolve the challenges facing Illinois retailers and at the same time to create opportunities for them. He provided training for his members to help them promote sales. He created a school-to-work training program to help cultivate the next generation of retail leaders. He led an effort to publish a manual to help merchants become more environmentally friendly. And throughout his tenure, he was the voice for business as Illinois policymakers addressed dilemmas in unemployment insurance, worker's compensation, and sales taxes.

I can't thank David enough for the support he helped build across Illinois for the Marketplace Fairness Act. I am proud to say that in May, the Senate passed this bill by a vote of 69-27, helping to level the playing field for retailers in Illinois and across the country. With David's help, we were able to communicate with retailers in every corner of Illinois to better understand the need and urgency for tax fairness legislation.

I would like to thank David for his leadership and many contributions over his decades of work with communities and business. Illinois retail has been lucky to have had such a strong, good-willed advocate. I wish him the very best in his retirement.

CLEAN CRUISE SHIP ACT OF 2013

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week, I introduced the Clean Cruise Ship Act to limit the dumping of wastewater by cruise ships.

Cruise ships generate millions of gallons of wastewater every day, and currently these ships can dump their waste directly into the oceans with minimal oversight.

The Clean Cruise Ship Act would require these ships to obtain permits through EPA's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System to be able to discharge sewage, graywater, and bilge water.

It also would require cruise ships to upgrade their wastewater treatment systems to meet the standards of today's best available technology. This technology significantly reduces the pollutants that ships discharge and is already being used successfully on some cruise ships.

The problem is real. The number of cruise ship passengers has been growing nearly twice as fast as any other mode of travel.

In the U.S. alone, cruise lines carried over 10 million passengers in 2011, with some ships carrying 8,000 passengers or more.

These ships produce massive amounts of waste: one ship can produce over 200,000 gallons, or 10 backyard swimming pools, of sewage each week; a million gallons of graywater from kitchens, laundry, and showers; and over 25,000 gallons of oily bilge water that collects in ship bottoms.

I have nothing against cruise vacations. They can be a wonderful way to visit many beautiful places.

In fact, it is because these ships sail often into these beautiful, sensitive environments that we need to be particularly careful of the pollution they release into those waters.

Here is the unpleasant reality. Within 3 miles of shore, vessels can discharge wastewater from toilets and showers into the ocean provided that a "marine sanitation device" is installed.

However, a 2008 report released by the Environmental Protection Agency concluded that these systems simply do not work.

The devices allow ships to discharge waste that consistently exceeds national effluent standards for fecal coliform and other pathogens and pollutants.

In fact, fecal coliform levels in effluent are typically 20 to 200 times greater than in untreated domestic wastewater.

While cruise ships must obtain permits to discharge graywater within 3 miles of the coast, graywater should not go directly into the sea.

Graywater from sinks, tubs, and kitchens contain large amounts of pathogens and pollutants.

Fecal coliform concentrations, for example, are 10 to 1,000 times greater than those in untreated domestic wastewater.

These pollutants sicken our marine ecosystems, wash up onto our beaches, and contaminate food and shellfish that end up on our dinner plates.

Even worse, beyond 3 miles from shore there are no restrictions on sewage or graywater discharge. Cruise ships can actually dump raw sewage directly into U.S. waters.

The Clean Cruise Ship Act seeks to address these practices.

No discharges would be allowed within 12 miles of shore.

Beyond 12 miles from shore, discharges of sewage, graywater, and bilge water would be allowed, provided that they meet national effluent limits consistent with the best available technology. That technology works and is commercially available now.

Under this legislation, the release of raw, untreated sewage would be banned. No dumping of sewage sludge and incinerator ash would be allowed in U.S. waters.

All cruise ships calling on U.S. ports would have to dispose of hazardous waste in accordance with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

The bill would establish inspection and enforcement mechanisms to ensure compliance.

The protection of U.S. waters is vital to our nation's health and economy. The oceans support the life of nearly 50 percent of all species on Earth.

Some cruise ship companies already are trying to improve their environmental footprint. They also want to preserve the environment—it is the natural beauty of the sea that attracts their passengers.

But the efforts between cruise ship companies are not uniform. A federal standard would apply one set of requirements to all companies.

It is time to bring the cruise ship industry into the 21st century. It is time to update the laws that protect our oceans and urge adoption of the best available wastewater treatment technology at sea.

Working together, we can support the industry while protecting the natural treasures that are our oceans. The approach taken in the Clean Cruise Ship Act will move us toward that goal.

I encourage my colleagues here in the Senate to work with me to pass legislation that will put a stop to the dumping of hazardous pollutants along our coasts. Together we can clean up this major source of pollution that is harming our waters.

REMEMBERING DR. JOHN M. SMITH JR.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to an honored Kentuckian who, sadly, has been lost to us after a long and fruitful life. The man I speak of is Dr. John M. Smith Jr. of Beattyville, KY. Born in Hazard, KY, in 1922, he passed away on June 15 of this year. He was 91 years old.

Dr. Smith was revered in his community as a man of medicine. In the 1940s, he was one of the first recipients of the Rural Kentucky Medical Scholarship Fund, and graduated from the University of Louisville School of Medicine in 1949. He has worked in Morehead, Lexington, Woodford County, and most of all in Beattyville, where he served as a general practitioner for 38 years until the age of 90. Generations of Beattyville-area Kentuckians knew and loved Dr. Smith as their primary-care doctor.

Dr. Smith also proudly served his country in both World War II and the Korean War. In 1942, he enlisted in the U.S. Navy and served in both the Atlantic and Pacific campaigns of World War II. He then volunteered to serve as a medical officer at the Louisville, KY, recruiting station during the Korean War.

Dr. Smith received many accolades and recognitions from his community, and will be missed by a great many beloved family members and friends, in-

cluding his wife of 54 years, Patty. Elaine and I send our thoughts and prayers to the Smith family for their loss. And I know my colleagues in this U.S. Senate join me in recognizing the long and accomplished life of service led by Dr. John M. Smith Jr.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the obituary for Dr. Smith that appeared in the Lexington Herald-Leader be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the obituary was ordered to appear as follows:

[From the Lexington Herald-Leader, June 18, 2013]

JOHN SMITH: OBITUARY

BEATTYVILLE.—Dr. John M. Smith, Jr., 91, of Beattyville, KY, the son of John M. and Treva Smith, was born April 9th, 1922, in Hazard, KY, and passed away June 15th, 2013. He was a practicing physician for 61 years. He was one of the first graduates from Caney Creek College, now known as Alice Lloyd College in Pippa Passes, KY. After graduating from the University of Kentucky, Phi Beta Kappa, in 1942, he enlisted in the United States Navy and served as a first lieutenant aboard the U.S.S. *Weeden*, serving in both the Atlantic and Pacific campaigns of World War II.

Upon his honorable discharge, he was selected as one of the first recipients of the Rural Kentucky Medical Scholarship Fund, and entered and graduated from the University of Louisville School of Medicine in 1949. Following his medical internship, he extended his service to our country by volunteering for the Korean War, serving as a medical officer at the Louisville, KY, recruiting station. At the time of his discharge on July 6th, 1951, he opened his first medical practice 10 days later in Beattyville, KY. In 1962, he left Beattyville temporarily to practice in the field of radiology working at Morehead Hospital, Woodford County Hospital, and the Lexington Clinic. In June 1974, he returned to Beattyville as a general practitioner—his true love and passion—faithfully serving the patients he loved for the next 38 years until the age of 90.

He was a member of the Masonic Proctor Lodge 213 and the Lee County Shrine Club, VFW Post 11296, and the Kentucky Medical Association. He served as the Medical Director of the Lee County Constant Care and Geri Young House and a member of the Lee County Board of Health. Dr. Smith is survived by his wife, Patty, of 54 years; sons John S. (Vivian) of Beattyville, KY, Robert of Versailles, KY, William (Kim) of Arlington, VA, Sparkman, Daniel (Jo, Martha), Giletta, and John A., all of Lexington, KY; one brother, Luther (Rosemary), Beattyville, KY; two sisters, Janet (Glenn) Moore, Scottsburg, IN, and Joan Tilford, Falls of Rough, KY; 17 grandchildren and 11 great-grandchildren.

Visitation will be Wednesday, June 19th from 6 to 8 p.m. and Thursday, June 20th from 10 to 11 a.m. at Saint Thomas Episcopal Church in Beattyville. Funeral services will be Thursday, June 20th at 11 a.m. also at Saint Thomas Episcopal Church with The Reverend Bryant Kibler officiating. Burial will follow at the Lexington Cemetery, Lexington, KY.

SYRIA

Mr. McCain. Mr. President, as we prepare to head out for the August recess, I have returned to the floor today

to speak, once again, about the horrific and worsening situation in Syria—a conflict that, we learned this week, has now claimed 100,000 lives.

I would like to take a few minutes to read from a remarkable statement that was delivered on Monday by Mr. Paulo Pinheiro, the chair of the United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Syria. The excerpts I wish to read are long, but they are shocking, and worth quoting in full.

Here is the assessment Mr. Pinheiro gave to the U.N., and I quote:

Syria is in free-fall. Relentless shelling has killed thousands of civilians and displaced the populations of entire towns. An untold number of men and women have disappeared while passing through the ubiquitous checkpoints. Those freed from detention are living with the physical and mental scars of torture. Hospitals have been bombarded, leaving the sick and wounded to languish without care. With the destruction of thousands of schools, a generation of children now struggle to obtain an education. The country has become a battlefield. Its civilians are repeatedly victims of acts of terror.

Mr. Pinheiro concludes with this powerful plea for action:

That civilians should come under such sustained unlawful attacks should shock your conscience and spur you to action. But it has not. As the conflict drags on, you—and the world—have become accustomed to levels of violence that were previously unthinkable . . .

It is time for the international community to act decisively. There are no easy choices. To evade choice, however, is to countenance the continuation of this war and its many violations . . . The world must hear the cry of the people—stop the violence, put an end to this carnage, halt the destruction of the great country of Syria!

Again, this is not my assessment; it is that of a senior United Nations leader. And I applaud Mr. Pinheiro for his moral leadership on behalf of the Syrian people. At the same time, I say with the utmost respect that I disagree with Mr. Pinheiro's counsel for what is required to achieve the goal we share, which is to create conditions that favor a negotiated end to the conflict in Syria. I continue to believe that, while there is not a purely military solution to the conflict in Syria, I find it difficult to avoid the conclusion that military intervention by the United States and our allies must be a critical part of the solution we seek. Indeed it is unrealistic to think we can arrive at a diplomatic solution otherwise.

Let's be absolutely clear about the realities in Syria today and where this conflict is headed. Asad is never going to negotiate himself out of power or seek to end the conflict diplomatically so long as he believes he is winning on the battlefield, and right now, he clearly has the advantage on the ground. This is thanks, in critical part, to his air power, which not only allows Asad to pound opposition military positions and civilian populations—including

with chemical weapons, which nearly everyone believes he has used and will use again—but also to move his troops and supplies around the battlefield in ways that he cannot do on the ground.

Asad's growing military advantage is also thanks to the influx of thousands of Hezbollah fighters who are leading offensives in key parts of the country, Iranian special forces who are training and advising Asad's troops and private militias, Shia militants from Iraq and Lebanon, as well as a steady and decisive flow of weapons and other assistance from Iran and Russia, which is being brought into Syria with impunity, including through overflights of Iraq.

The consequences of this onslaught for Syria are bad enough. The strategically vital city of Homs is expected to fall imminently, which would be a major victory for Asad that would strengthen his position immeasurably. The consequences for the region, however, are arguably worse. Syria's main export today is its civilian population, which is flooding into Turkey, Lebanon, and Jordan, by the hundreds of thousands. Indeed, 15 percent of Jordan's population is now Syrian refugees, and the fourth largest city in the country is now a Syria refugee camp.

At the same time, Syria's primary import today seems to be foreign extremists from all across the region and indeed the world. It is well known from estimates in published reports that as many as several thousand people from all across the Middle East have moved into Syria to fight with Al Qaeda and other extremist groups. But, in addition, the New York Times reported this week that Western counterterrorism and intelligence officials now believe that hundreds of Muslims from Western countries have joined the fight in Syria, including 140 French, 75 Spaniards, 60 Germans, a few dozen Canadians and Australians, as well as fighters from Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Italy, Norway, Sweden, and the Netherlands. As many as a dozen Americans are believed to be among them. It is difficult to conclude that Al Qaeda does not enjoy safe haven in Syria today, and no one should believe that it won't be used eventually to launch attacks against us.

Make no mistake, this is where we are headed. Syria is becoming a failed state in the heart of the Middle East and a safe haven for Al Qaeda and its allies. It is becoming a regional and sectarian conflict that threatens the national security interests of the United States. And it is becoming the decisive battleground on which Iran and its allies are defying the United States and our allies and prevailing in a test of wills, which is fundamentally undermining America's credibility among both our friends and enemies throughout the region and the world.

Some may see this as an acceptable outcome. I do not.

I know Americans are war weary. I know the situation in Syria is complex, and there are no easy answers. That said, all of us must ask ourselves one basic question: Are the costs, and risks, and potential benefits associated with our current course of action better or worse than those associated with America becoming more involved militarily in Syria? I believe our current course of action is worse, because it virtually guarantees all of the bad outcomes that are unfolding before our eyes and getting worse and worse the longer this conflict grinds on.

Now, some would have us believe that military action of even a limited nature is too cost intensive, too high risk, and too marginal in its potential impact in Syria. In a letter dated July 19, 2013, to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and myself, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, GEN Martin Dempsey, described the requirements to conduct various military options in Syria. He spoke of scenarios that would demand hundreds of military assets and thousands of special forces to resource military options that no one is seriously considering.

Now, in my many years, I have seen a lot of military commanders overstate what is needed to conduct military action for one reason or another. But rarely have I seen an effort as disingenuous and exaggerated as what General Dempsey proposed.

The option that many of us have proposed is limited standoff strikes to degrade Asad's air power and ballistic missile capability. But here is General Dempsey's description of what would be needed to conduct "limited standoff strikes":

Potential targets include high-value regime air defense, air, ground, missile, and naval forces as well as the supporting military facilities and command nodes. Stand-off air and missile systems could be used to strike hundreds of targets at a tempo of our choosing. Force requirements would include hundreds of aircraft, ships, submarines, and other enablers. Depending on duration, the costs would be in the billions.

This is a completely disingenuous description of both the problem and the solution. No one is seriously talking about striking Asad's naval forces as part of a limited campaign. And no one seriously thinks that degrading Asad's air power would require hundreds of American military assets. The whole thing is completely misleading to the Congress and the American people, and it is shameful.

For a serious accounting of a realistic limited military option in Syria, I would strongly recommend a new study that is being released today by the Institute for the Study of War, or ISW, which was overseen by GEN Jack Keane, the author of the surge strategy that enabled us to turn around the war in Iraq. This new study confirms what

I and many others have long argued: That it is militarily feasible for the United States and our friends and allies to significantly degrade Asad's air power at relatively low cost, low risk to our personnel, and in very short order—and to do so, I want to stress, without putting any U.S. boots on the ground.

Specifically, the ISW study reports that Asad's forces are only flying a maximum of 100 operational strike aircraft at present, an estimate that ISW concedes is likely very generous to the Asad regime. The real figure, they maintain, is more likely around 50. What is more, these aircraft are only being flown out of 6 primary airfields, with an additional 12 secondary airfields playing a supporting role. What this means is that the real-world military problem of how to significantly degrade Asad's air power is very manageable—again, as I and others have maintained.

ISW calculates that U.S. and allied forces could significantly degrade Asad's air power using standoff weapons that would not require one of our pilots to enter Syrian airspace or confront one Syrian air defense system. With a limited number of these precision strikes against each of Asad's eight primary airfields, we could crater their runways, destroy their fuel and maintenance capabilities, knock out key command and control, and destroy a significant portion of their aircraft on the ground. The ISW study estimates that this limited intervention could be achieved in 1 day and would involve a total of 3 Navy surface ships and 24 strike aircraft, each deploying a limited number of precision-guided munitions—all fired from outside of Syria, without ever confronting Syrian air defenses.

This should not come as a surprise. After all, hitting static targets from a distance is what the U.S. military does best. And hitting static targets in Syria, without ever confronting Syrian air defenses inside of Syrian airspace, is something that our Israeli allies now seem to have done on several occasions. Surely we can too.

There are other things we should do in conjunction with targeted strikes against Asad's air power. We could expand the list of targets to include Asad's ballistic missiles, as well as key regime command-and-control sites. This would be an equally minimal number of targets that could be hit with the same standoff weapons. We should also stand up a far larger train-and-equip operation than what published reports suggest has been authorized to date. What all of the Syrian opposition leaders have told me their forces need most of all is antitank weapons that can destroy Asad's artillery and armor, which would remain a major threat even if we significantly degrade Asad's air power. We should

give the Syrian opposition these kinds of capabilities to level the playing field themselves.

If we were to do all of these things—degrade Asad's air power and ballistic missiles and train, equip and advise the opposition on a large scale—it probably would not end the conflict in Syria immediately. But it could turn the tide of battle against Asad's forces and in favor of the opposition, and begin to create conditions on the ground that could make a negotiated end to the conflict possible.

We cannot afford to lose the moral dimension from our foreign policy. If ever a case should remind us of this, it is Syria. Leon Wieseltier captured this point powerfully in *The New Republic* last month. His words are as true today as they were then, and I quote:

The slaughter is unceasing. But the debate about American intervention is increasingly conducted in "realist" terms: the threat to American interests posed by jihadism in Syria, the intrigues of Iran and Hezbollah, the rattling of Israel, the ruination of Jordan and Lebanon and Iraq. Those are all good reasons for the president of the United States to act like the president of the United States. But wouldn't the prevention of ethnic cleansing and genocidal war be reason enough? Is the death of scores and even hundreds of thousands, and the displacement of millions, less significant for American policy, and less quickening? The moral dimension must be restored to our deliberations, the moral sting, or else Obama, for all his talk about conscience, will have presided over a terrible mutilation of American discourse: the severance of conscience from action.

We have had these debates before. In Bosnia, and later in Kosovo, we heard many arguments against military intervention that we now hear about Syria. It was said that there was no international consensus for action, that the situation on the ground was messy and confused, that it was not clear who we would actually be helping, and that our involvement could actually make matters worse. Fortunately, we had a President who led—who explained to the American people what the stakes were in the Balkans, and why we needed to rise to the role that only America could play. Here is how President Bill Clinton described Bosnia in 1995:

There are times and places where our leadership can mean the difference between peace and war, and where we can defend our fundamental values as a people and serve our most basic, strategic interests. [T]here are still times when America and America alone can and should make the difference for peace.

Nearly two decades ago, I worked with both my Democratic and Republican colleagues in Congress to support President Clinton as he led America to do the right thing in stopping mass atrocities in Bosnia. The question for another President today, and for all of my colleagues in this body, indeed for all Americans, is whether we will once

again answer the desperate pleas for rescue that are made uniquely to us, as the United States of America.

REMEMBERING COLONEL GEORGE "BUD" DAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to take time today to honor the life of a very brave man, and an exemplary Iowan, Col. George "Bud" Day, who passed away over the weekend.

Bud Day's brave and memorable military career started at the age of 17, when he volunteered for the Marine Corps during World War II in Sioux City, IA.

After this period of service, Bud returned home, and received a law degree from the University of South Dakota.

His military service to this country, however, would resume.

Bud Day joined the Air National Guard in 1950 and was called up for active duty a year later during the Korean War.

By 1955 he had become a captain with the Air Force.

With the same go-getter attitude he displayed throughout his service, then Captain Day went on to command a squadron of F-100s in Vietnam in 1967.

On August 26, Bud's plane was hit and took a steep dive. Upon ejection he sustained many injuries.

Shortly after the crash, Bud was taken prisoner and tortured.

Maintaining his unflagging spirit and fueled by his love for his country, Bud Day refused to cooperate and escaped his captors. Surviving treacherous conditions and life-threatening situations every minute, Bud spent 2 weeks trying to find U.S. troops.

His efforts left him exhausted and he was later recaptured and returned to the same camp he had escaped from.

He was then moved to the infamous "Hanoi Hilton" camp where torture was commonplace for the next 5 years of his life until his release in 1973.

Even after all of this, Bud Day resumed his service with the U.S. Air Force, and was appointed vice commander of the 33rd Tactical Fighter Wing at Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

Three years after his release from the Hanoi Hilton, Bud received the Medal of Honor from President Gerald Ford for not divulging information in the face of torture, thereby putting his own life in imminent risk to save others.

He has also received numerous other awards and recognitions such as the Air Force Cross for extraordinary heroism in military operations against an opposing armed force as a POW, making him one of America's most decorated servicemen.

Bud Day remained public spirited even after his military service, continuing to advocate for veterans and other causes that were important to him.

His life of service is a tremendous role model for future generations and he will be missed.

I am proud to have been able to call Bud Day an Iowan and a friend.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. CHIESA. Mr. President, due to a long standing personal commitment, I was unable to cast votes on rollcall vote Nos. 188 through 194. Had I been present, I would have voted yes on No. 188; I would have voted no on No. 189; I would have voted no on No. 190; I would have voted no on No. 191; I would have voted no on No. 192; I would have voted no on No. 193; and I would have no on No. 194.

REMEMBERING KAREN PAULSON

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to offer a tribute honoring the life and service of Karen Paulson, who passed away this week. Karen was a friend and a dedicated, hard-working member of my staff for a number of years. She also served as an aide to several other Members of Congress, including Congressman Jon Porter from my home State of Nevada, and House Speaker JOHN BOEHNER.

Karen was a tremendously talented administrator who cared deeply about public service. She was an individual upon whom many others relied. Karen could always be counted on for her steadfastness and initiative. She was an attentive problem-solver and was ever eager to help make things simpler for her colleagues however she could. I can personally attest to her commitment to excellence in whatever role she held, and I am deeply grateful for the special years she spent as a member of my staff.

While Karen will be dearly missed, her service and her spirit will be long remembered. I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering this dedicated public servant, and offer my deepest condolences to Karen's family and loved ones during this difficult time.

SEA OF CHANGE

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, on April 16, 2013 President Ma Ying-jeiou of Taiwan gave a speech on a videoconference with Center on Democracy, Development and the Rule of Law at Stanford University. I feel my colleagues could benefit from reading this speech. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD President Ma Ying-jeiou's speech.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. OPENING REMARKS

Professor Rice, Professor Diamond, Professor Fukuyama, Admiral Roughead, distinguished guests, faculty members and stu-

dents of Stanford University, ladies and gentlemen: Good evening! It's your evening now, but it's our morning here in Taipei.

Before I start, I want to pay my deep condolences to those victims suffered by the explosions happened at Boston Marathon on Monday. My prayers and thoughts are with their family members. In the meantime, I also strongly condemn the violence on behalf of the government of the Republic of China (Taiwan).

It is a great pleasure to be addressing my friends at Stanford University this evening. Stanford University has long been a distinguished center of learning. Under the guidance of Professor Diamond, the Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law, through the Journal of Democracy, has made incomparable contributions to the study of democracy. Since Taiwan represents a shining example of how democracy can take root in the Chinese-speaking world, it is only fitting to join you today for this video-conference.

II. CHANGES IN EAST ASIA

Since I took office as President of the Republic of China in 2008, the geopolitical situation in East Asia has undergone tremendous change. Five years ago, there were two flash points: the Korean Peninsula and the Taiwan Straits. Today, the Korean Peninsula is at an unprecedented level of tension: North Korea has conducted a third nuclear test explosion, and in the aftermath of the resulting UN sanctions continues its saber rattling, even claiming that it has abrogated the 1953 Armistice Agreement that ended Korean War fighting 60 years ago. In contrast, tensions in the Taiwan Straits have been greatly reduced, and relations between Taiwan and mainland China continue to advance toward peace and prosperity.

This does not necessarily mean, however, that only one potential source of instability remains in East Asia. Geopolitical competition in both the East China Sea and the South China Sea is growing more intense even as the drive toward regional economic integration continues. In addition, three of the major players in East Asia—mainland China, South Korea and Japan—have changed leadership in the last eight months, while here in Taiwan, I was elected to a second term of office early last year.

Thus, amidst the uncertainty resulting from such changes, the Republic of China on Taiwan remains firmly committed to fostering peace and stability, and is a strong proponent of the liberal values cherished by democracies worldwide. It is against this backdrop that I would like to discuss how my administration has steered Taiwan through this sea of change.

III. HOW CROSS-STRAIT RAPPROCHEMENT WAS ACHIEVED

I decided to seek rapprochement with mainland China long before I took office in 2008. To ensure peace in the Taiwan Straits after some sixty tumultuous years, my administration had to meet both the challenges of establishing mutual trust between the two sides of the Taiwan Straits and of rebuilding Taiwan's strength so that peace could be guaranteed.

From the start, the "92 Consensus" was a critical anchoring point for Taiwan and mainland China to find common ground on the otherwise intractable issue of "One China." The consensus, reached between the two sides in 1992, established a common understanding of "one China with respective interpretations." With this understanding as the foundation, my administration designed

a number of modus operandi that broadly defined how Taiwan would pursue peace and prosperity with mainland China. These included iteration of the "Three No's"—"No Unification, No Independence, and No Use of Force"—under the framework of the ROC Constitution. This formulation, grounded de jure in the 1947 Constitution of the Republic of China, sets clear parameters for how both parties can work to move the relationship forward in a positive direction without misunderstandings or hidden agenda, so as to build mutual trust and achieve mutual benefit for the people on either side of the Taiwan Straits.

"Beating swords into ploughshares" requires pragmatism and the wisdom to remain focused on what can be accomplished in spite of past differences. So we then called for "mutual non-recognition of sovereignty, mutual non-denial of governing authority" allowing both sides to pursue substantive exchanges without being derailed by disagreements over sovereignty issues.

We also spelled out clearly to the other side, as well as to the Taiwan public, how we intended to proceed with the cross-strait dialogue. The priority of issues for the two sides to address would be "pressing matters before less pressing ones, easy matters before difficult ones, and economic matters before political ones". My administration firmly believed in setting a clear agenda from the start, to prevent the cross-strait dialogue being bogged down by intractable issues when we could see that agreement might be found on many others. The goal is to build mutual trust which is fundamental for long-term progress in developing a peaceful cross-strait relationship. I firmly believe that this "building-blocks" approach is the only way to achieve lasting peace in the Taiwan Straits.

The result of this is 18 agreements concluded between Taiwan and mainland China over the past five years, covering such issues as direct flights, tourism, economic cooperation, intellectual property rights, nuclear safety, and mutual judicial assistance. Let me just give you an example of how things stand now. Five years ago, there were no scheduled flights between Taiwan and the mainland, now there are 616 scheduled flights per week. Five years ago, there were 274,000 mainland people visiting Taiwan, in 2012, there were 2.5 million people. When the SARS epidemic first broke out in 2003, mainland China completely ignored Taiwan's needs and concerns. But when the H7N9 avian flu struck recently, public health experts from both sides began working together to check its spread.

Over the next three years, the two sides are expected to complete negotiations on trade in services and trade in goods under the 2010 Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement (ECFA). Both sides will also greatly expand the level of educational and cultural exchanges. For example, the number of students from mainland China studying in Taiwan, which currently is 17,000 a year, is expected to rise and there will be more cross-strait cultural cooperation. Each side also intends to set up offices in major cities on the other side to take better care of the 7 million people and over 160 billion US dollars' worth of goods and services moving across the Taiwan Straits last year alone. As a result, cross-strait relations are now the most stable and peaceful that they have been in over 60 years.

IV. TAIWAN'S ENHANCED INTERNATIONAL PRESENCE

As cross-strait relations continue to develop peacefully, Taiwan is gaining an enhanced international presence. The clear parameter articulated by my administration as we began resumption of the cross-strait dialogue counter any mistaken attempt to link Taiwan's greater international participation to an agenda of "two Chinas", "one China, one Taiwan", or "Taiwan Independence". Taiwan today strives to conduct itself as a responsible stakeholder, that is, as a facilitator of peace, a provider of humanitarian aid, a promoter of cultural exchanges, a creator of new technology and business opportunity, and the standard bearer of Chinese culture.

The international community has seen recently how Taiwan depicts itself as a responsible stakeholder and facilitator of peace. Last August, my administration proposed an East China Sea Peace Initiative urging that negotiation take precedence over confrontation regarding the sovereignty dispute over the Diaoyutai Islets. The following November, Taipei and Tokyo began negotiations on an East China Sea fishery agreement. Sixteen rounds of such talks had been held since 1996 but no agreement was ever reached. This time, both sides decided to jointly conserve and manage fishery resources in the Agreement Area of the East China Sea, without changing their respective territorial and maritime claims regarding the Diaoyutai Islets. A fishery agreement was thus signed six days ago which safeguards the security of fishing boats from both sides in the Agreement Area twice the size of Taiwan. This agreement marks a historic milestone in the development of Taiwan-Japan relations and sets a good example for how the concerned parties can find ways to settle their disputes and preserve peace and stability in the region at the same time.

Our efforts over the past five years to enhance Taiwan's participation in the international community have also resulted in concrete progress. The Republic of China has kept intact its diplomatic relations with its 23 allies, and has enhanced its substantive relations with other countries. For instance, we signed an investment agreement with Japan in 2011, and are working to sign economic cooperation agreements with Singapore and New Zealand respectively in the near future. Meanwhile, our health minister has attended the World Health Assembly (WHA) of the WHO as an official observer since 2009, the same year as Taiwan acceded to the Government Procurement Agreement (GPA) of the WTO. For five years in a row, former Vice President Lien Chan at my request has attended as "leader's representative" the Leaders' Meeting of Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC). On March 19 this year I led an official delegation to attend the investiture of Pope Francis, the first time for a ROC president to meet with a Pope in the last 71 years ever since the two countries established diplomatic ties in 1942. Taiwan's enhanced international presence attests to a virtuous cycle of improved cross-strait relations that encourages greater international support for allowing Taiwan further opportunities to play its role of responsible stakeholder. This in turn further enhances regional peace and stability, which is in the best interest of the international community.

V. TAIWAN-US TIES: SECURITY, ECONOMIC, AND CULTURAL

My administration is fully aware that strength is fundamental to achieving peace.

When I took office five years ago, my administration worked promptly to restore high-level trust between Taipei and Washington. As former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said in 2011 in Honolulu, Hawaii, Taiwan is an important security and economic partner of the United States. We deeply appreciate the relationship we have with the United States, including US arms sales to Taiwan. Only with a sufficient self-defense capability can Taiwan confidently engage in a dialogue with mainland China. The stability engendered by America's enhanced presence in the Western Pacific will certainly help.

The United States is Taiwan's third largest trading partner but remains the most important source of our technology. However large a trading partner mainland China is to Taiwan, the United States has always been an important trade and investment partner to Taiwan. The ICT (information and communication technology) industries are Taiwan's most important export sector and they are the largest recipient of U.S. investment. After successfully resolving the beef import issue last year, the Republic of China resumed trade negotiations with the U.S. under the 1994 Taiwan-US Trade and Investment Framework Agreement (TIFA). Obviously, Taiwan needs to accelerate its pace of trade liberalization. For the good of its economic prosperity and national security, Taiwan cannot afford to be left out of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP).

Culturally, American values and its high academic standards have attracted Chinese students since Yung Wing became the first Chinese student to study in the U.S. back in 1847. Generations of Chinese students who studied in the United States brought American values back to their homeland, making tremendous contributions to China's modernization, including the 1911 revolution. Today, the United States still remains the most sought after academic destination for Taiwan students.

Taiwan is grateful to the United States for letting Taiwan join the Visa Waiver Program beginning in November last year. The Republic of China is the 37th nation in the world to secure that status, and the only one that does not have formal diplomatic relations with the United States. The more than 400,000 Taiwan visitors to the U.S. each year not only take in American culture and natural scenery, they also shop very seriously in the United States and thus help reduce the U.S. trade deficit with Taiwan. In a word, relations between the Republic of China and the United States continue to thrive and grow since the end of formal diplomatic ties in 1979.

Nevertheless, Taiwan still faces many challenges with only limited resources at its disposal. In formulating Taiwan's national security strategy, my administration has steered Taiwan toward a tripartite national security framework. The first part involves institutionalization of the rapprochement with mainland China so that neither side would ever contemplate resorting to non-peaceful means to settle their differences. The second part involves making Taiwan a model world citizen by upholding the principles of a liberal democracy, championing free trade and providing foreign aid to the international community. The third part involves strengthening national defense capability. This national security strategy is formulated to facilitate peaceful and positive development of cross-strait ties while remaining grounded in pragmatic realization

of the challenges we face. In other words, Taiwan and the United States share the same values and interests in preserving regional peace and stability.

VI. TAIWAN'S ULTIMATE VALUE: A BEACON OF DEMOCRACY

States in a security partnership frequently fear being entrapped or abandoned by their partners. In the past, some in the United States have expressed concern that as mainland China rises, Taiwan might someday entrap the United States in an unnecessary conflict with mainland China. Others fear that Taiwan is tilting toward mainland China, thus "abandoning" the United States. Both arguments imply that the United States should reduce support for Taiwan. But neither view is warranted. My administration's pursuit of rapprochement with mainland China has clearly helped preserve and enhance peace in the Taiwan Straits. My administration's adherence to the Constitution of the Republic of China legally rules out any possibility of a reckless change in the status quo.

Taiwan has so much in common with the United States, from our love of democracy, to respect for human rights and the rule of law, to support for free trade, and even to an intense passion for basketball and baseball! We are also crazy about Jeremy Lin and Jianmin Wang! Taiwan cherishes its longstanding friendship with the United States and will always cherish the values and culture that the Chinese people have developed over five thousand years. Preserving the Republic of China has immense importance that goes far beyond the borders of Taiwan. For the first time in Chinese history, we in Taiwan have proved that democracy can thrive in a Chinese society. It presents shining ray of hope to the 1.3 billion Chinese people on the mainland. I know how much this means to the government and people of the United States, just as it does to my administration and the people of Taiwan.

Ladies and gentlemen, my administration will steer this democracy through the sea of change in East Asia. We will endeavor to strengthen peace and prosperity in the Taiwan Straits; and, in the meantime, we will strive for an enhanced international presence for Taiwan that allows it to play its role as a responsible stakeholder in the international community. I feel nothing but confidence about the future of the Republic of China!

Thank you.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL F. ADAMS

• Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the career of Dr. Michael F. Adams, who stepped down as president of the University of Georgia on June 30 after 16 years of dedicated service to our State university.

Dr. Adams became president on June 11, 1997, and he immediately began his work to make the University of Georgia one of the Nation's top public research universities. Under his leadership, UGA has excelled tremendously and student quality has risen steadily. He is one of America's best known and longest serving university presidents.

Dr. Adams' dedication to improving the university's facilities and infrastructure is evident upon visiting the

campus. He secured over \$1 billion in new construction programs through his foundation of the UGA Real Estate Foundation. The university has undergone incredible renovations and now boasts the nation's most state-of-the-art facilities. Adams has overseen the construction of the East Campus Village, the Georgia Museum of Art, the Tate Student Center and the Richard B. Russell Special Collections Library. His commitment to providing students with the best learning environment is apparent throughout the highly impressive and ever-improving campus.

Under Adams' leadership, the University of Georgia has achieved the highest rankings in its history, with the U.S. News and World Report ranking UGA in its top 20 public research universities for 8 out of the past 10 years. Student enrollment has grown from 29,000 to 35,000 students. UGA has become more selective and student quality is at its best. Adams oversaw the establishment of five new colleges and schools, increasing the diversity of academic programs and fields of study. While the university continued to excel academically, the Georgia Bulldogs' rich tradition of athletics flourished as well, with 27 national championship titles, 58 SEC Titles, and 125 individual titles.

It comes as no surprise Adams has received over 50 awards in higher education throughout his time with the university, including the Knight Foundation Award for Presidential Leadership, the Pioneer Award for Leadership in Civil Rights, and the James T. Rogers Award, the highest honor bestowed by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. He has also been listed as one of Georgia Trend magazine's Most Influential Georgians for 11 years in a row.

I am honored to have attended the University of Georgia and grateful for all that President Adams has done to make it the educational standard that it is today. I thank him for his service to the University of Georgia and to our great State.●

REMEMBERING REV. CAESAR CAVIGLIA

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to offer a tribute honoring the life and work of Father Caesar Caviglia. Father Caviglia was a dedicated community leader from my home State of Nevada who passed away this week. He touched the lives of countless Nevadans and will be long remembered for his compassion, faith, and service to his church and community.

Father Caviglia was a lifelong Nevadan who spent more than half a century as a minister and educator. Throughout his life, he served in various capacities across the entire State. He was born in Ely, NV in 1928, and returned to the Silver State after being

ordained and earning multiple degrees in philosophy, theology and education. He was a committed educator who spent time teaching at Bishop Manogue Catholic High School and the University of Nevada, Reno before moving to the southern part of the State to serve as the superintendent of Nevada State Catholic Schools.

Father "C," as he was known by his parishioners, spent much of his ministry serving as the parish priest at St. Peter's Catholic Church in Henderson, NV. Throughout his time there, he took on a variety of leadership roles and was active in advocating for important issues affecting those he served. He was a member of the faculty at the Henderson Campus of the College of Southern Nevada, where he taught sociology, anthropology and philosophy. He played a key role in the construction of that campus, and one of its academic buildings is named in his honor. He returned to Ely to begin his retirement, but soon after, he resumed his role of service as the administrator at Sacred Heart Catholic Church, where he served until 2008.

Father Caviglia spent a lifetime devoted to serving his community and serves as an example to us all. I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering Father Caesar Caviglia, and offer my deepest condolences to his family and parishioners as they mourn the loss of this great Nevadan.●

TRIBUTE TO ALAYNA ACKERMAN

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Alayna Ackerman, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Alayna is a graduate of St. Thomas More High School in Rapid City, SD. Currently, she is attending University of South Dakota, where she is majoring in criminal justice and political science. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Alayna for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO TARA AL-HAJ

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Tara Al-Haj, a page in the United States Senate, for all of the hard work she has done for the Senate and its staff.

Tara is currently attending Stevens High School in Rapid City, SD, where she will be entering her junior year this fall. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of this unique experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Tara for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ERIKA BACHMEIER

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Erika Bachmeier, an intern in my Aberdeen, SD, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Erika is a graduate of Central High School in Aberdeen, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of North Dakota, where she is majoring in occupational therapy. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Erika for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MADISON BLAKE

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Madison Blake, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Madison is a graduate of Liberty High School in Liberty, MO. Currently, she is attending the University of Missouri, where she is majoring in health sciences. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Madison for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO BETHANY BUELL

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Bethany Buell of the University of South Dakota, USD, for becoming the first NCAA Division I National Champion in school history. Buell captured the National Championship by pole vaulting 14 feet, 7.25 inches on June 7, 2013 at Hayward Field in Eugene, OR.

Bethany Buell has had a terrific season for the USD Coyote's, earning All-American honors before ultimately capturing the D-I NCAA National Championship. Buell's record-breaking season was almost cut short after tearing ligaments in her shoulder after setting the highest national mark of 14 feet, 7.5 inches on March 29th. Buell returned from injury to compete on May 9th at the Summit League Championships. Buell was also named the NCAA Division I Outdoor Field Scholar Athlete of the Year by the U.S. Track and Field/Cross Country Coaches Association.

Bethany Buell is a redshirt junior from Rockwood Summit High School, in St. Louis, MO. Bethany, the daughter of Bill and Kerry Buell, is currently majoring in psychology with a minor in anthropology. Buell's career at USD has been record-breaking; as a true freshman, Bethany won the pole vault at the GWC Indoor Championships and broke the school record in the event

twice. In 2011, Buell became the first USD Coyote to qualify for the NCAA D-I National Championships, where she would finish 13th and earn 2nd team All-America honors. In 2012, Bethany continued her ascent as one of the Nation's top pole vaulters becoming the first Coyote to earn All-American First-Team honors. She later finished 3rd at the NCAA D-I National Championships.

As a graduate of the University of South Dakota, I am honored to recognize Bethany Buell for her outstanding accomplishments and contributions to the University of South Dakota and to the State of South Dakota. Congratulations to Bethany, and to the Coyote Track and Field Team for a great season. Go Yotes!●

TRIBUTE TO SKYE DEARBORN

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Skye Dearborn of Sioux Falls Lincoln High School for being South Dakota's first representative in the National Youth Orchestra of the United States of America. Dearborn played the trombone for the inaugural Carnegie Hall National Youth Orchestra.

Before Dearborn performed in the National Youth Orchestra she played trombone in Lincoln High School's symphonic band, jazz band, marching band, and was part of the South Dakota Symphony Youth Orchestra. Dearborn also participated in the concert orchestra, won first place in the Young Musicians Concerto Competition, and was an AP Scholar at Lincoln High School. In the future, Skye plans on attending the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor where she will major in trombone performance.

2013 marks the inaugural tour for the National Youth Orchestra of the United States of America in modern history. The NYO-USA is comprised of 120 of the finest youth musicians from across the United States and is conducted each year by a different celebrated conductor. The conductor for the 2013 orchestra is Valery Gergiev, the principal director of the London Symphony Orchestra. The NYO-USA performed in New York, NY, Washington, DC, Moscow, St. Petersburg, and London.

The National Youth Orchestra of the United States of America performed on tour July 11 through July 21 around the globe. I am honored to recognize Skye Dearborn for her accomplishments and contributions to this prestigious group of young people.●

TRIBUTE TO JENNA HEADRICK

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Jenna Headrick, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Jenna is a graduate of Brandon Valley High School in Brandon, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of Minnesota—Twin Cities, where she is majoring in political science and sociology. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jenna for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MATTHEW REEVES

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Matthew Reeves, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Matthew is a graduate of Sioux Falls Christian in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, he is attending the University of Arkansas, where he is majoring in international relations and political science. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Matthew for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL REULAND

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Samuel Reuland, an intern in my Sioux Falls, SD, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Samuel is a graduate of White Lake High School in White Lake, SD. Currently, he is attending the University of South Dakota, where he is majoring in political science and history. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Samuel for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO OWEN SHAY

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Owen Shay, an intern in my Sioux Falls, SD, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Owen is a graduate of Sunshine Bible Academy in Miller, SD. Currently, he is attending South Dakota State University, where he is majoring in history. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Owen for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

SIOUX FALLS ORPHEUM THEATER

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Sioux Falls

Orpheum Theater Center's 100th Anniversary. Opening their doors in 1913, The Orpheum Theater Center was built to serve the City of Sioux Falls as a venue for theatrical presentations. Over the past 100 years, the Orpheum Theater has grown to become a cherished location for South Dakotans to enjoy quality entertainment.

The Orpheum Theater was built for the Solari Brothers and opened on October 3, 1913, as a vaudeville house and seated 1,000 audience members. Tickets for the opening night were sold for \$5 each and acts included features such as "An Evening in Honolulu," two different comedy acts, and the Orpheum Concert Orchestra.

In 1919, the theater was sold to a major theater management firm. It remained as a vaudeville house until 1927, when it was sold and became a second run and B movie theater. It was not until the Sioux Empire Community Playhouse purchased the building in 1954 that it was restored to its original theater space.

The City of Sioux Falls purchased the Orpheum and neighboring buildings in 2002 and has since named the entire facility The Orpheum Theater Center.

The Orpheum Theater Center has provided quality entertainment to many generations of South Dakotans. It attracts over 100,000 visitors each year with events that include plays, concerts, community events, and private events. Known for its superb acoustics, it is the oldest theater in Sioux Falls. In 1983, the Orpheum Theater was added to the National Register of Historic Places.

I am honored to congratulate the Sioux Falls Orpheum Theater Center on their 100th Anniversary and wish them another 100 years of success.●

TRIBUTE TO ADAM TIMMERMAN

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Adam Timmerman, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Adam is a graduate of Sioux Falls Lincoln High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, he is attending University of Kansas, where he is majoring in environmental studies. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Adam for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1300. An act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer programs and community partnerships for the benefit of national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2094. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

H.R. 2754. An act to amend the Hobby Protection Act to make unlawful the provision of assistance or support in violation of that Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151), as amended by section 1601 of Public Law 111-68, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 491 of the Higher Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1098(c)), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, and upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader, the Speaker appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for a term of 4 years: Mr. Fred Hurst of Flagstaff, Arizona.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2903, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission: Mr. McDERMOTT of Washington.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio, and Mr. HONDA of California.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY) reported that he had signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 1092. An act to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center".

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1300. An act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer programs and community partnerships for the benefit of national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 2094. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 2754. An act to amend the Hobby Protection Act to make unlawful the provision of assistance or support in violation of that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1392. A bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-90. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah urging the United States Congress to pass S. 336 and H.R. 684, the Marketplace Fairness Act; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas, the Supreme Court of the United States held in *Quill v. North Dakota*, 504 U.S. 298 (1992) that the "dormant" or "negative" Commerce Clause of the Constitution of the United States prohibits a state from requiring a retailer to collect and remit sales tax on sales to consumers in the state unless the retailer has physical presence in the state;

Whereas, the Supreme Court further held "that the underlying issue is not only one that Congress may be better qualified to resolve, but also one that Congress has the ultimate power to resolve";

Whereas, the sales tax, as applied to consumer purchases, can be a transparent tax levied by state and local governments;

Whereas, the sales tax is, from the individual consumer's perspective, one of the simplest taxes imposed by state and local governments;

Whereas, a complex aspect of sales taxation, from the individual consumer's per-

spective, is the requirement to pay "use" tax directly to the state or locality when sales tax is not collected by the retailer;

Whereas, the electronic commerce industry needs to be left free from government interference, and any argument in favor of taxing sales on the Internet is problematic in light of constitutional provisions regarding interstate commerce and interstate compacts;

Whereas, because there are over 9,600 state and local taxing jurisdictions in the United States, each with unique and changing definitions, rules, and holidays, the sales tax is, from a remote seller's perspective, one of the most complex and costly taxes imposed by state and local governments;

Whereas, consumption taxes can be used to achieve competitiveness;

Whereas, the sales tax has been a stable source of state and local revenue and provides some level of certainty for states and localities;

Whereas, some proposed federal legislation authorizing states to require all retailers whose sales to consumers in those states exceed a minimum threshold to collect sales taxes has garnered support from some businesses and organizations;

Whereas, despite the progress states have made in simplifying state sales tax collection for remote sellers, there remain some inequities between the burden of tax collection obligations imposed upon sellers with physical presence and the burdens those same obligations would impose on remote sellers serving consumers in multiple states without physical presence;

Whereas, any federal legislation should be fair to both in-state and remote sellers, whether such legislation requires sales and use taxes to be collected on a point-of-sale or point-of-delivery basis; and

Whereas, the state of Utah has adopted or supports, and Congress is considering, the following items in federal legislation:

1. State-provided or state-certified tax collection and remittance software that is simple to implement and maintain, and paid for by states;

2. Immunity from civil lawsuits for retailers utilizing state-provided or state-certified software in tax collection and remittance;

3. Tax audit accountability to a single state tax audit authority;

4. Elimination of interstate tax complexity by streamlining taxable good categories;

5. Adoption of a meaningful small business exception so that small, remote seller businesses are not adversely affected; and

6. Fair compensation to the tax-collecting retailer, taking into account such elements as the exchange fees retailers are charged for consumer credit card transactions, which fees apply equally to any state taxes collected on the purchase of goods sold as well as the actual purchase amount;

Whereas, the Marketplace Fairness Act, currently introduced in the United States Senate as S. 336 and the United States House of Representatives as H.R. 684, helps level the playing field between remote sellers and main street sellers by requiring larger remote sales to collect the same sales and use taxes that the brick and mortar stores in Utah already collect;

Whereas, in *Quill Corp. v. North Dakota* (1992), the Supreme Court of the United States indicated that Congress has the ability to resolve this sales tax collection inequity between remote sellers and brick and mortar sellers;

Whereas, the Marketplace Fairness Act will provide states with the authority to require remote sellers to collect and remit the

sales tax due if the state is willing to make significant simplifications for sellers;

Whereas, Utah has already shown the way by adopting all the simplifications and uniformity standards required in the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement;

Whereas, these simplifications, along with the ease of reporting through recent technological advances, have removed the obstacles to remote sellers collecting sales taxes just like any other retailer;

Whereas, this is evidenced by the fact that over 1,800 sellers have voluntarily registered to collect the taxes in the states, including Utah, that have conformed their laws to the requirements of the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement;

Whereas, there is an urgent need to pass this long overdue legislation to level the playing field for all retailers;

Whereas, the legislation is about fairness, simplification, and stemming the erosion of state sales tax systems;

Whereas, that both houses of Congress have agreed on the approach and legislative language indicates there is a readiness to take this important step to safeguard state sales tax systems;

Whereas, although purchasers still owe a corresponding use tax on taxable purchases from remote retailers, most individuals are either not aware of this requirement or choose to ignore it;

Whereas, while the Internet was essentially unknown to consumers in 1992, the loophole identified in the Quill Corp. v. North Dakota decision points out the competitive advantage online and mail order merchants have over traditional brick and mortar stores that are required to collect and remit sales tax from their customers; and

Whereas, no compelling reason exists for government to continue to give remote sales retailers a competitive advantage over in-state merchants who live and work in a community, hire employees, and pay taxes;

Whereas, the United States Congress should act now so businesses compete on the basis of price and service, not on the ability of one form or retailer to avoid collecting taxes;

Whereas, the Marketplace Fairness Act would give states the authority to require remote sellers with more than \$1 million in total remote sales in the preceding calendar year to collect their state's sales and use tax on sales to customers; and

Whereas, the Marketplace Fairness Act identifies minimum simplification requirements a state must enact before it can require remote sellers to collect its sales and use taxes, making it easier for the remote sellers to comply with the laws of multiple states: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah urges Congress to enact S. 336 and H.R. 684 to authorize states, consistent with this resolution and principles of taxation espoused by national associations of legislators and governors, and subject to the enactment of any necessary state laws, to establish true fairness in state tax collection for both retailers having physical presence in a state and retailers who are remote sellers; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah, having addressed the principles of fairness outlined in this resolution, urges Congress to require all retailers whose sales to consumers exceed a minimum threshold to collect and remit applicable sales taxes on sales in the state; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the members of the United States

House of Representatives and to the members of the United States Senate.

POM-91. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Utah urging the United States Congress to repeal portions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE RESOLUTION

Whereas, sections 9010 and 10905 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and section 1406 of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act, impose an unprecedented new tax on health insurance that numerous policy experts agree will be passed on to individuals, working families, small employers, and senior citizens, contradicting a primary goal of health reform by making care more expensive;

Whereas, the health insurance tax will cause premiums on the individual market to rise an average of \$2,150 for individuals and \$5,080 for families nationally over 10 years and will increase premiums for families over \$4,305 over 10 years;

Whereas, the health insurance tax will impact small employers over the next 10 years, reducing private sector jobs by 125,000;

Whereas, 59% of these lost jobs will come from small businesses;

Whereas, potential sales will be reduced by at least \$18 billion, 50% of which will come from small businesses;

Whereas, in the state of Utah, premiums for small employers will increase by an average of \$2,173 per employer over 10 years and premiums for large employers will increase by an average of \$2,400 over 10 years;

Whereas, the health insurance tax will impact Medicare Advantage beneficiaries in the state of Utah by costing an average of \$2,926 in additional premiums and reduced benefits over 10 years;

Whereas, the health insurance tax will impact Medicaid beneficiaries in the state of Utah enrolled in a coordinated care program by costing an average of \$1,506 over 10 years, putting pressure on already strained state budgets, decreasing benefits, and potentially creating coverage disruption; and

Whereas, higher premiums are a disincentive for everyone to obtain insurance coverage, particularly younger, healthier people who are likely to drop their policy if it becomes too expensive, further eroding the risk pool and making coverage less affordable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the state of Utah strongly urges the United States Congress to enact legislation to repeal the health insurance tax, sections 9010 and 10905 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and section 1406 of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act, to make health care more affordable for working families, individuals, and businesses; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of Utah's congressional delegation.

POM-92. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Kansas recognizing the many contributions made by the citizens of the Republic of Azerbaijan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 6022

Whereas, The Republic of Azerbaijan and the United States of America are long-stand-

ing allies, both dearly cherishing the universal values of freedom, democracy and human rights; and

Whereas, The State of Kansas and the Republic of Azerbaijan enjoy a strong, vibrant and mutually beneficial economic relationship with the prospect of further growth; and

Whereas, It is the custom of the State of Kansas to welcome all who come to our state, especially those who come in the interest of friendship and commerce; and

Whereas, It is the policy of the Kansas House of Representatives to recognize the contributions of our allies and the value of maintaining beneficial relationships with the allies of the United States of America, including the contributions made by the Republic of Azerbaijan and the value of our positive relationship with this ally: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas: That we recognize the many contributions made by the citizens of the Republic of Azerbaijan and that it is in the best interest of the State of Kansas to promote relationships with Azerbaijan.

POM-93. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania supporting those peaceful political actions that will result in the final reunification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 53

Whereas, Ireland and its people comprise an ancient and distinct island nation, and the people of Ireland have a right and the responsibility to govern themselves; and

Whereas, Human and civil rights derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed" and are best guaranteed by people freely elected by democratic means to an independent government; and

Whereas, The logic of history, international law, human rights and peaceful political actions dictate the reunification of the island of Ireland, and the reality of the moment in the Peace Process, the Good Friday Agreement, the Desolved Assembly and the development of the All-Ireland institutions of governance attest to this momentum; and

Whereas, In the past, the General Assembly adopted the MacBride Principles for Northern Ireland and strongly endorsed passage of the Good Friday Agreement among the parties, in part because of the dedication and bipartisan support of three separate presidents of the United States, in seeing the Good Friday Agreement to fruition and formation of the Assembly; and

Whereas, The contributions of the Irish born and Irish Americans to the United States of America and this Commonwealth are legion; and

Whereas, The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is home to a significant percentage of Americans whose ancestors migrated in times of famine and war to seek a better life, but in whose hearts still desire peace and unification for their ancestral home: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of Pennsylvania strongly support a United Ireland by supporting those peaceful political actions that will result in the final reunification of Ireland; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States; the United States Secretary of State; all members of the Pennsylvania Congressional Delegation; the Governor of Pennsylvania; and the Taoiseach and President of Ireland; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Ambassador to Ireland, who shall be urged to transmit a copy to the United States Ambassador to Great Britain and to Great Britain's Ambassador to the United States.

POM-94. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to observe the California Week of Remembrance for the Armenian Genocide by participating in the Armenian Genocide Commemorative Project; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas, The Armenian Genocide of 1915-1923 was the first genocide of the 20th century, in which 1.5 million men, women, and children lost their lives at the hands of the Turkish Ottoman Empire in their attempt to systematically eliminate the Armenian race; and

Whereas, In their 3,000 year historic homeland in Asia Minor, Armenians were subjected to severe and unjust persecution and brutality by the Turkish rulers of the Ottoman Empire before and after the turn of the 20th century, including widespread acts of destruction and murder during the period from 1894 to 1896, inclusive, and again in 1909; and

Whereas, The massacre of the Armenians constituted one of the most atrocious violations of human rights in the history of the world; and

Whereas, Adolph Hitler, in persuading his army commanders that the merciless persecution and killing of Jews, Poles, and other people would bring no retribution, declared, "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"; and

Whereas, Unlike other people and governments that have admitted and denounced the abuses and crimes of predecessor regimes, and despite the overwhelming proof of genocidal intent, the Republic of Turkey has inexplicably and adamantly denied the occurrence of the crimes against humanity committed by the Ottoman and Young Turk rulers, and those denials compound the grief of the few remaining survivors of the atrocities, desecrate the memory of the victims, and cause continuing pain to the descendants of the victims; and

Whereas, Leaders of nations with strategic, commercial, and cultural ties to the Republic of Turkey should be reminded of their duty to encourage Turkish officials to cease efforts to distort facts and deny the history of events surrounding the Armenian Genocide; and

Whereas, The determination of those who continue to speak the truth about the Armenian Genocide is tested to this day with some of these speakers of truth being silenced by violent means; and

Whereas, The accelerated level and scope of denial and revisionism, coupled with the passage of time and the fact that very few survivors remain who can serve as reminders of indescribable brutality and tormented lives, compel a sense of urgency in efforts to solidify recognition of historical truth; and

Whereas, By consistently remembering and forcefully condemning the atrocities committed against the Armenians, and honoring the survivors as well as other victims of similar heinous conduct, we guard against repetition of such acts of genocide and provide the American public with a greater understanding of its heritage; and

Whereas, This measure would provide that the Legislature deplores the persistent, on-

going efforts by any person in this country or abroad to deny the historical fact of the Armenian Genocide; and

Whereas, California is home to the largest Armenian-American population in the United States, and Armenians living in California have enriched our state through their leadership in business, agriculture, academia, government, and the arts; and

Whereas, The State of California has been at the forefront of encouraging and promoting a curriculum relating to human rights and genocide in order to empower future generations to prevent recurrence of the crime of genocide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the State of California commends its conscientious educators who teach about human rights and genocide; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby designates the week of April 18 to 24, 2013, as "California Week of Remembrance for the Armenian Genocide of 1915-1923"; and be it further

Resolved, That California commemorates California Week of Remembrance for the Armenian Genocide through the Armenian Genocide Commemorative Project; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of California respectfully calls upon the Congress and the President of the United States to act likewise and to formally and consistently recognize and reaffirm the historical truth that the atrocities committed against the Armenian people constituted genocide; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature calls upon the Republic of Turkey to acknowledge the facts of the Armenian Genocide and to work toward a just resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, Members of the United States Congress, the Governor, and the Turkish Ambassador to the United States.

POM-95. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts reaffirming the friendship between the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, the United States and Taiwan share a most important relationship supported by the 2 countries' common values and support for freedom, democracy and a commitment to a free market economy; and

Whereas, the President of Taiwan, Ma Ying-Jeou, has worked tirelessly to uphold democratic principles in Taiwan, ensure the prosperity of Taiwan's 23 million people, promote Taiwan's international standing and further improve relations between the United States and Taiwan; and

Whereas, the United States and Taiwan, and especially the Commonwealth, share a historically close relationship marked by strong bilateral trade, educational and cultural exchange, scientific and technological interests and tourism; and

Whereas, Taiwan is a member of the United States Visa Waiver Program, reflecting the cooperation shared between the 2 countries and making travel between Taiwan and the United States for business and tourism more convenient; and

Whereas, the United States ranks as Taiwan's third largest trading partner and Taiwan was the eleventh largest trading partner of the United States in 2012; and

Whereas, bilateral trade in goods and services between the United States and Taiwan

reached \$85 billion in 2011 and the New England region exported approximately \$1.4 billion in goods to Taiwan, of which, \$956 million was exported from the Commonwealth; and

Whereas, Taiwan is the seventeenth largest trading economy in the world and a member of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, or Apec Forum, which promotes free trade and economic cooperation throughout the Asia-Pacific region: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts General Court seeks to reaffirm the friendship between the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Taiwan; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the clerk of the Senate to the Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States, to the Massachusetts Delegation of the United States Congress, to the Honorable Deval Patrick, Governor of the Commonwealth, to the Honorable Ma Yingjeou, President of Taiwan and to Anne Hung, Director-General of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in Boston.

POM-96. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging careful review of the proposed underground nuclear waste repository in Ontario, Canada, and memorializing the United States Congress to do all it can to see that Michigan's concerns are fully addressed; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 58

Whereas, Ontario Power Generation is proposing to construct an underground, long-term burial facility for all of Ontario's low- and intermediate-level radioactive waste at the Bruce Nuclear Generating Station, some of which is long-lived intermediate waste. This site, less than a mile inland from the shore of Lake Huron and about 440 yards below the lake level, is approximately 120 miles upstream from the main drinking water intakes for Southeast Michigan; and

Whereas, Lake Huron and the other Great Lakes are critically important resources to both the United States and Canada. The Great Lakes contain 95 percent of North America's surface fresh water and provide drinking water to tens of millions of people. Pristine water is important to fishing, boating, recreation, tourism, and agriculture in Michigan and throughout the region. Agriculture, commercial and sport fisheries, shipping, recreation, and tourism are important components of the Great Lakes economy. This proposal to place a permanent nuclear waste burial facility so close to the Great Lakes raises serious concerns; and

Whereas, As part of an effort to protect water quality, Michigan's siting criteria for the disposal of low-level radioactive waste prohibits any site located within ten miles of Lake Michigan, Lake Superior, Lake Huron, Lake Erie, the Saint Mary's River, the Detroit River, the St. Clair River, or Lake St. Clair. It also excludes sites located within a 500-year floodplain, located over a sole source aquifer, or located where the hydrogeology beneath the site discharges groundwater to the land surface within 3,000 feet of the boundaries of the site. We encourage Canada to consider similar siting criteria; and

Whereas, International agreements between the United States and Canada state that radiological contamination should be reduced and emphasize the concept of prevention. We encourage Canada, as part of its public review process, to make known the steps that have been or will be taken to fulfill the requirements of these agreements; and

Whereas, Siting an underground nuclear waste repository in limestone, as proposed by Ontario Power Generation, is the first of its kind. The environmental impact statement for this proposed nuclear waste burial facility noted that the acceptability of an alternative site was "unknown." We encourage the use of sound scientific principles and analyses in determining whether this geologic formation is appropriate for the safe long-term storage of radioactive waste and that before making any further approvals of this proposed facility, this scientific data, along with information regarding the alternative sites that were considered, be made available; and

Whereas, Given the proximity and potential impact to many Michigan residents, we urge Canadian and Ontario officials, along with all relevant governmental agencies, to ensure open communication and information sharing with Michigan citizens about this proposal and to possibly consider extending the public comment period: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge Canadian officials to thoroughly review the proposed underground nuclear waste repository in Ontario, Canada, including the issues raised herein, and we memorialize the United States Congress to do all it can to see that Michigan's concerns are fully addressed; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Prime Minister of Canada, the Premier of Ontario, the President of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, the Chairman of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-97. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas, in the late 1950s, the United States began sending advisors to help train the South Vietnamese Army and Air Force to withstand the onslaught from Communist North Vietnam;

Whereas, the Military Assistance and Advisory Group (MAAG), along with 700 other U.S. military advisors, worked for eight years to train the South Vietnamese for conventional warfare;

Whereas, on October 11, 1961, President John F. Kennedy authorized a detachment from the 4400th Combat Crew Training Squadron to deploy to South Vietnam as Project Farm Gate;

Whereas, Operation Mule Train, begun in January 1962, was designed to drop supplies to isolated outposts and transport parachutists into areas controlled by the Vietcong;

Whereas, at the request of South Vietnam's President, the United States Air Force was directed to spray the Vietnamese countryside with an aerial herbicide that would strip the jungles of all foliage and eliminate the cover and available food for the North Vietnamese;

Whereas, this action, named Operation Ranch Hand, began in 1962;

Whereas, arguments in Washington erupted on whether the spraying actually did any good, or whether the Americans and the South Vietnamese governments were risking the loyalty of the South Vietnamese people whose livelihoods were also at risk;

Whereas, President Kennedy allowed the spraying, but only under limited conditions and as long as crops were not damaged;

Whereas, the planes that dropped the herbicide were modified to carry and spray the defoliants to only attack areas of the jungle where combatants could hide, but by 1971 the policy had changed and even crops were sprayed;

Whereas, the operation continued for nine years and affected 36% of the mangrove forest and 20% of the jungles of South Vietnam;

Whereas, this operation began the controversy over the effects of the defoliant Agent Orange on humans, which continues today;

Whereas, in August 1964, two U.S. destroyers, the USS Turner Joy and the USS Maddox, were performing surveillance patrols in conjunction with the South Vietnamese Navy along the North Vietnamese coast in the Gulf of Tonkin;

Whereas, North Vietnam claimed a 12-mile territorial zone off its coastline, but the United States only recognized a 3-mile border and allowed its ships to sail within 11 miles of the coast;

Whereas, when ships would come into range, the North Vietnamese radar sites on shore would activate and the South Vietnamese Navy would then harass the installations with gunfire;

Whereas, in retaliation, the North Vietnamese Navy sent out several torpedo boats on an attack, which proved unsuccessful;

Whereas, when President Lyndon B. Johnson received notification of the incident, he ordered the first American air strikes against North Vietnamese naval bases;

Whereas, a few days later, Congress passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, which gave President Johnson the authority to increase America's involvement in Vietnam;

Whereas, in February 1965, President Johnson ordered a series of reprisal air strikes after several attacks on U.S. bases by Vietcong units;

Whereas, a series of paved and unpaved roads, rivers, and sometimes narrow footpaths through dense jungle, commonly referred to as the Ho Chi Minh Trail, were being utilized by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong armies to smuggle supplies and troops back and forth from North and South Vietnam;

Whereas, this intricate transportation system stretched throughout the mountains along the Vietnamese-Laos-Cambodia borders and was a large problem for the South Vietnamese and U.S. forces;

Whereas, cutting off the Ho Chi Minh Trail, often called the "Secret War," was controversial because it often entailed constant air strikes to areas in Laos and Cambodia, which were neutral countries, and these tactics were not known to most Americans;

Whereas, after several attacks upon United States Air Force bases, 3,500 United States Marines were dispatched to South Vietnam on March 8, 1965;

Whereas, this marked the beginning of the American ground war, and public opinion at the time overwhelmingly supported the deployment;

Whereas, the initial deployment of 3,500 Marines increased to nearly 200,000 American military personnel by December of 1965;

Whereas, that same month, South Vietnamese forces suffered heavy losses in a battle that both sides viewed as a watershed, and American leaders responded by developing plans for U.S. troops to move from a defensive strategy to an offensive approach to the escalating war;

Whereas, the bombing campaigns that began in 1964, which were intended to force

North Vietnam to cease its support for the National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam, escalated significantly by the end of 1966;

Whereas, where ground combat was sometimes made complicated by unconventional military opposition and difficult terrain, U.S. air superiority remained constant, and throughout the Vietnam War, various policies and strategies were put in place by the U.S. military to take advantage of that strength;

Whereas, over the course of the conflict, U.S. forces dropped over 7 million tons of bombs through Southeast Asia, compared to only about 2 million tons dropped during all of World War II;

Whereas, geared towards suppressing the Pathet Lao's Communist guerrillas in Northern Laos, Operation Barrel Roll, a heavily covert operation, was initiated to provide air support for the Royal Laotian Army, and included the first bombings in Laos in support of the war against North Vietnam;

Whereas, another interdiction effort, Operation Steel Tiger, was aimed at destroying the North Vietnamese flow of supplies and troops along the Ho Chi Minh Trail and involved heavy covert bombing in Southeastern Laos;

Whereas, Operation Tiger Hound, initiated in support of both Barrel Roll and Steel Tiger, focused solely on disrupting movement along the Ho Chi Minh Trail on the lower portion of the Laotian panhandle and was initiated by the South Vietnamese Air Force and by United States Air Force units based in South Vietnam;

Whereas, what was expected to be the usual two-day cease-fire in observance of Tet Nguyen Dan, the lunar New Year and the most important Vietnamese holiday, became an opportunity for the North Vietnamese Army and Vietcong to strike;

Whereas, this large, well-coordinated surprise campaign on cities and U.S. targets throughout South Vietnam, named the Tet Offensive, was North Vietnam's attempt to end the war in one swift blow;

Whereas, the morning of January 31, 1968, saw many provincial capitals and cities such as Saigon and Hue under siege from large numbers of Communist fighters who had apparently infiltrated the South in the months and weeks leading up to the planned offensive;

Whereas, U.S. and South Vietnamese forces, initially unprepared and overwhelmed, countered many of the attacks, and eventually gained back control by early March of all areas where the Vietcong were entrenched;

Whereas, in the aftermath, many cities and towns in South Vietnam were devastated, with thousands of casualties sustained by forces and civilians in the South;

Whereas, the Tet Offensive was evidence of North Vietnam's ability to stage a large-scale attack;

Whereas, this turning point in the war would lead to a change in approach by political and military leadership, and change the way many in the United States viewed the war from home;

Whereas, the first major bombing campaign on North Vietnamese territory, Operation Rolling Thunder was intended to place heavy military pressure on the North Vietnamese leaders and reduce their ability and desire to wage war against the U.S.-supported South Vietnamese government;

Whereas, from 1965 to 1968, about 643,000 tons of bombs were dropped on North Vietnam;

Whereas, leading up to the Tet Offensive, widespread protests and demonstrations against U.S. involvement and the continued loss of American lives were already taking place in the United States;

Whereas, beginning in 1964, these protests and demonstrations led to a polarization of Americans, with one side continuing to support America's role in Southeast Asia and the other preaching peace and the end to U.S. operations in the region;

Whereas, although most demonstrations were peaceful, some were highlighted by violence and, whether instigated by protestors or police, these confrontational events often received more attention than the war itself;

Whereas, the North Vietnamese-led Tet Offensive in early 1968 brought a new wave of criticism from the American public as images of those events shocked many across the nation;

Whereas, with many news outlets publicizing the horrors encountered in South Vietnam during that period, as well as the depiction of the attack on the American Embassy in Saigon, many Americans questioned the ability of the United States to resolve the conflict by use of military intervention and the validity of previous reports of successful operations in the region;

Whereas, Operation Menu was a highly secretive bombing campaign of Communist-supported supply bases in Cambodia that the North Vietnamese used in aiding attacks on South Vietnam;

Whereas, these controversial B-52 bombing raids in neutral Cambodia, authorized by President Richard Nixon, continued until 1973 when information about those raids was leaked and the devastation to the region was exposed;

Whereas, public protests increased, and on May 4, 1970, the Ohio National Guard fired on Kent State University students, killing four students, during a protest against President Nixon for sending American troops into Cambodia;

Whereas, the killings resulted in a nationwide student strike;

Whereas, the Vietnam War was the central issue of the 1972 presidential election, with President Nixon's opponent, George McGovern, campaigning on a platform of withdrawal from Vietnam;

Whereas, starting in 1969, President Nixon's National Security Adviser, Henry Kissinger, carried on secret negotiations with North Vietnamese officials;

Whereas, in October 1972, an agreement was reached, but South Vietnamese President Nguyen Van Thieu demanded massive changes to the peace proposal;

Whereas, with negotiations deadlocked, President Nixon approved Operation Linebacker II, a massive bombing campaign by B-52 strategic bombers aimed at reassuring the South Vietnamese and forcing the North Vietnamese back to the negotiating table;

Whereas, in just 11 days, over 49,000 tons of bombs were dropped on North Vietnam, devastating the country and forcing North Vietnam back to the table;

Whereas, on January 15, 1973, President Richard Nixon announced the suspension of offensive action against North Vietnam;

Whereas, the Paris Peace Accords, the agreement signed on January 27, 1973, between North Vietnam and the United States and South Vietnam, effectively ended the conflict and began the complete withdrawal of American troops;

Whereas, the key provisions of the agreement included a cease-fire throughout Vietnam, withdrawal of U.S. combat forces, the

release of prisoners of war, and the reunification of North and South Vietnam through peaceful means;

Whereas, the South Vietnamese government was to remain in place until new elections were held, and North Vietnamese forces in the South were not to advance further or be reinforced;

Whereas, little more than two months after the peace agreement, U.S. combat troops left Vietnam;

Whereas, Operation Homecoming, a result of the Paris Peace Accords, made possible the return of nearly 600 American prisoners of war (POWs) held by North Vietnam;

Whereas, groups of released POWs were selected on the basis of their length of time in prison, with the first group consisting of POWs that had spent six to eight years as prisoners of war;

Whereas, after Operation Homecoming, about 1,350 Americans were still listed as prisoners of war or missing in action, and another 1,200 Americans were reported killed in action without their bodies being recovered;

Whereas, these missing personnel would become the subject of an intense search by the United States Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, with many remains of missing personnel located and returned in the decades since;

Whereas, following the refusal of Congress to fund additional U.S. activity in Vietnam, all American troops and equipment were withdrawn from Vietnam;

Whereas, Communist leaders in the North had expected that the cease-fire terms would favor their side, but even before the last American combat troops departed on March 29, 1973, the Communists violated the cease-fire;

Whereas, in Saigon, approximately 7,000 United States Department of Defense civilian employees remained behind to aid South Vietnam in conducting what was beginning to look like a fierce and ongoing war with Communist North Vietnam;

Whereas, Saigon, bolstered by a surge of U.S. aid received just before the cease-fire went into effect, at first started to push back the Vietcong, but by early 1974, full-scale warfare had resumed;

Whereas, the Vietcong recaptured the territory it lost during the previous dry season, and during the rest of 1974 Communist forces took possession of additional areas in the South;

Whereas, at the end of 1974, South Vietnamese authorities reported that 80,000 soldiers and civilians had been killed, making it the costliest year of the war;

Whereas, in the spring of 1975, 20 divisions of the North Vietnamese Army invaded South Vietnam;

Whereas, South Vietnamese forces fell back in disorder and panic, abandoning air bases, weapons, aircraft, fuel, and ammunition, and on April 29, 1975, Communist forces reached Saigon, the South Vietnamese capital, and quickly overran the city;

Whereas, South Vietnam formally surrendered the next day;

Whereas, April 30, 1975, also saw the last American civilians and military personnel still in South Vietnam airlifted out of Saigon by U.S. support forces;

Whereas, statistics from the 1970 census indicate that 27,910 Utahns served in Vietnam;

Whereas, 388 Utahns were killed, 14 are still listed as missing in action, and many more were wounded during their service;

Whereas, a new exhibit, which honors and pays tribute to the sacrifices of POWs during the Vietnam War, opened September 12, 2012, at the Hill Air Force Base museum; and

Whereas, it is fitting that in the 50th year since the beginning of the conflict Utahns reflect on the Vietnam War and its legacy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, recognize the 50th Anniversary of the Vietnam War and those who fought, suffered, and died in the conflict; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor urge the citizens of Utah to reflect on the service and sacrifice of many during the Vietnam War; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Veterans of Foreign Wars USA, the United States Department of Veterans Affairs, the Utah Department of Veterans' Affairs, the Hill Air Force Base museum, and the members of Utah's congressional delegation.

POM-98. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah recognizing Israel's legal, historical, and moral right of self-governance and self-defense; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas, the Jewish people have a long standing connection to the land of Israel;

Whereas, the claim and presence of the Jewish people in Israel has remained constant throughout the past 4,000 years;

Whereas, Israel declared its independence and self-governance on May 14, 1948, with the goal of reestablishing a homeland for the Jewish people;

Whereas, the United States, having been the first nation to recognize Israel as an independent nation and as Israel's principal ally, has enjoyed a close and mutually beneficial relationship with Israel and her people;

Whereas, Israel is the greatest friend and ally of the United States in the Middle East and the two countries enjoy strong bonds and common values;

Whereas, there are those in the Middle East who, since the time of Israel's inception as a state, have continually sought to destroy Israel;

Whereas, Israel and the United States have similar goals of democracy and stability in the Middle East; and

Whereas, Utah and Israel have enjoyed a cordial and mutually beneficial relationship since 1948, a friendship that continues to strengthen with each passing year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, commend Israel for its cordial and mutually beneficial relationship with the United States and with the state of Utah; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor express support for Israel in its legal, historical, and moral right of self-governance and self-defense upon its lands; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor recognize that Israel is not an attacking force of other nations, and that peace can be afforded the region only through combined efforts and trust; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Embassy of Israel to the United States, the President of the United States, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of Utah's congressional delegation.

POM-99. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah urging the

President of the United States and the United States Congress to support free trade with Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 12

Whereas, the state of Utah is proud of the sister-state relationship it has enjoyed with Taiwan since 1980;

Whereas, Taiwan, as a full-fledged democracy, shares the same values of freedom, democracy, human rights, open market, peace, and prosperity with the United States;

Whereas, Taiwan is currently the 18th largest exporter as well as importer, the United States' 10th largest trading partner, and the 6th largest agricultural products market;

Whereas, despite being a member of the World Trade Organization since 2002 and a faithful ally and an important strategic partner of the United States, Taiwan has yet to sign a free trade agreement with the United States;

Whereas, approximately 580,000 people from Taiwan visit the United States annually, and Taiwanese airline carriers currently have more than 40 flights destined for the United States weekly, carrying more than 5,000 passengers daily for business, tourism, study, and other purposes;

Whereas, Taiwanese airlines fly to every corner of the globe and Taiwan aims to ensure that all aspects of its aviation sector conform to the standard formulated by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) for safety and security;

Whereas, for the past 40 years, however, Taiwan has not been able to enter or meaningfully participate in the ICAO;

Whereas, this hampers Taiwan's voluntary efforts to comply with the ICAO standards due to lack of timely and comprehensive information;

Whereas, Taiwan has recently promoted an East China Sea Peace Initiative, a commendable effort to ease tensions that might seriously endanger peace and prosperity in the region; and

Whereas, resolving disputes in the East China Sea in a rational and peaceful manner is in the best interests of all parties in the region and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah reaffirms the friendship, and encourages the sister-state relationship, between Utah and Taiwan; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature urges the President of the United States and the United States Congress to support a free trade agreement with Taiwan and support Taiwan's participation in multilateral free trade negotiations; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature expresses its continued support for Taiwan's meaningful participation in United Nations specialized organizations, conventions, and programs, such as acquiring an observer status in the International Civil Aviation Organization; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature welcomes Taiwan's initiative for peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific Region and urges all parties concerned in East China Sea disputes to refrain from any antagonistic actions and resolve their differences through open dialogue and other peaceful means; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the Republic of China on Taiwan, and the members of Utah's congressional delegation.

POM-100. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska opposing

the United States Food and Drug Administration's preliminary finding relating to genetically engineered salmon; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas the United States Food and Drug Administration recently announced the release of a draft environmental assessment and preliminary finding of no significant impact concerning genetically engineered AquaBounty AquAdvantage salmon; and

Whereas the state has bountiful fisheries that provide wild, natural, and sustainable seafood; and

Whereas Alaska seafood is naturally high in essential vitamins, including vitamins E, C, D, and A, and minerals, including zinc, iron, calcium, and selenium; and

Whereas fish habitat in the state is cleaner than fish habitat in other locations; and

Whereas fisheries are a vital component of the state's economy; and

Whereas the state's fisheries are managed to ensure that Alaska seafood continues to be the finest in the world for future generations; and

Whereas, in 2009, 95 percent of pacific salmon landings in the United States occurred in the state; and

Whereas, in 2012, 124,000,000 salmon were harvested in the state, for a value of \$505,000,000; and

Whereas Alaska ports consistently rank among the top ports in the United States based on volume and ex-vessel value for various fisheries, including salmon; and

Whereas the state's fishing industry provides over 70,000 jobs annually and is the second largest source of private sector employment in the state; and

Whereas the United States Food and Drug Administration is accepting comments on the proposal to allow, for the first time, a genetically modified organism to be sold for human consumption; and

Whereas the inevitable accidental release of transgenic fish into the wild could devastate native fish populations and ecosystems; and

Whereas citizens and public interest groups overwhelmingly oppose genetically engineered food and have submitted over 400,000 public comments opposing genetically engineered salmon; and

Whereas the United States Food and Drug Administration has not conducted adequate testing to determine the long-term safety of consuming genetically engineered salmon; and

Whereas the sale of genetically engineered salmon could imperil the state's fishing industry; and

Whereas seven members of the United States Senate continue to have concerns about AquaBounty's proposal and the United States Food and Drug Administration's review of the proposal; and

Whereas the United States Food and Drug Administration's review applies only to a limited set of production and rearing facilities and fails to consider the broader applications of this technology that would assuredly occur should final approval be granted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature urges the United States Food and Drug Administration not to make a final decision regarding genetically engineered salmon until the United States Congress has fully examined the issue and the potential release of genetically engineered fish into the waters of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature opposes AquaBounty's petition to

produce AquAdvantage Salmon, a genetically engineered salmon; and be it further

Resolved, That, if the petition is approved by the United States Food and Drug Administration, despite strong environmental and human health concerns, product labeling requirements must include, as required by Alaska law, the words "Genetically Modified" prominently displayed on the front of the product's packaging.

POM-101. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the United States Congress to oppose section 8 of H.R. 1919; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, Section 8 of H.R. 1919, "An Act to Amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act," allows prescription drug manufacturers to decide to supply drug information labels only by electronic means, as opposed to the paper labels currently accompanying prescription drugs upon receipt; and

Whereas, a similar provision is not contained in the United States Senate's version of the bill; and

Whereas, the United States Congress addressed electronic labeling in 2012 and directed the United States Government Accountability Office to study the potential advantages and associated risks of this labeling and the results of the study are due to be released in July 2013; and

Whereas, Congress should await the results of the study it ordered to be undertaken before passing legislation that would require critical medical information, such as information on dangerous side effects and contraindications, to be made available to health care professionals and prescription drug consumers only by electronic means; and

Whereas, Maine would be disproportionately negatively affected by Section 8 of H.R. 1919; and

Whereas, as of 2011, 16.3% of Maine's population was over 65 years of age, compared to only 13.3% for the nation as a whole; and

Whereas, due to its geography, climate and highly dispersed and rural population, significant areas of Maine do not have reliable access to the Internet; and

Whereas, Maine relies on the forest products industry to create and maintain jobs and sustainably manage Maine's forests, and that industry would be negatively affected by Section 8 of H.R. 1919 without further study of the effects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, the Members of the One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Legislature now assembled in the First Regular Session, on behalf of the people we represent, take this opportunity to urge and request that Section 8 of H.R. 1919 not be passed until the Government Accountability Office study on the effects of required electronic-only labeling for prescription medications is published, reviewed and considered; and be it further

Resolved, That We urge and request that this section of the bill not become law without further consideration and mitigation of the disproportionate negative effects on Maine's elderly, rural and highly dispersed population; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM-102. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California supporting the congressional action to reverse

the suspension of new student enrollments in the Job Corps; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 13

Whereas, the State of California serves the largest proportion of Job Corps students administered by the United States Department of Labor. Currently, there are seven Job Corps centers located in California in the Cities of Long Beach, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, and San Jose; and

Whereas, these seven Job Corps centers provide a vital piece of California's workforce development system by serving 5,373 disadvantaged youth between 16 and 24 years of age, inclusive, by providing high school diplomas and career technical education to young men and women, all of whom come from very low income households and are unemployed or underemployed; and

Whereas, in addition to academic and employment training, these Job Corps centers provide social skills training and other services to empower these young men and women to obtain and hold a job, enroll in advanced training, attend college, or enter the Armed Forces to defend the interests of the United States around the world; and

Whereas, over 8,000 former dropouts have received fully accredited public high school diplomas at the Job Corps centers and thousands more unemployed youth have received career training and job placement assistance; and

Whereas, the young men and women who participate in the Job Corps gain entry level job skills for well-paying careers in construction, health care, culinary arts, security services, and other employment sectors vital to California's economy; and

Whereas, recent studies demonstrate a significant economic gain from funds invested in dropout recovery by increasing employment, raising individual earnings, improving home and auto sales, increased job and economic growth, greater spending and investments, and tax revenues, and significant reductions in health care costs, crime prevention and corrections expenditures, and other social services provided by California; and

Whereas, the National Job Corps Association reports that the combined economic activity stimulated by the Job Corps centers in California is two hundred forty-three million seven hundred twenty-six thousand five hundred nineteen dollars (\$243,726,519), and that 2,971 local jobs are created by the operation of the Job Corps centers in California; and

Whereas, the United States Department of Labor is entrusted to serve the disadvantaged youth in America. However, the United States Department of Labor recently decided to suspend all new student enrollments to Job Corps centers in California and throughout the 125 Job Corps centers serving the nation, which would prevent as many as 30,000 otherwise eligible young men and women from receiving diplomas and job training; and

Whereas, recent decisions of the United States Department of Labor to implement a 93-day suspension of new student enrollment and a 21-percent reduction in funding for future enrollments appear to be inequitably balancing a budget shortfall on the backs of disadvantaged youth it is entrusted to serve when other alternatives are available for closing the shortfall; and

Whereas, seventy-one members of the United States House of Representatives and 17 members of the United States Senate have sent a bipartisan letter asking Acting Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Labor, Seth

D. Harris, to reverse the suspension of new student enrollments in order to protect the opportunities provided to the nation's most disadvantaged youth and to prevent further economic damage to the communities served by the Job Corps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature supports the United States congressional action to reverse the suspension of new student enrollments in the Job Corps, to prevent any limits to student enrollment until other cost-saving measures have been exhausted, and to maintain the full range of educational and employment services provided by the Job Corps; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

POM-103. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging and requesting the Department of Health and Hospitals examine the benefits of routine nutritional screening and therapeutic nutrition treatment for those who are malnourished or at risk for malnutrition; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 41

Whereas, the National Black Caucus of State Legislators (NBCSL) has established policy promoting the importance of quality nutrition for all Americans in order to maintain healthy, active, independent lifestyles; and

Whereas, the NBCSL adopted policy supporting increased access to quality nutrition and support for infants and children, as passed by the United States Congress in Resolution HHS-11-19; and

Whereas, leading health and nutrition experts agree that nutrition status is a direct measure of patient health and that good nutrition and good patient health can keep people healthy and out of institutionalized health care facilities, thus reducing healthcare costs; and

Whereas, inadequate or unbalanced nutrition, known as malnutrition, is not routinely viewed as a medical concern in this nation, and that malnutrition is particularly prevalent in vulnerable populations, such as older adults, hospitalized patients, or minority populations that statistically shoulder the highest incidences of the most severe chronic illnesses such as diabetes, kidney disease, and cardiovascular disease; and

Whereas, illness, injury, and malnutrition can result in the loss of lean body mass, leading to complications that impact good patient health outcomes, including recovery from surgery, illness, or disease; the elderly lose lean body mass more quickly and to a greater extent than younger adults and weight assessment (body weight and body mass index) can overlook accurate indicators of lean body mass; and

Whereas, the American Nursing Association defines therapeutic nutrition as the administration of food and fluids to support the metabolic processes of a patient who is malnourished or at high risk of becoming malnourished; and

Whereas, access to therapeutic nutrition is critical in restoring lean body mass such that it resolves malnutrition challenges and, in turn, improves clinical outcomes, reduces health care costs, and can keep people and our communities healthy; and

Whereas, despite the recognized link between good nutrition and good health, nutritional screening and therapeutic nutrition treatment have not been incorporated as routine medical treatments across the spectrum of health care: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana urges and requests that the Department of Health and Hospitals examine the benefits of routine nutritional screening and therapeutic nutrition treatment for those who are malnourished or at risk for malnutrition, as well as examine the benefits of nutrition screening and therapeutic nutrition treatment as part of the standard for evidenced-based hospital care; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana supports an increased emphasis on nutrition through the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act, as well as for Medicare beneficiaries, to improve their disease management and health outcomes; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana is encouraged that preventive and wellness services, such as counseling for obesity and chronic disease management, are part of the Essential Health Benefits package included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the president of the United States, the vice president of the United States, the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress, and to the secretary of the Department of Health and Hospitals.

POM-104. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah describing the impacts of the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act on Utah families, insurers, health care providers, and the state; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 10

Whereas, the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and its companion legislation, the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, referred to jointly as "the Affordable Care Act," "the ACA," or "Obamacare," were enacted in March 2010;

Whereas, under the ACA, Utah families, employers, manufacturers, and insurers will pay at least 18 new or increased taxes and fees that over 10 years will transfer \$500 billion from the private sector to the public sector, suppressing economic growth and reducing employment in the state;

Whereas, hundreds of Utah medical device companies will be subject to the ACA's excise tax on manufacturers and importers of certain medical devices, without regard for company profitability;

Whereas, the tax will threaten the viability of many firms and have a chilling effect on the very innovation needed to drive down health care costs and support economic growth in this state;

Whereas, Utahns will suffer further reductions in employment growth and economic activity as employers comply with uncompensated regulatory burdens imposed by the ACA;

Whereas, Utah families will also pay more for goods and services as employers, insurers, and medical providers pass along various costs imposed by the ACA;

Whereas, health insurance premiums for certain younger, healthier Utahns will more than double in 2014 as the result of various ACA provisions, including a prohibition on medical underwriting and restrictions on the use of age-based premiums;

Whereas, the cost of insurance for many other Utah families will go up as well in response to ACA provisions that are known to drive up costs, including prohibitions on pre-existing condition exclusions, annual benefit limits, and lifetime benefit limits;

Whereas, the ACA will penalize Utah employers that have more than 50 employees if they do not offer health insurance to their employees, even if an employer cannot afford insurance or chooses instead to compensate employees with higher wages, larger retirement contributions, or other employee benefits;

Whereas, working Utah families will have fewer full-time employment opportunities as employers replace full-time workers with part-time workers to avoid ACA penalties;

Whereas, some Utah families will be unable to keep their current health insurance and may have fewer options as employers abandon plans not meeting minimum benefit and affordability requirements in order to avoid ACA penalties;

Whereas, working Utah families will find it even harder to secure employment with health insurance benefits as premium increases continue unabated in response to both the ACA and long-term cost drivers not addressed by the ACA;

Whereas, many Utahns will face increased premiums as their insurers attempt to fund \$81 million in losses created by the ACA's transfer of individuals from publicly funded high-risk pools to the private insurance market;

Whereas, many Utah families with insurance offered by small or midsize employers could be threatened with higher premiums or no insurance at all if commercial insurance risk increases too much as the result of employers dropping coverage or switching to self-insurance arrangements;

Whereas, there is a high likelihood that many Utah families will experience higher premiums due to the ACA's minimum benefit requirements, which threaten to ratchet up plan costs both inside and outside health insurance exchanges;

Whereas, Utah families will pay higher insurance premiums because of ACA provisions that subsidize states with high-cost, poorly managed health care plans at the expense of states like Utah that have low-cost, better managed plans;

Whereas, Utah seniors will likely have fewer care options due to Medicare provider payment reductions made by the ACA;

Whereas, Medicaid enrollees will likely have greater difficulty making appointments with health care providers as Medicaid enrollment expands under the ACA, particularly after the two-year enhanced reimbursement rate for primary care providers ends;

Whereas, Utah hospitals will suffer as a result of ACA reductions in funds paid to hospitals that serve a disproportionate number of low-income individuals;

Whereas, Utah families will suffer if medical facilities close or medical practitioners leave their professions in response to the financial strain created by shrinking provider payments under the ACA;

Whereas, state funding for education, roads, public safety, and other important services will be crowded by a \$46 million annual liability to pay for the ACA's mandatory Medicaid eligibility expansion;

Whereas, we and our children must one day pay the price for entitlements Congress has created but failed to realistically fund, including the ACA;

Whereas, that price already includes tax increases and cost shifting to our posterity,

and will likely include benefit reductions and even currency devaluation;

Whereas, that price will tend to include the shifting of greater fiscal responsibility for government programs—including Medicaid—from Washington to the states, even further crowding out funding for education and other essential state services;

Whereas, the real cost of more Utahns having insurance under the ACA will be a far greater dependence on government, not less;

Whereas, under an optional Medicaid expansion the state would incur large, ongoing funding liabilities and both the state and its citizens would be more dependent, not less dependent, on a fiscally unsustainable federal government;

Whereas, Utah has refused to exacerbate the federal fiscal crisis by choosing not to implement the ACA's federally subsidized health insurance exchange, which makes people dependent on large government subsidies and gives priority to publicly funded, rather than privately funded, coverage;

Whereas, because of the ACA, Utah employers, insurers, and health care providers will face more regulation, not less regulation, and will have fewer options, not more options, for addressing the underlying challenges faced by our health care system;

Whereas, notwithstanding the ACA's focus on preventive care and its acknowledgment of alternative payment and delivery systems, many Utahns will see little relief from premium increases driven by underlying problems the ACA fails to address, including reliance on payment and delivery systems that promote over consumption of health care;

Whereas, implementation of the ACA will tend to destroy the private market for health insurance and move families, insurers, and health care providers ever closer to a single-payer system of federally controlled health care;

Whereas, the state, its citizens, employers, insurers, and health care providers will all suffer as the ACA fails to bring unsustainable health care spending under control and metastasizes instead into greater federal regulation and control of not just health care, but most aspects of Utahns' and Americans' daily lives and activities;

Whereas, the ACA disregards state jurisdiction over health care policy and constrains the state's efforts to develop and implement meaningful health care reform; and

Whereas, the Legislature and the Governor believe that successful reform of health care's most vexing problems will require more—not less—state flexibility and innovation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, urges the state's Congressional delegation to continue its efforts to arrest the devastating impacts of the ACA on Utah's economy, its citizens, its employers, its medical providers, and its insurers, using all means possible, including repeal of the act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor urge Utah's Congressional delegation to work cooperatively with other members of Congress and officials of this state and other states to develop workable alternatives to the ACA that encourage state innovation, preserve states' policy-making jurisdiction and regulatory authority, and lead to greater enrollment in affordable health insurance; be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor affirm by this resolution the state's policy that no person in this state should be required to either sponsor or enroll

in health insurance, particularly under threat of federal penalty; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor urge the Legislature's Health Reform Task Force to continue working cooperatively with the Governor's Office to ensure that ACA implementation rules address the needs of Utah families, employers, health care providers, insurers, and insurance regulators; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor urge all stakeholders in Utah's health care system—including families, employers, health care providers, and insurers—to continue working cooperatively with the Governor and the Legislature to develop state-based health care reforms with the greatest potential for increasing consumerism, improving quality of care, constraining spending growth, and promoting enrollment in affordable health insurance, regardless of how ACA implementation unfolds; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Governor, the Legislature's Health Reform Task Force, Utah's Congressional delegation, the Utah Health Policy Project and other consumer advocacy groups, the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce and other employer associations, the Utah Hospital Association, the Utah Medical Association, Utah insurers, the Utah Association of Health Underwriters, and the Speakers and Presidents presiding over the legislatures of each of the 49 other states.

POM-105. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah urging the federal government to take action to ensure continued funding of cancer education, screening, and treatment services to victims of mill tailings exposure; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 10

Whereas, the Rural Health Care Services Grant Program Outreach, a federally funded project providing cancer education, screening, and treatment services to those who are victims of mill tailings exposure, resulted in the diagnosis of 39 new cancers and 32 cases of precancerous polyps;

Whereas, funding has been exhausted and program activities halted, pending continued federal support;

Whereas, the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services should instruct the Health Resources and Services Administration to fund cancer education, screening, and treatment services to victims of mill tailings exposure until 2044, or until another equitable resolution can be reached through the United States Department of Energy;

Whereas, the assistance of Utah's congressional delegation would help provide federal resources to ensure cancer education, screening, and treatment services to victims of 51 mill tailings exposure through 2044;

Whereas, the United States Attorney General's Office should investigate the United States Department of Energy's federal statutory limitations in providing cancer education, screening, and treatment services to victims of mill tailings exposure and offer suggestions for federal legislation;

Whereas, the Office of the Utah Attorney General should investigate the inclusion of victims of mill tailings exposure in the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act, which provides medical benefits to workers, contractors, subcontractors, and vendors at specified Department of Energy facilities;

Whereas, the Office of the Utah Attorney General should investigate the inclusion of victims of mill tailings exposure in the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act for their onsite participation and exposure to radiation from the uranium mill and its tailings; and

Whereas, the United States Congress should direct Legacy Management to provide from its budget an annual stipend for victims of mill tailings exposure to use in establishing a consistent cancer education, screening, and treatment services program; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, urge the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services to instruct the Health Resources and Services Administration to fund cancer education, screening, and treatment services to victims of mill tailings exposure until 2044 or until another equitable resolution can be reached through the United States Department of Energy; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor urge Utah's congressional delegation to help provide federal resources to ensure cancer education, screening, and treatment services to victims of mill tailings exposure through 2044. Be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor urge the United States Attorney General's Office to investigate the United States Department of Energy's federal statutory limitations in providing cancer education, screening, and treatment services to victims of mill tailings exposure and offer suggestions for federal legislation. Be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor urge the Office of the Utah Attorney General to investigate the inclusion of victims of mill tailings exposure in the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act and their inclusion in the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act for their onsite participation and exposure to radiation from the uranium mill and its tailings. Be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor urge the United States Congress to direct Legacy Management to provide from its budget an annual stipend for victims of mill tailings exposure to use in establishing a consistent cancer education, screening, and treatment services program. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Victims of Mill Tailings Exposure, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Office of Legacy Management, the Office of the Utah Attorney General, the United States Attorney General's Office, the United States Department of Energy, the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Health Resources and Services Administration, and the members of Utah's congressional delegation.

POM-106. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii commemorating the twentieth anniversary of Public Law 103-150; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas, in 1993, the United States Congress passed Public Law 103-150 (the "Apology Resolution"), acknowledging and apologizing for the critical role of United States diplomats, military forces, and citizens in the overthrow of the sovereign Kingdom of Hawai'i; and

Whereas, the Apology Resolution confirms that the actions of United States agents in the overthrow and occupation of the Hawaiian government violated treaties between the United States and the sovereign Kingdom of Hawai'i, and norms of international law; and

Whereas, the Apology Resolution confirms that one million eight hundred thousand acres of crown and government lands were thereafter ceded to the United States without consent or compensation to the Native Hawaiian people or their sovereign government, as a result of the United States' annexation of Hawai'i; and

Whereas, the Apology Resolution recognizes that the Native Hawaiian people never relinquished their claims to their inherent sovereignty as a people or of their national lands throughout the overthrow, occupation, annexation, and admission of Hawai'i into the United States; and

Whereas, the Apology Resolution recognizes that the health and well-being of the Native Hawaiian people is intrinsically tied to their deep feelings and attachment to the land; and

Whereas, the Apology Resolution recognizes that the Native Hawaiian people are determined to preserve, develop, and transmit to their descendants, both their ancestral lands and their cultural identity; and

Whereas, the Apology Resolution acknowledges that the overthrow has resulted in the suppression of the inherent sovereignty of the Native Hawaiian people; and

Whereas, the Apology Resolution apologizes to the Native Hawaiian people on behalf of the people of the United States, commends the efforts of reconciliation initiated by the State of Hawaii and the United Church of Christ with the Native Hawaiians, including the appropriation of funds to educate the public regarding Hawaiian sovereignty; and

Whereas, the State Legislature also passed Act 340, Session Laws of Hawaii 1993, mandating that the lands and waters of Kaho 'olawe island be held in the public land trust, directing the State to transfer management and control of these lands and waters to the sovereign Native Hawaiian entity upon its recognition by the United States and the State of Hawai'i, and establishing the Kaho 'olawe Island Reserve Commission to manage these lands and waters in the interim; and

Whereas, the State Legislature passed Act 329, Session Laws of Hawaii 1997, recognizing the deep sense of injustice felt among many Native Hawaiians and others and affirming that reconciliation with the Native Hawaiian people is desired by all people of Hawai'i; and

Whereas, in 2000, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice published a report, "From Mauka to Makai: The River of Justice Must Flow Freely," which formally initiated the federal government's efforts to reconcile past injustices, and recognize and establish a government-to-government relationship with the Native Hawaiian people; and

Whereas, in 2000 and 2002, the United States Congress passed Public Law 106-568, the Hawaiian Homelands Homeownership Act, and Public Law 107-110, the reenacted Native Hawaiian Education Act, confirming the special relationship between the federal government and the Native Hawaiian people; and

Whereas, in 2005, Hawai'i's entire congressional delegation, including then-representative and current Governor of Hawai'i, Neil Abercrombie, as well as the then-Hawai'i

Governor, expressed to the United States Senate Committee on Indian Affairs their unanimous support for self-governance and self-determination for Native Hawaiians; and

Whereas, in *Office of Hawaiian Affairs v. Housing and Community Development Corporation of Hawaii (HCDCH)*, 117 Hawaii 174, 195 (2008), rev'd and remanded by 556 U.S. 163 (2009), the Supreme Court of the State of Hawai'i held that "the Apology Resolution and related state legislation . . . give rise to the State's fiduciary duty to preserve the corpus of the public lands trust, specifically, the ceded lands, until such time as the unrelinquished claims of the native Hawaiians have been resolved."; and

Whereas, in *Office of Hawaiian Affairs v. HCDCH*, 117 Hawaii 174, 216, the Supreme Court of the State of Hawai'i also recognized the critical importance of the 'āina to Hawaiian people and stated, "We firmly believe that, given the 'crucial importance [of the 'āina or land to] the [native Hawaiian people and their culture, their religion, their economic self-sufficiency, and their sense of personal and community well-being,' any further diminishment of the ceded lands (the 'āina) from the public lands trust will negatively impact the contemplated reconciliation/settlement efforts between native Hawaiians and the State"; and

Whereas, the State Legislature passed Act 195, Session Laws of Hawaii 2011, acknowledging that Native Hawaiians are the only indigenous, aboriginal, maoli population of Hawai'i nei, that the State of Hawai'i has a special political and legal relationship with the Native Hawaiian people, that Native Hawaiians have continued to maintain their identity as a distinctly native political community with rights to self-determination, self-governance, and self-sufficiency, and establishing a Native Hawaiian roll commission to maintain a roll of qualified Native Hawaiians to facilitate Native Hawaiian self-governance; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 2013, the Senate concurring, That the Legislature hereby commemorates the twentieth anniversary of the Apology Resolution, recognizes the progress that has been made towards reconciliation and Native Hawaiian self-governance and self-determination, reaffirms the State's commitment to reconciliation with the Native Hawaiian people for historical injustices, urges the federal government to advance reconciliation efforts with Native Hawaiians, and supports efforts to further the self-determination and sovereignty of Native Hawaiians; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Hawai'i, the Governor of the State of Hawai'i, and the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs.

POM-107. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey expressing strong opposition to the recent United States Supreme Court decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 86

Whereas, A divided United States Supreme Court, in a 5-to-4 decision issued on January 21, 2010 in *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission*, overturned two important

precedents by lifting a 20-year ruling in *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce*, that restricted campaign spending by corporations in support of or in opposition to political candidates; and

Whereas, The Court also overturned part of its 2003 decision in *McConnell v. Federal Elections Commission* by rejecting a large portion of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, commonly called McCain Feingold, which restricted campaign spending by corporations and unions by banning broadcast, cable or satellite transmissions of electioneering communications paid for by corporations or labor unions from their general funds in the 30 days before a presidential primary and in the 60 days before the general election; and

Whereas, In his 80-page dissent in the *Citizens United* case, Justice Stevens called the decision “a radical change in the law” that ignores “the overwhelming majority of justices who have served on this court” and stated that “In the context of election to public office, the distinction between corporate and human speakers is significant . . . [Corporations] cannot vote or run for office. Because they may be managed and controlled by nonresidents, their interests may conflict in fundamental respects with the interests of eligible voters”; and

Whereas, President Obama recently criticized the ruling as “a green light to a new stampede of special interest money,” and declared “It is a major victory for big oil, Wall Street banks, health insurance companies and the other powerful interests that marshal their power every day in Washington to drown out the voices of everyday Americans”; and

Whereas, Senator John McCain who co-wrote the 2002 campaign reform law with Senator Russell Feingold, said he was “disappointed” by the decision, and Senator Feingold called the decision “a terrible mistake” ignoring “important principles of judicial restraint and respect for precedent”; and

Whereas, For decades, Congress has exercised its constitutional authority to regulate elections by seeking to prevent corporations and unions from exerting undue influence or the appearance of undue influence over federal candidates; and

Whereas, It is fitting and proper for the [Senate] General Assembly of this State to express its opposition to the *Citizens United* decision and to call upon the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the United States Constitution to provide that, with respect to corporation campaign spending, a person is only a natural person for First Amendment protection of free speech; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. The General Assembly of the State of New Jersey expresses strong opposition to the United States Supreme Court ruling in *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission* and calls upon the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the United States Constitution to provide that with regard to corporation campaign spending, a person means only a natural person for First Amendment protection of free speech.

2. Duly authenticated copies of this resolution, signed by the Speaker of the General Assembly and attested to by the Clerk of the Assembly, shall be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House

of Representatives, and to each member of the United States Congress elected from this State.

POM-108. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the United States Congress to pass a constitutional amendment to reverse the ruling of the United States Supreme Court in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, United States Supreme Court rulings, beginning with *Buckley v. Valeo* and continuing through *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* and others, disproportionately elevate the role of wealthy special interests in elections and diminish the voices and influence of ordinary Americans; and

Whereas, Maine citizens wish to develop effective tools for self-governance, including strong laws governing elections and campaign finance; and

Whereas, the current legal landscape severely constrains the range of options available to citizens, frustrating efforts to reduce the influence of moneyed interest in elections and in government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, hereby declare our support for an amendment to the United States Constitution regarding campaign finance that would reaffirm the power of citizens through their government to regulate the raising and spending of money in elections; and be it further

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, call upon each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation to actively support and promote in Congress an amendment to the United States Constitution on campaign finance; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM-109. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Tennessee urging the United States Congress to adopt a balanced budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 38

Whereas, with each passing year our nation falls further into debt as federal government expenditures repeatedly exceed available revenue; and

Whereas, the annual federal budget has risen to unprecedented levels, demonstrating an unwillingness or inability of both the Legislative and Executive branches of federal government to control the federal debt; and

Whereas, knowledgeable planning and fiscal prudence require that the budget reflect all federal spending and that the budget be in balance; and

Whereas, fiscal discipline is a powerful means for strengthening our nation; with less of America's future financial resources channeled into servicing the national debt, more of our tax dollars would be available for public endeavors that reflect our national priorities, such as education, health, the security of our nation, and the creation of jobs; and

Whereas, Thomas Jefferson recognized the importance of a balanced budget when he wrote: “The question whether one genera-

tion has the right to bind another by the deficit it imposes is a question of such consequence as to place it among the fundamental principles of government. We should consider ourselves unauthorized to saddle posterity with our debts, and morally bound to pay for them ourselves.”; and

Whereas, state legislatures overwhelmingly recognize the necessity of maintaining a balanced budget; whether through constitutional requirement or by statute, forty-nine states require a balanced budget; and

Whereas, the federal government's unlimited ability to borrow involves decisions of such magnitude, with such potentially profound consequences for the nation and its people, today and in the future, that it is of vital importance to the future of the United States of America that a balanced budget be adopted on an annual basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the One Hundred Eighth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the House of Representatives concurring, That we hereby strongly urge the United States Congress to adopt a balanced federal budget on an annual basis; and be it further

Resolved, That an enrolled copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President and the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and each member of Tennessee's Congressional delegation.

POM-110. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma reaffirming the definition of marriage as the union of one man and one woman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 1009

Whereas, marriage is the building block upon which our society is based; and

Whereas, on November 2, 2004, Oklahoma voters expressed their collective intent to define marriage as the union of one man and one woman by approving State Question 711 which was an amendment to Article II of the Oklahoma Constitution; and

Whereas, the power to regulate marriage is a power reserved to the states that lies within the domain of state legislatures and not with the judicial branch of government; and

Whereas, the United States Supreme Court recently heard oral arguments in two separate cases that challenge the constitutionality of the federal Defense of Marriage Act and the authority of states to regulate marriage; and

Whereas, the Oklahoma Legislature commends the Honorable E. Scott Pruitt, Attorney General of Oklahoma, for filing an amicus curiae brief supporting Oklahoma's right to regulate marriage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 1st Session of the 54th Oklahoma Legislature, the Senate Concurring Therein, That the Oklahoma Legislature reaffirms its commitment to define marriage as the union of one man and one woman and urges the United States Supreme Court to uphold the Defense of Marriage Act and the right of states to regulate marriage. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be distributed to the President and Vice President of the United States and to the Oklahoma Congressional Delegation.

POM-111. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California urging the federal government, including the Department of Homeland Security and the General Services Administration, to fund necessary improvements at the San Ysidro,

Calexico, and Otay Mesa Ports of Entry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas, The United States, Canada, and Mexico signed the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1993 to foster trade among the countries, and improve global competitiveness; and

Whereas, Trade between the United States and Mexico has more than quintupled since the implementation of NAFTA, totaling \$500 billion in bilateral trade in 2011; and

Whereas, Mexico continues to be California's number one export market with \$25.8 billion in goods exported to Mexico in 2011, accounting for 16 percent of all California exports; and

Whereas, Ninety-nine percent of trade between California and Mexico is carried by trucks; and

Whereas, The SANDAG 2050 Comprehensive Freight Gateway Study projects that the nearly two million trucks that crossed the California-Mexico border in 2007 will increase to nearly five million trucks in 2050. In 2011, over \$33.5 billion in goods moved between Mexico and the United States at the Otay Mesa Port of Entry and at the Tecate Port of Entry; and

Whereas, The San Diego and Imperial Counties' border traffic congestion and delays cost the U.S. and Mexican economies an estimated \$8.63 billion in gross output and more than 73,900 jobs in 2007; and

Whereas, New land port of entry and improvement projects are under federal jurisdiction with significant influence over local communities; and

Whereas, The San Ysidro-Puerta Mexico Land Port of Entry is the busiest port of entry between the United States and Mexico and is undergoing a major reconfiguration and expansion project; and

Whereas, The Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Land Port of Entry has plans for the expansion and modernization of passenger and commercial inspection facilities; and

Whereas, The Calexico West Port of Entry also has plans to renovate and expand the facility to process and expand its operation for pedestrians and automobiles; and

Whereas, The collaboration between federal, state, and local agencies is essential for the development of border infrastructure projects and security; and

Whereas, The General Accountability Office and the Department of Homeland Security estimate that \$6 billion in border infrastructure is needed to fulfill their mission of preventing unlawful entry and smuggling while facilitating legitimate trade and tourism; and

Whereas, The need for improved border capacity and efficiency comes at a time when traditional federal funding is scarce and increasingly difficult to obtain; and

Whereas, Since February 2009, Congress and the Obama administration have not funded border infrastructure projects; and

Whereas, The San Ysidro project has a stated funding gap of \$285 million, the Calexico project needs \$318 million to complete construction, and the Otay Mesa project requires \$161 million for completion; and

Whereas, Various agencies of the United States, including the Department of Homeland Security and the General Services Administration, should work with Congress to provide funding to support these border infrastructure investments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legis-

lature urges the federal government, including the Department of Homeland Security and the General Services Administration, to fund necessary improvements at the San Ysidro, Calexico, and Otay Mesa Ports of Entry; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

POM-112. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California urging the President to sign and Congress to pass the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, The federal Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) was developed with the input of advocates from around the country with diverse backgrounds and experiences, and addresses the real and most important needs of victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking; and

Whereas, VAWA represents the voices of women and their families, and the voices of victims, survivors, and advocates; and

Whereas, VAWA was first enacted in 1994, and has been the centerpiece of the federal government's efforts to stamp out domestic and sexual violence, VAWA provides millions of dollars to support programs for victim services, transitional housing, and legal assistance, as well as tools that law enforcement, prosecutors, and judges need to hold offenders accountable and keep communities safe while supporting victims; and

Whereas, Domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking, once considered private matters to be dealt with behind closed doors, have been brought out of the darkness; and

Whereas, VAWA has been successful because it has had consistently strong, bipartisan support for nearly two decades; and

Whereas, Senators Patrick Leahy and Mike Crapo and Representative Gwen Moore have introduced identical legislation, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, in their respective houses with language that includes several updates and improvements to the law, including the following:

(a) An emphasis on the need to effectively respond to sexual assault crime by adding new purpose areas and a 25-percent set-aside in the STOP (Services, Training, Officers, and Prosecutors) Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program (STOP Program) and the Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders Program.

(b) Improvements in tools to prevent domestic violence homicides by training law enforcement, victim service providers, and court personnel to identify and manage high-risk offenders and connecting high-risk victims to crisis intervention services.

(c) Critical improvements that provide important protections for students, immigrant women, as well as the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender and Native American communities.

(d) Improvements in responses to the high rate of violence against women in tribal communities by strengthening concurrent tribal criminal jurisdiction over perpetrators who assault Indian spouses and dating partners in Indian countries.

(e) Measures to strengthen housing protections for victims by applying existing hous-

ing protections to nine additional federal housing programs.

(f) Measures to promote accountability to ensure that federal funds are used for their intended purposes.

(g) Consolidation of programs and reductions in authorization levels to address fiscal concerns, and renewed focus on programs that have been most successful.

(h) Technical corrections to update definitions throughout the law to provide uniformity and continuity; and

Whereas, There is a need to maintain services for victims and families at the local, state, and federal levels. VAWA reauthorization would allow existing programs to continue uninterrupted, and would provide for the development of new initiatives to address key areas of concern. These initiatives include the following:

(a) Addressing the high rates of domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault among women 16 to 24 years of age, inclusive.

(b) Improving the response to sexual assault with best practices, training, and communication tools for law enforcement, as well as for health care and legal professionals.

(c) Preventing domestic violence homicides through enhanced training for law enforcement, advocates, and others who interact with those at risk: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature requests the President to sign and Congress to pass the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act and ensure the sustainability of vital programs designed to keep women and families safe from violence and abuse; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

POM-113. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of California recognizing the critical importance of continued access to safe and legal abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 10

Whereas, January 22, 2013, marks the 40th anniversary of the United States Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Roe v. Wade*, which held that every woman has a fundamental right to control her own reproductive decisions and decide whether to end or continue a pregnancy, and is an occasion that deserves celebration; and

Whereas, The 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision, making access to abortion safe and legal, has greatly improved the health of women and families; and

Whereas, *Roe v. Wade* has been the cornerstone of women's remarkable strides toward equality in the past four decades, and reproductive freedom is critical to a woman's ability to participate fully in the social, political, and economic life of the community; and

Whereas, California is committed to protecting public health and the welfare of all its residents, and recognizes that access to reproductive health services, including family planning and prenatal care, supports individuals and their families by ensuring that babies are planned, wanted, and healthy; and

Whereas, The public policy of California, as expressed in the Reproductive Privacy

Act, and protected by the California Constitution's express right to privacy, is that each woman has the fundamental right to make decisions regarding her reproductive health; and

Whereas, California has a pioneering history in supporting reproductive rights, including the California Supreme Court's 1969 decision in *People v. Belous*, recognizing that a woman's decision to end a pregnancy is protected by her constitutional right to privacy, four years prior to the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*; and

Whereas, In a democracy, people may have differing views about abortion, but most Californians recognize that only a pregnant woman can know, and should be entitled to decide, what option is best for herself and her family; and

Whereas, Over 75 percent of Californians oppose efforts to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, which could create a public health crisis if individual states made abortion illegal and unsafe; and

Whereas, The 2012 elections sent a powerful and unmistakable message to Members of Congress and state legislatures that women do not want politics or politicians to interfere with their personal medical decisions; and

Whereas, Violence against abortion providers and laws that create barriers to abortion endanger a woman's health: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That on the 40th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, the senate of the State of California recognizes the critical importance of continued access to safe and legal abortion and urges the President of the United States and the Congress to protect and uphold the intent and substance of the 1973 United States Supreme Court decision in *Roe v. Wade*; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

POM-114. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine honoring the victims of the Boston Marathon explosions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, on April 15, 2013, multiple explosions at the finish line of the 117th Boston Marathon, a horrific act of terrorism, killed at least 3 people and injured more than 175 people; and

Whereas, law enforcement's unprecedented response and willingness to put their lives on the line to protect the innocent and bring those responsible to justice is an inspiration to us all; and

Whereas, many of the victims of this tragedy, who are both United States citizens and international visitors, are friends and family members of athletes and spectators celebrating community, sport and the intense effort and sacrifice required to qualify for the Boston Marathon; and

Whereas, many Americans and people of the world watched with horror as the tragedy occurred and the day progressed; and

Whereas, heroic emergency medical technicians, police officers, firefighters, members of the National Guard and other first responders, as well as many marathon partici-

pants, volunteers and spectators, saved lives while putting themselves at risk; and

Whereas, Maine and Massachusetts have a special historical, economic and cultural relationship, extending back before our Nation's founding, including our mutual celebration of Patriot's Day as a state holiday, and scores of Maine people run in the Boston Marathon every year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, the Members of the One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Legislature now assembled in the First Regular Session, on behalf of the people we represent, join the people of Maine, the City of Boston, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the rest of the United States in collective sorrow and anguish; and be it further

Resolved, That We, the Members of the One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Legislature, stand united with the people of Maine, the City of Boston, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the rest of the United States against violence perpetrated against innocents; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Barack H. Obama, President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the governors of the State of Maine and Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the President of the Massachusetts Senate, the Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives and the Mayor of the City of Boston.

POM-115. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah recommending a name for a new federal courthouse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 9

Whereas, a new federal courthouse is currently being constructed at 351 South West Temple in Salt Lake City;

Whereas, if this new structure is to bear the name of an exemplary Utahn, it should be named after Justice George Sutherland, the only Utahn to serve on the United States Supreme Court;

Whereas, to date, Justice Sutherland is Utah's most accomplished attorney, public servant, and judge;

Whereas, before joining the United States Supreme Court, Sutherland was a renowned legal scholar and sage politician, having served in the Utah State Senate, the United States House of Representatives, and the United States Senate;

Whereas, no past or present Utahn has done more for his state or country, or accomplished more as a lawyer;

Whereas, Sutherland was born in England in 1862 to converts to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS);

Whereas, Sutherland's family immigrated to Utah as part of an oxcart company in October 1863;

Whereas, the Sutherland family first settled in Springville, Utah, and then moved to Tintic, Utah, where George Sutherland, Sr. sold dry goods to miners;

Whereas, George Sutherland, Sr. left the LDS Church in 1870, and young George was never baptized;

Whereas, Sutherland recalled his boyhood as a "period when life was very simple, but, as I can bear testimony, very hard as measured by present day standards. . . . Nobody worried about child labor, the average boy of 10 worked—and often worked very hard";

Whereas, Sutherland grew up in a time when everybody was poor and everybody worked;

Whereas, neither the 8-hour day nor the 40-hour week had arrived, so work began when it was light enough to see and ended when it became too dark;

Whereas, Sutherland worked first in a clothing store in Salt Lake City, then as a Wells Fargo agent and later as a mining recording agent until age 17, when his family moved to Provo;

Whereas, Sutherland had no schooling from ages 12 to 17, but because he was taught well by his parents, he entered the Brigham Young Academy in 1879 as an excellent student and writer;

Whereas, at Brigham Young Academy, he flourished under the tutelage of renowned headmaster Karl Maeser, who nurtured the institution for decades;

Whereas, at Brigham Young Academy, George Sutherland made many lifelong friends, nearly all members of the LDS Church, including Sam Thurman, who later became his law partner, cofounder of the predecessor firm to Snow, Christensen & Martineau, and a Utah Supreme Court Chief Justice; William H. King, his future law partner and political opponent against whom he ran for Congress in 1900 and the United States Senate in 1916; and James E. Talmage and Richard Lyman, future Apostles of the LDS Church;

Whereas, at Brigham Young Academy, he met Rosamond Lee of Beaver, Utah, and several years later they married;

Whereas, George and Rosamond Sutherland were together for nearly 60 years and had three children, a boy who died at 17 and two daughters who survived him;

Whereas, Sutherland graduated from Brigham Young Academy in 1881 and attended the University of Michigan Law School for a year, passed the Michigan Bar, and then married Rosamond and moved to Provo, where he started a practice with his father, by then a self-taught lawyer;

Whereas, Sutherland once stated, "I transacted all kinds of business, both civil and criminal. A lawyer in a small town can't pick and choose—public opinion demands that he shall treat all men alike when they call for his services. I often traveled on horseback in the mountains to try cases before Justices of the Peace";

Whereas, Sutherland earned a well-deserved reputation as a hardworking and honest family man who was smart, empathetic, and kind;

Whereas, in 1886, at age 24, his law partnership with Sam Thurman began, and they were joined by William King two years later;

Whereas, as young lawyers, Sutherland and Thurman defended nine Irish miners accused of lynching, a capital offense; all were tried and convicted but none was executed—a victory for Sutherland and Thurman;

Whereas, Sutherland also represented many members of the LDS Church charged with violating the Federal Edmund's Act outlawing polygamy;

Whereas, through these cases and his general character, he earned respect within the LDS community and at the same time received the political support of the non-LDS community;

Whereas, Sutherland did not represent Karl Maeser when he was convicted in 1887 of violating the Edmund's Act, but he nonetheless appeared at Maeser's sentencing and made an impassioned and successful plea to the Court not to jail Maeser, citing his many accomplishments at Brigham Young Academy;

Whereas, the Court did not sentence Maeser to jail, but fined him \$300, which Sutherland immediately paid to the Court;

Whereas, as a young lawyer, Sutherland dove into public service and politics;

Whereas, from 1886 to 1890, Sutherland was an Overseer of the State Hospital in Provo, and in 1890 he ran for Mayor of Provo as a Liberal Party candidate on an antipolygamy platform, and lost;

Whereas, LDS-Church sanctioned polygamy ended in late 1890, gutting the Liberal Party of its purpose, so Sutherland became a Republican and narrowly lost the 1892 Republican nomination for Congress;

Whereas, Sutherland was gratified that Utah's new Constitution provided for women's suffrage, a cause for which he campaigned throughout his political career;

Whereas, Sutherland's legal practice blossomed, and in 1894 he left Thurman & Sutherland and moved to Salt Lake City where he joined the predecessor to the Van Cott law firm;

Whereas, Sutherland helped form the Utah Bar Association in 1895, and in 1896 was elected to the first Utah State Senate, where he chaired the Judiciary Committee, which drafted the first Utah Judicial and Penal Codes;

Whereas, Sutherland proposed the state's first State Workers' Compensation Statute and laws granting eminent domain to miners and those working in irrigation;

Whereas, in 1900, Sutherland narrowly defeated Democrat and former law partner William H. King for Utah's lone seat in the United States House of Representatives;

Whereas, Sutherland remained very active in state and national Republican Party affairs, serving as a party delegate from Utah to every Republican convention between 1900 and 1916;

Whereas, in his only House term, Sutherland was instrumental in passing the Reclamation Act, which allowed Western water projects to be engineered and financed with federal money, allowing the Western States to grow much faster than if water projects had been left to private and state financing;

Whereas, Sutherland chose not to run for a second term and resumed his practice with Van Cott;

Whereas, in 1905, United States Senators were elected by State Legislatures;

Whereas, years earlier, Sutherland had represented United States Senator Reed Smoot's father in a polygamy case and now, with the endorsement of his friend and Senator, Sutherland prevailed in an interparty fight with incumbent Thomas Kearns;

Whereas, Sutherland's two-term Senate career was stellar;

Whereas, through his legal ability, affability, and hard work, Sutherland accomplished much regarding women's suffrage, workers' compensation, reclamation, Indian affairs, and foreign policy;

Whereas, Sutherland was the driving force behind the Federal Employer Liability Act, which created a workers' compensation system;

Whereas, in support of the new system, Sutherland argued, "When we are able to get to the truth as to how these accidents happen we will be able to apply the remedy with greater certainty, so that the law is not only just in providing compensation to all injured employees, one of the legitimate expenses of the industry, but what is perhaps still more important, it will tend to greatly reduce the number of accidents and consequently the aggregate of human suffering";

Whereas, Sutherland championed many other labor causes, earning him the praise of Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor;

Whereas, Sutherland's Judiciary Committee rewrote the United States Criminal and Judicial codes, "a monumental task" according to Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes of the United States Supreme Court;

Whereas, in 1907, Sutherland's courtroom skills were well displayed in the Senate where he mounted a detailed and successful defense of Senator Reed Smoot when the Senate considered expelling Smoot due to his religious and alleged polygamous practices;

Whereas, Sutherland sponsored the Nineteenth Amendment to give women the right to vote in 1915 and exerted every effort to assure its passage;

Whereas, Sutherland gave several well received speeches promoting the amendment, including a 1914 speech in which he stated, "I give my assent to woman suffrage because, as the matter appeals to me, there is no justification for denying to half our citizens the right to participate in the operations of a government which is as much their government as it is ours upon the sole ground that they happen to be born women instead of men";

Whereas, Sutherland was not a pacifist, and contended that security should be won through vigilance and strength;

Whereas, when Germany's new submarine fleet attacked shipping in the open sea, President Wilson's apparent vacillation in 1915 gave rise to sham criticism from Sutherland in the Senate, where he stated, "... my own view of the matter is that the new weapon [the submarine] must yield to the law not that the law must yield to the new weapon. ... I for one am becoming sick and tired of the spineless policy of retreat and scuttle. ... Instead of warning our own people to exercise their rights at their peril I would like to see issued to other people a warning to interfere with these rights at their peril. The danger of it all is that by this policy of always backing down, instead of backing up, we shall encourage an increased encroachment upon our rights until we shall finally be driven into crises from which nothing but war can extricate us";

Whereas, during his Senate years, Sutherland was frequently engaged as a speaker on many public issues and he gained a strong reputation as a constitutional scholar;

Whereas, this reputation was enhanced by the fact that he argued three cases before the United States Supreme Court while serving in the Senate;

Whereas, in 1915, Sutherland supported the Seventeenth Amendment, which provided for popular election of United States Senators;

Whereas, in 1916, Sutherland ran for a third term against his old law partner and friend, William King, and lost;

Whereas, although Sutherland had not run a statewide campaign for 16 years, his loss was likely due to the coattail effect of the antiwar fervor that propelled President Wilson to a second term, on the mantra that "He kept us out of war";

Whereas, many Republican candidates were badly defeated in 1916, but in his consoling words to William Howard Taft on his loss of the presidential race, Sutherland stated, "We are to pass through a period of readjustment, and the present administration, in view of its past history, is not likely to deal with the serious problems which will arise in such a way as to satisfy the country. The result will be, therefore, that we shall come back into power for a long time";

Whereas, the Republicans won the next three presidential elections;

Whereas, after leaving the Senate, Sutherland practiced law in Washington, D.C. and

argued four cases before the United States Supreme Court;

Whereas, in 1917, Sutherland was elected President of the American Bar Association and gave a series of six lectures at Columbia University Law School on the Constitution and foreign affairs;

Whereas, always a keen political strategist, Sutherland supported Warren G. Harding's seemingly unlikely but successful bid for the Republican presidential nomination, and after Harding was elected he appointed Sutherland as lead counsel for the United States in a seven week trial at The Hague;

Whereas, Sutherland was also counsel to the United States Delegation to the Armament talks of 1921;

Whereas, on September 5, 1922, President Harding nominated Sutherland for an open seat on the United States Supreme Court and the Senate unanimously confirmed him the same day;

Whereas, there was great public interest in and support for Sutherland's appointment because he was the first Utahn to be appointed, one of the few Senators to ascend to the bench, only the fourth foreign born Justice to serve on the Court, and the first to do so since 1793;

Whereas, as he had throughout every aspect of his life, Justice Sutherland worked very hard on the United States Supreme Court;

Whereas, in 15 years he wrote 295 majority opinions, 35 dissents, and 1 concurrence—an average of 20 majority opinions per year, which is double the average production of today's Supreme Court Justices;

Whereas, Justice Sutherland's broad life experiences, sobriety, hard work, and self-reliance brought a valuable perspective to the Court;

Whereas, Justice Sutherland's impoverished upbringing and boyhood years filled with extremely hard work, combined with his intellect and ambition, propelled him into the highest echelon of power on the state and national levels, exposing him to people from all walks of life;

Whereas, Justice Sutherland's extensive experience in the state and national legislative branches gave him a solid foundation as a constitutional scholar and an expert in governmental affairs;

Whereas, having seen temporary factions spring to life from time to time, claiming to have all the answers to society's challenges only to fade away and leave in their wake ill-considered legislation that often infringed on individual rights or violated other constitutional principles, Justice Sutherland was wary of the tyranny of the majority;

Whereas, Justice Sutherland challenged the Congress, the President, and other courts in order to protect individual rights or fundamental constitutional doctrines;

Whereas, in 1935, in *Berger v. United States*, wherein an Assistant U.S. Attorney was guilty of gross misconduct during a criminal trial, Justice Sutherland eloquently set the standard for prosecutorial misconduct when he wrote that the misconduct called for a stern rebuke and repressive measures, stating, "The United States Attorney is the representative not of an ordinary party to a controversy, but of a sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern at all; and whose interest, therefore, in a criminal prosecution is not that it shall win a case, but that justice shall be done. As such, he is in peculiar and very definite sense the servant of the law, the twofold name of which is that guilt shall not escape, or innocents suffer. He may prosecute with earnestness and vigor, indeed he should do so. But,

while he may strike hard blows, he is not at liberty to strike foul ones. It is as much his duty to refrain from improper methods calculated to produce a wrongful conviction as it is to use every legitimate means to bring about a just one”;

Whereas, this decision better clarified the prosecutor's role and obligations and gave trial judges a clear directive and authority to punish prosecutorial misconduct;

Whereas, when Franklin D. Roosevelt overwhelmingly defeated President Hoover in 1932, the Congress quickly passed many acts to address the economic calamity, but the laws were not thoroughly assessed from a constitutional point of view before they were passed;

Whereas, this led to scores of court challenges, and many laws were struck down by unanimous vote in 1934, 1935, and 1936, while others were struck down by close votes on various constitutional grounds;

Whereas, the most controversial opinions that Justice Sutherland wrote struck down portions of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal legislation;

Whereas, after his landslide 1936 reelection, Roosevelt proposed adding six Justices to the United States Supreme Court, which Justice Sutherland saw as a roadblock to economic recovery;

Whereas, the political upheaval that the court-packing plan sparked caused conservative Justice Owen Roberts to change his votes and to uphold the New Deal legislation;

Whereas, this switch of a vote and strong public opposition to court-packing led to its defeat in the Senate and avoided a constitutional, and perhaps a national, crisis;

Whereas, Justice Sutherland was bitterly disappointed with Justice Roberts's vote change, and when the Supreme Court then reversed recent Supreme Court decisions, Sutherland dissented sharply, contending that political expediency had trumped constitutional principles;

Whereas, much to the disappointment of moderates and conservatives, Justice Sutherland retired in 1938;

Whereas, humble to the end, Sutherland did not mention the Supreme Court or his career in his last public address, the Convocation of the BYU Class of 1941, but instead reminisced about Utah in the 1860s and 70s, his daylong labors as a child, and his education at his beloved Brigham Young Academy;

Whereas, above all he implored graduates to be vigilant caretakers of their character, then to focus on career, family, and church;

Whereas, George Sutherland passed away in 1942;

Whereas, this nation's heritage and good sense teach us to honor distinguished and exemplary forefathers; and

Whereas, other public servants may deserve the recognition of having their names on the new federal courthouse, but none deserves it more than George Sutherland: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah urge the members of Utah's congressional delegation to work to have the new federal courthouse in Salt Lake City named after Justice George Sutherland; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature urge the members of Utah's congressional delegation to make this effort in recognition of Justice Sutherland's lifetime of service to the citizens of the state of Utah as a member of the Utah Senate and to the United States as a member of the United States House of Rep-

resentatives, a member of the United States Senate, and the only Utahn to serve on the United States Supreme Court, and whose example of humility and integrity in public service is unsurpassed; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the members of Utah's congressional delegation.

POM-116. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah supporting the Financial Ready Utah enterprise risk management process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Legislature of the state of Utah declares that the nation's fiscal recklessness poses a great, clear, and present threat to America's future;

Whereas, David Walker, former Comptroller General of the United States warns, “The most serious threat to the United States is not someone hiding in a cave in Afghanistan or Pakistan, but our own fiscal irresponsibility”;

Whereas, the federal government is now in its fourth year of not passing a budget;

Whereas, the national debt has now surpassed \$16.4 trillion, more than \$136,000 per household;

Whereas, annual deficits have exceeded \$1 trillion for each of the last four years, and unfunded obligations for social programs now exceed \$85 trillion, with no apparent Congressional resolution on the horizon;

Whereas, it took 200 years for the United States to accumulate the first trillion dollars in debt and only 286 days to accumulate the most recent trillion;

Whereas, \$85 billion per month of the national debt and annual deficits are now offset through Federal Reserve operations such as “quantitative easing” and “operation twist”;

Whereas, more than 40 cents of every dollar the state of Utah spends comes from the federal government that borrows and prints more than 40 cents of every dollar it sends to Utah;

Whereas, last New Year's Eve, the United States Congress merely delayed until March 1, 2013, the implementation of the automatic cuts or “sequestration” of 8-9% of federal discretionary spending, including funds to state and local governments, and 10% of military spending under the Budget Control Act of 2011;

Whereas, in its recently released audit of the federal government's financial statements, the Government Accountability Office declared, “Over the long term, the structural imbalance between spending and revenue will lead to continued growth of debt held by the public as a share of GDP [Gross Domestic Product]; this means the current structure of the federal budget is unsustainable”;

Whereas, this fiscal scenario is by all accounts unsustainable for the nation as well as for our state;

Whereas, in May 2012, the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, in its review of the federal government's most recent annual financial statements, warned, “The U.S. is not exempt from the laws of prudent finance. We must take steps to put our financial house in order. The credit rating agencies have recently issued renewed warnings of U.S. credit downgrades unless substantive reforms are made. Our current fiscal policy results in mortgaging our nation's future without investing in it, leaving our children, grandchildren and future generations to suffer the consequences. This is irresponsible, unethical and immoral”;

Whereas, restoring fiscal sanity and sustainability is at the heart of jumpstarting economic growth and fostering a business climate where companies can grow and begin to hire; and

Whereas, absent credible actions to address this fiscal irresponsibility, uncertainty will continue to dominate business decision making and economic recovery will languish: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, wholeheartedly supports the Financial Ready Utah initiative of fostering within the state of Utah an enterprise risk management process to assess the immediacy, severity, and probability of risks from any reductions of federal funds to the state of Utah and how the state will marshal its resources, both human and capital, to prioritize and provide the most essential government services; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor strongly urge local, state, and national representatives to take immediate and sustained action to eliminate deficit spending and secure economic self-reliance to the state of Utah and to the United States;

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor strongly urge the President of the United States and the United States Congress to pass a budget each year and adopt a credible and sustainable plan to balance those budgets;

Resolved, That the Legislature and the Governor strongly urge Utah's towns, cities, and counties to adopt and implement comprehensive financial risk management measures as soon as possible;

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Attorney General of the United States, the President of the United States, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Utah Association of Counties, the Utah League of Cities and Towns, Financial Ready Utah, the Utah State Chamber of Commerce, the Utah Board of Regents, the Utah State Board of Education, and the members of Utah's congressional delegation.

POM-117. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah rejecting United Nations Agenda 21 and urging state and local governments across the United States to reject it; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 11

Whereas, the United Nations Agenda 21 was initiated at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1992;

Whereas, the United Nations Agenda 21 is being introduced into local communities across the United States through the International Council of Local Environmental Initiatives, through local “sustainable development” policies including Smart Growth America, the Wildlands Project, and Center for Resilient Cities;

Whereas, the United Nations has accredited and enlisted numerous nongovernmental and intergovernmental organizations to assist in the implementation of its policies relative to Agenda 21 around the world;

Whereas, the United Nations Agenda 21 plan of sustainable development views private property ownership, single family homes, private car ownership, individual travel choices, and privately owned farms as destructive to the environment;

Whereas, according to the United Nations Agenda 21 policy, social justice is described

as the right and opportunity of all people to benefit equally from the resources afforded citizens by society and the environment, which would be accomplished by redistribution of wealth;

Whereas, according to United Nations Agenda 21 policy, national sovereignty is deemed a social injustice;

Whereas, Utah has a tradition of locally driven community planning efforts dating back to the first settlers who laid out a community plat that formed the basis for most of the cities in Utah;

Whereas, Utah regional planning efforts have focused on citizen participation, local decision making, transparent processes, sound technical data, response to market demand, and respect for due process and private property;

Whereas, Utah's Associations of Governments and Councils of Governments are created and controlled by Utah counties, cities, and towns, predate the adoption of Agenda 21 by more than 20 years, and provide a forum for these local governments to cooperate on issues of regional significance; and

Whereas, cooperative decision making that is locally driven and controlled provides great benefits in terms of cost and service delivery and continues to serve the state of Utah well: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah rejects United Nations Agenda 21, both its intent and its potential for abuse; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature urges Utah's state agencies and political subdivisions to not adopt or implement policy recommendations that deliberately or inadvertently infringe or restrict private property rights without due process, as may be required by policy recommendations originating in or traceable to Agenda 21, adopted by the United Nations in 1992 at its Conference on Environment and Development, or any other international law or ancillary plan of action that contravenes the Constitution of the United States or the Constitution of the state of Utah;

Be it Further Resolved, That the Legislature urges Utah's state agencies and political subdivisions to not adopt or develop environmental and developmental policies that, without due process, would infringe or restrict the private property rights of property owners;

Be it Further Resolved, That the Legislature urges state and local governments across the United States to be well informed regarding the underlying harmful implications of implementing United Nations Agenda 21's strategies for "sustainable development.";

Be it Further Resolved, That the Legislature urges state and local governments across the United States to not enter into any agreement, expend any sum of money, contract services, or give financial aid to those non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations affiliated with United Nations Agenda 21;

Be it Further Resolved, That the Legislature urges state and local governments across the United States to reject United Nations Agenda 21 and any grant money or financial aid attached to it;

Be it Further Resolved, That the Legislature of the state of Utah supports the locally directed regional planning efforts that are occurring in Utah and encourages other states to look to the Utah model of collaboration that protects local sovereignty and private property rights;

Be it Further Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Council of State

Governments, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Association of Counties, the United Nations General Assembly, the Wildlands Project, Smart Growth America, Center for Resilient Cities, the International Council of Local Environmental Initiatives, the Utah Association of Counties, the Utah League of Cities and Towns, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of Utah's congressional delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment:

S. 415. A bill to clarify the collateral requirement for certain loans under section 7(d) of the Small Business Act, to address assistance to out-of-State small business concerns, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-84).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 1171. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property.

S. 233. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the "Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building".

S. 668. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building".

S. 796. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the "James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building".

S. 885. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, as the "Thaddeus Stevens Post Office".

S. 1093. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, as the "First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building".

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HARKIN for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Robert F. Cohen, Jr., of West Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2018.

*William Ira Althen, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2018.

*Catherine Elizabeth Lhamon, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Education.

*Harry R. Hoglander, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2014.

*Linda A. Puchala, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2015.

*Nicholas Christopher Geale, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2016.

By Mr. CARPER for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Katherine Archuleta, of Colorado, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of four years.

*John H. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Census for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 2016.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

S. 1401. A bill to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOZMAN:

S. 1402. A bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1403. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to facilitate the screening of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans at airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO,

Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELLER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1404. A bill to prohibit the consideration of any bill by Congress unless the authority provided by the Constitution of the United States for the legislation can be determined and is clearly specified; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LEAHY, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1405. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of certain ambulance add-on payments under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1406. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1407. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to strengthen elementary and secondary computer science education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1408. A bill to address the dramatic increase of HIV/AIDS in minority communities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 1409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for employer-provided job training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1410. A bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1411. A bill to specify requirements for the next update of the current strategic plan for the Office of Rural Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs for improving access to, and the quality of, health care services for veterans in rural areas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1412. A bill to provide the Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the Department of the Treasury with authority to more aggressively enforce customs and trade laws relating to textile and apparel articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. COATS):

S. 1413. A bill to exempt from sequestration certain fees of the Food and Drug Administration; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1414. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1415. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1416. A bill to protect miners from pneumoconiosis (commonly known as black lung disease), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. REID, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASEY, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 207. A resolution designating August 16, 2013, as "National Airborne Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 208. A resolution designating the week beginning September 8, 2013, as "National Direct Support Professional Recognition Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. Res. 209. A resolution remembering the anniversary of the tragic shooting on August 5, 2012, at the Sikh Temple of Wisconsin in Oak Creek, Wisconsin; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. Res. 210. A resolution recognizing and honoring Robert S. Mueller, III, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. Res. 211. A resolution designating September 2013 as "National Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. JOHANNES, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. Con. Res. 21. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that construction of the Keystone XL pipeline and the Federal approvals required for the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline are in the national interest of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 116

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 116, a bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend section 520J of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for mental health first aid training programs.

S. 195

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 195, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and

violence to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

S. 315

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 315, a bill to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 351

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 351, a bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 422

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 422, a bill to amend the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Programs Enhancement Act of 2001 and title 38, United States Code, to require the provision of chiropractic care and services to veterans at all Department of Veterans Affairs medical

centers and to expand access to such care and services, and for other purposes.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 496

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 496, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms.

S. 562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 562, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 573

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 573, a bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property.

S. 647

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 647, a bill to modify the prohibition on recognition by United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names, or commercial names.

S. 692

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 692, a bill to rescind certain Federal funds identified by States as unwanted and use the funds to reduce the Federal debt.

S. 709

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, leading to better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

S. 718

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 718, a bill to create jobs in the United States by increasing United States ex-

ports to Africa by at least 200 percent in real dollar value within 10 years, and for other purposes.

S. 809

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 809, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that genetically engineered food and foods that contain genetically engineered ingredients be labeled accordingly.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 862, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 915

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 915, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to update reporting requirements for institutions of higher education and provide for more accurate and complete data on student retention, graduation, and earnings outcomes at all levels of postsecondary enrollment.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 968

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 968, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, to advance the ability of credit unions to promote small business growth and economic development opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 1012

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1012, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve operations of recovery auditors

under the Medicare integrity program, to increase transparency and accuracy in audits conducted by contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 1118

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1118, a bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent sex trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

S. 1123

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1123, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 1135

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1135, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to repeal a certain exemption for hydraulic fracturing, and for other purposes.

S. 1137

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1137, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modernize payments for ambulatory surgical centers under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1155

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1155, a bill to provide for advance appropriations for certain information technology accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to include mental health professionals in training programs of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1181

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1181, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1204, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related

discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1217

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1217, a bill to provide secondary mortgage market reform, and for other purposes.

S. 1235

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1235, a bill to restrict any State or local jurisdiction from imposing a new discriminatory tax on cell phone services, providers, or property.

S. 1250

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1250, a bill to provide \$50,000,000,000 in new transportation infrastructure funding through bonding to empower States and local governments to complete significant infrastructure projects across all modes of transportation, including roads, bridges, rail and transit systems, ports, and inland waterways, and for other purposes.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1251, a bill to establish programs with respect to childhood, adolescent, and young adult cancer.

S. 1276

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1276, a bill to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management, strengthen the authority to terminate or debar employees and contractors involved in misconduct affecting the integrity of security clearance background investigations, enhance transparency regarding the criteria utilized by Federal departments and agencies to determine when a security clearance is required, and for other purposes.

S. 1277

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1277, a bill to establish a commission for the purpose of coordinating efforts to reduce prescription drug abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1310

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr.

CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1310, a bill to require Senate confirmation of Inspector General of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes.

S. 1323

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1323, a bill to address the continued threat posed by dangerous synthetic drugs by amending the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues.

S. 1324

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1324, a bill to prohibit any regulations promulgated pursuant to a presidential memorandum relating to power sector carbon pollution standards from taking effect.

S. 1332

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 1335

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1335, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1360, a bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1386

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1386, a bill to provide for enhanced embassy security, and for other purposes.

S. 1392

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1823

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, the names of the Senator from

Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1823 intended to be proposed to S. 1243, an original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOZMAN:

S. 1402. A bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, part of the American Dream is to build an inheritance that will benefit our future generations. The death tax works against that idea by making planning and passing on family farms and businesses to the next generation even more difficult. Often times the cost is too much to absorb and families end up spending their hard-earned money on attorney fees, selling their land or business and its assets, or laying off workers just to pay Uncle Sam. We need to eliminate policies like the death tax that create unnecessary burdens on our agriculture community and family businesses. The Death Tax Repeal Act would permanently eliminate the federal estate and gift taxes that punish America's agriculture producers and small business owners. According to a study by Douglas Holtz-Eakin, a former director of the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, repealing the death tax would create 1.5 million additional small business jobs and would decrease the national unemployment rate by nearly 1 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1402

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Death Tax Repeal Act".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to estate, gift, and generation-skipping taxes) is hereby repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeal made by subsection (a) shall apply to estates of decedents dying, gifts made, and generation-skipping transfers made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1410. A bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1410

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Smarter Sentencing Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. APPLICABILITY OF STATUTORY MINIMUMS.

Section 3553(f)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “defendant” and all that follows through “point” and inserting “criminal history category for the defendant is not higher than category 2”.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY OF THE FAIR SENTENCING ACT.

(a) DEFINITION OF COVERED OFFENSE.—In this section, the term “covered offense” means a violation of a Federal criminal statute, the statutory penalties for which were modified by section 2 or 3 of the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-220; 124 Stat. 2372), that was committed before August 3, 2010.

(b) DEFENDANTS PREVIOUSLY SENTENCED.—A court that imposed a sentence for a covered offense, may, on motion of the defendant, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, the attorney for the Government, or the court, impose a reduced sentence as if sections 2 and 3 of the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-220; 124 Stat. 2372) were in effect at the time the covered offense was committed.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—No court shall entertain a motion made under this section to reduce a sentence if the sentence was previously imposed or previously reduced in accordance with the amendments made by sections 2 and 3 of the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-220; 124 Stat. 2372) or if a motion made under this section to reduce the sentence was previously denied. Nothing in this section shall be construed to require a court to reduce any sentence pursuant to this section.

SEC. 4. SENTENCING MODIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN DRUG OFFENSES.

(a) CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.—Section 401(b)(1) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the flush text following clause (viii)—

(A) by striking “10 years or more” and inserting “5 years or more”; and

(B) by striking “such person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment which may not be less than 20 years and” and inserting “such person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment which may not be less than 10 years and”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), in the flush text following clause (viii)—

(A) by striking “5 years” and inserting “2 years”; and

(B) by striking “not be less than 10 years” and inserting “not be less than 5 years”.

(b) CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES IMPORT AND EXPORT ACT.—Section 1010(b) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the flush text following subparagraph (H)—

(A) by striking “not less than 10 years” and inserting “not less than 5 years”; and

(B) by striking “such person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not less

than 20 years” and inserting “such person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not less than 10 years”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), in the flush text following subparagraph (H)—

(A) by striking “5 years” and inserting “2 years”; and

(B) by striking “10 years” and inserting “5 years”.

SEC. 5. DIRECTIVE TO THE SENTENCING COMMISSION.

(a) DIRECTIVE TO SENTENCING COMMISSION.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this section, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and amend, if appropriate, its guidelines and its policy statements applicable to persons convicted of an offense under section 401 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841) or section 1010 of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960) to ensure that the guidelines and policy statements are consistent with the amendments made by sections 2 and 4 of this Act and reflect the intent of Congress that such penalties be decreased in accordance with the amendments made by section 4 of this Act.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out this section, the United States Sentencing Commission shall consider—

(1) the mandate of the United States Sentencing Commission, under section 994(g) of title 28, United States Code, to formulate the sentencing guidelines in such a way as to “minimize the likelihood that the Federal prison population will exceed the capacity of the Federal prisons”; and

(2) the findings and conclusions of the United States Sentencing Commission in its October 2011 report to Congress entitled, Mandatory Minimum Penalties in the Federal Criminal Justice System;

(3) the fiscal implications of any amendments or revisions to the sentencing guidelines or policy statements made by the United States Sentencing Commission;

(4) the relevant public safety concerns involved in the considerations before the United States Sentencing Commission;

(5) the intent of Congress that penalties for violent and serious drug traffickers who present public safety risks remain appropriately severe; and

(6) the need to reduce and prevent racial disparities in Federal sentencing.

(c) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.—The United States Sentencing Commission shall—

(1) promulgate the guidelines, policy statements, or amendments provided for in this Act as soon as practicable, and in any event not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with the procedure set forth in section 21(a) of the Sentencing Act of 1987 (28 U.S.C. 994 note), as though the authority under that Act had not expired; and

(2) pursuant to the emergency authority provided under paragraph (1), make such conforming amendments to the Federal sentencing guidelines as the Commission determines necessary to achieve consistency with other guideline provisions and applicable law.

SEC. 6. REPORT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report outlining how the reduced expenditures on Federal corrections and the cost savings resulting from this Act will be used to help reduce overcrowding in the Federal Bureau of Prisons, help increase

proper investment in law enforcement and crime prevention, and help reduce criminal recidivism, thereby increasing the effectiveness of Federal criminal justice spending.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1414. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce two bills that are aimed at righting past wrongs and fostering the self-sufficiency of proud nations. The Canyon Mountain Land Conveyance Act of 2013 and the Oregon Coastal Land Conveyance Act will provide homelands for the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians and the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, respectively—two tribes that are currently without a land base or that have only a nominal land base. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by my friend and colleague, Senator MERKLEY.

Our country's official policies toward its native peoples have changed over time since the founding of the United States. When European settlers came to American shores, they recognized that the lands on which our Nation now sits were occupied by millions of people organized by hundreds of governments, and these European colonial powers respected these governments as fellow sovereigns. In the late 1700's, when our great Nation was born, it followed suit, making treaties with the governments of the various tribes and aiming to get along with them to ensure peace and prosperity for all. As our Nation became more powerful, its policies toward Native peoples and governments shifted with the political tides of those times. If you examine history books, some of the darkest episodes in our history can be found in the chapters written about our federal government's treatment of the first Americans.

Our Nation's past is littered with failed policies toward its first peoples, and one of those failed policies—that to which scholars refer to as, “Termination”—had a profoundly negative impact on my State. During the 1950's, the federal government was not in the business of honoring the treaties it made with the Indian tribes nor was it interested in living up to its trust responsibility toward its first peoples. Importantly, and as an aside, the tribes had bargained for these rights in exchange for the millions of acres of lands ceded to the United States to enable our westward expansion. At that time, our official Federal stance was focused on terminating the government-to-government relationships between tribal governments and the United States. In my own State of Oregon, several tribes west of the Cascade

Mountains were terminated, including the two that are the subjects of the bills I am introducing today. The Termination Era had tragic effects on those tribes that lost Federal recognition. Members of terminated tribes struggled to retain their cultural and religious identities and to survive in a new landscape in which federal programs for their health, education, and housing did not exist.

The Termination Era was such a disaster that the Federal Government formally rebuked it a mere twenty years later when Presidents Johnson and Nixon ushered in the Self-Determination Era. Now, our Federal stance toward tribes is one that respects tribal sovereignty and supports a tribe's right to determine its own destiny while at the same time, fulfilling our duty as trustee to the various tribes. Our Federal policy of self-determination has been lauded by scholars as being the only Federal Indian policy that has succeeded in benefitting our native peoples. Self-Determination Era policies have resulted in an economic boom all over Indian Country as tribes have used Federal assistance to create jobs for Indians and non-Indians alike all across the Nation, much of the time in rural areas where economic opportunities would otherwise not exist. Many of the tribes in my State, for instance, have been able to build their economies, become more self-sufficient and provide valuable goods and services as well as jobs to surrounding community members.

For a tribe to fully exercise its governmental powers—to protect and nurture its members, to retain its cultural and religious heritage, and to grow its economy—it needs a land base. Even though the Cow Creek and Coos tribes were restored to Federal recognition in the 1980's, they still have not been given back any of their former land from which they can exercise their inherent authority as sovereigns. My bills would provide home bases for these tribes from which they can flourish.

The bills I am introducing today convey 17,826 and 14,804 acres of land that is now managed by the Bureau of Land Management, to the Secretary of the Interior to hold in trust for the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians and the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, respectively. The bills specify that commercial forestry activities taking place on the land must be done pursuant to all applicable federal laws, and because both of the tribes already own casinos, they specify that the land cannot be used for gaming purposes. Lastly, to address the concerns of counties over lost timber revenues from the Oregon and California Railroad lands within the conveyances, the bills contain provisions ensuring there will be no net loss of O&C lands to the counties.

I want to thank the tribes, counties, and other stakeholders for working together to find the common ground which made these bills a reality.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bills be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1414

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Oregon Coastal Land Conveyance Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term "Federal land" means the approximately 14,804 acres of Federal land, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Oregon Coastal Land Conveyance", and dated March 27, 2013.

(2) **PLANNING AREA.**—The term "planning area" means land—

(A) administered by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management; and

(B) located in—

- (i) the Coos Bay District;
- (ii) the Eugene District;
- (iii) the Medford District;
- (iv) the Roseburg District;
- (v) the Salem District; and
- (vi) the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview District.

(3) **DEFINITION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In this subsection, the term "public domain land" has the meaning given the term "public lands" in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(B) **EXCLUSION.**—The term "public domain land" does not include any land managed in accordance with the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874, chapter 876; 43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.).

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) **TRIBE.**—The term "Tribe" means the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land, including any improvements located on the Federal land, appurtenances to the Federal land, and minerals on or in the Federal land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) **SURVEY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

SEC. 4. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Federal land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) **FORCE AND EFFECT.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may

correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Unless expressly provided in this Act, nothing in this Act affects any right or claim of the Tribe existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) **PROHIBITIONS.**—

(1) **EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.**—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Federal land.

(2) **NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.**—Any real property taken into trust under section 3 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100-497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

SEC. 6. FOREST MANAGEMENT.

Any commercial forestry activity that is carried out on the Federal land shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

SEC. 7. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION OF OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD LAND.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall identify any land owned by the Oregon and California Railroad that is conveyed under section 3.

(b) **IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify public domain land that—

(1) is approximately equal in acreage and condition as the land identified under subsection (a); and

(2) is located within the planning area.

(c) **MAPS.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register 1 or more maps depicting the land identified in subsections (a) and (b).

(d) **RECLASSIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—After providing an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall reclassify the land identified in subsection (b) as land owned by the Oregon and California Railroad.

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—The Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874, chapter 876; 43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.) shall apply to land reclassified as land owned by the Oregon and California Railroad under paragraph (1)(B).

S. 1415

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Canyon Mountain Land Conveyance Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term "Federal land" means the approximately 17,826 acres of Federal land, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Canyon Mountain Land Conveyance", and dated June 27, 2013.

(2) **PLANNING AREA.**—The term "planning area" means land—

(A) administered by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management; and

(B) located in—

- (i) the Coos Bay District;
- (ii) the Eugene District;
- (iii) the Medford District;

(iv) the Roseburg District;
 (v) the Salem District; and
 (vi) the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview District.

(3) DEFINITION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In this subsection, the term “public domain land” has the meaning given the term “public lands” in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term “public domain land” does not include any land managed in accordance with the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874, chapter 876; 43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land, including any improvements located on the Federal land, appurtenances to the Federal land, and minerals on or in the Federal land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) SURVEY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

SEC. 4. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Federal land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Unless expressly provided in this Act, nothing in this Act affects any right or claim of the Tribe existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) PROHIBITIONS.—

(1) EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Federal land.

(2) NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.—Any real property taken into trust under section 3 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100-497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

SEC. 6. FOREST MANAGEMENT.

Any commercial forestry activity that is carried out on the Federal land shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

SEC. 7. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD LAND.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Sec-

retary shall identify any land owned by the Oregon and California Railroad that is conveyed under section 3.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify public domain land that—

(1) is approximately equal in acreage and condition as the land identified under subsection (a); and

(2) is located within the planning area.

(c) MAPS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register 1 or more maps depicting the land identified in subsections (a) and (b).

(d) RECLASSIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After providing an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall reclassify the land identified in subsection (b) as land owned by the Oregon and California Railroad.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874, chapter 876; 43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.) shall apply to land reclassified as land owned by the Oregon and California Railroad under paragraph (1)(B).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 207—DESIGNATING AUGUST 16, 2013, AS “NATIONAL AIRBORNE DAY”

Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. REID, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASEY, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 207

Whereas the members of the airborne forces of the Armed Forces of the United States have a long and honorable history as bold and fierce warriors who, for the national security of the United States and the defense of freedom and peace, project the ground combat power of the United States by air transport to the far reaches of the battle area and to the far corners of the world;

Whereas the experiment of the United States with airborne operations began on June 25, 1940, when the Army Parachute Test Platoon was first authorized by the Department of War, and 48 volunteers began training in July 1940;

Whereas August 16 marks the anniversary of the first official Army parachute jump, which took place on August 16, 1940, to test the innovative concept of inserting United States ground combat forces behind a battle line by means of a parachute;

Whereas the success of the Army Parachute Test Platoon in the days immediately before the entry of the United States into World War II validated the airborne operational concept and led to the creation of a formidable force of airborne formations that included the 11th, 13th, 17th, 82nd, and 101st Airborne Divisions;

Whereas, included in those divisions, and among other separate formations, were many airborne combat, combat support, and combat service support units that served with distinction and achieved repeated success in armed hostilities during World War II, and provide the lineage and legacy of

many airborne units throughout the Armed Forces;

Whereas the achievements of the airborne units during World War II prompted the evolution of those units into a diversified force of parachute and air-assault units that, over the years, have fought in Korea, Vietnam, Grenada, Panama, the Persian Gulf region, and Somalia, and have engaged in peacekeeping operations in Lebanon, the Sinai Peninsula, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo;

Whereas, since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the members of the United States airborne forces, including members of the XVIII Airborne Corps, the 82nd Airborne Division, the 101st Airborne Division, the 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team, the 4th Brigade Combat Team (Airborne) of the 25th Infantry Division, the 75th Ranger Regiment, special operations forces of the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force, and other units of the Armed Forces, have demonstrated bravery and honor in combat, stability, and training operations in Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas the modern-day airborne forces also include other elite forces composed of airborne trained and qualified special operations warriors, including Army Special Forces, Marine Corps Reconnaissance units, Navy SEALs, and Air Force combat control and pararescue teams;

Whereas, of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces, thousands have achieved the distinction of making combat jumps, dozens have earned the Medal of Honor, and hundreds have earned the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, or other decorations and awards for displays of heroism, gallantry, intrepidity, and valor;

Whereas the members and former members of the United States airborne forces are all members of a proud and honorable tradition that, together with the special skills and achievements of those members, distinguishes the members as intrepid combat parachutists, air assault forces, special operation forces, and, in the past, glider troops;

Whereas individuals from every State in the United States have served gallantly in the airborne forces, and each State is proud of the contributions of its paratrooper veterans during the many conflicts faced by the United States;

Whereas the history and achievements of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces warrant special expressions of the gratitude of the people of the United States; and

Whereas, since the airborne forces, past and present, celebrate August 16 as the anniversary of the first official jump by the Army Parachute Test Platoon, August 16 is an appropriate day to recognize as National Airborne Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates August 16, 2013, as “National Airborne Day”; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe National Airborne Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 208—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 8, 2013, AS “NATIONAL DIRECT SUPPORT PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION WEEK”

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr.

BROWN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 208

Whereas direct support professionals, direct care workers, personal assistants, personal attendants, in-home support workers, and paraprofessionals (referred to in this preamble as “direct support professionals”) are the primary providers of publicly funded long-term supports and services for millions of individuals;

Whereas a direct support professional must build a close, trusted relationship with an individual with disabilities;

Whereas a direct support professional assists an individual with disabilities with the most intimate needs on a daily basis;

Whereas direct support professionals provide a broad range of support, including—

- (1) preparing meals;
- (2) managing medications;
- (3) bathing;
- (4) dressing;
- (5) helping with mobility;
- (6) providing transportation to school, work, and religious, and recreational activities; and
- (7) helping with general daily affairs;

Whereas a direct support professional provides essential support to help keep an individual with disabilities connected to the family and community of the individual;

Whereas direct support professionals enable individuals with disabilities to live meaningful, productive lives;

Whereas a direct support professional is the key to allowing an individual with disabilities to live successfully in the community and avoid more costly institutional care;

Whereas the majority of direct support professionals are female, and many are the sole breadwinners of their families;

Whereas direct support professionals work and pay taxes, but many are impoverished and are eligible for the same Federal and State public assistance programs on which the individuals with disabilities served by the direct support professionals must depend;

Whereas Federal and State policies, as well as the Supreme Court in *Olmstead v. L.C.*, 527 U.S. 581 (1999), assert the right of an individual to live in the home and community of the individual;

Whereas, in 2013, the majority of direct support professionals are employed in home- and community-based settings, and this trend is projected to increase during this decade;

Whereas there is a documented critical and growing shortage of direct support professionals in every community throughout the United States; and

Whereas many direct support professionals are forced to leave jobs due to inadequate wages and benefits, creating high turnover and vacancy rates that research demonstrates adversely affects the quality of support provided to individuals with disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning September 8, 2013, as “National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week”;

(2) recognizes the dedication and vital role of direct support professionals in enhancing the lives of individuals of all ages with disabilities;

(3) appreciates the contribution of direct support professionals in supporting the needs

that are beyond the capacities of millions of families in the United States;

(4) commends direct support professionals as integral in supporting the long-term support and services system of the United States; and

(5) finds that the successful implementation of the public policies of the United States depends on the dedication of direct support professionals.

SENATE RESOLUTION 209—REMEMBERING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRAGIC SHOOTING ON AUGUST 5, 2012, AT THE SIKH TEMPLE OF WISCONSIN IN OAK CREEK, WISCONSIN

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 209

Whereas, on Sunday, August 5, 2012, a shooting took place at the Sikh Temple of Wisconsin in Oak Creek, Wisconsin;

Whereas 6 innocent people of the United States, including one woman and 5 men, lost their lives on that day in a senseless and violent act of hate at a house of worship;

Whereas 3 people sustained serious injuries, including Lieutenant Brian Murphy, the first responding officer;

Whereas many members of the Sikh community and the community as a whole selflessly sought to aid and protect others by putting their own safety at risk;

Whereas the heroic action of law enforcement officers such as Officer Sam Lenda prevented additional loss of life; and

Whereas the Sikh community has responded to the shooting in a peaceful manner consistent with the Sikh religious tenets of peace and equality: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) remembers the anniversary of the tragic shooting on August 5, 2012, at the Sikh Temple of Wisconsin in Oak Creek, Wisconsin;

(2) condemns in the strongest possible terms that horrific shooting;

(3) condemns hatred and acts of violence towards racial and religious groups and calls for renewed efforts to end that violence;

(4) honors the memory of Suveg Singh Khattri, Satwant Singh Kaleka, Ranjit Singh, Sita Singh, Paramjit Kaur, and Prakash Singh, who died in the shooting;

(5) offers heartfelt condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of those who died in the shooting;

(6) commends the heroism of first responders, and members of the community who courageously and selflessly placed their lives in danger to prevent the death of more innocent people; and

(7) stands with those who plan to gather in Oak Creek on August 2 through August 5, 2013, to memorialize the lives lost in the shooting and to continue healing as a community.

SENATE RESOLUTION 210—RECOGNIZING AND HONORING ROBERT S. MUELLER, III, DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr.

DURBIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 210

Whereas Robert S. Mueller, III has enjoyed a long and distinguished career in public service as a military officer, as a prosecutor, and as the sixth Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (referred to in this preamble as the “FBI”);

Whereas Director Mueller received his undergraduate degree from Princeton University, a master’s degree in International Relations from New York University, and a juris doctor from the University of Virginia;

Whereas Director Mueller served with bravery in the United States Marine Corps during the Vietnam War, leading a rifle platoon of the 3rd Marine Division and earning the Bronze Star, 2 Navy Commendation Medals, the Purple Heart, and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry;

Whereas Director Mueller began his career in law enforcement in 1976 as an Assistant United States Attorney in the United States Attorney’s Office for the Northern District of California in San Francisco, and then served as an Assistant United States Attorney for the District of Massachusetts in Boston;

Whereas Director Mueller later served in a variety of other positions in the Department of Justice, including as a senior litigator in the Homicide Section of the United States Attorney’s Office for the District of Columbia, assistant to Attorney General Richard L. Thornburgh, and Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division;

Whereas, in 1998, Director Mueller was nominated by President William J. Clinton and confirmed by the Senate to be the United States Attorney for the Northern District of California in San Francisco;

Whereas, in 2001, Director Mueller was nominated by President George W. Bush and confirmed by the Senate to be the Director of the FBI;

Whereas Director Mueller took office as Director of the FBI on September 4, 2001, just 1 week before the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001;

Whereas Director Mueller led the FBI in the wake of the September 11 attacks and helped transform the FBI into an intelligence-driven organization with a primary focus on national security threats;

Whereas, in 2011, Director Mueller again answered the call to public service by agreeing to serve for an additional 2 years beyond his original 10-year term as Director of the FBI;

Whereas, in 2011, Congress enacted legislation creating a special 2-year term that enabled Director Mueller to continue serving as Director of the FBI;

Whereas Director Mueller has earned the trust and respect of Senators from both parties as a result of his candor, integrity, and unwavering commitment to the rule of law; and

Whereas, throughout the past 12 years, Director Mueller has embodied the principles of fidelity, bravery, and integrity that are at the core of the FBI: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and honors the distinguished service of Robert S. Mueller, III as the sixth Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

(2) expresses, on behalf of the United States, its deep appreciation to Director Mueller for his dedication, sacrifice, and outstanding service to his country.

SENATE RESOLUTION 211—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2013 AS “NATIONAL SPINAL CORD INJURY AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. NELSON) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 211

Whereas the estimated 1,275,000 individuals in the United States who live with a spinal cord injury cost society billions of dollars in health care costs and lost wages;

Whereas an estimated 100,000 of those people are veterans who suffered the spinal cord injury while serving as members of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas accidents are the leading cause of spinal cord injuries;

Whereas motor vehicle crashes are the second leading cause of spinal cord and traumatic brain injuries;

Whereas 70 percent of all spinal cord injuries that occur in children under the age of 18 are a result of motor vehicle accidents;

Whereas every 48 minutes a person will become paralyzed, underscoring the urgent need to develop new neuroprotection, pharmacological, and regeneration treatments to reduce, prevent, and reverse paralysis; and

Whereas increased education and investment in research are key factors in improving outcomes for victims of spinal cord injuries, improving the quality of life of victims, and ultimately curing paralysis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2013 as “National Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Month”;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Month;

(3) continues to support research to find better treatments, therapies, and a cure for paralysis;

(4) supports clinical trials for new therapies that offer promise and hope to those persons living with paralysis; and

(5) commends the dedication of local, regional, and national organizations, researchers, doctors, volunteers, and people across the United States that are working to improve the quality of life of people living with paralysis and their families.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT CONSTRUCTION OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE AND THE FEDERAL APPROVALS REQUIRED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ARE IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES

Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. JOHANNIS, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. CON. RES. 21

Whereas safe and responsible production, transportation, and use of oil and petroleum products provide the foundation of the energy economy of the United States, helping to secure and advance the economic pros-

perity, national security, and overall quality of life in the United States;

Whereas the Keystone XL pipeline will provide short- and long-term employment opportunities and related labor income benefits, such as government revenues associated with taxes;

Whereas the State of Nebraska has thoroughly reviewed and approved the proposed Keystone XL pipeline reroute, concluding that the concerns of Nebraskans have had a major influence on the pipeline reroute and that the reroute will have minimal environmental impacts;

Whereas the Department of State and other Federal agencies have conducted extensive studies and analysis over a long period of time on the technical, environmental, social, and economic impact of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline;

Whereas assessments by the Department of State found that the Keystone XL pipeline is “not likely to impact the amount of crude oil produced from the oil sands” and that “approval or denial of the proposed Project is unlikely to have a substantial impact on the rate of development in the oil sands”;

Whereas the Department of State found that the incremental life cycle greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Keystone XL project are estimated in the range of 0.07 to 0.83 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents, with the upper end of this range representing 12/1,000 of 1 percent of the 6,702,000,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide emitted in the United States in 2011;

Whereas after extensive evaluation of potential impact to land and water resources along the 875-mile proposed route of the Keystone XL pipeline, the Department of State found, “The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that there would be no significant impacts to most resources along the proposed Project route (assuming Keystone complies with all laws and required conditions and measures).”;

Whereas the Department of State found that “[s]pills associated with the proposed Project that enter the environment are expected to be rare and relatively small” and that “there is no evidence of increased corrosion or other pipeline threat due to viscosity” of diluted bitumen oil that will be transported by the Keystone XL pipeline;

Whereas, the National Research Council convened a special expert panel to review the risk of transporting diluted bitumen by pipeline and issued a report in June 2013 to the Department of Transportation in which the National Research Council found that existing literature indicates that transportation of diluted bitumen poses no increased risk of pipeline failure;

Whereas plans to incorporate 57 project-specific special conditions relating to the design, construction, and operations of the Keystone XL pipeline led the Department of State to find that the pipeline will have “a degree of safety over any other typically constructed domestic oil pipeline”;

Whereas, the Department of State found that oil destined to be shipped through the pipeline from the oil sands region of Canada and oil shale deposits in the United States would otherwise move by other modes of transportation if the Keystone XL pipeline is not built; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) construction of the Keystone XL pipeline will promote sound investment in the infrastructure of the United States;

(2) construction of the Keystone XL pipeline will promote energy security in North America and will generate an increase in private sector jobs that will benefit both the region surrounding the Keystone XL pipeline and the United States as a whole; and

(3) completion of the Keystone XL pipeline is in the national interest of the United States.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the Keystone XL Pipeline. I am going to submit a concurrent resolution that I am sponsoring with MARY LANDRIEU of Louisiana, but before I do that, I want to talk specifically in terms of the Keystone XL Pipeline and correcting the record. I am correcting the record relative to statements the administration has made recently about the project.

As we all know, the Obama administration has been reviewing this project for 5 years. The initial application was submitted by TransCanada, the parent company, in September of 2008, and we are now almost in August of 2013. So in addition to delaying the project, they are also putting out false information. President Obama and Treasury Secretary Lew presented information this week on the Keystone Pipeline that is wrong, and today I want to correct the record.

I want to quote directly from an interview President Obama conducted and reported in the New York Times on Saturday. I am going to read from that transcript because it goes to a number of issues in terms of jobs and energy development as well as the requirements the administration says need to be addressed for the Keystone Pipeline. However, I think the company has addressed those issues in great detail.

Again, this is the transcript from the New York Times. Also, the interview was conducted last week when the President was on his jobs tour.

The interviewer said:

A couple of other quick subjects that are economic-related. Keystone pipeline—Republicans especially talked about that as a big job creator. You’ve said that you would approve it only if you could be assured it would not significantly exacerbate carbon in the atmosphere. Is there anything that Canada could do or the oil companies could do to offset that as a way of helping you reaching that decision?

That was the question asked of the President. The President responded:

Well, first of all, Michael, [the interviewer] Republicans have said that this would be a big jobs generator. There is no evidence that that’s true. And my hope would be that any reporter who is looking at the facts would take the time to confirm that the most realistic estimates are this might create maybe 2,000 jobs during the construction of the pipeline—

That is the Keystone Pipeline.

which might take a year or two—and then after that we’re talking somewhere between 50 and 100 [chuckles] jobs in an economy of 150 million working people.

The interviewer goes on:

Yet there are a number of unions who want you to approve this.

Mr. Obama:

Well, look, they might like to see 2,000 jobs initially. But that is a blip relative to the need.

So what we also know is, is that that oil is going to be piped down to the Gulf to be sold on the world oil markets, so it does not bring down gas prices here in the United States. In fact, it might actually cause some gas prices in the Midwest to go up where currently they can't ship some of that oil to world markets.

Now, having said that, there is a potential benefit for us integrating further with a reliable ally to the north our energy supplies.

But I meant what I said; I will evaluate this based on whether or not this is going to significantly contribute to carbon in our atmosphere. And there is no doubt that Canada at the source in those tar sands could potentially be doing more to mitigate carbon releases.

The interviewer asked:

And if they did, could that offset concerns about the pipeline itself?

To which the President responded:

We haven't seen specific ideas or plans. But all of that will go into the mix in terms of John Kerry's decision or recommendation on this issue.

That was the key part of the interview I want to address in my comments.

There are three points I would like to make. The first one is jobs. President Obama says the project will create 2,000 jobs during construction. Then he says maybe 50 or so after that, and he kind of chuckles as he says that.

The first question is: Where does that number come from? Where is he getting his number? His own State Department has a very different number. They say it is going to create more than 42,000 jobs during construction. They didn't say 2,000 jobs during construction, but more than 42,000 jobs during construction.

I will read from the State Department report. It is a draft from the environmental impact statement which came out on March 1, 2013. The State Department report says:

Including direct, indirect, and induced effects, the proposed Project would potentially support approximately 42,100 average annual jobs across the United States over a 1-to 2-year construction period.

That is right out of the report. The State Department goes on to talk about some of the other employment benefits created by the Keystone project.

This employment would potentially translate into approximately \$2.05 billion in earnings. Direct expenditures such as construction and material costs . . . would total approximately \$3.3 billion. Short-term revenues from sources such as sales and use taxes would total approximately \$65 million in states that levy such a tax.

So you are getting tax revenues and \$65 million as well.

Yields from fuel and other taxes could not be calculated, but would provide some additional economic benefit to host countries and states.

There is the environmental impact as to the employment right out of the State Department report. We have to ask: Why is President Obama talking about a number like 2,000? It appears the number he is quoting comes from opponents of the projects. Rather than taking his own State Department numbers—done after 5 years of study—he is quoting numbers which are wrong from opponents of the project. Again, don't take my word for it.

Recently the Washington Post—in their fact-check article—stated that President Obama appeared to be using numbers from opponents of the project rather than from his own State Department.

So why would he do that? Why would he take numbers from opponents rather than the State Department?

Well, here is what Sean McGarvey, president of North America's Building Trades Unions, had to say about it in a statement he issued several days ago. According to Sean McGarvey, president of North America's Building Trade Unions:

America's Building Trade Unions were disappointed to see that the President chose to minimize the importance of jobs for construction workers and to use employment figures promulgated by special interests and activist billionaires rather than his own Department of State's findings that the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline would support approximately 42,100 average annual jobs across the United States over a 1- to 2-year construction period.

But the President goes on—it is not just the jobs number that is incorrect. The President also stated this in that New York Times interview:

What we also know is, is that that oil is going to be piped down to the Gulf to be sold on the world oil markets, so it does not bring down gas prices here in the United States. In fact, it might actually cause some gas prices in the Midwest to go up where currently they can't ship some of that oil to world markets.

So he is saying the oil won't be used in the United States and, in fact, it might cause gas prices to go up. But now he is contradicting a report from his own Department of Energy. His own Department of Energy addressed those very issues back in June of 2011. They issued a report, and that report forecasted that the oil will be used in the United States and, further, that it will reduce the price of fuel at the pump for Midwest consumers. I will quote from that report. Again, this is a report from the Department of Energy that was provided in June of 2011.

Without a surplus of heavy oil in (the Gulf Coast), there would be no economic incentive to ship Canadian oil sands to Asia via Port Arthur (in Texas). Many of these (Gulf Coast) refineries rely on declining supplies of Mexican and Venezuelan heavy crudes. . . . They would be natural customers for increased supplies of Canadian dilbit (oil sands oil). . . . The Gulf Coast appetite for Canadian oil sands . . . will be much higher than can be supplied by just the Keystone XL Pipeline.

So they are saying it will be used in the United States.

Concerning the cost of fuel to customers, DOE said:

With substantial additional volumes of light-sweet and other crudes accessible to Gulf Coast refineries, (West Texas Intermediate) prices would increase, Brent, Argus and other market crude prices would decline. Crude costs to (East Coast) and (Gulf Coast) refineries would be lower.

Here is the key sentence from this section:

Gasoline prices in all markets served by (East and Gulf Coast) refineries would be lower, including the Midwest.

So the Department of Energy in its report specifically states that the oil will be used in the United States—we are a net importer of crude oil—and that gas prices would be lower, not higher. As I said earlier, the State Department in the EIS said the job number will be 42,000, not 2,000.

The President then concludes the interview by essentially telling Canada what they should do in terms of their regulatory requirements. He says:

And there is no doubt that Canada at the source in those tar sands could potentially be doing more to mitigate carbon release.

The interviewer then asks:

And if they did, could that offset the concerns about the pipeline itself?

President Obama declines to indicate any specifics, but he says essentially all of that will go into the mix for the decision on whether to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

So here we are. After 5 years—after 5 years of delay, the President is talking about adding new requirements to the project. He is talking about adding those requirements in another country—our closest friend and ally, Canada—or I guess he is essentially saying he would turn down the project—a project that actually reduces greenhouse gas because there is less greenhouse gas if we move that oil by pipeline than if it is moved by truck, by train, or by tanker.

Furthermore, perhaps the biggest irony is that he is imposing this type of regulatory barrier at the same time he is on a jobs tour, which created some problems for his Cabinet members as well. For example, Jack Lew was on "Fox News Sunday" with Chris Wallace, and he got it wrong on Keystone as well last Sunday. The following is part of that transcript. Again, this was "Fox News Sunday" with Chris Wallace and Jack Lew. Wallace asked this question:

Let me ask you one question. If you're so interested in creating more jobs, why not approve the Keystone Pipeline which would create tens of thousands of jobs, sir?

Lew responds:

Chris, I think, as you know, the Keystone Pipeline is being reviewed. It's been in the process that was slowed down because—

Wallace then says:

Several years it's being reviewed. I think what, three, four years.

Lew responds:

It was—there were some political games that were played that took it off the trail, past its completion. When Republicans put it out there as something that was put on a timetable where it could not be resolved, it caused a delay. We are getting to the end of the review and we'll have to see where that review is. But I think playing political games with something like this is a mistake.

So he is saying that somehow the Republicans were playing political games and that slowed down the project and that is why it has been in review for 5 years. Five years it has been in review.

Well, as for Secretary Lew's remarks on "Fox News Sunday," we need only to let the facts—especially the dates—speak for themselves. Secretary Lew claimed that the Keystone XL project was delayed because Republicans politicized it. I would be happy to share with them a letter I received in the summer of 2011 from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. In that letter the Secretary assured me that the Department was poised to make a permitting decision on the Keystone XL project by December of that year—December of 2011.

I have the letter here. It is dated July 26, 2011. It is addressed to Senator HOEVEN. It says: "Thank you for your letter regarding the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline." It goes on to make various comments. The key line in the letter is this: "We expect to make a decision on whether to grant or deny the permit before the end of the year." This is for the Keystone XL Pipeline project from, at that time, Secretary of State Clinton. Instead, however, during the 2012 Presidential election—less than a year away in November—President Obama intervened to postpone that decision until after the election. Then and only then did I press to seek legislatively for a timely decision on the Keystone XL Pipeline and introduced legislation, which we passed, calling for a decision within 60 days, which the President declined to make. So clearly the delay of 5 years is because the administration has refused to make a decision and not for any other reason.

It is not only time to make a decision on the Keystone Pipeline, it is far past time. That is exactly what the American people want. As a matter of fact, in a recent—the most recent poll on the Keystone Pipeline project, Harris Interactive Poll, 82 percent of Americans support approving the Keystone XL Pipeline—82 percent. The President has continued to review it and talk about more requirements. He has provided incorrect information on the jobs and whether the oil will be used here and the impact on gas prices. But 82 percent of Americans want this project approved.

It is about energy. It is about jobs. It is about economic activity. It is about energy security for our country. That is why, as I conclude here today, I wish to submit for the Senate RECORD today,

along with Senator MARY LANDRIEU of Louisiana, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline and the Federal approvals required for construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline are in the national interests of the United States. Essentially, with this concurrent resolution, what we are saying is that the Keystone XL Pipeline is in the national interests of the United States and that the administration needs to approve it. It is a bipartisan resolution, and we will seek to have it approved here in the Senate and approved in the House as well. This is in addition to bipartisan legislation I have already introduced which would approve the project congressionally.

The simple point is this: We need to keep the push on to get this project approved, whether it is with a joint resolution of Congress in support of the project, getting the President to make a decision and to make a favorable decision and to do it now instead of continuing to postpone after 5 years or whether Congress steps forward and approves the project directly through legislation I have already submitted.

We need to get this project done for the American people. It really is about jobs. It is about economic growth and activity. It is about energy for our country and getting this country to the point where we are energy independent, energy secure, where we don't need to rely on oil from the Middle East. That is why 82 percent of Americans in the most recent poll across this country are saying this is the kind of project we need. Mr. President, step up and get it done for the American people.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1832. Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1833. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1834. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1835. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1836. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1837. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1838. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her

to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1839. Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1832. Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 91, line 8, strike the period and insert "": *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall notify public housing agencies of their annual formula allocation not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may extend the notification period established in the prior proviso with the prior written approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations."

SA 1833. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 74, line 18, strike "\$521,375,000" and insert "\$516,375,000".

On page 98, line 5, strike "\$3,295,000,000" and insert "\$3,300,000,000".

On page 98, line 11, after the colon insert "*Provided further*, That of the total amounts made available under this heading, \$5,000,000 is for carrying out grants to assist tribal colleges and universities under the Tribal Colleges and Universities Program pursuant to section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5307):".

SA 1834. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 75, line 8, strike "\$193,600,000" and insert "\$191,100,000".

On page 84, line 10, strike "\$78,000,000" and insert "\$80,500,000".

SA 1835. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 85, line 21, after the semicolon insert “*Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, in administering and distributing rental voucher assistance funded under this paragraph, give consideration to the unique challenges of identifying homeless veterans in rural areas during point in time counts, and adjust their rental voucher assistance allocations accordingly.”

SA 1836. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 74, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 192. (a) The Surface Transportation Board shall investigate any complaint filed by any office or agency of the State of Illinois concerning a freight railroad's actions to delay or obstruct studies, access, investigations, or planning of a new or existing intercity passenger rail route in Illinois.

(b) The Surface Transportation Board is authorized to award damages and other relief pursuant to section 24308 of title 49, United States Code, if the Board finds that a freight railroad—

(1) has delayed studies, access, investigations, or planning of a new or existing intercity passenger rail route in Illinois; or

(2) is deemed to have failed to negotiate with any agency or office of the State of Illinois on any such route.

SA 1837. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 169, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

SEC. 244. BUDGET-NEUTRAL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ENERGY AND WATER CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENTS AT MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL UNITS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) shall establish a demonstration program under which, during the period beginning on October 1, 2013, and ending on September 30, 2016, the Secretary may enter into budget-neutral, performance-based agreements that result in a reduction in energy or water costs with such entities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate under which the entities shall carry out projects for energy or water conservation improvements at not more than 20,000 residential units in multifamily buildings participating in—

(1) the project-based rental assistance program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), other than assistance provided under section 8(o) of that Act;

(2) the supportive housing for the elderly program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q); or

(3) the supportive housing for persons with disabilities program under section 811(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013(d)(2)).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) PAYMENTS CONTINGENT ON SAVINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide to an entity a payment under an agreement under this section only during applicable years for which an energy or water cost savings is achieved with respect to the applicable multifamily portfolio of properties, as determined by the Secretary, in accordance with subparagraph (B).

(B) PAYMENT METHODOLOGY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Each agreement under this section shall include a pay-for-success provision—

(I) that will serve as a payment threshold for the term of the agreement; and

(II) pursuant to which the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall share a percentage of the savings at a level determined by the Secretary that is sufficient to cover the administrative costs of carrying out this section.

(ii) LIMITATIONS.—A payment made by the Secretary under an agreement under this section shall—

(I) be contingent on documented utility savings; and

(II) not exceed the utility savings achieved by the date of the payment, and not previously paid, as a result of the improvements made under the agreement.

(C) THIRD PARTY VERIFICATION.—Savings payments made by the Secretary under this section shall be based on a measurement and verification protocol that includes at least—

(i) establishment of a weather-normalized and occupancy-normalized utility consumption baseline established preretrofit;

(ii) annual third party confirmation of actual utility consumption and cost for owner-paid utilities;

(iii) annual third party validation of the tenant utility allowances in effect during the applicable year and vacancy rates for each unit type; and

(iv) annual third party determination of savings to the Secretary.

(2) TERM.—The term of an agreement under this section shall be not longer than 12 years.

(3) ENTITY ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary shall—

(A) establish a competitive process for entering into agreements under this section; and

(B) enter into such agreements only with entities that demonstrate significant experience relating to—

(i) financing and operating properties receiving assistance under a program described in subsection (a);

(ii) oversight of energy and water conservation programs, including oversight of contractors; and

(iii) raising capital for energy and water conservation improvements from charitable organizations or private investors.

(4) GEOGRAPHICAL DIVERSITY.—Each agreement entered into under this section shall provide for the inclusion of properties with the greatest feasible regional and State variance.

(c) PLAN AND REPORTS.—

(1) PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed plan for the implementation of this section.

(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall—

(A) conduct an evaluation of the program under this section; and

(B) submit to Congress a report describing each evaluation conducted under subparagraph (A).

(d) FUNDING.—For each fiscal year during which an agreement under this section is in effect, the Secretary may use to carry out this section any funds appropriated to the Secretary for the renewal of contracts under a program described in subsection (a).

SA 1838. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . TECHNICAL CORRECTION RELATING TO FORMULA GRANTS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.

Section 5336(b)(2)(E) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “22.27 percent” and inserting “27 percent”.

SA 1839. Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 74, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 192. (a)(1) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”), shall publish on the website of the Department of Transportation the following information relating to the rupture of the Pegasus pipeline in the State of Arkansas:

(A) A summarized analysis of the ExxonMobil 2010 and 2013 in-line inspection reports or the full reports.

(B) A summarized analysis of the ExxonMobil 2006 hydrostatic test report or the full report.

(C) The 2013 metallurgical report.

(2) The Secretary shall publish the information required under paragraph (1) in full, with limited redactions allowed under paragraphs (4) and (7)(A) of section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress (including the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate) a report that—

(1) describes the status of the investigation of the Secretary of the rupture of the Pegasus pipeline;

(2) contains an evaluation of the integrity of the remaining pipeline; and

(3) provides recommendations for improving future pipeline inspections, testing, and monitoring.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2013 at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, "Energy Drinks: Exploring Concerns about Marketing to Youth."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2013, at 9:30 a.m. in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate office building, to conduct a hearing entitled, "Strengthening Public Health Protections by Addressing Toxic Chemical Threats."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2013, at 3 p.m., to hold a European Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, "Where is Turkey Headed? Gezi Park, Taksim Square, and The Future of the Turkish Model."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR AND PENSIONS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD-608 of the Dirksen Senate office building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2013, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2013, at 9 a.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Strengthening Privacy Rights and National Security: Oversight of FISA Surveillance Programs."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SR-418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Relations, and the District of Columbia of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2013, at 2 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, "How Prepared is the National Capital Region for the Next Disaster?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY, NATURAL RESOURCES, AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure of the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room 215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Powering Our Future: Principles for Energy Tax Reform."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate to conduct a hearing on July 31, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Allan Van Vliet be given floor privileges for the balance of the day. He is an intern in my office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two fellows from Senator BROWN's staff, Andrew Steigerwald and Katherine LaBeau, be granted floor privileges for tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF NATO ALLIED COMMAND TRANSFORMATION

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 146, S. Res. 156.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 156) expressing the sense of the Senate on the 10-year anniversary of NATO Allied Command Transformation.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and an amendment to the preamble, as follows:

(Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic.)

(Strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic.)

Whereas, on June 19, 2003, NATO's Allied Command Transformation (ACT), was formally established to increase military effectiveness and prepare the Alliance for future security challenges;

Whereas, on June 19, 2013, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) will celebrate the 10-year anniversary of the establishment of NATO ACT;

Whereas the security of the United States and its NATO allies have been enhanced by the establishment and continued work of NATO ACT;

Whereas, for the past 10 years, ACT has been leading NATO's military transformation, and providing relevant and timely support to NATO operations, while developing partnerships around the globe to adapt to the changing global security environment;

Whereas ACT is the only NATO headquarters in the United States, and the only permanent NATO headquarters outside of Europe;

Whereas ACT provides state of the art education, training, and application of best practices and lessons learned from past operations, and equips Alliance troops with the tools they need to win today's wars;

Whereas ACT improves NATO's defense planning and develops compatible equipment and common standards necessary to keep Alliance capabilities aligned;

Whereas NATO ACT has been integral to a NATO mission of promoting a Europe that is whole, undivided, free, and at peace;

Whereas NATO ACT strengthened the ability of NATO to perform a full range of missions throughout the world;

Whereas NATO ACT has provided crucial support and participation in the NATO International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, as NATO endeavors to help the people of Afghanistan create the conditions necessary for security and successful development and reconstruction;

Whereas ACT employs personnel from 26 of the 28 NATO member nations and six of the 41 NATO Partner nations and contributes more than \$100,000,000 annually to the local economy;

Whereas NATO has been the cornerstone of transatlantic security cooperation and an enduring instrument for promoting stability in Europe and throughout the world for over 60 years, representing the vital transatlantic bond of solidarity between the United States and Europe, as NATO nations share similar values and interests and are committed to the maintenance of democratic principles;

Whereas the Chicago Summit Communiqué affirms that all NATO members “are determined that NATO will continue to play its unique and essential role in ensuring our common defense and security” and that NATO “continues to be effective in a changing world, against new threats, with new capabilities and new partners”;

Whereas, through the Alliance, the United States and Europe are effective and steadfast partners in security, and ACT is well positioned to contribute to the strength of the Alliance on both continents;

Whereas NATO ACT has done much to help NATO meet the global challenges of the 21st century, including the threat of terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, instability caused by failed states, and threats to global energy security; and

Whereas the 10th anniversary of NATO ACT is an opportunity to enhance and more deeply entrench those principles, which continue to bind the alliance together and guide our efforts today: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 10th anniversary of the establishment of NATO Allied Command Transformation (NATO ACT);

(2) recognizes NATO ACT’s leading role in transforming Alliance forces and capabilities, using new concepts such as the NATO Response Force and new doctrines in order to improve the Alliance’s military effectiveness;

(3) expresses appreciation for the continuing and close partnership between the United States Government and NATO to transform the Alliance;

(4) remembers the 64 years NATO has served to ensure peace, security, and stability in Europe throughout the world, and urges the United States Government to continue to seek new ways to deepen and expand its important relationships with NATO;

(5) recognizes the service of the brave men and women who have served to safeguard the freedom and security of the United States and the whole of the transatlantic alliance;

(6) honors the sacrifices of United States personnel, allies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and partners in Afghanistan;

(7) recognizes the outstanding partnership between the local community in Norfolk, Virginia and NATO personnel assigned to ACT;

(8) reaffirms that NATO, through the new Strategic Concept, is committed to helping the Alliance adapt and prepare for the complex and demanding future security;

(9) urges all NATO members to take concrete steps to implement the Strategic Concept and to utilize the taskings from the 2012 NATO summit in Chicago, Illinois, to address current NATO

operations, future capabilities and burden-sharing issues, and strengthen the relationship between NATO and partners around the world;

(10) calls upon the President to use the momentum of the occasion of the 10th anniversary of NATO ACT—

(A) to engage each of the member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in a dialogue about the long-term health of the Alliance, and strongly encourage each of the member states to make a serious effort to protect defense budgets from further reductions, better allocate and coordinate the resources presently available, and recommit to spending at least 2 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) on defense; and

(B) to examine and report to Congress on recommendations that will lead to a stronger Alliance in terms of military capability and readiness across the 28 member states, with particular focus on the smaller member states; and

(11) conveys appreciation for the steadfast partnership between NATO and the United States.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported substitute was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 156), as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration en bloc of the following resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 207, S. Res. 208, S. Res. 209, S. Res. 210, and S. Res. 211.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, before I note the absence of a quorum, let me express my appreciation to Senator MORAN for his patience as we go through the closing script. He will have an opportunity to speak at the conclusion of this, and I appreciate very

much his courtesy in accommodating us in this way.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, 3 years ago Congress passed a massive health insurance law which didn’t have a single Republican vote, and it had significant opposition by the public.

In an administration proclaiming to be the most transparent ever, this 2,700-page bill was rammed through Congress in the early morning hours on Christmas Eve. Even then-Speaker of the House PELOSI said Congress had to pass this bill so that we could find out what was in it.

Well, we did. It was passed, and the American people are not liking what they have discovered.

While the President promised the Affordable Care Act would lower health care costs and strengthen our health care system, the law, instead, is increasing health insurance premiums, slowing economic recovery, and hindering job creation. We should not allow the administration to continue to ignore this reality. We must permanently delay the Affordable Care Act.

Since its enactment in 2010, 18 components of the health care law have been changed, cancelled, or delayed. The President downplays the law’s substantial defects by characterizing them as “glitches and bumps” that are to be expected. He also claims that the Affordable Care Act critics are responsible for the law’s broken promises by arguing that the problem is with “folks out there who are actively working to make this law fail.” Meanwhile, the Affordable Care Act is slowly unraveling.

Every day brings new information about missed deadlines, funding shortfalls, soaring health insurance premium rates, and a technical implementation that is floundering. Is it any wonder that this law continues to be publicly unpopular?

With the majority of mandates, fees, and taxes taking effect in 2014, we are already beginning to see the alarming effects of the law on individuals, families, employers, and on our economy. It is one broken promise after another.

Promise No. 1. In attempting to convince the American people that the ACA was good, the President promised it would “save families \$2,500 in the coming years.” But since 2008, the average American family has seen health insurance premiums rise more than \$3,000. Nonpartisan actuaries estimate

that national health spending will grow at an average rate of close to 6 percent annually between 2011 and 2021. As national spending ticks up, American families will continue to see their monthly premiums go up.

States are beginning to release details on the rates consumers will pay for ACA-related health insurance starting on January 1. An unfortunate pattern is emerging—ACA-mandated insurance is going to increase costs for many Americans.

Recently, the State of Indiana announced that insurance rates will increase 72 percent for consumers in the individual market. Consumers in Ohio, Florida, South Carolina, and Maryland have also announced they are expecting to see their premiums increase significantly. Just yesterday, the Georgia insurance commissioner asked the Department of Health and Human Services to extend the deadline to approve health plans in their State because some rates were expected in Georgia to rise by 198 percent.

In my home State of Kansas, I consistently hear concerns from individuals, business owners, and even local government officials about the impending costs of the Affordable Care Act.

For example, rural Kansas school districts and special education co-ops, whose budgets are already stretched thin, will now be forced to cover the costs associated with the law. This has resulted in reductions in employees' hours and may trigger layoffs in order for the districts to avoid significant ACA-related penalties.

It is sad to visit with the director of a special education co-op only to learn that less services are going to be provided to special needs students because of the costs associated with the Affordable Care Act.

The American people were promised savings and security. Instead, we are experiencing less of both. The Affordable Care Act is leaving Americans with less options and simply unaffordable care.

Promise No. 2. In 2009, the President said:

No matter how we reform health care, we will keep this promise: If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor, period.

Reality has since whittled down this promise dramatically. If you go to the Affordable Care Act Web site today, you will find this far less confident statement:

Depending on the plan you choose in the Marketplace, you may be able to keep your current doctor.

Even large labor unions have recently criticized the President and congressional Democrats for breaking this promise. Notably, the National Treasury Employees Union, the union that represents most IRS employees, is urging its members to write their elected officials to oppose any effort that

would force them to participate in the health insurance exchanges.

Further, several unions stated:

When you and the President sought our support for the Affordable Care Act (ACA), you pledged that if we liked the health plans we have now, we could keep them. Sadly, that promise is under threat.

And another statement:

[A]pproximately 3 million laborers, retirees, and their families now face the very real prospect of losing their health benefits. This, I must remind you, was something that you promised would not happen.

Promise No. 3. The President indicated that the Affordable Care Act would "lower costs for . . . the federal government, reducing our deficit by over \$1 trillion in the next two decades. It is paid for. It is fiscally responsible."

The only way the Affordable Care Act will reduce deficits is by grossly increasing the taxes and fees associated with this law. One wonders how anyone believed at the time that the new entitlement program would ever save money.

These broken promises are more than just words. The administration's false starts and early failures in implementing the Affordable Care Act are just the beginning. The harm this law will do to individuals, families, and businesses will continue to emerge. In less than 3 months, individuals will be asked to start enrolling in a health insurance exchange when insurance rates, coverage requirements, and subsidy amounts are still largely unknown. And, increasingly, the question being asked is, What happens to individuals required to buy health insurance or face penalties if the exchanges are not ready on time?

I am the ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services. I offered two amendments to the fiscal year 2014 bill that would bring some certainty to this overarching issue.

First, I offered an amendment to codify the administration's decision to delay the employer mandate. While many of my colleagues on the Democratic side issued press releases praising the administration's decision to delay, when asked to affirmatively vote in committee to delay for 1 year, they all voted no. The amendment failed on a straight party-line vote.

The second amendment I offered delayed the implementation and enforcement of the individual mandate for 1 year. While I support the delay of the employer mandate, in that decision, like it or not, the administration undermined its own credibility in stating that the Affordable Care Act would be implemented on time, as promised. We should not, and cannot, require individuals to risk their health care coverage by signing up for an unworkable program with a dubious future. Unfortunately, my colleagues—again, on the Democratic side—disagreed. They re-

fused to extend the exemption the President granted to businesses to families and individuals—to all Americans.

The evidence continues to show that the Affordable Care Act is so large and convoluted that it cannot be implemented into practice. Reports from State actuaries, the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Accountability Office, and nonpartisan think tanks have reached the same conclusion: Almost everything we were told about the Affordable Care Act is untrue.

We were told 3 years ago that we need to pass the Affordable Care Act to find out what is in it. Now we know, and it is not good. We don't need to force American families to endure another 3 years just to see how bad it actually will be.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 2013

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, August 1, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use until later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 96, the Chen nomination, under the previous order; and finally, that the second-degree filing deadline for amendments to S. 1243 be 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. There will be two rollcall votes at noon tomorrow: confirmation of the Chen nomination and cloture on the THUD bill. Additionally, there will be a vote in the afternoon on confirmation of the Power nomination.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:17 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, August 1, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

KENNETH L. MOSSMAN, OF ARIZONA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 18, 2016, VICE JOHN EDWARD MANSFIELD, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

SYLVIA I. GARCIA, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, VICE CHRISTOPHER P. BERTRAM, RESIGNED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

JO EMILY HANDELSMAN, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY, VICE CARL WIEMAN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

MICHAEL L. CONNOR, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, VICE DAVID J. HAYES, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

SARAH BLOOM RASKIN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE NEAL S. WOLIN.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

L. PAIGE MARVEL, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOHN L. ESTRADA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO.

NOAH BRYSON MAMET, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

ROBERT O. BLAKE, JR., OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA.

THOMAS FREDERICK DAUGHTON, OF ARIZONA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA.

PHILIP S. GOLDBERG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER-MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES.

MICHAEL STEPHEN HOZA, OF WASHINGTON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON.

EUNICE S. REDDICK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NIGER.

KAREN CLARK STANTON, OF MICHIGAN, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF TIMOR-LESTE.

GREGORY B. STARR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (DIPLOMATIC SECURITY), VICE ERIC J. BOSWELL, RESIGNED.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

KENNETH R. WEINSTEIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2014, VICE DENNIS MULHAUPT, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

AMY JANE HYATT, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF PALAU.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

FRANCE A. CORDOVA, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE SUBRA SURESH, RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 31, 2013:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BYRON TODD JONES, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 31, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HECK of Nevada).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 31, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOSEPH HECK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

PANCREATIC CANCER AND BETSY KAPLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support cancer victims and also to honor a valiant leader in our community who turns 86 on August 12—Betsy Kaplan.

I will start by asking all of us to support the patients, the families, and victims of a special type of cancer—pancreatic cancer. Pancreatic cancer is the deadliest of all forms of cancer with a 5-year survival rate of just 6 percent. In 2013 alone, pancreatic cancer will affect 45,000 patients—73 percent of whom will die within 1 year of diagnosis. In my home State of Florida, it is estimated that out of the 3,380 new cases, 2,770 people will die from this terrible disease.

Last year, I was proud to help pass the Recalcitrant Cancer Research Act, a bill designed to turn around these horrible statistics. Mr. Speaker, we must continue to make survival from pancreatic cancer a priority, and I urge my colleagues to stand with us in this fight.

A south Floridian who is involved in many worthwhile causes, whether they are related to improving the lives of others or fighting for better treatment for the disabled, is Betsy Kaplan. Betsy is a retired school board member from Miami-Dade County Public Schools. She served there for 16 years and has been recognized in our community for her notable achievements and contributions fostering arts education and student guidance in our public schools.

With an unprecedented 47 years of professional experience in the education field, Betsy retired with many honors from her teaching career to spearheading the adoption of the tobacco-free schools policy and advocating for educational programs that cater to special needs students.

A decorated award winner, Betsy has received numerous honors ranging from the Florida School Board's President's Award to being recognized as a Woman of Impact by the Community Coalition for Women's History. Most recently, Betsy received the Breaking the Glass Ceiling Award from the Jewish Museum of Florida at Florida International University.

It is thanks to Betsy that the Miami-Dade school district is known as an outstanding model of public arts education in the Nation.

As a former Florida certified teacher, I recognize Betsy's commitment to ensuring that our students get the quality education they deserve, and I thank Betsy for her exceptional efforts in creating opportunities for students to learn, to grow, and to succeed in their educational, social, and professional lives.

So congratulations to Betsy Kaplan, and let us all keep up the fight to beat all types of cancer, especially pancreatic cancer.

INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes, we will be meeting with President Obama here in the Capitol. While I appreciate the President's commitment to the economy, and I do believe he is passionate about renewing and rebuilding America, there is a certain irony to having the conversation today, because this is the very same day the House is supposed to be completing its work on a woefully inadequate budget bill to fund Transpor-

tation, Housing and Urban Development.

By insisting on an increase in defense spending and approving a budget target that is unrealistically low and freezing in the sequestration, we are seeing budgets that bear no relationship to reality: \$44.1 billion in transportation discretionary appropriations, down 15 percent from the authorized level. It makes no attempt to deal with the looming collapse of the highway trust fund; it slashes Amtrak a third below the current level—hardly responsible.

Many of the budget reductions in the housing programs and the Community Development Block Grants are even worse. We began those deliberations on the same day the American Society for Civil Engineers released their report card on the state of America's infrastructure. The grade was D-plus. It was only that high because we have increased some private investment, some local government funding and, of course, the reviled stimulus funding that helped reduce some of the more egregious shortfalls while putting people to work.

It is ironic that some of the rationale for some of this bizarre budget behavior, which, thankfully, will never be enacted into law, is the need to save taxpayer money and reduce deficits.

In reality, if this budget were approved, it would actually end up costing American taxpayers more. Families will earn even less if we continue this funding level for infrastructure that is inadequate. There will be hundreds of millions of hours of time lost as people are stuck in traffic, and the number of miles of congestion increased over 30 percent. Of course, our businesses will pay almost a half trillion dollars more in transportation costs and repair while business will be underperforming, and that will cost money too.

The path forward is clear. We should provide increased funding for transportation and infrastructure. The gas tax has not been increased in 20 years, which, incidentally, was the last time we had balanced budgets. This is the quickest way to get the new revenues that many feel are necessary to be part of any rational, long-term grand budget agreement and tax reform.

It would be supported by a wide array of business, labor, environmental groups, and local government. Indeed, there is a vast coalition that is saying, tax me so I can do my job better and we can revitalize America's communities and our sagging economy.

It is no longer acceptable for us to talk past one another. By dealing boldly with the infrastructure crisis in the context of realistic budgets and meaningful tax reform, we can put Americans back to work. We can break the logjam here on Capitol Hill. We can strengthen the economy while we make our communities more livable and our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

TENTH UNANSWERED BENGHAZI QUESTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 weeks, I raised a series of questions focusing on the attack on the U.S. consulate in Benghazi, as well as Washington's response, or lack thereof.

To date, little is known why Ambassador Stevens was in the U.S. consulate in the days leading up to the anniversary of 9/11. Even less known is about the other American facility in Benghazi: the CIA annex. When was the annex established? How many people worked at the annex? Of these, how many were direct agency employees and how many were contractors? What was the ratio of CIA staff to security contractors? Why was there a facility operated by the CIA in Benghazi? Perhaps it was established to assist in U.S. efforts to secure weapons in the wake of the Libyan revolution.

As early as 2011, National Journal reported:

The U.S. is also planning to ramp up spending to help Libya's interim government secure and destroy the shoulder-fired surface-to-air missiles and weapons looted from Qadhafi's stockpiles. A senior State Department official said Clinton will tell Libyan leaders that the U.S. contribution to these efforts will go up to \$40 million.

The same article noted:

The U.S. has already spent nearly \$6 million on its conventional weapons disposal efforts, sending a quick reaction force of weapons experts to Libya by October 2011.

If, indeed, the facility in Benghazi was involved in the collection of these weapons, where are they? The \$40 million promised by Secretary Clinton would buy a very large quantity of weapons. Were they shipped out of Benghazi? Are they in warehouses on U.S. soil? Are they in other allied countries? Or did they end up elsewhere?

There has been speculation that some of these weapons may have ended up in Syria.

It is particularly noteworthy that during the same time period that the U.S. engaged in collecting weapons in Libya, respected national security reporter Mark Hosenball wrote on August 1, 2012:

President Barack Obama has signed a secret order authorizing U.S. support for rebels

seeking to depose Syrian President Bashar al-Assad and his government, U.S. sources familiar with the matter said. Obama's order, approved earlier this year and known as an intelligence "finding," broadly permits the CIA and other U.S. agencies to provide support that could help the rebels oust Assad.

The article continued:

The White House is for now apparently stopping short of giving the rebels lethal weapons, even as some U.S. allies do just that, and precisely when Obama signed the secret intelligence authorization, an action not previously reported, could not be determined.

However, Hosenball also reported this important information:

A U.S. Government source acknowledged that under provisions of the Presidential finding, the United States was collaborating with a secret command center operated by Turkey and its allies, and NBC said the shoulder-fired missiles, also known as MANPADS, had been delivered to the rebels via Turkey.

Is it possible that the President's intelligence finding included an authorization for the weapons collected in Libya to be transferred to Syrian rebels? Was the CIA annex being used to facilitate these transfers? If so, how did the weapons physically move from Libya to Syria? By plane? By ship?

And, again, I ask, if these weapons were not being transferred to other countries like Syria, where exactly did they end up? Was the CIA annex being used as a logistics center to track and transfer these weapons? Was Ambassador Stevens' visit to the CIA annex on September 10 associated with these operations? And if these activities were taking place, was this consistent with the President's intelligence finding? Was the Congress notified?

Mr. Speaker, I raise these questions knowing that CIA operations anywhere are sensitive and there is an appropriate time and place for the discussions. However, I don't think the American people will ever learn the truth about what happened that night and why—including the questionable U.S. response—unless they understand what exactly was taking place at the annex.

That is why I continue to believe that a House select committee is the most appropriate path forward to investigate this and many other unanswered questions about Benghazi.

□ 1015

IN HONOR OF JAMES WATTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise, along with my colleague Representative STEVEN PALAZZO, to honor James Watts for his many years of service to community and country.

Born in 1919 in McComb, Mississippi, Mr. Watts has dedicated his career to

public service. His children and stepchildren have followed in their parents' footsteps and have been leaders in their own right throughout the United States.

During World War II, Mr. Watts defended his country by tracking German submarines as a member of the United States Coast Guard. Later, in civilian life, he would go on to hold executive board positions in both the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of America organizations.

Mr. Watts' passion for volunteerism speaks volumes about his character. While he lived in Grand Junction, Colorado, he volunteered as an EMT and then as a paramedic for what is now St. Mary's Hospital and Regional Medical Center in Grand Junction, Colorado. Upon relocation to Gulfport, Mississippi, Mr. Watts taught CPR and first aid for the American Red Cross and various organizations around the country—a testament to his devotion to the well-being of the communities he has lived in and visited.

Perhaps one of his biggest accomplishments was in 1956 while he worked for the Atomic Energy Commission. As a mine safety engineer in New Mexico, Mr. Watts noticed a uranium boomtown of more than 10,000 residents who were living without access to a local hospital for emergency services. With ambition and selflessness, he took it upon himself to spearhead organizational efforts for the creation of the Cibola General Hospital, which has been committed to serving the medical needs of the community since 1959. Ever since, patients continue to be saved; the critically ill continue to be treated; and the 24-hour emergency care is still available to the community.

Now at 94 years old, Mr. Watts resides with his wife, Barbara, in Gulfport, Mississippi. Although he is retired, the organizations and community projects developed under his leadership are still in operation today. I believe Mr. Watts' life is a great example of generosity and devotion to the greater good of society. We can all learn from Mr. Watts' inspiring story of public service, and I join my colleague in recognizing and in thanking Mr. Watts for his life of service.

We wish him, his wife, Barbara, and their children—Susan, Rick, who is here with us in the gallery, Jane, Danette, and Paul—all of the best in their future endeavors, and we thank them for continuing their father's legacy of noble service to the community.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from referring to occupants of the gallery.

GOVERNMENT WASTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in strong support of the eight bills before the House today or, more importantly, in support of what they represent, which is commonsense government reform.

As a Representative of the hard-working taxpayers in southeastern Pennsylvania, it is my duty to make sure that they are getting value for every dollar that they send to the Nation's Capital. Right now, our Federal Government seems to find better ways to waste money than to save it. The culture of systemic waste, abuse, and lack of accountability needs to end.

We have the opportunity this week. We can vote to streamline the Federal Government to make it work for the American taxpayer. The Stop Government Abuse legislative package being considered today works to rein in widespread waste and inefficiency throughout Washington. These bills represent commonsense, bipartisan solutions that actually solve problems.

After this week, Members will leave for a month to head back to our districts. Many of us are going to be attending events and hosting town halls to facilitate conversations with our constituents. I am eager to report to them that, despite our differences, this body was able to come together to support so many commonsense reforms. So I urge my colleagues to support the bills being considered here and to vote to begin restoring faith in government.

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HARTZLER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the 20th time this Congress, I stand here to talk about how we can end hunger now. Hunger is a political condition. We have the food; we have the means; and we have the systems to end hunger now. We know how to do it. We just don't have the political will to make it happen, but that wasn't always the case.

In the late 1960s, America began seriously to confront its poverty problem. President Johnson fought the war on poverty, and his programs, including Medicare, Medicaid, and title I education programs—just to name a few—started to combat the poverty and inequality that were rampant across many parts of this country. President Nixon followed in his footsteps by hosting the first and only White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health, a conference that focused on hunger in America.

The result of that conference was a precipitous drop in the number of hungry people in America. Contrary to Budget Committee Chairman PAUL

RYAN's belief, the antipoverty programs from the Johnson administration and the antihunger programs created by the Nixon administration worked. In fact, hunger and poverty would be much worse today if it weren't for these programs.

The truth is we almost eradicated hunger in America thanks to a strengthened food stamp program and the creation of the WIC program in the 1970s, but those gains were erased and hunger increased because of the policies of Ronald Reagan. Since then, we've seen food stamp usage increase during every single administration. We can and we must do better.

One of the highlights of the effort that nearly ended hunger in America in the 1970s was the WIC program, formally titled the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children. WIC is an innovative program that provides nutritious food and food counseling for pregnant women, nursing mothers, infants, and children under the age of 5.

Why is this program so critical?

Madam Speaker, prenatal enrollment in WIC is associated with lower infant mortality, in fewer premature births, and in a lower likelihood that infants will have very low or low birth weights; and because an infant's medical costs increase tenfold if he is of low birth weight, every dollar invested in WIC yields between \$1.90 and up to \$4.20 in Medicaid savings. This is literally about improving the physical well-being of developing children. This program affects these participants for the entirety of their lives. It's just that important, and it's critical that we get it right.

But, unlike SNAP, WIC is a discretionary program. This means that it is subject to the appropriations process; and in this time of budgetary austerity, WIC was included in the across-the-board cuts to defense and non-defense discretionary programs under the sequester. SNAP was excluded because it's an entitlement like Social Security and Medicare, but WIC was included in the sequester because it is not an entitlement.

As if the cuts in sequester were not bad enough, the House Agriculture appropriations bill now cuts the program even further by more than \$500 million. The 7.3 percent cut to WIC in this bill could result in over 200,000 pregnant mothers and infants losing nutritious food. Even factoring in the reserve fund, 55,000 moms and kids will go without the nutrition that they need. It is sad that the Republican-controlled House of Representatives is cutting vital health and development programs for pregnant and nursing mothers and their very young children while at the same time they've found billions of dollars to send overseas in a wasteful war in Afghanistan.

Madam Speaker, during my series of End Hunger Now speeches, there has

been one unifying theme that, I believe, puts us on the path to end hunger now. That theme is Presidential leadership. We need Presidential leadership to end hunger now. The last White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health nearly ended hunger in America. I know that we can do even better if President Obama would convene such a conference. With a White House conference on food and nutrition, we could focus on ways to reduce hunger and obesity in smart, not arbitrary ways. We could figure out how to treat hunger and obesity as health issues while we work on ways to properly attack these scourges.

Madam Speaker, we desperately need Presidential leadership. We need a comprehensive plan. We need the political will. We need a White House conference on food and nutrition. I urge the President to act now.

THE FACE OF A HERO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today with a heavy heart to pay my respects and to bid a solemn farewell to Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Officer David Vanbuskirk. Officer Vanbuskirk was killed in the line of duty on Tuesday, July 23 while participating in a rescue mission outside of Las Vegas. He was 36 years old.

To me, Dave was more than a constituent, and he was more than a public servant. He was one of my medics and a teammate. You see, prior to coming to Congress, I was a member of the LVMPD Search and Rescue team and the department's medical director.

A 13-year veteran of the department and one of only seven commissioned search and rescue officers on this elite force, Officer Vanbuskirk was called into action on the night of the 22nd to rescue a hiker who was stranded on a rocky ledge above Mary Jane Falls on Mount Charleston. Once he reached the stranded hiker via helicopter, Officer Vanbuskirk secured the man and himself with harnesses to be lifted back into the helicopter. It was at some point during the lift that Officer Vanbuskirk became detached from the harness and fell to the ground below.

The hiker survived. He was saved by the heroic actions of Officer Vanbuskirk.

David's career with the department was marked by many accomplishments, but the notable achievements he would want us to remember cannot be hung on a wall or pinned on a uniform. These achievements can be summed up this way: David Vanbuskirk answered the call when people needed him. This is a man who, when the call came out to rescue a hiker stranded high on Mount Charleston, did not think of himself or of the

danger he would be putting himself in. Like so many times before, he climbed into the helicopter and thought only of the person to be rescued, of the life to be saved.

Of course, answering calls like this are what David and the rest of the Las Vegas Search and Rescue team do. The work our law enforcement and search and rescue officers do around the valley and around our Nation to keep our communities safe is dangerous work, and this tragedy is a somber reminder that they put their lives on the line every time they are on duty, every time they answer that call.

Dave's personal courage and selfless dedication to his work and the community he served epitomized the very core of those in the public safety professions—of those who run towards the sound of gunfire or run into a burning building while everybody else is running away.

I remember when Dave first joined the unit. He was ambitious, motivated, professional—and he was always smiling. And he was smart—one of the brightest with whom I've ever had the opportunity to serve. He was always looking to learn more about search and rescue techniques and about emergency medical care.

We spent long hours together on SWAT missions, sitting in the cab of our rescue vehicle or on the rock during training exercises, and he was always asking questions. He was the proverbial sponge for knowledge. It was always, "Hey, Doc. What about 'this' or 'that'?" or "Hey, Doc. What 'if'?" He always put others first, and nowhere is that more evident than in how he spent his final hours—in the dark of night, with the search and rescue team, finding someone who needed help.

Madam Speaker, I think we use the word "hero" so often to describe athletes or celebrities or public figures that we sometimes forget what a real hero looks like. One only needs to look to my left. David Vanbuskirk was a hero, and that was evident by those who eulogized him this past Monday in the outpouring of public support, by the thousands who lined the funeral procession route and attended his services. He touched many hearts in his short time on this Earth, and stories about how he helped so many brought tears to the eyes of everyone who filled the church, even to the toughest cops in attendance.

While the Las Vegas search and rescue community, the metro police family, his friends, family members, wife, and all who knew him mourn his loss, we also celebrate Officer David Vanbuskirk's 13-year career of answering the call to serve the residents of Clark County. He is survived by his wife of 11 years, Adrianna; by his mother, Pat; by his sister, Jennifer; and her two sons, Reid and Griffin.

I extend my most heartfelt condolences to Adrianna and the Vanbuskirk

family, and I pray they will be strengthened by friends and family during this difficult time.

Police Officer David Vanbuskirk, P No. 6482. Secure. Final.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 29 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Imam Talib Shareef, Masjid Muhammad, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Merciful, the Wise, the Most High, the Possessor of Greatness, we stand and humbly beseech Your Divine Providence upon this House of Representatives.

Grant them clear vision and legislative acumen as they navigate the waters of our national issues. Grant them insight and wisdom, and bless them to follow the logic to its logical conclusion. Grant them the quality of excellence in planning both short and long term that focuses on the right thing, the right way, at the right time.

As we pledge "one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all" in acknowledging You, God, who created us all and cares about us all equally, bless this House to be reflective of *E pluribus unum*—the many diverse, wonderful, beautiful expressions of human life that have contributed to the beauty and strength of America; and bless them to have always the right perception of our Nation that, first of all, this Nation is a gift from You, and under You, God, we are responsible for how we treat everything.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WITTMAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING IMAM TALIB SHAREEF

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor, privilege, and pleasure to introduce Imam Talib Shareef today, who is the resident imam—which is simply a word that means "leader"—of Masjid Muhammad, which is a Washington, D.C., mosque with a 75-year history.

Imam Talib Shareef is a 30-year veteran of the United States Air Force, and he served our country nobly in uniform for many years. He also holds a master's in business administration from the American InterContinental University and a diploma in the area of Arabic studies and language from the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center. I might also add that the imam is a leader in the interfaith movement and regularly works with faith leaders of all faiths, building understanding, cohesion, and unity amongst all people and all Americans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

REMEMBERING LINDY BOGGS

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a former Member of the House and a grand lady from Louisiana, Ms. Lindy Boggs.

She was a pioneer and a trailblazer for the State of Louisiana. She served Louisiana's Second Congressional District following the death of her late husband, Hale Boggs, who was then the majority leader of the House. She was the first woman elected to represent the State of Louisiana in Congress, and she was a founder of the Congresswoman's Caucus. In tribute to her service as a pioneer for women, the Congressional Women's Reading Room down the hall is rightfully named in her honor. Lindy was the first woman and only Louisianian Ambassador to the Holy See during the tenure of Pope John Paul II.

Lindy effortlessly balanced her role as a respected leader and as a loving mother. She loved her city of New Orleans. In fact, she lived on Bourbon

Street in New Orleans for many of her later years. She loved her beloved Tulane University. In fact, just recently, she and her daughter Cokie participated in a fundraiser to benefit Tulane University just a few weeks ago in New Orleans.

She is somebody who will be dearly missed and someone whom we are honored to be able to call a former colleague of ours here in the House.

REMEMBERING LINDY BOGGS

(Mr. RICHMOND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Louisiana, Representative SCALISE, and our leader, Leader PELOSI, in recognizing such a great and remarkable woman. It is with a heavy heart that I rise to recognize the loss of a true legend in Louisiana, Ambassador and former Representative Lindsay Boggs.

She was the perfect example of leadership—never afraid to fight for justice and to demand equality. She took the responsibility of service seriously, addressing the plight of everyday people, and the State of Louisiana and our Nation are better for it. She was a first-class woman who enjoyed numerous firsts and was an effective legislator. She loved this body, earning the respect of her colleagues on both sides of the aisle, which is exemplified here today through Congressman SCALISE and me, and she loved her family—a role model for all of us.

During Women's History Month this year, we were able to recognize former Ambassador Boggs on her 97th birthday with a tribute, which was led by our leader, Leader PELOSI.

Mr. Speaker, after words from Leader PELOSI, I would just ask that we have a moment of silence in recognition of the great contribution and sacrifice of a true, remarkable Louisiana citizen who, I think, displayed what was best of the best in Louisiana.

REMEMBERING LINDY BOGGS

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for the kind words that they have said about our former colleague, Congresswoman Lindy Boggs, and I associate myself with their remarks.

I will only add that bipartisanship was the nature of how Lindy Boggs led and served in this body. When we would have our heated discussions on the floor, she would call us back and say, "Darlin', Hale used to always say, 'Don't fight every fight as if it's your last fight.'" We are all friends. We are a resource to each other to do good

things for our country. No wonder a room is named for her, a room that has shared bipartisan enjoyment and participation, in which we have come together as Democrats and Republicans to bring about solutions.

It was referenced that we had a bipartisan tribute to her on her birthday, March 13. I think you would find some joy in the fact that, as a devout Catholic, on her birthday, which was when we planned to have the tribute, it was the day that white smoke went up in the chimney in Rome. So, for her birthday, we could also celebrate a new Pope, Pope Francis. What better gift for her than to enjoy that on her birthday?

All of us are mourning and will be in New Orleans for her service tomorrow. Our prayers go to her family. I hope it's a comfort to them to know that so many people loved Lindy Boggs and share their grief and are praying for them at this time.

ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan Congressional Natural Gas Caucus convened a congressional field hearing on Friday at the Pennsylvania College of Technology in Williamsport, Pennsylvania. I am proud to have joined Representatives GENE GREEN, TOM REED, and TOM MARINO to hear from State and local officials and leaders on the economic impacts of natural gas production in the Marcellus shale region. The hearing offered an insightful look at the benefits of the 3,551 gas-producing wells in Pennsylvania.

One of those benefits is jobs. Today, 30,752 people in Pennsylvania are employed in the natural gas industry. This is a 164 percent increase since 2009. The average salary is \$82,643. Additionally, 214,302 are employed in ancillary industries, a 7.9 percent increase since 2009. In just two rural northern Pennsylvania counties, testimony revealed an increase of 4,832 jobs and 226 businesses between 2006 and 2012. Most importantly, 80 percent of those jobs are now filled by local workers.

Mr. Speaker, the responsible production of natural gas is producing energy security and an economic impact that surpasses all expectations.

MR. SPEAKER, CANCEL THIS RECESS

(Mr. NOLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am calling on the

Speaker to cancel or to postpone the August recess until we get our work done here.

As a businessman, the last thing I would ever consider doing is giving my employees a month or 5 weeks off when we're not getting our job done.

Mr. Speaker, you're the boss. You set the schedule, and you put together the work agenda. The simple truth is that this Congress is being recognized as the least productive or accomplished in the history of this country. We have an appropriations bill; we have budget bills; we have the farm bill; we have immigration; we have the President's jobs bill; we have the debt ceiling limit; we have Members of Congress threatening to shut down the government—and we're going on a recess? It makes no sense whatsoever.

It's time that this Congress goes to work, puts the subcommittees to work, goes to work 5 days a week like everybody else in America, and does its job. Put America back to work. Rebuild the middle class. Get this country moving again.

Mr. Speaker, cancel this recess.

KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a few questions:

Should 16,000 IRS bureaucrats have the power to penalize the American people if they don't like your health care decisions?

Will the quality of your health care depend on whether or not you support the President's political views? The IRS has already targeted conservative political groups. Will this intimidation be intensified once the IRS is enforcing ObamaCare?

Is Sarah Hall Ingram, the IRS bureaucrat who previously managed the tax exemption department, really qualified to run the IRS-ObamaCare enforcement division? Abuse of American citizens occurred on her watch. Is anyone worried—at least a little bit—that she now oversees our health care decisions?

Mr. Speaker, the IRS has forfeited any claim to impartiality and has violated the trust of the American people. The IRS must not be involved in the health care decisions of ordinary Americans. On Friday, I urge you to join me in supporting H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act.

□ 1215

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's now been 941 days since I arrived in Congress, and the Republican leadership has still not allowed one single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis.

According to a new survey by the Associated Press, 80 percent of adults experience either prolonged unemployment, a year or more reliance on government aid such as food stamps, or poverty-level income at some point in their lives. That's four out of five Americans experiencing severe economic insecurity at least once.

Mr. Speaker, is this the land of opportunity? The people demand a remedy.

It's time to bring the American Jobs Act to the floor. It deserves a vote. The American Jobs Act prevents layoffs, invests in long-term job creation, and expands workforce training.

Mr. Speaker, the mantra of this Congress should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

IN DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

(Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in defense of freedom. I rise in defense of the ideals that our Founding Fathers fought and bled and died for. I believe we are in a fight for the very heart and soul of our country.

We know that IRS agents targeted conservative groups and individuals. No one has been held to account for this. Such arrogance and impunity cannot go unanswered.

We know that Federal regulations are being proposed that will cost trillions of dollars and millions of jobs. These regulations are being proposed without any transparency or accountability to the people. Such arrogance cannot go unanswered.

Thanks to this administration, more and more Americans believe in the idea of Big Government. We have Benghazi. We have ObamaCare. We have the politicization of the Justice Department. We have government snooping on journalists.

The Federal Government was created to serve the people, and it is now standing with its boot on the necks of the people.

Our Founding Fathers would not recognize the Nation that we have become. We can change this. Join with me as we fight to overcome government abuse.

IN OPPOSITION TO CUTTING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDING

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the 50 percent cut

in the Community Development Block Grant program in the Transportation-Housing and Urban Development bill currently being considered. This cut is reckless and punitive to communities in need.

This year, western New York communities are scheduled to receive a total of \$22.2 million, which they plan to use to improve public infrastructure, policing facilities, and fund economic development initiatives. The bill before us cuts that funding in half to \$11 million next year.

Cutting Community Development Block Grant funding is completely counterproductive and will cost the country in the long term. These cuts will erode community revitalization and job creation, only adding to the financial burden on our Federal budget in the long run.

I urge the House to reject these cuts to our communities and defeat this shortsighted bill.

VOTE AGAINST ADJOURNMENT

(Mr. WITTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with disappointment because Congress plans to adjourn without addressing critical issues important to the American people.

It shouldn't take a government shutdown threat in September each year to will Congress to do its job. It also should not be difficult to achieve an efficient, lean, and functional government with a real budget and appropriations blueprint.

I appreciate that district work periods allow Members to visit with folks back in their community, but this August the work is too important. Unfortunately, Congress has not completed the job it needs to. It has not completed the work of the people. Too much unfinished business requires some overtime and it begs Members to stay and finish.

Let's clear our schedules, vote against the adjournment of Congress for the month of August, and stay in Washington to finish the business of the people.

As I was last August, I'm prepared to stay in Washington as long as it takes. These issues are too important to wait.

IN OPPOSITION TO CUTTING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDING

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the deep and drastic cuts to the Transportation-HUD appropriations bill.

In existence since 1974, the CDBG program has invested \$135 billion to local communities. In this Chamber, it is often said that we need to make sure that government is more efficient and reduces wasting taxpayers' dollars. Well, I am happy to report that this program continues to be one of HUD's most efficient programs, with grantees devoting on average 94 percent of CDBG funds directly to efforts that provide benefits to low- and moderate-income families. The Republican chairperson has said, "Cutting over \$7 billion in programs was very challenging."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say if this Chamber cuts these programs that provides jobs and infrastructure development, I can assure you that the children, the seniors, and the families helped by these programs will find it much more challenging dealing with \$7 billion in cuts.

I urge you to oppose these cuts.

HOLDING ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER ACCOUNTABLE

(Mr. GOSAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address truly disturbing comments President Obama made during his hour-long speech on July 24. He mentioned "an endless parade of distractions and phony scandals," as if to belittle the significance of these stories. Well, there's nothing phony about the deaths linked to Attorney General Holder's Operation Fast and Furious.

Beside me is a photo of blood running through the streets of Mexico, the blood of high school students murdered by guns Holder's DOJ sold to Mexican drug cartels. This massacre is far from phony, Mr. President. Brian Terry, the Border Patrol agent murdered by violent criminals whom Holder's DOJ gave the guns to, is definitely not phony.

These deaths are real.

What else is real? Attorney General Holder's violation of the law, the ramifications of which are far from phony. As Supreme Court Justice Brandeis said:

In a government of laws, the existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. If government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself. It invites anarchy.

I ask you, has the Attorney General invited anarchy?

I will continue to make my case here in the people's House, at the people's pulpit. I will be back.

THE ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

(Mr. LOEBACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 48th anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid.

I grew up in poverty, and my grandmother often relied on Social Security survivor benefits to put food on the table. I know firsthand how important initiatives like Medicare and Medicaid are to seniors and families in America. No senior should have to make the choice between putting food on the table and paying for their medication.

Our country's retirees have paid into Medicare their entire lives. That is why it is so critical that those who have worked hard get their earned benefits.

Medicaid is critical to low-income families and individuals with disabilities that depend on the program for their basic health care needs, many of whom are struggling just to get by.

I look forward to continuing to work to strengthen and protect Medicare and Medicaid to ensure that the promise of health and economic security will be there for generations to come.

THE FATHER OF FRACKING

(Mr. WEBER of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week, Texas and America's energy industry lost a friend. George Mitchell, who many knew as the "father of fracking," passed away last week at his home in Galveston, Texas. While his death is a sad occasion, his legacy will live on as the energy industry continues to grow and prosper. Texas now stands ranked as No. 14 in the world in oil and gas production, largely due to Mr. Mitchell's innovation.

Not only was George an energy innovator, he was a community builder. He was a visionary. He developed the Woodlands Master Community when many just saw it as useless swampland. Mr. Mitchell also played an integral role in reviving what I consider a precious gem in my district: the island of Galveston. George and his wife put countless hours and resources into restoring the strand which helped keep the island a popular tourist destination and number one in Texas, for that matter.

It's important that we remember George Mitchell not only for his contribution to Texas business, but also for his zeal and tenacity to give back to the communities where he lived and worked.

I'm RANDY WEBER, and that's the way I see it from where I sit here in America.

RECOGNIZING DR. EMILY RUFFO

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to recognize Dr. Emily Ruffo, administrator of the Hayward Police Department's Youth and Family Services Bureau, who has been named the California School Resource Officer Association's Law Enforcement Administrator of the Year. She'll be honored with this award today at the School Safety Conference in Anaheim.

She's been helping kids and families for years, joining the Hayward Youth and Family Services Bureau in 2011. Just this year, Dr. Ruffo was promoted to be administrator of the bureau, and her work has been a great help to Hayward and the entire 15th Congressional District.

The bureau Dr. Ruffo leads offers services to youth such as counseling to help keep kids out of trouble. For kids who have violated the law, it offers an alternative to juvenile justice to get them back on the right track. As a former prosecutor in the Alameda County District Attorney's office, I've worked closely with the Hayward Police Department and know how important this program is.

Dr. Ruffo is rightly being recognized for her commitment and care for the children and families of the East Bay. It's people like her willing to dedicate their careers to helping those at risk who are helping to provide us with a brighter future.

On behalf of the people of Hayward and the entire 15th Congressional District, I want to thank Dr. Ruffo for her service, congratulate her on her award, and wish her continued success.

REGULATING THE RABBIT

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, Washington bureaucrats are up to their old tricks again. They're interfering with how we run our businesses, dictating the type of health insurance we have to purchase, and stonewalling tax-exempt status based on political speech. Now they're going so far as to tell magicians how to do their magic shows.

Let me introduce you to Marty Hahne. He's an area magician from Missouri who's been doing magic shows for children in southern Missouri for over 27 years. This summer, he received a chilling letter from the Federal Government requiring him to have a license. Not for himself, but for his rabbit. The Agriculture Department is interpreting a decades-old law on animal exhibitions to now include pet bunnies used in magic shows. In order to continue conveying to children that reading is magic, he has to not only obtain a license, but also write a mandated disaster plan for his rabbit, including

provisions for fire, floods, tornados, ice storms, and power failures.

This is just another example of government overreach and loss of freedoms in our country. It is time for this to stop. It is time for common sense to prevail. It's time for Big Government to leave us alone. With the track record of this current administration, that really would be like pulling a rabbit out of a hat.

CANCEL THE RECESS

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wrote the following letter to the Under Secretary of Defense a few days ago:

Just this past Saturday, I attended a welcome home event for the 1109th TASMG, the Connecticut National Guard, who spent the last year in Afghanistan providing critical maintenance for our helicopter fleet.

Their joy at being home with family was undermined by the reality that nearly a third of the 100 returning members are dual-status technicians and, therefore, hit by furlough. After serving in a war zone away from family, it was a bitter pill for these patriots to lose 20 percent of their pay almost immediately upon their return.

I do believe that the Department of Defense can do a better job managing the furloughs. However, the real responsibility rests in this Chamber to turn off sequester. It has been 210 days since the governing Republican majority took power, and 81 legislative days that we have not taken up one measure to turn off sequester during that time. Incredibly, in 3 days, we are going on a 5-week recess, and on Friday we're going to vote for the 40th time to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I have a news flash: it's not going anywhere.

We should cancel the recess, and we should focus on making sure that these patriots are not treated so shabbily. We should make sure that the 600,000-plus civilian DOD Federal employees have their furloughs turned off.

Cancel the recess. Let's turn off sequester. Let's stand up for America's middle class.

WASHINGTON NEEDS HOOSIER COMMON SENSE

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, when I was back in the district this week in Indiana, Hoosier requests were pretty simple. They said: work on reforms, create more jobs, and jump-start the economy. In addition they said, We don't trust our government.

They're tired of Big Government policies that are intruding on the lives of American citizens and increasing government abuse. That's why I'm

proud today to cosponsor and support bills that rein in Washington, refocus on the priorities to create jobs, and protect our citizens.

Every week we hear chilling reports about the Internal Revenue Service exercising poor judgment, intentionally going after American citizens. So I'm cosponsoring the STOP IRS Act.

While IRS employees are under investigation or forced to take administrative leaves, they continue to receive salaries funded by our taxpayer dollars. So I'm cosponsoring the Government Employee Accountability Act to freeze pay and demand accountability.

It's been reported that the IRS spent \$15 million between 2010 and 2012 to hold lavish, indulgent conferences. So I'm cosponsoring the Stop Playing on Citizens' Cash Act to stop wasting our tax dollars.

These same individuals are set to lead a commanding role implementing and enforcing ObamaCare. So I'm cosponsoring the Keep the IRS Off Our Health Care Act to prevent this agency from getting their hands on our health care.

Washington needs a strong dose of Hoosier common sense. I'm proud to stand with the thousands of letters and phone calls from Hoosiers and put the brakes on this reckless government.

□ 1230

ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Ms. BROWNLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues and the American people just how important passing comprehensive immigration reform is to the growth of our economy.

Study after study has shown that successful implementation of comprehensive immigration reform will strengthen agriculture, cut the deficit, create manufacturing and job opportunities, and put hundreds of thousands of Americans back to work. This will increase our country's GDP and pump billions of dollars into our economy.

Here in Congress we talk a lot about creating jobs and growing the economy, but now it is time to act. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting comprehensive immigration reform for our economy and for the future of our country.

REPEAL MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, the President's \$30 billion excise tax on medical device manufacturers is bad

for America. The tax is costing jobs, particularly in Indiana, and limiting patient access to lifesaving devices and therapies. We should not be putting American manufacturers at a competitive disadvantage and forcing Americans to look beyond our shores for care simply to pay for the President's broken health care law.

There are more than 26,000 Hoosiers employed by the medical device manufacturing industry and thousands more whose jobs are supported by the industry. The Indiana General Assembly has passed a resolution calling for repeal of the tax. This House should pass H.R. 523, the Protect Medical Innovation Act, to repeal the tax, preserve patient access to care, and save these Hoosier jobs.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to shed light on the importance of the Community Development Block Grant Program. This program provides urban communities with vital resources needed to address a wide range of community development needs, growing local economies, and improving the quality of life for low- and moderate-income citizens.

Since the start of the program, the Community Development Block Grant program has invested over \$135 billion in local economies by helping families, creating jobs, supporting businesses, improving infrastructure, and providing housing to many Americans who are in need.

The program has provided the great State of Texas with over \$60 million in direct grants this year alone, with over \$28 million going to the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex. Funding for this program is vital to the constituents of the 33rd Congressional District. It has assisted homeowners with rehabbing their homes, providing downpayment and closing cost assistance to qualified home buyers; funded public improvements; provided public services, including employment training, meals and services to the elderly.

The appropriations bill up for vote this week cuts the fiscal year 2014 budget for these grants nearly in half. This is the lowest level of funding in history. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and save this important program.

STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE

(Mrs. WAGNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, today the House will vote on a series of bills that aim to stop government abuse. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely disheart-

ening that the Federal Government has acted and continues to act in a manner that cultivates distrust. Unfortunately, there are countless examples of misconduct among the Federal agencies, ranging from the IRS discriminating against conservative groups, to denying American citizens their constitutional rights in administrative proceedings.

Over the past month, I have heard from 1,187 of my constituents regarding their distrust in government; and as more activities of the agencies and the executive branch come to light, who can blame them. What is even more troubling than the misconduct itself is the fact that the President stands by it. Last week he called such transgressions "phony scandals."

These are hardly phony scandals. These are real and unconscionable actions taken by our Federal Government, and these actions are unacceptable. It is past time for us to do something about it.

We must take the necessary steps to start earning the trust of the American people, and that's why I back and have cosponsored several bills to be considered in the House this week. They are commonsense measures that work to begin restoring confidence in the American people.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. GUTIÉRREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to still be waiting for a vote on immigration reform in August. But here we are, 48 hours from leaving town for 6 weeks, and there has been no definitive House action.

Many of us will spend time with our children and loved ones, whether on vacation or just in the backyard. I urge my colleagues to think about the millions of immigrant families who are no longer able to spend time together—the mother who was deported yesterday; the sister who feared deportation and left last year; the tens of thousands who wait in line for visas; and the ones for whom there is no line available.

For those who are in detention, like the Dream 9 in Arizona, and the many others who, because of their status, a trip to the hospital or getting a traffic ticket could mean they never see their children again. The American Dream will end for 44,400 immigrants who will be deported between now and September 9. I hope they are in your thoughts.

Mr. Speaker, I will be inserting into the RECORD a letter from JARED POLIS of Colorado and myself to the President of the United States asking for the release of the Dream 9 held in detention in Arizona.

REPEAL OBAMACARE AND CUT TAXES

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, President Obama says he now has serious ideas about taxes and job creation. I'd like to take him seriously, but the truth is that the President has spent the last 4½ years hammering the Nation's businesses with taxes, regulations, and ObamaCare. His business mandate has already forced many small businesses to convert full-time jobs to part-time jobs.

And let's remember the jobs that have already dissipated due to the medical device companies that are reducing employees to pay a new ObamaCare excise tax. One company has already terminated more than 1,000 workers.

As for taxes, the President's fiscal cliff deal pushes taxes up to as much as 45 percent for many small business owners and investors. That simply diminishes their incentive to move forward with expansions that would create jobs.

So Mr. President, if you'd really like this economy to get going, let's start by repealing ObamaCare and cutting taxes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address all remarks to the Chair.

MEDICARE AND MEDICAID ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. DUCKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 48th anniversary of the establishment of Medicare and Medicaid. Since Medicare was signed into law in 1965, millions of Americans have relied on the crucial programs to live their lives in dignity, and millions more who have paid into the system are counting on Medicare to one day provide them with quality health care.

This historic commitment and pledge from our country is one of our greatest achievements. Seniors like my mother, and those living with disabilities, all understand the essential role Medicare plays in the lives of so many Americans.

In April, I held a roundtable with constituents in Elk Grove Village, Illinois. They all stressed to me the importance of protecting and preserving Medicare, but also on cracking down on abuse and fraud that exists in the program.

I have met with people living with disabilities who rely on these benefits for their health services. As we celebrate and acknowledge the great benefits of Medicare, it is important that we reinforce our commitment to the

program, even as we cut down on the waste and fraud. We must continue our fight to strengthen and enhance Medicare and fulfill our 48-year-old promise to millions of hardworking Americans across this great Nation.

STOP OBAMACARE

(Mrs. ELLMERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act. ObamaCare has proven to be a terrible law that will continue to hurt individuals, employers, and our health care system.

While accurate information regarding the law has been scarce, what we know for sure is that premiums are skyrocketing, American families are confused, and doctors and nurses are afraid they will not be able to continue to care for their patients.

Businesses across the country are being forced to not only adhere to the onerous paperwork requirements, but have been in a holding pattern for over 3 years waiting for implementation. Recently, we learned that the IRS has been targeting different groups and singling them out for intense scrutiny based on their political views. But as ObamaCare is set to be implemented, Americans are expected to trust the IRS with the responsibility of implementing this destructive law. This has proven to be unworkable and a dangerous path for our health care system and our country to be on.

CALIFORNIA AND RISING SEA LEVELS

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, climate change is a long-term threat to my home State of California and to all coastal States. Climate change will increase the risk of flooding and eventual submersion of millions of American low-lying homes.

Mr. Speaker, I hold up this article that a group of scientists from Princeton and the University of Arizona recently published, a journal article that quantifies State by State the coastal populations that are exposed to storm surges and sea level rise.

The researchers found that in California there are more than 138,000 housing units and over 325,000 Californians living on land that is below one meter of high tide. And in the entire United States, there are approximately 3.7 million Americans living on land below one meter of high tide.

Mr. Speaker, if Congress and the world does nothing, climate change

will have a devastating impact on these 3.7 million Americans who are on the front line of climate change. And that number will only grow.

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor with a letter from a constituent, a businessman, and I will just read parts of it:

I did not need to read about the ObamaCare health insurance tax increase that will be passed on to small businesses. It has already happened to my small firm. Last week I was advised by my insurance agent that Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Illinois is increasing my rates by more than 38 percent.

I want to relay to you that due to a decrease in business, likely caused by uncertainty of our future, I have had to release one employee and have advised all remaining employees that the increase of health insurance premiums will be passed on to them. I was proudly able to pay 100 percent of employees' health care coverage, but after two consecutive 20 percent increases in the last two years, and the latest 40 percent increase, simple business logic requires that I pass on this increase or simply go out of business. My employees will have less take-home pay under ObamaCare. Does anyone in Congress realize that under this still uncertain program, it is more logical for me to shut down my business and take the subsidies on one of the exchanges than to remain open?

□ 1245

THE BIPARTISAN STUDENT LOAN CERTAINTY ACT

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1911, the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act.

Last month, I urged my colleagues in this House to take up and help our students because the interest rate was going to double on July 1. The Senate has already acted, and this week we have a chance to make things right.

The Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act will not only reverse the July 1 student loan interest rate hike, but it actually makes things better for our students.

As students around the world are acquiring higher education, master's and training, it's imperative that our students here in this country also receive the opportunities to compete on a global scale. By making higher education more accessible, H.R. 1911 accomplishes that.

When it is signed by President Obama, it will give \$25 billion in debt relief over the next 6 years. It will give students the ability to lock in the interest rate for the life of their loan so

they know exactly what they are going to be paying in interest, and it will save thousands of dollars and lower interest payments.

I look forward to sending this bill to our President.

STOPPING GOVERNMENT ABUSE

(Mr. HECK of Nevada asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, in our Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson wrote that governments derived their power from "the consent of the governed." Years later, Abraham Lincoln called our American democracy a government "of the people, by the people, for the people." What would these great men think if they saw the waste and abuse so rampant in our government today?

House Republicans are committed to maintaining a government that works for the American people, not against them. That's why this week we're bringing a number of bills to the floor to do just that. We believe in an America with expanded opportunity and a more secure future for all.

There's no place in that America for massive government overreach, and that's why the House Republicans will continue to fight it.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 31, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 31, 2013 at 9:45 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2167.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2611.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 44.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

CITIZEN EMPOWERMENT ACT

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2711) to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2711

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Citizen Empowerment Act".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 79, the following:

"CHAPTER 79A—SERVICES TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

"Sec.

"7921. *Procedure for in-person and telephonic interactions conducted by Executive Branch employees.*

"§7921. *Procedure for in-person and telephonic interactions conducted by Executive Branch employees*

"(a) *PURPOSE.*—The purpose of this section is to ensure that individuals have the right to record in-person and telephonic interactions with Executive agency employees and to ensure that individuals who are the target of enforcement actions conducted by Executive agency employees are notified of such right.

"(b) *DEFINITIONS.*—For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'telephonic' means by telephone or other similar electronic device; and

"(2) the term 'employee' means an employee of an Executive agency.

"(c) *CONSENT OF EXECUTIVE AGENCY EMPLOYEES.*—Participation by an employee, acting in an official capacity, in an in-person or telephonic interaction shall constitute consent by the employee to a recording of that interaction by any participant in the interaction.

"(d) *NOTICE OF RIGHTS WHEN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN CERTAIN ACTIONS.*—A notice of an individual's right to record conversations with employees shall be included in any written material provided by an Executive agency to the individual concerning an audit, investigation, inspection, or enforcement action that could result in the imposition of a fine, forfeiture of property, civil monetary penalty, or criminal penalty against, or the collection of an unpaid tax, fine, or penalty from, such individual or a business owned or operated by such individual.

"(e) *OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVE.*—Any person who is permitted to represent before an Executive agency an individual under this section shall receive the same notice as required under subsection (d) with respect to such individual.

"(f) *NO CAUSE OF ACTION.*—This section does not create any express or implied private right of action.

"(g) *DISCIPLINARY ACTION.*—An employee who violates this section shall be subject to appropriate disciplinary action in accordance with otherwise applicable provisions of law.

"(h) *PUBLIC INFORMATION CONCERNING RIGHT TO RECORD.*—

"(1) *POSTING ON AGENCY WEB SITES.*—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, each Executive agency shall post prominently on its Web site information explaining the right of individuals to record interactions with employees.

"(2) *OMB GUIDANCE.*—Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Office of Management and Budget shall issue guidance to Executive agencies concerning implementation of paragraph (1)."

(b) *CLERICAL AMENDMENT.*—The analysis for part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 79 the following:

"79A. *Services to members of the public* 7921".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have the author of this legislation before us, a principled Member of Congress who saw a problem and sought to fix it, and we brought it before you today. We brought it before you today because we hear, and hear rightfully, horror stories of harassment that includes Federal officials at the IRS, the EPA, the SEC, the FEC, and a list of other ABCs.

The truth is that in 39 out of 50 States, every Member on a phone, every American has a right to record that conversation without asking permission of that Federal officer on the other end. But in 11 States, States that most people don't know which is which, that is muddled. When a conversation occurs between two States, it is muddled.

The gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), as the author of this bill, sought, in principle, to fix that, and I'd like to yield 2 minutes to her to explain her bill.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership on this very important issue.

Whether I'm talking to Kansans back home or listening to witnesses at Ways and Means hearings, I've heard story after story of Federal regulators abusing their power.

What is worse, many people are afraid to share their stories of harassment or other inappropriate behavior by government officials out of fear of retaliation. The Citizen Empowerment

Act will give them certified proof and help to alleviate this fear.

This bill will give Americans a new tool to protect themselves and their businesses from government overreach and abuse by expanding the rights of all citizens to allow them to record meetings and telephone conversations with Federal regulators and officials. The Citizen Empowerment Act will also ensure individuals are made aware of this right by requiring government agencies to notify them of this right.

Not only do Federal agencies get to write rules, they get to enforce them, too. In fact, a citizen is 10 times more likely to be tried by a Federal agency than by an actual court, and citizens have fewer rights during agency proceedings than in a courtroom.

The Citizen Empowerment Act will give Americans a tool to even the playing field with Federal regulators by increasing transparency and accountability within the system.

Americans deserve a government who puts its citizens first, and this is exactly what this bill does. We spend far too much time in this body debating bills to empower the government. This bill empowers Americans.

Enacting the Citizen Empowerment Act and the other nine Stop Government Abuse bills will be a positive step toward getting Big Government out of the way of our economy and rebuilding trust that has been broken by rampant abuse of Federal power.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2711. This legislation would have a significant impact on law enforcement, and it would interfere with laws in a dozen States.

The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association sent a letter to Chairman ISSA and me opposing this bill. This is part of what they wrote, and I quote:

As the chair and ranking member with jurisdiction over H.R. 2711, we urge you to ensure that the bill is not considered on the floor unless it is amended to exempt law enforcement in its provisions. Until that time, FLEOA will continue to strongly oppose this legislation.

They also wrote, and I quote:

The legislation puts law enforcement activities at risk and does a disservice to the brave men and women who are asked to put their lives on the line to protect us from terrorists and criminals.

They're not the only law enforcement organizations that oppose the legislation. The National Association of Assistant U.S. Attorneys also sent a letter opposing H.R. 2711. Here's part of what they wrote, and I quote:

The most disturbing aspect of the legislation involves its dramatically negative impact on civil and criminal law enforcement investigative efforts.

They went on to say, and I quote:

The version of legislation approved by the House Committee on Oversight and Govern-

ment Reform on July 24 did not contain any exceptions. Clearly, this measure raises a magnitude of administrative and legal concerns that should be addressed before the House gives further consideration to approval of this legislation.

The committee held no hearings on the legislation and heard testimony from no law enforcement officials before marking up the bill, and now it is being rushed onto the floor in record speed with apparently no regard to its consequences to law enforcement.

The bill also would interfere with the laws put in place by 12 States to protect their citizens. For example, my home State of Maryland enacted a law in 1977 that made it a felony to record a private conversation unless every party to the conversation consents to the recording or another exception applies. This law was deliberately crafted to provide greater protection to Maryland residents.

H.R. 2711 preempts the laws of Maryland and other States that require all parties to consent to a recording. The bill deems Federal employees to have consented to a recording just by performing their official duties and does not even require that they be notified.

Maryland's statute requires actual consent, not forced or assumed consent. To assume a person consents to having their conversation recorded just by participating in the conversation undermines the State's laws, as well as those in California, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and other States that require multiple-party consent for recordings.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2711 is a dangerous and poorly considered piece of legislation. I oppose this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I would ask what day it is, what day of the month it is.

Mr. Speaker, is it the 31st day of July? Can you verify that for me? Because on the 24th of July, we amended this bill to send it to the House, and the ranking member knows full well, as I'm sure the National Association of Assistant U.S. Attorneys and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association know full well; and I'm shocked that they would write and that, in fact, the ranking member would write in a Dear Colleague, citing them, things that just aren't so in this bill.

Before us today we do not preempt States. As the ranking member rightfully so said, we make a statement on behalf of the Federal Government for our employees that we hereby consent that you may record us.

In 39 out of 50 States—there's a little ambiguity in that Montana allows these recordings; it just doesn't broadly allow them, but does recording for a law enforcement officer. But having said that, whether it's 11 or 12, the gentleman cited a portion of that letter from the National Association of U.S.

Attorneys, but let me give you a portion that I want to make sure gets on the record.

It says, H.R. 2711 requires any employee of an executive agency, before or at a personal interview or telephonic interchange with an individual, to allow the individual to make an audio recording of the in-person or telephonic interaction.

We'll let that one slide. We'll go to the next sentence.

In addition, the legislation requires the executive branch employee to first provide notice to the individual of their right to make such a recording.

Mr. Speaker, that's just not true. We went through a long markup and, in that markup, in a manager's amendment, we made it very clear that the only notice the Federal Government would give would be a notice in its publications, Web sites, and so on letting Americans know that they no longer had to ask, if they were in Idaho, if, in fact, somebody calling them from Maryland did or didn't need to know that they were recording.

This interstate situation is one in which the American people deserve to know that they have a right to document when someone calls them, and if they trip up in that answer, they could go to jail or get a fine or lose their business.

Thirty-nine out of 50 States recognize it, and all we're saying, very clearly, is the Federal Government gives its approval.

These documents, sadly, were accurate, if you looked at the bill on the 23rd of July. The ranking member knows full well these documents are somewhat inaccurate. And his own letter implies that law enforcement will somehow be crippled by having to give notice. It's just not true.

In 39 out of 50 States, law enforcement would already know that somebody could be recording and not telling them. That's the law of those States.

□ 1300

But, more importantly, we're not affecting the ranking member's Maryland law enforcement. We're affecting Federal officers, such as the EPA, OSHA, and the IRS, when they call and ask you questions. And those questions could lead to real harm to you. And you would be able to document it. And if you're harassed, you'll be able to document it. That's what we're doing here today. We're empowering Americans to know that their Federal Government will never answer the question of, "May I record this to protect myself? No."

And in no way, shape, or form are these personal calls. This only affects when a member of our Federal employment is doing their official duty and calling a private citizen. Of course, the private citizen should have the rights since this isn't a personal call and one

in which you should expect to be able to say whatever you want. These are not private. These are public conversations. These are public investigations. And the public should have a right to protect itself.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman is inaccurate. The fact is that when the bill came in, at first, we did apparently have certain exceptions for law enforcement, consistent with these concerns. That's not in the bill. As a matter of fact, just today, July 31, 2013, we have a letter from the Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association talking about the bill that's on the floor right now:

H.R. 2711 creates a broad right to record conversations with Federal employees and requires that the notices of the right to record conversations be provided to individuals engaged in discussion with Federal employees without any exceptions related to criminal investigations. This proposal risks undermining criminal investigations by reducing the willingness of individuals to cooperate with law enforcement and would result in the creation of recordings of law enforcement conversations that could jeopardize sensitive and important criminal and counterterrorism investigations.

That's from the Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association.

I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the committee, the Congressman from the great State of Missouri, LACY CLAY.

Mr. CLAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the bill, also. This bill would compromise the privacy rights of Federal employees and it would negatively impact law enforcement. The bill would assume that every Federal employee consents to having any conversation recorded as long as they are acting in an official capacity. The bill contains no exceptions for law enforcement or military personnel.

This bill is opposed by the National Association of Assistant U.S. Attorneys. In their letter, they said:

Passage of this legislation, as approved by the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on July 24, will disserve the dedicated and brave public servants in United States Attorneys Offices and law enforcement who work tirelessly to pursue justice on behalf of the United States.

The National Treasury Employees Union also wrote in opposition to this bill. They said:

H.R. 2711 provides that every official interaction by any executive branch employee, whether by telephone or in person, shall be allowed to be recorded by the other party. And in certain circumstances, these executive branch employees must notify the other party of their right to record or be subject to appropriate disciplinary action. No exceptions are made in the bill for law enforcement or other sensitive communications.

The Oversight Committee did not hold a single hearing on this bill. The

bill was rushed through just to get it on the floor this week in time to fit the House leadership's message agenda. This is irresponsible legislating and should be defeated.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. ISSA. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a longtime businessman and someone who knows firsthand about abusive governments.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2711. Let me tell you why.

I hear about protecting rights all the time and how important it is for the government to be able to do the things that they need to do. Let me tell you what it's like as a private citizen to be sitting in your office and getting a phone call from somebody that says, I'm sitting here in Detroit, I'm recording this, and I have a lawyer sitting beside me because we're going to put you out of business today.

And my response was, Give me a little bit of time. Let me get my lawyer, and let me get a tape recorder and tape what you're saying to me.

Now what's right anymore? Boy, have we confused things. Is this a government that works for the people or people that work for the government? My goodness, have we gotten things out of focus here.

We think we are so powerful, we are so intelligent. We have reached a level of arrogance that is unbelievable to the American people. Why do they no longer trust us? I can record you but you can't record me. I can have a whole list of everything that you've done, but God help you if you ever try to look into what I'm doing to you. Baloney. It's time for it to stop.

If we're really going to restore trust in this government, it's going to take both sides. This is not a Republican or a Democrat issue. This is an American issue. My goodness, how can we be so far from what the Founders envisioned when they had absolutely nothing to work for, nothing to work with—nothing but the providence and the hand of God in helping to form a government that is absolutely phenomenal?

We're sitting here today and saying it's not okay for a private citizen to record what this government is saying to them. Now the government can do just the opposite. And I don't want to get mixed up with what's legal, because we all know that what's legal has nothing to do with what's right. We've seen that too many times. We've watched it pushed back and forth.

And while it may be funny to some, I've got to tell you, it may be funny when you sit here, but I would love you to meet me in the private sector and get a phone call from somebody from the government. It is truly not just chilling; it is freezing. You have got to sit back and listen to these folks, and

they're recording every single thing you say. God help you if you stumble or stutter. That's what they're looking for.

This gives the private citizens the same rights that they should have. This is a government that's supposed to work for the people and not the people working for the government. It's time to restore trust in this government.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to only speak once, even though there's seven bills. Time is short. We have just a few days left in the legislature until we shut down the government if we don't act. We passed three of the appropriations bills. My understanding is that the one we've had under consideration is not going to be brought to final passage. I may be incorrect in that, but that's the understanding. At least there's some talk about that.

This Congress has been the worst Congress for Federal employees that I have ever served in. The gentleman who spoke before me says he ran a business. If you treated your employees as we're treating our employees, they would have all quit. They would have all walked out. They would talk about the epithets that are used and that "bureaucrats" spit out as a pejorative term to the people who make this government run.

I don't know whether the gentleman read this in the paper today, but two of our largest financial institutions were fined very heavily for misconduct. Do people do things wrong? They do. They do them wrong in the private sector. They do them wrong from time to time in the public sector. Should we be concerned about that? We should be. Should we excise that kind of behavior from private and public sectors? Absolutely.

But I will tell you that these bills—and some of them are okay; they're somewhat redundant. The bill the gentleman speaks of—I just got on the floor when the gentleman was speaking so I don't know exactly what the circumstances are in terms of his being, obviously, from his perspective, threatened by the fact that somebody was going to record him. I understand his concern about that. Frankly, if they'd called me and done that, I would have said, very frankly, I'm going to hang up, and I'll talk to you later with my lawyer, and you're welcome to meet with me. I'm a lawyer so I would have advised him to do that.

That does not explain the torrent of antigovernment workers that we have seen from this Congress and, frankly, to some degree, from the last Congress. They can't strike. And because they have to support their families, they

can't walk out. They don't have many tools. They have us, of course, who represent many of them, to stand up for their rights. But much more importantly, for respect from their employer, which they're not getting.

I would tell my friend that he can come with me. I was down at Pax River, a big naval base, talking about the 20 percent cut that we've asked people to take. They perceive it's because of our dysfunction and because we can't get our job done here, not because of anything they did wrong, not because of a lack of performance.

And I will tell my friend, Mr. KELLY, that an awful lot of my folks are saying, We want to be at work. We've got guys at the point of the spear relying on it, and we're not able to work on Fridays. But they're still fighting on Fridays. They're still at risk on Fridays.

And so when they see these bills, I tell my friend, it's a "gotcha" reaction they have. We'll get 'em. You didn't like being recorded, so your response is to do what you didn't like to them. Now my response, if I were them, is to say, Sorry, Mr. KELLY, I can't talk to you. If you're going to record me, I'm not going to talk to you. We'll put it down on paper, we'll do whatever. As you were concerned about that effort, understand their concern as well.

As I said, out of eight of these bills, four of them aren't too bad. Three of them, obviously, go to undermining due process. The gentleman talks about being concerned. One of the bills says: no due process. You're fired because I think you did something wrong. Not because I proved you did something wrong, not because maybe you did do something wrong. But because I think you did something wrong, you're off—and you're off with no pay.

Maybe the gentleman is asking Mr. ISSA whether in fact that's one of the bills, but I assure him it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest we're the employer, we're the board of directors. And I think, frankly, in the IRS case, we haven't proved any wrong yet. There's been a lot of assertions but not much proof. We shouldn't go head-over-heels denigrating those folks on whom we rely to carry out the very policies we adopt.

Do we need oversight? Of course. Do we need honesty in performance of public duties? Absolutely. But we also need respect and consideration shown for those who work for America—the best civil service in the world. It's the most competent, best-educated civil service in the world, and we treat them as second-rate citizens. We ought not to do that.

We ought to reject this bill and a number of others of these bills. Let us

think of our Federal employees. Because if we don't, we won't have the kind of government that America deserves and wants.

□ 1315

Mr. ISSA. I yield myself 10 seconds simply to say, you know, if two people take the Fifth when asked about their official conduct and there isn't a scandal, I'd be surprised to find that the gentleman from Maryland would find a scandal no matter what we find there.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. ISSA. My 10 seconds has expired.

Mr. HOYER. I didn't think you would.

Mr. ISSA. Pardon me?

Mr. HOYER. I didn't think you would.

Mr. ISSA. I yield myself an additional 10 seconds and yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Her lawyer, or the lawyers, because there was a criminal investigation underway, did what lawyers do in an abundance of caution. That, by the way, is provided for in the Constitution of the United States—I know the gentleman's read it. I've read it as well. So they were availing themselves of their constitutional right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ISSA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the minority whip knows the Constitution. All of us have taken time to understand it. But when we investigate real wrongdoing—wrongdoing like the IRS, wrongdoing that the American people understand, it was just wrong. Even the President started off agreeing with that. Then somehow, whether it's IRS, Benghazi, Fast and Furious, or just somebody at the IRS putting a half-billion-dollar contract out to their buddy and then claiming that, as they got them to contract, that they didn't really know them well, somehow these become phony scandals.

There's only one scandal in Washington, and that's when we find things that are wrong and we don't fix them. We don't have to worry about who at the top is in charge, but we have an obligation to fix them. When people take the Fifth when you're asking simply questions about their official conduct, yes, that's the beginning of a scandal here in Washington—and if not here in Washington, around the rest of America.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) to speak on the bill before us.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I'm troubled by the assertion that we don't treat our Federal employees right because we're asking them to do their job correctly and give their employers—we, the people, we, the taxpayers—the

authority to make sure they're doing their job right when they call us by recording it, by giving us as taxpayers and as citizens the opportunity to avoid a he says-she says when a Federal agency, who has the power to fine us and get us through all kinds of trouble, calls us. We want to keep our evidence and we want to know.

The gentleman on the other side of the aisle talks about not treating the employees the same as the private sector. There are very few large companies I don't call that the first thing I hear is: "This call is going to be recorded for quality assurance purposes." Well, we're giving the employers of the Federal employees—the taxpayers—the power to record those calls for quality assurance purposes.

Federal employees who are doing their job right, who are not intimidating taxpayers, have nothing to hide. We don't want to record their private conversations on their cell phones. We don't even want to get that metadata. We just want to record what the Federal employee is saying to us in the course and scope of his employ at our tax dollars' expense.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield myself 10 seconds.

Just listening to the arguments, this is why, Mr. Speaker, it would have been quite helpful to have had a hearing on the bill so that we could flesh through some of these concerns.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, a member of the committee, the gentleman from the great State of Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend and colleague from Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo what the distinguished minority whip had to say. These bills were rushed to the floor. They've been long in the planning on the Republican side of the aisle. They passed out of our committee on a party-line vote. Hearings were not held. And little niceties like the fact that there wasn't a law enforcement exemption on this particular bill get overlooked in drafting when you rush to the floor like this.

But of course the purpose of these bills is not really to protect American citizens, though we could have done that. Because I would say to my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), I'm deeply sympathetic to the plight he found himself in. I think we probably could have worked out a bipartisan set of proposals today that would have protected people like Mr. KELLY, now a Member of Congress and my friend from Pennsylvania. What he described

is not acceptable and we do need to protect people from it, but that's not the purpose of these bills today.

The purpose of these bills is cynically political. It is to allow one side of the aisle, the majority, to go home and talk about an abusive government that they're standing up to. And in that narrative, you do terrible damage to the courageous men and women, the diligent men and women who serve our constituents, known as Federal employees.

It is part of a relentless—and I think reckless and inexcusable—attack on Federal employees, on public servants because it serves a political agenda. But the long-term cost is the disparagement of public service and the difficulty we are going to have in the out-years in recruiting and retaining talent for the workforce of the future. That's why I oppose these bills, because of the context.

We could have made them better. We could have made them bipartisan. We could have actually worked together. But there was a cynical calculation not to do that, because the purpose of these bills is to continue to use Federal employees as a political punching bag and to make some cheap, short-term political gains.

I thank the Ranking Member for yielding me time . . . and I appreciate his comments in support of our dedicated Federal workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2711, 2579, and 1541.

These misguided, anti-Federal workforce bills are just the latest partisan jab at the dedicated Federal employees who serve on the front lines, protecting and helping our constituents every day.

Yet, House Republicans routinely use them as a punching bag—chipping away at their pay and benefits; stripping them of due process rights and Constitutional Protections; while denigrating the very concept of public service on behalf of our fellow citizens.

Take H.R. 2711, the so-called Citizen Empowerment Act. This hastily drafted measure was introduced a mere 14 days ago, and is now being rushed to the floor without a single hearing examining the bill, or the issue it purports to address.

It is ironic that on a day when Republicans are pushing an anti-Federal Government message, they are seeking to ram through a partisan messaging bill that would actually empower the Federal Government to pre-empt 12 existing State privacy laws.

Further, it is simply inexcusable that in the Republicans' rush to produce a political press release, they have slapped together a measure that does not contain any law enforcement or sensitive information exemptions that may be necessary to protect ongoing law enforcement or intelligence investigations.

To be clear, I do not oppose the principle of allowing citizens to record conversations with Federal employees in the course of official business—in fact, in many situations that can already be done today.

What I am certain of is that this measure—which is opposed by the Federal Law Enforce-

ment Officers Association and the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys—is not ready for prime time.

Of course, this is not even the worst bill the majority is attempting to jam through. H.R. 2579, or as I call it, the "Fire First and Ask Questions Later Act," is even more egregious and indefensible than H.R. 2711.

Republicans are intent on pushing one's tolerance for cruel irony when one considers that again, under the auspices of an anti-Obama Administration messaging effort—Republicans have carelessly drafted provisions in this bill that would vastly strengthen the power of Obama agency leaders to unilaterally, and arbitrarily, fire career civil servants under a "guilty until you prove yourself innocent" construct.

H.R. 2579 makes a mockery of our Nation's long-held principles embodied in the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, and no Member of Congress would dare hold him or herself to a similar Kangaroo Court procedure that presumes an American is guilty until proven innocent.

It is the height of hypocrisy that some of my colleagues are willing to foist such a disgraceful system on our civil servants to score political points.

And finally, last, but certainly not least damaging, we have H.R. 1541, the Preventing Government from Acting Like a Business Act.

As I noted at last week's markup, if this bill were purely standing on its own merits, it may make sense in tough times.

However, H.R. 1541 must be seen in the context of the relentless assault on Federal employees that commenced when Republicans assumed the majority in the House.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle appear unaware that SES pay is discretionary under a Republican-instituted pay-for-performance system.

Contrary to the Republican rhetoric of lavish, unearned bonuses for undeserving members of the SES—the reality is that Senior Executives receive performance awards, and do not receive guaranteed annual increases, cost-of-living increases, locality pay, or overtime compensation.

Almost across the board, members of the SES receive significantly lower compensation than their private sector counterparts. For example, the maximum salary for a Federal VA hospital director is \$179,900, while the average salary of a private sector hospital director is \$800,000.

This bill is a slap in the face to thousands of career Senior Executives who excel in their fields and serve our Nation with distinction. From winning Nobel prizes, to hunting down Osama bin Laden, members of the SES are an incredibly valuable resource that our Nation should cultivate—not demean and tear down.

And for my colleagues who would profess a concern for the deficit, I would, simply close by noting that in 2012, the 46 winners of the Presidential Distinguished Rank award collectively saved American taxpayers \$94 billion in cost-savings and avoidances. Their bonuses were most definitely merited.

I urge House Republicans to finally relent in scoring cheap political points at the expense of our dedicated Federal workforce.

I hope all my colleagues will join me in standing up for our civil servants and opposing these cynical bills.

Mr. ISSA. I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, there was only one amendment offered by the minority, and this bill passed unanimously on a voice vote. The gentleman on the other side could have asked for a recorded vote if he objected to it; he did not.

We are trying to give the 2 million men and women who are Federal workers the right to record when they're called. This is a right every American gets, including the Federal worker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2711, the so-called Citizen Empowerment Act, that has been brought to this floor without a hearing.

While I do understand that the legislation purports to address accountability and transparency in the Federal Government, I am greatly concerned that H.R. 2711, in its current form, will actually have quite the opposite effect.

In particular, this bill would allow the recording of any telephonic or in-person conversation with a Federal employee that is conducted in an official capacity. Regrettably, however, the bill does not include critical exemptions pertaining to the discussion of classified information or conversations relating to sensitive Federal law enforcement or public safety investigations.

In light of this significant flaw in the bill, our Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association has underscored that, rather than enhance accountability in government, this bill would actually have a chilling effect on the ability of Federal law enforcement officers to perform their duties.

According to the association—and I'll quote them:

Put simply, this legislation does not work in the context of Federal law enforcement and does a disservice to the brave men and women who are asked to put their lives on the line to protect us from terrorists and criminals.

For this same reason, the bill is also opposed by the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys. Moreover, this legislation actually is evidence of a shift away from a greater transparency by failing to include a requirement that Federal employees receive fair notice that their official conversations are being recorded.

Importantly, 12 States, including my home State of Massachusetts, have enacted State laws requiring the consent of both parties to a conversation to give their consent. These States' efforts have been undertaken in the interest of government transparency. Regrettably, this legislation would unfortunately serve to undermine them and preempt them.

In addition, I would note that this bill would also serve to promulgate the

severely misguided notion that our Federal workforce is not to be trusted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 45 seconds.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman.

Let us remember that our Federal employees are dedicated public personnel who work at our veterans hospitals. I have three hospitals in my district. I know how hard they work. They protect our borders. They research cures for deadly diseases and provide key services in support of our Departments of Defense, State, and Treasury. They deserve better than this, Mr. Speaker. They deserve better than this legislation. I hope my colleagues vote against it.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will read from the actual language, as amended, the bill before us today that says, "Notice of rights when Federal employees engage in certain actions." It says:

A notice of an individual's right to record conversations with employees shall be included in any written material provided by an executive agency.

Mr. Speaker, that's the only notice that's required in this bill. And that's simply, quite frankly, to let people know that it's a 50-State right, where today it's a 39-State right.

I appreciate the fact that unions and associations representing Federal employees have made statements. I just don't appreciate the fact that they've gotten the details of the actual bill wrong—and knowingly wrong, based on the dates of their letter.

More importantly, let's understand, this bill does not require verbal notice of a right to record given by a Federal official. It does not compromise that. More importantly, in 39 States, the public has this right; and in the other States, in most cases, the worst that would happen would be, if a person pulled it out, they might not be able to use it when trying to defend themselves.

But most important, this bill does not override existing Federal wiretap laws. Of course, if somebody's talking classified on an open telephone, yes, I'd like it recorded because I'd like them to be able to make the case that classified information is being inappropriately talked for. But it does not override the right to go into a classified session. But that better not be with the public generally. If you're discussing classified information, please understand that's a secure location.

So I won't accept these canards, these false statements as to what could happen, because it simply isn't in the four squares of the bill.

Mr. LYNCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISSA. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. The gentleman misunderstands. The Federal employee doesn't know what is going to come out of the caller's mouth next, so classified information can come without notice.

Mr. ISSA. Reclaiming my time, classified information said by a Federal employee has an obligation to be said in a secure location. Of course, under the law, they can say no recording devices can be here in this secure location. But of course you go into a classified briefing, one, because you're cleared, and two, you go there knowingly. So let's not accept these kinds of things.

And let's understand, in 39 States, law enforcement is recording without the permission of the public—and more importantly, so is the IRS, the EPA, OSHA, Fish and Wildlife in many cases, or they're simply taking notes and holding you accountable. Remember, in America, if you answer the IRS wrong over the phone, you might very well get a bill; and your only ability to appeal that bill is to the IRS, and you must pay that bill before you can then go to the courts.

Let's understand, we're dealing in all kinds of agencies, and there are good people, lots of good people there. But on behalf of the 2 million Americans who work for the Federal Government, I want them to have the right to protect themselves by being able to have a right to record in all 50 States.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, as I close, let me say this. The chairman has made some allegations that things were not true—and I guess he's not talking about us, but I guess he's talking about the Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association in a letter that, just today, referring to what he just talked about, says—and I further quote from this letter of July 31, 2013:

Also, by requiring written notices under the threat of disciplinary action, H.R. 2711 would create new administrative and bureaucratic requirements for agents conducting investigations. The time and the resources available to agents are already stretched too thin, and new administrative burdens make it more difficult for agents to protect the public.

That's from them.

By the way, the letters from the Association of Assistant U.S. Attorneys and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, their opposition to this bill goes to the bill that is on the floor right now, so they have their concerns.

Again, I wish that this was something that we could have had testimony so that we could hear from those law enforcement agencies so that we could come to some type of agreement with regard to their concerns, but we did not have that opportunity.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, based upon the arguments that we've already made, I

would urge Members to vote against this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ISSA. In closing, Mr. Speaker, we hold these truths to be self-evident: one of them clearly is our right of free speech; another, free association. But protecting from our government is what our Constitution is all about.

My Democratic friends want to talk about the good workers; but the ranking member knows well there are good workers, and there are some that aren't good. There are workers who would never call and harass somebody, and there are people who have threatened Americans repeatedly. We have whistleblowers, and we have proof of that. We have wrongdoing.

When you get harassed by the government or you simply want to make sure that you know what you said, you have the right to do it in 39 States. You have the right to do it in your State, but you may or may not have the right to do it in the other State which the Federal agency is calling you from. If you are a rancher—Fish and Wildlife, EPA, OSHA—these are not just names on a board; these are people who really affect your life and your liberty and your very commerce, your very ability to feed your family.

The minority whip talked about the Federal workforce not having a choice except to keep working because they need the money and they can't strike. We are not going to that issue. In the vast majority of States, this is already the law. They don't need the Federal Government's approval to record.

When we look at harmonizing how people in every State in the Union look to their government and expect their government to look to them, that is a solemn responsibility. We don't preempt States in any way, shape, or form. We simply make it clear that Americans have a relationship with their government that they can count on. One of them is if they get a harassing call from somebody, somebody who is out of line, or they're asked inappropriate questions, it won't be a "he said, he said, she said, he said." They'll have the ability to record it if they choose.

Around here, we know that fact-based documentation and recordings have made a huge difference in finding out the truth about things that have happened. We also know that what people say is often discounted here, even when they're talking about horrific things that happened to them.

If we didn't have documents, not coming very quickly and usually blacked out, about the IRS's abuse of Americans simply trying to teach the Constitution or in some other way assert their rights of free speech, if we didn't have any documentation, it would just be a "he said, she said." It shouldn't be a "he said, he said." It should be absolutely something where you have that right.

I want all 2 million American Federal workers, I want State workers, I want everyone to know that they have this ability. And, yes, I want Federal workers to have an understanding that when they send an email out on the government email system, they, in fact, are sending out a public document, and it is going to be discovered potentially and used and they should be careful what they say or do, because they represent us, they represent the American people.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that didn't need a long set of hearings. I suspect that the same groups would object to it no matter how many hearings we had about Americans' right to life and liberty, their ability to assert what people would consider to be unalienable rights. We are not talking about a complex issue. We are talking about the vast majority of States have one rule, a few have a different rule, and as to Federal workers we are making the statement that we, their government, have decided that the answer if you're asked if you can record is, yes, and you don't even have to be asked.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your consideration, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following exchange of letters.

JULY 30, 2013.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN ISSA: I am writing concerning H.R. 2711, the "Citizen Empowerment Act," which your Committee ordered reported on July 24, 2013.

As you know, H.R. 2711 contains provisions within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 2711, the Committee on the Judiciary will not assert its jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

JULY 30, 2013.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2711, the "Citizen Empowerment Act," and your willingness to forego consideration of H.R. 2711 by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on the Judiciary has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of H.R. 2711 and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 2711. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your Committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2711, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2013

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 313) to amend title 5, United States Code, to institute spending limits and transparency requirements for Federal conference and travel expenditures, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 313

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Government Spending Accountability Act of 2013" or the "GSA Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. LIMITS AND TRANSPARENCY FOR CONFERENCE AND TRAVEL SPENDING.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 5711 the following:

"§ 5712. Limits and transparency for conference and travel spending

"(a) CONFERENCE TRANSPARENCY AND SPENDING LIMITS.—

"(1) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF CONFERENCE MATERIALS.—Each agency shall post on the public website of that agency detailed information on any presentation made by any employee of that agency at a conference (except to the extent the head of an agency excludes such information for reasons of national security or information described under section 552(b)) including—

"(A) the prepared text of any verbal presentation made; and

"(B) any visual, digital, video, or audio materials presented, including photographs, slides, and audio-visual recordings.

"(2) LIMITS ON AMOUNT EXPENDED ON A CONFERENCE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (B), an agency may not expend more than \$500,000 to support a single conference.

"(B) EXCEPTION.—The head of an agency may waive the limitation under subparagraph (A) for a specific conference after making a determination that the expenditure is justified as the most cost-effective option to achieve a compelling purpose. The head of an agency shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on any waiver granted under this subparagraph, including the justification for such waiver.

"(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to preclude an agency from receiving financial support or other assistance from a private entity to pay or defray the costs of a conference the total cost of which exceeds \$500,000.

"(b) INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE RULE.—An agency may not pay the travel expenses for more than 50 employees of that agency who are stationed in the United States, for any international conference, unless the Secretary of State determines that attendance for such employees is in the national interest, or the head of the agency determines that attendance for such employees is critical to the agency's mission. The Secretary of State and the head of an agency shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on any waiver granted under this subsection, including the justification for such waiver.

"(c) REPORTING ON TRAVEL AND CONFERENCE EXPENSES REQUIRED.—At the beginning of each quarter of each fiscal year, each agency shall post on the public website of that agency a report on each conference that costs more than \$10,000 for which the agency paid travel expenses during the preceding 3 months that includes—

"(1) the itemized expenses paid by the agency, including travel, lodging, and meal expenses, and any other agency expenditures to otherwise support the conference;

"(2) the primary sponsor of the conference;

"(3) the location of the conference;

"(4) the date of the conference;

"(5) a brief explanation of how the participation of employees from such agency at the conference advanced the mission of the agency;

"(6) the title of any employee, or any individual who is not a Federal employee, whose travel expenses or other conference expenses were paid by the agency;

"(7) the total number of individuals whose travel expenses or other conference expenses were paid by the agency; and

"(8) in the case of a conference for which that agency was the primary sponsor, a statement that—

"(A) describes the cost to the agency of selecting the specific conference venue;

"(B) describes why the location was selected, including a justification for such selection;

"(C) demonstrates the cost efficiency of the location;

"(D) provides a cost benefit analysis of holding a conference rather than conducting a teleconference; and

"(E) describes any financial support or other assistance from a private entity used to pay or defray the costs of the conference, and for each case where such support or assistance was used, the head of the agency

shall include a certification that there is no conflict of interest resulting from such support or assistance.

“(d) **FORMAT AND PUBLICATION OF REPORTS.**—Each report posted on the public website under subsection (c) shall—

“(1) be in a searchable electronic format; and

“(2) remain on that website for at least 5 years after the date of posting.

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **AGENCY.**—The term ‘agency’ has the meaning given that term under section 5701, but does not include the government of the District of Columbia.

“(2) **CONFERENCE.**—The term ‘conference’ means a meeting, retreat, seminar, symposium, or event that—

“(A) is held for consultation, education, discussion, or training; and

“(B) is not held entirely at a Government facility.

“(3) **INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE.**—The term ‘international conference’ means a conference occurring outside the United States attended by representatives of—

“(A) the Government of the United States; and

“(B) any foreign government, international organization, or foreign nongovernmental organization.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5711 the following:

“5712. Limits and transparency for conference and travel spending.”.

(c) **ANNUAL TRAVEL EXPENSE LIMITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, an agency (as defined under section 5712(e) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)) may not make, or obligate to make, expenditures for travel expenses, in an aggregate amount greater than 70 percent of the aggregate amount of such expenses for fiscal year 2010.

(2) **EXEMPTIONS.**—The agency may exclude certain travel expenses from the limitation under paragraph (1) only if the agency head determines that inclusion of such expenses would undermine national security, international diplomacy, health and safety inspections, law enforcement, or site visits required for oversight or investigatory purposes.

(3) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—In each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, the head of each agency shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report containing—

(A) the justification for any expenses excluded (under paragraph (2)) from the limitation under paragraph (1); and

(B) the positive or negative impacts, if any, of the limitation under paragraph (1) on the agency’s mission, cost-effectiveness, efficiency, and ability to perform core functions.

(4) **IDENTIFICATION OF TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—

(A) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—Not later than September 30, 2013, and after consultation with the Administrator of General Services and the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall establish guidelines for the determination of what expenses constitute travel expenses for purposes of this subsection. The guidelines shall identify specific expenses, and classes of expenses, that are to be treated as travel expenses.

(B) **EXEMPTION FOR MILITARY TRAVEL.**—The guidelines required under subparagraph (A) shall exclude military travel expenses in determining what expenses constitute travel expenses. Military travel expenses shall include travel expenses involving military combat, the training or deployment of uniformed military personnel, and such other travel expenses as determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services and the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last year, the public became aware of the now-infamous GSA Las Vegas conference that cost taxpayers some \$820,000.

In the wake of that public outcry, the Office of Management and Budget issued a May 2012 memo outlining new policies and procedures for Federal travel and conferences. In the memo, OMB told agency heads to reduce travel spending for fiscal year 2013 to 70 percent of the fiscal 2010 levels. Senior-level review was instituted for all events, with senior-level approval and public reporting for events costing some \$100,000 or more, and a general prohibition on events costing half a million or more, unless the agency signed a waiver.

The Oversight Committee learned that in fiscal year 2012 alone, nearly 900 Federal conferences costing in excess of \$100,000 were held. The total cost of these events exceeded \$340 million.

H.R. 313 codifies OMB’s travel and conference guidelines with some important changes. While exempting military travel, the bill eliminates loopholes in the OMB guidance in order to ensure that agencies actually achieve a 70 percent reduction in nonmilitary-related travel.

The bill also mandates transparency by requiring agencies to post online, on a quarterly basis, detailed, itemized reports of all conference spending. And it requires that materials presented at the conference by a Federal employee be made available online.

Last year, the House approved unanimously substantially similar legislation that was also reported from the

Oversight Committee. I would like to thank Mr. FARENTHOLD for his leadership on this bill, and Mr. POCAN for working with us at the committee markup to help make important improvements to this bill.

I urge all Members to support this good government and commonsense legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 313, as amended. I support the intent of this legislation to reduce wasteful travel and conference spending and to shine light on the Federal Government expenditures in those areas.

The recent instances of excessive spending at a 2010 Las Vegas conference held by the General Services Administration and two 2011 Orlando conferences hosted by the Veterans Affairs Department gave good cause for the introduction of this measure. I believe that safeguards and heightened congressional and public scrutiny are needed to prevent incidents like those from happening again.

This bill is similar to legislation that passed the House in the last Congress and similar to administration guidance issued to agencies. Legislation would require agencies to reduce travel spending by 30 percent below fiscal year 2010 levels in each of the next 5 fiscal years and limit expenditures on any single conference to \$500,000.

I also thank Chairman ISSA for working with us to make some changes to the bill to address some of our major concerns. We added language to the bill to allow agency heads or the Secretary of State to waive the 50 percent limit on the number of employees who may attend international conferences. This change was made to address concerns raised by Representatives RUSH HOLT, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, and others in the scientific community about the potential negative effect of the limit on the free and open exchange of scientific and technical knowledge.

We also established \$10,000 as the minimum threshold amount a conference would have to cost before agencies would be required to provide cost information in their quarterly reporting.

Lastly, we appreciate the addition of the language in the bill exempting travel expenses from the required 30 percent reduction when the reduction would undermine national security, international diplomacy, health and safety inspections of law enforcement, or site visits required for oversight investigations.

I believe that H.R. 313 has been greatly improved by the exchanges. I offer my support for this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the ranking member's support of this bill.

This is not an anti-travel, anti-conference bill. This is a commonsense transparency and good government bill. It was designed to stop wasteful spending.

You hear a lot of talk here around Washington, D.C., about we've got to stop the waste, fraud, and abuse. Well, we are doing that here today with H.R. 313. What we are doing is saying if there is a government conference, it needs to be for government purposes and real work needs to be done.

We are not asking the taxpayers to foot the bill for a vacation for Federal employees. We don't need clowns, we don't need mind readers, we don't need a Star Trek video, we don't need pictures of agency representatives in a bathtub with a glass of wine.

We need Federal employees conducting Federal business and doing what the taxpayers are paying them to do. Many of these conferences are great opportunities for training, great opportunities in the scientific community to move forward with advancements. But what we've got to do is make sure taxpayers' money is not wasted, that it is spent wisely. We need a culture in this government where Federal employees, each and every one of them, know it is not their money they're spending; it's the hardworking American taxpayers' money that they are spending.

That's what we are doing here today. We are putting limits on the amount that can be spent. In certain cases, you can go over these limits, but we need to have someone held accountable for these conferences. So when you get into the big-dollar amounts, an agency head, somebody who is politically accountable, has to sign off for it, somebody who actually is thinking all the time about what is the public going to think about this.

This is a great solution we've crafted in a bipartisan manner that doesn't end conferences, but promotes responsible conferences.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 313.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the time.

I would first respectfully correct the record because the GSA conference was not in Las Vegas; it was in Henderson, Nevada, which is in District 3.

Like my colleagues, I believe that government agencies should spend every cent in the most careful and responsible way possible, and it is our job as Members of Congress to ensure that all government spending is effective and efficient.

While there are still improvements that can be made, and I agree with many of the comments that have been

issued on the floor already, Congress and the administration have already taken many steps to eliminate excessive travel, require transparency, and improve oversight.

I rise today, however, because I believe that H.R. 313 sends the wrong message about business travel. I am proud to represent Las Vegas, one of the premier business destinations in the United States. Last year, we hosted some 21,000 meetings and conventions attended by almost 5 million business travelers. These business meetings supported 60,000 jobs with an economic impact of \$6.7 billion.

Business travel is an important aspect of the economy, with over \$250 billion in direct spending by business travelers, which supports 2.2 million jobs nationwide. Even in this age of technology, where lots of business is conducted via the Internet, small businesses across Nevada tell me all the time that the opportunity to meet face-to-face to discuss new programs, cultivate business at a trade show, or learn about new products and designs is just irreplaceable.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to cultivate this important aspect of our economy while also ensuring that our tax dollars are well spent.

□ 1345

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of reining in excessive government spending and waste, and I thank my colleague from Texas for his work on this important matter.

As the Representative who represents Henderson, Nevada, I am pleased Congress and the administration worked together to reduce wasteful government spending and to prevent flagrant abuses of taxpayer funds on lavish conferences and travel. These efforts will certainly increase oversight and transparency. However, I urge my colleagues to avoid those unnecessary restrictions on government travel which could significantly affect conference cities like Las Vegas and Henderson.

Despite the inexcusable actions of a few, government conferences can benefit the public and private sectors and contribute to our economic health. Cancelling conferences outright solves nothing. The cancellation of a 2013 Military Health System Conference to train military medical personnel actually cost the government more than \$800,000 in replacement expenses and lost revenue. I am concerned that those approving government conferences under these new standards may limit agency travel to specific geographic locations solely to avoid the perception of the misuse of taxpayer funds.

These decisions should not be about perception but should be based on cost-

effectiveness, efficiency, and the best interests of taxpayers. That's why I co-sponsored H.R. 1880, the Protecting Resort Cities from Discrimination Act, to prohibit Federal agencies from implementing policies that discourage travel to perceived resort or vacation destinations. Cities like Las Vegas, Henderson, and Orlando are equipped with an abundance of affordable rooms and conference spaces, and independent studies confirm that the per attendee cost of government conferences is nearly half that of similar private sector conferences, but these cities should not suffer from poor judgment by a handful of government workers.

Again, I strongly support the efforts to eliminate the waste and abuse of taxpayer funds. Federal travel and conference participation benefits our economy when done appropriately and responsibly. So I support this legislation, and I ask to continue to work together to encourage accountability and transparency for government travel to ensure conference cities like Las Vegas, Henderson, and others can continue to provide their valuable services.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Government Spending Accountability Act, which will rein in out-of-control government spending by providing much-needed reforms and transparency for Federal employee travel and government-sponsored conferences.

As someone who introduced similar legislation last year, I want to thank Chairman FARENTHOLD for his continued work on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, reports of lavish and out-of-control spending by various Federal agencies, most notably by the General Services Administration, have highlighted the need for serious reform for these types of fiscally irresponsible practices. However, other agencies have been responsible for carelessly wasting taxpayer funds as well.

One example of this waste took place an hour from my home in Lakeland, Florida. In 2011, the Department of Veterans Affairs held two human resources training conferences in Orlando, Florida, at a cost of \$6.1 million to the taxpayers. Last year, an inspector general report published within the Department of Veterans Affairs found that the Department conference planners allowed up to \$762,000 in unauthorized or wasteful spending. This included gifts, spa treatments, tickets for helicopter rides, and golf packages.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women in uniform are some of the best and proudest that America has to offer.

They take an oath to uphold not only the Constitution of this United States but also to give the ultimate sacrifice of their lives. Here, the veterans administration agency, which is charged with making sure that their benefits are adequately and appropriately provided, has been indicted with wasting these taxpayer dollars. Unfortunately, at a time when veterans are waiting in line for benefits they fought and sacrificed to earn, taxpayers should not be subsidizing lavish hotel bills and golf outings.

Once again, I want to thank the chairman for introducing this legislation, and I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in passing this good government legislation.

Mr. MEADOWS. I want to thank the ranking member for his support of this legislation, and I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 313, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for making small changes to this legislation to address concerns that I raised about this bill last year. However, the premise of the bill remains the same and for that reason, I oppose H.R. 313, the so-called "Government Spending Accountability Act". H.R. 313 is fundamentally flawed because it would make significant changes to federal employees' ability to travel to conferences and meetings.

This bill institutes prohibitions and impediments that would hinder American scientists' ability to collaborate and communicate with scientists at other institutions and laboratories.

Although I appreciate the sponsors' efforts to ensure oversight on travel expenditures, I'm not sure they realize the impact that this legislation would have on science and technology, which is the engine of American innovation. The informal conversations, as well as the formal presentations and everything else that goes on between scientists from different institutions, from different countries, lead to new collaborations that have the promise of new discoveries. These are not fancy junkets.

Scientific conferences are critically important. For example, the American Chemical Society and, the American Physical Society have stated that the development of an anticancer drug was the result of collaboration between a team of scientists from three laboratories that took place at one of these conferences. This bill would hinder that kind of collaboration. In a time when the federal government should be making science a priority, passing a bill that would make scientists jump through hurdles and get around impediments would, in fact, weaken American scientists, weaken American science, and impede the ability of American scientists to innovate.

That is not wise. This is not the way to build our economy and to foster advancements in innovation. We should be investing more in research and development, which means, of course, investing in scientists, but also investing in their ability to pursue science.

Would Congress do better if we did not meet in person, if we stayed home and got on

conference calls every once in a while? I don't think so. I think the gains that are made in good legislation that come from conferences, from working together as colleagues as we gather for votes, or in committees, are invaluable. The same can be said for scientific conferences—better innovation can occur when scientists meet together, face-to-face.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 313, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2579) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for investigative leave requirements with respect to Senior Executive Service employees, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2579

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Government Employee Accountability Act".

SEC. 2. SUSPENSION FOR 14 DAYS OR LESS FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EM- PLOYEES.

Paragraph (1) of section 7501 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) 'employee' means—

"(A) an individual in the competitive service who is not serving a probationary or trial period under an initial appointment or who has completed 1 year of current continuous employment in the same or similar positions under other than a temporary appointment limited to 1 year or less; or

"(B) a career appointee in the Senior Executive Service who—

"(i) has completed the probationary period prescribed under section 3393(d); or

"(ii) was covered by the provisions of subchapter II of this chapter immediately before appointment to the Senior Executive Service;"

SEC. 3. INVESTIGATIVE LEAVE AND TERMINATION AUTHORITY FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SUBCHAPTER VI—INVESTIGATIVE LEAVE FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

"§ 7551. Definitions

"For the purposes of this subchapter—

"(1) 'employee' has the meaning given such term in section 7541; and

"(2) 'investigative leave' means a temporary absence without duty for disciplinary reasons, of a period not greater than 90 days.

"§ 7552. Actions covered

"This subchapter applies to investigative leave.

"§ 7553. Cause and procedure

"(a)(1) Under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, an agency may place an employee on investigative leave, without loss of pay and without charge to annual or sick leave, only for misconduct, neglect of duty, malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds.

"(2) If an agency determines, as prescribed in regulation by the Office of Personnel Management, that such employee's conduct is flagrant and that such employee intentionally engaged in such conduct, the agency may place such employee on investigative leave under this subchapter without pay.

"(b)(1) At the end of each 45-day period during a period of investigative leave implemented under this section, the relevant agency shall review the investigation into the employee with respect to the misconduct, neglect of duty, malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds.

"(2) Not later than 5 business days after the end of each such 45-day period, the agency shall submit a report describing such review to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

"(3) At the end of a period of investigative leave implemented under this section, the agency shall—

"(A) remove an employee placed on investigative leave under this section;

"(B) suspend such employee without pay; or

"(C) reinstate or restore such employee to duty.

"(4) The agency may extend the period of investigative leave with respect to an action under this subchapter for an additional period not to exceed 90 days.

"(c) An employee against whom an action covered by this subchapter is proposed is entitled to, before being placed on investigative leave under this section—

"(1) at least 30 days' advance written notice, stating specific reasons for the proposed action, unless—

"(A) there is reasonable cause to believe that the employee has committed a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment can be imposed; or

"(B) the agency determines, as prescribed in regulation by the Office of Personnel Management, that the employee's conduct with respect to which an action covered by this subchapter is proposed is flagrant and that such employee intentionally engaged in such conduct;

"(2) a reasonable time, but not less than 7 days, to answer orally and in writing and to furnish affidavits and other documentary evidence in support of the answer;

"(3) be represented by an attorney or other representative; and

"(4) a written decision and specific reasons therefor at the earliest practicable date.

"(d) An agency may provide, by regulation, for a hearing which may be in lieu of or in addition to the opportunity to answer provided under subsection (c)(2).

"(e) An employee against whom an action is taken under this section is entitled to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board under section 7701.

"(f) Copies of the notice of proposed action, the answer of the employee when written, and a summary thereof when made orally, the notice of decision and reasons therefor, and any order effecting an action covered by this subchapter, together with any supporting material, shall be maintained by the

agency and shall be furnished to the Merit Systems Protection Board upon its request and to the employee affected upon the employee's request.

"SUBCHAPTER VII—REMOVAL OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES"

"§ 7561. Definition"

"For purposes of this subchapter, the term 'employee' has the meaning given such term in section 7541.

"§ 7562. Removal of Senior Executive Service employees"

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and consistent with the requirements of subsection (b), the head of an agency may remove an employee for serious neglect of duty, misappropriation of funds, or malfeasance if the head of the agency—

"(1) determines that the employee knowingly acted in a manner that endangers the interest of the agency mission;

"(2) considers the removal to be necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States; and

"(3) determines that the procedures prescribed in other provisions of law that authorize the removal of such employee cannot be invoked in a manner that the head of an agency considers consistent with the efficiency of the Government.

"(b) An employee may not be removed under this section—

"(1) on any basis that would be prohibited under—

"(A) any provision of law referred to in section 2302(b)(1); or

"(B) paragraphs (8) or (9) of section 2302(b); or

"(2) on any basis, described in paragraph (1), as to which any administrative or judicial proceeding—

"(A) has been commenced by or on behalf of such employee; and

"(B) is pending.

"(c) An employee removed under this section shall be notified of the reasons for such removal. Within 30 days after the notification, the employee is entitled to submit to the official designated by the head of the agency statements or affidavits to show why the employee should be restored to duty. If such statements and affidavits are submitted, the head of the agency shall provide a written response, and may restore the employee's employment if the head of the agency chooses.

"(d) Whenever the head of the agency removes an employee under the authority of this section, the head of the agency shall notify Congress of such termination, and the specific reasons for the action.

"(e) An employee against whom an action is taken under this section is entitled to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board under section 7701 of this title.

"(f) Copies of the notice of proposed action, the answer of the employee when written, and a summary thereof when made orally, the notice of decision and reasons therefor, and any order effecting an action covered by this subchapter, together with any supporting material, shall be maintained by the agency and shall be furnished to the Merit Systems Protection Board upon its request and to the employee affected upon the employee's request.

"(g) A removal under this section does not affect the right of the employee affected to seek or accept employment with any other department or agency of the United States if that employee is declared eligible for such employment by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

"(h) The authority of the head of the agency under this section may not be delegated."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 7543 the following:

"SUBCHAPTER VI—INVESTIGATIVE LEAVE FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES"

"7551. Definitions.

"7552. Actions covered.

"7553. Cause and procedure.

"SUBCHAPTER VII—REMOVAL OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES"

"7561. Definition.

"7562. Removal of Senior Executive Employees."

SEC. 4. SUSPENSION OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

Section 7543 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "misappropriation of funds," after "malfeasance,"; and

(2) in subsection (b), by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) at least 30 days' advance written notice, stating specific reasons for the proposed action, unless—

"(A) there is reasonable cause to believe that the employee has committed a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment can be imposed; or

"(B) the agency determines, as prescribed in regulation by the Office of Personnel Management, that the employee's conduct with respect to which an action covered by this subchapter is proposed is flagrant and that such employee intentionally engaged in such conduct;"

SEC. 5. MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS AMENDMENTS.

(a) REINSTATEMENT IN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.—Section 3593 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting "misappropriation of funds," after "malfeasance,"; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "or malfeasance" and inserting "malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds".

(b) PLACEMENT IN OTHER PERSONNEL SYSTEMS.—Section 3594(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "or malfeasance" and inserting "malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

From Jeff Neely at the GSA to Lois Lerner at the IRS, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee has

uncovered numerous examples of high-ranking government employees engaging in behavior contrary to the principles of public service.

In the private sector, these behaviors would be grounds for serious disciplinary action or termination. In some cases, these employees could face civil or criminal penalties—but not in the Federal bureaucracy. Only in Washington would these employees not be terminated but, instead, be placed on administrative leave with pay.

H.R. 2579 helps ensure Senior Executive Service employees are held accountable for their actions while maintaining existing due process rights. This legislation was unanimously approved by the Oversight Committee last week, and a similar version of this bill was passed by the House by a vote of 402-2 last Congress.

I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) for his work on this bill, and I urge all Members to support its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am no longer surprised, but I am saddened that the Republicans are wasting the last few days before the August recess to vote on bills to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 40th time and to continue their campaign to blame our country's civil servants for the challenges we face. We could be addressing the many serious and important issues facing our country, such as appointing conferees to negotiate a balanced budget to replace the harmful sequester, or passing legislation that would create jobs for the middle class, or voting on comprehensive immigration reform. Instead, Republicans are more interested in playing partisan games and in advancing political messaging bills.

Americans want Congress to focus on creating jobs and on growing our economy. The Democrats have put forward a responsible budget that invests in the future and in the middle class while taking a balanced approach to deficit reduction. Yet, Republicans refuse to listen, with a record defined more by what they have failed to do than what they have actually achieved.

It has been 209 days since the start of this Congress, and the Republicans have failed to pass a single jobs bill. It has been 129 days since the Senate passed a budget, and the Republicans have refused to appoint conferees to complete negotiations and resolve final legislation. Now Senators JOHN MCCAIN, SUSAN COLLINS, LAMAR ALEXANDER, and BOB CORKER have joined House Democrats in our calls to go to conference. Yet, here we are today debating on H.R. 2579, a bill that would strip due process protections from Senior Executive Service employees accused of wrongdoing.

This bill would give a politically appointed agency head broad discretion

to fire Senior Executive Service employees without advance notice. The bill would provide no opportunity for a proper investigation or for employees to address the agency's concerns before such action is taken. H.R. 2579 would eliminate due process protections that were put in place precisely to protect civil servants from partisan, political influence. It would shift the burden onto employees to prove their innocence and seek reinstatement. This is contrary to the core legal principle of the American justice system—the presumption that one is innocent until proven guilty.

My Republican colleagues would have you believe that this is a bill needed to hold senior executives in our Federal Government agencies accountable. Although abuses committed by government employees certainly need to be addressed, denying due process rights to employees is not the appropriate way to do it.

There are existing procedures in place to deal with these challenges. Under current law, agencies may take action against senior executives for misconduct, neglect of duty, malfeasance, or the failure to accept a reassignment or a transfer of function. However, current law requires agencies to give Senior Executive employees 30 days' advance notice, among other rights, before disciplinary action is commenced unless there is reasonable cause to believe that the employee has committed a crime.

I believe that we need to strengthen and improve the agency implementation of existing disciplinary procedures rather than pass legislation that would abridge the fundamental rights of our public servants. This bill would fire accused employees first, then ask questions later. I am afraid agency heads could feel undue pressure in particularly high-profile cases to terminate employees without first conducting a thorough investigation to determine the facts. For these reasons, I strongly oppose H.R. 2579, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. For those of you up in the gallery, please put on your seatbelts. Again, this room is spinning so fast right now that it's hard to determine what's being said or why it's even being said. So, please, put them on. I don't want you to fall out of the gallery in trying to keep up with what's being said.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to address their remarks to the Chair and to refrain from referring to occupants of the gallery.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. My comment, Mr. Speaker, is I'm con-

cerned about the safety of those watching today from the gallery. I just wanted them to be aware that there is a definite turntable here, and I'm really surprised that anybody can walk straight when they leave this room because of the spin that's put on everything. So my concern is for the safety of those watching today.

In going back to February 6, 1788, James Madison said to us, "If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary."

I've got to tell you that Madison is still alive, and he is alive on both sides of the aisle. What amazes me sometimes is how we get so far away from what it is that we are trying to do and who it is we are trying to protect. Now, I've heard the terms that—do you know what?—we're not protecting those who work for America. Let me tell you about those who work for America.

When I come out of my church on Sunday morning—out of St. Paul's, the 8 o'clock mass—I see all kinds of people who work for America. When I'm down at the Kmart, doing my shopping, I see all kinds of people who work for America. When I'm in Erie, Pennsylvania, I see all kinds of people who work for America—the same in Meadville, Pennsylvania, and the same in Butler, Pennsylvania. So I'm sometimes confused about who it is we're trying to protect. If it's truly those who work for America, it is those who work for America.

All of these folks behind me work for America. All of the people at our homes work for America, do they not?

Now the question is: Who looks after those people, those American taxpayers? When there is an abuse, my goodness, have we gotten to the point at which our only concern is for those who get a check that says it came from the United States Government?

I know who funds America. It is hardworking American taxpayers. That is why it's so unbelievable for me to sit here and listen to how we're not protecting those who work for America.

□ 1400

This is not about the men and women, the guys and gals that go to work every day for the government. The ranking member knows that this is not about stripping them of their rights. It truly is not. In fact, if you go to page 8, lines 15 through 17:

An employee against whom an action is taken under this section is entitled to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board under section 7701 of this title.

Nobody is being stripped of anything. What we're doing is taking care of all those people who elected us to come here. I've got to tell you, I wasn't just elected as a Republican to come and take care of only those folks in my district that are registered Republican. I was sent here to represent everybody.

I've never sat back and said, You know what? This isn't in the best interest of my Republican constituents. It helps my Democrat constituents. Since I'm a Republican, I'll game it, I'll spin it so that I can't vote that way. That's absolutely stupid.

Again, how far have we gotten from the initial message of what it is we're trying to do? The Government Employee Accountability Act—when we had the GSA hearing and the ranking member sat there, I said, Why is Mr. Neely on leave with pay when you know the IG had him under investigation? In fact, you bonused him money for the very same event that he's being investigated for. You bonused him, and then you let him go home to do what he wants to do. He's on leave with pay.

When I go back home, people ask me all the time, and I see their faces, and I can't look at them and say, You know what? What you don't understand is that in Washington, you can do the wrong thing and there's no accountability. Now, if you're back home in the private sector and you do the wrong thing, you're held accountable. What you have to understand is that you work in the private sector, not the public sector. They cry out for equal treatment. Not special treatment, not to be handled differently than anybody else. But they say, Mr. KELLY, if it's good for the goose, it's good for the gander.

Should not both sides of this aisle be concerned with what's right for the American taxpayer? Should we not be concerned with what's right for American citizens? Should we not say to these same people who run these agencies, Look, we know you don't have the tools that you need—and that's what I was told by the GSA, that they put Mr. Neely on leave because they don't have any mechanism to do otherwise.

I don't want to keep beating up Jeff Neely, but by the same token, I refuse to keep beating up American taxpayers. If I don't have the stomach, if I don't have the backbone to do what's right, and if I can't walk a straight line when I leave here—this is not about taking the rights away from people who work for the government. Come on, guys. You know that.

Oh, my goodness. We've got to get together on this because this is not making sense to me. This looks like the back end of a frat party where everybody's kind of a walking crooked coming out, trying to figure out what it is they did for the last 3 or 4 hours. I've got to tell you that this is common sense for America. If we cannot protect those who sent us here, if we cannot restore the trust of those who sent us here, if we're going to come here and debate and make a mockery and spin it to the point where it confuses the American people—this is not about taking anybody's rights away. This is about reinforcing the responsibilities

of those who work for the American taxpayer, and that is all of us, both Republican and Democrat.

I've got to tell you what I've said before. There is no way I'll ever go back to northwest Pennsylvania and tell them, You just don't get it. See, the problem with you people is you're so busy working trying to make ends meet, you don't understand how government works. We can twist it. We can turn it. We can say anything we want. What we ask you is to believe. You know what the American people are telling us? I don't believe you any more. I don't trust you any more. I don't understand why I can be held accountable for everything I do, but other folks that work for me can do pretty much anything they want. Then we'll redeploy them. We'll push them off to another area. They won't lose a penny. We'll bring them back in under some other title, some other agency. All I want to do is give those managers of those agencies the tools that they have requested of us in Congress, give them the ability to hold people accountable.

Who am I talking about? I'm talking about the senior executives. I'm not talking about every gal and guy who walks into an office every day that does great work for the American people. Let's not get confused. So, please, don't spin it. My days of riding a merry-go-round are over, and so should yours be. We can fix this. We have to put things in there that make it possible to hold people accountable. The people that raised me, the people that I've worked for, the people that I have played under as coaches, hold you accountable for everything you do, and there are repercussions for doing the wrong thing. You don't give them a pat on the back and say, You know what? Go home for a while. Don't worry about your pay. The American taxpayer is going to pick up the tab on that. We'll keep you safe. We'll keep you covered.

Senior executive, this is the *creme de la creme*. This is the top of the bunch. This isn't all those people you see walking in and out. I don't want to get it confused with the gentleman from Maryland about sequestration. This is about what's fair for this Nation. I'm sick and tired of having everyone else throwing in and saying, No, you don't understand. Let's all put it in a blender, we'll pour it out, and they'll drink it. No, they won't. The American people are choking now on the rhetoric that comes out of this House because we don't talk straight. We talk Washingtonese, which nobody understands. We wouldn't allow it in our public sector, and we shouldn't allow it here.

If it's about accountability, listen, I will tell you what, I would like to see accountability not just in the government employee, but also in Members of this great legislature. My goodness, if

we don't understand what Madison said and we are truly not ruled by angels, as we know, we are obliged to put in elements that force us—because we won't do the right thing on our own—force us to do the right thing for the American taxpayers and those men and women who get up every day, throw their feet out over the bed, and go to work. Do you know why they do it? Because they love their families and they love their country, and they know they have to do it.

Mr. Speaker, thank you so much for allowing this piece of legislation to come forward. I can't tell you how proud I am to be a Member of this body. We may disagree on some things, but people tell me, KELLY, you don't understand. I say, No, no, no. The problem is I do understand; I just don't agree. I understand it so well that if we don't right these wrongs, this great country will never be what it was supposed to be. For us to sit here as a body and allow it to happen and say, Too tough a vote. Man, some people are not going to like me for this. I may not get elected the next time. I just say, Get a stomach, get a stronger back, and do what's right for America. This is about what's right for the true Americans that keep this great organization going. That is the American taxpayer.

So having said that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you so much for allowing me to get up and speak, and please, "If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary." Isn't it amazing that over 225 years ago, the same thing rings true today? If it were really angels that were running the organization, we wouldn't be having these conversations, and we would just go ahead with every day and say it's all right.

We're not. We're ruled by men. Men make mistakes. Men need to be held accountable when they make a mistake. I want to make sure that each of us, no matter what party you represent, is able to go to their home district and say, I did what was right for you today. I did what was right for you, your children, and your grandchildren. I did what was right for America.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before yielding to Mr. LYNCH, I just want to say one thing. I listened to the gentleman, and I have the utmost respect for him. But I remind him that this is American jurisprudence that has had the concept of "innocent until proven guilty" for as long as he just talked about.

Mr. KELLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I just want to finish this. I listened to you very carefully. You had an outstanding speech, but I want to just make sure we're clear on something.

The senior executives suspected right now of criminal activity may already

be removed or placed in indefinite suspension without pay. We need to focus on improving agency implementation.

You talk about the Neely case. Rather than passing legislation that would deprive employees of their due process rights—I do want to keep in mind that there is a little thing called the Constitution of the United States of America that every 2 years we come and swear we're going to uphold. Part of that Constitution is about due process, and that's what we are trying to adhere to here.

I think we have to be very careful when we start looking at just individual cases. We're making legislation for Federal employees throughout this country, and I just want to provide some caution there.

I now yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say that I have the utmost affection and respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He and I are friends. But I must say that he's wrong on this case.

It's ironic that you choose James Madison as the one person that you rely upon in your argument, because it was James Madison that actually drafted the due process clause. He was the one that took the recommendations from the delegates from New York and actually drafted the text. He made his own amendments to the due process clause that we today rely upon to protect constitutional rights.

Let me also talk about the Senior Executive Service in our Federal government. Those are the employees that rise to the top. They do after years of serving in many cases because of their expertise in protecting our veterans at the VA hospitals. But the Senior Executive Service is an experienced corps of dedicated Federal employees who provide institutional stability and continuity across administrations, and they serve as a vital link between political appointees, frontline managers, and the Federal workforce. We don't want each administration coming in and saying for no reason, Well, I'm a Republican. I'm going to fire all the Democratic executives in the Senior Executive Service. We don't want a Democrat coming in and saying, I'm going to fire all these Republicans who are in senior positions.

One of the protections we provide is due process of law. Despite the important role that Senior Executive Service employees play in the Federal Government, this bill that's on the floor today would deprive these employees of the basic due process rights available to them under existing law. The legislation would give agency heads the broad discretion to just fire people, fire senior executives that are suspected of

misconduct, and employees would bear the burden of proving their reinstatement. This is called "ready, fire, aim." It would allow firing employees for basically any reason that in the discretion of the senior management is required. As the gentleman from Maryland and I—and I congratulate him on his advocacy here—it presumes guilt before we get all the facts. That is completely inconsistent with the principles of our Constitution.

I am deeply concerned that this legislation may cause irreparable reputational damage if an individual is wrongly accused and forced to seek reinstatement. The person may eventually be vindicated, but the damage to the individual's reputation, their financial stability, and their career may be beyond repair. Moreover, there are effective tools already existing to hold senior executives accountable for performance and conduct issues. These disciplinary procedures provide very simply, 30 days' notice. You have to have notice why you're fired in writing. That's not a lot to ask, 30 days' notice of why you're being fired. This is what you're eliminating from the law right now. It gives that person 30 days to scramble to get a representative to put a case together to say, No, these aren't the facts. It allows them, if they are able, to get an attorney or a representative, which includes the right to that written decision and the right to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board.

Those are the basic due process rights that James Madison has supported. You're right, James Madison is still here today. He's on this side. He's on the side of due process. He doesn't want a kangaroo court. He wanted protections for constitutional rights, and he thought it was so important that he incorporated those in the text of the Constitution.

During committee consideration of H.R. 2579, I offered an amendment to apply these existing due process protections to the expedited removal provisions in the bill, but my amendment was rejected. For these reasons—and I say again I have great respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania—I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure in support of due process, in support of the principles that James Madison advocated. Also, I want to say the previous bill that the gentleman talked about earlier that we voted on, 410 votes, that had the "ready, aim, then fire" provision.

□ 1415

It gave the due process rights. The bill that we supported in the previous session, it wasn't exactly the same, as the gentleman acknowledged; it had due process rights. It allowed employees to have 30 days to have a written decision to know what the charges were against them and to respond. So

this is a very, very different bill than passed the House overwhelmingly in the previous session.

This bill does not allow the employee the 30 days' notice of what they did wrong. It does not allow them to defend themselves against the charges. It does not allow them to have a representative. It does not allow them the ability to protect their reputation in real-time. This bill fires them first and then asks questions later. For those reasons, it should be rejected.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The gentleman has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side, I do have great respect for both of the gentlemen. It is not a question of respect for other Members of Congress. The question is: How much respect do we have for American taxpayers?

I think sometimes we get too confused right here about the collegial atmosphere that has to exist. You know, if you don't talk nicely to each other, it can cause a problem. And I understand that. But we know each other. I have shared some very emotional moments with Mr. CUMMINGS when he lost his nephew. I understand that. STEVE—Mr. LYNCH—and I know each other. It's not about the spin. Nobody is losing their due process under this. You know that.

Again, I refer back to page 8, lines 15 through 17:

An employee against whom an action is taken under this section is entitled to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board under section 7701 of this title.

There is no reason for us to be having a conversation that again divides the Nation; and it divides people because we constantly want to make sure that everybody understands that one party is for one type of philosophy, the other party is not. You know, they don't ever want to take care of everybody.

I'm talking about the American taxpayer here. I'm talking about the agencies.

Mr. CUMMINGS and I sat and listened to the people from the GSA; and when we asked them why are they placed on leave with pay when there is obviously an investigation going on, you knew about it. The IG came to you and told you that, in spite of that, you still bonused this gentleman. They gave him extra money for doing exactly what he was being investigated for.

And we said: My goodness, why would you do that?

And they said: Because we don't have any tools to do anything about it. We don't have the mechanism to do that.

Why is it that we have to constantly widen the gap between what's right for America and what's just flat out right?

This isn't about Democrats and Republicans trying to protect our friends who work here in the government. Of course I want to protect them. And I will guarantee you that if this is going to pass today, I guarantee you will not see a mass exodus of people who work for the government saying, oh, my gosh, let me get my resume together; I've got to get out of here.

They're not leaving. And why aren't they leaving? Because these are good jobs. We're talking about the senior executives. We're not talking about every gal and guy. We're not talking about those in uniform who protect us. We're talking about the senior executives, those to whom we have given the most responsibility and authority. We're talking about giving them a tool to hold those who work under them responsible. They don't have it now.

I don't want to walk away or turn my back on people who work every day for this government. These are darn good jobs. Please tell me, if it's such a terrible place to work, why do so many people apply for work?

Mr. LYNCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No, I will not yield.

Mr. LYNCH, we've been yielding for far too long, and I will be glad to yield to you when I'm done here, and that's up to the chairman.

But I have to tell you, why do we constantly put this spin on to divide this body?

If I were a manager and I were put in charge and given the responsibility to do things, but then told, Look, you have the responsibility, you better perform to the right level here, but by the way, when you have people who are not acting appropriately, you don't have any tool to change that. You don't have any way to reprimand them, to call them forward.

It just doesn't make sense. And I'll tell you who it doesn't make sense to. It doesn't make sense to all those folks I described before. I've got people back in western Pennsylvania working two jobs. This is mom and dad working a job. Why? Because they have this tremendous ability to self-reliance, and they know they have children they've got to take care of. They want to feed them, they want to clothe them, they want to educate them. They want to be part of the system that has made sense to so many people for so long.

Why do people come to this country? My goodness, they come across the ocean in inner tubes to try to get here. They crawl across the desert to get here. They don't get here because they don't like us. They get here because they love the opportunity.

All I want to do is give the managers of these agencies the same tools that everybody else has. This is not about trying to make an employee look bad. This is about holding an employee accountable. When is it that we got to

the point that accountability is a political agenda? Really? Really?

And we're going to take any time we can get to try and make the other party look bad, because I've watched here for 2½ years. It's not enough to win the vote. You've got to make the other side look really, really bad. It's not enough to say we just didn't agree on this and we moved to something else. No, the point is to say, you know what, this is how horrible these people are. They don't care about you. They don't care about your kids or your grandchildren. They really want to hurt you.

No, we've shared too much time together. I don't sit in any committee with anybody, whether from our party or from your party, that says, I came here to destroy America. They don't say that. They don't say, I came here to divide America. They don't say that. They say, I came here because I thought I had a calling and I want to make a difference.

This bill is so simple. It is so much common sense. Really, this is a problem, to hold people accountable for a job they're not doing right? We didn't strip them of anything in due process. They still have their rights, everything. And it's not for everybody; it's for the senior executives at the top. The top. That's all it's about.

So, Mr. Chairman, I've got to tell you, this is so common sense. It's what we do in the private sector every day. I don't want it to become a political battle over something that makes sense to the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

You know, it has been sad to have to sit here for so long and hear the Kafkaesque understanding of due process by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. In a word, due process has to come before the sanction, not after; before the loss of job, not after, or it means nothing.

Today, of course, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2579 that would eliminate due process protections for senior executive servicemembers by allowing agency heads, political appointees, for the first time since the passage of the great civil service reforms in the early part of the 20th century, to fire Federal employees without giving them advance notice or an opportunity to address allegations against them before they are dismissed.

This bill, in particular, gives real credence to the view that the series of

bills on the floor today are an attack on Federal employees. H.R. 2579 would reverse the long-settled principle of "innocent until proven guilty" to "guilty until proven innocent."

Employees could be immediately fired by the politically appointed agency head. They could get their job back only by accepting the burden of proof to prove their innocence. It's not enough that employees would be notified of the reasons of their removal and would have 30 days to respond. They're gone. They're fired immediately. No due process rights like those currently in place: at least 30 days notice; representation by an attorney; a written decision; a right to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board.

The absence of due process and of standards that the political appointee must use in making the decision to fire is nothing short of breathtaking. Under this bill, the agency head, one person, one political appointee, determines whether the employee knowingly acted in a manner that—get this—"endangers the interest of the agency mission." What could be broader than that? You could be fired for anything under that standard.

One person decides whether the employee's removal is "necessary in the interest of the United States." Wow, let's rein that in somewhat.

One person decides that other procedures prescribed in other provisions of law just can't be invoked; they're not good enough. There you have it—judge and jury—exactly what the civil service system was developed to avoid, exactly what the Constitution says we must avoid. If you believe in the Constitution, it is important not to demagogue, but rather to explain to the public why every State, local, and Federal government puts employees—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentlelady.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman.

Why is it that every unit of government puts employees they want to fire, they know they want to fire them, on administrative leave with pay while due process proceeds, even when the person is accused of serious offenses? Because the employer, my friends, is the government. That's the difference. The employee has certain due process rights that the same employee would not have if the employer were a private business. That is civics 101, gentlemen.

Justice Powell, writing in *Arnett v. Kennedy* about due process rights of employees said:

Due process is conferred not by legislative grace, but by constitutional guarantee.

This bill comes from a Republican House that requires that Members state the constitutional basis for every bill introduced in this House. This bill expresses a Republican frustration that Lois Lerner of the IRS was placed on

administrative leave with pay. Sorry folks, you're not allowed to support the Constitution only when you like the results. Let's defeat this "prove your innocence" departure from the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say first of all that I associate myself with the words of the gentlelady from the District of Columbia. I think she said it quite well.

Mr. Speaker, we must be about the business of guarding this thing we call the Constitution. We are here only for a moment—only for a moment—and in that moment we have already been given a document by which we should govern ourselves. It has been interpreted by courts over and over again, and one of the things that has stood the test of time is due process. That very due process, I have said many a time, has allowed me to be a Member of this Congress of the United States and so many others who would have never had an opportunity. And so no matter when we are here, no matter what time we are here for, we must guard it.

□ 1430

Mr. LYNCH was very clear when he talked about how we are in a situation where we fire somebody first, and then suddenly we say, okay, we're going to give them some due process.

Going back to Ms. NORTON, due process comes before the firing. That's the way it's supposed to be.

And we all care about every employee. We care about how every American is treated, and that's what this argument is all about—fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. How much time do we have, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate his advocacy.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to point out some inconsistencies in the argument by my friend from Pennsylvania. In the case of Mr. Neely and in the case of Lois Lerner, under existing law, all that was required before they fired either of those individuals is to give them 30 days' notice, 30 days' written notice of the charges against them, give them the 30 days to put together a defense or to offer their version of the facts.

That's all that was required, and then we could have fired them or put

them on administrative leave without pay. That was within the discretion of GSA.

So when GSA tells Mr. KELLY they can't do anything, there's plenty they could do. They could have taken both those employees, put them on administrative leave without pay—talk about protecting the taxpayer. I'm for that. They had the power to do that in these cases.

They could have taken both those employees, under current law, with due process in place, put them both on administrative leave without pay, and we could have protected the taxpayer. That was the discretion on the part of the administration and the folks that made the decision in that place. It was not a fault of the law.

But interestingly enough, it also protected us to have the second version of the facts put forward to bring more light to this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to yield the 45 seconds we have remaining to Mr. LYNCH to close.

Mr. LYNCH. Think about this. That due process right would allow an employee who might be the fall guy, it might be a person that they're trying to fire to shut them up, it gives them an opportunity to come before the public and say, while they're still in their job, to say, no, that's not the way it went down.

Now, it might be to the benefit of the Republican, it might be to the benefit of the Democrat, whatever position you have, whoever that individual might be. But it brings truth, it brings facts, and it brings the ability of that individual employee to protect themselves.

That's what we're asking for here, that 30 days' opportunity. And it can be without pay. We can protect the taxpayer and still give due process rights to our employees. This bill should be opposed for all those reasons.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for yielding.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, facts are a stubborn thing, and what we are hearing today are a number of assertions that truly are not the facts.

Let me read from the bill, because the opposing arguments would be that we can fire them for any particular reason, but that's not what the bill says. The bill says we may remove an employee for serious neglect of duty, misappropriation of funds—which, I might add, was the case in point that we were just talking about—or malfeasance. And the head of the agency has to know that it was knowingly done.

This gives just another tool in the toolbox. It doesn't do away with due process. It doesn't do away with a number of the facts that we already have today, but it adds another tool.

What it really does is allow our managers to manage. What a novel concept. We're going to actually allow and trust Federal employees to manage the people under them.

We have been in hearing after hearing that says, Well, why didn't you do something about it? Why did you not address this? And they said, Well, our hands are tied. We didn't have the tools to do it.

This bill, as Mr. KELLY has so eloquently put it, gives them the tool to do exactly that. It doesn't do away with due process.

We've accepted amendments, three different amendments that protect the rights of employees—they are embedded in this bill—and yet we still find that my colleagues opposite want to say that they're not in support of this.

I just find it just appalling that we can continue to allow employees to stay on the taxpayers' dollars when we know that there has been malfeasance, misappropriation of funds, and the neglect of duty.

With that, I encourage all my colleagues to support this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud cosponsor of H.R. 2579, the Government Employee Accountability Act, offered by my good friend Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

I applaud this commonsense legislation that was initially developed in response to a senior GSA employee orchestrating the infamous GSA conference in Las Vegas that cost taxpayers \$800,000. He was placed on administrative leave with pay. Under current law, this is not only permitted, but there is little other recourse. There is no current mechanism for agencies to take away the pay of Senior Executive Service (SES) employees under investigative review for misconduct. Rather, employees can be placed on administrative leave or suspension, both with the opportunity for pay.

Mr. Speaker, the necessity of the legislation before us today is again highlighted by the recent scandals plaguing the IRS and its targeting of conservative groups. Despite the continued emergence of compelling facts detailing Ms. Lerner's involvement with discriminatory targeting and her refusal to cooperate with Congressional investigations, Ms. Lerner continues to draw a \$180,000 salary from the federal government. When she refused to resign, she was placed on administrative leave, so rather than being punished for targeting Americans based on their political beliefs, she is taking a well-paid vacation on the taxpayer dime.

H.R. 2579 would authorize all federal agencies to place an employee on investigative leave without pay if the employees conduct was serious or flagrant. I believe that this legislation is critical in regaining the trust of Americans. Paid leave is a slap on the wrist, and simply does not sufficiently restore the public's trust that the federal government will hold those responsible for serious misconduct accountable.

Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve real answers and solutions to ensure that high-ranking federal employees are reprimanded and held responsible for unacceptable behavior. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2579.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2579, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

COMMON SENSE IN COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1541) to establish limitations, during any sequestration period, on the total amount in awards or other discretionary monetary payments which may be paid to any Federal employee, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1541

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Common Sense in Compensation Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "employee" means an employee (as defined by section 2105(a) of title 5, United States Code) holding a position in or under an Executive agency;

(2) the term "Executive agency" has the meaning given such term by section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) the term "discretionary monetary payment" means—

(A) any award or other monetary payment under chapter 45, or section 5753 or 5754, of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) any step-increase under section 5336 of title 5, United States Code;

(4) the term "covered compensation", as used with respect to an employee in connection with any period, means the sum of—

(A) the basic pay, and

(B) any discretionary monetary payments (excluding basic pay), payable to such employee during such period;

(5) the term "basic pay" means basic pay for service as an employee; and

(6) the term "sequestration period" means a period beginning on the first day of a fiscal year in which a sequestration order with respect to discretionary spending or direct spending is issued under section 251A or section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and ending on the last day of the fiscal year to which the sequestration order applies.

SEC. 3. LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) no discretionary monetary payment may be made to an employee during any sequestration period to the extent that such payment would cause in a fiscal year the total covered compensation of such employee for such fiscal year to exceed 105 percent of the total amount of basic pay payable to such individual (before the application of any step-increase in such fiscal year under section 5336 of title 5, United States Code) for such fiscal year; and

(2) except as provided in subsection (b), during any sequestration period, an agency may not pay a performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, to the extent that such payment would cause the number of employees in the agency receiving such award during such period to exceed 33 percent of the total number of employees in the agency eligible to receive such award during such period.

(b) WAIVERS.—For the purposes of any sequestration period—

(1) the head of any agency may, subject to approval by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, waive the requirements of subsection (a)(2); and

(2) the head of any agency may waive the requirements of subsection (a)(1) with respect to any employee if the requirements of such subsection would violate the terms of a collective bargaining agreement covering such employee, except that this paragraph shall not apply to any employee covered by a collective bargaining agreement that is renewed on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—In the case of an agency for which the Director of the Office of Personnel Management grants a waiver under subsection (b)(1), the agency shall notify the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate of the percentage of career appointees receiving performance awards under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, and the dollar amount of each performance award.

(d) APPLICATION.—This section shall apply to any discretionary monetary payment or performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, made on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. REGULATIONS.

The Office of Personnel Management may prescribe regulations to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 1541, brings common sense to the policies

governing Federal employee bonuses while still providing agencies flexibility to recognize outstanding performance.

In fiscal year 2011, 75 percent of Senior Executive Service employees throughout the Federal Government received bonuses at an average of nearly \$11,000 per person. The government's decision to furlough hundreds of regular, often blue-collar, Federal workers while senior employees cash in is unacceptable.

Americans are rapidly losing trust in government as the list of abuses by Federal agencies grows, but bureaucrats continue collecting large bonuses at the expense of hardworking taxpayers.

The IRS is a prime example. Between the years of 2006 to 2012, IRS Director of Exempt Organizations, Lois Lerner, was paid a combined total of \$110,035 in bonuses.

Faris Fink, the senior IRS official best known for his starring role as Mr. Spock in a "Star Trek" parody at the IRS conference received some \$149,506 in bonuses between 2007 and 2012.

The Federal Aviation Administration is another example. It threatened 90-minute delays for airline passengers in the weeks leading up to sequestration. However, the FAA handed out more than \$12 million in bonuses during fiscal year 2012 despite knowing that sequestration was likely to occur.

These bonuses exemplify Washington's spending problem. A national debt of \$17 trillion and an unemployment rate at 7.5 percent should not add up to millions of dollars in bonus payouts.

Following the President's decision to impose a 2-year pay freeze at the end of 2010, the administration issued a memo limiting the amount available to pay bonuses for fiscal years 2011 and 2012. This past February, the administration issued a memo limiting bonuses to those legally required, and in June, you, the administration, suspended rank awards for senior leaders.

This bill builds on the administration's initiatives, limiting the amount and number of bonuses paid to Federal workers in periods of sequestration. It is time for the government to stop furloughing workers who depend on paychecks from week to week while awarding hundreds of thousands of dollars in bonuses to senior employees.

I urge all Members to support the Common Sense in Compensation Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed that the Republican leadership is wasting the few days we have remaining before the August recess with political message bills like this one instead of dealing with the major challenges the American people want us to address.

The American people care about jobs. Let me say that again. The American people care about jobs. And the Democrats have introduced a Make It in America agenda that would create good-paying jobs by rebuilding America's infrastructure, investing in innovation and education, and reducing the deficit through a balanced approach.

But the Republican leadership apparently has chosen a No Jobs Agenda. It has been 7 months since the start of this Congress, and we have not passed a single jobs bill on the floor of this House. Instead, the Republican sequestration plan is expected to cost up to 1.6 million American jobs through next year.

The American people also want the Congress to pass a budget for our country. More than 4 months ago, both the Senate and the House passed their respective budgets, but the House Republicans are now refusing to appoint conferees to complete negotiations. For years, Republicans complained about not having a budget, yet now they are actively blocking it by refusing to negotiate with the Senate.

Rather than dealing with these critical issues, we're being asked to vote on H.R. 1541, which is one of many bills that are a part of a relentless campaign to demonize Federal employees.

H.R. 1541 would impose an arbitrary, across-the-board cap of 5 percent of basic pay on the amount of bonuses that Federal workers can receive and limit the number of senior executives who may receive performance awards to 33 percent of those eligible in each agency.

These employees carry out our critical missions that serve and protect the American people. Among these awards are Presidential Rank Awards for senior executives who saved the Federal Government more than \$95 million last year, quality step increases for our highest Federal employee performers, awards to law enforcement officers for foreign language capabilities, and recruitment, retention, and relocation incentives to fill critical gaps in such fields as nursing, information technology, and cybersecurity.

I'm very concerned about the Federal Government's recruitment and retention efforts if Congress eliminates agency discretion to provide awards to our best performers.

In an analysis of the Best Places to Work in the Federal Government, the Partnership for Public Service and Deloitte found that only 4 out of 10 Federal workers believed they will be rewarded or promoted for doing a good job. This is the definition of counterproductive.

I don't understand how Republicans can call for pay for performance and then eliminate the very performance awards they said they supported.

Last Congress, our committee chairman, Representative ISSA, and committee member DENNIS ROSS sent a letter to the Government Accountability Office proposing that we replace the Federal Government's General Schedule system with a "merit-based, market-sensitive system that recognizes and rewards individual employee performance."

How can we take such proposals seriously if we are being asked at the same time to slash the very awards that are supposed to incentivize performance? Of course, we cannot.

□ 1445

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 2579, and I reserve the balance of my time.

I ask unanimous consent for the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) to manage the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts will control the remaining time.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADOWS. I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, common sense is something often discussed here but it is rarely put into practice. It's time for that to change. That's why we need the Common Sense in Compensation Act.

While the administration plays political games with the sequestration by forcing hardworking Americans to take a furlough, they continue to hand out bonus checks to highly paid bureaucrats. Between 2008 and 2011, the Federal Government spent \$340 million on cash bonuses for Senior Executive Service employees. Some of these bureaucrats have used their time to attack the average American through regulations and the Tax Code. The American people are not getting what they paid for from many of these Federal regulators and senior staff.

The Common Sense in Compensation Act brings much-needed reform to the bonus system for Federal employees. Under this legislation, employee discretionary bonuses are limited to no more than 5 percent of their base salary while the sequestration is in effect. Additionally, it limits the total amount of Senior Executive Service performance awards to 33 percent of all SES employees in a given agency. Both of these changes prevent the most wealthy in the Federal system from becoming richer while those actually engaging and serving the general public are getting laid off.

Opponents of the bill may claim that limiting Federal Government employee bonuses may be an unsound business

move. Here's what I think: it is an unsound business move being \$17 trillion in debt and shackling our grandchildren with a Nation worse off than how we received it from our parents. When a business is struggling, they don't pass out bonuses. They cut waste. It's time to rein in spending. And this practice of excessive bonuses for the very top of our bureaucracy must stop while we're all trying to tighten our belts.

If we truly want to rein in our spending, we need to fix not just the amount of money we choose to spend, but how effectively we spend it as well. Making sure that those who provide the actual services to the public aren't being furloughed at the expense of luxurious bonuses for upper management is a good way to start.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The tailored use of incentive awards, such as performance-based bonuses, help agencies recruit, develop, and retain employees who have the knowledge, skill, and ability to help agencies accomplish their critical missions. Such incentives also allow agencies to compete with the private sector for talent. Right now, we have incredible doctors, nurses, therapists, and staff at the VA hospitals all across America, that I'm sure—at least in my district—they could walk out that door and earn sometimes twice or three times as much at a private hospital as they do at the VA. The incentive programs that we have in place allow us to rebalance a little bit of what they might be compensated, but for the fact that they are committed to caring for our veterans.

It's a similar situation with the SEC. Obviously, many of our securities analysts that we use at the SEC could go to Wall Street tomorrow and earn multiples of what their salary is and have great success and incredible rewards financially. But they work at the SEC because they're committed to protecting the taxpayer and working on behalf of their country.

We have similar examples of banking supervisors at the FDIC that have such knowledge and such capability that they could go out tomorrow and work for one of these big banks like Citibank or Bank of America and go to work tomorrow at multiples of their salary. We have derivative analysts over at the CFTC that do such great work on our behalf, that I'm sure that—because that's such a hot area of employment—with their expertise and their resumes, they could demand tremendous resources. As well, we have scientists at NIH and lawyers over at the Department of Justice that we're lucky to have working on behalf of the government because we're trying to keep up with the changes in industry and in these areas of commerce that require excellent talent.

For example, a 2010 Rand Corporation study found that the Department of Defense's increased use of bonuses had positive effects on recruitment and retention in the Armed Forces. Notably, the study found that without the increase in bonuses, Army enlistments would have been 20 percent lower between 2004 and 2008 when the war in Iraq was at its peak. Further, the study found that bonuses were generally a cost-effective measure.

Despite the importance of performance awards, this bill, H.R. 1541, as amended, would prohibit Federal workers from receiving discretionary bonuses that exceed 5 percent of their base pay during sequestration. This bill couldn't happen at a worse time. H.R. 1541 would undermine the Federal Government's ability to recruit and retain its most talented employees in the midst of a 3-year Federal pay freeze and ongoing furloughs.

Right now, we have over 700,000 Federal employees at DOD that have taken 11-day furloughs. I sat with a group of firefighters on an Air Force base that are concerned about the safety protocols at that base because of the number of employees that are affected by furloughs. We've got 90,000 employees in other agencies that are taking between 2- and 5-day furloughs. And those furloughs are going to continue.

H.R. 1541 would undermine the Federal Government's ability to recruit and retain our most talented employees in the midst of all these cutbacks. This bill would simply continue to demoralize the Federal workforce. By removing agency flexibility, the legislation would also impede managers in their efforts to keep employees committed and motivated to excel and to provide superior service.

It is understandable that these employees do accept less pay because they work for the government, in many of these industries that I mentioned. Further, these awards are exactly the type of individual merit-based performance management tools that the committee chairman and other committee members have embraced in the past.

During committee consideration, I offered an amendment that would exempt collective bargaining agreements from the caps on awards. But the majority modified my amendment so the caps would still apply to future agreements. I believe that determining by law or statute the terms of future bargaining agreements with the recognized representatives of those employees improperly interferes with the management and labor contract negotiations.

This legislation would restrict agency flexibility at a time when it is critically needed for ensuring that the Federal workforce attracts and retains the best and brightest.

For these reasons, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R.

1541, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1541, the Common Sense in Compensation Act.

I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me this time. I also want to commend him for coming up with this very sensible, reasonable, moderate response in legislation to a problem that's been growing bigger and bigger with each passing year.

As the previous speaker, the gentleman from Michigan, mentioned, in one recent 3-year period there were over \$340 million worth of Federal bonuses given out. I didn't know about that figure but I have seen some other figures which relate to this legislation that I would like to mention at this time.

A couple of years ago, the Commerce Department's Bureau of Economic Analysis completed a study showing that the average Federal employee received a salary and benefits totaling \$119,982, while the average private sector employee made a salary and benefits of \$59,909. In other words, the Federal salaries and benefits were approximately twice or double what people in the private sector were receiving.

The Washington Examiner newspaper, in a lead editorial after that report came out, described these Federal salaries as "scandalously higher" than private salaries, and added:

With the Federal deficit and national debt heading into the stratosphere, taxpayers can no longer afford to support such lucrative government compensation.

Certainly, it's already been mentioned that our national debt is now approximately \$17 trillion—a figure that almost no human being can really comprehend.

At the height of the recession there was a front-page story in USA Today, which said:

Federal workers are enjoying an extraordinary boom time—in pay and hiring—during a recession that has cost \$7.3 million jobs in the private sector.

The report in USA Today said that the "highest-paid Federal employees are doing best of all."

I read a report a few months ago that said 6 of the 10 wealthiest counties in this country were all suburban counties to Washington, D.C.

In addition to much higher Federal salaries and benefits, Federal employees have the best pension plans in this country, while fewer than 20 percent of employees in the private sector even have any employer-provided pension plan other than Social Security. These very high pensions were started many years ago when Federal salaries often were lower than in the private sector. But that is certainly not the case

today, when Federal salaries are averaging about twice what the average salary is in the private sector. Also, Federal employees are allowed to retire at younger ages.

Almost everyone, I realize, Mr. Speaker, feels underpaid when you hear about these obscene, ridiculous salaries of CEOs and athletes and movie stars. But Federal employees need to realize that you're talking about just one-tenth of 1 percent of the people. Compared to about 96 to 97 percent of the American people, Federal employees are very fortunate to have their jobs, and are very well paid.

I know from my experience with the Tennessee Valley Authority, where they've given out many bonuses in the hundreds of thousands of dollars range, this situation will spiral completely out of control because Big Government can justify or rationalize almost anything.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MEADOWS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I will simply say that this is a good bill. This is good legislation to limit these bonuses to about 5 percent of these very high salaries. I hope all of my colleagues will support H.R. 1541, the Common Sense in Compensation Act.

Mr. LYNCH. Could I ask the Speaker how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to address a couple of issues the gentleman has raised and say that I have enormous respect for the previous speaker as well.

Oftentimes, these studies look at the average employee in the Federal Government versus the average employee in the private sector. In recent decades, the Federal Government has privatized a lot of our common labor rather than employing them directly. We have become a much more specialized and much more professionalized workforce, between the doctors and nurses we hire at the VA; the scientists that we have at the National Institutes of Health and the EPA; the lawyers we have at the Department of Justice; financial analysts that we have at the CFTC and FDIC, as well as the SEC and other banking industries. Those are more professionalized employees.

□ 1500

So naturally, if you look at a retail clerk, compare their salary to a scientist, there will be a drastic disparity between what an attorney is making or a financial analyst is making versus a secretary in the private sector. So that's a very crude way of comparison.

One way of comparison is required in the Federal Pay Comparability Act.

That's a statute that we passed here in Congress. It requires that we compare the levels of Federal doctors versus private sector doctors; federally employed scientists versus private sector scientists; finance analysts at the SEC versus those at Goldman Sachs. So we compared job to job. At the end of that analysis, the studies showed that Federal employees are making 26 percent less than their comparable job in the private sector; just a point that I wanted to raise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address a few of the items that have been brought up because we seem to talk about these in abstract ways, but the truth of the matter is is that bonuses have gotten way out of hand. You know, when we start to give out bonuses as a way to bypass the payment structure that we have established for the Federal Government employees, that is not what it was intended to do.

You know, the ranking member earlier, Mr. Speaker, mentioned a survey, which was the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. He used that data as evidence of, really, about performance pay, but I'd like to quote from that same study, that same survey.

A recent survey found that only 22 percent of Federal employees believe that performance and pay are linked. And I would like to point out that this bill certainly would cover that.

We are not saying do away with all bonuses; quite the contrary. We believe that people need to be incentivized. We believe in merit pay. We believe in bonuses for those that work. But I can say this, that when you start paying out bonuses to 75 percent of all senior executive employees, the people back home don't understand. Maybe the people in Massachusetts understand, but I can tell you the people in North Carolina don't understand.

We've got some 7,000 Senior Executive Service employees that make an average of \$168,500 every year. So when you go back home and you say, Well, they're making \$168,000 a year, and on top of that we're going to pay them a \$30,000 bonus, those people don't understand. Whether they work for the Federal Government or whether they are in the private sector, they don't understand.

I've got single moms, Mr. Speaker, that said, You know what? I'd be glad to go to work just for the bonus pay that you're paying some of those Federal workers.

We go on a lot and we start talking about it, but it's interesting, because many times my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle want to go ahead and talk about what is fair. Well, this is not fair, Mr. Speaker, when we start to look at that. The rich, indeed, are getting richer at the expense of the hardworking American taxpayers, and that is not what we should be doing.

I also want to go on a little bit further, because when we start to look at these bonuses, it is the Federal employees in my district that have a problem with it as well. I have two of them, Paula and Martha. I won't give their last names, but Paula and Martha. I was there talking to them, and they said, You know, we are sacrificing under this pay freeze. We're having to give up. Why in the world are you awarding such bonuses to these people when we're having to suffer?

Now, I know the gentleman from Massachusetts has a real heart for Federal employees, as do I. I look here and there are a number of people that I would call my friends. There are a number of people that are watching this perhaps even on TV right now that are Federal employees that I enjoy being with. This is not about them. This is about being fair. What it is is, when we start to pick the winners and losers with bonuses and bypass the payment structure that we have, you know, it's not right, Mr. Speaker, and we have to adjust that.

I would be glad to work in a bipartisan way. If we're having a hard time retaining scientists and doctors, I would be glad to work in a bipartisan way with my friend opposite here to come up with a structure that works on pay and merit pay to that and address it, but why do we allow the bonuses that we have today to bypass the very fundamental reason that we have it set up?

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to point out, though, if we're talking about what's fair and what's not fair, I think the Federal employees have taken it on the chin recently. They're in year three of their pay freeze. A lot of them say that's not fair because as costs keep going up, their pay has been frozen for the past 3 years. Now, on top of the third-year pay freeze, they're being asked—at least 700,000 employees in the Department of Defense, including civilian employees that we rely on for a lot of key services—are being asked to take 11 days on furlough without pay. About 100,000 other Federal employees are being asked to take between 2 and 5 days right now. The first year of sequestration I think we cut \$37 billion. This year we will cut \$52 billion, next year is 60. And this is just year 2 in a 10-year furlough schedule. So if you want to talk about unfair, I think that they're being asked to do more than their share.

I do want to remind the gentleman that the bonuses and awards limited by this bill, H.R. 1541, are based on performance. The quality step increases are given to rank-and-file employees who achieve superior performance. The Presidential Rank Awards are given to

senior employees who achieve extraordinary results or who are able to sustain superior accomplishments.

Recruitment bonuses, now, they can't be paid to employees who work for the Federal Government, but someone who's done a very good job in the private sector, you know, running a hospital might come onto the Federal payroll to do that, and we might have to recognize that person's prior service. An individual's performance rating is based on how well they met or exceeded their expectations.

In addition, I know that my friends across the aisle are eager to cap Federal employee and senior executive pay, but they're completely silent on capping Federal contractor pay. Under current law, Federal contractor executives can be reimbursed by the Federal Government for their salaries up to \$950,000—Federal contractors. This is the private side. These are not the folks that are being capped. These are not employees. These are private contractors, \$950,000 for 2013. Not a word, not a word in print or speech to cap those individuals. Contracting employees at the Department of Defense, Coast Guard, and NASA can also have their salaries reimbursed up to \$950,000 as well in this current year, 2013.

But just a comparison, the maximum salary for a senior executive in the Federal Government is \$179,700. For example, the VA Administration head, the hospital director at one of my hospitals, he makes \$179,700, while the average salary in my district for a hospital director in the private sector is \$800,000. That's for the private hospitals in my area. So my VA director earns about 25 percent of what they make in the private sector.

By the way, the maximum salary for a General Schedule step 10 employee at the top of the ladder is \$155,500. That's what we're talking about here. And they are blown away by the salaries paid—as I mentioned, \$950,000 in 2013—for Federal contract executives who are not Federal employees but are on the Federal payroll, about which this bill says zero. Completely silent. Zip.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few of the comments that the gentleman opposite made.

When he said not a word has been mentioned about bonuses for contractors, I would remind the gentleman that in the NDAA we addressed this very subject. So that was addressed, which I'm sure the gentleman was here for that particular vote; but as we've looked at this, we have addressed that particular thing. I will go ahead and talk about a couple of other things, though.

We talk about this pay freeze and how we're asking so many people to suffer. I'm not talking about the normal pay that we would give employees. I'm talking about the excessive bo-

nuses that have failed to be an incentive anymore.

When you give a bonus to 75 percent of the employees, it ceases to be an incentive; in fact, quite the opposite. All you have to do is make sure that you are not in the bottom quartile. It says all I have to do is perform better than only a few people to get my bonus. So if I'm just better than the worst 25 percent, I get a bonus. That's not an incentive. That's why we're looking at 33 percent. It rewards those people who rise to the top, the cream of the crop, and we need to do that.

I also want to mention that we were talking about all these pay freezes. Where is a pay freeze not a pay freeze? Only in Washington, D.C. Mr. Speaker, 99.4 percent of Federal employees got an increase in salary during this pay freeze. That's the only ones we denied were 6 out of every 1,000 employees. So the gentleman opposite making comments that they've sacrificed, indeed, they have, but it's not as if they have not gotten pay increases.

What do I tell my constituents back home who are dealing with double-digit unemployment? They would love just to have a job. Many of them would take a job at 10 to 15 to 20 percent less than what they were making if they could just go to work. Yet here we are talking about people who continue to get raises as if they are suffering. You know, we've got to make sure that we're clear on the subject and we need to make sure that we're fair.

I keep coming back to the word "fair," because when we are not fair with the government responsibility that we have, the American people lose trust in their government; and it is time that we hold it accountable, give tools to those managers that reward good behavior and good performance, but yet not continue to dole it out at the expense of every American taxpayer.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Just one final point before I yield. The gentleman is correct, we did address contractor caps on pay in the NDAA, but we capped it at \$950,000 a year. That's a far cry from anything that any Federal employee is earning here.

As I mentioned before, the head of our VA hospitals makes \$179,700. That's the max. Meanwhile, private contractors working for the Federal Government are making \$950,000 this year, in 2013, with the NDAA caps in place. I'm just saying, what's good for the goose is good for the gander. There's an opportunity in this bill to cap these salaries, and we have not done that.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his candor and his passion with which he rises and debates it.

I do want to point out, though, that what we are talking about here are apples and oranges. When you start to look at contractors and the benefits of those contracts, those are really issues that we must address, and I'm willing to work with him on a bipartisan basis, but let's not take our eye off the ball.

Why would we allow Sarah Hall Ingram, who is going to be administering over the Affordable Care Act, a bonus of \$35,000? Why would we award a bonus of almost \$31,000 to a gentleman that played Mr. Spock? It's indefensible to me. I can't imagine why my colleague opposite would want to defend that and why he wouldn't want to have tools to let managers manage the process.

□ 1515

I'm going to close with this point: Daniel Pink writes in a book called "Drive" that really it's about motivational theory; it's about the fact that bonus impact is minimal. I think we see that even here because of the surprising truth about what motivates us. It says:

The carrot and the stick approach to motivating employees through bonuses and benefits is statistically ineffective. What they would rather have is a mastery of their position, they would rather have autonomy, they would rather have a sense of purpose that the job that they are doing is very meaningful.

So, in essence, what it says is that if we get rid of the bureaucracy, our Federal employees will be more motivated to do a good job knowing that they are fulfilling a purpose. Yet we continue to throw bonuses at them over and over again, Mr. Speaker.

I just have a hard time going back home, as a number of my colleagues would go back home, and defending these excessive bonuses.

I would urge all of the folks here, all of my colleagues, to join with me in supporting this critical bill, the Common Sense in Compensation Act, H.R. 1541, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, for the last four years, Congress has frozen federal employee pay.

And this year, we are at it again, extending the freeze.

Congress has also increased federal employee pension contributions for new hires without a corresponding increase in benefit.

And, through furloughs, we are essentially imposing a 20% pay-cut and continuing to punish these people who took an oath to support and defend our country.

All of this has added up—Over the last four years, Congress has reduced federal employee pay and benefits by \$118 billion. Per capita, that's nearly \$50,000 per employee—far more than any other American has been asked to contribute towards deficit reduction.

I take issue with the practice of continuing to punish a workforce that is predominantly composed of hardworking Americans, simply because they happen to work for all of us.

Your public servants have already been injured financially by a series of spirited provisions that are now law.

The bills before us today would strip the ability of managers within the federal government to reward our federal workers. In fact, they end up punishing some of our highest performing federal employees.

The Congressional Budget Office has confirmed that federal employees in highly skilled professions could earn much more in the private sector.

The Federal Salary Council issued a report in 2012 finding that federal employees were being paid nearly 35% less than similar occupations in the private sector.

Why do they choose public service? Clearly, not for monetary gain—they do it for love of country and the opportunity to make peoples' lives better.

But they have families to feed, mortgages to pay, and children to send to college. Where does it end?

From my first job as a budget officer at HEW through to my service today, nearly 40 years later, I have witnessed countless occasions where the federal government and federal employees have been a positive force, improving the lives of their fellow Americans.

No matter how many times the House majority says the government cannot solve problems, cannot create jobs or cannot help the American people, it will never be so.

Why does this Congress insist on continuing to punish federal employees for their service to the American people?

Bearing a disproportionate share of deficit reduction has directly hurt them and their families. It's time to stop singling them out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1541, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GOVERNMENT CUSTOMER SERVICE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1660) to require the establishment of Federal customer service standards and to improve the service provided by Federal agencies, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1660

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Government Customer Service Improvement Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency"—

(A) means an Executive agency (as defined under section 105 of title 5, United States Code) that provides significant services directly to the public or other entity; and

(B) does not include an Executive agency if the President determines that this Act should not apply to the Executive agency for national security reasons.

(2) CUSTOMER.—The term "customer", with respect to an agency, means any individual or entity that is directly served by an agency.

SEC. 3. DEVELOPMENT OF CUSTOMER SERVICE STANDARDS.

(a) GOVERNMENT-WIDE STANDARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall develop Government-wide standards for customer service delivery, which shall be included in the Federal Government Performance Plan required under section 1115 of title 31, United States Code.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The standards developed under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) Government-wide goals for continuous service improvements and efforts to modernize service delivery; and

(B) where appropriate, Government-wide target response times for telephone calls, electronic mail, mail, benefit processing, and payments.

(b) AGENCY STANDARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Performance Improvement Officer for each agency shall establish customer service standards in accordance with the Government-wide standards developed under subsection (a), which shall be included in the Agency Performance Plans required under section 1115 of title 31, United States Code.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Agency standards established under paragraph (1) shall include, if appropriate—

(A) target call wait times during peak and non-peak hours;

(B) target response times for correspondence, both by mail and electronic mail;

(C) procedures for ensuring all applicable metrics are incorporated into service agreements with nongovernmental individuals and entities;

(D) target response times for processing benefits and making payments; and

(E) recommendations for effective publication of customer service contact information, including a mailing address, telephone number, and email address.

(c) CUSTOMER SERVICE INPUT.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall establish a Customer Service Feedback Pilot Program. The pilot program shall include participation by the Internal Revenue Service and a minimum of two additional agencies selected by the Director and shall continue for a period of at least three years. The Director shall require participating agencies to implement a customer service feedback system to collect information from customers of the agency regarding the quality of customer service provided by the agency, including—

(A) information on the extent to which agency performance complies with the Government-wide standards developed under subsection (a); and

(B) feedback on the quality of customer service provided by the agency employee or employees with whom the customer interacted.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—An agency may not publish or make publically available information collected under the feedback system that is specific to a named employee.

(3) **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN PERFORMANCE REPORT.**—In developing the performance report made available by the agency under section 1116 of title 31, United States Code, each agency—

(A) shall include the information collected under this subsection; and

(B) may include aggregate data collected under paragraph (1)(B) without including names of specific agency employees.

(4) **REPORT TO CONGRESS ON CUSTOMER SERVICE FEEDBACK PILOT PROGRAM.**—Not later than two years after the implementation of the Customer Service Feedback Pilot Program established under this subsection, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report assessing the pilot program and a recommendation on whether such program should be expanded Government-wide.

(d) **ANNUAL PERFORMANCE UPDATE.**—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall include achievements by agencies in meeting the customer service performance standards developed under subsection (a) in each update on agency performance required under section 1116 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 4. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL.

Compliance with customer service standards developed under this Act shall be included in employee appraisal systems established by agencies, including the performance appraisal systems referred to in chapter 43 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 5. SERVICE IMPROVEMENT UNIT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHED.**—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall establish a pilot program, to be known as the Service Improvement Unit Pilot Program (in this section referred to as the “pilot program”), to provide assistance to agencies that do not meet the Government-wide standards developed under section 3.

(b) **PERSONNEL.**—The heads of agencies with expertise in change management, process improvement, and information technology innovation shall detail employees to the Office of Management and Budget to work on the pilot program, based on the expertise and skills required to address service improvement goals.

(c) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—Under the pilot program, the Office of Management and Budget shall work with agencies that are not meeting the customer service standards developed under section 3 to improve and modernize service delivery to develop solutions, including—

(1) evaluating the efforts of the agency to improve service delivery;

(2) developing a plan to improve within existing resources and by drawing on expertise and assistance from other agencies (including the Office of Management and Budget) where necessary;

(3) monitoring implementation by the agency of the plan developed under paragraph (2) until the customer service standards are met; and

(4) submitting to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget monthly reports on the progress being made to improve service at the agency until the customer service standards are met.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress a report on the accomplishments and outcomes of the pilot

program and any recommendations relating to achieving the customer service standards developed under section 3.

(e) **SUPPORT.**—The Administrator of General Services shall provide administrative and other support in order to implement the pilot program under this section. The heads of agencies shall, as appropriate and to the extent permitted by law, provide at the request of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget up to 2 personnel authorizations who have expertise in change management, process improvement, and information technology innovation to support the pilot program.

(f) **TERMINATION.**—The authority to carry out the pilot program shall terminate 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. RETIREMENT REPORTING.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “agency” has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every month thereafter, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall submit to Congress and the Comptroller General of the United States, and issue publicly (including on the website of the Office of Personnel Management), a report that—

(A) for each agency, evaluates the timeliness, completeness, and accuracy of information submitted by the agency relating to employees of the agency who are retiring; and

(B) indicates—

(i) the total number of applications for retirement benefits, lump sum death benefits, court ordered benefits, phased retirement, and disability retirement that are pending action by the Office of Personnel Management; and

(ii) the number of months each such application has been pending.

(2) **SUSPENSION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management for any month immediately following an 18-month period in which the average processing time of applications described in paragraph (1)(B) reaches 90 days or less.

(c) **MODERNIZATION TIMELINE.**—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall establish—

(1) a timetable for the completion of each component of the customer-focused retirement processing system of the Office of Personnel Management, including all data elements required for accurate completion of adjudication; and

(2) the date by which all Federal payroll processing entities will electronically transmit all personnel data to the Office of Personnel Management.

(d) **BUDGET REQUEST.**—The Office of Personnel Management shall include a detailed statement regarding the progress of the Office of Personnel Management in completing the customer-focused retirement processing system of the Office of Personnel Management in each budget request of the Office of Personnel Management submitted as part of the preparation of the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 7. NO INCREASE IN EXPENDITURES.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out this Act. This Act shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized or appropriated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Americans depend on Federal agencies for certain vital services. Failure by Federal agencies and employees to process in a timely manner requests for help or information can result in frustration and financial hardship.

Poor customer service should not be tolerated at the IRS any more than it is at the private sector companies that must continually earn the right to serve its clients.

H.R. 1660 helps ensure our government is more responsive to the public by establishing customer service standards and performance expectations for each agency. It will enable citizens to provide direct feedback concerning specific agency employees—including at the IRS—and have that feedback considered in employee evaluations that impact the awarding of bonuses.

H.R. 1660 puts taxpayers first by holding Federal workers accountable for their interactions with the public.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1660, the Government Customer Service Improvement Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank Representative CUELLAR, my friend from Texas, for his leadership and his persistence in advocating for this bill.

The Federal Government provides services that significantly impact the American people. There are many dedicated Federal employees who perform their jobs with professionalism and distinction.

But there are areas in need of improvement. For instance, the Department of Veterans Affairs takes an average of 243 days to process a disability claim, and that is unacceptable.

This legislation would require the Office of Management and Budget to establish government-wide standards for customer service delivery, including target response times for phone calls, emails, letters, benefits processing, and payments.

I thank the chairman of the full committee for working with me during the committee's consideration of this bill. The bill we are considering today includes a pilot project to evaluate customer feedback systems. This was a

compromise that will provide a more limited application than requiring every agency to institute their own individual feedback system. I hope the chairman will continue to work with us and all Members on both sides in moving this bill as we go through this legislative process. It is important that we ensure that the bill can achieve its intended purposes without negatively impacting the ability of Federal employees to do their jobs.

H.R. 1660 is a good government bill in the truest sense.

At this point, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), the principal sponsor of this bill.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his time, the gentleman from North Carolina also, and I certainly want to thank Chairman ISSA, Ranking Member CUMMINGS, and the staff, both the Democratic and Republican staff, for helping pass this bill out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, and all the work and the compromises we worked out to make sure that we got a bipartisan bill.

The primary goal of the Federal Government is to serve taxpayers. Currently, U.S. law does not require Federal agencies customer service standards, which is long overdue.

Every day taxpayers interact with the Federal Government on a regular basis, whether it is through the passport services to travel, student loans through the Direct Loan Program to pay for higher education, health insurance under Medicare to get benefits, or Social Security for retirement planning. All these services are vital to operate a good government, especially in times when Americans are relying more on these types of services.

Too often we hear veterans are waiting months to get critical medical services or Federal employees experience long waits for their retirement benefits. These are just two examples, but millions of Americans rely on Federal agencies for vital services, which is why we must usher in a new chapter to accelerate response time and overall performance for better customer experience.

With only one-third of Americans holding a favorable opinion of the Federal Government, according to a 2012 report from the Pew Research Center, this is a necessity that we must change. The bill is simple and necessary.

First of all, H.R. 1660 improves customer service standards across the board. It does this by requiring the Office of Management and Budget, the OMB, to develop performance standards to determine whether Federal agencies are providing high-quality customer service and improving service delivery to agency customers.

Second, the bill raises the bar for enhancing quality and access for customer service. This is accomplished by requiring agencies to collect information from their customers regarding the quality of service and ensures that there is customer feedback, which will be used to develop the standards.

This bill also requires the development of a customer service feedback system, the results of which must be included in annual performance reports. Just like the private sector strives to provide excellent customer service in business, the Federal Government should also embed better service to bring efficiency.

H.R. 1660 has no cost.

This bill also has precedent. We passed this last session, and now we are hoping that with enough time that we are passing this, we'll get it over to the Senate so we can get it passed.

This effort to examine agency customer service is also bicameral. Senator WARNER and Senator JOHNSON dropped a companion bipartisan bill, as well.

H.R. 1660 seeks to operate a better Federal Government to provide the taxpayers—who fund them—better quality service, which they deserve.

I thank you for the time, and I encourage my colleagues to support and pass this bill.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his foresight in bringing forth this bill. I certainly appreciate the fact that we need to be providing better customer service to those who call in and talk to employees on a regular basis. I commend the gentleman from Texas for that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. At this point, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, we have had some vigorous debate. Really what this is about is the American people back home. It is about doing the responsible thing for them to see that government actually works and that we are willing to stand up with the people back home to do what is best and right and return government back to “we the people.”

It has been great to hear some of the arguments from my colleagues opposite. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, the passion with which he has argued these points; and I look forward to working with him in a bipartisan way on some of these issues that he has highlighted.

I urge all the Members to join me in support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1660, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOP PLAYING ON CITIZENS' CASH ACT

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2769) to impose a moratorium on conferences held by the Internal Revenue Service, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2769

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stop Playing on Citizens' Cash Act”.

SEC. 2. MORATORIUM ON IRS CONFERENCES.

The Internal Revenue Service shall not hold any conference until the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration submits a report to Congress—

(1) certifying that the Internal Revenue Service has implemented all of the recommendations set out in such Inspector General's report titled “Review of the August 2010 Small Business/Self-Employed Division's Conference in Anaheim, California”, and

(2) describing such implementation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2769 offers the House an opportunity to go back to our constituents who are asking this question when we are out and about at home: What in the world is the House of Representatives doing about the IRS scandals? There is a series of scandals that we've heard about that we've heard testimony from in both the Ways and Means Committee, on which I and the ranking member serve, and also the Government Oversight Committee—and my suspicion is maybe some other committees of the House. But when our constituents say, What in the world are you doing?, this bill that we are discussing is part of that remedy.

Here is one of the things that we have come to learn, Mr. Speaker:

We've come to learn that the Inspector General, the Treasury Inspector

General for tax administration, did an audit; and in the course of the audit discovered that there were funds that were being misused in the context of conferences. Some of them were conferences that looked at, even in the most favorable light, even if you were looking at it in the most favorable light from an IRS point of view, were clearly gratuitous and an abuse and overspending. Some of this had to do with videos that were videos of parodies of the television show "Star Trek" and, actually, I think a bunch of nonsense. Some of it had to do with the purchasing of trinkets. Some of it had to do with overspending. So the Inspector General very clearly said, Look, there has to be a remedy here.

What the House is proposing in consideration of this bill is that all of these IRS conferences have to stop—hit the pause button on all of them—until the recommendations of the Inspector General are met. When the Inspector General then reports to Congress that those recommendations that would stop the nonsense have been fulfilled under a new set of criteria, the IRS says that they've met these, the Inspector General certifies it, then the conferences can go on.

□ 1530

I think it's thoughtful. I think it has been approached on a bipartisan basis. I have been very encouraged by the spirit with which the Democrats and Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee have worked together to investigate and inquire of the IRS but not just looking through the rearview mirror. Looking through the rearview mirror, yes, but also saying: What did we learn? How do we prospectively make sure that these things don't happen again?

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The bills today and the bill on Friday on ACA are more about politics than policy—politics at any cost by the Republican majority. They want to change the subject from their inability to legislate and their refusal to go to conference on a budget so that we could implement long-term deficit reduction and not threaten our economy with default again this fall. In their abysmal failure to act on jobs legislation all of these months, there has been no real effort to join hands on their part on jobs—the number one concern of the American people. So they hope to launch their so-called "Republican playbook" for August by which they have told their Members to go home and echo the same message and reaffirm their theme—fighting Washington for you.

They have failed miserably to fight in Washington for you, the American people.

There was terrible mismanagement at the IRS in the Tax Exempt Division. I was among the first to call for the Acting Commissioner and Lois Lerner to be removed from their duties; but instead of exploiting the deep problems at the IRS Tax Exempt Division, instead of exploiting them for political purposes, we should be fixing these problems and restoring the trust of the American people in that entity, the entity to which they voluntarily pay taxes. The Republicans have desperately sought to tie their antigovernment message to the President. Let's review the Republican approach, some of it.

Chairman ISSA said:

This was a targeting of the President's political enemies, effectively, and lies about it during the election year so that it wasn't discovered until afterwards.

Chairman HAL ROGERS said:

Of course, the enemies list out of the White House that IRS was engaged in shutting down or trying to shut down the conservative political viewpoint across the country—an enemies list that rivals those of another President some time ago.

Totally, totally false.

The facts were clear that both conservative and liberal groups were in the groups set aside by the IRS for further scrutiny, and when that became clear, the Republicans shifted to the notion that the conservative groups received more scrutiny. When all evidence to date has indicated that there was no political motivation involved and that no one outside of the IRS was involved, the majority of Republicans here shifted to the notion that they don't have all of the documents, but the political motivation has been that of the Republicans.

I want to also, at this time, express our deep disappointment with the work of the IG and the audit that he did on the Tax Exempt Division. He failed to disclose that both conservative and liberal groups were set aside for further scrutiny. He failed to disclose that he asked his investigative arm to review 5,500 emails and that they found no evidence of political motivation. This flawed report set the stage for the Republicans' manipulation of the facts, and now we are going to spend months cleaning up that work.

As to the bills before us today, these three bills, we agree that the IRS should stop unnecessary conferences, that the employees should not do their work with any political motivation, and that taxpayer rights should be codified in the law.

This bill would impose a moratorium on conferences held by the IRS until the inspector general has submitted a report to Congress that certifies that all recommendations from the TIGTA audit of the IRS conference in Anaheim have been implemented. This audit report included nine recommendations, as the majority has now said, for the

IRS to improve the oversight of conferences.

I just want the facts to be put on the table here as to what has happened by the leadership now of the IRS.

Three of the nine recommendations have been fully implemented, and it is anticipated that the remaining six recommendations will be put in place shortly, likely within 3 months. We all agree with the recommendations. The IRS has already agreed to those recommendations, and importantly, it must be acknowledged it is in the process of implementing all nine of these recommendations over the next few months.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that's an endorsement of the bill. It took a while. The ranking member took us on a journey, and I appreciate the journey, but I think what the ranking member said is that he actually supports H.R. 2769, and I appreciate that. I think one of the things that may have been persuasive to the ranking member, which was persuasive to me, is that part of the report—the summary from the inspector general—in which the inspector general, after reviewing all of this, says that procedures at the time of the conference did not require IRS management to track and report actual conference costs.

In other words, the IRS wasn't holding to a standard that it holds you to, Mr. Speaker, and your constituents or the ranking member's constituents or my constituents, because, when my constituents go to the IRS and when they say, "Well, I don't have my receipts," or "I don't have 'this' or I don't have 'that,'" they get a cold, glassy-eyed stare from the Internal Revenue Service and no mercy from the Internal Revenue Service.

So I am delighted and I am encouraged, and I very much appreciate the ranking member's pointing out the progress that the IRS has made and the other areas where the IRS needs to go. Just let me briefly draw the body's attention to what these nine actual recommendations are. After all, this is not climbing Mount Everest, but they are pretty solid, commonsense recommendations:

It requires the IRS' Chief Financial Officer to verify that appropriate information is being tracked to ensure actual costs of the conferences can be established and audited. That's what I referenced a minute ago;

It implements a policy to determine whether training sessions held at the conference qualify for continuing professional education credits for CPA employees;

It sets standards for the site of a conference. The report recommends against nongovernmental facilities unless the benefits will offset increased

expenditures and spending will not be seen as unnecessary by the public;

It implements procedures to identify when nongovernment event planners are used, how much they are paid and how they are being selected;

It directs the Chief Financial Officer to establish standards regarding planning trips for conferences;

It outlines the necessity for produced videos at conferences in response to the claim that the IRS spent over \$50,000 on video skits;

It sets standards on whether hotel room upgrades should be allowed;

It requires the submission of W-2 tax forms for local IRS employees who were reimbursed for staying overnight at conferences—just a little irony there if you're tracking with me, Mr. Speaker;

Finally, it recommends that the CFO establish procedures to determine the necessity of an exhibitor's hall, promotional items, and other significant costs.

Common sense. Thoughtful. It's meant to restore the public's confidence in the Internal Revenue Service, and it is my hope that it is widely supported on both sides of the aisle today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Might I ask the gentleman, are you ready to close?

Mr. ROSKAM. I am.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of the recommendations make sense. We Democrats—throughout our Caucus and the President, all of us—joined in making clear what we thought of the mismanagement within the IRS and what we thought about the abuse of conferences.

As I said before, with this leadership of IRS appointed by the President, all of these recommendations either have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented. So, before the end of the year—I think well before it—this one problem—and there are others—will be resolved. I support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 2769, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as the Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, my Subcommittee directly oversees the Internal Revenue Service's budget. And for the past 6 months now I have witnessed an arrogant and absolute abuse of power. Targeting groups based on their names and political beliefs is both chilling and outrageous regardless of their political affiliation. And then finding out of the flagrant waste of taxpayer dollars on conferences and videos, is just downright disheartening.

Two weeks ago my Subcommittee Marked-up our Fiscal Year 2014 Financial Services and General Government Appropriations bill in

the full Appropriations Committee. In my mark, I include this exact language of H.R. 2769, the "Stop Playing on Citizen's Cash Act"—common sense legislation prohibiting conferences until the IRS implement all of the recommendations from the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration.

As the agency tasked with processing over 237 million tax returns that result in the collection of \$2.5 trillion in taxes and \$373 billion in refunds annually you would think they would have safeguards in place that treats all Americans equal and the hard-earned taxpayer dollars they send to Washington spent wisely, effectively and legally. This however, is not the case.

Congress appropriates more than \$10 billion in hard-earned taxpayer dollars each year for IRS operations. Before we spend one more dime on the IRS, we need to know how it spends the money it already receives. And, we need to know what safeguards the IRS plans to have in place to make sure the funds are used in a legal and appropriate way.

These conferences and videos were a flagrant waste of taxpayer dollars. And, what is most disconcerting, the money came in part from unused funds from the IRS enforcement budget—at a time when they were asking for even more funding.

Nonetheless, we need to fund this agency so that it can accurately answer questions from individuals and businesses about tax issues, produce tax forms and instructions that promote compliance, process tax returns in a timely manner, and investigate criminals committing tax fraud.

However, we cannot in good conscience provide taxpayer dollars that are used to abuse the rights of American citizens, nor can we provide dollars that are wasted in such a flagrant manner as we have discovered.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlemen from Illinois for bringing forward this common sense legislation to the floor; a step in the right direction of accountability for an agency that receives such a large appropriation of taxpayer dollars.

But I also hope we can bring forward the Fiscal Year 2014 Financial Services and General Government Appropriations bill to the floor for consideration. It is time to have a serious debate on ways to increase transparency and bring accountability to many agencies that have had a history of wasteful spending.

Just last year we heard of the GSA scandal at their Las Vegas conference. This year we included instructions to make the GSA more transparent by requiring additional reporting, separating administrative funds from programmatic funds, and encouraging the better utilization of their space inventory.

In addition, we make regulators such as the FCC and FTC do more with less. And in order to increase the transparency and accountability of agencies created by Dodd-Frank, the bill makes the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau subject to the appropriations process.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2769 on the floor today. A voluntary tax system depends on a fair and impartial collection process because, as Chief Justice Marshall said, the power to tax is the power to destroy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2769, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAXPAYER BILL OF RIGHTS ACT OF 2013

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2768) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are familiar with and act in accord with certain taxpayer rights, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2768

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Taxpayer Bill of Rights Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. DUTY TO ENSURE THAT IRS EMPLOYEES ARE FAMILIAR WITH AND ACT IN ACCORD WITH CERTAIN TAXPAYER RIGHTS.

Section 7803(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4) and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) EXECUTION OF DUTIES IN ACCORD WITH TAXPAYER RIGHTS.—In discharging his duties, the Commissioner shall ensure that employees of the Internal Revenue Service are familiar with and act in accord with taxpayer rights as afforded by other provisions of this title, including—

- "(A) the right to be informed,
- "(B) the right to be assisted,
- "(C) the right to be heard,
- "(D) the right to pay no more than the correct amount of tax,
- "(E) the right of appeal,
- "(F) the right to certainty,
- "(G) the right to privacy,
- "(H) the right to confidentiality,
- "(I) the right to representation, and
- "(J) the right to a fair and just tax system."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2768 is entitled the "Taxpayer Bill of Rights Act of 2013." What it does is address a fundamental question. There was an ambiguity, apparently, Mr. Speaker, in the testimony that you heard in the Ways and Means Committee and that the ranking member heard in the Ways and Means Committee and in some other testimony that we've heard from the other body, which is this: Who is responsible for having an understanding of what's going on at the Internal Revenue Service? Who is responsible for the missteps and the mishaps and so forth?

There was a theme that we heard from a couple of folks who you would have thought would have said that the responsibility was theirs, but they weren't really willing to take the responsibility. Here is what I mean by that. There currently exists 10 enumerated rights in the statute, and let me just quickly run through these. It's important that we look at this as a foundation upon which we have an expectation that the Internal Revenue Service is operating:

Taxpayers have the right to be informed, the right to be assisted, the right to be heard, the right to pay no more than the correct amount of tax, the right of appeal, the right of certainty, the right of privacy, the right of confidentiality, the right to representation, and the right to a fair and just tax system.

That's current law, but here is where parts of things get lost in the shuffle in that, apparently, the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service doesn't view that as that person's responsibility to make sure, A, that the Commissioner knows it and, B, that other employees know it.

So what we are doing today, what we are proposing to the House today, is to put this in a place in the statute that unambiguously says that this is the responsibility of the Commissioner's. I alluded to a couple of quotes before, and I want to walk through them with you just briefly and put it in this context:

What we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, are fundamental rights that are foundational and that the Congress has put into the Internal Revenue Code to make sure that taxpayers are protected. This is settled ground. This is common knowledge. This is a general understanding. There is no new ground. Nobody is hunting out ahead of the pack here. This is a very solid doctrine, these 10 enumerated rights.

□ 1545

The former Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, Douglas Shulman, said before the Finance Committee in the other body on May 21:

I certainly am not personally responsible for creating a list that had inappropriate cri-

teria on it. What I know, with the full facts that are out, is from the inspector general's report, which doesn't say I'm responsible for that.

With that said, this happened on my watch, and I very much regret that it happened on my watch.

He also said this:

I had a partial set of facts, and I knew that the inspector general was going to be looking into it, and I knew that it was going to be stopped. Sitting there then and sitting here today, I think I made the right decision, which is to let the inspector general get to the bottom of it, chase down all the facts, and then make his findings public.

We heard, in the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Speaker, from the former Acting Commissioner, Steven Miller. He said this:

I think that what happened here was that foolish mistakes were made by people trying to be more efficient in their workload selection. The listing described in the report, while intolerable, was a mistake and was not an act of partisanship.

Can you imagine how we would all be feeling if somebody came and there was an officer of the law who said, Well, I know I'm supposed to read Miranda rights. I know that's what the law says. I know it's settled doctrine. I know that that's what a defendant expects. But I was busy. I had a heavy workload. So I chose not to Mirandize the defendant. I just figured I didn't have enough time.

There are so many things that are going on in this IRS story, there are so many components and elements of it, much of this is actually things that we have yet to learn. I think we're marveling every day at new facts that are coming out, and I think the House has been very disciplined, frankly, in letting the facts speak for themselves. But there is a fact, and here it is: there is ambiguity about who is in charge at the IRS; there is ambiguity about who is responsible at the IRS. And when the IRS commissioners, both of these recent appointees—not the current one, but both recent appointees—have the sense of, Well, the responsibility belongs here and the responsibility belongs there, I think it is incumbent on the House to say, No, the responsibility for this lies with the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, and that's what the plain language of this bill does.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I support this bill, and I think everybody will.

I think we all agree that IRS employees, indeed, should perform their duties in accordance with the taxpayers' rights outlined in this bill. These rights have been outlined a number of times in the National Taxpayer Advocate's annual report to Congress. In fact, Democrats in the past have introduced legislation to codify these rights, and the National Taxpayer Advocate's

support for codifying these rights dates back to 2007.

I urge support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 2768, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2768, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOP TARGETING OUR POLITICS IRS ACT

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2565) to provide for the termination of employment of employees of the Internal Revenue Service who take certain official actions for political purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2565

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Stop Targeting Our Politics IRS Act" or as the "STOP IRS Act".

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE EMPLOYEES FOR TAKING OFFICIAL ACTIONS FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES.

Paragraph (10) of section 1203(b) of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998 is amended to read as follows:

"(10) performing, delaying, or failing to perform (or threatening to perform, delay, or fail to perform) any official action (including any audit) with respect to a taxpayer for purpose of extracting personal gain or benefit or for a political purpose."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to urge approval of H.R. 2565, the Stop Targeting Our Politics IRS Act.

Despite being introduced only 1 month ago, this bipartisan legislation already has over 75 cosponsors, but also overwhelming support from the American people. This support shows that the vast majority of Members and Americans, regardless of their party affiliation, believe the IRS should be above politics. This is not a partisan issue. It is absolutely unacceptable for a government official to consider the political leanings of any taxpayer when conducting official business.

If it is determined that a Federal employer did, in fact, engage in targeting, they should be relieved of their duties. It is that simple. In fact, this is so commonsense, in 1998, Congress enacted the IRS Restructuring and Reform Act by a vote of 402-8. That legislation sought to bring accountability to the IRS by allowing for immediate termination of IRS employees who engaged in the so-called "10 Deadly Sins" against taxpayers.

A large percentage of the Members here in this Chamber today supported those reforms back then. Unfortunately, while the legislation covers many offenses, it did not include political targeting. I have no doubt this was a simple oversight. I cannot imagine any Member would support a process for removing an employee for bad behavior, but somehow not consider political targeting to be bad enough. This is exactly what my legislation would do. It would specifically spell out that any IRS employee, regardless of political affiliation, who targeted a taxpayer for political purposes could be immediately relieved of their duties. This legislation does not change any of the procedures for removing an IRS employee. It simply adds political targeting to the list of 10 Deadly Sins already in existence. Any statements to the contrary are simply not true.

Some have said this bill is not needed because the current investigation is still ongoing. This legislation does not, in any way, impact the current investigation. It simply says, regardless of the current situation, if you work for the IRS, you cannot target taxpayers for political purposes. There should be no controversy in that. There is currently a process in place to remove bad actors. There is currently a list of offenses that would subject an employee to that process. All I want to do is add political targeting to the list of fireable offenses.

Regardless of the outcome of this current investigation, the reputation and credibility of the IRS has been badly damaged. The IRS needs this legislation. The entire Federal Government needs this legislation. And most importantly, the American people need this legislation. They need to know that they will not be targeted by their government for political purposes. They need to know that those who are entrusted with the vast power of this

Federal Government are going to act in a responsible and professional manner, or be held accountable if they do not.

I urge all Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me spend a few minutes, if I might, discussing the context of this legislation and a bit of what's in it.

The Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998 enacted a list of 10 "acts or omissions" for which IRS employees face mandatory firing. This bill would amend the 10th act or omission to expand existing grounds for termination to include political motivation.

We all agree that IRS employees should not act with a political purpose. We all passionately believe that. But I want it to be clear that because of the environment in which this bill is being considered, there is absolutely no evidence that any IRS employees acted with political motivation in the matter under investigation. The inspector general reviewed and concluded that "there is no indication that pulling these selected applications was politically motivated."

The inspector general has come before Congress repeatedly and testified numerous times that he has found no evidence of political motivation. At the very first hearing on this matter that was held in mid-May, the inspector general was asked if he found any evidence of political motivation in the selection of the tax exemption applications. He answered, "We did not, sir."

When questioned by my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MCDERMOTT, whether he stands behind the assertion that "no one acted out of malice or political motivation," the inspector general answered, "We have no evidence at this time to contradict that assertion, sir."

When my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. BECERRA, asked him if it is correct that he did not find any evidence of political motivation here, the inspector general replied, "That is correct, sir."

In addition—and I want to emphasize this—staff from the Ways and Means Committee and Government Oversight Committees of this House have interviewed 17 IRS employees directly involved in this matter under oath, and none of these employees have suggested that the IRS actions were either politically motivated or the result of influence by any individual or organization outside of the IRS.

Finally, as I mentioned earlier, the IG asked his investigative arm to review 5,500 emails. The head of the investigation concluded, "The emails indicated the organizations needed to be pulled because the IRS employees were not sure how to process them, not because they wanted to stall or hinder

the application. There was no indication that pulling these applications was politically motivated. The email traffic indicated there were unclear processing directions and the group wanted to make sure they had guidance on processing the applications so they pulled them."

It's clear that there's no evidence of political motivation by the IRS under investigation now. Indeed, there has been too much political motivation in this entire effort by Republicans.

I want to say just a few words about what's in the bill, and the gentleman from Ohio and I have discussed this. The majority did not follow regular order. This bill did not come before the Ways and Means Committee. It essentially was not considered either at the subcommittee level, I believe, or the full committee level. So the Republican majority, in my judgment, did not carefully draft their bill to ensure that it was consistent with the current statute. If it had done so, there might have been improvement to this legislation and added the language "willful failure" as it appears under four of the other acts and omissions.

I think this bill will go to the Senate, as it should. I hope if it considers it, it will take up this issue of whether or not there should be a willful requirement in terms of its conduct because we're talking about the ability administratively to discharge an employee.

□ 1600

I think if there is political motivation on their part, action should be taken. I think it is also important that we understand that there had to be some willfulness in that action.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by saying this bill has nothing to do with the current investigation. It's really about installing public confidence back when it comes to the IRS. I would also like to say this that bill makes no changes to the current process or procedures for removing an IRS employee. It would simply add political targeting to the list of offenses listed in current law. And I've already said, in 1998, this legislation was approved 402-8.

As far as not having a hearing, is that technically going to be the reason opponents vote again restoring credibility to the IRS? And for the record, this bill was widely circulated, and I was more than willing to make changes to the bipartisan legislation. I drafted this language to remain as close to existing law as possible.

My addition is simply added to the current offense list No. 10: targeting a taxpayer for personal gain. Under current law, No. 10 does not use the term "willful." Therefore, I did not add willful. However, targeting a taxpayer for personal gain or political purposes could only be done in an intentional

manner. And let's not forget the Commissioner of the IRS always has the ability to not remove somebody.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a member of our committee and the vice chair of our caucus.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my friend and colleague and ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee for yielding me this time.

I do appreciate and I don't want to call into question the motivation of how this bill came to the floor, but I find it hard to believe that we are here on this particular issue dealing with individuals who work at the IRS and what would be deemed as a fireable offense and somehow not be related to the ongoing investigation into the IRS and the political motivations behind not the gentleman but my Republican colleagues as a whole in bringing this bill to the floor without a hearing in committee. That it just happened to fall onto the floor this afternoon and has no tangential connection to what is happening, I find a little bit difficult to believe.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill because it is not an attempt at better governance, but rather it is a solution in search of a problem. In the months of investigations into the IRS targeting of nonprofits, here is what we found without a doubt:

Progressive groups were targeted alongside Tea Party affiliations.

There was no interference or coordination in the targeting scandal by anyone at the White House or at the Treasury Department.

No IRS agents have ever been cited or even been accused of forcing their own personal political ideology onto the process of granting nonprofit status. In fact, the person who was in charge of the IRS nonprofit office in Cincinnati self-identifies as a conservative Republican.

Those are all facts. So this bill is a solution in search of a problem.

But still, Mr. Speaker, I recognize the sensitive powers at the fingertips of IRS employees, and I would be open to looking into whether we should add something to this as a fireable offense. But the Ways and Means Committee, as I said before, held no hearings on this bill. We've had many hearings of testimony on the issue of the IRS, but not on this specific bill. It was never considered in committee. It was drafted at the last minute to fulfill, in my opinion, the Republican Party desire to say how awful government is. What better way to do it than to use the IRS?

And when you govern like that, these are the kinds of bills we get on the floor. But worse, I believe this is just a ploy being used to cover up the facts surrounding this IRS problem, and I

believe it actually harms our ability to address the real management issues at the IRS that were the basis of the problem to begin with.

So once again, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, bills don't just fall out of the sky and land on the floor of the House without a hearing in committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. CROWLEY. Bills don't just fall out of the sky, Mr. Speaker. They don't. They're here to meet a purpose. The purpose was to evade the committee process in regular order and to bring this bill here before we break for the summer recess, the last week in Congress before the summer recess, for a political purpose. I've stated it. It's not worth restating again, but I do suggest that the notion or idea that this bill is on the floor and has nothing to do with the ongoing investigation, in my opinion, is very hard to believe.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I hope the American people are listening to this debate because the American people are the ones who have the right, they have the right to know that they are not going to be targeted, whether they're conservative, liberal, whatever organization they are. And that's what this bill is about. It's about the American people.

In regards to bringing it up in a hearing, it's interesting because I think my colleagues were at the hearing where I actually asked the Commissioner what he thought about political targeting being added and he indicated he wasn't sure if it was in there, but thought it was a good idea. So even the Acting Commissioner made that comment, that this was an issue that should be considered.

This is about the American people. This is about restoring confidence not only in the American people but in the IRS. As an employer for over 28 years, I wanted to make sure all of my employees felt the integrity, and when there was a concern, we had issues with fixing that problem. This is about fixing a problem for the American people. I hope the American people continue to listen to this debate because this is one that I know the American people are behind.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Is the gentleman from Ohio ready to close?

Mr. RENACCI. I am.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

There's no question there should be no political motivation. So far there's been no evidence there was any.

This bill is being brought up in a context. It's outlined in the Republican playbook and, that is, go home and essentially go after the government. I think we should make sure in Wash-

ington that we act so the government acts on our behalf.

So everybody can reach their own judgment. I've told the gentleman from Ohio that the way you drafted it—and I'll just read this. The present language says "threatening to audit a taxpayer for the purpose of extracting personal gain or benefit." That's the present language. Threatening is willful by definition. You can't threaten somebody unwillfully. Instead, we have new language, and I want to pick up the point of Mr. CROWLEY in terms of regular procedure. I mentioned it before.

It's important that we follow regular order in this institution. The bills before oversight were brought before the committee. We had no chance to act on this, and I would have suggested that the word "willful" be placed before it. However, everyone will vote as they wish on this. I think it will pass. It will go over to the Senate, and I will suggest if this passes and the Senate decides to act, that they take a clear look at whether there needs to be a requirement of an intentional misdeed as defined here because what we're talking about is the discharge of an employee; and whether it's IRS or some other government employee, whether in a local unit or any unit, it seems to me—or in the military, for example—I think we want to have some consideration of due process for them.

So that's the basis for the discussion here. This bill, I think, talks about political motivation. And I just wanted to add, as I end, the thought expressed before. There has been no evidence of political motivation by an IRS employee, and the effort to try to tie what happened there to the executive was an example of pure political motivation and terribly misguided and I think a harmful kind of connection when it did not exist. We should not do that in this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, I want to thank my colleague for saying that political targeting should not occur in any way, shape, or form. So I would agree with him. And what this does, this ensures no political targeting going forward, which is important. We agree that political targeting shouldn't occur. This ensures political targeting doesn't happen going forward.

The other issue, when we talk about the change in the language, the current language says threatening to audit a taxpayer for the purpose of extracting personal gain. We talk about the same thing by saying:

Performing, delaying, or failing to perform (or threatening to perform, delay, or fail to perform) any official action (including any audit) with respect to a taxpayer for purpose of extracting personal gain or benefit or for a political purpose.

So we are actually protecting the integrity of the IRS going forward. This

is a simple piece of legislation that really implements the will of the American people. It shows we will not allow our constituents to be targeted based on their political beliefs. This is the only bipartisan measure we consider on this topic today. It simply improves an existing process that was approved with overwhelming bipartisan support.

As I said earlier, the IRS needs this. The hardworking employees of the IRS who have been tainted by this scandal need this. But let's remember this has nothing to do with the scandal. Let's begin the long process of restoring faith in our government. Let's come together, put politics aside, and show the American people that the IRS is above politics. I urge all Members to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2565.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIPARTISAN STUDENT LOAN CERTAINTY ACT OF 2013

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1911) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. INTEREST RATES.

(a) INTEREST RATES.—Section 455(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting "AND BEFORE JULY 1, 2013" after "ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2006";

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "and before July 1, 2013," after "on or after July 1, 2006,";

(C) in subparagraph (B), by inserting "and before July 1, 2013," after "on or after July 1, 2006,"; and

(D) in subparagraph (C), by inserting "and before July 1, 2013," after "on or after July 1, 2006,";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

"(8) INTEREST RATE PROVISIONS FOR NEW LOANS ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2013.—

"(A) RATES FOR UNDERGRADUATE FDSL AND FDSL.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct Stafford Loans and Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans issued to undergraduate students, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

"(i) a rate equal to the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 2.05 percent; or

"(ii) 8.25 percent.

"(B) RATES FOR GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL FDSL.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans issued to graduate or professional students, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

"(i) a rate equal to the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 3.6 percent; or

"(ii) 9.5 percent.

"(C) PLUS LOANS.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct PLUS Loans, for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2013, the applicable rate of interest shall, for loans disbursed during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30, be determined on the preceding June 1 and be equal to the lesser of—

"(i) a rate equal to the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the final auction held prior to such June 1 plus 4.6 percent; or

"(ii) 10.5 percent.

"(D) CONSOLIDATION LOANS.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, any Federal Direct Consolidation Loan for which the application is received on or after July 1, 2013, shall bear interest at an annual rate on the unpaid principal balance of the loan that is equal to the weighted average of the interest rates on the loans consolidated, rounded to the nearest higher one-eighth of one percent.

"(E) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall determine the applicable rate of interest under this paragraph after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and shall publish such rate in the Federal Register as soon as practicable after the date of determination.

"(F) RATE.—The applicable rate of interest determined under this paragraph for a Federal Direct Stafford Loan, a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan, or a Federal Direct PLUS Loan shall be fixed for the period of the loan."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on July 1, 2013.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

SEC. 4. STUDY ON THE ACTUAL COST OF ADMINISTERING THE FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) complete a study that determines the actual cost to the Federal Government of carrying out the Federal student loan programs authorized under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), which shall—

(A) provide estimates relying on accurate information based on past, current, and projected data as to the appropriate index and mark-up rate for the Federal Government's cost of borrowing that would allow the Federal Government to effectively administer and cover the cost of the Federal student programs authorized under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) under the scoring rules outlined in the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.);

(B) provide the information described in this section in a way that separates out administrative costs, interest rate, and other loan terms and conditions; and

(C) set forth clear recommendations to the relevant authorizing committees of Congress as to how future legislation can incorporate the results of the study described in this section to allow for the administration of the Federal student loan programs authorized under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) without generating any additional revenue to the Federal Government except revenue that is needed to carry out such programs; and

(2) prepare and submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives setting forth the conclusions of the study described in this section in such a manner that the recommendations included in the report can inform future reauthorizations of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1911.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

□ 1615

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act, also known as the Smarter Solutions for Students Act.

After many weeks of delay, I'm pleased we finally have a bipartisan agreement to address the student loan interest rate problem. My colleagues and I have been fighting for months for a long-term, market-based solution that will serve students and taxpayers, and the legislation before us today will do just that.

As you can see in this chart, much like the Smarter Solutions for Students Act approved by the House back

in May, the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act will tie student loan interest rates to the market, taking away the uncertainty that comes with allowing Congress to arbitrarily set rates.

Similarly, both bills provide a permanent fix to the interest rate problem, granting students the certainty they need to make smart, fiscally responsible investments in their education.

And most importantly, this legislation, like its predecessor, doesn't unfairly penalize taxpayers. Unlike some half-baked proposals that would put taxpayers on the hook for billions of dollars to pay for artificially low student loan interest rates, both the House-passed Smarter Solutions for Students Act and the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act will generate a small amount of savings over 10 years.

Reports confirm the similarities between the House bill and its Senate companion. MSNBC has said the House bill is "very similar" to the Senate proposal. The Minneapolis Star Tribune recently noted the Senate compromise "closely resembles" the House-passed Smarter Solutions for Students Act, and the Associated Press called the differences between the two proposals "relatively small."

While I'm happy with the legislation we will consider today, I'm disappointed it took us so long to get to this point. Students and their families got roped into an all-too-tumultuous debate and were forced to deal with the fallout when Congress was unable to reach an agreement to prevent subsidized Stafford loan interest rates from doubling on July 1.

By getting politicians out of the business of setting student loan interest rates, the measure we consider today will protect students from future uncertainty. I applaud my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for finally recognizing this long-term, market-based proposal for what it is: a win for students and taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1911.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act. It has been nearly a month since interest rates on student loans were allowed to double on millions of our neediest students, but thanks to the bipartisan negotiations in the Senate, we now have a solution that provides real relief. And I want to thank Senator DURBIN, Senator HARKIN, Senator MANCHIN, and Senator KING for all of their work on this effort.

Thanks to this legislation, over the next 5 years, borrowers across the country will save \$25 billion in interest

payments. In my home State of California, this bill will cut the cost of college for more than 550,000 students this coming academic year. It was worth the wait.

When we started work on this issue, I said that any long-term solution to student loan interest rates must help, not harm the students or their families, must not make college more expensive, and it must protect students in the future from spiking interest rates. I believe that this bipartisan bill accomplishes that goal.

It locks in interest rates for borrowers when they sign on to their loans; it provides a reasonable cap to protect students from rising interest rates; and it rolls back the doubling of interest rates, saving students and families real money right now.

Today's bipartisan student loan deal stands in stark contrast to the partisan bill passed by the House majority in May. The bill would have made college more expensive by nearly \$4 billion to students and their families. It would have subjected students to a bait-and-switch scheme. It offered students teaser rates that balloon annually, leaving students deeper in debt and guessing what they will owe.

If you look at this chart, you will see that, under the bipartisan agreement we're voting on today, it will cost students about \$11,363. The current law raises the cost to \$14,000, and the bill that passed the House, the Republican bill, was \$16,400. So it's been well worth students to have this disagreement, to have this wait so that we could save this kind of money for students and families.

Next year's freshmen who borrow a maximum amount of subsidized and unsubsidized Stafford loans over 5 years would have paid \$5,000 more in interest rates under the House Republican plan than under today's bipartisan compromise, and nearly \$2,000 more than if we did nothing.

The House majority's solution wasn't a solution at all. Their approach was best summed up by the chair of the Higher Education Subcommittee who recently said, "It is not the role of the Congress to make college affordable or accessible."

I couldn't disagree more. That statement explains why their bill piled debt on the backs of students rather than trying to lighten the load.

The Senate bill before us today takes the opposite approach. It saves students and families money.

I understand the concerns that some have raised by this solution. While it provides real relief for the next few years, it does not solve the long-term student debt crisis. We have much more work to do to address the underlying cost of college, and we must remain on guard against any unacceptable rise in interest rates.

In the meantime, we now have a bill that will make a positive difference to families struggling to pay for college.

Today, I ask the Republican majority to drop their support for the original House bill that was so devastating to students and families and, instead, support this bipartisan bill that delivers real interest rate relief for millions of Americans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chair of the Higher Education Subcommittee.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

I rise in support of the Smarter Solutions for Students Act, renamed as the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act by the Senate. It's about time that bipartisanship on this issue won the day in Washington.

Earlier this year, my colleagues and I warmly welcomed the President's ideas to settle how student loan interest rates are calculated. Referencing his plan and his premise that student loan interest rates should be permanently free of politics and set using market interest rates, we introduced, and a bipartisan House majority passed, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act in May, well before rates were scheduled to double on July 1.

Our friends in the Senate were on a much different schedule. Rather than immediately building on the striking similarities between President Obama's initial proposal and the House Republican solution, Senate Democrats chose infighting over completing this important work.

July 1 came and went without any agreement from the Senate. Rates doubled.

But advocates of common sense and bipartisanship made a better case. Last week, Senate Democrats finally chose to support a permanent, market-based solution much like what the President had originally requested and practically identical to our Smarter Solutions for Students Act.

Campaign promises and political posturing should not play a role in the calculation of student loan interest rates. As we've seen, Washington's involvement in the rate-setting equation is a recipe for uncertainty and confusion. Borrowers deserve better.

The Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act will apply predictable, market-based interest rates to all Federal Stafford and PLUS loans, ensuring that student and parent borrowers will be able to capitalize with certainty on low rates while being shielded from high rates by specified caps.

From personal experience, I know that paying for college is hard work. It's getting harder as tuition and fees increase, and the vast majority of American households are feeling that pressure.

The need for solutions to help ease the challenge of college affordability is especially acute in today's jobless

economy. Many recent graduates took out loans with the expectation that they would be able to find a job to pay off their debt. Now, many find themselves among the 53 percent of their peers struggling with un-or underemployment.

Like our colleagues across the aisle, we want every student to have the necessary, honest information they need to make an informed decision about the financial obligations they voluntarily assume, and we want taxpayer subsidies for higher education to be well-spent, not wasted.

Now, with interest rates settled permanently for students and taxpayers, the Higher Education Subcommittee I chair will continue to look for and promote solutions to help bring clarity to college costs for all students and families considering the investment.

Students, families, and taxpayers deserve a long-term student loan solution, not more can-kicking from Washington. The Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act, like the House-passed Smarter Solutions for Students Act, puts an end to temporary fixes and campaign promises that have failed to strengthen our Nation's student loan system. This legislation offers students simplicity and predictability as they prepare to pay for college.

The American people deserve the clarity, certainty, and protection guaranteed by this legislation. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would not want the Members of this House to believe that somehow this bill that we're going to vote on in a few minutes is the same as the Republican bill. This bill saves \$25 billion for those students over the next 5 years. The Republican bill that was voted on in this House costs those students a billion dollars. So there's a big difference. As I say, it was well worth the wait.

So let's understand very clearly. The Members of this House are getting a better deal with this legislation if they vote "yes" on this bill, both sides of the aisle.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of the Student Loan Certainty Act and again want to emphasize the fact that, compared to the product that came out of this Chamber on May 23 that the majority passed on a partisan, party-line vote, on which the White House issued a veto threat, the final bill that's before us here today is a far superior piece of legislation that protects students.

Again, as Mr. MILLER said, the numbers don't lie. The bill that the Republicans passed on May 23 had a 4.3 percent interest rate, which was a teaser rate. The bill that's being passed here today is 3.86 percent, and over time, that nets about \$5,000 of additional sav-

ings for students. That's real money, and that certainly is something that's worth the wait.

But what I want to point out is that there is actually, in my opinion, a more fundamental difference which is so critical for borrowers, which is that this piece of legislation will fix the rate at time of origination. In other words, when students take on these 10-year notes, which is what Stafford student loans are, the rate is fixed at the time the note is written.

The bill that came out on May 23 was a floating variable rate product which would not be set until the time that students commenced payment. Some students take Stafford loans out over a period of 5 and 6 years, so the rates that they were touting back on May 23 were an illusion. They were not what the rate was that the student actually was going to be paying.

And again, for this country, which went through the trauma of the subprime mortgage variable rate fiasco, this is a critical difference which provides greater protection for the borrower.

If you go online today, a 30-year mortgage for a house is about 4 percent, for an auto loan it's about 3.8 percent. They are fixed loans if you took those loans out today. And that's exactly what this compromise creates is that there will be real borrower certainty and protection, unlike the bill that recklessly, and on a partisan, party-line basis, flew out of this Chamber on May 23.

This is a better deal for America's students. It's why, again, the process that we went through was worth it. And again, it's certainly worth people's support.

At the end of the day, though, let's remember, students are still paying into the deficit of this country. The Congressional Budget Office has told us over 10 years, \$184 billion of revenue is going to be generated through this program towards the deficit.

We need to change that. That's not the purpose of the Stafford student loan program. When Senator Stafford from Vermont passed it many years ago, it was about providing an affordable system of access for higher education, not a cash windfall for the coffers of the government.

And that's why we have more work to do. That's why we need to pass a Higher Education Authorization Act which, again, balances these priorities in the right direction for students, not for government coffers. And again, this legislation gives us the time to address that issue and come out with an even better program for students which, again, is good for them and good for our country, to make sure that we have a workforce which is ready for the challenges of the future.

□ 1630

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the com-

mittee, the gentleman from Nevada, Dr. HECK.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013.

As the first in my family to go to college—and as a parent—I fully understand the value of a high-quality education and the opportunities it provides. I also know that accessing higher education is not cheap. I just started paying back the student loans of my daughter. I'm still paying back my student loans for medical school.

Throughout Nevada, many new high school graduates are preparing to head to college this fall. Without this bipartisan compromise, originally proposed by the House Committee on Education and the Workforce and based largely on the President's own proposal, students face significant uncertainty over their student loans. This legislation provides a permanent, market-based solution that gives students and taxpayers the certainty they need and deserve. Additionally, by ensuring the interest rates are set by the market, rather than legislators, this bill rightly takes politics out of the student loan discussion.

While we must continue our work to address the skyrocketing costs of higher education—because the much greater issue is the total indebtedness upon graduation—this bill is an important step in addressing the near-term needs of students.

I strongly support H.R. 1911 and urge the passage of this important bill to help not only Nevada students, but students throughout our Nation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of the underlying legislation. Although this compromise is far from perfect, it is a step that must be taken in order to provide financial relief to American students and their families.

This legislation will bring undergraduate interest rates back under 4 percent for the upcoming academic year—a far more sustainable and appropriate level than the current 6.8 percent rates. Graduate students and parents will also benefit from lowered interest rates within this bill. Importantly, and in contrast to the bill that previously passed the House, the legislation also locks in those interest rates for the lifetime of each annually disbursed loan, providing student borrowers with critical consumer protections and a measure of predictability. Finally, this compromise provides interest rate caps for all student loans, offering an essential safety net to protect students and their families from the whims of market-based rates.

While this isn't a bill that I would have written, we must all recognize the urgency of our current situation and

pass it today. Classes are starting at many institutions within just a few weeks. Students around the country are signing master promissory notes even as we speak, committing themselves to years of debt and loan repayments in order to make an investment in their future. At the very least, this Congress has the responsibility to momentarily end the political gridlock that paralyzes our Nation and notify these hardworking students what their interest rates will be.

However, let's not think for one second that our work on college access and affordability is now complete. With the Congressional Budget Office projecting interest rates of 10-year Treasury notes—the baseline that determines student interest rates—to rise significantly over the next 5 years, we must work proactively and cooperatively to assure affordable student interest rates not only for present students but future students as well.

American student loan debt stands at \$1.1 trillion. And it continues to rise. The Federal Government continues to make a huge profit on student loan repayment, even as students are forced to shoulder more of the burden than ever before. Balancing our deficit on the backs of students is simply not right, especially when considering the broader economic impact of saddling students with untenable amounts of debt.

When borrowers are forced to devote huge chunks of their paychecks to student loan repayment, it means they will have less income to spend on major purchases like homes or vehicles. They are less likely to start a business. They are less likely to invest in retirement accounts or the stock market—all negative indicators that will affect our economic prosperity now and into the future.

Mr. Speaker, a college education has represented a path to the middle class for millions of American families. Taking direct action to bring down the cost of a college degree by lowering student loan interest rates is a step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KLINE. I yield 2 minutes to another member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 1911, the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act, I rise in support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1911.

President Obama, as part of his budget request, proposed returning student loan interest rates to a system of market-based variable rates tagged to the 10-year Treasury note.

As a member of the Education and Workforce Committee, I can attest the committee staff and members worked in good faith to meet the President's

request, developing a bill that could pass the House and promote certainty for student borrowers. The House moved to pass the bill in May, reasserting that access to education for so many of America's young people should not be subject to annual political battles. Unfortunately, the Senate chose politics over students and delayed passage of the legislation until last week.

The positive is that H.R. 1911 is a complete departure from what had become an annual debate within Congress on how to set the rates for student loans. This measure modifies how interest rates on most Federal student loans are set, returning to a system under which interest rates are tied to market rates, but with rates fixed for the period of the loan. It would apply retroactively to any loans since July 1, when the 3.4 interest rate on Stafford loans rose to 6.8 percent.

This bill will transition the student loan system to one that is more predictable and affordable—one that protects both taxpayers and students. We have a responsibility to America's youth. We have a responsibility to the students such as those seeking opportunities at Penn State, Pitt, Lock Haven, Clarion, Edinboro, Juniata, Dubois Business College, and South Hills. We have to put forward a long-term plan for college affordability. This bill is a good first step and will offer students the lowest possible rate for higher education while ensuring the solvency of these important loan programs.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. I'm very pleased that finally we are taking action on the pressing issue of college affordability for constituents of mine across Colorado and Americans across our country.

Absent congressional action, the current law today has effectively doubled the interest rate that our neediest families pay to be able to borrow money for afford college to 6.8 percent. I believe that the previous bill that passed the House was better than the doubling to 6.8 percent. It would save families money in the short- and medium-term while Congress worked through a final solution. But I'm very proud to say here today that this bill is far better. And I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill, which has several features that are strong improvements over the original House-passed version, including a fixed interest rate for the life of the loan so that our students are not beholden to the fluctuations of the market when they can least afford it—after they graduate.

This bill would keep interest rates low for our neediest students and their

families, providing some certainty and some surety. Under this bill, the typical undergraduate student borrower this year will save \$1,500 over the life of a loan. A graduate student will save over \$3,000.

This bill is a step towards making sure that our student loan system is not subject to the whims of Washington every week, with arbitrary expirations and control over the interest rate. We have to make sure that our students are able to plan their futures.

This bill is but the first step in the much-needed reforms that we need as we reauthorize the Higher Education Act. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill to keep college affordable now, and I hope that my colleagues will be able to consider Representative PETRI's and my H.R. 1716 bill as we look towards long-term solutions.

The ExCEL Act, H.R. 1716, would replace this complicated array of loans, subsidies, deferments, forbearances, and repayment options with a single loan repaid through simplified and improved income-based repayment. One of our goals is to protect our neediest Americans. Income-based repayment is a better tool than interest subsidies. While interest subsidies are based on a student's family income before school, income-based repayment ensures that students are protected when they truly need it—when they graduate from school, if they go through tough times, or if they're in a service-related profession. Under the ExCEL Act, we include strong borrower protections so our neediest students after graduation will be paying effectively a zero percent rate for the balance of their payments.

We need to pass this bill now and send it to President Obama to prevent our students this fall from paying 6.8 percent. I hope we can continue the discussion and dialogue about thoughtful student loan reform proposals like the ExCEL Act that address keeping college affordable for American families.

I am so grateful the Democrats and Republicans have come together to, hopefully, pass a bill here today that will be able to be brought to President Obama for his signature to provide some commonsense and predictability by lowering the student loan interest rates from 6.8 percent, which they are under statute today, and putting us on a path toward fiscal sustainability.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. KLINE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I yield 3 minutes to another member of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Smarter Solutions for Students Act, also known as the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act. I commend Chairman KLINE; our Education Subcommittee chairwoman, Ms. FOXX; Ranking Member MILLER; and others for their hard work and diligence throughout this process of getting this bill where it is today.

I am pleased that cooler heads have prevailed and Senate Democrats finally have agreed to the commonsense solutions proposed months ago by House Republicans and the President in his budget to stop interest rates on student loans from doubling. This is a good deal for 11 million students. The rates are better in this agreement. Students will save an estimated \$1,500 in interest over the life of their college loans as a result.

Those beneficiaries include more than 200,000 students in Indiana alone, who will be taking out their student loans this year. It will help young people like John Houston, a Ball State University student and intern in my office this summer, who will be taking out student loans as he heads back to school this fall. Getting Congress out of the business of randomly setting interest rates is a good deal—both for students like John and taxpayers.

The bill will allow students to benefit from lower interest rates and prevent taxpayers from being forced to subsidize arbitrary rates set by politicians for political reasons rather than for policy purposes. Maybe most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this legislation shows that, even in a challenging partisan environment, Congress can come together and work on behalf of the American people to make their lives a little easier. I hope this agreement builds momentum for reaching bipartisan solutions to other problems that our Nation faces.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I'm just delighted to be able to say that the leadership of the Senate realized that the Republican bill would have overwhelmed our young people.

I was just talking to someone just a few minutes ago, and they were saying we need to have a commitment that every person that graduates from college has a job. We should also have a commitment that every young person that wants to go to school and get a higher education should not be burdened with hundreds of thousands of dollars of debt.

For over 2 years, our good friend, Mr. COURTNEY from Connecticut, Demo-

crats, the Education Committee, and Mr. MILLER have been begging on behalf of the American children to not cause them to pay this enormous amount but to hold the interest rates for middle class families and working families at 3.4 percent. And we struggled. There were many discussions in the United States Senate. And the reason why they continue to struggle is because they wanted to make sure that the victory came out for those young people of working parents and middle class parents. That's why we're here today—because they held out and we held out. Now we're glad to be in a bipartisan mode. But it's important to note that this was a struggle.

If we pass this bill and get it on the President's desk, the 3.6 percent or so will be held. As we go forward over the years, we'll have a measured increase. Not a high increase to market rates or rates higher than that, but a measured increase of 3, 4, or 6 percent. And then some 5 years out, when it reaches about 7 percent, we'll have the ability as a Congress to come back and look. Because we should not burden our students to the point where they cannot get an education.

We all are created equal. Maybe education is not written in the Constitution, but certainly the opportunity for the pursuit of happiness. Therefore, the opportunity for education must be protected.

This is a crucial difference between the bipartisan Senate bill of \$11,000. The current law right now is \$14,000. And what the House Republican bill passed was almost \$17,000.

Mr. Speaker, this is a relief. This is to be applauded. And I'm delighted that we have finally come to our senses.

Today the House of Representatives will have a second chance to get Student Loans right. This is an opportunity to relieve the fears and anxiety of families of college bound students across the nation by passing H.R. 1911—the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013. By passing this legislation the Congress can take a concrete step toward restoring the economic security, educational opportunities, and peace of mind of America's students.

The goal of our nation should be to educate our youth to reach their greatest potential in life. A good education should be accessible and affordable to all of your young people.

For too long, millions of America's best and brightest have been waiting for Congress to find a responsible solution to rising student loan interest rates. While House Republicans have insisted on saddling students with even more debt, the bipartisan legislation we passed today seeks to ease that burden.

This bipartisan compromise offers hard-working students and families critical protections, reduces rates on all new loans this year, and saves undergraduates \$1,500 on average over the life of their loans.

The plan caps market-based interest rates, ensuring students won't bear the brunt of sky-

rocketing rates in the future. While the House Republican bill considered earlier this year only offered uncertainty, insecurity, and more debt for our students, the Senate compromise that we are considering today will restore a sense of security for nearly 11 million Americans who are seeking a better life through higher education.

The passage of the College Cost Reduction and Access Act of 2007, Congress made historic investments in student aid. The law did what Congress should always do when considering the needs of students seeking education to improve their chances of success. This bill halved interest rates on need-based federal student loans to 3.4 percent—making these loans more affordable for low- and middle-income students. If Congress doesn't act before July, the rate will jump back up to 6.8 percent, making it much more difficult for many American students and their families to afford a college education.

I represent colleges and universities in my District who serve the higher education needs of tens of thousands of Houstonians and others who come to our city for its education opportunities.

A college education should not be only for the lucky few, but should be available to all of those with skill and determination. Given the opportunity, millions of young and older Americans would access higher education to provide their families with a more certain financial future, while also strengthening our nation's economic and national defense human capital. A college degree is also becoming essential to a growing number of jobs in the 21st century economy.

STEM EDUCATION STATISTICS

STEM workers earn 26 percent more than non-STEM graduates.

By 2018 we will need: 710,000 Computing workers, 160,000 Engineers, 70,000 Physical Scientists, 40,000 Life Science workers, and 20,000 Mathematics workers.

STEM Computing Jobs are critical to America's future: Software engineers, Computer networking workers, Systems analysis, and Computer researcher or support workers.

College student STEM retention according to the President's report is improved when students have the proper peer and instructor support system, which is what Superintendent Dr. Soner Tarim has done at each of the area's 17 Harmony Schools.

By providing access to an affordable education we are eliminating the shortage in two ways by: (1) creating opportunities for Americans to prepare for STEM careers, and (2) by welcoming those from other countries who choose to study and remain in the United States to work.

According to the Association for Computing Machinery K-12 computer science education as a component of STEM education would help students have a deeper understanding of the fundamentals of computing, which is a critical foundational knowledge for a wide range of education needs for other STEM education programs and future jobs.

We know that fewer than 40 percent of new college students enter College intending to get a STEM related degree. This is not good enough for America—we need to do much better.

By making college more affordable and accessible we could increase the retention of the STEM degree majors from 40 percent to 50 percent, if we reach this goal the nation can meet three fourths of the 1 million STEM workers we will need.

Minority college students who major in STEM higher education make 25 percent more than minority graduates with non-STEM educations. Minority students who take STEM

jobs make 50 percent more than minority non-STEM graduates.

Students and families cannot wait any longer to know how much they will owe on their student loans in the coming academic year. Making college more affordable is critical to sustaining America's economic competitiveness. Business leaders know it is vital for the workforce of tomorrow to get an education beyond high school. If more of today's students cannot afford college, busi-

nesses will not have the workers with the education and training they need to keep our economy competitive and dynamic far into the future.

I urge my colleagues in joining me in support of this Student Loan legislation.

PROJECTED INTEREST RATES UNDER SENATE BIPARTISAN AGREEMENT

Below are the projected interest rates under the bipartisan Senate agreement for 2013–2023:

Year	Undergraduate students (subsidized and unsubsidized Stafford loans)	Graduate students	Parent loans for undergraduate students (PLUS)
2013	3.86	5.41	6.41
2014	4.62	6.17	7.17
2015	5.4	6.95	7.95
2016	6.29	7.84	8.84
2017	7	8.55	9.55
2018	7.25	8.8	9.8
2019	7.25	8.8	9.8
2020	7.25	8.8	9.8
2021	7.25	8.8	9.8
2022	7.25	8.8	9.8
2023	7.25	8.8	9.8
Caps	8.25%	9.50%	10.50%

Note: Rates fixed through repayment once borrowed. Rates are based on CBO projections of 10-year Treasury rates.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I'm prepared to close.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I have no further speakers.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank the chair of the committee for bringing this bill to the floor as soon as it was possible to do, but certainly before we break for August.

This legislation, as I said earlier, is a vast improvement over what we voted on before and what was presented to this House. I think families all across the country with students heading off to college or returning to college this fall will be happy to know that as they take out a student loan this year, they will save over the next 5 years some \$25 billion because those loans that they take out will have that interest rate guaranteed at that rate today and for the life of that loan.

□ 1645

Big distinction between this bill and the bill that was presented for the House to vote on, which many of us rejected but the Republicans supported and was passed to the Senate. Over the next 10 years, it provides about \$4 billion in additional relief.

What's important to know is that this will deal with making college more affordable. But, clearly, what is on the agenda of the Education and Workforce Committee is making sure that we're dealing with the cost of college so that we can reduce the student debt in this country, we can reduce the affordability of college in this country.

We expect that as we struggle to try to figure out how to provide this loan money on behalf of the taxpayers to these students who are the future of our economy, the future of our society, that the institutions will struggle with seeing what they can do to lower the cost of these colleges.

This is a very exciting time in post-secondary education because we have opportunities now with technologies and the ability to present classes in new formats, in new forums for students much differently than in the past. We've got to make sure that we're providing that quality education, but perhaps in a way that's more cost efficient. And efficiency isn't the enemy of intellectual curiosity or intellectual achievement or scholastic achievement, but it may be helpful to those families who are struggling with a debt to provide one, two, or three children a college education, or for those students who graduated who are struggling with that debt as they enter the job market.

So we really want to say that we've done the best we can under these circumstances with this legislation, but we expect the institutions of higher education all across this country to re-examine how they're doing their business and what they can do to reduce the cost of college. And we'll continue to do our part, trying to make it more affordable for the American family.

But in the past, we've seen where we put money in at the top and the States took the money out at the bottom. We're not going to play that game anymore, and we can't play that game anymore. That has ended up with a lot of increased debt on the part of students. Certainly with respect to the public institutions, the States have to step up and share the responsibility for their public institutions. We cannot have this situation where they continue to decline their support and then foster that off on parents and students, and then the parents and students need help from the Federal Government. That chain has got to stop here.

But I think today, this is a big and important step in terms of the afford-

ability of college for students. And all of the indicators are that that college degree is well worth it over the lifetime of work of students, over the types of jobs that they will get, the types of wages that they will receive. It's still a huge benefit. There has been a lot of discussion over the last few months that maybe college isn't worth it anymore. It is, but we have to do it right. And young people have to be able to obtain that college education, and they have to do it with the least amount of debt possible.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It's always interesting to listen to the debate here on the floor. No matter how hard we try to use the word "bipartisan," we get into these partisan squabbles: the Republican bill was bad and this bill is good, and that bill is—look, we needed to change the status quo, and that's always hard to do.

We had some pretty simple goals here that we were trying to reach. We wanted to get out of the partisan political squabble that was occurring in this city every year as we tried to figure out, through some alchemy, what the student loan interest rate ought to be. The answer has been in front of us for a long time: the market is the best determiner of that.

So we wanted to put together legislation that would get us out of this political squabble, let the market do this in a way that was fair to students and fair to taxpayers. Let the market do it based on the 10-year Treasury, which is the best indicator of what it costs the Federal Government to borrow money; do it so that it was as close to budget neutral as we could get it.

The President of the United States had a proposal that did those things.

At the end of 10 years, I think the President's budget saved the taxpayer about \$3 billion. The House bill that we've been discussing saved the taxpayers about \$3.5 billion. And this bipartisan Senate bill, just under \$1 billion saved. That's budget neutral in this city, in a 10-year window, from the Congressional Budget Office. We're trying to get that.

It was a bizarre circumstance, Mr. Speaker, that I and House Republicans were working with the White House and the Department of Education trying to convince our Senate colleagues, Senate Democratic leadership that the answer was there in front of them, all they had to do was pick it up and pass it. We can get it done in this House. We can answer the questions of parents and students and put some certainty in this. I am very, very pleased that the Senate was able to put together that bipartisan—

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLINE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I didn't mean to interrupt. I thought you were going to yield back your time. I just wanted to ask you for 30 seconds. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have these differences at the Member level and the institutional level.

I just forgot, before I sat down, to thank the staffs of both sides of our committee for their professional work. Because whatever's going on on the surface here and surface warfare, we know that, underneath, the staff is trying to make it work out whatever direction we decide to move in. So I just want to thank so much the staff both of the majority and minority side for their help.

Mr. KLINE. I thank the gentleman.

Reclaiming my time, I will pick up on that note because we could not have done this without the hard work of some really instrumental people.

Certainly, I'd like to take a moment to recognize and thank the committee staff, as my colleague has done, for their hard work on this important issue, both sides of the aisle.

First, I would like to thank the majority staff director, Julianne Sullivan; our education policy director, James Bergeron; and professional staff member Brian Melnyk; and of course Amy Jones, sitting next to me here today, who started working to solve this problem more than a year ago. That's the frustrating thing here, Mr. Speaker. This problem didn't arise in April or May. We've known for more than a year, with certainty, that we had to address this issue. So I thank Amy for her passion in all higher education work. I know she's just resting up so that we can start into reauthorization of the Higher Education Act as we go forward.

Certainly I'd like to thank VIRGINIA FOXX, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, who helped craft the Smarter Solutions for Students Act. Again, I would remind my colleagues, this was a bipartisan bill. It came out of the committee bipartisan, came off the floor with a bipartisan vote, and Ms. FOXX deserves a lot of credit for her hard work.

In closing, I remind my colleagues, the legislation before us today is a victory for students, families, and taxpayers. It deserves our robust support.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I will vote for H.R. 1911, the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013. Due to congressional inaction student loan rates doubled to 6.8% on July 1st. This is not the bill I would've written but it was necessary to come to an agreement so that today's students don't see their interest rates double. It would have been my preference to pass the legislation introduced by Senator ELIZABETH WARREN that gives students the same low interest rates that the Federal Reserve grants Wall Street banks.

With passage of H.R. 1911, this year's students will only pay a 3.8% interest rate when they go back to school in the fall. This rate will be locked in for the entire life of their loan. Although the interest rates will likely increase for future students under this bill, they should remain below the current 6.8% for the next few years. This is a short term solution to the long term problem of rising college costs and increasing student debt. I stand ready to work with my colleagues to address the issue of college affordability including student loan interest rates in the upcoming reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as you may know, on July 1st the rate for subsidized Stafford student loans doubled from 3.4% to 6.8%. Today, students already face over \$1 trillion in student loan debt nationally and any effort to further indebted working students and families would be disgraceful. This Congress needs to act in a responsible fashion in order to help alleviate the cost prohibitive status of higher education in this country. Today, I am pleased to say that this Congress has acted to help students and families by putting forward H.R. 1911, the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013, legislation that I am proud to support.

Unlike the proposals floated earlier this Congress by the House majority, this bill offers students and families a reasonable way to finance higher education. As opposed to rates that fluctuate throughout the life of the loan, H.R. 1911 allows for a variable rate for new borrowers that adjusts yearly but is fixed for the life of the loan once borrowed. Further, the bill offers lower interest rates for undergraduate borrowers of subsidized and unsubsidized Stafford loans by pairing them to the 10 yr Treasury (T) bill + 2.05% as opposed to the 10 yr T bill + 2.5% in the original House majority proposal. Lastly, the bill offers interest rate caps for borrowers to ensure that interest

rates do not soar to undesirable levels in the years to come.

If this bill is signed into law, rates on new subsidized Stafford and PLUS loans will go down this year. Undergraduates would borrow at 3.86%, a cut from 6.8%, graduate students would borrow Stafford loans at 5.4%, a cut from 6.8% and parents and graduates borrowing PLUS loans would borrow at 6.4%, a cut from 7.9%. For a freshman undergraduate beginning school this year and taking out the maximum amount of loans, he/she will save \$3,300 in interest payments over their college career as compared to current law and undergraduate students would save \$25 billion in debt relief, according to CBO projections, over the next five years as compared to current law. While this bill represents a significant improvement for students, I do have reservations that the undergraduate interest rate cap, currently set at 8.25%, is too high. While it is widely believed that students will enjoy low rates in the short-term, there is a strong possibility that rates will skyrocket as our national economy improves. I believe that, for undergraduates, a lower cap should be considered and I would welcome its continued review by this Congress in the years to come.

Overall, Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill that will give students and families alike significant financial relief and stability in the years to come.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1911, the Smarter Solutions for Students Act.

This bill returns federal student loans to a system of market-based variable rates, an imprudent policy that seeks profits for deficit reduction at the expense of students struggling with the substantial and climbing cost of post-secondary education.

While the bill may appear to reverse the interest rate hike that occurred on July 1, setting rates at 3.8 percent for this year and 4.6 percent for next year for undergraduate Stafford student loan borrowers, it is essentially a bait and switch that will pile extra debt onto students when the current record-low rates inevitably rise.

This is unacceptable. Student loan debt is a major drag on the American economy, reaching \$1 trillion and climbing, and recently surpassing credit card debt as the largest form of consumer debt. Approximately 60 percent of students take out loans to attend college, and increasing the costs of borrowing will prevent millions from being able to pursue higher education.

While the interest rate caps are a step in the right direction, they are too high to meaningfully protect students when the temporarily low rates give way to rates that are even higher than the 6.8 percent rate this bill attempts to fix.

College educated students are the future engine of our country, and anyone who wants to pursue a post-secondary education should have the opportunity to do so without going into crushing debt. I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation and instead, extend the current interest rate of 3.4 percent until Congress enacts a true long-term solution to the cost of college that is worthy of our Nation's young people.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to the Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1911—the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013.

This bill will peg student loan interest rates to the 10-year Treasury note allowing the rate to fluctuate with financial markets.

Specifically, the bill would peg the permanent student loan interest rate to the 10-year Treasury note plus 2.05% for undergraduate subsidized and unsubsidized Stafford loans; the 10-year Treasury note plus 3.6% for subsidized and unsubsidized Stafford loans; and the 10-year Treasury note plus 4.6% for Parent Plus and Graduate Plus loans.

One positive thing that this bill does do is that it caps student loan interest rates at 8.25% for undergraduates, 9.5% for graduate students, and 10.5% for Parents Plus and Graduate Plus loans.

I am disappointed with this bill because it fails to permanently keep student loan interest rates at their current fixed rate, and in doing so increases the cost to borrowers over the next 10 years by an estimated \$715 million.

Despite the public outcry over student loan debt, now totaling over \$1 trillion, Congress has chosen to make an estimated \$715 million profit off of student loans.

This is shameful! We should not be making a profit off the backs of students. Students are our future. An educated populous is what America needs to remain competitive in the 21st century. Balancing the budget on the backs of students is wrong, unfair and shameful!

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 1911, the Senate bill called the “Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act”. While some argue the bill is better than the bill the House passed earlier this year, this bill fails to guarantee that students can have affordable loans to go to college. It fails to take interest rates on college loans as low as we could or should, and it allows the rates to grow to truly unacceptable levels.

Wall Street, whose reckless policies caused the greatest fiscal crisis since the Depression, is able to borrow money at 0.75 percent interest, yet under this bill, students will have to pay far more than that to borrow for their studies. Proponents of this bill claim that they are lowering interest rates for students, although they do not lower them as low as the rate we set several years ago and that was in effect until last month. Worse, the bill allows rates to go far higher than the already very high rates that began in July. Why? Why should students pay interest eight, nine, ten times higher than the rate that Wall Street pays. This bill will have some students paying interest rates as high as ten and a quarter percent. Ten and a quarter percent! Maybe not this year, but in future years. Ten and a quarter percent!

This is a very serious issue for our overall economic health. Student loan debt now stands at over \$1 trillion. It is the second highest debt in the nation, only mortgage debt is higher. Furthermore, to help our economy grow we should be encouraging motivated, prepared students to go to college, not making it more expensive and inaccessible for them. The New York Federal Reserve has noted that the tremendous burden of student debt is slowing the economy. People strapped with

debt cannot buy a house, they cannot spend money to improve our economy, and they cannot make strides to further improve their quality of life.

The authors of the legislation passed earlier this year and of this bill are stuck on the idea of trying to balance the budget on the backs of students and recent students. Why should they have to pay to restore the economy? They are not in a good financial position to pay for the misdeeds of Wall Street. Why shouldn't those made wealthy by Wall Street's misdeeds pay; they can afford it. In the past year, the federal government has already made more than \$50 billion in profit off student loan interest. Why should we continue to squeeze more revenue for the government out of students and former students?

Senator ELIZABETH WARREN has it right. Her plan would allow students to borrow at the same rate Wall Street does, the discount rate, the low rate that banks pay. Why should Wall Street get to borrow money at the lowest interest rate while college students pay more? They shouldn't. We will saddle with heavy debt the very people we want to go out and build businesses and raise families and work toward the American Dream.

This debate comes down to an important question of domestic policy and priorities. How important is it to us as a country to make college accessible for students so they can improve their lives and improve our country? We do it by making college more affordable—through increasing Pell grants, by allowing students to borrow money at the same rates that Wall Street banks pay. We do it by not taking money from students to pay for the mess that Wall Street caused in the first place.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, student loan debt in our country tops \$1 trillion, burdening graduates with high repayment as they begin their working lives and preventing them from making other purchases, like a home or a car. This is a problem that requires a comprehensive solution that includes affordable financial assistance and collaboration with states and colleges to keep costs down.

Today's bill, while imperfect, will prevent rates from doubling immediately on loans for the neediest students. It locks in rates for each new loan, providing more certainty than the House Republican proposal, which I opposed when it passed the House earlier this year. It includes a cap, preventing rates from skyrocketing in the future. I remain concerned, however, about increasing rates for students in the long-term, and would urge future action on this issue as rates rise.

Ultimately, we must look at the alternatives available today. Had I been in the Senate, I would have voted against this bill in an effort to get a better long-term deal for students. However, now that it has passed the Senate and is before us on the House Floor with no opportunity for amendment, we are faced with a choice between keeping the doubled student loan rate or reducing it for this year's students. Therefore, I will vote for this bill today, but will seek to amend this law in the coming years should rates rise and further burden our nation's students.

Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act will provide a good opportunity to revisit this issue and address college costs in a more

comprehensive way, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on that effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1911.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

NUCLEAR IRAN PREVENTION ACT OF 2013

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 850) to impose additional human rights and economic and financial sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 850

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings and statement of policy.

TITLE I—HUMAN RIGHTS AND TERRORISM SANCTIONS

- Sec. 101. Mandatory sanctions with respect to financial institutions that engage in certain transactions on behalf of persons involved in human rights abuses or that export sensitive technology to Iran.
- Sec. 102. Prevention of diversion of certain goods, services and technologies to Iran.
- Sec. 103. Designation of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps as foreign terrorist organization.
- Sec. 104. Imposition of sanctions on certain persons responsible for or complicit in human rights abuses, engaging in censorship, or engaging in the diversion of goods intended for the people of Iran.
- Sec. 105. Sense of Congress on elections in Iran.
- Sec. 106. Sense of Congress on designation of a Special Coordinator for advancing human rights and political participation for women in Iran.

TITLE II—ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL SANCTIONS

Subtitle A—Amendments to Iran Sanctions Act of 1996

- Sec. 201. Transfer to Iran of goods, services, or technology that would materially contribute to Iran's ability to mine or mill uranium.

Sec. 202. Repeal of waiver of sanctions relating to development of weapons of mass destruction or other military capabilities.

Subtitle B—Amendments to Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 and Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012

Sec. 211. Modifications to prohibition on procurement contracts with persons that export sensitive technology to Iran.

Sec. 212. Authority of State and local governments to avoid exposure to sanctioned persons and sectors.

Sec. 213. Sense of Congress regarding the European Central Bank.

Sec. 214. Imposition of sanctions with respect to certain transactions in foreign currencies.

Sec. 215. Sanctions with respect to certain transactions with Iran.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

Sec. 221. Imposition of sanctions with respect to the Central Bank of Iran and other Iranian financial institutions.

Sec. 222. Imposition of sanctions with respect to ports, special economic zones, free economic zones, and strategic sectors of Iran.

Sec. 223. Report on determinations not to impose sanctions on persons who allegedly sell, supply, or transfer precious metals to or from Iran.

Sec. 224. Imposition of sanctions with respect to foreign financial institutions that facilitate financial transactions on behalf of persons owned or controlled by specially designated nationals.

Sec. 225. Repeal of exemptions under sanctions provisions of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

Sec. 226. Termination of government contracts with persons who sell goods, services, or technology to, or conduct any other transaction with, Iran.

Sec. 227. Conditions for entry and operation of vessels.

TITLE III—ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES TO PREVENT CENSORSHIP ACTIVITIES IN IRAN

Sec. 301. Report on implementation of sanctions against the Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting.

Sec. 302. List of persons who are high-risk re-exporters of sensitive technologies.

Sec. 303. Sense of Congress on provision of intercept technologies to Iran.

Sec. 304. Sense of Congress on availability of consumer communication technologies in Iran.

Sec. 305. Expedited consideration of requests for authorization of transfer of goods and services to Iran to facilitate the ability of Iranian persons to freely communicate.

TITLE IV—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 401. National Strategy on Iran.

Sec. 402. Report on Iranian nuclear and economic capabilities.

Sec. 403. Report on plausibility of expanding sanctions on Iranian oil.

Sec. 404. GAO report on Iranian strategy to evade current sanctions and other matters.

Sec. 405. Authority to consolidate reports required under Iran sanctions laws.

Sec. 406. Amendments to definitions under Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 and Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012.

Sec. 407. Rule of construction.

Sec. 408. Implementation; penalties.

Sec. 409. Severability.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) Iran's acquisition of a nuclear weapons capability would—

(A) embolden its already aggressive foreign policy, including its arming of terrorist organizations and other groups, its efforts to destabilize countries in the Middle East, and its efforts to target the United States, United States allies, and United States interests globally;

(B) increase the risk that Iran would share its nuclear technology and expertise with extremist groups and rogue nations;

(C) destabilize global energy markets, posing a direct and devastating threat to the American and global economy; and

(D) likely lead other governments in the region to pursue their own nuclear weapons programs, increasing the prospect of nuclear proliferation throughout the region and effectively ending the viability of the global nonproliferation regime, including the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Washington, London, and Moscow July 1, 1968, and entered into force on March 5, 1970.

(2) A nuclear arms-capable Iran possessing intercontinental ballistic missiles, a development most experts expect could occur within a decade, would pose a direct nuclear threat to the United States.

(b) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It shall be the policy of the United States to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability.

TITLE I—HUMAN RIGHTS AND TERRORISM SANCTIONS

SEC. 101. MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS ON BEHALF OF PERSONS INVOLVED IN HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES OR THAT EXPORT SENSITIVE TECHNOLOGY TO IRAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 104(c)(2) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) facilitates a significant transaction or transactions or provides significant financial services for—

“(i) a person that is subject to sanctions under section 105(c), 105A(c), 105B(c), or 105C(a); or

“(ii) a person that exports sensitive technology to Iran and is subject to the prohibition on procurement contracts as described in section 106.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to any activity described in subparagraph (F) of section 104(c)(2) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (as added by subsection (a)(3) of this section) initiated on or

after the date that is 90 days after such date of enactment.

(c) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations to carry out the amendments made by subsection (a).

SEC. 102. PREVENTION OF DIVERSION OF CERTAIN GOODS, SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGIES TO IRAN.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 301(1) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8541(1)) is amended by striking “knows or has reason to know” and inserting “knows, has reason to know, or should have known”.

(b) **IDENTIFICATION OF COUNTRIES OF CONCERN WITH RESPECT TO THE DIVERSION OF CERTAIN GOODS, SERVICES, AND TECHNOLOGIES TO OR THROUGH IRAN.**—Section 302(b) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8542(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) that are—

“(A) items described in the Nuclear Suppliers Group Guidelines for the Export of Nuclear Material, Equipment and Technology (published by the International Atomic Energy Agency as Information Circular INFCIRC/254/Rev. 3/Part 1, and subsequent revisions) and Guidelines for Transfers of Nuclear-Related Dual-Use Equipment, Material, and Related Technology (published by the International Atomic Energy Agency as Information Circular INFCIRC/254/Rev. 3/Part 2, and subsequent revisions);

“(B) items on the Missile Technology Control Regime Equipment and Technology Annex of June 11, 1996, and subsequent revisions;

“(C) items and substances relating to biological and chemical weapons the export of which is controlled by the Australia Group;

“(D) items on the Schedule One or Schedule Two list of toxic chemicals and precursors the export of which is controlled pursuant to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction; or

“(E) items on the Wassenaar Arrangement list of Dual Use Goods and Technologies and Munitions list of July 12, 1996, and subsequent revisions.”.

(c) **DESTINATIONS OF DIVERSION CONCERN.**—Section 303(c) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8543(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Not later than” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) **ADDITIONAL MEASURES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in this section, the President may impose restrictions on United States foreign assistance or measures authorized under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act with respect to a country designated as a country of diversion concern if the President determines such restrictions or measures would prevent the transfer of United States-origin goods, services, and technology to Iran.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—The authority to impose sanctions under subparagraph (A) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions relating to the importation of goods.

“(C) GOOD DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘good’ has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to countries identified in any update to the report that is required under section 302(c) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 and submitted to Congress on or after such date of enactment.

SEC. 103. DESIGNATION OF IRAN'S REVOLUTIONARY GUARD CORPS AS FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title III of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8741 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 304 as section 305; and

(2) by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

“SEC. 304. DESIGNATION OF IRAN'S REVOLUTIONARY GUARD CORPS AS FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of State shall determine if Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps meets the criteria for designation as a foreign terrorist organization as set forth in section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

“(b) AFFIRMATIVE DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary of State determines under subsection (a) that Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps meets the criteria set forth under such section 219, the Secretary shall designate Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps as a foreign terrorist organization under such section 219.

“(c) NEGATIVE DETERMINATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary of State determines under subsection (a) that Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps does not meet the criteria set forth under such section 219, the Secretary shall submit to the committees of Congress specified in subsection (e) a report that contains a detailed justification as to which criteria have not been met.

“(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex, if necessary.

“(d) APPLICABILITY OF SANCTIONS TO QUDS FORCE.—The sanctions applied to any entity designated as a foreign terrorist organization as set forth in such section 219 shall be applied to the Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps Quds Force.

“(e) COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS SPECIFIED.—The committees of Congress specified in this subsection are the following:

“(1) The Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

“(2) The Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 is amended by striking the item relating to section 304 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 304. Designation of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps as foreign terrorist organization.

“Sec. 305. Rule of construction.”

SEC. 104. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS ON CERTAIN PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR OR COMPLICIT IN HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES, ENGAGING IN CENSORSHIP, OR ENGAGING IN THE DIVERSION OF GOODS INTENDED FOR THE PEOPLE OF IRAN.

(a) FINDING AND SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Section 401(a) of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-158; 126 Stat. 1251) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) FINDING AND SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

“(1) FINDING.—Congress finds that Iranian persons holding the following positions in the Government of Iran are ultimately responsible for and have and continue to knowingly order, control, direct and implement gross violations of the human rights of the Iranian people, the human rights of persons in other countries, censorship, and the diversion of food, medicine, medical devices, agricultural commodities and other goods intended for the Iranian people:

“(A) The Supreme Leader of Iran.

“(B) The President of Iran.

“(C) Members of the Council of Guardians.

“(D) Members of the Expediency Council.

“(E) The Minister of Intelligence and Security.

“(F) The Commander of the Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps.

“(G) The Commander of the Basij-e-Mostaz'afin.

“(H) The Commander of Ansar-e-Hezbollah.

“(I) The Commander of the Quds Force.

“(J) The Commander in Chief of the Police Force.

“(K) Senior officials or key employees of an organization described in any of subparagraphs (C) through (J) or in the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran, the Islamic Consultative Assembly of Iran, the Council of Ministers of Iran, the Assembly of Experts of Iran, the Ministry of Defense and Armed Forces Logistics of Iran, the Ministry of Justice of Iran, the Ministry of Interior of Iran, the prison system of Iran, or the judicial system of Iran.

“(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

“(A) the President should include any Iranian person holding a position in the Government of Iran described in paragraph (1) on one or more of the lists of persons subject to sanctions pursuant to section 105(b), 105A(b), 105B(b), or 105C(b) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8514(b), 8514a(b), 8514b(b), or 8514c(b)); and

“(B) the President should impose sanctions on such Iranian person pursuant to section 105, 105A, 105B, or 105C of such Act (as the case may be).”

(b) ADDITIONAL FINDING AND SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Section 401 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-158; 126 Stat. 1251) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) ADDITIONAL FINDING AND SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

“(1) FINDING.—Congress finds that other senior officials of the Government of Iran, its agencies and instrumentalities, also have and continue to knowingly order, control, direct, and implement gross violations of the human rights of the Iranian people and the human rights of persons in other countries.

“(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

“(A) the President should investigate violations of human rights described in paragraph (1) to identify other senior officials of the Government of Iran that also have or continue to knowingly order, control, direct, and implement gross violations of human rights of the Iranian people and the human rights of persons in other countries;

“(B) the President should include any such official on one or more of the lists of persons subject to sanctions pursuant to section 105(b), 105A(b), 105B(b), or 105C(b) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8514(b), 8514a(b), 8514b(b), or 8514c(b)); and

“(C) the President should impose sanctions on any such official pursuant to section 105, 105A, 105B, or 105C of such Act (as the case may be).”

(c) REPORT.—Section 401(c)(1) of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-158; 126 Stat. 1251) (as redesignated by subsection (b) of this section) is amended—

(1) by striking “Not later than” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than”;

(2) by striking “this Act” and inserting “the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, and annually thereafter for 3 years”;

(3) by striking “otherwise directing the commission of” and inserting “otherwise directing—

“(i) the commission of”;

(4) by striking “Iran.” and inserting “Iran;”

“(ii) censorship or related activities with respect to Iran; or

“(iii) the diversion of goods, food, medicine, medical devices, and agricultural commodities, intended for the people of Iran.”;

(5) by striking “For any such person” and inserting the following:

“(B) REQUIREMENT RELATING TO PERSONS NOT INCLUDED.—For any such person”;

(6) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) REQUIREMENT RELATING TO FINANCIAL NET WORTH.—For each such person described in subparagraph (A) and each such person described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary of State shall include in the report a description of the estimated net worth of the person.”

(d) ADDITIONAL REPORT.—Section 401 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-158; 126 Stat. 1251), as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) ADDITIONAL REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, and annually thereafter for 3 years, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report with respect to whether each person described in subsection (a) or any family member of such person has facilitated deceptive transactions for or on behalf of any person subject to United States sanctions concerning Iran in violation of Executive Order 13608 of May 1, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 26409; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) or any other provision of law.

“(2) FAMILY MEMBER DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘family member’ includes, with respect to a person, any relative of such person to the third degree of consanguinity.”

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading for section 401 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-158; 126 Stat. 1251) is amended by striking “COMMITTED AGAINST” and all

that follows and inserting “, **ENGAGING IN CENSORSHIP, OR ENGAGING IN THE DIVERSION OF GOODS INTENDED FOR THE PEOPLE OF IRAN.**”.

(f) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 is amended by striking the item relating to section 401 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 401. Imposition of sanctions on certain persons responsible for or complicit in human rights abuses, engaging in censorship, or engaging in the diversion of goods intended for the people of Iran.”.

SEC. 105. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ELECTIONS IN IRAN.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Iranian people are systematically denied free, fair, and credible elections by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

(2) The unelected and unaccountable Guardian Council disqualifies hundreds of qualified candidates, including women and most religious minorities, while the regime intimidates others into staying out of elections completely.

(3) Voting inconsistencies, including an absence of international observers, and fraud are commonplace.

(4) The 2009 presidential elections proved that the regime will engage in large scale vote-rigging to ensure a specific result.

(5) The Iranian regime combines electoral manipulation with the ruthless suppression of dissent. Following the 2009 elections, peaceful demonstrators were met with violence by the regime's security apparatus, including arbitrary detentions, beatings, kidnappings, rapes, and murders.

(6) The electoral manipulation and human rights violations are in violation of the Government of Iran's agreed to obligations under the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Iranian people are deprived by their government of free, fair, and credible elections;

(2) the United States should support freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and the rule of law in Iran, and elections that are free and fair, meet international standards, and allow independent international and domestic electoral observers unrestricted access to polling and counting stations; and

(3) the United States should support the people of Iran in their peaceful calls for a representative and responsive democratic government that respects human rights, civil liberties, and the rule of law.

SEC. 106. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DESIGNATION OF A SPECIAL COORDINATOR FOR ADVANCING HUMAN RIGHTS AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION FOR WOMEN IN IRAN.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should designate a Special Coordinator position in the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs whose primary function is to facilitate cooperation across departments for the purpose of advancing human rights and political participation for women in Iran, as well as to prepare evidence and information to be used in identifying Iranian officials for designation as human rights violators for their involvement in violating the human rights of women in Iran.

TITLE II—ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL SANCTIONS

Subtitle A—Amendments to Iran Sanctions Act of 1996

SEC. 201. TRANSFER TO IRAN OF GOODS, SERVICES, OR TECHNOLOGY THAT WOULD MATERIALLY CONTRIBUTE TO IRAN'S ABILITY TO MINE OR MILL URANIUM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **TRANSFER TO IRAN OF GOODS, SERVICES, OR TECHNOLOGY THAT CAN BE USED FOR MINING OR MILLING OF URANIUM.**—Except as provided in subsection (f), the President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 6(a) with respect to a person if the President determines that the person knowingly transferred, on or after the date of the enactment of the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, to Iran goods, services, or technology that would materially contribute to Iran's ability to mine or mill uranium.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 5 of such Act is amended in subsection (b)(3), (c), and (f) by striking “paragraph (1) or (2)” each place it appears and inserting “paragraph (1), (2), or (3)”.

SEC. 202. REPEAL OF WAIVER OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION OR OTHER MILITARY CAPABILITIES.

Section 9(c)(1) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B); and

(3) in subparagraph (B) (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this section)—

(A) by striking “or (B)” each place it appears; and

(B) by striking “, as applicable”.

Subtitle B—Amendments to Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 and Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012

SEC. 211. MODIFICATIONS TO PROHIBITION ON PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS THAT EXPORT SENSITIVE TECHNOLOGY TO IRAN.

(a) **APPLICATION TO OWNERS AND SUBSIDIARIES.**—Subsection (a) of section 106 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-195; 22 U.S.C. 8515) is amended—

(1) by striking “goods or services with a person” and inserting the following: “goods or services—

“(1) with a person”;

(2) in paragraph (1), as added by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by striking the period at the end and inserting and inserting “; or”;

and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) with respect to a person acting on behalf of or at the direction of, or owned or controlled by, a person described in paragraph (1) or a person who owns or controls a person described in paragraph (1).”.

(b) **SENSITIVE TECHNOLOGY DEFINED.**—Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended by striking “is to be used specifically” and inserting “has been designed or specifically modified”.

(c) **PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION AND IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS.**—Such section, as so amended, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) **PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION AND IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS.**—The

President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 6(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) with respect to—

“(1) a person if the President determines that the person knowingly exports sensitive technology to Iran; or

“(2) a person acting on behalf of or at the direction of, or owned or controlled by, a person described in paragraph (1) or a person who owns or controls a person described in paragraph (1).”.

(d) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The heading of such section is amended by inserting “**AND IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS AGAINST**” after “**WITH**”.

(e) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 is amended by striking the item relating to section 106 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 106. Prohibition on procurement contracts with and imposition of sanctions against persons that export sensitive technology to Iran.”.

(f) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to exports of sensitive technology to Iran that occur on or after such date of enactment.

SEC. 212. AUTHORITY OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO AVOID EXPOSURE TO SANCTIONED PERSONS AND SECTORS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 202 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8532) is amended by striking subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting the following:

“(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should respect the decision of any State or local government to divest from or prohibit the investment of assets of the State or local government in a person described in subsection (c) or to impose disclosure and transparency requirements on any person subject to the jurisdiction of such government, except with respect to an activity that is exempt, licensed, or otherwise authorized by a Federal department or agency.

“(b) **AUTHORITY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a State or local government may adopt and enforce measures that meet the requirements of subsection (d)—

“(1) to divest the assets of the State or local government from a person described in subsection (c);

“(2) to prohibit investment of the assets of the State or local government in any such person; or

“(3) to impose disclosure and transparency requirements on any person subject to the jurisdiction of such government, except with respect to an activity that is exempt, licensed, or otherwise authorized by a Federal department or agency.

“(c) **PERSONS DESCRIBED.**—A person described in this subsection is a person with respect to which sanctions have been, and continue to be, imposed pursuant to—

“(1) section 104(c) of this Act;

“(2) section 5 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note);

“(3) section 1245(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)); or

“(4) sections 1244, 1245, 1246 or 1247 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (22 U.S.C. 8803, 8804, 8805, or 8806).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 202 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8532) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(4), by striking “engages in investment activities in Iran described in subsection (c)” and inserting “is a person described in subsection (c)”;

(2) in subsection (f), by striking “or (i)” and inserting “or (g)”;

(3) by striking subsection (h) and by redesignating subsections (i) and (j) as subsections (h) and (i), respectively; and

(4) in paragraph (1) of subsection (i) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection), by striking “(determined without regard to subsection (c))”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply to measures adopted by State and local governments on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 213. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Government of Iran, its agencies and instrumentalities, continue to have access to, and utilize, euro-denominated transactions, including for goods and services that are subject to sanctions imposed by the United States, the European Union and its member states and by the United Nations.

(2) The Guidelines of the European Central Bank (Article 39(1)) states that: “Participants shall be deemed to be aware of, and shall comply with, all obligations on them relating to legislation on data protection, prevention of money laundering and the financing of terrorism, proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities and the development of nuclear weapons delivery systems, in particular in terms of implementing appropriate measures concerning any payments debited or credited on their PM accounts.”

(3) United States and European convergence with respect to United States sanctions efforts toward the Government of Iran is a vital component of United States policy aimed at preventing the Government of Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should continue to closely coordinate and cooperate with the European Union and its member states to restrict access to and use of the euro currency by the Government of Iran, its agencies and instrumentalities, for transactions with the exception of food, medicine, medical devices, and agricultural commodities.

SEC. 214. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS IN FOREIGN CURRENCIES.

(a) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—Subtitle B of title II of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8721 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 220 the following:

“SEC. 220A. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS IN FOREIGN CURRENCIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this section, the President—

“(1) shall prohibit the opening, and prohibit or impose strict conditions on the maintaining, in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that is a person described in subsection (c); and

“(2) may impose sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) with respect to any other person described in subsection (c).

“(b) EXCEPTION.—The authority to impose sanctions under subsection (a)(2) shall not

include the authority to impose sanctions relating to the importation of goods.

“(c) PERSON DESCRIBED.—A person described in this subsection is a person the President determines has—

“(1) knowingly conducted or facilitated a significant transaction involving the currency of a country other than the country in which the person is operating at the time of the transaction with, for, or on behalf of—

“(A) the Central Bank of Iran or another Iranian financial institution designated by the Secretary of the Treasury for the imposition of sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); or

“(B) a person described in section 1244(c)(2) of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act (22 U.S.C. 8803(c)(2)) (other than a person described in subparagraph (C)(iii) of that section); or

“(2) knowingly conducted or facilitated a significant transaction by another person involving the currency of a country other than the country in which that other person is operating at the time of the transaction, with, for, or on behalf of a person described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1).

“(d) WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive the application of subsection (a) with respect to a person for a period of not more than 180 days, and may renew that waiver for additional periods of not more than 180 days, if the President—

“(A) determines that the waiver is vital to the national security of the United States; and

“(B) not less than 7 days before the waiver or the renewal of the waiver, as the case may be, takes effect, submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the waiver and the reason for the waiver.

“(2) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1)(B) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

“(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit any person from, or authorize or require the imposition of sanctions with respect to any person for, conducting or facilitating any transaction in the currency of the country in which the person is operating at the time of the transaction for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ACCOUNT; CORRESPONDENT ACCOUNT; PAYABLE-THROUGH ACCOUNT.—The terms ‘account’, ‘correspondent account’, and ‘payable-through account’ have the meanings given those terms in section 5318A of title 31, United States Code.

“(2) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term ‘agricultural commodity’ has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

“(3) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘foreign financial institution’ has the meaning given that term in section 561.308 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

“(4) GOOD.—The term ‘good’ has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

“(5) IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘Iranian financial institution’ has the meaning given that term in section 104A(d) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513b(d)).

“(6) MEDICAL DEVICE.—The term ‘medical device’ has the meaning given the term ‘device’ in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

“(7) MEDICINE.—The term ‘medicine’ has the meaning given the term ‘drug’ in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

“(8) TRANSACTION.—The term ‘transaction’ includes a foreign exchange swap, a foreign exchange forward, and any other type of similar currency exchange or conversion or similar derivative instrument.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—Section 601(a)(1) of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8781(a)(1)) is amended by inserting “220A,” after “220.”.

(2) PENALTIES.—Section 601(b)(2)(A) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 8781(b)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “and 220,” and inserting “220, and 220A.”.

(3) TERMINATION.—Section 605(a) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 8785(a)) is amended by inserting “220A,” after “220.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 220 the following:

“Sec. 220A. Imposition of sanctions with respect to certain transactions in foreign currencies.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to transactions entered into on or after May 22, 2013.

SEC. 215. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title II of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8721 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 225. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH IRAN.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION OF SANCTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this section, the President may impose sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) on a foreign person that the President determines has, on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, knowingly conducted or facilitated a significant financial transaction with the Central Bank of Iran or other Iranian financial institution that has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury for the imposition of sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, for—

“(A) the purchase of goods or services by a person in Iran or on behalf of a person in Iran; or

“(B) the purchase of goods or services from a person in Iran or on behalf of a person in Iran.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The authority to impose sanctions under paragraph (1) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions relating to the importation of goods.

“(B) GOOD.—In this paragraph, the term ‘good’ has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

“(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the

imposition of sanctions with respect to a financial transaction for the purchase of petroleum or petroleum products from Iran under section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1648).

“(b) EXCEPTION FOR OVERALL REDUCTIONS OF EXPORTS TO AND IMPORTS FROM IRAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized not to impose sanctions under subsection (a) on a foreign person if the President determines and submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a determination of the President that the country with primary jurisdiction over the foreign person has, during the time period described in paragraph (2), significantly reduced the value and volume of imports and exports of goods (other than petroleum or petroleum products) and services between such country and Iran.

“(2) TIME PERIOD DESCRIBED.—The time period referred to in paragraph (1) is the 60-day period ending on the date on which the President makes the determination under paragraph (1) as compared to the immediately preceding 60-day period.

“(c) EXCEPTION FOR SALES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, FOOD, MEDICINE AND MEDICAL DEVICES.—The President may not impose sanctions under subsection (a) on a foreign person with respect to a transaction for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine or medical devices to Iran.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ‘foreign person’ has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

“(2) IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘Iranian financial institution’ has the meaning given that term in section 104A(d) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513b(d)).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 224 the following:

“Sec. 225. Sanctions with respect to certain transactions with Iran.”

Subtitle C—Other Matters

SEC. 221. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE CENTRAL BANK OF IRAN AND OTHER IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) EXCEPTION TO APPLICABILITY OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PETROLEUM TRANSACTIONS.—Section 1245(d)(4)(D)(i)(I) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1648; 22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)(4)(D)(i)(I)) is amended—

(1) by striking “reduced reduced” and inserting “reduced”;

(2) by inserting “value and” before “volume”;

(3) by inserting “or of Iranian origin” after “from Iran”; and

(4) by adding at the end before the semicolon the following: “, and the President certifies in writing to Congress that the President has based such determination on accurate information on that country’s total purchases of crude oil from Iran or of Iranian origin”.

(b) FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS DESCRIBED.—Section 1245(d)(4)(D)(ii)(II) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1648) is amended—

(1) by striking “(II)” and inserting “(II)(aa)”;

(2) in item (aa) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new item:

“(bb) the foreign financial institution holding the account described in item (aa) does not knowingly facilitate any significant financial transfers for, with, or on behalf of the Government of Iran, unless the transaction is excepted from sanctions under paragraph (2) or is a transaction described in subclause (I) and item (aa).”

(c) STRATEGY TO REDUCE CRUDE OIL PURCHASES FROM IRAN OR OF IRANIAN ORIGIN.—

(1) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to seek to ensure that countries that have received an exception under subparagraph (D)(i)(I) of section 1245(d)(4) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1648) shall reduce their crude oil purchases from Iran or of Iranian origin so that the aggregate amount of such purchases is reduced by not less than an average of 1,000,000 barrels of crude oil per day by the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of submission of the strategy described in subparagraph (E)(ii) of this section (as added by paragraph (2) of this subsection).

(2) AMENDMENT.—Section 1245(d)(4) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1648) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) STRATEGY TO REDUCE CRUDE OIL PURCHASES FROM IRAN OR OF IRANIAN ORIGIN.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, the President shall make a determination, based on the information contained in the most recent report required under subparagraph (A), of whether each country that received an exception under subparagraph (D)(i)(I) before such date of enactment is able to reduce its crude oil purchases from Iran or of Iranian origin so that the aggregate amount of such purchases is reduced by not less than an average of 1,000,000 barrels of crude oil per day by the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of submission of the strategy described in clause (ii). If the President makes an initial determination under this clause that the requirements of this clause cannot be met, then the President shall continue to make a determination under this clause every 90 days thereafter as to whether or not the requirements of this clause can be met.

“(ii) STRATEGY.—If the President determines that the requirements of clause (i) can be met, then not later than 60 days after the date of such affirmative determination, the President shall develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy to seek to ensure that the requirements of clause (i) are met by the end of the 1-year period beginning on such date of submission.

“(iii) FUTURE EXCEPTIONS.—

“(I) AFFIRMATIVE DETERMINATION.—If the President determines that the strategy described in clause (ii) was achieved, then each country described in clause (i) shall be eligible to receive one or more further exceptions under subparagraph (D)(i)(I) in accordance with the provisions of such subparagraph.

“(II) NEGATIVE DETERMINATION.—Except as provided in subclause (III), if the President determines that the strategy described in clause (ii) was not achieved, then each country described in clause (i) shall be ineligible to receive any further exception under subparagraph (D)(i)(I) in accordance with the provisions of such subparagraph.

“(III) EXCEPTION.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—Subclause (II) shall not apply with respect to a country described in clause (i) if the country—

“(AA) dramatically reduced its crude oil purchases from Iran or of Iranian origin during the 1-year period described in clause (ii); and

“(BB) has committed itself to continue to reduce its crude oil purchases from Iran or of Iranian origin to a de minimis level.

“(bb) DATA.—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees all data used to make a determination under item (aa) not later than 15 days before issuing an exception under item (aa).

“(iv) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(I) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

“(II) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.”

(d) DEFINITION OF CRUDE OIL.—Section 1245(d)(4)(D) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)(4)(D)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iii) CRUDE OIL.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘crude oil’ includes unfinished oils, liquefied petroleum gases, distillate fuel oil, and residual fuel oil.”

(e) WAIVER.—Section 1245(d)(5)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)(5)(A)) is amended by striking “in the national” and inserting “vital to the national”.

(f) DEFINITIONS OF “SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION”.—Section 1245(h)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(h)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking “price or volume” and inserting “price and volume”; and

(2) by adding at the end before the period the following: “and at least a pro rata amount totaling, in the aggregate, not less than an average of 1,000,000 barrels of crude oil per day by the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of submission of the strategy described in subsection (d)(4)(E)(ii)”.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section take effect beginning on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 222. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PORTS, SPECIAL ECONOMIC ZONES, FREE ECONOMIC ZONES, AND STRATEGIC SECTORS OF IRAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 1244 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (22 U.S.C. 8803) is amended by striking “and shipbuilding” and inserting “shipbuilding, automotive, construction, engineering, or mining”.

(b) DESIGNATION OF PORTS, SPECIAL ECONOMIC ZONES, FREE ECONOMIC ZONES, AND ENTITIES IN STRATEGIC SECTORS AS ENTITIES OF PROLIFERATION CONCERN.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “AND ENTITIES IN THE ENERGY, SHIPPING, AND SHIPBUILDING SECTORS” and inserting “, SPECIAL ECONOMIC ZONES, FREE ECONOMIC ZONES, AND ENTITIES IN STRATEGIC SECTORS”; and

(2) by striking “and entities in the energy, shipping, and shipbuilding sectors” and inserting “, entities that operate special economic zones or free economic zones, and entities in strategic sectors (as defined in subsection (c)(4))”.

(c) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY OF PORTS, SPECIAL ECONOMIC ZONES, FREE ECONOMIC ZONES, AND ENTITIES IN STRATEGIC SECTORS.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “ENTITIES IN ENERGY, SHIPPING, AND SHIPBUILDING SECTORS” and inserting “PORTS, SPECIAL ECONOMIC ZONES, FREE ECONOMIC ZONES, AND ENTITIES IN STRATEGIC SECTORS”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “the energy, shipping, or shipbuilding sectors” each place it appears and inserting “a strategic sector (as defined in paragraph (4)(A))”; and

(B) by inserting “, special economic zone, or free economic zone” after “port” each place it appears; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) STRATEGIC SECTOR DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘strategic sector’ means—

“(A) the energy, shipping, shipbuilding, automotive, or mining sector of Iran; and

“(B) the construction or engineering sector of Iran if the President determines and reports to Congress not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013 that the construction or engineering sector of Iran, as the case may be, is of strategic importance to Iran.

“(5) NOTIFICATION AND REPORT RELATING TO STRATEGIC SECTORS.—

“(A) NOTIFICATION.—The President shall submit to Congress a notification of the designation of a sector as a strategic sector of Iran for purposes of paragraph (4)(C) not later than 30 days after the date on which the President makes such designation.

“(B) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress a notification of the designation of a sector as a strategic sector of Iran under subparagraph (A), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report that contains—

“(i) a review and comment on such designation; and

“(ii) recommendations regarding the designation of additional sectors as strategic sectors of Iran for purposes of paragraph (4).”.

(d) ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO STRATEGIC SECTORS.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “THE ENERGY, SHIPPING, AND SHIPBUILDING SECTORS” and inserting “STRATEGIC SECTORS”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “the energy, shipping, or shipbuilding sectors” and inserting “a strategic sector (as defined in subsection (c)(4)(A))”.

(e) EXCEPTION FOR AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (f) of such section is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “for a period of not more than 1 year, and may renew that exception for additional periods of not more than 1 year” after “economic development for Afghanistan”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “to the extent that” and inserting “if”;

(B) by inserting “or the renewal of the exception, as the case may be,” after “such an exception”; and

(C) by striking “in the national interest” and inserting “in the national security interest”; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “or the renewal of the exception, as the case may be,” before “not later than 15 days”; and

(B) by inserting at the end before the period the following: “or the renewal of the exception”.

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Such section is further amended in the section heading by striking “THE ENERGY, SHIPPING, AND SHIPBUILDING SECTORS” and inserting “PORTS, SPECIAL ECONOMIC ZONES, FREE ECONOMIC ZONES, AND STRATEGIC SECTORS”.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section—

(1) take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2)(A) with respect to subsection (c) of section 1244 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, as so amended, apply with respect to all transactions in all property and interests in property of any person described in subsection (c)(2) of such section that occur on or after the date that is 180 days after such date of enactment; and

(B)(i) with respect to subsection (d)(1) of section 1244 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, apply with respect to the sale, supply, or transfer to or from Iran of goods or services described in subsection (d)(3) of such section, as so amended, that occurs on or after the date that is 180 days after such date of enactment; and

(ii) with respect to subsection (d)(2) of section 1244 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, apply with respect to the conduct or facilitation of a significant financial transaction for the sale, supply, or transfer to or from Iran of goods or services described in subsection (d)(3) of such section, as so amended, that occurs on or after the date that is 180 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 223. REPORT ON DETERMINATIONS NOT TO IMPOSE SANCTIONS ON PERSONS WHO ALLEGEDLY SELL, SUPPLY, OR TRANSFER PRECIOUS METALS TO OR FROM IRAN.

Section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (22 U.S.C. 8804) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

“(h) REPORT ON DETERMINATIONS NOT TO IMPOSE SANCTIONS ON PERSONS WHO ALLEGEDLY SELL, SUPPLY, OR TRANSFER PRECIOUS METALS TO OR FROM IRAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, and every 90 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on each determination of the President during the preceding 90-day period not to impose sanctions under subsection (a) or (c) with respect to a person who allegedly sells, supplies, or transfers precious metals, directly or indirectly, to or from Iran, together with the reasons for such determination.

“(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex, if necessary.”.

SEC. 224. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS THAT FACILITATE FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS ON BEHALF OF PERSONS OWNED OR CONTROLLED BY SPECIALLY DESIGNATED NATIONALS.

Section 1247 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (22 U.S.C. 8806) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

“(f) PERSONS OWNED OR CONTROLLED BY SPECIALLY DESIGNATED NATIONALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose sanctions described in subsection (a) with respect to a foreign financial institution, including but not limited to a foreign central bank, that the President determines has, on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, knowingly facilitated a significant financial transaction on behalf of any person determined by the President to be directly owned or controlled by an Iranian person included on the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury (other than an Iranian financial institution described in subsection (b)).

“(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President routinely should determine on or after the date of the enactment of the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013 those persons that are directly or indirectly owned or controlled by an Iranian person included on the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury (other than an Iranian financial institution described in subsection (b)).

“(3) CONSIDERATION OF DATA FROM OTHER COUNTRIES AND NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The President shall consider credible data already obtained by other countries and nongovernmental organizations in making determinations described in paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 225. REPEAL OF EXEMPTIONS UNDER SANCTIONS PROVISIONS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.

Subtitle D of title XII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (22 U.S.C. 8801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1244—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)—

(i) by striking “(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—” and all that follows through “On and after” and inserting “(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—On and after”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(B) in subsection (d)(1)—

(i) by striking “(1) SALE, SUPPLY, OR TRANSFER OF CERTAIN GOODS AND SERVICES.—” and all that follows through “Except as provided” and inserting “(1) SALE, SUPPLY, OR TRANSFER OF CERTAIN GOODS AND SERVICES.—Except as provided”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B);

(2) in section 1245(a)—

(A) by striking “(a) SALE, SUPPLY, OR TRANSFER OF CERTAIN MATERIALS.—” and all that follows through “The President” and inserting “(a) SALE, SUPPLY, OR TRANSFER OF CERTAIN MATERIALS.—The President”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively (and by redesignating all subunits therein accordingly);

(C) in paragraph (3)(B) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “subclause (I) of clause (i)” and inserting “clause (i) of subparagraph (A)”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “subclause (II) of that clause” and inserting “clause (ii) of that subparagraph”; and

(iii) in clause (iii), by striking “subclause (III) of that clause” and inserting “clause (iii) of that subparagraph”; and

(D) by striking “(2) EXCEPTION.—” and all that follows through “paragraph (1).”; and

(3) in section 1246(a)—

(A) by striking “(a) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—” and all that follows through “Except as provided” and inserting “(a) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—Except as provided”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively (and by redesignating all subunits therein accordingly); and

(C) by striking “(2) EXCEPTION.—” and all that follows through “paragraph (1).”; and

SEC. 226. TERMINATION OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS WHO SELL GOODS, SERVICES, OR TECHNOLOGY TO, OR CONDUCT ANY OTHER TRANSACTION WITH, IRAN.

(a) MODIFICATION OF FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be revised to require a certification from each person that is a prospective contractor that the person, and any person under common ownership or control with the person, does not sell goods, services, or technology to, or conduct any other transaction with, Iran for which sanctions may be imposed under this Act.

(b) REMEDIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the head of an executive agency determines that a person has submitted a false certification under subsection (a) on or after the date on which the applicable revision of the Federal Acquisition Regulation required by this section becomes effective, the head of that executive agency shall terminate a contract with such person or debar or suspend such person from eligibility for Federal contracts for a period of not less than 2 years. Any such debarment or suspension shall be subject to the procedures that apply to debarment and suspension under the Federal Acquisition Regulation under subpart 9.4 of part 9 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) INCLUSION ON LIST OF PARTIES EXCLUDED FROM FEDERAL PROCUREMENT AND NON-PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS.—The Administrator of General Services shall include on the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Nonprocurement Programs maintained by the Administrator under part 9 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation each person that is debarred, suspended, or proposed for debarment or suspension by the head of an executive agency on the basis of a determination of a false certification under paragraph (1).

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall not be construed to limit the use of other remedies available to the head of an executive agency or any other official of the Federal Government on the basis of a determination of a false certification under subsection (a).

(d) WAIVERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may on a case-by-case basis waive the requirement that a person make a certification under subsection (a) if the President determines and certifies in writing to the congressional committees described in paragraph (2) that it is essential to the national security interests of the United States to do so.

(2) CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DESCRIBED.—The congressional committees referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term “executive agency” has the meaning given that term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

(2) FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—The term “Federal Acquisition Regulation” means the regulation issued pursuant to section 1303(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code.

(f) APPLICABILITY.—The revisions to the Federal Acquisition Regulation required under subsection (a) shall apply with respect to contracts for which solicitations are issued on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 227. CONDITIONS FOR ENTRY AND OPERATION OF VESSELS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Ports and Waters Safety Act (33 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 16. PROHIBITION ON ENTRY AND OPERATION.

“(a) PROHIBITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No foreign vessel described in subsection (b) shall enter or operate in the navigable waters of the United States or transfer cargo in any port or place under the jurisdiction of the United States.

“(2) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to a vessel described in subsection (b)(2) on and after any date on which the Secretary of State determines that the vessel is no longer registered as described in that subsection. The Secretary of State shall publish a notice of each such determination in the Federal Register.

“(b) VESSELS DESCRIBED.—A vessel referred to in subsection (a) is a foreign vessel for which a Notice of Arrival is required to be filed under section 160 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, and that—

“(1) is on a list of vessels published in Federal Register under subsection (c)(2); or

“(2) more than 180 days after the publication of such a list, is registered, pursuant to the Geneva Convention on the High Seas (13 U.S.T. 2312; TIAS 5200; 450 UNTS 82), by a government the agents or instrumentalities of which are maintaining a registration of a vessel that is included in such list.

“(c) INFORMATION AND PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall—

“(1) maintain timely information on registrations of all foreign vessels over 300 gross tons that are—

“(A) owned or operated by or on behalf of—

“(i) the National Iran Tanker Company or the Islamic Republic of Iran Shipping Line; or

“(ii) any successor to an entity referred to in clause (i); or

“(B) otherwise owned or operated by or on behalf of Iran; and

“(2) publish in the Federal Register a list of vessels described in paragraph (1), including periodic updates of such list.

“(d) NOTIFICATION OF GOVERNMENTS.—The Secretary of State shall notify each government the agents or instrumentalities of which are maintaining a registration of a foreign vessel that is included on the list published under subsection (c)(2), that all vessels registered under such government’s authority are subject to the prohibition under subsection (a) if more than 180 days after such publication the government continues to maintain a registration for a vessel that is included on the list published under subsection (c)(2).

“(e) NOTIFICATION OF VESSELS.—Upon receiving a Notice of Arrival under section 160 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013) from a vessel described in (b), the Secretary shall notify the master of such vessel that the vessel may not enter or operate in the navigable waters of the United States or transfer cargo in any port or place under the jurisdiction of the United States, unless—

“(1) the Secretary has made a determination described in subsection (a)(2); or

“(2) the Secretary allows provisional entry of the vessel, or transfer of cargo from the vessel, under subsection (f).

“(f) PROVISIONAL ENTRY OR CARGO TRANSFER.—Notwithstanding subsection (e), the Secretary may allow provisional entry of, or transfer of cargo from, a foreign vessel described in subsection (b), if such entry or transfer is necessary for the safety of the vessel or persons aboard.

“(g) RIGHT OF INNOCENT PASSAGE.—This section shall not be construed as authority to restrict the right of innocent passage as recognized under international law.

“(h) FOREIGN VESSEL DEFINED.—In this section the term ‘foreign vessel’ has the meaning given that term in section 110 of title 46, United States Code.”.

(b) DEADLINE FOR PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish a list under section 16(c)(2) of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act, as amended by this section, by not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 13(e) of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act (33 U.S.C. 1232(e)) is amended by striking “section 9” and inserting “sections 9 and 16”.

(2) Section 4(b)(2) of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act (33 U.S.C. 1223(b)(2)) is amended by striking “section 9” and inserting “section 9 or 16”.

TITLE III—ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES TO PREVENT CENSORSHIP ACTIVITIES IN IRAN

SEC. 301. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF SANCTIONS AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN BROADCASTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report on the following:

(1) The current status of availability of the Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting (IRIB) on international satellites, entities that facilitate its operation by providing services or equipment, and the technical means that it engages in jamming.

(2) The instances, since January 1, 2012, in which the IRIB engaged in activities that violated Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, including broadcasting forced confessions and hate speech against minorities.

(3) The instances, since January 1, 2012, in which international broadcasting programs originating from the United States and Europe have been subject to disruption in Iran, with relevant details such as which programs were disrupted, available location information on the origin of the disruption, and the extent of the disruption.

(b) COORDINATION.—In developing the report required by subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall coordinate with the Broadcasting Board of Governors, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—All unclassified portions of the report required by subsection

(a) shall be made publicly available on the Internet web site of the Department of State.

SEC. 302. LIST OF PERSONS WHO ARE HIGH-RISK RE-EXPORTERS OF SENSITIVE TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce, in conjunction with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury, shall make publicly available and update as appropriate a list of persons who are high-risk re-exporters of sensitive technologies in order to seek to ensure that the Government of Iran or an entity owned or controlled by that Government is unable to obtain sensitive technologies through the re-export of such sensitive technologies by third-party intermediaries.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “sensitive technology” has the meaning given that term in section 106 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8515).

SEC. 303. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROVISION OF INTERCEPT TECHNOLOGIES TO IRAN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) those that provide intercept technologies that limit freedom of speech or expression to the Government of Iran should be held accountable for the repression of the Iranian people; and

(2) no person should use an existing contract with the Government of Iran as a justification to continue to supply intercept technologies to the Government of Iran for purposes of restricting the free flow of information.

SEC. 304. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON AVAILABILITY OF CONSUMER COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES IN IRAN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Department of State should encourage the free flow of information in Iran to counter the Government of Iran's repression of its own people; and

(2) in order to facilitate the free flow of information in Iran, the Department of State should promote the availability of certain consumer communication technologies to Iranian civil society and the Iranian people.

SEC. 305. EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF REQUESTS FOR AUTHORIZATION OF TRANSFER OF GOODS AND SERVICES TO IRAN TO FACILITATE THE ABILITY OF IRANIAN PERSONS TO FREELY COMMUNICATE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 413 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8753) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

“(e) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—The expedited process for the consideration of complete requests for authorization to engage in the activities described in subsection (a) shall be construed to also apply to the transfer of goods and services to Iran to facilitate the ability of Iranian persons to freely communicate, obtain information, and access the Internet and other communications systems.”

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to requests described in section 413 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, as so amended, that are submitted to the Office of Foreign Assets Control on or after such date of enactment.

TITLE IV—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 401. NATIONAL STRATEGY ON IRAN.

(a) **NATIONAL STRATEGY REQUIRED.**—The President shall develop a strategy, to be known as the “National Strategy on Iran”, that provides strategic guidance for activities that support the objective of addressing the threats posed by Iran.

(b) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act or January 30, 2014, whichever occurs first, and every January 30 thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the National Strategy on Iran required under subsection (a).

(c) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report required under subsection (b) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A description of Iran's grand strategy and security strategy, including strategic objectives, and the security posture and objectives of Iran.

(2) A description of the United States strategy to—

(A) address and counter the capabilities of Iran's conventional forces and Iran's unconventional forces;

(B) disrupt and deny Iranian efforts to develop or augment capabilities related to nuclear, unconventional, and missile forces development;

(C) address the Government of Iran's economic strategy to enable the objectives described in this subsection;

(D) exploit key vulnerabilities; and

(E) combat Iranian efforts to suppress Internet freedom, including actions of the United States to—

(i) work to promote expanded Internet access for democracy activists in Iran;

(ii) add a public diplomacy page to the United States' virtual embassy in Iran; and

(iii) leverage multilateral organizations committed to Internet connectivity in Iran.

(3) An implementation plan for the United States strategy described in paragraph (2).

(d) **FORM.**—The report required under subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form to the greatest extent possible, but may include a classified annex, if necessary.

(e) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Finance, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 402. REPORT ON IRANIAN NUCLEAR AND ECONOMIC CAPABILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the following:

(1) An estimate of the timeline for Iranian capabilities to develop nuclear weapons, including—

(A) an estimate of the period of time it would take Iran to produce enough weapons-grade uranium for a single implosion-type nuclear weapon, taking into account all known relevant technical data;

(B) an estimate of the period of time it would take Iran to produce sufficient separated plutonium for a single nuclear weapon;

(C) a description of the assumptions underlying the estimates referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B), and any information about developments that might alter or otherwise affect those assumptions;

(D) an estimate of the date by which the periods of time referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) will be less than 45 days; and

(E) a description of any efforts by the United States to increase the frequency of inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency of nuclear facilities in Iran.

(2) An assessment of Iranian strategy and capabilities relating to development of nuclear weapons, including—

(A) a summary and analysis of current nuclear weapons capabilities;

(B) an estimate of the amount and sources of funding expended by, and an analysis of procurement networks utilized by, Iran to develop its nuclear weapons capabilities;

(C) a summary of the capabilities of Iran's unconventional weapons and Iran's ballistic missile forces and Iran's cruise missile forces;

(D) a detailed analysis of the effectiveness of Iran's unconventional weapons and Iran's ballistic missile forces and Iran's cruise missile forces as delivery systems for a nuclear device;

(E) a description of all efforts of Iran to design and develop a nuclear weapon, including efforts to design or fit warheads, and any other possible military dimensions of the nuclear program of Iran; and

(F) an analysis of the procurement network, including the amount and sources of funding expended by Iran on programs to develop a nuclear weapons capability.

(3) Projected economic effects of international sanctions on Iran, including—

(A) an estimate of the capital accounts, current accounts, and amounts of foreign exchange reserves (including access to foreign exchange reserves) of the Government of Iran, and other leading indicators of the status of the economy of Iran;

(B) an estimate of timelines with respect to macroeconomic viability of Iran, including the time by which the Government of Iran will exhaust its foreign exchange reserves;

(C) an estimate of the date by which the reserves of the Central Bank of Iran will be insufficient for the Government of Iran to avoid a severe balance of payments crisis that prevents it from maintaining a functioning economy, including—

(i) the inflation rate, exchange rates, unemployment rate, and budget deficits in Iran; and

(ii) other leading macroeconomic indicators used by the International Monetary Fund, professional rating agencies, and other credible sources to assess the economic health of a country;

(D) a description of the assumptions underlying the estimate referred to in paragraph (3) and an indication of how changes in each of those assumptions could affect the estimate;

(E) an assessment of the effect of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran on moving forward the date referred to in subparagraph (C); and

(F) a description of actions taken by the Government of Iran to delay the date referred to in subparagraph (C).

(b) **UPDATE.**—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an update of the report required by subsection (a) every 60 days after the date of submission of the report that includes any pertinent developments to Iranian nuclear or economic capabilities.

(c) **FORM.**—The report required under subsection (a) and the update required under subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form to the greatest extent possible, but may include a classified annex, if necessary.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Finance, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) **NUCLEAR EXPLOSIVE DEVICE.**—The term “nuclear explosive device” means any device, whether assembled or disassembled, that is designed to produce an instantaneous release of an amount of nuclear energy from special nuclear material that is greater than the amount of energy that would be released from the detonation of one pound of trinitrotoluene (TNT).

SEC. 403. REPORT ON PLAUSIBILITY OF EXPANDING SANCTIONS ON IRANIAN OIL.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report assessing the following:

(1) Whether petroleum and petroleum products originating in and exported from Iran are refined and sold outside of Iran.

(2) Whether products that contain Iranian-origin petroleum or petroleum products as part of their contents are imported into the United States and, if any such products are imported into the United States, whether such importation violates the ban on importation into the United States of Iranian-origin petroleum or petroleum products.

(3) Whether it is feasible to ban the importation into the United States of products described in paragraph (2), regardless of whether the ban on importation into the United States of Iranian-origin petroleum or petroleum products applies to such products.

(b) **BASIS OF REPORT.**—The report required under subsection (a) may be based on publicly-available information and classified information. The information that is not classified information shall be made publically available.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

SEC. 404. GAO REPORT ON IRANIAN STRATEGY TO EVADE CURRENT SANCTIONS AND OTHER MATTERS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) evaluates the strategy of the Government of Iran to evade current economic and financial sanctions; and

(2) specifically evaluates the ability of Iran to successfully diversify its economy beyond its energy sector, thereby lessening the im-

pact and effectiveness of economic and financial sanctions.

SEC. 405. AUTHORITY TO CONSOLIDATE REPORTS REQUIRED UNDER IRAN SANCTIONS LAWS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any or all reports required to be submitted to Congress under the provisions of law described in subsection (c) that are subject to a deadline for submission consisting of the same unit of time may be consolidated into a single report that is submitted to Congress pursuant to such deadline.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the initial report of any report described in subsection (a).

(c) **PROVISIONS OF LAW DESCRIBED.**—The provisions of law referred to in this section are the following:

(1) This Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(2) The Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801 et seq.).

(3) The Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.).

(4) The Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.).

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and applies with respect to reports required to be submitted to Congress under the provisions of law described in subsection (c) on or after such date of enactment.

SEC. 406. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS UNDER IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996 AND IRAN THREAT REDUCTION AND SYRIA HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 2012.

(a) **IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.**—Section 14(4)(B) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking “may include, in the discretion of the President” and inserting “includes”.

(b) **IRAN THREAT REDUCTION AND SYRIA HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 2012.**—Section 211 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8721) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ includes the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.”.

SEC. 407. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act shall be construed to apply with respect to—

(1) any activity relating to a project described in subsection (a) of section 603 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8783) to which the exception under that section applies at the time of the activity; or

(2) any authorized intelligence activity of the United States.

SEC. 408. IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.

(a) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) **PENALTIES.**—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of this Act or any amendment made by this Act or regulations prescribed under this Act to the same

extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in section 206(a) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705(a)).

SEC. 409. SEVERABILITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is found to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, or the application of that provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE UNDER SECTION 214.**—If subsection (d) of section 214 is found to be unconstitutional in accordance with subsection (a), the amendments made by such section 214 take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to transactions entered into on or after such date of enactment.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from New York opposed to the motion?

Mr. ENGLE. I am not opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) one-half of my time and that he be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York will control 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is no higher national security priority than preventing a nuclear-armed Iran. Foreign Affairs Ranking Member ENGEL and I have worked closely in a bipartisan way to bring this legislation to the floor, and we do it with unanimous support of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, all Democrats and all Republicans on that committee. Indeed, 375 Members of the House are cosponsors of this legislation. That's the broad recognition that exists right now, that more needs to be done to stop Iran's nuclear program, which is a danger not only to us in the United States, but certainly to the region and to the world.

Today, we act with that sense of urgency, urgency because Iran's march to nuclear weapons continues. In less than 2 years, the International Atomic

Energy Agency has told us that they have doubled in Iran the installed centrifuges at the facilities at Natanz and Fordo. They've doubled those from 8,500 to more than 15,700 centrifuges. And these new centrifuges, many of them are five times more powerful. They spin much faster than those earlier models.

A key facility is buried deep below a mountain, and Iran continues to stone-wall the IAEA on its development of nuclear explosive devices. So Iran's intent to develop this weapons capability is very evident.

New President in Iran or not, I am convinced that Iran's supreme leader intends to continue on this path because that is what he says he intends to do; that is, unless sanctions bite to the point where the regime has to make a choice between compromise on its nuclear weapons program or the consequences of the sanctions on the regime.

That is why this legislation dramatically steps up the pressure on the regime in Iran:

It targets the energy sector by compelling countries that are currently purchasing oil from Iran to reduce their collective total by 1 million barrels per day within a year;

It targets additional sectors of Iran's economy;

It further denies the regime access to foreign currency reserves;

It effectively targets Iran's efforts to circumvent international sanctions against the shipping sector in the country;

Equally important, this legislation increases sanctions against Iranian human rights abusers, making clear that it's the Iranian people that we are siding with.

Only when the Iranian leadership truly feels a choice between maintaining power and obtaining the bomb does our diplomacy have a chance to succeed. And we know the Iran regime's view of the world, we know it only too well because its support of keeping the brutal Assad regime in power is self-evident. It has resupplied Hezbollah with 25,000 new rockets, which target Israel.

In recent years, there have been Iranian-sponsored attacks or plots uncovered by the Europeans in Bulgaria, also in India, Thailand, in Georgia, in Azerbaijan, in Cyprus, in Kenya, and even here in Washington, D.C. I'd hate to see an Iran emboldened by a nuclear weapon, but that is the course we are on unless we dramatically step up the pressure. So let's pass this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 26, 2013.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE, I am writing with respect to H.R. 850, the "Nuclear Iran Pre-

vention Act of 2013," which the Committee on Foreign Affairs ordered reported favorably on May 22, 2013. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 850 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, and your agreement to support mutually-agreeable changes to the legislation, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 850 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 850, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 850.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 26, 2013.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, and for your agreement to discharge H.R. 850 from the Committee on the Judiciary so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding regarding your Committee's continuing Rule X legislative jurisdiction over portions of H.R. 850, and my support for your Committee's participation in any conference committee that may be named to consider this bill.

I appreciate your assistance in expediting this important legislation for Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 26, 2013.

Hon. DARRELL E. ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, and for your agreement to discharge H.R. 850 from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding regarding your Committee's continuing Rule X legislative jurisdiction over portions of H.R. 850, and my support for your Committee's participation in any conference committee that may be named to consider this bill.

I appreciate your assistance in expediting this important legislation for Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM
Washington, DC, July 26, 2013.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 850, the "Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013," which your Committee reported on May 22, 2013.

H.R. 850 contains provisions within the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2013.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: On May 22, 2013, the Committee on Foreign Affairs ordered H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, as amended, to be reported favorably to the House. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to discharge our committee from further consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 850, as amended, at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I appreciate your July 26 letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 850, as amended, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee's report to accompany the legislation and/or in

the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 26, 2013.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, and for your agreement to discharge H.R. 850 from the Committee on Financial Services so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding regarding your Committee's continuing Rule X legislative jurisdiction over portions of H.R. 850, and my support for your Committee's participation in any conference committee that may be named to consider this bill.

I appreciate your assistance in expediting this important legislation for Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, July 26, 2013.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing regarding H.R. 850, the "Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013," which was favorably reported out of your Committee on May 22, 2013. I commend you on your efforts to make sure that the United States is better able to address the critical threats that Iran poses.

I appreciate that in response to the concerns raised by the Committee on Ways & Means, you have agreed to modify sections 102, 201, 214, 215, and 222 of H.R. 850 as reported out of your Committee. As a result, in order to expedite floor consideration of the bill, the Committee on Ways and Means will forgo action on H.R. 850. Further, the Committee will not oppose the bill's consideration on the suspension calendar, based on our understanding that you will work with us as the legislative process moves forward to ensure that our concerns in the sections indicated above as well as other provisions in the Committee's jurisdiction continue to be addressed. This is also being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 850, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 26, 2013.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran

Prevention Act of 2013, and for your agreement to discharge H.R. 850 from the Committee on Ways and Means so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding regarding your Committee's continuing Rule X legislative jurisdiction over portions of H.R. 850, and my support for your Committee's participation in any conference committee that may be named to consider this bill.

I appreciate your assistance in expediting this important legislation for Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2013.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your consultation with the Foreign Affairs Committee on H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, and your agreement to forgo a sequential referral of that bill. I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding regarding your Committee's continuing Rule X legislative jurisdiction over portions of H.R. 850, and my support for your Committee's participation in any conference committee that may be named to consider that bill.

I appreciate your assistance in expediting this important legislation for floor consideration.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, June 26, 2013.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, as ordered reported. There are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will not assert a jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so does not in any way alter or diminish the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please, place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the committee report on H.R. 850 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleagues come here today proposing this new, intensified legislation

on the basis that they would like to stop Iran from having a nuclear weapon. So do we.

□ 1700

Everything that my colleague, Mr. ROYCE, detailed a moment ago is something that we are concerned about.

But we have a changed circumstance, a changed circumstance that this legislation does not acknowledge, and that is that the Iranian people had a choice between candidates, and they selected the candidate who decided to reject extremism and actually campaign on the basis of moderation. Why not? At least until Mr. Rouhani has a chance to forestall legislation like this and engage in diplomacy to reach the goals that Mr. ROYCE has identified.

Mr. Rouhani ran on a policy of promise to pursue a path of moderation. He promised to pursue a "policy of reconciliation and peace." Obviously, we don't have rose-colored glasses. We don't know. But why don't we wait and see. Why aren't we at least curious to find out whether or not President Rouhani means that he wants to pursue this course of peace. It is what we want—negotiated settlement. Why are we slapping his hand down when apparently the Iranian people are willing to support a candidate who is willing to extend a hand?

The New York Times agrees. It said:

While sanctions are an important element of American strategy, piling on more at this time and this moment could harm, rather than advance, the chances for a negotiated deal with Iran.

In fact, Secretary of State John Kerry warned that additional sanctions at this moment might undermine diplomatic efforts.

The fact of the matter is, why do we want to strengthen the hand of extremists who will say to Rouhani, See, you thought you could work with them. We were right all along.

I say they're wrong. I say let's accept the olive branch extended by the Iranian people who selected a more moderate candidate.

In fact, I would like to submit this document into the RECORD. The headline reads:

Mohammad Javad Zarif, Iran's Nominee for Foreign Minister, Seen as Olive Branch to United States.

Let me also acknowledge and put into the RECORD this letter, dated July 19, by 130 Members of Congress on a bipartisan basis to say President Obama pursued negotiations in this window of time when we have a President who won on the basis of extending a hand for negotiation.

We don't have to do this now. We can do this when we come back after at least Mr. Rouhani is inaugurated into the presidency of Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I do have a number of speakers, when we're ready for that.

[From HuffPost World, July 31, 2013]

MOHAMMAD JAVAD ZARIF, IRAN'S NOMINEE FOR FOREIGN MINISTER, SEEN AS OLIVE BRANCH TO UNITED STATES

(By Marcus George and Paul Taylor)

DUBAI/PARIS, July 29, 2013 (Reuters).—If Iranian President-elect Hassan Rouhani wanted to signal his determination to rebuild relations with the United States and strike a “grand bargain,” he could hardly do better than pick Mohammad Javad Zarif as his foreign minister.

Iranian news agencies reported on Monday that Zarif, a former ambassador to the United Nations and Tehran's leading connoisseur of the U.S. political elite, is set to be in the cabinet Rouhani will announce after taking office on Sunday. A source close to Rouhani confirmed Zarif will be nominated as foreign minister.

A fluent English speaker who earned his doctorate at the University of Denver, Zarif has been at the centre of several secret negotiations to try to overcome 35 years of estrangement between Washington and Tehran, diplomats said.

Those talks failed because of deep mistrust on a range of disputes from Iran's secretive nuclear programme and support for anti-Israeli militants to U.S. sanctions and hopes of engineering “regime change” in Tehran.

Zarif's elevation, however, suggests the moderate new president is keen to make another try at breaking the deadlock.

“He was always trying to do what was possible to improve relations in a very intelligent, open and clear way,” said a senior Western diplomat who had repeated dealings with Zarif.

“This is someone who knows the United States very well and with all the frustrations of the past is still someone they know in Washington,” he said.

The usual caveats about Iran apply: under the Islamic Republic's complex institutional set-up, Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei calls the shots in foreign and security policy and controls the nuclear programme, which Western powers say is aimed at developing atomic weapons.

The foreign minister ranks roughly fourth in the foreign policy pecking order, after Khamenei, the head of the National Security Council, who also serves as Iran's chief nuclear negotiator, and the president.

Nevertheless, assuming he is confirmed by Iran's prickly, conservative-dominated parliament, Zarif's appointment would be a strong gesture of positive intent towards the United States.

The two countries have had no official ties since 1980 after Iranian students occupied the U.S. embassy in Tehran, taking 52 diplomats hostage in protest against Washington's admission of the former Shah after he was toppled by the Islamic revolution.

CONTACT BOOK

Zarif's Washington contact book includes Vice President Joe Biden, Secretary of Defence Chuck Hagel and a who's who of U.S. national security officials on both sides of the aisle.

The soft-spoken career diplomat resigned from the nuclear negotiating team after hardline President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad was elected in 2005.

In 2007, he returned from New York after five years as Iran's permanent representative to the United Nations and found himself out of favour as his country turned its back on the notion of seeking better ties with the West and Ahmadinejad sidelined English-speaking diplomats.

Since then, Zarif has been in a holding pattern, nominally senior adviser to the foreign minister from 2007 to 2010, then from 2011 international director of Islamic Azad University, a network of educational institutions established by ex-president Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, his political patron.

Rafsanjani, who is also Rouhani's mentor, has long favoured a pragmatic rapprochement with the United States, but Khamenei has stamped on all such efforts since he succeeded the founder of the Islamic Republic, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, in 1989.

Dennis Ross, a veteran U.S. diplomat who served as President Barack Obama's top Middle East adviser until 2011, said Zarif had shown a willingness to negotiate in good faith and his appointment would be seen in Washington and Europe as an indication that Rouhani wants to “do business” with the West.

But he cautioned that the question remained whether this would translate into an easing of Tehran's resistance to curbing its nuclear drive. “Zarif is not someone who does favours for the United States,” Ross said. “He fits the category of a sign or signal until you see Iran actually doing something.”

Brent Scowcroft, national security adviser to President George H.W. Bush, described Zarif as “reasonable” but said much would depend on how much leeway he is given.

Western diplomats said Zarif was a central negotiator in the last major effort to negotiate a “grand bargain” between Tehran and Washington that began after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks on the United States and foundered in mid-2003.

U.S. newspapers published in 2007 the bare text of a draft agreement, put together in secret talks in Paris, Geneva and New York, that would have established negotiations between the two countries on all outstanding issues.

While the draft fell short of an agreement on substance, it noted both sides' expectations on issues such as assurances that Iran's nuclear programme has no military capability, and assurances that the United States would act against anti-government People's Mujahideen activists based in Iraq.

“The texts are authentic,” said a Western diplomat who was involved in the back-channel talks, confirming that Khamenei had given the green light for negotiations to go ahead.

HOSTAGE NEGOTIATOR

Years earlier, as a junior diplomat Zarif was involved in negotiations to win the release of U.S. hostages held by pro-Iranian gunmen in Lebanon, according to the memoirs of former U.N. envoy Giandomenico Picco. Even though the United States did not make a promised reciprocal goodwill gesture at the time, Zarif remained committed to improving ties.

In Washington, Trita Parsi, president of the pro-dialogue National Iranian American Council, said Zarif has been involved in multiple U.S.-Iranian negotiations, including talks on Afghanistan after the U.S.-led 2001 invasion, and Tehran's 2003 proposal for a “grand bargain” with the United States.

“Based on my interviews with him, (Zarif) was involved in the drafting of it,” Parsi said of that offer of a comprehensive new start, which then President George W. Bush's administration spurned.

Veteran U.S. diplomat James Dobbins, the U.S. point man at a 2001 Bonn conference that formed a new Afghan government after the overthrow of the Taliban, credited Zarif with a pivotal, positive role in the diplomacy—and with a sense of humour.

Dobbins—now the State Department's special envoy for Afghanistan and Pakistan—recalled in 2007 testimony to the U.S. Congress how Zarif, then a deputy foreign minister, persuaded the anti-Taliban Northern Alliance to drop its demand for control of an outsize proportion of Afghan ministries.

The Northern Alliance delegate “remained obdurate. Finally, Zarif took him aside and whispered to him for a few moments, following which the Northern Alliance envoy returned to the table and said: ‘Okay, I agree. The other factions can have two more ministries. And we can create three more, which they can also have.’ We had a deal,” Dobbins recalled.

“Zarif had achieved the final breakthrough without which the (Hamid) Karzai government might never have been formed.”

[From the New York Times, July 26, 2013]

IRAN IS SAID TO WANT DIRECT TALKS WITH U.S. ON NUCLEAR PROGRAM

(By Michael R. Gordon)

WASHINGTON.—Prime Minister Nuri Kamal al-Maliki of Iraq told the Obama administration this month that Iran was interested in direct talks with the United States on Iran's nuclear program, and said that Iraq was prepared to facilitate the negotiations, Western officials said Thursday.

In a meeting in early July with the American ambassador in Baghdad, Mr. Maliki suggested that he was relaying a message from Iranian officials and asserted that Hassan Rouhani, Iran's incoming president, would be serious about any discussions with the United States, according to accounts of the meeting.

Although Mr. Maliki indicated that he had been in touch with confidants of Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, he did not disclose precisely whom he was dealing with on the Iranian side. Some Western officials remain uncertain whether Iran's leaders have sought to use Iraq as a conduit or whether the idea is mainly Mr. Maliki's initiative.

State Department officials declined to comment on Mr. Maliki's move or what steps the United States might have taken in response. American officials have said since the beginning of the Obama administration that they would be open to direct talks with Iran.

“Iraq is a partner of the United States and we are in regular conversations with Iraqi officials about a full range of issues of mutual interest, including Iran,” said Patrick Ventrell, a State Department spokesman. “As we have repeatedly said, we are open to direct talks with Iran in order to resolve the international community's concerns about Iran's nuclear program.”

Gary Samore, who served as the senior aide on nonproliferation issues at the National Security Council during President Obama's first term in office, said that it was plausible that Iran would use Iraq to send a message about its willingness to discuss nuclear issues.

“The Iranians see Maliki as somebody they have some trust in,” said Mr. Samore, who is the director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard. “From Maliki's standpoint, it would serve a number of different purposes. He does not want to be squeezed between Washington and Tehran.”

In a separate move on Thursday, the State and Treasury Departments announced that the United States was expanding the list of medical devices, like dialysis machines, that could be sold to Iran without a license.

In a conference call with reporters, David Cohen, the under secretary for terrorism and

financial intelligence, said that the move was intended to “accelerate trade” in these medical devices and address humanitarian needs in Iran. The announcement was also seen by many observers as a good-will gesture before Mr. Rouhani prepares to take office in Tehran on Aug. 4.

Direct talks have the potential to ratchet down some of the pressure on President Obama over one of his greatest foreign policy challenges, the buildup of Iran’s nuclear program.

Mr. Obama has said that he will not permit Iran to have a nuclear weapon and has asserted that the use of military force is an option. Israeli officials have staked out a far tougher position, asserting that Iran should not be allowed to have the ability to build a weapon—and that the United States should do more to convince the Iranians that its threat to use force is credible. Israel has not ruled out military action of its own.

International sanctions have taken a serious toll on the Iranian economy and have helped bring Iran to the negotiating table, but have not yet extracted significant concessions from Iran on its nuclear program. For years, the United States and its partners—Britain, France, Germany, Russia and China—have met on and off with Iranian officials in a dialogue that has become known as the “P5 plus 1” talks.

Nonproliferation experts continue to argue that it is difficult to make major headway in such a committelike forum, and that if progress is to be made, it will have to happen in private one-on-one discussions between Iranian officials and the Obama administration.

Whether Iran is genuinely interested in such talks, however, has been a subject of debate. In 2009, William J. Burns, then the under secretary of state for political affairs, met with Saeed Jalili, the Iranian nuclear negotiator, on the margins of the “P5 plus 1” talks. They agreed in principle that a portion of Iran’s enriched uranium could be used to make fuel for Tehran’s research center, which would preclude that material from being further enriched to make nuclear weapons.

But that deal fell through after Ayatollah Khamenei objected, and there have been no direct talks since. In a meeting this month with Iran’s departing president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, Ayatollah Khamenei was sharply critical of the American stance.

“The Americans are unreliable and illogical, and are not honest in their approach,” Ayatollah Khamenei said. But he also said that he did not oppose talks “on certain issues.”

Even if direct talks are agreed to they are almost certain to be tough.

“The establishment of a bilateral channel is a necessary but not sufficient condition for coming to an agreement,” Mr. Samore said. “They want a nuclear weapons capability, and we want to deny them a nuclear weapons capability. Finding a compromise between those two objectives is going to be very difficult.”

Mr. Maliki, Western officials said, is not the only Iraqi politician who has encouraged a dialogue between the United States and Iran. Ammar al-Hakim, the leader of a major Shiite party in Iraq, is also said to have made that point.

During the war in Iraq, Iraqi officials also urged direct dealings between the United States and Iran.

Talks were held in Baghdad, but they were focused on the conflict in Iraq and Iran’s support for Shiite militias there—not the nuclear question—and got nowhere.

Mr. Maliki’s government appears to have been aligned with Iran on some issues, like its support for President Bashar al-Assad of Syria. Iranian aircraft have ferried huge quantities of arms through Iraqi airspace. Iraqi officials have asserted that they do not have the means to stop the flights, but Mr. Maliki has also been concerned that Mr. Assad’s fall will lead to an escalation of Sunni challenges to his government in Iraq.

American officials have repeatedly said that Mr. Maliki is not a pawn of Iran and that the United States should try to expand its influence in Iraq, including by selling arms.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2013.

President BARACK OBAMA,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT OBAMA: As Members of Congress who share your unequivocal commitment to preventing a nuclear-armed Iran, we urge you to pursue the potential opportunity presented by Iran’s recent presidential election by reinvigorating U.S. efforts to secure a negotiated nuclear agreement.

As you know, on June 14 the Iranian people elected Hassan Rouhani president with over 50 percent of the vote in the first round, overcoming repression and intimidation by the Iranian government to cast their ballots in favor of reform. Dr. Rouhani campaigned on the promise to “pursue a policy of reconciliation and peace” and has since promised “constructive interaction with the outside world.” As Iran’s former lead nuclear negotiator, he has also publicly expressed the view that obtaining a nuclear weapon would run counter to Iran’s strategic interests and has been critical of the nuclear “extremism” of outgoing President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad.

We are mindful of the limitations of the Iranian presidency within the country’s political system, of the fact that previous Iranian presidents elected on platforms of moderation have failed to deliver on promised reforms, and of the mixed signals that Dr. Rouhani himself has sent regarding Iran’s nuclear ambitions. It remains to be seen whether his election will indeed bring significant change with regard to Iran’s relations with the outside world. His government’s actions will certainly speak louder than his words.

Even so, we believe it would be a mistake not to test whether Dr. Rouhani’s election represents a real opportunity for progress toward a verifiable, enforceable agreement on Iran’s nuclear program that ensures the country does not acquire a nuclear weapon. In order to test this proposition, it will be prudent for the United States to utilize all diplomatic tools to reinvigorate ongoing nuclear talks. In addition, bilateral and multilateral sanctions must be calibrated in such a way that they induce significant and verifiable concessions from Iran at the negotiating table in exchange for their potential relaxation.

We must also be careful not to preempt this potential opportunity by engaging in actions that delegitimize the newly elected president and weaken his standing relative to hardliners within the regime who oppose his professed “policy of reconciliation and peace.” Likewise, it will be critical for the United States to continue its efforts to foster unprecedented international cooperation on this issue so that the international community remains united in its opposition to Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon.

We look forward to working with your Administration on this important issue in the months ahead.

Sincerely,

CHARLES DENT,
DAVID PRICE,
Members of Congress.

LIST OF COSIGNERS (131)

Dent, Charles (PA-15); Price, David (NC-04); Barber, Ron (AZ-02); Bass, Karen (CA-37); Becerra, Xavier (CA-34); Bera, Ami (CA-07); Bishop, Sanford (GA-02); Bishop, Tim (NY-01); Blumenauer, Earl (OR-03); Bonamici, Suzanne (OR-01); Bordallo, Madeleine (GU); Braley, Bruce (IA-01); Bustos, Cheri (IL-17); Campbell, John (CA-45); Capps, Lois (CA-24); Capuano, Michael (MA-07); Cárdenas, Tony (CA-29); Carson, André (IN-07); Cartwright, Matthew (PA-17); Christensen, Donna (VI); Clay, William Lacy (MO-01); Cleaver, Emanuel (MO-05); Clyburn, James (SC-06); Coble, Howard (NC-06); Cohen, Steve (TN-09); Cole, Tom (OK-04); Connolly, Gerald (VA-11); Conyers, John (MI-13); Courtney, Joe (CT-02); Cuellar, Henry (TX-28).

Cummings, Elijah (MD-07); Davis, Danny (IL-07); DeFazio, Peter (OR-04); DeGette, Diana (CO-01); DeLauro, Rosa (CT-03); DelBene, Suzan (WA-01); Dingell, John (MI-12); Doggett, Lloyd (TX-35); Doyle, Michael (PA-14); Duckworth, Tammy (IL-08); Duffy, Sean (WI-07); Duncan, Jr., John (TN-02); Edwards, Donna (MD-04); Ellison, Keith (MN-05); Enyart, William (IL-12).

Eshoo, Anna (CA-18); Esty, Elizabeth (CT-05); Farr, Sam (CA-20); Fattah, Chaka (PA-02); Fitzpatrick, Michael (PA-08); Fortenberry, Jeff (NE-01); Foster, Bill (IL-11); Garamendi, John (CA-03); Grijalva, Raúl (AZ-03); Grimm, Michael (NY-11); Gutiérrez, Luis (IL-04); Hanna, Richard (NY-22); Hastings, Alcee (FL-20); Heck, Denny (WA-10); Higgins, Brian (NY-26).

Himes, James (CT-04); Holt, Rush (NJ-12); Honda, Michael (CA-17); Jackson Lee, Sheila (TX-18); Johnson, Eddie B. (TX-30); Johnson, Hank (GA-04); Jones, Walter (NC-03); Kaptur, Marcy (OH-09); Kelly, Robin (IL-02); Kind, Ron (WI-03); Kuster, Ann (NH-02); Larsen, Rick (WA-02); Larson, John (CT-01); Lee, Barbara (CA-13); Lewis, John (GA-05).

Loebach, David (IA-02); Lofgren, Zoe (CA-19); Lujan, Ben Ray (NM-03); Lujan Grisham, Michelle (NM-01); Matheson, Jim (UT-04); McCollum, Betty (MN-04); McDermott, Jim (WA-07); McGovern, James P. (MA-02); Meeks, Gregory W. (NY-05); Miller, George (CA-11); Moore, Gwen (WI-04); Moran, James P. (VA-08); Napolitano, Grace F. (CA-32); Neal, Richard E. (MA-01); Nolan, Richard (MN-08).

Norton, Eleanor Holmes (DC); Nugent, Richard B. (FL-11); O’Rourke, Beto (TX-16); Pascarella, Bill, Jr. (NJ-09); Pastor, Ed (AZ-07); Payne, Donald M., Jr. (NJ-10); Perlmutter, Ed (CO-07); Peters, Scott H. (CA-52); Peterson, Collin C. (MN-07); Petri, Thomas E. (WI-06); Pingree, Chellie (ME-01); Pocan, Mark (WI-02); Polis, Jared (CO-02); Rahall, Nick J., II (WV-03); Rangel, Charles B. (NY-13).

Roybal-Allard, Lucille (CA-40); Ruiz, Raul (CA-36); Runyan, Jon (NJ-03); Rush, Bobby L. (IL-01); Ryan, Tim (OH-13); Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho (MP); Schakowsky, Janice D. (IL-09); Scott, Robert C. “Bobby” (VA-03); Serrano, José E. (NY-15); Shea-Porter, Carol (NH-01); Sinema, Kyrsten (AZ-09); Slaughter, Louise McIntosh (NY-25).

Speier, Jackie (CA-14); Takano, Mark (CA-41); Thompson, Glenn (PA-05); Thompson, Mike (CA-05); Tiberi, Patrick (OH-12); Tierney, John (MA-06); Tonko, Paul (NY-20); Tsongas, Niki (MA-03); Visclosky, Peter (IN-01); Walz, Timothy (MN-01); Waters, Maxine

(CA-43); Welch, Peter (VT-At Large); Whitfield, Ed (KY-01); Yarmuth, John (KY-03).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013.

It's been a pleasure working with Chairman ROYCE to craft this bipartisan legislation, which, by the way, passed unanimously in the Foreign Affairs Committee. Every Republican, every Democrat voted "yes" on this. It now has more than 370 cosponsors. We share the goal of preventing a nuclear-capable Iran, and I could not ask for a better partner than Mr. ROYCE in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us agree that a nuclear-capable Iran would pose a grave threat to the U.S., a threat to our allies in the region, and a threat to the future of the global nonproliferation regime. All of us are aware that Iran has violated numerous U.N. Security Council resolutions and repeatedly blocked IAEA inspectors seeking to investigate its nuclear program.

After many years of deceit and stonewalling by the Iranian regime, I continue to hold out hope that we can achieve a peaceful resolution of the Iranian nuclear crisis through diplomatic means. But time is growing short. According to the IAEA, Iran is installing advanced centrifuges to enrich more uranium and continues to build a heavy water reactor that could produce plutonium.

We must not allow the Iranians to play the same old game, engaging in endless negotiations with no results while continuing to advance the nuclear program. That's why we must continue to pursue a two-track approach to Iran, one that incorporates both pressure and negotiations.

The legislation before us today will significantly ratchet up the pressure and hopefully give our diplomats the leverage they need to persuade Iran that its only viable option is to end its pursuit of nuclear weapons.

Among other things, this bill seeks to cut Iran's oil exports by another 1 million barrels a day, a reduction of two-thirds from current levels. It also strengthens existing sanctions by authorizing the President to restrict significant commercial trade with Iran.

In addition, the bill seeks to deny the Iranian regime hard currency by enhancing efforts to cut off Iran's access to euros.

Finally, the legislation imposes new sanctions against Iranian shipping ports and expands existing sanctions against Iranian human rights violators.

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues argue that we should delay sanctions until after the new President of Iran takes office. I respectfully disagree. I know they share the goal of preventing a nuclear-capable Iran, but I believe we should take a different approach.

Our efforts to impose new sanctions should not be based on the Iranian political calendar. In my view, the paramount consideration should be the Iranian nuclear clock, the nuclear calendar, the amount of time it will take Iran to achieve a nuclear weapons capability.

I have no reason to believe that the results of the recent Iranian election will fundamentally alter Iran's current course. The unelected supreme leader, the Ayatollah, remains the one true decision-maker at the pinnacle of the regime. And president-elect Rouhani, who was directly involved in efforts to deceive the international community when he served as Iran's chief nuclear negotiator, made clear during the campaign that he supports Iran's nuclear ambitions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

If Rouhani truly has the willing authority to make a bold gesture on Iran's nuclear program, like suspending enrichment, he has a small window of opportunity before this bill becomes law. I think all of us would welcome such a gesture, but I'm not holding my breath.

In closing, I would like to reiterate that by strengthening sanctions we are not calling for an end of diplomacy. After many years of fruitless negotiations, it is clear that talks will only succeed if the regime feels pressure to change course. That is what we are trying to accomplish with this legislation today.

I look forward to working with Chairman ROYCE to ensure that the strongest possible sanctions are enacted into law, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this measure before us today.

I have supported the repeated rounds of sanctions that Congress has already enacted. I have supported them because of the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran and because of the intransigence of the Iranian Government in defiance of the international community.

These sanctions have brought the Iranian economy to its knees, they have yet to produce meaningful concessions by the Iranian Government. I have thus remained open to the possibility of additional sanctions as part of a broader strategy to induce the Iranian Government to change its course.

But the bill before us today could not come at a worse time. In 3 days, Iran will inaugurate a new President, Hassan Rouhani, elected on promises of moderation and openness despite repression and intimidation by the Iranian regime, trying to deny him that election.

Since his election, Dr. Rouhani has made repeated overtures to the international community, signaling his intent to resume the stalled P-5+1 nuclear talks upon taking office and promising greater transparency and confidence-building measures. He reportedly intends to appoint as his foreign minister a seasoned diplomat who favors closer ties with the West.

Let us be clear: we do not know whether Rouhani truly intends to follow through on these promises. We don't know if he'll be able to overcome the resistance of Iran's hardliners. We do know that history counsels us to be cautious about the prospects for meaningful change in Iran, and Rouhani's actions will surely speak louder than his words.

But to rush through a new round of sanctions before the new President has even taken office could slam the window of opportunity shut before we even have a chance to test whether it is genuine.

A recent letter to the President signed by a group of respected former diplomats and military officials—including Ambassador Tom Pickering and the former commander of CENTCOM, General Joseph Hoar—has warned that further sanctions "could empower hardliners, in the Iranian Government, who are opposed to nuclear concessions, at the expense of those seeking to shift policy in a more moderate direction."

Moreover, by removing the President's authority to relax sanctions on countries that are cooperating with our strategy toward Iran, this bill risks shattering the unprecedented international coalition which we have worked so hard to build, thus making sanctions less effective than they are at this moment.

Some argue that we should not be concerned about the House passing this bill, since it will be some time before the Senate follows with an improved bill, and longer still before the new sanctions take effect. I must say, that is not a very compelling argument for rushing this bill to the floor right now. Why not act when we can assess the diplomatic prospects more accurately?

Mr. Speaker, I will take a back seat to no one when it comes to my concern about the threat posed by a nuclear Iran to our ally Israel, to the broader Middle East, and to the United States. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I will yield to no one in my concerns about these matters. I believe we must redouble our efforts to secure an enforceable agreement that ensures Iran does not acquire a nuclear weapon.

But sanctions alone are not a strategy. In order to be effective, they must

be integrated into a broader strategy that brings all other elements of American power to bear on the challenge. The administration is working hard to advance such a strategy, with unprecedented cooperation from our international partners.

If the strategy fails to induce the new Iranian Government to change its course, then new sanctions may, indeed, be warranted. But to pass them now only undercuts our Nation's strategic objectives.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this ill-timed bill.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the esteemed majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act.

I want to commend the gentleman from California, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, in his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. I also would like to commend Congressman ENGEL for his leadership in working through this issue bringing forward this piece of legislation.

The authoritarian regime in Iran is a brutal theocracy that suppresses dissent at home and sponsors terrorism and chaos abroad. For years, our State Department has listed Iran as the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, and many Americans have lost their lives at the hands of Iranian-backed killers. In a bid to establish reasonable dominance, Iran foments instability in neighboring countries and is a co-belligerent in Bashar Assad's ruthless war against the Syrian people. Despite rhetoric that may lead some to a contrary conclusion, this is the nature of a regime that continues its headlong effort to acquire nuclear weapons capability.

Like all Americans, I want to see Iran abandon its nuclear aspirations through peaceful negotiations, but its leaders must understand the path they are on now will only lead to more condemnation and pressure.

Considering that Iran continues to flagrantly violate numerous U.N. Security Council resolutions that call for the suspension of its nuclear enrichment program, while denying inspectors access to suspected nuclear sites, it is clear that Iran has negotiated again and again in bad faith. America's policies must be based on facts and not some hope about a new government perhaps in Iran that somehow will change the nature of the clerical regime in Tehran. We must respond to Iran's policies and behavior, not to its rhetoric.

This act will strengthen the sanctions already in place and provide the President with new economic tools to pressure Iran to change course before it is too late.

□ 1715

Strengthening these measures will help our diplomatic efforts to encourage Tehran to become a responsible member of the international community and, once and for all, to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from California, the gentleman from New York, and the rest of the Foreign Affairs Committee for their hard work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ELLISON. May I inquire as to the time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 12½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota, my friend.

Mr. Speaker, 29 prominent policymakers and experts who understand Iran and international relations, which includes former CENTCOM Commander, Ambassador Tom Pickering, stated in a letter to President Obama just 2 weeks ago: "No further sanctions should be imposed or considered at this time."

There were 131 bipartisan Representatives who also urged the President to test the opportunity presented by Iran's recent election to avoid actions that could delegitimize the democratic election that just took place in Iran, because the fact is that the Iranian people rejected the very cleric of government that we have all opposed that has been defined by hostile actions against the United States. In fact, when Mr. Rouhani was running, the people of Iran knew he was a former nuclear negotiator, and he promised greater nuclear transparency and to pursue, in his words, peace and reconciliation with the outside world.

Isn't that just what we are looking for?

I can't imagine we are looking for another war of choice, that we want to escalate the rhetoric. This is the best opportunity we have had in at least 8 years, if not more. Why throw that away?

Now, some will say, "Well, what we do in the House doesn't really matter. The Senate isn't going to do anything," but that's a nuance. We may understand why the House is acting, but the rest of the world doesn't likely understand what's going on here.

The fact is that this bill empowers the very hard-liners who are the problem. The Iranian people are extraordinarily diverse. In fact, they used to be America's best friend in the Muslim world, and they just rejected a government that represented all of the things we oppose, and they did it democrat-

ically. I can't imagine that we have to operate in such a vacuum that we are going to continue to impose sanctions, that we are going to take away the President's ability to exercise leverage in those negotiations, and that, in fact, we are even going to lay it on further by taking away the exemption for necessary food and medicine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MORAN. This is destructive because it punishes the Iranian people and empowers the hard-liners. We have no problem with punishing the clerical government and many of the people in the military. They don't represent our values, but we want the Iranian people to seize democracy, to represent our values, to enter into negotiations. We've got to be able to bring about a more peaceful and productive world.

So I would strongly urge this House to hold off. Let the new President at least take over. Let's see what we can do. Let's not act so prematurely and destructively.

Mr. ROYCE. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague from California—the chairman of the committee—and his whole committee for their hard work on this issue, and a special thanks to the chairman emeritus of the committee, my colleague from Florida (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN), on whose efforts we are building today.

I also want to thank the committee chairs and the members who have worked so hard to get this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act. This legislation recognizes a stark truth, and that is that Iran is a global menace, and this bill empowers the President to act decisively to address it.

We know Iran is the world's most aggressive sponsor of terrorism, extending now into Syria, Libya, Lebanon, even into our hemisphere. We know that Iran is attempting to build an illicit nuclear weapons capability in willful defiance of both the U.N. Security Council and the IAEA, and we know the Supreme Leader and the Ayatollahs remain committed to the destruction of Israel, one of our dearest allies.

The United States, especially its Congress, has a duty to respond to Iran's actions, not to its rhetoric, so this bill seeks to reduce Iran's oil exports by an additional 1 million barrels a day, which would be a two-thirds reduction from its current levels. We are also looking to target human rights violators, to close loopholes on access

to hard foreign currency, and we will give the President the authority to restrict significant commercial trade with Iran. These strong and targeted sanctions will ensure that the administration has both the political and the economic tools to deal with this regime.

Because the American people are not interested in allowing Iran another shot at running out the clock on negotiations while it marches toward developing a breakout of nuclear capability, I will cast my vote for this measure, and I would urge all of my House colleagues to join me.

Mr. ENGEL. It is my pleasure now to yield 1½ minutes to the minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this legislation, but I also thank my friend KEITH ELLISON for his perspective on this, and I want to speak to that as well. I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the most dangerous threat to peace and stability in the Middle East continues to be that posed by Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons, which would launch this turbulent region into a nuclear arms race that no one can afford to risk, including our troops in the region. Time and again, Security Council resolutions after Security Council resolutions, Iran has refused to heed the international community's warnings, and it has, instead, continued along a path toward the bomb, choosing isolation over integration.

We are here today to talk about how to stop Iran's pursuit. As a government, we have many tools to use. Diplomacy is one and diplomacy must continue. Indeed, many feel the time is right to test President-elect Rouhani's sincerity, and I agree, but he must expect us to turn his positive talk of a policy of reconciliation and peace into action. We should welcome and pursue his willingness to come to the table to negotiate. We need to test that, but delay has been too long for us not to pursue concurrent approaches. That tool of economic pressure, which is working, should also be pursued additionally. That is why I support this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his thoughtfulness.

Hopefully, negotiations will prove successful and such pressure can be either moderated or removed. President-elect Rouhani campaigned on a promise to ease the burden of sanctions on the Iranian people, and he won. We

would welcome a second victory for him and the United Nations in seeing that objective of denuclearization realized.

I support today's bill because I believe a robust sanctions regime could help encourage Iran to abandon its pursuit of the bomb and to end its support for terrorist groups and human rights abuses. President-elect Rouhani is uniquely positioned, I believe, to show leadership on this and achieve early success in his new administration.

However, our skepticism about the Iranian leadership's action in the past has been more than justified, but we must nevertheless continue to work for a resolution of this challenging issue. Engaging President-elect Rouhani in our quest for early resolution is appropriate, but these sanctions are also appropriate. Therefore, I rise in their support.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in February, I joined with our ranking member and our chairman and others in introducing this legislation, which passed our committee unanimously.

Congress needs to act now because, while we go on summer break, new, faster centrifuges will be spinning 24-7/365. We are seeing Iran, as we've seen in hearings before our committee, evade the current sanctions. So, if we're going to keep the sanctions in force, we need this legislation to plug the loopholes that they are exploiting.

Two facts remain unchanged by the Iranian elections: first, their program to create nuclear weapons continues; and second, the supreme leader, not the newly elected President, is making the decisions.

Our committee adopted many amendments unanimously, including four of mine, and two I'd like to mention: one provides sanctions for those who sell uranium mining equipment to Iran, and another imposes sanctions on those who sell them dissident-suppressing technology.

Those who oppose this bill need to come to the floor and say why Iran needs uranium mining equipment and dissident-suppressing technology. Let's pass this bill.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard on the floor that we shouldn't base our diplomacy on the Iranian political calendar—I agree—but we shouldn't base our diplomacy and our foreign policy based on our political calendar.

Recently, we enacted the most effective, crippling economic sanctions

against Iran—ever—and it was done by the hard work of the administration, supported by Congress, to be able to mobilize an unprecedented coalition of people who agreed with us that they wanted to prevent Iran from having nuclear weapons and sending that signal.

But sadly, you can forget about President-elect Rouhani. This weakens President Obama. The optics now are to pull the rug out from underneath the newly elected moderate candidate. He's not my guy, he's not yours, but of the choices, it was a signal by the Iranian people.

Think about the future tools. Are you really going to be able to ratchet up these sanctions much more dramatically? Do you expect China and Japan are going to follow that path? And, if they work, what about the dislocations to the American economy and the global economy in moving this oil off the market? I think people ought to consider that. Ultimately, the only solution is a diplomatic solution to try and work this through. We're not going to go to war and nuclear bomb them. We are not going to occupy Iran.

It's ironic. Until recently—maybe still—Iran is the only country in the Middle East that had a positive view of Americans despite the fact that we helped the British overthrow their popularly elected President, Mossadegh, in 1953 and install the Shah as a dictator to rule over them.

□ 1730

I think there is a possibility that that recent election makes a difference in Iran. I hope it does. But one way to guarantee that it doesn't is to tell the Iranian people, We don't care what you do. We're going to ratchet up the sanctions. We're going to undercut the new guy. We're going to tell you that we're just going to go down this path. It ought to be based on facts, on reason. Let these sanctions work. Don't undercut our President and the ability to be flexible if there is some daylight. Don't poke the Iranian people in the eye and ignore the sorry history we've had of fumbling the relationship with that country.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank you for the time and for your leadership as the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reiterate my strong belief that one of the basic objectives of U.S. foreign policy is to build a world free of nuclear weapons. I applauded President Jimmy Carter at his inauguration in 1977 on a cold January day; I saluted President Reagan when he made his visit to Reykjavik, Iceland; and the commitment that many of our Presidents have made, including President Obama on this score.

One of the pillars of our foreign policy must be to end the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; that is, to get rid of them. To meet that task today, our actions must be clear and our commitment must be unwavering. It must be to continue this policy of the United States to prevent any country from developing a nuclear weapons capability. That is why I offer my support for this bill today, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act.

This legislation recognizes that an Iran with a nuclear weapon would be an urgent threat to regional security and to global security, and, therefore, to the security of the United States of America. This measure builds on the progress made in 2010 when we enacted the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act. That law imposed sanctions to companies that sell Iran technology, services, know-how, and materials for its energy sector. It was the strongest Iran sanctions legislation ever passed by the Congress, but we must do more.

With President Obama's strong, clear, and effective leadership, with broad bipartisan backing for a comprehensive strategy to halt Iran's nuclear program, we are seeing the results of the actions we have taken. More and more, Iran is being cut off from the financial system. Iran's oil is coming off the market. Iran's partners are cutting off ties of trade, business, and commerce. That's the way I think we should get this done, with economic sanctions.

In short, Iran is feeling the bite of our sanctions, but we must keep the pressure on. Iran's nuclear pursuits continue. Iran's leaders refuse to change their approach and their policies. Iran's neighbors still feel the threat of the regime's declarations and actions. So our message must remain firm: Iran must suspend uranium enrichment, return to the negotiating table, and abandon its reckless pursuit of nuclear weapons.

Now I appreciate and I have listened carefully and have the highest respect for Mr. MCGOVERN and others, Mr. ELLISON, who are opposing the resolution and have a different idea. I think as we weigh the equities, as they say, with all due respect to that approach, which I think is a reasonable one if we were dealing with a reasonable country with a reasonable leadership, but we are not.

I know that the proximity to Israel is a cause for concern for Israel, our partner in the Middle East, and a concern for those of us who value the Israel-U.S. relationship. Israel has proximity, but we all have the problem. If Iran were to go farther in the development of a nuclear weapon, who else would want one in the region? What message does that send about our resolve to arrive at a world free of nuclear weapons?

Anyway, I hope, as our colleagues say, a new regime is going to do all

these things. I happen to think that no matter who is in power in Iran, that they probably would not abandon a nuclear program, calling it one for domestic and civilian use. That may be true. I hope it is. But I do think it is really important for us, because we have to make this opportunity—I hope that the inauguration of a new President, talks with the U.S. and the European allies and all the rest, can bear fruit. We can only hope that those reports prove true. We hope that progress is made toward an agreement that puts an end to Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons and advances the cause of peace and security in the Middle East and around the world. Until that day comes, the Congress must continue to apply pressure. We must pursue all avenues of diplomacy and international leadership.

Again, what are the pillars of our foreign policy? To promote our economy, the creation of jobs by promoting exports—that's on the economic side; export our values, the commitment to freedom and democracy throughout the world. What does that mean? To protect the American people and our national security. An important part of that pillar of our foreign policy is to rid the world of weapons of mass destruction and make sure that we're not adding countries to that club. For that reason, we must prevent a nuclear armed Iran. Let's do it diplomatically. Let's do it with economic sanctions. Let's do it by encouraging dialogue, engagement, and the rest. But let's do that engagement from strength.

I urge a "yes" vote on the resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairman emeritus of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the author of the previous Iran sanctions legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, a nuclear Iran is one of our biggest national security threats and the number one existential threat to our ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel. We cannot and must not allow Iran, who is a designated state sponsor of terrorism, to reach nuclear breakout capability.

The Obama administration should not be mistaken. The Iranian regime does not want peace. It still wants to wipe Israel off the map. Iran may be able to process low-enriched uranium for a nuclear weapon by next year.

Iran has agreed to offer Syria a \$3.6 billion credit facility to buy oil products to help keep Assad's murderous regime afloat. Iran supports and fights alongside Assad's forces, brutally slaughtering thousands of Syrians. Rouhani has no intention of changing Iran's dangerous path, and the ultimate decisionmaker in this oppressive regime remains the Ayatollah Khamenei, who has a blatant hatred of us and our allies.

This bill includes my amendment that would eliminate the authority to waive sanctions against persons who are guilty of the most egregious activities in direct support of the Iranian regime's nuclear program.

This is a commonsense provision. This is a strong bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to fully support its passage.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL and incredible respect for my Democratic leaders and the Republican leaders who have spoken in favor of this bill. But I must rise in opposition to H.R. 850.

This Sunday on August 4, Iran will inaugurate a new President, Hassan Rouhani. It is a moment that allows President Obama, Secretary of State Kerry, Secretary of Defense Hagel, and the international community an opportunity to reengage with Iran on key issues of concern, most importantly the development of Iran's capacity to develop and launch a nuclear weapon.

This may be a very small window of opportunity for a fresh start on dialogue and action on the future of a nuclear Iran. It may be short-lived, depending on how Iran's new President views this moment. But it is a time when I, for one, want to support the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon's ability to move forward our relationship and dialogue with Iran on this most serious matter.

It is not the moment for Congress to increase and expand the level of U.S. sanctions against Iran. We have plenty of sanctions right now against Iran. If for some reason we need to increase even further the pressure against Iran and its new President, then we have the time to do so. It does not need to be done before the new Iranian President even takes office. We have time to weigh his sincerity and, more importantly, his actions to improve Iran's relations with the international community in the weeks and months to come. If he does not, if Iran remains intransigent and determined to develop a nuclear weapon, then the current onerous regimen of sanctions can be increased. But now is not the time to undermine U.S. diplomacy before it even has a chance to take shape.

Like all my House colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I'm skeptical that President-elect Rouhani will change the course of Iran's nuclear development, but I am willing to give him a chance. I'm willing to give Secretary Kerry a chance. If nothing changes, then we can revisit this bill or others at a later date. But not now.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me and vote against the untimely consideration of this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I rise in support of the measure that is being offered.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Global Human Rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank Chairman ROYCE for offering this urgent and necessary bill, and ELIOT ENGEL for his good cooperation on this important bill.

The Iranian government is estimated to be a little more than a year away from developing nuclear weapons, an unprecedented and absolutely unacceptable threat. Iran's repeated threats to annihilate Israel are unconscionable and constitute a direct and public incitement to commit genocide in violation of article III of the 1948 Genocide Convention. Iran's Supreme Leader Khamenei speaks of Israel as a cancerous tumor, calls for the annihilation and destruction of the Jewish state, and the leveling of Tel Aviv and Haifa. These are not idle threats. President-elect Rouhani, the past master of using negotiations as a cover to move Iran's nuclear program forward, is now being presented as a moderate, yet last year referred to Israel as the "Great Zionist Satan."

Mr. Speaker, this bill dramatically ramps up sanctions pushed so effectively by Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN last Congress not only to pressure Iran to negotiate, but also to mitigate Iran's emerging capability to launch the genocidal war against Israel it has been threatening for years.

This is a bipartisan bill, and it sends a clear, unmistakable message to Iran that we mean business. Those loopholes need to be closed, and Iran needs to be told that we want the sanctions to work. This tightens those loopholes and moves us in that direction.

□ 1745

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am standing here asking: What's the rush? The Iranian President is being sworn in in 4 days. For the first time in years, there is a moderate who's been elected as head of Iran, who promises us progress on the issues that are of most concern to us.

I'm not a blind optimist, and I have no illusions about the nature of Iran's Government. I understand that one election won't ensure us peace, but it could mean change, and we need to see what it looks like. Experts and former military officers, including the Com-

mander in Chief of Central Command, warn that more sanctions right now will "undercut the new President and his pledged plan of moderation." It gives ammunition to the hardliners who will operate against him. So the timing of this bill could not be worse from a foreign policy perspective.

In addition, Members have not had a chance to fully review the bill, which is significantly different than when it was marked up coming out of the Foreign Affairs Committee. The marked-up version became public only a few days ago, and I know that many Members who cosponsored the original bill are not aware of the changes made in it. For these reasons, we sent a letter to our leadership asking, along with 15 other Members, urging them to delay consideration until after September. We could come back after our vacation and deal with this if it's really needed. It doesn't have to happen now, except because we're going out on Friday.

Passing this legislation would support the hardliners' claims that we have no intention of negotiating; we hit the President before he even sits down in the chair. It's a dangerous sign to send and it limits our ability to find a diplomatic solution on nuclear arms in Iran.

There is no public support in this country for another war. We've seen this movie before. We put sanctions on Iraq. I was here when they put them on. I saw us squeeze them for 10 years. The World Health Organization said 500,000 Iraqi kids died because we cut off medicine and food and other essentials to the Iraq community. Did it end in a change? No. We went to war with them. And if you think that this is going to squeeze and bring us to war, and you think that what happened in Iraq is going to happen here, remember we're 11 years in Iraq. And we do not have a stable democracy today. We have a government that's about to collapse.

What we think we can do by squeezing people—and you're squeezing Iranian children today. Iranians cannot buy medicine on the world market and pay because we have cut off all of the banking connections everywhere so that there's no way for them to slip money through the banking system to pay for medicine for kids.

We should delay this vote. Vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I want to thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon through sanctions and diplomatic pressure is one of the paramount issues of our

time, and I am appreciative that today we will continue this important work to contain the threat.

The bill before us seeks to expand the instruments available to the administration in implementing targeted sanctions against the Iranian Government, while at the same time providing flexibility to relieve undue burden on the population of Iran. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member and the committee for working diligently on this bill, and I want to thank the members of the committee for joining me in support of this bill.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Nonproliferation.

Mr. POE of Texas. This new so-called President of Iran is no different than Ahmadinejad. Rouhani is no moderate; he's just slick. He has lied to the United States in the past. Don't be deceived; he is not even in charge of Iran.

The Ayatollah is in charge, and the Ayatollah picked all of the candidates running for president. The Ayatollah is still running the shots and is determined to get nuclear weapons and eliminate Israel and then the United States. And then what? Are we going to say, Oops, we made a mistake.

We need these sanctions. We need a regime change in Iran, a peaceful one with the Iranian people. This Ayatollah has Hezbollah running all over the world causing terror, including killing his own people in Camp Liberty. We need to pass this legislation.

Mr. ENGEL. I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with respect to all of my colleagues and the various positions that are being put forth, I support H.R. 850, a copy of which I happen to have in my hand; and I would point to page 38, line 11, which deals with exceptions for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, and medical devices. I wanted to bring some clarity to this issue.

With global security at risk, I don't think that we can take the risk. I do believe that we can proceed with diplomacy and sanctions at the same time. I support H.R. 850.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), who helped forge this legislation, H.R. 850.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, Hassan Rouhani is no moderate. He was a devoted follower of the 1979 revolutionary cabal in Iran. He led the 1999 crackdown on students in Iran. He's bragged about deceiving Western nuclear inspectors. He's called Israel a Zionist Satan. He's not even a President-elect because he was chosen in a sham democracy and a sham election.

Iran isn't looking for a chance to get to "yes" in negotiations. They are looking to give you a pretext to get to

“no” on this legislation. Stand strong and vote “yes” to sanction Iran to stop their nuclear weapons capabilities.

Mr. ENGEL. At this time I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), the ranking member of the Middle East Subcommittee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for working so hard to shepherd this bill through the House in a bipartisan way.

This legislation before us today takes a significant step forward in our efforts to prevent the Iranian regime from acquiring nuclear weapons capabilities. Sanctions passed by this House have had devastating effects on the Iranian economy, and this legislation will continue our efforts to financially squeeze the regime by dramatically reducing Iran's oil exports and by diminishing Iran's ability to access other currencies, all of this while ensuring that humanitarian aid will continue to flow.

Despite claims made earlier, this does not cut off medicine for children.

Beyond that, this bill recognizes that despite a somewhat surprising outcome to the June presidential elections, the Iranian people are still living under a regime that too often brutally represses democratic ideals, and it imposes sanctions on those who aid the regime's active violation of human rights.

To my friends who argue that this is the wrong time, I'd ask you to consider this: newly elected President Rouhani is scheduled to be sworn in in 4 days. He campaigned on economic sanctions relief. This relief will only come when the Ayatollah, when the supreme leader, decides to relinquish the nuclear weapons program. Now is the time to let President-elect Rouhani's actions speak louder than his words. Let him tell the supreme leader that the United States House of Representatives has passed new, devastating sanctions, and the only way to relief is through a negotiated end to the nuclear weapons program.

Our policy on Iran has always been dual track: sanctions and diplomacy. Now is not the time to give up on either.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

We have to look at things as they really are, not as we wish them to be. To my friends who say, What's the hurry? The hurry is we don't have time to wait. While we're talking, centrifuges are spinning and Iran is getting ever closer to having a nuclear weapon. By waiting, we're only aiding and abetting them.

Mr. Rouhani is no moderate. Moderates were not allowed to run in this Iranian election. He may be the least hard-core of all the hardliners; but make no mistake about it, he was directly involved in efforts to deceive the international community when he

served as Iran's chief nuclear negotiator. And he made clear during his campaign that he supports Iran's nuclear ambitions.

This is a bipartisan bill, and for good reason we have over 370 cosponsors. I respectfully ask my colleagues to vote “yes.”

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the centrifuges are, indeed, spinning. And it is Mr. Rouhani as chief negotiator who met the international community with delay, with more centrifuges, more missiles, more stonewalling. And as my colleagues have pointed out, during that campaign he was the hand-picked candidate of the Ayatollah, one of eight hand-picked candidates because reformers were not allowed to run, was the one on the campaign who said—who boosted—about how he, as chief negotiator in Iran, didn't suspend enrichment but instead completed the program.

This is the individual who, when he chaired Iran's National Security Council between 1989 and 2005, was at the table when Iran masterminded the 1994 bombing of the Jewish center in Buenos Aires. He is the individual who gave the order and boasted of it; the man who called on the regime's besieging militia to attack the students in 1999 and crush them, in his words, crush them mercilessly, crush them monumentally—a thousand arrested; hundreds tortured; 70 disappeared; many, many killed. This is the nature of that man. Do not misunderstand his intentions. That's why we need this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, last week The Hill published a column entitled “Don't force an irresponsible vote on Iran sanctions.” The column started with the following two sentences: “The House of Representatives is under pressure to vote on a new Iran sanctions bill, H.R. 850, before members leave town for August recess. Scheduling such a vote would be irresponsible and highly counterproductive to U.S. strategy on Iran.”

The authors of the column were not some peaceniks or pundits, but experts with real life experiences in military, diplomacy and fighting for a future of freedom for the people of Iran—Gen. (retired) Joseph Hoar, former Commander in Chief of United States Central Command, Col. (retired) Lawrence Wilkerson, former Chief of Staff to General Colin Powell, and Trita Parsi, president of the National Iranian American Council.

Today, the House of Representatives is advancing this “irresponsible and highly counterproductive” bill to push Iran deeper into a state of isolation and push the U.S. further away from a diplomatic resolution to Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons. Most disturbing, by severely limiting diplomatic options for the U.S. and our international partners, this bill advances the agenda of those who seek to once again push the U.S. towards military confrontation. Our nation has been down this irresponsible, dangerous and costly path before

with the war in Iraq and I completely reject the idea that war with Iran is inevitable or a viable solution to this situation.

On August 3rd the new president of Iran, Dr. Hassan Rouhani, will take office. Dr. Rouhani was elected as a moderate voice who campaigned to “pursue a policy of peace and reconciliation” with the West. The new president was Iran's former lead nuclear negotiator and was critical of the nuclear “extremism” of his dangerous predecessor, President Ahmadinejad. This is the absolute best opportunity and most favorable conditions to proceed with a diplomatic course.

Just in the past month, I received over 100 calls, e-mails and letters urging me to sign a letter to President Obama calling for a renewed diplomatic effort with Iran's new leader.

On July 19th I joined 130 Democrats and Republicans in signing the letter to Mr. Obama urging him “to pursue the potential opportunity presented by Iran's recent presidential election by reinvigorating U.S. efforts to secure a negotiated nuclear agreement.” Our letter goes on to say, “we believe it would be a mistake not to test whether Dr. Rouhani's election represents a real opportunity for progress toward a verifiable, enforceable agreement on Iran's nuclear program that ensures the country does not acquire a nuclear weapon. In order to test this proposition, it will be prudent for the United States to utilize all diplomatic tools to reinvigorate ongoing nuclear talks.”

H.R. 850 and its extreme sanctions takes the opposite course. It sends the signal that the U.S. wishes to punish the Iranian people and will only settle for submission, rather than a negotiated, face saving solution that meets the security needs of the United States, Israel, and the entire international community and the economic needs of the Iranian people. This bill is a blunt instrument that harms U.S. interests, undercuts President Obama, and gives no hope to the millions of Iranians who look to the U.S. as a beacon of freedom and inspiration.

Clearly there are no guarantees that diplomacy will work in the near term and preventing a nuclear-armed Iran is an absolute. So, advancing H.R. 850 and tougher sanctions can proceed at anytime in the months ahead if Iran rejects negotiations or refuses to take tangible, verifiable steps towards an agreement. The House could vote on this bill in October or November, giving President Obama, our international partners, and the new Iranian leadership a legitimate window of time to seek peaceful progress.

This bill has 375 co-sponsors so there is absolute certainty that this bill will pass and then Congress can go on its August recess. This bill will not move in the U.S. Senate in the days ahead so nothing will be accomplished by the passage of H.R. 850 other than some chest pounding by politicians, the imposition of an embarrassing obstacle to U.S. diplomats, and a victory for the hardliners in Iran who reject negotiations as much as hardliners in this country.

Today, at this moment in time, this is a bill that harms U.S. interests and I will vote against it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express concern about the decision to bring H.R. 850 to the floor for

a vote today. We must act strongly and strategically to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran, and I believe diplomatic negotiations are currently the best possible means at our disposal for achieving this goal.

Unfortunately, I am concerned that voting on H.R. 850 now may undermine efforts to achieve a peaceful, negotiated elimination of Iranian nuclear capacity. At a time when a new Iranian President-elect has made statements indicating a greater openness to diplomacy, returning this message with a vote on tougher sanctions only serves to empower Iranian hardliners and weaken Iranian moderates.

U.S. policy must make it clear that the goal of sanctions on Iran is to elicit verifiable concessions from Iran that have a material impact on its ability to develop a nuclear weapon. In order to achieve this goal, the President must have the ability to waive sanctions in exchange for Iranian concessions. Yet H.R. 850 places significant restrictions on the President's authority to waive sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, while we must maintain a credible military threat towards Iran, we must also make every effort to promote the success of diplomatic negotiations with Iran. If we fail to negotiate a solution that ensures the safety of the U.S. and our close ally Israel by verifying that Iran does not have the capacity to develop nuclear weapons, we will be left with few alternatives but military engagement. I urge my colleagues to come together and support tough but fair diplomacy with Iran.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 850, which provides our diplomats the leverage they need to persuade Iran that the only viable course of action is to suspend work on its nuclear program.

The bill restricts oil exports from Iran and cuts off various Iranian industries from the global marketplace. It also expands sanctions on Iranian human rights violators. Lastly, this bill provides flexibility for the President to not apply sanctions when he deems it appropriate.

There is adequate time to test the willingness and ability of President Rouhani to pursue good faith talks and reach an acceptable resolution. That said, complete inaction could signal indifference or a weakening of our resolve to pro-nuclear forces in Iran. Incoming President Rouhani and the other regime leaders must be made to understand that U.S. economic pressure and other sanctions will remain in force until there is a reliable and verifiable halt to Iran's nuclear program. Given Iran's progress in nuclear enrichment, time is of the essence and Iran's past delaying tactics cannot be allowed to continue.

As an original cosponsor of H.R. 850, I urge my colleagues to send a strong, unequivocal message to the Iranian regime.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am a co-sponsor of this legislation and I urge my colleagues to support it today.

It is clear that the current regime in Iran poses troubling security challenges to the world community and our allies in the Middle East. The hateful and threatening comments made by the President of Iran against Israel cannot be tolerated. Further, the provocative actions taken by Iran to further their nuclear weapons program must be stopped. A nuclear Iran would destabilize the region and threaten

the United States and our allies. Iran must alter its dangerous course, and the United States needs to be fully involved to help bring this about.

I continue to support the Obama Administration's actions to seek a diplomatic solution to Iran's unnecessary and unwise pursuit of nuclear weapons. It is unacceptable for Iran to possess nuclear weapons. However, despite having imposed some of the most stringent sanctions on Iran ever, the United States and our international partners have thus far been unable to compel Iran to abandon its quest for a nuclear weapon. Accordingly, the House has no choice but to pass H.R. 850.

This bill would designate the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps as a foreign terrorist organization, impose sanctions on specific Iranian officials (i.e., the Supreme Leader, Guardians Council, MOIS, Quds Force, etc.), and tie additional sanctions to human rights abuses. I regret that the failure of Iran's government to change its course makes this bill necessary, as many ordinary Iranians have already suffered much as a result of the existing sanctions. We all want to see the people of Iran freed from the tyranny and oppression of the current clerical regime, but above all our greatest obligation is to prevent Iran from building and fielding nuclear weapons. This bill, if enacted into law, will hopefully bring us one step closer to that goal.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I, along with the Gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. COTTON, recognize that this critical legislation requires countries still purchasing oil from Iran to reduce their combined imports by 1 million barrels per day within a year. Iran's energy sector provides the regime the resources needed to fund its nuclear weapons program. We remain extremely concerned with the pace of Iran's nuclear program. Some estimate that Iran may achieve a nuclear weapons breakout capability next year.

For this reason, we remain committed to sending the toughest possible sanctions bill to the President's desk, as quickly as possible.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 850—the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013. As a cosponsor of this important legislation, I would like to commend the bipartisan leadership of Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ROYCE of California and Ranking Member ENGEL of New York on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that our strongest ally in the Middle East is the State of Israel. It is, therefore, incumbent upon us to provide them with our unwavering support. In order to uphold this commitment, we must stop Iran's nuclear proliferation efforts. That is why I am pleased that from the outset of this legislation, the statement of policy is absolutely clear when it states, "It shall be the policy of the United States to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability."

Congress took an important step during 2012 to implement economic sanctions on Iran through the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012. This important legislation punishes individuals who knowingly sell more than 1,000,000 barrels of refined product, or individuals that sell, lease, or provide Iran with goods, services, technology, or information.

However, despite this effort, Iran's nuclear program has continued to grow. It was reported today that Iran has an additional 5,000 new centrifuges are ready to start operation to complement the existing 12,000 already in place. This comes on the heels of the International Atomic Energy Agency's statement in June that Tehran was violating international regulations by increasing the number of centrifuges. This continued growth in Iran's nuclear proliferation is simply unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, while we took a critical first step in the 112th Congress, it is abundantly clear that further action is needed to curtail Iran's nuclear program. H.R. 850 today will only expand sanctions targeting Iran's human rights violations, and—for the first time—allow the President of the United States to impose sanctions on any entity that maintains significant commercial ties to Iran. H.R. 850 hits Iran where it hurts the most. By strengthening existing sanctions on 1,000,000 barrels of crude per day, this bill essentially takes money away from the Iranian regime that it would potentially use on the nuclear program.

Once again, this legislation will show our strong support of Israel and its ability to remain a beacon of democracy in the Middle East. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 850.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the goals of H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons and establishing clear controls and transparency so that it cannot move toward becoming a nuclear weapon state. Despite that, I have grave concerns with the timing of this vote as well as amendments made to the bill in Committee.

As marked up in Committee, H.R. 850 places inappropriate and counter-effective restrictions on the President's authority to waive sanctions in exchange for Iranian concessions that would be in the national security interest of our Nation and in the security interests of our ally Israel. By attempting to hobble the President's Article II authority to engage in foreign policy on behalf of the United States, the bill would limit the President's negotiating ability and thereby undermine our diplomatic efforts; this is particularly concerning given that the White House has signaled willingness to restart direct negotiations with Iran.

It is especially counterproductive to vote on this measure before Iran's new president is inaugurated on August 4, 2013. In fact, experts have argued a vote on new sanctions ahead of the inauguration would only benefit Iranian hardliners opposed to compromising their goal for a nuclear Iran.

Lastly, this bill should include language explicitly stating that nothing in its provisions is intended to or may be used as a basis for authorization for war with Iran. The bill as currently written is too open to interpretation and I strongly oppose this Congress granting an implicit authorization for war, especially in the wake of the two wars we have so devastatingly waged over the past decade.

Because of these flawed provisions, I voted against H.R. 850. I look forward to working with colleagues to amend it as it moves through conference.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have voted for many of the Iran

sanctions bills that have to come before this body in the past, and I strongly believe that sanctions are a crucial tool in the extremely important effort to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons. But I am disappointed that the House took up and passed H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act, this week. I believe that the timing and substance of this latest sanctions bill are ill-considered and would have the effect of pushing Iran in the opposite direction we seek.

More than 100 Members of Congress from both parties wrote to President Obama just two weeks ago in support of efforts to “utilize all diplomatic tools to reinvigorate ongoing nuclear talks.” I signed that letter because I believe that, while we cannot know at this point whether President-elect Rouhani will in fact be willing to negotiate in good faith to end Iran’s pursuit of a nuclear weapon, we must do everything in our power to demonstrate to Iran that it will benefit from ending its pursuit of nuclear weapons. Bringing H.R. 850 for a vote this week, just before President-elect Rouhani’s inauguration, I believe, does the opposite, as it indicates an unwillingness to adapt to any adjusting circumstances that may occur. Moreover, it strengthens the hands of extremists in Iran who could use this vote to falsely claim that the American government is not interested in pursuing a diplomatic solution.

Additionally, I am concerned that certain provisions in H.R. 850 would unwisely limit President Obama’s authority to negotiate as he sees fit. In particular, the bill would impose a total oil embargo, without providing an appropriate exemption for President Obama to utilize if need be. This creates two problems. First, it diminishes President Obama’s ability to offer economic benefits to Iran in exchange for an Iranian halt to enrichment of uranium. Second, it makes it substantially more challenging for President Obama to maintain the strong international coalition that he has developed in support of sanctions. Without international support, our sanctions would be for naught, as Iran would be able to simply continue trading with other countries and would not face the economic harms intended by sanctions.

I support a strong sanctions regime as part of an effort to achieve a diplomatic solution that prevents Iran from developing nuclear weapons. I also support some important provisions of H.R. 850, such as those that provide for new sanctions against Iranian officials who are responsible for human rights abuses. Yet, overall, I am concerned that H.R. 850 will not strengthen the effort to utilize sanctions to achieve a diplomatic solution, but will instead be counterproductive to it.

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into the record my support for H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act. Unfortunately, I was not present for the rollcall vote on this bill. Please let the record show that I am a co-sponsor of this legislation and that had I been present I fully intended to vote: “yea.”

The message should be heard loud and clear from America: Iran must abandon its nuclear ambition. H.R. 850 is the vital next step in toughening sanctions on this brazen nation. Iran is an existential threat to Israel, our strongest ally in the Middle East, and a threat

to peace throughout the world. Our steadfastness and resolve for peace and stability in the world will see this through.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully rise to express my opposition to H.R. 850, the most recent legislative effort by this body to further increase sanctions on Iran. Although I believe the intentions of the authors of this legislation are good, I believe our shared goal of preventing Iran from achieving a nuclear weapon will actually be harmed by bringing this legislation forward at this critical moment.

In three days, Iran will inaugurate a new president—Hasan Rowhani—who was elected after he ran on a platform of engaging with the United States and rejecting the extremist policies of his predecessor. Despite the fact that Mr. Rowhani was not the preferred candidate of Supreme Leader Khamenei, he was elected by an overwhelming majority of the Iranian people this past June. In short, the Iranian people rejected an extremist government and voted for the candidate who represented the best opportunity to break with the human rights violations and belligerent policies of the past.

Yet, instead of taking this moment to re-engage with Iran and pursue diplomacy—which is the only way to ultimately prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon—we are instead moving forward with new, crippling sanctions before we have the opportunity to see whether President-elect Rowhani’s campaign promises will lead to new, positive action. Even worse, this legislation sends a message to the Iranian people that their bravery and massive turnout this past June in the face of violent repression and intimidation from the government, was a futile and irrelevant action in the eyes of the United States.

In addition to this legislation’s unfortunate timing, this bill also contains several troubling provisions which diverge significantly from previous Iran sanctions legislation. The bill contains policy language that changes the red line for war with Iran from the clear position laid out by the Obama Administration to a nebulous position that Iran should not be allowed to obtain a nuclear weapons “capability.” The term “capability” is not defined in the bill. When dealing with questions of war and peace, it is incumbent that Congress and the Administration speak with one voice and avoid putting forward policy positions that are open to interpretation and could pave the way for war.

Additionally, the bill places significant restrictions on the President’s ability to waive sanctions in exchange for positive action by Iran on the nuclear issue. In doing so, the bill threatens to fracture the unprecedented international coalition working to prevent Iran from achieving a nuclear weapon.

For all of these reasons, both procedural and substantive, I oppose the bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act.

This legislation will significantly strengthen the impact of existing sanctions on Iran in the hopes of convincing the regime’s leaders to stop their nuclear weapons program.

The message to Iran must be crystal clear: stop your nuclear program or face intensifying international isolation and crippling economic pressure until your program stops.

I stand with over 350 over my colleagues who have co-sponsored this legislation in strong opposition to Iran’s nuclear weapons program.

Allowing Iran to achieve nuclear weapons capability would start a very dangerous nuclear arms race in a region that is already unstable—endangering our Nation’s security and the security of our friends and allies in the Middle East.

Iran continues to increase its stockpiles of twenty-percent enriched uranium, approaching a level where they can very quickly breakout whenever they want. They are also installing advanced centrifuges that would allow them to substantially increase their uranium enrichment at a rapid pace.

This legislation will eliminate sources of foreign funding, reduce oil exports by an additional million barrels per day and apply harsh penalties to human rights violators.

By passing this legislation and ensuring its enforcement, we can continue to enforce the strongest possible amount of financial pressure against Iran.

The window for a peaceful resolution is quickly closing. Through tightening sanctions, pursuing the diplomatic track, and keeping all options on the table, I believe we can persuade the Iranian regime to stop their quest for nuclear weapons before it is too late.

As co-chair of the Democratic Israel Working Group, I urge my colleagues to stand for peace and a nuclear-free Middle East and vote in support of this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 850, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1911, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 850, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

BIPARTISAN STUDENT LOAN CERTAINTY ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in

the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1911) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 31, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

YEAS—392

Aderholt	Conaway	Gibson
Alexander	Connolly	Gingrey (GA)
Amash	Cook	Goodlatte
Amodei	Cooper	Gosar
Andrews	Costa	Gowdy
Bachmann	Courtney	Granger
Bachus	Cramer	Graves (GA)
Barber	Crawford	Grayson
Barletta	Crenshaw	Green, Al
Barr	Crowley	Griffin (AR)
Barrow (GA)	Cuellar	Griffith (VA)
Barton	Culberson	Grimm
Beatty	Cummings	Guthrie
Becerra	Daines	Gutiérrez
Benishek	Davis (CA)	Hahn
Bentivolio	Davis, Danny	Hall
Bera (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Hanabusa
Bilirakis	DeFazio	Hanna
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Harper
Bishop (NY)	Delaney	Harris
Bishop (UT)	DeLauro	Hartzler
Black	DelBene	Hastings (FL)
Blackburn	Denham	Hastings (WA)
Blumenauer	Dent	Heck (NV)
Bonamici	DeSantis	Heck (WA)
Bonner	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Boustany	Deutch	Higgins
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart	Himes
Brady (TX)	Dingell	Hinojosa
Braley (IA)	Doggett	Holding
Bridenstine	Doyle	Hoyer
Brooks (AL)	Duckworth	Hudson
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Huelskamp
Brown (FL)	Duncan (SC)	Huffman
Brownley (CA)	Duncan (TN)	Huizenga (MI)
Buchanan	Edwards	Hultgren
Bucshon	Ellmers	Hunter
Burgess	Engel	Hurt
Bustos	Enyart	Israel
Butterfield	Eshoo	Issa
Calvert	Esty	Jackson Lee
Camp	Farenthold	Jeffries
Cantor	Farr	Jenkins
Capito	Fattah	Johnson (GA)
Capps	Fincher	Johnson (OH)
Cárdenas	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, E. B.
Carney	Fleischmann	Johnson, Sam
Carson (IN)	Fleming	Jones
Carter	Flores	Jordan
Cartwright	Forbes	Joyce
Cassidy	Fortenberry	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Foster	Keating
Castro (TX)	Fox	Kelly (IL)
Chabot	Frankel (FL)	Kelly (PA)
Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)	Kennedy
Cicilline	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Clay	Gabbard	Kilmer
Cleaver	Gallego	King (IA)
Clyburn	Garamendi	King (NY)
Coble	Garcia	Kingston
Coffman	Gardner	Kinzinger (IL)
Cohen	Garrett	Kirkpatrick
Cole	Gerlach	Kline
Collins (NY)	Gibbs	Kuster

Labrador	Nugent	Scott, Austin
LaMalfa	Nunes	Scott, David
Lamborn	Nunnelee	Sensenbrenner
Lance	O'Rourke	Serrano
Langevin	Olson	Sessions
Lankford	Owens	Sewell (AL)
Larsen (WA)	Palazzo	Shea-Porter
Larson (CT)	Pascarell	Sherman
Latham	Pastor (AZ)	Shimkus
Latta	Paulsen	Shuster
Levin	Pearce	Simpson
Lewis	Pelosi	Sinema
Lipinski	Perlmutter	Sires
LoBiondo	Perry	Slaughter
Loeb	Peters (CA)	Smith (MO)
Loeb	Peters (MI)	Smith (NE)
Lofgren	Peterson	Smith (NJ)
Long	Petri	Smith (TX)
Lowenthal	Pingree (ME)	Smith (WA)
Lucas	Pittenger	Southland
Luetkemeyer	Pitts	Stewart
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Poe (TX)	Stivers
Lummis	Polis	Stockman
Maffei	Pompeo	Swalwell (CA)
Maloney,	Possey	Terry
Carolyn	Price (GA)	Thompson (CA)
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Marchant	Quigley	Thompson (PA)
Marino	Radel	Thornberry
Massie	Rahall	Tiberi
Matheson	Rangel	Tipton
Matsui	Reed	Titus
McCarthy (CA)	Reichert	Tonko
McCaul	Renacci	Turner
McClintock	Ribble	Upton
McCollum	Rice (SC)	Valadao
McDermott	Rigell	Van Hollen
McHenry	Roby	Vargas
McIntyre	Roe (TN)	Veasey
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Vela
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Velázquez
McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Visclosky
Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Wagner
McNeerney	Rokita	Walberg
Meadows	Rooney	Walden
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Walorski
Meeks	Roskam	Walz
Meng	Ross	Wasserman
Messer	Rothfus	Schultz
Mica	Roybal-Allard	Waters
Michaud	Royce	Watt
Miller (FL)	Ruiz	Waxman
Miller (MI)	Runyan	Weber (TX)
Miller, Gary	Ruppersberger	Wenstrup
Miller, George	Ryan (OH)	Whitfield
Moore	Ryan (WI)	Williams
Moran	Salmon	Wilson (FL)
Mullin	Sánchez, Linda T.	Wilson (SC)
Mulvaney	Sanchez, Loretta	Wittman
Murphy (FL)	Sarbanes	Wolf
Murphy (PA)	Scalise	Womack
Nadler	Schiff	Woodall
Napolitano	Schneider	Yarmuth
Neal	Schock	Yoder
Negrete McLeod	Schrader	Yoho
Neugebauer	Schwartz	Young (AK)
Noem	Schweikert	Young (IN)
Nolan	Scott (VA)	

NAYS—31

Bass	Grijalva	Richmond
Broun (GA)	Honda	Sanford
Capuano	Kind	Schakowsky
Chu	Lee (CA)	Speier
Clarke	Luján, Ben Ray	Stutzman
Conyers	(NM)	Takano
Cotton	Lynch	Tierney
Ellison	McGovern	Tsongas
Fudge	Pallone	Welch
Gohmert	Payne	Westmoreland
Green, Gene	Pocan	

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell	Holt	Webster (FL)
Collins (GA)	Horsford	Young (FL)
Graves (MO)	McCarthy (NY)	
Herrera Beutler	Rush	

□ 1821

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Ms. SPEIER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. CICILLINE and BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to reiterate the announcement of February 26, 2013, concerning proper attire on the floor of the House.

Members should wear appropriate business attire during all sittings of the House, however brief their appearance on the floor.

This standard applies even when a Member is entering the Chamber only to vote by electronic device or by card in the well.

Members are reminded of the unique tradition and dignity of the House that sets it apart from other institutions and workplaces.

The Chair expresses gratitude for those Members that meet this standard, especially those who have had to change longtime personal customs or traditions to do so.

The Chair appreciates the attention of the Members to this matter.

NUCLEAR IRAN PREVENTION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 850) to impose additional human rights and economic and financial sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 20, answered “present” 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

YEAS—400

Aderholt	Beatty	Bonamici
Alexander	Becerra	Bonner
Amodei	Benishek	Boustany
Andrews	Bentivolio	Brady (PA)
Bachmann	Bera (CA)	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Bilirakis	Braley (IA)
Barber	Bishop (GA)	Bridenstine
Barletta	Bishop (NY)	Brooks (AL)
Barr	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (IN)
Barrow (GA)	Black	Broun (GA)
Barton	Blackburn	Brown (FL)
Bass	Boehner	Brownley (CA)

Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Galleo
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs

Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzer
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huiuzenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant

Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta

Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalese
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schramer
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez

Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—20

Amash
Blumenauer
Carson (IN)
Edwards
Ellison
Grijalva
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Lee (CA)
Massie
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Miller, George

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Johnson (GA)

NOT VOTING—13

Campbell
Collins (GA)
Conyers
Graves (MO)
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
King (IA)
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Schock
Yoder
Young (FL)

□ 1834

Mr. PAYNE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, due to being unavoidably detained, I missed the following Rollcall Vote: No. 427 on July 31, 2013. If present, I would have voted: Rollcall vote No. 427—H.R. 850, Nuclear Iran Prevention Act, as amended, "aye."

ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1582.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 315 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1582.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1838

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This evening, we will be debating H.R. 1582, the Energy Consumers Relief Act of 2013, authored by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Madam Chairman, one of the major issues that the American people face today is a slow growth in its economy. Our economy has been sluggish for some time. The last quarter of 2012 and the first quarter of 2013, gross domestic product grew by less than 2 percent. And in the last 15 quarters, the growth of our economy in America has been the slowest since World War II. So we need to do everything in this country to promote economic growth, and this bill looks at the impact of regulations as obstacles to economic growth.

I want to just read a few of the regulations that have been adopted by EPA since January 2009:

Greenhouse gas regulations for cars, and these are EPA numbers. It cost \$52 billion. Greenhouse gas standards for cars 2017–2025, \$144 billion; greenhouse gas standards for trucks, \$8 billion; Utility MACT, \$9.6 billion annually; Boiler MACT, \$2.2 billion annually.

Now, I could go on and on, but I think that that shows that the cost of some of these regulations present serious obstacles to economic growth. So the legislation that we consider tonight is simply a commonsense approach, a way to review the impact of energy-related regulations at the Environmental Protection Agency.

All this legislation does is this:

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not promulgate as final an energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than \$1 billion unless:

One, they make a report to Congress setting out what the regulation does; and

Two, the Secretary of Energy, working with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Small Business Administration will look at these regulations and look at the impact on consumer energy cost, the impact on employment, and the impact on economic growth. The Department of Energy certainly has the expertise to analyze these kinds of figures, and if the Secretary determines that it would be harmful to economic growth, then the Secretary can actually stop the regulation from taking effect.

Now, the good news is, at that point, EPA could go back and redo the process. But I can tell you, from my personal experience of working with people in my district who are affected by regulations every day, most people genuinely believe that there's not anything wrong with having other government agencies review the impact of the cost of regulations on the economy, on jobs, on the price of fuel. That's precisely what Dr. CASSIDY's bill does. I think it's a commonsense approach and something that the American people need as additional protections.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Affordable and reliable energy is critical for our basic necessities, from heating or cooling homes, to transportation and obtaining healthcare. When energy prices rise, it threatens public health because it hurts the poor and disadvantaged disproportionately.

Energy is also critical for a growing economy. When energy prices rise, it can cause job losses that can be devastating to public health.

Given the prolonged weakness in the economy, high unemployment, and rising gasoline and other energy prices, the Nation can ill-afford to be further burdened by billion-dollar energy regulations that destroy jobs and significantly harm the economy.

Today we have an opportunity to help protect families, consumers, and manufacturers from rising energy costs triggered by billion-dollar energy regulations imposed by the Environmental Protection Agency. We can do this by requiring greater transparency and more inter-agency scrutiny of EPA's most expensive energy regulations, and that is why I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1582, the "Energy Consumers Relief Act."

This additional scrutiny of EPA's costs and benefits analysis is warranted. For example, EPA estimated that only 4,700 MW of coal-fired generation would be lost as a result of its Utility MACT rule. Yet, with 2 years left until the 2015 compliance deadline, nearly 44,000 MW of coal-fired generation have already announced retirement.

Further, we received testimony before the Energy and Power Subcommittee that under EPA's formula used to measure job impacts, the more costly the regulation, the greater the

job increase EPA's formula will project. The use of such fuzzy math to calculate employment impacts led one economist to conclude, "one cannot characterize the current formula favored by EPA as an economic methodology at all."

It's exactly these types of skewed methodologies and flawed results that H.R. 1582 will help shine a light on. We owe it to the American people to ensure that our federal agencies are not overstating benefits or understating economic impacts to further political agendas.

Such scrutiny will become increasingly critical as EPA and the Administration attempt to justify its forthcoming greenhouse gas regulations on coal-fired power plants with unsound and untested "Social Cost of Carbon" methodology.

With more EPA billion-dollar energy-related rules on the horizon, it is imperative that we understand the impacts of these rules on jobs and the economy before they are implemented.

By passing the "Energy Consumers Relief Act" we have the chance to protect American consumers and businesses from billion-dollar regulations that significantly harm the economy. And I might add that this Act does nothing to affect existing laws and regulations that protect public health and the environment.

I urge all my colleagues to support this bill. Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This Republican bill is simply a disguised assault on EPA rules that protect human health and the environment. That's why the White House has said that the President would veto this bill—if it got to him.

Last Congress, this House, under Republican leadership—they know how to dress, but they don't know how to legislate. The Republicans voted over 300 times to roll back environmental laws. Nearly half of these votes were efforts to block EPA rules.

The House voted to block EPA standards for mercury, a serious toxin, and other air pollutants that are similarly poisonous from power plants and incinerators.

□ 1845

The House voted to strip EPA of authority to set water quality standards. The House even voted to overturn EPA's scientific finding that carbon pollution endangers health and the environment.

The problem the Republicans face is that the public doesn't want more air and water pollution. They don't support these attacks on public health standards that protect our kids and our seniors. The public doesn't want to weaken the Clean Air Act or the Clean Water Act or the Safe Drinking Water Act. The public supports our bedrock environmental laws.

So it should come as no surprise that none of these attacks on EPA in the last Congress became law. They all died in the Senate.

Now, House Republicans are trying a new approach: rather than blocking

EPA action directly, they want to give another agency veto power over EPA rules.

Under this bill, if the Department of Energy determines that a rule proposed by EPA would cause any "significant adverse effects to the economy," EPA would be blocked from finalizing the rule.

This bill would set a terrible precedent. If we give DOE a veto power over EPA, where do we stop? Are we next going to give the Department of Commerce a veto over the State Department or the IRS a veto over the FDA? This kind of thinking would mean that our government would be so dysfunctional that the whole government would look like the Congress of the United States.

Even if DOE does not veto an EPA rule, the extensive analysis required under the bill could delay EPA rules for years, which means more air pollution, more asthma for our kids, and more danger to our planet.

We have an obligation to our children and future generations to protect our atmosphere while there is still time. We need to be acting faster, not putting on the brakes to benefit the big polluters.

This is a costly bill. The Congressional Budget Office says that the price tag for all the reviews and the reports required under this legislation would be \$35 million over 5 years. This is money that we don't have to spend, especially since the DOE reviews will simply be duplicative of exhaustive analysis already done by the EPA. And while EPA is acting, they can give EPA their point of view.

And consider this point: at the same time that the House Republicans are telling DOE to undertake exhaustive analysis of EPA rules, they are slashing DOE's budget. DOE could end up with no resources to do these reviews. Existing statutory deadlines for EPA to issue public health standards would be replaced with indefinite delay.

This bill is a recipe for making the Federal agencies dysfunctional. No one should want that.

Let me give you an example of the kind of public health standard this bill is designed to block. During the committee markup, the chairman of the Energy and Power Subcommittee argued that this legislation is needed because he was not satisfied with EPA's analysis of the mercury and air toxics rule. He wasn't satisfied. EPA did a whole analysis. They got the costs; they got the benefits. It was all quantified.

Every year, EPA's standards will help reduce mercury pollution, prevent up to 11,000 premature deaths, and deliver up to \$90 billion in benefits to the Nation. But this individual Member wasn't satisfied. It's a tremendous success story that will deliver up to \$9 of benefits for every \$1 spent. That's what

EPA was proposing to do. No Member of Congress, no other department, should stop those kinds of regulations from being put in place.

The fact that this rule is the poster child for the public health rule this legislation is designed to block shows just how misguided this legislation truly is.

This bill is deeply flawed; it is a veiled assault on critical public health and environmental protections. I urge all Members to oppose this latest Republican attempt to gut our Nation's cornerstone environmental laws, which were adopted by bipartisan votes. And now the Republicans in a partisan way are trying to make sure those laws do not work to protect public health and the environment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, I might say, with all due respect to my friend from California, that he is exactly correct. I was not satisfied with Utility MACT, but primarily because EPA misled the American people. Publicly they were always talking about the mercury reductions and that the benefits would come from mercury reductions. Yet at the hearing, EPA's own analysis showed that the benefits were not there for mercury reductions; the benefits were there from particulate matter reduction. So I don't see why they deliberately misled the American people on that.

I might just make one other brief comment. We were talking about the money involved by the Department of Energy in implementing this bill. At the end of fiscal year 2012, the Department of Energy had over \$2.36 billion in excess carry-over balances.

At this time, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. CASSIDY, the author of this bill.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairman UPTON, Chairman WHITFIELD, and their staff for their hard work in preparing this important legislation and bringing it to the House floor, which, by the way, passed the committee with bipartisan support.

Currently, millions of Americans are unemployed or underemployed, millions more have left the labor force entirely, and our economy continues to struggle to recover.

This is particularly true among blue collar workers, blue collar workers who have traditionally been employed in mining, manufacturing, and construction. Those three are related because the mining, the bringing of resources from underneath the ground, fuels literally energy-intensive manufacturing enterprises, which will then go on to make steel, use the steel to construct pipelines, or first make steel pipes, then to construct pipelines. It is an energy-intensive economy that brings good jobs with good benefits to blue collar workers. I have no clue why

folks on the other side of the aisle are so hostile to our blue collar workers.

While we have all these millions unemployed, the EPA has been advancing an expansive regulatory assault on the production and distribution of affordable and reliable energy.

Now, by the way, current regulations don't change. That does not roll back anything. This is only about prospective regulations. So if there is a concern about the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act, those regulations as they have currently been enforced remain the same. It is just that numerous new regulations have created uncertainty, contributing to an unprecedented number of announced power plant shutdowns, destroying blue collar jobs, increasing energy costs on manufacturers, and raising concern regarding electrical grid reliability.

Although the EPA attributes large public health benefits to billion-dollar regulations, their scientific analysis has been sharply criticized, with one public health expert saying their method of analysis is misleading to public policymakers.

Another, the National Academy of Science, on a formaldehyde rule saying that the conclusions are not justified by the methodology or the research that was presented.

We are using faulty research to justify the destruction of blue collar jobs. I don't know why anybody wouldn't want to be for this, but some are not.

There are concerns that the EPA ignores a significant public health cost associated with energy prices and result in job losses. I'm a doc. I know that when someone loses their job with good benefits and goes on something like Medicaid their health suffers.

There is a researcher, Dr. Till von Wachter, currently an associate professor of economics at UCLA, who testified that job losses can lead to significant reductions in life expectancy of 1 to 1.5 years. This isn't just a parent, the worker; it's their children as well. It is so well documented, and yet folks are just cavalier and casual about the job losses that EPA regulation brings about. When energy becomes expensive or unreliable, public health is threatened, as that research shows.

All we are asking for here is accountability and transparency to determine the full impact of EPA's major energy-related regulations—the impact it will have on jobs, energy prices, and our Nation's economy. If the benefit outweighs the cost, the rule goes forward; but if the cost greatly outweighs the benefit, then let's just stick up for the blue collar worker, her family, let's just stick up for them so maybe they don't have to go on government dependency.

By the way, it is not unprecedented. OMB has previously put a hold on EPA rules, and EPA has the right to put a hold on Army Corps of Engineer rul-

ings. Commonly, agencies are accountable to one another. All we ask is that the EPA will be accountable to the Department of Energy, but, if you will, to the American people.

This rule requires that if the energy rules are appropriately reviewed by the Secretary of Energy, consulting with the other relevant agencies to determine whether the proposed rules will cause significant adverse effects to the economy if this review takes place and it does not outweigh the benefits, then the rule is put on hold. By so doing, the legislation ensures energy cost and economic and job impacts are given appropriate consideration.

It is important to note, again, nothing in the legislation prevents consideration of both cost and benefits in the proposed rule; and an independent and thorough review by Federal departments with expertise in energy and economic analysis is merely a check, merely a call, for EPA to be transparent, which they have not been in the past.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. The bill will protect consumers from higher energy prices by providing additional oversight of EPA's most expensive rules that regulate the production, supply, distribution, or use of energy. Most importantly, it protects blue collar jobs from construction by an overzealous bureaucrat who just decides because they have something that they want to do and they don't wish to be transparent about it, it is okay to destroy blue collar jobs.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 1582, the Energy Consumers Relief Act of 2013.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I am pleased at this time to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the subcommittee from which this bill emerged.

Mr. RUSH. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to this horrendous bill, H.R. 1582.

Although this bill is called the Energy Consumers Relief Act, a more appropriate title would be the Shamelessly Blocking Public Health Protections Act.

While the gentleman from Louisiana and the rest of my Republican colleagues may attempt to fool the American people into thinking that this is some kind of a jobs bill, the fact of the matter is, as the Republican leadership admitted on national television a few days ago, the majority party is not interested in working on legislation to address the real problems that American families face, but rather they are

more concerned with trying to overturn and undo any and all of the initiatives that the President has already accomplished. Whatever President Obama has done, the Republicans want to undo.

So, Madam Chair, while the majority party proudly wears the label as the leaders of one of the most ineffective, do-nothing Congresses of all times, we are here today yet again spending valuable time debating yet another rhetorical, meaningless message bill that will never ever become law, instead of working on real problems that confront the American people.

□ 1900

Madam Chairman, I am here today to say enough is enough.

Let us get back to the business of governing by working on legislation to put Americans back to work and to get our economy running at full steam once again for the benefit of all the American people. Instead, we are here debating a bill that we know and that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know is dead on arrival in the Senate due to its radical and extreme positions.

Make no mistake about it, Madam Chairman. This bill is not about making government more open and more accountable to the American people. In fact, the opposite is true. This bill is simply and solely about blocking the EPA from finalizing rules that would make our air and our water cleaner and help avert catastrophic climate change.

This bill has many problems, but its most egregious flaw is that it gives the Department of Energy an unprecedented veto over the most important EPA rules, which are to protect human health and to protect our Nation's environment.

The EPA regulations most likely to be delayed or the most likely to be destroyed by this legislation have tremendous benefits for human health and the environment, including money saved on energy bills and at the gas pump; reductions in the emissions of toxic pollutants, which cause cancer and developmental delays in children; hospitalizations that will be averted; and the prevention of asthma attacks and premature deaths, all of which provide real benefits to the American people—real people.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RUSH. The title of this bill is the Energy Consumers Relief Act, but yet the majority prevented me from offering an amendment that simply stated that the EPA rules could not be blocked if they resulted in consumers saving money at the gas pump. So, if the purpose of this bill were truly to provide relief to consumers, then al-

lowing my amendment would have been, simply, a no-brainer.

Madam Chairman, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time. Enough is enough. Let us get back to considering real legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I would like to remind everyone once again that this legislation applies only to energy-related regulations that exceed \$1 billion. That's all that it applies to.

At this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Energy Consumers Relief Act.

This commonsense legislation will protect workers, families, small businesses, and manufacturers by providing for more rigorous oversight and public disclosure of expensive and job-killing EPA regulations.

Yesterday, President Obama's new EPA Administrator demonstrated how out of touch she was by denying that regulations have an impact on jobs. She is quoted as saying: "Can we stop talking about environmental regulations killing jobs, please, at least for today?"

We'll stop talking about it when they stop robbing us of the jobs that support our communities.

Within the last month, regulations have cost another 300 jobs in western Pennsylvania. The damage wrought by these regulations extends far beyond the individual families affected. They hurt their surrounding communities where these moms and dads live, work, and send their kids to school. They increase the cost of energy, which is a direct cost on families and businesses. It is especially painful for seniors and others who live on fixed incomes.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation that will protect workers, families, and businesses from higher electricity prices, less reliable energy, and more lost jobs.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who is the ranking member of the subcommittee called Environment and the Economy.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Ranking Member WAXMAN, for the opportunity to share some thoughts on this legislation.

Madam Chair, H.R. 1582 is yet another attempt to block the Environmental Protection Agency from fulfilling its mission, which is to protect public health and our environment.

The bill is premised on the false notion that the protection of public health and the environment comes at the price of jobs. Simply, it does not. H.R. 1582 is not about transparency or fairness. The bill creates a burdensome

and duplicative requirement for analysis by the Department of Energy, designed to block EPA from moving forward to address climate change.

The people standing in the way of policy to address climate change are willing to subject us to ever-increasing costs of natural disasters, damaged infrastructure, and the loss of lives and livelihoods.

Why? To preserve our dependence on a fossil fuel-only energy economy.

Proposed regulations are analyzed and reviewed now under multiple laws and multiple executive orders. Rules in the Federal Register consume more page numbers now due to the requirements for additional analyses and documentation under the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Unfunded Mandates Act, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, and multiple executive orders. These additional analyses, studies, and peer reviews have repeatedly shown that EPA's rules are justified and deliver many more benefits to people's health and our environment than costs to business. If and when they do not, either the rule does not go forward or opponents can have their day in court.

H.R. 1582 pits one department against another. The Secretary of the Department of Energy should not have veto power over regulations that EPA is empowered by law to issue. There are ample opportunities for interagency consultation during the rulemaking process. Regulations to improve our air quality and to address other pollution problems have been opposed over the years with the threat that controlling pollution would bankrupt our industries and our economy. That has not happened. We have managed to create a cleaner, healthier environment for our people and have a robust, dynamic recovery. H.R. 1582 is designed to hamstring the EPA and continue to delay action on the looming, serious challenge of climate change.

We can and must do better. We have the innovative capacity to meet these challenges. The only thing lacking is political will—political will to move forward. This Nation did not become great by denying and avoiding challenges. Avoiding this problem will only increase costs and risks across the Nation. I oppose H.R. 1582, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, may I ask how much time is remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I would like to yield 3 minutes to a very important member of our full committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

As far as I am concerned, this is just another attack on the EPA. Some of

my colleagues have spent hundreds of hours this session attacking the EPA. May I remind them that Congress set up the EPA to regulate dangerous and toxic substances in order to keep our air and water clean. We must continue to support the EPA in this task. Who would not want clean air and clean water? I think the EPA does a fine job in protecting us.

My district has one of the highest asthma rates in the country. It is one of the reasons that I championed clean energy and have argued for strong EPA rules to help protect our children.

If this bill had been law already, the EPA could have been delayed or blocked from finalizing the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards, which set emissions limits for new coal- and oil-fired power plants for mercury and other toxic air pollutants. Why would anyone want to block the EPA from doing that? The EPA estimates that these new standards will save up to 11,000 lives and prevent 130,000 asthma attacks. That's good enough for me.

There are many, many reasons to continue to support the EPA. This bill, unfortunately, does not do that, so I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and to support the EPA in a goal we should all share of protecting our air and water.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I only have one more speaker on my side.

May I inquire of the manager of the bill, how about you?

Mr. WHITFIELD. We have no other speakers.

Mr. WAXMAN. So, under those circumstances, I would like to yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, there was a claim from one of the supporters of this bill that the EPA is using faulty science to justify its rules. In fact, the proponents of this bill are using faulty examples to try to justify this ridiculous bill. For example, the gentleman from Louisiana's chief example of a faulty EPA rule is what he refers to as a "formaldehyde rule." In fact, this isn't a rule. It is a draft scientific assessment that is completely unrelated to the energy-related rules that are the subject of this bill. I do want to point out that pollution control regulations create jobs because they create clean technologies that the whole world wants.

The proponents of this bill claim they are worried about jobs and the unemployed. I think they're crying crocodile tears. The Republicans are for the sequestration, which is costing hundreds of thousands of jobs. They are threatening the U.S. with default. They are against food stamps for people who don't have jobs and who don't have food to eat. Give me a break. They're not trying to save jobs; they're trying to save some of these big polluting industries that have to pay to reduce their pollution.

Now, we've heard that this bill is going to provide more checks and balances because the EPA will then have its rules reviewed by the Department of Energy, but EPA rules go through a very extensive interagency process. Other agencies, including the Department of Energy, can make their views known to the EPA. The Office of Management and Budget already has the ability to have any concerns addressed before they allow EPA rules to go forward. These rules go through months or even years of scrutiny before they are issued, but this bill creates a new, unchecked authority for the Department of Energy to veto public health rules. That's a terrible idea.

Why would we give one agency the unchecked authority to block another agency's rules? There are plenty of checks and balances in the existing law.

□ 1050

Then we hear the argument that this bill is really about transparency because somebody else should be overseeing EPA rulemaking. But, in fact, this bill will do the opposite. The bill creates a duplicative and confused regulatory process for EPA rules. After EPA has done its analysis, they've weighed the risks and the costs and the benefits, they've heard from people who are claiming the costs are too high, they've heard from people claiming the benefits are not enough. Whatever the claims are, they evaluate those claims based on science. And according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, if we let EPA review all these regulations again from scratch, the taxpayers are going to pay \$35 billion.

The bill gives the Department of Energy an unprecedented veto over EPA public health rules. And you know what? There's no public comment when DOE does that. They don't hear from the public. They'll hear from the industry, but they won't hear from the public. They're not equipped to evaluate the scientific health benefits. They're looking at the costs. It's a skewed DOE analysis. This bill is not about transparency.

We were told this is not over any simple rules; it's only over the expensive ones, regulations that will cost over a billion dollars. A billion dollars over a year? A billion dollars over 10 years? A billion dollars over 20 years? There is no definition of that. They say a billion dollars. Okay. But that could, then, be used to stop a rule that is far less than what people think it would cost, and, of course, the benefits have to outweigh the cost before the rule can even be issued by EPA.

I want to give a good example of regulations that would be stopped by this legislation. EPA and the Department of Transportation work together on tailpipe standards and fuel efficiency

rules for automobiles and other motor vehicles. There are huge benefits. They help consumers save money at the pump. When you have a car that runs on more miles per gallon, you're saving money. We're also protecting the environment because we're not burning as much carbon.

Under the rules, by 2025, Americans will be able to travel twice as far on a gallon of gas, which will save consumers thousands of dollars. But that rule won't go into effect because the DOE now has to get involved. Transportation and EPA are proposing rules over their jurisdiction, over transportation and over air pollution. These rules, which could lead to consumers seeing gasoline at the pump drop by over a dollar a gallon, could be held up.

And even though these rules are all supported by the major auto companies, including Ford, GM, and Chrysler, these rules will cut U.S. emissions and carbon pollution by \$6 billion, but this bill could prevent EPA from adopting new vehicle rules that will save consumers even more money and continue to address the threat of climate change.

This is a very bad bill. It doesn't make sense, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Once again I want to thank Dr. Cassidy for authoring this bill and bringing it to the House floor.

I would like to remind everyone that EPA has made great strides. We all recognize the improvements that have been made in our air quality, water quality, particulate matter, et cetera. As a matter of fact, carbon dioxide emissions are the lowest that they've been in 20 years here in America. Yet I would say that EPA is not the Holy Grail. The EPA does make mistakes.

I would like to just read a couple of comments from some witnesses who testified over the last year at the Energy and Commerce Committee's Energy and Power Subcommittee. Dr. Peter Valberg, former member of the Harvard School of Public Health, testified that "there are major questions about EPA's forecast of serious health effects caused by small increments in particulate matter levels. EPA's statistical approach is fraught with numerous assumptions and uncertainties."

Dr. Tony Cox of the Colorado School of Public Health testified that "the use of statistical associations to address causal questions about health effects of regulation is not only technically incorrect, but, as practiced by EPA and others, is also highly misleading to policymakers."

Then Dr. Anne Smith, an economist with NERA Economic Consulting, talked about the uncertainties and the statistical models used by EPA having serious flaws.

All we're saying is at a time when the economy is struggling—particularly now—and when EPA is the most aggressive that it has been in recent memory—as a matter of fact, even though our CO₂ emissions are down to the lowest level in 20 years, America is the only country in the world where you cannot build a new coal-powered plant. All this legislation does is it says if EPA comes up with a new regulation, energy related, that costs over a billion dollars, they've got to make a report to Congress.

Then the Secretary of Energy, working with the Secretary of Commerce and the Small Business Administration and the Energy Information Agency, they will look and they will see what is the impact of this regulation upon the cost of energy, the cost of gasoline, the cost of electricity; what is the impact on causing jobs to be lost or a plant maybe not to be built and a job will be lost or a plant will close. So it's not dictating anything.

It's the Cabinet members of the same administration simply reviewing all of the evidence, doing its own analysis, and then deciding that if it has significant impact on the economy, then they can rule that the regulation will not take effect, at which point the EPA can go back, make some adjustments, and redo it.

I think it's a good piece of legislation that provides additional transparency and additional review of the regulation, the impact on the economy, the impact on jobs, the impact on prices. And what is wrong with that? What is wrong with the Congress getting a report back from the agency and letting the other Department heads in the government review it? That's all this legislation is about.

I urge Members to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1582.

This bill would prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from finalizing any "energy-related rule" that is estimated to cost more than \$1 billion if the Secretary of Energy determines that the rule will cause "significant adverse effects to the economy." The term "significant adverse effects to the economy" is not defined. In addition, the term "energy-related rule" is broadly defined to include any rule that "regulates any aspect of the production, supply, distribution, or use of energy or provides for such regulation by States or other governmental entities."

Many of the rules that this bill aims to stop are rules that would directly affect my constituent companies—rules that I too have serious concerns about how they were developed.

I could support a bill that would require the Department of Energy to have an official consulting role similar to the Office of Management and Budget in the drafting of EPA rules where appropriate. For example, I was very frustrated to hear that DOE's concerns about grid reliability were not heeded by EPA during the Utility MACT rulemaking.

I am shocked though that my colleagues are okay setting a precedent where one Department has veto power over another Department or Agency's actions. What's next? Are we going to give the Department of Treasury veto power over the Securities and Exchange Commission or give the Department of Defense veto power over the Department of Homeland Security just because we have concerns about their rulemaking processes?

The Environmental Protection Agency is already required to conduct two Regulatory Impact Analyses, once when the rule is proposed and another when the rule is final, and then this analysis is reviewed by the OMB for accuracy.

This Congress should be able to address the core concerns we have about how these rules are developed without completely gutting an agency's statutory responsibilities and independence.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this bill. This legislation is unprecedented and duplicative.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this so-called Energy Consumers Relief Act, which would be more accurately titled the Blocking Public Health Protections Act. The best I can say about this bill is that it is going precisely nowhere—and for good reason.

Under this legislation, the Department of Energy would be required to waste increasingly limited resources undertaking costly and time-consuming review of certain "energy-related" EPA rules. The term "energy-related" is not defined, and no time limit is given for completion of DoE's duplicative analysis.

As a result, H.R. 1582 would have the practical—and intended—effect of blocking or indefinitely delaying important public health protections, even if the Secretary of Energy never exercises his authority to overturn the EPA—protections like the Mercury and Air Toxic Standards, which will reduce mercury and other harmful toxins from power plants; or the vehicle tailpipe standards, which, ironically, are already saving consumers money at the pump.

Madam Chair, Americans expect their government to ensure that their air is healthy and their water is clean. H.R. 1582 is poorly drafted, ill-conceived legislation that would take us in precisely the opposite direction.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, this bill leads me to ask a question.

Who are we here to protect? The American people, or big business?

If we don't stand up to protect public health, who will? Are we going to trust big oil, gas, and coal companies to look out for the public's health?

This bill is just another give-away to big polluters.

As we just saw with the coal ash bill, this bill would further harm human health by tearing down the EPA. The EPA—not big business—is trying to protect Americans' health.

Take the Clean Air Act, for example. In its first 20 years, it prevented 205,000 premature deaths and 18 million child respiratory illnesses.

The result? Billions of dollars in economic savings from prevented diseases and greater worker productivity.

This bill is yet another attempt to tear down the EPA. It's immoral. I urge my colleague to oppose this bill.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-19. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1582

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Energy Consumers Relief Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION AGAINST FINALIZING CERTAIN ENERGY-RELATED RULES THAT WILL CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECTS TO THE ECONOMY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not promulgate as final an energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than \$1 billion if the Secretary of Energy determines under section 3(3) that the rule will cause significant adverse effects to the economy.

SEC. 3. REPORTS AND DETERMINATIONS PRIOR TO PROMULGATING AS FINAL CERTAIN ENERGY-RELATED RULES.

Before promulgating as final any energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than \$1 billion:

(1) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall submit to Congress a report (and transmit a copy to the Secretary of Energy) containing—

(A) a copy of the rule;

(B) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

(C) an estimate of the total costs of the rule, including the direct costs and indirect costs of the rule;

(D) an estimate of the total benefits of the rule, an estimate of when such benefits are expected to be realized, and a description of the modeling, the assumptions, and the limitations due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information associated with the estimates under this subparagraph;

(E) an estimate of the increases in energy prices, including potential increases in gasoline or electricity prices for consumers, that may result from implementation or enforcement of the rule; and

(F) a detailed description of the employment effects, including potential job losses and shifts in employment, that may result from implementation or enforcement of the rule.

(2) INITIAL DETERMINATION ON INCREASES AND IMPACTS.—The Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall prepare an independent analysis to determine whether the rule will cause—

(A) any increase in energy prices for consumers, including low-income households, small businesses, and manufacturers;

(B) any impact on fuel diversity of the Nation's electricity generation portfolio or on national, regional, or local electric reliability;

(C) any adverse effect on energy supply, distribution, or use due to the economic or technical infeasibility of implementing the rule; or

(D) any other adverse effect on energy supply, distribution, or use (including a shortfall in supply and increased use of foreign supplies).

(3) **SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATION ON ADVERSE EFFECTS TO THE ECONOMY.**—If the Secretary of Energy determines, under paragraph (2), that the rule will cause an increase, impact, or effect described in such paragraph, then the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall—

(A) determine whether the rule will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, taking into consideration—

(i) the costs and benefits of the rule and limitations in calculating such costs and benefits due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information; and

(ii) the positive and negative impacts of the rule on economic indicators, including those related to gross domestic product, unemployment, wages, consumer prices, and business and manufacturing activity; and

(B) publish the results of such determination in the Federal Register.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The terms “direct costs” and “indirect costs” have the meanings given such terms in chapter 8 of the Environmental Protection Agency’s “Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses” dated December 17, 2010.

(2) The term “energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than \$1 billion” means a rule of the Environmental Protection Agency that—

(A) regulates any aspect of the production, supply, distribution, or use of energy or provides for such regulation by States or other governmental entities; and

(B) is estimated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency or the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to impose direct costs and indirect costs, in the aggregate, of more than \$1,000,000,000.

(3) The term “rule” has the meaning given to such term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 113–174. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113–174.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment under the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, lines 4 through 13, strike section 2.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair and my colleagues and anybody listening to this debate, under this bill, if DOE determines that a rule by the Environmental Protection Agency would cause any significant adverse effects to the economy, EPA would be permanently blocked from finalizing that rule. That’s a pretty broad assault on the rules that EPA might issue because EPA rules are to protect public health and the environment.

So if this bill became law, a lot of clean air and clean water protections would be at risk, and the terms in the bill are so expansive and vague that nearly every major public health proposed rule could be delayed and would be affected because DOE is not going to do this extensive analysis.

My amendment is straightforward. It eliminates the bizarre provision in this bill that gives the Secretary of Energy the unprecedented authority to effectively veto public health rules. It makes no sense for DOE to veto an EPA public health rule, especially since the veto would be based on DOE’s analysis of the economic impact, which is by its terms a macroeconomic analysis.

What is this going to do to the economy if this rule goes into effect? Did anybody ever think that the DOE does not do that kind of analysis? Perhaps they should have had the Department of the Treasury do a macroeconomic evaluation. They do things like that. But instead, the authors of this bill want DOE to do it. All right. It’s outside of DOE’s area of expertise. This, I think, would be a terrible precedent.

Time and time again, Congress has turned to the EPA to trust the agency with the mission of protecting our air and our water from pollution. The Department of Energy should not have the power to veto the public health protections that Congress required in the Clean Air Act or the Clean Water Act or other bedrock environmental laws. The DOE veto is inconsistent with the stated purpose of this bill because the other side of this bill thinks DOE ought to do an independent analysis. We would concede it: let DOE do an independent analysis, but don’t let it stop the rule from going into effect.

EPA’s analysis, before they issue their proposed regulation, goes through an interagency process, DOE can intervene, the Office of Management and Budget can review it and even hold up the regulation. So let the regulation go forward and let DOE do its additional analysis, but don’t let that analysis lead to paralysis if we’re talking about affecting the public health in this country.

This amendment would stop the veto of an EPA regulation by DOE. It does not stop the Department of Energy from doing its analysis, but it would stop them from—while they’re doing the analysis particularly—holding up a regulation and then leaving it to them exclusively to decide that they’re going to veto the regulation based on a different kind of analysis than one would expect, which is to look at the benefits, to look at the costs, and make sure those benefits are more of a benefit in dollars and cents even. Put a price on life. That’s what we’re talking about. Put a price on a kid’s asthma. That’s what we’re talking about.

□ 1930

But EPA tries to do that analysis and has to show that its regulation is going to be more economically beneficial than the cost of the regulation. And of course you imagine when they look at costs and benefits, the costs are always overstated. I’ve seen that in all of the years I’ve been here, and I’ve been here for decades. The costs are always overstated by the polluting corporation that doesn’t want to have to take the steps to reduce their pollution.

EPA hears what they have to say, but they do their own analysis of the cost to do the regulation.

So I would urge support for this amendment. Leave the bill if you want it, but don’t give that veto power to DOE.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. As the gentleman said, his amendment would, in effect, strike the provisions preventing EPA from finalizing rules that the Energy Secretary determined will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, and that’s precisely why I respectfully oppose the gentleman’s amendment.

All of the debate this afternoon has focused on how EPA is focused totally on health benefits, and health benefits are vitally important. We recognize that.

I think I also pointed out from experts that EPA makes mistakes in their benefit analysis, in their cost analysis when they look at costs. And so once again, what we’re trying to do with the Cassidy bill is look at health, yes, but what is the impact on jobs. What is the impact on those families who lose a job because of the regulation? What is the impact on the children of the family who loses the job because of the regulation? What is the effect on their ability to provide the needs for their family, their health insurance, their food, and so forth?

So all we’re saying is that the Secretary of Energy in the same Cabinet

as the administrator of the EPA would head up an analysis to review the EPA rule that exceeds \$1 billion and affects energy alone. And if they decide that it will have significant adverse impact on the economy, then they can stop it. And by the way, under the legislation, EPA would also have to give a report to Congress on the impact on energy cost, how much will gasoline go up, electricity, how many jobs would be lost, how many jobs would be created.

So when we have a struggling economy, the last thing we want to do is to create additional obstacles that really are not necessary at a time when you can do other things and protect health also.

So with that, I would respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment and ask that Members vote against the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 2 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113-174.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 13, after "effects to the economy," insert "This section shall not apply with respect to any rule that relates to air quality or water quality."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Chair, and at this time I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), my co-author of this amendment.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chair, I thank my friend, Mr. CONNOLLY, for his leadership and for working on this amendment with me.

I represent nearly 100 miles of Great Lakes shoreline. When I ran for Congress, I made a commitment to my constituents in the Fifth District that I would fight every day to create jobs, to strengthen the economy, and to protect our precious water resources. Our amendment would do just that.

In Michigan, we know well the value of clean water since we're surrounded

by the largest bodies of surface freshwater on Earth, the Great Lakes. As a kid, I spent many summer weekends with my family at a city campground in East Tawas, a lakefront city that I now have the privilege of representing in Congress.

Our amendment would protect our precious waters from pollution. Without our amendment, today's legislation would put the safety of the Great Lakes, of our lakes and waterways in jeopardy. History has repeatedly taught us what polluters will do if left unregulated. We have seen disastrous oil spills—including the Enbridge oil spill in Michigan—that threatened our State and our Nation's natural resources.

I will not sit idly by and allow the very rules that protect towns like East Tawas, Oscoda, Bay City, Au Gres, and other towns in my district be tossed aside for political expediency.

This bill, as written, would give the Department of Energy unprecedented power to veto EPA rules that protect public health, save lives, and protect the Great Lakes. Our amendment would prevent the DOE from being able to veto rules that regulate air or water quality.

I have heard a lot of discussion about jobs. Michigan's Great Lakes are an economic asset for my State, supporting 1.5 million jobs and pumping over \$62 billion into our economy. These jobs and Michigan's recreational economy depend on clean water for fishing for swimming and for drinking. We must protect them from pollution and harm.

Today's legislation is clearly misguided and fails to provide the necessary tools to protect our Nation's critical natural resources. Republicans in committee have already voted to decrease funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative by almost 80 percent, something that I strongly oppose; and now they want to make it easier for polluters to poison our waters. I will fight these bad proposals every day I am in Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support our commonsense amendment to protect the Great Lakes and protect our natural waterways.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, I would say, first of all, with all due respect, we have no intent to pollute additionally the waterways that the gentleman referred to in Michigan, and I rise to oppose his amendment simply because he would say that this legislation would not apply to any rule that relates to air quality or water quality. So this amendment would exclude virtually all EPA rules from the transparency and inner-agency review requirements of the act.

I would just summarize, once again, we are talking about energy-related rules that exceed \$1 billion. We know that EPA looks closely at health benefits, health impacts; and we certainly favor that. But that's not the only thing that should be examined, and that's what this legislation is about. The Secretary of Energy, with other Cabinet officials in the Obama administration, would look at the impact of the regulation on the cost of electricity, the cost of gasoline, how many jobs might be lost, how many jobs might be created, would it have significant adverse impact to the economy as a whole.

And I would think that everyone would say if it does, particularly with the slow economic growth we have today, the last 15 quarters have been the slowest since World War II, and the last quarter of 2012, the first quarter of 2013, the gross domestic product increased less than 2 percent. So we need to pay special attention to the impact that regulations may have on creating job loss and the impact on those families that lose those jobs, and that's what the gentleman's legislation is all about.

I know the gentleman rose with the very best intentions, but I would respectfully oppose this amendment and ask Members to defeat his amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chair, I rise to join my colleague, Mr. KILDEE from Michigan, in offering what I think is a commonsense amendment that protects public health and safety.

I didn't think it was possible, Madam Chair, but this bill may actually be worse than the anti-regulatory legislation Republicans rammed through the last Congress. The House majority calls this latest version the Energy Consumers Relief Act, an Orwellian name if there ever was one, deceptively titled as Congress heads for recess, but the title does not reflect reality. This bill more aptly might be called the Blocking Public Health Protections Act.

Shamefully, this is yet another attempt by the majority to gut public health and safety protections so they can give more handouts to big energy producers, many of which of course have financed the majority in this House.

Not only does this bill block or delay the EPA from finalizing rules, Madam Chairman, to reduce pollution that threatens the air we breathe and the water we drink. It also gives unprecedented power, as the distinguished ranking member of the committee pointed out, to the Department of Energy to veto EPA rules—nonsensical and a non sequitur if there ever was one.

We know rules already in place, like the mercury and air toxic standards

that effectively regulate carcinogens, neurotoxins, smog and soot pollution, prevent up to 11,000 premature deaths, 47 heart attacks, and 130,000 asthma attacks every year. So I ask my colleagues: Why are we trying to prevent proven protections on public health?

Our amendment will continue to put public health first by ensuring that EPA retains that authority to implement the vital safeguards that protect air and water quality that previous generations in this House on a bipartisan basis believed were necessary and important to protect the public we serve.

I yield back the balance of my time. The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LANKFORD) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

□ 1945

VIETNAM HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 2013

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1897) to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1897

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2013”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Findings and purpose.
- Sec. 3. Prohibition on increased non-humanitarian assistance to the Government of Vietnam.
- Sec. 4. United States public diplomacy.
- Sec. 5. United Nations Human Rights Council.
- Sec. 6. Annual report.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The relationship between the United States and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam has grown substantially since the end of the trade embargo in 1994, with annual trade between the two countries reaching nearly \$25,000,000,000 in 2012.

(2) The Government of Vietnam’s transition toward greater economic freedom and trade has not been matched by greater political freedom and substantial improvements in basic human rights for Vietnamese citizens, including freedom of religion, expression, association, and assembly.

(3) The United States Congress agreed to Vietnam becoming an official member of the World Trade Organization in 2006, amidst assurances that the Government of Vietnam was steadily improving its human rights record and would continue to do so.

(4) Vietnam remains a one-party state, ruled and controlled by the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV), which continues to deny the right of citizens to change their Government.

(5) Although in recent years the National Assembly of Vietnam has played an increasingly active role as a forum for highlighting local concerns, corruption, and inefficiency, the National Assembly remains subject to the direction of the CPV and the CPV maintains control over the selection of candidates in national and local elections.

(6) The Government of Vietnam forbids public challenge to the legitimacy of the one-party state, restricts freedoms of opinion, the press, and association and tightly limits access to the Internet and telecommunication.

(7) Since Vietnam’s accession to the WTO on January 11, 2007, the Government of Vietnam arbitrarily arrested and detained numerous individuals for their peaceful advocacy of religious freedom, democracy, and human rights, including Father Nguyen Van Ly, human rights lawyers Nguyen Van Dai, Le Thi Cong Nhan, Cu Huy Ha Vu, and Le Cong Dinh, and bloggers Nguyen Van Hai, Ta Phong Tan, and Le Van Son.

(8) The Government of Vietnam continues to detain, imprison, place under house arrest, convict, or otherwise restrict persons for the peaceful expression of dissenting political or religious views.

(9) The Government of Vietnam continues to detain labor leaders and restricts the right to organize independently.

(10) The Government of Vietnam continues to limit the freedom of religion, restrict the operations of independent religious organizations, and persecute believers whose religious activities the Government regards as a potential threat to its monopoly on power.

(11) Despite reported progress in church openings and legal registrations of religious venues, the Government of Vietnam has halted most positive actions since the Department of State lifted the “country of par-

ticular concern” (CPC) designation for Vietnam in November 2006.

(12) Unregistered ethnic minority Protestant congregations, particularly Montagnards in the Central and Northwest Highlands, suffer severe abuses because of actions by the Government of Vietnam, which have included forced renunciations of faith, arrest and harassment, the withholding of social programs provided for the general population, confiscation and destruction of property, subjection to severe beatings, and reported deaths.

(13) There has been a pattern of violent responses by the Government to peaceful prayer vigils and demonstrations by Catholics for the return of Government-confiscated church properties. Protesters have been harassed, beaten, and detained and church properties have been destroyed. Catholics also continue to face some restrictions on selection of clergy, the establishment of seminaries and seminary candidates, and individual cases of travel and church registration.

(14) In May 2010 the village of Con Dau, a Catholic parish in Da Nang, faced escalated violence during a funeral procession as police attempted to prohibit a religious burial in the village cemetery; more than 100 villagers were injured, 62 were arrested, five were tortured, and at least three died.

(15) The Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam (UBCV) suffers persecution as the Government of Vietnam continues to restrict contacts and movement of senior UBCV clergy for refusing to join the state-sponsored Buddhist organization, the Government restricts expression and assembly, and the Government continues to harass and threaten UBCV monks, nuns, and youth leaders.

(16) The Government of Vietnam continues to suppress the activities of other religious adherents, including Cao Dai and Hoa Hao Buddhists who lack official recognition or have chosen not to affiliate with the state-sanctioned groups, including through the use of detention, imprisonment, and strict Government oversight.

(17) Many Montagnards and others are still serving long prison sentences for their involvement in peaceful demonstrations in 2001, 2002, 2004, and 2008. Montagnards continue to face threats, detention, beatings, forced renunciation of faith, property destruction, restricted movement, and reported deaths at the hands of Government officials.

(18) Ethnic minority Hmong in Northern Vietnam, the Northwest Highlands, and the Central Highlands of Vietnam also suffer restrictions, confiscation of property, abuses, and persecution by the Government of Vietnam.

(19) The Government of Vietnam restricts Khmer Krom expression, assembly, and association, has confiscated nearly all the Theravada Buddhist temples, controls all Khmer Kaon Buddhist religious organizations and prohibits most peaceful protests.

(20) The Government of Vietnam controls nearly all print and electronic media, including access to the Internet, jams the signals of some foreign radio stations, including Radio Free Asia, and has detained and imprisoned individuals who have posted, published, sent, or otherwise distributed democracy-related materials.

(21) People arrested in Vietnam because of their political or religious affiliations and activities often are not accorded due legal process as they lack full access to lawyers of their choice, may experience closed trials, have often been detained for years without trial, and have been subjected to the use of torture to admit crimes they did not commit or to falsely denounce their own leaders.

(22) Vietnam continues to be a source country for the commercial sexual exploitation and forced labor of women and girls, as well as for men and women legally entering into international labor contracts who subsequently face conditions of debt bondage or forced labor, and is a destination country for child trafficking and continues to have internal human trafficking.

(23) There are many reports of Vietnamese officials and employees participating in, facilitating, condoning, or otherwise being complicit in severe forms of human trafficking.

(24) United States refugee resettlement programs, including the Humanitarian Resettlement (HR) Program, the Orderly Departure Program (ODP), Resettlement Opportunities for Vietnamese Returnees (ROVR) Program, general resettlement of boat people from refugee camps throughout Southeast Asia, the Amerasian Homecoming Act of 1988, and the Priority One Refugee resettlement category, have helped rescue Vietnamese nationals who have suffered persecution on account of their associations with the United States or, in many cases, because of such associations by their spouses, parents, or other family members, as well as other Vietnamese nationals who have been persecuted because of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a particular social group.

(25) While previous programs have served their purposes well, a significant number of eligible refugees from Vietnam were unfairly denied or excluded, including Amerasians, in some cases by vindictive or corrupt Vietnamese officials who controlled access to the programs, and in others by United States personnel who imposed unduly restrictive interpretations of program criteria. In addition, the Government of Vietnam has denied passports to persons who the United States has found eligible for refugee admission.

(26) The Government of Vietnam reportedly is detaining tens of thousands of people, with some as young as 12 years old, in government-run drug detention centers and treating them as slave laborers.

(27) In 2012, over 150,000 people signed an online petition calling on the Administration to not expand trade with communist Vietnam at the expense of human rights.

(28) Congress has passed numerous resolutions condemning human rights abuses in Vietnam, indicating that although there has been an expansion of relations with the Government of Vietnam, it should not be construed as approval of the ongoing and serious violations of fundamental human rights in Vietnam.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to promote the development of freedom and democracy in Vietnam.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON INCREASED NON-HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF VIETNAM.

(a) ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Federal Government may not provide nonhumanitarian assistance to the Government of Vietnam during any fiscal year in an amount that exceeds the amount of such assistance provided for fiscal year 2012 unless—

(A) with respect to the limitation for fiscal year 2014, the President determines and certifies to Congress, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, that the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (G) of paragraph (2) have been met during the 12-month period ending on the date of the certification; and

(B) with respect to the limitation for subsequent fiscal years, the President determines and certifies to Congress, in the most recent annual report submitted pursuant to section 6, that the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (G) of paragraph (2) have been met during the 12-month period covered by the report.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of this paragraph are the following:

(A) The Government of Vietnam has made substantial progress toward releasing all political and religious prisoners from imprisonment, house arrest, and other forms of detention.

(B) The Government of Vietnam has made substantial progress toward—

(i) respecting the right to freedom of religion, including the right to participate in religious activities and institutions without interference, harassment, or involvement of the Government, for all of Vietnam's diverse religious communities; and

(ii) returning estates and properties confiscated from the churches and religious communities.

(C) The Government of Vietnam has made substantial progress toward respecting the right to freedom of expression, assembly, and association, including the release of independent journalists, bloggers, and democracy and labor activists.

(D) The Government of Vietnam has made substantial progress toward repealing or revising laws that criminalize peaceful dissent, independent media, unsanctioned religious activity, and nonviolent demonstrations and rallies, in accordance with international standards and treaties to which Vietnam is a party.

(E) The Government of Vietnam has made substantial progress toward allowing Vietnamese nationals free and open access to United States refugee programs.

(F) The Government of Vietnam has made substantial progress toward respecting the human rights of members of all ethnic and minority groups.

(G) Neither any official of the Government of Vietnam nor any agency or entity wholly or partly owned by the Government of Vietnam was complicit in a severe form of trafficking in persons, or the Government of Vietnam took all appropriate steps to end any such complicity and hold such official, agency, or entity fully accountable for its conduct.

(b) EXCEPTION.—

(1) CONTINUATION OF ASSISTANCE IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST.—Notwithstanding the failure of the Government of Vietnam to meet the requirements of subsection (a)(2), the President may waive the application of subsection (a) for any fiscal year if the President determines that the provision to the Government of Vietnam of increased nonhumanitarian assistance would promote the purpose of this Act or is otherwise in the national interest of the United States.

(2) EXERCISE OF WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise the authority under paragraph (1) with respect to—

(A) all United States nonhumanitarian assistance to Vietnam; or

(B) one or more programs, projects, or activities of such assistance.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) NONHUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.—The term “nonhumanitarian assistance” means—

(A) any assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including programs under title IV of chapter 2 of part I of that Act, relating to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation), other than—

(i) disaster relief assistance, including any assistance under chapter 9 of part I of that Act;

(ii) assistance which involves the provision of food (including monetization of food) or medicine;

(iii) assistance for environmental remediation of dioxin-contaminated sites and related health activities;

(iv) assistance for demining and unexploded ordnance (UXO) remediation, and related health and educational activities;

(v) assistance to combat severe forms of trafficking in persons;

(vi) assistance to combat pandemic diseases;

(vii) assistance for refugees; and

(viii) assistance to combat HIV/AIDS, including any assistance under section 104A of that Act; and

(B) sales, or financing on any terms, under the Arms Export Control Act.

(2) SEVERE FORM OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.—The term “severe form of trafficking in persons” means any activity described in section 103(8) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-386 (114 Stat. 1470); 22 U.S.C. 7102(8)).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to the provision of nonhumanitarian assistance to the Government of Vietnam for fiscal year 2014 and subsequent fiscal years.

SEC. 4. UNITED STATES PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.

(a) RADIO FREE ASIA TRANSMISSIONS TO VIETNAM.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should take measures to overcome the jamming of Radio Free Asia by the Government of Vietnam and that the Broadcasting Board of Governors should not cut staffing, funding, or broadcast hours for the Vietnamese language services of the Voice of America and Radio Free Asia, which shall be done without reducing any other broadcast language services.

(b) UNITED STATES EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS WITH VIETNAM.—It is the sense of Congress that any programs of educational and cultural exchange between the United States and Vietnam should actively promote progress toward freedom and democracy in Vietnam by providing opportunities to Vietnamese nationals from a wide range of occupations and perspectives to see freedom and democracy in action and, also, by ensuring that Vietnamese nationals who have already demonstrated a commitment to these values are included in such programs.

(c) UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should strongly oppose, and encourage other members of the United Nations to oppose, the candidacy of Vietnam for membership on the United Nations Human Rights Council for the term beginning in 2014.

SEC. 5. RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

(a) COUNTRY OF PARTICULAR CONCERN.—It is the sense of Congress that Vietnam should be designated as a country of particular concern for religious freedom pursuant to section 402(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6442(b)).

(b) MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—It is the sense of Congress that the Government of Vietnam does not fully comply with the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking and is not making significant efforts to bring itself into compliance, and this determination should be reflected in the annual report to Congress required pursuant to

section 110(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)).

SEC. 6. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 12 months thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report on the following:

(1) The determination and certification of the President that the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 3(a)(2) have been met, if applicable.

(2) If the President has waived the application of section 3(a) pursuant to section 3(b) during the reporting period—

(A) the national interest with respect to which such a waiver was based;

(B) the amount of increased nonhumanitarian assistance provided to the Government of Vietnam; and

(C) a description of the type and amount of commensurate assistance provided pursuant to section 3(b)(1).

(3) Efforts by the United States Government to promote access by the Vietnamese people to Radio Free Asia transmissions.

(4) Efforts to ensure that programs with Vietnam promote the policy set forth in section 102 of the Human Rights, Refugee, and Other Foreign Policy Provisions Act of 1996 regarding participation in programs of educational and cultural exchange.

(5) Lists of persons believed to be imprisoned, detained, or placed under house arrest, tortured, or otherwise persecuted by the Government of Vietnam due to their pursuit of internationally recognized human rights. In compiling such lists, the Secretary shall exercise appropriate discretion, including concerns regarding the safety and security of, and benefit to, the persons who may be included on the lists and their families. In addition, the Secretary shall include a list of such persons and their families who may qualify for protections under United States refugee programs.

(6) A description of the development of the rule of law in Vietnam, including—

(A) progress toward the development of institutions of democratic governance;

(B) processes by which statutes, regulations, rules, and other legal acts of the Government of Vietnam are developed and become binding within Vietnam;

(C) the extent to which statutes, regulations, rules, administrative and judicial decisions, and other legal acts of the Government of Vietnam are published and are made accessible to the public;

(D) the extent to which administrative and judicial decisions are supported by statements of reasons that are based upon written statutes, regulations, rules, and other legal acts of the Government of Vietnam;

(E) the extent to which individuals are treated equally under the laws of Vietnam without regard to citizenship, race, religion, political opinion, or current or former associations;

(F) the extent to which administrative and judicial decisions are independent of political pressure or governmental interference and are reviewed by entities of appellate jurisdiction; and

(G) the extent to which laws in Vietnam are written and administered in ways that are consistent with international human rights standards, including the rights enumerated in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

(b) CONTACTS WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS.—In preparing the report under subsection (a), the Secretary shall, as appropriate, seek out and maintain contacts with

nongovernmental organizations and human rights advocates (including Vietnamese-Americans and human rights advocates in Vietnam), including receiving reports and updates from such organizations and evaluating such reports. The Secretary shall also seek to consult with the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom for appropriate sections of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

This bill, which we rise in support of, H.R. 1897, is the Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2013, and it is authored by the chairman of the Africa, Global Human Rights, and Health Subcommittee, Mr. CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey.

And I thought I would just take a moment and, as a prelude, talk about the efforts that Mr. SMITH has put in over the years, not just to the issue of human rights but, in particular, identifying those most at risk, identifying those who are held captive in prison, and taking the personal effort to go and try to visit them in these horrible conditions which they find themselves in.

I remember him saying to me once, Can you imagine what it is like for someone who's a prisoner, a prisoner because he attempts to speak out for some modicum of free speech, or for religious liberty, and he finds himself there in confinement, not knowing, when they open that door, when they come for you, what they might do to you next, not knowing what type of torture might be applied?

It takes a strong constitution for a Member of this House, year after year after year, to continue to go to bat for those who are held in captivity, those who are subject to show trials and then disappear. And part of his efforts have been to pass this particular legislation because he's concerned with the magnitude of what is happening in Vietnam, but also what he has seen with his own eyes with respect to some of those victims.

Over the years, the Foreign Affairs Committee has held many hearings on this subject, and if these hearings have had one consistent theme, it's the deterioration of human rights. And I think this is the thing we really find most regrettable: that at a time when we hoped that Vietnam might change its policies, it actually has regressed.

And we've heard from the witnesses of the use of the government by government agents, by militias—some call them thugs—who use everything from electric batons to metal prods to beat those who are demonstrating in Vietnam and who are in the process of speaking up for religious liberty or speaking up for the rights of free speech.

And now it's gotten to the point that any young person who dares to blog those words, "freedom of speech," those words, "democracy," anyone who publishes material promoting democracy or criticizing totalitarian rule, faces so many years in jail. It is so disproportionate, it is so ridiculous to put a young person in jail for 6 or 7 years because they blog on democracy.

But the thing that I think CHRIS SMITH and I and others here, ELIOT ENGEL, find so objectionable is the physical abuse that they are subject to in confinement.

So, as we say, religious freedom is also under attack with freedom of speech. Residents of Con Dau, Da Nang, have suffered severe violence. I've seen some of the photographs of the consequences of these beatings with batons and electric rods during a May assault at the hands, again, of Vietnamese Government officials. And again, this was because the parishioners attempted to protect their historic Catholic cemetery from seizure by the government.

We have over 350 Montagnard Christians who remain in prison for their beliefs, and other religious groups.

When I was in Vietnam, I talked to the leader of the Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam, the venerable Thich Quang Do, who was under house arrest, and Le Quang Liem, another. He was the leader of the Hoa Hao Buddhists at the time. He has subsequently, in a protest, been beaten so badly I don't think he can carry on a conversation today.

The Cao Dai Buddhists face severe persecution from the government, the communist government there.

So what brings us here tonight is that Vietnam has actually taken steps backwards. As we heard from the witnesses who testified before our committee, in the first 6 weeks of this year, 40 dissidents have been convicted in show trials, more than all of last year. That's how bad things are deteriorating.

And that means that the communist government is not only eclipsing their past bad performance, but, paradoxically, the government is also actively pursuing a seat on the U.N. Human Rights Council. That is why we need to take this step and why passage of the Vietnam Human Rights Act is so important and why we've got to use what

leverage we have. And part of that leverage is nonhumanitarian U.S. assistance to Vietnam. And we do that unless the Vietnamese Government improves its respect for human rights to meet specified requirements.

Let's send a message to that regime that the status quo is unacceptable. This bill does that. I strongly urge its passage.

And once again, I strongly commend and thank its author for his perseverance on this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1897. I'd like to thank the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), and once again thank the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ROYCE, for their leadership in advocating for human rights in Vietnam.

Despite Vietnam's transition to a more open economy in recent years, political and religious freedoms for the people of Vietnam remain severely curtailed.

Just last week, President Obama hosted the President of Vietnam for a visit. I was there for the luncheon at the State Department, and I am pleased that he urged the Vietnamese leader to respect freedom of expression, freedom of religion, and freedom of assembly. At that very luncheon, I sat next to one of the Vietnam ministers and urged the same thing to him as well.

As the United States and Vietnam build a closer and more cooperative relationship, we must continue to be candid in calling for more progress in protecting the human rights and civil liberties of the Vietnamese people.

I certainly remember the Vietnam war, as I know many of my colleagues do, and it seems a bit strange that the United States and Vietnam are, in many ways, allied and working together. That's fine. But human rights is so important to us, and it's not something we can just sweep under the rug.

This legislation, the Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2013, takes a step in the right direction by prohibiting an increase in nonhumanitarian assistance to Vietnam above fiscal year 2012 levels unless the Government of Vietnam makes significant progress on critical human rights issues.

The bill makes it clear to Vietnam that the only factor limiting U.S. aid is positive action by the Vietnamese Government on political, human, and religious rights.

The Government of Vietnam has an important choice to make: Will it protect human rights and provide religious and political freedom to its citizens, or will it shirk those responsibilities and forsake the closer relation-

ship that it wants with the United States?

Again, I think a closer relationship with Vietnam is something that I would like to see. But, you know what? We have principles, and the Vietnamese have to respect those principles. We respect them. They need to respect us.

So I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, and the author of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I want to thank, first of all, you for your very kind remarks, but also for moving this legislation very swiftly through the full committee, along with ELIOT ENGEL's full support, and the chairwoman emeritus, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you for your steadfast support for human rights, now presiding over this session.

And, Mr. Chairman, I do want to thank you for being a champion on behalf of the dissidents, the bloggers, the religious dissidents, political and religious in Vietnam, who suffer daily beatings at the hands of an increasingly absurd and worsening dictatorship.

Vietnam is in a race to the bottom with some of the dictatorships around the world, including Cuba, including China, Somalia, and other places where people's human rights are systematically trashed by the regimes.

I do rise to ask, respectfully, that Members support the Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2013. The purpose of this bipartisan legislation is simple: to send a clear, strong, and compelling message to the increasingly repressive communist regime in power in Vietnam that says that the United States is serious about combating human rights abuse in Vietnam.

Underscoring the worsening situation in Vietnam, John Sifton of Human Rights Watch testified at a June 4 hearing that I chaired, and he noted that "in the first few months of 2013, more people have been convicted in political trials as in the whole of the last year." And that has only gotten worse as each week passes in Vietnam.

Reporters Without Borders have put out their numbers, and there's at least 35 netizens, bloggers, journalists who write online who have been incarcerated by this dictatorship.

I'll never forget, on one particular trip to Vietnam, I met with Dr. Pham Son; I met with his wife. He was in prison. And what was his crime? He went on U.S. Embassy Hanoi, took an essay entitled, "What is Democracy?" translated it, and rebroadcast, resent it

out online, and for that he got a multi-year sentence in jail.

I met with his wife, who lived in great fear that they would go after her as well. And certainly, when I had dinner with her one night, sitting as far away as Chairman ROYCE, at the next table at a hotel were three bully boys from the—three thugs from the secret police of Vietnam, very, very visibly standing up and taking pictures to let us know that they were watching. Of course, I took their picture as well. But that's the kind of intimidation campaign this wonderful wife of a dissident was experiencing.

Boat People at the SOS suggest that there are well over 625 political prisoners and religious prisoners, as we meet here tonight, who are suffering. And of course that number often goes up. One might be let out, two more incarcerated by this dictatorship.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1897 is designed to promote the development of freedom of democracy in Vietnam. The bill will bring much-needed scrutiny to a seriously deteriorating situation. It stipulates that the United States can increase nonhumanitarian assistance to Vietnam above the 2012 levels only if the President is able to certify that the Government of Vietnam has made substantial progress in establishing a democracy and promoting human rights, including respecting religious freedom and the release of political prisoners and religious prisoners, repealing and revising laws that criminalize peaceful dissent, respecting human rights of members of all ethnic groups—there's an enormous amount of racism in Vietnam, particularly directed at people who happen to be Montagnard, and others—taking all appropriate steps, including the prosecution of government officials to end government complicity in that nefarious practice called human trafficking. There are also very clear benchmarks articulated in the legislation.

Madam Speaker, in the last 4 months alone, on April 11 and June 4, I've held two more congressional hearings on this deteriorating situation. We heard stories about individuals and groups who are being persecuted in a variety of ways. Their testimony confirmed that religious, political, and ethnic persecution has worsened, and that there is complicity by leadership, by the people who are in the Government of Vietnam, in human trafficking.

The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, in 2013, in their report, noted:

The Government of Vietnam continues to expand control over all religious activities, severely restricting independent religious practice and to repress individuals and religious groups it views as challenging their authority.

□ 2000

The Commission says very candidly that Vietnam ought to be a country of

particular concern—a CPC designation—pursuant to the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998. Unfortunately, that was removed by President Bush—a misguided move on his part—in 2006, when it was thought that the bilateral trade agreement and the permanent normal trading relations might lead to a matriculation from a dictatorship to a democracy. Things actually have gotten worse since this government got this trade benefit. Rights have suffered and people—real casualties—have endured unspeakable hardships.

Mr. Speaker, on several human rights trips to Vietnam, I have met, as has Chairman ROYCE and other Members—and I know when you meet these people you are forever moved—courageous leaders who struggle, sacrifice and endure numbing hardships, including torture, to promote fundamental human rights in their beloved country. Many of these remarkable individuals hail from virtually every denomination of faith, whether it be Christian, Falun Gong, or Buddhists, and suffer, again, horrifically because of their faith.

I met with the Venerable Thich Quang Do, under pagoda arrest—a great Buddhist leader who has been relegated to his pagoda. He couldn't step one foot outside of that pagoda without the secret police rushing in. He told me if he took one step out with me to say good-bye, there would be an onslaught of these bully boys who would push and shove or mistreat him.

I met with Father Ly when he was under house arrest before being re-arrested. He was a great democracy activist who was being so callously mistreated by this dictatorship. And he is only one of many.

It is not just the religious leaders in particular or individuals who are victimized by the government. Entire communities are also targeted by the regime. Mr. Tien Tran testified at our April 11 meeting and told my subcommittee of the brutality experienced by the Con Dau Catholic Parish, which has been repressed like you can't believe, Mr. Speaker. Individuals have been beaten to a pulp. Some have died. And they have confiscated their property. So they're kleptomaniacs as well.

Also, at the April 11 meeting we heard from the sister of a Vietnamese woman who was forced to work in a brothel in Russia with 14 other Vietnamese women. When there was an effort made by the Russian Government to liberate those women, it was the Embassy of Vietnam in Moscow that tipped off the traffickers—because they were complicit with them—to ensure that these women were not liberated but continued to be hurt by the traffickers. There was another one dealing with women who were trafficked to Jordan. Those officials of the Vietnamese Government were complicit in that as well.

Again, that's only the tip of the iceberg of this terrible complicity with heinous crimes against women.

I think the State Department report on trafficking was a good one, but they made a gross exception when it came to Vietnam, and actually improved their grade, when the information even in the narrative about Vietnam and the TIP report would have suggested otherwise.

I'm the prime author of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act and worked to create those minimum standards. It's appalling that Vietnam is not where it ought to be, a Tier 3 country, an egregious violator subject to sanctions.

This will be the fourth time, if this bill passes, Mr. Speaker, that we've been able to get the Vietnam Human Rights Act passed. In 2004, 2007, and last year, 2012, iterations of this bill have gotten over to the Senate, only to die through holds and other very non-democratic means of suppressing the will of the Senate in working on this bill. I hope that changes.

We have seen a deterioration, as my colleagues and I have all pointed out tonight, in the human rights situation in Vietnam. It is time to stand with the oppressed people who are yearning to be free in Vietnam and to stand up against this dictatorship. It's time to meet with them, talk with them, and talk to President Sang, who was here last week to meet with President Obama, and lay down very specific benchmarks on simple respect for the fundamental liberties of people in Vietnam who just yearn to be free and to experience their God-given rights.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. In closing, I, again, want to thank my colleague, Mr. SMITH from New Jersey, for his dedication to human rights in Vietnam, and for human rights in general, and for not only his work on this bill but, again, the time and energy that he has put into attempting to intervene on behalf of those who have been subject to these beatings that he has cited, to this maltreatment, to these long prison terms.

Last week, we had President Sang of Vietnam visiting Washington for the first official visit, I think, since 2007. While we've been assured that human rights were on the agenda during these meetings with the President and with the State Department, we did all we could to make certain that this time they were on the agenda. But I think the Vietnamese people need more than talk. And that is why we need to pass this legislation. It's a sign to all Vietnamese people that the U.S. is committed to the cause of human rights, but it is also leverage that can be used to guarantee some measure of attention from the regime.

This is Congress's chance to speak to those Vietnamese people who are

yearning for freedom. It's our chance to do so by vocally supporting a human rights agenda in Vietnam. We've got to get this back on the agenda.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I fully support HR 1897—the Vietnam Human Rights Act and I thank my distinguished colleague from the Foreign Affairs Committee and champion of human rights—CHRIS SMITH—for bringing this legislation forward and I am happy to cosponsor this bill.

We all want to see a prosperous, democratic and free Vietnam under which all people enjoy equal opportunities and fundamental freedoms.

This bill prohibits U.S. non-humanitarian assistance to the government of Vietnam unless the President certifies to Congress that Vietnam has made substantial progress respecting political, media, and religious freedoms, minority rights, access to U.S. refugee programs, and actions to end trafficking in persons and the release of political prisoners.

I continue to be concerned about the deteriorating human rights situation in Vietnam. The United States should stop sending American taxpayer money to governments that deny its citizens even the most basic human rights. Instead, we should leverage our assistance to push these governments into implementing democratic reforms, improving their human rights practices and allowing their citizens their fundamental rights, and that is what this bill will do.

My husband Dexter is a Vietnam combat veteran and former Army Ranger who was wounded defending the ideals of freedom and democracy—not just for Americans, but for all those who seek them. As the leading nation of the free world, the United States must stand with the Vietnamese people who are being brutally oppressed by their authoritarian government so that they may all live in a free and democratic country.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1897, the Vietnam Human Rights Act. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation, and I thank my colleague Mr. SMITH for introducing it.

This bill would prohibit any increase in U.S. non-humanitarian assistance to Vietnam until substantial progress has been made with regard to political and religious freedom for the citizens of Vietnam. The bill also expresses the sense of Congress that Vietnam should be designated as a Country of Particular Concern for religious freedom, and that the government does not meet the minimum standards for the elimination of human trafficking. In addition, the bill urges the Secretary of State to strongly oppose Vietnam's candidacy for membership on the United Nations Human Rights Council.

I strongly support this bill. Vietnam's record on human rights is appalling. The government in Vietnam continues to repress its citizens, including peaceful democracy activists, bloggers, and religious minorities. Reporters Without Borders ranks Vietnam as 172nd of 179 countries, only two places above China, and the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom has once again identified Vietnam as a "Tier 1 Country of Particular

Concern," grouping it with nations such as North Korea, Burma, and Iran. The Vietnamese government has clearly indicated by its actions that it lacks a meaningful commitment to reform. This Congress needs to send a message to the government that the status quo is unacceptable, and if the Vietnamese government wants to continue to engage with the United States, these violations must end. I support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1897, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ENCOURAGING PEACE AND REUNIFICATION ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 41) encouraging peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 41

Whereas the Republic of Korea (in this resolution referred to as "South Korea") and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (in this resolution referred to as "North Korea") have never formally ended hostilities and have been technically in a state of war since the Armistice Agreement was signed on July 27, 1953;

Whereas the United States, representing the United Nations Forces Command which was a signatory to the Armistice Agreement, and with 28,500 of its troops currently stationed in South Korea, has a stake in the progress towards peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula;

Whereas progress towards peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula would mean greater security and prosperity for the region and the world;

Whereas, at the end of World War II, Korea officially gained independence from Japanese rule, as agreed to at the Cairo Conference on November 22, 1943, through November 26, 1943;

Whereas, on August 10, 1945, the Korean Peninsula was temporarily divided along the 38th parallel into two military occupation zones commanded by the United States and the Soviet Union;

Whereas, on June 25, 1950, communist North Korea attacked the South, thereby initiating the Korean War and diminishing prospects for a peaceful unification of Korea;

Whereas, during the Korean War, more than 36,000 members of the United States

Armed Forces were killed and approximately 1,789,000 members of the United States Armed Forces served in-theater along with the South Korean forces and 20 other members of the United Nations to secure peace on the Korean Peninsula and in the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas, since the end of the Korean War era, the United States Armed Forces have remained in South Korea to promote regional peace;

Whereas provocations by the Government of North Korea in recent years have escalated tension and instability in the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas North Korea's human rights abuses, suppression of dissent, and hostility to South Korea remain significant obstacles to peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula;

Whereas North Korea's economic policies have led to extreme economic privation for its citizens, whose quality of life ranks among the world's lowest;

Whereas North Korea's proliferation of nuclear and missile technology threatens international peace and stability;

Whereas North Korea has systematically violated numerous International Atomic Energy Agency and United Nations Security Council Resolutions with respect to its nuclear weapons and ballistic missile programs;

Whereas the refusal of the Government of North Korea to denuclearize disrupts peace and security on the Korean Peninsula;

Whereas, beginning in 2003, the United States, along with the two Koreas, Japan, the People's Republic of China, and the Russian Federation, have engaged in six rounds of Six-Party Talks aimed at the verifiable and irreversible denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and finding a peaceful resolution to the security concerns resulting from North Korea's nuclear development;

Whereas the three-mile wide buffer zone between the two Koreas, known as the Demilitarized Zone, or DMZ, is the most heavily armed border in the world;

Whereas the Korean War separated more than 10,000,000 Korean family members, including 100,000 Korean Americans who, after 60 years of separation, are still waiting to see their families in North Korea;

Whereas reunification remains a long-term goal of South Korea;

Whereas South Korea and North Korea are both full members of the United Nations, whose stated purpose includes maintaining international peace and security, and to that end "take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace";

Whereas the Governments and people of the United States and South Korea have continuously stood shoulder-to-shoulder to promote and defend international peace and security, economic prosperity, human rights, and the rule of law both on the Korean Peninsula and beyond, and the denuclearization of North Korea; and

Whereas July 27, 2013, marks the 60th anniversary of the Armistice Agreement of the Korean War: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the historical importance of the Korean War, which began on June 25, 1950;

(2) honors the noble service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces and the armed forces of allied countries that have served in Korea since 1950;

(3) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to its alliance with South

Korea for the betterment of peace and prosperity on the Korean Peninsula; and

(4) calls on North Korea to respect the fundamental human rights of its citizens, abandon and dismantle its nuclear weapons program, and end its nuclear and missile proliferation as integral steps toward peace and eventual reunification.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the author of this bill and a hero of the Korean War, who served his country with valor during that tough campaign. After surviving an onslaught by waves of Chinese troops, he led his surviving comrades, while wounded, to safety from behind enemy lines, for which he was awarded a Purple Heart and also a Bronze Star for Valor.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was prepared to respond to the chairman and ranking member for their legislative courtesies they had extended to me. I appreciate the tribute being paid to me which, unusually, I was awkwardly unprepared for. But I do want to thank the gentleman for his friendship in more ways than just this resolution, as well as Tom Sheehy, who worked with your staff, and, of course, my friend from New York, J.J., on the committee staff. He guided to make certain that this almost-legislatively impossible resolution was so expediently brought up to be considered by this august House.

On Saturday last, the President of the United States, along with our congressional colleague, who is now the Secretary of the Department of Defense, and the Secretaries of all of the Armed Forces groups, got together to honor the veterans of the Korean War. It was a sight to see so many Korean veterans from so many different parts of the country.

They were reminded by the President that we had been labeled—those that participated—as what was referred to as "the forgotten war." Because most all of the world knew about the importance of America being involved in saving democracy in World War II. And Vietnam, for good or bad, everyone knew people that went there. But somehow, in the middle of that, no one really missed us or knew where Korea was—or it didn't appear there was too

much concern. When we did return, unlike the Vietnam veterans, who really had unfairly been treated, but fortunately for us, we were never missed, except by our families and friends. People never knew where we were. The Congress was not as kind to us as they had been to the veterans.

Having said all of that, it was a wonderful tribute. Veterans turned out from all over. Certainly, there were comrades that were part of the 20 countries that were part of the United Nations. And when the North Koreans invaded South Korea, those of us that were called to go to South Korea to defend them were going to a country that we never knew to fight for a people that we never met and for causes that were not well known.

And the war has never really been called a war. It's never been called a truce. It still is a division between these people. But as a result of the United States and the United Nations' efforts, millions of lives lost—54,000 Americans killed, 100,000 Americans wounded, and close to 9,000 either captured or missing in action—one would say, With all of the blood and money, what did we get out of this?

And that's what we discussed Saturday with the Korean War veterans. What we got out of this was the integrity of the United States of America. That any commitment that we had made to the United Nations not only would we be participating but we would lead, as we did under the direction of General MacArthur.

And today, as we look back and see that, out of the rubble of a country that had been reduced by war, and we take a look at what exists in the northern part, as this division still exists today, in Communist North Korea, we have seen a people that had no jobs, no homes, no resources, but they did have hope.

□ 2015

Out of the South Korean hope and dream came a nation, a new nation, a nation that demonstrated what democratic people can do; an economy was built, and a friendship and a partnership with the United States and freedom-loving people all over the world.

So today, we don't just say as Korean veterans that we know where Korea is. We say that no matter how little a part we played, that we can look back and be proud as Americans that we have, in a small part, been possible to see this small nation become a world power, not only in terms of its military, but its friendship in terms of America's national defense; not only in terms of friendship, but being one of our wonderful trading partners that provides jobs for Koreans and Americans.

So it only makes sense, as a great country of ours that still has the scars of the Civil War, that we should want Koreans, North and South, to find some

way to seek unity, to find some way to understand the values of democracy, to find some way that the thing that democracies are willing to fight and die for exists in that peninsula.

I want to specifically thank Hannah Kim of my office for doing what staff does for all of us in getting people even from the other body to understand how important this was to the President and to the Congress; and, of course, to the Speaker's staff, who worked closely with Chairman ROYCE—that's Mike Sommers and Dave Schnittger. And on the other side of the Capitol, Todd Womack, chief of staff of Senator CORKER, and Mike Henry and his gang, as chief of staff of Senator TIM Kaine.

And on behalf of all of the veterans, I can tell you, as I yield my time back to the chairman, that we all have felt that America really did love us; they just needed an opportunity to express it.

So we thank you for this resolution. It's not just for me and Koreans, but it's also for Korean Americans. So many Asians, and especially Korean Americans, they love Korea, but they love our country best.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank Mr. RANGEL, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 41, as amended, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say, first of all, that I want to thank my colleague and friend from New York, Congressman RANGEL, for his service to our country in the Korean War; also, for his long service in the House of Representatives and for offering this important resolution.

If you grew up in New York, as I did, and you grew up in politics, everyone knows who CHARLIE RANGEL is, anyplace in New York—New York City or New York State. And now we actually have adjoining districts, back-to-back districts. He obviously means so much to so many people, and I'm proud to call him my colleague and even more proud to call him my friend. So I want to thank Congressman RANGEL, who sponsored this legislation. I want to thank our chairman, ED ROYCE, for his leadership as well on this resolution.

What this does is H. Con. Res. 41 recognizes the historical importance of the Korean War, which ended 60 years ago this past weekend. The resolution also affirms the strong bonds between the United States and the Republic of Korea which were forged in blood during the Korean War.

During that conflict, nearly 1.8 million American soldiers served in the theater to defend freedom and democracy. Sadly, almost 55,000 were killed, over 100,000 were wounded, and about 8,000 were listed as missing in action or prisoners of war.

Just as I thank Congressman RANGEL, my good friend, I want to also say that the House has other Korean War

veterans in the House—Representative JOHN CONYERS, Representative SAM JOHNSON, and Representative HOWARD COBLE. CHARLIE RANGEL and all the other Korean War veterans in the House I just mentioned all deserve our recognition and sincere thanks.

From the ruins of that conflict 60 years ago, we've seen the rise of a strong alliance between the United States and South Korea, the emergence of South Korea as one of the major economies of the world and a leading trading partner of the United States.

This past January, I visited South Korea with Chairman ROYCE, where we had an opportunity to meet South Korea's new President—and we also met her when she came here and spoke before the joint session of Congress a few months ago—and we also met with other senior officials when we were in Seoul. Based on these conversations, I can tell you that the U.S.-South Korea relationship has never been stronger. With the continued threat posed by North Korea, the U.S.-Korea alliance is needed more than ever to safeguard peace and stability in that region of the world.

More than 28,000 American armed services personnel serve in Korea today, and Chairman ROYCE and I met many of those people when we were over in Korea. And just as Korean War veterans fought for freedom, so, too, do these current-day defenders stand ready to help protect freedom on the Korean Peninsula and throughout the region.

So I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would close my remarks by saying that I rise in strong support of this resolution.

I'd like to add my voice to others grateful for the sacrifices so many Americans made to protect the freedom of South Korea. And I again acknowledge the four Members of this House—Congressman CHARLIE RANGEL, JOHN CONYERS, SAM JOHNSON, and HOWARD COBLE—the veterans of that war, to thank them for their service in the Armed Forces.

I commend Congressman RANGEL for offering this resolution here on the 60th anniversary of this special relationship that we have with South Korea. We recall that 22 nations came together to defend the Republic of Korea, and fighting stopped 3 years later with an armistice that still remains in place. 5.7 million Americans served during that conflict. As noted, the casualties were 56,000, if you count those missing and presumed dead. Over 100,000 Americans were wounded in that war. And 140,000 South Koreans were killed in action, many of whom fought side by side with American forces for the cause of freedom. But when you calculate the more than 3

million Korean civilians killed in that conflict, you begin to appreciate the enormity of the human loss.

The heroic deeds of these servicemen, both Korean and American, laid the foundation for that alliance that we speak of here that has lasted some 60 years, but also brought relative stability, as Mr. RANGEL pointed out, to northeast Asia, and certainly laid that foundation for the prosperity that we see in Seoul and around the country today.

Yet Korea remains a divided peninsula. This is a calamity for the Korean people. The United States and South Korea have spent much of the last 20 years offering to engage North Korea with aid, with trade, and with diplomacy. All of these initiatives, unfortunately, have failed. And the North Korean response? Besides its aggressive behavior towards South Korea, the regime there continues to develop nuclear weapons, to test missiles, and to supply weapons to countries like Iran and Syria.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried many strategies. I think only one has worked, really, and that was financial pressure. I recall in 2005 when an Under Secretary of the Treasury caught North Korea counterfeiting \$100 bills, so what he did was used the power of the U.S. financial system to cut off Kim Jong Il's access to his vast offshore wealth. And while the North Korean people were starving at the time, as you know, the country's dictator had billions of dollars stashed away in foreign banks that suddenly he did not have access anymore to that money when the sanctions were put on the Banco Delta Asia. Blocking those accounts denied Kim Jong Il the cash he needed to sustain that vast police state, to sustain that million-man army, to pay for his nuclear weapons and his luxurious lifestyle.

For a while, the world had his attention. For a while, he wanted to come back to the table. I think that approach worked. I suspect North Korea will only change when it's forced to change, and I think we must resurrect a successful strategy of financial pressure.

But, Mr. Speaker, today what we do, what we dedicate ourselves to is recognizing the 60th anniversary of the Armistice Agreement of the Korean War. Importantly, this resolution not only honors the service and sacrifices of the members of the Armed Forces, but it also reaffirms our commitment to the U.S.-Korea alliance. And this resolution sends a message that the U.S. goal remains that which thousands of Americans, including four of our Members, fought for; that goal remains peace on the Korean Peninsula.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Before I yield back, I want to thoroughly embarrass my col-

league and friend from New York because we found, in our cloakroom, this wonderful picture. This good-looking guy is CHARLIE RANGEL when he was a soldier in Korea. And now you know why he was elected to Congress. Anyone who looks that good, everyone votes for. It's nice to hold a picture of a hero.

Mr. RANGEL. If the gentleman would yield, I thank you so much, my dear colleague from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I fully support H. Con. Res. 41—Encouraging peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula. I would like to thank Congressman RANGEL for bringing this bill forward and thank him for his service as a Korean War Veteran.

This past week marked the 60th Anniversary of the Korean War Armistice and I want to thank all of our service men and women who served and continue to serve in Korea. This timely resolution recognizes the historical importance of the Korean War and honors the service and sacrifice of the U.S. Armed Forces and the armed forces of allied countries that served, and continue to serve, in Korea. It reaffirms the commitment of the United States to our alliance with South Korea, and calls on North Korea to abide by international law and cease its nuclear proliferation in order to resume talks that could lead to peace and reunification.

As one of our strongest allies in that region, South Korea stands firmly for the ideals of democracy and freedom. This bill sends a strong message to the people of South Korea that we stand with them on their struggle against North Korean oppression. Our policy should be clear: the oppressive Pyongyang regime will face continued sanctions and isolation unless it ceases its illicit activities and its persistent threats against us and our allies.

I hope that one day Koreans will be able to reunite, and this bill helps promote this noble cause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 41, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 8162 of Public Law 106-79, as amended, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission:

Mr. BISHOP, Georgia

Mr. THOMPSON, California

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF GEORGE MITCHELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Energy Action Team, I want to open this Special Order by paying tribute to a man who made American energy independence possible in the 21st century, George Mitchell.

Mr. Mitchell left us this past Friday. He was 94 years old, 6 years short of a century. He was truly a larger-than-life figure in Texas, America, and the world. He spent more than 20 years of his life risking tens of millions of his own dollars looking to unlock the natural gas and oil that he knew existed in shale plates all across this country.

□ 2030

In the mid-1990s, Mr. Mitchell finally succeeded in tapping into the Barnett shale plate outside of Dallas and Fort Worth. He got his first operation well, profit well, after 35 wells. The 36th one was the one that made the difference.

The Barnett shale plate led to the Haynesville shale plate in western Louisiana and eastern Texas. That led to the Marcellus shale plate in western New York, western Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. That led to the Bakken shale plate in North Dakota and eastern Montana. And that led back home to the Eagle Ford shale plate south of San Antonio, going down to the Rio Grande border with Mexico.

Mr. Mitchell came into this world with a very special title—"BOI," born on island, a title of reverence for someone who is born on Galveston Island. He was born on May 21, 1919. Galveston was still struggling to recover from America's worst natural disaster—the Galveston hurricane of 1900, in which at least 6,000 Americans died in one night in September of that year.

But being "BOI," Mr. Mitchell did not despair. He felt resurgence, he felt hope. He took that resurgence and hope to College Station and Texas A&M University where he studied petroleum engineering and geology. He finished first in his class and was the captain of the varsity tennis team. Texas A&M gave him the tools he needed to succeed.

He gave tools back to Texas A&M. He donated \$4.2 million for a new Aggie tennis stadium and \$35 million for two new physics buildings.

When Alzheimer's took his wife of nearly 70 years, Cynthia, he gave the University of Texas Medical Branch in Galveston, Texas' oldest medical school, millions to study research like Alzheimer's.

He gave \$20 million for biomedical research at the MD Anderson Cancer

Center and brought Dr. Steven Hawking to Texas A&M to help with studying degenerative diseases, like the one Dr. Hawking had that he overcame for most of his adult life.

George Mitchell literally built The Woodlands north of Houston, one of the fastest growing and safest communities in America. George Mitchell has a very special place in my heart because my daughter, Kate, saw her idol Taylor Swift at the Cynthia Woods Mitchell Pavilion in The Woodlands.

Mr. Mitchell never forgot his hometown of Galveston, Texas. He had the vision to restore the Galveston Strand, bringing the cruise ships back to Galveston, and started a Mardi Gras celebration larger than New Orleans.

George Mitchell was a visionary who tapped into American exceptionalism and left a lasting mark on Texas, America, and the world.

George Mitchell gave my kids and every kid in America a very special gift—the gift of freedom that comes from knowing that a foreign nation cannot hurt our economy by taking away the oil and gas we need.

I saw this firsthand in 1979 when the Ayatollah overthrew the Shah of Iran. The Shah came here to America in exile being treated for cancer that ultimately took his life. The Arab world was not happy that we let the Shah come to America, and so OPEC took away every drop of oil that they had been giving our country for over 20 years.

I was 16 years old when that happened. I had just got my driver's license. My job was to drive our Chevy Silverado pick-up truck down to the gas station, depending upon the last digit of my license plate, odd or even, to fill up the truck with a maximum of 20 gallons of gasoline. The price of that gasoline doubled overnight.

Because of George Mitchell, American children will never have to go through that again if we can follow his dream of developing shale plates all across this great Nation.

George Mitchell embodied the qualities of hard work, innovation, compassion, and a can-do spirit that make America the greatest Nation on Earth.

We are better off today because of George and Cynthia Mitchell. May God bless the Mitchell family, their 10 children, and everyone whose life was touched by their presence.

In naval aviation we say “bravo zulu, Mr. Mitchell, bravo zulu.” You are cleared to depart the pattern and rejoin Cynthia in a life of shared eternity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2138

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) at 9 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 367, REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2009, KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 3, 2013, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2879, STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-187) on the resolution (H. Res. 322) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is en-

acted into law; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2009) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; providing for proceedings during the period from August 3, 2013, through September 6, 2013; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2879) to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MEADOWS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for July 30 on account of attending the installation of Sheriff Frye as president of the Sheriffs' Association in Wilmington, North Carolina.

Mr. MILLER of Florida (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after 6 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of attending the funeral of Colonel George E. “Bud” Day, Medal of Honor recipient.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of bronchitis.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), consistent with the fourth clause in section 5 of article I of the Constitution, and notwithstanding section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 1, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second quarter of 2013 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Tom Rice	5/26	5/27	Kosovo		194.95						194.95
	5/27	5/28	Germany		267.08						267.08
	5/28	5/29	Qatar		339.77						339.77
	5/29	5/31	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/31	6/1	United Arab Emirates								
							11,826.45				11,826.45
Hon. Bill Flores	4/19	4/19	United Arab Emirates								
	4/19	4/29	Afghanistan		43.00						43.00
	4/29	4/29	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
							10,709.60				10,709.60
Committee total					1,024.80		22,536.05				23,560.85

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PAUL RYAN, Chairman, July 24, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
David Redl	5/13	5/17	Switzerland		1,597.41		2,002.70				3600.11
Shawn Chang	5/13	5/17	Switzerland		1,597.41		2,002.70				3600.11
Hon. Michael C. Burgess	5/24	5/25	United Arab Emirates		372.00		13,065.10				13,437.10
	5/25	5/26	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	5/26	5/27	United Arab Emirates		221.07						221.07
Committee total					3,815.89		17,070.50				20,886.39

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Includes entire roundtrip for the Honorable Michael C. Burgess.

HON. FRED UPTON, Chairman, June 17, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Judy Chu	5/24	5/24	Cuba				415.90				415.90
Committee total							415.90				415.90

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, July 23, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. LAMAR SMITH, Chairman, July 24, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Steve King	5/28	6/3	Russia		3,588.00		20,207.42				23,795.42
Committee total					3,588.00		20,207.42				23,795.42

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. SAM GRAVES, Chairman, July 15, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DAVE CAMP, Chairman, July 16, 2013.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2433. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2434. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting FY 2012 PDUFA financial report to Congress required by the Prescription Drug User Fee Act, as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2435. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of State, Local, and Tribal Affairs, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting the Annual Progress and Evaluation Report on the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2436. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-37, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2437. A letter from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2438. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2013 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for the South Atlantic Lesser Amberjack, Almaco Jack, and Banded Rudderfish Complex [Docket No.: 100812345-2142-03] (RIN: 0648-XC714) received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2439. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC722) received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2440. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackarel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands

Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC724) received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2441. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2013 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Golden Tilefish [Docket No.: 120403249-2492-02] (RIN: 0648-XC671) received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2442. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Amendment 4 to the Corals and Reef Associated Plants and Invertebrates Fishery Management Plan of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands; Seagrass Management [Docket No.: 120718255-3500-02] (RIN: 0648-BC38) received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2443. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Amendment 94 to the Gulf of Alaska Fishery Management Plan and Regulatory Amendments for Community Quota Entities [Docket No.: 120223143-3489-02] (RIN: 0648-BB94) received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2444. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #4 and #5 [Docket No.: 130108020-3409-01] (RIN: 0648-XC705) received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2445. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the 2012 Report of Statistics Required by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2446. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Boothbay, ME [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0792; Airspace Docket No.: 12-ANE-00] received July 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2447. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act [TD-9624]

(RIN: 1545-BJ60) received July 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2448. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the Board's quarterly report to Congress on the Status of Significant Unresolved Issues with the Department of Energy's Design and Construction Projects (dated July 15, 2013); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations.

2449. A letter from the Secretaries, Department of the Interior, Department of Defense, Department of State, transmitting draft legislation to amend Title I of Public Law 99-658 (100 Stat. 3672), regarding the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Palau; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Foreign Affairs, and Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 2579. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for investigative leave requirements with respect to Senior Executive Service employees, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 322. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2009) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; providing for proceedings during the period from August 3, 2013, through September 6, 2013; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2879) to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes. (Rept. 113-187). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 2869. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish payment parity under the Medicare program for ambulatory cancer care services furnished in the hospital outpatient department and the physician office setting; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. KIND, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2870. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself, Mr. WATT, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 2871. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to modify the composition of the southern judicial district of Mississippi to improve judicial efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 2872. A bill to secure the borders of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 2873. A bill to evaluate and authorize the continuation of the activities of the Economy, Energy, and Environment (E3) Initiative to Support Sustainable Manufacturing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Education and the Workforce, Small Business, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HONDA, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2874. A bill to ensure that the United States promotes women's meaningful inclusion and participation in mediation and negotiation processes undertaken in order to prevent, mitigate, and resolve violent conflict and implements the United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2875. A bill to authorize programs and activities for the improvement and protection of ports and harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. COOK, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 2876. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide veterans with a 1-year exemption from the requirement to maintain minimum essential coverage under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 2877. A bill to prevent certain discriminatory taxation of natural gas pipeline property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 2878. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for innovative teacher retention programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2879. A bill to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2880. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to use the excess revenue generated from the William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program to carry out the Federal Pell Grant Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BEATTY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BASS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2881. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the amount of loan forgiveness available to highly-qualified teachers employed in low-income schools who teach in the same school district for five consecutive years; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 2882. A bill to amend the Small Business Act and title 38, United States Code to provide for a consolidated definition of a small business concern owned and controlled by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 2883. A bill to provide, for purposes of mitigating the effects of a sequestration, the Secretary of Defense transfer authority with respect to amounts made available to the Department of Defense in fiscal years 2014 through 2021, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 2884. A bill to require the Attorney General to make competitive grants to State, tribal, and local governments to establish and maintain witness protection and assistance programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 2885. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily exclude capital gain from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself and Mr. CULBERSON):

H.R. 2886. A bill to require agency notice and receipt of public comment before using any estimate for the social cost of carbon, to require reports on the results of and methods used to calculate any cost-benefit or regulatory impact analysis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 2887. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide assistance for condominiums and housing cooperatives damaged by a major disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2888. A bill to authorize assistance to aid in the prevention and treatment of obstetric fistula in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. SABLON):

H.R. 2889. A bill to provide funds to States, units of general local government, and community-based organizations to save and create local jobs through the retention, restoration, or expansion of services needed by local communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2890. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain tax incentives for investment in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2891. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate regulations on the management of medical waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 2892. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to preclude law firms and licensed attorneys from the definition of a debt collector when taking certain actions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 2893. A bill to address the dramatic increase of HIV/AIDS in minority communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 2894. A bill to discontinue eligibility of former Members of Congress and their dependents for coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program (FEHBP) if the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is repealed; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2895. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MAFFEI, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 2896. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify provisions relating to grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Com-

merce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2897. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for core curriculum development; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 2898. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to modify the composition of the southern judicial district of Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 2899. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the quarterly wages paid threshold for classification as an agricultural labor employer for purposes of unemployment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

110. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 13 supporting the congressional action to reverse the suspension of new student enrollments in the Job Corps; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

111. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2 commending its conscientious educators who teach about human rights and genocide; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

112. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 151 encouraging and supporting the Nagorno Karabakh Republic's continuing efforts to develop as a free and independent nation in order to guarantee its citizens those rights inherent in a free and independent society; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

113. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 180 memorializing the Congress to take such actions as are necessary to operate the fleet of the United States Postal Service vehicles on natural gas; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

114. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Utah, relative to Joint Resolution H.J.R. 4 memorializing Congress to pass S. 336 and H.R. 684, the Marketplace Fairness Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

115. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 192 urging and requesting the Louisiana Congressional Delegation to review the basis for the discontinuance of funding of the Bossier Sheriff's Young Marines Program through a Juvenile Accountability Block Grant with the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Civil Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

116. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 88 memorializing Congress to adopt the Constitution Restoration Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

117. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 7 urging the President and the Congress to exclude Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid from being part of any legislation to reduce the federal deficit; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

118. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 81 urging the Congress to enact federal legislation to propose a constitutional amendment granting full voting rights residents of the District of Columbia; jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and the Judiciary.

119. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 119 memorializing Congress to establish a task force to study and make recommendations relative to implementation of the Federal REAL ID Act of 2005 in Louisiana; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Homeland Security, and Oversight and Government Reform.

120. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 125 memorializing Congress to urge the U.S. Department of State to approve the Presidential permit application allowing the construction and operation of the TransCanada Keystone XL pipeline between the United States and Canada; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources.

121. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virgin Islands, relative to Resolution No. 1794 memorializing Congress to pass and adopt H.R. 92, which would authorize a grant to the Virgin Islands Water and Power Authority to alleviate the energy crisis in the territory; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, and Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 2869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 2872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4: To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 2873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the powers of Congress, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 2875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 2876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 2877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

H.R. 2878.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper" to provide for the "general Welfare" of Americans. In the Department of Education Organization Act (P.L. 96-88), Congress declared that "the establishment of a Department of Education is in the public interest, will promote the general welfare of the United States, will help ensure that education issues receive proper treatment at the Federal level, and will enable the Federal Government to coordinate its education activities more effectively." The Department of Education's mission is to "promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access."

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 2879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18,—"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 2881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 2882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 2883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 2884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 2885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 2886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under article I of the United States Constitution, including the power granted to Congress under article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 2887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which reads: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 2889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, 3, and 18 of the Constitution of the United States; Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2891.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 2892.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 "to provide for the common Defense and Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 2894.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this bill stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2896.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 2898.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause IX and clause XVIII of section VIII of Article I of the Constitution; and section I of Article III of the Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. . .

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 25: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 107: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 129: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 183: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 259: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 280: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 303: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 320: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 322: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 351: Ms. ESTY.

- H.R. 366: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. FORBES.
- H.R. 411: Mr. MATHESON.
- H.R. 436: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DeSANTIS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FLORES, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
- H.R. 495: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. HUDSON.
- H.R. 508: Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 515: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 523: Mr. JORDAN.
- H.R. 525: Mr. O'ROURKE.
- H.R. 526: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CAPPES, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 543: Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 556: Mr. REICHERT.
- H.R. 609: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
- H.R. 647: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DeSANTIS, Mr. RADEL, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
- H.R. 679: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 685: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LoBIONDO, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. McKEON.
- H.R. 686: Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 721: Mr. WALZ.
- H.R. 794: Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 808: Mr. HOLT.
- H.R. 822: Mr. YARMUTH.
- H.R. 842: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
- H.R. 855: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
- H.R. 920: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
- H.R. 938: Mr. WITTMAN.
- H.R. 946: Mr. MARCHANT.
- H.R. 960: Mr. McINTYRE.
- H.R. 961: Mr. NEAL.
- H.R. 975: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 997: Mr. WOMACK.
- H.R. 1000: Ms. CHU and Ms. CLARKE.
- H.R. 1020: Mr. MASSIE.
- H.R. 1024: Ms. CHU, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. ROONEY.
- H.R. 1027: Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 1095: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
- H.R. 1105: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 1123: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 1139: Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD.
- H.R. 1154: Ms. BASS.
- H.R. 1176: Mr. LATTI.
- H.R. 1179: Mr. PETERS of California.
- H.R. 1186: Mr. McCLINTOCK and Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 1209: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
- H.R. 1226: Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. UPTON, and Ms. JENKINS.
- H.R. 1250: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. WOMACK.
- H.R. 1254: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. BARR.
- H.R. 1287: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
- H.R. 1288: Mr. O'ROURKE.
- H.R. 1313: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
- H.R. 1339: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 1351: Mr. KIND and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
- H.R. 1354: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. CARNEY.
- H.R. 1420: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
- H.R. 1466: Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 1488: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H.R. 1518: Mr. TURNER and Mr. PAULSEN.
- H.R. 1526: Mr. MULLIN.
- H.R. 1563: Mr. KILMER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. CLEAVER.
- H.R. 1571: Mr. NUNNELEE.
- H.R. 1579: Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 1587: Mr. COTTON.
- H.R. 1620: Mr. DEUTCH.
- H.R. 1661: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 1701: Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 1708: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
- H.R. 1716: Mr. HANNA.
- H.R. 1717: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
- H.R. 1728: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MENG, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
- H.R. 1771: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
- H.R. 1798: Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 1801: Mr. BONNER and Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 1814: Mr. JOYCE.
- H.R. 1825: Mr. RICE of South Carolina and Mrs. WALORSKI.
- H.R. 1827: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
- H.R. 1845: Mr. TONKO.
- H.R. 1847: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MEADOWS, and Ms. SINEMA.
- H.R. 1869: Mr. DELANEY.
- H.R. 1878: Mr. ROONEY.
- H.R. 1959: Mr. VEASEY.
- H.R. 1962: Mr. WALZ.
- H.R. 1985: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. ENGEL.
- H.R. 1995: Mr. MORAN.
- H.R. 1998: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 2000: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
- H.R. 2009: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. HULTGREN.
- H.R. 2019: Mr. RICE of South Carolina and Mr. WENSTRUP.
- H.R. 2041: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
- H.R. 2044: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 2052: Mr. LEVIN.
- H.R. 2085: Mr. ROKITA.
- H.R. 2116: Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 2199: Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 2239: Mr. GOHMERT.
- H.R. 2255: Mr. MORAN.
- H.R. 2288: Mr. WITTMAN.
- H.R. 2296: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. HECK of Washington.
- H.R. 2300: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
- H.R. 2305: Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 2308: Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 2315: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
- H.R. 2324: Mr. O'ROURKE.
- H.R. 2330: Mr. ANDREWS.
- H.R. 2347: Mr. LABRADOR and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
- H.R. 2415: Mr. TERRY, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
- H.R. 2429: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUNYAN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
- H.R. 2457: Mr. VARGAS.
- H.R. 2480: Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 2485: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. KUSTER.
- H.R. 2506: Mr. DELANEY.
- H.R. 2519: Mr. McDERMOTT.
- H.R. 2537: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
- H.R. 2549: Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 2565: Mr. GARCIA.
- H.R. 2575: Mr. DENHAM and Mr. TURNER.
- H.R. 2579: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
- H.R. 2588: Mr. PEARCE.
- H.R. 2590: Ms. JENKINS.
- H.R. 2591: Mr. WALBERG.
- H.R. 2607: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 2619: Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 2632: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 2654: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. TIERNEY.
- H.R. 2660: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 2679: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 2682: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. AMASH, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. LONG, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. STEWART, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
- H.R. 2689: Mr. McKINLEY and Mr. PAULSEN.
- H.R. 2692: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 2706: Mr. LOEBSACK.
- H.R. 2717: Mr. LATTI, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. BROWN of Georgia.
- H.R. 2720: Mr. LEWIS.
- H.R. 2725: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LaMALFA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. GARDNER.
- H.R. 2726: Mr. ROONEY.
- H.R. 2728: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. FLEMING.
- H.R. 2768: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
- H.R. 2769: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
- H.R. 2772: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.R. 2773: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 2775: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MICA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. RADEL, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. PITTINGER.
- H.R. 2776: Mr. PEARCE.
- H.R. 2777: Mr. CARTER.
- H.R. 2778: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
- H.R. 2794: Mr. RUSH, Mr. LATTI, and Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 2801: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
- H.R. 2805: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H.R. 2806: Mr. BOUSTANY.
- H.R. 2810: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LATTI, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 2826: Mr. ROSKAM.
- H.R. 2834: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 2836: Ms. MENG.
- H.R. 2837: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. LONG.
- H.R. 2843: Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 2854: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. YOHO.
- H.J. Res. 34: Mr. TAKANO.
- H.J. Res. 40: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
- H.J. Res. 51: Mr. GIBBS.
- H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
- H. Con. Res. 34: Ms. ESTY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. TSONGAS.
- H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CHU, and Mr. SCHIFF.
- H. Res. 101: Mr. TIBERI.
- H. Res. 109: Mr. KLINE and Mr. PAULSEN.
- H. Res. 112: Ms. CHU.
- H. Res. 153: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LaMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
- H. Res. 188: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
- H. Res. 231: Mr. ROSS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
- H. Res. 249: Mr. COSTA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H. Res. 254: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MENG, and Ms. Frankel of Florida.
- H. Res. 281: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DeSANTIS, Mr.

VEASEY, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. JOYCE.

H. Res. 291: Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 293: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H. Res. 308: Ms. MENG, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. TITUS.

H. Res. 314: Mr. VEASEY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Oversight and Govern-

ment Reform in H.R. 2879 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

41. The SPEAKER presented a petition of City Council of Monterey, CA, relative to Resolution No. 13-091.C.S. petitioning Congress to enact Comprehensive Immigration Reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

42. Also, a petition of the Pecos River Commission, New Mexico, relative to a resolution requesting the Congress to reauthorize the Water Resources Development Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. WALBERG

AMENDMENT No. 22: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 421. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide housing assistance benefits for an individual for whom criminal conviction records made available pursuant to section 6(q) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d(q)), or to subsection (b) or (c) of section 578 of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 13663(b), (c)), indicate that the individual has been convicted of aggravated sexual abuse under section 2241 of title 18, United States Code, murder under section 1111 of title 18, United States Code, or an offense under chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code.

H.R. 2610

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 23: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 421. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide a grant under the Natural Experiment Grant Program.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CELEBRATING THE 15 YEARS OF SERVICE OF THE TAHOE TRUCK- EE COMMUNITY FOUNDATION

HON. TOM MCCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Tahoe Truckee Community Foundation for 15 years of service to the community. The Foundation began with a generous gift of one million dollars from William Hewlett, co-founder of Hewlett Packard. It was his vision and commitment that challenged other individuals to dedicate time and resources to help promote philanthropy. Today, more than 3,000 donors have distributed millions of dollars to local nonprofits, improving the quality of life in this historic and beautiful region.

The Tahoe Truckee Community Foundation has awarded more than \$20 million in grants to the community. The most recent project, the Community House, opens this fall and will serve as a long-term community wellness center. The House will provide a variety of services including professional counseling and enrichment classes to help individuals become more self-reliant.

It is the initiative of private citizens to improve the quality of life for all that has earned the Foundation national recognition by the Council on Foundations as one of the top community organizations in the entire nation. This honor attests to the vibrancy of the group and the importance of the Foundation's deeds.

As John Adams put it, the success of this organization is the "result of good heads prompted by good hearts." May the good hearts of the many donors and volunteers continue to make the name of the Tahoe Truckee Community Foundation a beacon for all those in need and an enduring example for those who work to make our cities, states, and the nation better for all. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize and thank the Foundation for its years of service to our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF C. WAITMAN TAYLOR AND HIS CAREER IN SERVICE TO OWENSBORO, KEN- TUCKY

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of C. Waitman Taylor, Jr. Born and raised in Lewisport, Kentucky, Waitman has continued the Taylor family legacy by serving Hancock and Daviess Counties in a variety of ways.

Waitman is retiring as Executive Director of Owensboro Health's Foundation for Health. Nearly 86 years old, Waitman has over 60 years in the workforce along with serving in the U.S. Air Force, retiring as a captain of the U.S. Air Force reserves in 1966. The list of titles and duties are long, but his distinguished career is truly one to be acknowledged.

Waitman has served in his current role since 2002. Prior to that, Waitman served as an industry official at institutions such as L.R. Chapman Inc., General Electric Co. and Texas Gas Transmission. He was also elected Mayor of Owensboro, a position he held from 1972–1976, after serving as Mayor Pro-Tem for two years.

Waitman's roles go beyond industry and elected office. Waitman served in numerous board positions for the University of Louisville, Murray State University and 30 years with Brescia University receiving honorary doctorate in 1976. Waitman's list of community and fundraising activities are equally as impressive, serving in a variety of leadership positions at the Owensboro-Daviess County Chamber of Commerce, United Way, Owensboro-Daviess County Industrial Foundation, Junior Achievement, Owensboro-Daviess County Regional Airport and Industry Inc., now known as Greater Owensboro Economic Development Corp. Waitman was the co-founder and chairman of Community Foundation of Owensboro-Daviess County. And he was a member of the first Leadership Kentucky class in 1985.

It should come as no surprise that Waitman's achievements have been recognized with numerous awards. In 1958, Waitman was named Owensboro's Outstanding Young Man. Hancock County Historical Society named him Historian of the Year in 2012. In January 2013, when the Greater Owensboro Chamber of Commerce celebrated its 100th birthday they named Waitman as their Chamber Member of the Century.

Quoted in Owensboro's Messenger Inquirer, Waitman said, "Looking back, if I had retired at 65, I wouldn't have met and worked with all these wonderful people in the last 21 years." I can tell you that sentiment is shared. It has been a true pleasure working with Waitman and I join the people of Kentucky's Second District in thanking him for his contributions. Please accept my best wishes and blessings for Waitman and his family.

A TRIBUTE TO JAMES WATTS

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise, along with my colleague Representative STEVEN PALAZZO, to honor James Watts for his many

years of service to the community. Born in 1919 in McComb, Mississippi, Mr. Watts has dedicated his career to public service. His children and stepchildren have followed in their parent's footsteps and have been leaders in their own right throughout the United States.

During World War II, Mr. Watts defended his country by tracking German submarines as a member of the United States Coast Guard. Later, in civilian life, he would go on to hold executive board positions in both the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of America organizations.

Mr. Watts' passion for volunteerism speaks volumes about his character. While he lived in Grand Junction, Colorado, he volunteered as an EMT and then a paramedic for what is now St. Mary's Hospital and Regional Medical Center in Grand Junction, Colorado. Upon relocation to Gulfport, Mississippi, Mr. Watts taught CPR and First Aid for the American Red Cross and various organizations around the country, which is a testament to his devotion to the well-being of the communities he has visited.

Perhaps one of his biggest accomplishments was in 1956 while he worked for the Atomic Energy Commission. As a mine safety engineer in New Mexico, Mr. Watts noticed a uranium boom town of more than 10,000 residents who were living without access to a local hospital for emergency services. With ambition and selflessness, he took it upon himself to spearhead organization efforts for the creation of Cibola General Hospital, which has been committed to serving the medical needs of the community since 1959. Ever since, patients continue to be saved, the critically ill continue to be treated, and 24-hour emergency care is still available to the community.

Now at 94 years old, Mr. Watts resides with his wife, Barbara, in Gulfport, Mississippi. Although he is retired, the organizations and community projects developed under his leadership are still in operation today. I believe Mr. Watts' life is a great example of generosity and devotion to the greater good of society. We can all learn from Mr. Watt's inspiring story of public service. I join my colleagues in recognizing and thanking Mr. Watts for his life of service. We wish him, his wife Barbara, and their children Susan, Rick, Jane, Danette, and Paul all the best in their future endeavors and thank them for continuing their father's legacy of noble service to the community.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

RECOGNIZING BRYON MAZADE'S
NINETEEN YEARS AS CITY MAN-
AGER OF MUSKEGON

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bryon Mazade and his over 19 years of commendable service to Muskegon, Michigan as their city manager.

Bryon grew up in Muskegon and graduated from Reeths-Puffer High School. After earning a Master's in Public Administration from Western Michigan University, Bryon stayed in West Michigan to serve his community. He quickly earned a reputation in West Michigan as a hard-working and reliable city manager for both Coopersville and Newaygo. Bryon had the opportunity to return to his hometown of Muskegon in 1994 and has served as the city manager ever since.

Muskegon is a place where families and businesses can thrive. A city of 38,000 people and 1,100 businesses, Muskegon is representative of Michigan as a manufacturing hub, popular beach-town, and close knit community. Bryon certainly played a large roll in making Muskegon what it is today.

During his 19 years as the city manager for Muskegon, Bryon tackled challenging projects that revitalized his hometown. To name just a few, Bryon oversaw the implementation of the Muskegon Lake Express, Lake Michigan's first high-speed, cross lake ferry. He also spearheaded improvements to L.C. Walker Arena, helped establish two Grand Valley State University facilities in Muskegon, developed Shoreline Drive and Bluffton Bay Estates, created many beautiful miles of bike trails, and encouraged countless other redevelopment projects, improving the economy while showcasing Muskegon's natural beauty on the shores of Lake Michigan.

Bryon recently announced that he will retire in October, capping 19 notable years as the Muskegon City Manager. His tenure in a position that rarely has longevity, speaks volumes about his managing skills and ability to work with Commissioners and staff for the good of the people. While Bryon will no longer be Muskegon's City Manager, he will continue to play a prominent roll in the city that he dedicated decades to.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring City Manager of Muskegon Bryon Mazade for his great service in Muskegon and throughout West Michigan.

A MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO ROBERT
SIEV

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Robert Siev of South Pasadena, California, a kind, brave and highly respected man.

Robert was born on April 6, 1926, in Germany. During the Holocaust, at the age of thir-

teen, he and some of his family escaped by boarding a moving train in Lithuania, getting their visas stamped by Japanese Consul General Chiune Sugihara, and then jumping off of that train. After a dangerous flight across Russia, they eventually made it to America. Having lost much of his family to the Holocaust, including his younger brother Jonah, Robert was eternally grateful to the United States for permitting his family to emigrate, live freely and for the educational opportunities the United States afforded.

The Sievs came to the United States and settled in New York, where Robert attended New York University. During this time period, he taught himself English, joined the Army, and became a United States citizen. Robert moved to Philadelphia and while at Penn State University, in 1943, he met the love of his life, Beatrice (Bea) Spector. Robert and Bea got married and in 1946, their daughter Carol was born. In 1955, Robert moved his family to South Pasadena, California, where he and Bea became active in the community.

A chemical engineer by trade, Robert worked for renowned engineering companies CF Braun, Aerojet General, and Bechtel from which he retired. In his volunteer life, Robert was involved in all aspects of the South Pasadena community. Generous with his time and money, he was active in the South Pasadena Educational Foundation—which supports the city's schools, interested in city politics, and he was a staunch "freeway fighter" in the effort to stop the 710 freeway extension through South Pasadena. Robert was a steadfast supporter of Israel and was proud of the accomplishments made by the Jewish people. He was very involved in his temple, Temple Beth Israel in Highland Park, and was a continuous contributor to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and the Holocaust Museum. In addition, Mr. Siev was also occasionally the featured guest speaker at various organizations, where he would speak about his own experiences during the Holocaust.

Robert passed away on July 6, 2013, and is survived by his wife of nearly 70 years, Beatrice, daughter Carol, brother-in-law Ellis, son-in-law Stuart, grandchildren Lisa and Daniel, and one great-grand daughter Shana. I ask all members to join me in remembering Robert Siev, a true treasure to the South Pasadena and greater Los Angeles community.

HONORING THE LIFE OF COLONEL
JESSE EDWARDS GREEN

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of a dear friend, Colonel Jesse Edwards Green. Col. Green passed away at the age of 90 in Windermere, Florida, on June 30, 2013.

Col. Green was born in Leavenworth, Kansas, on September 30, 1922, to the late Claire and Jesse Green. As the son of a career Army officer, he followed in his father's footsteps and attended the United States Military Academy at West Point. In 1946, he grad-

uated from West Point with his Army Air Corps pilot wings and was assigned to the Air Force's first all jet squadron. In January 1947, Col. Green married the love of his life, former Caroline Bailey, and started a family which grew to four children.

Col. Green's 30-year military career included over 120 combat missions in Korea, where he was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, and two tours in Vietnam. He also graduated as a test pilot from the Air Force Flight Test School at Edwards Air Force Base in California and was among the first Air Force pilots to fly above 50,000 feet in the Lockheed F-104 Starfighter. His bravery, dedication and sacrifice to our nation will not be forgotten.

In 1976, after retiring from the Air Force, Col. Green and his wife moved to Windermere, Florida. During retirement, they both enjoyed water skiing, cooking and gardening together. Today, their papayas are legendary on Second Avenue in downtown Windermere. Col. Green was also a beloved friend, board member and construction volunteer of the Edgewood Children's Ranch and West Orange Habitat for Humanity. For 37 years, he volunteered alongside many friends and neighbors building homes and varieties of construction projects. The numerous contributions that Col. Green made to his community, along with his legacy of hard work, strength and love he leaves behind to his children and grandchildren will be forever cherished.

He was a loving and dedicated father, son, brother, grandfather, and uncle. On behalf of the citizens of Central Florida, my prayers and condolences go out to his loving wife of 67 years Caroline, his daughters Patricia, Molly, and Judy, son Mike, grandchildren Leon, Cannon-Marie, Cody, Kyr, Serafina, Tyler, Evan, Kellen, Caitlin, and Michael, sister-in-law Anne Bailey, and many beloved nieces and nephews. May God bless them through this time of remembrance.

CONDEMNING THE ATTACK ON
THE TURKISH EMBASSY IN SO-
MALIA

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sincere condolences to the people and Government of Turkey.

On July 27, 2013, their embassy in Mogadishu, Somalia was attacked by three suicide bombers. Two security guards and a Somali student lost their lives in the explosions, while several members of the embassy staff were also injured. An al-Qaida-linked, Somali militant group named al-Shabab has claimed responsibility for the attack. This serves as a stark reminder that al-Qaida remains strong throughout the Middle East and Africa and needs to be confronted at every turn.

Turkey has been a force for good in Somalia and is actively involved with Somalia's reconstruction. Turkish aid workers have been assisting Somali authorities to rebuild their war torn country by undertaking development

projects, including street renovations and the construction of schools. Furthermore, Turkey continues to strengthen commercial times with Somalia to help boost its economy.

Mr. Speaker, I share the Obama administration's condemnation of this attack and express my condolences in the strongest terms possible.

HONORING DANIEL WEICKENAND

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Daniel Weickenand on his recent election to the Board of Directors at the National Association of Federal Credit Unions (NAFCU).

Mr. Weickenand is the President and CEO of Orion Federal Credit Union in Memphis, Tennessee. He earned his BA in accounting and MBA from the University of Texas in San Antonio. He practiced public accounting before devoting more than 20 years to the credit union industry. Prior to his service at Orion Federal Credit Union, where he oversaw a complete brand overhaul from Memphis Area Teacher's Credit Union, Mr. Weickenand served as the Chief Financial Officer at FedEx Employees Credit Association.

In addition to his expertise in financial services, Mr. Weickenand is actively involved in the Memphis community in various charitable capacities and is currently serving as treasurer for the Memphis in May International Festival Board of Directors.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Weickenand will bring a tremendous amount of expertise to the NAFCU Board. I wish Mr. Weickenand the best of luck in his new role on the NAFCU Board. I ask that my colleagues join me today in congratulating him on this achievement.

HONORING ANDREW JAMES FARNEN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Andrew James Farnen. Andrew is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 138, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Andrew has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Andrew has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned 24 merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Andrew has earned the rank of Firebuilder in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say, become an Ordeal Member of the Order of the Arrow, and led his troop as the Junior Assistant Scout Master and Senior Patrol Leader. Andrew has also contributed to

his community through his Eagle Scout project. Andrew designed and constructed a sandbox for a new outdoor classroom at Burr Oaks Nature Center in Blue Springs, Missouri. Andrew cut down trees for logs, cleared the area for the sandbox, constructed and filled the sandbox, and landscaped the area surrounding the sandbox for the Nature Center.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Andrew James Farnen for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING THE LIFE AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF COLONEL GEORGE EVERETT "BUD" DAY

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of one of America's greatest warriors, Colonel George Everett "Bud" Day. Colonel Day was a proud resident of Northwest Florida where he retired from the United States Air Force after courageously serving our Nation with honor and distinction in three wars across four decades.

Colonel Day's service began in 1942 when he voluntarily joined the United States Marine Corps and subsequently served 30 months in the South Pacific Theater during World War II as a non-commissioned officer. Following the War, Colonel Day attended Morningside College in Sioux City, Iowa earning a Bachelor of Science degree and a Doctor of Humane Letters. He also earned a Master of Arts degree from St. Louis University, a Juris Doctor from the University of South Dakota, and a Doctor of Laws from Troy State University. Colonel Day was also admitted to practice law in South Dakota and Florida.

After being honorably discharged from the Marine Corps, Colonel Day continued his quest to serve our Nation when he joined the Air National Guard after receiving a direct commission as a Second Lieutenant in 1950. In 1951, Colonel Day was called to active duty in the United States Air Force and entered Undergraduate Pilot Training. Following his graduation from training, Colonel Day served two tours in the Far East as a fighter bomber pilot during the Korean War.

In April 1967, Colonel Day was assigned to the 31st Tactical Fighter Wing at Tuy Hoa Air Base, Republic of Vietnam. He later moved to Phu Cat Air Base where he organized and became the Commander of Detachment 1 of the 416th Tactical Fighter Squadron also known as the "Misty Super FAC's." This new unit flew two-seated F-100F Super Sabre aircraft in a pioneering top secret mission as Fast Forward Air Controllers operating inside many high threat areas of Vietnam and Laos.

On August 26, 1967, flying under the call sign "Misty-01" and after flying more than five thousand hours defending our great Nation, Colonel Day was shot down over North Vietnam and began sixty-seven long and brutal months as a Prisoner of War. Despite severe injuries from his ejection over enemy territory

and repeated torture, Colonel Day was always defiant to his captors who labeled him a "hard resistor" and often singled him out for exceptionally harsh treatment. During one such event in which Colonel Day participated in a forbidden religious service amongst his fellow prisoners, Colonel Day defiantly stared down the Vietnamese guards who tried to stop the service ultimately singing our National Anthem in protest. Colonel Day's resistance, leadership, and bravery in the face of deadly enemy pressure saved the lives of countless fellow aviators who were still flying over Vietnam, and he served as an inspiration to his fellow servicemembers who were also held as Prisoners of War.

In March 14, 1973 Colonel Day was released after an unimaginable two thousand twenty-eight days of captivity. His heroism, determination, and courage were further echoed by the presentation of our Nation's highest award, the Medal of Honor by President Gerald Ford on March 6, 1976.

Colonel Day retired from the Air Force on December 9, 1977 as the Vice Commander of the great 33rd Fighter Wing at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida. By the end of his career, Colonel Day was the Air Force's most highly decorated officer having been awarded nearly seventy military decorations and awards with an astounding fifty earned for actions in combat. A patriot in the truest sense of the word, Colonel Day never stopped looking out for his brothers in arms.

Following his retirement, Colonel Day continued to be a very passionate and active leader in the community and throughout the Nation. Colonel Day had a very successful law practice often championing veterans and military retiree issues. His leadership was instrumental in protecting the earned health care benefits of military retirees both in litigation before the federal court system and through his successful advocacy of the Congress which ultimately resulted in the restoration of military medical benefits.

Colonel Day's most important legacy is that of a family man and as a great neighbor and friend to so many in our community. Colonel Day's enduring impact on his community and Nation will be felt for generations to come. Though many have bravely served their country before Colonel Day, and many continue to honorably serve, few have endured as much as Bud Day for duty, honor, and love of country.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it gives me great pride to honor the life and service of an American hero, Colonel George Everett "Bud" Day. Our community and countless others will miss his unwavering perseverance and optimism, but his legacy will endure for years to come. My wife Vicki joins me in extending our most sincere condolences to Colonel Day's wife, Doris; their four children, Steven; George, Jr., Lieutenant Colonel (USAF retired); Sonja; and Sandra; their fourteen grandchildren; and the entire Day family.

HONORING THE CEREALINE
MANUFACTURING CO.

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Cerealine Manufacturing Co., the newest addition to the roster of the Indiana Historical Bureau's state historical marker series.

The Cerealine Manufacturing Company, founded in 1880, was an early producer of corn flakes and grew to prominence as the railroads opened national markets to Midwest producers. Founded in Columbus, Indiana, the Cerealine Manufacturing Co. produced up to 12,000 bushels of product daily, creating a corn flake that was the precursor to the famous cold breakfast cereal. The state historical marker honoring the company will be placed at the site of the original mill building, currently restored and serving as offices for Cummins, Inc.

I want to thank the Indiana Historical Bureau for its continued leadership in recognizing and commemorating significant individuals, organizations, places, and events in Indiana history. These roadside markers are familiar to all Hoosiers and visitors who pass through the State. With over 500 state historical markers in place, the Indiana Historical Bureau impresses on Hoosiers across the State the importance of our history and the promise of our future.

I ask the 6th Congressional District to join me in thanking the Indiana Historical Bureau for recognizing and publicly marking our shared history and the heritage of the Cerealine Manufacturing Company in Columbus, Indiana.

HONORING WILLIE B. NELSON, DISTRICT DEPUTY GRAND EXALTED RULER FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, IMPROVED BENEVOLENT PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS OF THE WORLD

HON. WILLIAM L. ENYART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Willie B. Nelson, District Deputy Grand Exalted Ruler for the Southern District of Illinois and Exalted Ruler of Hercules Lodge #90 in East St. Louis, of the Improved Benevolent Protective Order (I.B.P.O.) of Elks of the World.

Willie B. Nelson has been a pioneer who helped break down racial barriers in the local banking community. He worked as a custodian at the former Illini Federal Savings and Loan Association in East St. Louis at a time when management positions were not available to African-Americans. While working for the financial institution, which would later become Associated Bank, Nelson went to school at nights and took a number of financial training

and internship programs. His determination and stellar performance succeeded in his appointment as Branch Manager for the bank. He would retire as Branch Manager after serving Associated Bank for 43 years.

In addition to his professional career, Willie B. Nelson has dedicated his life to service and leadership within his community. Since being initiated into the I.B.P.O. Elks of World in 1955, he has served in virtually every leadership position for that organization, including two times as Exalted Ruler, first from 1975 through 1990 and again from 2007 to the present. In addition to serving as District Deputy Director for the Southern District of Illinois, he also served for 15 consecutive years as State Director of the Illinois/Wisconsin States Association.

Willie B. Nelson has served in a leadership capacity on many other community organizations. He has served as President of the East St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, the Leadership Council of Southwestern Illinois, Target 2000, the Katherine Dunham Museum and the Southern Illinois Healthcare Foundation. He has also served as a Commissioner on the Board of the Illinois Housing Department. His leadership service extends to his church as well where he serves as Chairman of the Board of Trustees and Interim Finance Director for the Greater Faith Christian Church in Centreville, Illinois.

Willie B. Nelson has been a devoted family man as well. His wife and two of his children have gone on to their heavenly reward but he is still blessed with the presence of his loving daughter, Lavonda Nelson, along with numerous grandchildren and great grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of community service of Willie B. Nelson and wishing him the very best in the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF RALPH PETTY

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Ralph Petty as he retires from 38 years with the U.S. Postal Service. As his family, friends, and colleagues gather to celebrate his illustrious career, I ask my colleagues to join me in tribute to Mr. Petty's many years of service.

After honorably serving his nation in the Vietnam war, Ralph began a long career with the Postal Service as a letter carrier. He would later rise to become the spokesman and customer relations coordinator for the Postal Service in Sacramento, where he has constantly engaged the public, furthering access and understanding of the postal services available to area residents and businesses. Ralph has a widespread reputation for incredible customer service, and is a well-beloved member of the Postal Service staff, even earning the nickname "Mr. Stamp". His good nature and excellent work ethic have made him an invaluable asset to Sacramento area residents, including my staff and me, and his service will be sorely missed.

Ralph has left his mark of the Postal Service in California and our Nation. He was instrumental in the creation of the Breast Cancer Stamp that has raised over \$75 million for breast cancer awareness, and has been recognized by the Postal Service's leadership with the "Benjamin Award" for spreading postal services and products. Ralph was also a key proponent of the Santa Letter Program, which brings joy to countless needy children, and created a time capsule in 1993 that marked 150 years of mail delivery to Sacramento.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pay tribute to Mr. Ralph Petty, who has served our Nation and community for so long. His diligent work has greatly contributed to the Sacramento region and he has helped to ensure that the Postal Service products are at the forefront of the public's mind. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this man whose community mindedness and service have been such an asset to Sacramento and our Nation.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,084,158,233.57. We've added \$6,111,207,109,320.49 to our debt in 4 and a half years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our Nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for rollcall vote No. 424. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

HONORING KYLE WILLIAM
MILLSAP

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Kyle William Millsap. Kyle is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 138, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Kyle has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the

many years Kyle has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned 32 merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Kyle has earned the rank of Firebuilder in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say, become an Ordeal Member of the Order of the Arrow, and led his troop as the Patrol Leader. Kyle has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Kyle leveled the ground, installed a border ring and placed rubber mulch within the ring for the Joella Conrad Memorial Playground at Heartland Church in Blue Springs, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Kyle William Millsap for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

LETTER TO SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, THE HONORABLE ROBERT F. HALE

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I insert this letter from myself to Under Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert F. Hale.

Hon. ROBERT F. HALE,
Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY HALE: Thank you for providing me and members of the Readiness Subcommittee a briefing on the implementation of civilian furloughs at the Department of Defense. I appreciate your first-hand view of the policy and its impacts on our defense civilian workforce and our military readiness, and I benefitted from your candid remarks about the challenges that sequestration continues to present to the department.

While I continue to believe that the best way to address furloughs and other impacts to our military readiness is for Congress to pass a comprehensive and balanced plan to end sequestration, I also believe that the department must continue to evaluate all options available to it in reducing or eliminating furloughs this year. During our briefing you indicated that the department was evaluating whether additional reductions in furlough days can be made. It is my hope that the department will finish that analysis and make a positive public announcement on that matter as quickly as possible in order to provide furloughed employees the greatest possible certainty as to their financial outlook for the rest of the year.

Additionally, as I and several of my colleagues mentioned in our session, there are a number of specific aspects of the current furlough policy that continue to frustrate those individuals facing loss of pay through no fault of their own. For example, I believe that the individual military services and agencies can be provided with greater flexibility to pay down or eliminate furloughs under their purview. Additionally, further consideration must be given to the status of dual status technicians and those whose work is funded through the defense working capital funds—both workforces are critical to the day-to-day needs of our military, and I continue to believe that exceptions must be made for these personnel.

Just this past Saturday, I attended a welcome home event for the 1109th TASMG of

the Connecticut National Guard, who spent the last year in Afghanistan providing critical maintenance for our helicopter fleet. Their joy at being home with family was undermined with the reality that nearly a third of the 100 returning members are dual status technicians and therefore hit by furlough. After serving in a war zone away from family, it was a bitter pill for these patriots to lose 20 percent of their pay almost immediately upon return.

As I also mentioned in our briefing, the department must better quantify and communicate the cuts that have already been made in attempting to avoid furloughs. When I recently met with furloughed personnel at Naval Submarine Base New London, I received many questions about whether the department made any attempts to cut back on contracting for services, returning outsourced work to federal employees and other potential ways to find the savings necessary to reduce or eliminate furloughs. It is my hope that you will provide members of this committee, as well as the workforce at large, with additional information on the extent to which the department has, or plans, to cut in other areas to limit the reach of furloughs.

Finally, let me thank you for your positive words about the work that our DOD civilians do each and every day in support of the defense of our nation. As you shared in our meeting, one of the most disappointing impacts of the furloughs has been giving our defense civilians the impression that they are not important to or valued by the department, by Congress and by our fellow Americans. That these furloughs, and the greater budget uncertainty at large, is causing long-serving and hard working civilian professionals to question whether they want to stay at the defense department is one of the most insidious impacts of this budget impasse. That is why I hope you and Secretary Hagel will continue to do all you can to reduce or eliminate furloughs, revisit specific unique exemptions, and provide more detailed information about the steps you have, and will continue to take, to limit furloughs through reductions in areas like service contracting and reversing outsourcing decisions.

Thank you, again, for taking the time to meet with me and my colleagues on the Readiness Subcommittee, and I sincerely thank you for your service to our country in these challenging times.

Sincerely,

JOE COURTNEY,
Member of Congress.

HONORING THE DEDICATED SERVICE OF HEDY RATNER AND CAROL DOUGAL

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Hedy Ratner and Carol Dougal, the founders of Women's Business Development Center (WBDC), for their exemplary leadership in supporting women's entrepreneurship. As Hedy and Carol step down from their role as co-presidents of the WBDC, let us recognize the work that these two remarkable women have done for more than 25 years to empower other women to start, improve and expand their small businesses.

In 1986, Hedy Ratner and Carol Dougal created the Women's Business Development Center to address the lack of support for women in the business world. Since then, Hedy and Carol have worked tirelessly to accelerate the growth of women-owned businesses and microenterprise ownership, increase the economic impact of women business owners on families and communities, build awareness of business ownership as a path to economic self-sufficiency, and help stimulate policy and system changes to empower women in the economy. Today, the positive impact of the WBDC is clear, and the Center continues to be a leader in expanding opportunities for women.

Over the years, the WBDC has helped more than 66,000 women in the greater Chicago area in their entrepreneurial efforts. Its success has spurred the creation of 14 other centers in 6 states. The oldest and largest women's business assistance center in the country, the WBDC is constantly developing and implementing new approaches to help potential and current women business owners. The Center and its outstanding staff give women the tools, the needed support and the confidence to know that they can become successful entrepreneurs.

Hedy and Carol are recognized leaders who have advised business groups and public officials at all levels about ways to help women improve their families' well-being and our nation by creating new business opportunities. I am one of many who have been fortunate enough to receive their advice on ways to improve federal contracting and lending policies and to learn about the barriers that must be torn down so that more women can enter the realm of business ownership.

I congratulate Hedy and Carol on the extraordinary contributions they have made through the Women's Business Development Center. Although they are leaving their posts as co-presidents of WBDC, I know that they will remain leaders in advocating for women-owned businesses in Chicago and nationwide. I look forward to watching their next steps toward helping women business owners successfully achieve economic independence through entrepreneurship.

RELEASE OF THE DREAM 9

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I submit this letter, from Rep. JARED POLIS of Colorado and myself to the President of the United States asking for the release of the DREAM 9 held in detention in Arizona.

JULY 25, 2013.

President BARACK OBAMA,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT OBAMA: We write you to express concern for the nine undocumented young people who earlier this week attempted to re-enter the United States from Mexico to return to their homes. They presented themselves at a check point, were detained by U.S. border patrol and are currently being held in the Eloy detention center in Arizona.

As we understand it, these "DREAMers" are asking that discretion be exercised by federal authorities to allow them back into the United States and to return to their families and communities. An additional goal that they express is to work to change a system that has resulted in the deportations of DREAMers. Regardless of whether we feel their actions are the best way to affect the change they desire, we share their goal to allow DREAMers and others with strong ties to the United States and who were deported to return to the United States. You stood firmly with the DREAMers when you put in place beneficial case by case relief for DREAMers through Deferred Action of Childhood Arrivals (DACA). We believe that the DREAMers currently detained on the border should have your concern and consideration, as well.

We understand that a long term legislative solution is required in order to provide the most justice for the most people. We are deeply committed to ensure that the ability to return to the U.S. for previously deported individuals is enacted into law, and have worked hard to incorporate such relief into the bipartisan proposal currently being drafted in the House of Representatives. We continue to build the bipartisan support needed to pass legislation this year. While immigration reform is making its way through Congress, we ask that the young people currently detained at the border be released from detention and allowed back into the United States. Their actions to lift up the needs of those deported should not result in detention or exclusion from the United States. In fact, their return would likely be allowed under the Senate-passed immigration bill, S. 744, which we all support.

Thank you for your leadership on behalf of DREAMers and your support of comprehensive immigration reform. We urge you to release the DREAMers detained on the U.S. border in Arizona and allow them to rejoin their families. We urge you to act with all possible speed to make this happen.

Sincerely,

LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ,
Member of Congress.

JARED POLIS,
Member of Congress.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to participate in the following votes. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

July 30, 2013—rollcall vote 419: on agreeing to the Gallego Amendment to H.R. 2610—I would have voted "nay"; rollcall vote 420: on agreeing to the Young Amendment to H.R. 2610—I would have voted "nay"; rollcall vote 421: on agreeing to the Grayson Amendment to H.R. 2610—I would have voted "aye"; rollcall vote 422: on agreeing to the McClintock Amendment to H.R. 2610—I would have voted "aye"; rollcall vote 423: on agreeing to the First Hastings Amendment to H.R. 2610—I would have voted "nay"; rollcall vote 424: on agreeing to the Second Hastings Amendment to H.R. 2610—I would have voted "nay"; rollcall vote 425: on agreeing to the Third Has-

tings Amendment to H.R. 2610—I would have voted "nay".

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCENTIVES FOR BUSINESS AND INDIVIDUAL INVESTMENT ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the District of Columbia Incentives for Business and Individual Investment Act, to reauthorize the federal tax incentives for investment in economically distressed areas in the District of Columbia, commonly known as the D.C. empowerment zone, and the D.C. \$5,000 first-time homebuyer tax credit, both of which expired at the end of 2011. This bill would reauthorize the tax incentives through the end of 2015, and would be retroactive for 2012 and any period in 2013 during which they remain lapsed, consistent with similar empowerment zone legislation. The empowerment zone incentives include a special capital gains rate, expanded tax-exempt bond financing, additional expensing for equipment purchases and a wage credit of up to \$3,000.

The D.C. tax incentives were due to be extended with the package of temporary tax provisions that Congress regularly extends, commonly known as "tax extenders." However, the D.C. tax incentives, for the first time, were not included in the most recent tax extenders package, the American Taxpayer Relief Act (ATRA or P.L. 112-240), which was approved at the beginning of the year. This omission was possible, and we believe occurred, because the D.C. empowerment zone was separately and specially created in 1997, several years after the first, similar urban empowerment zones were created.

Although the D.C. tax incentives, as well as a small number of other expiring temporary tax provisions, were not extended in ATRA, Congress, in the same bill, recognized that the benefits of incentives for investment in economically distressed communities outweighed their costs when it extended all the other empowerment zones. This same logic has particularly strong application to the D.C. tax incentives.

The Republican Party Platform first proposed the D.C. tax incentives in 1996, a year before Congress created them. Republicans, who saw D.C. as a demonstration for what tax incentives could do to revitalize a city, wanted to make the entire District of Columbia an empowerment zone. The Republican platform stated, "We endorse proposals by the congressional Republican Leadership for dramatic reductions in federal taxes . . . within the District . . . A Republican president will make it part of a comprehensive agenda to transform the nation's capital into a renewal community, an enterprise zone leading the way for the rest of urban America to follow." Every Republican platform since 1996 has indicated strong support for one or more of the D.C. tax incentives.

Senate and House Republicans took the lead in the creation of the D.C. tax incentives

after an unprecedented financial crisis revealed the unique peril for a city required to pay for many state-like functions. They reasoned that the tax incentives would revive and sustain the District, and where they have been applicable, they have met that test. The success of the tax incentives is a vindication of the work of the cosponsors. The D.C. tax incentives were proposed by, among others, then-Senators Trent Lott (R-MS), Connie Mack (R-FL), Sam Brownback (R-KS), Spencer Abraham (R-MI), Kent Conrad (D-ND) and Joe Lieberman (D-CT), as well as by then-Representative Amo Houghton (R-NY), and have always been embraced by both Republican and Democratic Congresses and presidents.

The wisdom of the bipartisan use of modest, targeted tax incentives has been amply and visibly demonstrated in the economic resurgence in parts of the city designated as empowerment zones, including parts of downtown Washington. Effects of the empowerment zone incentives are apparent throughout the city, but among the most visible are the Penn Quarter neighborhood, which had limited residential, commercial and retail spaces and is now a popular mixed-use neighborhood, and the vibrant area around the Verizon Center, then a virtual downtown slum but now surrounded by offices, restaurants and nightlife.

Before the business tax incentives, the city found it difficult to retain, much less attract, businesses. However, one of the business tax incentives enabled the city government to issue more than \$155 million in tax-exempt bonds on behalf of for-profit and non-profit entities for capital projects. For example, \$15 million was issued for the construction of the International Spy Museum, which has brought the added benefit of increasing tourism.

In addition to the business tax incentives, the \$5,000 homebuyer tax credit has provided invigorating nourishment to the District's badly starved residential tax base. This credit, which applied citywide, almost immediately reversed the city's alarming residential decline. According to the 2010 census, the District gained population (5.2%) for the first time since the 1950 census, with much of this increase traceable to the homebuyer tax credit. Not only did the homebuyer tax credit staunch the taxpayer exodus for the first time in decades, but with the stability that the credit initiated, other individuals and families began moving to the city. The District is attracting 1,100 residents a month, but these are mostly young, unmarried people. However, the goal of growing the residential tax base by 100,000 to ensure sustainability, set by Alice Rivlin, chair of the D.C. Financial Control Board, as well as a respectable business tax base, is far from being achieved. The city's residential tax base remains well below the Washington metropolitan region and the nation, where it trails all 50 states. In 2012, the homeownership rate in D.C. was 45%, compared to the national rate of 65.4%. D.C.'s homeownership rate was also lowest among the 75 largest Metropolitan Statistical Areas and significantly lower than in the statistical area for the Washington metropolitan region, which was 66.9%. The reauthorization of the homebuyer tax credit is essential if the District is to reach the 100,000 residents the Financial Control Board said was required for the city to sustain itself.

For all of its recent economic progress, the District remains a city without a state backstop. Recognizing this anomaly, Congress passed the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, but the city continues to operate many state-like services, such as higher education, roads and bridges, and health and human services. Furthermore, the federal government continues to impose significant revenue constraints on the District in the Home Rule Act, including a tax exemption on the federal government's use of the city's most valuable real property, a federal limit on the height of buildings in the District and a prohibition on taxing non-resident income.

Now, the city's low-income neighborhoods east of the Anacostia River and in Northeast are on the brink of developing economically, similar to the development experienced in other parts of the District such as NoMa and Capitol Riverfront. The new headquarters for the U.S. Coast Guard will open in August, the first in a complex of buildings Congress has authorized for the federally owned West Campus of the St. Elizabeths hospital. The tax incentives have demonstrated that they can revitalize the eastern half of the nation's capital. Particularly after the recent recession, the business and homebuyer tax incentives are essential for these neighborhoods to see the revival that the incentives have contributed to in downtown and near-in neighborhoods. Withdrawing these incentives, particularly after they have proven effective elsewhere in city, leaves the nation's capital with essentially half of a revival, and would be tragically timed just as the lower-income parts of the District, which need the incentives most, are ready for residential and commercial redevelopment.

There is no reason to extend incentives to the other large empowerment zone cities but not to the nation's capital, which lacks many of the advantages of other cities. Like the health of many other cities, the District's fiscal health has improved since the tax incentives were established in 1997, but the incentives continue to be indispensable for ensuring that lower-income areas of the city are part of the city's economic progress. It would be tragic to single out the nation's capital as the only empowerment zone city not to be renewed just as the eastern sections of the city are about to take off. As essential as the federal incentives have been, their costs have been de minimis compared to the billions of dollars in construction, new local revenue and new taxpayers the incentives have generated. They deserve to be extended.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE FOURTH ANNUAL CIGAR BOX FESTIVAL

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the York Emporium as it hosts its fourth annual Pennsylvania Cigar Box Guitar Festival in York, Pennsylvania.

The cigar box guitar is a traditional American instrument, with roots running through the

Civil War, the Great Depression, and the Panic of 1983. It harkens back to a time when folks would make-do with musical instruments they had constructed with their own hands, using found objects.

The annual Pennsylvania Cigar Box Guitar Festival, now in its 4th year, celebrates this homegrown musical style and the ingenuity of its musicians with the largest music festival of its kind. It features performers from Illinois, Ohio, Maryland, New Jersey, North Carolina, upstate New York and Pennsylvania. The festival brings tourists from throughout New England, the Mid-Atlantic and Midwestern states. In recent years, the festival has even seen the arrival of international visitors.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues in recognizing the uniquely American attributes that this festival celebrates.

HONORING JAMES K. BAKER

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and extraordinary accomplishments of one of my constituents, James K. Baker of Columbus, Indiana.

James Baker became president and chief executive officer of Arvin Industries in 1981 and served until his retirement in 1998. During James' stewardship of the company, Arvin Industries was noted for its aggressive pursuit and success in building a globalized sales and supply infrastructure as the auto industry diversified globally in the 1980s.

In addition to building a Fortune 500 company, James served from 1990–1991 as the chairman of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. He was a former chairman of the DePauw University Board of Trustees, his alma mater, the Indiana Chamber of Commerce, and the 2003 Indiana Government Efficiency Commission. James was a strong advocate of education reform efforts and higher educational standards as a means of building and sustaining a global and competitive workforce in our communities across the State. I know Jim was particularly proud of his involvement as a Member of the Board of Trustees with the Charles A. Tindley Accelerated School, an Indianapolis charter school.

James Baker was my friend and an inspiration to people across the Hoosier State. I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to keep his wife, Beverly, in your thoughts and prayers as we celebrate the life of James Baker.

CELEBRATING 28 YEARS OF SERVICE: PEGGY LYNCH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, FRIENDS OF THE PARKS AND TRAILS OF SAINT PAUL AND RAMSEY COUNTY

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the inspiring career of Ms. Peggy

Lynch, a leader in preservation of parks and green space, on the occasion of her retirement as Executive Director from Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County.

The Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County has its origins in a group of citizens who banded together to protect Hidden Falls—Crosby Lake Regional Park in 1984 from developers proposing to build housing within the park. After the housing proposal was defeated, the group continued to meet, and a permanent organization was established in 1985 with a grant from the Saint Paul Foundation. Peggy Lynch co-founded the organization and served as Executive Director for the next 28 years. Today, because of Peggy's extraordinary persistence and advocacy for the outdoors, the organization has led development and preservation of parks across the east metro region and earned her the title the "Conscience of the Parks."

Thanks to Peggy Lynch's vision, the organization achieved foundational work to protect public access to green space. In 1985 the group initiated a study of parks in Saint Paul and Ramsey County during a period of intense developer interest in prime park land. At the time, there were few local park commissions and developers had no obligation to contribute to the park system. Cities such as Saint Paul sold parkland for a dollar per parcel. As a result of a study by the Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County, Park Commissions in Saint Paul and Ramsey County were established. The amendment of the City of Saint Paul and Ramsey County charters for "no net loss" of parkland were approved. These actions built a system to preserve and add parkland for public use.

Additionally, Peggy and Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County have helped develop and support the environment by promoting appreciation for parks and open space through quality parks, trails, and bikeways. Through educational, community, and corporate outreach programs, they have provided access to recreational opportunities to communities who otherwise may not have the opportunity to experience it.

Peggy's influence brought increased recognition and elevated the importance of preserving the great outdoors for present and future generations to come. Her work along with the Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County are legacies that will live on in the organization's work advocating for the environment in the Twin Cities.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of Ms. Peggy Lynch, a leader in the environmental community, I am pleased to submit this statement to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in recognition of her retirement as Executive Director of the Friends of the Parks and Trails of Saint Paul and Ramsey County.

HONORING THE LIFE AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF DR. REED BELL

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and dedicated service of Northwest Florida's Dr. Reed Bell, who passed away on July 28, 2013. Dr. Bell's mission was to better the lives of children, and still today, his name is synonymous with pediatric health. The entire Northwest Florida community mourns the loss of this talented, kind-hearted man.

Dr. Bell was born on December 24, 1926 at Sacred Heart Hospital in Pensacola, Florida. Growing up, he attended Pensacola High School, where he was a model scholar-athlete. He was the captain of both the football and basketball teams, elected king of the high school's coronation, and graduated as Salutatorian. Dr. Bell then took his athletic talents to the University of Florida, where he was awarded a football scholarship. However, shortly thereafter, he answered the call of his Nation by serving in World War II. When he returned home, Dr. Bell opted to attend the University of the South, where he further applied his natural leadership abilities by again captaining both the basketball and football teams.

Despite his athletic successes, Dr. Bell was destined to serve his community through his knowledge of medicine and his love of children. He graduated from Duke's College of Medicine in 1953 and performed his residency in pediatrics and fellowship in endocrinology at Baylor University in 1957. Returning to his native Pensacola, Dr. Bell began practicing as a board-certified pediatrician and pediatric endocrinologist. In 1969, however, Dr. Bell founded the Sacred Heart Children's Hospital, the only facility of its kind in the area. To support this great endeavor, founded at the hospital where he himself was born over forty years prior, he served as the Medical Director, formed a pediatric residency program, and established a neonatal intensive care unit to better serve the children of our community. In a further testament to his strength as a leader and his humanitarian nature, Dr. Bell also co-founded the Ronald McDonald House of Northwest Florida.

Dr. Bell's exceptional abilities were not localized to Northwest Florida alone. In 1986, then-President Ronald Reagan appointed him as the founding Director of the National Institute of Health Office of Substance Abuse Prevention, the federal government's first substance abuse prevention program. This appointment marked another example of Dr. Bell's exceptional ability to lead and help his fellow man. It would be exhausting to list the many awards and accolades he received throughout his career, which further represents his tremendous strength of character. However, these pale in comparison to his sheer love of family, service, and community.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to honor the life of Dr. Reed Bell. My wife Vicki and I offer our

prayers and sincerest condolences to his wife, Nell; six children, Rev. William R. Bell, Jr.; Mitzi Peters; Terry Bush; Former Florida Supreme Court Justice Kenneth Bell; Lance Bell; and Brian Bell; 20 grandchildren; and 13 great-grandchildren. He will truly be missed by all who were fortunate enough to know him.

INTRODUCTION OF THE OBSTETRIC FISTULA PREVENTION, TREATMENT, HOPE, AND DIGNITY RESTORATION ACT OF 2013

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I, along with Representatives JOSEPH CROWLEY, JOHN CONYERS, SAM FARR, RAÚL GRIJALVA, HENRY "HANK" JOHNSON, JIM McDERMOTT, GWEN MOORE, JAMES MORAN, and JACKIE SPEIER, am reintroducing the "Fistula Prevention, Treatment, Hope and Dignity Restoration Act." This comprehensive legislation both prevents new obstetric fistulas and helps to treat existing ones, helping millions of women throughout the world.

Pregnancy shouldn't leave a woman with a disability and ostracized from her community. Congress should ensure investments for the more than two million women worldwide that have obstetric fistula and we do what we can to prevent new cases. Obstetric fistula is a devastating condition that results from prolonged labor without medical attention. During delivery, the infant's head presses against the woman's pelvis for so long that it kills the tissues. This causes a hole between the woman's vagina and rectum develops, leaving her without control of her bladder and/or bowels for the rest of her life if she goes untreated. It often results in the death of the infant. They are almost always abandoned by their husbands and shunned by their families. According to the World Health Organization, about two million women suffer this condition worldwide.

Fortunately, multilateral organizations such as UNFPA (the United Nations Population Fund) and bilateral organizations such as USAID are working with partners on a global campaign to prevent and treat fistula with the goal of making the condition rare in developing areas such as sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia.

It is imperative that we in Congress support these efforts to eradicate the devastating condition which is why this bill authorizes the President to provide assistance to prevent and treat obstetric fistula. This legislation allows for a comprehensive, three pronged approach of prevention, treatment and reintegration which includes: increasing access to prenatal care, emergency obstetric care, postnatal care, and voluntary family planning; building local capacity and improving national health systems; addressing underlying social and economic inequities such as reducing the incidence of child marriage and increasing access to formal and informal education; and supporting reintegration and training programs to help women who have undergone treatment return

to full and productive lives. These essential investments create a multiplier effect of benefits in the lives of women and their communities.

The legislation also supports coordination among the community working to prevent and treat obstetric fistula through the International Obstetric Fistula Working Group. Support for monitoring, evaluation, and research to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of such programs throughout their planning and implementation phases will ensure the most efficient and effective use of U.S. foreign assistance dollars.

I urge my colleagues to support this important, meaningful legislation.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF COLONEL KEIL GENTRY, USMC

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a fellow Marine, Colonel Keil Gentry. After more than two years of service as the Marine Corps' Deputy Legislative Assistant to the Commandant, Keil will be assuming responsibilities as the Director of the Marine Corps War College. On this occasion, I believe it is fitting to recognize Colonel Gentry's distinguished service and dedication to fostering the warm relationship between the United States Marine Corps and the Congress.

With over two decades of dedicated service to his country, Colonel Gentry has distinguished himself serving the cause of freedom across the globe. His service leading young Marines as a Battery, Battalion, and Regimental Commander, in garrison and in combat, is emblematic of the caliber of his character.

Over the course of the last two years, Colonel Gentry has been instrumental to ensuring the Marine Corps' story is heard on the Hill. Known for his in-depth knowledge of legislative issues, personal warmth, and an ability to skillfully navigate Headquarters Marine Corps, Colonel Gentry worked long hours and through major surgery to ensure that Congress was armed with timely information on Operation Enduring Freedom, Marine Security Guards at our Embassies, and all other forward deployed Marine forces. Colonel Gentry could be counted on as a trustworthy source on Marine Corps Programs, be it the Joint Strike Fighter, the Amphibious Combat Vehicle, or the MV-22 Osprey. Moreover, his efforts helped this body properly recognize the contributions of the first African American Marines through the award of the Congressional Gold Medal in tribute to the Montford Point Marines.

As Keil departs the Pentagon he will be heading just down the road to Quantico, Virginia. There he will be directing the Marine Corps' top level school, the Marine Corps War College. It is only fitting that an officer who has spent a career mentoring and training Marines should assume this great responsibility. Here Keil will interact with the Corps' senior leaders, those ready to assume vital commands around the globe. We can have no

doubt that he will ensure they are well prepared for the duties they are about to undertake.

Colonel Gentry's absence will be felt in the Congress and the Pentagon. I join many past and present Members in my gratitude and appreciation to him for his outstanding leadership and his unwavering support of the missions of the United States Marine Corps. I wish him and his wife, Jenny, fair winds and following seas as he continues to serve our great nation.

KEEP TEACHERS TEACHING ACT

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper" to provide for the "general Welfare" of Americans. In the Department of Education Organization Act (P.L. 96-88), Congress declared that "the establishment of a Department of Education is in the public interest, will promote the general welfare of the United States, will help ensure that education issues receive proper treatment at the Federal level, and will enable the Federal Government to coordinate its education activities more effectively." The Department of Education's mission is to "promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access."

HONORING THE LIFE OF MIKE TAUGHER

HON. JERRY McNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my friends and colleagues to join me in recognizing the distinguished public servant Mr. Mike Taugher and his dedicated work in journalism and his dedication to protecting the environment. Mike passed away earlier this month at the age of 50.

For many years, Mike worked as the environmental reporter for the Contra Costa Times. His deep knowledge and tireless pursuit of articles earned Mike the respect of readers, citizens, and other journalists in addition to numerous awards. Governor Jerry Brown recognized his expertise on environmental issues and appointed Mike as a spokesperson for the California Department of Fish and Wildlife in May of 2012. His commitment to these issues was a benefit for all Californians.

With his outstanding public service both as a reporter and a spokesperson, the people of California will always be thankful to Mike. I myself enjoyed working with him during his years as a reporter. In his personal life, Mike

was known to talk as much about his family as his work. In the words of his brother, David, "Mike loved his family very dearly."

I ask you all to join me in honoring the life and work of Mike Taugher.

RETIREMENT OF POLICE SERGEANT JOEL R. ORR

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant Joel R. Orr as he retires after nearly 25 years of law enforcement service to the City of Fairfield.

Hired as a Public Safety Officer with the Fairfield Police Department on July 25, 1988, and served the community in various capacities that included Patrol, Investigations, and School Resource Officer. Sergeant Orr also took on ancillary assignments by joining the Crisis Negotiation Team and being selected for the first Street Criminal Apprehension Team (SCAT). In the course of teaching important skills such as Parent Project, Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) and driver awareness, he earned the City Manager's Commendation Award for outstanding leadership in developing and implementing the City's Driver Training Program. Sergeant Orr also assisted California's Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) with their Entry-Level Patrol Officer Job Analysis Project and then completed the distinctive Robert Presly's Institute of Criminal Investigation (ICI) certification course with a specialty in homicide investigation.

On December 5, 2003, Sergeant Orr was promoted to Police Corporal and then on August 18, 2006, he was promoted to Police Sergeant where he served in Patrol, Investigations and Professional Standards, and as a Public Information Officer. In 2008 and 2010, as the Police Department experienced changes in leadership and command staff, Sergeant Orr consistently stepped in and assisted City management in filling the gaps. Over the last five years, he has assumed the Police Lieutenant's position twice and managed Patrol Operations. Sergeant Orr has a can-do attitude and he consistently provided quality service to the community.

Sergeant Orr has been a valued employee and leader and his commitment to the community was evidenced on a daily basis. He was a loyal representative of the law enforcement community and admired for his hard work, dedication, and positive work ethic.

RECOGNIZING TRANSPORTATION SECURITY OFFICER, JACOB NEAL, FOR SAVING A MAN'S LIFE

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize one of my constituents, Transpor-

tation Security Officer Jacob Neal, who saved a life at Chicago O'Hare International Airport with the help of two other TSA officials earlier this month.

When TSO Marvin Jackson noticed that a passenger had collapsed and lost consciousness, he quickly placed a call to his supervisor, Jacob Neal. TSO Neal, who served in the U.S. Air Force as a firefighter and medic before joining the TSA, demonstrated great leadership and poise as he took control of the situation, asking everyone to step away unless they were certified in CPR. He put on his gloves and started to give chest compressions, while also comforting the passenger's wife by letting her know that he was a former paramedic. His quick thinking, expertise, and professionalism made the difference.

"When someone is suffering like that you just feel compelled to jump in and help," said TSO Neal, a two-time O'Hare TSO of the Year honoree.

Jacob Neal along with the others who helped save a man's life that day showed extraordinary strength and exemplified what it means to go above and beyond the call of duty. It is acts like these that inspire us to be better people and better citizens. Due to the quick thinking and composure of the men and woman involved, a potentially tragic situation was avoided.

Again, I would like to thank Jacob Neal for his commendable efforts in saving a life this past month. I also want to recognize him and his TSA colleagues, and other federal employees who work hard each and every day to serve the public and keep our nation strong and secure.

RECOGNIZING MYKE REID ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE AMERICAN POSTAL WORKERS UNION, AFL-CIO

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and commend Myke Reid on the occasion of his retirement after a distinguished career as the Legislative and Political Director for the American Postal Workers Union, APWU. Mr. Reid dedicated his career to postal reform and played an integral role in the enactment of important legislation, including the Family & Medical Leave Act in 1993 and reform of the Hatch Act.

Myke Reid began his long and accomplished career with the United States Postal Service in 1976 as a clerk in Norfolk, VA. Mr. Reid's community involvement and enthusiasm for legislative reform won the recognition and admiration of his fellow union members, and he quickly rose to the position of state legislative director and state president.

In 1984, Mr. Reid arrived in Washington, DC, and joined the fight to preserve Social Security. For nine years, Mr. Reid served as the Special Assistant to the President of the APWU.

After the retirement of Roy Braunstein in 2004, Mr. Reid was appointed to serve as the

Legislative and Political Director of the APWU. His service, his expertise on postal issues, and his accomplishments have earned the respect of many within the APWU and across the postal community and Capitol Hill. Commenting on Mr. Reid's retirement, APWU President Cliff Guffey spoke for many when he said, "He has made great contributions to our struggle and will be missed."

In addition to his service to the nation's postal workers and his important contributions in the halls of Congress, Mr. Reid still found the time to serve his community. He served on many community-based organizations, including the Virginia Employment Commission Advisory Board, the Virginia Community College Board, the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority Board, and the Alexandria Democratic Committee. Mr. Reid is a native Virginian, born in Portsmouth. He received a B.A. from Norfolk State University and currently resides in Alexandria.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Myke Reid on this occasion and in commending him for his service and his work to represent the interests of America's Postal Workers and working families.

HONORING THE VOLUNTEERS OF HONOR FLIGHT SOUTH ALABAMA

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize the driving force behind Honor Flight South Alabama, the organization which sent more than 950 World War II veterans from Southwest Alabama to the National World War II Memorial in Washington, DC from 2009 to 2013.

I was honored to have met all nine flights of courageous veterans as they arrived at their Memorial. The monumental effort required to complete these flights came to fruition due to the hard work of the seven key players, each donating their tremendous talents to ensure this noble effort to thank our veterans was a success. Today, I pay tribute to those who made this remarkable program possible: Margaret Coley, Col. Pat Downing, Col. John New, Cdr. Pete Riehm, Anne Eubanks, Tina McGrath, and Dr. Barry L. Booth.

Over the last four years, Honor Flight South Alabama provided the veterans of Southwest Alabama an opportunity to visit the memorials on the National Mall as well as Arlington National Ceremony and to receive our Nation's sincerest gratitude for their selfless sacrifice and service. Honor Flight South Alabama chartered their final plane to Washington on May 8, 2013, and returned home to a grand welcome by family, friends and the community at large.

While the Honor Flight South Alabama program gleamed in a well-deserved spotlight, the efforts behind it went somewhat unnoticed. Each beautifully orchestrated event required careful attention to detail and collaboration. The organizing team of Honor Flight South Alabama worked together to create a powerful

legacy of volunteerism. Therefore, it is my honor to recognize the people integral to the success of the program.

Margaret Coley, the Director of Volunteer Activities and School Support System, took on the responsibility of the mail call from South Alabama students and the magnificent ticker tape parade at the Mobile Airport. Col. John New, the Security Liaison, coordinated the security arrangements between Mobile and Washington DC through the airports and U.S. Park Service. Cdr. Pete Riehm, Director of Operations, ensured a smooth Honor Flight orientation and flight day. Anne Eubanks, Director of Medical Support, ensured the veterans' medical care needs were met. Tina McGrath, Director of Administration, worked tirelessly to maintain and coordinate documentation and all administrative duties. Col. Pat Downing, Director of Guardian Training, was truly in the crosshairs of responsibility with the Guardian Training Program. And, of course, Dr. Barry L. Booth, Director of the Veteran Guardian Program, coordinated the assignments of all 957 veterans with their Guardians in each of the nine Honor Flights.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly grateful for the contributions of these men and women, and I rise to pay tribute to all those who have worked tirelessly to serve our area's veterans. May we never forget the valiant deeds and tremendous sacrifices of America's military heroes who have secured our Nation's freedom.

RECOGNIZING ROSE MARY SARGENT

HON. JOHN F. TIERNEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank Rose Mary Sargent for her 16 years working in my district office and serving the people of the Sixth District of Massachusetts.

Rose Mary came to work in my District Office soon after I was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1997. Born in Costa Rica, Rose Mary grew up and attended public schools in San Jose, California. Having received her undergraduate degree at College Luis Dobles Segreda, she completed her secondary education at North Shore Community College in my district.

Rose Mary's intricate knowledge of the immigration system, her Spanish-speaking abilities, and her enthusiasm to assist others made her a perfect candidate for managing immigration and refugee casework. Throughout her tenure with my office, Rose Mary has assisted thousands of people and has not only guided constituents through the complex immigration system, but she has also contributed to public education regarding the benefits of immigration to our communities.

In what spare time she has, Rose Mary volunteers as an active member of the community of Lynn. She founded several organizations and currently serves as an Executive Board member for at least three others. Among the organizations she helped found are VOCES—Guardians Against AIDS, the

Lynn Hispanic Festival, and Lynn's Cultural Diversity Task Force.

And she has done all of this while balancing her responsibilities as a mother of two adult daughters and a grandmother to five.

Rose Mary's dedication to the people of the City of Lynn and the entire Sixth District of Massachusetts is well-known. She has dedicated her career to improving her community and building "ladders of opportunity" for all.

I congratulate Rose Mary on her remarkable career and wish her all the best in her retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 30, 2013, I missed seven roll-call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Nos. 419 and 420, and voted "no" on Nos. 421, 422, 423, 424, and 425.

HONORING GEORGE WASHINGTON JULIAN

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize George Washington Julian, honored as the newest addition to the roster of the Indiana Historical Bureau's state historical marker series.

George Washington Julian of Centerville, Indiana was a United States Representative during the Civil War. His legacy lives on through his moral convictions as he advocated for abolition, equal rights, and land reform during an era of discrimination. He demanded rights and freedom for slaves as an attorney in several historic fugitive slave cases and also supported freedom and equal access to public lands for immigrants and women. Julian was an extraordinary Congressman who helped shape our country into what it is today.

I want to thank the Indiana Historical Bureau for its continued leadership in recognizing and commemorating significant individuals, organizations, places, and events in Indiana history. These roadside markers are familiar to all Hoosiers and visitors who pass through the State. With over 500 state historical markers in place, the Indiana Historical Bureau impresses on Hoosiers across the State the importance of our history and the promise of our future.

I ask the 6th Congressional District to join me in thanking the Indiana Historical Bureau for recognizing and publicly marking our shared history and the legacy of George Washington Julian in Centerville, Indiana.

HONORING COLONEL WILLIAM W.
MOORE

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Colonel William W. Moore's posthumous awarding of the Prisoner of War Medal. He was held captive by Chinese forces for 33 months during the Korean War.

Col. Moore began his military career by joining the Army Air Corps in 1942 and graduated flight school in 1944. He was assigned to Wheeler Field in Oahu, Hawaii for deployment, but World War II ended before he got to fly any missions. His next assignment was at Eglin Air Force Base near Ft. Walton, Florida where he served as a test pilot. While stationed there he was able to fly up to five fighters in one day.

He was then assigned to 7th Fighter Squadron in the 49th Fighter Group in South Korea. While on temporary duty as a Forward Air Controller, he was taken captive when his vehicle was ambushed by Chinese forces. Col. Moore liked to make clear that he was "captured out of his element" on the ground rather than being shot out of the sky.

While in captivity, he was determined to stay alive and return home to his wife and sons; remaining active and trying to eat everything he could, helped to save his life. The prisoners were marched at night when it was -40° in the snow up North, and they secretly stole as much wood and coal as they could find to keep themselves warm when they rested during the day. When they arrived at the camp, Col. Moore was elected by the other prisoners to be the cook, a position he held the entire time of his captivity.

While in the camp the Chinese tried to re-educate the captured Americans, holding classes to teach them the "truth" about America. The Americans resisted everything they could through subtle tactics such as retelling the landing of Pilgrims and other stories of history with humor and distorting facts to maintain a healthy morale for the prisoners. They also tried to attend all of the church services so as to annoy their communist captors.

When the Armistice was signed in 1953, Col. Moore was finally released from captivity and reunited with his family. After the war he was assigned to the 94th Fighter Interceptor Squadron, where he flew the F-86D and F-102. In 1958, he was promoted to the rank of Major and assigned to the Air Defense Tactical Evaluation Team at Air Defense Command Headquarters in Colorado Springs, CO. While with the ADC he wrote the training and flying manual for the F-106. His next assignment took the new Lt. Col. to Australia to join the RAAF Operational Command as the Chief of Fighter Operations.

In 1964, the Air Force sent him to the Pentagon where he was the F-5 plans officer in the Military Assistance Program where he was promoted to full Colonel. He selflessly volunteered to go to Vietnam, but only if he could fly; instead he was given command of the 27th Fighter Interceptor Squadron in Loring, Maine. As commander of a fighter squadron, with

over 400 men and 18 aircraft, Col. Moore flourished. His last assignment took him to Murphy Dome, Alaska where he was the base commander for a radar unit.

After 30 years of a full career in the Air Force, Col. Moore retired in 1972 to Colorado Springs, CO. He and his wife, Lila, had four boys they raised as they moved all around the country. Col. Moore and Lila were married for 60 years before she passed away. He then remarried his wife of 10 years, Bonnie. He was a devoted family man who enjoyed fishing, camping and hunting with his sons.

While he was in captivity for 33 months, Col. Moore did not let that define his life or his career. He continued to look at the positives and strive for the best, yet gained a lot of perspective on life while a prisoner. He was a man who selflessly did not call attention to the fact he was accidentally not awarded the POW medal when he returned from Korea, instead his loving wife, Bonnie, sought to honor him by correcting that error. I am truly humbled and offer my sincerest thanks to Col. Moore and his family for their selfless service to our nation.

CELEBRATING MILTON AND
RENEE KAMEN'S 65TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate my constituent Michael Kamen's parents, Milton and Renee Kamen, who celebrated their 65th wedding anniversary on June 27, 2013.

The Kamens have been voting in Presidential elections since 1948, although not always on the same side. In fact, the first time they voted for the same presidential candidate was 2008. Their ability to disagree for so many years while maintaining a harmonious marriage is a testament, both to their love for each other and to their dedication to the American political process.

The Kamens are truly an exceptional family. I know I join with their friends and loved ones in celebrating this magnificent milestone and wishing them good health and continued success in the coming year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, during an evening series of votes on July 30, 2013 on amendments to the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act 2014, (H.R. 2610), I intended to vote "no" on the McClintock Amendment, but inadvertently voted "yes". This amendment would zero out the appropriation for the Essential Air Service account (a cut of \$100 million).

STOPPING GOVERNMENT ABUSES
AND HOLDING THE ADMINISTRATION
ACCOUNTABLE

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, over four years ago, President Obama asserted that his would be "the most transparent Administration in history." Instead, we have seen the Executive Branch act in a manner wholly inconsistent with that statement and take great strides to conceal the truth from public scrutiny. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better.

That is why today the House is considering several pieces of legislation aimed at curbing the widespread abuse that we have witnessed in recent years and helping to restore faith in the federal government for hardworking taxpayers across this country. As a senior Member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I have been involved with investigating the many scandals that have been reported on throughout the last several months.

As we continue to see in the ongoing investigation of conservatives being targeted for their political beliefs, the Internal Revenue Service, IRS, has failed to act in a fair, non-partisan, and nondiscriminatory manner. In targeting an individual or group for audits and investigation on the basis of their beliefs—and not a legitimate tax-related purpose—the IRS has weakened its level of trust among both the American public and Congress. That is why I introduced H.R. 1950, the Taxpayer Nondiscrimination and Protection Act of 2013. With over 100 cosponsors and a companion measure in the Senate authored by Senator MARCO RUBIO, this bill is aimed at preventing biased, politically-motivated discrimination and seeks to strengthen taxpayer protections in current law by making such action a crime.

Earlier this year the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform also heard from the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration in which details were exposed of a lavish, taxpayer-funded conference for IRS employees in Anaheim, California. The IRS reported an estimated final cost of \$4.1 million for the conference—\$3.2 million of which were transferred from the funds appropriated by Congress for salaries, expenses, and personnel. In response to the revelation that taxpayers footed nearly 80% of the tab for this wasteful party, I introduced H.R. 2345, the Stop Internal Resource Slush Fund Act. This bill would address the back-door budgeting used by the IRS and put an end to these government slush funds.

In addition to the deeply troubling actions by the IRS, the Administration remains defiant in what may well be the lasting legacy of President Obama's scandals: the plight of Delphi Salaried Retirees. For over three years, I have worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both chambers to hold the Administration accountable for unjustly terminating the pensions of an estimated 22,000 retirees in the wake of the General Motors bailout.

Both Congress and these hardworking men and women continue to press the Treasury

Department, the President's Auto Task Force, and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation for answers and full and complete disclosure of their actions that have led to tremendous hardship for thousands across the country. Despite bipartisan efforts toward fairness and transparency, the Administration has thus far remained secretive and defiant.

It is my sincere hope that the measures we are considering today, the legislation I have authored, and the ongoing investigations of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform will put an end to these government abuses and hold bad actors accountable to the American people.

U.S. NAVY COMMISSIONS NEW
SUBMARINE: "MINNESOTA"

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the commissioning of the newest United States Navy submarine: The USS *Minnesota*. The USS *Minnesota* will be commissioned on September 7th, and is only the third ship to be named after the great state of Minnesota. The last Navy ship to be named the Minnesota was commissioned in 1907 and later joined the active fleet during World War I.

The USS *Minnesota* is the tenth Virginia-class submarine to be constructed for the Navy. The 377-foot long sub is capable of submerged speeds of nearly 30 miles per hour and can stay submerged for up to three months at a time. It has been built for increased firepower, maneuverability, and stealth and will be the most advanced warship of the Navy. The *Minnesota* will be manned by a crew of 134 brave officers and enlisted personnel who will be led by Commander John Fancher.

After more than 100 years, it is a tremendous honor for the state of Minnesota to be the namesake of another mighty ship. As the USS *Minnesota* sets its course around the globe, we must take this opportunity to thank the men and women who have sacrificed and bravely serve to keep us safe here at home.

HONORING JIM DOWNING

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2012

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Jim Downing who will be celebrating his 100th birthday on August 22, 2013. Throughout his century of life, he loyally served the United States Navy, was a devoted husband and father and faithful to his Creator.

He enlisted in the Navy in 1932, and was assigned to the USS *West Virginia* where he held a variety of roles onboard. On April 8, 1935 Jim gave his life to the Lord and vowed to follow Him wherever he was led. Jim was involved with original founders of The Navigators who disciplined him and gave him the tools to evangelize to his whole ship and lead regular Bible studies onboard.

A survivor of the attack on Pearl Harbor, he helped rescue men from his ship and fight fires onboard. He later rose to the rank of Lieutenant, commanding his own ship the USS *Patapsco*. While at sea in 1954 his ship was showered with the radio-active ash from the "H" bomb being tested at Bikini Atoll. He served as an advisor to the Brazilian Fleet in Rio de Janeiro and later became an assistant professor of Naval Science at the Merchant Marine Academy.

Jim retired in 1956 with 24 years of service in the Navy and went to work for The Navigators for the next 22 years. During the years he served on The Navigator staff he held many capacities including, Divisional Director for Europe the Middle East and Africa with Headquarters in London, Vice President, Deputy to President Lorne Sarmy, and Chairman of the Board of Directors.

Jim and his wife Morena were married for 68 years before her passing. He has authored two books, *Meditation and Living Legacy*, both of which have been very well received. He has spent over 78 years working for the Lord and being a disciple maker wherever he is located. While he retired from full-time ministry in 1983, he has not retired from teaching others about the Lord and is on the volunteer staff of The Navigators' Collegiate Ministry.

To this day, Jim is investing in the lives of thousands of young people through personal discipleship and The Navigator's Collegiate and Military Ministry. I am greatly honored to help celebrate 100 years of life for a man who has been influential to so many communities

around the world through his service and devotion to the Lord.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, August 1, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

AUGUST 2

9:30 a.m.

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the employment situation for July 2013.

SD-G50

SEPTEMBER 10

2:30 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts

To hold hearings to examine an original bill entitled, "Federal Judgeship Act of 2013".

SD-226

SEPTEMBER 11

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2014 for the Federal Communications Commission.

SD-138

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, August 1, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

August 1, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BILL HUIZENGA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

SENATOR PAUL SIMON WATER FOR THE WORLD ACT OF 2013 (H.R. 2901)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, if someone asked what a bow tie-wearing progressive Democrat from Oregon and my colleague TED POE, a cowboy, boot-wearing conservative Republican from Texas, could agree on, you would have said, Not much.

Today, we are partners on an issue, however, that makes sense regardless of your politics: ensuring sustainable, equitable access to clean water for nearly 800 million women, children, and men who don't have it and the 2.5 billion without even the most basic sanitation services. TED POE and I think that politics should stop with water. That's why, today, we are introducing the Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013 (H.R. 2901).

Since Congress passed the Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act in 2005, the United States has become a global leader in efforts to increase access to clean water and sanitation, developing and implementing some of the most in-

novative approaches to help those in greatest need. We must not only maintain this progress but work to further refine and focus the efforts at USAID and at the Department of State by enacting the World Act.

We are committed because dirty water and a lack of sanitation affects all areas of development assistance. This is especially the case when it comes to women and children. More children are killed by waterborne disease than any other. Increasing access to clean water and sanitation has a significant multiplier effect on other areas of development, enabling us to do more with less—critical in a time of constrained budget resources.

Every day, the world has more people but fewer freshwater resources. Our bipartisan legislation will give the United States the capacity to avoid unnecessary loss of life and conflict in the future. It would ensure that water, sanitation, and hygiene programs are reflected in other development assistance; prioritize long-lasting impacts of United States foreign aid dollars; and increase the focusing on monitoring, evaluation, transparency, and capacity building.

Children cannot attend school if they're sick from dirty water. Half the world's hospital beds today are filled with people suffering from waterborne disease needlessly. Hours spent getting water are hours not working or in school.

A lack of clean drinking water has a disproportionate effect on women, who, in developing countries, walk an average of 3.7 miles a day to get water. The estimates are that 40 billion working hours are lost each year in Africa alone—200 million hours today.

Having water means girls can go to school and build a better future. It also reduces the risk of violence and sexual assault. A study by Doctors without Borders found that 82 percent of the women and girls treated for rape in West and South Darfur were attacked while they were gathering water or firewood.

The challenge is not getting easier, because 97 percent of the water on Earth is salty and unfit to drink. Of the 2½ percent, roughly, of the Earth's water that is fresh, two-thirds of that is frozen—locked away in the ice caps and glaciers. Although it's rapidly melting because of climate change, that's not going to help us, because it will be largely salty as well. We've got less than 1 percent of global freshwater available for human use; and because of

the demands for growing food, energy and industry, only about one-tenth of a percent is available for people to drink. This tiny fraction is further diminished by deficient or nonexistent water infrastructure. Even in the United States, we waste 6 billion gallons of freshwater every day through leaky pipes. We are entering an era of severe water scarcity that the Department of Defense warns could lead to global insecurity.

In short, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more fundamental to families and global health than clean water and sanitation. More needs to be done, and it needs to be done well. Taxpayers, understandably, demand better results and greater transparency from foreign aid. This bill provides the tools and incentives to do just that.

We urge our colleagues to adopt our motto—"politics stops at water"—and support this effort. This magnitude will take a team working together, united in the goal of saving lives and improving communities around the world. Please join us in this critical legislation, the Paul Simon Water for the World Act (H.R. 2901).

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.'S MARCH ON WASHINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, from time to time in our Nation's history, people of faith have stepped forward to call this Nation to something greater. This is steeped in our culture, our tradition, and our founding documents. It goes back to the cross at Cape Henry and to the landing at Plymouth Rock. You see it in our Declaration of Independence and again in the movement to abolish slavery.

Then, in the 1950s and 1960s, it was people of faith who birthed the new civil rights movement. No figure cast a wider shadow on that movement than the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King. This month, we mark the 50th anniversary of one of the most iconic speeches in American history—Dr. King's address at the Lincoln Memorial. It is a great honor for me to stand here today to recollect the words of Dr. King, a man who stands among the heroes of our Nation.

Dr. King was a pastor. He received a divinity degree from Crozer Theological Seminary in Pennsylvania. His

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

call to the ministry led him to the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Alabama, where, in the church's basement, he helped to plan the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955. That Dr. King's actions were motivated by his faith in a just God is evident when you read his words.

From the marble steps of the Lincoln Memorial, he used the words of the prophet Isaiah to articulate his dream of an end to injustice and oppression:

That one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low; the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight; and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

Martin Luther King, Jr., looked not for a revolution but for an affirmation of the country's founding principles when he declared:

That we have come to our Nation's Capital to cash a check. When the architects of our Republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men would be guaranteed the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It was not the first time that Dr. King had alluded to the promise of our founding documents. Just 4 months before the March on Washington, in writing from a Birmingham jail, he wrote that African Americans had waited for more than 340 years for their constitutional and God-given rights.

King's letter from a Birmingham jail could not be clearer in its articulation of the moral status of law and the role that religion plays in a just society:

Now [King wrote] what is the difference between a "just" and an "unjust" law? How does one determine whether a law is just or unjust? A just law is a manmade code that squares with the moral law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law.

Yes, Dr. King appealed to the Nation's religious roots to encourage social change, and from a Birmingham jail, he encouraged individuals to confront unjust laws:

[T]here is nothing new [King wrote] about this kind of civil disobedience. It was evidenced sublimely in the refusal of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego to obey the laws of Nebuchadnezzar, on the ground that a higher moral law was at stake. It was practiced superbly by the early Christians, who were willing to face hungry lions . . . rather than submit to certain unjust laws of the Roman Empire. . . . In our own Nation, the Boston Tea Party represented a massive act of civil disobedience.

We should never forget [King continued] that everything Adolf Hitler did in Germany was "legal" and everything the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was "illegal." It was "illegal" to aid and comfort a Jew in Hitler's Germany. Even so, I am sure [King proclaimed] that, had I lived in Germany at the time, I would have aided and comforted my Jewish brothers. If today I lived [King continued] in a Communist country, where certain principles dear to the Christian faith are suppressed, I would open-

ly advocate disobeying that country's anti-religious laws.

King's letter from a Birmingham jail and his "I Have a Dream" speech should be required reading for every American high school student and for every Member of Congress.

With the 50th anniversary of Dr. King's speech upon us, it is good to remember his words. It is good to appreciate all that faith in God and the moral law have done to advance the cause of freedom in our country. It is good to reflect on whether policies enacted by government in our time are a step back from, or show a rising intolerance of, the religious freedom that has been instrumental in defining our country and defending our rights.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, AN UMBRELLA ON A RAINY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman who preceded me for that very powerful message; and it reminds us generally of, really, the elements of our presence here in this House. When we represent the people of this country, it is important that we are lawmakers and that we have the compassion that was evidenced by the movement that Dr. King led and by the movement that he was leading at the time of the tragedy of his death and that was, of course, the Poor People's March in 1968.

I rise today to discuss that capacity and to say that I know that our friends, Republicans and Democrats, can come together around important service elements that this Nation engages in. The Federal Government is an umbrella on a rainy day. It is the engine of the economy. It is the answer to issues such as transportation and housing. It really provides housing to working families. It boosts the middle class and poor families, and it gives jobs to builders and contractors. So that is why, I think, it was quite appropriate for this, unfortunately, poorly driven and constructed Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill to go to its timely death.

How can you with any compassion cut so much money that you cut even the amount of money under the present budget, and you cut 9 percent below the level now mandated by the across-the-board spending cuts by sequestration?

You went below that. This bill was \$44.1 billion—shameful—cutting public housing, cutting housing vouchers, cutting opportunities for the homeless, and particularly for our young people. As the cochair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, every day, I note that children in America suffer for a variety of reasons. The Senate, of

course, had a bill, which they are pushing through, that was at the \$54 billion level—still very far short of the great needs of this community.

So I rise today to say that it landed with a thud, and I think, more importantly, my colleague from Texas—again, from Houston—spoke on the floor of the House about some untimely language on page 52—I remember it—that cut into the light rail system of Houston. It would impact my district. It would stop students at the University of Houston and at Texas Southern University from being able to have access to rail by cutting down on their travel costs because there was a provision in the bill that did not fund just a sector of that light rail.

□ 1015

My colleagues, how can you build light rail when you cut it in the middle, almost like the western movies, where the train rushes up and finds a big hole over the mountains where something has happened and it can't go any further?

It was a bill that was destined to die and should have died because it lacked compassion. I stand here opposing any language that does not fund or find an alternative route in any community's light rail new starts on which that community chooses to move forward. In Houston, we should not be attacked, if you will, for that kind of singular targeting. Our light rail should proceed.

I rise today to again reinforce this question of homelessness by showing this picture, which states, "Houston seeks better ways to serve homeless youth," and to be able to indicate that in trying to count homeless youth, they were only able to count a tenth, 378. When Houston's leadership went out on streets to try and count them, there were over 4,000. Our school districts say there are 19,000. Yet, we have a home called Little Audrey that the very public dollars that are supposed to be in the HUD funding could fund. We have a directive housing community development near Ratcliff that has a million dollars that could fund this particular facility. Mind you, in a city as large as Houston, there are only four for homeless youth.

I visited Little Audrey. These are the kind of young people who are there:

A young man who lived in a crack house not because he was on crack, but because he had no place else to live. He's found his way to Little Audrey; or the twins whose father died in Hurricane Katrina, were brought here by their mother to Houston, and then the mother died and they were homeless; or a young woman who was abused; or a young man who came and was put out of his house, from Dallas.

Little Audrey is a refuge that would be as helpful to the children that I met with and sat down with as this young

man is being helped by Covenant House. Covenant House cannot do it alone. So it is important that communities who receive the public dollars, who, given the opportunity such as the public facilities dollars that the Housing and Community Development office has in the city of Houston, utilize it so we do not have this kind of shame in our community.

I look forward to working with the city Housing and Community Development and the Secretary of Housing to stop youth homelessness in America and to helping these young people. I know we can do it together.

THE TRUTH ABOUT YOSEMITE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, Yosemite Valley is a national treasure that was set aside in 1864 with the promise that it would be preserved for the express purpose of "public use, resort, and recreation." Ever since, Americans have enjoyed a host of recreational opportunities and amenities as they come to experience the splendor of the valley.

Now the National Park Service, at the urging of leftist environmental groups, is proposing eliminating many of these amenities, including bicycle and raft rentals, horseback riding rentals, gift shops, snack facilities, swimming pools, and iconic facilities, including the ice skating rink at Curry Village, the art center, and the historic stone bridges that date back to the 1920s.

For generations, these facilities have enhanced the enjoyment of the park for millions of visitors, adding a rich variety of recreational activities amidst the breathtaking backdrop of Yosemite. But today the very nature and purpose of Yosemite is being changed from its original promise of public resort, use, and recreation to an exclusionary agenda that can best be described as "look, but don't touch."

As public outrage has mounted, these leftist groups have found willing mouthpieces in the editorial boards of the left-leaning San Francisco Chronicle and Sacramento Bee. It is obvious their editorial writers have either not read the report or are deliberately misrepresenting it to their readers. They say the plan is designed to relieve overcrowding in the park. In fact, this plan compounds the overcrowding.

In 1997, flooding wiped out almost half the campsites in Yosemite Valley. Congress appropriated \$17 million to replace these campsites. The money was spent; the campsites were never replaced. That's what's causing the overcrowding—half the campsites for the same number of visitors.

This plan would lock in a 30 percent reduction in campsites and a 50 percent

reduction in lodging compared to the pre-flood area. Three swimming pools in the valley give visitors a safe place with lifeguards for their children to cool off in the summer. The park service wants to close two of them. That means packed overcrowding at the remaining pool, pushing families seeking water recreation into the perilous Merced River.

They assure us they're not eliminating all the shops at Yosemite, but only reducing the number of them. Understand the practical impact on tourists. It means they're going to have to walk much greater distances to access these services and then endure long lines once they get there.

Another of the falsehoods is that the plan doesn't ban services like bike rentals, but just moves them to better locations. The government's own report puts the lie to this claim. It specifically speaks to "eliminating" and "removing" these services. It goes on to specifically state: "Over time, visitors would become accustomed to the absence of these facilities and would no longer expect them as a part of their experience in Yosemite." Their intent could not possibly be any clearer.

We are assured that although bicycle rentals will be—and I'm using the government's word—"eliminated" from the valley in the interest of environmental protection, visitors will still be free to bring their own bikes. That invites the obvious question: What exactly is the environmental difference between a rented bicycle and a privately owned bicycle?

We're assured in the smarmy words of the Sacramento Bee that the plan merely contemplates relocating raft rentals so they meet visitors at the river. In truth, the plan specifically states that it will "allow only private boating in this river segment," and even then will limit total permits to only 100 per day.

Mr. Speaker, every lover of Yosemite needs to read this report. It proposes breaking the compact between the American people and their government that promised public use, resort, and recreation for all time when the park was established.

My district includes the Yosemite National Park. I represent the gateway communities that depend on park tourism to support their economies. The affected counties and communities are unanimous in their vigorous opposition to this plan; and in a recent phone survey, the people of these communities, who are jealous guardians of Yosemite, expressed opposition to it in numbers well exceeding 80 percent.

Many things need to be done to improve gate access and traffic flow through the park, but destroying the amenities that provide enjoyment for millions of Yosemite visitors each year is not among them.

CLIMATE RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, climate change is not a science debate; it never was. As we know, science is never universally agreed upon. It's a constant reexamining of what is deemed the *squats quo*. Nonetheless, the science surrounding climate change is near universal and it is incontrovertible. Over several decades of study, an overwhelming majority of scientists, including many at NOAA and NASA Goddard, in fact, in my district, as well as researchers worldwide, have concluded that climate change is real, is caused by man, and will have a significant impact on our Earth, its process, the safety of our public, and our economy. These findings simply must quell the ideological differences and guide our policy decisions with regard to our environment in all due haste.

As a member of the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I remain astounded that so much climate denial exists within these Chambers. This doubt is translated into slashing funding for climate research and Earth science research, both short-term and long-term. It's resulted in preventing agencies with the expertise to maintain and develop Earth-observing systems and conduct the analysis necessary to understand our Earth—all slashed.

Just 2 weeks ago, our House Science Committee reported out legislation that would cut NASA's Earth science budget by a third, something like over \$600 million. NASA is a major contributor to our U.S. Global Change Research Program, and such a cut would not only devastate Earth science research, but hamper our ability to understand what is truly a matter of national significance, indeed, global significance.

Unfortunately, my home State of Maryland will suffer disproportionately if this Chamber refuses to act. Maryland has the fourth longest tidal coastline and is the third most vulnerable to sea level rise, one of the major consequences of climate change. Islands and low-lying communities throughout our State will be impacted by rising seas and severe weather events like Hurricane Sandy. Just last week, The Washington Post reported that Maryland's coastal waters could rise 6 feet by the end of this century. This increase could cause flooding in major cities like Baltimore and Annapolis. Areas on the lower half of the Delmarva Peninsula could be especially impacted. While our State has been proactive about preparing for these kind of environmental changes, thermal expansion of our oceans and waterways will pose significant problems for the State, indeed, for our Nation.

But this is not one State's concern; it's a 50-State concern and a global concern.

Goddard Spaceflight Center, which is located just outside my congressional district, is home to a number of climate scientists who are genuinely concerned about observed and predicted trends for the future. This historical trend of warming and sea level ice, in particular, are not fiction or hyperbole. They are, in fact, facts that are indisputable and in many ways terrifying.

I want to bring to your attention image 1 here. In Maryland, the warming trend over 100 years has increased from 2 degrees Fahrenheit to 6.1 degrees, just since 1960. This is significant and concerning warming in just my State. The U.S. trends are equally staggering, and the global trends are even more overwhelming.

But what concerns me even more is this chart here. This chart depicts polar sea ice, which is important to control and moderate global climate. As sea ice melts in the summer, it absorbs the sunlight and warms our poles. What's happening is that, because, according to the National Snow and Ice Data Center, even a slight warming of the poles will quicken the pace of global warming and likely lead to more severe climate patterns. Since 2000, Arctic ice during the summer has been melting at rates that are scaring scientists. Here, what you see is a sharp decline during the summer ice melting. Last year, half of the sea ice actually melted during the summer.

I want to highlight one more thing. Our most conservative models didn't predict what we've actually observed in terms of decline in sea ice thickness. Our climate model simulations have failed to keep up with actual significant loss. This problem is twofold:

First, additional cuts to climate research and gaps in our satellites—and there are gaps because we're not funding them—make these observations even less accurate and weaken our modeling;

Second, the poles are actually warming faster than we ever predicted. It's estimated that by 2020, all the sea ice during the summer will be melted.

It's time for us to act. For the sake of the future generations of our economy, our environment, let's restore climate research capacity. Let's act for future generations.

HONORING THE LIVES OF THIRTY-TWO AMERICAN HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this, the people's House, to pay tribute to, to honor, and to remember the lives of 32 American heroes.

Next Tuesday is August 6, and it is the most sobering anniversary in the

district I have the privilege to represent. It was on that day in 2011 that enemy fighters in Afghanistan shot down a Chinook helicopter, killing 5 soldiers, 3 airmen, and 24 Navy SEALs. This tragedy marks the heaviest loss of life for our elite Navy SEAL community.

The warriors we lost that day were loving husbands, devoted fathers, brave sons, selfless patriots. While their families struggle with the loss of their own personal hero, our Nation stands with them, and the good folks in Virginia's Second Congressional District stand with them, as well.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, men and women have sacrificed for this country at a high cost. I have wrestled with this question, and I do not know why providence calls upon some to give so much, including in cases like this, for young men or young women to give the full measure of sacrifice in defense of our freedom. But I do know this, Mr. Speaker: I know the duty we have to the fallen, and that's to honor and to remember them and to care for their families and to meet our obligation today in this place and across this great land and press on for the freedom and liberty that they indeed gave their life for.

So it is with reverence and respect, Mr. Speaker, and sincere appreciation from one American to the families of the fallen that I will now read the names of these Americans whose lives were taken that day in defense of our country.

These are Navy servicemen killed August 6, 2011:

Jonas B. Kelsall
Louis J. Langlais
Thomas A. Ratzlaff
Craig M. Vickers
Brian R. Bill
John W. Faas
Kevin A. Houston
Matthew D. Mason
Stephen M. Mills
Nicholas H. Null
Robert J. Reeves
Heath M. Robinson
Darrik C. Benson
Christopher G. Campbell
Jared W. Day
John Douangdara
Michael J. Strange
Jon T. Tumilson
Aaron C. Vaughn
Jason R. Workman
Jesse D. Pittman
Nicholas P. Spehar
The five soldiers killed that day:
David R. Carter
Bryan J. Nichols
Patrick D. Hamburger
Alexander J. Bennett
Spencer C. Duncan
And the three airmen killed that day:
John W. Brown
Andrew W. Harvell

Daniel L. Zerbe

Mr. Speaker, as these families continue to struggle with their loss, we continue to pray for them, asking that God will give them a special measure of grace and peace on this day and the days ahead.

SUPPORT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of support for funding for the Community Development Block Grants, commonly known here as CDBG funding.

Public-private partnerships are great investments for our communities. And on the central coast of California, as well as in communities all across our country, Community Development Block Grants have long been a critical source of funding for local initiatives. CDBG funding gives nonprofits opportunities to provide locally tailored services in an efficient and effective manner. These nonprofits are then able to leverage additional private funding, giving taxpayer dollars an extra bang for the buck in spending power. It is a win-win for everyone. The investments that are made stimulate and grow our local economies. They improve the quality of life for our working families.

My constituents see CDBG funding at work each day, even though they may not know what it is. It's there working on their behalf. It's the Santa Maria Meals on Wheels program, which delivers nutritious meals to local seniors each day. For many of these seniors, it's the only real meal they'll have in a day.

It's the Thrifty Shopper and Catholic Charities' Community Services, which support mobile food distribution and case management for our neighbors in need.

It is the youth education enhancement programs which provide quality after-school youth education programs. These programs improve reading and study skills. They promote high school graduation, and foster parent participation in a child's academic life. CDBG supports our local Boys and Girls Clubs, the food bank, and legal aid. It's giving Santa Maria a chance to rehab Oakley Park, which benefits the entire community.

CDBG helps those in need, and it makes life a bit better for everyone. These are investments with real local impacts, and that's why cuts to this program, like the drastic ones we've been debating, also have a direct impact.

Already, important programs like Meals on Wheels are having trouble reaching all those in need due to sequestration cuts. So to slash the program in half will only add to this devastation. These aren't disposable

projects. They are truly investments in our people and in our community, and that is why I urge my colleagues to stand with the central coast of California, to stand with communities across this Nation who can't afford the bill the House majority has brought to the floor.

STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this week in the House, we are voting on pieces of legislation that will roll back the Obama administration's overreach. We term this effort Stop Government Abuse Week. Our message to the administration is quite simple: no more wasted tax dollars, no more abuse of power by Federal agencies. The Federal Government must be accountable to the American people, not unelected bureaucrats.

Right now, a senior Federal employee can be placed under investigation for serious misconduct, yet the Federal Government isn't allowed to put that person on leave without pay, meaning they get an extended paid vacation. That's the case with IRS official Lois Lerner, who took the Fifth Amendment and testified before Congress. She's now on paid leave while Congress continues the agency's misconduct investigation.

The Employee Accountability Act, introduced by my friend MIKE KELLY from Pennsylvania, will address this issue. It will allow agencies to place employees on unpaid leave when they are under investigation for serious offenses.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work the House is doing this week on behalf of the American people. We are sending a very strong message to the Obama administration: enough is enough.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk today about important issues involving climate change going on all over America, all over this world. But specifically today, I want to talk about our urban communities. Global warming is expected to increase the frequency and intensity of natural disasters, like wildfires in the West and hurricanes like Sandy on the east coast, and record drought conditions that continue for another year across the Midwest.

But in urban areas, cities like D.C., or my hometown of Minneapolis, we have something known as an urban heat island. Urban heat islands are a serious problem because urban areas tend to have temperatures 5-20 degrees

warmer than rural areas, which is known as heat island effect. Heat islands are caused by a lack of natural vegetation, dark colored, impervious roads and concrete, and exhaust from vehicles and industry. As global temperatures increase, urban areas are warming at double the rate of the average global temperature, so this is a real serious issue.

Heat islands drive people to increase their use of air conditioning, which of course has a vicious effect in terms of just increasing an already serious problem. In turn, increasing the air conditioning drives up energy costs and increases power plant emissions, which contributes to the heat island in the first place.

These emissions not only contribute to global warming, they impact human health, increase emissions of carbon monoxide, mercury, and particulate matter, which leads to increased risks of heart attacks, strokes, and asthma. Particulate matter is very fine pieces that are emitted from coal plants. They go up into the air and come down, and we breathe that stuff in.

The effect of extreme heat in urban areas disproportionately affects some Americans as opposed to others. It affects anyone who lives in an urban area. But given the populations of urban areas, it affects certain communities more, including communities of color, low-income communities, and the elderly.

This housing segregation that we have in our country in which you have this disproportionate number of some populations in urban areas, concentrates racial ethnic minorities in dense environments, and that's why we see African Americans experiencing some of these heat-related hazards that have to do with everything from asthma and other sorts of issues like that. The low-income, minority, and elderly are less able to adapt and recover from these extreme climate events and are the communities most at risk from heat island effects and heat waves.

These communities are already plagued by higher pollution than wealthy, white communities. Coal plants, bus depots, and trash incinerators are disproportionately located in these areas that I speak of, and the heat island effect makes it worse.

The high cost of air conditioning, the inability to move into special heat wave shelters increases risk. Urban minorities often have more underlying health issues, such as higher rates of asthma, as I mentioned before, which also creates susceptibility to increased pollutants in these heat islands.

In 1995, a Chicago heat wave killed more than 700 people over 5 days, mostly elderly people who couldn't escape. The European heat wave in 2003 killed 30,000 people, although some estimates put that number as high as 70,000. Socioeconomic disparities will worsen

through the health and economic effects of climate change.

As global temperatures continue to rise, heat waves in urban areas are increasing in frequency, duration, and intensity; and the effect on my community of Minneapolis, and urban areas all over this country, will be devastating. This is a serious issue that we need to focus on. We need to do something about it. The time is now.

I want to thank the Safe Climate Caucus for organizing Members to discuss this issue for the public today so we can all come to a greater level of awareness about the true dangers of ignoring global climate change.

SUPPORT PATIENT OPTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this government is out of control. It has become too big and too intrusive. It is spending too much. It is taxing too much. It is regulating too much. It is borrowing too much. And it's sticking its ugly nose into our business too much. This must stop.

ObamaCare does every one of those things. This law is as disastrous as a train running full throttle without an engineer, speeding toward a head-on collision and wrecking everything in its tracks.

I come before you today with a solution, my Patient Option Act, H.R. 2900. My Patient Option Act will revitalize American health care, not through government interference but by giving the American people full control over their health care decisions. It will make health care cheaper for everyone. It provides coverage for all Americans, and it will save Medicare from going broke.

My Patient Option Act repeals ObamaCare in its entirety and replaces it with some patient-centered, commonsense solutions. These solutions include 100 percent deductibility for health care expenses for everyone, including insurance; flexibility for individuals and businesses to join associations where there will be a smorgasbord of health care insurance options; expanding health savings accounts that patients will own and control; freedom for consumers to purchase health insurance across State lines; and tax incentives to reward physicians who provide free care to patients who cannot afford health insurance.

My Patient Option Act accomplishes all of this, and more, in just 77 pages.

□ 1045

That's a stark contrast to the over 2,700-page regulatory nightmare of ObamaCare. In fact, ObamaCare's regulations are 2 million words longer than the Bible. Any bill that much longer

than the Bible has to be bad for America.

My Patient Option Act is the solution that Americans need and deserve. Unfortunately, the clock is ticking and time has almost run out.

A Georgia businessman recently told me that his insurance premiums for his employees have increased by 40 percent this year, compared to last, due to ObamaCare.

Another Georgia businessman, who is an owner of several fast-food restaurants and currently employs over 200 full-time workers, recently told me that he is seriously considering letting them all go and hiring only part-time employees.

And recently, even President Obama's Health and Human Services Department has admitted that you might not be able to keep your current doctor, even if you want to. If Congress does not act soon, we will be hearing more and more of these same stories.

I'm here to tell all Americans and all American families that it doesn't have to be this way.

Mr. Speaker, if Americans want true, patient-centered, health care reform, then they must contact their Congressman and Senators and urge them to pass my Patient Option Act.

Mr. Speaker, if Americans want lower costs, coverage for everyone, and government out of the way of the doctor-patient relationship, then they must contact their Representatives and urge them to pass my Patient Option Act.

If Americans want full control of their coverage and freedom to make their own decisions in health care, then the Patient Option Act is the only true solution.

We don't have much time; but through the voices of we, the people, the American people, we can work to repeal this disastrous law and replace it with legislation that serves the best interest of my patients and all patients, not government. That's my Patient Option Act.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS IN CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon we will board our flights back to the district for the August recess. Sadly, we'll be leaving behind a lot of unfinished business.

Just yesterday, the Republican leadership pulled the catastrophe of a transportation and housing appropriations bill because it couldn't even get the votes within their own caucus.

I ask my friends, when are we going to begin to govern and work together?

When we come back from the August recess period, we will have 9 days, just 9 days left until the farm bill extension

expires. But we're leaving the House without passing a true farm bill that we can conference, much less appointing any conferees to work out the differences between the two bills. The farmers, ranchers and dairymen expect better in my district.

Uncertainty swirls around the Capitol, but the only thing that seems certain here lately is that we cannot act on anything that the American people want us to that they view as no-brainers.

Take immigration reform. Over half the voters in this country think we should get this done and pass the Senate bill. Yet we are watching the summer fade into fall without even a timeline for when the House will bring up real immigration reform.

It's far too easy for us to throw up our hands and say this place is broken, but that's not why we came to Washington.

No budget, little in appropriations bills, no tax reform, little progress on immigration reform, and no farm bill.

Yet last week, the Republican leaders said that we should, instead, be measured by the laws that we repeal. Okay. Well, on that score, we've exactly repealed zero laws.

I came here to roll up my sleeves and get to work. We have real problems in this country; but we also, I think, share in real bipartisan solutions to fix those problems. All that we need is the green light.

The problem here is that the art of the political compromise has been lost. And it's about time we rediscover that art of the political compromise.

We have divided government. That's not a secret. We've had divided government in the past. And by the way, we're going to have divided government for the next 3½ years.

Let's get real. It's about time that we begin to figure out ways to work together. My hope is that when we go back home we are reminded that every vote here in the House of Representatives, the people's House, is not a litmus test, and that every issue that we deal with should not be looked at in terms of black and white, but in shades of gray.

We have a lot of challenges facing America. I hope, after the August recess, we come back here in September and that we put solving America's problems before our own political agendas.

America cannot afford to continue this three-ring circus. It's about time we begin to work together, ladies and gentlemen.

HONORING MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT ARMY STAFF SERGEANT TY MICHAEL CARTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Army Staff Sergeant Ty Michael Carter, who will be awarded with the Congressional Medal of Honor in recognition of his heroic actions in Afghanistan in 2009.

As the father of a veteran, I am truly honored to represent Staff Sergeant Carter, a resident of Antioch, California. The Medal of Honor is our Nation's highest military award presented for selfless sacrifice and acts of courage above and beyond the call of duty at the risk of his or her life.

Staff Sergeant Carter was born in Spokane, Washington, in 1980 and graduated from North Central High School. After high school, he enlisted in the Marine Corps and served in Japan. He had two additional deployments before being honorably discharged from the Marine Corps in the year 2002.

During this time, Staff Sergeant Carter enrolled in the Los Medanos Community College in California and studied biology. Upon the birth of his first daughter, and after traveling throughout the United States, he enlisted to serve his country as a soldier in the United States Army in the year 2008.

It was on October 3, 2009, when Specialist Carter and the 54 Members of B Troop, 3rd Squadron, 61st Cavalry Regiment came under heavy enemy fire in the Nuristan province of Afghanistan.

At great risk of his own life, Staff Sergeant Carter resupplied ammunition to help his fellow soldiers, provided first aid to a comrade, eliminated enemy troops, and risked his own life to help carry a fellow soldier from harm's way.

The actions that Mr. Carter took during this ambush were critical to the defense of the COP Keating, which was established in 2006 as a provincial reconstruction team camp located near the confluence of the Kushtowz and Landay Sin Rivers.

All of our Nation's servicemembers and their families make great sacrifices, and we can never fully repay them. It's important that we pay tribute to those who show their devotion to the United States through their service and that we ensure those who return home are provided with the services they deserve and have earned.

These brave men and women are committed to one another and to honoring the call of duty to protect our great Nation. We owe them the same respect.

I want to commend Staff Sergeant Carter and all of our Nation's veterans for their courage and dedication to this country. Our Nation has always been able to depend on the selfless actions of men and women in uniform for our very existence.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Staff Sergeant Ty Michael Carter, as well as our servicemen and

women, their families and veterans, for their service to the United States.

NATIONAL COACHES DAY

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I also want to recognize the efforts of Madeline Woznick, a 12-year-old student athlete who lives in Lodi, California. Madeline is a competitive swimmer and has worked to bring attention to the hard work and dedication of coaches across the country and is advocating for an annual National Coaches Day.

There are tens of millions of student athletes in the country. Coaches can have a fundamental impact on these students, and I'm grateful for their endeavors to train and mentor the next generation.

Today's students are tomorrow's leaders, and it is important that they have teachers and mentors who inspire and encourage them in their educational pursuits. As Madeline says, coaches motivate and inspire students to better themselves.

In 1972, President Nixon declared October 6 as National Coaches Day, and Madeline is working to ensure that every October 6 is National Coaches Day so their efforts are appreciated and recognized by communities across the country.

I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding Madeline Woznick and coaches across the country.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of the Universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon those who have worked so hard these past few days. Many issues remain, and their solutions continue to elude. Not all are completely satisfied, but help us all to proceed graciously, remaining vigilant for those values held most dear while being just.

In the days that come, help each Member to understand well and interpret positively, as they are able, the positions of those with whom they disagree. Grant to each the wisdom of Solomon, and to us all the faith and confidence to know that no matter how

difficult things appear to be, You continue to walk with our Nation as You have done for over two centuries.

May all that is done today in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. FORBES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, we're now in the 4th week of the civilian furloughs at the Department of Defense that are wreaking havoc on our national security and the lives of patriotic men and women across this country. Mr. Speaker, I've said repeatedly the decisions that led us here were not the result of strategic analysis but yet another consequence of misguided cuts to our national defense.

Just a few moments ago, we were in a hearing in the Armed Services Committee and a high-ranking member of the Pentagon said that the suggestion that we now know the President made for sequestration was a dumb idea. It was certainly a wrong idea. It was wrong when the President signed it into law, but what is worse is the current position of the White House, that even if the House and the Senate can reach an agreement to fix sequestration and stop these furloughs, that they will not agree to it unless we give the President all the spending he wants in every area of government and increases in taxes in all the areas of government he wants.

Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. We need to address sequestration now for national defense and stop it before it's too late.

NATION-BUILDING AT HOME

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, last week I met with Rich Lowry, the editor of the National Review, whose new book, "Lincoln Unbound," urges the Republican Party to embrace an aspirational agenda of Abraham Lincoln, who led an ambitious program of rail and canal construction.

His book calls to mind the words of Sheila Bair, a George W. Bush administration official, who, in February, urged her fellow Republicans to remember that, from Lincoln's transcontinental railroad to Eisenhower's highway system, Republicans have understood that investing in critical infrastructure projects creates jobs and expands the economy.

Yet the appropriations bill that was on the floor this week would have cut \$2 billion from the Department of Transportation. It was a total rejection of the Lincoln-Eisenhower tradition.

We have spent \$87 billion rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan and just approved \$5 billion more. According to the United States inspector general, supporters of the Taliban and al Qaeda are getting the contracts and "far too much will be wasted" due to insufficient oversight.

This, Mr. Speaker, is appalling, and it's time to do nation-building right here at home.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. MULLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, according to the most recently released numbers by the Congressional Budget Office, ObamaCare is now going to cost the American taxpayers nearly \$1.4 trillion.

With our national debt sitting at \$16.8 trillion and rising every single day, I must ask my colleagues who support this: Can America really afford this?

NUCLEAR IRAN PREVENTION ACT

(Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the dangers of a nuclear Iran are real and represent one of the greatest threats to our country and to our allies.

In addition to the existential threat to our ally, Israel, Iran is a growing source of violence in the Middle East, propping up the Syrian regime, arming Hezbollah, and undermining a fragile peace in Iraq. More troubling, the Iranian regime is pursuing an active nuclear capability, which we cannot allow.

While we have strong laws on the books already, we can and must go even further to isolate the Iranian regime and the major sources of funding that support it. The Nuclear Iran Prevention Act will cripple that country's energy sector and tighten sanctions on Iran's radical leadership and human rights violators. For the first time, the bill authorizes the President to impose sanctions on any entity that maintains significant commercial ties with Iran.

Without question, we must come together to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join us in sending a clear message to the Iranians that we will stand firmly with our friend, Israel, until the Iran regime forsakes this reckless course and rejoins the peaceful community of nations.

ELEVENTH UNANSWERED QUESTION ON BENGHAZI

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I've been asking a series of questions over the last 3 weeks about what happened in Benghazi last September. After a year of investigation, none of the questions have been answered publicly, not one.

Tomorrow is the last day before Congress departs for its August recess, and I plan to resubmit all the questions that I've asked so they are listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for history to see—and history will determine whether the American people ever learned the truth.

Yesterday, I focused my questions on the other U.S. facility that was attacked that night, the CIA annex. Today, I have only one question: Who in the White House knew what was going on in the annex? That's it. One question: Who knew? The Chief of Staff? Then-Deputy National Security Advisor and current CIA Director John Brennan?

Something is just not right.

It is time to honor both those who were killed and the survivors by creating a House select committee and, in the words of the editorial page of *The Wall Street Journal*, let Benghazi's chips fall.

ANNIVERSARY OF OAK CREEK SHOOTING

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, the Sikhs at the Oak Creek, Wisconsin, temple, or gurdwara, were peacefully preparing meals for Sunday worship, but that peace was shattered when a 40-year-old neo-Nazi man walked in and began shooting anyone in his path. I stand here today to honor the six victims of this senseless massacre:

Suveg Singh Khattria
Satwant Singh Kaleka
Ranjit Singh
Sita Singh
Paramjit Kaur
Prakash Singh

You will never be forgotten.

Sikhs have been the targets of discrimination and violence. Just this week, the word "terrorist" was scrawled against the wall of a gurdwara in Riverside.

In the memory of Oak Creek, we will recommit to fighting against intolerance wherever and whenever it occurs so that the lives of those six brave souls will not be lost in vain.

STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the measures we're bringing to the floor this week aimed at stopping government abuse.

With millions of working middle class Americans struggling, House Republicans have chosen to lead on the issues that matter to them. We've focused on creating jobs, lowering energy prices, offering children a better education, and lessening the burden of regulations and red tape on their lives. This week, we are holding government accountable to them by increasing transparency, cutting waste, and giving them new protections from an out-of-control bureaucracy.

Our plan is to stop the reckless waste of taxpayer dollars with new controls for Federal agency spending and to give new powers to our citizens so that government bureaucrats can be held accountable for any political intimidation or poor customer service that may occur.

These reforms are reforms that our country needs because many in Washington simply have forgotten the most important principle—the Federal Government works for the people and not the other way around.

I'm surprised that the Democratic leaders have urged opposition to several of these commonsense measures. Why do they want to forbid citizens from transparently recording conversations with Federal regulators? You have to ask: Why do they want to keep paying out hefty bonuses to well-compensated executives in these times of fiscal stress and economic restraint? Why is it that the opposition leaders want to keep paying senior Federal officials who are under investigation for serious ethical wrongdoing? Why do they want to use taxpayer dollars to do that? It just defies logic, Mr. Speaker.

The package of bills being brought to the floor this week are common sense, and they should easily garner bipartisan support. There's simply no reason

for Members of either party to support megabonuses, expensive paid vacations, and zero accountability measures for Washington bureaucrats.

We are here to represent the people, not the government. Working families in America want to trust their government, and they want to rebuild their faith in our economy. These bills are a much-needed step in the right direction toward accomplishing this goal.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense legislation. I urge the Senate to join us in this effort and not waste time while these abuses continue.

RECOGNIZING TAFT EARLY LEARNING SCHOOL

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Taft Early Learning School in Uxbridge, Massachusetts, for being named as a Bronze Award Winner in the USDA Healthier School Challenge. This initiative recognizes those schools enrolled in Team Nutrition that have created healthier school environments through promotion of nutrition and physical activity, a program that is now part of First Lady Michelle Obama's Let's Move campaign.

To achieve this challenge, Taft applied for and received a salad bar grant, which enabled them to offer lots of fresh fruit and vegetable choices every day as part of lunch. They incorporated more whole grains and beans into the menu. They hired an experienced cook to make this happen and added extra physical activity every day, which required the creativity and cooperation of the classroom teachers.

I want to congratulate Principal Judi Lamarre, Food Service Director Janice Watt, the teachers, administrative staff, students, and parents for their hard work in improving the food, nutrition, and exercise programs at Taft Early Learning School. This is a big deal, and I'm proud of this important accomplishment.

KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in May, the IRS proved to the American people it cannot be trusted to fairly enforce laws.

As if the intentional targeting of Americans was not troubling enough, ObamaCare will give the IRS even more power in just a short month. That's right, the agency that bullied Americans for exercising their right of

free speech will be the same agency involved in enforcing health care. Patients and their doctors should make the decisions that work best for them, not Washington, much less the IRS.

Allowing the IRS to enforce ObamaCare opens the door to more abuse, targeting, and intimidation of Americans. That's why I join my colleagues in support of a commonsense bill, H.R. 2009, Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, that will stop the IRS from enforcing or implementing any part of ObamaCare.

It's time for our friends across the aisle to listen to the American people. Keep the IRS out of our lives and out of our health care.

□ 1215

IN MEMORY OF LOIS DeBERRY

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the United States lost a great citizen and a legend on Sunday when Lois DeBerry passed away. Lois was the Speaker Pro-Temp Emeritus of the Tennessee General Assembly and the longest-serving member of the Tennessee General Assembly. I had the honor to serve with her. She was a great orator, and she was the go-to person of the Tennessee General Assembly on civil rights issues, women's issues, children's issues, education issues, and anything about Memphis. She served with distinction and was recognized all over the country. The Delta Sigma Thetas were valued to her and valued to have her as a member. She was a past president of the National Association of Black Local Elected Officials and respected in the National Conference of State Legislatures.

Yesterday, a flag flew over the Capitol, which I have to present Saturday at her funeral, the day that we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington, a march in which Lois participated as a very young person. Her's was a life well lived. She will be missed by all in Memphis and me.

HONORING CHERYL SCOFIELD

(Mr. GARDNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Cheryl Scofield of the USDA Rural Development Office in Wray, Colorado. Cheryl will retire next month as the USDA Rural Development Northeast Area director after 30 years of dedicated service. A fourth-generation Yuma County resident, Cheryl studied at Jones Real Estate College and the University of Colorado, earning a graduate degree in public administration.

After getting her start at Wray State Bank and World Savings Mortgage Company, she took a job with the Department of Housing, but it was at the USDA Rural Development Office where Cheryl spent 31 years as an outstanding and invaluable asset to her agency. Her rural background, education, and true passion for her work gave wind to Cheryl's impressive career.

Outside of work, Cheryl has been an active member of her community—board member, small business development, and a wealth of professional experience she's shared with communities throughout the eastern plains. She's been married to her husband, Delbert, for 41 years. There's not a single community on the eastern plains that Cheryl's work hasn't impacted. Her legacy will live on on every Main Street of eastern Colorado.

Thank you, Cheryl, for your service.

SUPPORT NIH FUNDING

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support funding for the National Institutes of Health and to stop the mindless and automatic sequestration cuts.

Earlier this month, I met with Carlos Santos and James Hodge, two young men from Florida. We talked about their sisters, who suffer from cystic fibrosis, and how potential budget cuts to the NIH will drastically affect their lives.

Cystic fibrosis is a chronic disease with no cure. While discoveries from NIH over the past 30 years have helped double the life expectancy of those with cystic fibrosis, there is much more we can do, including finding a cure for this disease in our lifetime.

Because of NIH's groundbreaking research into this disease and others, I ask my colleagues to support funding for NIH. We must secure our Nation's future by making smart investments in our Nation's health.

SUPPORT CANCER RESEARCH

(Mr. WALDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently met with my good friend, Linda Sindt, a former colonel in the United States Air Force from Medford, Oregon. For many years, Linda has served on my service academy nominations board, helping me find honorable young men and women to serve their country in our academies.

This time, though, we discussed a much different issue. Last year, Linda lost her husband, U.S. Air Force Major Duane Sindt, to pancreatic cancer. It's

a terrible disease with an extremely low survival rate. We owe it to Linda and other families affected by this disease to help improve treatment and to find a cure.

So last year, with the help of Linda and her fellow advocates, Congress passed and the President signed the Recalcitrant Cancer Research Act, which helps incentivize research and treatment for this horrible disease and others like it. There is still much more work to be done, but we are hopeful we can continue to build upon this effort and find treatments and cures to help patients and families nationwide.

AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT JOBS

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American people have said loud and clear that what they want the most from Congress is jobs. And what is Congress giving them? Jobs—threats to bring the government to a halt; threats to let the United States Treasury default; threats to slash the funding for mass transit that brings people to their jobs. And the tentacles of sequestration will strangle growth even more. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that sequestration will cost us 900,000 fewer jobs next year.

It's time to stop playing politics with our economy and do the people's work. We need to provide a strong workforce, a strong infrastructure, and manufacturing sectors. We need to provide a living wage to grow the middle class and strengthen America's standing as a leader in education and pioneering research.

But still, our friends on the other side of the aisle are marching to the tune of their own drum when what they should be listening to is the cry of the American people for more jobs.

STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the legislation that the House is considering this week. The people of eastern and southeastern Ohio sent me to Congress to get the government off their backs, to allow them to create jobs and to earn a living and raise a family without government overreach and interference.

Over the past 2½ years, the Republican-led House has done exactly that on a daily basis. However, some in Washington have not gotten the message. I'm proud to continue supporting legislation that stops government

abuse like we've seen in the IRS, restrains a runaway Federal Government that doesn't seem to have any brakes, and that empowers the American people with greater opportunities to pull themselves up by their bootstraps.

The people of eastern and south-eastern Ohio want a strong economy that will create a more secure future for them. The House Republican plan to stop government abuse lays the groundwork for more secure jobs and a more secure future with new jobs, more freedom, and expanded opportunities.

LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the misguided priorities that are driving the GOP's obstruct, repeal, and repeat agenda, and to call instead for a new policy that addresses the serious challenges our Nation faces.

When we adjourn tomorrow, Republican leadership will leave behind a staggering record of unfinished business and partisan messaging bills that put politics ahead of the American people's priorities. Since January, Republicans have not even allowed a vote on a real jobs bill. They haven't finished a budget, passed comprehensive immigration reform, restored funding on nutrition programs, or fixed the sequester.

Their aversion to meaningful action is undermining the important economic progress we've made. It's keeping 11 million undocumented immigrants in the shadows, and it's disproportionately harming low-income women and families. Hopefully they will see the light during the August recess and put aside the obstruct, repeal, and repeat agenda and set a new one that answers the public's outcry for action.

IRS CANNOT BE TRUSTED

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is a train wreck quickly approaching the station near you. This unworkable, unaffordable law will destroy hundreds of thousands of jobs, disrupt the doctor-patient relationship and offer a "Free Ticket, No Show" health care system.

According to a recent CBS News poll, 54 percent of Americans disapprove of the health care law, while only 36 percent approve. It is clear the American people have lost faith in the President's government health care takeover bill. The Federal Government, especially the IRS, has betrayed the trust of the American people. Every

day, more groups come forward and reveal unfair targeting by the IRS.

House Republicans are acting to protect every American family from the abuse, targeting, and harassment by the IRS. This week, we will vote on the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, legislation that bars the IRS from implementing ObamaCare.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill and help restore the American people's faith in limiting government.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

I am grateful to welcome the Sunny and Jay Philips family to the Capitol.

HONORING ANDREW WALTER

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a talented educator in my district, Andrew Walter. Mr. Walter is a math teacher at Stagg High School in Stockton, California. He is one of five California finalists for the 2013 Presidential Awards for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching.

For the past 20 years, Mr. Walter has been enriching the lives of youth in San Joaquin County as the chair of the mathematics department, as well as serving as the math, engineering, science, and achievement adviser for pre-engineering students. An education in STEM-related fields is critical for our students to help them survive in these competitive fields.

Mr. Walter has led his Math Engineering Science Achievement, or MESA, team to win the State championships multiple times and the national championship last year with a wind turbine built solely by his high school students.

It is this type of dedication and commitment that will lead to innovation, the creation of good-paying jobs, and keep America as a world leader in these areas.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Andrew Walter not only for his nomination, but everything he has done for his students.

ATTORNEY GENERAL MISLEADS CONGRESS

(Mr. GOSAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address Attorney General Holder misleading Congress with deceptive testimony. If I or any other ordinary citizen did what the Attorney General did, we would be thrown in jail for perjury. In front of the House Judiciary Committee on May 15, Holder said he knew nothing of the targeting of journalist James Rosen, yet Holder

himself signed the subpoena for Mr. Rosen's records.

Does the Attorney General suffer from Sergeant Schultz syndrome—where he hears nothing, sees nothing, and knows nothing? How convenient for Mr. Holder—but at what cost to our Constitution?

We are a Nation of laws, but the Attorney General has created an atmosphere of lawlessness in America. Nobody is above the law. He must be held accountable.

As Supreme Court Justice Brandeis said:

In a government of laws, the existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. If government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for the law. It invites every man to become a law unto himself. It invites anarchy.

I ask you: Has the Attorney General invited anarchy? I will continue to make my case here in the people's House, at the people's pulpit. I will be back.

SHELTER HOUSING FOR THE HOMELESS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a picture of a homeless young person; 19,000 of them are in Houston, according to 28 school districts. And just think, on the floor of the House before it went thud, there was a housing bill that cut the housing appropriation for homeless and veterans and working Americans to \$44.1 billion. But more importantly, under the sequestration amount offered by the Republicans, even the Senate, in a compromise manner, put it at \$54 billion.

So I rise today to ask, is anyone speaking for these young people, such as those who reside in a place called Lil Audrey in my district, where I sat down with young people who had lived in a crack house, not because they were on crack, but because that was a place for them to live until they found Lil Audrey? Or the young lady that was abused until she found Lil Audrey? Or the twins who were homeless with no parents until they found Lil Audrey?

I'm going to ask the city of Houston to use its public facilities money, money that it has been blessed to have from the Federal Government Housing and Urban Development, to help build a facility for Lil Audrey, and I'm going to insist that when local communities get Federal dollars that we fight so hard for, to be able to use them creatively to serve people, to serve the taxpayer, to serve the homeless, to serve homeless youth.

How long are we going to have to cry out for young people who suffer from mental concerns and others who have no place to live? I hope Houston will

listen, and I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle will have mercy on those who need housing.

END SEX TRAFFICKING ACT— PROSECUTE THE DEMAND

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for some of us, growing up was the best of times; simple times; safe times. But life isn't that way anymore for some kids.

Today, young girls, the average age between 12 and 14, are lured into a crooked, despicable business. It's sex trafficking—modern day slavery. Girls have been threatened, raped, forced into selling their bodies on the streets by the worst deviants in our society. Some of these girls are smuggled into the United States by slave traffickers from other countries, and some are from our own neighborhoods.

Sex traffickers should be put into the jailhouse forever. But society must get to the root of the problem: the demand. That's why I have introduced the End Sex Trafficking Act, along with Representatives MALONEY, GRANGER, and NOLAN. Our bill targets the interstate criminals who purchase sexual acts from child victims and ensures that they, too, are prosecuted as human traffickers. No longer can these deviants hide. Let the long arm of the law punish the child-molesting pedophiles who steal the innocence of children.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1230

LET'S TURN OFF THE SEQUESTER

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, a word not much known about 2 years ago now is a household word. It is "to sequester," a verb, and "sequestration," a noun.

Today, in the Armed Services Committee, we heard the Republican chair and the Democratic ranking member state in almost unison, Sequestration must end. It is a threat to our great Nation's readiness posture, affects jobs, and the manufacturing base.

DOD alone has 800,000 civilian employees. It is not only defense that's being affected. It is all of the discretionary budget. CBO estimates it will cost about 750,000 jobs this year alone. We saw it earlier this year with the FAA.

We will see how the U.S. Forest Service is affected by 500 firefighters that are lost, 50 to 70 fire engines, and two aircraft.

We will also see 70,000 children lose access to Head Start.

What will it take to turn it off, to quote our HASC ranking member?

We all agree it was not meant to be. It's a mistake. Mr. Speaker, let's turn it off.

THERE IS A BETTER WAY

(Mr. TIPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, the President is giving speeches on his plan for economic growth. His economic plan is to grow government, regulate more, spend more, and tax more. His speeches will not create jobs.

The economy does not improve when the administration piles on tens of thousands of pages of costly new regulations. Families don't thrive when the only jobs they can find are part-time because of ObamaCare's onerous mandates forcing employers to cut back on hours in order to be able to keep their doors open.

This administration's oppressive regulations cost small businesses, on average, \$10,585 per employee. To create jobs and jump-start the economy, we must pull back on unnecessary punitive regulations, hold the bureaucracy accountable, and shrink the size of government and reward, rather than punish, success.

This week we are voting to be able to stop government overreach, stand up for the American people, and give them a fighting chance to be able to succeed, to have access to fair and affordable and effective health care systems, not to have to worry about the Federal Government increasing burdens on their lives, abusing power, and stunting economic growth and putting their jobs at risk.

The American people need this response.

BRING THE AMERICAN JOBS BILL TO THE HOUSE FLOOR

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow begins a long district work period. When I arrive, the number one question will be: Congresswoman WILSON, what are they doing in Washington to help us with unemployment and the economy? What are they doing about sequestration?

I will say, The Republicans have not allowed one vote on serious legislation to create jobs or jobs training programs, not one vote to rebuild our bridges and schools, not one bill to hire more teachers and police officers, and nothing to stop sequestration.

Mr. Speaker, bring the American Jobs bill to the floor. It creates jobs and stops sequestration.

The farm bill is still up in the air. Judicial confirmations are on hold. Im-

migration reform is still on the radar, and Mr. Snowden is still a fugitive from justice.

Still, all the polls tell us that the number one issue for the American people is jobs and the economy.

Bring the American Jobs Act to the floor. It deserves a vote, and it stops sequestration. Jobs, jobs, jobs should be the mantra of this Congress.

THE GREAT LAKES ECOLOGICAL AND ECONOMIC PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. JOYCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes are truly one of the jewels of North America. They contain 20 percent of the world's surface water and provide drinking water for 30 million people. They're also a driver of our economy, as studies have shown 1.5 million jobs are directly connected to the Great Lakes, generating \$62 billion in wages.

That's why I'm encouraging my colleagues to support my Great Lakes Ecological and Economic Protection Act. This bill will help ensure we have a healthy Great Lakes, while boosting the economies along the Great Lakes region.

This bill already enjoys bipartisan support, and I hope my colleagues will join me in protecting one of the most precious resources in North America, the Great Lakes.

OBAMACARE

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, as we see ObamaCare go into effect, we see that it is making affordable health insurance a reality for hardworking families. Thanks to ObamaCare, 360,000 small businesses have the right to receive tax credits to help with the cost of providing coverage to their employees.

Thanks to ObamaCare, senior citizens have the right to affordable prescription drugs and free preventative benefits.

Thanks to ObamaCare, millions of young adults have the right to stay on their parents' health insurance until they're 26.

And thanks to ObamaCare, women have the right to no longer be denied coverage because they are sick or have preexisting conditions; and thanks to ObamaCare, women no longer have to pay higher premiums for health insurance just because we're women.

We are finally making great progress in fixing an outdated health care system that has been broken for far too long. Let's not vote to take away the American people's rights.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF SERGEANT CARL MOORE, III

(Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sergeant Carl Moore, III, from Bigelow, Arkansas, for his continuing service to our country. Sergeant Moore, a fellow Screaming Eagle, is with the 101st Airborne Division.

In early June of this year, Sergeant Moore was wounded while on patrol in Afghanistan. A bullet struck him under his arm, puncturing one of his lungs and grazing his spine.

Sergeant Moore is currently at Tampa Polytrauma Rehabilitation Center where he is recovering. He's unable to walk, but he has feeling in his legs and toes, and his prognosis is good.

I pray for Carl's speedy recovery so he can get back to enjoying the things he loves. My thoughts go out to his parents, Carl and Teresa, of Conway, Arkansas, and his wife, Heather, and their 4-year-old daughter, Addison.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking Sergeant Moore for his service and saluting all who have served and continue to serve our Nation.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LILLIAN KAWASAKI

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I sadly come before the Congress to recognize and honor a person that I loved very much, Lillian Kawasaki. Lillian Kawasaki was a dedicated public servant, a respected community leader, a beloved wife, a sister, and she was a dear, dear friend of mine.

Sadly, on July 18, Lillian passed away, and a memorial service will be held this Saturday, August 3.

Lillian was a generous soul. Her generosity of self always was done with grace and enthusiasm. She engendered tremendous respect and love from all who knew her. She possessed an infectious smile. Her laugh made everybody feel better.

Her work for the last two decades was on environmental efforts, first with the Port of Los Angeles, and then with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. It brought not only recognition to her throughout California but also throughout the Nation.

She was an expert on water issues and when she passed away was a member of the Water Replenishment District, elected.

Long Beach has lost one of its finest. I, and countless others in California, already miss Lillian. She will not be forgotten.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the bad news on ObamaCare just keeps rolling in. As if it's not bad enough that the IRS will be helping run ObamaCare, Maryland announced last Friday that health insurance premiums will go up 25 percent next year under ObamaCare.

Whatever happened to the President's promise that premiums would go down, not up? Just another empty promise?

Maryland's middle class families, already struggling to pay their health insurance premiums, will see their policies cost over \$1,000 more next year under ObamaCare. Many will just drop their insurance, and that will just increase the long lines we already see in our crowded emergency rooms.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is a disaster. We should repeal it before it does more damage to our hardworking middle class taxpayers and before it destroys even more jobs.

CELEBRATING AMERICA'S IMMIGRANT HERITAGE

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined my colleagues in a bipartisan trip to New York City to celebrate America's immigrant heritage. Together, we sailed toward the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island.

We stared down those dark, cascading waterfalls at the 9/11 Memorial, and remembered our ancestors at the Museum of Jewish Heritage and the African burial grounds. All around us were reminders of how people came to America, by choice or not, sometimes not by choice, but then hoping for a better life.

Our country has been the better because of it. Whether it's the laborers who built our bridges or the scientists and leaders who made their mark in history, we couldn't be where we are today without immigrants.

I was reminded of that as I witnessed a naturalization ceremony; 82 people from 27 countries became new Americans that day, and you could see their beaming faces.

Immigration is at our core, the moral fiber that binds us together and makes us stronger. Congress now has a responsibility to pass an immigration bill that is worthy of our rich heritage.

Let's write the next chapter of American history, one that our children and our grandchildren can be proud of.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 367, REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2009, KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 3, 2013, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2879, STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 322 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 322

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House

the bill (H.R. 2009) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. House Resolution 292 is laid on the table.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from August 3, 2013, through September 6, 2013, —

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved;

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment; and

(c) bills and resolutions introduced during the period addressed by this section shall be numbered, listed in the Congressional Record, and when printed shall bear the date of introduction, but may be referred by the Speaker at a later time.

SEC. 5. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 6. Each day during the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 7. Each day during the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

SEC. 8. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2879) to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 9. Upon passage of H.R. 2879, the following bills shall be laid on the table: H.R. 1541, H.R. 2579, and H.R. 2711.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1245

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself

such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of H.R. 367, the REINS Act; H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act; and H.R. 2879, the Stop Government Abuse Act.

The rule provides a structured rule for consideration of the REINS Act, allowing debate time for 12 of 23 amendments submitted. In addition, the rule incorporates a technical correction to the bill from Chairman SESSIONS. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

Additionally, the rule provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, and provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Furthermore, the rule provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2879, the Stop Government Abuse Act, and provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides floor management tools to be used during the August recess.

Mr. Speaker, America's job creators have struggled against strong headwinds to recover. In fact, since President Obama took office, 131 new major regulations, costing at least \$70 billion, have been added to America's regulatory system.

Under current law, Congress only has the power to disapprove regulations put forward by the executive branch. H.R. 367 flips that presumption on its head. Any major regulation estimated to cost over \$100 million would need to be approved by Congress and must be given an "up-or-down" vote within 70 legislative days.

In his State of the Union address, President Obama said:

To reduce barriers to growth and investment, when we find rules that put an unnecessary burden on businesses, we will fix them.

H.R. 367 does just that. It allows Congress to decide whether major rules place unnecessary burdens on job creators.

The second bill covered by this rule, Mr. Speaker, would prohibit the Treasury Department, including the IRS,

from implementing or enforcing any provision of ObamaCare. In the last few months, the American people have learned that the IRS has targeted and intimidated Americans exercising their First Amendment rights. Given the recent scandal and the massive amount of sensitive information the IRS is required to collect under ObamaCare, it's completely inappropriate for the IRS to be given this responsibility.

A recent poll showed that 53 percent of Americans want ObamaCare repealed entirely. Mr. Speaker, health care decisions should be made by a patient and his or her doctor, not Washington bureaucrats.

The final bill covered by this rule, H.R. 2879, was extensively debated on the floor yesterday. In fact, it combined three bills, all aimed at limiting government and returning that power back to the people. This bill accomplishes three major objectives:

First, it caps bonuses for Federal employees at a maximum 5 percent of their salary through the end of fiscal year 2015. With Federal officials furloughing employees due to sequestration, the government should not, at the same time, be handing out millions of dollars in bonuses to other employees;

Second, this bill allows for senior Federal officials under investigation for serious misconduct to be put on unpaid leave. Under current law, agencies have little recourse but to put officials on paid leave, where they can collect a paycheck for months or even years while the investigation occurs;

Finally, this bill allows for citizens to record their meetings and telephone exchanges with Federal regulatory officials. In my home State of Oklahoma, along with 37 other States, this is already the case. However, 12 States require all parties involved in the conversation to consent to recording. This bill would allow individuals in all 50 States to record their conversations when meeting with Federal officials acting in their official capacity.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 367, H.R. 2009, and H.R. 2879 all express the views of my constituents. They're increasingly concerned and opposed to an intrusive and expansive government that seeks to tell them what they can and cannot do. These bills seek to stem the tide of crushing regulation and rein in an overbearing Federal bureaucracy.

I urge support for the rule and the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague for yielding me the 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the final week that the House will be in session before we begin our recess. I don't like to call it recess since we work as hard at home, but this is probably the last time we'll get together until we come back in the fall. As the clock runs out

on another legislative session, we are voting for the 40th time to repeal or to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

By now, we all know how today's debate will end. The majority will pass the bill, the Senate will refuse to take it up, and we will have wasted, again, the public's time and their patience. And then they will adjourn for August recess, only to return in September with issues like jobs, immigration reform, and sequestration left unsolved, as they are today.

The other night, I was watching comedian Stephen Colbert on his program. He was talking about the number of times we've voted to try to repeal health care. He had a good idea for the Republicans. He said, Obviously, you're not going to be able to do it if you say you're going to repeal health care, so he suggested that a bill be written that is titled, "This is Not Another Repeal of ObamaCare, We Swear, But Don't Look Inside It, Just Sign It Act." If you put that act out, maybe you would get somewhere with it.

Some speculated the GOP is desperate to get rid of this law because they know it is working and will work better as it gets fully implemented and they know they have firmly planted their feet on the wrong side of history once again. I can't comment on their motivation, but it's clear that millions of Americans are using this law because of the incredible benefits that it provides.

I was really stunned by the last speaker on the 1-minutes this morning talking about Maryland, because we just got the statistics from Maryland. The health plans are better than ever. Just last week, Maryland announced their rates are going to be among the lowest in the country, and not, as he said, a 20 percent increase.

Nevada announced a young adult will be able to purchase a catastrophic health insurance plan for less than \$100.

And I said last week, when we had the other vote to get rid of health care, New York had just come out with wonderful news on the exchanges. Seventeen insurers had applied to provide insurance in the State of New York, and it would cause those premiums to fall by more than 50 percent. And we join 11 other States with the same kind of news. It's happening all over America.

For those States that decided not to do an exchange and are going to let the government do it, fine. I think they'll do okay there. Maybe we'll move closer to single-payer, which is what we should be doing.

Sixty-two days from now, those new exchanges will open their doors and they're going to provide millions of Americans with secure and affordable health care. For the very first time, insurers are going to be barred from denying coverage because of a preexisting condition and barred from placing life-

time and yearly limits on an individual's health care. They are sending checks back to customers all over the country, because the new law requires them to spend 80 percent of the premium dollar on health care. And since far less than 80 percent is spent, many companies are doing rebates, and people are getting those checks.

I really can't go on much further without talking about what it is we are doing here today. I think it's somewhat historical, but it may not be the first time. It's probably not. I have not had the pleasure before of doing a rule which consists of five bills with very little in common being stuffed into one because the House, basically, imploded yesterday. I've done all of the rules on health care repeal. If I had a machine, I could just press "repeat" and walk out of the room and do the same speech over and over again.

The other day I asked Dr. McDERMOTT, who's a psychiatrist, "What do you call someone or one group that does the same thing over and over and over again, anticipating a different result?" and he gave me the psychiatric definition for that.

□ 1300

We all know that today's vote is not a single thing except another cynical attempt to score political points. As we go to our districts this August, the question is whether or not the majority will double down on their failed agendas in September and continue the irresponsible attempts to repeal the health care law. If they do, they will be escalating their brinksmanship to a new level and risking a government shutdown simply because they don't want to compromise.

Already, as you know, Members of the majority are threatening to shut down the government if the Affordable Care Act is not repealed. That does show kind of an act of desperation, doesn't it? In fact, a dozen Republican Senators have signed a letter vowing to vote against a continuing resolution—that we have to have because nobody got their work done—that funds the Affordable Care Act, and more than 60 House Republicans have called on the majority's leadership to defund the Affordable Care Act in any continuing resolution that comes before the House.

Instead, I want the majority to make a change here. My fellow Kentuckian, HAL ROGERS, who is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, yesterday made it plain to everybody that this is all a hoax. He talked about sequestration and the impossibility of bringing a transportation bill that scarcely has enough money to maintain what roads we have, and it imploded on the floor when nobody would vote for it. While we're out on recess, please think about this, and think about what sequestration is doing in the United States.

I hope you read former Senator Byron Dorgan's article in The New York Times talking about the devastation on the Indian reservations because of the money that we owe them by treaty, which is being lost through sequestration; the people who are doing health research at the National Institutes of Health, where they tell me in the human genome project that they are very close to finding a cure for cancer, but now they have to stop it. As a scientist, I can promise you, you do not turn research off and on like a faucet. And think of all the people who can't get their treatment because of sequestration. Think of all the people who live in this area and work for this government and keep this government working, many of them two members of the family on the Federal payroll, who have suffered as much in that family as a 40 percent pay cut.

And the bills that are in here today, again, saying to the Federal employees: We don't value you for anything. We've already passed legislation in here that hurts their pensions. They haven't had a raise in 4 years. What we're saying now, if this bill passes today, is that they can be fired without cause and that their phones will be tapped by any citizen in the United States. I really am concerned about what's going on here.

We talk about too much regulation. I want to close with something I mentioned last night at the Rules Committee because I realize most Americans don't know it. But let me talk about under-regulation.

In the food market, chickens are inspected 100 at a time—100 a minute going through the conveyor belt. They're covered with barnyard debris and feces and whatever else. One person is inspecting them as 100 of them go by. So what's going to happen now they have decided to regulate? They will have to do 140 chickens a minute.

Recently, The Washington Post had a front-page story that stunned me to the core. It said that a young food inspector, working for the government, his lungs bled out and he died from the chemicals that he inhaled from his chicken inspection days. Now, after the chicken goes through a conveyor belt, it goes into a bath of cool water and Clorox. Then it's ready to be packaged and all plastic-ed up and have it for dinner. Is that overregulation? For heaven's sakes, give me more regulation than that.

But I want to urge my colleagues today to vote "no" on this rule, the underlying legislation, and quit this farce in the House of Representatives.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to quickly respond, if I may, to a couple of points my good friend made.

First, I want to begin by agreeing with her because, quite frankly, as I've

stated publicly on many occasions, I don't believe a government shutdown is a good idea either. I think that's not a responsible political tactic. And while my good friend has been concerned that some people in my party have advocated that, I would also express a similar concern, quoting press reports that some advisors to the President have recommended that, should we send a so-called "continuing resolution" that funded the government that did not repeal sequester, he should veto it and that would shut down the government.

So I think there's been a little bit of irresponsible discussion about shutting down the government—which, with my friend, I agree, is never a good idea—that's come from both sides of the aisle.

In terms of her observations about sequestration, as an appropriator, again, we probably find some common ground here. I would like to see us also get rid of sequestration, but I'd like to do it by redistributing the cuts to the nondiscretionary side of the budget where I think they belong. We need to keep the savings—that's why the deficit is coming down—but there are certainly smarter and better ways to do that. And if the President is willing to do that, I suspect he would find a willing negotiating partner on our side of the aisle.

In fact, though, many of my friends advocate what is effectively a third tax increase this year. We had a tax increase with the so-called "fiscal cliff." When all the Bush tax cuts ended, the President used that to raise taxes. We have a tax increase this year associated with his health care plan kicking in that's major. And now my friends on the other side of the aisle want a third tax increase to keep the government open and operating. We think we can spend money better and smarter, and that we ought to continue to reduce spending, not increase the burdens on the American people.

Finally, I want to talk to my friend, who discussed ObamaCare, and she's absolutely right; we certainly would like to repeal it, and we certainly have tried to make that point repeatedly. Frankly, her disagreement is not with us so much as it is with the American people. This is an extraordinarily unpopular law. No poll has ever shown that more people like it than dislike it; quite the opposite. People would like to see it repealed. It's simply not a very good idea. Frankly, we're seeing signs of that right now. The President himself, in a signature piece of legislation, had to ask that the business mandates actually be pushed back by a year. We would like to help him in that, and we'd like to do it for individuals as well, but that suggests this was certainly a bill not ready for prime time.

A former Presidential candidate—I very seldom quote Howard Dean in

agreement, but he had an interesting piece in *The Wall Street Journal* this week on why the central cost-control mechanism of ObamaCare—the Independent Payment Advisory Board—simply wouldn't work. Now, that's not us; that's criticism from somebody that probably supports a national health care plan of some kind.

Finally—and I think this does get overlooked in a debate, and I want to end my comments on a point of agreement, because while we have voted repeatedly to repeal, there have actually been times that we have, on both sides of the aisle, agreed—and agreed with the President—about changing this bill.

In the last couple of years, we have actually passed seven pieces of legislation when we were in the majority—they obviously had to go through a Democratic Senate and to the President's desk—that changed or modified ObamaCare—and saved, by the way, about \$62 billion. My friends, after ramming that legislation through, looked at the so-called 1040s that were going to be attached to every \$600 purchase and said, you know, you guys are right, that's a really bad idea. The President thought so too. And we got rid of it.

We also got rid of the assisted living portion of it, the so-called "CLASS Act" that was just financially unsustainable. Why? Secretary Sebelius looked at it and said, you know, this really isn't going to work. And I'll bet you sooner or later we'll get a medical device tax elimination down here on this floor—people on both sides know it's nuts to be taxing people's wheelchairs and oxygen cans because they're sick and use that to fund health care, and I'll bet you we can probably find common agreement on that.

So, while we would like to repeal, we certainly are willing to work when we find common areas and continue to try and improve a very flawed product.

With that, I'd like to yield such time as he may consume to my good friend and fellow Rules Committee member from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I thank my good friend on the Rules Committee, a member that I have the pleasure of serving with.

Today, I rise in support of House Resolution 322 and the underlying legislation, H.R. 367, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Security Act. I want to thank my friend for bringing this forward as the rule. But this is better known as the REINS Act. The underlying legislation would bring much-needed reform to our broken regulatory process.

Now, my good friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) talked about chickens—and she mentioned it last night. But the issue really, what she's talking about when you're talking about the

number of chickens being observed by the USDA, this is the President. They want to increase the number. They want to go to a private system. So I agree that it's a bad idea. But maybe the REINS Act could actually help in that particular instance because you could bring it back to this House to talk about it because, as a valued member of the Rules Committee, she brought up a good idea.

But somewhere along the line we have lost sight of what Congress' responsibility in the role of regulation is all about. Through the years, we have delegated away our responsibility. We gave it to unelected bureaucrats to make decisions that have far-ranging effects on the American people. I'm pretty sure that our Founding Fathers really didn't envision us doing that; that bureaucrats are going to decide the fates of small businesses and industries. That's exactly what we let happen because it was easy—it's easier. And all too often, in making regulations in D.C., we just aren't in touch with how that actually affects real Americans, real jobs in this country.

We all hear from folks back home about how regulations passed in D.C. are preventing their businesses from growing and expanding. It's a common refrain, Mr. Speaker.

The REINS Act, however, would return us to the vision our Founding Fathers had for this institution and for this Nation. It does so by ensuring that any major rule—that's a rule that has over \$100 million in impact to our economy—receive approval from this body and from the Senate before it actually goes into the process of regulation.

Certainly, regulations with an impact this large deserve to have our attention, our review, and ultimately our blessing by our vote. Frankly, they deserve more than just a public comment period that regulatory agencies give the public. For that reason, I urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

I'll just give you one anecdote, Mr. Speaker. Back home, we have a cement kiln that produces cement for use all over the United States; employs 200 people right there. And I come from a county today that still has unemployment of 8.9 percent. What the EPA is looking to do is put those businesses out of existence.

When I talked to the folks that actually run the cement kiln, they said, RICH, we can just go across the border into Mexico, where they don't have any restrictions on air pollution, and we can do it cheaper because we don't have to have the pollution controls. But you know what, that air doesn't stop at the border, it comes back into the United States. So when you force companies out—and we have some of the strongest and most stringent EPA requirements for air and water—when you force those companies to leave our

country, take the jobs with them, we still breathe dirtier air than we would have. So there has got to be a common ground.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me take just a second to say another case of un-regulation is the fertilizer plant blowing up in West, Texas, that had not been inspected in over 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the ranking member of the Rules Committee, my friend, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Oklahoma. But I say that this House is not working. And the American people are angry with all of us, 100 percent of us.

The gentleman from Florida just said “surely we can find common ground.” The gentleman talked about shutting down the government being an unreasonable response, although many in his party promote that. The President’s not promoting it; the President is against it. You know our side is against that. Surely, we can reach common ground.

Yesterday, we had eight bills on the floor on suspension. The public doesn’t know process, I understand that—they’re not too interested in hearing about process. But suspensions make for short debates and no amendments, no ability to make changes in those bills. That’s why they were offered on suspension.

□ 1315

Apparently, three of those bills were pulled because they didn’t think they had the votes. I don’t think they had the votes either—“they” being the majority.

So what did they do in their pursuit of a transparent “let the House work its will” pledge that they had made to the American public when they sought control, being in the majority? They’ve gone to the Rules Committee. One rule, five bills. How can you debate five different bills with rules, whether the rules are correct? And what are those rules? Closed, no amendments, limited discussion.

Yesterday, we had an appropriations bill on the floor. It was pulled. It was pulled, as I predicted it would be, because the Republican majority cannot get its act together. It disagrees with itself. It is a deeply divided party.

I was just on television, and they played a clip of Rush Limbaugh before that, and Rush Limbaugh said “we ought not to compromise because we don’t have anything in common with them”—meaning Democrats. My response was: “Oh, I think Rush Limbaugh is wrong.”

We are all Americans, and we are all elected here by Americans to serve

them and to serve their country, to serve our communities and our neighbors, and to try to do things that make sense. Americans elected all of us from different places, different interests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I say this because, Mr. Speaker, the American people need to know what’s happening.

They pulled the Transportation-Housing bill. I wasn’t for that bill as it came out of committee, nor were any Democrats that voted on it in committee, but they brought it to the floor and then pulled it. Nine days from tomorrow, nine legislative days from tomorrow, we are going to have that issue of how we are going to fund government and keep it running.

The Senate just a few minutes ago refused to allow the Senate—because the Republican Party voted “no” on bringing debate to close after days of debate and discussion, and they voted “no” to take the HUD bill up for discussion.

So in both Houses the Republican Party has abandoned the appropriations process. Now, I’ve just said that.

HAL ROGERS, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a conservative Republican, says this:

“I am extremely disappointed with the decision to pull the bill from the House calendar today. The prospects of passing this bill in September are bleak at best, given the vote count on passage that was apparent this afternoon. With this action, the House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted” without a single Democratic vote.

He went on to say—Mr. ROGERS, conservative, Kentucky, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Republican:

Thus, I believe that the House has made its choice: sequestration—and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.

The Ryan budget was unrealistic when it was considered on this floor. Mr. ROGERS voted for that budget. He knew then it was unrealistic. He knew then it could not be implemented.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I predicted then that if you took every Democrat out of the House and every Democrat out of the Senate, that that budget could not be implemented through the appropriations process and through the Ways and Means process, and I was right.

Yes, we need to seek common ground. We are hurting the economy, we are undermining the confidence of the

American people and, indeed, we are undermining the confidence of our international partners.

TOM COLE sits here representing the Rules Committee. I want to tell everybody in America TOM COLE is a reasonable Member of this House. He’s been a leader of this House. He wants to see common ground, in my view, so I do not criticize him.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, as you tap the gavel, time is not only running out on STENY HOYER, time is running out on this House, time is running out on America, time is running out on the patience of Americans that their House is not working.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing on full display the utter failure of Republicans to govern as the majority.

Yesterday, after the Speaker and Majority Leader pulled the Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development appropriations bill from the floor, because they didn’t have the votes to pass it, chairman HAL ROGERS of the Appropriations Committee—that is, Republicans’ top appropriator—issued a scathing rebuke to his party’s own sequester strategy.

He wrote:

With this action, the House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted just three months ago. Thus, I believe that the House has made its choice: sequestration—and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.

Not my words, Mr. Speaker, but the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

What a shame that we are now harming our national security and limiting our ability to protect the most vulnerable people in America through this sequester process.

It is also hurting our economic recovery, as the nonpartisan CBO has estimated it could cost us as many as 1.6 million jobs that would have been created by the end of the next fiscal year—and 1.3 percentage points of added GDP.

The sequester is a result of Congress stalling on tough decisions and an insistence by tea party Republicans on divesting from America and dismantling the foundations of the American Dream.

And it has been embraced by the Republican leadership as their singular approach to deficits.

But the sequester is not a rational or responsible solution.

It was never meant to be.

The mere threat of sequester was intended to be so severe that it would compel both parties to cooperate and find a balanced alternative.

Now, like Chairman ROGERS, many Republicans are growing tired of the sequester and are ready to compromise.

But not the Republican leadership, and that is very sad.

The complete implosion of their appropriations strategy demonstrates that, in order to pass appropriations or any substantive legislation, Republicans will have to compromise and work with Democrats in a bipartisan way.

It is sad and shameful that we are about to adjourn for a 5-week district work period, leaving critical business to create jobs and tackle deficits unfinished, while Republicans waste this Congress's time on a 40th vote to repeal ObamaCare.

When we return in September, I hope Republicans will see this week's appropriations debacle as their own appropriations chairman has—and abandon their reckless support for the sequester.

Let us focus now on seeking bipartisan compromise and the big, balanced solution that will restore fiscal sanity and give American families and businesses the certainty they deserve.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend—and he is my friend—I think is really one of the great speakers of this Chamber. I mean that with all sincerity.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE. But this isn't the Senate. We don't have unlimited debate over here, so he's kind of stretching it a little bit, but it's always worth listening to.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I will certainly yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. I used to be the majority leader, and the thing that I hated losing most was my magic 1 minute, because as the gentleman will recall, it was an unlimited 1 minute.

Mr. COLE. And I want to say, my friend, the gentleman, exercised it to the extreme, but he's always worth listening to.

I want to underscore a point my good friend made, because I do agree with you very much about government shutdown. I don't think that's a responsible tactic. I've seen it advocated from time to time from people on both sides of the aisle. We've had reports of it from advisors to the President. I certainly wouldn't suggest the President would agree with that. But I hope we don't get there, and I will pledge to work with my friend to make sure that we do not.

I also think, though, that we ought to recognize that we have worked together on some occasions. My friend and I worked together on the fiscal cliff, we worked together on violence against women, we worked together on Sandy, we worked together, actually, on the CR in March. So there are times when we can come together.

We are working together now. I suspect the President will soon sign the Student Loan Act, an act that was originated on our side—problems were on the Senate side—and passed. Eventually, they came around and saw the same thing the way the President and we saw it on this side of the aisle.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield, I say respectfully to my friend, we think the President sent down a piece of legislation similar to yours,

correct. But we both worked together; you're right.

Mr. COLE. We did. I appreciate that, and we found common ground. I hope we can again.

But also when we're lectured a little bit on rules—and, look, we both wear these hats occasionally—I will remind my friends, when they were in the majority, the rules under which they brought a massive health care bill to this floor with almost no debate, a massive stimulus, billions of dollars, with essentially no debate and no consideration, the Dodd-Frank rule.

So whatever sins have been committed on our side of the aisle, I would suggest this is one where you need to look at the log in your own eye in terms of the size and scope of that legislation and the rules that accompany them.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield on that point?

Mr. COLE. I will yield to the gentleman on that.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is correct. Both sides have done it. But you will recall, your side criticized us very substantially and said you would not do it. That I think is the difference. But both sides, you're absolutely correct, have brought rules that have been closed and limited in their scope.

Mr. COLE. Reclaiming my time, I seriously doubt that you have never said we wouldn't do this. I've heard the same thing when we talk about debt ceiling where we know the rules get reversed from time to time.

So I think this legislation—and I think it's very significant legislation—but I don't think it ranks with either of the three examples that I gave in which this body was not given the opportunity. Frankly, I think the Republican majority is here today largely because that's the way the House was operated the way the last time my friends had an opportunity to do that.

But regardless of that, I appreciate my friend's remarks as always. I always enjoy the exchange, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me some time to talk about one specific bill that this rule would allow the House to consider.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on the underlying bill. It's called the REINS Act, Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act.

What does that mean? Well, that's a bill that says anytime there's a regulation adopted pursuant to a law that we passed that costs over a certain amount of money, Congress is going to pass the regulation. Well, that just

delays things and means special interests can get in here and stop those regulations that are needed to protect the public health and the environment.

I want to give an example. I asked the Rules Committee to make in order that this particular bill shouldn't stop proposed FDA food safety regulations. Well, they didn't even allow me to offer that amendment.

But the reason I wanted to offer that amendment and the reason this bill is not a good bill, is that foodborne illnesses, we are seeing outbreaks striking often and more frequently, and that can happen to anybody, Democrat or Republican. Foods we never thought would have imagined to be unsafe—everything from spinach to peanut butter—have sickened an untold number of Americans. Our food supply has also become increasingly globalized, which poses another danger. So 50 percent of our fresh fruit and 20 percent of our fresh vegetables are imported, and this imported food is responsible for a large share of the number of foodborne illness outbreaks. Since 2011, eight of the 19 multi-State outbreaks were from imports.

So what did Congress do? Well, we said we've got to do something about it, and we adopted a bill on a bipartisan basis called the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act. It passed in 2010. That law provided FDA the power to set a way to police the food supply and make significant improvements throughout the food chain from the farm to the dinner table to stop these unsafe foods.

FDA has been working hard to comply with this mandate. This year, they issued three proposed rules that would implement some of the key pieces of the food safety legislation.

One rule would require farmers to comply with science-based standards for safe production and harvesting of produce. Another would require companies that process or package foods to implement preventive systems to stop outbreaks before they occur.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. The purpose of these rules are to stop and prevent the outbreak of foodborne illnesses.

Last week, FDA issued a proposed rule to mandate that importers demonstrate that the food they bring into the country is safe. Well, these rules will not be allowed to go into effect until Congress—both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States with all their committees and subcommittees—meet to consider the regulations that FDA adopted. While they're doing all of that, we'll be exposed to foodborne illnesses.

My amendment would make this process of the REINS bill unnecessary

as it applies to this particular area, but it illustrates why the REINS bill is not well thought through. Congress shouldn't have to adopt every regulation if we adopt a law saying to an agency "adopt regulations based on the science, adopt regulations to enforce the law."

I would urge we oppose the rule and oppose the REINS bill as well.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

□ 1330

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, there were 87 new Members elected in the last session of the Congress—about half of them Republicans, about half of them Democrats. I'll tell you what, we all got the same message in the last election, and that was that the people in this country had had it with gridlock and partisanship, and they wanted to see some more collaboration, some co-operation, some problem-solving, fixing things, getting things done.

There is so much that we agree on. I mean, our roads are in need of repair; our bridges are literally falling down; the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer; the middle class is getting crushed, and we all want to rebuild this middle class; there are millions of people who are unemployed every day, and there are millions more who are underemployed.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a businessman. I've been a business owner, responsible for the bottom line and for getting things done in my business. I've got to tell you, if we weren't getting the job done, we wouldn't be going on a 5-week recess, vacation—or whatever it is you want to call it. There are so many pressing needs, and we are scheduled to be in session for 9 days in September, and we know what those Mondays and Tuesdays are like. We know what happens here. So we're looking at about 3 or 4 days, and what have we got to deal with? We have to deal with appropriations, the budget, the farm bill, the jobs bill, immigration, transportation, the debt ceiling—and there are Members of this Congress who are calling for a shutdown of the Federal Government.

So I wanted to address just two things today. One is to postpone, or delay, this recess; and let's take up a couple of things. Like I said, our bridges are falling down. Let's take up the SAFE Bridges Act that Congressman RAHALL has offered. Let's take up the American Jobs Act that the President has offered. Let's put people to work in this country. Let's support Congresswoman SLAUGHTER's motion to defeat the previous question, and let's amend it to allow for the consideration of the SAFE Bridges Act.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what is particularly frustrating about what we are doing here today is that this is a colossal waste of time. We are taking up five bills that are going nowhere in the Senate. The President has already issued veto threats on all of them. These are just press releases that the Republican National Committee has decided would be good things for Republican Members to release in their districts. None of this stuff is meaningful. It's going nowhere.

We are also repealing the Affordable Care Act for the 40th time. When the gentleman says that the Affordable Care Act is not popular, I will remind him that we had a referendum on the Affordable Care Act—it was called a Presidential election. The last time I checked, Mitt Romney was not in the White House. I think he's out on his yacht somewhere, but he's certainly not in the White House.

So we are doing this meaningless stuff, and we have 9 legislative days left before the end of the fiscal year, before we approach a government shutdown, and we have people on the other side of the aisle—people running for President on the other side of the aisle—publicly bragging about how they want to shut the government down.

Now, I have great respect for the gentleman from Oklahoma. I think he is a reasonable, rational, good Member of this Congress. I wish there were more like him on his side of the aisle, but there aren't. In fact, the Republican Party is being ruled by the fringe right-wing elements of that party—those who are pushing for a shutdown, those who are saying compromise on nothing, those who helped defeat the farm bill, those who, quite frankly, are insisting on budget numbers that are so unbelievably low for things like our infrastructure that they had to pull the Transportation-HUD bill from the floor yesterday.

We ought to be fixing sequester. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, on our side of the aisle, has an alternative to sequester. We ought to vote on it. My Republican friends haven't allowed a vote on an alternative to sequester all year—nothing. We ought to go to conference on the budget so that we can actually get a budget so that we can have reasonable numbers on our appropriations bills that we can pass and be proud that we're doing something to put people back to work. We are doing nothing in this House. We ought not go on recess until we do the people's business.

Mr. COLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we did have a referendum on ObamaCare. Do you know what we got? We got a split decision because, while the American people certainly reelected the President, they also reelected a Republican House. That's a hard thing to achieve in what my friends would regard as a great Presidential victory. We had 435 different referendums about this. So the American people, for whatever reason, either wanted the debate to continue or certainly didn't want to leave the President, as they did in 2009 and 2010, with essentially total control over the legislative branch. They didn't like what they saw then, and I don't think they would like what they would see if that were to happen.

As for our friends in the Senate, letting them decide what the agenda is going to be in the House, I think, is, quite frankly, a mistake. They don't get a lot done over there. Every now and then, though, they'll surprise you.

I remember hearing these same arguments about the Student Loan Act in that, gosh, what we were planning and proposing, even though it was relatively close to what the President proposed, was never going to happen. In fact, if you'll remember at one point and if I recall correctly, I think the President, himself, issued a veto threat against the legislation. So, had we followed our friend's advice, everybody's student loans in America would be skyrocketing right now.

Every now and then, you just have to go out and fight for the things that you believe in; and, amazingly, sometimes the United States Senate will come around, and, occasionally, the President of the United States will change his mind or at least will decide this was close enough to be good enough.

So I would suggest we just continue to get up every day as we all do, to work as best we can for the things that we believe in, and at the end of the day—believe me—the American people will make a judgment, and we'll see what happens.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule.

Every weekend, I go home to New Mexico, and my constituents always ask me: What's going on in Congress? What is Congress doing to create jobs and grow the economy and end the sequester?

There are currently 2,000 constituents in my district who are getting furloughed every week, and they want to know. There are countless teachers, construction workers, small business

owners, and first responders; and they want to know. Unfortunately, the answer is “nothing” because of the House Republican leadership. They simply cannot govern.

Yesterday, Republicans pulled the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill from the schedule, illustrating that the sequester and the Republican budget are not feasible. Tomorrow, we will adjourn for a 5-week district work period, and we still haven’t passed a jobs bill or a budget that replaces the sequester or that reduces the deficit, and we haven’t passed comprehensive immigration reform. Instead of addressing any of these critical issues, House Republicans have decided that it’s more important to vote one more time to repeal the Affordable Care Act—for the 40th time.

Mr. Speaker, New Mexicans and Americans want Congress to focus on jobs and economic growth.

Mr. COLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to a number of points my friends have made about the issue of sequester. I simply want to remind them whose idea it was. If they have any doubt, they should read the Bob Woodward book, “The Price of Politics,” or follow the lively correspondence that came after the book was published.

The reality is that the idea of sequester was the President’s proposal. He proposed it; he advocated for it; he signed it into law. Now we hear from our friends, gosh, the Republicans won’t undo it or we didn’t really mean that it would actually ever happen.

We’ve had this discussion before. The simple truth is that we are willing to renegotiate where the cuts come from. We actually agree with our friends on that. What they’re not willing to do is to actually reduce spending. That’s essentially what the debate is about.

This is the method that the President recommended, signed and advocated for. If he wants to undo it—something, by the way, this House twice in the last term did, but our friends in the Senate never picked it up, and the President never came up with a counteroffer, so we’re sort of still waiting over here—and if the President would like to redistribute the cuts, I have no doubt the Speaker would like to talk to him. But the idea that we’re just going to simply undo it and lose all the savings, I think, is also unlikely to occur.

So let’s sit down. We all know there are better ways to do this. We’re willing to do that on our side, but we are not willing to raise taxes, and we are not willing to lose savings.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), a

member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Ms. TITUS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and the underlying bills. I am especially disappointed that my amendment to H.R. 367, the REINS Act, wasn’t made in order.

My amendment would have protected women and children from the delay and obstructionism in this bill by exempting the Family Medical Leave Act, the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act, the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, and the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act from the bill’s intrusive provisions.

These four laws safeguard the economic, social, and physical well-being of women and children in Nevada and across the country. They give mothers the chance to care for a new child, ensure that our students have access to nutritious food, protect the rights of students with disabilities, and help women fight for equal pay for equal work.

My amendment would have offered the Republicans a chance to be reasonable and to dial back their war on the most vulnerable in our country.

H.R. 367, like the other bills being considered under this rule, would hinder our government’s ability to serve the people, and it is simply a waste of valuable time. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, instead of bickering over partisan pieces of legislation that will go nowhere, we should be working to fix the sequester and hammer out a budget that creates jobs, grows our middle class, and responsibly reduces the deficit.

We should be taking up a well-funded Transportation and Housing appropriations bill rather than the draconian measure that drastically underfunded projects like those in my home district, such as the Elgin-O’Hare and the Barrington Road and Interstate 90 interchange. We need to make investments to rebuild our bridges, to improve our infrastructure, and to keep our children safe. We should be working on comprehensive immigration reform that is practical, fair, and humane. Reform with a pathway to citizenship will expand our workforce, secure our borders, and bring in new revenue to help us balance our budget.

I was sent to Washington to work on legislation that creates jobs and tackles the deficit. I don’t want to leave for a 5-week district work period without taking some action on our critical, unfinished business.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer on our side an amendment to the rule that allows the House to consider the SAFE Bridges Act, which funds emergency repairs and creates countless American jobs. We are about to go into a 5-week break; and so far, the Congress has done nothing to end sequestration or to create jobs for the country. My amendment will prevent the House from going home until we have done the job we were sent here to do.

To discuss our proposal, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. LARSEN), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support Ranking Member SLAUGHTER’s motion to call up the SAFE Bridges Act.

In May, a portion of a bridge on Interstate 5 in my district collapsed into the Skagit River. Like most of my constituents, I’ve driven over that bridge hundreds of times. The fact that no one died when it collapsed was a blessing, but not everyone has been so lucky. My colleagues will remember in 2007 when a bridge spanning the Mississippi River in Minneapolis crashed down during rush hour, killing 13 people and injuring 145.

So, today, I want to ask my colleagues a very simple question: Should not Americans be able to drive across a highway bridge with the reasonable expectation that it will not crumble away from underneath them?

There are 67,000 bridges in our country that are rated structurally deficient—67,000 bridges. When those bridges fall, it isn’t just the unlucky few on those bridges who suffer. Whole economies that rely on safe and efficient transportation suffer. The I-5 bridge across the Skagit River doesn’t just connect Burlington and Mount Vernon. It connects the entire west coast and carries millions of dollars’ worth of trade every day between Canada and the U.S.

□ 1345

Here’s the good news: we know how to build safe bridges. There are thousands of civil engineers devoting their lives today to building good structures that don’t fall down, but we need to pay for them. We need to maintain our bridges until they’re old and replace them when we need to. We can’t wait for them to crumble into the water below.

In light of this obvious need, how much has this Congress done to improve bridge safety or invest in infrastructure?

Mr. Speaker, that was the sound of how much congressional action has been taken—nothing.

Just yesterday, house leadership pulled the Transportation appropriations bill because they couldn't find enough Republicans to support its draconian cuts. Instead of rushing home, we should take up the SAFE Bridges Act introduced by Mr. RAHALL to im-

mediately invest in bridges. Rather than repealing ObamaCare for the 40th time this Congress, we should invest in our infrastructure for the first time.

If you think your constituents should be able to drive over a bridge without wondering whether it will crumble be-

neath them, then this Congress must act on robust transportation funding.

Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD a State-by-State funding table under the SAFE Bridges Act.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF \$2,750,000,000 FOR EACH OF FISCAL YEARS 2013 AND 2014 BASED ON THE DRAFT BILL, STRENGTHEN AND FORTIFY EXISTING BRIDGES ACT OF 2013

State	Estimated FY 2013	Estimated FY 2014	Estimated Total
ALABAMA	34,528,552	34,528,552	69,057,105
ALASKA	10,150,614	10,150,614	20,301,227
ARIZONA	14,438,937	14,438,937	28,877,874
ARKANSAS	28,254,401	28,254,401	56,508,803
CALIFORNIA	232,052,224	232,052,224	464,104,449
COLORADO	15,902,404	15,902,404	31,804,807
CONNECTICUT	126,132,725	126,132,725	252,265,450
DELAWARE	8,962,416	8,962,416	17,924,832
DIST. OF COL.	20,403,500	20,403,500	40,806,999
FLORIDA	46,328,630	46,328,630	92,657,259
GEORGIA	24,586,058	24,586,058	49,172,116
HAWAII	17,770,494	17,770,494	35,540,988
IDAHO	7,397,016	7,397,016	14,794,031
ILLINOIS	88,159,721	88,159,721	176,319,441
INDIANA	37,906,433	37,906,433	75,812,866
IOWA	31,283,878	31,283,878	62,567,756
KANSAS	22,117,236	22,117,236	44,234,472
KENTUCKY	38,179,080	38,179,080	76,358,160
LOUISIANA	123,906,912	123,906,912	247,813,824
MAINE	18,533,603	18,533,603	37,067,205
MARYLAND	63,577,346	63,577,346	127,154,692
MASSACHUSETTS	137,288,383	137,288,383	274,576,767
MICHIGAN	49,782,579	49,782,579	99,565,158
MINNESOTA	22,911,312	22,911,312	45,822,625
MISSISSIPPI	20,657,648	20,657,648	41,315,297
MISSOURI	63,319,326	63,319,326	126,638,651
MONTANA	7,815,085	7,815,085	15,630,171
NEBRASKA	15,165,106	15,165,106	30,330,212
NEVADA	2,891,304	2,891,304	5,782,609
NEW HAMPSHIRE	15,442,851	15,442,851	30,885,702
NEW JERSEY	137,486,038	137,486,038	274,972,076
NEW MEXICO	5,953,606	5,953,606	11,907,212
NEW YORK	341,675,601	341,675,601	683,351,202
NORTH CAROLINA	63,124,530	63,124,530	126,249,060
NORTH DAKOTA	3,830,998	3,830,998	7,661,997
OHIO	111,055,549	111,055,549	222,111,097
OKLAHOMA	39,269,408	39,269,408	78,538,816
OREGON	54,382,275	54,382,275	108,764,549
PENNSYLVANIA	250,234,865	250,234,865	500,469,731
RHODE ISLAND	37,487,542	37,487,542	74,975,083
SOUTH CAROLINA	21,911,959	21,911,959	43,823,919
SOUTH DAKOTA	6,903,255	6,903,255	13,806,510
TENNESSEE	29,951,857	29,951,857	59,903,714
TEXAS	73,722,532	73,722,532	147,445,064
UTAH	6,055,018	6,055,018	12,110,037
VERMONT	9,894,077	9,894,077	19,788,153
VIRGINIA	84,581,236	84,581,236	169,162,472
WASHINGTON	79,795,827	79,795,827	159,591,654
WEST VIRGINIA	28,908,317	28,908,317	57,816,633
WISCONSIN	14,616,136	14,616,136	29,232,273
WYOMING	3,313,600	3,313,600	6,627,199
TOTAL	2,750,000,000	2,750,000,000	5,500,000,000

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. May I inquire if my colleague has more speakers?

Mr. COLE. I do not have any more speakers, and I'm prepared to close whenever my friend is.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I shall close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we speak, sequestration is hitting very hard in communities all across the country. Federal employees are furloughed; important investments in science, technology, public health, and defense are being curtailed; children are being shut out of Head Start. Meanwhile, the majority has repeatedly refused to repeal the sequester and have failed to pass a single job bill creation into law.

The American people need us to stop these political games and get down to work creating jobs and rebuilding this economy. Now is not the time to adjourn Congress, and we should not leave here until we have produced real

results for the American families that are truly struggling to get by.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" to defeat the previous question and to vote "no" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I want to begin by reminding my friends whose idea sequester was. It was the President of the United States.

The President likes to take some credit—and in some ways he deserves some—for our budget deficit coming down. Frankly, after four trillion-dollar deficits in a row, a Republican Con-

gress came into office and that deficit is now moving down. It's about half of what it was. We've worked with the President to actually achieve something he said he wanted to, which is lower the deficit. He likes to take credit for it.

Second, I'd like to also remind my friends, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that I think these bills really are good bills. They provide important checks on the expanding power of the executive branch. How many times have all of us gone home and been regaled with tales of bureaucrats that are simply out of control or rules that make no sense or have an enormous economic impact? It happens all the time. That needs to change.

Senator Daniel Webster described the Federal Government as "made by the people, made by the people, and answerable to the people." I would suggest we've forgotten the last of these three phases, "answerable to the people." That's what these bills are about,

trying to make the Federal Government more responsive and more answerable to the people. The underlying bills recognize just that and restore the power of governance to elected officials, not to unaccountable Washington bureaucrats.

I would urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on Rules filed its report (H. Rept. 113-187) to accompany House Resolution 322 the Committee was unaware that the waiver of all points of order against consideration of H.R. 2879 included:

A waiver of clause 9(a)(2) of rule XXI, prohibiting consideration of a bill or joint resolution not reported by a committee, unless the chair of each committee of initial referral has caused a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to its consideration. The required statement from the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the primary committee of jurisdiction, was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated July 31, 2013. However, the required statement from the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, which also received an additional referral, was submitted for printing on August 1, 2013. Both statements provide that H.R. 2879 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits.

A waiver of clause 11 of rule XXI, prohibiting the consideration of a bill or joint resolution which has not been reported by a committee until the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which such measure has been available to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner. While the text of the bill is substantially identical to the three bills previously debated in the House on July 31, 2013, H.R. 2879 was not introduced until later that day.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 322 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 10. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2428) to direct the Secretary of Transportation to assist States to rehabilitate or replace certain bridges, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Com-

mittee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 11. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 10 of this resolution.

SEC. 12. It shall not be in order to consider a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment or adjournment sine die unless the House has been notified that the President has signed legislation to provide for the creation of American jobs.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 1582.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 315 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1582.

Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1353

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, with Mr. YODER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 31, 2013, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113-174 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113-174.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, lines 11 through 17, amend subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

(D)(i) an estimate of the total benefits of the rule and when such benefits are expected to be realized;

(ii) a description of the modeling, the calculations, the assumptions, and the limitations due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information associated with the estimates under this subparagraph; and

(iii) a certification that all data and documents relied upon by the Agency in developing such estimates—

(I) have been preserved; and

(II) are available for review by the public on the Agency's Web site, except to the extent to which publication of such data and documents would constitute disclosure of confidential information in violation of applicable Federal law;

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to talk about an amendment that recognizes that knowledge is power.

So often today, we've talked about what we can do to make the government more accountable to the people. One of those things is entailed in the underlying bill that says, for these big rules that make a big difference, tell us what it is that you did. How did you come to this decision that this is the rule that you want to implement? My amendment goes one step further and asks for the underlying data on which that decision was made. We want to know what those calculations were.

It's going to be a good step forward if we can get agencies to share with us their modeling, but one step further would be those calculations that went into the modeling and came out of the modeling. What about the underlying data, Mr. Chairman? How in the world can we be in a conversation with the American people as the Congress with the agencies if we don't have access to the underlying data?

This is not a trade secret. This is not private information. This is the information that the agency uses to promulgate these rules that will then govern the entire United States of Amer-

ica. We simply say, if the disclosure of that data won't violate any laws, if it won't violate any trade secrets, if it's not going to be in violation of any applicable Federal laws, share that with America, post that on your Web page so that anyone who is interested in understanding how it is that these decisions that often go on behind closed doors, that often go on without the oversight of the public, not just what did you decide, but how did you decide it.

It's very difficult, whether you're a Republican or whether you're a Democrat, to hold the considered experts at these agencies accountable if you can't see the underlying data that went into their calculations. It's a simple amendment that says please share that with us. We're not questioning your expertise. We simply want to be a part of that process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, as I rise in opposition to this amendment, the supporters would claim that it's about transparency. What it's really about is not transparency. It's about a way to block or delay critical EPA rules. That's what this whole bill is all about. The amendment does the same thing. They use rhetoric about transparency to cloud the amendment's true impact.

The amendment would prevent EPA from using the best science available when implementing its public health laws. It accomplishes this by not allowing EPA to rely on any scientific study unless the agency can publish, on its Web site, all of the underlying data associated with that study.

Today, EPA prides itself on using the best science available. The Agency understands that ideology will not stand the test of time, but science will; and their rules and regulations have to be based on the science, so they gladly inform stakeholders and the public about the studies upon which they rely.

The underlying data to peer-reviewed studies is often not published. That's because the data sets underlying peer-reviewed scientific studies are the property of the scientists that spend their careers gathering that information. The EPA cannot require the scientists to give up their private information. Oftentimes, those studies involve going to a lot of people and trying to find out the impact of certain exposure to pollutants. Those people agree to the study on the basis that this information about them will not be made public. But this amendment would say it would be impossible for EPA to use gold-standard scientific studies available to them unless they post this other data on their Web site.

Why do we want to prevent EPA from using high-quality scientific studies to set new pollution standards?

□ 1400

This is an issue that came up many years ago. In 1997, EPA used a study conducted by researchers at Harvard to set a new air quality standard for particulate matter. They did a rigorous peer-reviewed study that was conducted over a period of 16 years. The Harvard people showed conclusively that exposure to particulate matter in the air can kill people, while polluters said: We don't want EPA to issue this rule, it's going to cost us money.

So they said that EPA should publish all of the Harvard scientists' data, claiming that the scientists were keeping a secret. Well, the data is the work product and property of the Harvard scientists, not EPA. The agency couldn't release that information. They're relying on the Harvard scientists to give independent scientists access to the data after the scientists signed a confidentiality agreement. So independent scientists spent the next 3 years reanalyzing the data, and came to exactly the same conclusion.

There should be no objection to EPA relying on studies like this one. It's a long-term study with a huge sample. This is exactly the kind of rigorous review we expect of EPA. I urge opposition to this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to say nothing can be further from the truth. There is a specific provision in this amendment that says you shall not disclose anything for which the disclosure would violate your commitments under Federal law. All we're asking is for whatever EPA saw, whatever the agency saw to make their decision. If it was good enough for the agency, shouldn't it be good enough for Congress as well?

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why somebody would object to this. The bill is about transparency, and this amplifies that transparency. EPA can impose rules which cost tens or even hundreds of billions of dollars on the U.S. economy. Those expenses translate into jobs lost.

Having access to the underlying information, and the estimates of cost and benefits, is critical to know why that is. And as my colleague said, there is no reason to have to reveal information about individuals. And let me just point to the medical literature. In the medical literature, there is a push that when the Federal Government funds research, that that underlying data is made subject, is made available to the general public. When the FDA reviews drugs, FDA will look at underlying data. So why would we require it for

medications, which obviously affect many people, but not for the EPA. Having methodology which is transparent is absolutely essential in modern scientific literature. I don't see why there is an objection to it unless the hope is that EPA can satisfy an ideological bent without having to justify it.

This amendment will provide more transparency for EPA's billion-dollar rules. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment and "yes" on the underlying bill. The American people cannot afford to have jobs shipped overseas or have their economy otherwise wrecked. More rationality, transparency, and accountability must be brought to the EPA and its rulemaking process.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that EPA does not have this underlying data. It doesn't belong to EPA. It belongs to the scientists who did the study.

Consider this issue in a different context. If a pharmaceutical manufacturer wants to bring a new product to market, they would never be required to post all of their underlying data on the public Web site in order for FDA to rely on it. There's no other agency that would be held to such an unreasonable requirement as this amendment would impose on EPA. They review the data, but they don't put it on their Web site. EPA does not have the underlying data, and they can't require that the owners of the underlying data who did the study, often based on confidential agreements for those who participate in the study, they can't require that study be given to them. They are relying on the scientific data and the study results.

I think all this would do is make it more difficult for EPA to protect the public health.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to say that I think I speak for most of America that says I understand the government has to make decisions, but since the government is making those decisions on my behalf, shouldn't the government share with me the data that it uses to make those decisions?

The gentleman says this is going to hold EPA to a higher standard than the other agencies. I would say to the gentleman, you can look forward to me being back with this same amendment for absolutely every agency.

All we're saying is if you've seen the data, if you've utilized the data, if you believe this is sound enough science on which to base a regulation that is going to cost not \$1, not \$100, not \$1,000, not \$1 million, but more than \$1 billion, isn't it worth sharing with the

American people how you reached that conclusion?

Mr. Chairman, the work that we do here, we should be proud enough of to share with absolutely anyone who asks. This is about transparency. And even if you don't support the underlying bill—I'm a strong supporter, but even if you don't—you should support in the context of transparency providing the underlying materials to the American public that went into this decisionmaking process.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great step forward as a transparency tool for the American public to restore that faith in government that has been lost.

I rise in strong support of the underlying bill and ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 5 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113-174.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the committee print, add the following section:

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON USE OF SOCIAL COST OF CARBON IN ANALYSIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any executive order, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not use the social cost of carbon in order to incorporate social benefits of reducing carbon dioxide emissions, or for any other reason, in any cost-benefit analysis relating to an energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than \$1 billion unless and until a Federal law is enacted authorizing such use.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "social cost of carbon" means the social cost of carbon as described in the technical support document entitled "Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013, or any successor or substantially related document, or any other estimate of the monetized damages associated with an incremental increase in carbon dioxide emissions in a given year.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I have an amendment in order that would prohibit the EPA from using "social cost of carbon" estimates for any energy-related rule that costs more than \$1 billion unless and until a Federal law is enacted authorizing such use.

The administration slipped into a rule about microwave ovens a new prediction for the cost of carbon dioxide between now and the year 2300. Despite the profound implications to the economy and the families who make a living from coal, there was no public debate, no stakeholder comment, no vote in Congress on this new estimate.

In southwestern Pennsylvania, coal is our heritage. It fires the steel mills that built the Empire State Building, the St. Louis Arch, and the Golden Gate Bridge. But that heritage and prosperity is threatened by this new regulation. We've already seen what the social cost of the war on coal is today—the cost is jobs.

Three weeks ago, more than 380 workers at the Hatfield's Ferry and Mitchell power plants in Pennsylvania were told they are losing their jobs. The plants had to shut down under EPA regulations after they had spent hundreds of millions of dollars in new environmental modernizations.

More than 15 organizations representing workers and stakeholders endorse my amendment because these groups share my concern that this bypassed congressional oversight and will put hundreds of thousands of miners, boilermakers, factory workers, laborers, railroaders, electricians, operating engineers, steamfitters and machinists out of work.

My amendment says Congress, not the EPA, decides regulations by considering what this means to the families and workers. The EPA's policies have real-world consequences. Annual coal production in central Appalachia is dropping sharply—by more than half in just 5 years' time. There are towns where mines are shutting down, where a staggering 41 percent of the residents fall below the poverty line.

The social cost of carbon and the wider war on coal is a war on the American worker and their family.

Let me show you the real cost of the EPA's rules. Those who oppose this amendment ignore the health effects on those living in poverty, who are twice as likely to have a risk of depression, asthma, obesity, diabetes, heart attacks, and other health effects. Poverty leads to devastated communities, early death, and lost dreams of a generation of Americans and their children.

Many of us can remember Bobby Kennedy's walk through those broken Appalachian coal towns back in the 1960s to illustrate the abject poverty where families and children were living. I worked and volunteered in those towns, trying to help families hang on

to some sort of semblance of hope in a hard-scrabble life.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Too often their hope failed, and now history is about to repeat itself. First, jobs are lost by the tens of thousands and, after that, the hundreds of thousands. And when people lose their jobs, we give them unemployment compensation. They go hungry; we give them food stamps. They lose unemployment; we give them welfare. They lose their homes; we give them public housing. They lose their dignity and pride, and the government has nothing left to give—nothing—when all these folks ever really wanted was a job—a job and a chance for the American dream not shattered by the EPA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. The Murphy amendment denies that carbon pollution is harmful. It prohibits the Environmental Protection Agency from considering the costs of climate change when analyzing the impacts of its rules. According to this amendment, the cost of carbon pollution is zero. Well, that's science denial at its worst. We are telling EPA the cost of carbon pollution is zero. It's like waving a magic wand. We are going to decree that climate change imposes no costs at all.

The House Republicans can vote for this amendment. They can try to block EPA from recognizing the damage caused by climate change, but they cannot overturn the laws of nature. We should be heeding the warnings of the world's leading climate scientists, not denying reality.

In the real world, scientific instruments accurately measure the levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and the levels trapped in ancient ice. Those measurements tell us that carbon dioxide levels just hit 400 parts per million this spring, and that's the highest levels in the last 3 million years. In the real world, higher levels of heat-trapping carbon pollution are warming the planet and changing the climate. We are experiencing more record-breaking temperatures, worse droughts, longer wildfire seasons with more intense wildfires, and an increased number of intense storms, more flooding, and rapidly rising sea levels. Pretend it doesn't happen. Pretend that's not the reality.

On the other hand, as the proponent of this amendment suggested, let's look at the impact on the family that may lose its job. Well, I think that ought to be under consideration, but let's not have an amendment that

would ignore the cost of carbon pollution.

We are seeing the effect of climate change not some time in the future but right now. And we're being told it's not going to get better by itself; it's going to get worse. Scientists have been telling us for years. EPA and other Federal agencies have a responsibility to calculate the cost of climate change and take them into account when they issue new standards. That's common sense, and that was the clear message from the Government Accountability Office when it added climate change to its high-risk list earlier this year, and that's exactly what the Obama administration is doing.

□ 1415

They have an interagency task force that worked, over the course of several years, to estimate the cost of the harm from carbon pollution. It incorporated the latest scientific and technical information.

I'm sorry people lose their jobs, but they don't have to lose their jobs. If an industry is told to reduce carbon emissions, they don't have to fire people. They can develop and buy the technology that would reduce that pollution.

So to help those polluters not have to do that, we're going to pretend there's no cost. Mr. MURPHY's amendment would require the government to assume zero harm, zero cost from carbon pollution and climate change.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. It's based on magical thinking. Don't be a science-denier. Vote against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have left on our side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the number two coal-producing State in America.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of my colleague Mr. MURPHY's amendment and in opposition to the EPA's arbitrary, backdoor approach to regulating carbon dioxide emissions. These regulations would and are having a catastrophic effect on jobs and economic activity across the country, especially in our coal-producing States such as West Virginia and Pennsylvania.

The administration's new Social Cost of Carbon calculation is nothing more than a gimmick used to circumvent Congress so that job-killing regulations and an anti-domestic energy agenda can move forward.

Perhaps to no one's surprise, just as the administration is stepping up its

efforts to issue regulations aimed at closing existing plants and stopping new ones, it decided, without public comment or transparency, to increase the cost of carbon by 44 percent. The fact is, U.S. carbon emissions from the energy sector have fallen in the last 4 of 5 years.

I am not willing to sacrifice West Virginia jobs to the administration's ideological efforts. I ask my colleagues to put jobs ahead of politics and pass the Murphy amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Murphy amendment, and I also want to say we should vote for that in conjunction with the gentleman from Georgia's amendment that was just heard previously.

If you walk into a greenhouse anywhere in America, do you know what the average carbon concentration will be? It won't be 350 parts per million. It won't be 400 parts per million. It will be over 1,000 parts per million. We have records that indicate the CO₂ concentration in the upper atmosphere has been as high as 5,000 to 6,000 parts per million in the past.

The gentleman from California and those adherents of his philosophy would have you believe that having a carbon concentration between 350 and 400 parts per million is somehow cataclysmic. Nothing could be further from the truth.

And this new cost of carbon calculation that the EPA and the DOE have begun to include needs to be, at a minimum, made transparent. I think it's fine until we have the facts that it shouldn't be allowed at all.

So vote for the Murphy amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, this is not my philosophy that would lead me to urge that we reduce carbon emissions. It's based on the science. Thousands of peer-reviewed scientific studies have indicated that carbon causes problems. It causes health effects, and it threatens the climate.

The homeowners in Arizona, Texas, Colorado, and California who have seen their homes ravaged by drought-stoked wildfires know the cost of carbon pollution. The families of brave firefighters know the cost of carbon pollution.

The farmers and ranchers suffering the effects of prolonged drought, many of whom have lost entire crops or been forced to sell their livestock, know the cost of carbon pollution. And the thousands who lost businesses and homes after Hurricane Sandy slammed into the east coast know the cost of carbon pollution.

That cost is not based on a philosophy. It's based on the science and the reality.

Reject this magical-thinking amendment. Don't be a science-denier. Vote against the amendment and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this isn't about denying science; this is about denying jobs and denying opportunity.

The underlying amendment here is supported by the boilermakers, the electrical workers, the operating engineers, the carpenters, and United Mine Workers, the American Energy Alliance, National Mining Association, National Taxpayers Union, and Chamber of Commerce because they want jobs and they don't want poverty.

And poverty, Mr. Chairman, is the number one threat to the environment. Poverty is the number one threat to public health. It's time Congress took charge of regulations and not unregulated divisions of the government.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1435

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 315 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1582.

Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1436

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, with Mr. FORTENBERRY (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113-174, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113-174 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. WAXMAN of California.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 230, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

AYES—183

Andrews	Grayson	Nolan
Barber	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Bass	Green, Gene	Owens
Beatty	Grijalva	Pascarell
Becerra	Gutiérrez	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Hahn	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Peters (MI)
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Himes	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Price (NC)
Bustos	Hoyer	Quigley
Butterfield	Huffman	Rangel
Capps	Israel	Rohrabacher
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Ruiz
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Keating	T.
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Ciциlline	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clarke	Kilmer	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schneider
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Clyburn	Kuster	Schwartz
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Levin	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lipinski	Sherman
Crowley	Loeb sack	Sinema
Cummings	Lofgren	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Lowe y	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Speier
DeGette	(NM)	Stallwell (CA)
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
DeLauro	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Maffei	Tierney
Dingell	Maloney,	Titus
Doggett	Carolyn	Tonko
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Duckworth	Matsui	Van Hollen
Edwards	McCollum	Vargas
Ellison	McDermott	Veasey
Engel	McGovern	Vela
Enyart	McNerney	Velázquez
Eshoo	Meeks	Visclosky
Esty	Meng	Walz
Farr	Michaud	Waters
Fattah	Moore	Watt
Foster	Moran	Waxman
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Fudge	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Neal	
Garcia	Negrete McLeod	

NOES—230

Aderholt	Calvert	Duffy
Alexander	Camp	Duncan (SC)
Amash	Cantor	Duncan (TN)
Amodei	Capito	Ellmers
Bachmann	Carter	Farenthold
Bachus	Cassidy	Fincher
Barletta	Chabot	Fitzpatrick
Barr	Chaffetz	Fleischmann
Barrow (GA)	Coble	Fleming
Barton	Coffman	Flores
Benishek	Cole	Forbes
Bentivolio	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Bilirakis	Conaway	Fox
Bishop (GA)	Cook	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Cotton	Frelinghuysen
Black	Cramer	Gallego
Blackburn	Crawford	Gardner
Bonner	Crenshaw	Garrett
Boustany	Cuellar	Gerlach
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Gibbs
Bridenstine	Daines	Gibson
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Gingrey (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Denham	Gohmert
Broun (GA)	Dent	Gosar
Buchanan	DeSantis	Gowdy
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Granger
Burgess	Diaz-Balart	Graves (GA)

Graves (MO) McHenry
 Griffin (AR) McIntyre
 Griffith (VA) McKeon
 Grimm McKinley
 Guthrie McMorris
 Hall Rodgers
 Hanna Meadows
 Harper Meehan
 Harris Messer
 Hartzler Mica
 Hastings (WA) Miller (MI)
 Heck (NV) Miller, Gary
 Hensarling Mullin
 Holding Mulvaney
 Huelskamp Murphy (PA)
 Huizenga (MI) Neugebauer
 Hultgren Noem
 Hunter Nugent
 Hurt Nunes
 Issa Nunnelee
 Jenkins Olson
 Johnson (OH) Palazzo
 Johnson, Sam Paulsen
 Jones Pearce
 Jordan Perry
 Joyce Peterson
 Kelly (PA) Petri
 King (NY) Pittenger
 Kingston Turner
 Kinzinger (IL) Poe (TX)
 Kline Valadao
 Labrador Posey
 LaMalfa Price (GA)
 Lamborn Radel
 Lance Rahall
 Lankford Reed
 Latham Reichert
 Latta Renacci
 LoBiondo Ribble
 Long Rice (SC)
 Lucas Rigell
 Luetkemeyer Roby
 Lummis Roe (TN)
 Marchant Rogers (AL)
 Marino Rogers (KY)
 Massie Rokita
 Matheson Rooney
 McCarthy (CA) Ros-Lehtinen
 McCaul Roskam
 McClintock Ross

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell King (IA) Richmond
 Collins (GA) Lewis Rogers (MI)
 Goodlatte McCarthy (NY) Ruppersberger
 Herrera Beutler Miller (FL) Sensenbrenner
 Holt Miller, George Wasserman
 Horsford Pallone Schultz
 Hudson Pelosi Young (FL)

□ 1502

Messrs. KINGSTON, POSEY, and CUELLAR changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. O’ROURKE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 428, I inadvertently voted “yes,” when my intention was to vote “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

Rothfus
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

RECORDED VOTE
 The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 224, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—182

Andrews
 Barber
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera (CA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kelly (IL)
 Loebsack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia
 Gibson
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hastings (FL)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Polis
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kelly (IL)
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lipinski
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Titus
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Maloney, Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (FL)
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Nolan
 O’Rourke
 Owens
 Pascarell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Perlmutter
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Titus
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Maloney, Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Moore
 Moran
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cotton
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais

NOES—224

Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barrow (GA)
 Barton
 Burgess
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cantor
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cantor
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cantor
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn

Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Fox
 Franks (AZ)
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Holding
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kelly (PA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Lankford
 Latham
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Lankford
 Latham
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—27

Campbell King (IA) Rogers (MI)
 Carter Lewis Ruppersberger
 Collins (GA) Luetkemeyer Rush
 Delaney McCarthy (NY) Schiff
 Frelinghuysen Miller (FL) Sensenbrenner
 Goodlatte Miller, George Wasserman
 Herrera Beutler Nadler Schultz
 Holt Pallone Young (FL)
 Horsford Pelosi Young (IN)
 Hudson Richmond

□ 1508

Mr. LARSEN of Washington changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 429, the Connolly/Kildee amendment 3, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 429, The Connolly/Kildee Amendment 3, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) on which further proceedings

were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 178, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

AYES—234

Aderholt	Garrett	Mullin
Alexander	Gerlach	Mulvaney
Amash	Gibbs	Murphy (PA)
Amodei	Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Gohmert	Noem
Bachus	Gosar	Nugent
Barletta	Gowdy	Nunes
Barr	Granger	Nunnelee
Barton	Graves (GA)	Olson
Benishek	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Bentivolio	Green, Gene	Paulsen
Bilirakis	Griffin (AR)	Pearce
Bishop (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Perry
Bishop (UT)	Grimm	Peterson
Black	Guthrie	Petri
Blackburn	Hall	Pittenger
Bonner	Hanna	Pitts
Boustany	Harper	Poe (TX)
Brady (PA)	Harris	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Hartzler	Posey
Bridenstine	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Brooks (AL)	Heck (NV)	Radel
Brooks (IN)	Hensarling	Rahall
Broun (GA)	Holding	Reed
Buchanan	Huelskamp	Reichert
Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Burgess	Hultgren	Ribble
Butterfield	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Calvert	Hurt	Rigell
Camp	Issa	Roby
Cantor	Jenkins	Roe (TN)
Capito	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Carson (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Cassidy	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Joyce	Rokita
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Rooney
Coble	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Coffman	Kingston	Roskam
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)	Rothfus
Collins (NY)	Klaine	Royce
Conaway	Labrador	Runyan
Cook	LaMalfa	Ryan (WI)
Cotton	Lamborn	Salmon
Cramer	Lance	Sanford
Crawford	Lankford	Scalise
Crenshaw	Latham	Schock
Culberson	Latta	Schweikert
Daines	LoBiondo	Scott, Austin
Davis, Rodney	Loeb	Sessions
Denham	Long	Shimkus
Dent	Lucas	Shuster
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
DesJarlais	Lummis	Sires
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Smith (MO)
Doyle	Marino	Smith (NE)
Duffy	Massie	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (SC)	Matheson	Smith (TX)
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Southerland
Ellmers	McCaul	Stewart
Enyart	McClintock	Stivers
Farenthold	McHenry	Stockman
Fincher	McIntyre	Stutzman
Fitzpatrick	McKeon	Terry
Fleischmann	McKinley	Thompson (PA)
Fleming	McMorris	Thornberry
Flores	Rodgers	Tiberi
Forbes	Meadows	Tipton
Fortenberry	Meehan	Turner
Fox	Meeks	Upton
Franks (AZ)	Messer	Valadao
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Wagner
Fudge	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Gardner	Miller, Gary	Walden

Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield

Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—178

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson

Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod

Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Campbell
Carter
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson

King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond

Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman
Schultz
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1513

Messrs. ENGEL and GRIJALVA changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, and, pursuant to House Resolution 315, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. CAPPS. Yes, I am opposed.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1582 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end, add the following section:

SEC. 5. PROTECTING THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN AND SENIORS.

This Act shall not apply with respect to rules that will result in reduced incidence of cancer, premature mortality, asthma attacks, or respiratory disease in children or seniors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer the final amendment to the bill, and I want to be clear—passage of this amendment will not prevent passage of the underlying bill. If

it's adopted, my amendment will be incorporated into the bill, and the bill will immediately be voted upon.

As currently written, H.R. 1582 would cripple the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to protect the water we drink and the air we breathe. My amendment simply ensures that the EPA can continue to protect children and seniors from the harmful impacts of pollution. My friends across the aisle claim this bill is about transparency, but let's call it what it is—just another attempt to block the EPA from doing its job.

This bill makes no sense on so many levels. It's redundant and it's unnecessary. It gives the Energy Secretary unprecedented authority to veto EPA rules, and it allows for the indefinite delays of EPA rulemaking. Our top priority should be the health of our children and of our families, not the bottom line of the polluting energy companies.

It's scary to think how many EPA protections that we now take for granted would have been delayed or derailed if this bill were law. Consider the recently finalized Mercury and Air Toxics Standards. Before these rules, there were no Federal standards limiting power plant emissions of toxic pollutants like mercury and arsenic. As we know, these toxic pollutants are really poisons. They cause a variety of serious health problems in people of all ages. They affect brain development in children, and they can cause serious birth defects when pregnant women are exposed. That's why EPA put restrictions on these toxic emissions—restrictions that protect future generations and set them up for success while also reducing preventable health care costs. If H.R. 1582 had been law, these rules could have been delayed indefinitely or could not have happened at all.

Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle talk frequently about the financial costs of these and other EPA actions, but what about the health care costs—costs that all of us pay when these preventable ailments occur—and what about the human costs of inaction?

Delaying the air toxics standards for just an additional 1 year would have resulted in more than 11,000 heart attacks, more than 120,000 asthma attacks, more than 12,000 more hospital and emergency room visits, and up to 25,300 lives lost due to smog, due to soot, due to toxic air pollution—and that's just in 1 year. Mr. Speaker, people should be more important than profit.

My amendment speaks to just this. It would simply shield the rules that protect the health of children and of seniors from this dangerous bill. If my colleagues are serious about protecting our children and our seniors, they should have no trouble supporting this amendment.

More than anyone, children and seniors rely on the EPA to do its job of protecting public health and the environment. The Mercury and Air Toxics rule and others like it are helping children and families across the Nation live healthier, longer lives. Perhaps polluters find these rules inconvenient, but the American people certainly don't. They want clean air to breathe. They want clean water to drink, and they want the peace of mind that comes from strong public health standards.

My amendment ensures that protecting the health of our children and seniors never takes a back seat to the financial interests of our polluters. So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and make sure that the health and well-being of our children and seniors always come first.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order, and I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, this bill doesn't cripple anything. Laws that are currently on the books stay on the books. The problem is that the EPA uses bad science. I say that not as a Republican. I say that as quoting other scientists.

For example, a gentleman who is a former member of the Harvard School of Public Health testified: "EPA's statistical approach is fraught with numerous assumptions and uncertainties." A physician from the Colorado School of Public Health said that the way that EPA uses statistics "is also highly misleading to policymakers."

I will make the point. You cannot be pro-family unless you are pro-environment, and you cannot be pro-environment unless you are pro-family, but you can't be either unless you first have a strong and healthy economy. Now, the Energy Consumers Relief Act simply puts a check on the billion-dollar energy rules that may hurt American families and cost American jobs.

If you support transparency and good government, you should support this bill. If you support protecting American families and consumers from higher energy costs, you should support H.R. 1582. If you support having the prosperity needed for families and for environmental health protections, you should support H.R. 1582. If you are pro-jobs, pro-economic growth and anti-poverty, you should support H.R. 1582.

I urge you to vote "no" on this motion to recommit. I urge you to support the Energy Consumers Relief Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on the passage of H.R. 1582, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 322; adoption of House Resolution 322, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1897.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, yeas 221, noes 221, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

AYES—188

Andrews	Gabbard	Moore
Barber	Galleo	Moran
Barrow (GA)	Garamendi	Murphy (FL)
Bass	Garcia	Nadler
Beatty	Grayson	Napolitano
Becerra	Green, Al	Neal
Bera (CA)	Green, Gene	Negrete McLeod
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Nolan
Bishop (NY)	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Bonamici	Hahn	Owens
Brady (PA)	Hanabusa	Pascarell
Bralley (IA)	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Payne
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Bustos	Himes	Peters (CA)
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Capps	Honda	Peterson
Capuano	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Cárdenas	Huffman	Pocan
Carney	Israel	Polis
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Jeffries	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Chu	Kaptur	Ruiz
Cicilline	Keating	Rush
Clarke	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver	Kildee	T.
Clyburn	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Kind	Sarbanes
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Conyers	Kuster	Schiff
Cooper	Langevin	Schneider
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Crowley	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	Levin	Scott, David
Cummings	Lipinski	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Loebuck	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Loftgren	Shea-Porter
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Sherman
DeGette	Lowe	Sinema
Delaney	Lujan Grisham	Sires
DeLauro	(NM)	Slaughter
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)
Deutch	(NM)	Speier
Dingell	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Doggett	Maffei	Takano
Doyle	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Duckworth	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Tierney
Ellison	Matheson	Titus
Engel	Matsui	Tonko
Enyart	McCollum	Tsongas
Eshoo	McDermott	Van Hollen
Esty	McGovern	Vargas
Farr	McIntyre	Veasey
Fattah	McNerney	Vela
Foster	Meeks	Velázquez
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Visclosky
Fudge	Michaud	Walz

Waters
Watt

Waxman
Welch

NOES—221

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodel
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishkek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar

Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall

NOT VOTING—24

Blumenauer
Campbell
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
King (IA)

Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Rahall
Richmond

Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman
Schultz
Woodall
Young (FL)

□ 1532

So the motion to recommit was re-jected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 181, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

AYES—232

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodel
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishkek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach

Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar

Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar

Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Rosen
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—181

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi

Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson

King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi

Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman
Schultz
Young (FL)

□ 1539

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 367, REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2009, KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 3, 2013, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2879, STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 322) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2009) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; providing for proceedings during the period from August 3, 2013, through September 6, 2013; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2879) to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 191, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

YEAS—222

Aderholt	Burgess	DeSantis
Alexander	Calvert	DesJarlais
Amash	Camp	Diaz-Balart
Amodel	Cantor	Duffy
Bachmann	Capito	Duncan (SC)
Bachus	Carter	Duncan (TN)
Barletta	Cassidy	Ellmers
Barr	Chabot	Farenthold
Barton	Chaffetz	Fincher
Benishek	Coble	Fitzpatrick
Bentivolio	Coffman	Fleischmann
Bilirakis	Cole	Fleming
Bishop (UT)	Collins (NY)	Flores
Black	Conaway	Forbes
Blackburn	Cook	Fortenberry
Bonner	Cotton	Fox
Boustany	Cramer	Franks (AZ)
Brady (TX)	Crawford	Frelinghuysen
Bridenstine	Crenshaw	Gardner
Brooks (AL)	Culberson	Garrett
Brooks (IN)	Daines	Gerlach
Broun (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Gibbs
Buchanan	Denham	Gibson
Bucshon	Dent	Gingrey (GA)

Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)	Rothfus
Gosar	McCaul	Royce
Gowdy	McClintock	Runyan
Granger	McHenry	Ryan (WI)
Graves (GA)	McKeon	Salmon
Graves (MO)	McKinley	Sanford
Griffin (AR)	McMorris	Scalise
Griffith (VA)	Rodgers	Schock
Grimm	Meadows	Schweikert
Guthrie	Meehan	Scott, Austin
Hall	Messer	Sessions
Hanna	Mica	Shimkus
Harper	Miller (MI)	Shuster
Harris	Miller, Gary	Simpson
Hartzler	Mullin	Smith (MO)
Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney	Smith (NE)
Heck (NV)	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Hensarling	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Holding	Noem	Southerland
Huelskamp	Nugent	Stewart
Huizenga (MI)	Nunes	Stivers
Hultgren	Nunnelee	Stockman
Hunter	Olson	Stutzman
Hurt	Palazzo	Terry
Issa	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Jenkins	Pearce	Thornberry
Johnson (OH)	Perry	Tiberi
Johnson, Sam	Petri	Tipton
Jones	Pittenger	Turner
Jordan	Pitts	Upton
Joyce	Poe (TX)	Valadao
Kelly (PA)	Pompeo	Wagner
King (NY)	Posey	Walberg
Kingston	Price (GA)	Walden
Kinzinger (IL)	Radel	Walorski
Kline	Reed	Weber (TX)
Labrador	Reichert	Webster (FL)
LaMalfa	Renacci	Wenstrup
Lamborn	Ribble	Westmoreland
Lance	Rice (SC)	Whitfield
Lankford	Rigell	Williams
Latham	Roby	Wilson (SC)
Latta	Roe (TN)	Wolf
LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	Womack
Long	Rogers (KY)	Woodall
Lucas	Rohrabacher	Yoder
Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Yoho
Lummis	Rooney	Young (AK)
Marchant	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (IN)
Marino	Roskam	
Massie	Ross	

NAYS—191

Andrews	DeFazio	Jeffries
Barber	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Delaney	Johnson, E. B.
Bass	DeLauro	Kaptur
Beatty	DelBene	Keating
Becerra	Deutch	Kelly (IL)
Bera (CA)	Dingell	Kennedy
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kildee
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Kilmer
Blumenauer	Duckworth	Kind
Bonamici	Edwards	Kirkpatrick
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Kuster
Braley (IA)	Engel	Langevin
Brown (FL)	Enyart	Larsen (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Larson (CT)
Bustos	Esty	Lee (CA)
Butterfield	Farr	Levin
Capps	Fattah	Lipinski
Capuano	Foster	Loeb
Cárdenas	Frankel (FL)	Loewenthal
Carney	Fudge	Lowe
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lujan Grisham
Cartwright	Gallego	(NM)
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray
Castro (TX)	Garcia	(NM)
Chu	Grayson	Lynch
Cicilline	Green, Al	Maffei
Clarke	Green, Gene	Maloney
Clay	Grijalva	Carolyn
Cleaver	Gutiérrez	Maloney, Sean
Clyburn	Hahn	Matheson
Cohen	Hanabusa	Matsui
Connolly	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Conyers	Heck (WA)	McDermott
Cooper	Higgins	McGovern
Costa	Himes	McIntyre
Courtney	Hinojosa	McNerney
Crowley	Honda	Meeks
Cuellar	Hoyer	Meng
Cummings	Huffman	Michaud
Davis (CA)	Israel	Moore
Davis, Danny	Jackson Lee	

Moran	Roybal-Allard	Speier
Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Swalwell (CA)
Nadler	Rush	Takano
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (CA)
Neal	Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (MS)
Negrete McLeod	T.	Tierney
Nolan	Sanchez, Loretta	Titus
O'Rourke	Sarbanes	Tonko
Owens	Schakowsky	Tsongas
Pascarella	Schiff	Van Hollen
Pastor (AZ)	Schneider	Vargas
Payne	Schrader	Veasey
Perlmutter	Schwartz	Vela
Peters (CA)	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Peters (MI)	Scott, David	Visclosky
Peterson	Serrano	Walz
Pingree (ME)	Sewell (AL)	Waters
Pocan	Shea-Porter	Watt
Polis	Sherman	Waxman
Price (NC)	Sinema	Welch
Quigley	Sires	Wilson (FL)
Rahall	Slaughter	Wittman
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell	King (IA)	Richmond
Collins (GA)	Lewis	Rogers (MI)
Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Ruppersberger
Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Holt	Miller, George	Wasserman
Horsford	Pallone	Schultz
Hudson	Pelosi	Young (FL)

□ 1547

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 189, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Conaway	Gosar
Alexander	Cook	Gowdy
Amash	Costa	Granger
Amodel	Cotton	Graves (GA)
Bachmann	Cramer	Graves (MO)
Bachus	Crawford	Griffin (AR)
Barletta	Crenshaw	Griffith (VA)
Barr	Culberson	Grimm
Barton	Daines	Guthrie
Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Hall
Bentivolio	Denham	Hanna
Bilirakis	Dent	Harper
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Harris
Black	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (WA)
Bonner	Duffy	Heck (NV)
Boustany	Duncan (SC)	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Holding
Bridenstine	Ellmers	Huelskamp
Brooks (AL)	Farenthold	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Fincher	Hultgren
Broun (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Hunter
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Hurt
Bucshon	Fleming	Issa
	Flores	Jenkins
	Forbes	Johnson (OH)
	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
	Fox	Jones
	Franks (AZ)	Jordan
	Frelinghuysen	Joyce
	Gardner	Kelly (PA)
	Garrett	King (NY)
	Gerlach	Kingston
	Gibbs	Kinzing (IL)
	Gibson	Kline
	Gingrey (GA)	Labrador
	Gohmert	LaMalfa

Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo

NAYS—189

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart

Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus

Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Campbell
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
Huffman

Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

NOT VOTING—21

King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond

Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yarmuth

Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman
Schultz
Young (FL)

□ 1554

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAREWELL REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JO BONNER

(Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, as many of our colleagues know, tomorrow will mark my last day to walk onto this House floor as a Member of the United States House of Representatives.

Since I announced my plans to leave this place in late May, a place where I have been so privileged and honored to work for the last 28 years—18 as a staffer and the last 10½ as a Representative—the past few days and weeks, as you might imagine, have been rather poignant.

So many of you, my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle, have been so very kind to offer an encouraging word, or to extend heartfelt good wishes as I begin a new chapter in my life as the vice chancellor of government relations and economic development for the University of Alabama system. To each and every one of you who have been so generous with your words, thoughts, and even a few prayers, I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart.

A few of you have even asked if I have any parting wisdom to offer, and I won't share these with my colleagues, I wouldn't do that to you, but I would like to speak for just one minute to the American people.

You know, one of the reasons I so rarely come to the House floor and speak is because my father, who died when I was 13, always told me, my brother, and sister that if you listen to the words of others instead of listening to your own words, you'll learn a lot more. So I've tried to follow my father's advice.

The other reason I so rarely take your time to listen to my thoughts is because of my very first speech on the House floor. With your indulgence, I will share it briefly with you.

Everyone remembers your first House speech, I'm sure, when you were a newly minted Member of Congress. Mine was unforgettable for a different reason. It was back in early 2003 when the House was debating the Healthy Forests bill. I remember it as though it were yesterday.

Like most freshmen, I served on several committees, and I was actually in a Budget Committee hearing all day long when I got a call from the chairman of the Ag Committee, BOB GOODLATTE. He said:

Joe, you need to get over on the House floor because you're getting ready to make your first speech.

One of our colleagues, who's still here and will remain anonymous, was about to offer an amendment to the Healthy Forests bill that would have stripped the \$250,000 provision that I had inserted to do research on insects, on pine beetles that we don't care for in south Alabama and throughout the country, and he was going to strip it and take it for a project that was near and dear to him in his district.

□ 1600

As I was running over to the Capitol, I did what you would have done: I called my wife and told her to get the kids in front of the TV set, turn on the VCR, and I said to my daughter, Lee, who was 7 at the time, and my son, Robins, who was 5, I said, "Daddy is about to make his first speech on the House floor."

My staff had given me some beautiful words that day. They were somewhere between the Gettysburg Address and the Kennedy inauguration.

But as so often is the case here on the floor, instead of having 5 or 10 minutes to speak, Chairman GOODLATTE gave me 90 seconds. So I put aside my prepared remarks; and, instead, I spoke from the heart, or from the top of my head.

I said, "Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment from the gentleman from California and to urge support for the underlying bill."

I went on to say, "Now, if I represented pine beetles, I would actually support the gentleman's amendment, because, if I were a pine beetle, I would like it. He would take the money we've put in there and redirect it to a program out in his district in California."

"But I don't represent pine beetles. I represent hardworking men and women who own a few acres and they grow pine trees. And pine beetles are a real threat to a healthy forest."

You know, if I'd only stopped there, I would have made a good first impression. But like so many new politicians who didn't know when to stop, I said, "You know, we have a real problem with incest in south Alabama."

I said, "In fact, I would venture a guess that we have more problems with incest in my district in Alabama than

Maloney,
Esty
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rigell
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Larsen (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradner
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter

in any other congressional district in America."

Chairman GOODLATTE was going like that, and I thought he was saying preach on, brother, preach on. Instead, he was urging me to shut up.

So I got back to my office, thinking I'd delivered one of the best speeches on insects ever made, and my staff said, "Jo, in about 2 minutes you just reinforced in the minds of all Americans what we have a problem with in south Alabama."

That's the other reason that I don't often speak on the House floor. But, fortunately for me, these wonderful people who work here taking note of every word knew what I meant to say, not what I did say.

I tell that story, Mr. Speaker, in closing, for this one reason: you all laughed at that story, as so many others have over the years. And a little laughter from time to time is good medicine, as the doctor says.

Perhaps our country needs to laugh a little more often, as well, and stop yelling at each other and work closer together.

For sure, our great country has many daunting challenges facing us. Sadly, all across our land, there's anger, there's frustration and concern on both sides of the political spectrum about what's going on or what's not going on.

Public approval of this body which we are all so honored to serve in is at or near an all-time record low.

But if I could say one parting word to the American people, it would be this: the men and women that you've elected to represent you in this, the people's House, have different views and positions on the very issues that you have different views and positions on.

And, by and large, and with rare exception, these are men and women of courage, of integrity, of decency, and they serve, along with many, many men and women, as staff, who work here, oftentimes in the shadows of the spotlight. They serve for the same reason, a common love of country.

Make no mistake. SAM JOHNSON loved America when he was being brutally beaten and held against his will as a prisoner of war for over 7 years in Vietnam, often wondering whether he would ever see his family again.

And JOHN LEWIS loved his country when he was beaten and bloodied, fighting for the civil rights of all Americans as he was crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge in the city I was born in, Selma.

And just like SAM and JOHN, every other Member here, Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative, we all work for the American people with the singular goal of making our country a better, more perfect Union, even though sometimes, as humans, we fail to meet your expectations.

This is especially true of our leadership, on both sides of the aisle, who

often have one of the toughest jobs, trying to corral the strong will of 435 Members of Congress who come from all parts of America to try to do the right things. To my committee chairmen and ranking members, and all of the people I've served with, I owe you my debt of gratitude.

In closing, I want to express my last expression to the wonderful people of south Alabama for giving me the opportunity to work for you for the last 10½ years as your Congressman.

I came to this job having studied at the feet of two of the most outstanding men I know. Jack Edwards and Sonny Callahan, like me, came to office as a Representative from Alabama, but they left office as statesmen. And anything that my staff or I have ever been able to do for the people of my district, it's been to build on the legacy of those two great men.

Lastly, I would like to say this: the people of my district have afforded me a rare honor in Alabama, one of only 167 people, men and women, to ever serve in this body. The rest of us, only 10,000-plus, men and women, have ever had the privilege of being called a representative of the people.

I would be extremely remiss if I didn't say a special thank you to my wife, Janee, our daughter, Lee, and my son, Robins, who, like they were 10½ years ago, are back home in Alabama listening to your daddy talk about incest.

Thank you for your love and support. May God bless you, and may God bless America.

VIETNAM HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1897) to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 3, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

YEAS—405

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber

Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek

Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn

Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry

Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long

Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

Rooney	Sherman	Valadao
Ros-Lehtinen	Shimkus	Van Hollen
Roskam	Shuster	Vargas
Ross	Simpson	Veasey
Rothfus	Sinema	Vela
Roybal-Allard	Sires	Velázquez
Royce	Slaughter	Visclosky
Ruiz	Smith (MO)	Wagner
Runyan	Smith (NE)	Walberg
Rush	Smith (NJ)	Walden
Ryan (OH)	Smith (TX)	Walorski
Ryan (WI)	Smith (WA)	Walz
Salmon	Southerland	Waters
Sanchez, Linda	Speier	Watt
T.	Stewart	Weber (TX)
Sanchez, Loretta	Stivers	Webster (FL)
Sanford	Stockman	Welch
Sarbanes	Stutzman	Wenstrup
Scalise	Swalwell (CA)	Westmoreland
Schakowsky	Takano	Whitfield
Schiff	Terry	Williams
Schneider	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Schock	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (SC)
Schrader	Thompson (PA)	Wittman
Schwartz	Thornberry	Wolf
Schweikert	Tiberi	Womack
Scott (VA)	Tierney	Woodall
Scott, Austin	Tipton	Yarmuth
Scott, David	Titus	Yoder
Serrano	Tonko	Yoho
Sessions	Tsongas	Young (AK)
Sewell (AL)	Turner	Young (IN)
Shea-Porter	Upton	

NAYS—3

Broun (GA)	Jones	Meeks
------------	-------	-------

NOT VOTING—25

Butterfield	Hudson	Richmond
Campbell	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Cleaver	Lewis	Ruppersberger
Collins (GA)	McCarthy (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Wasserman
Goodlatte	Miller, George	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Owens	Waxman
Holt	Pallone	Young (FL)
Horsford	Pelosi	

□ 1612

MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 322, I call up the bill (H.R. 2879) to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2879

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Stop Government Abuse Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—COMMON SENSE IN COMPENSATION

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Sec. 102. Limitations.

Sec. 103. Regulations.

TITLE II—GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE ACCOUNTABILITY

Sec. 201. Suspension for 14 days or less for Senior Executive Service employees.

Sec. 202. Investigative leave and termination authority for Senior Executive Service employees.

Sec. 203. Suspension of Senior Executive Service employees.

Sec. 204. Misappropriation of funds amendments.

TITLE III—CITIZEN EMPOWERMENT

Sec. 301. Amendments.

TITLE I—COMMON SENSE IN COMPENSATION

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title—

(1) the term “employee” means an employee (as defined by section 2105(a) of title 5, United States Code) holding a position in or under an Executive agency;

(2) the term “Executive agency” has the meaning given such term by section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) the term “discretionary monetary payment” means—

(A) any award or other monetary payment under chapter 45, or section 5753 or 5754, of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) any step-increase under section 5336 of title 5, United States Code;

(4) the term “covered compensation”, as used with respect to an employee in connection with any period, means the sum of—

(A) the basic pay, and

(B) any discretionary monetary payments (excluding basic pay), payable to such employee during such period;

(5) the term “basic pay” means basic pay for service as an employee; and

(6) the term “sequestration period” means a period beginning on the first day of a fiscal year in which a sequestration order with respect to discretionary spending or direct spending is issued under section 251A or section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and ending on the last day of the fiscal year to which the sequestration order applies.

SEC. 102. LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) no discretionary monetary payment may be made to an employee during any sequestration period to the extent that such payment would cause in a fiscal year the total covered compensation of such employee for such fiscal year to exceed 105 percent of the total amount of basic pay payable to such individual (before the application of any step-increase in such fiscal year under section 5336 of title 5, United States Code) for such fiscal year; and

(2) except as provided in subsection (b), during any sequestration period, an agency may not pay a performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, to the extent that such payment would cause the number of employees in the agency re-

ceiving such award during such period to exceed 33 percent of the total number of employees in the agency eligible to receive such award during such period.

(b) WAIVERS.—For the purposes of any sequestration period—

(1) the head of any agency may, subject to approval by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, waive the requirements of subsection (a)(2); and

(2) the head of any agency may waive the requirements of subsection (a)(1) with respect to any employee if the requirements of such subsection would violate the terms of a collective bargaining agreement covering such employee, except that this paragraph shall not apply to any employee covered by a collective bargaining agreement that is renewed on or after the date of enactment of this title.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—In the case of an agency for which the Director of the Office of Personnel Management grants a waiver under subsection (b)(1), the agency shall notify the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate of the percentage of career appointees receiving performance awards under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, and the dollar amount of each performance award.

(d) APPLICATION.—This section shall apply to any discretionary monetary payment or performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, made on or after the date of enactment of this title.

SEC. 103. REGULATIONS.

The Office of Personnel Management may prescribe regulations to carry out this title.

TITLE II—GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 201. SUSPENSION FOR 14 DAYS OR LESS FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

Paragraph (1) of section 7501 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(1) ‘employee’ means—

“(A) an individual in the competitive service who is not serving a probationary or trial period under an initial appointment or who has completed 1 year of current continuous employment in the same or similar positions under other than a temporary appointment limited to 1 year or less; or

“(B) a career appointee in the Senior Executive Service who—

“(i) has completed the probationary period prescribed under section 3393(d); or

“(ii) was covered by the provisions of subchapter II of this chapter immediately before appointment to the Senior Executive Service;”.

SEC. 202. INVESTIGATIVE LEAVE AND TERMINATION AUTHORITY FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER VI—INVESTIGATIVE LEAVE FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

“§ 7551. Definitions

“For the purposes of this subchapter—

“(1) ‘employee’ has the meaning given such term in section 7541; and

“(2) ‘investigative leave’ means a temporary absence without duty for disciplinary reasons, of a period not greater than 90 days.

“§ 7552. Actions covered

“This subchapter applies to investigative leave.

“§ 7553. Cause and procedure

“(a)(1) Under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, an agency may place an employee on investigative leave, without loss of pay and without charge to annual or sick leave, only for misconduct, neglect of duty, malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds.

“(2) If an agency determines, as prescribed in regulation by the Office of Personnel Management, that such employee's conduct is flagrant and that such employee intentionally engaged in such conduct, the agency may place such employee on investigative leave under this subchapter without pay.

“(b)(1) At the end of each 45-day period during a period of investigative leave implemented under this section, the relevant agency shall review the investigation into the employee with respect to the misconduct, neglect of duty, malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds.

“(2) Not later than 5 business days after the end of each such 45-day period, the agency shall submit a report describing such review to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

“(3) At the end of a period of investigative leave implemented under this section, the agency shall—

“(A) remove an employee placed on investigative leave under this section;

“(B) suspend such employee without pay; or

“(C) reinstate or restore such employee to duty.

“(4) The agency may extend the period of investigative leave with respect to an action under this subchapter for an additional period not to exceed 90 days.

“(c) An employee against whom an action covered by this subchapter is proposed is entitled to, before being placed on investigative leave under this section—

“(1) at least 30 days' advance written notice, stating specific reasons for the proposed action, unless—

“(A) there is reasonable cause to believe that the employee has committed a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment can be imposed; or

“(B) the agency determines, as prescribed in regulation by the Office of Personnel Management, that the employee's conduct with respect to which an action covered by this subchapter is proposed is flagrant and that such employee intentionally engaged in such conduct;

“(2) a reasonable time, but not less than 7 days, to answer orally and in writing and to furnish affidavits and other documentary evidence in support of the answer;

“(3) be represented by an attorney or other representative; and

“(4) a written decision and specific reasons therefor at the earliest practicable date.

“(d) An agency may provide, by regulation, for a hearing which may be in lieu of or in addition to the opportunity to answer provided under subsection (c)(2).

“(e) An employee against whom an action is taken under this section is entitled to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board under section 7701.

“(f) Copies of the notice of proposed action, the answer of the employee when written, and a summary thereof when made orally, the notice of decision and reasons therefor, and any order effecting an action covered by this subchapter, together with any supporting material, shall be maintained by the

agency and shall be furnished to the Merit Systems Protection Board upon its request and to the employee affected upon the employee's request.

“SUBCHAPTER VII—REMOVAL OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES**“§ 7561. Definition**

“For purposes of this subchapter, the term ‘employee’ has the meaning given such term in section 7541.

“§ 7562. Removal of Senior Executive Service employees

“(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and consistent with the requirements of subsection (b), the head of an agency may remove an employee for serious neglect of duty, misappropriation of funds, or malfeasance if the head of the agency—

“(1) determines that the employee knowingly acted in a manner that endangers the interest of the agency mission;

“(2) considers the removal to be necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States; and

“(3) determines that the procedures prescribed in other provisions of law that authorize the removal of such employee cannot be invoked in a manner that the head of an agency considers consistent with the efficiency of the Government.

“(b) An employee may not be removed under this section—

“(1) on any basis that would be prohibited under—

“(A) any provision of law referred to in section 2302(b)(1); or

“(B) paragraphs (8) or (9) of section 2302(b); or

“(2) on any basis, described in paragraph (1), as to which any administrative or judicial proceeding—

“(A) has been commenced by or on behalf of such employee; and

“(B) is pending.

“(c) An employee removed under this section shall be notified of the reasons for such removal. Within 30 days after the notification, the employee is entitled to submit to the official designated by the head of the agency statements or affidavits to show why the employee should be restored to duty. If such statements and affidavits are submitted, the head of the agency shall provide a written response, and may restore the employee's employment if the head of the agency chooses.

“(d) Whenever the head of the agency removes an employee under the authority of this section, the head of the agency shall notify Congress of such termination, and the specific reasons for the action.

“(e) An employee against whom an action is taken under this section is entitled to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board under section 7701 of this title.

“(f) Copies of the notice of proposed action, the answer of the employee when written, and a summary thereof when made orally, the notice of decision and reasons therefor, and any order effecting an action covered by this subchapter, together with any supporting material, shall be maintained by the agency and shall be furnished to the Merit Systems Protection Board upon its request and to the employee affected upon the employee's request.

“(g) A removal under this section does not affect the right of the employee affected to seek or accept employment with any other department or agency of the United States if that employee is declared eligible for such employment by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

“(h) The authority of the head of the agency under this section may not be delegated.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 7543 the following:

“SUBCHAPTER VI—INVESTIGATIVE LEAVE FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

“7551. Definitions.

“7552. Actions covered.

“7553. Cause and procedure.

“SUBCHAPTER VII—REMOVAL OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

“7561. Definition.

“7562. Removal of Senior Executive Service employees.”.

SEC. 203. SUSPENSION OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

Section 7543 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “misappropriation of funds,” after “malfeasance,”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) at least 30 days' advance written notice, stating specific reasons for the proposed action, unless—

“(A) there is reasonable cause to believe that the employee has committed a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment can be imposed; or

“(B) the agency determines, as prescribed in regulation by the Office of Personnel Management, that the employee's conduct with respect to which an action covered by this subchapter is proposed is flagrant and that such employee intentionally engaged in such conduct;”.

SEC. 204. MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS AMENDMENTS.

(a) REINSTATEMENT IN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.—Section 3593 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting “misappropriation of funds,” after “malfeasance,”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “or malfeasance” and inserting “malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds”.

(b) PLACEMENT IN OTHER PERSONNEL SYSTEMS.—Section 3594(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “or malfeasance” and inserting “malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds”.

TITLE III—CITIZEN EMPOWERMENT**SEC. 301. AMENDMENTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 79 the following:

“CHAPTER 79A—SERVICES TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

“Sec.

“7921. Procedure for in-person and telephonic interactions conducted by Executive Branch employees.

“§ 7921. Procedure for in-person and telephonic interactions conducted by Executive Branch employees

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that individuals have the right to record in-person and telephonic interactions with Executive agency employees and to ensure that individuals who are the target of enforcement actions conducted by Executive agency employees are notified of such right.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) the term ‘telephonic’ means by telephone or other similar electronic device; and

“(2) the term ‘employee’ means an employee of an Executive agency.

“(c) CONSENT OF EXECUTIVE AGENCY EMPLOYEES.—Participation by an employee, acting in an official capacity, in an in-person or telephonic interaction shall constitute consent by the employee to a recording of that interaction by any participant in the interaction.

“(d) NOTICE OF RIGHTS WHEN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN CERTAIN ACTIONS.—A notice of an individual’s right to record conversations with employees shall be included in any written material provided by an Executive agency to the individual concerning an audit, investigation, inspection, or enforcement action that could result in the imposition of a fine, forfeiture of property, civil monetary penalty, or criminal penalty against, or the collection of an unpaid tax, fine, or penalty from, such individual or a business owned or operated by such individual.

“(e) OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVE.—Any person who is permitted to represent before an Executive agency an individual under this section shall receive the same notice as required under subsection (d) with respect to such individual.

“(f) NO CAUSE OF ACTION.—This section does not create any express or implied private right of action.

“(g) DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—An employee who violates this section shall be subject to appropriate disciplinary action in accordance with otherwise applicable provisions of law.

“(h) PUBLIC INFORMATION CONCERNING RIGHT TO RECORD.—

“(1) POSTING ON AGENCY WEB SITES.—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, each Executive agency shall post prominently on its Web site information explaining the right of individuals to record interactions with employees.

“(2) OMB GUIDANCE.—Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Office of Management and Budget shall issue guidance to Executive agencies concerning implementation of paragraph (1).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 79 the following:

“79A. Services to members of the public 7921”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2879 and include extra-neous materials thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2879, the Stop Government Abuse Act, combines three bills that were each voice voted out of

my committee. They are H.R. 1541, the Common Sense in Compensation Act; H.R. 2579, the Government Employee Accountability Act; and H.R. 2711, the Citizen Empowerment Act.

The Common Sense in Compensation title of this bill brings common sense to the policies of governing employee bonuses while still providing agencies flexibility to recognize outstanding performance.

Madam Speaker, 75 percent of senior executives will receive bonuses of at least \$6,000 while more than 650,000 defense employees are in the midst of 11 furlough days. This sends the wrong message to our Federal workforce. The men and women of the Federal workforce work hard—all of them.

Some of them do exceptional work, and bonuses are not only an incentive but a recognition. But these bonuses come on top of annual salaries ranging from \$119,554 to over \$179,000. Going in the range of \$30,000 or more sends a message to many of our Federal workforce—in fact, Madam Speaker, most of our Federal workforce—that people at the top get even more.

Following the President’s decision to impose a 2-year pay freeze, the administration issued a memo limiting the amount available to pay bonuses for fiscal years 2011 and 2012. Moreover, this past February, the administration issued a memo limiting bonuses to those legally required. In June, the administration suspended rank awards for senior leaders. H.R. 1541 builds on the President’s initiatives.

The Government Employee Accountability title of the bill helps ensure Senior Executive Service employees are held accountable for their actions while maintaining due process rights. From Jeff Neely at GSA to Lois Lerner at the IRS, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee has uncovered numerous examples of high-ranking government officials engaging in behavior that certainly seems to be contrary to the principles of public service.

When people come before Congress and cannot even answer questions as to what they have done in their official capacity by “taking the Fifth” and find themselves fully paid for not working, it sends the wrong message to the vast majority of Federal workers. In some cases, these employees could face civil or criminal penalties.

In the private sector, these behaviors would be grounds for serious disciplinary action and, likely, termination. But in the Federal bureaucracy, that isn’t what happened. Only in Washington could these employees be not terminated but, instead, placed on administrative leave with full pay, full benefits, and accruing additional retirement.

This bill provides agencies with additional tools to use when senior managers behave badly. It does not require

these tools be used, but it makes them available. A similar version of this bill was passed by the House by a vote of 402-2 in the last Congress.

The final title of the bill before us today consists of the text of House Resolution 2711, the Citizen Empowerment Act, as reported from my committee. This legislation protects individual citizens from harassment, intimidation, and inappropriate behavior by a few Federal officials representing agencies such as the IRS, EPA, and the SEC.

Unfortunately, these few bad actors at agencies have, from time to time, threatened, intimidated, coerced, lied, or violated the public trust. And yet, in 12 out of our 50 States, citizens are not empowered to unilaterally record these conversations for their own protection. In 38 States, they may. We simply seek, in this bill, to harmonize across the government a predictability. When intimidation and wrong behavior happens, we need to make sure that there is a simple solution that every American can avail themselves of.

This bill ensures individuals have a right to record in-person meetings and telephone calls with Federal employees, including regulatory officials engaged in enforcement activities that can lead to the imposition of fines and penalties. In essence, what this bill does is provide consistency on behalf of the Federal employees acting in their official capacity. I want to make that very clear, Madam Speaker.

Federal employees today don’t have an easy answer. In some States—38 of them—they can be recorded; in one State, they may be recorded; and in 11 States, they are likely not to be recorded because, in fact, it requires their advance permission. Uniformity across the Federal workforce is a good thing. We believe that it also will tell every member to treat people the same, whether they live in a State where they may be recorded or not.

I encourage all Members to support these three bills and remind all that these passed on a voice vote out of our committee and were not considered controversial in the previous Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2879 and to the failure of this House to address the issues of real concern to the American people and the people of my district.

Congress has been in session now for more than 200 days, and yet we have not passed a single bill to create a single job. The government must be funded by October, yet House Republicans have refused to appoint conferees to resolve a budget resolution after repeatedly calling for regular order.

After bringing to the floor a farm bill that gutted the SNAP program on which tens of millions of hungry Americans depend, including 17 million children, the majority brought a T-HUD

appropriations measure that would have gutted the Community Development Block Grant program, the HOME program, Amtrak, and the effort to modernize our Nation's air traffic control system. It became clear this week, however, that the majority did not have the votes to pass it.

We could be working today to end the damaging cuts imposed by the Ryan budget, which the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee called "unrealistic and ill-conceived." That's the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Instead of working on any of these issues, we're wasting the last days remaining before a 5-week recess on a measure that threatens to impede our Nation's law enforcement efforts and continues senseless attacks on our Nation's civil servants.

H.R. 2879, the bill before us now, was thrown together last night from the ruins of three bills the majority did not have the votes to pass yesterday. The Rules Committee had to call an emergency meeting last night to push this bill through, and no amendments are being allowed.

So what would this legislation do? First and foremost, it would undermine our Nation's law enforcement activities. In fact, this bill should more appropriately be called the "Ignoring the Concerns of Law Enforcement Act." It would allow individuals to record telephone calls and in-person conversations with Federal employees, including Federal law enforcement agents, without their knowledge. The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association have all written letters opposing these provisions.

The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association wrote:

This legislation puts law enforcement activities at risk and does a disservice to the brave men and women who are asked to put their lives on the line to protect us from terrorists and criminals.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association wrote:

This proposal risks undermining criminal investigations by reducing the willingness of individuals to cooperate with law enforcement, and would result in the creation of recordings of law enforcement conversations that could jeopardize sensitive and important criminal and counterterrorism investigations.

This morning, after listening to the debate we had here on this floor yesterday, and after this bill was filed last night, the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys sent a letter to every Member of the House, opposing the bill. Their letter states:

Section 301 of H.R. 2879 will undermine Federal civil enforcement activities and criminal prosecutions during the investigative, pretrial, trial, and enforcement phases of litigation involving the interests of the United States.

The fact is that we have held no hearings on this legislation before we marked it up in committee last week. We had no testimony from law enforcement officials about their concerns with the bill. Instead, the House Republicans rushed it to the floor without adequate consideration. In fact, in their rush to bring this bill to the floor, committee Republicans apparently did not even contact key law enforcement agencies to make sure this bill would not harm ongoing investigations.

This morning, I directed my staff to contact the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the Department of Homeland Security, including its operational components, the Secret Service and Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Officials from all of these entities have now reported that they have significant operational concerns with the bill.

Does that matter to the supporters of this bill? Don't you think it makes sense to hear from key stakeholders before changing Federal law in this extreme way?

The bill also would interfere with existing State laws prescribing the conditions under which conversations can be recorded. Thirty-six years ago, my home State of Maryland enacted a law that made it a felony to record a private conversation unless every party to the conversation consents to the recording or another exception applies. Maryland statute requires actual consent, not forced or assumed consent. The bill negates these protections—and the protections of 11 other States—by deeming Federal employees, including all law enforcement personnel, to have consented to the recording of their official conversations just by coming to work.

The bill has several other troubling provisions. It would remove due process protections from members of our Senior Executive Service by giving politically appointed agency heads broad discretion to fire these employees without providing advance notice, without conducting a proper investigation, and without giving employees an opportunity to respond to accusations against them.

Under this bill, employees could be fired and then forced to prove their innocence to seek reinstatement. This turns on its head the most basic protection guaranteed to all Americans by our Constitution: the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty.

I urge Members to reject this senseless, ill-considered legislation that will impede law enforcement activities and eliminate constitutional protections for civil servants. I urge Members to vote "no" on H.R. 2879, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. This is probably Groundhog Day, because these were the same statements made yesterday by the

ranking member from Maryland, who implied that somehow what happens in 38 States would be draconian if it happened in 12 more.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

□ 1630

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

We have seen too many examples of our Nation's bureaucracy making life harder for Americans and their families. Every weekend, when I return to Kansas, I hear story after story of Federal regulators abusing their power. But far too often, many of these people are afraid to tell their stories in public because they fear retribution. What country do we live in where Americans are afraid to tell the truth because they fear what their government might do to them?

The recent revelations that IRS officials targeted conservative organizations has shown light on the immense power Federal bureaucrats from hundreds of different agencies have over matters both large and small. When these officials abuse their power and waste taxpayer dollars, liberty is eroded, the economy is slowed, trust is lost, and the rule of law is betrayed.

The most troubling part is, when Americans are confronted by agency officials, they have few rights and insufficient resources to protect themselves. Not only do Federal agencies get to write rules, but they get to enforce them too. In fact, a citizen is 10 times more likely to be tried by a Federal agency than an actual court, and citizens have fewer rights during agency proceedings than in a courtroom.

I introduced the Stop Government Abuse Act to allow citizens to protect themselves or their small businesses when a government official comes calling. Among other things, this bill gives Americans a new tool to fight back by allowing them to record any conversation with most Federal agencies and finally have proof of what happens in these interactions.

Is it any wonder why Americans have lost faith and trust in our government when the Feds have allowed the IRS to target Americans based on their personal beliefs; allowed the Federal General Services Administration regional commissioner, Jeff Neely, to spend nearly \$900,000 of taxpayer money on a conference in Las Vegas and then receive a bonus after being placed under investigation? And they have allowed high-ranking bureaucrats like Lois Lerner to still be on the government's payroll funded by taxpayers.

This stunning lack of accountability and transparency in our current system is unacceptable. And the Stop Government Abuse Act is a good first step to help level the playing field between the average American and Federal regulators.

The vast majority of Federal workers are good, patriotic people, but that doesn't mean that an additional check and balance can't help. This bill does not villainize Federal employees. And as long as they're doing their jobs properly, they have not a thing to worry about.

Unfortunately, with all the recent scandals, we have heard about far too many Federal employees who have had the luxury of playing by different rules than the rest of the hardworking men and women in this country. This must end, and the Stop Government Abuse Act helps do just that.

Parts of this legislation already passed the House last year after news broke of the GSA scandal, but the Senate never acted on the legislation. It's time to do something about this, and today I demand action be taken.

While Americans are toiling across this country in factories, on farms, and elsewhere, to make ends meet, Lois Lerner is collecting her full paycheck. This bill would allow agencies to fire reckless employees on the spot and stop those under investigation from receiving salaries paid for by the very taxpayers they abused.

It's time to stand up against Big Government overreach and abuse. Americans deserve a government that expands their rights, not the rights of Big Government. Enacting the Stop Government Abuse Act will help restore trust in our government and get Big Government out of the way of our economy.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the wise words of his opening statement. I also thank him for retrieving the views of law enforcement officials—inasmuch as we had no hearing on this bill. They were very informative.

Madam Speaker, with most of the business of the Nation languishing with no action in this House, Republicans have rushed to the floor with these so-called “messaging” bills. Let's make sure we get the message:

Republicans—the party that champions states' rights—want to preempt the States, to require Federal employees acting for the government to record conversations with clients. Republicans—the party that wants the Federal Government to operate like the private sector and pay people on the basis of merit—wants to deny bonuses to Federal employees who deserve them, regardless of merit. Perhaps worst of all, Madam Speaker, Republicans—who spent most of this term accusing IRS employees of denying due process to Republican organizations—now propose to fire SES employees without due process.

And get this: the Republican version of due process is to give the employee

the right to apply for reinstatement to the political appointee who fired him. Then, after the fact, having never had a hearing, the dismissed employee can now appeal to the MSPB. This last one, of course, reverses the age-old principle of innocent until proven guilty, but it's much worse. Not only is there no due process, there's no process at all. You're fired. That one is embarrassingly unconstitutional.

These are messaging bills all right, Madam Speaker, and we get the message. Republican principles apply—except when they don't.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, today I want to speak a little bit from the heart.

We've heard a lot of debate going back and forth about how we haven't talked about this and how we haven't debated it, but there have been a number of amendments. As this bill comes to the floor today, what it's about is about fairness; it's about fairness to employees; it's about fairness to those who manage. And what we're seeing is that there is a trend where we're not being fair with bonuses.

You know, I've had my colleagues opposite here talk about the fact that we need to continue to incentivize. But when 75 percent of senior executive employees receive bonuses at an average of \$11,000, it's out of control. This little chart shows that the Veterans Administration, 74 percent of those employees received bonuses of over \$11,000 apiece. Now, why is this a problem? Because back in my district, the veterans are having to wait over 600 days, Madam Speaker, to get a determination on benefits, and yet we continue to give bonuses. I find that appalling.

The other part of that is we talk about being for small businesses, and small businesses are hurting. So what do we do with the Small Business Administration? Ninety-two percent of those employees are getting over \$13,000 a year in bonuses. It's appalling, Madam Speaker. We need to make sure that we bring it back.

We've got Mr. Spock there that was part of the “Star Trek” parody that received a bonus of almost \$31,000 the same year that he spent over \$5 million on a conference. Where is the sanity?

When we really talk about Federal employees, the rank and file, the blue collar Federal employees, are going with pay freezes while we pay out ridiculous bonuses. Madam Speaker, I think it's time that we really turn back the tide.

You know, if the Democrats are going to vote against this particular bill, the headline tomorrow should read that the Democrats have embraced the 1 percenters, because that's what it is. It is 1 percent getting all the bonuses while the rest of the Federal workers

are not receiving the benefits that they deserve.

It is time that we bring some sanity to this situation. I strongly urge support of this bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), a member of our committee.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2879, the so-called “Stop Government Abuse Act.” This legislation is simply a rehash of the three attacks on Federal workers that were incorporated in the bills that the Republican leadership abruptly pulled from the suspension calendar yesterday due to a lack of support from the required two-thirds majority of this House.

The fact that these anti-Federal worker suspension bills have now been reconstituted into a single anti-Federal worker bill does not make this legislation any less misguided or any less harmful to our Federal workers than it was yesterday. After all, H.R. 2879 is based on the same message that has been continually reflected in a series of Republican legislative attacks on our Federal workers throughout this Congress. That message from the Republican leadership has been that our hardworking Federal employees cannot be trusted, and they are the primary source of our deficit burden.

On the heels of repeated attempts to freeze Federal employee pay beyond the current 3 years, efforts to increase Federal pension contributions and slash our Federal workforce across the board, we are now considering legislation that would only add insult to injury by depriving Federal employees of their constitutional rights to due process of law.

In particular, I'm deeply concerned about the expedited termination provisions in H.R. 2879. These provisions would give agency heads broad discretion, without limitation, to immediately fire senior executives accused of misconduct without notifying the employees of the charges against them and without giving them a reasonable opportunity to defend themselves. Instead, it places the burden on the employee, after they fire them, to prove that their reinstatement is required. This “ready, fire, aim” approach by my Republican colleagues, where they fire the employee first and ask questions later, flies in the face of the rights guaranteed to all Americans under our Constitution.

The “guilty until proven innocent” framework violates the due process protections envisioned by James Madison and guaranteed under the Constitution. In 1985, in *Loudermill v. Cleveland Board of Education*, the United States Supreme Court held that public employees, Federal employees, who are facing discipline are entitled to certain

due process rights. The U.S. Supreme Court held that public servants had a property right in the jobs that they held and in continued employment, and that such employment could not be denied to employees unless they were given a meaningful opportunity to have notice of the allegations against them, to have a fair hearing and an opportunity to respond against the charges against them. Notably, that must occur prior to being deprived of their right to employment. The court stated:

An essential principle of due process is that a deprivation of life, liberty, or property be preceded by notice and opportunity for hearing appropriate to the nature of the case.

The court goes on further and it says:

This principle requires some kind of a hearing prior to discharge of an employee who has a constitutionally protected property interest in his employment.

Now, this is unconstitutional. This provision is flatly unconstitutional, and there's a long line of Federal cases under the Supreme Court that declares it so. The one saving grace, in my opinion, in this bill is that there's no severability clause, and that after this provision is struck down by the Supreme Court, these employees will all be reinstated with back pay. And the whole bill that they're offering will be struck down because of the lack of a severability clause in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman.

Look, this Nation was founded on the principle that every person, every man and woman is entitled to due process before he or she is deprived of life, liberty, or property. Our Supreme Court in the *Loudermill* case understood the injustice of depriving a person of their livelihood, and I hope that my colleagues understand that H.R. 2879 unfortunately would do just that.

Due process demands that we oppose H.R. 2879. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on this legislation.

I thank the ranking member for his advocacy and his courtesy.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, the gentleman is entitled to his opinion, but not his facts.

In the bill itself, which I read yesterday, it says:

An employee removed under this section shall be notified of the reasons for such removal within 30 days.

□ 1645

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to explain a little bit about what's going on.

The other day we talked a little bit about the dizzying effects of being on this floor, and somehow things get

twisted around, so when you see people bumping off the walls you know it's because of the spin.

Let me tell you what I'm talking about here today. When I walked on the floor today—and some of my friends did also—we passed the Capitol Police, passed all these people on the dais, we passed so many people on the way, and you would think that we are talking about every single person that works for the government.

Now, the truth of the matter is that there are over 2.1 million people working for the government. That doesn't include the Army. It doesn't include the post office. That includes people who are out there. So the people that we are talking about that we want to hold accountable—and, my goodness, what an unusual effort for Congress to try and hold people accountable. Why in the world would you do that? Half of us wouldn't be back here.

So we are talking about four-tenths of 1 percent. And as the President is fond of saying: "Just do the arithmetic. Just do the arithmetic." It isn't everybody that you talked about. It's not all these folks that are sitting here tonight. It's not the Capitol Police that we walk by. It's not the people that clean our offices every night. It's none of those folks. It's the senior executives.

Now, these poor people are going to be under such great duress by this that they're probably going to get their resumes together and that loud "whoosh" you hear is them running away from \$199,000 a year jobs. Are you kidding me? You can't say that with a straight face about how are we ever going to keep qualified people here.

I got to tell you something. I've got a lot of unemployed people back in northwest Pennsylvania that will line up for these jobs. Now, the \$199,000, of course, is the top of it. But the real kicker is they can't go over \$230,000 with their bonuses. These are people that are going to walk away from these jobs because we have the unmitigated gall to hold them accountable to the people who pay those wages, and that's the American taxpayers. That's who we are talking about. My goodness, have we fallen that far away from what this country was supposed to be?

Now, here's all we are saying to them—and we came about this because in a hearing on the GSA we asked about why is Mr. Neely on leave with pay. The people at the GSA say: "Well, you see, you don't understand, Congress. We don't have any mechanism to put them on leave without pay." I said: "I have never heard anything like that." Of course I haven't heard it because I come from the private sector. We don't do that in the private sector. But what I did find out was they would love to have that.

The people we put in charge of these agencies would actually love to be able

to hold those that work for them accountable and responsible. So what did we give them? We gave them the ability to do that. They can fire somebody on the spot. But we didn't do anything about their due process. That person is still entitled to come back and any protections under the law he or she still gets.

We can create an investigation on a leave without pay, but we also require that the agencies report to Congress every 45 days to let us know where the investigation is. My goodness, there's nothing harder in this body than trying to get information when there's an investigation under way. I just think that we've seen that the last couple of months, of: "You want to get the information? Well, we can't talk about it now because there's an investigation going on." It doesn't make sense to me. It doesn't make sense to the people I represent.

Now, you know when we talk about protecting American workers and we talk about what our duty is here, we were elected by a group of people from districts all over this country to come and represent them. According to the IRS, there are 145 million Americans who pay taxes. They file their taxes every year. There's 300 million out there, but 145 million pay taxes.

That's who it is that we are trying to protect. They're the ones that pay for every single thing that happens here. Or they cosign the note on the loan to keep this place floating.

So I want you to look at this now. There are "total Federal employees"—2.1 million. Now, this little red sliver—and it's really hard to see—remember, this represents four-tenths of 1 percent. As the President would say: "It's all about the arithmetic. It's all about the arithmetic." I would say to my colleagues on both sides, it's all about the people we represent.

I appreciate the spin. I appreciate the fact that you like to make every Capitol policeman think that he's unappreciated or she's unappreciated, or that everyone that works in our office is unappreciated, or that everybody from the private sector that works for this great Nation is unappreciated, but you know it's not true and you know what you are saying is not true.

What I would love to see is for you to stand up on this floor and look at people and say, this is what's going on, and you know it's not true. You absolutely know it's not true, but you say it anyway. And why? Because it wears well.

Thank you for bringing this legislation up, and thank you for protecting the American taxpayer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that they are to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time both sides have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 15½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Supreme Court *Loudermill* case, which Mr. LYNCH cited, says that the employee must be given notice before they are fired and an opportunity to respond. This bill, basically you're fired and then you appeal trying to get your job back, so you don't really truly have notice.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend from Maryland.

Madam Speaker, the distinguished manager on the other side of this bill says you are entitled to your own opinion, but not your own facts, in taking to task my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) in his reading of this bill. And I've got the bill in front of me. It says that "at least 30 days' advance written notice stating specific reasons for the proposed action"—that is to say, the removal or suspension of an employee—"unless there's a reasonable cause to believe the employee has committed a crime or the agency determines, as prescribed in regulation, that the employee's conduct with respect to an action covered by the subchapters proposed is flagrant and such employee intends to engage in such contact," and then you can be removed without that notice.

So Mr. LYNCH was right: facts are stubborn things.

If we really wanted to understand the motivation behind the legislation in front of us, it is a cynical political ploy before this Congress goes out on recess to allow one whole party and its Members to go home and avoid discussing the tough issues of the day and make the Federal employee the bogeyman. That Federal employee, whoever he or she is, vaguely abuses you, and you need to be protected against them.

So we are going to pass a bunch of bills that had no hearings, that are flawed in their drafting, that had to be removed from the floor yesterday and redrafted in order to come back today to qualify for a vote, because they otherwise wouldn't have passed on a suspension rule, and it is all part of this consistent and flagrant and, in my opinion, reckless campaign to demonize the public servants who serve us. And the loser ultimately in this game, this political game, will be the constituents they serve and we are supposed to serve.

It is not right to demonize Federal employees, and we've done that. We've cut their pay. We've frozen their pay for 3 years. We've raided their pensions

to try to finance things that have no relationship whatsoever to Federal employment per se, and we've characterized them in disparaging and negative ways that are not worthy of this body.

So it's all right. Go home, campaign against the Federal employee, and maybe you will make some headway. Maybe, in fact, it's a brilliant move short term, in terms of short-term political gain. But it's at long-term expense—expense at the truth and expense of the men and women who serve this country ably every day and who deserve better from their elected representatives.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia would have kept this person on for how long—weeks, months, more than a year? This individual received a bonus after more than a year.

When this bill came through our committee, the amendment to say "in all cases 30 days" could have been offered; it wasn't. This came through in regular order of the committee. The language was published. There was every opportunity.

When the gentleman from Virginia said "redrafted," with all due respect, not a word was changed in any of these three bills from the time it left our committee until today when it's being considered.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. I thank the gentleman from California.

Madam Speaker, Federal agencies not only get to write rules, they get to enforce them. It was recently noted that a citizen is ten times more likely to be tried by an agency than by an actual court. In any given year, Federal judges conduct roughly 95,000 adjudicatory proceedings, including trials, while Federal agencies complete more than 939,000—939,000.

In these agency proceedings, citizens have fewer rights than in a courtroom. And unfortunately, there are some bad actors who intimidate, coerce, or even lie, violating public trust and potentially breaking laws. Far too often, the public is left without evidence to help prove Federal employees mistreated them.

For example, the SEC bowing to political pressure to scrutinize donations to tax-exempt groups; IRS employees targeting Tea Party groups applying for tax-exempt status; and other agencies that are writing and enforcing rules and regulations written in legalese to confuse and frustrate the public.

Title III of this bill ensures that individuals have the right to record their meetings and telephone exchanges with Federal regulatory officials engaged in enforcement activities.

The manager's amendment adopted in committee ensures that law enforcement would not be impacted adversely.

Undercover investigations and wiretap surveillance would not be interfered with.

This legislation does not supersede any State laws, and it has no impact on citizen interactions with non-Federal officials such as State and local police officers.

Madam Speaker, it is the duty of Congress to protect rights, not take them away. This legislation is just another step in protecting the rights of our citizens.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend.

Madam Speaker, the distinguished chairman of this committee throws a picture up on the floor and, of course, doesn't allow me to respond when he demands "is this what the gentleman from Virginia is talking about."

It is wrong for the chairman of the distinguished committee to suggest or allow the inference to be drawn that somehow that picture represents all Federal employees. And the gentleman who just spoke, talking about rights, what about the rights of the employees who serve our country, what about their rights that are being trampled on in this legislation?

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I was not going to speak. I was constrained to speak, to come to the floor, when we had this chart about 2 million employees.

But only adversely affecting just a small sliver. The premise seems to be you can undermine—as long as they're a small minority—the rights of people.

And those Capitol policemen of which the gentleman spoke, and the people at the desk of whom the gentleman spoke, people who serve in our committees of whom the gentleman spoke, people who serve as nurses—not necessarily in VA hospitals because they're exempt—zero COLA 4 years in a row. All 2 million have been affected.

□ 1700

Every new employee has been affected—everyone—not just that small, little sliver that apparently the SES is. They don't get rights. If it were 1.98 million, well, then, that's a different story, but as long as it's only a small sliver, undermine their rights.

I came to the floor to say that, if we undermine the rights of one, frankly, the rights of all are soon at risk. We have learned that throughout history. So I would hope that we would reject this bill, which was seven or eight bills to start out with, which were put up here in a way that you could not amend them—suspension—in this

transparent, open, “let the House work its will” process, and we now come back with a closed rule, putting all the bills in one—a rule covering all seven bills—and the chairman shakes his head and shows pictures and believes those are facts.

My friends, we ought to reject these bills because they are about all employees. They may affect only a small few at this juncture, but they are about all employees; and it's about undermining their rights and the respect we ought to accord to them for the service they give to the people of the United States of America.

Mr. ISSA. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the gentleman from Maryland as he talks about its being about all employees. Indeed, it is, because, if we allow this continued behavior to go on, it will tarnish the good reputation of Federal workers who day in and day out serve this country and the citizens so well.

What we are talking about is giving a tool, a management tool, to let managers manage. We are talking about not giving bonuses to those who are of the very highest—the 1 percent—while the rank and file goes so many times without being recognized or compensated for what it deserves. We are talking about employees who make an average salary of \$168,000 a year, and yet we are talking about a privileged few whom we need to make sure we address. So, Mr. Speaker, it is about all of the employees, and it is about being fair.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, there is so much I would like to say, particularly as to the extraordinary discrepancy between those folks who make far less than their counterparts in the private sector and those who work in the private sector, who, perhaps, have less responsibility on their shoulders. Look it up. See the statistics. That's the case.

The other thing I want to say to my friend is that the law now provides for procedures to remove bad actors. Do we have some bad actors in the Federal service? We do. That's human life. That's the human experience.

Mr. MEADOWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I don't have anymore time, but if the gentleman from California will yield you some time, I will be glad to yield you some time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ISSA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority whip presumes to tell me about the private sector and how much peo-

ple make. The problem is that I came from the private sector. I know the difference between management and labor, and I know the difference between people who elect to be the top-paid management of entities and who typically serve at will in the private sector. Those of the Senior Executive Service are, in fact, people who choose to get additional pay for these special responsibilities, and they know what they're doing when they get into it. We are proud of most of them, the vast majority of them.

The fact is that Mr. HOYER has people who serve at will. He fires them without notice if he chooses to. Yet he cannot understand the fact by that picture I held up—I won't hold it up again; it's reprehensible even though it has been well seen—that that man continued to work and get a bonus during the 10 months in which the GSA Administrator knew wrongdoing had occurred on his watch. It wasn't until he decided to retire—to be honest, my understanding is with criminal allegations—that he even left and stopped getting his pay, and, today, he enjoys a very comfortable retirement.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is truly astonishing. We have serious issues before us. We should be focused on job creation, on comprehensive immigration reform, on providing nutrition assistance to children and seniors, on postal reform or on funding the government; but we are again debating partisan bills that stand no chance of becoming law, including the 40th vote to defund or to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Now, as kids, we are told that people in glass houses shouldn't throw stones, so I sure hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have not given one bonus to one of their senior staff members.

I hope that that is the case, that you have not given one bonus to a senior staff member. I hope, furthermore, that each of you is recording all of your staff members when they answer the phones because you want to know how they are treating your constituents.

This particular bill is the height of hypocrisy. It is a blatant attack on Federal employees that reinforces the fact that current leadership is only interested in political messaging, including through repeated attacks on hard-working Federal employees. It is simply shameful to say that we will belittle public service like that. I am a pub-

lic servant, and I am proud to be a public servant. Every Federal employee who works in this building and virtually every Federal employee who is out there in our communities is doing so because he believes in public service. I think that a Federal employee today is pretty crazy to be doing this job. He basically is being told, You're not worth very much. His integrity is constantly being questioned. He has had 3 years of pay freezes and furloughs, and he is supposed to continue to do public service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman.

I want to address one section of this bill that would now allow individuals to record telephone and in-person conversations with Federal employees. This would preempt the law in my State of California and in the chairman's State of California and in 11 other States that require the consent of all parties to a conversation. It contains no exceptions for law enforcement, sensitive communications, the military or anything else.

The FBI has already indicated to us that it strongly opposes this bill because, in its words, “this proposal risks undermining criminal investigations by reducing the willingness of individuals to cooperate with law enforcement and would result in the creation of recordings of law enforcement conversations that could jeopardize sensitive and important criminal and counterterrorism investigations.”

I think this is ill-founded.

Even the ACLU, which strongly supports the principle of allowing citizens to record law enforcement interactions, does not support the provision in this bill because it “threatens to impermissibly interfere with government workers' constitutional liberties.”

So this is a bill in search of a problem that actually makes it harder to go after real criminals, and this bill does not apply to this body, to Members of Congress. Maybe it's time for this bill's authors to look a little closer to home.

Mr. ISSA. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY DAVIS), a member of the committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation, the Stop Government Abuse Act. I would feel much better about it if it were labeled the Promotion of Government Abuse Act, because it encourages government to roll back the clock and take away rights that workers have earned from working hard.

Can you imagine being fired after you've worked up to the ranks of the SES, which is very difficult to get to, and being told that you've been let go on the basis of an IG report? Where is the equal protection under the law there? There is none. I think that it's unfortunate that we would treat our Federal workforce this way. They work hard, deserve better; and I oppose this legislation.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, this is one more bill designed to punish the Federal workforce and to discourage the very people whom we need to join the Federal workforce. It's singling it out for harsher treatment than we would apply to ourselves or to our workforces, frankly. You need to be able to reward your best workers. If this were a private sector corporation, our revenue would have dried up; our stock value would have imploded; and our employees would have left.

Federal employees stick with it because they believe in this government. They hope that, one day, the legislative branch will appreciate what they do. I worked for the Federal Government 40 years ago; and while I worked 10 or 12 hours a day, there were people working longer than that. They did that for about 40 years, and they worked very hard and in a dedicated way.

This legislation isn't even properly thought through. No congressional hearing has been held on this measure that, in fact, jeopardizes law enforcement. It would intrude upon and disrupt sensitive phases of many Federal civil and criminal investigations and law enforcement efforts, as well as litigation involving the government. We hear that from the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys. We hear from the FBI employees that this proposal risks undermining criminal investigations by reducing the willingness of individuals to cooperate with law enforcement. It would result in the creation of recordings of law enforcement conversations that could jeopardize sensitive and important criminal counterterrorism investigations. We hear from Federal law enforcement officers that it puts law enforcement activities at risk and does a disservice to the brave men and women who are asked to put their lives on the line to protect us from terrorists and criminals.

This is bad legislation. We know why it is being offered. We also trust that it's not going to become law. So you have to ask, Why are we doing it? We are doing it to send a message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MORAN. The message it's sending is that our Federal employees are not to be valued, that our managers are not to reward people for good work, that, in fact, we want the government to shrink, that we don't want it to be able to carry out its necessary activities. When we do that, we do a disservice to our constituents and to this country. This stuff has got to stop.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT
OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 29, 2013.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight & Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ELIJAH CUMMINGS,
Ranking Member, Committee on Oversight & Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ISSA AND RANKING MEMBER CUMMINGS: On behalf of the membership of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA), I am writing to oppose H.R. 2711—the “Citizen Empowerment Act,” as amended by the Committee and urge you to further amend the bill to ensure that law enforcement and other public safety activities are not covered by its provisions.

As originally written, the legislation contained general exceptions for situations where classified information, public safety or an on-going law enforcement investigation would be at risk. This language was necessary to ensure that federal law enforcement officers and the critical work they perform are not adversely impacted by this bill. In fact, the original language should have gone even farther to make clear that law enforcement activities would not be jeopardized in any way.

For incomprehensible reasons the committee approved an amended bill that removed even basic exceptions.

When a federal law enforcement officer is conducting a criminal investigation via telephone, i.e. on a suspect of terrorism, the officer should not have to notify the suspect of the right to record the conversation and whether the officer is recording the conversation. Obviously, conventional wisdom tells us that any thought of conducting a successful investigation after disclosure of this type is impossible. There is no logical reason why criminal investigations shouldn't be exempted from the proposal.

This legislation puts law enforcement activities at risk and does a disservice to the brave men and women who are asked to put their lives on the line to protect us from terrorists and criminals. FLEOA opposes any actions by Congress that lessens the ability of our Citizenship to remain safe and secure and jeopardizes the ability of federal law enforcement officers to continue to perform their sworn duties to protect them.

As the Chair and Ranking Member with jurisdiction over H.R. 2711, we urge you to ensure that the bill is not considered on the Floor unless it is amended to exempt law enforcement from its provisions. Until that time, FLEOA will continue to strongly oppose this legislation.

Respectfully,
FRANK TERRERI,
National Vice President for
Legislative Affairs.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS,
Lake Ridge, VA.

VOTE “No” ON H.R. 2879, “THE STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT”

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS OPPOSES H.R. 2879, “THE STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT,” AND URGES HOUSE MEMBERS TO VOTE NO ON THIS LEGISLATION

Section 301 of H.R. 2879 will undermine federal civil enforcement activities and criminal prosecutions during the investigative, pretrial trial and enforcement phases of litigation involving the interests of the United States.

Section 301 is the former “Citizen Empowerment Act” (H.R. 2711), as amended by the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee on July 24. The provision contains no exemption for litigation involving the United States or the activities of federal law enforcement personnel. No Congressional hearing has been held on the measure.

Section 301 requires the Government broadly to inform an individual of the right to record in-person and telephonic interactions with Government employees—including law enforcement officers, investigative agents and Assistant United States Attorneys and other federal prosecutors—whenever an Executive Agency provides “any written material . . . to the individual concerning an audit, investigation, inspection, or enforcement action that could result in the imposition of a fine, forfeiture of property, civil monetary penalty, or criminal penalty against, or the collection of an unpaid tax, fine, or penalty from, such individual or a business owned or operated by such individual.”

This notice requirement would reach to a myriad of legal and law enforcement-related documents regularly issued by the federal government, including subpoenas, search warrants, arrest complaints and forfeiture notices. This mandate is far more expansive than requiring the government to post notice of the right to record on agency websites, as also included in section 301.

The notice mandate of H.R. 2879 would intrude upon and disrupt sensitive phases of many federal civil and criminal investigations and law enforcement efforts, as well as litigation involving the government. The breadth of the “written material” trigger could undermine undercover investigations, given its potential to “tip off” witnesses, suspects and targets of investigations. The bill also would permit defense counsel to insist upon recording all interactions with federal prosecutors and law enforcement personnel in all phases of litigation with the government, including sensitive settlement and plea-bargain discussions. Even federal court proceedings, whose rules prohibit recording by individuals, could be impacted by this bill.

Citizens already may record their interactions with federal government officers and employees in most states within a carefully balanced set of legal and practical concerns. There is no compelling need for a measure like H.R. 2879, especially considering its incalculable damage on law enforcement efforts. At the very least, an exception should be included in the measure that exempts law enforcement-related activity involving government agents, investigators and Assistant United States Attorneys.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
AGENTS ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, July 31, 2013.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman, Comm. on Oversight & Government
Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ELLIJAH CUMMINGS,
Ranking Member, Comm. on Oversight & Gov-
ernment Reform, Washington, DC.

Re: H.R. 2711, the Citizen Empowerment Act

DEAR CHAIRMAN ISSA AND RANKING MEMBER CUMMINGS: On behalf of the FBI Agents Association ("FBIAA"), a voluntary professional association currently representing approximately 13,000 active duty and retired FBI Special Agents, I write to express the FBIAA's concerns about H.R. 2711, the Citizen Empowerment Act.

H.R. 2711 creates a broad right to record conversations with federal employees, and requires that notices of the right to record conversations be provided to individuals engaged in discussions with federal employees—without any exceptions related to criminal investigations. This proposal risks undermining criminal investigations by reducing the willingness of individuals to cooperate with law enforcement, and would result in the creation of recordings of law enforcement conversations that could jeopardize sensitive and important criminal and counterterrorism investigations.

Also, by requiring written notices under the threat of disciplinary action, H.R. 2711 would create new administrative and bureaucratic requirements for Agents conducting investigations. The time and resources available to Agents are already stretched too thin, and new administrative burdens make it more difficult for Agents to protect the public.

For these reasons, the FBIAA opposes H.R. 2711 as currently written, and hopes that the House will make significant changes to H.R. 2711 before considering the legislation.

Sincerely,

REV TARICHE,
President.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I've heard so much about pay being frozen that I've got to tell you: the people that I represent in the Third Congressional District of western Pennsylvania wish their pay had been frozen. It has gone down steadily since 2010.

We talk about the inability to get the economy going. I feel the same way—it's embarrassing—but at the end of the day, we are not benevolent monarchs. We are stewards of the taxpayers' moneys. All we are doing is talking about accountability. Only in Washington is "accountability" a bad word. In the private sector, "accountability" reigns. The market determines my accountability. That's what holds me accountable in coming from the private sector.

Why is that so foreign here to, all of a sudden, have bills—to have things in front of us—that will help us to say to people in charge to hold people responsible and to hold people accountable?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as I've listened to all of these arguments, I cannot help but think about the many employees whom we see every day—the hardworking employees who give their blood, sweat, and tears to keep our country together.

When we talk about our senior executives, I will remind this body of something that Mr. HOYER talked about and, that is, under current law, senior executives may be disciplined for misconduct, neglect of duty, malfeasance, or of the failure to accept reassignment or transfer. There is a current statutory list of reasons for which actions may be taken against senior executives that covers a broad variety of situations, and they are adequate to deal with the problems that we are addressing today.

□ 1715

Senior executives suspected of criminal activity may already be removed or placed on indefinite suspension without pay. We need to focus on improving agency implementation rather than passing legislation that would deprive employees of their due process.

I know Mr. MORAN is right. There has been a relentless attack on Federal employees. The fact is that they're in their third year of pay freezes. They've been asked to pay more for their pensions and get less. We constantly hear negative comments about them, still folks say, We love them; we appreciate them. They are often the ones that aren't seen, unnoticed, unappreciated, and unapplauded.

We have a bill here that takes away something very fundamental, and that is their due process rights. A lot of people may think about due process and say, Oh, it's no big deal. Later, we'll take a little bit of due process here and take a little bit there. It is that due process that is the basic foundation of our Constitution and of our democracy. What we're talking about here is making sure that employees are afforded that due process.

So you get somebody who says, Okay. Fine. Fire them, and then let them appeal to get their job back. That's not how it's supposed to work. They're to be given some type of notice and given an opportunity to simply address whatever the accusations are. A lot of times we may look at folks and say we don't like what they allegedly did, but the fact is that we still have that little document—which, to me, is a big document—that we must adhere to.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all Members of the Congress to vote against this bill and give us a chance to come back, perhaps, and make the appro-

priate amendments so that it will be one that is suitable for the Congress to vote on.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify one thing.

When we talk about a freeze, when is a freeze not a freeze? Only in Washington, D.C.

Over the last 3 years, 99.4 percent of Federal employees got increases. Out of every 1,000 employees, only six were denied an increase. I think the record needed to be clarified.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. ISSA. Then I will close at this time and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, controversy comes in all forms. Sometimes it's legitimate; sometimes there are differences that are unresolved; sometimes, though, you find yourself befuddled.

These three bills passed on a voice vote. It didn't mean that they would have been authored by any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle or that they loved them. It meant that they were given a full opportunity to evaluate these, to offer amendments, to have up-or-down votes on them. Many of the suggestions they made were taken into account on many of the bills marked up during that long day. Many of the things being brought up here today simply were not brought up, and it's not because they didn't know about this.

When you have a version of this bill that's almost identical to that passed on December 19 of last year by a vote of 402-2, that means that you have people that today are vehemently opposed to provisions that they already voted for. I repeat, they're vehemently opposed to provisions they already voted for. I don't have the names of the two people that voted "no." They certainly have a right to express why they voted "no" last December.

I can tell you that when you have to only terminate 4/100 of 1 percent of the workforce, if you do it at all, the head of the agency has to determine that the employee has done something seriously wrong in regards to negligence of duty or misappropriation of funds or malfeasance. They have to determine that the employee did it knowingly, and they have to consider it necessary and advisable to protect this enterprise.

On top of that, the employee does have to be told why they're being terminated. I think that's important, because the ranking member and I heard from a woman in a hearing who left me feeling absolutely shocked. She's been

on leave without pay, and to this day, an investigation that is ongoing, months into it, she's never been told why she's on leave without pay. To be honest, she's a member of the Senior Executive Service.

Maybe she would fall under this bill. But in order to fall under this bill, some things would have to happen. First of all, the head of the agency would have to make a decision of wrongdoing, and it would be held by that decision being reasonable after the fact. They'd have to have told her why she's being removed, and she would already have had an opportunity in front of the Merit Systems Protection Board and the U.S. Court of Appeals, known as the Fed circuit. She already would have had all this due process, except months go by and she doesn't know and she's on administrative leave.

The fact is this is a tool. They don't have to use it. If they use it, they have to make sure that it's only for serious violations: neglect of duty, misappropriation of funds, or malfeasance. These are very serious. An extremely small part, highly compensated, respected people, and a few bad actors for neglect of duty, misappropriation of funds, or malfeasance can be removed. They still have their rights. We knew this was constitutional. To be honest, the complaint we seemed to have in committee for hours was something that I want to share with you, Mr. Speaker.

Members of my committee, when talking about the idea that only one-third without special exception of employees in any agency could receive bonuses rather than the 75 or 80 percent you heard about here today, they said, But this is their right. They've negotiated that. You're interfering with their contracts.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government does not allow negotiation in collective bargaining or otherwise for wages. We have a standard scale. Bonuses were created for only one purpose, and that was, in fact, to reward good behavior as an incentive.

These bills are well thought out and are only controversial today because the minority wants to make them controversial to create a controversy.

I urge support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. It's become a ritual with the House Republican Leadership to devote the dying hours of the legislative calendar to the task of beating up on federal employees.

You'll remember that the last time we found ourselves in this position was on January 1, 2013. As the clock ticked down the minutes closing the 112th Congress, instead of addressing the host of pressing financial matters that threatened the fiscal health of this nation, my Republican colleagues chose to focus those precious minutes on legislation to claw-back the meager .5% COLA promised to fed-

eral employees when the Continuing Resolution expired in March of that year.

As this country faced a wave of serious economic difficulties, instead of spending the time focusing on legislation to address these challenges, Republicans in Congress turned their attention to squeezing even more out of the hard working federal employees who had already contributed \$60 billion of their pay as part of a two-year pay freeze. By no fault of their own, our dedicated federal workers have become pawns in a ritualistic game fashioned to distract the American public from the real challenges confronting our country.

This week, this body considers a number of bills that again scapegoat federal employees. I rise today to ask my colleagues not to fall for this game again and to reject this gratuitous and disrespectful attack on our federal workers.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 2879, the Stop Government Abuse Act because the bill eliminates due process protections for members of the Senior Executive Service (SES) by allowing agency heads to fire SES employees without giving them advance notice or an opportunity to address the allegations against them. The bill would place the burden of proof on SES employees by requiring them to prove their innocence when seeking reinstatement. Democrats on the House Committee on Oversight tried to amend the bill to preserve existing due process protections for these employees, but their efforts were rejected.

Further, the bill would limit bonuses federal workers may receive to 5% of basic pay during sequestration and limit the number of Senior Executives who may receive performance awards to 33% of those eligible in each agency. If passed, this bill could further harm our government's ability to attract the best and the brightest managers, make it more difficult to retain current employees and exacerbate personnel shortages in nursing, information technology, cybersecurity, and acquisition where shortages have been a major concern for some time.

Federal employees dedicate their lives to the service of our nation. They protect our borders, care for our wounded service members and work to discover treatments and cures for diseases that touch virtually every American family. With their diligence and unwavering devotion, they have earned the right to be treated with respect and they do not deserve to be the target of arbitrary attacks seemingly just to fill space on the legislative calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 176, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

YEAS—239

Aderholt	Gosar	Pearce
Alexander	Gowdy	Perry
Amash	Granger	Peters (CA)
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Peterson
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Petri
Bachus	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Barber	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Barletta	Grimm	Poe (TX)
Barr	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barrow (GA)	Hall	Posey
Barton	Hanna	Price (GA)
Benishek	Harper	Reed
Bentivolio	Harris	Reichert
Bera (CA)	Hartzler	Renacci
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Rice (SC)
Black	Hensarling	Rigell
Blackburn	Holding	Roby
Bonner	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hurt	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Issa	Rooney
Buchanan	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Calvert	Jordan	Rothfus
Camp	Joyce	Royce
Cantor	Kelly (PA)	Ruiz
Capito	King (NY)	Runyan
Carter	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon
Chabot	Kline	Sanford
Chaffetz	Labrador	Scalise
Coble	LaMalfa	Schock
Coffman	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cole	Lance	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Latham	Sessions
Cook	Latta	Shimkus
Cotton	LoBiondo	Shuster
Cramer	Long	Simpson
Crawford	Lucas	Sinema
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Cuellar	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Maffei	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Marino	Southerland
Denham	Massie	Stewart
Dent	Matheson	Stivers
DeSantis	McCarthy (CA)	Stockman
DesJarlais	McCaul	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	McClintock	Terry
Duffy	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	McIntyre	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Tiberi
Ellmers	McKinley	Tipton
Farenthold	McMorris	Turner
Fincher	Rodgers	Upton
Fitzpatrick	McNerney	Valadao
Fleischmann	Meadows	Wagner
Fleming	Meehan	Walberg
Flores	Messer	Walden
Forbes	Mica	Walorski
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Fox	Miller, Gary	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Gallo	Murphy (FL)	Whitfield
Garcia	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Gardner	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Noem	Wittman
Gerlach	Nugent	Womack
Gibbs	Nunes	Woodall
Gibson	Nunnelee	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Olson	Yoho
Gohmert	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NAYS—176

Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Brown (FL)
Bass	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Beatty	Bonamici	Bustos
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Butterfield
Bishop (GA)	Braley (IA)	Capps

Capuano	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Cárdenas	Huffman	Pocan
Carney	Israel	Polis
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Jeffries	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Chu	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Clarke	Keating	Rush
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Kildee	T.
Connolly	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Cooper	Kind	Sarbanes
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Courtney	Kuster	Schiff
Cummings	Langevin	Schneider
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
DeFazio	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Levin	Scott, David
Delaney	Lipinski	Serrano
DeLauro	Loeb	Sewell (AL)
DeBene	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
Deutch	Lowenthal	Sherman
Dingell	Lujan	Sires
Doggett	Grisham	Slaughter
Doyle	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Duckworth	Lujan, Ben Ray	Speier
Edwards	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Ellison	Lynch	Takano
Engel	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Enyart	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Tierney
Esty	Matsui	Titus
Farr	McCollum	Tonko
Fattah	McDermott	Tsongas
Foster	McGovern	Van Hollen
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Vargas
Fudge	Meng	Veasey
Gabbard	Michaud	Vela
Garamendi	Moore	Velázquez
Grayson	Moran	Visclosky
Green, Al	Nadler	Walz
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Wasserman
Grijalva	Neal	Schultz
Gutiérrez	Negrete McLeod	Waters
Hahn	Nolan	Watt
Hanabusa	O'Rourke	Waxman
Hastings (FL)	Owens	Welch
Heck (WA)	Pascarella	Wilson (FL)
Higgins	Pastor (AZ)	Wolf
Himes	Payne	Yarmuth
Hinojosa	Perlmutter	
Honda	Peters (MI)	

NOT VOTING—18

Campbell	Holt	Miller, George
Cleaver	Horsford	Pallone
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Pelosi
Conyers	Lewis	Radel
Crowley	McCarthy (NY)	Richmond
Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)

□ 1749

Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. PAYNE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CHAFFETZ changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I attended a meeting at the White House with the President of the United States. As such, I was unfortunately not able to be present for the following vote:

On final passage of H.R. 2879, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that a meeting at the White House caused me to miss the first vote series on August 1, 2013. Had I been present, my intention was to vote

as follows on the amendments to H.R. 1582, the Energy Consumers Relief Act: "no" on the Waxman Amendment, "no" on the Connolly Amendment, and "yes" on the Murphy (PA) Amendment. I would have voted "no" on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 1582 and "yes" on Passage on H.R. 1582. Further I would have voted "yes" on the previous question, "yes" on the combined rule for the REINS Act, Keep IRS Off Health Care Act, and the Stop Government Abuse Act. Finally, I would have voted "yes" on the passage of H.R. 1897, the Vietnam Human Rights Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 9 of House Resolution 322, H.R. 1541, H.R. 2579, and H.R. 2711 are laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 319

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 319. It was put on that resolution inadvertently.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2783

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentleman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) as a cosponsor from H.R. 2783.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE
IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT
OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 367.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 322 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 367.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1757

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, with Mr. HULTGREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Earlier this month, President Obama announced that he would, once again, pivot to the economy. The bottom line of his speech, after 4½ years of the Obama administration: "We're not there yet."

The President is right: we're not there yet. Economic growth is the key to job creation and recovery, but America's growth rate is historically anemic. From 2010 through 2012, it averaged barely 2 percent. In the fourth quarter of 2012, growth was just four-tenths of one percent.

In the first two quarters of this year, growth averaged only 1.4 percent according to the most recent estimates. These dismal figures translate into deep economic pain for America's workers and families.

The June 2013 jobs report showed an increase of 240,000 in the number of discouraged workers, those who have simply quit looking for a job out of frustration or despair.

The number of people working part-time, but who really want full-time work, passed 8.2 million. That represents a jump of 322,000 in just 1 month.

Worst of all, the truest measure of unemployment, the rate that includes both discouraged workers and those who cannot find a full-time job, continues to exceed 20 million Americans. That rate rose from 13.8 percent back to 14.3 in June.

America's labor force participation rate has fallen to levels not seen since the Carter administration. Median real household income, meanwhile, is 5 percent lower than in June of 2009, when the recession officially ended.

□ 1800

Median incomes are supposed to rise during economic recoveries, not fall. The Obama administration, however, has managed to buck the historical trend. Worse, median incomes remain 9 percent below the peak they reached in January 2008, before the financial crisis. The President is indeed right: we're not there yet. But what the President missed in his speech is that it is his administration's policies that are responsible for America still remaining so

deep in this economic hole. To see how true that is one only has to look at the historical record.

The current recovery is the weakest on record in the post-World War II era. The contrast with the recovery Ronald Reagan achieved is particularly stark. Four-and-a-half years after the recession began in 1981, the Reagan administration, through policies opposite to the Obama administration, had achieved a recovery that created 7.9 million more jobs than when the recession began. Real per capita gross domestic product rose by \$3,091. Real median household income rose by 7.7 percent.

Surely, the administration knows this. But instead of fixing the problem by changing its policies, the Obama administration knows only one response: double down, increase taxes, increase spending, and increase regulation.

The number of new major regulations the Obama administration has issued and plans to issue—generally, regulations with more than \$100 million in impacts—is without modern precedent. Testimony before the Judiciary Committee this term and during the 112th Congress has plainly shown the connection between skyrocketing levels of regulation and declining levels of jobs and growth.

To make matters worse, it is increasingly the case that, when Congress refuses to enable the administration's flawed policies through legislation, the administration unilaterally issues new regulations to achieve an end run around Congress.

The REINS Act is one of the most powerful measures we can adopt to put an end to regulation that wrongheadedly imposes the administration's flawed policies on the American people. It achieves that result in the simplest and clearest ways—by requiring an up-or-down vote by the people's representatives in Congress before any new major regulation can be imposed on our economy.

Some say the REINS Act will mean an end to new major regulation, even when regulation is needed. But the REINS Act does not prohibit new major regulation. It simply establishes the principle: no major regulation without representation.

By restoring to Members of Congress, who are accountable to the American people, the responsibility for America's costliest regulatory decisions, the REINS Act provides Congress and, ultimately, the people with a much-needed tool to check the one-way cost ratchet turned by the Obama administration and Washington's regulatory bureaucrats.

I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the REINS Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 367, the REINS Act of 2013.

As I noted during our extensive debate in the Judiciary Committee on this bill, it reminds me of the movie "Groundhog Day." I feel like Bill Murray. It's that day over and over again. We come back to the same bill.

We extensively debated this bill in the last Congress; we debated bills very similar to it in this Congress; and, again, we're here debating this bill, which, by any sensible measure and probably a civics student in the 10th grade or less would know that this is a seriously flawed bill that will impede legislation and hurt the American public. It's based on a premise that regulations by themselves stifle job creation, a rather unique concept that we have come to debate in our committee and now on the floor.

H.R. 367 threatens to undermine vital protections that ensure the safety and soundness of the entire range of societal needs, from food safety to clean air and clean water, to workplace safety, to consumer product safety, to financial stability. It does this by bringing most important Federal rulemakings—including those that protect the public like the Affordable Care Act and the implementation thereof, as well as the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act aimed at keeping us back from the catastrophic days back in 2008 or 2009 when the world was coming to an end because of derivatives—it takes the implementation of these bills to a screeching halt, a result that will put at risk the well-being of millions of Americans, both from fiscal health and physical health.

The REINS Act would require that both Houses of Congress pass and the President sign a joint resolution of approval within 70 legislative days before a major rule can take effect. In the House, a committee of jurisdiction would have but 17 legislative days to consider a joint resolution of approval, after which it would automatically be discharged from the committee and sent to the full House—certainly not enough time to do a good job of reviewing the regulations. The House must consider such a resolution either on the second or fourth Thursday of every month, assuming that the House is even in session on that Thursday.

The bill also defines a "major rule" as one having at least a \$100 million economic impact or having one of a number of other economic impacts. In all, Federal agencies issue about 50 to 100 major rules every year. That means that if the REINS Act had become law this year, there would only be 5 days left in 2013 for the House to consider 50 to 100 major rules. And while the other side loves gas, as we've seen with the farm bill and THUD, they can't pass it.

Given those traps set forth in the bill, no major rule would ever go into effect. This, in turn, threatens agen-

cies' ability to protect Americans' health, safety, and well-being. It's a way of stifling the opportunity to protect Americans.

Another concern with the REINS Act is the influence of industry lobbyists over rulemaking would tremendously increase. K Street would love it. Given the complexity of the rules at issue and the expedited timeframe for congressional consideration, Members would instead be bombarded with visits, phone calls, and talking points from industry lobbyists, who would no doubt take advantage of the REINS Act's short-circuited process to shape Members' views about a particular rule, probably within days of a major fundraiser.

On top of all the problems with this bill, it is simply unnecessary. First, to the extent that its proponents are concerned with Congress's accountability for agency rules, there are already numerous tools at our disposal to shape agency rulemaking. For example, Congress can rescind or limit its delegation authority to an agency if an agency acts beyond what we intended. Congress can also disapprove a rule under the Congressional Review Act process, defund enforcement of a rule or an agency through its appropriations and authorization power, overturn specific rules through legislation, and conduct regular oversight activity.

Second, to the extent that the REINS Act's proponents claim that the bill is necessary because the Obama administration has inundated the country with costly regulations, the facts simply do not bear this out. Just because you say "Obama" doesn't mean it's bad. Most Americans like Obama. He's been elected President twice.

In an op-ed that appeared in the *Memphis Commercial Appeal*, Doyle McManus cited Cass Sunstein, former director of OIRA, known as the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, who noted that in President Obama's "first 4 years in office, he has issued fewer new Federal regulations than any of the four Presidents who came before him, including Ronald Reagan."

Moreover, the op-ed noted that this President has revoked "hundreds of outmoded rules that produced savings for government, business, and consumers that will add up to billions."

Congress has already considered and rejected congressional approval schemes in the past. For instance, Chief Justice John Roberts—not exactly a flaming liberal—criticized legislation that was similar to the REINS Act back in 1983 when he was an associate White House counsel. In a memorandum, he objected that such legislation would "hobble agency rulemaking by requiring affirmative congressional assent to all major rules" and would "seem to impose excessive burdens on the regulatory agencies."

So before Chief Justice Roberts saved the ACA, he spoke out on this legislation as well in giving us wise counsel.

Finally, the broader premise underlying the REINS Act—that regulation stifles economic growth and job creation—is simply false.

It's pretty incredible that the proponents of antiregulatory bills like the REINS Act continue to make this claim in light of the fact there's absolutely no credible evidence establishing the fact that regulations have any substantive impact on job creation. But do not just take my word for it. Listen to some respected Republicans and conservatives.

Bruce Bartlett, a senior policy analyst in the Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations, said:

Republicans have a problem. People are increasingly concerned about unemployment, but Republicans have nothing to offer them. The GOP opposes additional government spending for jobs programs and, in fact, favors big cuts in spending that would likely lead to further layoffs at all levels of government. These constraints have led Republicans to embrace the idea that government regulation is the principal factor holding back employment. They assert that Barack Obama unleashed a tidal wave of new regulations, which has created uncertainty among businesses and prevents them from investing and hiring.

He concludes:

No hard evidence is offered for this claim. It is simply asserted as self-evident and repeated throughout the conservative echo chamber.

It's as if you say it enough, people will believe it.

On the related argument that regulations create business uncertainty, Mr. Bartlett has said:

Regulatory uncertainty is a canard invented by Republicans that allows them to use current economic problems to pursue an agenda supported by the business community year in and year out. In other words, it is a simple case of political opportunism, not a serious effort to deal with high unemployment.

That was Bruce Bartlett from the Reagan and George H.W. Bush days.

Susan Dudley, who headed the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs during the administration of George W. Bush, has been quoted as saying that it is "hard to know what the real impacts of regulation are." She also stated that she was unaware of any "empirically sound way to assess the impact that proposed rules have on jobs."

During one of the many hearings held on this issue in the last Congress, the majority's own witness clearly debunked the myth that regulations stymie job creation. Christopher DeMuth, with the conservative American Enterprise Institute, stated in his prepared testimony that "the focus on jobs . . . can lead to confusion and regulatory debates" and that "the employment effects of regulation, while important, are indeterminate."

The REINS Act is seriously flawed in its very conception and based on false

premises that regulation kills jobs. Ultimately, it will only serve to needlessly heighten risks to the health and safety—financial and physical—of the American people. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to H.R. 367, which I feel confident will pass this House and meet a timely death before it gets to see the light of day in the Senate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 367, the REINS Act.

Some of my Democrat friends want to characterize this bill as an antiregulation bill. But a vote for the REINS Act isn't a vote against regulations. It's a vote for better regulations. It's a vote in favor of a smarter regulatory system. It's a vote to balance broad economic interests against the narrow jurisdiction of individual Federal agencies. It's a vote to give the people most affected by regulations a louder voice in the democratic process.

Yesterday, the White House threatened to veto this bill if it passes. In their veto threat, they wrote:

Maintaining an appropriate allocation of responsibility between the two branches is essential to ensuring that the Nation's regulatory system effectively protects public health, welfare, safety, and our environment, while also promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation.

I couldn't agree more. That's exactly why I introduced this bill in January. For those, like me, who are truly concerned about maintaining an appropriate allocation of responsibility between the two branches, regardless of who occupies the White House, it's worth noting the executive branch only derives its power and only invokes its responsibility to issue a given legislation when the legislative branches authorize it to do so, and only in accordance with legislation passed by Congress.

However, this "allocation of responsibility" has been thrown out of whack because Congress has taken to the habit of passing sweeping, ambiguous laws that leave it to Federal agencies to sort out the details. This is typically done for the purpose of rushing bills through Congress in order to meet a political timetable or because certain Members would prefer to avoid working through the controversial details. It's much easier to leave such decisions to unaccountable rulemakers, after all.

ObamaCare is a great example of this phenomenon. As the minority leader said when she served as Speaker:

We have to pass the bill so you can find out what is in it.

It turns out that's exactly the case. They had to pass the bill so HHS, the

IRS, and our veritable alphabet soup of Federal agencies could tell us how the law would actually work. In fact, we still don't know exactly what's in the bill because we're still waiting on more regulations.

□ 1815

If the REINS Act were in place, none of the major regulations that are issued for ObamaCare or other sweeping laws would take effect until Congress approved them. This would make our regulatory process smarter for a number of reasons—chiefly, because we currently regulate in silos.

Now, when HHS employees are drafting a regulation about health insurance, for instance, they narrowly focus only on insurance. They aren't too worried about economic growth. If the IRS is drafting a regulation on tax collection, they are likely to focus narrowly on taxes. They don't take much into account job losses and income effects.

We need a Congress that can comprehensively look at these things, a body that can, in the words of the White House, "protect public health, welfare, safety, and our environment, while also promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation," all at the same time.

So as we learn what's actually in ObamaCare and other laws, why is it such a bad idea to ensure that individual, rank-and-file Americans get to weigh in, through their elected representatives, on the important details that impact their pocketbooks, consume their time, and govern countless aspects of their daily lives?

The truth is it's not a bad idea. In fact, I predict Congress would take the time to more thoroughly and publicly deliberate about these large ambiguous bills if the regulators didn't get the final say. In the end, we would end up with better, clearer legislation in a diminished role for unelected rulemakers. More Americans could stay engaged in the entire lawmaking process and could voice their concerns in a meaningful way. And politicians would be unable to hide behind so-called "unelected bureaucrats" because the American people could ultimately hold Congress accountable for the rules coming out of Washington.

I implore my colleagues to join me in restoring a measure of accountability to the democratic process. Support this bill.

The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in

which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent Resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Committee will resume its sitting.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to set the frame for where we are.

What we're asking is for all major rules and regulations to have to be approved by both the House and the Senate and signed by the President before they would ever go into effect. That message is one of the few things we can agree on—the Senate agreed on the time we can adjourn. That's about what we agree on. Seventeen bills have made it through here in 7 months, and we're talking about 50 to 100 major rules. Not gonna happen.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend from Tennessee, and I thank him for his able leadership on this bill.

Listening to our friends on the other side of the aisle, I urge them all to reread Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle," because that's where you would take us. You would take us to a world in which there was no Federal oversight of the food supply in America, there was no oversight of child labor in America, there was no oversight of workplace safety in America. And tragedies ensued.

America's water, America's air is cleaner, more breathable, and healthier today precisely because of regulation. The narrative that all regulation is burdensome—it only entails a cost, it never entails a benefit—is absolutely false and needs to be rejected by this body.

Sadly, Mr. Chairman, it is once again shaping up to be a lost summer for Congress as a number of issues ripe for debate—not this one—will be left to wither on the vine as Members leave town for the next 5 weeks. That's frustrating, after this year began with so much promise.

I was pleased to be part of a bipartisan coalition that voted for the New Year's Day deal to avert the fiscal cliff. A few weeks later, that same bipartisan coalition banded together to provide emergency aid to communities ravaged by Superstorm Sandy. Thankfully, our success didn't stop even there. We came together again on a bipartisan basis to reaffirm the strong support for the Violence Against Women Act after it had languished in this body because leadership refused to compromise.

At that point, people were actually beginning to wonder if the 113th Congress had finally gotten the message—that the American people want us to work together to get things done, not to just make cheap political points. But sadly, that progress was not sustained.

The first fissure appeared after the Senate's adoption of its first budget in nearly 4 years. I guess my friends on the other side of the aisle, the House Republicans, who had repeatedly beat up on the other Chamber for not doing its job with respect to the budget, are still dumbfounded that they in fact did pass one because it's been 4 months and they still have yet to appoint Members to the conference committee they claim they wanted.

Then the Senate managed to pass bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform. Our Republican colleagues may talk a good game on immigration, but that's all they've done so far here in the House. Not one of the bills in their piecemeal approach has come to this floor for consideration.

And just recently, House leaders allowed extreme partisanship to not only derail what was originally a bipartisan farm bill, but to also cast aside a critical safety net that was founded on a bipartisan basis in both the Senate and the House decades ago to protect families who need help putting food on the table.

The list of unfinished business continues to grow as we enter the final days of summer, but where is the urgency to resolve them? I was puzzled to see House Republicans bring up a so-called "jobs" bill that once again provided less infrastructure funding than we did the previous year in what was called the T-HUD appropriation bill. Of course it wasn't a surprise they had to pull it from the floor in the face of bipartisan opposition. Their parting shot of this week will be the 40th attempt to repeal part or all of ObamaCare. That's 40.

When we return from this ill-timed recess, Congress will have just 9 legislative days to reach a deal on keeping the government open for business beyond the end of the fiscal year, and by that time we're going to be bumping up against the debt ceiling. We actually managed a bipartisan accord to suspend that debt ceiling earlier this year, but we haven't been able to rekindle that spirit of cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, the American people aren't taking 5 weeks off like we are, and neither should this Congress. We can't afford another lost summer.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time it's my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law.

Mr. BACHUS. The gentleman from Fairfax, Virginia, has just told us that

we have avoided the fiscal cliff. I wonder if our children and grandchildren can take any comfort in that. I had no idea that the deficit and the debt had gone away. I had been told they were increasing by billions of dollars every day.

We have another difference of opinion across the aisle. Our colleagues are saying we need more Federal regulations—those that are covered by this bill that cost \$100 million or more. We on this side of the aisle think that we could do well with a few less more regulations. Yes, every President has added regulations, every administration—and we're supposed to say that that is a good thing?

Regulations today cost \$11,000 per American worker. Now, that's not taxes; that's not your Social Security; that's not their expense. That is just the Federal regulations. Fourteen percent of our national income, according to Dr. Douglas Holtz-Eakin, our former Congressional Budget Office director, 14 percent of our national income is being absorbed by Federal regulations.

Now, the gentleman from Tennessee says there were all these regulations before, and the Obama administration, they passed very few regulations. Well, not according to Dr. Holtz-Eakin. He actually says that in the last 4 years, the Obama administration has added over a half-trillion dollars worth of new regulations. Boy, so it may be Groundhog Day, but we're another half-trillion dollars deeper in Federal regulations.

But let's talk about one family. Let's talk about one family and what regulations mean to them. One regulation caused American families to pay \$20 more for a bronchial dilator. That was despite the fact that in 1987, in Montreal, there was an accord. And the reason is, the FDA said we're not going to allow an ozone-depleting substance to come out of these bronchial dilators, so they banned it. And immediately, in 2008, the cost of these bronchial dilators went from \$6 and \$8 up to as much as \$30. Well, you know what the effect of that was? Let me tell you what The New York Times said. The New York Times described this as a rough transition to new asthma inhalers because several million Americans suddenly were paying \$20 more and some couldn't afford it.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Some couldn't afford it, I'll say to the gentleman from Virginia, the gentleman from Georgia, and the gentleman from Tennessee. Several million Americans were suddenly being forced—some elderly, some children—to pay \$20 more for what had been a \$7 or \$10 item. And you know what happened? A lot of them couldn't afford it,

and there were more asthma attacks and there was more bronchitis, and emphysema increased. That was despite the fact that in Montreal, in 1987, there was an accord that said, number one, that substance in a medical inhaler was essential and was excepted from the accord because the ozone was improving, number one. But number two, even if you banned all non-industrial discharges of ozone-depleting substances—all of them—it wouldn't do any good; it would have an insignificant effect. And of the non-industrial discharges, the amount from medical inhalers was infinitesimal. We denied millions of Americans an essential health item.

Mr. COHEN. Before I yield to Mr. JOHNSON, I would say that I could respond to some of the statements that the gentleman from Alabama made, but I won't do it because I have the highest respect for him. He's one of the finest Members of this House.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 367, the REINS Act.

I have profound concerns with the REINS Act. This bill would undermine the ability of agencies to protect the public interest. It is a continuation of the majority's obstructionist approach that led to sequestration.

This deregulatory train wreck threatens to send us back to the days before the Wall Street collapse, a financial catastrophe that could have been avoided by responsible policies. This bill comes from the same brain trust that pulled the bill for transportation funding yesterday. Apparently, \$4.4 billion in budget cuts is not good enough for these Republicans.

And now we consider the REINS Act, a bill that would require Congress to have the final say on regulations. Stop and think about that. The same House Republicans that could not vote to fund transportation now want to have the final say on all major rules. Never mind that Congress already has that power under the Congressional Review Act. Never mind that House Republican leadership tried this same maneuver in 2011.

□ 1830

If Republican leadership truly believed in growing the economy and creating jobs, we would have come together with a grand bargain long ago. We could even vote on job-creating legislation to strengthen the middle class. But instead, this Republican Congress insists on voting on a messaging bill that will go absolutely nowhere. Few Americans are surprised by yet another Republican leadership failure that has become par for the course.

Mr. Chairman, millions of Americans are still out of work. As we go back to our districts over the recess, I hope my

Republican colleagues can look into the eyes of the poor and the unemployed in their communities and say: "Don't worry, I voted for a messaging bill to deregulate America."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it's my pleasure to yield 2 minutes on this job-creating legislation to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), a great new member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 367, the REINS Act of 2013.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and a cosponsor, I am pleased to see a good reform bill like REINS come to the floor. Regulations impose hundreds of billions of dollars—in fact, trillions of dollars—on family farmers and small businesses, which significantly affect our economy and job creation in southeast Missouri.

Businesses and individuals face an uncertain regulatory future, and this gives them pause as they seek to start or grow their businesses to encourage economic growth and create jobs. The REINS bill adds just a little more certainty to the process. It allows these individuals to hear about regulations and give input to Congress before they vote up or down on an agency rule.

As I travel across Missouri, I always run into business owners, family farmers, and individuals who have felt the sting of government and their overreach, with the over 170,000 pages of rules and regulations affecting their lives. The "pie in the sky" regulations here in D.C. have real effects back home. The voice of the American people through their elected representatives should be the determining factor in government regulation, not that of a beltway bureaucrat.

I urge adoption of the REINS Act.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes and 53 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose this misguided piece of legislation, which would erect new obstacles and red tape to protecting American lives.

At the outset, let me just reiterate what Mr. COHEN said earlier in his opening remarks, which is that Congress already has the power to disapprove any rule through the Congressional Review Act, through the appropriations process, and through other authorizing legislation.

H.R. 367, let's face it, is essentially an attempt to impose a procedural chokehold on protecting American citizens. I want to talk about one of those proposed rules, which is now pending at OSHA, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, which is a rule to prevent the continuing litany of workplace fire and explosions from combustible dust.

Unfortunately, the Rules Committee didn't see fit to allow an amendment offered by Representative GEORGE MILLER to exclude that rule from the underlying bill. It has been abundantly clear for a decade that Federal regulatory action is needed to prevent combustible dust explosions and fires.

In 2003, the Chemical Safety Board found that protections to stop these explosions were grossly inadequate. The Board identified hundreds of other combustible dust fires and explosions, causing at least 119 fatalities and 715 injuries over the last 15 years.

The investigators themselves are not alone in demanding action. Tammy Miser of Kentucky testified before Congress recently about how her brother Shawn was killed in a metal dust fire at an aluminum wheel plant in Huntington, Indiana, in 2003. She told us how he was left lying on a smoldering floor after the explosion while aluminum dust burned through his flesh and muscle tissue. And each breath caused his internal organs to be burned even more.

Shawn wasn't the first to die at work this way, and he hasn't been the last. It has been more than 5 years since the Imperial Sugar explosion in Georgia, an explosion that killed 14 workers. It caused hundreds of millions of dollars in damage because an unchecked accumulation of sugar dust ignited and caused a chain of explosions, leveling the plant.

These workplace explosions have not stopped. There have been 49 major combustible dust fires or explosions that have killed 18 and injured 131 workers since Imperial Sugar.

More recently, five workers were killed in three separate events at a factory north of Nashville because an iron powder processing plant failed to abate repeated dust hazards. Each of the five left behind a wife and child; one had four children under 11, another became a grandfather the day before he was killed.

Widows have called on their government to protect them, and that's where OSHA comes in. In 2009, OSHA finally started work on a rule to reduce the risk of these explosions. There will be small business panels, risk assessments, public hearings, and plenty of opportunities for comments.

Despite the clear need to move forward, this bill would give special interests a new way to block needed protections, and they are already lining up to kill a rule they dislike.

The sad truth is that the underlying bill is nothing more than an effort to put the powerful above the lives and limbs of working families and their widows.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this bill.

If I have another few seconds, I just want to say we are now hours away from a 5-week recess. 640,000 DOD civilian employees are looking at Congress,

asking why they should be furloughed for the next 8 weeks, losing 20 percent of their pay, some of whom are doing critical work for our national security, and yet not once in the over 200 days since this Congress was sworn in, has the governing majority brought a bill to this floor to turn off sequester and make sure that these people who are doing critical work for our national security can do their job. That's what we should be focused on. We should cancel the recess, turn off sequester, and end the endless debate about bills that are headed nowhere.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the REINS Act.

The REINS Act is needed, frankly, because for decades now Congress has abdicated its responsibility for lawmaking to unelected Federal elites in the executive branch. They often create overbearing regulations that stifle innovation, reduce productivity, prevent businesses from growing and adding jobs, and increase prices on everything from gasoline to groceries. Don't get me wrong; some regulations are good and necessary, but they come with substantial cost, and there is not enough accountability for them.

I would look forward to voting for good regulations, and I would think my colleagues across the aisle would also look forward to voting for good regulations and taking credit for them. At this moment, however, the Obama administration has regulations in the pipeline that could cost the American people more than \$50 billion. The Competitive Enterprise Institute estimates the regulatory burden to be almost \$15,000 a year per family. Another study estimates that just six EPA regulations will cause the loss of almost 10 million jobs.

These rules are written by unelected elites with very little accountability to individual citizens across my district in western Pennsylvania, from Ellwood City to Lower Burrell to Somerset.

The REINS Act requires your elected representatives to be more accountable for regulations. Very simply, if the regulations will cost Americans more than \$100 million, then Congress has to vote on it. Good regulations will be approved, and others will not. But your representative will have to declare a position, and you can hold them accountable for their votes.

Mr. Chairman, the REINS Act makes sense to me, it makes sense to my constituents in western Pennsylvania, and I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 11½ minutes. The gentleman from Tennessee has 10½ minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the chair for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the REINS Act, and I rise in support of the man who introduced it, my friend and colleague from Indiana, Mr. YOUNG.

I want to start out by addressing something the gentleman from Tennessee debated and talked about just a little bit earlier. He said that "we don't get anything done here." I would like to take some opposition to that.

Just this week, we solved in a permanent fashion, Mr. Chairman, the student loan situation. We didn't do it with Democratic-inspired price fixing; we tied it to the market. Now, it's true it was very much a Republican bill when it left this House, then it was wisely adopted by the Senate in agreement last week, and it came back over here for a final vote 99 percent the same as it left. That's getting something done. That is real.

But let's take the gentleman's point a little bit further. Let's say sometimes we don't get something done; let's say sometimes we don't agree. The gentleman's solution is to let the unelected, unaccountable, nameless, faceless bureaucrats handle it, who aren't directly elected by anybody.

That is an abdication of the constitutional duty of this House, of this branch of government. It is our duty to make the laws; it is our duty to make the rules. And not only is it our duty to debate and pass legislation—hopefully not every time with our names on it—but it's also our constitutional duty to oversight the executive branch. That's exactly what the REINS Act acts to do.

How dare we decide we don't want to address, we don't want to tackle the big issues, Mr. Chairman, because they're too controversial; let the bureaucrats do it. That's not the way to run a government, that's not a way to run this branch of government, and that's not the way to run this House.

It's time this body starts doing its second and equally important constitutional duty, and that is oversight of the executive branch. The REINS Act, again, helps us do that in large measure. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. COHEN. I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), home of Archie Bell and the Drells.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his distinguished leadership and friendship, and the chairman of the full committee, because I believe that it is fair to have a difference of opinion. It is also fair to

say that there are times when we have a great opportunity to work together.

I believe the gentleman mentioned my tenure on the Judiciary Committee, so let me document for my colleagues: the REINS Act goes around and around and around and around. It is constantly repeated and reintroduced, and it constantly fails.

For the new Members, my friends on the other side of the aisle who are standing up and talking about what a great impact this would have, they are using old data and misinterpretation, for there is no real documentation that the REINS Act is going to stop \$1.5 trillion in excess cost. In fact, the authors of the study that my friends are using—the study was assessed by the Congressional Research Service.

I know when I speak to the American people and my colleagues they want to debunk all of this procedure and say "enough is enough." But the CRS showed that the study was flawed, but more importantly, the author said: "We never intended for this to determine benefits to regulation. Our studies have nothing to do with it."

We cannot document the \$1.5 trillion or the billions of dollars that our friends say that they're going to lose. They know full well that there is a procedure of disapproval that Congress can respond to the needs and the questions of the American public.

□ 1845

What they do not tell you is that this procedure—oh, I hate to talk about it. Please let me apologize. If you hear it, your eyes will roll back in your head, for what has to happen now is that the agency is doing its work. The DOD, Health and Human Services, the Department of Education are doing their work under existing law. They are trying to work on clean air and clean water, safe toys, safe cars, and safe workplaces.

By the way, I offered an amendment to exempt children's regulations for babies who are 2 and under, and I was denied by the majority, by the Republican Rules Committee, so that babies who need safe cribs and toys now have to have this happen. Unless both Houses of Congress pass a joint resolution—let me tell you how long that might take—2 years, 3 years, five sessions, who knows—and then such rule within a fixed 70-legislative-day period, it kicks over into the next Congress. In the meantime, babies' heads are driven through cribs.

Those of us who are mothers know that era. It hasn't stopped. Each time, you have to look at the technology of cribs—or of toys that they choke on—and be able to discern how newborns are impacted. The Consumer Product Safety Commission can't effectively put a regulation in. Mothers understand that. Can you imagine a resolution of two Houses of Congress? Right

now, we can't even get a budget resolution going forward.

I will tell you what the American people want us to do. It's not the REINS Act, which goes around and around. I think it was in the 112th Congress and in the 111th Congress. We are now in the 113th, and we will do it in the 114th. It does not save money. The American people want a solution-based budgeting process. They want us to go back to the budget reconciliation. They want us to stop laying off, as my good friend from Connecticut said, hardworking Defense workers, hardworking Homeland Security workers, hardworking Department of Education workers, who are trying to help this country be better. They want us to reduce the deficit. I will raise my hand for that. That is a good thing. They want us to create jobs, and they want us to be fair to the middle class.

I come from Texas. One of the worst disasters ever to occur was in West, Texas—the tragedy and the devastation of the loss of our fellow Americans in an explosion that should not have happened. What was the cry? What was the Federal Government doing? What was the regulatory scheme in order to prevent whatever ignited that terrible tragedy to see the loss of first responders?

The Federal Government is an umbrella on a rainy day. Fix the problems of regulation one by one. If there is one that is undermining small businesses, we are happy to do the disapproval process, and you can be assured that the voices of the American people will cry out. I can tell you that there is no proof—no legitimacy, no documentation—but anecdotal stories of, I hate the Federal Government. I don't hate the Federal Government. I pledge allegiance to this great flag and to this great Nation. I love my country. Therefore, I understand that it is the umbrella on a rainy day.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. COHEN. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady in order to explain the fallacies of this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his kindness.

Mr. Chairman, the reason we had to reassess the Army Corps of Engineers and have a regulatory scheme is that we lost almost 1,000-plus individuals in Hurricane Katrina. It wasn't the hurricane that had come through; it was the dam that broke. I know it well because I walked those streets of the Ninth Ward, and I saw the babies' shoes and the clothing hanging on closets and the whole area that was literally destroyed and that killed 1,000 people.

It's the regulatory structure of what kind of oversight was given, what regulatory structure the Army Corps was working under, what oversight they gave, what the regulation period was in

which they had to review these kinds of structures around America. Then people wanted us to get in and get something accomplished. So I am just perplexed that there is no evidence whatsoever that this will create jobs, and it does not answer, by any means, how this government can work better.

I started to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that we all love this country—we pledge allegiance to the flag in our schools and in this body—and I wish my friends on the other side of the aisle would find some other way that we could work together. They talk about Obama administration regulations. My friends, they have been submitting this over and over again. These regulations have been carried forward from the Bush administration. This is not from the Obama administration.

Let me close by saying that I want clean air, that I want clean water, that I want our babies to be safe in their cribs and playpens. I am appalled that they put this legislation on the floor as something new when this is as old as Methuselah and, I might say, has limited value. As we would say in Texas, it's something that would be very doubtful. I'll leave it at that because we usually talk Texan in Texas, and I'm not there now.

What I will tell you is that we have ways of explaining how things are not relevant. This is not relevant, and it does not equate to a State legislature at all. This is for the United States of America. You cannot put the REINS Act in place and talk about jobs. I simply ask that we defeat this bill and pass these amendments that have been offered by Democrats, who want to make sure that we address the question of the American people.

I leave this podium by saying to the gentleman from Tennessee: Is it ludicrous to place as a responsibility of the Congress a 70-day window for two Houses to pass a resolution when we did not and were not able to pass a student loan effort for months and months, which, by the way, was made better by Senate Democrats? Is it reasonable?

Mr. COHEN. It is not reasonable.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, since 1996, the disapproval process described by the gentlewoman from Texas has succeeded just one time. During that time, tens of thousands of regulations have been passed; and if people think that all but one of them were just fine, I would suggest it's just the opposite. It's the process right now—the inability of the Congress to rein in regulations that are out of control—which is lacking, and that's why we need the REINS Act, so that regulations that cost more than \$100 million come back to the Congress for approval.

It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee and the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I want to address, too, what my colleague from Houston, Texas, just said.

I love clean air, clean water, safe working places as much as she does; but we've got a government now that, instead of working with the people and with industry, is working against them. The trust in our government is at an all-time low. Scandal after scandal is plaguing the government. We have got to get people who are accountable in charge of those regulations, not unelected bureaucrats who are writing regulations that only in the history of the Review Act have been overturned one time. Ergonomic furniture was the only time that was able to work.

What I want to talk about is the Constitution.

The Constitution granted this body—the House of Representatives—and our colleagues across the Capitol, the Senate, the legislative power in this country to write laws and make rules that the American people must abide by. Now, for a variety of reasons, past Congresses have delegated this part. I mean, it makes sense. I don't know how many parts per billion of whatever substance in water is safe and what isn't. I don't know how many feet high a barrier needs to be to keep our workers safe. We've given this authority to our regulatory agencies. Yet, under this President in particular—and even under past Presidents—these agencies have seized that power and have written more and more burdensome regulations that go beyond the intent of this body.

Before we burden the American people with expensive, burdensome and intrusive regulations, the American people have a right to have their elected officials vote on it. This is how we are starting to reclaim some of the power that past Congresses have given away and are bringing it back to where our Founding Fathers rightfully intended—into the Halls of Congress. This is a rational way to do it.

Washington works best under pressure. We give ourselves a deadline. If there is a bad rule that comes up under the REINS Act, we will get to it. We will approve it if it's good, and we will disapprove it if it's bad. That's our job. That's what we were sent here to do and, with our salaries, what we are paid to do.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CONAWAY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. It is my pleasure to yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to wrap up by saying that this really is a problem. Elected officials are not making the rules. There is no accountability, and it's going to be hard for us to do it. This is the first step in bringing the power back to the people and to their elected Representatives. The REINS Act is a commonsense way to hold government accountable and to start to rebuild that trust that the American people have lost in Washington, D.C. That is what is good for America, and I urge my colleagues to support the REINS Act.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I would reserve what few precious minutes and seconds I may have left, and I would like to be informed of how many precious minutes and seconds I have.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding and for bringing this bill forward.

Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of the REINS Act. If you look at why we are bringing this bill forward, it is because of the onslaught of radical regulations that have been coming from this Obama administration for the last 4½ years.

Every time I go back home and talk to small business owners in my district, the biggest impediment that they tell me they have to creating more jobs—the biggest impediment—is the rules and regulations coming down from the Federal Government. If you look at what the REINS Act does, it doesn't stop those rules and regulations. It just says, if these rules and regulations are so important and have a \$100 million impact on our economy, shouldn't they come before Congress and have to state their cases? I mean, what are you so afraid of in coming before the public body and having transparency?

President Obama said he was going to be the most transparent President ever. Yet he has got these bureaucrats who want to go behind closed doors and come up with rules and regulations. We have had hearings on some of this stuff, by the way, and they talk about things that are going to save kids' lives and things that are going to improve the quality of our air. We have had hearing after hearing in which the rules that they come up with have absolutely nothing to do with improving the quality of people's health.

What it has to do with is ramming through a radical agenda that they can't pass through Congress, and if Congress can't pass it—the publicly elected body of the United States Government—then you shouldn't go through the back door and have some

unelected bureaucrat try to ram that through on this country and cause a devastating impact on jobs.

There have been over 130 different major rules under the Obama administration having a \$70 billion impact on families in this country. With that \$70 billion of impact that's going to cost families more money for food, for energy—for everything they do—shouldn't they have to come before the public bodies here in Congress and state the case? If it's such a good rule, what are they afraid of? Why don't they want that transparency?

It's because they don't want the transparency. They want to ram through the radical agenda, and the REINS Act just puts a stop to the unelected bureaucrats from doing it.

Mr. COHEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I believe all of the speakers on our side have spoken. I reserve the right to close, and at this time, I await the gentleman's actions. Then I will be happy to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a good discussion on this bill. Indeed, it is "Groundhog Day" as we have had it so many times. We've just gone around and around.

It is amazing that this body, which I am so proud to serve in, has popularity ratings amongst the American public of less than 10 percent because of the ineffectiveness of the House to work with the Senate and get anything done. Yet here we are, trying to give this body more power over the safety and health—fiscal and physical—of the American public.

One of the gentlemen spoke and said, I don't know how tall something has to be—a dam. I don't know.

Of course he doesn't know. You leave it to the experts. We pass laws. We instruct the agencies to come up with reasonable rules and regulations because they know how to build dams and know how to have airplanes that you can get off of in case of a crash and save people's lives and how to have fire-retardant seats and deal with other safety issues. There are abundant safety issues for the American public.

This is a bad idea. It is an idea that will not create jobs. It will hurt the American public. It will hurt safety and possibly our financial safety as well because it could impede Dodd-Frank from going in to protect the American public from future financial doom like we almost saw in 2008 with derivatives here in this Congress.

So I would ask that we vote "no," that we protect the American public, and that we respect the system that we have had for so many years for safety and health.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1900

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

A year and a half ago, the President of the United States came to give his State of the Union address here in the House Chamber and stood at the podium just below where you're standing right now. He had a long list of legislative items he wanted the Congress to pass. At the conclusion of it he said, If you don't do it, I will. I'm paraphrasing, of course. The question that many of us had was: By what authority in the United States Constitution does the President of the United States have the ability to do something that he has come to the Congress to ask to be passed legislatively and to tell us, if we don't do it, he's going to do it himself in the executive branch?

Well, the way he does it, when he's not stopped by lawsuits and other means, is he simply has regulations passed to accomplish those objectives. You know what? Thousands of regulations are passed every Congress compared to a few hundred laws that are passed. All we're asking here today is that for those regulations that cost the American people \$100 million or more, that they have to come back here and be approved by the Congress rather than have executive fiat control that.

This is the representative democracy here in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate. This is the people's House. We have the authority to pass laws, and we definitely are concerned about the welfare and well-being of our American people. But when we add trillions of dollars in costs to the expenses of American families, \$11,000 per family, that's a stunning thing to think about what money could have been spent on other things. Yes, of course, some of those regulations are necessary, but many of them are not. Many of them needlessly add cost and create an ever-growing bureaucracy in the executive branch. We need to have ways to rein that in.

The most effective way to do that is to start with the largest regulation. Many people would say, well, we should do it for all regulations. That ought to be our objective, to make it very clear that we do not want to see regulations passed that are ineffective, that are needless, that add costs. Starting with those that cost more than \$100 million, it is absolutely appropriate for the elected representatives of the people to have the final say on whether those regulations are, indeed, what the Congress intended when they passed the underlying laws upon which those regulations are based. That's all we ask in this legislation. It is reasonable. The American people want it. This Congress should pass it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chair, I strongly support of the REINS Act.

The American people today face an onslaught of unnecessary Federal regulations. From the President's health care law to the never-ending list of EPA rules, government regulation has become a barrier to economic growth and job creation.

Congress hears from employers daily about the threat of Federal regulations to their businesses. These employers are rightly concerned about the cost of compliance that regulations impose on their businesses. Overly burdensome regulation diverts limited money and resources away from business investment and expansion to meet the government's demands. This harms the ability of business owners to create more jobs and boost local economies. That should motivate us to take action today.

Rather than halt its efforts to expand government, the administration seeks to use the regulatory agencies to accomplish what it cannot get approved by Congress. The REINS Act ensures that Congress has the final say over whether Washington will impose major new regulations on the American economy. Specifically, the bill establishes a procedure for Congress to approve all new major regulations proposed by the administration.

The President himself has expressed the risks that excessive regulations pose to our economy. He has called for reviews of existing regulations to provide relief. He has also made a commitment to make the regulatory process more transparent. However, the President has failed to deliver on these promises. Instead, the Obama administration has proposed four times the number of major regulations than the previous administration over the same time period.

It is time for Congress to reverse this harmful trend in overregulation. The REINS Act holds the administration accountable for its unjustified regulatory assault on job creators. It guarantees that Congress, not unelected bureaucrats, will be the final arbiter of all new major regulatory costs.

The American people want job creation and economic growth, not more regulation. The REINS Act reins in out-of-control Federal regulations that burden the economy.

I thank Mr. YOUNG of Indiana for introducing this important legislation and I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for taking up the REINS Act.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, as an administrator and policymaker at the local, state, and federal levels, I have often seen the value of common-sense regulations that save lives. I have also seen the challenges associated with cumbersome regulations that are difficult to navigate. However, in my experience, regulations tend to be less stringent than necessary rather than overly strict. There are ways to make regulation more efficient and easier to navigate, but we must do so in a way that protects public health, maintains our environmental protections, and ensures fair market interactions.

For the second time in less than two years, today Congress is considering H.R. 367, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act. I oppose this legislation, as I did in 2011, and urge my colleagues to vote against it. This bill is an attack on our government's basic ability to enforce laws that protect public health and the environment. Every

major law requires enforcement by the executive branch of government, and enforcement requires agencies to write regulations that explain and make public how that agency is going to enforce the law. This is how legislation is implemented. This bill would require both the House and the Senate to vote on every major regulation before that regulation can be enforced, providing only seventy days to do so. This allows Congress to effectively veto any legislation we have already passed, simply by taking no action and keeping agencies from moving forward with implementation. Agencies will not be able to enforce new laws or complete updates to regulations as required by existing laws, such as the Clean Air Act.

We do not need to extend Congress's dysfunction to the rest of the federal government. I strongly oppose H.R. 367 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise today as a proud original cosponsor of H.R. 367, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny—or REINS—Act.

Far too much authority has been delegated to federal agencies, leading to a lack of accountability and massive Executive overreach through regulation. According to current procedure, major rules promulgated by agencies take effect unless Congress passes and the President signs a joint resolution disapproving them under the Congressional Review Act. The Obama Administration has abused this process time and time again to bypass the legislative branch to regulate what it cannot legislate, with \$50 billion in new rules proposed this year alone and the overall cost of the current regulatory burden coming in at \$1.8 trillion.

At a time when nearly 12 million Americans are searching for work, the Obama Administration continues to burden the economy with cumbersome, bureaucratic regulations that harm small businesses and hamper economic growth. To make matters worse, this Administration has made a habit out of ignoring the legal obligation to transparency in the regulatory process. The constant flow of regulations has led to uncertainty and a lack of oversight, and Americans deserve a government that is truly accountable to the people.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 367 would restore Congressional accountability by requiring Congress and the President to approve major rules—those with an impact on the economy of more than \$100 million—before they can be enforced, thereby allowing a means to stem the flow of unnecessary, complex, and ineffective regulations. Congress has the right and responsibility to exercise rigorous oversight over the rulemaking process to ensure that we reduce needless and excessive regulatory burdens, protect current jobs, and promote future growth. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 367.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 367, the “Regulations from the Executive in Need of Need of Scrutiny Act.”

Without question, this bill will have dangerous consequences for all Americans by creating an unworkable approval process that will make it nearly impossible for many new regulations to go into effect.

It does this by imposing impossibly unrealistic deadlines by which Congress must con-

sider and pass exceedingly complex and technical regulations in order for such regulations to take effect.

Under H.R. 367, Congress would have only 70 legislative days within which to act after it receives a major rule.

Now, let us put this in some perspective. Over the past few years, the average number of major rules promulgated each year is about 85.

In 2010, for instance, 94 major rules were issued. But keep in mind the following fact: there were just 116 legislative days in the House during 2010.

Worse yet, the bill restricts the days on which these major rules may be considered in the House, which—for last year—would have been just 10 days.

Assuming there is just an average number of major rules, the House would have to consider an average of 8 separate major rules on each of those days.

And, if the REINS Act were to become law today, there would be only 5 days left in 2013 on which the House could consider the merits of major rules.

Under H.R. 367, there is just no way Congress could possibly have the time to consider all the major rules issued during the year.

And, if Congress fails to act within this mandatory time frame, the regulation cannot be considered until the next Congress.

Even Chief Justice John Roberts criticized a prior iteration of the REINS Act back in 1983. He said that such legislation would “hobb[e] agency rulemaking by requiring affirmative Congressional assent to all major rules” and would “seem to impose excessive burdens on the regulatory agencies.”

The bottom line is that the bill would at least significantly delay rulemaking and at worst bring it to a halt.

Avoiding undue delay in rulemaking is important because strong regulation is vital to protecting Americans in nearly every aspect of their lives.

According to the Government Accountability Office, if the REINS Act were in effect now it would delay or possibly derail at least 32 major proposed regulations issued this year and 68 such rules issued last year.

Among other things, these proposed regulations pertain to:

- reimbursement rates for end-stage renal disease Medicare providers;
- payments to primary care physicians under the Vaccines for Children Program;
- various Federal student loan programs;
- the Justice Department's National Standards to prevent, detect, and respond to prison rape;
- meal requirements for the National School Lunch Program under the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010;
- the Transportation Department's Certified Medical Examiners National Registry;
- Labor Department Standards for H-2B Aliens in the United States;
- the subsistence allowance for veterans under the Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Program;
- and the Patent and Trademark Office's proposal setting and adjusting patent fees.

And, this is just a small sample of the many kinds of protections that the REINS Act would jeopardize. I could go on and on.

This explains why nearly 70 consumer groups, environmental organizations, labor unions, and other entities, strenuously oppose this bill.

Likewise, the Administration issued a strongly worded veto threat against this bill. It warns that H.R. 367 “would delay and, in many cases, thwart implementation of statutory mandates and execution of duly-enacted laws, create business uncertainty, undermine much-needed protections of the American public, and cause unnecessary confusion.”

Finally, H.R. 367 will give anti-regulatory interests yet another opportunity to derail rule-making.

Major rules are the product of an intensive, multi-year process, based on extensive input received from the public and affected entities through a notice and comment period.

Agencies often spend many months, if not years, to perfect these rules based on feedback from these sources and their own expertise.

Under the bill's short-circuited process, however, Congress will not realistically be able to second-guess the merits of these rules.

Instead, we in Congress will be bombarded with visits, phone calls, and talking points from industry lobbyists and well-funded special interests that can use every resource available to persuade us of the validity of their views.

Superficially, it may seem like a good idea to make Congress the final arbiter of all significant regulatory decisions. After all, Members of Congress are elected and regulators are not.

But realistically, we simply lack the expertise and resources to make the requisite prudential decisions about the bona fides of these rules, particularly given the limited time frame we have to act under the bill.

An example of how this legislation would work:

I recently introduced H.R. 2480, the Nurse and Health Care Worker Protection Act of 2013, which would require the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to promulgate a regulation that protects our caretakers from debilitating injuries. Nursing professionals and health care aids have among the highest rates of back, neck, and shoulder injuries of any profession, due to the trauma of lifting, supporting, and repositioning patients. Through a straightforward regulation that promotes safe patient handling practices, including the use of mechanical devices, this regulation could save millions of dollars each year, and countless years of experience.

Now even if the House and Senate pass H.R. 2480 and the experts with OSHA develop the proper standards to prevent these debilitating injuries, under the REINS Act, any resulting regulations would have to be assessed by Congress and voted on in a short time frame. Let's be honest, who in this body know about ergonomics and the technical aspects of a nurse's day to day job?

Accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this seriously flawed bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Congress adopted the current system over a hundred years ago because it recognized the necessity of assigning the job of crafting appropriate regulations to the scientific, economic, legal,

and other experts in agencies. The REINS Act is an extreme departure from current procedures designed only to stymie the development of regulations with which the industry does not want to comply.

The current system of administrative agencies of the federal government began more than 100 years ago, and developed through the 20th century. It was codified in its present form in the Administrative Procedures Act. The REINS Act guts this precedent, and replaces it with insurmountable hurdles.

Congress already has the power to stop regulations if extreme circumstances dictate under the Congressional Review Act. The REINS Act requires agencies to submit new final rules to Congress for review, delaying the effective date of those rules to permit Congress to block them, and establishes a fast-track process for legislation proposed to overrule a regulation.

The bill would make it virtually impossible for an approval resolution to pass because it does not entirely prohibit a filibuster. Since the bill does not clearly prohibit a filibuster in the Senate, more specifically it does not prohibit a filibuster on a motion to take up a matter, it would empower a few, or even one Senator, to block regulations.

The legislation gives Congress a short 70-day window to approve a regulation, and if either chamber fails to do so during that time period, the regulation is deemed to have been rejected, and Congress is barred from subsequently voting to approve the regulation or one “substantially similar” to it for the remainder of that Congress. The 70-day requirement will make it next to impossible for any regulations to be approved.

Resolutions approving regulations would first have to be cleared by committees. The vast majority of bills introduced in Congress die in committee, and there is no reason to believe that new regulations wouldn't suffer the same fate.

Claims about so-called “job-killing” regulations are a fabrication, a reiteration of the same doomsday rhetoric that has been used to oppose virtually every major step forward for health and safety. In actuality, the REINS Act is about giving representatives of industry more opportunities to kill regulations they find inconvenient, posing a great detriment to public safety and health.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the so-called Regulations in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act.

This misguided legislation would overturn the long-established process for the promulgation of major federal policy rules and tie the health, environment, and economy of our nation to the ability of Congress to act. Considering we are working through the 113th Congress—which is on pace to be the least productive Congress in history—this is a terrible idea.

Federal agencies issue rules to implement laws that are passed by Congress and signed by the President. Federal agencies cannot issue rules on policies Congress has not authorized them to act on, and the very laws the Congress passes explain in detail the authority of the agency to issue rules and often mandate the very rule the agency must issue. The purpose of this process is to allow the policy

experts at those agencies to conduct the research, seek the public input, and craft the most efficient and effective way to issue the rules to implement the legislation that Congress has passed. This bill would insert partisan politics into this deliberative and complex process, undermining the ability of these agencies to protect the public's health and safety.

Besides ignoring the fact that the agencies are simply issuing rules to implement the statutes that the Congress has enacted, supporters of this legislation forget that there already exists a mechanism through which Congress can review and reject rules issued by executive agencies. Under the Congressional Review Act, the Congress can help reject a rule if it passes a joint resolution disapproving any rule within 60 days of receiving the rule (the President must also sign the resolution). Additionally, Congress has considerable authority over federal rulemaking through the appropriations process, where it can restrict the use of funds to implement certain rules. Finally, the Congress can continue to pass legislation to reform the rulemaking process, such as when it enacted the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, and the Paperwork Reduction Act.

This legislation would cause any major rule issued by a federal agency to be automatically rejected unless Congress acts in approval within 70 days. The legislation does not guarantee that there will be an up-or-down vote in that time period; therefore, it leaves these important rules vulnerable to partisan obstruction and inaction. Congressional Republicans exemplify the danger of this approach through their repeated rejection of all compromise and obstruction of efforts to move our country and our economy forward. Giving one chamber of Congress de-facto veto-power over Executive Branch agencies would put at risk our environment, inject uncertainty into the economy for our businesses, and endanger the health and well-being of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise to strongly oppose the REINS Act (H.R. 367). This reckless legislation would put American families at risk while doing nothing to create jobs.

If enacted, H.R. 367 would delay and possibly block agency rulemaking in critical areas of public health and safety. This legislation would require that any “major” new rule be approved by Congress and the President within 70 legislative days. If Congress fails to act by the deadline, the proposed rule could not be reviewed again until the next Congress. My Republican colleagues do not deny this cumbersome process would prevent many new rules from taking effect. They argue preventing new rules is necessary to stimulate hiring and strengthen the economy.

Bruce Bartlett, a former advisor to Republican Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush, said congressional Republicans' anti-regulatory fervor has nothing to do with jobs. Bartlett recently wrote: “Regulatory uncertainty is a canard invented by Republicans that allows them to use current economic problems to pursue an agenda supported by the business community year in and year out. In other words, it is a simple case of political

opportunism, not a serious effort to deal with high unemployment.” Supporters of this legislation rely on a thoroughly debunked study that claims regulations cost Americans in excess of \$1.75 trillion. Moreover, the independent, nonpartisan Congressional Research Service (CRS) cited major flaws in the study’s methodology, noting that the bill’s authors admitted that it was “not meant to be a decision-making tool for lawmakers or Federal regulatory agencies to use in choosing the ‘right’ level of regulation” and that they made “no attempt to estimate the benefits” of regulations.

H.R. 367 will fail to create jobs and expose American families and small businesses to new and unnecessary risks. President Obama has threatened to veto the bill, arguing it would “delay and in many cases thwart” implementation of important rules and increase unnecessary confusion and uncertainty in the economy. The Coalition for Sensible Safeguards warns that this legislation “would make it virtually impossible for federal agencies to ensure that American families are protected from tainted food, unsafe drugs, predatory financial schemes, dirty air and water, and dangerous workplaces.”

Abandoning Americans to an unregulated marketplace is not a solution for economic growth—it is a sure threat to public safety. In recent years, many Americans have died as a result of E. coli and salmonella outbreaks in our food supply. A failure to enforce federal workplace safety standards resulted in the tragic deaths of 29 miners in West Virginia. Finally, under-regulation allowed irresponsible bankers and mortgage lenders to destroy the education and retirement savings of millions of Americans. America is, in fact, facing a regulatory crisis. Not the crisis of “over-regulation” my Republican colleagues claim, but a series of crisis resulting from a failure to enforce and enact common-sense rules.

Sensible regulation is necessary for an efficient, fair and innovative private market. But we should not be surprised that industry will not always support—and rarely ask—to be regulated. History shows that industry groups initially opposed new requirements for seat belts and air bags, limitations on mercury pollution and even restrictions against child labor. In the short-term, narrow private interests often conflict with the broader public interest. Over time, well-designed and consistently-enforced rules often prove to be less costly and more beneficial than originally expected.

Democrats and Republicans should be working together to improve the federal regulatory structure. Our shared focus in Congress should be on reforming regulations to increase results and reduce costs. Partisan attempts to weaken common sense rules and protections will not make our economy—or our country—stronger.

I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 367 because it undermines public safety and distracts Congress from the urgent task of creating jobs.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, as modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 113–187, shall be considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 367

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to increase accountability for and transparency in the Federal regulatory process. Section 1 of article I of the United States Constitution grants all legislative powers to Congress. Over time, Congress has excessively delegated its constitutional charge while failing to conduct appropriate oversight and retain accountability for the content of the laws it passes. By requiring a vote in Congress, the REINS Act will result in more carefully drafted and detailed legislation, an improved regulatory process, and a legislative branch that is truly accountable to the American people for the laws imposed upon them.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.

Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING

“Sec.

“801. Congressional review.

“802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules.

“803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules.

“804. Definitions.

“805. Judicial review.

“806. Exemption for monetary policy.

“807. Effective date of certain rules.

“§ 801. Congressional review

“(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

“(i) a copy of the rule;

“(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

“(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C);

“(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

“(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

“(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency promulgating the rule shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

“(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any;

“(ii) the agency’s actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of this title;

“(iii) the agency’s actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995; and

“(iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

“(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide

copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

“(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the agency’s compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

“(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General’s report under subparagraph (A).

“(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

“(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

“(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

“(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

“(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

“(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

“(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

“(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

“(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

“(C) necessary for national security; or

“(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

“(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

“(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

“(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days, or

“(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days, before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first

convenes its next session, sections 802 and 803 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

“(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

“(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

“(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day, or

“(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day, after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

“(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

“(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

“(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

“§802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

“(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term ‘joint resolution’ means only a joint resolution pursuant to a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

“(A) bears no preamble;

“(B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): ‘Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____’;

“(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): ‘That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____’; and

“(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

“(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within three legislative days; and

“(B) in the case of the Senate, within three session days.

“(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

“(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

“(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

“(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the con-

sideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

“(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

“(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

“(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

“(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

“(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

“(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

“(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

“(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

“(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 801(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

“(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

“(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint res-

olution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

“(2) with full recognition of the Constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

“§803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

“(a) For purposes of this section, the term ‘joint resolution’ means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ‘That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect.’ (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

“(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

“(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

“(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

“(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

“(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

“(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

“(e) In the Senate the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

“(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date, or

“(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

“(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

“(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

“(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

“(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

“(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

“§804. Definitions

“For purposes of this chapter—

“(1) The term ‘Federal agency’ means any agency as that term is defined in section 551(1).

“(2) The term ‘major rule’ means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

“(A) an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more;

“(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

“(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

“(3) The term ‘nonmajor rule’ means any rule that is not a major rule.

“(4) The term ‘rule’ has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term does not include—

“(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

“(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

“(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.

“(5) The term ‘submission date or publication date’, except as otherwise provided in this chapter, means—

“(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

“(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

“(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

“(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

“§805. Judicial review

“(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

“(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

“(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 802 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

“§806. Exemption for monetary policy

“Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

“§807. Effective date of certain rules

“Notwithstanding section 801—

“(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

“(2) any rule other than a major rule which an agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest, shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency promulgating the rule determines.”

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Any rules subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.”

SEC. 5. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY OF RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine, as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) how many rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect;

(2) how many major rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect; and

(3) the total estimated economic cost imposed by all such rules.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113-187.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 17, insert after the period the following: “Moreover, as a tax on carbon emissions increases energy costs on consumers, reduces economic growth and is therefore detrimental to individuals, families and businesses, the REINS Act includes in the definition of a major rule, any rule that implements or provides for the imposition or collection of a tax on carbon emissions.”

Page 20, strike lines 10 through 14, and insert the following:

“(2) The term ‘major rule’ means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds—

“(A) has resulted in or is likely to result

Page 20, line 15, redesignate subparagraph (A) as clause (i).

Page 20, line 17, redesignate subparagraph (B) as clause (ii).

Page 20, line 21, redesignate subparagraph (C) as clause (iii).

Page 20, line 25, strike the period and insert “; or”. Page 20, insert after line 25 the following:

(B) is a rule that implements or provides for the imposition or collection of a carbon tax.

Page 22, insert after line 8 the following:

“(6) The term ‘carbon tax’ means a fee, levy, or price on—

“(A) emissions, including carbon dioxide emissions generated by the burning of coal, natural gas, or oil; or

“(B) coal, natural gas, or oil based on emissions, including carbon dioxide emissions that would be generated through the fuel’s combustion.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I bring this amendment forward on the REINS Act to simply prohibit the Obama administration from imposing a carbon tax on the United States. If they wanted to impose that kind of tax, they could not do it through regulation. Of course, we’ve heard the Obama administration, from President Obama to his EPA Administrator and others, talking about various forms of taxes on energy that they want to impose. Whether it’s a carbon tax, whether it’s a cap-and-trade-type scheme, they’ve continued to throw out that opportunity to impose that kind of radical regulation by themselves without action from Congress.

Clearly, as we talk about the REINS Act and we talk about any kind of regulation having over a \$100 million impact on our economy, we want to make it very clear that any attempt to impose a carbon tax would fall under that same definition of “major rule” where they could not do it by regulation.

If you look at what's been studied on this issue—again, this idea of a carbon tax has been floating around for a while by the Obama administration. In fact, the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. Chairman, did a study, and it's titled "The Economic Outcomes of a U.S. Carbon Tax." Let me tell you, it's not pretty some of the things that they talk about in this study.

If the Obama administration had their way and imposed a tax on carbon, manufacturing output in energy-intensive sectors, for example, could drop by as much as 15 percent. We're talking real job losses that would come to this country.

What would it do to families in terms of energy costs? How would it affect them? In the same study, they say, just in the first year of a carbon tax, we would see an increase in the cost of natural gas by more than 40 percent, and the price of gasoline at the pump would go up by 20 cents a gallon. That's just in the first year of a carbon tax. It would have devastating impacts on our economy.

Clearly, if you look at what President Obama and his administration officials are doing and saying, they want to keep the door open to impose a carbon tax through regulation. This amendment says absolutely not.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a bad amendment to a bad bill, so it's doubly bad.

This would take almost anything that protects the air, the water, the public from carbon emissions away from the opportunity of the EPA to protect us. Many cities, such as Houston, Texas, and L.A. and other cities, have problems with smog. They have programs that they have to put a price on pollutants that cause urban smog, and these programs are part of the State-approved implementation plans through the EPA to protect the air. They are improving the air quality in Houston and Los Angeles, but under this amendment, if Texas or California ever needed to change these programs, they wouldn't be able to do so. Los Angeles has had enough smog, so has Houston and the rest of the country, and we have to be able to have laws that effectively protect our air.

Public health programs are important, and the amendment would risk the ability of EPA also to have its sanctions that they put into place. Right now, EPA, to ensure civil enforcement procedures, they change their penalties every 4 years to keep up with inflation so they're effective deterrents. This would stop this from happening, and eventually the deter-

rents would be less than necessary to stop bad actors from engaging in risky behavior that causes harm to the environment and harm to humans.

We just saw in January that Transocean agreed to pay \$1 billion to resolve Federal Clean Water Act civil penalty claims for the 3-month-long oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, the BP there. BP also has got the same risk. If we don't allow the penalties to be adjusted for inflation, they won't have an effect. The sanctions won't deter bad actors. We saw it in the BP Deepwater Horizon explosion, and we see it as it applies to the Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and all those others.

The bottom line is this could have unintended consequences, but its intended consequence is to protect the oil industry from regulations and imperil the American public. This is a bad amendment to a bad bill, and I ask my colleagues to defeat it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, if I could go back to that National Association of Manufacturers study on the impact of a carbon tax, the gentleman from Tennessee might be interested in knowing that in Tennessee alone, in the first year of a carbon tax, household utilities would go up by 14 percent, and, in fact, they could experience job losses of up to 40,000 lost jobs just in the State of Tennessee in year one, with a 40 percent increase in their natural gas prices.

I wanted to point that out, and then yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is a good amendment to a good bill, and I support it.

By requiring all new major regulations to be submitted to Congress for approval, the REINS Act provides a powerful check on overreaching executive action. This check could not come sooner. The Obama administration increasingly, and increasingly openly, is pursuing unilateral regulatory action to thwart Congress' decision not to pass legislation the administration desires. This includes legislation that would impose a carbon tax as part of the administration's climate agenda.

The amendment guarantees that no carbon tax can be imposed unless Congress consents to it, no matter how much the Obama administration would like to impose such a dramatic tax by executive fiat. This is the people's House. This is where new public policy should be established, and this amendment is a good one to assure that this is where policy related to carbon taxes is made, not in the administration.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'll just reiterate that this is a bad amendment to a bad bill. It basically puts the interests of special industry—the gas and oil industry, particularly—above the American public's health, clean air, and the environment. If you want to have an Earth that we can give to the next generation that's in as good a shape so that their lungs can survive in it, you won't be for this type of regulation, this amendment, or for this bill.

I ask us to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to point out that clearly the Obama administration must be very interested in imposing a tax on carbon through regulation. The fact that the opposition has objected to this and stated all of the reasons that they think a carbon tax should be imposed tells you that they are holding out for that opportunity.

Of course, if you look at the devastating impacts of a carbon tax—there are a lot of good studies out there. Again, I go back to the National Association of Manufacturers. It's a very respected national organization, people that stand up for American jobs. The report they did, entitled, "Economic Outcomes of a U.S. Carbon Tax," is devastating.

Clearly, the administration wants to do this. If it's such a good idea, bring the idea to Congress; bring it through the House; bring it through the Senate. They could get their floor leaders in the Senate to bring it up tomorrow, but they don't want this kind of scrutiny.

Just the other day, the President was in Tennessee bragging about all these new jobs plans that he has; and while he was doing it, ironically, in another State, his new EPA Administrator was talking about climate change. In fact, she called climate change the "opportunity of a lifetime," and that the EPA would continue to impose regulations despite what we think here in Congress.

That's not the way the legislative process works. That's not the system of government our great Founders created. They said, if an idea is so good, bring it to the people's House; bring it to the Senate, and pass it that way. Don't try to impose it through radical regulation and devastate our economy.

I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. SCALISE. This amendment would prevent the President and the EPA from bypassing Congress and imposing a devastating national energy tax that would affect every American.

Struggling Americans who have been unable to find a job or have not seen their paychecks grow would pay this national energy tax every time they pay their utility bills or fill

up their gas tanks or go to the grocery store. It would also be another tax on manufacturers and another increased cost of doing business under the Obama administration.

House Republicans have been fighting to fix our broken tax code to make it simpler, fairer and flatter for American families and businesses. We cannot let the Obama Administration make an end run around the Congress' Constitutional responsibility for tax policy and use the regulatory process to impose a national energy tax that will cost trillions of dollars in economic growth and lost opportunities for hard-working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support the Scalise amendment—to ensure tax policy starts where the Constitution's Framers intended—here in the people's House.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the Scalise amendment to H.R. 367, the Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act. While Mr. SCALISE may have the best intentions in trying to prevent the Administration from regulating carbon, the amendment actually subjects any regulation that places a fee, price or levy on pollution to the Congressional approval procedure mandated under the bill.

While some of my colleagues would still definitely support that, there are some unintended consequences to this approach. Take Houston, for example.

Houston has two programs that put a price on nitrogen oxide and volatile organic compound emissions. These market-based programs have been successful in lowering smog levels. Houston has had to have its programs approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as part of the state implementation plan (SIPs) under the Clean Air Act.

Under the Scalise amendment, the EPA cannot approve state programs in SIPs that would put a fee on emissions without an act of Congress. Houston's program could remain in place, but if they ever wanted to strengthen, relax or otherwise modify the program, it appears that the Scalise amendment would prevent that from happening. That would require Houston to find another way to comply with the Clean Air Act, which would likely be less flexible and more burdensome.

I want to be clear that I do not support the Administration devising a carbon control program; that is the job of the Congress. That said, this Congress must get to work and pass a bill that deals with carbon with input from Members that represent diverse constituencies nationwide. Cap and Trade legislation will not pass this Congress, but I believe a solution can be found for controlling carbon emissions by using nuclear and natural gas to generate electricity.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Louisiana will be postponed.

□ 1915

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113-187.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, beginning on line 12, strike "sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C)" and insert "clauses (i) through (iii) of section 804(2)(A) or within section 804(2)(B)".

Page 20, beginning on line 11, strike "the Administrator", and insert "—"

"(A) the Administrator".

Page 20, line 15, by redesignating subparagraph (A) as clause (i).

Page 20, line 17, by redesignating subparagraph (B) as clause (ii).

Page 20, line 21, by redesignating subparagraph (C) as clause (iii).

Page 20, line 25, strike the period at the end and insert ";; or".

Page 20, insert after line 25 the following:

"(B) is made by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and that would have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture (who shall publish such determination in the Federal Register)."

Page 22, insert after line 8 the following:

"(6) The term 'agricultural entity' means any entity involved in or related to agricultural enterprise, including enterprises that are engaged in the business of production of food and fiber, ranching and raising of livestock, aquaculture, and all other farming and agricultural related industries."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer the bipartisan Davis-Peterson amendment, which helps address the disconnect between the EPA and the agricultural community. Under our amendment, EPA rules that have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities—as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture—would be considered "major rules."

Under the REINS Act, major rules need congressional approval. We view this as another way to give agriculture a stronger voice when it comes to EPA regulations. As I travel throughout the 13th District of Illinois and listen to farmers and producers, one of their top concerns is regulatory actions by EPA. Ag has been a bright spot in our economy. For every \$1 billion in agriculture exports, more than 8,000 jobs are supported here at home. With USDA projecting \$139.5 billion in ag exports for

fiscal year 2013, American agriculture will support more than 1 million jobs.

This is a good story, and my colleagues and I on the House Agriculture Committee do our best to tell it. However, our farmers remain concerned that the EPA does not understand production agriculture. These are concerns we take very seriously. We aren't the only ones that see this problem; EPA recognizes it as well. Acting Administrator For Water, Nancy Stoner, told me when I asked her if her agency was aware of the disconnect between EPA and the agricultural community:

We are actively working with those groups to improve communication on issues as to which we have had some difficulties. And I will acknowledge that we have had some, and we are doing the very best we can to improve that situation.

This amendment provides a solution to the problem by allowing the Secretary of Agriculture to examine EPA regs and identify those that have a significant impact on a significant number of agricultural entities. The USDA must be included in these decisions and equipped with the authority to identify these rules. This agency understands farmers and works best with them on a daily basis. We believe this amendment would improve communication between EPA and the USDA.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

It would improve communication between the EPA and USDA, give agriculture a place at the table during the process, and ultimately result in getting government out of the way to allow our family farmers to do what they do best. I urge support of this bipartisan amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, again, this is just another amendment in another area in what's totally a bad concept. The basic concept is that any rule or regulation would have to go through a passage in both the House and the Senate and Presidential approval to become effective. And it would have to happen in committees only on Tuesdays or Thursday, and within 15 days they would have to pass it. Basically, this is creating a Rube Goldberg type of legislative mechanism that would thwart the creation of regulations and rules that protect the American public. That's just plumb wrong.

What this does is tries to gut the EPA, and I'm shocked that my good friends on the other side of the aisle would try to gut the work of one of their great Presidents, Richard Nixon. He served in this House, served in the Senate, and 4 years as vice president. I

think he almost eked out 5 years, he had some kind of ethically challenged problem when he was President, but he did create the EPA. He did some good environmental things. I think those things should be standards for the Republican Party. They should hold up the EPA and remember Richard Nixon as one of their party standard bearers, one of the men who served probably the longest time in a major capacity as President and Vice President and Senate leader. And his work on the House Un-American Activities Committee—we can't forget that in this House. To forget Richard Nixon and to minimize his work, I am just amazed, because that's one of the great heroes on the other side of the aisle, I believe.

But the EPA is important. It was good work that he gave us, and it shouldn't be gutted. And to make these rules have to go through passage in the House and Senate, we know the House and the Senate don't get along. They mentioned we got the loan bill through. That's the first thing we've kind of done since we did the Violence Against Women and kind of saved the storm victims of Superstorm Sandy. We really haven't got much done. Oh, I forget, a couple of post offices, we agreed on them. And maybe some coins for the Hall of Fame or something. But to get these major rules done, it wouldn't happen. And so we're jeopardizing the American public. I urge us to defeat this as a bad amendment to a bad bill. It is deleting the legacy of Richard Nixon.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I respect and thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his comments on Richard Nixon. However, I was not yet in kindergarten when Mr. Nixon served, so, therefore, I do not remember him creating the EPA, but I thank him for reminding me of that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for offering this amendment. It is another good amendment.

I also want to say to my good friend from Tennessee that I was a little older when Richard Nixon was in office. We are not minimizing what he did; we are going to maximize the amount of attention that Congress pays to the EPA when they get it wrong, particularly when the Secretary of Agriculture determines that any regulation issued by the EPA will have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities. We ought to take a look at that. As a result, it subjects such regulations to congressional approval before they can become effective.

This is an important step to rein in what is often regarded as the most overreaching of all Federal regulatory

agencies. The EPA's actions and proposals have been particularly problematic for America's farmers, including small farmers. This includes, for example, the EPA actions aimed at farm dust.

The Secretary of Agriculture has a greater incentive than EPA to ensure that potential adverse impacts on agricultural entities have been adequately and accurately assessed. The amendment guarantees that regulation that should be characterized as major due to their impacts on agricultural entities will be so characterized and submitted to Congress for approval.

I urge my colleagues to support this very worthy amendment.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, was alive when Richard Nixon was doing his service, and I remember him getting on that helicopter, waving good-bye. There were regulations that made sure that he was able to get away from Washington and get home to California, and we need to make sure those regulations that might be impeded by this REINS Act are still in effect so that Presidents like him can make their escape.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wonder, even though I don't remember Richard Nixon getting up and flying away, I wonder if the EPA would let that helicopter leave Washington, D.C., today.

But I have to tell you, this is a commonsense, bipartisan amendment that gives our farmers a stronger voice and a better place at the table when EPA is considering these regulations that impact the ag community.

And I want to thank Ranking Member PETERSON for supporting this effort as well. I urge my colleagues' support. I want to say thank you, Mr. Chairman, to my colleague from Tennessee for making this actually a lively debate tonight. And hopefully a few more viewers on C-SPAN are smiling this evening because of it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113-187.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, beginning on line 12, strike "sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C)" and insert "clauses (i) through (iii) of section 804(2)(A) or within section 804(2)(B)".

Page 20, beginning on line 11, strike "the Administrator", and insert "—"
"(A) the Administrator".

Page 20, line 15, by redesignating subparagraph (A) as clause (i).

Page 20, line 17, by redesignating subparagraph (B) as clause (ii).

Page 20, line 21, by redesignating subparagraph (C) as clause (iii).

Page 20, line 25, strike the period at the end and insert "; or".

Page 20, insert after line 25 the following:
"(B) is made under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Pub. Law 11-148).".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as I have traveled across the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri from my hometown of Salem to the Ozark Hills in Wright County, Douglas, Howell County, to the banks of the Mississippi River, one of the largest concerns that my constituents have is the uncertainty surrounding the Affordable Care Act.

Individuals are concerned about the relationship with their doctor and what their costs are going to be. Businesses are left with a tremendous uncertainty. They are understaffed because they are afraid to hire additional employees, and they're also firing employees just to fall below the 50 individual threshold.

The effects of the Affordable Care Act are adversely affecting health care and the jobs of folks all across this great country. That is why I'm offering my amendment to revise the definition of major regulations to include any regulation under the Affordable Care Act. With over 3,000 pages of Federal regulations already issued, and many more to follow, Congress must prevent this widely unsupported law from causing further damage to our health care system.

Mr. Chairman, there is broad bipartisan opposition to the Affordable Care Act. The administration has demonstrated its own certainty through the delays to several key provisions of the bill. Congress must assert its role in oversight and give the American people their voice back in government, away from the bureaucrats. My amendment does just that. I urge adoption of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a microcosm of this 113th Congress; the macro has been the 40th attempt coming up to repeal ObamaCare. This is a microcosm to try to defeat ObamaCare

through a little regulation. It seems like the preoccupation that the other side has with what is one of the most important social safety network provisions passed by this House in history, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, and then the Affordable Care Act, is amazing. We've had 40 bills, and now this rule and regulation, to try to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act means your child can stay on your insurance unless they are 26 years of age. It means you can't have lifetime caps on your health insurance. It means you can't be denied coverage because of a preexisting condition. It means that being a woman doesn't classify you as having a preexisting condition. It says that certain care comes to you, like colonoscopies or mammograms, without a copay, and it means yearly annual checkups, which can detect disease early and save people's lives. It is a way to provide health care for at least 40 million people in this country who don't have health care.

And it has already been shown to drive down the cost of health care. For those States that have worked with us and that have exchanges, we have seen reductions in what was expected to be the cost of insurance from 25 to 30 to even 50 percent in different States. Health care costs are not rising at the rates that they were otherwise because of the fact that we passed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

It's important that individuals get more community health centers, which come with this provision. Lots of people, particularly in my district, they don't live near hospitals and doctors. They need community health centers, and community health centers have been funded and created to give people access to health care otherwise denied.

We are the last industrialized country on the face of the Earth to provide health care for its people, the last industrialized country to do so. That is one of the shames that we have tried to cure with this bill.

And this provision, this amendment to this REINS Act, would deny people that health care coverage. It would say if you have a preexisting condition, too bad, you don't get insurance.

As President Obama said, the Affordable Care Act is insurance reform on steroids. Do you want to have the health insurance industry have total control without regulations, without controls, then you want to defeat it. But the American public doesn't want that. They want their health care costs to be contained, and they don't want the insurance companies to have total control. They like the idea of their children having insurance up to the time they're 26, and to have preventive care come without copays, not have yearly caps on your insurance or lifetime caps

on your insurance benefits that can be paid out.

So this is a sad state that we've spent so much time in this Congress trying to deny people health care and save their lives.

So this is a bad amendment. I would ask us to defeat it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1930

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the fine gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend him and support this important amendment.

The REINS Act restores to Congress the accountability for regulatory decisions that impose major burdens on our economy. This amendment strengthens congressional accountability for regulations under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. You know, ObamaCare? That legislation that has 400 new authorities, 400 new ways for the Secretary of Health and Human Services and other bureaucrats to regulate the American people, businesses, large and small, local governments, State governments, health care providers?

Yeah, that one. Imposed over the will of the American people, implementation of ObamaCare has demonstrated that the act imposes a detrimental and unworkable reform of the Nation's health care system. And one after another, promises made to the American people by the act's supporters when the law was passed have been broken.

Moreover, the Obama administration's own actions to waive or suspend ObamaCare requirements have made clear that regulatory actions to implement the act form a "seamless web."

Too often, actions to avoid one adverse effect of the act's implementation send ripple effects of unfairness or other harmful consequences throughout the ObamaCare web, requiring adjustments to other aspects of implementation.

This, too, justifies the amendment's requirement that Congress approve any new regulation promulgated under the act, and I urge my colleagues to support this excellent amendment.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, what this shows is exactly what the situation is. You've got a majority in the House that's against the Affordable Care Act, and you've got a majority in the Senate that's for it.

To have any rules and regulations under it go into effect, the House and the Senate would both have to approve it, which means you could have one House, not both Houses, the way we work, it's a bicameral legislature and the House and the Senate have to work together and pass the bill to become law.

But one House, by not passing it, could kill it—one House veto. This Re-

publican Congress could veto every single regulation under the Affordable Care Act.

And then preexisting conditions, no insurance. Lifetime caps, back in effect. Yearly caps, back in effect. Child's 23, nope, can't stay on dad and mom's policy anymore.

Get hurt, go broke. Too bad. That's just wrong.

And that's what this would do for any regulations. One House could veto and kill legislation. That's antithetical to the bicameral legislature.

That's just one of the many reasons why we should defeat this amendment, defeat the bill, and go on and try to pass a jobs bill, and kill sequester, and see that the National Institutes of Health, which is cut \$1.6 billion by sequester, isn't cut.

That's our Department of Defense. They protect us from Alzheimer's, AIDS, heart disease, cancer, diabetes, Parkinson's. Those are the enemies. The National Institutes of Health is the Department of Defense, and we shouldn't be cutting \$1.6 billion from them because we're all going to be victims.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this is truly a jobs bill. When you're looking at over 170,000 pages of Federal rules and regulations that affect jobs, this amendment will help alleviate that.

As I've traveled across the Eighth Congressional District, I've had businesses, one after the other, that said they had 56 employees. Well, they were going to reduce those employees because of one piece of legislation that was passed out of this Chamber that Congress never even took the time to read until after they passed it, and yet they've even passed it.

The problem with the Affordable Care Act is it affects more than one-sixth of our Nation's economy; and because of the burdensome regulations that are being promulgated from the Affordable Care Act, businesses are scared to death to hire additional employees, and they are firing additional employees.

I have had restaurant owners in our district that have sold restaurants because they want to fall below the 50-employee mark.

Folks, this is a jobs bill. Less government regulation that is breaking the backs of small businesses is what we need to do to turn this country around.

Mr. Chairman, I ask this body to adopt this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LATHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 15, insert before “intended to implement” the following: “taken by or that will be taken by the Federal agency promulgating the rule that are”.

Page 6, line 17, strike “and” at the end.

Page 6, after line 17, insert the following (and redesignate provisions accordingly):

“(v) a list of any other related regulatory actions taken by or that will be taken by any other Federal agency with authority to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective that are intended to implement such provision or objective, of which the Federal agency promulgating the rule is aware, as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, while my amendment is very simple, it's aimed at addressing a very complex problem, the problem of duplicative and conflicting Federal regulations.

In the underlying bill, Federal agencies are required to submit, along with the rule they want Congress to approve, a list of other regulatory actions to implement the same statute or regulatory objective, in other words, Mr. Chairman, to actually investigate whether the regulations may be redundant.

It's not clear whether the requirement to list other regulatory actions applies only to the promulgating agency or other agencies. The amendment clarifies that this list must include related regulatory actions by any other Federal agency.

Earlier this year, the GAO delivered to Congress its third annual report on duplication in government programs, identifying 17 specific areas of fragmentation, overlap, and duplication where multiple programs and activities are creating inefficiencies.

Unfortunately, these inefficiencies result in regulatory duplication, heaping needless costs and paperwork on businesses at a time when our economy continues to struggle enough already.

A group run by former CBO Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin recently compiled information on regulations in the specific problem areas identified by the

GAO, using the government database contained by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. This report found 470 related paperwork requirements, 642 million hours of regulatory duplication involving 990 Federal forms, and at least \$20 billion in compliance costs to employees.

Take these examples:

We have three agencies issuing regulations on catfish inspections, at a cost of 2 million work hours and \$146 million in compliance costs.

Ten different agencies handle Medicare forms submitted by health care providers, generating 486 million hours of paperwork and 281 different forms.

Nine different agencies administer higher education assistance programs, involving 66 Federal forms and duplication, resulting in 47 million hours of paperwork at a compliance cost of \$3 billion.

Congress must act to eliminate or consolidate duplicate and inefficient programs; but in the meantime, agencies must at least acknowledge requirements imposed by other agencies working on the same issues and work to minimize burdens on our small businesses.

According to the Small Business Administration, it already costs American businesses at least \$8,000 and often more than \$10,000 per employee to comply with Federal regulations.

It's no wonder that the massive Federal regulatory regime is consistently cited as a roadblock to job growth and economic recovery. I believe this amendment will help clarify areas of overlap and highlight opportunities for reducing the compliance burden faced by American employers.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment because it would add yet another onerous and unnecessary burden on agencies and will further stifle agency rulemaking.

Among other things, the REINS Act requires that an agency issuing a rule submit reports to Congress and the GAO containing a list of related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as the rule at issue, together with the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions.

This amendment would add to that list actions taken, or that will be taken, by Federal agencies other than the agency issuing the rule to meet the same objectives. Such a requirement means that an agency issuing a rule would now be obliged to survey the vast panoply of Federal agencies to de-

termine what other actions are being taken by other agencies before it could issue a rule.

Congress did not create agencies, Mr. Chairman, to keep tabs on other agencies. This amendment would only serve to divert already limited agency resources away from protecting the American people.

This amendment is just a further effort to derail rulemaking. It's placing another burden on already limited agency resources and is really just busy work.

So for those reasons I rise in opposition.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding, and I support his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, interrelated Federal regulations are a common feature of the modern regulatory landscape. Numerous major regulations form part of a web of regulations agencies develop to implement one statutory division or one statutory goal.

In addition, numerous regulatory statutes entrust rulemaking authority over a given problem to more than one agency. This is the case, for example, with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' joint authority over wetlands. It is also the case with the EPA's and the Department of Transportation's joint authority over fuel economy standards.

The amendment requires that agencies, when they submit new major regulations to Congress for approval, provide a list of related regulatory actions that the submitting agency or other agencies have taken or will take to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective. Seems pretty reasonable to me to have to find out what other regulations are impacting the same objective.

This helpful amendment will provide Congress with more complete information on the extent of regulations agencies have taken or plan to take to implement an authorizing statute or achieve a regulatory goal. That information will better enable Congress to determine whether to approve or disapprove the submitted regulation.

This can only improve congressional accountability and the regulatory process, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, in response, I would point out that with respect to interrelated regulations, different regulatory authorities have different regulatory objectives. And so, to require that one agency survey the other to see whether or not there are any similar or the same

objectives, with no power or authority to decide to do away with a particular regulation, based on an objective that is no longer suitable, I think, is not something that this amendment allows for; and it's also something that agencies themselves are not equipped to do.

I agree that we need to have some mechanism whereby regulatory regulations can be looked at, modified, strengthened or weakened or done away with at any particular time. But this anti-regulatory legislation and this amendment will not accomplish that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time there is.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 15 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LATHAM. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will just obviously be very brief. But the gentleman was talking earlier about opposing this amendment because it creates busy work for the agencies.

What about the busy work of the small businesses to comply with these mountains and mountains of regulations?

And the previous speakers have said the biggest reason that people are not hiring today is because of the cost of regulations.

I would ask for this amendment to be passed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1945

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 113-187.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 24, insert before the semicolon the following: “, including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, tonight we engage this House to talk about some commonsense legislation that would, in fact, allow the American people and this Congress to understand more about rules and regulations as they are presented that the American people have to live under.

My amendment requires that an agency submitting a report on any proposed Federal rule include an assessment of anticipated jobs gained or lost as a result of the implementation of any rules that fit within the REINS Act.

This is very important, Mr. Chairman, because many times rules and regulations are implemented without regard for what the impact would be on the people who have to live under them. We believe this is common sense. We believe this happens in businesses every day. We're asking for a cost-benefit analysis of the impact of the rules that are written, combined with the impact that they would have upon job losses, whether it be the government or the free enterprise system.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment presupposes that regulations depress job creation. To the contrary, there's no credible evidence that regulations depress job creation.

The majority's own witness at one of our hearings clearly debunked the myth that regulations stymie job creation. Christopher DeMuth of the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative think tank, stated in his prepared remarks that the “focus on jobs . . . can lead to confusion in regulatory debates.” Also, he stated that “the employment effects of regulation, while important, are indeterminate.”

Nonetheless, I appreciate that this amendment recognizes that regulations could create jobs. I am, however, concerned about this amendment because it would add to the analytical burdens of agencies a speculative assessment of jobs added and lost and how many of those jobs would be added or lost to the public and private sectors.

To the extent that regulations have anything to do with jobs, H.R. 367 proponents should overwhelmingly support my amendment, which is upcoming, which simply exempts from H.R. 367's congressional approval mechanism all rules that OMB determines would result in net job creation. This way, job creating rules would not effectively be vetoed, which would be the precise result under H.R. 367.

Also, instead of trying to make Congress a superadministrative agency,

what we should be doing is considering actual job creation legislation. We also should be talking about how to help middle class families who are struggling financially.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the opportunity to rise in support of this important amendment and to rise in support overall of the REINS Act, a critical tool in the battle against overregulation, which is destroying jobs.

The gentleman from Georgia talked about whether or not regulations actually destroy jobs. Well, from my home State of Kentucky, I can tell you we've lost 5,700 coal mining jobs in east Kentucky as a result of this administration's overzealous overregulation of our coal industry.

Small business owners from across Kentucky continually tell me that they want to create more jobs and grow their businesses. They want to help put food on the table, gas in the tank, and more money in the pockets of Kentucky families, who are hurting under this administration's war on coal. But costly and burdensome regulations coming out of unaccountable Federal agencies are raising their cost of doing business, leading to higher prices for consumers, fewer jobs for workers, and weakened American competitiveness.

While Federal regulations wreak havoc on families in Kentucky, small businesses, and our overall economy, the unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats writing them are hiding behind the fact that they are not always required to fully analyze the impact their proposal will have on jobs.

If you want to know about the impact of these regulations on jobs, come to eastern Kentucky and see those lost jobs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. In response, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the old ways of creating or producing energy—those ways that foul up our environment and pollute our air and water and cause health concerns to the people of this great Nation—those types of jobs, fortunately, yield to a brighter day of new renewable and clean forms of energy. That's a growth industry that, if this legislature could only see the brightness of the future, I think we would have a whole lot more jobs created as the jobs of the past recede into history.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, we see 25 million people struggling in this country as a result of that same attitude that the Democrat Party and the President has about having jobs go off into the past and looking to the future.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I would like to thank my colleague from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I'm a proud cosponsor of this amendment. This is a common-sense amendment that brings to mind the irony that, yesterday, the President of the United States came to the Capitol to brief certain Members of Congress on the other side of the aisle about another phony jobs plan that he's putting forth at the same time his signature legislation, ObamaCare, is killing jobs in America.

This amendment would make sure that we measured how many jobs his phony jobs plan is going to create versus how many jobs ObamaCare is going to kill in this country. It is essential.

And forgive me, Mr. Chairman, for not having compassion for the bureaucrats who are going to be burdened by analyzing this information, when we have millions of Americans—hard-working taxpayers of this country—worried about keeping their own jobs and getting a new job.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment wholeheartedly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, ObamaCare is resulting in 30 to 40 million people having access to the health care system, and that's not going to create any jobs? When you're bringing that many people into the health care system, that's going to kill jobs? How many more doctors will be needed? Maybe 20,000 will be needed to accommodate and treat those people. How many nurses and medical care practitioners will we need to train in order to accommodate the growth in the health industry that ObamaCare brings about?

We have to use our common sense. ObamaCare is not going to result in job loss.

Mr. COHEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. I find it interesting that today we're talking about the country is in such danger because of ObamaCare and regulations and rules and all these other things President Obama has done, and the Dow Jones Industrial average almost hit an all-time high of 15,600 and change.

So somewhere something must be working. Thank you, President Obama. Keep going.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman is expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor, I rise in support of this important amendment to protect and promote job creation in both southern Ohio, where I'm from, and for this entire country.

Business owners and entrepreneurs currently live and work under an executive branch hostile to the free enterprise system and a President whose governing philosophy has been: You didn't build that.

Agencies like the EPA, Health and Human Services, and the Department of Education hand down new regulations with little regard for the real-world impacts. These bureaucrats do not care if jobs are lost, as long as their rules are enforced.

This amendment requires an analysis of how many jobs would be added or lost due to new regulations brought forth under this or any future administrations. This amendment also requires the distinction as to whether the jobs affected are government or private sector jobs.

This amendment further protects real-world businesses from bureaucrats who are often punitive rather than constructive and are often far removed from everyday economic realities.

I stand in support of this amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, tonight, we've had three new first-term Members of Congress who have come on the floor to talk about things that are important to them, and it's a balance. It's making a difference so that people back home have confidence in the rules and regulations that are promulgated by the Federal Government and that Congress knows how we can react and act upon those.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113-187.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 20, line 10, insert after "means any rule" the following: "(other than a special rule)".

Page 21, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: ", and includes any special rule".

Page 22, after line 8, insert the following: "(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would exempt the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from the bill so that the

NRC can continue to protect Americans from nuclear disasters under current law, rather than the bill's proposed system.

Today's bill, H.R. 367, in the name of so-called reform, adds over 60 new procedural and analytical hoops agencies and departments must go through before a regulation can be issued. The result is simply to impede, obstruct, and delay the attempt of government to accomplish one of its most basic functions: protecting the health and welfare of its citizens.

Not surprisingly, groups who care about protecting public health, safety, and the environment, such as the Natural Resources Defense Counsel, Public Citizens, Defenders of Wildlife, and U.S. Public Interest Research Group, oppose this bill. According to the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, which represents a coalition of many such groups, this bill "will grind to a halt the rulemaking process" and "is nothing less than an attempt to roll back our critical public safeguards and promote industry interests instead of protecting American citizens."

□ 2000

Americans should rightfully be scared that this bill will put their health and safety at risk. One example that highlights this fact is the subject of this amendment—nuclear power.

The risks and dangers of nuclear power were made all the more real by the nuclear disaster in Japan at Fukushima 2 years ago. We all watched in horror when that country was devastated by the earthquake and resulting tsunami. That disaster then caused its own disaster—the meltdown of three reactors at the Fukushima nuclear power plant. That led to the release of radioactive isotopes, the creation of a 20-kilometer exclusion zone around the power plant, and displacement of 156,000 people. Inside the evacuation zone all farming has been abandoned.

In 2011, Virginia itself was struck by a relatively rare but strong earthquake felt up and down the eastern seaboard. It caused a nuclear power plant near the epicenter to have to go offline. For me, this concern hits close to home. A nuclear power plant, Indian Point, about which many people, myself included, have had concerns for years, lies just less than 40 miles away from my New York City district on an earthquake fault. There are 20 million people living within a 50-mile radius around the plant, the same radius used by the NRC as the basis for the evacuation zone recommended after the Fukushima disaster. Indian Point also sits near two fault lines and, according to the NRC, is the most likely nuclear power plant in the country to experience core damage due to an earthquake.

To keep my constituents, and indeed all Americans, safe, I am offering this

amendment today. Because of the catastrophes that can result in disasters—be they natural or manmade—at nuclear power plants, prevention of meltdowns is the key. Since Fukushima, the NRC has issued new rules designed to upgrade plants to withstand severe events like earthquakes and to have enough backup power so as to avoid a meltdown for a significant period of time.

The NRC must have the ability and flexibility to issue new regulations to safeguard the health and well-being of all Americans and to prevent nuclear disasters. However, this bill is intentionally designed so new and vital regulations will likely never be put into place. We cannot permit the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to never be able to create new regulations ever again should the need arise.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to exempt the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from the onerous new requirements for rule-making imposed by this bill. In that way, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission would continue to have the ability to safeguard public health and safety, as it should.

We should not risk the lives of millions and millions of people. If a danger becomes evident and the experts in charge of protecting against that—the Nuclear Regulatory Commission—deem some new protection necessary, this bill would prevent those protections from going into effect. So my amendment would exempt the Nuclear Regulatory Commission with respect to safety regulations for nuclear power plants.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment carves out of the REINS Act Congressional Approval Procedures all regulations that pertain to nuclear reactor safety standards. REINS Act supporters believe in nuclear safety. We want to guarantee that regulatory decisions that pertain to nuclear reactor safety are the best decisions that can be made. That is precisely why I oppose the amendment.

By its terms, the amendment shields from the REINS Act Congressional Approval Procedures not only major regulations that would raise nuclear reactor safety standards, but also regulations that would lower them. All major regulations pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards, whether they raise or lower standards, should fall within the REINS Act. That way, agencies with authority over nuclear reactor safety will know that Congress

must approve their major regulations before they go into effect. That provides a powerful incentive for the agencies to write the best possible regulations, ones that Congress can easily approve. It is a solution that everyone should support because it makes Congress more accountable and assures agencies will write better rules. All Americans will be safer for it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. NADLER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, under current law, Congress can disapprove any proposed rule and regulation under the Congressional Review Act. Under this bill, no regulation could go into effect until Congress affirmatively approved the regulation. If the Nuclear Regulatory Commission were to approve some rule that reduces nuclear safety, Congress, under current law, could block that rule.

What this bill says, and what my amendment seeks to exempt the NRC from, is that no safety regulation can go into effect until Congress gets around to approving it. The Republican leadership took the appropriations bill for the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development Departments off the floor yesterday allegedly because they have no time to consider it. We've passed all of 12 bills this year for the President's signature, and we would have hundreds or thousands of regulations by all the different agencies that we would have to consider. Most would never be approved simply because we would not have time to consider them.

All this amendment says is, for regulations regarding nuclear disasters, to prevent nuclear disasters, let Congress veto them if necessary, but not kill them by not having the time to get to them.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that, when it comes to regulatory safety, the gentleman cites the Congressional Review Act. I'll remind the House that, as I noted earlier, since 1996, it's been used one time for ergonomic furniture. That is not a very good track record when tens of thousands of regulations have been passed during that time that should be reviewed by this Congress. This legislation only asks that those regulations that cost more than \$100 million should be reviewed. But it's especially true of the most important regulations related

to, for example, the nuclear power industry where safety is a very important standard, as is efficiency and making sure that the American people have the electric power generation that they need. So the Congress has great incentive to reach quick agreement on regulations like that, and it's very important that we have that jurisdiction.

But many regulations are not needed; they cost jobs in our economy. I know those on the other side of the aisle have been citing academics who claim that that's not the case. But I want to call attention to one more academic who wrote just on January 18, 2011. He said:

Sometimes, those rules have gotten out of balance, placing unreasonable burdens on business—burdens that have stifled innovation and have had a chilling effect on growth and jobs.

That academic's name is Barack Obama, and he is currently the President of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 113-187.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 20, line 10, insert after "means any rule" the following: "(other than a special rule)".

Page 21, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: ", and includes any special rule".

Page 22, after line 8, insert the following: "(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job growth."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which is very simple: it would exclude from this bill any rule that would result in net job growth.

I ask that my colleagues support this commonsense amendment to promote job growth and help to strengthen the middle class. After all, the stated purpose of the REINS Act is to grow the economy and create jobs, isn't that correct?

Although this bill purports to grow the economy and create jobs, nothing could be further from the truth. This bill's myopic focus on gumming up the regulatory process will not create a single job. It will, however, result in the loss of much-needed rules that protect the health, safety, and well-being of the men, women, and children of America.

I have profound concerns about the REINS Act. What would be its impact on air and water quality? This bill would undermine the ability of agencies to protect the public interest. It is a continuation of the majority's anti-middle class, pro-big business, anti-regulatory approach to governing.

The majority continues to rely on debunked partisan studies. These studies presuppose that regulations have harmful effects on job growth. Far from it. There is ample bipartisan evidence in support of the opposite conclusion.

Regulations ensure that the water we consume, the air that we breathe, the places where we work and where our kids go to school are safe. Regulations ensure fairness in the workplace and in the marketplace. Regulations are necessary to protect the have-nots from the haves; whereas the REINS Act protects the haves from the have-nots.

Nevertheless, the House Republican leadership continues like an out-of-control freight train to drive its reckless deregulatory agenda through Congress. This deregulatory train wreck threatens to send us back in time to the early 1900s, when there was no minimum wage, no workplace protections, and no limits on Wall Street.

If Republican leadership truly believed in growing the economy and creating jobs we would have come together with a grand bargain a long time ago. We could have agreed to a mix of spending cuts and tax reforms to address the government's long-term debt. We could have prevented the mindless austerity of sequestration which threatens our still-fragile economic recovery. Instead, this Tea Party Congress could not even muster the will to vote to fund the transportation bill yesterday. This is yet another example of a "do-nothing" Congress under the leadership of an anti-middle class Republican leadership.

Americans have a right to expect that their elected legislators will enact laws that help create jobs, like doing something about sequestration. My colleague, Mr. HAL ROGERS, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, hit the nail on the head yesterday when he said, and I quote:

"Sequestration—and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end."

American workers continue to face hurdles to providing for their families, and I'm gravely concerned about the effects of sequestration on my home State of Georgia. Last month, furloughs began for most civilian Defense Department employees at Robins Air Force Base and other military bases across Georgia. This won't just affect the hardworking people at the base, like firefighters; it will also have a substantial impact on the local economies.

As retired General Robert McMahon reports, the furloughs which began last week will take \$50 million out of the economy around the Robins Air Force Base alone. Multiply that with the economic catastrophe across other military bases in Georgia and throughout the country, and you begin to understand the truly caustic effects of sequestration on small businesses and on the economy. But instead of working together to come to a bipartisan solution to the sequestration fiasco, this Congress is continuing an agenda to make life worse for American families.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to promote job creation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment carves out of the REINS Act Congressional Approval Procedures regulations that the Office of Management and Budget determined will lead to net job creation.

The danger in the amendment is the strong incentive it gives OMB to manipulate its analysis of a major regulations job impact. Far too often, OMB may be tempted to shave the analysis to skirt the bill's congressional approval requirement. In addition, regulations alleged to create new jobs often do so by destroying real existing jobs and creating new hoped-for jobs associated with regulatory compliance.

For example, some Environmental Protection Agency Clean Air Act rules will shut down existing power plants. EPA and OMB may attempt to justify that with claims that more new green jobs will be created as a result. In the end, that is just another way in which government picks the jobs winners and the jobs losers. And there's no guarantee that all of the new green jobs will ever actually exist. And I would cite Solyndra as perhaps the best evidence of promised jobs that don't exist and cost the taxpayers half a billion dollars.

The REINS Act is not intended to force any particular outcome. It does

not choose between clean air and dirty air. It does not choose between new jobs and old jobs. Instead, the REINS Act chooses between two ways of making laws. It chooses the way the Framers intended, in which accountability for laws with major economic impacts rests with Congress. It rejects the way Washington has operated for far too long, where there is no accountability because decisions are made by unelected agency officials.

□ 2015

The amendment would undermine that fundamental choice. Let me give you a few examples of this:

Regulatory agencies routinely estimate the benefits and costs of regulatory changes under the assumption that any individuals that become unemployed are instantly and constantly reemployed in nearly identical jobs. But the EPA's employment impact analysis is frequently flawed because it fails to account for the cascading employment effects of regulation across interconnected industries and markets.

Using the proper full economy model, NERA Economic Consulting found that the EPA's Utility MACT Rule would have a negative impact equivalent to 180,000 to 215,000 lost jobs in 2015, versus the EPA's claim of 8,000 net new jobs, and which, therefore, wouldn't come to the Congress, even though private consultants say it would lose over 200,000 jobs. EPA claims it would create 8,000 jobs.

The EPA's Cross-State Air Pollution Rule would have had an economic impact equivalent to the annual—annual—loss of 34,300 jobs from 2013 through 2037 versus the EPA's claimed 700 jobs gained annually.

Finally, the EPA's industrial Boiler Maximum Achievable Control Technology—or MACT—Rule would have a negative impact equivalent to 27,585 jobs per year on average from 2013 through 2037, compared with the EPA's claim of 2,200 per year claim.

All of this goes to show that this would be a shell game allowing the executive branch to claim job increases when actually there are massive job losses and, therefore, avoid the scrutiny of the people's House and the entire United States Congress where these massive regulations should come back for review and approval before they're implemented, and before they cost those kind of jobs to Americans.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 113-187.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The right to close will not be established until the time in opposition is claimed.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Is it the proponent or the author of the amendment?

The Acting CHAIR. Under clause 3(c) of rule XVII, a manager in opposition would have the right to close.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 20, line 10, insert after "means any rule" the following: "(other than a special rule)".

Page 21, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: ", and includes any special rule".

Page 22, after line 8, insert the following:

"(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that is promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my colleagues. Whenever they engage in debate, I know they have a serious commitment to the process of this House and this Nation.

But I rise today to offer an amendment, and I hope that it addresses the chairman's offer of legislative collegiality. If this is such an important effort, then I believe that the amendments that have been offered by my colleagues, and the one that I introduce as we speak, are ones that makes this bill reasonable.

My amendment would except from the bill's congressional approval requirement any rule promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security organized and established in the backdrop of the heinous and tragic terrorist act of 9/11. In fact, I can't imagine this legislation being effective in the midst of tragedy and devastation.

I don't think my friend understands that there's nothing in the REINS Act that prevents a filibuster. A filibuster means that we will never get a resolution voted on by the two Houses—

never—because it does not negate a filibuster.

So in the midst of a crisis, where people are in need of relief by the Department of Homeland Security, such as the Department of Homeland Security having to act quickly to establish new or emergency regulations in the protection of critical infrastructure, here it comes, the dastardly REINS Act. I think we would be better off right now to be debating H.R. 900 to eliminate the sequestration to bring jobs back to America.

But I hope that this amendment will be considered, because I can't imagine the very Department that was established to put its foot in the gap now is going to be hindered by the REINS Act. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentlewoman from Texas that the bill prohibits a filibuster in the Senate from being used to block consideration of regulations that come before the Congress.

We are making every effort to have that bipartisan collegiality that she suggests, but I don't think this amendment accomplishes that. The amendment seeks to shield the Department of Homeland Security from Congress' authority to approve regulations under the REINS Act. That shield should be denied.

For example, take the Department's rule to extend compliance deadlines for States to issue secure driver's licenses under the REAL ID Act. More than a decade after 9/11 hijackers used fraudulent licenses to board airplanes used to murder 3,000 innocent Americans, DHS continues to keep this extension in place.

This is the kind of decisionmaking that takes place at the Department of Homeland Security. Congress should use every tool it can to reassert its authority over the legislative rulemaking functions it has delegated to DHS, and the REINS Act is available to do that.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and to support the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you.

To the contrary, to my good friend from Virginia, the bill does not entirely prohibit a filibuster. In fact, a filibuster can be used on the procedural motion to bring the bill up, and in the Senate they can never bring this up.

So let me remind my friends:

Galveston, 6,000 people dead and climbing, 1900; Hurricane Katrina, one

of the 10 worst, killing 1,836 in 2005; 1980, a heat wave in the southern and central States killing 1,700; Chicago heat wave in 1995.

Disasters that need the relief that the American people deserve.

This tells us what we will be facing while a filibuster is going on in the Senate. This is a map only of this year. Already disasters in Washington State with mud slides, Oklahoma with tornados, Arizona with wildfires, Miami with mud slides.

Then they want to block Homeland Security from developing regulations for infrastructure, they want to stop what is going on with Hurricane Sandy and the repair that is needed and the infrastructure with something called the REINS Act, which, as I said earlier, goes around and around and around.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to point out to the House that the assertion that this does not prevent a filibuster in the Senate is incorrect. If Members would examine pages 12 through 14 of the bill, they will see multiple ways in which procedural motions and substantive motions in the Senate are barred from undertaking a filibuster, and they must proceed through those points of order and other objections that might be raised to a final vote on this regulation under the REINS Act.

This is a good thing because it will allow for expeditious consideration by the Congress of regulations. Whether they are needed or not needed, they ought to be considered by the Congress, especially if they cost more than \$100 million to the American economy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman pointed us out to pages 12 to 14, because he indicated a number of procedural hula hoops that we have to jump through. Each of those procedural hula hoops will be subject to a filibuster.

But this is what the American people go through: Here is a tornado or an earthquake, here is Hurricane Sandy. There are a variety of issues that it results in. Here is a wildfire.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you. I appreciate you bringing this amendment. There are a whole lot of opportunities for the people of west Tennessee to benefit from it.

We are an area that has been known to have tornados; we have the potential for an earthquake from Reelfoot Lake. FEMA comes under this, and to stop FEMA from having proper regulations that could protect the public would be a serious mistake. It is important that we safeguard our citizens, particularly

when they are victims of natural tragedies.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman.

I would like to ask my colleagues to be sensible and realize that you cannot control the other body.

This amendment is a sensible amendment that responds to the outcry of wildfires, tornados, hurricanes, earthquakes. The American people are looking for the Department of Homeland Security to be able to focus on the infrastructure repair, the regulatory scheme and structure to respond to an emergency.

This bill does not deal with emergencies. It deals with an elongated process that, unfortunately, will drown, if you will, the people with a regulatory structure that does not provide them with the relief that first responders need or the people need.

I ask my colleagues of this House to be sensible and vote for the Jackson Lee amendment.

My amendment would exempt from the bill's Congressional approval requirement any rule promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security. As a Senior Member of the Homeland Security and Ranking Member of the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, I am very concerned about any legislation that would hinder the Department of Homeland Security's ability to respond to an emergency.

The bill would add new review requirements to an already long and complicated process, allowing special interest lobbyists to second-guess the work of respected scientists and staff through legal challenges, sparking a wave of litigation that would add more costs and delays to the rulemaking process, potentially putting the lives, health and safety of millions of Americans at risk.

The Department of Homeland Security simply does not have the time to be hindered by frivolous and unnecessary litigation, especially when the safety and security of the American people are at risk.

According to a study conducted by the Economic Policy Institute, public protections and regulations "do not tend to significantly impede job creation", and furthermore, over the course of the last several decades, the benefits of federal regulations have significantly outweighed their costs.

There is no need for this legislation, aside from the need of some of my colleagues to protect corporate interests. This bill would make it more difficult for the government to protect its citizens, and in the case of the Department of Homeland Security, it endangers the lives of our citizens.

In our post 9/11 climate, homeland security continues to be a top priority for our nation. As we continue to face threats from enemies foreign and domestic, we must ensure that we are doing all we can to protect our country. DHS cannot react to the constantly changing threat landscape effectively if they are subject to this bill.

Since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2002, we have overhauled the government in ways never done before. Steps have been taken to ensure that

the communication failures that led to 9/11 do not happen again. The Department of Homeland Security has helped push the United States forward in how to protect our nation. Continuing to make advances in Homeland security and intelligence is the best way to combat the threats we still face.

The Department of Homeland Security is tasked with a wide variety of duties under its mission. One example of an instance where DHS may have to act quickly to establish new or emergency regulations is the protection of our cyber security.

In the past few years, threats in cyberspace have risen dramatically. The policy of the United States is to protect against the debilitating disruption of the operation of information systems for critical infrastructures and, thereby, help to protect the people, economy, and national security of the United States.

We are all affected by threats to our cyber security. We must act to reduce our vulnerabilities to these threats before they can be exploited. A failure to protect our cyber systems would damage our Nation's critical infrastructure. So, we must continue to ensure that such disruptions of cyberspace are infrequent, of minimal duration, manageable, and cause the least possible damage.

Like other national security challenges in the post 9/11 era, the cyber threat is multifaceted and without boundaries. Some cyber attackers are foreign nations' that utilize their military or intelligence-gathering operations, whereas others are either operating alone or are connected to terrorist groups. In addition, there are cyber threats that are international or domestic criminal enterprises.

According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the number of cyber incidents reported by Federal agencies to USCERT has increased dramatically over the past four years, from 5,503 cyber incidents reported in FY 2006 to about 30,000 cyber incidents in FY 2009 (over a 400 percent increase).

The four most prevalent types of cyber incidents and events reported to US-CERT during FY 2009 were malicious code; improper usage; unauthorized access and incidents warranting further investigations (unconfirmed malicious or anomalous activity).

Critical infrastructure in the nation is composed of public and private institutions in the sectors of agriculture, food, water, public health, emergency services, government, defense industrial base, information and telecommunications, energy, transportation, banking and finance, chemicals and hazardous materials, and postal and shipping.

With cyberspace as their central nervous system—it is the control system of our country. Cyberspace is composed of hundreds of thousands of interconnected computers, servers, routers, switches, and fiber optic cables that allow our critical infrastructures to work. Thus, the healthy, secure, and efficient functioning of cyberspace is essential to both our economy and our national security.

In light of an attack that threatens the United States' cyber protection, Homeland Security officials may need to issue emergency regulations quickly. Attacks can be sent instantly in cyber space, and the protection of our critical infrastructure cannot be mitigated by cumbersome bureaucracy.

The Department of Homeland Security is also tasked with combating terrorism, and protecting Americans from threats. With the current unrest in the Middle East, why would we want to limit DHS's ability to do its job?

The Department of Homeland Security is constantly responding to new intelligence and threats from the volatile Middle East and around the globe. We must not tie the hands of those trusted to protect us from these threats.

Hindering the ability of DHS to make changes to rules and regulations puts the entire country at risk. As the Representative for the 18th District of Texas, I know about vulnerabilities in security firsthand. Of the 350 major ports in America, the Port of Houston is the one of the busiest.

More than 220 million tons of cargo moved through the Port of Houston in 2011, and the port ranked first in foreign waterborne tonnage for the 15th consecutive year. The port links Houston with over 1,000 ports in 203 countries, and provides 785,000 jobs throughout the state of Texas. Maritime ports are centers of trade, commerce, and travel along our nation's coastline, protected by the Coast Guard, under the direction of DHS.

If Coast Guard intelligence has evidence of a potential attack on the port of Houston, I want the Department of Homeland Security to be able to protect my constituents, by issuing the regulations needed without being subject to the constraints of this bill.

The Department of Homeland Security deserves an exemption not only because they may need to quickly change regulations in response to new information or threats, but also because they are tasked with emergency preparedness and response.

There are many challenges our communities face when we are confronted with a catastrophic event or a domestic terrorist attack. It is important for people to understand that our capacity to deal with hurricanes directly reflects our ability to respond to a terrorist attack in Texas or New York, an earthquake in California, or a nationwide pandemic flu outbreak.

On any given day the City of Houston and cities across the United States face a widespread and ever-changing array of threats, such as: terrorism, organized crime, natural disasters and industrial accidents.

Cities and towns across the nation face these and other threats. Indeed, every day, ensuring the security of the homeland requires the interaction of multiple Federal departments and agencies, as well as operational collaboration across Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector. We can hinder the Department of Homeland Security's ability to protect the safety and security of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment in order to ensure that life saving regulations promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security are not unnecessarily delayed by this legislation.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and would just say in opposition to this amendment again, Members only need

to look to the bill itself to see that the process in the Senate will not tolerate filibusters at any point in the process from start to finish.

Let me also point out that the American people care very much about how disasters are handled, and so do elected representatives of the American people. But we are talking about regulations written by the agency that cost more than \$100 million.

Those regulations, if they are written wrong—and many people would suggest that the Department of Homeland Security has gotten it wrong many times with regulations from the TSA, for example—those regulations should come back to this Congress for review. The American people have the first and foremost place to look for leadership on these issues in the Congress of the United States, the people's House, and the United States Senate, and not to government regulatory agencies.

Yes, they need to write regulations, but they shouldn't have the final say, particularly on the most expensive regulations affecting our economy.

Money that is diverted—money that is diverted—to pay for unnecessary regulations is money that can't be spent to address other problems that we have in this country or to pay down our national debt. That's what is important, and that's why this amendment should be defeated.

We need to have common sense brought to our regulatory process. The REINS Act does it. The REINS Act reins in unnecessary burdensome regulations, it helps protect American jobs, and it ought to be protected, and that includes protected from unnecessary or burdensome regulations in the Department of Homeland Security.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 113-187.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 20, line 16, strike "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman

from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill currently requires that all regulations that cost \$100 million or more must first be approved by Congress.

□ 2030

Therefore, I rise today to offer an amendment to reduce that threshold from \$100 million to \$50 million. This would ensure greater transparency and more accountability in the process. Let's put this in perspective, Mr. Chairman.

For the past 2 years, according to the regulators, of all of the regulations individually that have exceeded \$100 million, only 2 percent have been reviewed. That means 98 percent of all of the regulations that we have faced in America have not had the involvement of Congress. I mean, who would be satisfied if only 2 percent of our food that we eat has been inspected? Who would be satisfied if only 2 percent of the planes that we fly in are inspected—or of our homes? businesses? The Obama administration and its overly aggressive bureaucrats are playing with people's lives.

Last weekend, I was at a Serbian picnic in northern West Virginia, and I was approached by two adult males who were very concerned. Mr. Chairman, their eyes welled up with fear and concern because of all of these regulations that are being imposed on them. They fear whether they're going to have jobs because of all of these regulations which no one is overseeing. These men love to work and they want to work, but they feel these new regulations threaten their American Dream and are taking away the possibility for them to raise their families. Each of us knows men like them. They live in our neighborhoods. Whenever we go home, we see these people. They want to work, but they're afraid of someone moving the goalpost with a new regulation that's not checked by Congress.

Every year, these regulations cost hundreds of billions of dollars annually, and 98 percent of them are implemented without congressional oversight. According to the Small Business Administration, the cumulative burden of regulations exceeds more than \$1 trillion annually out of our economy. Let me say this again: nearly 98 percent of all new regulations have no economic analysis or oversight by the American public. According to the GAO, Federal regulators last year, Mr. Chairman, issued 2,500 new regulations—just in 1 year alone.

Doesn't this administration understand that excessive, unchecked regulations harm working families?

Just because the administration can issue a regulation doesn't mean that it

should. By reducing the threshold from \$100 million to \$50 million, we provide Congress an opportunity to rein in these out-of-control agencies and allow more of our people to continue working and supporting their families.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment. I share in my colleague's desire to bring more congressional scrutiny to regulations with high economic impacts, and I know that recent major regulations have hit West Virginia and the gentleman's constituents particularly hard.

The Environmental Protection Agency's regulations that affect energy sources and power production are among the most troubling. The \$100 million threshold for major regulations in the bill is consistent with definitions that have been used by Presidential administrations of both parties since at least the 1990s. However, regulations with a \$50 million impact in today's economy will hit America's job creators and families too hard. This is particularly true of small businesses and the families that depend on them on Main Streets throughout the Nation. As a result, the amendment would make sure that Congress is accountable for regulatory decisions of this magnitude, which impose harm on an economy that can ill afford it.

Therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Mr. COHEN. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is twice as bad as the bill because it decreases by \$50 million the threshold, which means more and more regulations would have to go through this cumbersome process and really stifle regulations and rules, and that's what this is about.

The Speaker said that the job of this Congress is not to pass legislation but to repeal legislation. That's what these bills are about. They're not to improve the lives of Americans by having more safety and more protection but, rather, to defeat proposals that may come from the EPA, which are to protect the air and the water and our Earth, as well as to protect other areas of safety, whether it's automobiles or airplanes or trains or trucks or whatever.

The fact is that this would make it almost impossible to pass a rule or a regulation, and it would allow one House the ability to kill a regulation. This is a House that doesn't have the expertise within it, which has been said by some of the Members in their saying they didn't know how big to build a

dam or whatever. That's why we have government people who study and do research and promulgate rules and regulations—to protect us—and it's done in a nonpolitical environment. If you bring it to this environment, you're going to have lobbyists coming up, trying to kill things that affect their industries.

This is a yo-yo bill: you are on your own. That's what they're saying basically, that we don't want protections for consumers or protections for citizens. We want to have something *laissez-faire*: no rules and regulations. You're out there on your own.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with my good friend who has offered this amendment, which is even more extreme.

I proceeded to read the sections that my good chairman referred me to on how expeditious this process would be in the United States Senate. It's unworkable. How does anyone think that the Senate is going to pass this bill? They've never passed it because what it says is that you're going to kick the resolution out of committee, that you're going to discharge it, and then you're going to move it beyond all of their rules. You're literally abolishing the Senate's rules that they have not redone themselves. They never got an agreement on ending a filibuster, so I have no idea as to issues of security and safety as it relates to homeland security or of the issues dealing with fuel and greenhouse gases, which have decidedly impacted positively the American people as it relates to emissions.

Now we're going from \$100 million to \$50 million, which, I hate to say, in a country of this size means that we are going to multiply the number of resolutions on this body that has really been slow in the passing of any legislation. Then we are going to move to the Senate, and we are going to tell the Senate committees, If you don't act in 15 days, we're discharging this. Then we will expect the Senate to pass this bill, which is the only way that it's going to get to the President's desk.

I might also say to my good friend from Tennessee, over and over again, we keep talking about what President Obama's administration has done. If this is about President Obama, that's one thing. If this is about creating jobs, the President has offered the American Jobs Act, and we have introduced a bill that has been calculated to have helped create jobs and stop the bleeding of the economy.

I am glad my good friend talked about the success of the Dow. That translates into jobs if we get rid of the sequester. There is a bill that will get rid of it, H.R. 900, offered by Mr. CON-

YERS, which many of us have cosponsored. Where is the debate on the floor of the House of that?

I would simply say that we are now going from the extreme to the very extreme, and you're going to see a pounding of regulations. Moms and dads and children—families—municipalities, places need clean air, clean water. They need better emissions to the extent that it helps with clean air. They need safety. They need security. Now we are going to pile it up with those that may cost \$50 million.

How absurd is that in terms of the legislative schedule of this place and the legislative schedule of the United States Senate? Now, I'm not saying anyone is going to shuck off any work—we welcome that—but you have the regular order of legislation. Then every time an amendment comes up—now \$50 million—then you're going to say that this must kick in.

I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment because it simply will not work.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 113-187.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. WEBSTER
OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 113-187.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 21, beginning on line 4, strike “except that such term does not include—” and all that follows through line 18, and insert the following: “except that such term does not include any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, this amendment is straightforward. It closes a regulatory loophole that allows Federal agencies to make major policy changes without appropriate congressional review.

As currently written, the REINS Act covers agency rules developed through the formal notice and comment rule-

making process, but that's not enough. By removing two exceptions from the definition of “rule,” we ensure that agency actions that serve a regulatory purpose are subject to the \$100 million threshold.

The current administration circumvents congressional oversight and public input by issuing general statements of policy known as “guidance documents” in order to achieve its intrusive regulatory agenda. This tactic shields major and costly policy changes from any congressional oversight laws put in place to protect citizens. Let me give you two examples.

The EPA used a guidance document to remove the word “navigable” from the definition of “waters of the United States.” This would expand its jurisdiction to potentially regulate traditional State waters and roadside ditches that hold water after rainfall. The EPA estimates that this guidance document could cost Americans \$171 million annually. Last month, we all know the administration used a guidance document to delay the health care law's employer coverage mandate. The CBO estimates this guidance document will cost \$12 billion.

Both of these guidance documents make substantive changes to policy without congressional review. Under the REINS Act as currently drafted, these costly guidance documents would escape the disapproval process even though they breach the \$100 million threshold established by REINS.

Good policy does not have to be hidden within the cloak of bureaucratic power grabbing. My amendment seeks to shine light into the dark corner of regulatory infrastructure that is abused by those with an agenda that must be hidden from view. It simply allows elected Representatives the opportunity to review policy changes issued through internal guidance that exceed the \$100 million threshold. Hard-working taxpayers are owed a choice and a voice through their elected Representatives in all major policy changes that impact their jobs and their pocketbooks. This amendment secures this fundamental measure of government, accountability, and respect for taxpayers.

By requiring a vote of Congress in all substantive agency rules, the REINS Act results in more clearly written legislation; it improves the regulatory process; and it holds government accountable to the American people for the laws imposed upon them.

I urge my colleagues to support the Webster amendment and strengthen the REINS Act by closing this guidance document loophole, which erodes the rule of law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2045

Mr. COHEN. In what I'm sure is no surprise to the Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Once again, this just takes it to another level. It's not just the rules, but then the rules of the rules.

Really what this bill is about is a messaging opportunity. We're supposed to be legislating. The reality is that we don't legislate in Congress; we message. One side says, We're for business. We're against regulations. We're against rules. We want to create enterprise by destroying rules and regulations. The other side, which is my side, says, We're for consumers. We're for safety. We're for protection. We're for health and clean water and clear air. We think that the government process works because it saves people; it saves their lives. We go back and forth.

This would effectively destroy the opportunity to have rules and regulations passed at all. It's not going to get through the Senate, so what it is is a messaging opportunity for us to fill up C-SPAN. It's unfortunate because we should be legislating about jobs and about the sequester. We ought to be talking about benefits that the government does provide, but right now sequestration is taking away important jobs in the Defense Department, moneys from the National Institutes of Health, which would protect people's lives in the long run with treatments and cures that we need, and the next generation will benefit greater than us; yet we're here talking about something that is not going to happen.

It is really unfortunate, because we should be legislating, and this bill just gets us into the weeds, gets us down into the regulations. It's like we're going to strangle the "bureaucrats." But the bureaucrats are the experts who come up with the safety provisions that say your children's toys are going to be safe and your car is going to have brakes and work in the proper manner and your airplane is not going to fall out of the sky when it's not near the airport.

Those are important things to the American people, and if you don't have rules and regulations by experts that can be implemented, we're going to have a lot of accidents. That's why this is a very bad bill and a bad amendment and a bad use of the public's time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, and I'm going to support his amendment.

I share my colleagues's desire to curb the abuse of agency guidance documents and other agency directives, statements, and actions that too often have escaped adequate congressional scrutiny.

The amendment brings within the scope of the Congressional Review Act and the REINS Act rules of agency practice, procedure, and management that could be abused but otherwise would escape a congressional check and balance. It is a measured first step in reining in agency excess, and I look forward to working with the gentleman in the future to see if we can identify additional ways to rein in abusive agency practices and guidance.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time so we can get to the next program on C-SPAN quicker.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to remind everyone that we all remember what happened on July 3 when there was an announcement made that all of the sudden we were going to basically reverse our decision on the Affordable Care Act passed by this Congress. I would not have voted for it had I been here. With one stroke of the pen on a guidance document, they were able to thwart the law that we passed.

We talk about this body is for legislating? Yes, it is. When it does, we expect the executive branch to enforce that law, which it didn't; and it didn't because it was able to use that guidance document to change the law. It's not right. Vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 113-187.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 23, line 19, insert after "determines," the following (and amend the table of sections accordingly):

"§ 808. Exemption for certain rules

"Sections 801 through 807 of this chapter, as amended by the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013 shall not apply in the case of any rule that relates to veterans or veterans affairs. This chapter, as in effect before the enactment of the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013, shall continue to apply, after such enactment, to any such rule, as appropriate."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R.

367, the REINS Act, and I yield myself 3 minutes of my time.

Today's REINS Act would require a joint resolution approval of Congress every time the executive branch promulgates a major rule. My amendment would simply exempt our Nation's veterans from the burdensome layers and hurdles that H.R. 367 will add to the administration's rulemaking process.

I oppose the underlying bill because it will severely restrict agency or department action when many vulnerable veterans need help. It is just simply unacceptable every single time our Nation's veterans are held hostage by the gridlock we experience in Congress. This is yet another moment. This amendment offers an opportunity to exempt them from that.

Mr. Chairman, just a few little facts:

Today's veterans need help more than ever, and they really deserve it. Unfortunately, over 3,000 Active Duty troops have taken their lives since 2011. We have an estimated 22 veteran suicides per day. We've had over 2 million Active Duty soldiers deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan, many of whom are struggling to transition and trying to find employment. While the VA has made some progress in recent months, Mr. Chairman, the backlog of over 500,000 claims—those older than 125 days—is simply unacceptable.

Some veterans have had to wait up to 2 years for an administrative decision on a claim, and we're adding more administrative requirements for them. We're gravely concerned, all of us are here, on a bipartisan basis, about the growing backlog of appeals pending with the VA as resources are shifted. The amount of claims waiting to be heard by the Board of Veterans Affairs is currently over 45,000 and estimated to increase to approximately 102,000 by 2017. The average length of an appeal completed in fiscal year 2012 was 903 days, Mr. Chairman. Adding hurdles now will do nothing but curtail options available to the administration as it works toward solving these serious problems.

I appeal to the common sense and compassion for veterans of my colleagues. My amendment is simple. Veterans deserve to be left out of this political fight.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the statistics about the delays in poor performance at the Department of Veterans Affairs with regard to veterans' claims are reasons to oppose the gentlewoman's amendment. The amendment carves out of the REINS act congressional approval procedures all regulations that affect veterans and Veterans Affairs.

We want to guarantee that the regulatory decisions that affect them are the best decisions. That's why major regulations that affect veterans and Veterans Affairs, like all other major regulations, should fall within the REINS Act. Under the legislation, agencies with authority over veterans' issues will know that Congress must approve their major regulations before they go into effect.

That provides a powerful incentive for the agencies to write the best possible regulations, ones that Congress can easily approve. Congress will have every incentive to approve good regulations and every incentive to disapprove regulations that have led to the kind of delays and uncertainty that veterans face today.

That's a solution that everyone should be able to support. Congress will be more accountable, agencies will write better rules, and veterans and all Americans will reap the benefit.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'm sure my colleague agrees with me that we should not add hurdles. We've passed 11 bills since September on behalf of veterans, including the following kinds of initiatives: the 9/11 GI Bill, which we all agreed upon; copayments for medication; and resources for radiation poisoning. Had we had this bill in place, each and every one of these initiatives would have required a joint resolution from Congress each time the VA promulgated these rules.

If those sessions of Congress were anything like the majority's calendar for this year, we would not have had a lot of time to have completed work. This year we've only passed 15 bills into law. That's a record low compared to last year. As the Speaker just recently said—I suppose it would apply here—we should not be judged on how many laws we create; we should be judged on how many laws we repeal. Certainly, we would not have been able to do things like the GI Bill or reduce copayments for medications for veterans had we had this bill in place.

The other thing is you would think that my colleagues would have some pride in this institution. All this bill will do is put much more power within the hands of the executive. We can't appoint bureaucrats to conference committees on the budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS NATIONAL SERVICE & LEGISLATIVE HEADQUARTERS,

Washington, DC, July 31, 2013.

Hon. GWEN MOORE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MOORE: On behalf of DAV (Disabled American Veterans), an organization of 1.2 million wartime wounded, injured, and ill veterans, I am writing with re-

spect to your proposed amendment to H.R. 367, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013, or the "REIN" Act.

Your proposed amendment, if accepted, would exempt veterans and veterans affairs from the requirements of the bill that all proposed federal rules that convey a cost of \$100 million or more, or that are subject to other circumstances described in the bill, be submitted to Congress before promulgation by the Executive Branch. Under the bill, Congress would require itself to mandatorily act to approve or disapprove any such regulation through fixed rules of procedure and calendars.

Your effort to protect veterans to ensure their benefits and services are provided in an expeditious manner, as proposed by an Executive Branch agency, is deeply appreciated. Under the DAV Constitution and By-Laws, any federal legislation or policy that furthers the interests of wounded and injured veterans carries DAV's strong support.

While endorsing your specific amendment, DAV takes no position on the underlying bill itself, because our membership has not approved a resolution specific to the purpose of Congress generally limiting government regulation-making across the vast federal landscape.

Thank you for proposing your amendment, and please advise me how DAV can aid you in gaining its acceptance by the House as it concludes consideration of the REIN Act.

Sincerely,

BARRY A. JESINOSKI,
Executive Director, Washington Headquarters.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I say to the gentlewoman, my colleague from Wisconsin, that this House is very proud of the fact that we worked in a bipartisan fashion to pass all of those bills. I have absolutely no doubt that if, after we pass those bills, the Department of Veterans Affairs and other agencies affecting veterans didn't do the work properly and didn't get it done right that this Congress would again work in a very bipartisan fashion to say, No, you didn't get it right. Get it right.

That's what this is all about. That's why the REINS Act is important. It's not just for every other American, but also for veterans. This is something that will improve the regulatory process.

There is another study that talks about the creation of jobs, which are important to our veterans who have returned and are looking for employment in this country. This is a study by the Phoenix Center, and it's entitled, "Regulatory Expenditures, Economic Growth and Jobs: An Empirical Study." It was performed by three Ph.D.'s and a lawyer. What could be better than that? I want to read from part of the abstract. It says:

Even a small 5 percent reduction in the regulatory budget, about \$2.8 billion, is estimated to result in about \$75 billion in expanded private sector GDP each year with an increase in employment by 1.2 million jobs annually. On average, eliminating the job of a single regulator grows the American economy by \$6.2 million and nearly 100 private sector jobs annually. Conversely, each mil-

lion-dollar increase in the regulatory budget costs the economy 420 private sector jobs.

This is a study that shows conclusively that we're right when we say that the REINS Act will help to create jobs in this country and the current regulatory morass that we're facing in this country is costing American jobs. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and to support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

□ 2100

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAMER) having assumed the chair, Mr. CONAWAY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, had come to no resolution thereon.

NATURAL GAS ECONOMIC IMPACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I addressed the positive economic impact on jobs of shale gas production that was documented during a recent hearing in Pennsylvania by the bipartisan Natural Gas Caucus, which I cochair.

An additional area of economic impact of the natural gas production is the direct benefits to Pennsylvania. From 2008 to 2010, Pennsylvania established three leases for natural gas production on State forest lands. These leases have generated signing bonuses totaling \$413 million and earned the State another \$100 million in royalties.

Since 2007, a total of \$1.7 billion in corporate taxes have also been paid. During 2012 and 2013, the natural gas industry contributed \$406 million in impact fees that are benefiting counties and communities across Pennsylvania.

By 2035, shale gas will contribute \$42.4 billion annually to Pennsylvania's

economy, up from the \$7.1 billion in 2010.

Mr. Speaker, the economic impact from natural gas development in Pennsylvania is exceeding all expectations. Governor Corbett and the Pennsylvania State legislature are to be congratulated for their leadership in shale gas production.

HEALTH CARE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for the remainder of the time until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a little time tonight with my colleague, Representative YOUNG from Indiana, to talk a little bit about health care in America, talk a little bit about the Affordable Care Act that is currently being implemented, and talk about the need for real health care reform in this country.

I want to start out by just emphasizing that I firmly believe we need health care reform. I believe that the health care reform we got in the form of the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, is not the health care reform that we need. And I would say that we have lots of proposals here in the House. I think last Congress we had over 200 bills introduced that related to the health care system, reforming our health care system. And this Congress, we have dozens of health care reform related bills as well.

So the idea that it's either the Affordable Care Act as we're seeing it unfold, or nothing at all, it's a false choice. That's not the choice that we have. There are lots of ideas; lots of much better ideas, I must add. And while I am personally for repeal—I certainly want the Affordable Care Act repealed—I want to replace it with quality, patient-centered health care reform.

I am not against providing relief to Americans who are feeling the burden of the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare right now. In fact, we had a hearing on the implementation of the ObamaCare law in the Ways and Means Committee today, a committee of which I am a member. And my colleague Representative YOUNG is also a member. And we heard a lot of people say hey, this is the law of the land, don't mess with it. This is the law of the land, let it go. This is the law of the land, any attempt to criticize it, to discuss its shortcomings, is a waste of time.

Well, I reject that outright. And, you know, I think the President, through his actions, has rejected that.

What am I talking about? Well, it's interesting because we've passed seven bills in this House, seven bills, that relate to ObamaCare, changing

ObamaCare, repealing a part of ObamaCare, seven that not only passed this House, we sent them to the other side of the Capitol. They passed the Senate. And you know what? The President signed them into law. That may come as a surprise to some folks, but it's the truth. We passed seven bills to change, to modify, to repeal parts of, to make better ObamaCare, and the President has agreed with us on all seven. He signed them into law.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Are these some of the very same bills, my good colleague, that the President in recent speeches has characterized as partisan, misguided, meaningless? I do believe you may be referring to some of those bills.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Those are the same bills, and I would like to go through, if I can, the seven bills, and talk a little bit about what they do and how they were an improvement. I think they are evidence that yes, we'd like to replace this bill with something much better, this law, but in the short term, we will do whatever it takes to provide relief to American workers, relief to American families, relief to small businesses that are under the burden of ObamaCare.

So let me mention a few of these.

H.R. 4: H.R. 4 repealed the small business paperwork 1099 mandate. I remember when I first got to Congress, I heard from a bunch of folks about the 1099 filing obligation under the President's health care law. We repealed that. You know what the President did? He agreed. Bad part of the law.

Next, H.R. 1473. We cut \$2.2 billion from what was characterized as a stealth public plan, a consumer-operated and -oriented plan, and froze the IRS budget. The President signed that into law.

Next, H.R. 674. We saved taxpayers \$13 billion by adjusting the eligibility for ObamaCare programs. The President signed that into law.

H.R. 2055 made more reductions to the consumer-operated and -oriented plan that I mentioned earlier, also to the IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, an independent board that's going to cut Medicare, because it hasn't been reformed, when it runs out of money. So that was signed into law. And again in today's hearing in the Ways and Means Committee, folks on the other side of the aisle were saying this talk, this criticism about the President's law, ObamaCare, a waste of time, meaningless, all politics. Hogwash; the President signed a bunch of it into law.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Well, it is hogwash. And it's particularly hogwash because among those various reforms that you've itemized there, let's reflect on how much persuasion, how much public argument was required to even bring the President of the United States to go along with repealing this

egregious, superfluous 1099 obligation. We had to make the public argument. We had to win the argument because there was great reluctance, if recollection serves, and I think it does, to make any changes whatsoever to what most Americans now know as ObamaCare.

The thought was and the thinking still seems to be among a number of our colleagues that if they touch the act, then that is going to lead to further reform, perhaps dissolution or repeal of the act altogether and replacement with something that is more patient centered, with something, frankly, that is more bipartisan.

So to our colleagues who often level criticisms at those of us who are identifying ways to alleviate the pain on the American people with respect to this law, the so-called Affordable Care Act, I think it bears reminding the importance of continuing the argument, forcefully making the argument about all the pain that it is causing.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Precisely. And a lot of people ask, why all the focus, why all the energy, why all the speeches? Because it's important, number one. And, number two, it takes the energy, the focus, the time, the prioritization, the resources, to convince people, the President included, that this is not the way to go.

Now, I think if you were to throw these seven different bills out there a few years ago when ObamaCare passed and say, hey, what are the chances of the President signing this? People would have said no way. No way it's going to happen. So it's a process. It's a process of making the argument with facts; not through personal attack, with facts. Make the vigorous argument. That's what this body and democracy is about, make the argument, win the argument, and then repeal or change.

And I would mention, there are three more: H.R. 3630 slashed billions of dollars from some discretionary funds, some slush funds which they had some flexibility to use, and the President agreed with that. He signed that into law.

H.R. 4348 adjusted a drafting error. It saved \$670 million.

And H.R. 8 repealed what was called the CLASS program—Community Living Assistance Services and Support program. The former Democratic chairman of the Senate Budget Committee called the CLASS program “a Ponzi scheme of the first order, the kind of thing Bernie Madoff would be proud of.”

We saved billions of dollars through the repeal of H.R. 8. So to reiterate, there are seven bills we fought hard for, and every single one of them ultimately was signed into law by the President of the United States.

Now, I would be remiss if I didn't mention that the biggest change, the

most consequential change to ObamaCare, the most open and full recognition that the President's health care law is unworkable and problematic and a burden is the fact that the President himself just a few weeks ago on July 2, through a blog post, a Department of Treasury blog post, said, you know what? I am going to suspend, postpone for a year the so-called employer mandate that is one of the key pillars of the ObamaCare law.

□ 2115

Now, what is that mandate?

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Well, the mandate is that every employer across the United States of America who employs 50 or more persons on a full-time basis must provide government-sanctioned, government-approved health insurance to their employees.

Now, look, superficially, that sounds just great. There's some problems here. First, this law redefines full-time in a way that Americans have never understood.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. If you were to ask me what does full-time mean to you, I'd say, growing up in south Arkansas, full-time means 40 hours in a week or more, right?

That's a commonsense, practical application of what full-time is.

Would that be right under ObamaCare?

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. That's what most Hoosiers think as well.

I think I've traveled quite a bit, gotten to know people around the country. And I don't believe I've encountered, I reckon, anyone who thought that full-time was 30 hours. So where did this come from? Out of thin air, presumably.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. So the bottom line is the President recognized—and I applaud him for this—I applaud him for recognizing the problem, the burden of his law, particularly the employer mandate. And he said, I'm going to postpone that part of the law. I'm basically going to repeal, in effect, repeal that for a year; just make that go away for a year as a practical matter.

Now, I applaud his recognition that the law has problems. The problem I had with that action is I don't think, still do not believe the President had the power to do that. If he wants the law changed, he should have called Congress. We would have been more than happy to deliver up a bill—send it over to the Senate—that postponed the employer mandate a year.

In fact, because of the President doing that, that's precisely what we did. So I introduced H.R. 2667, that does that in legislation, not through a regulatory change, a blog post. But I introduced the Authority for Mandate Delay Act, which we voted on. We passed on this floor.

Why?

It does the same basic thing, a little bit different, but the same basic thing that the President was doing, and we did it so that what he did would be legal. And you know what? Thirty-five Democrats supported this bill. Thirty-five Democrats supported this bill, and I applaud them for doing it.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Potentially, you, myself and so many other Members of this body agreed with the substance of the President's blog post, though one would question whether we were intended to be a Nation of laws or instead a Nation of blog posts. We could get into that separate conversation.

I think fair-minded people agreed that the delay was appropriate. ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. The computer systems don't seem to be ready. Employers are confused about exactly how this law's going to work, exactly how it's going to impact them. Employees are confused. And something had to be done.

But I think that recognition that something had to be done only occurred because there were people in Congress making arguments, as they continue to make arguments, with respect to the flaws in this legislation.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. And I would add to that there are many of us that believe the reason this law is not working is because it will never work. It is unworkable by design. It is top-down. It is the old way of doing things in a world that is becoming network bottom-up, innovative, new way of doing things. This is an old central control, top-down way of legislating.

And so the President recognized that. But, of course, for partisan politics reasons, even though my bill did basically what he did, he opposed it. He opposed the bill that would have made his actions legal.

And, of course, now it is sitting, napping, because we hope to awake it, it's napping in the Senate, in the United States Senate, with your companion bill, the Individual Mandate Delay.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Well, kudos to the one of, what is it, six colleagues on the other side of the aisle that joined us in voting for your bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thirty-five Democrats.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Thirty-five in total?

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. That's right.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I think one out of every six members of their conference were supportive of your bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. That's exactly right.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I think that was the right thing to do, the right vote to cast. It certainly preserved the precedent that it is this body that passes the laws, that develops the legislation.

It's the job of the executive branch to sign those various acts into law, and

then to execute them, not to recraft the laws as it might see convenient, for whatever motives.

And so you mentioned my bill, which is really, in the end, the American people's bill because it's designed to provide relief to American families, the Fairness for American Families Act.

You know, the thinking behind this is quite simple. If the President wants to offer businesses a relief from the employer mandate tax, as our Supreme Court has styled it, then why won't you offer relief to working Americans and their families?

It's that simple. And I have yet to hear an acceptable response. No, we're playing politics.

Well, are those one of nine Democrats who voted for my legislation also playing politics?

No, candidly, I think they're being fair minded. Some would argue that they're looking for political cover or whatever. I'll let others assess that.

But, certainly, it's good legislation. It's fair and equitable legislation to accord the same sort of treatment to hardworking Americans that the President would give to the business community.

And though I agree, let me go on record that that business community needs relief too.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Well, and one in nine of the Democrats voted for your bill. I think it was 22 total. I think, just a year or two ago, that would have been unthinkable, that 35 would have joined voting for the Employer Mandate Delay and 22 or so for your bill. It would have been unthinkable.

It is because we have been relentless in pursuit of a better way, relentless in pursuit of real health care reform, relentless in identifying and letting folks in Washington know that the people back home, constituents, have made their voice very clear, where I live, in Arkansas, on the issue of the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare.

And what's interesting is, today, in the Ways and Means Committee, we had the head of the IRS testifying. And he was explaining why the President decided to delay, for 1 year, one of the two key components of the Affordable Care Act—one being the employer mandate, and the other part of the law being the individual mandate.

We know that the President delayed that one, the employer mandate, and he was explaining why he did that. And this is a paraphrase of what he said.

It's the head of the IRS describing why the President gave 1 year relief to businesses impacted by the employer mandate. He said, to paraphrase, not a direct quote, but to paraphrase, he said, in effect, we heard from a lot of American small businesses that this was a burden on them, and so we acted to give them relief. That's a paraphrase, but that's effectively what he said.

I agree with the general sentiment. It is a burden on American workers and small businesses, et cetera, and they do need relief, and I'm glad they're getting it.

But it raises the question, why wouldn't you give that same relief, as a matter of fairness, to individuals, families, workers impacted by the individual mandate, the other key component of ObamaCare, of the Affordable Care Act?

Why would you give relief to small businesses and businesses and what have you, but not give relief to individuals?

It fundamentally doesn't make sense. It's not fair.

And when he said that, I thought to myself, well, is it possible that he doesn't know, that the head of the IRS and the administration don't know that individuals and families and workers are also impacted in a negative way, that they are burdened, many of them, by this law?

Yes, they want health care reform. Yes, people need insurance. Yes, people want to be covered. But this is not the way to go.

Does he not know the impact that this law is having?

So I thought, why don't we put all the opinions aside, the op eds, the editorialists, and why don't we just talk about some of the news headlines?

Without my commentary, I thought you and I could just read some of the headlines. These are news stories, not op eds, not editorial writers. These are news stories from a variety of publications from around the country. And I thought it would be instructive to run through some of those tonight.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. There seem to be a lot there. How would you like to proceed?

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I tell you what, I'll read through one of these, and I'll put one up. You could read through, and then I'll take one. These are headlines from around the country. And we're going to run through them because they are news stories that, regardless of what you hear from this administration, this is what's happening around the country.

The AP: Florida Insurance Officials: Rates Will Rise Under ObamaCare.

Georgia Insurance Rates Spike Under ObamaCare.

Now, I would point out, we don't have to guess what's going to happen anymore. We don't have to predict what's going to happen.

Why? Because we're already there. Implementation is under way. It's already happening. So we'll just let the facts speak.

Chattanooga Business Owner Says ObamaCare Costing Workers Pay Raises and Benefits.

Consumers Could See 25-Percent Premium Increases Under ObamaCare.

UNA Asks Student Employees to Work Fewer Hours.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. So the Contra Costa Times of Concord says that half of the Affordable Care Act call-center jobs will be part-time.

The Missourian says ObamaCare is going to impact Franklin County workers.

The Weekly Standard reports Wisconsin grocery store forced to cut hours due to ObamaCare.

The Huffington Post reports that White Castle indicates that ObamaCare is causing them to consider only hiring part-time workers.

KHN indicates Wellpoint sees small employers dropping their health coverage.

There's more.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I would point out that these are from all over the country. Growing worries about ObamaCare forcing insurers out of State markets.

Iowa Public Radio: Full-time vs part-time workers. Restaurants weigh ObamaCare.

ObamaCare forces work-hour limits for CMU students.

Brevard cuts some workers' part-time hours to avoid ObamaCare rules.

ObamaCare delay is a relief for a family business.

□ 2130

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. So we're already picking up on some trends here. From a number of the headlines, we're getting the sense that this health care law is not what we were told it would be, what the American people were told it would be. It's not sustainable. That's why there's all manner of taxes, from medical device taxes to what was once a tanning tax. They're looking for revenue under every rock to make this thing sustainable.

It doesn't control costs. By some estimates in my own State, the State of Indiana, premiums are expected to go up 70 percent-plus within the next year or so. There are problems about access that we're hearing about that are captured in articles around the country. Rural areas, in particular, can expect to have a shortage of doctors as a direct result of this law. And there are quality concerns.

I've just listed my thoughts on what health care reform ought to accomplish. All those various things ought to happen. Unfortunately, ObamaCare is failing on every front. And I don't say this with any celebration. I lament the fact. It's all the more reason that we need to continue to educate our colleagues and that minority of the American people that still believe this is going to work.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. As we see here:

Texas Business Owner Facing \$1 Million in Annual ObamaCare Costs;

Maryland Employers Cutting Hours Due to ObamaCare;

Waitress Said She's Losing Full-Time Status Due to the ObamaCare Rule;

St. Pete College: HCC Cut Adjuncts' Hours Over Health Care;

Local Entrepreneur Sells Part of Business Due to ObamaCare.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. There are people behind every one of these headlines.

Forbes says: Labor Unions Are Indicating That ObamaCare Will Shatter Our Health Benefits and Cause Nightmare Scenarios.

My recollection was that labor was very much behind this bill, originally. I would love to work with them or any members of union or union leadership to be part of the solution here to help alleviate some of the pain. Welcome home.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I share your feeling there. I found common ground with a lot of labor union folks on the Keystone pipeline because they want the jobs.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Absolutely.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Here, the labor unions are realizing this is a nightmare.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Well, they're hearing from their members.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. The members are speaking out.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. That's right.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Here you see:

Restaurant Shift: Sorry, Just Part-Time.

There's a theme here.

Workers' Hours Cut—'ObamaCare' Blamed.

Again, for those just tuning in, we're just reading news headlines, not op-eds. These are news headlines, stories from around the country, everything from the Weekly Standard to the Huffington Post, the AP.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Objective journalists.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. ObamaCare Strikes: Part-Time Jobs Surge to All-Time High; Full-Time Jobs Plunge by 240,000;

16,500 Working Fewer Hours Due to ObamaCare Mandate.

This is one of the mandates we've been talking about here tonight.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Let me press "pause" here before we read more of these headlines, which are incredibly illustrative and instructive.

So many of them deal with the cut in the number of hours for our wage earners during the worst economy since the Great Depression.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Sure.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Why is that happening? Why is that happening?

Well, you've got employers that are now mandated to provide health insurance to their employees, and many of them, in order to remain profitable, must change their way of doing business. So they change people from full-time into a part-time status. They hire people into part-time positions rather than full-time positions.

And then we have, perhaps most pathetically and tragically, what has been dubbed the “29er effect,” where people are working more than 30 hours a week, many of whom are barely getting by, barely able to put food on the table and meet their utility bills and so on, that are being dropped down to 29 or fewer hours.

How is that helpful to the American people?

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. And these are folks that the Obama administration says are full-time, but they're really not full-time. They may be working 35 hours a week. They don't even have a truly full-time, 40-hour-a-week job, what most folks across America know to be full-time. We talked about this before. Who said that 30 hours is full-time?

A lot of folks working 35 hours are trying to make ends meet. They would rather work 40 and get some other time. But what is happening is they're being cut back below 30, which is not just the number of hours they work. It's simultaneously reducing the money they take home.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. That's right. And we have legislation here, again, to address this problem, like the Saving American Workers Act. There's lots of cosponsors here in the House.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. That's your bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I introduced the bill in response to some of the same things I'm hearing from my colleagues who are, in turn, hearing from their constituents and the sort of things I hear back home in Indiana, which is this is absolutely ridiculous. We're helping very few people at the expense of many.

Let's restore the definition of full-time as it's always been popularly understood and provide some relief. So we need to move forward on that. Let's continue to educate and assess what is being reported across the country on some of these.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Houston Doctors to Close Doors Because of ObamaCare;

Aetna Letter Warns Customers: ‘Many People Will Pay More for Health Insurance’ Under ObamaCare;

East Penn Cuts Cafeteria Workers’ Hours to Avoid ObamaCare;

Affordable Care Act Insurance Mandates Leading Some Businesses to Cut Employees’ Work Hours;

Limiting Part-Time Hours Unintended Result of Health Law.

Maybe the unintended consequences have something to do with the fact they didn't know half of what was in the law in the first place.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. That's right.

I've seen some Indiana headlines—a number of them—related to some of these effects. One pops out there for me.

The Indianapolis News: School Part-Timers Fear Fewer Hours, Less Pay, as Impact of Health Care Law Kicks In.

Let's remember this is not just businesses that are being impacted. We've got municipalities, school workers, and businesses, especially in the hospitality industry or your retail sector, where we see a lot more people being hired on a part-time basis. Seemingly, every aspect of our economy and much of our society is being adversely impacted by this law.

Now, that's not to say that some people aren't helped. All things being equal, if we can insure a few more million people, that's a great thing; but with all the collateral damage created by this law and its unsustainability, that's the real problem here.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. And we can help those people. We can help those people through other means. As I said before, the idea that it's the ObamaCare model or nothing is a false choice. There are many other better patient-centered ways to do this to reach the same goal.

Health Care Law Causing SCC to Re-examine Adjunct Faculty Members;

Local Employers Struggle with Affordable Care Act.

When employers are struggling, the workers are struggling. The families are struggling.

ObamaCare Glitch Could Make Coverage Unaffordable for Low-Wage Workers;

ObamaCare's \$96-an-Hour Cost Spike May End 30-Hour Workweek.

We're getting short on time, so I think we ought to run through these.

I want to talk a little bit about where our bills are now, sitting at the other end of the Capitol. I want to urge our Senate friends to think about the opportunity they have.

But let's take a quick look at these before we close out.

Rancho Cucamonga May Reduce Part-Time Hours to Avoid Health Care Costs;

Part-time Staff Hours in Flux Due to ObamaCare;

Fort Wayne Community Schools Cut Hours for Part-Time Positions;

Maricopa Community College Staffs Pinched by Obama Health Law;

Dallas Area Cities, School Districts Expect Budget Hits from Affordable Care Act.

And the good news just keeps on coming. There's a little sarcasm there. This is just awful.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Out in Colorado: Fort Collins Small Businesses Prepare for Affordable Care Act Changes;

The World-Herald: Districts to Cut Back Paraprofessionals' Hours as a Result of Health Care Law.

It's already even impacting paraprofessionals right now.

Beacon Journal: Limiting Part-Time Hours to Avoid Health Care Costs.

More of the same, impacting yet more Americans.

Requirements for Health Care Reform and Resulting Requirements for Chesterfield County Public Schools;

The Salt Lake Tribune: Ahead of Health Reform, Granite District Cuts Part-Time Workers' Hours.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. And there's so many more. One that I actually didn't get up here was reported just tonight. In Ohio, they announced that premiums statewide are going up 41 percent.

AAA Parks Full-Time Jobs, Cites Health Law;

Agencies Must Cut Some Part-Timers' Hours or Offer Health Insurance;

Part-Time Employee Hours Cut Over Health Care;

Fast-Food Worker Hours Cut, New Health Care Law Blamed.

I know we're short on time. We've got some other colleagues that want to talk tonight, but I just want to close by first of all thanking my colleague, Representative YOUNG of Indiana, for being here with me.

But I'd just like to point out that the employer mandate bill that mimics what the President did, that postpones the employer mandate for 1 year, we passed it here with 35 Democrats, bipartisan. Your bill, the individual mandate postponement, 22 Democrats. We passed them out of here. We did our job.

The worst the White House could say about my bill is that it was redundant. Those bills are sitting down in the Senate, waiting for action.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Redundant to the Treasury Department's blog post, it bears reminding. They're sitting over there, gathering dust, as the American people demand relief. It is so important.

I want to thank you for your leadership on this issue. Those in Arkansas are well represented by you on this and other matters, working very hard to ensure that where relief can be provided, we provide it; where the prerogatives of the legislative branch can be defended, you will defend them.

That's where I stand as well. We just need the United States Senate to act.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. On the employer mandate delay, they should pass that immediately to make the President's actions legal, and they should pass the individual mandate delay to make the President's actions fair.

I appreciate you being here with me tonight. You are an outstanding member of the Ways and Means Committee, and I appreciate your leadership.

We're running out of time. I want to thank folks for joining us tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2145

JERUSALEM AS THE CAPITAL OF ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for the remainder of the

time until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank Congressman GRIFFIN for the opportunity here. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time.

Mr. Speaker, the tiny Nation of Israel began in earnest more than 3,000 years ago. Since that time the people of Israel have faced more heartaches, threats of annihilation, bigotry, torture, and genocide than any other people in the history of humanity. Yet even today, in 2013, against all odds and opposition, the noble people of Israel remain. And the peace of Israel continues to be the linchpin of peace for the entire world.

Today Israel faces another catastrophic challenge among the many in its long struggle throughout history that threatens to end its existence as a nation. The greatest challenge Israel faces today is the growing threat of a nuclear armed Iran. This is a menace that also threatens the peace and security of the entire family of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, Israel has been our truest friend and ally in the Middle East now for approximately 65 years, and during that entire time it has faced many unthinkable threats from enemies who desire to see its absolute annihilation. Now more than ever before the United States of America and the nation of Israel must stand together against the threat of a nuclear Iran and against those who would see our two nations and all those we love and all those who love human freedom eradicated from the face of the Earth.

One of the most important ways America can send a signal to the world that there is no space between us and Israel is to transfer our Embassy to an existing, newly constructed consulate in Jerusalem and once and for all make it clear that the United States officially and unequivocally recognizes Jerusalem as the undivided capital city of the state of Israel.

This is something we should have done a long time ago, Mr. Speaker. However, there has never been a more important time to do it because the world today, including some of our most dangerous enemies, doubt America's resolve to stand with Israel. And the actions of the Obama administration would create such doubt in any reasonable person's mind. For instance, when it was announced that the Israeli Government had completed one more step in the permit process for building houses in Jerusalem, the Obama administration openly rebuked Israel and demanded that they do several things by way of "penance" for building houses for its citizens.

Now Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell you how bewildering it is for me as an American Congressman to hear our own American President expressing more outrage toward Israel for building homes in its own capital city than he

has expressed toward a madman like Mahmoud Ahmadinejad for building nuclear weapons with which to threaten the peace and security of the entire world.

Mr. Obama demanded that the permits be canceled, despite the fact that every Prime Minister of Israel has allowed them in their capital. Mr. Obama told Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to make a "substantial gesture" towards the Palestinians and release Palestinian prisoners. Mr. Obama has made no such demands of the Palestinians, and the Palestinians have made no such concessions. In fact, Mr. Speaker, every concession that Israel has ever made for decades has been met and responded to by violence and terror.

Nevertheless, President Obama is continuing to insist that Israel publicly state its willingness to negotiate the division of Jerusalem and the right of return for millions of descendants of Palestinian refugees to Israel. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, no President in our history has been more bent upon isolating our friends and emboldening our enemies as this President.

And Mr. Speaker, it places Israel in a great conundrum. For if, on the one hand, they take military action to halt Iran's nuclear program, the world—including this administration—will openly condemn them and they will face intense isolation and hostility from the international community.

On the other hand, if they do not take action and they allow Iran to gain nuclear weapons, they face the real and imminent possibility that Iran will either directly or through its proxies unleash a nuclear hell on Earth that will annihilate their tiny homeland.

It is perilous beyond description for us all, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the free world doesn't seem to understand the gravity of allowing the Iranian regime and the Government of Iran today to gain nuclear weapons capability. It is vital for those of us in Congress to make it clear that America's commitment to Israel remains steadfast and that Israel's enemy is America's enemy.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, America should make a major effort and make a major statement to that effect by transferring our Embassy to Israel's capital city, Jerusalem. This move would require nothing from American taxpayers. It could happen by selling the current Embassy in Tel Aviv, and that could even bring a substantial upside to America financially. This is something that we need to do for the sake of making it clear to the world that we will stand by Israel.

America has established bilateral relations with so many nations across the world, and in each case we have recognized their capital city. Yet when it has come to the State of Israel, our most critical and cherished ally on this

Earth, Israel's capital city of Jerusalem is the only one in the world which we have yet to recognize.

Ironically, Mr. Speaker, it was America that was the first nation on Earth to recognize Israel as a nation, a mere 11 minutes after Israel's declaration. President Harry Truman said:

I had faith in Israel before it was established, I have faith in it now. I believe it has a glorious future before it—not just as another sovereign nation, but as an embodiment of the great ideals of human civilization.

Mr. Speaker, if America now ignores the opportunity to be the first to fully recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital city, can we truly claim that we are Israel's nearest and dearest friend? And, can we honestly say that we are fully committed to our own principles?

The majority of Israel's citizens and leaders have yearned for their capital city's recognition by the people of the world and, moreover, by the people of the United States for so very long. Israel's capital city houses its government framework, including the Israeli Parliament, the Knesset, the Supreme Court, the Bank of Israel, its diplomatic corps of the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Prime Minister's and President's offices. And very significantly, Jerusalem surrounds many of Israel's most sacred remembrances, including the tombs of the fallen soldiers on Mount Herzl, as well as the symbol of the most insidious injustice ever endured by the Jewish people, the Holocaust Museum—Yad Vashem.

Mr. Speaker, not so long ago one of the Members of this House said very eruditely and arrogantly: "I don't take sides for or against Israel, and I don't take sides for or against Hezbollah." I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is more dangerous, that kind of moral equivalence, that kind of moral neutrality, it's more dangerous to humanity than terrorism itself.

Ronald Reagan gave an address in 1983 when the world faced a similar threat in the growing strength and nuclear ambition of the Soviet Union. He stated:

I urge you to beware the temptation to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong and good and evil.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot remove ourselves from that struggle.

Let us all be reminded that we have been here before. The free nations of the world once had opportunity to address the insidious rise of the Nazi ideology in its formative years, when it could have been dispatched without great cost. But they delayed, and the result was atomic bombs falling on cities, 50 million people dead worldwide, and the swastika's shadow nearly

plunging the planet into Cimmerian darkness.

You know, it is said that those who survived the Holocaust achieved their revenge through simply living. Rather than allowing their faith and their hopes to be crushed by the atrocities of the past, they chose instead to dry their tears and to look up and to begin building again. And indeed they did build again. They built a future and a family and a community and a nation. And Mr. Speaker, the God of Jacob honored their courage. The threat of the Nazis is no more, and one day this threat of global jihad will be no more.

Mr. Speaker, recognizing Jerusalem as the rightful capital of Israel is not solely an act of foreign attributes and powers. It is the noble act of courage and justice that comports with everything that America is. We have assisted the Jewish people in restoring their ancient state. We must now act and recognize her restored ancient city, Jerusalem.

Together, we can ensure that Jerusalem continues to be a center for answered prayers and dreams come true. And I pray that the United States will be the first nation to officially and formally recognize Israel's capital city and to transfer our Embassy to Jerusalem. This will undeniably affirm our commitment and our resolve on behalf of Israel. And we will be standing steadfastly on our own Declaration of Independence, as well, Mr. Speaker, as on the right side of history.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would just pray that the light of God's peace will shine down upon the streets of Jerusalem forever.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of bronchitis.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending Lindy Boggs' funeral.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1911. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study, on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2167. An act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish additional requirements to improve the fiscal safety and soundness of the home

equity conversion mortgage insurance program.

H.R. 2611. An act designate the headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia as the "Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building", and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 2, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2450. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Handling of Animals; Contingency Plans; Stay of Regulations [Docket No.: APHIS-2006-0159] (RIN: 0579-AC69) received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2451. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Releasing Information; General Provisions; Accounting and Reporting Requirements; Reports of Accounts and Exposures (RIN: 3052-AC76) received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2452. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities in Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2453. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Robert S. Harward, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2454. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on balances carried forward at the end of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2455. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting Annual Report to the Congress on the Presidential \$1 Coin Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2456. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No.: FEMA-2013-0002] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2457. A letter from the Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs Office, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program: Nutrition Standards for All Foods Sold in School as Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 [FNS-2011-0019] (RIN: 0584-AE09) received July 30, 2013, pursuant to

5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2458. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Animal Feeds Contaminated With Salmonella Microorganisms [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-0253] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2459. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Centerville, Midway, Lovelady, and Oakwood, Texas); Applications of Stations KTWL(FM), Hempstead, Texas (Facility ID No. 21204), and KLTR(FM), Brenham, Texas (Facility ID No. 40775), to Change Communications of License [MB Docket No.: 12-92] (RM-11650; RM-11679) (File No. BPH-20120529ADK; BPH-20120529ADI) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2460. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Regulatory Guide 1.124, Revision 3, "Service Limits and Loading Combinations for Class 1 Linear Type Supports", pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2461. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Interim Enforcement Policy for Permanent Implant Brachytherapy Medical Event Reporting [NRC-2013-0114] received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2462. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Developing Software Life-Cycle Processes for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.173, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2463. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Software Requirement Specifications for Digital computer Software and Complex Electronics Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.172, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2464. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Software Unit Testing for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.171, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2465. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Test Documentation for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants Regulatory Guide 1.170, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2466. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's

final rule — Configuration Management Plants for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.169, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2467. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Verification, Validation, Reviews, and Audits for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.168, Revision 2, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2468. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Applications; Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2469. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Final Safety Evaluation by the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation Topical Report WCAP-12610-P-A & CENPD-404-P-A, Addendum 2/WCAP-14342-A & CENPD-404-NP-A, Addendum 2, "Westinghouse Clad Corrosion Model for ZIRLO and Optimized ZIRLO" Westinghouse Electric Company Project No. 700, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2470. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations: Military Vehicles; Vessels of War; Submersible Vessels, Oceanographic Equipment; Related Items; and Auxiliary and Miscellaneous Items that the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control under the United States Munitions List [Docket No.: 10928603-3298-01] (RIN: 0694-AF39) received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2471. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Additions to the List of Validated End-Users in the People's Republic of China: Samsung China Semiconductor Co. Ltd. and Advanced Micro-Fabrication Equipment, Inc., China [Docket No.: 130611539-3539-01] (RIN: 0694-AF93) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2472. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter regarding the section 620K(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2473. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2474. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the twentieth quarterly report

on the Afghanistan Reconstruction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2475. A letter from the Director, Diversity and Inclusion Division, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's No FEAR Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2476. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2477. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Annual Category Rating Report from November 1, 2011 to October 31, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2478. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Air Force, transmitting ten reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2479. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting ATF 2013 PACT Act Report, pursuant to Public Law 111-154, section 4(f)(2) (124 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2480. A letter from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removing Unnecessary Office on Violence Against Women Regulations [OVW Docket No.: 110] (RIN: 1105-AB40) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2481. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report regarding the International Marriage Broker Regulation Act (IMBRA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2482. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0019; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-051-AD; Amendment 39-17485; AD 2013-12-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2483. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; B-N Group Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0314; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-004-AD; Amendment 39-17490; AD 2013-13-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2484. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1052; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-014-AD; Amendment 39-17471; AD 2013-11-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2485. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0205; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-226-AD; Amendment 39-17493; AD 2013-13-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2486. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1155; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-115-AD; Amendment 39-17445; AD 2013-09-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2487. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1214; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-071-AD; Amendment 39-17482; AD 2013-12-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2488. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30907; Amdt. No. 3542] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2489. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30906; Amdt. No. 3541] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2490. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30905; Amdt. No. 3540] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2491. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Port Townsend, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0926; Airspace Docket No. 12-ANM-24] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2492. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; El Monte, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0505; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-4] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2493. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Washington, DC [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0081; Airspace Docket No.: 12-AEA-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2494. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-55 and V-169 in Eastern North Dakota [Docket

No.: FAA-2013-0484; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-16] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2495. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Live Oak, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0001; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-45] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2496. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Selmer, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0074; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASO-3] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2497. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Captiva, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1335; Airspace Docket No.: 12-ASO-19] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2498. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-537, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0971; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-31] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2499. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tuskegee, AL [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0158; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASO-5] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2500. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0420; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-284-AD; Amendment 39-17315; AD 2013-01-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2501. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0302; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-019-AD; Amendment 39-17503; AD 2013-13-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2502. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0598; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-015-AD; Amendment 39-17506; AD 2013-14-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2503. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0864; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-023-AD; Amend-

ment 39-17496; AD 2013-13-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2504. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1330; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-006-AD; Amendment 39-17470; AD 2013-11-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2505. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0553; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-041-AD; Amendment 39-17502; AD 2013-13-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2506. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0223; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-049-AD; Amendment 39-17468; AD 2013-11-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2507. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1327; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-47-AD; Amendment 39-17478; AD 2013-12-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2508. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1034; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-051-AD; Amendment 39-17383; AD 2013-05-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2509. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hawker Beechcraft Corporation (Type Certificate Previously Held by Raytheon Aircraft Company) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0462; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-092-AD; Amendment 39-17476; AD 2013-11-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2510. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1221; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-151-AD; Amendment 39-17474; AD 2013-11-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2511. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0522; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-018-AD; Amendment 39-17487; AD 2013-10-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2512. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0018; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-060-AD; Amendment 39-17483; AD 2013-12-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2513. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Presidio, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0770; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASW-6] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2514. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30908; Amdt. No. 3543] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2515. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Parkston, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1282; Airspace Docket No. 12-AGL-16] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2516. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-345 in the Vicinity of Ashland, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0236; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2517. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Colt, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1281; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASW-13] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2518. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Worthington, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1139; Airspace Docket No. 12-AGL-12] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2519. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Elbow Lake, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1121; Airspace Docket No. 12-AGL-8] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2520. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Ogallala, NE [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1138; Airspace Docket No. 12-ACE-6] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2521. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Sanibel, FL

[Docket No.: FAA-2012-1334; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-18] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2522. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Areas R-2504A and R-2504B; Camp Roberts, CA, and Restricted Area R-2530; Sierra Army Depot, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0515; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2523. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Areas R-2907A and R-2907B; Lake George, FL; and R-2910, Pine Castle, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1146; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-25] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2524. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Grand Canyon, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0163; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-2] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2525. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class D and E Airspace; Twin Falls, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0258; Airspace Docket No. 13-ANM-12] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2526. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1230; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-107-AD; Amendment 39-17477; AD 2013-11-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2527. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0214; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-152-AD; Amendment 39-17497; AD 2013-13-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2528. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0620; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-357-AD; Amendment 39-17499; AD 2013-13-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2529. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland (Eurocopter) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0520; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-027-AD; Amendment 39-17484; AD 2013-12-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2530. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1035; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-235-AD; Amendment 39-17492; AD 2013-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2531. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1305; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-041-AD; Amendment 39-17475; AD 2013-11-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2532. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1039; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-275-AD; Amendment 39-17491; AD 2013-13-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2533. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DASSAULT AVIATION Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1067; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-231-AD; Amendment 39-17444; AD 2013-09-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2534. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dowty Propellers Propellers [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0776; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-32-AD; Amendment 39-17481; AD 2010-17-11R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2535. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0383; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-008-AD; Amendment 39-17498; AD 2013-13-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2536. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0535; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-018-AD; Amendment 39-17489; AD 2013-13-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2537. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1206; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-021-AD; Amendment 39-17269; AD 2012-23-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2538. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Air-

worthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0458; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-19-AD; Amendment 39-17480; AD 2013-21-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2539. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0983; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-001-AD; Amendment 39-17457; AD 2013-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2540. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Engine Alliance Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1329; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-46-AD; Amendment 39-17479; AD 2013-12-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2541. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0447; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-17-AD; Amendment 39-17488; AD 2013-10-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2542. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Helicopter Models [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0521; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-010-AD; Amendment 39-17486; AD 2013-06-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2543. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Revision to Fireworks Regulations (RRR) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2010-0320 (HM-257)] (RIN: 2137-AE70) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2544. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Memorandum of Understanding Between the United States and the Government of Belize Concerning the Imposition of Import Restrictions on Archaeological Materials Representing the Cultural Heritage of Belize, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2602(g)(1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2545. A letter from the Chief Counsel/Administrative Specialist, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sale and Issue of Marketable Book-Entry Treasury Bills, Notes, and Bonds [Docket No.: Fiscal-BPD-2013-0001] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2546. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Appeals Settlement Guideline, New Qualified Plug-In Electric Drive Motor Vehicle Credit [UIL: 30D.00-00] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2547. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Recognizing advance payments for gift cards that are redeemable for goods or services from an unrelated entity (Rev. Proc. 2013-39) received July 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2548. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Change in Terminology: "Mental Retardation" to "Intellectual Disability", pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2549. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Memorandum of justification for the President's waiver of the restrictions on the provision of funds to the Palestinian Authority; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

2550. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System — Update for Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2013 (FY 2014) [CMS-1447-N] (RIN: 0938-AR63) July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H.R. 2900. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the percentage floor on medical expense deductions, expand the use of tax-preferred health care accounts, and establish a charity care credit; to amend the Social Security Act to create a Medicare Premium Assistance Program, reform EMTALA requirements, and to replace the Medicaid program and the Children's Health Insurance program with a block grant to the States; to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for cooperative governing of individual and group health insurance coverage offered in interstate commerce; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, the Judiciary, House Administration, Appropriations, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COLE, Mr. JONES, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SCHOCK, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 2901. A bill to strengthen implementation of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 by improving the capacity of the United States Government to implement, leverage, and monitor and evaluate programs to provide first-time or improved

access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene to the world's poorest on an equitable and sustainable basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 2902. A bill to require the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 2903. A bill to amend section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide increased accountability of nonprofit athletic associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 2904. A bill to provide for payment to the survivor or surviving family members of compensation otherwise payable to a contractor employee of the Department of Energy who dies after application for compensation under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 2905. A bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to strengthen the quality control measures in place for part B lung disease claims and to establish the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health for the contractor employee compensation program under subtitle E of such Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 2906. A bill to amend MAP-21 to improve contracting opportunities for veteran-owned small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 2907. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that members of the

reserve components of the Armed Forces who have served on active duty or performed active service since September 11, 2001, in support of a contingency operation or in other emergency situations receive credit for such service in determining eligibility for early receipt of non-regular service retired pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 2908. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow the use of physical damage disaster loans for the construction of safe rooms; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 2909. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2910. A bill to protect American children and their families from the epidemic of gun violence by banning access to certain weapons, strengthening the Nation's mental health infrastructure, and improving the understanding of gun violence; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2911. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to expand eligibility for part 74 licenses to certain wireless microphone users, to establish safe haven channels for wireless microphones, and to authorize access by owners and operators of wireless microphones to the TV bands databases for the purpose of protecting wireless microphone operations from interference; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2912. A bill to provide authority for the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction to suspend and debar contractors under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2913. A bill to authorize certain Department of Veterans Affairs major medical facility leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a

period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H.R. 2914. A bill to prevent abusive billing of ancillary services to the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 2915. A bill to amend section 2423 of title 18, United States Code, to eliminate a defense, to a criminal prosecution under that section, based on the state of mind of the defendant as to the age of the minor engaging in, or intended to engage in, a commercial sex act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LATTA, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BUCHSHON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RADEL, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. PERRY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. NUNES, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 2916. A bill to require congressional review of certain rules promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SRES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 2917. A bill to promote savings by providing a tax credit for eligible taxpayers who contribute to savings products and to facilitate taxpayers receiving this credit and open a designated savings product when they file their Federal income tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BARR, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ENYART, Mr. BUCHSHON, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 2918. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the Multiemployer Health Benefit Plan and the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently de-

termined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 2919. A bill to amend titles 5 and 28, United States Code, to require annual reports to Congress on, and the maintenance of databases on, awards of fees and other expenses to prevailing parties in certain administrative proceedings and court cases to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2920. A bill to improve the financial literacy of students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 2921. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the taxation of hard cider; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLDING (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WATT, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 2922. A bill to extend the authority of the Supreme Court Police to protect court officials away from the Supreme Court grounds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2923. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to disclose certain taxpayer rights in the letter of acknowledgment of receipt of an application to be treated as an organization described in section 501(c)(3); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that the Secretary of the Treasury follow certain procedures relating to status applications of 501(c)(4) organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. KIND, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOUTSTANY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. REED, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2925. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to expand the permissive exclusion from participation in Federal health care programs to individuals and entities affiliated with sanctioned entities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 2926. A bill to prohibit the revocation or withholding of Federal funds to programs

whose participants carry out voluntary religious activities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2927. A bill to prevent the implementation of certain tax and fee provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until the Secretary of the Treasury certifies that reporting requirements relating to employer status and employee income levels and health care status may be made with 100 percent accuracy and without fraud; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2928. A bill to direct the Election Assistance Commission to develop and publish recommendations for best practices that States may use in establishing and operating independent Congressional redistricting commissions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2929. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for contributions to tax-exempt Housing Equity Savings Accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2930. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk middle school students with the transition from middle school to high school; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2931. A bill to amend the false claims provisions of title 31, United States Code, with respect to health care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JONES, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. UPTON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Ms. GRANGER):

H.R. 2932. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 2933. A bill to require States and local educational agencies to report on the achievement of military-connected students in annual report cards under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 2934. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardant chemicals from use in

resilient filling materials in children's products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2935. A bill to establish more efficient and effective policies and processes for departments and agencies engaged in or providing support to, international conservation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLIS, Ms. TITUS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ENYART, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 2936. A bill to provide for punishments for immigration-related fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HURT (for himself, Mr. GRIF-FITH of Virginia, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 2937. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the guidelines for specification of certain disposal sites for dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 2938. A bill to provide that certain requirements of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act do not apply if the American Health Benefit Exchanges are not operating on October 1, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 2939. A bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. LARSEN of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 2940. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of tax on domestic manufacturing income to 20 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (for herself, Mr. COLE, Mr. COOK, Ms. TITUS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2941. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make certain grants to assist nursing homes for veterans located on tribal lands; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 2942. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reestablish the Professional Certification and Licensure Advisory Committee of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JONES, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2943. A bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to prohibit Federal education funding for elementary or secondary schools that provide access to emergency postcoital contraception; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2944. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for the TIGER discretionary grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 2945. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 2946. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to assess and report on the risk posed to commercial aviation security if a flight deck door is opened during flight; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2947. A bill to express United States foreign policy with respect to, and to strengthen United States advocacy on behalf of individuals persecuted and denied their rights in foreign countries on account of gender, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 2948. A bill to require analyses of the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2949. A bill to delay for one year certain amendments to the Medicaid program made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2950. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate for individuals who have not attained age 27; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2951. A bill to require certain preconditions for allowing premium tax credits, reductions in cost-sharing, and funding of Navigators and related Exchange enrollment activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 2952. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the advancement of security technologies for critical infrastructure protection, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2953. A bill to provide Medicare payments to Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities for items and services provided to Medicare-eligible veterans for non-service-connected conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2954. A bill to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 2955. A bill to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to ensure that recipients of assistance under that Act provide services to sexual and gender minority youth in a manner that is culturally competent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. BARBER):

H.R. 2956. A bill to eliminate unnecessary oil tax credits and subsidies for major oil companies to reduce the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BARBER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. DENT, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 2957. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Social Security Act to extend health information technology assistance eligibility to behavioral health, mental health, and substance abuse professionals and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 2958. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide certain port authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NUGENT (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 2959. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard

in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry concealed firearms in the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2960. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require sponsors of Medicare prescription drug plans to implement procedures to prevent fraud and abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. RUNYAN):

H.R. 2961. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional disclosures and protections for students and cosigners with respect to student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SIREs, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 2962. A bill to provide for an independent assessment of the future resilience and reliability of the Nation's electric power transmission and distribution system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2963. A bill to provide dollars to the classroom; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2964. A bill to establish and provide for the treatment of Individual Development Accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2965. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow nontaxable employer matching contributions to section 529 college savings plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 2966. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to suspend, for a certain period, the use of adverse credit history in determining eligibility for Federal Direct PLUS Loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 2967. A bill to provide for fiscal gap and generational accounting analysis in the legislative process, the President's budget, and annual long-term fiscal outlook reports; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 2968. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, with respect to congestion mitigation and metropolitan transpor-

tation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2969. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the recognition of attending physician assistants as attending physicians to serve hospice patients; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 2970. A bill to facilitate the remediation of abandoned hardrock mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2971. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the deployment of highly efficient combined heat and power property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2972. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for producing electricity from wasted heat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2973. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to carry out projects and conduct research on water resources in the Hudson-Mohawk River Basin, to establish a Hudson-Mohawk River Basin Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 2974. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the eligibility for beneficiary travel for veterans seeking treatment or care for military sexual trauma in specialized outpatient or residential programs at facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2975. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for training and support services for Alzheimer's patients and their families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SEWELL of Ala-

bama, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2976. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to reauthorize the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 2977. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage, as supplies associated with the injection of insulin, of containment, removal, decontamination and disposal of home-generated needles, syringes, and other sharps through a sharps container, decontamination/destruction device, or sharps-by-mail program or similar program under part D of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself and Mr. SALMON):

H.J. Res. 55. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the equal application to the Senators and Representatives of the laws that apply to all citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DENT, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOESACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO,

Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.J. Res. 56. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.J. Res. 57. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a two-thirds vote of each House of Congress to increase the statutory limit on the public debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of SOUTH CAROLINA (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. CRAMER):

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 46th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY of PENNSYLVANIA:

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the Reverend Doctor Leon Sullivan and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution designating a National Railroad Monument located in Diamond District Park in historic downtown Durand, Michigan, as the "National Railroad Memorial"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H. Res. 323. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to observe a moment of silence in the House on the first legislative day of each month for those killed or wounded in the United States engagement in Afghanistan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARR (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H. Res. 324. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 22, 2013, through September 28, 2013, as "National Marine Technology Week" to recognize the important contributions that marine technology has made to the United States; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HALL, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California):

H. Res. 325. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should award the Presidential Medal of Freedom posthumously to Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods, both of whom died from enemy action during the attack on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on the night of September 11-12, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

122. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 104 urging the President and the Congress to support the adoption of House Bill 1014; to the Committee on the Budget.

123. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 13-003 urging the Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

124. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 246 urging the Congress to pass the Secure Travel and Counterterrorism Partnership Program Act; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 2900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (the Spending Clause) of the United States Constitution states that "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay for Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States." This bill restores the proper balance of power between the federal and state governments as intended under the 10th Amendment to the Constitution by devolving the responsibilities related to health care to the states and individuals. It also reinforces the founding constitutional principle that state governments and individuals are properly situated with attending to their own health, safety, and general welfare.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 2904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 2905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 2907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 2908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which allows Congress to regulate trade with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 2910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have Power 'to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.'"

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 2912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Clause 14 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the states, and provide for the general welfare.

By Mr. COTTON:

H.R. 2915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests in the power of Congress:

(1) to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) to make all laws necessary and proper for executing powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 2916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution, including the power granted Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, of the United States Constitution, and the power granted to each House of Congress under Article I, Section 5, Clause 2, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, which states that that "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises. . . ." In addition, this legislation is introduced pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states that Congress shall have the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 2919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States)

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill modifies the Internal Revenue Code, which Congress enacted pursuant to its powers under the U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section VIII as well as the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and, more generally, its powers to tax and spend for the general welfare. Congress has the power under those provisions to enact this legislation as well.

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 2922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 2926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 2929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 2930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution, Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 which authorizes Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 2932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the Power to . . . coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures . . .

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 2935.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 2936.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. HURT:

H.R. 2937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 2938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:
The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 2939.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2940.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 2941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, "The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 2942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, "The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 2943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 “all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress . . .”

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 2945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 2946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which reads: “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress’ legislative powers under Article I, Section 8, clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress’ legislative powers under Article I, Section 8, clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress’ legislative powers under Article I, Section 8, clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 2952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section III, Clause II

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 2956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, commonly referred to for this purpose as the Commerce Clause, which states the following: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 2959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in Any Department of Officer thereof

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this bill stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 2967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 and Article I, Section 9 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SIRE:

H.R. 2968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 2969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority comes from Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 1, the “tax and spend clause.” This clause provides, “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; . . .”

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 2970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 2974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 2975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 2976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 2977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.J. Res. 55.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.J. Res. 56.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article V—Amendment. The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.”

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.J. Res. 57.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Amendments Article V

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 60: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 148: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 182: Mr. SIREs.

H.R. 183: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 262: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 279: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 281: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 292: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 301: Mr. GARDNER and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 310: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 362: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 363: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 366: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 419: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 460: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 474: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 485: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 491: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 508: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 523: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 525: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 533: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 543: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 574: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 578: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 580: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 620: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 621: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 647: Mr. PASCARELL, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 679: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 685: Ms. MOORE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. KILMER, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 690: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 702: Mr. COHEN and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 720: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 724: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 755: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 792: Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 795: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 846: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 920: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 938: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 961: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 975: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1001: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1014: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1015: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1020: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1024: Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1074: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1091: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1094: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1105: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1146: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1175: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1176: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1237: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1249: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1250: Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1252: Mr. COOK, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1276: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FARR, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1318: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1327: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1346: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1354: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1389: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1416: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1428: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1476: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1518: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1526: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1563: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1593: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1677: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1690: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. DEFazio, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1692: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1701: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1705: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 1725: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BARBER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1726: Mr. MARINO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1750: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BARR, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 1779: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1780: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1787: Mr. CLAY, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 1795: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1798: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1801: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1814: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1818: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1823: Mr. HONDA and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1825: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 1830: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1852: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1869: Mr. KILMER and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1878: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1880: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1905: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. HANNA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1921: Ms. NORTON and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1923: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1967: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1979: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1980: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1985: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 1998: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1999: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2000: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VELA, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2003: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2009: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 2012: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2016: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. YOHO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CHU, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. HAHN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. Cárdenas, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. DENHAM, and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 2018: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 2022: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2026: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 2041: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 2046: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2058: Mr. POLLS and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 2061: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 2068: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2072: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 2083: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2101: Mr. LOEBACK.
 H.R. 2116: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 2130: Mr. COHEN and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 2131: Mr. HULTGREN.
 H.R. 2154: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2175: Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 2207: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2241: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. YODER.
 H.R. 2273: Mr. PETERS of Michigan and Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 2278: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 2302: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2308: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 2317: Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 2324: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 2328: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 2355: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2356: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 2382: Mrs. WALORSKI.
 H.R. 2387: Mr. WALDEN and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 2399: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 2424: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 2429: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 2445: Mr. WENSTRUP.
 H.R. 2453: Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 2476: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. JOHN-SON of Ohio.
 H.R. 2505: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 2509: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 2510: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2512: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2527: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2539: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 2540: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 2578: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 2585: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2590: Mr. KILMER, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 2591: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. ENYART, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 2633: Mr. FARR, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 2654: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2663: Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 2665: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2670: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 2682: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 2687: Mr. HALL, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. ROHRBACHER.
 H.R. 2691: Ms. ESTY.
 H.R. 2694: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 2710: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 2717: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. SALMON.
 H.R. 2720: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 2725: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 2743: Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 2752: Mr. HARRIS.
 H.R. 2770: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 2773: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BENISHEK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 2775: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SHIM-KUS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DENHAM, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
 H.R. 2783: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. KAP-TUR, and Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 2799: Mr. HANNA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2804: Mr. MEADOWS.
 H.R. 2805: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 2809: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H.R. 2810: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 2812: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 2825: Ms. BASS, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2826: Mr. PAULSEN.
 H.R. 2833: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 2835: Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 2837: Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 2839: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SWALLOWELL of California, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 2845: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 2851: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WATERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. GEORGE MIL-LER of California.
 H.R. 2863: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 2869: Mr. RADEL.
 H.J. Res. 20: Ms. HANABUSA.
 H.J. Res. 34: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.J. Res. 44: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. VEASEY.
 H.J. Res. 50: Mr. CAMP, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H. Con. Res. 24: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. AMASH.
 H. Res. 19: Mr. ENGEL.
 H. Res. 30: Mr. DINGELL.
 H. Res. 36: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H. Res. 75: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H. Res. 109: Ms. GABBARD and Ms. ESTY.
 H. Res. 153: Mr. MASSIE.
 H. Res. 187: Ms. TSONGAS.
 H. Res. 188: Ms. TSONGAS.
 H. Res. 227: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H. Res. 250: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 281: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. ESTY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FARR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KEATING, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. DENT.

H. Res. 293: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KELLY of Penn-sylvania, and Mrs. WAGNER.
 H. Res. 301: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H. Res. 308: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Mr. FRELING-HUYSEN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jer-sey, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H. Res. 314: Mr. HIMES.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIM-ITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIM-ITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 2879 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff bene-fits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and reso-lutions as follows:

H.R. 2783: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H. Res. 319: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

43. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Falls City, Texas, relative to Res-olution No. 061213A calling upon our elected officials to affirm the rights of the citizens under the 2nd Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

44. Also, a petition of the Municipal As-sembly of Jayuya, Puerto Rico, relative to Resolution No. 76 expressing the condemna-tion of the application of the death penalty by the Federal District Court of the United States at the District of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

45. Also, a petition of the Municipal As-sembly of Jayuya, Puerto Rico, relative to Resolution No. 77 requesting the President to grant the immediate and unconditional release of Oscar Lopez Rivera; to the Com-mittee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Thursday, August 1, 2013

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, the source of our life, You are high above all, yet in all. Keep us from becoming weary in doing what is right, as You use us for Your instruments in these challenging times. Empower our Senators to bring Your freedom to those shackled by fear. Help them to lift the burdens that are too heavy for people to carry. Lengthen their vision that they may see beyond today and make decisions that will have an impact for eternity.

And, Lord, in a special way, bless Dave Schiappa, as he prepares to transition to new vocational opportunities. Thank You for his decades of faithful service for You and country on Capitol Hill. Be gracious to him and his family. We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks the Senate will be in morning business until 11 o'clock this morning. The time until then will be equally divided and controlled between the majority leader and the Republican leader.

At 11 the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the Chen nomination to be a U.S. circuit judge for the Federal circuit. Also, at 11 there will be a filing deadline for all second-degree amendments to the Transportation bill.

At noon there will be two rollcall votes on confirmation of Chen and cloture on the THUD bill. Following those votes, the Senate will recess until 2 p.m. for a bipartisan caucus meeting.

This afternoon there will be a rollcall vote on the confirmation of the Power nomination to be Ambassador to the United Nations.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

COMMENDING DAVID J. SCHIAPPA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning I wish to say a few words about somebody who will not be around when we get back after the recess. After nearly 30 years of service, Dave Schiappa is hanging up his cleats. Dave is not exactly a household name. I think he likes it that way, but there is no question to those who work here day in and day out that nobody is more essential to the running of this place than Dave. To the extent we get anything done around here, it is largely because of Dave. To the extent we are not getting into shouting matches and food fights the rest of the time, well, that is largely thanks to Dave too. He has been the glue and he has been the grease that keeps this place functioning and we are really going to miss him.

As Secretary for the Republican majority and minority under three different leadership offices, Dave has been

the eyes and ears on the floor for Republican leaders going back more than a decade. He has also been our chief diplomat to the other side. He has answered a million questions from all of us at all hours, always with the same tact, wicked sense of humor, and sharp mind that has made him not just an indispensable help to our conference but also the kind of guy we just like having around this place. I know I am speaking for everybody when I say that.

When I announced Dave's departure to the leadership team earlier this week, the entire room, Senators and staff, erupted in applause. I assure you it was not because folks were glad to see him go. There is just nobody you would rather be with, in a foxhole or just killing time on the Senate floor, than Dave.

Dave had a pretty illustrious career before he got the big office up on the third floor. Prior to joining the Senate as a cloakroom assistant at the tender age of 21, legend has it he did stints as a bartender—that was while he was in college—and as a hot dog vendor out on the National Mall during summers in high school. As far as I know, these are the only two jobs outside the Senate Dave has ever had. Somehow they turned out to be great preparation for this place. I am not exactly sure why that is, but I am sure we could all come up with some interesting theories about that.

So Dave came here right out of college, back when there were no cameras on the floor, just a radio. His job back then was basically to perform the role of play-by-play announcer, telling offices what was happening out here on the floor, matching the voices with names, and just letting everybody know where things stood at all times. I wanted to have a poster out here with a photo of Dave from those days, but all the photos have mysteriously somehow disappeared. Someone suggested it might have something to do with the fact that Dave sported a pretty serious eighties mustache back then. Maybe Cheryl can dig up that good photo from the family collection.

In 1994, Dave moved out of the cloakroom and onto the floor as Republican floor assistant. Two years after that, he was named Assistant Secretary for the majority and 2 weeks before 9/11, in August 2001, Senator Lott named him Secretary for the majority. Since then, the two parties have swung back and forth a couple of times, but Dave has been one of the constants—smoothing out all the rough edges during a thousand legislative fights, providing indispensable strategic advice to me and to

the rest of our conference, and just generally keeping everybody on both sides informed of everything that is going on out here.

It is not easy. It is not easy telling Senators they will not get an amendment they have been fighting for or that they have to wait. But Dave has always had the perfect temperament for that job.

Nobody on Earth—nobody—knows more about Senate precedent and procedure than Dave Schiappa, and nobody wears their knowledge and skill more lightly.

So we are going to miss him a lot. We will all miss his “Davisms,” whether he is reporting that some Senator just showed up in the cloakroom “in a three-point stance” or that the week is shaping up to be a “nothing burger.” Those are Davisms.

He will take some secrets, hopefully, with him. It will forever remain a mystery, for example, how Dave stuffs all of those cards into his suit coat pocket. Ask Dave a question about anything and he will have the answer written on some card inside his coat. The secrets of the Senate are contained on those cards.

They say there are no indispensable men, though many of us have long suspected that Dave is the exception. I guess we will soon find out.

Dave, thanks for all you have done for all of us and for your devotion to the institution. I know how much the Senate means to you personally and we all appreciate how much you have given to it over the years. Some folks complain about the hours and the unpredictable schedule around here, but Dave has us all beat. He is not only here whenever we are, he is here after the lights go out, finishing up the business of the day, sending out e-mails, tying up loose ends or “loose tarps,” as he might put it. We are all glad you will finally have a little predictability in your life.

Which brings me to my last point which is almost, actually, the most important. Nobody who has a family can handle this place without an understanding spouse. So I want to thank Cheryl for putting up with this place over the last 23 years. Dave tells the story that early on in their marriage, Cheryl got Dave tickets to a show at the Kennedy Center for his birthday. When he called to tell her something had come up and he couldn't make it, she didn't know what he was talking about. Dave explained that he was stuck and there just wasn't anything he could do about it; it is just how the Senate works. It was the last time she questioned his job or his schedule.

So as much as I am here to thank Dave today, I want to thank Cheryl. I want Cheryl to know we are grateful to her for all the sacrifices she has made over the years for Dave and their family.

Ask Dave why he has been here so long and he will tell you it is the people, but the truth is Dave is one of the best this place has ever seen. I have no doubt about it.

Dave, on behalf of the entire Senate family, thanks for everything. You will be missed.

I see my friend the majority leader. Let me call up a resolution before his comments and then we will move on.

COMMENDING DAVID J. SCHIAPPA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 212 and for the clerk to read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 212) commending David J. Schiappa:

S. RES. 212

Whereas, David Schiappa has loyally served the Senate for 29 years, his entire professional career, starting in the Senate in December 1984;

Whereas, David Schiappa grew up in Maryland and graduated from DaMatha Catholic High School, the University of Maryland, and Johns Hopkins University;

Whereas, David Schiappa rose through all the positions in the Republican Cloakroom finally serving as either Secretary for the Majority or Secretary for the Minority for the last three Republican Leaders;

Whereas, David Schiappa has at all times discharged the duties of his office with great dedication, diligence, and sense of service, thus earning the respect of Republican and Democratic Senators alike, as well as their staffs; and

Whereas, his good humor, storytelling ability, and easy-going manner have made him an invaluable member of the Senate family: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate expresses its appreciation to David Schiappa and his family and commends him for his outstanding and faithful service to the Senate.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to David J. Schiappa.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table with no intervening action or debate.

Mr. REID. I object.

(Laughter.)

I will withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 212) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. President, when I learned David Schiappa was going to leave, I had a brief conversation with him at the back of the Chamber. I am not very much for being emotional, but if ever there was a time I felt like shedding a tear, it was when I said goodbye to Dave Schiappa.

“Parting is such sweet sorrow,” and it really is. It is from Shakespeare:

“Good night, good night! Parting is such sweet sorrow.”

And it really is.

If you are looking for someone who is a true Washington insider, you need look no further than Dave. He was actually born in Washington, DC, and for a quarter of a century he has made the trains run on time in the Republican cloakroom. For 13 of those years he served as the Republican secretary. He has been the secretary, as the Republican leader mentioned, when the Republicans held the majority and the minority.

Regardless of who controlled this Chamber, my observation was that he has always managed the floor with integrity and an even temper. He has been a real pleasure to work with. When Gary, his counterpart, wasn't around, I would go to Dave and ask him questions. I never had any concern about the answer because he would always tell me the truth. Sometimes I didn't like to hear the truth, but he was always very forthright and candid.

No matter how bad things got on the floor between Members, Dave and his Democratic counterpart Gary Myrick were always looking for a path forward. Gary Myrick has been so important to this body, along with Dave.

How these staff members love their jobs. I try to tell people about my staff, and about the Senate staff in general. They do this because it is public service. He has put in 20 years—longer than 20 years. He is 50 years old and moving on to another career. I understand his doing that for himself and his family.

Gary Myrick has been my chief of staff. He ran my office. He loved this floor very much. This was always his dream job even though on paper he was a big shot by being the Democratic leader's chief of staff, but that is not what he wanted to do. He wanted to come to the Senate floor where he was raised in his employment. He knew this was the job that he wanted, and he told me that. I arranged things so he would come and be the secretary to the majority here.

Gary Myrick and David Schiappa were literally always looking for a way forward. They sorted through what I wanted, what the Republican leader wanted, and what Members wanted. They didn't always arrive at the conclusion the Republican leader or I wanted because sometimes that wasn't possible, but they worked through long hard days—and even longer nights—as well as holidays and birthdays. He has a friendly demeanor—Gary is not nearly as friendly as Dave but is just as effective.

They worked so well together. They are a team. Some day, when the history of this institution is written, they will have to talk about these two good men who made this place work through

some of the most difficult times this body has ever seen.

He will be missed by Democrats and Republicans alike, and that is the truth.

In all of the times we talked—and we talked about important things most of the time. I understand he and Gary have been working together since the 1980s, and they are supposedly great storytellers—one and all. They have been known to talk for hours on end. They would disappear, and when Gary came back, we would ask: What did you talk about? And Gary would say—and I want to make sure I get this right—“I have no idea.” But that was only a way of covering for both of them because they were so candid and forthright with each other. They always have been, and they would never ever divulge anything I was doing or going to do or anything Leader MCCONNELL was going to do or had done. They were absolutely confidential in their communications with each other. That is how they trusted each other. So when Gary said, “I have no idea,” he knew every idea, but he wasn’t going to tell me what they talked about.

They are two such fine men. Even though there were difficult situations where they found themselves forced to talk, I am sure time passed quickly because they are such good people.

I know David will be successful at whatever he does. I congratulate him and thank him for three decades of valued service to the United States Senate and to our country.

I wish him, his wife Cheryl, and his children Aly and Mason—by the way, that is my middle name—happiness. I mean it when I say: Parting is such sweet sorrow.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am both saddened and heartened by the departure of Dave Schiappa from the Senate family.

I share the sadness felt on both sides of the aisle that the Senate is going to lose a valuable, dedicated, and inspiring resource.

I am heartened to know, without doubt, that Dave will move on to pursuits in which everyone around him will benefit from his productive presence. I am heartened to think, also, that his family might be able to see him a bit more often.

Dave’s work in the Senate involves a challenging schedule, often involving brutal hours. He is often here morning, noon, and night—and sometimes overnight—helping to ensure that the Senate operates. With Dave at the helm, the operations are smooth, predictable, and disciplined. When things go smooth, as they normally do with Dave around, rest assured that much of that is the direct cause of Dave’s tireless work and devotion.

Amazingly, with all of his tireless devotion, Dave always has a positive and

uplifting disposition, and is always a pleasure to be around. Whether it is idle friendly chat, or discussions of Senate-rule intricacies, discourse with Dave always leaves you in a better place.

As Leaders MCCONNELL and REID and many others have attested, Dave always tells you the truth and is a straight-shooter, whether you like it or not. He tells the truth to any Senator on the floor, no matter what side of the aisle. That is what has helped the Senate work smoothly for the many years Dave has been at the steering wheel on our side.

Dave’s tenure in the Senate began almost 30 years ago when he began working in the cloakroom. Since those earlier days, he has moved up the ranks to be one of the few people around here who understands all of the intricacies of the Senate, and he uses that understanding to help all of us and to make this place work. Dave is ending his illustrious Senate career with more Senate years under his belt than most Senators he works with on the floor.

Dave Schiappa has been a true treasure for me, for the Senate, and for the American people. The Senate is losing a valuable resource, and I am sad to see him go. I, and I am sure all of my colleagues, wish Dave and his family all the very best, and I am confident that in whatever Dave chooses in his future endeavors, we will continue to see nothing but the very best from him.

When people talk about America’s best and brightest, they refer to folks like Dave who is truly one of our best and brightest.

In addition to thanking Dave for his counsel, camaraderie, guidance, and hard work, I also would like to give sincere thanks to Dave’s wife and family. They have endured the often-grueling schedule demanded by Senate hours, which for Dave often stretches well before and well after when the Senate is actually in session. We owe Dave’s family an enormous amount of gratitude for the time demands that the Senate has placed on them.

I am going to miss Dave Schiappa, as will the entire Senate as a collection of people and as an institution which Dave has nurtured and preserved.

COMMENDING ROHIT KUMAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in addition to David leaving, Rohit Kumar is also leaving. I don’t know what he did for Senator MCCONNELL, but most of the time I didn’t like it. But I learned in our conversations, most of them in the back room, what a fine man he is and how smart he is. He is incredibly intelligent, he is good at his job and, as I have just indicated, a little too good sometimes.

Even though we at times knew what was happening was happening because he was behind it, I am really sorry to

see him leave the Senate. He is a good person. I admire him and have such great respect for him. I wish him success and happiness in his next endeavor.

He has a beautiful young daughter that he boasts about all the time, and rightly so. He and his wife Hillary, I am confident, will have a very pleasant life outside the Senate, even though we will all miss him.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m. with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID SCHIAPPA

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader and the Republican leader for what they expressed about David Schiappa. We rank-and-file Senators feel the same way on both sides of the aisle.

I was reminded that the late Alex Haley, the author of “Roots,” once said: “When an old person dies, it’s like a library burning down.” Dave is neither old nor dying, but there is some similarity in what is happening. With his leaving after 30 years, a number of volumes from the Senate library are going out the door. We won’t have that wisdom, that experience, or that knowledge that has been so valuable to us, and that has been especially important to the Senate where nearly half the Members are in their first term. This is an institution that depends on precedent, understanding, and respect of its strengths over a long period of time.

I had a chance to work with Dave at the request of Senator MCCONNELL at the beginning of the last two Congresses to work on the Senate rules. In working with Dave and with Gary, what I found was they were representing our point of view, but they also had such a love of the institution, they wanted to make sure whatever we came up with enhanced it, strengthened it, and didn’t destroy it.

We wish Dave the best. We have admired his service and his friendship, and we hope that over the next few years he will allow us to bring those volumes of wisdom, knowledge, and experience back because occasionally we may need to read them.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be able to join my colleagues in wishing Dave Schiappa well

in his next adventure in life, and I know he will be successful and also build upon his knowledge and experience here in the Senate. I know his contributions will continue, and it will be a pleasure to continue to follow Dave in his career, noncareer, or long vacation. Whatever he chooses to do will be happy and rewarding as has his tenure here in the Senate.

No one is more respected or more appreciated than David Schiappa. So is it a sad day, in many ways, to see him leave, but a happy one to know he is going to begin a new era. We will watch him closely and stay in touch with him and continue to appreciate him throughout his career.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to add to the comments. In Wyoming we have what is called the code of the West. While Dave Schiappa may be the man of Washington, he abides by the code of the West. There are 10 points, and I won't name them all, but it is to live each day with courage, take pride in your work—and we see that year after year—do what needs to be done, if you make a promise, keep it. We also say ride for the brand.

Finally, we say—and this really applies to David—it is: Speak less and say more. When he speaks, we all listen, just like the old EF Hutton commercial. But he does epitomize what we look to in terms of leadership, and his guidance has been so wonderful for all of us. So I wanted to rise from the West to say that David Schiappa has done a remarkable job for all of us, both parties, and a wonderful job for this country.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, many of us will be leaving in the next day or so and heading to States across the country. As we travel across our States, we will be listening to our constituents and hearing what is on their minds.

One of the things I hear about every weekend in Wyoming is that people are concerned about the President's health care law, and specifically how the law affects their lives, their families, and their jobs. People all across Wyoming—and I believe all across the country—are angry. They are angry that the White House is unfairly giving employ-

ers a 1-year delay in the mandate to offer insurance but did not delay the individual mandate that says every American must buy or hold Washington-approved insurance. For many of these people this is very expensive insurance.

Instead of granting a permanent delay or helping all Americans, President Obama and his supporters are trying to convince the American people that this health care law is working fine. Once again, the Obama administration is lecturing the American people instead of listening to the American people. They think if they give more speeches and deliver more sales pitches the American people will finally like this law. It is not going to happen.

Look at how far the Obama administration is willing to go with its latest sales pitch. Last week CNN reported the administration called together a bunch of Hollywood celebrities to help convince young Americans to buy expensive health coverage. The youth of America are not going to fall for it. Even though many of these Hollywood stars are great actors who always remember their lines, young Americans understand that ObamaCare is the wrong script for America. Even though some of these stars deliver funny jokes on "Saturday Night Live," they are about to find out that this health care law is no laughing matter.

In fact, Americans of all ages believe the law is unworkable, unaffordable, and deeply unpopular. They are also finding out it is unfair, and that is what CBS found out last week. They did a poll. They found that 54 percent of Americans disapprove of the law. They also found that only 13 percent of the people say the law will actually help them personally. Three times as many Americans in the poll believe the law will hurt them personally. Three times as many people believe the law will hurt them personally than the people it will help. So over the next couple of months the American people can expect a barrage of advertising.

There was a big story about it today in the New York Times. Musicians are playing songs on the west coast and trying to get people to sign up for the exchanges. It was all aimed at trying to distract the American people from the health care train wreck that is coming.

According to the Associated Press, at least \$684 million will be spent nationally on publicity, marketing, and advertising for the law. The Washington Post found that the States will be running ads not just on TV and radio—and you are not going to believe this—they are also putting slogans on coffee cups, on airplanes flying banners across beaches, and even, believe it or not, on portable toilets at a cost of nearly \$700 million. It is a windfall for advertising agencies and a hard sell for hard-working taxpayers.

The administration is picking the pockets of the American people for advertising while the health care law is shrinking the paychecks of the people who can only find part-time work.

Speaking of part-time workers, I wish to talk about a new story that is out that demonstrates the height of hypocrisy surrounding the President's health care law. Frankly, the story is so outrageous that it is one of those things a person can't make up. The headline of the article reads "Half of Affordable Care Act call center jobs will be part-time." Here are the details.

The article is about a new call center in Contra Costa County, CA. This is part of the effort to have so-called navigators who will answer Americans' questions about the health care law. The call center ran ads for more than 200 jobs that said all of these jobs would be full time. That is what people are looking for in America—full-time jobs, full-time work. But once the new workers started training, some of them got a different story. They found out that they would actually be part-time employees with no health benefits.

Let me emphasize that point. Even the ObamaCare navigators are not going to be covered by the health care law and are not going to be provided health care. Even some of the navigators will not know how they can get affordable health care coverage even though they are the ones who are supposed to be giving advice to Americans. Some navigators are being forced to work part time because the company cannot afford to provide the expensive government-mandated, government-approved insurance they are supposed to teach others how to get. It turns out the ObamaCare navigators need their own ObamaCare navigators.

The article even quotes one worker saying, "What's really ironic is working for a call center and trying to help people get health care, but we can't afford it ourselves." That is what this administration has done to this country. I don't call that ironic; I call it outrageous.

So the question is, Who are the navigators going to call for help and how are they going to answer Americans' questions when many of them don't know how they are personally going to be able to afford the health care coverage the government and the President of the United States mandate they have?

The bad news is this story is only one of many new examples of hypocrisy recently surrounding the President's health care law. Week after week we have seen labor unions—one after another—that originally supported the law now express concerns about how the health care law will impact their members' access to care. Late last week we even heard from something called the National Treasury Employees Union. It is important to know that

this union represents most of the IRS workers—the 100,000 IRS workers—who are going to be enforcing the health care law. What about these IRS workers? What are they saying? Well, it turns out the IRS employee union said they are very concerned they might actually have to buy their own health insurance in the exchanges, just as other Americans will. These are the exact same IRS agents who will collect massive amounts of data—personal data—on people's individual lives and their health care choices. They will investigate whether people have the right coverage. They will apply the tax penalties to anyone who doesn't. These are the agents who now say they want no part of the health care law's exchanges for themselves. They actually have sample letters the union has sent to the IRS agents to send to Members of Congress to say: I am one of your constituents, and we don't want it to apply to us, and we want to hear back.

This health care law is bad for all Americans. Each of those stories demonstrates again that the President's health care law is fundamentally broken. Instead of spending the rest of the summer trying to sell an expensive failing product, the President should simply listen. He should listen to young people who are about to see their premiums soar. He should listen to ObamaCare navigators who can't find affordable health care. He should listen to the IRS agents who enforce the law and who don't want to live under the law. He should listen to the American people and what they have to say about the high costs of their health insurance coverage. He should listen to what Americans have to say about how hard it is to find a doctor who will take care of them.

Front-page story: So many people on Medicare cannot get a doctor to take care of them. Why? Because of the health care law. Twenty percent of family physicians in this country—this story was reported in the Wall Street Journal—20 percent of family physicians are not taking new Medicare patients. Thirty-three percent are not taking new Medicaid patients. But a big part of the President's health care law was to force people onto Medicaid—a program that is not working already.

The President should listen to what Americans have to say about how hard it is to keep their current coverage. And the President should listen to what the American people have to say about trying to make ends meet on a part-time salary—a part-time salary because of the health care law, because of the incentives of the health care law to knock down employees' work hours to less than 30.

Then the President should come back to Washington after he actually listens, not lectures, and sit down with Congress—Republicans and Democrats

working together—and work on real solutions that will give Americans what they wanted in the first place with health care. Americans want the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower cost. These are the things that have not been provided under the health care law.

Remember what NANCY PELOSI said: First we have to pass it to find out what is in it. The American people now know more and more what is in this health care law, which is why it is even less popular today than it was the day it passed and why; for every American who thinks they will be helped by the health care law, three Americans believe their lives will be made worse by the law forced through this body.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID LYLES

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, if you come to my office in the Russell Building, you will usually be greeted by one of the young and eager staffers who welcome visitors and answer the phones at the front desk. Every once in a while, you will find, instead, someone with a little more experience—my chief of staff, who has now about 30 years of Senate service in fact.

David Lyles often takes time to sit at the front desk and to answer phone calls—not during the slower, easier days of a summer recess, but always, instead, when the constituent calls are the hottest and the heaviest. It is his way of staying connected to the flow of feedback coming into the office and of letting the staff know that everybody, from the most experienced staffer to the most recent college graduate, is responsible for responding to the people we all serve. But it is also his way of providing some relief to the pressure these young new staffers are under—particularly when answering the phone calls at various times when issues are very contentious. That hands-on approach is emblematic of David's leadership—leadership that has meant so much to my work in the Senate and to me personally.

At the end of this week, when David Lyles retires from the Senate, we are going to miss his passion, his dedication, his South Carolina maxims, his encyclopedic knowledge of the Senate, Civil War history, and also his vast knowledge of the best bicycling routes in Northern Virginia.

Nearly all of David's professional life has been in public service, and nearly

all of that service has been spent with the aim of strengthening our Nation's security and honoring our commitments to the men and women of our military. Of more than 30 years of Senate service, most has been spent with the Armed Services Committee, first as a professional staff member, then as deputy staff director, and from 1997 to 2003 as director of the Democratic staff, before agreeing to serve as my chief of staff in my personal office.

He also served earlier with the Senate Appropriations Committee, as a civilian member of the Pentagon staff, and as staff director of the 1995 Base Realignment and Closure Commission—a difficult and at times thankless job that was nonetheless of major importance to our Nation.

His Armed Services Committee career even encompassed some of the most significant national security challenges of our time: the end of the Cold War, the Persian Gulf war, the 2001 terrorist attacks, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as the immense technological changes and major budget challenges we have faced during his years here.

I have asked David twice to change jobs: first in 1997 when I asked him to leave a brief stint in the private sector to serve as Democratic staff director on the Armed Services Committee and, second, when I asked him to give up that position to join my personal office as the chief of staff.

I made these requests because I value his judgment, his knowledge, and his integrity, because I know of his love and his respect for this institution. When new staffers join our office, David will usually walk them down to the Senate floor, bring them to the staff benches behind me along the walls, give them a chance to see in person what most have only seen on C-SPAN and to share some of the mix of excitement and responsibility that David still feels when he comes to this floor.

David once told a reporter for the Washington Post, "I've always felt that anonymity was the key to job security." Well, I am sorry to blow his cover, but David's outstanding career is worthy of public praise. He has served the American people and the Senate with great distinction. He has helped protect the men and women in uniform and their families. He has led the men and women in his charge with patience and loyalty and modesty at times of great challenge for the Senate and the Nation.

I am and I always will be deeply grateful to David Lyles for his wise counsel, for his loyalty, for his friendship, and above all for his integrity. I wish David and his wife Annie a long and happy retirement full of visits with laughing grandchildren, untroubled waters to paddle, and smooth roads to ride.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO DAVE SCHIAPPA

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise this morning to speak about my good friend and a great friend of this great institution who will be leaving us this week, Dave Schiappa.

I remember after I was elected in 2002 there was a transition in the leadership on the Republican side from Trent Lott to Senator Bill Frist. Trent told me one day that the first thing he told Bill Frist was make sure that Dave Schiappa is going to be your floor leader, and that is exactly what Bill did.

I was new to the Senate, did not know my way around at all, much less know the rules. I simply don't know how I would have functioned over the last 10 years without Dave Schiappa being here. He has been that valuable to all of us as Members of the Senate. He is available, frankly, to both sides of the aisle. I have heard a number of my Democratic friends over the last 24 hours, since we have been aware of Dave's departure, who have said: Gee, I don't know what I am going to do without Dave Schiappa being here.

Our floor leaders are all so vitally important. We do reach out to those Members on the other side who inform us from time to time of what is going on. They are always straight with us. This institution couldn't operate without them.

Dave has certainly been our leader. He is very smart, very knowledgeable, and he is very hard-working. All of these folks work such long hours. They are here long after we are here, and they are here well before we get here the next morning. We owe a deep debt of gratitude to all of them, and particularly when someone such as Dave Schiappa, who has been here for 28 years, makes a move on to another life. It is imperative that we say: Dave, thanks for your great work. Thanks for your inspiration to all of us.

Dave probably knows this institution better than any Member on the Republican side, certainly. The one thing I will always remember about is Dave, No. 1, keeps his word. If you tell him you have an issue with the bill, an

issue with a nominee, or you have an amendment you wish to call up, Dave takes care of you.

He has been so valuable to all Members of the Senate during his tenure. We are truly going to miss him. I know his next life will hold great things for him. He will be very successful there, and we certainly wish him the best.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. We are in morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are.

OBAMACARE

Mr. RUBIO. I wish to speak briefly about ObamaCare once again. This is an issue that is now coming to the forefront over the next few weeks.

As we get ready to start to implement portions of it across the country, we are starting to see the implications of it.

There is so much coverage given to this as a partisan fight between Republicans and Democrats or liberals and conservatives, but I actually think this issue goes much farther than that because it is impacting all Americans.

I understand the President was here yesterday and individuals from the White House as well. According to the press reports, they were here to reassure nervous Democrats about the implementation of ObamaCare and what it could mean.

I understand why people are nervous about this bill. They have the right to be. For example, the exchanges, health care exchanges which, if you can't get insurance, you are supposed to be able to go to them and buy health insurance, are not going as planned. Only yesterday there was a news report that in Georgia they have asked for an emergency extension because they won't be up and running by October 1.

There are more news reports of more people being pushed from full-time work to part-time work. The reason why is because ObamaCare says if a company has more than 50 employees at full-time status, there are certain rules to follow that are going to cost money. We are starting to see evidence that people are being moved from full time to part time. Some major companies are announcing that they are moving more people to part time. There are reports of impending rate increases.

In my home State of Florida 2 days ago, the insurance commissioner announced that the individual market rates, if you are buying as an individual, are going to go up 30 or 40 percent.

We know there are many people in the middle class, hard-working Americans who are happy with the health insurance coverage they have now. They are probably going to lose that coverage. They are going to have to go to

an exchange or another company their company is now offering. This doesn't mean you lose only the insurance with which you are happy, it means you lose the doctor, potentially, because you can only go to a doctor that is in the network on your insurance plan. If your new insurance doesn't have that doctor, you can't keep going to that doctor. There are a lot of reasons to be nervous.

Add to this a lot of the original supporters of this; for example, the labor unions. The Teamsters came out 2 weeks ago saying they want this suspended or repealed because it is breaking the promises it made in terms of the 40-hour workweek and the whole argument I made about full time to part time.

Here is the irony. The labor union that represents the IRS workers is asking to be exempted from ObamaCare. This is ironic, because they are the very workers who are in charge of enforcing the law. The people who are going to be in charge of enforcing ObamaCare have asked to be exempted from ObamaCare. There are a lot of reasons to be nervous about it if you are a supporter.

One more reason is the impact it is going to have on our insurers. We haven't heard a lot of talk about this yet, but I will focus on one group of seniors in particular, and that is seniors who are on something called Medicare Advantage. Medicare Advantage is the Medicare Program where basically you contract with a private company to administer your benefits under Medicare. How these companies compete for your business is they add all sorts of value-added services.

One example is transportation. My mom is on Medicare Advantage. One of the reasons they get her business is that in addition to good doctors, they actually will pick her up from home, because she can't and doesn't drive. They take her to her doctors' appointments. These are the kinds of benefits Medicare Advantage offers.

The problem is ObamaCare cuts about \$156 billion out of Medicare Advantage—not to save Medicare; it throws it into the overall budget on ObamaCare.

Who uses Medicare Advantage? This is an interesting statistic: Forty percent of African Americans on Medicaid use Medicare Advantage, 53 percent of Hispanic beneficiaries who are on Medicare use Medicare Advantage, and 38 percent of people on Medicare Advantage make less than \$30,000 a year.

What is the impact of taking \$156 billion out of Medicare Advantage? It is about \$11 billion this year alone being taken out of the Medicare Advantage Program.

This means—and the President would say we are going to pay less money to these insurance companies. Fine. What is the impact of that? Let me describe

to you the impact of what it is going to be.

First, you are going to see reductions in benefits, meaning a lot of these companies are going to have to save that money somewhere. Where they are going to save it is by reducing the benefits they offer you on Medicare Advantage.

For example, maybe there won't be anymore transportation in my mom's Medicare Advantage plan. We don't know.

There will be increases in copays, the amount of money seniors are going to have to pay every time they go to the doctor or hospital. They are going to have to tighten physician networks, which means the number of doctors available is going to shrink. If you have a doctor now who has been seeing you, and he or she gets kicked out of the network because they are tightening the network, you may not be able to keep going to the same doctor. That is the disruption it has.

One study found that by 2017, seniors on Medicare Advantage could lose on an average about \$1,841 a year. This is the impact.

I will say why this is pernicious, why this hurts. Medicare Advantage has some things about it that need to be fixed, but it is a good program. It has good outcomes. The fact is these companies want you to go to your doctors' appointments. They want you to be getting your flu shots and your vaccine against pneumonia and other things. Why? Because they want you to stay healthy. They need you to stay healthy in order for the plan to work. We see it in the results.

Medicare Advantage patients have 39 percent fewer hospital readmissions. When people leave the hospital, there is a 39-percent reduction in people who go back because something went wrong. There are 24 percent fewer emergency room visits and 20 percent fewer hospital days.

Medicare Advantage is the program that works. I say this firsthand because I see it in my mom's life, and I see it in the lives of thousands of seniors in Florida who are on Medicare Advantage.

You may ask yourself: Well, if this is so bad why haven't we heard any of this before? The reason is the insurance companies, because of a gag order, are prohibited from talking about any of this until you start getting your benefits letter, and they are coming. If you are a senior on Medicare Advantage, the chances are that soon you will open your mail to the bad news that the Medicare Advantage you have and are happy with has been changed in a negative way for you because of ObamaCare. They don't know that yet, because the companies have not been allowed to tell them yet, but they will have to tell them soon. When they do, this will add one more concern that

people should rightfully have about ObamaCare and the impact it is going to have on our people, particularly on seniors. This is why, my colleagues, I have become so passionate about this issue, one more reason why it is so important that we stop ObamaCare.

One may say what can we do to stop it? It is already the law. It is already in place. A lot of people have told me this. The answer is there is something we can do and it comes as soon as September. In September, in order for this government to continue to function, we have to pass a short-term budget. I wish it were a long-term budget that was balanced, but it looks as though it is going to be a short-term budget.

We should pass the budget. We have to. We can't shut down the government. I am not for shutting down the government. When we do this short-term budget, let's fund the government. Let's make sure Social Security checks go out. Let's make sure we are funding defense to keep our Nation safe. Let's make sure we fund the government, but let's not keep funding ObamaCare. Let's not keep pouring money into a program that even the unions are now against. Let's not keep pouring money into a program that not even the IRS workers, who are going to enforce this, want for themselves. Let's not keep funding this program that is going to hurt seniors on Medicare Advantage. Let's not keep funding it.

I will say what the blowback is: Oh, you are threatening to shut down the government. No, I am not. I don't want to shut down the government. In fact, the only people who are talking about shutting down the government are the people who go around saying: We will not support a short-term budget unless it funds ObamaCare. Those are the people who are threatening to shut down the government. Their position, basically, is that ObamaCare is so important we can't possibly fund government without funding it.

So if the government is shut down—and I hope that doesn't happen—because of ObamaCare, that is an unreasonable position, especially in light of all the problems we know this program has. And this idea that unless we fund ObamaCare we must shut down the government is a false choice. That is not true.

Let me just say every single Republican opposes ObamaCare. And I must share with you that there are a growing number of Democrats who are at least nervous about ObamaCare and would love for it to go away in some way, shape, or form. In fact, one of them is the President. The President has actually delayed a major portion of ObamaCare because he knows it is going to be a disaster.

I would just suggest to those who oppose ObamaCare to ask themselves this question: How can I possibly go back to the people who sent me here—to the

people who are going to be hurt by this, to the people being moved from full-time to part-time employment, to the businesses that can't grow, to the individuals who are going to lose the coverage they are happy with and the doctor they have gotten to know, to the seniors on Medicare Advantage who are going to see their benefits reduced and their out-of-pocket costs go up—and say to them I did everything I could to prevent these things from happening? How can I possibly say that to them if I vote for a budget that pays for this?

This September gives us the last best chance to slow this down or to stop it. Once this law starts kicking in and starts hurting our economy, we will start crossing some points of no return.

To my colleagues on the Republican side, I would just say: Look, if we are not willing to draw a line in the sand on this issue, what issue are we willing to draw a line in the sand on? If we are not willing to fight on this issue, what issue are we willing to do it on?

Right now I can think of nothing that is hurting our economy and nothing that is hurting job creation more than the uncertainty and the fear this law is imposing on our small businesses, on our middle class, on our working class, and on our seniors. I hope we will not let this last best chance go by. I hope we will take this opportunity to stop this law from hurting Americans, especially the millions of seniors who rely on Medicare Advantage for their health care.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF RAYMOND T. CHEN TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Raymond T. Chen, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour for debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Vermont

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 3 months ago, I noted in my statement on April 18 that it had taken the Senate almost 1 year longer to confirm 150 of President Obama's district court nominees

than it took the Senate to confirm the same number of President Bush's district court nominees. Unfortunately, we have not picked up the pace, and we remain almost 1 year behind the record we set from 2001 to 2005. Today, the Senate confirms the 200th of President Obama's circuit and district nominees. Thanks to Senate Republicans' concerted effort to filibuster, obstruct and delay his moderate judicial nominees, it took almost 1 year longer to reach this milestone than it did when his Republican predecessor was serving as President—over 10 months, in fact. I have repeatedly asked Senate Republicans to abandon their destructive tactics. Their continued unwillingness to do so shows that Senate Republicans are still focused on obstructing this President rather than helping meet the needs of the American people and our judiciary.

Earlier this month, the senior Senator from Tennessee observed that at the time there were only three circuit and district nominees on the Executive Calendar. He said, correctly, that we could clear those three nominees in just one afternoon. Weeks later, we are now being permitted to vote on just one of those nominees. As Senator ALEXANDER said, we could very easily be voting on several others as well. There are now 12 circuit and district nominees pending before the Senate. The only reason we are not voting on all 12 is the refusal of Senate Republicans to give consent. This refusal means that by the time the Senate returns in September, our district courts will once again be facing a period of what the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service calls "historically high" vacancy levels, which they last experienced 2 years ago. So the Republicans' effort to obstruct and delay the confirmations of President Obama's nominees means that we have essentially not been permitted to make any net progress in filling vacancies. We have barely kept up with attrition.

Over the past month, some Senate Republicans have been claiming that "at this same point in their presidenc[ies]" President Obama has had more circuit and district nominees confirmed than President Bush did. Of course, these Senators fail to mention that they are referring only to the fifth year of those presidencies, and ignoring both presidents' first terms. Such comparisons are misleading—the reason President Bush had so few confirmations in his fifth year is that we had made such good progress already in his first term—but I appreciate the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee for at least being honest when he makes this comparison by saying that it is between fifth years, and not entire Presidencies.

The assertion by some Senate Republicans that "there is no difference in how this President's nominees are

being treated versus how President Bush's nominees were treated" is simply not supported by the facts. Compared to the same point in the Bush administration, there have been more nominees filibustered, fewer confirmations, and longer wait times for nominees, even though President Obama has nominated more people and there are more vacancies. Anyone can point to this example or that example, but when one looks at the whole picture, it is clear that President Obama's nominees have faced unprecedented delays on the Senate floor and that his nominees have been less likely to be confirmed than President Bush's at the same point.

But if Senators wish to claim that there is no obstruction of the Senate's consideration of judicial nominees, or that we are matching or even exceeding the pace of confirmations from the Bush administration, let us make it a reality. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, it would require 27 additional circuit and district confirmations this year to reach the same number of confirmations as President Bush had achieved by the end of his fifth year in office. That means we must pick up the pace, since we have had only 26 circuit and district confirmations so far this year, and just two confirmations in the past month.

Fortunately, the Senate had already received more than enough judicial nominees to make this happen. There are eight circuit and district nominees pending on the calendar today, and another four were reported this morning. One of the nominees reported today is Patricia Millett, one of three well-qualified nominees for the vacancies on the D.C. Circuit. I hope Senate Republicans will end their misguided attempt to strip the D.C. Circuit of three seats and that we will be allowed to consider her nomination on the merits of the nominee. Five more nominees had a hearing last week, as the Judiciary Committee continues to do its job. If we do confirm 27 more nominees this year, we might even bring the number of vacancies below 70 for the first time in more than 4 years.

However, even if we do bring the number of vacancies down to 70, that number is still far too high. These vacancies impact millions of people all across America who depend on our Federal courts for justice. In addition to the 87 current vacancies, the Judicial Conference has identified the need for 91 new judgeships, so that the people who live in the busiest districts can nonetheless have access to speedy justice. Earlier this week, Senator COONS and I introduced a bill to create those judgeships, and I hope we can pass this long-overdue legislation into law. The Nation's growing demands on our courts also shows how important it is that we reverse the senseless cuts to

our legal system from sequestration. I continue to hear from judges and other legal professionals about the serious problems sequestration either has caused, or will cause, if we do not fix it. Last week the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts held a hearing on the impact of sequestration and highlighted how it is devastating our public defender service. This was an important and timely hearing, and I commend Chairman COONS for chairing it.

Today the Senate will vote on the nomination of Raymond Chen, who is nominated for the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Mr. Chen currently serves as Deputy General Counsel for Intellectual Property Law and Solicitor in the Office of the Solicitor at the United States Patent and Trademark Office, a position he has held since 2008. Prior to 2008, he was an Associate Solicitor in the Office of the Solicitor at the USPTO, a Technical Assistant for the Federal Circuit, and an Associate at Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear. Before practicing law, Mr. Chen was a scientist at Hecker & Harriman. The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary unanimously gave him its highest rating of "well qualified." Mr. Chen was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee over 3 months ago by voice vote.

We must work to reduce the number of judicial vacancies so that Americans seeking justice are not faced with delays and empty courtrooms. So let us act quickly on consensus nominees. And if Senate Republicans have concerns about a nominee, let us debate that nominee, for however long is necessary, and then have an up-or-down vote. Eleven of the twelve circuit and district nominees currently pending before the Senate were reported by voice vote. There is no reason we cannot consider all 12 today. If Senators are willing to work together to focus on meeting the needs of the Federal judiciary, then I am confident that we will be able to make real progress for the millions of Americans who depend on our courts for justice.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

POWER NOMINATION

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, let me express my thanks to Senator SANDERS for his willingness to yield to me and give me this time.

I am here very briefly to commend Samantha Power to the entire Senate as President Obama's nominee to be the U.N. ambassador representing the United States.

I do so proudly because of the great work she has done against genocide and atrocities around the world, because she has been an outspoken leader in terms of doing what is right, and I think she has the courage to represent our country on the Security Council better than anyone I know.

I got to know Samantha Power by reading her book, "A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide." It is the story about Rwanda and the genocide where 1 million people died while the rest of the world turned and looked away, and her calling on all people of democracies and freedom around the world to not let that happen again.

When she came to the White House, she created the Commission on Atrocities for President Obama to focus on that and see to it that it didn't happen again. It was through her leadership that she forced President Obama and the administration to engage in Libya and end what would have been a genocide in Libya by Muammar Qadhafi.

She is smart, she is intelligent, she is tough, and she has a Georgia tie of which I am very proud. She graduated from a high school in DeKalb County, GA, in the 1980s called Lakeside High School. She did an internship between her first and second year at Yale University in Atlanta, GA, for a sports broadcaster on a sports station in the city. He was asked a few days after she left to give some description of what kind of person Samantha Power was, and I want to read that quote because it reflects the kind of person we want representing us as an ambassador at the U.N. He said:

Oh, my God, was she bright. Acerbic, lightening-witted, and the depth of the Mariana Trench.

That is a quote from Jeff Hullinger, the first person she worked for in 1988.

Samantha Power is the right person, at the right time, to represent the right country in the U.N. on the Security Council. I commend her to the Senate and hope she receives a unanimous vote.

I yield back the remainder of my time and thank the Senator from Vermont.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate hundreds and hundreds of young people throughout the country who are standing up for justice, who are putting a spotlight on one of the major economic crises facing this country.

Today—this week and in recent weeks—we have had young people in New York City, in Chicago, in Washington, DC, in St. Louis, in Kansas City, in Detroit, in Flint, MI, and other areas around this country who are fast-food workers—the people who work at Burger King and McDonald's and Popeye's; the ones who give us the hamburgers and the french fries—saying that workers all over this country cannot make it on \$7.25 an hour, \$7.50 an hour. Often they are unable even to get 40 hours of work and, in most cases, they get no or very limited benefits.

So all over the country these workers, often young people, are walking

out of their establishments, their fast-food places, and are educating consumers about the economic injustice taking place in these fast-food establishments. What they are saying is that we need to raise the minimum wage in this country; that American workers cannot exist on \$7.25 an hour, which is the national minimum wage now, or \$8 an hour or \$9 an hour.

My own view is, at the very least, we should be raising the minimum wage to \$10 an hour. Just do the arithmetic, with somebody making \$7.25 an hour, and if they are lucky enough to be getting 40 hours a week—and many workers are not.

I was in Detroit a couple of months ago talking to fast-food workers, and what they are saying is they get 20 hours a week in one place to make a living and then they have to work at another place. One young man I talked to is working at three separate locations, having to travel, in order to cobble together what, in fact, is by far less than a livable income. So just do the arithmetic. If you make \$7.25 an hour, and if you are lucky enough to be working 40 hours a week, you are making about \$15,000 a year. Then, of course, your Social Security taxes are coming out of that and your Medicare taxes are coming out of that, and maybe some local taxes. You can't survive on \$14,000 or \$15,000 a year.

The point is these fast-food workers are educating the Nation about the fact that hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people are working hard every single day and are falling further and further behind economically. We have to stand with them and we have to raise the minimum wage in this country.

While workers at fast-food establishments and other places such as Walmart are earning the minimum wage, I should mention that the CEOs of these large corporations are, in many cases, making exorbitant compensation packages. The CEO of Burger King, a corporation with over 191,000 mostly low-wage workers gave its CEO Bernardo Hees a 61-percent pay raise last year, boosting his total compensation to \$6.5 million in 2012.

Well, if a millionaire can get a 65-percent pay raise, maybe it is time to get a pay raise for the workers who are making \$7.25 an hour.

Last year, McDonald's, a corporation with over 850,000 mostly low-wage employees, more than tripled the compensation of its CEO Don Thompson. In 2011, Mr. Thompson received a mere, paltry \$4.1 million. But last year, because of his significant raise, the CEO of McDonald's received \$13.8 million.

Well, if Mr. Thompson can make \$13.8 million as the head of McDonald's, surely the workers at McDonald's can make at least \$10 an hour, not \$7.25 an hour, not \$8 an hour.

David Novak, the CEO of Yum! Brands—the owners of Taco Bell, Pizza

Hut, Kentucky Fried Chicken, and Long John Silvers—was paid \$11.3 million last year and received over \$44 million in stock options.

Well, if this company has enough money to give this gentleman \$44 million in stock options, maybe we can end starvation wages at Yum! foods.

In terms of the minimum wage, since 1968, the real value of the Federal minimum wage has fallen by close to 30 percent. The purchasing power of the minimum wage has gone down by some 30 percent since 1968. If the minimum wage had kept up with inflation since 1968, it would be worth approximately \$10.56 per hour today.

The issue our young people working at these fast-food places are highlighting goes beyond the fast-food industry. The reality is that many of the new jobs being created in America today are low-wage jobs.

I think we all recognize, even some of my Republican colleagues understand, we have made significant economic gains since the collapse of the economy at the end of President Bush's tenure in 2008 when we were losing 700,000 jobs a month—an unsustainable reality, 700,000 jobs a month. Now we are gaining jobs, and that is a good thing, but not enough jobs. Unemployment remains much too high. Real unemployment today is close to 14 percent. But in the midst of understanding the job creation process in this country, we need to know that nearly two-thirds of the jobs gained since 2009 are low-wage jobs that pay less than \$13.80 an hour.

So the good news is we are now creating some jobs—not enough jobs; unemployment remains much too high—but we cannot lose track of the fact that most of the new jobs being created are not paying working people a living wage. While most of the new jobs being created are low-wage jobs, we should remember that nearly two-thirds of the jobs lost during the Wall Street recession were middle-class jobs that paid up to \$21 an hour. So the economic trend is not good. The Wall Street crash resulted in mass unemployment, and though we are gaining new jobs, many of the jobs we are gaining are low-wage jobs. Yet the jobs we have lost are higher wage jobs.

Also, while we discuss the state of the economy, let us never ever forget that middle-class families have seen their incomes go down by nearly \$5,000 since 1999, after adjusting for inflation.

Opponents, and there are many—the entire fast-food industry and all the big-money interests, the guys who make millions and millions of dollars a year, the people who have unbelievable pensions, who have all kinds of benefits, the CEOs—are working very hard to tell us in Congress not to raise the minimum wage, which is \$7.25. Among many other arguments they say: Well, if you raise the minimum wage, it is going to be a job killer. It will kill jobs.

Let me say this on a personal basis. I represent the State of Vermont. The State of Vermont has the third highest minimum wage in the country; it is \$8.60 an hour. Meanwhile, with an \$8.60-an-hour minimum wage, I am happy to say that the State of Vermont has the fourth lowest unemployment rate in the United States at 4.4 percent. And to be very honest, I have not bumped into many employers who tell me: I would be hiring more people if we lowered the minimum wage in Vermont. It does not happen. I think that is a bogus argument.

The State of Washington, if my memory is correct, has the highest minimum wage in the country. Their unemployment rate is lower than the national average.

There is another point I would like to make that needs to be made over and over. We talk a lot in this country about welfare reform. I think that in general, when people use that expression, what they are talking about is lower income people who may be breaking the law and taking advantage of programs for which they are not quite eligible.

Let me say a word about the need for welfare reform but in a somewhat different tone, and let me say that the biggest welfare recipient in this country happens to be the wealthiest family in the United States of America; that is, the Walton family, who owns Walmart, a family that is worth \$100 billion—more wealth, by the way, than the bottom 40 percent of the American people. The wealthiest family in America is the largest welfare recipient in America. How is that? Well, the reason they are so wealthy, the reason that family is worth \$100 billion is they make huge profits because they pay their workers starvation wages. But in order to keep their workers going, the taxpayers of this country—through Medicaid, through nutrition programs, through affordable housing—give assistance to Walmart so that their workers can keep coming to work. So somebody who works at Walmart for \$7.25 or \$8 an hour, more often than not their children are on Medicaid paid for by the taxpayers of this country. They and their kids are on food stamps paid for by the taxpayers of this country. Many of their employees live in affordable housing subsidized by the taxpayers of this country.

So the Walton family becomes the wealthiest family in this country while working-class and middle-class taxpayers provide assistance to their workers so they can continue going to work. Let me make the very radical suggestion that maybe the wealthiest family in America might want to pay their employees a living wage so that the taxpayers of this country do not have to subsidize them.

I would conclude by telling those young people in major cities around

this country that many of us respect and appreciate the courage they are showing. It is not easy to walk out of a job when you don't have any money, because your employer may say: You are out of here; you are fired. But these young people have the courage to stand and say: No. We are human beings. We live in the greatest country on Earth. We have to earn a living wage. We can't make it on starvation wages.

So I thank those young people for standing for justice not only for themselves but for all Americans, and I hope that Members of Congress listen carefully to what they are saying and that we go forward as soon as possible in passing a minimum wage that will provide dignity for millions of workers.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we know what is ahead of us the next hour or so. I ask unanimous consent that we change that.

In between the vote on Chen, the judge, and the next vote, I ask that there be 10 minutes, and 2 minutes of that would be 1 minute on each side, and 8 minutes would be given to the co-manager of that bill, SUSAN COLLINS. That would be for debate only.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THUD APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we have spent the last 2 weeks here on the Senate floor talking about our bipartisan transportation and housing bill. This is a bill that is all about creating jobs, investing in our families and in our communities, and laying down a strong foundation for a long-term and broad-based economic growth. This bill is not exactly a bill I would have written on my own. I know it is not exactly a bill Senator COLLINS would have written on her own. But it is a compromise bill that reflects the deep cuts we made when we set spending levels in the Budget Control Act as well as the best ideas from both sides of the aisle of ways we can improve and reform our transportation and housing investment.

The transportation and housing investments in this bill have a direct impact on the families and communities we represent, from improving our roads, to reducing traffic and helping Main Street businesses, to making sure our bridges are safe so we do not see more collapses like the one back home in my State of Washington, to sup-

porting our most vulnerable families, seniors, and veterans with a roof over their heads when they need it the most and making investments in our communities that mayors across our country use to create local jobs in their hometowns and so much more.

Senator COLLINS and I worked very hard together to write a bipartisan bill to invest in programs that should not be partisan. I think we succeeded. Six Republicans voted for this bill in committee; 73 Senators voted to bring this bill to the floor for a debate. That debate was a full and open one, with amendments and votes from Democrats and Republicans.

I wish to personally thank Senator COLLINS for her hard work on this bill, and I also thank all of our staff on the appropriations subcommittee: Alex Keenan, Dabney Hegg, Meaghan McCarthy, Rachel Milberg, and Dan Broder; as well as the staff of Senator COLLINS, who spent endless hours: Heideh Shahmoradi, Kenneth Altman, Jason Woolwine, and Rajat Mathur—all of whom worked so hard and put in so many hours and late nights on this strong bipartisan bill.

After 2 weeks of debate and discussion and a bipartisan bill before us, we are now going to move very shortly to a final vote. I want to be clear. This bill has the support of the majority of the caucus. In the House of Representatives, what did we see happen yesterday? They pulled their transportation and housing bill off the floor. The Republican leadership would not even allow a vote on their bill because they did not have a majority in their caucus. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee said that showed that sequestration is unworkable and needs to be replaced. That is the House Republican chairman. But here in the Senate we have a majority, and we should move to pass this bill.

The only thing that can block the passage of this bill, the only way a bipartisan bill with the support of the majority could be stopped is if Republican leaders whip their own Members into filibustering a jobs and infrastructure bill that many of those Republicans actually support. That is the only way.

The choice before us is clear, and I urge my colleagues to make the right one. This vote is not about whether you support this exact bill or agree with the exact spending level. As Senator COLLINS has made clear again and again, you can think the spending level is too high and still support this process in which we pass a bill in the Senate and work with the House bill on a compromise. You can certainly disagree with the bill and not think it should be subjected to a filibuster.

The bottom line is that a vote to wrap up and vote on this bill is a vote for jobs and the economy and for bipartisan solutions to the problems facing

our Nation. A vote to filibuster this bill is a vote for more gridlock, more obstruction, more partisanship, and more political games.

I know when I go home to Washington State I want to be able to tell my constituents that Democrats and Republicans worked together to solve some problems, help them, and grow the economy. I know there are many Democrats and Republicans here today who want to be able to say the same to their constituents, and I hope they will stand with me and Senator COLLINS and vote against a filibuster of our bipartisan bill.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 101

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I stand today to discuss and strongly support my bill, S. 101, the State and Local Government Bailout Prevention Act. I urge all of us to unite to pass this bill expeditiously. Let me briefly explain what it is about.

I first introduced this bill in early 2011, February 2011, because two things were happening. First of all, several significant State and local entities were teetering on the verge of bankruptcy. At the same time, the Federal Government—things in Washington—was in a horrible state fiscally, such that we could clearly not afford to take on more spending, more debt, more responsibility. I wanted to pass legislation that would make it crystal clear that neither we, the Congress, nor the Treasury Department, nor the Federal Reserve, nor any other Federal entity was going to bail out State or local governments that had acted irresponsibly and tipped into bankruptcy.

Things have not gotten better since then. In fact, in many ways things have gotten worse, and very recently, just in the last few weeks, the city of Detroit filed for bankruptcy—the largest municipal bankruptcy in U.S. history. Other large States and local communities are teetering on the verge of bankruptcy. Many States are in a horrible fiscal situation, such as California and Illinois.

Meanwhile, we are not in a fundamentally more sound place here in Washington at the Federal level. Even if we stick to the Budget Control Act numbers—and that is very much up in the air, but even if we stick to those numbers, Congress will spend \$967 billion in discretionary money this year, and that will result in a \$810 billion deficit—almost a \$1 trillion deficit this year.

This Nation, total, is almost \$17 trillion in debt. The balance sheet of the Federal Reserve has swollen from \$800 billion in August of 2007 to over \$3.5 trillion today.

Now more than ever, S. 101, the State and Local Government Bailout Prevention Act, is appropriate, is needed.

That is why I come to the floor today to urge expeditious passage of S. 101. This bill is very simple, basic, straightforward, but important. It would simply do four things: First, it would prohibit the use of Federal funds to bail out State and local government budgets. Second, it would prevent the Federal Reserve from providing assistance to or creating a facility to help, again, State and local governments in a bailout situation. Third, it would prevent Congress and the Treasury Department from bailing out State and local governments. Fourth, there is specific language so we do not create any confusion that this is not intended to stop or deter or interfere with appropriate assistance in declared disaster areas.

That is the sum and substance of S. 101, the State and Local Government Bailout Prevention Act. When you look at situations such as Detroit—the largest ever municipal bankruptcy—and when you look at our fiscal situation in Washington at the Federal level, this clear bar of the Fed bailing out State and local governments is very much needed.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Development be discharged from further consideration of S. 101 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration and that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will be very clear. First, I say to my colleague from Louisiana, he and I have worked together often on a whole host of issues. He is on Environment and Public Works; I chair Energy. I want him to know I am happy to continue working with him on this and other issues. The reason I have to object at this time is that the language as it is written would deal a huge body blow to more than 700 rural and heavily forested counties across the country in more than 40 of our States. It, in effect, could prohibit payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act.

This legislation, which was a bipartisan bill—Senator Larry Craig and I authored this legislation—is a lifeline for these hard-hit rural communities that are walking on a tightrope. They are trying to balance, for example, how they are going to keep the schools open and how they are going to have law enforcement in their communities. Declining revenues from Federal forests spurred the creation of this program to compensate for the loss of receipts from the Federal forests. Suffice it to say that without this legislation we could have school perhaps 3 days a

week in a big chunk of rural America. I mentioned law enforcement. The question of how you maintain 24-hour law enforcement in a lot of these areas has been drawn into question. I think that without this assistance we might have some counties facing bankruptcy.

Given the fact that this language does not clarify the status of the Secure Rural Schools Program, I have to object. I am going to continue to object until the legislation does clarify that it will not prohibit payments under that legislation, which is a lifeline for rural America.

We have had a number of recorded votes on that particular legislation here in the Senate. It has received overwhelming bipartisan support. It was authorized on a bipartisan basis.

I am going to yield the floor. I know colleagues want to speak on this issue. I want it understood how concerned I am about the legislation in its present form. That is why I have to object at this time.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I too join with our colleague from Oregon in raising great concern about what this proposal would do. This is a proposal—we have seen, actually, three of them now—that would cut all Federal funding for any community that has either defaulted or, more important, is at risk, has problems financially. What does that mean? It means that any city, any county, any local unit of government that is struggling with a tight budget could potentially lose all Federal funding. We are not talking about a bailout here. We are talking about the same Federal funds that go to every community—no funding for emergency services such as police departments and fire departments; no funding for transportation, for roads and bridges; cutting off funding for special education and for our schools; no funding for economic development to help these communities that are challenged because of, possibly, economic circumstances such as a shifting manufacturing base or other economic issues beyond their control.

This is extremely broad. According to some legal definitions, “default” could mean anything—late payments on any kind of an obligation. It makes absolutely no sense.

Let me also indicate that one of the real concerning problems here is that it would exempt emergency spending for a natural disaster. I appreciate that the Senator from Louisiana would want to do that given the fact that we had Hurricane Katrina hit in New Orleans and our whole country came together. People in Detroit raised money to help with Hurricane Katrina. But I suggest that for the 41 cities and counties that filed bankruptcy over the last 20 years or the hundreds from Texas, to

Kentucky, to Alabama, and beyond who now have troubled bond ratings and are considered at risk—this is really a slap in the face to every city and community across our country.

This is not about stopping a bailout for Detroit. We are working hard. People are coming together. This is a community that is coming back thanks to a tremendous amount of grit, hard work, and leadership from the business community, religious community, community leaders, and so on. This is about whether we are going to support communities that need some help.

Think about this: If a city is doing well and has a wealthy tax base and an upper middle-income community with high-powered lobbyists, then they should get Federal money—taxpayer money? Children with disabilities can get special education. We are going to help build roads and bridges in communities. But if a community is having some financial difficulty, then, unfortunately, we would say we would not allow the same ordinary Federal funding every community gets to be available for that community. That is not the right values for America.

That is why the International City/County Management Association, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Government Finance Officers Association strongly oppose this effort.

I have one final statement to make before turning to our distinguished senior Senator from Michigan.

When we are looking at what is happening right now in Detroit and around the country, once again we are seeing workers and retirees on the frontline who have lost their pensions and their wages. In the auto rescue, we saw Delphi retiree pensions were not protected. Now in the city of Detroit, police, fire, and city workers are not protected. So when we talk about the middle class of this country—people working hard every day—we need to put them first. We need to make sure nobody loses their pension. We need to make sure we stand as a country with cities that are in distress and working hard to become vibrant and strong again.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I too object to the unanimous consent request. While the sponsor says it is aimed at bailouts, no one I know of is seeking a bailout from the communities that would be impacted. Despite the stated intention, the effect of this bill is to endanger the financial health of hundreds of cities and counties in every corner of this country. It would weaken the safety and security of countless Americans who call those communities home. I don't know of anyone seeking a bailout. Yet bailout is the word that

is used frequently here by the sponsor of this legislation.

What is the definition? Communities at risk of defaulting. Hundreds and hundreds of communities are "at risk of defaulting." It is unclear what that means. But the strains on local governments in the last few years—particularly following the financial crisis we had—are real. To say that any community, city, or State, for that matter, that is at risk of defaulting is to be challenged in terms of getting regular support from the Federal Government.

This is not limited to loans. This bill affects grants as well as loans. In the words of the bill, "grants and aid" would be prevented. All sorts of Federal funding, in other words, besides those kind of actions of the Federal Government involving credit or reliance on credit of the donor or for repayment.

The Congressional Research Service says this, again, applies not just to loans but to grants as well. Why in Heaven's name would struggling communities—whether it is my hometown of Detroit or any other community in this country—be denied the ability to seek grants is beyond me. It is not limited to loans but grants as well. This bill goes way beyond the bailouts that no one is seeking and would have a severe impact on cities and towns across the country.

Standard & Poor's lists more than 250 securities offered by Louisiana municipalities that are below investment grade. One State has 250 communities with securities below investment grade, which presumably means there is a significant credit risk in those communities. Under this bill, are those communities not eligible to seek regular grants? I am afraid so, and that is not just me saying that. Again, that is from the CRS.

Finally, Senator STABENOW has made reference to a letter that we received from the National League of Cities, National Association of Counties, the United States Conference of Mayors, and others, opposing this legislation because it goes way beyond its stated purpose of preventing bailouts.

Again, my town—and I don't know of any town that has—has not asked for a bailout. I am proud to have been living in Detroit all of my life. It doesn't need this kind of legislation poking at it to stop something from going to Detroit, which it has not applied for.

I know this legislation was introduced before this recent bankruptcy application on the part of the city of Detroit, but nonetheless to seek a unanimous consent in this context and in this moment to pass legislation—apparently without even a hearing—seems to me to be beyond the pale.

As a lifelong resident of Detroit, I oppose this proposal. I oppose it because thousands of municipalities that have suffered in the aftermath of the recent

recession would be negatively affected. Our residents, their residents, our employees, their employees, and retirees around the country deserve better.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the two Senators from Michigan being the only ones on the floor right now objecting and saying this has nothing to do with Detroit, but, of course, it does.

I am very sorry to hear this objection. There is no objection on the Republican side. Of course there would be an objection if, in fact, this legislation would bar normal Federal grants and normal Federal loans unrelated to a bailout of a State or a municipality in bankruptcy mode, but it doesn't do that.

The legislation is very specific and very targeted. It is about a bailout of a State or locality in bankruptcy mode, and that is what it is about. It is not about normal routine Federal funding, and that is why there is no Republican objection.

One of the distinguished Senators from Michigan makes the point that Detroit has not formally asked for a bailout. That is true so far. But when the mayor talked to the Wall Street Journal about this, he "left the door open for a Federal bailout after the city's bankruptcy filing." When asked directly whether Detroit would seek a Federal bailout, Mayor Bing said, "Not yet."

Similarly, the Governor of Michigan Rick Snyder didn't support a bailout but said on CBS's "Face the Nation:" "If the Federal Government wants to do that, that's their option." That is not exactly not opening the door and considering that opportunity.

Again, I didn't file this bill in the last 2 weeks. I originally filed this bill in February of 2011. Unfortunately, Detroit isn't the only municipal or State bankruptcy on the maps. States can't formally file bankruptcy, but in laymen's terms they can essentially go bankrupt. Detroit is not the only issue on the map. Many States face a horrible fiscal situation as well, such as California and Illinois. There is a real danger of these States and localities seeking a Federal bailout. This bill is about that. It is not about normal Federal funding. It is not about the safe and secure rural schools program. It is not about any of that routine stuff. It is about a bailout of a State. It is about a bailout of the municipality or other local jurisdiction. Of course, Detroit, unfortunately, is the most obvious example after its historic bankruptcy filing very recently.

Again, I am sorry to hear their objection. I am sorry the two Senators from Michigan are here on the floor about this. I don't think that is a coincidence because this is a bill about bailouts. I

think we should pass it, and be very crystal clear at the Federal level that we are not going to take on that bail-out role and responsibility.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. On line 7, page 1: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law"—and then after talking about Federal funds not being used to purchase or guarantee obligations, it then says:

no Federal funds may be used . . . or provide direct or indirect grants-and-aid, to any State government, municipal government, local government, or county government which, on or after January 26, 2011, has defaulted on its obligations.

It is very clear. It is line 7, page 1, and lines 1 and 2 on page 2: "direct or indirect grants-and-aid to" may not be provided to any city which has defaulted on its obligations. This is the language of the bill.

It also says on line 12 of page 2 that the funds of the United States may not be used "to assist such government entity." "Assist any such government entity."

Hundreds of governments would be covered by this legislation. It is no coincidence that the Senators from Michigan are here on the floor because we are the most current victims of this language if it were ever passed. There are hundreds of others who would be victimized by this language because of its breadth, and that is what the Senator from Oregon was very dramatically pointing out.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the language from the bill be printed in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 101

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS TO PAY STATE AND LOCAL OBLIGATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds may be used to purchase or guarantee obligations of, issue lines of credit to, or provide direct or indirect grants-and-aid to, any State government, municipal government, local government, or county government which, on or after January 26, 2011, has defaulted on its obligations, is at risk of defaulting, or is likely to default, absent such assistance from the United States Government.

(b) LIMIT ON USE OF BORROWED FUNDS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall not, directly or indirectly, use general fund revenues or funds borrowed pursuant to title 31, United States Code, to purchase or guarantee any asset or obligation of any State government, municipal government, local government, or county government, or otherwise to assist such government entity, if, on or after January 26, 2011, that State government, municipal government, or county government has defaulted on its obligations, is at risk of defaulting, or is likely to de-

fault, absent such assistance from the United States Government.

(c) PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL RESERVE ASSISTANCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not provide or extend to, or authorize with respect to, any State government, municipal government, local government, county government, or other entity that has taxing authority or bonding authority, any funds, loan guarantees, credits, or any other financial instrument or other authority, including the purchasing of the bonds of such State, municipality, locality, county, or other bonding authority, or to otherwise assist such government entity under any authority of the Board of Governors.

(d) LIMITATION.—Subsections (a) through (c) shall not apply to Federal assistance provided in response to a natural disaster.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I support the nomination of Raymond T. Chen, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal circuit. This is the 29th judicial confirmation this year. With today's confirmation, the Senate will have confirmed 200 lower court nominees; we have defeated two. That's 200 to 2. That is an outstanding record. That's a success rate of 99 percent.

We have been doing that at a fast pace. During the last Congress, we confirmed more judges than any Congress since the 103rd Congress, which was 1993 to 1994.

So far this year, the first of President Obama's second term, we've already confirmed more judges than were confirmed in the entire first year of President Bush's second term. At a similar stage in President Bush's second term, only 10 judicial nominees had been confirmed. We are now at a 29-to-10 comparison with President Obama clearly ahead of where President Bush was. And, as I said, we have already confirmed more nominees this year—29—than we did during the entirety of 2005, the first year of President Bush's second term, when 21 lower court judges were confirmed.

With regard to hearings, the record shows that President Obama is being treated much better than President Bush during his second term.

Last week we held the 11th judicial nominations hearing this year. In those hearings we we have considered a total of 33 judicial nominees. Compare this favorable treatment of President Obama during the beginning of his second term versus the first year of President Bush's second term. At this stage in President Bush's second term, the Committee had held not 11 hearings with 33 judicial nominees, but only 3 hearings for 5 nominees, and all of those were hold-overs from the previous Congress.

In fact, for the entire year of 2005, Senate Democrats only allowed 7 hearings for a grand total of 18 judicial nominees.

It is hard to believe, but no nomination hearings on judicial nominees were held during April, May, June, or July. Four months with no judicial nomination hearings. Yet, we recently rushed through hearings on nominees to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, plus a number of District nominations. In fact, in just the last few weeks, we have held hearings for 14 judicial nominees. That's not very far behind the entire output of 2005—7 hearings, 18 nominees.

Again, we have already exceeded that number—11 hearings and 33 judicial nominees. The bottom line is that the Senate is processing the President's nominees exceptionally fairly.

President Obama certainly is being treated more fairly in the first year of his second term than Senate Democrats treated President Bush in 2005. It is not clear to me how allowing more votes and more hearings than President Bush got in an entire year amounts to "unprecedented delays and obstruction." Yet, that is the complaint we hear over and over from the other side. So I just wanted to set the record straight—again—before we vote on this nomination.

Raymond T. Chen is nominated to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal circuit. He received his B.S. from the University of California, Los Angeles, in 1990 and his J.D. from New York University School of Law in 1994. Upon graduation, Mr. Chen worked at Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear in California from 1994 to 1996. As an associate, he drafted district court briefs and legal memoranda on specific patent and trademark issues as well as several patent applications spanning various technologies.

In 1996, Mr. Chen joined the senior technical assistant's office at the Federal circuit in Washington as one of three technical assistants. There, he researched and wrote memoranda, commenting on drafts of court opinions for both legal and technical accuracy as well as identification of conflicting legal precedent, occasionally writing for individual judges.

From 1998 to 2008, Mr. Chen served as an associate solicitor in the Office of the Solicitor at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. During that time, he was first or second chair on several dozen Federal Circuit briefs defending the agency's patent and trademark decisions, and he presented approximately 20 arguments in the Federal Circuit.

He regularly appeared in district court defending the agency against lawsuits brought under the Administrative Procedure Act. He was also a legal advisor on several patent policy and legal issues within the agency, occasionally prosecuting patent attorneys in administrative proceedings for violating the agency's code of professional responsibility.

In 2008, Mr. Chen became the Deputy General Counsel of Intellectual Property Law and Solicitor. There he supervises other lawyers in the Solicitor's Office and has presented oral arguments in some of the seminal patent cases before the Federal circuit.

In addition, Mr. Chen deals with higher-level patent and trademark policy issues within the agency. He also coordinates the determination of what positions the United States should take as an amicus in intellectual property cases before both the Supreme Court and the Federal circuit.

Lastly, Mr. Chen is responsible for the review and clearance of all new regulations and amendments to existing regulations for the Office of the Solicitor.

The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave him a unanimous "well qualified" rating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). All time has expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask my colleagues to vote for this nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 additional seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. I believe we should act quickly on a number of judicial vacancies. Eleven of the twelve circuit and district nominees currently pending before the Senate were reported by voice vote. All Democrats, all Republicans on the Judiciary Committee voted together. There is no reason why we couldn't consider all 12 today, along with Mr. Chen. If we work together, then we can fulfill the needs of the Federal judiciary.

Madam President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. LEAHY. I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Raymond T. Chen, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 198 Ex.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Flake	Murphy
Ayotte	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Baucus	Grassley	Portman
Begich	Hagan	Pryor
Bennet	Harkin	Reed
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reid
Blunt	Heinrich	Risch
Boozman	Heitkamp	Roberts
Boxer	Heller	Rockefeller
Brown	Hirono	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johanns	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Chambliss	Kaine	Shaheen
Chiesa	King	Shelby
Coats	Kirk	Stabenow
Coburn	Klobuchar	Tester
Cochran	Leahy	Thune
Collins	Lee	Toomey
Coons	Levin	Udall (CO)
Corker	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Markey	Vitter
Crapo	McCaskill	Warner
Cruz	McConnell	Warren
Donnelly	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wicker
Enzi	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Moran	
Fischer	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—3

Inhofe Landrieu McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 10 minutes for debate only, with the Senator from Maine Ms. COLLINS controlling 8 minutes and with 2 minutes equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 1243.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not in order.

The Senate will be in order.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, have Senators sit down and shut up. OK. It is unfair. Senator MURRAY has something to say. Senator COLLINS has something to say. It is just not polite.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their conversations from the well. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, the Senate will shortly decide whether to invoke cloture on the fiscal year 2014 Transpor-

tation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill. We have spent nearly 2 weeks debating this bill and working through approximately 85 amendments.

We were making progress. We even had a vote on a nongermane amendment, which clearly would have fallen to a point of order had one been raised. So no one has been shut out of this process.

Chairman MURRAY and I have repeatedly encouraged Senators to come to the floor, file, and debate their amendments to improve the bill we reported.

It has been an open and transparent debate thus far, a return to regular order—something I have heard virtually everyone here urge us to do.

Nevertheless, some Senators are intent on preventing this legislation from moving forward, despite the fact that this bill is not the final version of the transportation and housing appropriations bill. It is only one step in the process but an essential step—one that will allow the Senate to move forward and eventually negotiate with the House of Representatives to decide on a top line and to further improve the bill.

A considerable number of my colleagues have advocated for the House funding level of \$44 billion and have opposed the Senate bill. But I would like to point out that not one of my colleagues has offered a specific amendment, account by account, to reduce the funding levels, program by program, in this bill to meet the \$44 billion level in the House bill.

I personally offered an amendment that said that in October, if we find we have breached the top line of the Budget Control Act, we would go back to the appropriations process and redo the bill to meet that top line.

I would also point out that yesterday the House leadership was forced to pull its THUD bill from the floor due to lack of support. Some Republican Members thought the spending levels were too high. But it is surely significant that a substantial number of Republicans felt the bill, as written, was far too low and would hurt our homeless veterans, would delay repair of our crumbling infrastructure, and would slash the Community Development Block Grant Program to the lowest level in history, to below the 1975 level when it was first created by President Ford.

Let me point out that the numbers in the House bill were not realistic. That is one of the reasons it failed. The numbers in our bill are not unrealistic. They are too high. They would come down in conference. The President's request was artificially low due to several budget gimmicks and scoring differences. We took care of those gimmicks. We have an honest bill that is before our Members. Let me give you just one example of a gimmick that

was in the President's budget. His request for the section 8 project-based rental assistance is insufficient to fully fund the 12-month renewal contracts with private owners.

We are not going to be throwing people out of those subsidized apartments after 10 months in the year. So Senator MURRAY and I added funding to more accurately reflect what was needed. That was over \$1 billion of the difference. There was the difference in the scoring by CBO and OMB. We have to go by CBO. That accounted for \$1.8 billion.

It is disappointing to me that we have not gone to conference on the budget because we would not be in this dilemma. We would have agreed-upon allocations that would guide the appropriations process. But in the absence of that, what is wrong with proceeding with this bill with cutting spending in it? If Members have amendments they wish to offer to cut spending—and there are a few that have been offered, but as I said, none that bring it down to the House's level in an account-by-account manner.

I am still hopeful we will be able to pass this bill and start bringing other appropriations bills to the floor before the end of the fiscal year because forcing the government to operate under continuing resolutions is irresponsible. It ends up costing more money in the long run. It is wasteful because we continue to fund programs that are no longer needed because we are just continuing current law.

So I urge my colleagues to think very carefully about this vote. It would be so unfortunate if we go home to our constituents in August and are forced to tell them we are unable to do our job. We should continue working on this bill. We should invoke cloture. This bill undoubtedly would have been reduced in conference had we been allowed to go forward.

I do wish to thank many of my colleagues for working with us as we tried so hard to advance this important legislation. I am particularly grateful to Chairman MURRAY for her bipartisan approach and collaboration and for working so closely with me throughout the process.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not thank our staffs on both sides of the aisle for their hard work. They have worked night and day on this bill. I will put all of their names in the RECORD. I know my time is expiring.

Let's do the right thing. Let's proceed to end the debate on this bill, take care of the rest of the germane amendments and proceed to final passage and ultimately to conference with the House. Let's show that we mean it when we say we are committed to full and open debate and returning to the process that used to serve us well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I wish to echo what my good friend and partner on this bill Senator COLLINS just said. Similar to all of us, when I go home to my State of Washington, I do not hear a lot from my constituents about partisan politics. They do not ask me which party is up or which party is down. They do not care about the political games and certainly not who is winning or losing them.

The vast majority of people I talk to when I go home ask me what we are doing in Congress to create jobs and get this economy going again. They ask me what we are doing to break through this gridlock and the constant manufactured crises and make sure this country, this economy, is working for them and their families.

They tell me they want Democrats and Republicans working together. They want us to get into a room and put politics aside and put our country first and find some common ground and get something done. That kind of work is far too rare these days, though many of us are fighting to change that. I am very proud the Transportation bill we are about to vote on does just that.

The bill is not exactly what I would have written had I done it on our own or what Senator COLLINS would have done on her own.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 additional seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. This is a bill that is a compromise that reflects the deep cuts we have set in the spending levels of the Budget Control Act. It reflects the best ideas of both sides. So I urge my colleagues to move past the obstruction, get over the gridlock. Let's show the American people we can work for them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I wish to commend the Senior Senator from Maine for the extraordinary amount of work she and her staff have put into this bill. But regretfully, where we are is cloture on this Transportation bill will be viewed as a question of whether we intend to keep the commitment we made to the American people 2 years ago this month to reduce \$2.1 trillion in spending over the next 10 years.

The House of Representatives is marking to a \$91 billion-a-year lower figure which reflects the law. I believe that if we invoke cloture on this bill and move forward, it will be widely viewed throughout the country that we are walking away from the commitment we made, on a bipartisan basis, that the President signed just 2 years ago, that we would reduce spending by this amount of money, \$2.1 trillion over the next 10 years.

Regretfully, I would strongly urge my colleagues to keep the bipartisan commitment we made 2 years ago and to vote no on cloture on this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1243, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Patty Murray, Barbara A. Mikulski, Jon Tester, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Dianne Feinstein, Tim Johnson, Tom Udall, Mark Begich, Christopher Murphy, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Bill Nelson, Christopher A. Coons, Amy Klobuchar, Mazie Hirono, Richard Blumenthal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 1243, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 199 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—43

Alexander	Blunt	Chambliss
Ayotte	Boozman	Chiesa
Barrasso	Burr	Coats

Coburn	Heller	Risch
Cochran	Hoeben	Roberts
Corker	Isakson	Rubio
Cornyn	Johanns	Scott
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Cruz	Kirk	Shelby
Enzi	Lee	Thune
Fischer	McConnell	Toomey
Flake	Moran	Vitter
Graham	Murkowski	Wicker
Grassley	Paul	
Hatch	Portman	

NOT VOTING—3

Inhofe	Landrieu	McCain
--------	----------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays 43. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

HIGH SPEED RAIL PERMITTING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, Chairman MURRAY, and Senator BOXER, I rise to discuss with you the importance of funding for the Surface Transportation Board in this legislation, as well as the funding that Chairman MURRAY has provided to the Federal Railroad Administration to continue to administer its grant awards.

As you know, opponents of California's high-speed rail project are attempting to use the Federal permitting process in order to prevent the Nation's first high-speed rail project from moving forward and succeeding.

The Surface Transportation Board funding will provide the resources necessary to continue the Board's efforts to permit the growth of passenger rail projects in the United States. The funding in the bill for the Federal Railroad Administration will ensure that this agency is able to monitor and administer the grants it already awarded.

Mrs. MURRAY. I am pleased to fund the Surface Transportation Board. I agree with my colleague from California that this agency needs funding in order to comply with its governing statute, which directs the Board to support the growth of rail in the United States.

I share your concern that some opponents of a single project in California are trying to limit the ability of the Surface Transportation Board to operate under its statute. The appropriations bill before us provides the Surface Transportation Board with the resources necessary to facilitate California high-speed rail, not stand in its way.

This bill in no way limits the ability of the Board to oversee projects under its jurisdiction and facilitate their construction.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I agree that this bill in no way limits the ability of the Board to oversee projects under its jurisdiction and facilitate their construction.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, Chairman MURRAY and Chairman MIKULSKI, for explaining that this legislation will allow California high-speed rail to move forward.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I also would like to thank Chairman MURRAY and Chairman MIKULSKI for your explanation.

I am deeply alarmed by attempts in the other body of Congress to prohibit the Department of Transportation and the Surface Transportation Board from completing their permitting and oversight responsibly.

These attempts violate the spirit of federalism. The California high-speed rail project was approved by California's voters on the ballot, the legislature has enacted enabling legislation, and the Governor supports it.

While some may not like this type of transportation investment, it is the choice that my State has made for their future, and the Federal Government should respect those decisions.

Furthermore, I strongly believe the Federal permitting process should not be used as a tool to obstruct and delay major infrastructure investments of our States.

Permitting infrastructure in California is a notoriously thorough, long, and comprehensive process. In the years California has analyzed this one project, China has built thousands of miles of high-speed rail.

But this year, in an attempt to stymie the project, opponents of California's plan forced the Surface Transportation Board—an agency dedicated to protecting fair competition in freight rail—to assert Federal jurisdiction over California's high-speed rail project.

This new layer of Federal permitting is duplicative of the thorough 5-year-long review performed by the Federal Railroad Administration. Nonetheless, State and Federal entities complied with this extraneous requirement. However, now opponents are working vigorously to stall the actions at the Surface Transportation Board that will allow construction to finally begin in earnest.

Fortunately, the Surface Transportation Board exists to facilitate the growth of rail in the United States—not to impede it. As long as the Board acts quickly within its statutory authority, it will not impede California's decisions.

Mrs. BOXER. I also share the concerns expressed by Senator FEINSTEIN, and I would also like to reiterate that the people of California voted to fund this project. The California State Legislature voted to fund this project, and the Department of Transportation, after weighing a number of applications for high-speed rail across the Nation, decided to fund this project. I find it troubling that opponents have attempted to hinder the advancement of this project by curtailing an independent agency's mission and responsibilities, as well as trying to prohibit the transmission of appropriated funds to its rightful destination.

I am pleased that this legislation will allow the Surface Transportation

Board to act within its statutory authority. I also see that the legislation will allow the Federal Railroad Administration to administer its previously awarded grants to California, and I thank Chairman MURRAY for advancing this legislation.

I would also like to note that this project is incredibly important to the future of California. California's 170,000 miles of roadway are the busiest in the Nation, with automobile congestion draining \$18.7 billion in lost time and wasted fuel from the State's economy every year.

Additionally, flights between Los Angeles and the Bay area, which is the busiest short-haul market in the United States with 5 million passengers annually, are the most delayed in the country, with approximately one in every four flights late by an hour or more.

California's high-speed rail system will not only increase mobility and save lost time and money over the coming decades, it will also create near-and long-term employment opportunities, enhance environmental and energy goals, and spur economic development.

Mrs. MURRAY. As my colleagues know, California has a grant agreement with the Department of Transportation, and California has spent funds consistent with that agreement. I was extremely careful to draft the Senate bill to ensure that California will be able to be reimbursed for their expenses.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you, Chairman MURRAY, for ensuring that California will not be left holding the bag, which is not a fair way for the Federal Government to treat the States. Were an appropriations bill to prevent the Federal Government from honoring its grant commitments, it would set a dangerous precedent. I am concerned that it would undermine the competitive process.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:57 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COONS).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA POWER TO BE THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 hours of debate equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to strongly support the nomination of Samantha Power to be the next United States Ambassador to the United Nations, and I commend President Obama for selecting her for this extremely important position.

Born of Irish parents and raised in Ireland until she was 9, Samantha and her parents emigrated to Pennsylvania and Georgia, and she attended Yale and Harvard.

She is well known for her accomplishments as a journalist during the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, her Pulitzer Prize-winning book, "A Problem from Hell," her leadership of the Carr Center for Human Rights, and her work as the senior director for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights at the National Security Council.

Samantha is a person of extraordinary intellect, exceptional integrity, and a strong moral compass. She is willing to challenge conventional wisdom and fight for things she feels passionately about, irrespective of the forces aligned against her.

Samantha is an internationalist. She believes in the indispensable role that multilateral organizations play in addressing global problems no country can solve alone—from genocide to global warming to international terrorism.

At the National Security Council she also brought much-needed attention to human trafficking, protection for refugees, gay rights, and gender-based violence. But what some people may be less aware of is the depth of Samantha's devotion to the principles on which this country was founded, and which I believe is one of the key reasons the President nominated her.

Samantha is an American patriot. She will not only strive to ensure that the United States leads by example at the United Nations, but that we do so in a manner that honors the Constitution and the idealism of those who wrote it, which continue to inspire people around the world. That is what people expect of the United States, and I know of no one better suited to turn that expectation into reality.

At a time when the United States faces emerging threats and intensifying competition for natural resources, human rights are under assault in many countries, and millions of people live in squalor or have fled their homes due to armed conflict, natural disasters, or the effects of overpopulation and climate change on the

availability of land, water and food, how effectively we use our influence globally will determine the kind of world our children and grandchildren inherit.

Now is the time for the United States to embrace these challenges, and I am confident that Samantha Power will do so with every bit of conviction and energy that she has.

To those Senators of either party who have at times differed with this administration over foreign policy or who may doubt the importance of U.S. support for the United Nations, I encourage those Senators to speak to Samantha directly. There is no one better informed, no one more willing to listen to other points of view, and no one more persuasive, than Samantha Power.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. RISCH. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. RISCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 1430 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I rise to promote and suggest to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we support the nomination of Samantha Power to be the next Ambassador to the United Nations.

This is a very complex world we live in today. Certainly the forum of the United Nations, in spite of some issues that all of us had with that body over the years, remains the one forum where the United States, No. 1, gets to exhibit strong leadership with our friends, our allies, our adversaries, and a strong voice in the United Nations is imperative.

Samantha Power is an individual who possesses the type of character, the type of strong background, and the person who possesses the intellect and the right kind of ability to communicate to represent us today in this complex world at the United Nations.

Samantha was born in Ireland but moved to the United States shortly thereafter. She was educated in the public schools in Atlanta, Yale, and Harvard. Obviously, she has the intellect, from a background standpoint, to represent our country at the U.N.

Between her stints at Harvard and Yale, she did reporting as a journalist on the ground, reporting on the Yugoslav wars. She was hands-on dodging bullets and being involved from the standpoint of making reports to various journals and other publications about what was happening in those Yugoslav wars.

Samantha is an individual who developed a passion for human rights. She is not bashful about sharing that passion. It is a commendable passion that she has for human rights.

From 2005 forward, Samantha has been involved almost exclusively in the arena of foreign policy, first as a staffer for then-Senator Obama, later involved in his campaign, and most recently as a member of the National Security staff.

Samantha is not only knowledgeable, she is knowledgeable in the right way when it comes to foreign policy. She is not only smart, but she is worldly. She has the charisma, in her own way, No. 1, to express herself in a way that right now the United States needs to be expressing itself.

This is why I am so excited about the opportunity to see her on the ground at the United Nations representing our great country. She can be tough when she needs to be tough. She can be charismatic, and she can also be sharp-tongued.

With the adversaries she is going to have to be dealing with at the United Nations, all of those assets are going to come into play. Samantha is going to do a great job as our next U.N. Ambassador. I applaud her for her willingness to engage in public service. I would encourage all of my colleagues to support her nomination to be the next Ambassador to the United Nations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I understand we have 1 hour available in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I wish to speak in opposition to the pending nomination. I would like to take a few minutes to discuss the nomination of Ms. Samantha Power to be the next U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Let me begin by saying that Ms. Power is an impressive person. She has an inspiring personal story, she is clearly very intelligent, and she has already accomplished much in her career. However, I do have three concerns I want to take a moment to highlight today.

The first has to do with a concern I have about her unwillingness to directly answer questions I personally posed to her during her confirmation hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I asked her about statements attributed to her in the past alleging that the United States had committed "crimes" that it needed to reckon with. I raised the question not to embarrass her but to give her the opportunity to clarify by either pointing out examples of these crimes or to clarify what she meant by those comments. Instead, she kept avoiding directly addressing my question. She kept saying that America was the greatest country in the world and that she wouldn't apologize for America.

I don't think it is unreasonable to be concerned about those statements, and

I do not think it is unfair to be concerned about the fact that we are sending someone to represent us at the most important international forum in the world who thinks the United States has committed crimes that it needs to reckon with.

I believe I and members of the committee deserved an answer to the question. Instead, what we got in response was a rehearsed line. I believe it was a missed opportunity for her and for all of us. To me, these statements she made in the past and her inability to answer or address them raise questions about her judgment, although—let me be clear—I certainly do not question her patriotism.

Secondly, I have an even greater concern that she is being appointed by a President whose foreign policy is fast becoming an utter and absolute failure. From crises in the Middle East, to strategic uncertainty in Asia, to a country we were told was a partner but is now harboring a fugitive and traitor who has done great damage to U.S. national security, I believe the world is now more dangerous and more uncertain than when President Obama took office. It is increasingly apparent that our foes are more willing than ever to challenge us. Even more troubling is that those who seek to emulate us, who desire the freedom we all, as Americans, enjoy, are often left to fend for themselves with little American support.

A strong, engaged America has been good for the world and for the American people. When America fails to lead, the result, as we see in Syria today, is chaos—a chaos that allows others with goals other than our own to fill the void we leave behind.

History taught us twice in the last century that even if we put our heads in the sand and try to ignore the world's problems, those problems will not ignore us. I realize the American people are weary of war. We have paid a tremendous price in lives and money in the war on radical Islamic terrorism. But to follow the advice of those—including some in the Republican Party—who advocate disengagement from the world would be a terrible mistake. If we follow their advice, we will only pay a higher price in the long term.

Let me be clear. That does not mean America can solve every problem or get engaged in every civil war on the planet. I would confess that we also have voices here that are too eager to engage America in every conflict on the planet. We need to be careful about when, where, and how we engage American forces overseas. But isolationism on the one hand and hyperintervention on the other are not our only two options. Between these two choices we have a third option, and it is this—one based on the idea that while the United States cannot solve every problem in

the world, there are very few problems in the world that can be solved without the United States.

If a problem can be solved by using an international forum such as the United Nations, that is fine, but more often than not the United Nations can not and will not confront the problem. In the end, the truth is that America is still the only Nation in the world able to form and lead coalitions to confront evil and solve problems. It is still the only Nation on Earth able to keep the seas open for trade. It is still the only Nation capable of maintaining the safe balance of power in Asia and Europe and around the world. It is still the only Nation on Earth capable of preventing rogue nations from becoming nuclear powers. And it is still the only Nation on Earth capable of targeting and diminishing radical terrorist organizations that plot to attack and kill Americans here at home and around the world.

We should be careful when we get involved. Foreign aid is not a one-way street and should always be conditioned and based on our national interests. Military power should be employed judiciously and only where it can make a difference in defending our long-term goals. But we cannot pretend that if we ignore our enemies, they will ignore us. We must be involved, and when we get involved we must make sure not just that we are doing it the right way, we must make sure we are doing it at the right time because sometimes acting too late is worse than not acting at all. When we do get involved, it is OK to be motivated by humanitarian concerns, but the primary objective of our foreign policy must always be to protect our people from those who do or may one day want to harm us.

This is the kind of clear strategic view of America's role and of our interests that should guide our foreign policy. It is the kind of clear strategic thinking this President has failed to lay out. As a result, what we see all around us is failure.

The President dithered on Syria. We should have tried to identify secular rebels early in the conflict, and we should have made sure they were the best armed and the best trained group on the ground. Instead, the President decided to lead from behind and allow others to decide whom to arm, and the result is that today it is rebel groups linked to Al Qaeda—foreign fighters, not even Syrians—who are the best armed and best equipped groups within Syria. Now I fear Syria may be headed toward becoming another Afghanistan before 9/11, toward becoming the premier operational area in the world for global jihadists.

The President entered office with the naive belief that we could convince Iran to become a responsible nation by, quite frankly, being nicer to them. He

wasted valuable early years in his Presidency not giving the Iranian threat priority, and now the Ayatollahs continue the march toward acquiring both nuclear weapons and long-range missiles that can one day threaten the United States.

I would be remiss if I did not point out that in 2009 he missed an opportunity to clearly stand on the side of those protesting a stolen election and instead chose not to because he didn't want to interfere in the "sovereignty" of another nation.

The President also wasted time thinking the cause of radical Islamic terrorism was partially because George W. Bush was hated in the Muslim world. But despite his speech in Cairo, despite his efforts to close Guantanamo, despite his elimination of the use of the term "war on terror," Al Qaeda continues to hate America, and even as I speak here today they continue to plan attacks against America here and around the world.

The President is not alone in failing to confront these threats. I am afraid that because of the success we have had in preventing another attack on the scale of 9/11, some of our leaders in both parties have been lulled into a sense of false security. I certainly support the privacy rights and expectations of all Americans, but, my colleagues, I also know for a fact that the surveillance programs our government uses have prevented attacks and saved American lives.

I think it is a mistake to dismiss privacy concerns as crazy. After all, we have a government whose tax-collecting agency has targeted Americans because of their political views. But it is also a mistake to exaggerate them. After all, if a known terrorist is emailing or calling someone in the United States, we had better be able to know who and where that person is.

If Osama bin Laden had been calling someone in the United States on their cell phone, I promise you it wasn't a stockbroker. We had better know because these people are still plotting against us, and not if but when they strike again the American people are going to turn to us and ask: What has the Federal Government been doing to prevent this, we had better have a good answer.

We live in a very dangerous world, one, by the way, where our enemies aren't just other countries anymore. Our enemies are also rogue states, well-armed militias, and radical clerics. This kind of danger calls for a clear strategic vision on foreign policy, and this President, sadly, does not have one, which brings me to my third and primary concern about Ms. Power's nomination, and it is one that is related to the United Nations itself.

We need an advocate in New York who makes it their primary focus to ensure that the United Nations is more

accountable, that it is more effective, and that it serves U.S. interests and is not just some multilateral ideal in which we invest all of our hopes.

If she is confirmed today, I hope Ms. Power does indeed become that type of Ambassador. But I have not been satisfied by the evidence thus far of this administration's willingness to be serious about tackling these issues over the last 4½ years that ensure that every American dollar going to the United Nations actually advances America's interests. I think Congress needs to play a more active role in forcing this very much needed change to occur.

What I would like to do in closing is spend a few minutes highlighting legislation that I recently introduced to this effect. I am pleased to have as co-sponsors Senators CORNYN, RISCH, and FLAKE, and I hope more of my colleagues will join this effort.

I am not the first person to raise concerns about the effectiveness and utility of the United Nations. Former Senator John Danforth, who was serving as our Ambassador to the United Nations in 2004, when the U.N. General Assembly couldn't even pass a resolution condemning human rights violations in Sudan, said at the time:

One wonders about the utility of the General Assembly on days like this. One wonders if there can't be a clear and direct statement on matters of basic principle, why have this building? What is it all about?

Anyone who has followed the United Nations closely, especially in recent years as the Security Council has failed to respond to the crisis in Syria as more than 100,000 Syrians have died and hundreds of thousands more have been forced out of their homes, across borders, straining all of Syria's neighbors, leaving behind a failing state that is becoming a safe haven for global jihadists—all of the people who have shared these concerns and have seen this happen should be rightly asking the same question Senator Danforth asked back then.

In the midst of this horrific crisis, the United Nations has even been unable to achieve consensus on the issue of whether to allow international humanitarian organizations to provide cross-border support to tens of thousands of Syrians stuck in camps facing frequent shelling and attacks from the Assad regime.

Just as we are troubled by this inability to tackle the world's toughest problems, we should also be angry about the fact that for decades more human rights criticism at the United Nations has been directed against Israel than against actual human rights violators and that U.N. agencies and organizations have employed blatant anti-Semites; or that for decades recipients of U.S. foreign aid have only voted with the United States at the United Nations less than one-third of the time and such support, by the way,

doesn't even currently factor into U.S. decisions about who receives our foreign aid; or the fact that the world's most notorious tyrants and human rights violators are allowed to serve on the Human Rights Council rather than being condemned by it; or by the fraud and the mismanagement that has pervaded the U.N.'s peacekeeping operations, including abuses and exploitation of the very people that those peacekeepers were sent to protect; or by the Security Council resolutions on Iran and North Korea that members of the U.N. willfully violate, as we recently saw with the Panamanian capture of a ship transferring weapons from Cuba, one rogue state, to North Korea, another one; or by the proliferation of mandates that have clouded the organization's mission and effectiveness.

The list goes on and on. But let me be clear. I am not here to argue that we don't need the United Nations. Ideally, we would have a United Nations where the nations of the world would come together and seriously deal with North Korea, Iran, radical Islam, and human rights. But the United Nations we have right now isn't capable of any of this. It has basically become a forum for nations whose interests are directly opposed to ours, to block our efforts using the United Nations as cover.

That is how North Korea and Iran continue to evade sanctions. That is how Israel's enemies continue their efforts to delegitimize the Jewish State. That is how Assad continues to massacre his own people with weapons built in and supplied by the Russians.

More than six decades after its creation, we still hope for a United Nations with resolve, a United Nations that acts with effectiveness and purpose. Sadly, the United Nations' persistent ethics and accountability problems are limiting its role. Until the organization addresses these important issues, it will continue to be ineffective and often irrelevant.

Americans should care about this more than any other people because we shoulder the primary fiscal burden of the United Nations' budget, and our patience is not limitless. We don't believe in continuing to throw money at programs and projects that fail to accomplish their objectives.

So my hope with the legislation I filed is to provide an incentive for the United Nations and the President and our Ambassador in New York to modernize that international body along a spirit of transparency, respect for basic human freedoms, and effective non-proliferation. This legislation would also attempt to address the anti-Semitic attitudes that have become so prevalent in certain corners of the United Nations and seriously diminish the effectiveness and credibility of the entire U.N. system.

At the core of these reforms that I proposed is an effort to instill a sense of transparency and competition at the United Nations by its adoption of a budgetary model that relies mostly on voluntary contributions. This legislation would also strengthen the international standing of human rights by reforming the U.N. Human Rights Council in a way that would deny membership to nations under U.N. sanctions, designated by our Department of State as state sponsors of terrorism or failing to take measures to combat and end the despicable practice of human trafficking. Other provisions of the bill seek meaningful reforms at the U.N. Relief and Work Agency that provides assistance to Palestinian refugees of the 1948 Arab-Israeli conflict.

This legislation is needed because the structure and bureaucratic culture of the organization often makes it impossible or, at best, downright difficult to achieve meaningful reforms.

In closing, for more than six decades now the United Nations has served as an important multilateral forum to address peace and security issues throughout the world. But it has never been, and it is not now, a substitute for strong American leadership. When America fails to lead, the world becomes more dangerous.

The United Nations is badly broken. I hope we will work to force meaningful transparency and accountability reforms for the United Nations. But so far this administration does not seem very interested in doing so and, unfortunately, at least based on our conversations, neither does the nominee before us. Therefore, until we begin to take some positive steps in that direction, I will not be able to support Obama administration nominees who have not committed to significant reform of the United Nations.

Ms. Power has failed to make such a commitment. Therefore, that is why I am voting against her nomination to be our next Ambassador to the United Nations.

• Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to express my opposition to the nomination of Samantha Power to be U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

As you know, I am very interested in the ability of our American oil and gas industry to compete for business in the country of Myanmar as soon as possible. By virtually every international standard, the U.S. oil and gas industry is the world leader in technical innovation. It is my understanding, however, that Ms. Power, as one of the Obama administration's point persons in pursuing a liberal international agenda attempted to 'carve out' the American petroleum industry from doing business in Myanmar when the United States suspended economic sanctions against this country last year. Fortunately, wiser powers within the executive branch prevented such a carve out

from occurring, and now the American petroleum industry can compete with those companies from the European Union, China and Russia, which are already there. Clearly, this carve out strategy would have been a strategic mistake, and it has led me to question seriously Samantha Power's ability to represent adequately U.S. national interests and security needs at the United Nations. I believe that American companies, and especially our oil and gas companies, can play positive roles in the democratic transition in Myanmar by demonstrating high standards of responsible business conduct and transparency, including respect for labor and human rights. Ms. Power's inability to recognize this fact is very troubling.

In addition, I find her position on Israeli-Palestinian relations of great concern. Israel is our friend and the sole democracy in the Middle East. It is a nation that we should support and promote in a region that is torn by violence and conflict. Samantha Power does not see it this way. Rather, she believes that Israel should give up its historical right to its land, and that the U.S. should impose a peace plan upon Israel with the Palestinian Authority. She has also repeatedly accused our friend Israel of human rights abuses. This certainly does not represent the views of the people or that of the leadership of the United States.

Lastly, in addition to her lack of diplomatic skills, Ms. Power has no management experience, causing me to question her ability to lead at the United Nations. The U.S. Mission to the U.N. is constantly facing management issues, and I had hoped that President Obama would have nominated someone who could effectively promote U.S. initiatives there. Unfortunately, Ms. Power is not such a nominee.

It is for these reasons that I oppose Samantha Power's nomination as the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. ●

Mr. RUBIO. I yield back the balance of the time available to the opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of Samantha Power's nomination to be the Ambassador to the United Nations.

As I said in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which I chaired, on Ms. Power, her appointment as Ambassador to the United Nations has come with much fanfare and with some criticism—which, at the end of the day, means she must be doing something right. In that regard, as I listen to my colleague member of the committee express his reservations and his opposition to Ms. Power, I think we have to have some context.

When she responded: The United States is the greatest country in the

world and I will not apologize for it, it was her way of rejecting any characterization of statements that she made in the past. It was very clear to me. I want a U.N. Ambassador sitting in front of the world who considers the United States the greatest country in the world and who will not apologize for the United States before that world body. She made it very clear that is exactly what she intends to do.

On accountability, we cannot achieve accountability at the United Nations if we do not have a U.N. Ambassador there to lead the effort on accountability. On those questions where she was asked by several members: Are you committed to making the United Nations a more accountable organization, not only did she say yes several times, in the affirmative, but she gave examples of how that accountability can be achieved. We need an Ambassador to pursue accountability at the United Nations.

Finally, I agree with my colleague that when America fails to lead in some critical times, we leave a void in the world. But we cannot lead if we do not have a U.N. Ambassador raising their voice and their vote on our behalf on some of the critical issues of the day.

So this nomination is critical to pursuing the national interests and security of the United States. Whatever my colleagues might think about her nomination, I don't believe anyone can question her considerable credentials or her years of service. Certainly, no one can question her willingness to speak her mind, especially her willingness to speak out on human rights issues around the world.

As a war correspondent in Bosnia, in the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Sudan, she has, as she said in her Pulitzer Prize-winning book, seen "evil at its worst."

Ms. Power has built a career and a reputation as one of the Nation's most principled voices against all human rights violations and crimes against humanity. I know that voice will be heard around the world should we confirm her.

While some of us may not agree with everything she has written and said during her extensive career as a journalist and foreign policy professional, she has been a tireless defender of human rights, and she has seen the tragedy of human suffering from the frontlines firsthand, and it has given her a unique perspective.

In her role at the National Security Council, she was clearly involved with U.S. policy toward the United Nations. She knows the United Nations' strengths, its weaknesses, and how it operates. At the end of the day the United States needs a representative at the United Nations who will uphold American values, promote human rights, secure our interests and the in-

terests of our national security. I have every confidence in Samantha Power's ability to do exactly that, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination.

Personally, I am incredibly appreciative of the principled positions she has taken on the Armenian genocide, her belief that we should use the lessons of what clearly was an atrocity of historic proportions to prevent future crimes against humanity is a view consistent with my own and which is supported by her role in the President's Atrocities Prevention Board. I agree we must acknowledge the past, study how and why atrocities happen, if we are ever to give true meaning to the phrase "Never again."

As the son of immigrants from Cuba, I personally appreciate her commitment to exposing Cuba's total disregard for human and civil rights, and I respect her for not idealizing the harsh realities of communism in Cuba. I know from the conversation we had in my office, she appreciates the suffering of the Cuban people—the torture, abuse, detention, and abridgement of the civil and human rights of those who voice their dissent under the Castro regime. I welcome her commitment to reach out to Rosa Maria Paya, daughter of the longtime dissident and Cuban activist, Oswaldo Paya who died under mysterious circumstances last year in Cuba as his car was bumped off the road, and I look forward to her fulfillment of that commitment.

At the end of day, it is fitting that someone with Ms. Power's background represent American interests and American values at the United Nations. In the words of the U.N. Preamble, it was created "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small. . . ."

Who better than Samantha Power, a recognized advocate for the fundamental rights of every human being, to be our ambassador to the United Nations? If confirmed, her focus will, of course, be on the crisis du jour: the Middle East, Syria, Iran, North Korea, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and others, and the nature of nations that emerge from the Arab spring. But I know while she is meeting those challenges, she will also be engaged on human rights around the world: on freedom of expression in Latin America; on fighting HIV-AIDS, malaria, and polio in Africa; on the status of talks to resolve the 66-year-old question of Cyprus; on women's rights in Pakistan and labor rights in Bangladesh and human rights in Sri Lanka.

Ms. Power, during her nomination process, has repeatedly expressed steadfast support for the State of Israel during her hearing, in her testimony,

and individually to several members of the committee, including myself as chair. She has promised to stand up for Israel at the United Nations, and I know she will.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the committee in support of Ms. Power from six bipartisan former Ambassadors to the United Nations be printed in the RECORD, calling on the Senate to confirm her as soon as possible in this time of opportunity, to have a U.S. Representative in New York advocating for American interests. I urge my colleagues to support this qualified, experienced nominee. I know she will serve the Nation well.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As former U.S. ambassadors to the United Nations in New York, we are writing in support of Samantha Power's nomination as U.S. ambassador and representative to the United Nations. We believe she is eminently qualified for the role and if confirmed she will effectively promote U.S. values and interests.

She has long been a champion of human rights and an advocate for American leadership around the world. As a Pulitzer Prize winner, university teacher, senior member of the National Security staff at the White House, and journalist, she has the knowledge base effectively and efficiently to promote U.S. interests at the U.N.

She has a record of support for Israel and she will continue her advocacy as U.N. ambassador for our important ally in the Middle East while bringing to the task the balance and judgment required to advise the President and the Secretary of State on the perspective from the United Nations on the important issues of Arab-Israeli peace as well as the host of other issues which are constantly part of United States's policy in dealing with the world community through and with the United Nations.

The administration will benefit from her perspective; if confirmed, her experience will allow her to be an effective leader beginning on her first day.

We believe that the Senate should confirm Samantha Power as soon as possible because in this time of opportunity and challenge we need to have the position of U.S. representative at the U.N. in New York filled and operating—advocating for U.S. interests—at the earliest possible time.

We would be most grateful if you would ask your staff to insure that this letter is made available to all the members of the Committee of Foreign Relations.

With warm regards and respect,

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT.
JOHN DANFORTH.
DONALD MCHENRY.
EDWARD PERKINS.
THOMAS R. PICKERING.
BILL RICHARDSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I also rise to support the nomination of Samantha Power to be our Ambassador at the United Nations. Within the last month I had a unique opportunity as the junior member of the committee

that my friend Chairman MENENDEZ chairs, as the head of Foreign Relations, to spend the day at the United Nations and learn about it from then-Ambassador Rice. I left that day with a couple of reactions: first, very proud to be an American, and, second, concerned about the challenges the institution faces.

First, on the proud to be American, I think it is important for us to realize, for whatever its flaws, the United Nations would not exist if it were not for this country. It is a quintessential American idea to pull together an institution that tries to build peace, that tries to solve hunger, that tries to solve global health needs. The idea first gained force through the efforts of American President and Virginian Woodrow Wilson who won the Nobel prize for trying to get the League of Nations going at the end of World War I. That league lasted for 20 years and collapsed, for many reasons, including the lack of participation in the United States in the global effort. But the idea did not die. The American idea stayed alive, and in 1939 the State Department, within 2 years after the collapse of the league, started to work on the next version. FDR worked on it during his entire Presidency and was scheduled to have the first conference on the United Nations 2 weeks after his untimely death in 1945.

The second decision made by President Truman in 1945—the first was to keep FDR's Cabinet—was he was posed with this: After FDR's death, we can postpone the meeting in San Francisco about the formation of the United Nations. But Truman said: No, we are going to go ahead because this is something the world needs and America is uniquely positioned to lead.

Ever since its start, in funding and support, through good times and bad, through controversies Senator RUBIO described on the floor, this United Nations has worked hard to do good, worked hard to achieve an ideal that may be impossible to achieve. It is a tribute to the U.S. role as a global leader that the United Nations exists today.

I was also struck again by many of the challenges—the challenges of a tough globe, the challenges of U.N. problems in the ethics and finance area, the challenges that confuse many Americans as we look at the U.N., principally those referred to by my colleague Senator MENENDEZ, a history of anti-Semitism at the U.N. that confuses us as we watch it.

What are we to do with this institution that we birthed, more than any other nation, that still offers great hope and service every day, yet still needs significant change? I think what we should do is put a strong person in to be U.S. Ambassador, and Samantha Power is that individual. She has the strength to tackle the challenges that

need tackling at the U.N. She has had the career, as described by earlier speakers, as a war correspondent, a writer, somebody who snuck across borders to take photos of atrocities in Darfur and then bring them to the attention of the world. Her writings and her activism have inspired generations of activists around the world to take up the cause of human rights.

She has been the President's senior adviser on matters in the United Nations in the last 4 years. To focus on this issue, here is what Samantha Power has done in that role to help deal with this issue of anti-Semitism at the U.N. and the double standard in the treatment of Israel. She worked to ensure the closest possible cooperation between the United States and Israel at the U.N., where she championed efforts to stand up against attempts to delegitimize Israel. She was key to the decision of the United States to boycott the deeply flawed "Durban II" conference in 2009, which turned into an event to criticize Israel. She helped mobilize efforts for the U.N. sanctions against Iran. She has challenged unfair treatment of Israel by U.N. bodies, including the one-sided Goldstone Report, and efforts to single out Israel in the Security Council after the Turkish flotilla incident, and she opposed the unilateral moves in the U.N. by the Palestinians that could undermine prospects for a negotiated peace agreement between Palestine and Israel, and how hopeful we are at the events this week, and we pray it goes forward and finds positive possibility. This is the activity she has had helping the U.N. while she was not the U.N. Ambassador. I want her in that seat so she can carry forward on those initiatives and others.

She will champion efforts to protect persecuted Christians and other religious minorities in the Middle East and beyond, and she helped spearhead the creation of new tools for genocide prevention and she led the administration's efforts to combat human trafficking, all values of which we can be proud if they would be on display at the United Nations.

I said during her hearing the one thing that made me scratch my head a bit about her when I heard she was nominated is I think of her primarily as a very blunt and outspoken person, and blunt and outspoken is not always the best job description of a diplomat. But in the case of the United Nations, with the challenges there, the challenges in the needed financial reform, the challenges in the need to push back against some instances of anti-Semitism, the challenges of ethics and other issues, we need blunt and outspoken at the United Nation. We don't need vague and ambiguous. We need the kind of strong leadership that Samantha Power would provide.

I think of many United Nations Ambassadors. It has been an "A" list of

people from Henry Cabot Lodge to President George H.W. Bush before he was President to Bill Richardson and Andrew Young. We can think of many. But the two I think of most—I guess I think of them because they are Irish Americans—when I think of Samantha Power is Daniel Moynihan and Jeane Kirkpatrick, strong United Nations Ambassadors who stood proudly for the values of this country, who gave no quarter, who were good diplomats but did not hesitate to call the truth whenever and wherever they saw it. I think Samantha Power will do the same, and that I is why I support her nomination.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Virginia. He is a very thoughtful member of the committee. I appreciate his remarks on behalf of Ms. Power.

With that, I yield all remaining time. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Shall the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 200 Ex.]

YEAS—87

Alexander	Coons	Johnson (SD)
Ayotte	Corker	Johnson (WI)
Baldwin	Cornyn	Kaine
Baucus	Crapo	King
Begich	Donnelly	Kirk
Bennet	Durbin	Klobuchar
Blumenthal	Feinstein	Leahy
Blunt	Fischer	Levin
Boozman	Flake	Manchin
Boxer	Franken	Markey
Brown	Gillibrand	McCaskill
Burr	Graham	McConnell
Cantwell	Grassley	Menendez
Cardin	Hagan	Merkley
Carper	Harkin	Mikulski
Casey	Hatch	Moran
Chambliss	Heinrich	Murkowski
Chiesa	Heitkamp	Murphy
Coats	Hirono	Murray
Coburn	Hoeven	Nelson
Cochran	Isakson	Portman
Collins	Johanns	Pryor

Reed	Schumer	Udall (CO)
Reid	Sessions	Udall (NM)
Risch	Shaheen	Warner
Roberts	Stabenow	Warren
Rockefeller	Tester	Whitehouse
Sanders	Thune	Wicker
Schatz	Toomey	Wyden

NAYS—10

Barrasso	Lee	Shelby
Cruz	Paul	Vitter
Enzi	Rubio	
Heller	Scott	

NOT VOTING—3

Inhofe	Landrieu	McCain
--------	----------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

PROMOTING ENERGY SAVINGS IN RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS AND INDUSTRY—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 154, S. 1392.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 154 (S. 1392), a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Con. Res. 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent res-

olution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 22

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, August 1, 2013, through Sunday, August 11, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, August 12, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Monday, August 12, 2013, it stand adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, September 9, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Friday, August 2, 2013, through Friday, September 6, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

PROMOTING ENERGY SAVINGS IN RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS AND INDUSTRY—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE FOR COOPERATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for this session, this work period, we have done a lot of work, and it has turned out quite well. None of us got what we wanted, but we all got something. I appreciate the cooperation of Democrats and Republicans this afternoon. It is always during the last few hours before a recess that problems come up, and this is an adjournment, so it is even more difficult. So I am grateful to everyone for their participation and their cooperation.

As for Senator GRASSLEY, he has left the floor, but I wish to express my appreciation to him. He had an issue that took us a while to work through, and it all worked out for the better for not only he and Senator LEAHY but, most importantly, for our staff.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with Senator STABENOW.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, as the two Chambers prepare to go to conference on the farm bill, I rise to request a commitment from the distinguished chairwoman of the Senate Agriculture Committee to protect the Senate farm bill's vital provision to end direct payments outright.

While I commend the chairwoman for her leadership in facilitating the full and immediate elimination of direct payments in the Senate-passed farm bill, many of my colleagues may be surprised to learn that section 1101 of the House-passed farm bill contains a carve-out that would actually continue direct payments to cotton farmers at a rate of 70 percent in 2014 and a rate of 60 percent in 2015.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this House-passed extension of direct payments would cost taxpayers an estimated \$823 million.

Already a poster child for Federal largesse, direct payments have more recently become synonymous with waste, fraud, and abuse. As the Washington Post put it, recent analyses of the program have found that it subsidizes people who aren't really farming: the idle, the urban, and, occasionally, the dead.

Investigations have uncovered taxpayer-backed direct payments being paid to billionaires, to New York City condo dwellers, and to nonfarming homeowners who happen to live on former farmlands.

Direct payments have also been the target of a series of scathing reports published by the GAO, the most recent of which went so far as to question the purpose and need for direct payments, stating that they did not "align with principles significant to integrity, effectiveness, and efficiency in farm bill programs." The report went on to recommend that Congress consider eliminating direct payments outright.

I ask the distinguished chairwoman, was the unsustainable cost and the pattern of waste, fraud, and abuse associated with direct payments the impetus for the chairwoman to ensure that this subsidy was fully and immediately eliminated in the most recent Senate-passed farm bill?

Ms. STABENOW. I thank my colleague from Arizona for his passion on this issue.

Yes, it has been my goal from the beginning of this farm bill process to end unnecessary subsidies and to clean up areas of waste, fraud, and abuse starting with the direct payment program. The program is indefensible in this current budget climate. It makes absolutely no sense to pay farmers when they don't suffer a loss and to pay people who aren't even farming.

That is also why we included the strongest reforms to the commodity programs in the history of the farm bill, eliminating payments to people

who are not farming and tightening the AGI requirements and the amount any single farmer can receive.

We even have reformed the crop insurance program. The No. 1 thing we have heard from listening to farmers all across this country is that they need market-based risk management tools.

Farming is an extremely risky business. Farmers plant seeds in the spring and hope that by the time the harvest rolls around there will have been enough rain and the right temperatures to give them a good crop. That is why we strengthened crop insurance and made that available to farmers growing different kinds of crops—because we want farmers to have skin in the game. As I have always said, that is about farmers paying a bill for crop insurance, not getting a check from the direct payment program.

Mr. FLAKE. To the chairwoman's credit, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry has maintained a sustained effort to eliminate direct payments. In fact, between the 2012 and 2013 Senate farm bills and the majority's sequester replacement legislation, 76 current Members of the Senate—76 current Members of the Senate—have voted for the full and immediate elimination of direct payments.

Does the chairwoman agree that even the limited \$823 million extension of direct payments found in the House-passed bill would be at odds with the recorded votes of a supermajority of the Senate?

Ms. STABENOW. My friend from Arizona is correct. The Senate has repeatedly voted to end direct payments.

Mr. FLAKE. To that end, I respectfully request that the distinguished chairwoman make a commitment that she will protect the Senate's vital provision and work to ensure that any conference report brought before the Senate achieves a full and immediate elimination of direct payments.

Ms. STABENOW. Yes, that is my intention. I strongly agree we should not be spending taxpayer dollars to fund these direct payment subsidies, and I will do everything I can to make sure the conference committee adopts the Senate version on this issue.

I would also say to my friend from Arizona that if we do not get the farm bill signed into law by September 30, then direct payments are scheduled to continue. So I hope we can count on the Senator's support to make sure we can pass the farm bill in time and eliminate direct payments.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the chairwoman for her commitment. To be frank, I believe the Senate farm bill leaves much to be desired. In fact, to gain my support, the farm bill will need to undergo dramatic changes to reduce the taxpayer cost of Federal crop insurance, remove market-distorting price supports, and limit the scope of the Federal Government in U.S. agriculture.

That said, the chairwoman is right to point out that as uncertainty continues to surround the farm bill, Congress appears poised to pass yet another extension of the 2008 farm bill and, in turn, continue direct payments.

With regard to direct payments, such an outcome would be a costly regression in light of the Senate's bipartisan efforts to eliminate this multibillion-dollar subsidy.

After 17 years, three extensions, and more than \$92 billion paid out, it is time for direct payments to come to a full and immediate end. On this point, the chairwoman and I are in full agreement.

To that end, the chairwoman has my commitment to do everything I can to ensure that any legislation that should come before the Senate containing an extension of direct payments will be met with my fierce opposition.

I thank the chairwoman again for her commitment and for her attention to these concerns.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues who have been patiently waiting. I know there are many Members who wish to speak.

I thank my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank my colleague as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 25

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment which is at the desk, the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses; and the chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate; that following the authorization, two motions to instruct conferees be in order from each side: motion to instruct relative to the debt limit and motion to instruct relative to taxes/revenue; that there be 2 hours of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to votes in relation to the motions; further, that no amendments be in order to either of the motions prior to the votes; all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would ask the Senator from Illinois if he would consent to a modification of his request that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes reconciliation instructions to raise the debt limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. DURBIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection to the modification has been heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. RUBIO. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am sorry we are ending this session and going home for August with this. This is an attempt to go to a conference committee with the House of Representatives to agree on how much money we as a government will spend next year.

Each Chamber has passed a budget resolution. The Senate passed one. The House passed one. The basic constitutional approach to this is to bring the two together, work out our differences. This is, in fact, the 18th time we have asked the Republicans for their consent to go to this conference committee to resolve the differences between the House and the Senate and the 18th time that a Republican Senator has stood and objected.

We have heard speech after speech about how bad it was that the Senate never passed a budget resolution. I bet you heard it too. So we passed one. We did not get any help from the Republicans in passing it, but we passed it. Then, when it came time to try to work out our differences with the House of Representatives, Republican Senator after Republican Senator stood and said: No, we do not want to meet with the House of Representatives, even though it has a Republican majority.

Well, what difference does it make if we agree on this number? Can life go on? It makes a big difference. You see, earlier this afternoon we had this bill on the floor, S. 1243. It is a bill for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development. Senator PATTY MURRAY of Washington chairs that appropriations subcommittee. Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine is her vice chairman on the Republican side. They worked long and hard on this bill.

It is a \$54 billion bill. It pays for the basics when it comes to transportation in America; TIGER grants so that communities can build the roads they need; money to rebuild bridges that are falling down; airports in Massachusetts, Illinois, and Florida. It has the Housing and Urban Development Program in it as well, housing for poor people, housing for veterans.

Well, it came to a procedural vote today on the floor. It was a dramatic moment. The Senator from Maine, the Republican Senator who has worked on this for so long, stood and begged her colleagues on the Republican side to

join her in moving this bill forward. She put in a lot of work, and she went through this long list of 85 different amendments that have been considered on this bill, how everybody has had their chance if they wanted to change it. Senator MURRAY of Washington said the same thing.

Then the Republican leader Senator MCCONNELL came to the floor and said: I am asking all the Republicans to vote no. Vote no because we have not reached an agreement on the budget resolution; we have not reached an agreement on the total amount of money we will spend next year.

So they all voted no—all except Senator COLLINS. Every one of them voted no because we did not have an agreement on the budget resolution.

So I just came to the floor and said: Why don't we sit down and try to reach an agreement on the budget resolution? And a Republican Senator said: No, I object to that.

Where does that leave us? They will not pass the bills—appropriations bills—for something as basic as transportation and infrastructure because we do not have an agreement on a budget resolution, and they will not give their consent for us to sit down and agree on a budget resolution.

The games politicians play. When we had this press conference outside, there were people from the construction industry—iron workers, transportation workers, some of them in hard hats—and one of them got up to the microphone and said: I don't know what is going on inside those rooms with all that wrestling, but we need more jobs in America. Why can't you pass a bill to create more jobs in America?

I think most Americans, wherever they live, would agree with that ironworker. Most of them would not understand what just happened today—how the Republicans, except for one, all voted against that bill for transportation, saying we had not reached an agreement on how much we were going to spend, and then they turned around and objected when we came forward and said: Then let's try to reach an agreement. They objected. You just heard it on the floor.

I respect my colleague from Florida. And do you know the reason for the objection? He is afraid we may resolve the issue about our debt ceiling. Do you know what the debt ceiling is? The debt ceiling is America's mortgage. When we vote for spending bills, we have to borrow some money to cover what we are voting for.

Many on the Republican side say: We want to vote for spending bills, but we do not want to be held responsible for the money you have to borrow to pay for it.

If we fail to enact a debt ceiling at the end of this year, America will default on its debt for the first time in history. The economic recovery we are

seeing now will disappear. Jobs will be lost. Businesses are going to contract, some will fail. It is totally irresponsible to say: I just hope we never extend that debt ceiling.

We need to do that. We did it 16 times under President Ronald Reagan—16 different times under President Reagan. This is not a Democratic or Republican issue. It is an issue of responsibility and fiscal responsibility.

I am saddened that we had such a good run for 2 weeks where we were working together and we end on such a sour note. I am saddened we could not pass this good, basic bill—a bill which had bipartisan support coming out of the committee. I am saddened that the Senator from Maine was the only Republican Senator who would vote for this bill today. And I am saddened that we will end this session with an objection to the House and Senate trying to sit down together and work out their differences.

If you wonder why the approval rating of Congress is at rock bottom, I am afraid we have seen today in the proceedings of the Senate exactly why that is the case.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to discuss the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act, which is also known as Shaheen-Portman. I am very pleased to be here with my cosponsor Senator ROB PORTMAN. He has been a partner in developing this legislation. I thank him for being such a great partner and because he has to go catch a flight, I am going to defer, yield to him for his remarks, if I could. I will yield to him for a question so he can speak to this bill and get to his flight on time.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the Senator for yielding. I appreciate that and I will yield back to her in a moment.

First, I want to say that I appreciate her working with me over the last couple years on this legislation. This is the kind of legislation we ought to be doing around here because it has a lot of benefits. It reduces our trade deficit. It helps encourage job creation. It actually makes our environment cleaner. I think it can be helpful in a renaissance to our manufacturing in America. It is called the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act.

I also want to thank the ranking member and chair of the Senate Energy Committee—that is Senator WYDEN and Senator MURKOWSKI—for their consistent support of this legislation. We got it through the committee with a strong vote, and we need to get it to the floor when we come back in September with a strong vote.

I am told this is going to be the first substantive Energy bill on the floor since 2007. It is about time. I hope it will have support from both sides of

the aisle, and I know it has support on both sides of the Capitol. It is going to help job creators all over the country. It is the right thing to do.

On this side of the aisle, we focused a lot on an “all of the above” energy strategy. We believe we ought to be producing more energy, particularly domestic sources of energy in the ground in America, and I support that strongly. We also, though, talk about embracing smart, economically viable policies that let us use less energy. So it is producing more and using less. There is a lot of focus on producing more but less on this part about using less, and that is what this bill does.

It is supported by more than 250 businesses, trade associations, advocacy groups—the National Association of Manufacturers, the Sierra Club, the Alliance to Save Energy, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—so it is a group that does not normally come together to support legislation. They like this bill because, again, it has these benefits for the environment, but also benefits for the economy and for our energy policy in this country.

It passed the Energy Committee with a strong bipartisan vote of 19 to 3. Simply put, Senator SHAHEEN and I have a bill that I think makes good environmental sense. It makes good economic sense, and it makes good energy sense.

I have visited with businesses and job creators all over Ohio, and they tell me pretty much the same thing. They are competing in a global marketplace. They are competing with companies in Indiana but also in India, and their ability to compete depends on their costs. They go up against companies and countries where the cost to produce goods tends to be lower. We are never going to compete on wages in developing countries, nor should we. We are not going to be able to reduce the quality of our goods, nor should we. We want to be sure we are not cutting corners.

One thing we can do is reduce the costs to our manufacturers on energy because it is a big input, particularly with heavy manufacturing. This enables us to do that through energy efficiency technologies.

What we can do as the Federal Government—through research, through disseminating best practices, through supporting skills training—is help the private sector develop the energy efficiency techniques of the future. We can make it easier for them to use efficiency tools to reduce their costs, which enables them to put those savings toward expanding their companies and hiring more people.

The proposals contained in the bill are commonsense reforms we have needed for a long time. The bill has no mandates on anyone in the private sector. In fact, many of our proposals come as a direct result of our conversations we have had with people in the

private sector about how the Federal Government can best help them to become more energy efficient, save money, and create more jobs by reinvesting in their businesses and communities.

Here is a brief overview of what the legislation does.

First, it helps manufacturers by reforming what is called the Advanced Manufacturing Office. This is an office at the Department of Energy. We need to provide clear guidance to this office that its responsibilities ought to include and ought to be prioritized to help manufacturers develop energy-saving technology for their businesses. Frankly, they have gotten a little bit off track and have focused more on helping manufacturers of clean energy, which other Departments and agencies do, including at DOE. This office ought to be focused on energy-saving technology.

It also requires the Department of Energy to assist with on-site efficiency assessments for manufacturers. It facilitates the already existing efforts of companies around the country to implement cost-saving energy efficiency policies by streamlining the way the government agencies in this area work together.

It increases partnerships with National Labs—the National Laboratories, which are a great source of research and technology—and energy service and technology providers together to leverage private sector expertise toward energy efficiency goals.

The legislation also strengthens model building codes, so that builders in States that choose to adopt them will have the most up-to-date energy-efficient building codes that are available—again, no mandates, but best practices.

It also establishes university-based building training and assessment centers, building on existing industrial assessment centers located around the country. We have one in Dayton, OH, that does a great job. We want to make sure they can also do energy efficiency work.

These centers will help train the next generation of workers in energy-efficient commercial design and operations through this legislation. Not only will these programs save energy but they also help provide our students and unemployed workers with the skills they need to compete in what can be a growing field, which is the energy efficiency field.

Again, this bill is not about forcing companies to become more energy efficient or imposing mandates, it is about giving these companies the help they are asking for. We can do that at no additional expense to the taxpayer because the cost of this legislation under our bill is fully offset.

In fact, I believe this bill will save the American people a bunch of money.

Why? Because the legislation takes on the largest user of energy in the world. That is the U.S. Government. The Federal Government needs to practice what it preaches. By requiring it in this bill to adopt energy-saving techniques that make its operations more efficient and less wasteful, we are doing just that.

The bill directs DOE to issue recommendations that employ energy efficiency on everything from computer hardware to operation and maintenance processes, energy efficiency software, power management tools. It also takes commonsense steps toward allowing the General Services Administration to update building designs that are out. Some of them have been out there for years. They have developed these designs over time. They are going to be permitted finally to update these efficiency standards, again with the latest energy efficiency technology. The government has been looking for places to tighten its belt. This is certainly one. Energy efficiency is a darn good place to start.

All this adds up to a piece of legislation that Americans across the spectrum can support. It is fully offset, contains no mandates on the private sector, and requires the Federal Government to become more efficient.

According to a recent study of our legislation and its impact, by 2020, using the tools of Shaheen-Portman, the private sector can create 80,000 new jobs, lower CO₂ emissions by the equivalent of taking 5 million cars off the road, and save consumers \$4 billion a year in reduced energy costs. A vote on the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act is one more step toward achieving the goal of a true “all of the above” energy policy that produces more energy at home while using less. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Again, I commend my colleague from New Hampshire for working with us. I yield to her after having answered her.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I assume the question is, will this bill pass the Senate?

Mr. PORTMAN. Will this bill pass the Senate is a question that I pose to my colleague from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I would say absolutely it will pass the Senate. It will do that because it represents almost 3 years of meetings, negotiations, and broad stakeholder outreach in an effort to craft the most effective piece of legislation with the greatest chance of passing not only the Senate but the House as well so it can be signed into law.

This bill, as has been explained so well, is a bipartisan effort that is designed to boost the use of energy efficient technologies. It will help create private sector jobs. It will save businesses and consumers money. It will reduce pollution. It will make our country more energy independent.

This legislation will have a swift and measurable benefit to our economy and

our environment. As Senator PORTMAN said, a study by experts at the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy found that last year's version would have saved consumers \$4 billion. This may be a little hard to read on the chart, but you can see it reduces energy costs. In doing so, it saves consumers \$4 billion a year. It would create about 80,000 jobs, if it were passed, by 2020. It would also be the equivalent of taking 5 million cars off the road.

The United States needs a comprehensive national energy policy. We are too dependent on foreign oil. We are overly reliant on an outdated energy infrastructure. We need to utilize a wide range of energy sources, including natural gas, oil, nuclear, and renewable such as wind, biomass, and solar.

But we cannot just focus on the supply side. We also need to think about how we consume the energy once we have it. Efficiency is the cheapest, fastest way to reduce our energy use. Energy-saving techniques and technologies lower costs, they free up capital that allows businesses to expand and create jobs and allows our economy to grow. We can start by improving our efficiency now by installing ready and proven technologies, things such as modern heating and cooling systems, smart meters, computer-controlled thermostats, and lower energy lighting, to name a few.

There are substantial opportunities that exist across all sectors of our economy to conserve energy, to create good-paying private sector jobs. In fact, there are countless examples of energy efficiency success stories in the private sector that I have had the good fortune to see as I have traveled around New Hampshire.

I visited small retail businesses, manufacturing companies, ski areas, apartment complexes, and municipal buildings throughout New Hampshire. They are all using energy-efficient technologies to lower costs, to improve working conditions and, most important, to stay competitive.

Not long ago I had the opportunity to visit a company on the seacoast in New Hampshire called High Liner Foods. It is a seafood processing plant. It requires a lot of energy to operate. In fact, at one point the 180,000-square-foot facility consumed roughly 2 megawatts of power at any given time during normal operations. So next to the core costs of personnel and fish, because it is a fish processing plant, energy was their biggest expense. But by installing efficient lighting, new boilers, various demand-response techniques such as adjusting its lighting to dim when no employees are in the area, establishing HVAC setpoints, High Liner Foods is making great strides in reducing energy consumption. It has allowed them to expand their footprint in the State and to be more cost-effective in their production.

This week I had the opportunity to visit the first LEED-certified auto dealership in New Hampshire. It is the first Toyota auto dealership that is LEED certified in New England, which I know the Presiding Officer will appreciate, being from the neighboring State of Massachusetts. They have implemented a number of effective energy-efficient initiatives to cut their energy cost, including the installation of solar panels, efficient lighting, and an impressive energy dashboard to monitor energy use throughout their entire service. Their customers can come in, they can touch this interactive dashboard, they can see what is going on throughout the physical plant.

I have also visited some great New Hampshire companies that also are producing energy-efficient technology. We have a company in New Hampshire called Warner Power, which has made the first breakthrough in transformers in over 100 years. Studies show that inefficiency in transformers results in a loss of about 5 percent of all electricity generated in the United States. With the wide-scale use of Warner Power's innovation, the Hexaformer, and their control system technology, the company estimates that 1.5 percent of all transformer energy losses could be eliminated. This would save the country 60 terawatts of electricity a year. That is equal to about five times New Hampshire's entire annual electricity consumption. So energy efficiency is an excellent example of a bipartisan and affordable approach that can immediately grow our economy and improve our energy security.

In addition to being affordable, efficiency is widely supported because its benefits are not confined to a certain fuel source or a particular region of the country. It is clearly one of those areas where we can all come to some common agreement, whether we support fossil fuels or whether we support alternatives such as wind and solar. So it is no wonder, as Senator PORTMAN said, that this legislation enjoys such a broad, diverse coalition of support. It has received more than 250 endorsements from businesses, environmental groups, think tanks, and trade associations, from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers to the National Resources Defense Council and the Painters Union. These are the types of non-traditional alliances that have helped us to get this bill to the floor.

The legislation provides a roadmap to create and implement a national strategy to increase the use of energy efficiency technologies in the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors of our economy.

It provides incentives and support, not mandates, for residential and commercial buildings in order to cut energy use. This is very important because buildings consume about 40 per-

cent of all energy in the United States. The bill strengthens voluntary national model building codes—I would emphasize that these are voluntary—to make new homes and commercial buildings more energy efficient, while working with States and private industry to make the code-writing process more transparent.

It also trains the next generation of workers in energy-efficient commercial building design and operation. The legislation also assists our industrial manufacturing sector, which consumes more energy than any other sector of the U.S. economy. It directs the Department of Energy to work closely with the private sector industrial partners to encourage research, development, and commercialization of innovative energy-efficient technology and processes for industrial applications.

It helps businesses reduce energy costs and become more competitive by incentivizing the use of more energy-efficient electric motors and transformers. It establishes a voluntary program called SupplySTAR, which is modeled on the successful ENERGY STAR Program, to help make company supply chains more efficient.

Finally, the legislation requires the Federal Government, the single largest user of energy in the country, to adopt more efficient building standards and smart metering technology. It requires the Federal Government to adopt energy-saving technologies and operations for computers. It allows Federal agencies to use existing funds to update plans for new Federal buildings using the most current building efficiency standards.

The best part, as Senator PORTMAN said, is the cost of this legislation is fully offset. It reallocates funding that has not been used from existing programs.

I thank Chairman RON WYDEN and his ranking member LISA MURKOWSKI from the Energy and Natural Resources Committee for their great support in getting this bill to the floor. This is a bipartisan, affordable, and widely supported piece of legislation. Most importantly, it is an effective step in addressing our Nation's very real energy needs. I thank Senator PORTMAN, Senator WYDEN, and Senator MURKOWSKI for all of their help with this bill. I look forward to debating the bill on the floor of the Senate, to listening to amendments, and to passing this bill out to the House and finally having it signed into law. I hope my colleagues will join me in this debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

IRS INVESTIGATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to talk about the status of the ongoing Finance Committee investigation into the targeting scandal at the Internal Revenue Service.

As you can tell, my voice is a bit hoarse this afternoon. I am feeling a

little bit under the weather. With the Senate about to go into recess, I thought it was important that I say a few words about this investigation, particularly with some of the statements we have heard coming from the administration this week.

In May, when the news broke that the IRS had been targeting conservative organizations applying for tax-exempt status with additional scrutiny, President Obama promised his administration would fully cooperate with Congress in its investigations. He also stated he directed Treasury Secretary Lew to follow up on the IRS inspector general audit to get more information as to how this happened, who was responsible, to make sure the public understood all of the facts.

I was encouraged by this initial response. As you recall, I worked to clear the way for Secretary Lew's confirmation in this Senate, even though many of my colleagues had expressed legitimate concerns about his nomination. I did so, in large part, because I believed him when he promised to be fully transparent and cooperative with Congress. When the President said he had ordered the Secretary to get to the bottom of this, I expected him to live up to his promises to do so and to work with us as we tried to do the same.

Imagine my surprise then to hear both the President and Secretary Lew state over the past week, with our investigations into the IRS targeting, Congress was creating a "phony scandal."

It started with the President who said:

With this endless parade of distractions and political posturing and phony scandals, Washington is taking its eye off the ball. And I'm here to say, this needs to stop.

That is what the President said.

That was followed by Secretary Lew stating on last Sunday's shows this past weekend that "there is no evidence that this went to any political official" and that congressional investigators' efforts to find evidence is "creating the kind of sense of a phony scandal."

In essence, they are saying our efforts to look into this mess are illegitimate and that the American people should simply ignore them. That is a far cry from the position the President and his administration took when this scandal was made public. As I said at that time, they were contrite. Officials were even apologizing for what went on at the IRS.

Today, however, it is a "phony scandal." It is not worthy of the public's attention, they say. I have to wonder what they are basing their dismissal on, certainly not a thorough review of all the relevant documents, that is for sure.

In a letter to congressional leaders on June 4, Danny Werfel, the Acting IRS Commissioner, stated that the IRS

had collected some 646 gigabytes of raw, electronically stored information, which is equal to 65 million pages' worth of documents relevant to this investigation.

Let me repeat that. The man in charge, Danny Werfel, stated that the IRS had collected some 646 gigabytes of raw, electronically stored information, which is equal to 65 million pages' worth of documents relevant to this administration. However, to date, only about 21,500 pages have been given to us—21,500 pages of documents. Those are the only documents produced to the Finance Committee to fulfill our comprehensive document request from May 20 of this year. The pace at which documents have been provided to our committee has been slow and often with long delays in between document productions.

Despite their initial pledges to be cooperative and responsive, the Obama administration has been slow-walking the Senate Finance Committee. We aren't the only ones being slow-walked.

Only last week, my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, chairman DAVE CAMP and ranking member SANDER LEVIN, wrote to Danny Werfel, who is currently the principal Deputy IRS Commissioner, that at the rate the IRS is producing documents, a full and responsive production will take months. It is actually much worse than that.

Let me refer to this pie chart. Look at the documents we received from the IRS, 6,000 pages of, guess what, training materials. Come on, give me a break. There were 500 pages of Steven Miller, Douglas Shulman, and William Wilkins, and 15,000 pages of nonpriority custodians. That is what we have gotten from them since May. It is pathetic.

As that chart illustrates, given the intermittent document production and the very small number of priority documents we have received thus far, it could be 2016 before we ever would be able to draw any conclusions about what happened at the IRS. That is pathetic. I have a feeling that is exactly what this administration wants, and that is what I call slow-walking.

Since the initial report confirming the inappropriate targeting released by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, or TIGTA, on May 14, this "phony scandal" has evolved from what the IRS first claimed was a couple of rogue employees in Cincinnati to direct IRS involvement from high-level officials in Washington, DC, including, at the very least, individuals in the IRS's Office of Chief Counsel.

I should note that the IRS Chief Counsel is also an Assistant General Counsel in the Treasury Department, and he reports to the Treasury's General Counsel. Clearly, much more needs to be learned about who was involved, why decisions were made, and what motivated these decisions.

This is why the Senate Finance Committee has been conducting a thorough, balanced, and fact-based bipartisan investigation that carefully examines every aspect of this in order to get to the truth.

We are not interested—

Mr. ROBERTS. Would the distinguished ranking member yield for one quick question? I know the Senator has prepared remarks, and I know he is not feeling well, but I am stunned by this. I am a member of the committee, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS. You have been promised full cooperation by the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Werfel. I have been present when he has tried to inform the committee of full cooperation. Now we find out what full cooperation is, more especially as the President has indicated these scandals are so-called phony scandals and repeated by Mr. Lew.

The Senator stated there are 65 million pages that should be available to the committee, which is stunning—stunning—in the job we would have to do. But out of those requested, only 21,500 documents have been presented. Of the 21,500, only 15,000—well, 15,000 pages, but those are nonpriority documents.

Thereby, if you try to figure out when this would be done, it would be in 2016; is that correct?

Mr. HATCH. That is right.

Mr. ROBERTS. I am stunned by this.

Mr. HATCH. It may be beyond that. It may actually go beyond that.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would imagine, if you do the math—and if you know how much time we have to actually do this—but I am stunned. This isn't what we were promised. This wasn't the understanding of the full committee and the bipartisan effort.

I don't know what we are going to have to do. We are going to have to do some drastic action if this is any indication of what we are taking.

The Senator pointed out that we have been thorough, we have been bipartisan, and we have kept absolute integrity with this. The key word was "painstaking." If we have this information, there is a lot of pain, but there is no take.

Mr. HATCH. You got that right.

Mr. ROBERTS. I am extremely upset about it. I thank my colleague for bringing this to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague from Kansas. All I can say is: Look, we were promised full cooperation, and we are not getting it.

I don't blame Mr. Werfel for this, although he is a very close friend of Mr. Lew's. I think he has wanted to be more cooperative. When I chatted with him today again, he indicated the attorneys are going over everything. Let me just say, are we going to get the

right papers? Are we going to get the truth?

We are not interested in some perceptions of the truth based on limited documents and limited facts. We wish to know precisely what happened, and we are going to find out.

Today, in addition to the small number of documents we have been able to review, the Finance Committee investigators have interviewed 14 individuals from IRS offices in both Cincinnati and Washington, DC. So far those interviews have yielded more questions than answers. In fact, the list of additional questions keeps growing as the investigation wears on.

After more than 2 months of investigation, here are just a few of the questions I have. I will not take too much of the Senate's time tonight, but I have a lot more questions than this, and I am going to ask these in a bipartisan manner.

Why did IRS Commissioner Shulman visit the White House 157 times? That is the number we have been given. That is unheard of. It has never happened before.

I admit ObamaCare has taken some time, but you can't justify 157 times. It sounds to me as if there is something fishy going on.

Why is it that the unions get tax-exempt status under 501(c)(5)? There was a surge in the 501(c)(5) applications in recent years. Why weren't they subject to some of the scrutiny?

Did the IRS give extra scrutiny to union applications for tax-exempt status? The answer to that is, no, they didn't.

I am not suggesting they should, but they certainly shouldn't have traded preelection of so-called conservative groups the way they treated them.

Everybody knows that is a scandal. Yet they call this not a scandal?

Once Deputy Treasury Secretary Neal Wolin learned from Inspector General Russell George of the TIGTA audit regarding IRS targeting of conservative groups on June 4, 2012, did he tell anyone else at the Treasury Department or the White House about his findings, including then-Treasury Secretary Geithner? Not that I can understand, because we don't know. They are not answering these questions.

When did Assistant General Counsel for Treasury William Wilkins, who also holds the title of IRS Chief Counsel, first find out that the IRS was targeting conservative groups? When did he find that out? Why can't we get a simple answer on that?

Whom did Mr. Wilkins inform about this targeting when he found out about it? What was the extent of the Treasury Department's role regarding Lois Lerner revealing, in response to a planted question, that the IRS had targeted conservative groups applying for tax-exempt status at an American Bar Association conference? When did any

employee of the Treasury Department first have involvement regarding the IRS targeting of conservative groups' applications for tax-exempt status?

What was first date that any White House official was informed about the IRS targeting of conservative applicants for tax-exempt status?

It has been reported that ProPublica obtained private information from the IRS about conservative groups that had applied for tax-exempt status. In addition, it has been reported that the National Organization for Marriage alleges that the IRS illegally leaked information about its donors.

What action, if any, has been taken by the IRS and the Department of Justice with respect to any IRS employee who may have illegally disclosed private taxpayer information in either of these cases? These are important questions.

Are there other cases where a conservative group or its members have had their private taxpayer information unlawfully disclosed?

It has been reported that the IRS attempted to impose gift taxes on donors to the conservative group Freedom's Watch. Did the IRS attempt to impose gift taxes on the donors of other tax-exempt groups? Has the IRS targeted individuals for an audit of their personal tax returns based on their membership in or donations to a conservative tax-exempt group?

It has been reported that Lois Lerner communicated with an attorney at the Federal Election Commission regarding a case before the FEC.

Did Lois Lerner violate section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with the protection of taxpayer privacy in her communications with the Federal Election Commission? She had a right to take the Fifth Amendment, but was that why she took it if she violated section 6103?

These are questions that have to be answered. Why did Sarah Hall-Ingram, who was in charge of the IRS's efforts in implementing ObamaCare, attend a meeting with then-IRS Commissioner Steve Miller in May 2012 regarding the IRS's targeting of conservative groups' applications for tax-exempt status?

It has been reported in the media that Christine O'Donnell had a tax lien put on her property the day she declared her candidacy for the Senate.

There is something wrong here. Anybody who is fair ought to be concerned about what is wrong here—not just this but in all these questions.

As part of the IRS internal investigation the President charged Secretary Lew with conducting, has the IRS examined whether any political candidates were inappropriately targeted?

Much has been made of the employees who have been "relieved of duty" and had "administrative actions" taken against them, allegedly in direct response to the inappropriate tar-

geting. Once again, the facts do not add up, as the administrative actions discovered thus far were against low-level employees for actions that were not directly tied to the allegations of inappropriate targeting.

So my question is, Who was relieved of duty? Lois Lerner supposedly was after she took the Fifth Amendment and refused to testify. But even she was able to log in to her computer after being allegedly relieved, and she is still being paid her full salary.

Who else has been relieved of duty? What does Lois Lerner know that prompted her to invoke her Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination?

Former IRS Commissioner Steve Miller and Doug Shulman were both aware of the targeting of conservative groups seeking tax-exempt status and the systematic practice of subjecting those conservative groups to intrusive and unwarranted scrutiny about their activities. Why did they both deceive the Senate by failing to inform us that these practices were going on? Why? I was disappointed in Commissioner Shulman because he came to my office long before this all came up and I was quite impressed. But I think he had an obligation to come clean.

Why did the tea party cases sit for months at the IRS, through the 2010 election cycle without activity? Why? Why did Lois Lerner direct the IRS Chief Counsel's Office—an office that was purportedly slow in its response to requests for assistance from other IRS components—to get involved in reviewing tea party cases? Why did the IRS demand that tea party organizations seeking tax-exempt status provide a list of their donors to the IRS when that was not required? Why?

These types of inappropriate actions, as I said, are just some of the many questions we have about the IRS targeting scam. These questions will simply not go away, and our investigation will not stop until all of them are answered. And we are doing this in a bipartisan way.

Just today we learned President Obama has selected a new nominee to serve as the next Commissioner of the IRS. I have to say I was a bit surprised, although perhaps I really shouldn't be. Given the dark cloud that currently hangs over the IRS, I would have thought the President would have taken the time to consult Congress before choosing the agency's next leader. Yet I am the ranking member of the appropriate committee with sole jurisdiction over the IRS, and today's announcement is the first I have heard of this decision, and it was only after the decision was made. I like the President. I think we are friends. But that was improper, and it was a slight that should not have happened.

I asked Senator BAUCUS if he was informed by the President, and he said:

About 3 hours ago. And he sounded a little disgusted himself.

I won't go into the merits of John Koskinen's nomination today. I have no intention of prejudging him. He will be fairly considered by the Finance Committee, and I have the reputation that he will be fairly considered. His record and qualifications will be thoroughly examined. But I want to assure my colleagues that I will demand significant answers from Mr. Koskinen when he comes before the committee, and I think other Republicans will as well.

My purpose will be twofold. First, we need to get to the truth about what happened at the IRS and, perhaps just as important, we need to make sure the Obama administration is fully cooperating with our efforts rather than using phony statements about phony scandals.

So today I want to call on President Obama and Secretary Lew to stop closing the door on this investigation that has just started and hasn't even been given a chance. If this is indeed a phony scandal, the burden is on them to prove it is. And just saying that it is isn't good enough. They should have the IRS produce all the requested documents and let the documents speak for themselves. There is no reason to hide these things, nor is there a reason to have a whole bunch of attorneys determining what can be released and what can't be released. Let them show how their partisan targeting began and why it continued for years. Let them show who was or was not involved and to what level within the IRS or elsewhere in government these activities were discussed and directed. Until then, this is certainly not a phony scandal. It is a legitimate bipartisan investigation being conducted in a fair and balanced way that seeks to let the facts dictate the outcome.

I have a reputation around here for being fair and honest, and I resent the way the Finance Committee is being treated. I can't speak for the chairman, but I believe he feels pretty much the same way because we are being mistreated with regard to our requests for information. This isn't some itty-bitty phony scandal. This is big-time stuff that should get into why the IRS was doing this to begin with.

People in this country are scared to death of the IRS, and with good reason. If they can do this to you, can you imagine what else they can do? And I have listed just a few things here today. I have a lot more I could say. This is an important investigation, and Senator BAUCUS and I intend to do it in a bipartisan way. But when we ask for documents, we want documents, and we don't want some bunch of partisan lawyers in the department stopping us from getting the documents they must provide. It sure looks as though they are deliberately trying to delay this as

long as they can so they can say: Well, nobody cares about it. Well, I have to tell you, everybody in this country must care about it. If they can do this to these small, conservative tax-exempt organizations, then they can do it to every other organization when the time comes.

This is an important investigation, and this administration ought to be at the forefront of trying to get to the bottom of it instead of pulling from behind, saying there is nothing here when they know there is a lot here. I would like these questions answered. They are important questions. This is an important investigation. We should not allow the IRS to run rampant like this. That is the beginning of tyranny—except it began before 2010—and we should get to the bottom of it so it never, ever happens again.

I think there are a lot of people at the IRS who would like to see us get to the bottom of it because they are being besmirched by the bad things that have happened. There are a lot of decent, honorable people working at the IRS, and they have to be as concerned as I am about the mistreatment that occurred prior to the last election and after.

Is it going to happen again? Are these agencies of government going to be used by partisan people in the way they have been used up until now? It is enough to scare the daylights out of anybody, and it is enough to think, are we moving toward a totalitarian system where the people in government can get away with anything they want to and especially an agency as powerful and scary as the IRS? I hope we can get the answers to these questions. If we can't, this isn't going to stop until we do. And these are just preliminary questions; I will come back with some more in the coming weeks.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). The Senator from Kansas.

MR. ROBERTS. Madam President, I would like to again thank the distinguished ranking member of the Finance Committee for his presentation and asking very pertinent questions with what I thought was going to be not an easy task but at least a task where we would receive cooperation from the IRS and, for that matter, the administration.

Nobody likes to be audited, and surely nobody likes to say they have been audited, as the distinguished ranking member pointed out about all the conservative groups. But let me point out that this has gone on not only with regard to them but to individuals as well. We are getting reports from the senatorial campaign committee indicating that people are hesitant to give, that people who have given in the past significantly to the Republican cause have been audited, and audited for the first time in their lives, to pro-Israel

groups—and I can go on and on with a list of the organizations.

This is a very serious situation. This really surprises me, that having said we were going to do this in a painstaking, bipartisan way, that this is simply not the case.

I am going to be joining the distinguished ranking member. I am very interested in the further questions we feel we can boil down that simply have to be answered first, and then obviously there are many more.

AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE ACT

This really goes to the subject I want to talk about. The American people now, as a result of this, do not trust the IRS, and they sure as heck do not trust the IRS to be in charge of their health care. That is the subject I want to touch on, and I will try to make it very brief.

It has been more than 3 years since the Affordable Care Act—referred to by some or most in the press as "ObamaCare"—was signed into law. At the time, I can recall, after months of markup in both the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions and Finance Committees, I had many concerns. I remember I was very frustrated with my amendments being defeated on partisan votes, most of them having dealt with rationing. I remember distinctly comparing this rush to government health care to a western or Kansas analogy of riding hell for leather into a box canyon to eventually finding the only alternative would be to turn around and ride back out to a more realistic market-oriented health care reform trade.

As it turned out, we never even saw the bill before we voted on it. I voted no, and so did every other Republican Senator and Member of Congress. And I regret to say to my colleagues that I told you so. Premiums are going up. Taxes are going up. Overall health care costs continue to rise. Burdensome, costly, and, I might add, difficult-to-understand regulations are confusing and confounding health care providers. Many of these folks will not even know about a particular regulation until they are fined by outside contractors. The results have been terribly counterproductive to any economic recovery. Regulations such as these have a way of dampening anything we are trying to do.

The current and growing problems are so large and complicated with this government takeover of health care that it has been difficult, if not impossible, for the administration to get ObamaCare off the ground. I mentioned what happened 3 years ago at the beginning of my remarks. Let's now talk about what is coming down the pike in just a matter of weeks.

October 1 is the deadline when, according to the Affordable Care Act, according to the law, according to promise, millions of Americans who do not

receive insurance through an employer will be forced to purchase health insurance in an exchange overseen by the States and the Federal Government—except for Georgia. Yesterday, Georgia was the first to announce that they will not be ready by the October 1 deadline and have asked for a delay.

I am going to make a prediction that what Georgia did, others will do, including the Federal Government. In fact, as we all know, the administration—in a weekend blog, no less—announced they would delay the employer mandate due to take place January 1, 2014, by a year, to January of 2015. I might add, that just happens to be after the midterm elections. This just means another delay for businesses that complained about the red-tape and costly burdens the mandate placed on their operations. Many are already laying off employees or moving them to part-time status to avoid the costly mandate. And all of this follows the thousands of waivers granted to corporations, unions, and other groups.

Again, my question is, Where is the waiver for the average family in Kansas and around the Nation? Where is the permanent delay for the taxes that will affect individuals?

As we warned, things are starting to crumble and get worse, which is why we need to sunset the exchanges and the individual mandate—literally, a tax on families.

This evening or tomorrow those of us privileged to serve in the Senate will leave Washington for the month of August, and we are going to get an earful regarding all of the problems associated with ObamaCare and the impending deadline. Will exchanges be ready? If they say they are ready, will they really be ready? Many Kansans who will be forced into a Federal exchange or see another last-minute delay—a Federal exchange, by the way, that doesn't exist as of my remarks—will ask how much the new plan will cost. They will say: What will it cover? Will they be able to see their family doctor? Will their personal health information remain private and safe or end up in a six-agency database? Some people call it seven agencies. Will they be losing the health insurance they like? Will the high costs force their employer to make them a part-time employee, change their plan, or just drop their coverage altogether?

Right now Kansans and everyone else in the country cannot answer these questions—and neither can the administration. And when we get back, we will have only 4 weeks until the October 1 deadline. That means, really, if we are going to do something about this, we are only going to have 3 weeks in which something can be done to sunset, delay, defund, or repeal the law and replace it with real health care reform that works and to restore the all-important relationship between patients and doctors.

Well, I do have an answer. Some time ago, when the ObamaCare storm clouds were first forming, I introduced legislation to sunset the exchanges and the individual mandate if they are not, as promised, up and running and ready to enroll by October 1 so that the exchanges can meet the requirements prescribed by law. Simply named the “Exchange Sunset Act of 2013,” S. 1272, my bill aims to make sure that if the exchanges are not ready, they go away and so does the mandate.

I realize, as we travel down this road to the October 1 deadline at ever-increasing speed, there will be those who support continued advertising and encouraging thousands to sign up in the exchanges. The question is, Sign up for what? The chances of the exchanges, State and Federal, being ready—and I mean ready and accessible to all that the advertising is trying to bring in—are remote at best. Obviously, there will be some kind of a delay, and once again we will have the administration rewriting laws which they had a direct hand in writing and which were passed exclusively by the Democratic majority. I submit, changing the law by the Executive—the Office of the President—without approval by the Congress is unconstitutional.

Three weeks, three weeks before the ObamaCare train wreck. When this body comes back, let's talk about it, and I urge immediate consideration and hopefully passage of S. 1272, the Exchange Sunset Act of 2013. It is a train wreck, folks, and we have to get America off the track.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

MANIPULATING TAX REFORM

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the so-called grand bargain referenced yesterday by the President.

On Tuesday, President Obama recycled a number of policy ideas that have lingered for months, if not years, and repackaged them as what he called “a grand bargain.” This proposal seems to be an attempt by the President to extend an olive branch to the Republican side of the aisle by offering corporate tax reform. In exchange, he is asking for additional stimulus spending.

I am in favor of a grand bargain, but this is not even close to a grand bargain. It is not even a bargain. A grand bargain would involve reform to entitlement programs to make them sustainable over time. A grand bargain would involve a farsighted look at the outyears, not just a shortsighted attempt to score political points for the next election cycle.

The administration has taken the taxpayer down the road of stimulus spending before, with the idea that we can stimulate job growth with so-called shovel-ready projects. Sadly, we have all seen what throwing taxpayer

money at supposed shovel-readiness gets you and just how lackluster this economic recovery has been. Wasting hard-earned dollars on so-called investments doesn't create jobs. Businesses and the people who build them is what creates jobs.

I think both sides of the aisle agree that our Tax Code is already far too complicated. In fact, a recent bipartisan letter from the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Finance Committee discussed the complexity, inefficiency, and unfairness of our Tax Code, which acts as a brake on our economy. But if we can't bring ourselves to do entitlement reform—or the so-called grand bargain—at least at this stage what we can do is perhaps a small bargain for businesses and the taxpayers just by simplifying both the individual and corporate codes to foster an environment that is hospitable to business expansion, to hiring, and to international competitiveness.

Last week I shared publicly with the leadership of our tax-writing committee my goals and principles for tax reform. Chief among them is lowering the business income taxation for corporations and those businesses that file as individuals.

With 95 percent of U.S. businesses structured as subchapter S corporations, limited partnerships, limited liability corporations, and other pass-through businesses, we can't ignore the fact that many of them pay a top rate of 39.6 percent in addition to several other layers of taxation. In my view, any substantive tax reform should include a reformed tax system that allows all U.S. businesses, including passthrough businesses, to thrive. Unfortunately, the proposed corporate taxation reforms the President included in his recent announcement will once again have the government picking winners and losers in the Tax Code.

Here in the Senate, there are efforts to work in a bipartisan fashion to reform the Tax Code. This is a good-faith effort that should be encouraged. As I mentioned, it would be a bargain for taxpayers and businesses alike.

If we can make progress on the small bargain, then perhaps some day we can return our attention to the grand bargain—a bargain that would include and involve entitlement reform and substantive tax reform in the same package.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2668

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 145, H.R. 2668. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, without intervening action or debate, and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Madam President, very briefly, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. It comes as no surprise that the Republicans are once again trying to repeal the health care act. By one count, the House and Senate Republicans have tried to fight the same fight more than 70 times.

Albert Einstein was not insane. He was very smart. But he described insanity pretty clearly as doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results. That is where we are here. This is insane. It is clear Republicans liked it better when insurance companies could deny coverage when you had a preexisting condition; when insurance companies could cut off your health insurance when you got sick; when insurance companies could raise insurance rates without any review. They would say—I guess when they say what they are saying now, that they want to prevent enforcement of the health care reform, what they are really saying is they want to repeal free mammograms and preventive care, repeal the law that lets kids stay on their parents' health care until they are 26.

Let's not fight the same fight over and over. It is time to stop fighting. It is time to work together.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2009

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives from the House H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, the Senate proceed to its consideration; that the bill be read a third time and passed, without intervening action or debate, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Republican leader.

DELAY THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, let me address the first consent I offered, which was objected to. Last month the administration announced it would delay ObamaCare's employer mandate on business. It is not hard to see why they wanted to do that. We keep reading about why businesses large and small will have little option but to cut employee hours and paychecks as ObamaCare comes on line, about how restaurants such as White Castle, for example, are considering hiring only part-time workers moving forward, about how small businesses are citing ObamaCare as a top worry.

I think there are a lot of Members on this side who would question the legality of what the President did. But with midterm elections on the horizon, it is no mystery why the administration would want to delay the law for businesses, considering how many jobs it is likely to kill, how many paychecks it is likely to slash. Here is the thing, though: Don't families and individuals deserve the same kind of relief? I believe they do. I do not believe it is fair to give a break to business and leave Americans out in the cold.

Recently we learned that Ohioans buying health insurance next year can expect about a 40-percent premium increase. Next door, in Indiana, costs could rise by more than 70 percent. Some Georgians could face a nearly 200-percent premium spike. In my home State of Kentucky, actuaries are predicting cost increases that could exceed 30 percent. Remember, the President said costs would go down, that ObamaCare was the Affordable Care Act.

Millions face the prospect of losing the insurance they like and want to keep, which again is not what the President promised. That is why I have asked the Senate to pass H.R. 2668. This legislation passed the House on a strong bipartisan vote with nearly 2 dozen Democrats supporting it and it would delay some of ObamaCare's most burdensome mandates for everyone.

Shortly after its passage in the House my colleagues and I called on the majority leader to bring it to the floor for a vote. Those calls were unheeded. So I am disappointed to hear that some of our friends on the other side have objected to this vote as well. I do not understand, frankly, why they would want to leave Americans out in the cold. I note that Members on this side are united in our belief that at the very least Americans deserve the same relief as businesses do. So we will all be supporting this commonsense bipartisan bill if we have a chance to vote on it.

You would think this is a principle Members of the body would support unanimously. If it is OK for businesses, why not for individuals? Unfortunately, objection has been heard and we will not get an opportunity to have the same break for the average American citizen as the administration is giving through executive action to businesses. It is a shame, but that is where we are going into the August recess.

I yield the floor.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES PRIVATE FIRST CLASS DUSTIN P. NAPIER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, it is with sorrow that I rise to pay tribute to a young man from Kentucky who gave his life in service to our country. PFC Dustin P. Napier of London, KY, died on January 8, 2012, in Zabul Province, Afghanistan while in

support of Operation Enduring Freedom. The cause of death was injuries sustained from small-arms fire. PFC Napier was 20 years old.

For his service in uniform, PFC Napier received several awards, medals, and decorations, including the Bronze Star Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon, the NATO Medal, the Combat Infantryman Badge, and the Overseas Service Bar.

Dustin's father Darrell Napier says of his son, "He was born in an Army hospital, and I'm sure he ended up dying in an Army hospital. He was my hero. Please pray for us."

Dustin was born in an Army hospital because he followed his father's example of military service. Darrell Napier served in the U.S. Army from 1989 to 1994, and was stationed in Germany and Fort Polk, LA. Dustin, the youngest of Darrell's three sons, knew from an early age he wanted a military career.

"He'd been wanting to do that since he was a little boy, about when he was six years old," Darrell recalls. "I encouraged him to do so. And he was a leader. He'd take the initiative to get things done. I've always raised my boys to do the right thing, no matter if the cause was popular or unpopular."

By the time he reached high school, Dustin was a top cadet in his Junior ROTC program. "I remember him as a model student, very quiet and serious. You always knew where he stood," says Colonel Mark Jones of the Air Force Junior ROTC program at South Laurel High School, Dustin's alma mater.

Dustin rose to be his Junior ROTC unit's corps commander and the most decorated cadet.

News of PFC Napier's loss shook many who remembered him at South Laurel High, where Dustin graduated in 2010 and had many friends. "When I . . . heard he died, my legs almost collapsed. It was unbelievable. He was a good friend, a good mentor, and truly a good person," says Devan Burkhart, a South Laurel student.

"I learned from him. He was the one who would tell me, 'Stick with it,' when I got frustrated with the program, and I did stick with it."

Steven Cheek, one of Dustin's best friends and a high-school classmate, recalls the fun he and Dustin had shooting rifles, going to ball games, watching movies, and listening to music. Dustin's favorite group was the Doors. Other friends remember Dustin loved to play the air guitar.

After graduating from South Laurel High in May 2010, Dustin joined the U.S. Army in July and completed basic training at Fort Benning, GA. In April 2011, he was deployed to Afghanistan

with C Company, 1st Battalion, 24th Infantry Regiment, 25th Infantry Division, based out of Fort Wainwright, AK.

Darrell Napier recalls that Dustin would call home from Afghanistan every now and then. "He did miss home a lot," Darrell says. "He loved to hang out with his friends very much. He missed his friends at Save-A-Lot, where he worked for almost four years. And if there was one meal Dustin really loved from his mother, it was her chicken and dumplings."

Dustin also found happiness thousands of feet in the air, while on R&R. It was in an airplane that he met Tabitha Sturgill Napier, who he married in October 2011.

Remembering her husband, Tabitha says, "You are my very best friend and I love you very, very, very much. You are an amazing husband."

A few days after his death, friends and classmates held a memorial service for Dustin at South Laurel High School. His friends from his old Junior ROTC unit thought it only fitting to hold the service where Dustin had served as such a fine example to past, present, and future cadets. Outside the school, the American flag stood at half-mast.

"Cadet Napier came here with a purpose from start to finish, from the first fall-in to the last fall-out," says CMSgt Randy Creech of Junior ROTC.

We are thinking of PFC Napier's loved ones today, including his wife, Tabitha Sturgill Napier; his parents, Darrell and Marianne Napier; his brother, Darrell Dean Napier; his stepbrother, Christopher Bittner; his stepson, Lane Robison; his grandmother, Monika Paul; his grandfather, James Napier; and many other beloved friends and family members.

I know that no words spoken in this chamber can take away the sadness and loss that Dustin's family must feel. But I do want them to know that this Nation, and this United States Senate, are deeply grateful for Private First Class Dustin P. Napier's service and sacrifice. And we are humbled to pay tribute to his life and legacy.

BURMA

Madam President, today I rise to discuss U.S. policy toward the Southeast Asian nation of Burma.

In a little over 2½ years, the world has witnessed dramatic change in Burma; change that would have been thought unimaginable not long ago. Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Daw Aung San Suu Kyi has been released from house arrest and now sits in parliament. Hundreds of political prisoners have been released from prison. A largely free and fair by-election was held in April 2012. Ceasefires have been signed between the central government and several ethnic minority groups.

Yet, despite these welcome reforms, much work remains to be done. At the

heart of Burma's existing problems is the need for constitutional reform. The current flawed constitution is not up to the task of supporting the country's democratic ambitions. Simply put, if Burma is to take the next big step toward economic and political reform and toward fully normalizing its relations with the United States, it needs to revise its constitution.

And there has been some encouraging news on that front. Just last week the Burmese parliament announced it would establish a committee to examine amending the constitution. This provides a great opportunity for the Burmese leadership to follow through on its commitment to full democratization.

As this parliamentary panel begins its efforts, I would highlight four areas of the constitution that are, in my view, in particular need of reform.

The first area of reform is the need to bring the Burmese military, called the Tatmadaw, under civilian control. Civilian control of the military is a fundamental condition of a stable, modern democratic country. Many of the stubborn problems Burma still needs to address stem from the continued outsized role of the military in Burmese political life. For example, Burma continues to maintain military ties with North Korea. Indications are that elements within the Burmese military want to continue enjoying the financial benefits of continued relations with North Korea.

The unfortunate result is that Burma's pro-reform president Thein Sein cannot formally rein in the Tatmadaw since, under the Constitution, the president is not head of the armed forces. A separate military Commander in Chief leads the armed forces and he is independent of the president.

Another example of the problems stemming from the lack of civilian control of the military is the tense state of relations between the armed forces and the Kachin ethnic group. The Kachin in northern Burma share a proud history with the United States stemming from our close cooperation during World War II. Ending the conflict in Kachin state—and all other ethnic conflicts for that matter—is essential to achieving lasting peace, reconciliation and security in Burma after 60 years of civil war.

In Europe recently, President Thein Sein predicted that a national ceasefire was right around the corner. And a peace process led by one of his close ministers has been ongoing. However, military clashes continue in northern Shan state as well as in Kachin state. The Tatmadaw has every right to protect itself, but, without transparency and civilian oversight, questions remain about the extent to which military operations have conformed with the President's guidance and intentions.

Without ending its relationship with Pyongyang and without building peace with the Kachin and other ethnic nationalities, U.S.-Burmese relations will not become fully normalized. Without the military accepting civilian oversight and demonstrating a commitment to peace, our military relationship will likewise be limited. Such a result would be to the detriment of both countries.

Having U.S. diplomats continue to urge Burma to amend its Constitution to bring the military under civilian control is important. But there are other policy tools that I believe can help reform the Tatmadaw. I believe that beginning a modest military-to-military relationship would serve this purpose. Just to be clear, I am not advocating rushing into lethal training of the Burmese military or arms sales. What I am talking about is the U.S. armed forces engaging with the Tatmadaw on compliance with the law of armed conflict, and other issues related to international standards of military professionalism.

What better way is there to show the virtues of civilian control of the military than to have the most highly regarded armed forces in the world—the U.S. military—engaged with the Tatmadaw about respect for human rights, accountability and rule of law? I believe that a modest, targeted military-to-military relationship would work hand in glove with diplomatic efforts to convince the Burmese military that placing themselves under civilian control is good for the nation.

Beginning a military-to-military relationship is common sense. Since before independence, the Burmese military has been a significant political institution in the country. And no lasting reform in Burma can take place without convincing the Tatmadaw that such a step is a positive development for the country.

A second area of needed constitutional reform involves amending the constitution to permit the Burmese people to choose freely whom they want to serve as their leader. This is a fundamental democratic principle. Current restrictions include a requirement that no one in the President's immediate family can be a citizen born to parents who were not born in Burma. Just think about that. That's a remarkably narrow requirement. Why does the Burmese government have so little faith in the ability of its citizens to freely and responsibly choose their own leaders?

These provisions, if left unamended, would cast a pall over the upcoming 2015 elections. And, those elections are viewed by many observers as the next high-profile step in Burma's reform efforts. If the 2015 elections are viewed as illegitimate, it will lead many to conclude that reform efforts have stalled in Burma and the country's stated commitment to democracy is hollow.

I think having the 2015 elections turn out to be flawed would cloud the reformist legacy of the current national leadership.

A third area of needed reform in this regard is judicial independence. Currently, the Burmese judiciary is not independent of the executive. As we ourselves have learned from experience in America, having judges who are not under the thumb of the other branches is not only a vital check on the other organs of government, but also a bulwark against violations of individual rights.

Finally, there need to be constitutional assurances for ethnic minorities. Burma faces no greater challenge than peacefully integrating its various ethnic groups. These groups have long harbored mistrust of the central government and the Tatmadaw. Building protections for ethnic minorities into the Constitution would, I suspect, go a long way toward making the ethnic groups more receptive to the new government. Such provisions would also be underscored by an independent judiciary to help enforce these protections.

As we know as Americans, amending a Constitution is not easy, nor should it be. But over the years, we in this country have amended our Constitution to make it more democratic and to provide greater protection of individual liberties.

Reforming the Burmese Constitution in areas such as the four I just raised is a necessary next step in Burma's own journey toward democracy and peaceful, national reconciliation.

There is still time for Burma to act ahead of the 2015 election and correct these problems. I urge the country's leadership to seize the moment, to take this vital step and to cement its reformist legacy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, turning to the matter upon which I asked unanimous consent and to which the majority leader objected, and that is to take up legislation that I have sponsored here in the Senate, which has been passed in the House, which is the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, with each passing day it seems as though more and more supporters of ObamaCare are having second thoughts. As I mentioned last week, three of America's most powerful labor leaders have declared the President's health care law is "creating nightmare scenarios" and threatening to "hurt millions of Americans." Those are some pretty remarkable words from people who were some of the foremost advocates for the Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare.

Meanwhile, the union that represents IRS employees has announced it does not want its members to receive health insurance through ObamaCare ex-

changes. In fact, earlier today the IRS Commissioner himself said he wants to keep his current health care policy and does not want to sign up for ObamaCare, as millions of other Americans will be required to do.

Speaking of the Internal Revenue Service, the agency's political targeting scandal continues to grow. I listened in my office to Senator HATCH, the ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee, the one primarily responsible for Internal Revenue oversight in the Senate, and I hope the questions he posed will be answered by the bipartisan investigation we are conducting. We recently learned the Internal Revenue Service's Chief Counsel's Office, headed by an Obama administration appointee, was aware of the abuses. So much for a couple of rogue agents in Cincinnati, as was originally reported. We have also learned that IRS officials have been improperly targeted, not only conservative organizations but political candidates and donors as well.

To make things worse, the same person who ran the IRS division that targeted conservative groups is now running the agency's ObamaCare office. I can't make this stuff up. Truth is stranger than fiction. Americans might be asking: What does the IRS have to do with ObamaCare?

America's tax collection agency will be responsible for administering several of the law's most important provisions, including the individual and employer mandates, which we have heard so much about, and all of the subsidies. In other words, all of the tax dollars will go to fund the exchanges under ObamaCare. Those will be administered by the Internal Revenue Service under the current law.

It is remarkable that at a time when public trust and the Internal Revenue Service has plummeted and IRS officials are complaining their staffers are overworked and overburdened, the Obama administration wants to use this tax agency to administer a massive new entitlement program affecting one-sixth of our national economy. To me, that sounds like another recipe for disaster.

Back in May I sponsored legislation that would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from a role in implementing ObamaCare. Last week, I introduced it as an amendment to the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill that was pending before this Chamber.

Congressman TOM PRICE of Georgia has introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives. Unfortunately—and this is pretty amazing—even before the House passed the House bill and before the Senate had a chance to take up the Senate bill, President Obama has already issued a veto threat were we to pass it. It sounds a little defensive to me. I understand ObamaCare

is a deeply decisive issue in Washington, and I understand that while many have been compelled to defend the law previously, they are now feeling a little skittish about it 3 years later.

I ask my colleagues: Given all we have learned about corruption and institutional abuse at the Internal Revenue Service, does anyone truly believe we should dramatically expand the agency's power to implement ObamaCare? Does anyone truly believe IRS agents should have access to even more personal financial information—not to mention medical information—about American citizens? If IRS officials conducted a systematic campaign of political targeting against conservative organizations, why should we have any more confidence that the agency will fairly and objectively implement the President's health care law?

Remember, the IRS has already announced it will violate the text of the law and issue health care subsidies through Federal exchanges. Let's recall what happened. Many States said: We will pass on State-based insurance exchanges upon which ObamaCare depends to be implemented in the States. So what the IRS has said is: We are going to paper over the fact that Congress never explicitly authorized tax dollars to subsidize the Federal exchanges, even though the law clearly states that those subsidies can be issued only through State exchanges. That is another example of lawlessness when it comes to ObamaCare.

In other words, the agency has already shown utter contempt for the rule of law when it comes to implementing the President's most cherished legislative accomplishment. They have already shown that contempt, and they don't deserve, nor have they shown themselves worthy of, our confidence when it comes to implementing this health care law.

In my view, the IRS has absolutely no business playing such a huge role in the American health care system. For that matter, I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle one final question: Do you still believe ObamaCare will reduce health care costs? After all, it is estimated that the law will cause a dramatic spike in individual insurance premiums across the country—from Maryland to Florida, to Indiana and Ohio, to Kentucky and Missouri, to Idaho and California.

Earlier this week, for example, the Florida insurance commissioner predicted that because of ObamaCare, the cost of health insurance in the individual market and Florida will increase by 30 to 40 percent. The reason for that is because the provisions in ObamaCare mandate the guaranteed issuance of health insurance even after a person is sick. Someone compared it to waiting until your house is on fire

to buy insurance. It is not insurance anymore, and it drives up the cost, not to mention the fact that young people—such as those sitting in front of me—are going to have to pay the price of subsidizing health care for older Americans. The so-called age-banding requirements don't allow older citizens to pay any more than three times what young people pay for health insurance, even though the cost of their health care, given their age, will be higher.

So this is what distorts the insurance markets, which is causing health insurance premiums to skyrocket across the States because of ObamaCare.

Rather than make our individual health insurance markets even more distorted and more dysfunctional than they are today, we should dismantle ObamaCare and replace it with patient-centered reforms that create a genuine national marketplace for health insurance.

I was just reading a story about an Oklahoma surgical center which publishes the price of common procedures for the public to read and which now has created—what markets always do—greater consumer awareness of what exactly these procedures cost. As we have seen in Medicare Part D, the prescription drug plan Congress passed a few years ago, when a market is created and vendors compete for consumers' business, prices go down and the quality of service goes up. That is what markets do. Ultimately, it benefits the consumer, and it would benefit taxpayers and patients as well.

What do I mean by patient-centered reforms? I am talking about reforms that empower individual Americans by giving them more choices and flexibility in the health care markets—such as the example of the Oklahoma surgical care center—by giving people more transparent information about pricing and quality and by directly assisting people with preexisting conditions.

I heard the majority leader earlier when Senator McCONNELL offered a unanimous consent to extend the moratorium on the individual mandate just as the President has unilaterally on the employer mandate. He said something to the effect of: Republicans want people to be subjected to preexisting condition exclusions that are not covered. That is simply false. We don't have to embrace 2,700 pages of ObamaCare just to take care of that problem or other problems we have agreement on. We should also work to protect the doctor-patient relationship.

The last thing we ought to do on my list of things to do to reform the health care system is to save Medicare from bankruptcy. It is on an unsustainable path. Yet any time we try to suggest reforms that will strengthen and stabilize Medicare and make sure it is there for future generations, they are met with a "stiff-arm."

If we want to reduce health care costs, if we want to expand quality insurance coverage and give Americans more choices and options, we should equalize the tax treatment for health insurance so it is treated the same whether it is provided by your employer or whether an individual buys it. We should let individuals and businesses form risk pools in the individual market, and we should let folks buy health insurance across State lines.

Why shouldn't I be able to buy health insurance in New Hampshire or Alabama or somewhere else if it fits my needs? Right now that is not possible. It would create a market which would create competition, bring down costs, and make it more affordable. We should expand tax-free health savings accounts so people can save their own money and spend it as they see fit on their health care. If they don't spend it there, it is available for their retirement, much like any other individual retirement account.

We should curb frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits. According to one study, the annual cost of defensive medicine is a staggering \$210 billion. In my State, we have had a lot of success with medical malpractice reform. It stabilized the cost of medical malpractice insurance that physicians have to buy, and it created a huge surplus of physicians who want to move to Texas and practice their profession. They realize they will not lose everything they have in the litigation lottery. They can buy affordable coverage that will protect their family and their patients should they make mistakes.

We should give each State much more flexibility to design a Medicaid Program that works best for their neediest residents. Medicaid is a wonderful program, but it is broken. This is designed to protect the most vulnerable people in our society and provide for their health care needs. But because of the broken Medicaid Program, only one out of every three doctors in my State will actually see a new Medicaid patient. Medicaid reimburses at about half of what private insurance reimburses, and as a result many doctors can't afford to see a new Medicaid patient. What we have is the appearance of coverage, but there is no real access to the doctor of their choice. So we need to fix Medicaid.

Finally, we should establish greater provider competition in Medicare so the competition I mentioned a moment ago in the Medicare prescription drug program could also apply in other aspects of Medicare and help make it more affordable, shore it up, and guarantee its availability to generations yet to come.

There is no reason why Americans have to accept an unworkable health care law administered by an agency such as the Internal Revenue Service that has grossly abused its power and

demonstrated that its current job is way beyond its capacity to perform.

I realize we will not be able to dismantle ObamaCare overnight—not with President Obama still in the White House and with a Democratic majority in the Senate. I realize many of these issues need to be debated further, but I hope we can all agree that the Internal Revenue Service, the IRS, should not be administering a law that affects one-sixth of our national economy and which so dramatically affects the quality of life for 320 million Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, last week in Illinois President Obama attempted to blame opponents of the ObamaCare for the law's broken promises. He lashed out at what he called "folks out there who are actively working to make this law fail." Those were his words. He further said: "[A] politically motivated misinformation campaign" is afoot. He strongly implied that fault rests not with those who conceived the law but those who have not, in his estimation, "committed themselves to making [it] work."

Think about it a minute. This flailing, of course, was nothing more than an effort by President Obama to dodge and deflect accountability for the law that bears his name. Let's be real. ObamaCare is not a failure because so many Americans reject it, rather so many Americans reject ObamaCare because it is a failure. I believe we should focus on what truly matters.

Americans are growing increasingly anxious about how the law will affect them and their families. They wonder what it will mean for health insurance and tax bills. They wonder whether they will be able to get the care they need when they need it. They wonder whether the quality of American health care will remain the best in the world and, yes, they wonder how a government reorganization of one-sixth of the economy will impact a weak jobs market. Unfortunately, neither the outset nor the outlook provides consolation.

President Obama has frequently sought to downplay the debacle surrounding the rollout of his health care law. He says "that glitches and bumps" are to be expected. But as the Wall Street Journal columnist Kimberly Strassel notes, the Democrats didn't "count on the hiccups turning into cardiac arrest," and that is what happened.

Since the enactment of ObamaCare, a laundry list of unworkable provisions has been repealed or delayed. But recently the administration announced two particularly notable delays.

First, the administration will delay implementation of the law's employer

mandate until 2015 because workable reporting requirements are not yet in place. This provision requires all employers in this country with more than 50 employees to provide adequate health care coverage for full-time employees, defined as those employed at least 30 hours per week or pay a penalty. In anticipation of this mandate many employers are cutting back hours for current workers and holding off on hiring new ones.

I welcome any relief from ObamaCare for anyone in this country, but why should such relief not apply to individuals and families as well as businesses? If the administration hasn't gotten its act together by now, what leads us to believe it ever will? Instead of temporarily delaying part of ObamaCare for some, I believe the best course would be to permanently delay all of it for everyone.

The administration also recently announced postponement of a critical taxpayer protection under ObamaCare. Taxpayers were previously told the government would verify that applicants actually qualify for subsidies before receiving them. Now the administration says it is not ready to do that until 2015, although it will still go ahead with enrollment in the program in 2014. So for the coming year, the Obama administration will trust but not verify anything. The honor system, I believe, is no taxpayer protection.

These are not run-of-the-mill glitches and bumps, as the President would say. These provisions are central to the legislation and may foreshadow major problems to come, as we find out every day. These provisions are unworkable or problematic not because people don't like them but because they were poorly designed. This isn't about a lack of commitment on behalf of those forced to comply with these mandates. Rather, it is about a lack of confidence on behalf of those who conceived and crafted these provisions.

In light of the disastrous rollout of ObamaCare, Americans are also apprehensive about the cost—yes, the cost. How will all of this impact their health insurance premiums? What will be the tax burden? What will a new entitlement program do to our \$17 trillion debt, which is growing?

With respect to premiums, President Obama told the American people his health care overhaul “could save families \$2,500 in the coming years.” Those were his words. But despite this bold claim, health insurance premiums for the average American family have increased over \$3,000 since 2008, and this is according to the Kaiser Family Foundation Employer Health Benefit Survey, which is very well respected.

Moreover, a recent Wall Street Journal analysis finds that premiums for healthy consumers could double or even triple under ObamaCare. Can we imagine that?

Although ObamaCare has not decreased premiums, it has certainly increased taxes. According to the Congressional Budget Office—CBO—and the Joint Committee on Taxation, ObamaCare imposes a \$1 trillion tax hike on the American economy over just the first 10 years—a \$1 trillion tax hike. Their analysis finds 21 tax hikes in ObamaCare due to the law's various mandates and restrictions. Among these, several affect individuals making less than \$200,000 and married couples making less than \$250,000—a clear violation of President Obama's often repeated campaign promise not to do so.

Despite this massive tax hike, ObamaCare will still add \$6.2 trillion—yes, \$6.2 trillion—to the debt in the years ahead. This is based on the Government Accountability Office projections. This clearly violates yet another promise by the President that he would “not sign a plan that adds one dime to our deficit—either now or in the future.” Goodness.

I believe ObamaCare will not only fail to control costs but will also destroy the best quality health care in the world—ours. Why do I say this? In 2009, Dr. Martin Feldstein, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Reagan and a Harvard professor, wrote an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal entitled “ObamaCare Is All About Rationing.” He backed up his statement by citing a report issued by President Obama's own Council of Economic Advisers which explained how the President would propose to reduce health spending by eliminating certain treatments—by rationing.

Dr. Feldstein went on to compare the Obama strategy to that of the British national health service. He concluded the existence of such a program in the United States would not only deny life-saving care but would also cast a pall over medical researchers who would fear that government experts might project their discoveries as “too expensive.”

Think of the implications of rationing health care. What does it mean for a patient sitting in the doctor's office when they get a life-changing diagnosis? I know that feeling. I have been there. It reassured me to know we have the best health care in the world and that everything possible would be done to save my life. I want others who encounter that situation to have the same reassurance. But will they?

Despite what President Obama may say, it is not just Republicans who have deep concerns about health care. This week, on the same Wall Street Journal opinion pages, Howard Dean, a former Democratic National Committee chairman and Governor, as well as a physician, concurred with Dr. Feldstein. Mr. Dean wrote that ObamaCare's independent payment advisory board—IPAB—“is essentially a

health care rationing body.” By setting doctor reimbursement rates for Medicare and determining which procedures and drugs will be covered and at what price, the IPAB will be able to stop certain treatments its members do not favor by simply setting rates to levels where no doctor or hospital will perform them. That was the plan.

Mr. Dean went on to say, “These kinds of schemes do not control costs. The medical system simply becomes more bureaucratic.”

We all know now ObamaCare is a bureaucratic nightmare. With more than 20,000 pages of new rules and regulations, the law expands government to an unprecedented level, creating 159 new boards, commissions, and government offices. Think of it.

Adding to these concerns, Deloitte's 2013 Survey of U.S. Physicians finds that due to recent developments in health care, “the future of the medical profession as we know it may be in jeopardy as it loses clinical autonomy and compensation.” The survey by Deloitte also found that “6 in 10 physicians”—6 in 10—“say it is likely that many physicians will retire earlier than planned in the next 1 to 3 years.”

Again, sitting in that doctor's office, I remember breathing a little easier to know we have not only the most advanced treatments but also the most skilled and experienced physicians in the world. We don't want to jeopardize that, do we?

In addition to concerns about the quality of care, the Obama administration has backtracked on still another of the President's promises. In 2009, he stated unambiguously: “If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. Period.” The President's words.

Despite this pledge, the Department of Health and Human Services, under the Obama administration, recently posted the following on healthcare.gov: “Depending on the plan you choose in the marketplace, you may be able to keep your current doctor.” It says “may” be able to keep your doctor. That is not what the President told the American people.

A University of Chicago study underscores this finding that more than half of current individual insurance plans do not meet ObamaCare's standard to be sold on the exchanges. So much for that ironclad promise.

But there is another area: ObamaCare is a job killer. How will ObamaCare affect jobs? In President Obama's recent Illinois speech I mentioned earlier, he made the following curious statement about Republicans and job creation: “They'll bring up ObamaCare despite the fact that our businesses have created nearly twice as many jobs in this recovery as they had at the same point in the last recovery when there was no ObamaCare.”

This is a non sequitur. At a minimum, President Obama implied that

ObamaCare has not hurt job creation. At worst, he implied it has helped.

In stark contrast, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's second quarter 2013 Small Business Survey in America finds that "71 percent of small businesses—and that is the job creation machine in this country—say the health care law makes it harder to hire." The same survey finds that "one-half of small businesses say that they will either cut hours to reduce full-time employees or replace full-time employees with part-time workers to avoid the mandate."

In addition, Gallup finds that "41 percent of small business owners say they have held off on hiring new employees" in response to ObamaCare.

The 1-year delay on ObamaCare's employer mandate provides momentary relief. But in light of sustained high unemployment in this country, I find it deeply troubling that perhaps the best thing President Obama has done for American business during his time in office is to provide only a brief reprieve from his own signature achievement.

Notably, labor unions agree with businesses now, that ObamaCare will hurt the economy. Recently, in a scathing letter to Democratic leaders in Congress, the president of the Teamsters Union, the UFCW, and UNITE-HERE, wrote that "ObamaCare will shatter not only our hard-earned health benefits, but destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class."

This brings me full circle to where I began my remarks. President Obama conveniently blames Republican opposition for the stumbles and failures of ObamaCare, despite the fact that Americans across the political spectrum have spoken up about its many flaws.

President Obama rammed his health care legislation through Congress without a single Republican vote. Why? Because he knew he did not need our votes to put the entire Nation under his health care plan. Yet now he claims that ObamaCare works for those who are "committed to it." Committed to it?

Republicans are committed to finding solutions that actually lower health costs, that do not tax and spend us into oblivion, that preserve the world's highest quality health care, and that foster economic growth. We have said all along that ObamaCare would fail on each of these counts.

I believe opposition to ObamaCare is not responsible for its failures, and commitment to it will not negate its deep flaws. The only way to achieve the goals we all share is to begin by repealing this failed law so we can replace it with a plan that works. I hope we can.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I would like to share some remarks about the economic condition of American workers, the immigration bill that passed here recently, and in general about where we are as a Nation and the difficulties we are facing.

I think there is a growing acceptance by most experts that we have, indeed, seen a decline in the wages of the middle-class and working Americans relative to inflation since maybe as long ago as 1999—a steady erosion of their income relative to the price of products they buy. That is not a healthy trend.

President Obama talked about it, our Democratic colleagues talked about it a lot when President Bush was President. But it has continued. I thought maybe it was an aberration, but I do not think so anymore. I think a lot of things are happening with robotics, ObamaCare, other things that are happening, that are making it more difficult for workers to find jobs—unemployment remains exceedingly high—and to have wage increases.

One of the things I noticed this week from the Republican side of the aisle is that Congress received two letters—one from Republican donors, according to some, and another from CEOs—urging that Congress act on immigration. This is primarily to the House Members.

Nearly 100 top Republican donors, they called themselves, and Bush administration officials sent a letter to the House Republicans on Tuesday urging lawmakers to pass a bill that legalizes illegal immigrants. The donor letter came the same day the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and 400 other businesses and umbrella groups fired off another letter to the House leaders of both parties urging them to pass something.

One word was not mentioned in either one of those letters: Wages. Nor was any discussion of jobs and unemployment raised in those letters.

Mr. Karl Rove—a man I know and like and a long-time friend—and these groups would have us believe this legislation is about the providing of amnesty to people who have been here a long time. That certainly is a large part of it. Businesses know that legalizing illegal workers will, indeed, expand the available labor pool for industries with the effect, I suggest, of bringing down wages, particularly in the areas where illegal workers might have previously not had access. So of the 11 million people, perhaps half, we

understand, do not have fake documents, are not able to work in the labor force, effectively, and they take marginal jobs. If this bill were to pass, all would immediately be given Social Security Numbers, and they could apply to any job in America.

That is both a good thing and a difficult thing. It is good that they would be able to work. It is not so good if you wanted one of the jobs that would be taken.

But there is a phrase in the letter which has gotten too little attention and which explains what this is all about. Mr. Rove and the donors say, the legislation must "provide a legal way for U.S.-based companies to hire the workers they need."

So we are supposed to pass a law that guarantees American companies the right to hire whoever they need, whoever they say they need, whoever they believe is best for them. That means the best worker at the lowest price. That is what free markets are all about. That is what the law of supply and demand is all about. It has not been repealed, by the way, the law of supply and demand.

First and foremost, that cannot be the goal of an immigration policy of the United States of America. It cannot be the overriding policy of our system to provide and to make sure that whatever workers our companies want at whatever price, apparently, they are willing to pay or want to pay—that we allow workers to come in from abroad and take those jobs, regardless of the unemployment rate in America, regardless of the number of people who are on welfare, on unemployment compensation, who have not had a good paycheck in a number of years, perhaps.

Our responsibility and our goal is to serve the people of this country and to try to create a climate, an economic agenda that allows them to prosper and to actually find jobs and actually get pay raises, not pay reductions.

Of course, there is already a legal way for U.S.-based companies to hire workers they need. They can hire the people living here today who are unemployed. Or they can hire some of the million-plus immigrants whom we lawfully admit each year. We have a very generous immigration policy. No one is talking about ending that and not allowing immigration to continue. We allow about 1.1 million immigrants a year come to America lawfully, plus guest workers who come specifically to work. That is very generous. But this bill would double the number of guest workers and increase substantially the number of people who come through immigration to become permanent residents in our country, at a time of high unemployment—much higher unemployment than we had in 2007. That bill would have allowed much fewer people to come into the country, and it was rejected by the American people.

No one is saying these programs cannot and should not exist, and that they should not be improved. But I am afraid the businesses want the choicest pick of labor at the lowest cost they can get it. That is what businesses do. That is what businesses want every day. When they go out and interview people, they want the best person they can get at the least cost. That is what their stockholders demand. So they believe the immigration policy for the entire Nation should exist to create an abundance of low-cost labor. I do not agree with that.

They, in their bubble they live in, think lower wages are good. You hear about it: There are concerns over rising wages. It might drive up prices, you hear the Wall Street Journal say.

Well, maybe some politicians think that way too. They are not concerned with how the plan impacts workers, the immigrants themselves, public resources, the education system, or taxpayer dollars. They are not focused on the broader economic and social concerns that happen when someone is not able to get a job for years at a decent wage. The focus tends to be on the reduction of the cost of labor.

But America has a larger concern. That concern is unemployment. It is workplace participation. It is wages. And it is the cost of social services to those in need. We all agree we must make America more competitive globally. Workers must be productive and competitive. But how do we close the income gap? How do we deal with that?

The best way to do that is not to reduce our wages and workers' quality of life. The way to do that is with a less burdensome Tax Code, a less intrusive regulatory system, and a tougher, smarter, fair trade policy. These policies would make us more competitive and help wages and working conditions improve.

So when these business voices and establishment figures say the GOP needs to support a comprehensive immigration bill, what they are really saying is the GOP and the Congress of both parties—which in the Senate, of course, a minority of Republicans voted for the bill, and every single Democrat voted for the bill. They would have done the things I am concerned about.

Now they are worried about the Republican House and they are trying to put the pressure on them. What they are saying is, we need to increase low-skill immigration, when we do not have enough jobs now. The Senate bill, based on CBO analysis, would provide legal status to 46 million people—mostly lower skilled immigrants—by 2033—46 million. Here is what the National Review editorialized on the subject:

By more than doubling the number of so-called guest workers admitted each year, the bill would help create a permanent underclass of foreign workers. The 2007 Bush-Kennedy proposal was rejected in part be-

cause it would have added 125,000 new guest workers. The Gang of Eight bill—The one we just passed in the Senate—would add 1.6 million in the first year, and about 600,000 a year after that and that is on top of a 50 percent or more increase in the total level of legal immigration. The creation of a large population of second-class workers is undesirable from the point of view of the American national interest, which should be our guiding force in this matter. The United States is a nation with an economy, not an economy with a nation.

This Nation owes certain things to its citizens, the people who are here now. We have a lot—300 million—and many of them are hurting. We owe them the best opportunity—owe them the best opportunity—to be successful and have a decent job with increasing wages, not declining.

Here is what conservative writer Yuval Levin wrote in a recent op-ed. I am saying this because these are conservative writers.

The Left's economic policies (and the legacy of decades of right-wing confusion about the difference between being pro-market and being pro-business too) are making the American economy less and less like the vision of capitalism that conservatives should want to defend. They should consider what now would be best for the cause of growth and prosperity—the cause of free markets and free people.

Capitalism is fundamentally democratic, after all—we today might say fundamentally populist and recovering this understanding of conservative economics would help today's Republicans see an enormous public need, and an enormous political opportunity, they tend to miss, and to which conservatism could be very usefully applied. It would point to a conservative agenda to help working families better afford life in the middle class, and to give more Americans a chance to rise.

So this is, I guess, directed—too late now to deal with the Senate. It passed the Senate, but not too late to deal with in the House, which does have a Republican majority. If Members of Congress want to broaden their appeal, the answer lies in speaking to the real and legitimate concerns of millions of hurting Americans whose wages have declined and whose job prospects have diminished.

The New York Times talked about this in 2000. They forgot about all of this now. But in 2000, they editorialized against an amnesty bill, what they called a "hasty call for amnesty" and warned that "between about 1980 and 1995 the gap between wages of high school dropouts and all other workers widened substantially." That is what the New York Times said then. It remains true.

Professor George Borjas, himself an immigrant to America as a young man from Cuba, now at Harvard, perhaps the most effective and knowledgeable and respected scholar of wages and immigration in the world, certainly in the United States, estimates—get this—that 40 percent, almost half, of the trend downward in wages today can be traced to immigration from un-

skilled workers. Businesses do not have to bid up salaries to get good workers if you constantly have a flow of people come in.

That data he reported has been updated. High levels of low-skilled immigration between 1980 and 2000—and those levels would be greatly increased if this bill that passed the Senate were to become law—have already reduced wages of native workers without a high school diploma by 8 percent, according to Professor Borjas. He has analyzed Labor Department statistics, census data, and all kinds of data, according to the highest academic standards.

Professor Borjas said their wages have fallen from 1980 to 2000 by 8 percent in real dollars as a result of the current flow of immigration. So that is about \$250 a month. You think that does not make a difference to working Americans and their families, to lose \$250 a month?

Oh, we do not want to talk about that. That is not a problem. The immigration bill will increase wages, we are told. Professor Borjas said it has already reduced wages enough to be very painful to people who are trying to take care of their families today. Wages continue to fall.

This is not only an economic problem, but it is a social problem. The idea that dramatically increasing the number of foreign workers to take a limited number of American jobs will reduce unemployment and raise wages is so ridiculous it is hard to think it worth discussing. The very idea of this is beyond my comprehension. Yet we have the President out there today sending out documents claiming just the opposite—the President of the United States. The law of supply and demand has not been eliminated. Wages today are lower than in 1999. Median household income has declined 8 percent in that time. Some 47 million of our residents are on food stamps today, including 1 in 3 households in Detroit. According to the Associated Press, four out of five U.S. adults struggle with joblessness, near poverty, or reliance on welfare.

There is no shortage of labor in the United States. There is a shortage of jobs in the United States. Our goal must be to help our struggling Americans move from dependency to being independent, to help them find steady jobs and rising pay, not declining pay. Our policy cannot be to simply relegate more and more of our citizens to dependence on the government while importing a steady stream of foreign workers to take the available jobs. That is not in the interest of our country or the people of this country.

Some contend our unemployed do not have the needed skills. Well, let's train them. We now spend over \$750 billion a year on means-tested welfare-assistance type programs. That is the largest item in the budget, bigger than Social

Security, bigger than defense, bigger than Medicare. Of that amount, for every \$100 we spend on those programs, we only spend \$1 on job training. So we need to wake up here. We need to quit paying people not to work, quit delivering money that creates dependence, and shift our policies in a way that puts people to work and gets them trained to take the jobs that are here today.

As we leave for recess, my message to my colleagues in the House is this: Do the right thing. Make your priority restoring the rule of law, defending working Americans, and helping those struggling, immigrant and native born.

People who immigrate here lawfully want to go to work here and see their wages rise too. Their wages are being pulled down if the flow of immigration is too large. It is amazing to me how the coalition has been put together. Some of the comments about it kind of take my breath away.

Here is what the President said today in his paper, claiming that everything is going to be great with this huge increase of immigration that was in the bill he wants to see passed in the House. This is their report. The broader leisure and hospitality industry, one of the fastest growing sectors in the U.S. economy, also stands to benefit significantly from commonsense immigration reform.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the leisure and hospitality industry has consistently added jobs over the last 3 years. These sectors remain a source of robust economic activity and continue to exceed expectations. Leaders of these industries have been long-time proponents of legislation that would legalize workers in the United States and facilitate the lawful employment of future foreign-born workers.

The head of the American Hotel and Lodging Association this year applauded the Senate—I bet he did—on behalf of the lodging industry for its bipartisan commitment to immigration reform that “creates jobs, boosts travel and tourism, preserves hoteliers’ access to a strong seasonal workforce, and stimulates economic growth.”

Well, sure. He would rather be able to have a large flow of workers from abroad take the jobs. What happens to the Americans who are not getting jobs? Are they on the food stamp rolls, the assistance rolls? Are they on unemployment compensation? Are they otherwise struggling to get by with government assistance? Would it not be better for our Americans to have those jobs?

I mean, think about it, the President of the United States out here celebrating special interests, hotel magnates, casino magnates who want cheap foreign labor so they do not have to hire American workers who are unemployed. That is what we are talking

about. I think it is time for the Republicans to stand up to the Republican 100 donors writing that letter. Give me a break. We need to reject their advice and the premise of their letter that the public policy of the United States should be based on giving U.S. companies a legal basis for hiring all the low-cost foreign workers they say they need.

They are not entitled to demand that. We are supposed to set national policy here. We are supposed to set policy that serves the national interest. We do not work for those donors and special interests. So the national interest is to reduce unemployment, certainly, and to create rising wages. That is our responsibility in this body. Let’s get on with it.

I want to say how great it is to see my friend Senator ENZI. I am taking up his time. I hope I have not kept him too late. He works late anyway. But he has been a great principled supporter of immigration reform and is opposed to the bill that came before us. I thank the Senator for his work on so many of these issues but immigration reform is on my mind today. It is great to see the Senator.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, a lot of Americans are worried right now about their health insurance. They know what is coming. Seniors have been turned down by their doctors for Medicare treatment because the doctors are not adequately compensated. If they have not been turned down, they know someone who has been turned down.

Medicaid is uncertain and a stigma. On the one hand, advances in medical technology and the capabilities and knowledge of our health care providers mean we are living longer and have more tools at hand than ever before to address diseases and illnesses.

However, on the other hand, this increasing life expectancy, coupled with the aging of our population and the steady increases in health care costs, means our health care system is on the verge of becoming completely unsustainable financially.

All across the country health insurance rates are skyrocketing. Families are struggling to cope with the higher costs and less choice. Employees are losing coverage and they are losing working hours. Businesses are not hiring. At the center of this uncertainty is the President’s health care law. A number of provisions have already gone

into effect, but we will not experience the full force of the law until 2014; that is, January.

The Democrats’ “go it alone” health care reform plan in 2009 was the first major piece of legislation to pass Congress without a bipartisan vote. Let me repeat that again. The Democratic “go it alone” health care reform plan in 2009 was the first major piece of legislation to pass Congress without a bipartisan vote. When you have a partisan bill you get partisan results.

After 20,000 pages of regulations and still a lot more to come, they are a little behind on those, and after over 150 new bureaucratic boards, agencies, and programs, the Federal Government still cannot figure out how to make the law work and has had to delay it, in part.

What I have seen to date is enough to convince me that we need a different path. I opposed the health care law initially and I support full repeal of the law. Fixing our health care system does not have to be divisive or partisan. There are clear differences in the approach to fixing health care from all across the political ideological spectrum. However, the least we have to do is to dismantle the worst parts of the law and replace them with reforms that actually work, reforms that lower cost and expand choice, reforms that do not bankrupt the country and every taxpayer.

The Federal Government needs to support viable solutions when needed and refrain from handcuffing innovative private designs with the excessive regulations for narrowed political interests. We need more competition, not less.

Unless we take concrete steps now, we will soon be unable to switch off the track toward government-run health care. When I first got here, I was warned that there were people who did not care who ran the train of health as long as it wrecked. Then we could have universal single-pay, government-run health care. I am not sure that is not still the goal.

One clear example of how convoluted this law is comes from the definition of who an employee is. I used to work in the shoe business, so I understand the difference between full-time work, which was 40 hours a week, and part-time work, which was under 40 hours a week.

However, under the health care law, there are now full-time employees and full-time equivalents. What this means is the law requires employers, and particularly small businesses, to determine how many of their part-time employees it takes to equal a full-time employee. They don’t come under the full force of the law until they hit 50 employees. There are businesses that understand that, and they are trying to avoid getting to the 50th employee. But there are some catches in this law.

First of all, the health care law sets full time at 30 hours, not 40 hours per week but 30 hours. It was news to me. It always was 40 hours.

Second, the law requires these employers to take everyone working 29 hours a week or less, combine all of their time for a week, and then divide by the number 30 to establish how many full-time equivalents these part-time workers represent. I don't think a lot of people planned on that.

If you are still following along at this point, congratulations. You can see how costly the taxes imposed by this law will be.

What if the rule forces you to add all of your employees' hours and divide by 30 hours to determine your full-time employees? What if you have 10 employees who are working 40 hours? That would be 400 hours. If you divided that by 30 and find out that you are paying 10 people, but you actually have 13⅓ employees at the full-time requirement, that could put you over the 50 and put you into a whole different category of costs and penalties.

If you have 10 employees and you watched it so that there are only 29 hours, that comes to 290 hours. If you divided that by 30, you would find out that even though none of these people are full-time employees, you have 9⅔ full-time employees. You can see how they could do a little miscalculation, suddenly be at the 50, and be into a whole new series of penalties.

The Obama administration also had to admit recently that the employer mandate, one of the key pieces of the law, isn't ready.

One of the most economically crushing and burdensome regulations will not be implemented until past 2014, past the 2014 election in 2015. I don't think that was a mistake on their part. I think it was intentional—to come after the election.

There is another little complication that gets thrown in here though. If those employers are not providing the health insurance and not being fined for not providing the health insurance, then the people who work for them have to go on the exchange to get their health insurance. If they go on the exchange to get their health insurance, they can't be subsidized by the businesses they worked for. That is going to be a surprise to a lot of employees too.

The delay will force more people to enroll in health care exchanges or face the tax penalty if they don't. A lot of people don't realize if they do go on the exchange, there is also a surcharge on the cost of their health insurance. They are going to be paying a 3.5 percent tax for buying the insurance. Of course, if they don't buy the insurance, then they get a penalty.

The delay was also made for the businesses without congressional approval, done administratively. The Congress-

sional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation informed Senator HATCH this week that this delay will increase the cost of the new insurance program established by law by \$12 billion. It is not as if we had an extra \$12 billion laying around here.

In particular, the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that the Federal Government will be required to pay an additional \$3 billion in subsidies for people on the exchanges. A lot of extra costs were just kicked in there. This delay not only increases the costs on hard-working Americans, but it fails the original intent of health care reform, and that is to provide Americans with high quality, affordable health care.

In addition, the law requires the administration to set up health insurance exchanges in a number of States, including Wyoming. We are sparsely populated, low numbers. The numbers wouldn't work out to do our own exchange.

One problem is the administration has yet to tell anyone exactly how they are going to do those exchanges or what even a basic plan is. If you are going to have a range of plans that insurance companies can bid on, that you can look up on the computer, doesn't it seem, before you can even start, that you would have to know what the basic plan is?

How the President can argue that everyone will love the health care law once it goes into effect is beyond me. This administration can't even tell anyone where they can buy their insurance, what plan options will be available, and, most importantly, what the costs will be.

Remember what NANCY PELOSI said before they passed the law? They will have to pass the bill before we get to know what is in it. The administration is shopping its own version of that statement.

As the Senate Finance Committee chairman put it recently: this law is a train wreck waiting to happen. That is the Democratic Senate Finance Committee chairman.

Of course, on top of all of this, the law relies in part on new taxes and tax subsidies to support the coverage expansion.

This means the IRS will be involved in implementation. I have significant concerns with the ability of the IRS, particularly in the wake of the current scandal. The fact that this organization, the IRS—tainted by such political behavior—is involved in implementing the new health care law has increased my belief that the health care law is not something the country wants or needs. Of course, the IRS employees don't want to come under this law either. I don't know of anybody who really wants to come under it.

I will take a close look at proposals to remove the IRS from any implemen-

tation activities, but I do think they should be subject to the law too. At the same time, I will continue to work to provide folks with relief from the health care law as a whole.

One of the things they have said if you are going on the exchange is, if you are in certain income categories, then you get a subsidy from the government to help you purchase your insurance. We are told now that will be self-reporting and will not be subject to audit. Doesn't that sound like something that could be fraught with a lot of fraud, where you say you just make enough to get into the biggest subsidies? Everybody wouldn't do that, of course, but I think there are some who would.

How is the government doing on some of the things that they already put into effect? I saw a little article on high-risk pools. When the bill went in, a lot of the States already had high-risk pools, and we worked with States to make those viable, but the Federal Government said we could do it for less. They put in a high-risk pool.

To keep people from jumping from the State ones, which, yes, are more expensive, over into the Federal one, which is less expensive, they said you couldn't make the jump unless you were without insurance for 6 months. People who are in the high-risk pool can't afford to be without insurance for 6 months.

There wasn't a big jump to the high-risk pool. But in spite of the fact that there wasn't a jump to the high-risk pool, the Federal high-risk pool went broke. It ran out of money.

Here is the disturbing part of that article. They said, well, they would just shift that cost over to the States. The States are already doing it, and they are doing the right thing. Now they are going to be asked to pick up the additional costs. How many parts of ObamaCare are going to get shifted over to the States? The States have had a lot of promises. Can any of those promises be met? Will they be met? A lot of decisions are being based on what the Federal Government promised.

Of course, in truth, we are out of money. The new law also tried to address the problem of rising health care costs. I believe the Federal fiscal situation is untenable, and we need to implement significant and far-reaching spending cuts to get our fiscal house in order. We cannot continue on our current path.

The President and his administration will argue that the new law will expand access and lower costs. While the law certainly increases access to insurance, it also moved billions of dollars from the Medicare Program to pay for this new insurance program. That is not exactly saving the government money.

The projections for lower costs also don't add up for the average American either. Insurance premiums and rates

are increasing. Small businesses are unable to continue to provide health insurance for their workers.

Businesses in general have delayed hiring or are only hiring people part time—although I hope they listen to the part that I gave about the little part-time catch that is built into the law.

All of these decisions are directly driven by the economic impact of the health care law. My Senate Republican colleagues and I are focused on developing proposals that address the worst aspects of the health care law. The law increases premiums and health care costs, forces employers to stop offering insurance to their employees, and slashes benefits for millions of Medicare beneficiaries.

I support repealing both the cap on health savings accounts, flexible spending accounts, and the prohibition on over-the-counter purchases included in the health care law.

Flexible spending accounts help make consumers more aware and engage in their health care spending.

Health savings accounts are something that young, healthy staffers of the Senate like to do. They can do the math real easy. They can look at the regular program and see how much that would cost or they could take a look at health savings accounts. The difference in the price, in only 3 years they could cover the whole deductible part as long as they were healthy for 3 years. They would be covered for that part until something major happened—and they were covered for catastrophic—so they found that to be a real bargain. But not anymore.

Additionally, a number of other Senators and I have put forward bills to repeal the taxes imposed by the President's health care law. That would be relief from new taxes on prescription drugs, relief from new taxes on medical devices, and relief from new taxes on health insurance plans. I wish to provide relief to employers from new regulations imposed on them by the law.

These ideas preserve competition in a private market for health care coverage and lower the cost of care for the consumer. All of these steps are commonsense reforms to the health care law that take us off the path toward a national, Federal health care system.

One of the most effective ways Congress can address the rising costs of health care is to focus on the way it is delivered as part of the Nation's current cost-driven and ineffective patient care system. America's broken fee-for-service structure is driving our Nation's health care system further downward.

Today's method of payment encourages providers to see as many patients and prescribe as many treatments as possible, but it does nothing to reward providers who keep patients healthy. Maligned incentives created by the fee-

for-service system drive up costs and hurt patient care.

Tackling this issue is a good start to reining in rising health care costs. The health care law championed by President Obama and the majority party in the Senate did little to address these problems because the vast majority of the legislation involved a massive expansion of the government price controls found in the fee-for-service Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

If we wish to address the threat posed by out-of-control entitlement spending, we need to restructure Medicare to better align incentives for providers and beneficiaries. This will not only lower health care costs, it will also improve the quality of care for millions of Americans. It is very important that we protect access to rural health care services too.

There is more that can be done to better align Federal programs to meet the needs of rural and frontier States. The criteria that determine eligibility for Federal funds to support rural health care programs are based on factors that make it difficult to prove the needs of the underserved, rural, and frontier areas.

For example, one provider for 3,500 people in New York City is entirely different than the 3,500 people living in Fremont, Campbell County or, perhaps more so, Niobrara County. I use Niobrara County quite a bit, for example, because Niobrara County is the size of Delaware and has 2,500 people living in it. It is 90 miles tall, 75 miles wide, and near the bottom of the center is a town called Lusk. This is where almost all of the people live. They do have a hospital there.

When they have a doctor or a physician's assistant, the hospital is open. When they do not, they are 104 miles from a trauma center.

You can't apply the same rules to that hospital that you apply to New York City hospitals. In addition, we need to think more creatively about how to use technology services, to improve telemedicine capabilities, particularly for the rural areas so that where a person lives has less impact on the level of care they are able to receive.

The advancement of more powerful, wireless technologies has substantial potential to remotely link individuals across the country to deliver health care in more accessible settings. Our Nation has made great strides in improving the quality of life for all Americans. We need to remember that every major legislative initiative that has helped transform our country has been forged in the spirit of cooperation. These qualities are essential to the success and longevity of crucial programs such as Medicare and Medicaid.

When it comes to health care decisions being made in Washington lately, the only thing the government is doing

well is increasing partisanship and legislative gridlock. The President and Democrats need to listen. It is time to admit that this partisan experiment in government-run health care is failing. In order for this to get better, they must acknowledge the problem. Some of the law's authors and biggest supporters admit this law is a mess, and it will only get worse.

However, those in the Democratic leadership continue to support flawed health care laws out of pride, politics, or a belief that the government knows best. It makes no sense to stubbornly cling to a law that is so massive, burdensome, bureaucratic, and confusing that it is collapsing under its own weight.

By focusing on positive changes, Congress can give the failed law's proponents a way out. The key is finding common ground. More often than not, the country hears about what divides Congress instead of what unifies us. We could come together and focus on commonsense solutions with the kinds of step-by-step reforms that would protect Americans. I believe Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle can agree on 80 percent of an issue 100 percent of the time.

I want to be clear that this isn't compromise. When you compromise, each side gives up something they believe in, and in the end they get something no one believes in. I am about agreeing on common ground without compromise, without sacrificing each party's principles, by leaving out parts of the issue to look for a solution later.

Congress also needs to stop deal-making and start legislating. We need to stop developing comprehensive bills and then marketing them as the only option. To me, comprehensive means incomprehensible. The larger a bill is, the harder it is to agree. And, of course, you can tuck some things in there that people never see. This is especially true when we pass a bill that no one has fully read and then afterwards we find out what is in it.

No party has all the good ideas. By working together, the end result should be something that not only works but moves the country forward in a responsible way.

We still need health care reform, but it has to be the right way, with strong bipartisan support on individual health care issues. What happened to individual choice on a policy? What happened to liability reform? What about the sale of insurance across State lines or pooling through an association so they have leverage against the insurance companies? What happened to adequate compensation for providers? All of these have been left out. Providing Americans with access to affordable health care at a high quality is something Republicans and Democrats should be able to agree upon.

The challenges of the American health care system are not going away.

If we improve health care in a practical instead of a political way, we can make it better. Good policy is good politics. Why do I have some hope this is going to happen? Congress is more interested now than they have ever been, and the reason is there was a Republican—yes, there was one Republican provision in the bill that forced Congress to go into the exchanges too. We and our staffs have to live under the law we passed. That is how it should be. But the result is hitting everyone in their offices right now. Every Senator and every Representative is looking at what may happen to their staff on January 1, and their staffs are concerned. It has changed the tenor of some of the hearings we are having. It is pretty hard-hitting on both sides. So with that, I do have hope.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

POSTAL SERVICE REFORM

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, most of our colleagues have finished, a lot of them packed up and are heading back to their home States to begin the August recess. I wish them all well, especially the one who just preceded me on the floor tonight.

I stand between the staff here and the pages who are wrapping up their summer with us—at least a month with us. They will be heading back to their home States across America. We had one of our pages—a page, actually, in the last group, at the beginning of the summer—from Delaware, and we are very proud of her and all the ones who have been here. I have told them they are among the best group we have ever had—even that guy from Arkansas, whose mom used to sit right down here in the row next to MARK PRYOR and me.

I thank the staff for their hard work throughout the course of this year. I think we are in a good place, and the Senate is starting to act more like the Senate of old. We are beginning to govern a little more from the center, and Democrats and Republicans are looking to find new ways to work together on a wide range of issues.

I am especially pleased with the progress we made on the Federal student loan program, again trying to make sure the program is available and at a reasonable interest rate cost to help make sure a lot of students, young and old, if they need help, can sign up for student loans late this summer and fall and then go back to school and complete their education.

Senator ENZI used the numbers 80–20. In the time I have known him, he has talked about the 80–20 rule, of which he may be the architect. The 80–20 rule is something like this: Around here, we agree on about 80 percent of the stuff and may disagree on about 20 percent of the stuff. But in the end, why don't we just focus on the 80 percent we

agree on and set aside the 20 percent we don't agree on and then take that up another day?

That is the spirit Senator TOM COBURN, who is the ranking Republican on the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, and I have taken to an issue that needs to be addressed, and that is a path forward in making sure we have a strong postal system in this country, as we have had for over 200 years. We need to have a strong, vibrant, financially strong, and sustainable postal system for a long time, for as long as we are going to be a country.

The nature of our needs and the way we communicate has changed dramatically. I remember finding in my parents' home, oh gosh, about 5 or 6 years ago, when, after my dad had died, my mom was going to move out of her home in Florida up close to my sister in Kentucky, this treasure trove of love letters my parents exchanged during World War II. For others of you whose parents have been in similar situations and whose folks were part of the "greatest generation," you may have uncovered a treasure trove of letters like that as well. They wrote literally every day—just about every day through the war.

I remember that the happiest days I spent in Southeast Asia, in the several tours I served there in the early 1970s, the happiest days for us each week were the days we got the mail. Those were the best days—letters from home, cards, postcards, newspapers, magazines. Those were great days.

Our troops in Afghanistan still get mail. They still get letters and postcards and birthday cards, Father's Day and Mother's Day cards, but it is different because they have Skype and cell phones and a lot of other ways to communicate.

I asked my staff recently to go back 12 years ago to when I first came here and tell me how many e-mails we got for every letter we sent—tell me how many e-mails we got for every letter we sent and received. It turns out for every 1 e-mail we received, we received 10 or 12 letters. That was just like 10 or 12 years ago. Then I asked them to tell me what it is today, and it has flipped. It is just the opposite. For every letter we get, we receive roughly 10 or 12 e-mails. So the way we communicate in this country has changed, and that is just one clear example of it for us here on Capitol Hill.

The Postal Service has struggled much like the U.S. auto industry did in the last decade or two to try to make a go of it. The auto industry found themselves in a situation where they had more plants than they needed, more suppliers than they needed, they had really in some ways more different models than they needed, and they had, sadly, more employees than they needed given their market share, which was

about 85 percent when I was in Southeast Asia, and it dropped to about 45 percent 3 or 4 years ago. Fortunately, the auto industry in this country has revived, is vibrant, and is coming back. They are hiring and building cars—award-winning, highly energy efficient cars.

The auto industry was an industry that had to retool itself and right size itself for the 21st century, and they have done that and done it well. The big three in the United States are back and building some of the best cars in the world. We are proud of the work they do, and they are not only hiring people but are paying bonuses to their people, and it has turned out to be a really great success story. These were companies that were literally going into bankruptcy—GM, Chrysler—not that many years ago. They are back, and we are a better country. Thank God we helped them get back. And Ford builds great vehicles.

What do we do about the Postal Service? The Postal Service has about 7 million people working for it or who have jobs that are related or are connected directly or indirectly to the Postal Service—7 million jobs. What do we do about them?

I think what we need to do and are trying to do is contained in the legislation Dr. COBURN and I are introducing tonight, which we have worked on for the last 6 months. I really thank him and his staff, especially Chris Barkley, who is here on the floor with us, who has worked very closely and hard with John Kilvington, who is a member of the majority staff at the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

We want to thank a lot of people, Democratic and Republican staff, majority and minority staff, for the terrific work they have done to try to find the middle, to focus on that 80 percent we can agree on, and the 20 percent we can't agree on, we will put off until another day.

The legislation we have written, put simply, addresses how we make possible and ensure that this Postal Service—which was literally spelled out and called for in our Constitution all those years ago—is still relevant today; that it is able to be financially viable today and help meet our communication needs today in a different age, in a digital age. They can do this. They can do this. There is a lot in the legislation that will help make that possible.

We have not written a perfect bill. The ones I have ever written or coauthored or authored, believe it or not, are not perfect. We do our best, and then we introduce the legislation and ask other people who have similar or different views to tell us what they like about our legislation and what they do not like.

In introducing this legislation, we would invite folks from around the

country, whether they happen to be residents, consumers, people living in homes, families who rely on the mail, whether they happen to be businesses that use the mail broadly or whether they happen to be folks who send out magazines or catalogs or other non-profit groups or other folks who work for the Postal Service, the employees, those who are retired, the customers of the Postal Service—we welcome their input as they have a chance to look over what we have written. We ask them to see if they can help us make it better.

Over in the House of Representatives, Congressmen ISSA and CUMMINGS have been working, along with their colleagues, on legislation. It has been reported out of committee over there, I think on a party-line vote.

One of the things that was important to me was to write a bipartisan bill. Dr. COBURN wanted us to write a bipartisan bill. Neither one of us got everything we wanted. The nature of compromise is there are some things that, frankly, you are not all that enamored with, and that is the case here. Our pledge going forward is to continue to work together, to ask Democrats and Republicans to help us improve on this legislation.

The challenge for us is this: In a digital age where people use Skype and Internet and Twitter and all, how do we enable the Postal Service to use what is truly unique—and it is a unique company, if you will; it is a public-private company, although a big company, the second largest employer in the country, and it is a business that goes to every mailbox in this country 5 to 6 days a week—to make a profit, to be financially sustainable, and to meet our communication needs without a huge ongoing reliance from the taxpayer, from the Treasury, to do that? I think they can do it. I think they can do it. I think the legislation we have written will help make that possible.

I want to say a special thanks to a number of folks. I want to thank the Postal Service, led by Pat Donahoe, the Postmaster General; the Board of Governors there, which is part of the Postal Service; the folks who represent hundreds of thousands of postal workers through the union; the businesses across the country that use and rely on the Postal Service; and a lot of customers—regular people who have given us their ideas and shared their ideas with us from towns large and small, cities and States large and small. We look forward to their input and their criticism—constructive, we hope—to make this legislation even better.

I would again say to our staffs who worked so hard to get us to this point a very special thank you.

To our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we look forward to working with you to make what we think is a good bill even better. I like to say that ev-

everything I do, I know I can do better. If it isn't perfect, make it better. And my last thought on this is that the road to improvement is always under construction.

So we have some more work to do, and we will take what is a good bipartisan bill and hopefully make it a lot better.

Madam President, with that, I will say good night to you. I look forward to seeing you in about 5 or 6 weeks. My best to you and the people you so ably represent in New Hampshire. God bless.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THANKING STAFF

Mr. REID. Madam President, I appreciate the Presiding Officer's patience in waiting for us to wrap up things.

Let me say a word very quickly about the staff. I wish everyone a good August. It has been an extremely difficult first 7 months of this congressional period. We got a lot done, and I appreciate very much all the hard work of everyone.

I have said before, but not recently, that we get a lot of things done around here—not nearly as much as we should—but it is the result of all the work that is done by those here and the scores of other people we don't see that are back there doing all kinds of things to make this place work, all the committee staff, the police officers but especially the floor staff.

As we talked earlier today about some departures we have here, one of the good things we have is that in all the time I have been here, as far as I am aware—there could have been instances, but I am unaware of any, where there was bitterness expressed publicly and, as far as I know, privately between each other. I haven't seen that. I appreciate very much the good work we do for the Senate. The staff is not partisan in the work for their bosses that they try to get done, and we can only do that through them.

I am so grateful for all they do for the Senate leadership, all the Senators, and the country. Words are not adequate for me to express that, but I truly do appreciate all they do.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1392

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, September, 10, 2013, the motion to proceed to S. 1392 be agreed to

and the Senate proceed to consideration of the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERCHANGE FEE RULEMAKING

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise to speak about a Federal court ruling handed down yesterday that represents a tremendous victory for consumers and Main Street businesses across America.

This ruling has to do with debit card swipe fees. Yesterday, a Federal judge in D.C. called for the Federal Reserve to lower the approximately 24 cent cap it set on debit swipe fees to a level that more closely reflects the actual cost of a debit transaction.

This decision is a major win for Main Street merchants and their customers.

It was urgently needed, because this decision corrects flaws in the Fed's rulemaking that had allowed Visa and MasterCard to triple the swipe fees they impose on many coffeeshops, convenience stores, restaurants and other merchants.

I had filed an amicus brief in this court case, since the case involved a rulemaking based on a law that I had authored. I am very pleased that the court ruled the way it did, and I will take a minute to explain why.

For years, I have been sounding the alarm about swipe fees, also known as interchange fees.

The swipe fee is a hidden fee that is charged on every debit or credit card transaction. It is a fee that a merchant has to pay to a bank when the merchant accepts a credit or debit card that the bank issued. The fee is taken as a cut out of the transaction amount.

These swipe fees are harmful to consumers and to our economy. They are hidden, they are anti-competitive, and they end up raising the price of everything we buy at retail.

It is important to understand how these fees work.

The vast majority of bank fees are set in a transparent and competitive market environment, with each bank setting its own fee rate and competing over them. But that is not the case with swipe fees.

With swipe fees, the big banks decided they would designate the two giant card companies, Visa and MasterCard, to set fees for all of them. That way each bank could get the same high fee on a card transaction without having to worry about competition.

Swipe fees have no transparency. Most customers and most merchants have no idea what kind of swipe fee is being charged when they use a debit or credit card.

The swipe fee system became an enormous money-maker for Visa, MasterCard and the banks. They were collecting an estimated \$16 billion in debit swipe fees and \$30 billion in credit fees each year.

Those billions are paid by every merchant, charity, school, and government agency that accepts payment by card—and the costs are passed on to American consumers in the form of higher prices.

By 2010, the U.S. swipe fee system was growing out of control with no end in sight. U.S. swipe fee rates had become the highest in the world—far exceeding the actual costs of conducting a debit or credit transaction.

There were no market forces serving to keep fees at a reasonable level. There was no competition and no choice. Merchants and their customers were being forced to subsidize billions in windfall fees to the big banks.

I knew we had to change this situation.

This is an issue of fundamental importance to our economy. Our nation is moving from a currency based on paper cash and checks to a system where American dollars are mostly exchanged through electronic transactions.

We cannot allow Visa, MasterCard and the big banks to dominate the electronic payments system and use it to enrich themselves at consumers' expense. Remember, this is America's currency we are talking about. We have to ensure transparency, competition and fairness when it comes to electronic payments involving U.S. dollars.

So I stepped in and introduced an amendment to the 2010 Wall Street Reform bill that for the first time placed reasonable regulation over debit swipe fees.

My amendment said that if the Nation's biggest banks are going to let Visa and MasterCard fix swipe fee rates for them, then the rates must be reasonable and proportional to the cost of processing a transaction. No more unreasonably high debit swipe fees for big banks.

My amendment passed the Senate with 64 votes and it was signed into law with the rest of Wall Street reform.

The swipe fee reform law that I wrote directed the Federal Reserve to issue regulations to bring down debit swipe fee rates.

In December 2010, the Fed issued a proposed rulemaking that called for debit swipe fees to be capped at 7 to 12 cents per transaction.

This was a significant reduction from what had been a 44 cent average debit swipe fee, though it still allowed banks to easily cover their debit transaction costs, which the Fed pegged at just a few cents.

However, after the Fed issued the draft rule, the big banks and card network giants turned their lobbyists loose on them. It was a lobbying stampede.

They pressured the Fed to raise the debit swipe fee cap to a level far higher than 12 cents, because they claimed that there were all sorts of additional costs that the Fed forgot to include in its analysis.

The Fed gave in, and in June 2011 issued a final rule that raised the cap level to about 24 cents—much higher than the actual cost of a debit transaction.

Predictably, Visa, MasterCard and the big banks took advantage of this watered-down regulation that they had lobbied for. Visa and MasterCard promptly jacked up any swipe fee rates that were below 24 cents so that this 24 cent ceiling became a floor.

With Visa and MasterCard's rate increases, stores that mainly handle small dollar purchases like coffeeshops, convenience stores, and fast food restaurants are now paying far more in swipe fees than they did before.

These merchants used to be charged debit fees that were a percentage of the purchase amount, and now they are charged around 24 cents no matter how small the purchase. Their customers ultimately pay the price.

This was not a flaw in the law, which required a "reasonable and proportional" fee. Instead, it showed the danger of watering down the regulations that implement these laws. The banks and card companies lobbied the Fed for a loophole and when they got one, they ran through it.

After the Fed issued its final rule and Visa and MasterCard promptly raised their swipe fee rates to the cap level wherever they could, a coalition of merchants led by the convenience stores filed a lawsuit in federal court.

They argued that the Fed failed to follow the law in issuing its final regulation. They urged the court to order the Fed to rewrite its regulation in compliance with the statute.

I filed an amicus brief in this case in support of the merchants' position. In my brief, I pointed out that when the Fed doubled its swipe fee cap between the initial rulemaking and the final rulemaking, the Fed cited the need to cover certain costs that the statute explicitly prohibited the Fed from including.

The bottom line, I argued, was that the Fed came far closer to following the statute in its draft rulemaking than after it had bent toward the banks in its final rulemaking.

The court agreed, and yesterday it ordered the Fed to rewrite its rules in compliance with what the law provides.

Here's a key quote from the court's opinion: "The court concludes that the Board has clearly disregarded Congress's statutory intent by inappro-

priately inflating all debit card transaction fees by billions of dollars."

The court also pointed out the problem with Visa and MasterCard's swipe fee increases on small dollar transactions. The Court said:

By including in the interchange fee standard costs that are expressly prohibited by the statute, the final regulation represents a significant price increase over pre-Durbin Amendment rates for small-ticket debit transactions under the \$12 threshold. Congress did not empower the Board to make policy judgments that would result in significantly higher interchange rates.

The court concluded that the Fed must rewrite its regulation to lower the debit fee cap and to halt Visa and MasterCard's fee increases on merchants for small dollar transactions.

Now, this process of rewriting the regulations will take some time, and I suspect there may be more litigation before this issue is over.

But this court ruling marks a tremendous win for Main Street merchants and their customers who deserve the swipe fee relief that the law provided for.

Fortunately for the Fed, there are some clear roadmaps for how it can fix its regulation. I pointed out in my amicus brief that the Fed's initial rulemaking, with its 7 to 12 cent cap, came far closer to reflecting the actual costs that Congress instructed the Fed to look at.

The Fed should look again to its initial rulemaking as it works to rewrite its final rule.

And just last week, the European Commission announced that it would seek to cap debit swipe fee rates throughout the European Union at 0.2 percent of the transaction.

Given that the average debit transaction is about \$38, that works out to an average cap of about 7 cents—right where the Fed was in its initial rule.

Congressman PETER WELCH and I sent a letter last week urging the Fed to closely review the European Commission's debit fee cap and to incorporate it in the Fed's debit fee regulation. I believe the Fed will find the Commission's analysis and conclusions to be very helpful in rewriting its final rule.

As we move forward on the path of reasonable swipe fee reform, I should note that Visa, MasterCard and the banking industry are probably not too pleased with this court decision.

I suspect they will be up here on Capitol Hill very soon, screaming bloody murder and arguing that this court decision means the end of the world.

I just want to point out that the banks and card companies have been spreading myths and using scare tactics about swipe fee reform for years. None of them have come true.

They argued that swipe fee reform would devastate small banks. Yet separate studies by the Fed, GAO and the FTC have all found that the exemption

I wrote in the law for small banks has worked as intended.

As it turns out, small banks and credit unions have thrived since this law took effect. Why? Because under my amendment, small banks and credit unions can continue to receive the same high interchange rates from Visa and MasterCard they got before far higher than the rates that their big bank competitors now receive.

Also, the big banks argued that they would have to jack up fees on consumers to make up for the lost revenue from swipe fees.

But we haven't seen that happen either, because there is transparency and competition when it comes to bank fees on consumers. In fact, we've gotten more transparency on these fees in the past few years as many banks have adopted a fee disclosure form developed by the Pew Charitable Trusts that I have strongly supported.

As the banks' other scare tactics have faded away, they have resorted to arguing that the problem with swipe reform is that merchants haven't passed along enough swipe fee savings to consumers.

This was a pretty hypocritical argument for them to make, because they knew that Visa and MasterCard had raised many swipe fee rates after reform took effect—a direct result of the higher cap that they had lobbied for.

But even though many merchants have suffered under those swipe fee increases, we have still seen aggressive price competition and discounting by retailers since swipe fee reform took effect. Consumers have benefitted from this price competition, and they will benefit even more from this court ruling.

In closing, I note that yesterday's court decision marks another important step in the effort to make sure the electronic payments system is reasonable and fair for American consumers and businesses. Our work is not over yet, but we are making great progress.

I want to thank my colleagues and all the consumers, merchants and advocates across America who have joined me in this effort. This marks a big win for Main Street over Wall Street, and it wouldn't have been possible without this excellent coalition.

TRIBUTE TO GLENN POSHARD

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I would like to thank Dr. Glenn Poshard for all he has done for Southern Illinois University and for his 40 years of public service to Illinois.

After more than 7 years as president of Southern Illinois University, Dr. Poshard will be retiring next year. Under Dr. Poshard's leadership, Southern Illinois University has been able to keep tuition costs low and the university's finances sound, despite the financial problems that have plagued the State.

Throughout his career, Dr. Poshard worked for the people of southern Illinois. He was born in Herald, IL, and graduated from Carmi Township High School. He left Illinois to serve his country in the U.S. Army in Korea, where he received a commendation for outstanding service.

Following his military service, Dr. Poshard returned to Illinois and used the G.I. bill to earn a bachelor's degree in secondary education, a master's degree in health education, and a Ph.D. in higher education administration. He received all three degrees from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Appointed to the Illinois State Senate in 1984, Dr. Poshard held the seat until the people of the 22nd Congressional District sent him to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1989. During his 10 years in Congress, Dr. Poshard was a strong proponent of campaign finance reform. When he ran for Governor in 1998, he limited individual donations to his campaign and refused to accept contributions from political action committees.

Following his tenure in Congress, Dr. Poshard and his wife Jo founded the Poshard Foundation for Abused Children. For the last 14 years, the Poshard Foundation has helped children who have been victims of abuse, abandonment, or neglect in southern Illinois.

After a 40-year affiliation with the university, Dr. Poshard is leaving his beloved SIU in good shape. At SIU, Dr. Poshard has been a student, a student worker, a civil service worker, an adjunct professor, vice chancellor for administration, and now as he retires—the second longest serving president in the history of the Southern Illinois University system, an experience he calls “the greatest honor of my life.”

I congratulate Glenn on his distinguished career and thank him for dedicating his life to public service. I wish him and his family all the best.

POLITICAL PRISONERS AND POLITICAL REPRESSION IN RUSSIA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, over the years I have come to the floor to raise the plight of political prisoners being held around the globe. These have included journalists, activists, bloggers, musicians, and opposition candidates who all had the misfortune of landing in an autocrat's jail for exercising or advocating for basic freedoms that most of the world takes for granted.

Many of these cases are ones that have received little attention or are not in the world's media spotlight, including: Gambian journalist Ebrima Manneh, who has been held incommunicado since 2006 and probably has died in detention; Vietnamese blogger Dieu Cay, who was jailed for 12 years for anti-state propaganda and is in poor health due to a hunger strike amid his president's recent visit to Washington;

Saudi blogger Hamza Kashgari, who was grabbed off a plane in Malaysia while fleeing for his safety and returned to Saudi Arabia to face charges of blasphemy; Turkmen political dissident and human rights activist Gulgeldy Annaniyazov, who has been in jail since 2008; and Belarusian opposition candidate Mikalai, who was thrown in jail for having the temerity to run against his country's strongman, President Lukashenko.

Many of my colleagues here have helped with these efforts, including 11 other Senators who recently joined in a letter to Uzbek President Karimov asking for the release of activist Akzam Turgunov and journalists Dilmurod Saidov and Salijon Abdurakhmanov.

Others have also championed the cause of political freedom around the world, including Senators McCain and Cardin, who have been leaders in trying to hold our Russian friends to a higher standard of political and human rights freedom.

In fact, Senator Cardin was tireless in his effort to pass the Magnitsky law—a law that I supported—that tried to bring about some measure of accountability regarding the death of Russian lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, who was jailed after exposing official corruption and later died from mistreatment while in custody.

I have also watched with great dismay the deterioration of democracy and human rights in Russia.

A few years ago I had the chance to speak to the Lithuanian Parliament on that country's—the country of my mother's birth—20th anniversary of independence from the Soviet Union. One of the other speakers on that memorable occasion was Russian democrat small “d” democrat—Yuriy Afanasyev.

Many probably did not realize or have forgotten that during those heady days in the early 1990s a number of countries—such as Lithuania—were early in declaring independence and, as a result, helped change history in Eastern Europe.

And who helped support many such efforts?

Russian democrats in the streets of Moscow—the same ones who were also instrumental in bringing a transition to democracy in their own country.

Afanasyev was just such a Russian. He helped lead large public protests in Moscow during the January 1991 crackdown against Lithuania's independence movement.

That is why I find myself so saddened by what is happening in Russia today—the systematic state-sponsored harassment and dismantling of those Russian citizens and organizations that are still hoping for a democratic and free Russia so many years later.

Just 2 weeks ago, the Russian government tried and convicted popular opposition leader and candidate for

mayor of Moscow Alesksei Navalny on charges that had already been thrown out as baseless after a local investigation.

If his conviction is upheld, he will be banned from public office for life.

Navalny's case is just one of a long list of politically motivated charges and actions in recent years used to squash any criticism of the Russian government or those who might want to run for political office:

A few weeks ago, hundreds of protesters were detained by Russian Interior Ministry personnel when protesting Navalny's dubious conviction—a fate met by scores of nonviolent protesters in recent years;

As of March of this year, the Russian Federal Security Service accompanied by tax enforcement and other government personnel has raided thousands of NGOs across Russia, seizing documents and interrogating staff—all in an orchestrated intimidation campaign;

Opposition leader Boris Nemtsov has been arrested multiple times for peacefully protesting government policies;

Deputy editor-in-chief of Russian newspaper *Novaya Gazeta* Sergei Sokolov fled Russia after the chief federal investigator took him into the forest and threatened to decapitate him;

Doctor of Political Sciences at Kuban State University Mikhail Savva, who was a member of the that region's Public Oversight Committee and an outspoken voice against corruption was arrested in April and has been held without bail on flimsy charges;

Leader of For Human Rights, Lev Ponomarev, a prominent human rights advocacy group in Moscow, was kicked and beaten during a forceful eviction of his organization from their headquarters. The assault was carried out by men dressed in civilian clothing, but was observed by riot police officers;

Lastly—and very symbolic of the hundreds arrested at recent protests—human rights activist Nikolay Kavkazsky was arrested last year at his home for allegedly hitting a policeman during a protest although an independent investigation implies he was in fact dodging blows from a policeman.

Let me take a moment to pause and mention an extraordinary story and photo from the Washington Post of Russian schoolteacher Marina Rozumovskaya, standing alone in front of Moscow City Hall in the freezing Russian winter in January of 2011.

In the photo she is holding an 8 by 11 inch sign that said "Freedom to political prisoners" in response to the arrest and jailing of a prominent opposition leader who had criticized the Russian government.

Watching and waiting for her to break the law across the street in the 10 degree weather were a dozen or so Russian police officers.

This brave schoolteacher told the Washington Post, "If you don't exer-

cise your rights as a citizen, nothing will ever change."

The Russian government has also used almost paranoid legislation to restrict Russian human rights and election monitoring organizations from doing their work.

For example, in March of 2013, Russian officials raided the offices of hundreds of non-governmental organizations, including Amnesty International.

Equally troubling, Russia's largest elections watchdog GOLOS, and its executive director Lilia Shibanova, were fined for failing to register as a "foreign agent," even after receiving the prestigious Sakharov Prize by the Norwegian Helsinki Committee and rejecting the monetary portion of the award.

Russia has also passed draconian laws that include fines equivalent to an average annual salary for taking part in unsanctioned protests, stiffer libel penalties, a broader definition of treason, and restrictions on websites—laws that former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has denounced as an "attack on the rights of citizens."

Earlier this year Gorbachev also warned Russian President Putin "not to be afraid of his own people."

Remember Sergei Magnitsky, the Russian who tried to draw attention to massive police and tax fraud who died in Russian custody? He was convicted a few weeks ago of perpetrating fraud himself—4 years after he died.

After what many brave Russian democrats did for countries such as Lithuania and others breaking free from the Soviet Union, we owe it to speak up for those who are fighting for basic political freedoms today in Russia.

These endless show trials are not for criminals or foreign agent organizations. They are not worthy of a great nation.

These are petty attacks on patriotic Russians who want the freedom to peacefully criticize and improve their government, to run for office, to have clean elections, and to have an independent judiciary that is not used to quash political opponents.

The Russian people—our friends—deserve better than to have such aspirations so brazenly and so shortsightedly repressed.

SMARTER SENTENCING ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, yesterday, I introduced the Smarter Sentencing Act, bipartisan legislation that would reform our drug sentencing laws to make Federal sentencing policy smarter, fairer, and more fiscally responsible.

This bill, which is cosponsored by Republican Senator MIKE LEE and Judiciary Committee chairman PATRICK LEAHY, would reduce certain mandatory minimum sentences for non-

violent drug offenses and give Federal judges more ability to impose individualized sentences for certain offenders. These modest changes will allow Federal law enforcement to focus limited government resources on the most serious offenders and public safety risks.

Why is this legislation needed? Let's look at where we are as a country. We incarcerate more individuals, including per capita, than any other nation in the world. Our rivals, with far lower incarceration rates, include countries like Rwanda, Cuba, China, and the Russian Federation.

And our incarceration rates are only growing over time. We have 500 percent more inmates in our Federal prisons than we did 30 years ago. For example, in 1980 we had fewer than 25,000 in Federal custody, and today there are more than 219,000.

Our Federal prison system is at nearly 40 percent over capacity—with more than 50 percent overcrowding at high-security facilities. As the Government Accountability Office has explained, this overcrowding is not only creating financial strain, but it is jeopardizing the safety of both inmates and prison guards.

And who are we incarcerating with our limited resources? Nearly 50 percent of Federal inmates are serving sentences for drug offenses.

Let's be clear: The price tag for this system is unsustainably high in terms of both financial and human costs. What we spend on Federal incarceration has increased more than 1100 percent in the last 30 years. The number was less than \$330 million in 1980 and had skyrocketed to more than \$6.6 billion by last year.

Our current incarceration policies are swallowing our limited law enforcement budget and forcing choices that many lawmakers and taxpayers would not agree with. Incarceration and detention costs account for nearly a third of the Department of Justice's discretionary budget. This threatens funding for Federal prosecutions, Federal law enforcement, funding and grant money for State and local law enforcement, and support for treatment, intervention, and reentry programs.

In the era of sequestration, we are faced with a choice: We can either change our sentencing policies or potentially suffer an erosion in public safety. We need to take steps to control Federal prison spending now or we will face significant cuts in the resources available for other pressing criminal justice priorities like making sure there are police on the streets, crime prevention programs in place, and an ability for offenders to reintegrate into their communities rather than become safety risks.

Many States across the country recognize that we are at a crossroads and they are pursuing important reforms with a high degree of success. A New

York Times article published this week explains the “new approach to crime” many States are taking and the resulting decline in State prison populations. The Federal Government should follow suit.

And let’s never forget the human costs. We hear every day about heart-breaking cases of mothers, fathers, uncles, aunts, and children who are behind bars for far too long sometimes decades—for nonviolent offenses. This harms communities and families.

One such case is a woman I came to know well, Eugenia Jennings. Because of unjust sentencing laws, she was incarcerated in Federal prison at the age of 23 for more than two decades for a nonviolent drug offense involving the exchange of a small amount of drugs for clothing. Eugenia had three children who were forced to grow up without their mother.

Even the sentencing judge acknowledged the injustice of Eugenia’s sentence, lamenting “there is nothing this court could do” because of the laws that existed. Eugenia was a model prisoner winning awards, completing substance abuse programs, and serving as a model employee who worked at a call center and sewed thousands of pairs of shorts for the military. Eugenia suffered from a serious and rare form of cancer while in Federal custody. Eugenia would still be serving a sentence today—a sentence that would be costing taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars and depriving children of a mother—had it not been for the highly unusual grant of a Presidential commutation. Who benefited from the many years Eugenia spent in prison?

How do we fix this problem or at least take an important step toward solving it? We have learned that our exploding prison population is in large part due to ineffective sentencing laws and the increasing number and length of Federal mandatory minimum sentences. Mandatory sentences, particularly drug sentences, can take individualized review out of a judge’s hands by requiring a one-size-fits-all sentence imposed by Congress. And the number of Federal mandatory sentences has doubled during the last 20 years.

More than 60 percent of Federal district court judges agree that existing mandatory minimums for all offenses are too high. Many think they are just bad policy. Justice Anthony Kennedy said: “I am in agreement with most judges in the federal system that mandatory minimums are an imprudent, unwise and often unjust mechanism for sentencing.”

The Judicial Conference of the United States, which represents all Federal judges, has “consistently opposed mandatory minimum sentences for more than 50 years.” The bipartisan U.S. Sentencing Commission recently said, after studying this issue in a 369-page report, “[T]he Commission unani-

mously believes that certain mandatory minimum penalties apply too broadly, are excessively severe, and are applied inconsistently. . . .”

We subject our Federal judges to a rigorous confirmation process. Congress should allow these judges to use their legal and law enforcement expertise to do their jobs and not micromanage their sentencing decisions. It is important in achieving both justice and public safety to have sentences tailored to the individual facts, background, and circumstances of each case and defendant. Only the judge who hears a case has the ability to set such a sentence.

We are at a crucial moment in history. We can no longer afford sentencing policies that are not working, are draining limited Federal funds, are leading to unjust sentences, and are failing to make our families and communities safer.

As a result of these problems, some of the country’s leading sentencing experts have called for the repeal of all Federal mandatory minimums. The Smarter Sentencing Act takes more modest but important steps in modernizing drug sentencing policy.

First, it modestly expands the existing Federal safety valve, which allows Federal judges to sentence certain nonviolent drug offenders below existing mandatory minimum sentences. This change will only apply to certain nonviolent drug offenses that do not involve weapons. It is supported by nearly 70 percent of Federal district court judges.

Second, the bill will permit those serving sentences that Congress has determined are unjust and racially disparate to petition for a reduction in their sentence. I authored the bipartisan Fair Sentencing Act in 2009 to help reduce the sentencing disparity between crack and powder cocaine offenses and to eliminate the mandatory minimum sentence for simple possession of crack cocaine. While African Americans were approximately 30 percent of crack users, they comprised more than 80 percent of those convicted of Federal crack offenses.

The bill passed the Senate unanimously. As one Judiciary Committee Republican stated, “[W]e are not able to defend” the unfair sentences that existed before the Fair Sentencing Act—sentences that disproportionately affected African Americans. Another stated that these changes were “long overdue” and that “Congress should act without any more delay to start to reduce the sentencing disparity.” A third Republican member of the Judiciary Committee stated, “The law created inequities. . . . We are working and will continue to work to roll back the injustice that was done.”

Because of the timing of their sentences, some individuals are still in jail serving lengthy, pre-Fair Sentencing

Act sentences that Congress has determined are unfair. To be clear, the Smarter Sentencing Act does not automatically reduce a single sentence in this respect. But it allows individuals sentenced under the old crack-powder sentencing disparity to petition courts and prosecutors for a review of their case, consistent with changes in the law made by the Fair Sentencing Act. Considering all of the circumstances, including public safety and the nature of the offense, a judge can grant or deny any petition. Federal courts successfully and efficiently conducted similar crack-related sentence reviews after 2007 and 2011 changes to the Sentencing Guidelines. Based on recent U.S. Sentencing Commission data, this change in the law alone could significantly reduce prison overcrowding and save taxpayers more than \$1 billion.

Third, the bill lowers mandatory penalties for certain nonviolent drug offenses. These modifications do not apply to, for example, statutory penalties involving firearms or bodily injury. And this bill does not repeal any mandatory minimum sentences. Rather, it reduces certain nonviolent drug mandatory sentences so that judges can determine, based on individual circumstances, when the harshest penalties should apply. Let’s allow these judges to do their jobs.

This bill crosses party lines; it is a bipartisan compromise from a Republican from Utah and a Democrat from Illinois. This bill is the right thing to do, which is why it is endorsed by faith leaders from the National Association of Evangelicals to the United Methodist Church. This bill would improve public safety, which is why it is endorsed by the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives. And this bill is good policy, which is why it is endorsed by groups on the right and left, ranging from Heritage Action to the ACLU. It is endorsed by Justice Fellowship of Prison Fellowship Ministries, Grover Norquist, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the NAACP, the Sentencing Project, Open Society Policy Center, the ABA, the Constitution Project, the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Families Against Mandatory Minimums, the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Drug Policy Alliance, and Brennan Center for Justice, among others.

I thank my partner in this effort, Senator LEE. We have taken many months to study this problem and work together on a bipartisan solution.

I am grateful to Senator LEAHY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for joining this effort and, as always, for his leadership on criminal justice reform.

I urge my colleagues to support the Smarter Sentencing Act.

REMEMBERING EDDY SIZEMORE, HERMAN 'LEE' DOBBS, AND JESSE JONES

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate the victims of a tragic accident that occurred recently in Clay County, KY. Three heroes were lost when a medical helicopter came down in the parking lot of Paces Creek Elementary School outside the town of Manchester on June 6 of this year. Crewmembers Eddy Sizemore, the pilot, Herman "Lee" Dobbs, the flight paramedic, and Jesse Jones, the flight nurse, sadly died in this crash.

The crew of this medical helicopter was returning back to their Manchester base after transporting a patient in urgent need of care to a hospital in London, KY. Medical helicopters help transport patients in remote areas to hospitals where they can receive all necessary medical attention. Sadly, these three crewmembers who worked to save others' lives lost their own.

Pilot Eddy Sizemore was 61 years old and a native of Laurel County, KY. He was a former chief deputy in the Laurel County Sheriff's Office. He worked most of his life in law enforcement, and was a veteran of the U.S. Army; he served his country in Vietnam and was awarded the Bronze Star Medal and the Purple Heart. He is remembered by his three daughters, Stacey Johnson, Kacey Bolton, and Jessica Sizemore; his son, Justin Sizemore; his father, Frank Sizemore; his brother, Jerry Sizemore; the mother and stepmother of his children, Pam Brock Sizemore; 10 grandchildren; and many other family members and friends.

Flight paramedic Herman "Lee" Dobbs, of London, KY, was 40 years old. He had worked for Knox County EMS and had a love of horses that led to his being put in charge of a horseback search unit for the Knox County Special Operations Response Team. He is remembered by his wife, Emilee Dobbs; his parents, Herman Dobbs and Patsy Light Dobbs; his children, Jordan, Hayden, and Walker Dobbs; his sister, Lori Crawford; his brother, Chad Dobbs; his aunt, Sherri Blakely; his uncle, Dale Light; his mother-in-law, Candace Hutton; and many other family members and friends.

Flight nurse Jesse Jones was 28 and from Bell County, KY. He graduated from Southeast Kentucky Community and Technical College as a registered nurse in 2007 and then pursued his dream of becoming a flight nurse. He is remembered by his grandparents, Mac and Ruby Jones; his son, Tyson Lee Jones; his father, Eddie Gene Jones; his stepmother, Patricia Maye Jones; his brother, Wiley Gene Jones; and many other family members and friends.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an article that was published recently in a southeastern Ken-

tucky publication describing the very moving memorial service held for the three crewmembers of the tragic Air Evac 109 flight be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Whitley County Times-Tribune, June 17, 2013]

"GOD SPEED AND BLUE SKIES"
AIR EVAC 109 CREW REMEMBERED
(By Jeff Noble)

CORBIN.—After the funerals of three of their crew members last week, it was time for Air Evac Lifeteam to remember Eddy Sizemore, Jesse Jones and Lee Dobbs.

On Saturday morning the company did just that, during an emotional and moving memorial service in London.

Outside the North Laurel High School Gymnasium, the weather was sunny and the skies blue, when an estimated 300 persons—including the families of the three who died, as well as Air Evac crews and first responders from Kentucky and other states as far away as Missouri, Illinois, Minnesota and North Carolina—came to say goodbye to their brothers who paid the ultimate price while doing their duty.

For all of them, the memory of what happened on that late Thursday night, June 6, will forever be seared in their hearts and minds.

Sizemore was the pilot. Jones was the flight nurse. Dobbs was the flight paramedic. All three died when their medical helicopter crashed in the parking lot of Paces Creek Elementary School in Clay County, just about 150 yards from the helipad where the crew is based in Manchester.

For the crews, it was their time to mourn. To persevere. And to have closure.

It was Pastor Donald Sims, of the City of Hope Community Fellowship in Manchester, whose opening prayer began the memorial service.

"Lord, be with the families, their friends, and bring hope, healing and comfort to all who are here," he prayed.

From the St. Louis suburb of O'Fallon, Missouri, came Air Evac Lifeteam's president, Seth Myers. He was the first speaker at the service, and told the audience and his employees, "It with a heavy heart that I stand here. To honor the life of Eddy Sizemore, Lee Dobbs and Jesse Jones."

He spoke of the three who perished, and spoke of the many first responders who came to pay their respects.

"I see uniforms of all colors. They all represent one thing. That's the dedication to serve others. The attendance today is a testament of these three people who served. They loved doing what they did, and the crews working with them. They helped to save lives and make a difference in peoples' lives. They're gone from us today, but they'll never be forgotten," Myers said.

He then read a letter from a woman, thanking the crews for their service.

"I can't imagine the emotions at this time, but you will work as a team and persevere . . . For Eddy, Lee and Jesse, their impact lives on in the life of every person they saved . . . I challenge you to move forward. A Japanese proverb said, 'Fall down seven times, stand up eight.' Signed, Mandy Curley," the letter said.

Eulogies were given for all three members of the helicopter crew by friends and family. Eddy Sizemore was remembered first.

"My definition of a hero is someone laying down their life helping someone they don't know. All three of those men did. I'm alive and able to stand on this stage today, because of Eddy's experience as a helicopter pilot. Eddy saved my life," said Officer Chuck Johnson of the Laurel County Sheriff's Department.

Johnson recalled riding with Sizemore as a spotter during a marijuana search in 2005 when both worked together with the sheriff's office. They were in the air when the chopper hit guy wires, then plunged to earth, hit the ground and skidded 96 feet on the blacktop. Johnson said it was Sizemore's skills, and cool in the hot seat, that brought the chopper down safely.

"I believe that God has a plan of a mission of all of us here on Earth. On that day, our mission wasn't finished. On June 6th, Eddy's mission was complete, and he was called home," he pointed out.

There was another side to Sizemore. A lighter side that permeated the workplace, and gave Johnson and his co-workers a wealth of what he affectionately called "Eddy Stories."

"He loved to sit and laugh and loved to cut up with us. Eddy loved to keep people entertained. He also liked to cheat at playing Rook during our times we worked the night shift years ago with the Sheriff's Office . . . Eddy always had our back. All of us who worked with him will continue to mourn. There was only one Eddy Sizemore," Johnson said.

Kathy Guyn spoke next. She remembered when Jesse Jones was in her nursing classes at the Pineville campus of Southeast Community and Technical College.

"He was the type of student everyone liked. Fun-loving, and had a good time. Jesse was very intelligent. He wanted to be a nurse. He made his patients feel very important, and that they were the most important person in the hospital. He loved to hunt. On more than one occasion he would remind me and the other teachers that it was the beginning of deer season. And he loved his family, especially his grandparents. When he graduated, he told me he wanted to be a flight nurse. He was meant to be in the skies. If I needed a flight nurse, I would want Jesse Jones, because I know he was the best," she stated.

Eliza Brooks started her nursing career with Jones at Pineville Community Hospital. She also spoke on behalf of Jesse's family.

"He had an eagerness to learn more. My husband also worked at the hospital, and he and Jesse became friends . . . We would serve lasagna for Jesse every deer season, and on Christmas, our family had a camouflage stocking for Jesse. To the family, we want to thank you for sharing Jesse with us. He loved all of you. He lived life every day to the fullest. He was always loving, kind and compassionate. He knew what to do, and never looked back. The sky was not the limit for Jesse," she said, holding back tears.

Letch Day, of Air Methods Corporation, gave the first of two eulogies for Lee Dobbs, the last of the crew of three that Day called "Our fallen heroes, our fallen brothers."

"To know Lee was an honor. He was a strong-willed person. EMS was his job. It was his life. It was his passion. The one letter to describe Lee was 'C' character, caring, compassion, commitment, companion, and childhood hero. His character was what propelled him to excellence. He loved and cared for his family. And he cared for his family and others with compassion and commitment. He was to others a companion, and to his children, a childhood hero to them," he said.

Day then looked at Dobbs's three sons and told them, "Your Dad. He is a hero. Don't ever forget that."

Lee's own father, Herman Dobbs, took the stage next. His voice cracked as he began to weep, while talking about the son he lost almost two weeks ago.

"Knowing Lee as my son, he would have said, Dad, did you tell the Jones family, and the Sizemore family, I'm sorry for their loss? They were my partners.' That's what he'd want me to say. He was my son. We tried to bring him up that way. I'm just so thankful the Lord gave me a son like that," Dobbs said, his voice choked with emotion.

In the place where the North Laurel High Jaguars held court, there were three wreaths on the stage—one each for the three fallen crew members. In the middle of each wreath was a picture of each of them. On each side of the stage was a large video screen, which showed pictures and moments of the lives of Lee, Eddy and Jesse. The seats on the gym floor were reserved for family members and Air Evac employees. When the doors opened at 10 a.m. for the service, the seats quickly filled, with other Air Evac crews and first responders joining the general public on the home side of the bleacher seats.

Two Air Methods Corporation employees from Missouri—Ray Haven and his wife, Veronica—sang the inspirational song "I Will Rise." Ray played acoustic guitar, while he and Veronica sang the duet.

Towards the end of the service, three recorded songs were played over the speakers while the audience watched the visual montage of the three men they called "their family."

One was the song "You Never Let Go," followed by "Shine Your Light," a tribute to first responders by Robbie Robertson, a former member of The Band. The set ended with an encore of "You Never Let Go."

When that ended, Brian Jackson, the program director of Air Evac 109 in Manchester, came to the stage, accompanied by nine crew members. Some of the crew shared stories and lighthearted moments about their work with Lee, Jesse and Eddy.

Several in the audience got some good laughs from the stories, which a nearby person in the bleacher seats said they needed.

Jackson told the crews and first responders, "Thank you for your prayers and your support during this time. It really means a lot. We agree. They were brothers to us. They would want me to tell you, 'Crawl back on that ambulance. Crawl back on that truck. Crawl back on that airplane. Do what you do best.'"

When the Manchester crew finished their final thoughts, they pinned the wings on the wreaths of Dobbs, Sizemore and Jones.

Letch Day returned, and presented a framed print in memory of the three crewmen to the Air Evac 109 base in Manchester.

"We're asking them to be our 'Guardian Angels' in memory of the job they did so well," he said.

Jackson and the base crew proudly accepted the print.

Kentucky state flags were presented to the families of the three crewmen by Mike Poynter, the state EMS director. Air Evac Lifeteam flags were also given to the three families, as were three fire helmets brought to them in memory of their fathers, by the Manchester Fire Department.

The tones were heard over the speakers, and the Last Call was given by a dispatcher. When that ended, a piper played "Amazing Grace" on the bagpipes as the color guard left the gymnasium. And the service ended.

Nearly everyone who attended went outside to wait for an aircraft flyover. Six helicopters and one airplane hovered overhead for the next five minutes, each one's pilot and crew showing in their own way their own respect and honor for their fallen comrades.

For those up in the air, and on the ground, this past Saturday was their time to remember.

It's a good bet that many of them will forever remember those final words when they heard the crew's last call inside the gymnasium.

"November One-One-Nine Alpha Echo is out of service. God speed and blue skies."

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would like to speak briefly about how the immigration reform bill affects access to health insurance coverage. In particular, I am pleased that the Senate-passed legislation preserves the ability for States to cover lawfully residing pregnant women and children under Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program CHIP. Importantly, States may extend full benefits under these programs to individuals who gain legal status as a result of the bill, including those granted Registered Provisional Immigrant RPI, Blue Card, and V-visa status.

My home State of Washington is one of 27 that have decided to exercise the option to extend these health care benefits to children or pregnant women. We do this because we know that when women have access to prenatal care, children are born healthier. We all benefit when children receive the immunizations they need and are able to see a doctor when they are sick.

During the debate on S. 744, two of my colleagues, Chairman LEAHY and Senator ROCKEFELLER, came to the floor to discuss this issue. I join them in support of preserving States' rights to extend Medicaid and CHIP benefits to lawfully residing noncitizen children and pregnant women. I thank my colleagues for addressing an issue that is critical to my home State and I echo their comments on the intention of the Senate with regard to this issue.

Madam President, I would also like to speak today about the need for comprehensive immigration reform by highlighting the work of one of my constituents.

I was touched when I read a poem written by 10-year-old Erin Stark of Bellevue, WA. I met Erin last month at a welcoming ceremony for new immigrants in my home State of Washington. She told me about her passion for writing and explained that she won a national writing contest with the submission of her poem on immigration. I think her words exemplify the diversity and extraordinary contributions made by immigrants to this country.

"WHAT WOULD YOU MISS ABOUT IMMIGRANTS,
IF THEY DIDN'T COME TO AMERICA?"
Would you miss the food?

The pot stickers, sushi, and dumplings,
Pizza, spaghetti, curry, or crepes?
Just think about it for a minute or two,
Could you survive eating fish at every meal?
Could you?

Immigrants are coming every day,
Variety is what they bring with them in every way.

Would you miss the holidays?
Day of the Dead, and Chinese New Year,
Hanukkah, Kwanzaa, and Ramadan too?
Why did the Christians travel the distance,
Was it to share their beliefs and Christmas?
Immigrants are coming every day,
Variety is what they bring with them in every way.

Would you miss their art,
Painting, literature, and music,
Plays, sculpture, and design?
Life would be dull without art,
People might become sad and would get broken hearts.

Immigrants are coming every day,
Variety is what they bring with them in every way.

Would you miss the things they made?
Railroads, canals, communities, and skyscrapers,
Schoolhouses, highways, churches, and businesses?

What would kids do without schools?
We might turn into fools!
Immigrants are coming every day,
Variety is what they bring with them in every way.

Immigrants are coming every day.
They bring recipes, celebrations, talents, and skills.

Variety is what they bring with them in every way.

USA would be bland without immigrants,
Now our nation is colorful and the joy is infinite.

—Erin Stark

Mr. President, I would like to extend a special welcome to Erin Stark. I look forward to seeing all that she will accomplish in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO ROHIT KUMAR

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to my colleague Rohit Kumar, who will soon, unfortunately, be leaving Senate service for other pursuits.

Rohit stood by me and others here in the Senate as we navigated through deep challenges faced by our Nation, and he has consistently and vigilantly worked for the American people to promote a lot of good, and to prevent a lot of bad from happening.

Rohit is a consummate Senate professional whose skills and accomplishments have provided a long strand of service to this body and to the country. He is a rarity, combining a razor-sharp intellect, logical patterns of thought, and an ability to obtain fair and balanced assessments of challenges that typically involve tradeoffs across a host of competing interests. He adds to that an uplifting disposition and a keen wit.

Rohit possesses mastery of policy, politics, rules of the Congress, and more. While most of us would be content having mastery of any one of

those realms, Rohit has managed to master them all. He is a complete package.

Rohit has been an asset to me, to my caucus, to Senate Leadership, and to the country, and his presence will be missed by all of us.

All of us here in the Senate are also indebted to Rohit's beautiful family, which has endured the often-rigorous demands that his Senate service has placed on them. I can think of more than a few occasions where Rohit was negotiating issues that are deeply important for the future of our Nation in stressful, around-the-clock marathon sessions.

If you were to ask me to construct a template for an ideal person to have by your side to navigate through the tough decisions, tradeoffs, and negotiations we face in Congress, I would simply point to Rohit Kumar.

We are all very sad to see Rohit leave. We trust that he will be able to take a bit more time with his family, and will pursue future endeavors with more of the same rigor and industriousness he has consistently shown in his service to the country while working in the Senate. Wherever he goes, without doubt, those around him will benefit tremendously.

I wish to thank Rohit for the many years of outstanding assistance he has provided to me, to my colleagues in the Senate, and to the country. I also thank his family for sharing Rohit with us, and for persevering as we often tapped his talents around the clock. I am proud to have worked with Rohit.

REMEMBERING HARRY BYRD JR.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today to pay special tribute to a man I admired for many years, former U.S. Senator Harry Byrd, Jr. Sadly, Harry passed away July 30, 2013, leaving behind a lasting legacy that garnered the respect of many throughout our State and Nation.

Senator Byrd made history in 1970 when he became the first person to win election to the U.S. Senate as an independent candidate. He used that independence to be a voice for good and was someone people respected for his deliberative manner.

Senator Byrd was not one to introduce unnecessary legislation and in fact believed legislation was not always the answer. However one of his proudest moments as a legislator was his work on a bill that mandated a balanced Federal budget in 1978. He set the tone for my own commitment to this principle that I have continued to fight for throughout my service in the Senate.

I had the pleasure of getting to know Harry during my early years as a Senator. In fact, after the important and difficult Labor Law Reform battle I waged 2-years into office, I received a

note from Harry that I treasure to this day. This Independent Senator praised my work and declared that "... the American people are indebted to you." Strong words from a strong man that I looked up to and admired as a very junior Senator just learning the ropes.

Senator Byrd not only conquered the political world—he was a highly respected voice in the newspaper business—two entities not always known for cohesive relationships. He spent many decades in publishing and served as editor and publisher for two newspapers; as well as the vice president of the Associated Press.

His service in the Senate was matched by his service to his country in the U.S. Navy as a lieutenant commander during World War II. His love for America and the ideals it represents could be found throughout the good works he performed throughout his life.

Our Nation lost a truly wonderful man. I know that many people will truly miss his strength, leadership, and wisdom.

Elaine and I convey our deepest sympathies to his three children and their families. May our Heavenly Father bless them with peace and comfort at this time. The contributions and impact Senator Byrd made on his family, his community, and our Nation will be felt and appreciated for generations to come.

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013 reaffirms the strong relationship the United States has with Israel. As the legislation states, our countries share a deep and unbreakable bond, forged by over 60 years of shared interests and shared values.

S. 462 includes provisions that will enhance cooperation between our countries in the areas of energy, defense, homeland security, and agriculture.

While I support the end goal of the bill, I do have reservations about a section dealing with the visa waiver program. The visa waiver program was created by Congress but is largely overseen and maintained by the executive branch. The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, may designate any country as a participant if certain qualifications are met. Congress laid out the criteria, which include low nonimmigrant visa refusal rate; machine readable passport program; law enforcement and security interests; reporting lost and stolen passports; repatriation of aliens; and passenger information exchange.

Once a country meets these requirements, the Secretary of Homeland Security allows the country to partici-

pate in the visa waiver program. Yet, S. 462 would amend the statute and allow Israel in the program even if all the criteria are not met. Specifically, under the legislation, Israel would not have to abide by the low nonimmigrant visa refusal rate. Currently, 37 countries participate in the visa waiver program without needing a special exception.

I am concerned about section 9 of the bill because it sets a precedent for other countries not to have to abide by all the terms of the program. Participating in the visa waiver program is a great benefit. Congress should not be making exceptions.

So, while I support the bill and am cosponsoring it today, I will advocate that section 9 be amended before it is passed by this body. The Senate should accept the House language, which simply includes a statement of policy and requires the Secretary of State to report on the extent to which Israel satisfies the requirements specified in law.

I hope my colleagues will work with me on this section, and I look forward to helping pass this bill in the Senate to reaffirm the partnership of United States with Israel.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT KIRK A. OWEN

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I pay tribute today to a true American hero, Army SSG Kirk A. Owen of Sapulpa, OK, who died on August 2nd, 2011, serving our Nation in Paktya Province, Afghanistan. Staff Sergeant Owen was assigned as a scout to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 279th Infantry Regiment, 45th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, Oklahoma Army National Guard.

Staff Sergeant Owen died of injuries sustained when the vehicle in which he was riding was attacked with an improvised explosive device in the Lajah District, Paktya Province while conducting combat operations. He was 37 years old.

Kirk enlisted in the Oklahoma National Guard at the age of 31 as a Chaplain's Assistant after seeing a recruiting commercial on television and deployed in support of disaster relief operations following Hurricane Katrina. Kirk then deployed again to Iraq in 2007 as an infantryman and rose through the ranks to Staff Sergeant. He served as a full-time Army National Guard Soldier. He strived to be the best in everything he did and was repeatedly recognized for his excellence as the Hero of the Battlefield and the outstanding soldier in the 45th Infantry Brigade Combat Team for his performance at the Joint Readiness Training Center, and presented the Unsung Hero Award when he attended the Ranger Reconnaissance and Surveillance Leader Course for his scout training. He

also was Soldier of the Cycle for basic training and given Distinguished Honors at Advanced Individual Training.

A true warrior and leader, Kirk died while escorting an Explosive Ordnance Disposal team to disarm dangerous explosive devices in Paktya Province. Kirk was a loving husband, endearing father, and faithful friend. His loving presence, strong faith, incredible sense of duty and honor, and his wonderful sense of humor left a lasting impression on every heart he touched.

First Baptist Church Pastor Doyle Pryor said, "Kirk is one of those guys who had a natural sense of duty and honor. He really believed his military service was a calling from God."

Major General Myles Deering, the Oklahoma National Guard Adjutant General, said, "He was an outstanding non-commissioned officer, dedicated to loyally serving his country and fellow Soldiers. His loss is being felt across the state and he will be greatly missed."

His daughter Kylie wrote:

My dad was a fantastic leader. All of his guys looked up to him. My nickname for him was Ironman. There was nothing to me that he couldn't do. He loved Jesus with all his heart and that's where my peace is coming from. I can just see him up in heaven following Jesus around wanting to know everything. A few weeks before he left we were at the grocery store and my dad and little sister were walking down the marshmallow aisle and he turned to her and said 'Kayci, I think heaven will smell like marshmallows.' I hope it does. The memory of my dad will live on forever and his good looks will too.

In July 2012, the town of Sapulpa dedicated a neighborhood park where the Owen family still lives as a tribute to Kirk and his service to our Nation. There is a lasting monument in his honor.

Kirk lived a life of love for God, his wife and daughters, family, friends, and country. He leaves behind a wonderful and loving family: his wife, Tiffany and daughters, Kylie and Kayci. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice for our protection and freedom. We will keep them in our thoughts and prayers, always.

HYDROPOWER REGULATORY EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. I rise today to express my support for the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013, H.R. 267. This important legislation will encourage and facilitate the development of clean and renewable hydropower capacity in the United States.

Hydropower has played a key role in the economic and industrial development of the State of Alabama over the last 100 years. In fact, according to the National Hydropower Association, Ala-

bama ranks among the top ten States in hydropower generation, with over 8,700,000 megawatt-hours of conventional hydrogeneration. I believe hydropower will continue to make important contributions to meet Alabama's energy needs well into the future. For that reason, I believe the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013 is an important piece of legislation that merits this body's full support. I would like to recognize the excellent work of the Senate Energy Committee, including the chairman and ranking member, on this legislation. At this time, I wish to ask the ranking member for permission to engage her in a brief colloquy concerning her understanding of Section 6 of this legislation.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I welcome an exchange for the record.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank my colleague for her willingness to discuss this legislation. Section 6 of the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013 promotes hydropower development by directing the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, to investigate the feasibility of a more streamlined licensing process for certain hydro projects that should not be subjected to the lengthy and expensive licensing process that was designed for projects with many more complicated issues and stakeholder interests.

Under H.R. 267, two types of projects would be eligible for the 2-year licensing process: new hydro developments at existing nonpowered dams and closed-loop pumped storage hydro. It is my understanding that adding generation capacity at existing nonpowered dams would tap into an important and substantial renewable energy resource at projects where the impacts of dam construction have already been realized.

For hydropower developers to take full advantage of any streamlined licensing process that FERC may develop as contemplated in Section 6 of the act, I believe there needs to be a good understanding of what types of pumped storage projects would be considered "closed-loop pumped storage projects." This term is not defined in the act, and I am not aware of any generally accepted engineering or industry definition for that term.

In order that I might have a better understanding of the types of hydropower projects that would be eligible for a streamlined licensing process that FERC may develop in accordance with Section 6 of the act, would the ranking member kindly provide a description of the types of pumped storage projects that she would consider to be "closed-loop pumped storage"?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Senator for his support of this legislation and for his inquiry about Section 6 of the Act. Streamlining the licensing process for "closed-loop pumped storage" projects will encourage development of new and important sources of

renewable energy that will help balance the country's energy resources and provide critical support to the Nation's power grid.

Section 6 of the bill directs FERC to develop criteria for identifying projects featuring "closed loop pumped storage" that would be appropriate for licensing within a 2-year process. This term was used in the bill to generally describe pumped storage projects that have a low impact on the various resources considered by FERC during the licensing process such as environmental, recreational, and navigation interests.

For example, pumped storage projects that are removed from major streams are likely to have fewer significant resource impacts and issues to be addressed and resolved, which makes them appropriate for the 2-year licensing process. Accordingly, the types of pumped storage projects considered "closed loop" and, therefore, eligible for FERC's expedited licensing process under this bill, would include projects where the upper and lower reservoirs do not impound or directly withdraw water from a navigable stream and projects that are not continuously connected to a naturally-flowing water feature.

These types of "closed loop pumped storage" designs are candidates for a 2-year licensing process because the resource impacts associated with such projects can be minimal as compared to more traditional pumped storage hydro designs and other conventional hydro projects for which the existing FERC licensing process was designed.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank Ranking Member MURKOWSKI for her explanation. Again, I applaud her for her work on the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013 and for her leadership in this body.

VOTE EXPLANATIONS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I regret having missed the July 31, 2013, vote on the confirmation of Byron Jones, of Minnesota, to be director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the confirmation of Mr. JONES.

I also regret having missed three votes on August 1, 2013. The three votes that I missed are as follows: the nomination of Raymond Chen to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit; cloture on S. 1243, Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations; and the nomination of Samantha Power to serve as the United States Ambassador to the United Nations. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of all three votes.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Madam President, I was unable to cast my vote earlier this week on the nomination of James

Comey to be the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, and the nominees for the National Labor Relations Board.

Had I been present, I would have voted to confirm Mr. Comey as FBI Director and would have voted in support of the motions to invoke cloture and confirmation of the nominations of Kent Hirozawa, Nancy Schiffer, and Mark Pearce to be members of the National Labor Relations Board.

REMEMBERING LINDY BOGGS

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to an incredible woman—former Congresswoman and Ambassador Lindy Boggs—who was a trailblazer for women and a passionate advocate for the people of Louisiana and people across the country who too often don't have a voice in Washington.

When I first became a Member of Congress in 1983, Lindy was one of only 21 women serving in the House of Representatives. I will always be grateful for the kindness and generosity she showed in taking me under her wing—and it was the same for so many other women who followed her in Congress and found in her a role model of such dignity and strength.

No one will ever forget her courage in the face of unspeakable tragedy—the loss of her husband, Congressman Hale Boggs, whose plane disappeared during a campaign trip to Alaska in 1972. Louisianans, including her husband's closest friends, urged her to run for the seat in a special election the next year, and she became the first woman elected to Congress from the State where she was beloved.

I remember visiting Lindy's home State of Louisiana years later and being overwhelmed at the outpouring of love and respect the people she represented had for her—and with good reason. Throughout her time in Congress, she was a champion for civil rights, women's equality, and social justice.

During her first term in Congress, Lindy was assigned to the House Banking Committee. At one point, the committee was considering an amendment to a lending bill banning discrimination on the basis of race, age or veteran status.

Seizing the opportunity, Lindy quickly added the words "sex or marital status" to the amendment and ran to a copy machine to make copies for each Member. She told her colleagues:

Knowing the Members composing this committee as well as I do, I'm sure it was just an oversight that we didn't have 'sex' or 'marital status' included. I've taken care of that, and I trust it meets with the committee's approval.

That is how sex discrimination was made illegal in the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974.

She was a skilled lawmaker who used her immense personal charm, political

savvy and intellect to win over colleagues on issues that were critical to her State and the country. One of her Republican House colleagues remarked:

It was impossible not to like Lindy. She liked everybody. She was nice to everybody. She achieved more with less huff and puff and bluster than any of the rest of us did.

Lindy stood up for equality and racial justice, even when her views were not popular with some voters in her own district. When she left Congress in 1991 after serving nine terms, she was the only White Member to represent a Black-majority district.

She led the fight for equal pay for women in government jobs and for greater access to government contracts for women business owners. She worked to protect women from domestic violence, and inspired so many young people—women and men—to follow her into public service.

Lindy was a pioneer in so many ways—the first woman to chair a major political party's nominating convention, the first woman to serve as U.S. Ambassador to the Vatican, and the first woman to have a room in the Capitol named in her honor. But because of her leadership and mentorship, Lindy made sure that she would not be the last and that generations of other women would be able to follow in her extraordinary footsteps.

My heart goes out to her family, her friends and all of those whose lives she touched. She will be dearly missed.

Mrs. LANDRIEU. Madam President, today I honor and celebrate the life of an extraordinary American: Marie Corinne Morrison Claiborne Boggs, who we all knew as "Lindy." She was a remarkable national leader, trailblazer for women everywhere, wife, mother, and a friend. Lindy taught me—and an entire generation of Louisianians, both men and women, through her example—to answer the call of public service.

With her death last Saturday, July 28, 2013, our entire State is in mourning but we are also celebrating a life well lived.

Throughout her life, she shaped the world to become a better and more just place. When she was born in 1916, women could not vote and segregation reigned supreme. But she refused to accept the world as it was and set about to change it. She lived through both World Wars and the Great Depression. Despite all of these daunting obstacles, Lindy—a graceful woman with a strong, passionate calling to serve others—was not deterred.

Like many women of her time, she married a man of great promise—and ultimately great power—Hale Boggs. But when he was lost in a tragic plane accident in Alaska, she—unlike many—stepped up and into his shoes, trusting God to lead her forward.

She was elected to succeed her husband in Congress on March 20, 1973, and

became the first woman elected to the House of Representatives from our State. At the time, there were only 15 women in the U.S. House of Representatives and none in the U.S. Senate.

But Lindy never let the novelty of this, the pressure of work and family, or any other challenge she faced throughout her career stand in her way or deter her from serving her State and her country.

Her keen political mind, iron will and graceful Southern charm helped her become one of the most formidable forces Congress has ever known. She was known for bridging the gap between Republicans and Democrats and convincing her colleagues to do what was right with poise, kindness and reason.

As her colleague Bill Frenzel, a Republican from Minnesota said of her: "It was impossible not to like Lindy. She liked everybody. She was nice to everybody. She achieved more with less huff and puff and bluster than any of the rest of us did."

She used her formidable influence to help lead the fight for civil rights, pay equity for women and the right for women to hold a mortgage on her own home without the necessity of a husband's signature.

As a member of the Banking Committee she inserted a provision barring discrimination over sex or marital status into the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974. She did not tell her colleagues before she did it and simply told them:

Knowing the members composing this committee as well as I do, I'm sure it was just an oversight that we didn't have 'sex' or 'marital status' included. I've taken care of that, and I trust it meets with the committee's approval.

There was no objection! And tens of millions of women were given access to credit, opportunity and a future of their own.

Lindy never tired in her fight to expand opportunities for women, whether it was helping women as candidates for public office at all levels of government, pressing Federal cabinet secretaries and agency heads to promote women to senior leadership and policy positions in government, supporting women that work two to three jobs to keep food on the table and a roof over their head or speaking out for victims of domestic violence.

In fact today, there is a place named "Lindy's Place" in New Orleans that carries on her work to support abused and battered women.

In 1976, she nominated a young woman from New Orleans to the U.S. Military Academy as soon as the Army dropped the gender bar, and then quickly nominated women to all four service academies. She applauded NASA when Sally Ride was the first female American astronaut to go into space. She knew women could really excel at anything whether it was on this planet or beyond.

Following her retirement from Congress in 1991, she once again answered the call to serve as the first female ambassador to the Holy See where she continued to exhibit the same strength, intelligence and respect that she was known for throughout her life. She was most certainly the only person to call the Pope “darlin’!”

Lindy’s decades of service to her family, community, Nation and church reminds us all to give of ourselves fully to a worthy cause, and is an example of what we can achieve when we do. She has certainly set the gold standard for public service.

But knowing Lindy as well as I did, I believe she was most proud of her 3 children, 8 grandchildren and 18 great-grandchildren.

As many of you know, the special cloakroom for the women of the House bears Lindy’s name. A few months ago when we celebrated the 40th anniversary of Lindy’s election, she said she was proud of that room, but that “Maybe, someday, the women will have to relinquish the room when women are the majority in the House.”

I know that Lindy will be proud when women achieve this milestone. Even after that day comes, Lindy’s legacy will continue to inspire us for many years to come.

REMEMBERING WILLIAM H. GRAY III

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, today I wish to honor and remember the full life of Congressman William H. Gray, III, and his exceptional service to his community, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and our country.

Bill was born in Baton Rouge, LA, the second child of Dr. William H. Gray, Jr., and Hazel Gray. Though he spent the first 8 years of his life in Florida, Bill moved to Philadelphia in 1949 and remained a distinguished resident of our Commonwealth until his recent passing.

Bill was a pastor and shepherd for his congregation, a respected member of the U.S. House of Representatives, and a powerful advocate for higher education. Today we honor his life, his good works, and his legacy.

As a pastor, Bill followed in the footsteps of his father and grandfather and led Philadelphia’s Bright Hope Baptist Church for more than 33 years. Knowing that the ministry was not just something you did on Sunday morning, Bill always believed strongly in the principle of a “whole ministry,” that the church must tend to all the needs of its entire congregation. Under Bill’s leadership, that congregation quickly grew to over 4,000 parishioners, but Bill remained committed to his “whole ministry” and made sure to continue his important advocacy work on issues ranging from housing, to economic justice, to excellent education for all. Bill

often said that his position as pastor of Bright Hope was the most important job he had ever had, one that cultivated the skills and priorities that shaped his life’s work.

As a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Bill proudly represented the Second District of Pennsylvania from 1979 to 1991 and built a reputation as a thoughtful and effective leader. Bill quickly rose through the ranks of leadership during his 12 years in Congress and assumed the chairmanship of the Budget Committee, after only 6 years in office. Three years later, in 1988, he was elected to chair his party’s House caucus, and then in 1989 he became the House majority whip, the third-ranking leadership position in the House.

As a lifelong advocate for higher education, Bill chose to leave Congress at the pinnacle of his career to accept the position of president and CEO of the United Negro College Fund. He said at the time that “Woodrow Wilson used to say, ‘My constituency is the next generation,’ and you know, that’s why I left Congress, because my constituency, really, is the next generation.” Bill’s 12-year tenure at UNCF brought unexpected growth in support for historically Black colleges, and he constantly sought innovative ways to both attract new investment and increase existing funding. By the time he left UNCF 12 years later, Bill and his team had raised more than \$1.54 billion.

Bill never rested and was never satisfied with one job at a time. While leading the UNCF, he was asked by President Clinton in 1994 to lead the efforts to restore democracy in Haiti. His work there earned him the Medal of Honor from the President of Haiti. In 2004, Bill started Gary Global Strategies, Inc., and served as a director on multiple corporate boards, including at Dell, JPMorgan Chase, and Pfizer. He also served as vice chairman for the Pew Commission on Children in Foster Care and on the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

Bill often said that he had “always been taught by my folk, parents, grandparents, that service is sort of the rent you pay for the space you occupy. And so, what I’ve tried to do is direct my life towards service based on faith and commitment, and social justice.” As Bill’s family and friends mourn his passing, I pray that they will be comforted by the knowledge that this great Nation will never forget the commitment Bill demonstrated to each of us, to his “whole ministry.” May he rest in peace.

TRIBUTE TO BLAISE MESSINGER

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, today I wish to recognize Blaise Messinger, Connecticut’s 2013 Teacher of the Year.

Every year the Connecticut State Department of Education selects one

teacher for this prestigious title who then serves as an ambassador for education throughout the State and also represents Connecticut on a national scale, working on panels and advisory committees with other State teachers of the year, as well as with the National State Teacher of the Year Program and the U.S. Department of Education. This year’s Connecticut Teacher of the Year, Blaise Messinger, was selected from 4 finalists, 15 semifinalists, and over 80 district teachers of the year for this tremendous distinction.

Mr. Messinger makes an extraordinary difference in the lives of his students and their families and at his school. He is an inspiration to his colleagues. At Woodside Intermediate School in Cromwell, CT, he is well known for his commitment to making fifth grade engaging and interesting. An actor in Los Angeles and New York City for many years, Mr. Messinger dedicates this thespian acumen and ability to his students’ progress. By making school fun and relevant, his students remember what he teaches and come out of his classroom as enthusiastic learners. When addressing fellow educators as Connecticut Teacher of the Year, he advised his colleagues to “think back to that teacher you can still hear in your head.” I am grateful that Mr. Messinger came to Connecticut to apply his talents, high energy, and positive spirit as a community leader.

One personal inspiration for Mr. Messinger’s incredible impact as a teacher is his own family—especially his two sons, Ethan and Caleb, who live with him and his wife Kimberley in Cromwell. Mr. Messinger has said that his love for them—and his witnessing how teachers impacted their lives, especially his son Ethan who has autism—drives his desire to change the lives of children.

I thank the Connecticut State Department of Education and the National Teacher of the Year Program for representing the voices of passionate, talented teachers and recognizing their heroic efforts. Mr. Messinger has already done great work on a national level, sparking important discussions about changing the way we educate our future generations. I am very proud that he represents Connecticut as 2013 Teacher of the Year and invite my colleagues to join me in applauding his invaluable contributions to our country.

SYRIA

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I wish to speak about the crisis in Syria and the role that one company in one nation is playing in perpetuating the strife.

Every day Syria descends deeper into chaos and civil war. Since March 2011, more than 100,000 Syrians have been

killed, an estimated 5 million have been internally displaced, and at least 1.6 million have fled their war-torn land. By the end of 2013, half of Syria's population may have left their homes.

The pressure on neighboring countries, Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq, is only increasing. Beyond the refugee crisis, the resulting chaos threatens unprecedented violence and instability for all of Syria's neighbors. As Syria's conflict grows increasingly radical, its borders are increasably insecure.

In August 2011, now nearly 2 years ago, President Obama declared that Syria's dictator, Bashar Assad, had lost all legitimacy and "must go." At the time of that statement, the number of Syrians butchered by the Assad regime numbered a then-shocking 6,000. There were frequent grim comparisons to Bashar al-Assad's father Hafez, who shelled Hama for days in 1982, killing perhaps 20,000. Now, today we see a nation on a path to destruction and Hafez Assad's 20,000 dead is just a fraction of the number his son has killed.

America must take seriously its commitment to doing what it can to bring an end to the Assad regime. We must not tolerate the empowerment of forces antithetical to our interests. And we certainly must not be complicit in their behavior.

The triumph of the Assad regime would validate and encourage the murderous behavior of leaders who spurn democracy and the rule of law. It would empower the belligerent regime in Tehran and offer support to Iranian proxies who seek to annihilate Israel and ultimately threaten our own nation.

While we view the Assad regime with rebellion, some others have stepped up support for him, facilitating Assad's brutal success. Among these is the Government of Russia. Russia has demonstrated time and again its support for Bashar Assad and its opposition to our own humanitarian and democratic values.

Russia has consistently thwarted multilateral efforts to stem the violence in Syria, including vetoing a United Nations Security Council resolution that would have penalized Assad's failure to carry out a peace plan. It has made clear its unwavering support for Assad's brutality. Addressing the compounding challenges posed by Russian intransience has proven increasingly difficult. The Obama administration has made a serious effort to engage in a direct dialog over matters related to Syria, most recently along the sidelines of the G8.

But that effort has not been fruitful. Indeed, the Russian Government has demonstrated no genuine interest in achieving a resolution to the Syria conflict. Moscow appears to simply enjoy the political cover that U.S.-Russian talks provide. Russia remains un-

wavering in its support for an Assad regime that has hosted its bases, served Russian economic interests, and anchored what remains of Russia's influence in the region.

At the same time, Moscow continues to flout international norms. Russia is acting antagonistically toward our Nation. It perpetuates human rights abuses at home. It sacrifices the well-being of Russia's orphans for the sake of political gains. And it is sheltering the fugitive Edward Snowden.

Russia's state-owned arms export firm, Rosoboronexport, has exacerbated the crisis in Syria. Instead of promoting a path to peace, Rosoboronexport has provided the Syrian Government with the means to perpetrate widespread and systemic attacks on its own people. It has supplied Assad with guns, grenades, tank parts, attack aircraft, anti-ship cruise missiles, and air defense missiles, which his regime in turn uses to perpetuate its rule and murder innocent civilians. Rosoboronexport also has made a commitment to provide Syria with S-300 advanced anti-aircraft missiles that would protect Syrian air dominance and facilitate its continued attacks on its civilian population.

These weapons do not threaten the Syrian people alone. They challenge American interests in the region, including the safety and security of Israel.

Let's look at one particular example that has received a good deal of international attention. It is certainly possible that NATO or our own Nation may decide it is necessary to create a no-fly zone over Syria to stop the carnage. Russian-provided S-300s would present a major threat to U.S. or allied aircraft and pilots seeking to establish such a zone. They would also pose a direct threat to Israeli civil and military air traffic.

The Russian transfer of weapons to Syria is not just inhumane, but it is a violation of U.S. law. The Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 and the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Accountability Act, as well as Executive Orders 13382 and 13582 all demand sanctions against "those entities that materially assist, or provide support for, the Government of Syria."

In addition, the fiscal year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act prohibits contracts with Rosoboronexport, and section 1233 of S. 1197, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, which was passed by the Senate Armed Services Committee, prohibits the use of funds to enter contracts with Rosoboronexport.

In light of the lack of progress of diplomatic efforts to end Russian support for the Assad regime and the direct nature of the threat these escalating arms sales pose, it is incumbent upon the U.S. Government to pursue more

aggressive measures as mandated by U.S. law to create incentives for the Russians to change their behavior. Indeed, Senator KELLY AYOTTE and I have written to the President urging that he take this course.

With the exception of particular circumstances of true military necessity, the administration must end all financial dealings with Rosoboronexport and begin to impose sanctions against Rosoboronexport.

We must also impose sanctions against any Russian manufacturers that provide military equipment such as advanced anti-aircraft systems to Syria in contravention of U.S. law.

In my view, it is unconscionable for us to provide Russia with the recently announced \$550 million contract for 30 additional Mi-17 helicopters, a purchase the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction has strongly advised against.

American taxpayer dollars should not be provided to a Russian state-owned corporation that is complicit in the murder of tens of thousands of innocent Syrian men, women, and children. The Department of Defense has the authority to end this contract with Rosoboronexport, which fails to meet the requirements of the Afghan military, and I have joined many of my colleagues in urging the administration to review this sale.

The United States must not be complicit in the arming of the Assad regime nor in the empowerment of countries like Iran, which will triumph if Assad succeeds. I urge the administration to impose sanctions on Rosoboronexport and to demonstrate to Russia that its behavior in Syria will not be cost-free in its relations with our Nation.

REMEMBERING PETER SORBO

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, today I wish to honor the service of Mr. Peter Sorbo, of Connecticut, whose family resides in Waterbury, CT. In January 1943, 18 year-old Peter Sorbo enlisted in the Army to serve his country during World War II. Deployed to the European theater and assigned to Bombardment Group 384, Squadron 545, he served as a waist gunner on a B-17 Flying Fortress and perished on August 12, 1943 after his plane was shot down above the Rhine.

I would like to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Waterbury Republican American that outlines this fascinating story about one of Connecticut's brave soldiers.

Many of Connecticut's sons, like Peter Sorbo, gave their lives defending our freedom and they deserve our perpetual gratitude. I ask that this body devote itself to remembering these courageous men and women by honoring their sacrifices and forever preserving their memories.

The following article written by Mike Patrick appeared in the July 29, 2013 edition of the Waterbury Republican-American. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE TRUTH . . . FINALLY

IT TOOK DECADES, BUT WATERBURY SISTERS LEARN ABOUT THEIR BROTHER'S DEATH IN WORLD WAR II

WATERBURY.—A family friend, some Internet research and the handwritten notes of prisoners of war have unearthed a story of tragic heroism that after seven decades has at last brought closure for two Waterbury sisters whose brother died in World War II.

"He was a good kid, a really good boy," Marie Debiase said through tears. "After 70 years, we're finally finding out what happened to him."

All she knew all these years, she said, was that her brother, Peter Sorbo, died when his plane was shot down over the Rhine in 1943.

But recently, her sister Joann Devino met Carmen Mancuso, one of their brother's old friends, at church. Mancuso said his son Richard was pretty handy at Internet research and may be able to learn a little more about the circumstances of Sorbo's death.

The sisters gave them some of their brother's letters and other documents, and Richard Mancuso, a sales manager from Madison and self-described history buff, got to work.

"I read a few of them it struck my interest," he said. "I started Googling it."

Mancuso discovered a treasure trove of information, including reports of Sorbo's death written by the men who served with him that day.

The following story was pieced together from those reports, and from family recollections.

Peter Sorbo was working in the United Cigar store late in 1942 when a woman came in and chided him with something like, "What are you doing working here when my son is overseas?"

The tall, quiet 17-year-old took it to heart. He quit school, to the consternation of his parents, and enlisted in January 1943.

"I remember every bit of that day he went into the Army," Debiase said. "It was a terrible blizzard that day."

For the next several months, he wrote his family letters from the European Theater, mostly general, mundane greetings. Those letters would later prove helpful to Mancuso in learning how he died.

In August that same year, the waist gunner on a recently formed B-17 Flying Fortress squadron went AWOL. Sorbo, by then a staff sergeant, was assigned to take his place on a bombing mission over a synthetic fuel plant in Germany.

It was an extremely dangerous operation. B-17s were large, obvious and difficult for their gunners to defend. That was especially so for waist gunners, who endured sub-zero temperatures and thin oxygen while shooting Axis fighter planes through a very small window into a powerful airstream that made it hard to lock onto a target.

The plane was hit by a 20-mm shell that caught Sorbo in the neck.

The plane started to go down under continuous enemy fire. The crew prepared to bail out. One tried desperately to get a parachute onto Sorbo, who was already dying from his neck wound.

Then the plane exploded.

Six airmen parachuted out, including one who said the blast blew him out of the craft, and another who said he saw the plane go down as he drifted into the Rhine.

All six survivors were captured by the Nazis. Sorbo and three others were killed, including the crewman who tried to save him.

Devino said she often thinks of that heroic airman.

"I thought of the family," she said. "If he didn't stop to try and get a parachute on Peter, he might have just been a POW."

The family didn't know any of this for decades.

After the plane was shot down, the military sent a letter saying Sorbo was missing in action.

"All those years, we were hoping maybe he was a prisoner, maybe he would get back," Debiase said. "My mother never stopped hoping."

It wasn't until the war was over that the government acknowledged the plane and Sorbo's remains had been found, and asked the family if it would like them to be returned for burial.

Debiase said her family doubted from the beginning that the remains were his, but figured it was a service member who needed burial anyway, so they accepted them.

"Who we got, I don't know, but we respect it as my brother," Debiase said. "We visit the cemetery and put the flags on when they need to be put on."

Sorbo's loss devastated his family. His father was so distraught that he walked off a 20-year job as a tool setter at Chase Brass & Copper.

"He couldn't handle it," Devino said.

The parents doted on and spoiled their remaining son. He ended up drafted into the Korean War, returned an alcoholic, and died young.

Debiase and her husband, Michael, live in a lovely house with a dining room table long enough to accommodate their many family gatherings.

Her brother Peter, she said, wanted to go into radio. He was funny and kind and protective—all the things an eldest brother should be to his siblings.

"We at least know what really happened," she said. "We never knew. I'm glad my parents never really knew."

Her memories of Peter, she said, she has "stored away in my heart" since she was 9, the age she was when he died. She's 79 now and Devino is 83.

Debiase looked over at that dining room table, on this day strewn with Sorbo's sepia-toned service photographs.

"Every holiday you sit down and say, 'There should be another chair,'" she said. "But there isn't."

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

SANDWICH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, today I wish to honor Sandwich, NH—a town in Carroll County that is celebrating the 250th anniversary of its founding. I am proud to join citizens across the Granite State in recognizing this historic event.

Sandwich is a picturesque community situated in the shadow of the Sandwich Dome, that has through the hard work and dedication of its citizens retained the look and feel of a traditional colonial New Hampshire village.

Sandwich was granted a charter by Governor Benning Wentworth on October 25, 1763, and derives its name from John Montague, the 4th Earl of Sandwich. Today, the population has grown to include over 1,300 residents.

Carpenters, wheelwrights, and blacksmiths formed the base of Sandwich's vibrant artisan history. The beauty of the region, and its rich history, has attracted a variety of artists to Sandwich.

In 1920, Sandwich Home Industries was founded. Today it is known statewide as the League of New Hampshire Craftsmen.

Sandwich is also home to one of New Hampshire's premier agricultural fairs. Held every year on Columbus Day weekend, the Sandwich Fair has been providing a venue for the celebration of New Hampshire's agrarian history for the past 125 years.

Named for the owner of the nearby grist mill, the historic covered Durgin Bridge is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and has been a part of the community since 1869. Before being washed away in 1865, a previous span served as a connection to North Conway for the Underground Railroad.

Sandwich is a place that has contributed much to the life and spirit of the State of New Hampshire. I am pleased to extend my warm regards to the people of Sandwich as they celebrate the town's 250th anniversary.●

ROSHOLT, SOUTH DAKOTA

• Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to the 100th anniversary of the founding of Rosholt, SD. Rosholt is a thriving agricultural community in northeastern South Dakota.

Rosholt was named for Julius Rosholt, an entrepreneur whose efforts brought the railroad to the townsites. Lots were first sold in the newly platted town on August 11, 1913, and shortly thereafter residents began to start businesses that would serve the growing community. The visionary spirit of these early pioneers is evident 100 years later, as the town gathers for their centennial celebration.

Today, folks in Rosholt are as hard-working and determined as ever, exhibiting the small-town South Dakota values that make our State a great place to live. Numerous prosperous businesses line Main Street and the town is home to the region's largest grain elevator. Rosholt's educators and students set a high standard of academic excellence that serves as a model for the rest of our State. The Rosholt School has recently been recognized by the South Dakota Department of Education as a "Distinguished School."

Rosholt's history teaches us that when a community comes together it can do great things. The citizens of

Rosholt have an undeniable pride in their community that will serve them well for many generations to come. I am proud to congratulate them on reaching this historic anniversary and wish them the best in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL TIM SCHEPPER

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, today I wish to recognize LTC Tim Schepper, who on July 15, 2013, became the first pilot to log 5,000 hours in the B-1 aircraft.

Lieutenant Colonel Schepper is a senior evaluator for the 28th Operations Group and a B-1 pilot at Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota. His impressive flying record on the B-1 highlights an Air Force career that spans 27 years, including two stints totaling over 14 years at Ellsworth. His record of 5,000 hours is well ahead of any other B-1 pilot in the Air Force. It is nearly 1,800 hours more than any pilot at Ellsworth and nearly 800 hours more than anyone Air Force-wide. Over one-quarter of his flying time, 1,300 hours, are combat hours.

He grew up on a ranch near Vargas, MN and joined the Air Force in 1986. In addition to his various duty assignments at Ellsworth, Lieutenant Colonel Schepper has also been stationed at bases in California, Texas, Mississippi and North Dakota and served 3 years as B-1 Functional Area Manager, B-1 Realistic Training Manager, Deputy Chief Flight Operations and Training Branch at Air Combat Command Headquarters in Langley, VA. From June 2010 to June 2011, he served as Deputy Commander, 379th Expeditionary Operations Group, in Southwest Asia.

His major awards and accomplishments include the Bronze Star Medal; Global War on Terrorism Service Medal; Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal; Iraq Campaign Medal; Afghanistan Campaign Medal; Air Force Commendation Medal with three oak leaf clusters; Air Force Combat Action Medal; Meritorious Unit Award with one oak leaf cluster; Combat Readiness Medal with five oak leaf clusters; National Defense Service Medal with bronze star; Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal; Meritorious Service Medal with four oak leaf clusters; Aerial Achievement Medal; and Air Medal with five oak leaf clusters.

Lt. Col. Schepper's feat underscores the great work of all B-1 personnel in the Air Force as well as civilian personnel from Boeing, who have been working on the B-1 program since it was introduced to the Air Force 30 years ago. According to Boeing's Dan Ruder, who was on hand for Lieutenant Colonel Schepper's record-setting flight arrival back at Ellsworth, the B-1 "has nearly 10,000 combat missions logged and has been deployed for 8 consecutive years. This day solidifies how

the B-1 is still a critical element to our national security."

Like many Air Force personnel, Lieutenant Colonel Schepper and his wife are quick to credit family as well as the military and civilian communities for their support over the years. "My family has always supported me significantly," said the Ellsworth pilot. "I've had five deployments over the past 10 years, and obviously as everyone knows, when you're away from home there are a lot of things that still need to be done. My wife and my kids had to endure and do a lot of things to make up for when I wasn't around."

Added his wife, Tania, "We have been part of this community for so long. He didn't just accomplish this on his own. It takes maintenance, and it takes the help and support of other pilots, and community members."

Lieutenant Colonel Schepper will be retiring in August, and I congratulate him on his impressive flying record, as well as his distinguished military service career, both of which serve as great standards of achievement for military personnel and the civilian community. I wish him all the best in his retirement.●

REMEMBERING KIP YOSHIO TOKUDA

● Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would like to pay tribute to a dedicated community leader, compassionate public servant, and advocate from the State of Washington, Kip Tokuda.

I am proud to recognize Kip as the kind of civic champion who did so much for all of the communities he touched, especially for children and families in need.

Mr. Tokuda was born in Seattle in 1946 and eventually served his home district in the Washington State House of Representatives from 1994 to 2002. Through his work on behalf of his constituents and Washington State, he earned a reputation as a deeply principled legislator and respect from both sides of the aisle.

In addition to his service as an elected official, Kip also cofounded the Asian Pacific Islander Community Leadership Foundation, an organization that empowers young people from Asian Pacific Islander communities to seek leadership positions in government and nonprofit organizations. He helped start the Japanese Cultural & Community Center of Washington and last year was awarded the Order of the Rising Sun from the Emperor of Japan for his work to build and maintain strong ties between the United States and Japan. Most recently, he was appointed to the city of Seattle's Community Police Commission, where he worked to create a more diverse police force.

But most importantly, he was a dedicated father, husband, friend, and mentor to many.

People respected Kip because he respected them, and even though he accomplished so much in his life and earned a position of influence, you could always count on Kip to listen.

As a longtime Seattle resident, his kindness and passion inspired all who knew him.

Kip passed away on July 13, 2013 from a heart attack at the age of 66.

Kip is survived by his wife Barb and their two children, Molly and Pei-Ming.

He will be missed by many, but his legacy of service will live on through the organizations he founded and the lives he touched.

Mr. President, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Kip Tokuda. He lived a full life and our thoughts are with his loved ones at this time of great and sudden loss.●

50TH ANNUAL ARKANSAS STATE CHAMPIONSHIP HORSE SHOW

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, it is with pleasure that I rise today to honor the 50th Annual Arkansas State Championship Horse Show. In 1963, three horse show associations in Arkansas joined efforts to hold a State equestrian championship. This championship show originated when the Hillbilly Horse Show Association, the Central Arkansas Horse Show Association, and the Northeast Central Arkansas Horse Show Association joined together to host a championship competition. Over the years, this partnership has expanded to include 12 horse show associations from across the great State of Arkansas. For the past 50 years, the top 5 contenders from each association compete to earn the honor of being named the Champion Rider of Arkansas.

Arkansans have long enjoyed riding horses for sport and pleasure. Horse shows across the State attract fans seeking to witness the athleticism and agility of the sportsmen and the horses. While these riders make it look easy, horse riding requires a great deal of balance, coordination, and physical strength. Each rider must also exemplify self-discipline, responsibility, and patience with their horse. Horse riding is important to the people of my State, and I support keeping this heritage strong.

At the 50th Annual Arkansas State Championship Horse Show later this summer, competitors will again showcase their talent by riding different breeds in a variety of equestrian disciplines. They will compete with great sportsmanship and at the end of the show one rider will be named as the best in Arkansas. The competitive events will include the talents of Arkansans of all ages and hailing from each corner of the State.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in congratulating the Arkansas State Championship Horse Show on its 50th anniversary and in wishing its competitors and fans a wonderful day of celebration.

QUALE'S ELECTRONICS

• Mr. RISCH. Madam President, family-owned small businesses are a crucial part of America's landscape. They supply a demand in locations all across the United States, and are built on the sweat and dedication of their owners and employees. It is for this reason that today I wish to rise to honor Quale's Electronics, its founder Mel Quale, and all those who now manage and work for this longstanding family business.

In 1966, Mr. Quale opened Quale's Electronics, located in Twin Falls, ID. Quale's Electronics began humbly as a television repair shop, but after only a year in business Mr. Quale expanded his business to include retail television and home electronics sales. Small businesses often have trouble obtaining deals to outlet products from top brands, but Mr. Quale's persistence in the late 1960s through early 1970s paid off with several high-level brands in the electronics industry signing them on as a local dealer. Sales quickly took off. Quale's Electronics expanded to a new and larger location in 1976. Always striving to stay ahead of the curve, Mr. Quale sought out and procured deals to sell many of the exciting new electronics that debuted in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. Quale Electronics to this day remains a family business. Today, Helen Quale, and Mr. Quale's sons, Bruce and Steve, spearhead the ownership and management responsibilities.

In addition to running a successful small business, Mr. Quale also takes a keen interest in his community, offering his time and funding to important local causes and projects. Mr. Quale has previously served as a member of the Bureau of Land Management Resource Advisory Council for 9 years, public lands advisor for the Magic Valley Trail Machine, and 20 years as a precinct committeeman for the Twin Falls Republican Party. Additionally, Mr. Quale is an active member of the Twin Falls Rotary Club.

The success Mr. Quale has found in his business and the work he has done for his community is a testament to the important economic and civic good that is created by self-employed entrepreneurs all across the U.S. and a prime example of the spirit of Idaho's entrepreneurs. It is inspirational to see a family-owned business with decades-old roots spanning more than one generation continue to grow and succeed. Such businesses are vital not only to the local and national economy, but also to their home communities, and will always have a prominent place in the fabric of the United States.●

HAMPTON FIRST RESPONDERS

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to recognize first responders from New Hampshire who heroically worked together to save two swimmers who were struggling to make their way back to shore at Hampton Beach in Hampton, NH, on July 25, 2013.

On the night of July 25, Hampton Fire & Rescue and the Hampton Police Department received notification that three individuals swimming in the water at Hampton Beach were unable to make their way back to shore. First responders from the departments immediately sprang into action and quickly arrived at Hampton Beach. While one of the three individuals was rescued by fellow beachgoers, two young men remained in the water not far from shore, struggling in rip tide conditions and unable to swim back to land.

Hampton firefighters including Fire Chief Christopher Silver, Deputy Fire Chief Jameson Ayotte, Captain William Kennedy, Lieutenant Michael Brillard, Greg Smushkin, Jed Carpentier, Nate Denio, Jason Newman, Kyle Jameson, Kyle Averill, Buck Frost, Matthew Clement, Donald Thibeault and Hampton Police Officer James Deluca worked together to save the two 28-year old men who were caught in the water. The first responders worked in varying capacities, with some in the water, some aboard the Hampton Fire Department's rescue boat and others on shore, and acted as a unified team to successfully pull the swimmers to safety.

First responders are fundamental to the safety of individuals and communities in New Hampshire and throughout the country, as evidenced by the lives that were so recently rescued at Hampton Beach. These public servants came together from across different departments and divisions, as they often do, to perform their selfless work on behalf of people in need. The work of heroes like those in Hampton often goes unnoticed, but it is important that we do not take for granted the daily efforts made by all first responders to make our communities safer and improve the quality of life of all Americans.

I commend these gentlemen for their selfless actions on the night of July 25. The Hampton-area community and all New Hampshire residents applaud the work that dedicated first responders do every day. We specifically thank this group of public servants for saving lives on the night of July 25, 2013.●

ALSTEAD, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the town of Alstead, NH.

Alstead was first chartered by Massachusetts Governor Jonathan Belcher as one of nine forts established in 1735 to

protect southwestern New Hampshire from attack. Once New Hampshire was decreed its own province, New Hampshire Governor Benning Wentworth granted the land, then called Newton, in 1752. The area was finally incorporated in 1763 and renamed Alstead in honor of Johann Heinrich Alsted, a German professor and encyclopedist, whose works were popular at Harvard College. Alstead was a predominantly agricultural community, but its waterways also provided sufficient power to run a number of small mills, including New Hampshire's first paper mill, built in 1793.

Alstead boasts a quintessentially New Hampshire history with the exception of a small misstep in 1781 when the town voted to join the State of Vermont. Alstead was not alone in this wavering allegiance after the Revolutionary War, but I am very pleased to report that residents came to their senses the following year and rejoined the Granite State.

Two hundred and fifty years later, Alstead's views of Feuer State Park and Warren Pond serve as a beautiful backdrop to the community's rich history and small town charm. From August to October, Alstead will celebrate their sestercentennial with historical plays and tours, parades, lectures and exhibits.

I congratulate Alstead on this milestone in their history and thank this community for its great contributions to our State.●

CANDIA, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the town of Candia, NH.

Candia was first settled in 1743 and was colloquially known as "Charmingfare," perhaps due to its many bridle paths and lovely scenery. Gov. Benning Wentworth incorporated the town in 1763 and renamed it Candia, likely in honor of the principal city of the Greek island of Crete, which he had visited after his graduation from Harvard College.

With some of the earliest farmed land in New Hampshire, Candia grew into a strong industrial center with the help of the railroad and well-established mills which dominated its economy. Today, Candia has become a popular tourist destination for its quaint New England feel, family-friendly attractions, beautiful scenery and ease of travel.

I was pleased to welcome award-winning Candia Vineyards to Washington this past June for our annual Experience New Hampshire reception, where Granite Staters and Washingtonians alike could sample their wonderful wares.

Candia will honor this 250th milestone through a yearlong series of celebrations commemorating their long

and rich history. I congratulate this wonderful community on their sestercentennial and wish them continued success for their next 250 years.●

CROYDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the town of Croydon, NH.

The town of Croydon was incorporated and granted in 1763 by Gov. Benning Wentworth. Named for the London suburb of Croydon, England, our Croydon is situated on the highlands between the Connecticut and Merrimack Rivers. It is home to Corbin Park, one of the largest private game reserves in New England. Visitors may hunt a variety of animals including elk, European boar and bison on 24,000 acres of forested and mountainous terrain. Croydon also boasts the Croydon Village School, one of two remaining one-room schoolhouses still in use in the State of New Hampshire.

Today, Croydon's quaint, small-town feel and natural beauty continue to charm visitors and residents alike today. I congratulate this close-knit community on their sestercentennial anniversary and wish them continued success in their next 250 years.●

GILSUM, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, today I wish to recognize an important milestone for the town of Gilsum, NH, upon the occasion of its semiquincentennial anniversary. Situated in scenic southwest New Hampshire, Gilsum actually received its first charter in 1752 under the name Boyle but was never settled. Governor Benning Wentworth re-chartered this land in 1763 to five proprietors, including Samuel Gilbert and his son-in-law Thomas Sumner. The name "Gilsum" was a compromise reached to resolve Gilbert and Sumner's ongoing dispute over the name of their new settlement.

Historically, Gilsum was a farming and manufacturing community, making use of the nearby Ashuelot River to power multiple factories by the 1850s. Gilsum also boasted a productive mine, which provided important economic stability for the town during its early years of development. Today, Gilsum is home to the W.S. Badger Company, a quintessential New Hampshire small business success story that now sells its wonderful skincare products, including its "Badger Balm," across the country.

Gilsum will mark its 250th anniversary in August with a parade, talent show, community exhibits and music to commemorate its proud heritage. I rise today to wish Gilsum a joyful celebration of this important milestone and thank all its citizens for their contributions to New Hampshire.●

HAMPTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise today to congratulate the town of Hampton, NH, on the occasion of its 375th anniversary.

Coastal Hampton is one of the 4 original New Hampshire townships chartered by the General Court of Massachusetts. It was first settled in 1638 under the name Winnacunnet, an Algonquian word meaning "pleasant pines." One year later, Winnacunnet's Puritan settlers renamed the town "Hampton" to honor the birthplace of their leader Reverend Stephen Bachiler, a colorful figure whose descendants still populate Hampton today.

Hampton was a modest but bustling community whose early industry centered around farming and fishing. All that changed with the arrival of the railroad in 1840. Visitors from Boston and other cities soon discovered the charms of Hampton's stunning coastline, aided by the Exeter, Hampton and Amesbury Trolley line, which connected inland mill towns to the seacoast. Today, thousands of visitors flock to Hampton's beaches to surf, sunbathe, or take to the high seas on chartered fishing or whale watching expeditions.

The Hampton Historical Society will host a series of events throughout 2013 to commemorate this important milestone through a series of lectures and town-wide activities. I congratulate this beautiful town on 375 years of success and thank them for their contributions to our great State.●

HAVERHILL, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to celebrate and recognize the 250th anniversary of the town of Haverhill, NH.

Haverhill, first known as Lower Coos, was settled by citizens from Haverhill, MA and incorporated by Governor Benning Wentworth in 1763. Haverhill is situated on our State border, next to the mouth of the Ammonoosuc River, and shares much of its heritage with its sister city of Newbury in Vermont across the Connecticut River. Haverhill's location at the end of the Old Province Road was critical to its rapid development; this road, one of the earliest highways in New Hampshire, served as a supply route connecting the northern and western settlements with the seacoast. Haverhill's village of Woodsville hosted a railway supply enterprise that played an important role in the early years of the Boston, Concord and Montreal Railroad. Haverhill may have looked remote on a map, but it was clearly a town on the move.

Today, visitors to Haverhill may visit the oldest covered bridge still in use in New Hampshire, the Haverhill-Bath Bridge, built in 1829 and listed on the National Register of Historic

Places. The Haverhill Historic Society has painstakingly curated many artifacts from the town's long and industrious history and hosts fascinating lectures throughout the year. Haverhill is also home to the Museum of American Weather, which offers an unusual and insightful view into New England history through its exhibits documenting weather events across our region.

The town of Haverhill will celebrate its semiquincentennial jointly with Newbury, VT through a series of events this year, culminating in an old-fashioned skating party in December. I congratulate Haverhill on 250 years of accomplishments, and thank its citizens for their many contributions to the Granite State.●

LISBON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I congratulate the residents of the town of Lisbon, NH as they celebrate its 250th anniversary.

Lisbon's roots date back to 1749, when Samuel Martin went on a hunting trip with his son in the wilderness along the Ammonoosuc River in the White Mountains. This beautiful region made a lasting impression on Martin, who returned to build a small cabin on Henry Pond with his family. This area would soon be settled and named the Gunthwaite settlement, which grew in size as soldiers returned from the Revolutionary War. In 1824, Gov. Levi Woodbury renamed the town Lisbon in honor of his friend Colonel William Jarvis, who had been appointed by President Thomas Jefferson to be the United States consul in Lisbon, Portugal.

The Ammonoosuc River provided a natural source of power for mills and factories that bolstered Lisbon's industry and helped it grow into a bustling town. At one time, Lisbon's Parker Young Company was the largest manufacturer of piano sounding boards in the world. Lisbon was also the first site in New Hampshire to have a ski rope tow.

Many of Lisbon's residents are descended from the town's original settlers and feel a strong commitment to preserving their town's history. Lisbon proudly honors New Hampshire's State flower during its annual Lilac Festival, held every Memorial Day weekend. Lisbon is also known for its public library, which houses nearly 10,000 volumes and serves neighboring towns Lyman and Landaff. On August 10, 2013, Lisbon residents and friends will come together to commemorate their 250th anniversary with music and community events to celebrate their past, present and future.

I wish the town of Lisbon a wonderful celebration and congratulate its citizens on this milestone in New Hampshire history.●

NEW BOSTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish today to honor the town of New Boston, NH, which celebrates its 250th anniversary this year. As its name suggests, New Boston's long and admirable history bridges that of New Hampshire and our neighbor Massachusetts.

New Boston's first settlers came north in search of new opportunity. The land was originally granted in 1736 by the regional governor of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, Jonathan Belcher. Records show that locals had originally planned to christen the town "Lanestown," but over time referred to the property as New Boston in honor of their former home. From 1736 until 1763, New Boston was legally part of Massachusetts; but during the course of those 30 years, the original grantees failed to establish a proper claim. In 1763, New Boston was formally incorporated and recognized as part of New Hampshire by Governor Benning Wentworth.

From its first census, we know that New Boston's residents quickly established a bustling community, building a lumber mill and clearing 200 acres of land. By the early 19th century, New Boston boasted 16 school houses, a bark mill, clothing mills, over 25 saw mills and even a tavern to host both travelers and townsfolk after a long day. Unfortunately, many documents depicting New Boston's origins were destroyed by the Great Village Fire of 1887, which ravaged the town and set over 40 of its buildings ablaze. New Boston's residents were undeterred by this tragedy, taking stock and quickly rebuilding their industrial center.

By 1893, New Boston had a railroad station, allowing merchants to move goods and services through their town into Massachusetts and further northeast. In the 1940s, New Boston became the proud home of two military institutions: the Gravity Research Foundation, which conducted research in hopes of creating a gravitational shielding system, and the New Boston Air Force Station, which tracks military satellites.

New Boston continues to inspire our State with its industrious and creative spirit. There is much to celebrate in New Boston's 250 years, and I am sure that the next 250 years will be equally or even more successful.●

PLYMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to congratulate the town of Plymouth, NH on their 250th anniversary.

Plymouth sits at the geographic center of New Hampshire on the west bank of the Pemigewasset River. Gov. Benning Wentworth granted this plot of land to returning soldiers from the French and Indian War and named it New Plymouth, after the original Plymouth Colony in Massachusetts.

Plymouth's unparalleled views of mountains, fields and forests provide a stunning backdrop to a bustling town noted for its focus on industry and education, as well as its historical significance.

Plymouth's educational commitment began with its earliest settlers, whose children were predominantly literate. This devotion to education continues today through Plymouth State University, one of the area's oldest and finest institutions that counts Poet Laureate Robert Frost as a former faculty member. Every September, the Plymouth population doubles from 4,000 to 8,000 as students return to campus to take advantage of the rich opportunities offered at this university.

Plymouth was originally an industrial center known for its buck glove industry, its farming and its logging industry. It was also home to Draper and Maynard, a renowned sporting goods purveyor that supplied baseball gloves to Babe Ruth and his Boston Red Sox teammates.

Plymouth's strong tourism and skiing tradition dates back to the 1930s, when the once ubiquitous snow trains brought hundreds of skiers from Boston and other cities to the slopes of the White Mountains. Plymouth has taken great strides to preserve this history and heritage through the recently opened Museum of the White Mountains, which houses treasured art and artifacts from more than a century ago. The town continues to attract tourists hoping to see a quintessential New England town in action and remains a popular year-round destination for camping, hiking and winter sports.

I congratulate Plymouth on its 250th anniversary and wish all its citizens a joyous year of celebration of their proud history.●

SANDWICH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to honor the town of Sandwich, NH, on the occasion of its 250th anniversary.

Sandwich is a quintessential New England village between the foothills of the White Mountains and breathtaking Squam Lake. Sandwich was chartered in 1763 by Governor Benning Wentworth and named for John Montagu, the 4th Earl of Sandwich. Lord Sandwich held various distinguished positions in British politics and its military, but is perhaps best known for his purported invention of a slice of meat between two slices of bread to sustain him while playing cards.

Sandwich's land would later double in size due to many concerns that the original grant was too inaccessible for a permanent settlement. In fact, from this expansion, Sandwich remains one of the largest towns in New Hampshire today. The first settlers arrived 4 years

later, and by the early 19th Century the town of Sandwich had grown from uncharted wilderness into a bustling community of farms, schools, churches, traders, and artisans.

Sandwich's local fair is a wonderful New Hampshire tradition that celebrated its 100th anniversary last year. The Sandwich Fair has origins as far back as 1886, when local farmers gathered together to show off their livestock in hopes of drawing a crowd to trade and sell their goods. The event quickly grew to include community events such as band performances, beautiful baby contests, and, in the 21st Century, carnival rides. Sandwich's vibrant community, natural beauty, outdoor activities and historic and cultural events continue to draw visitors year-round.

I congratulate Sandwich on this important milestone and wish all citizens of Sandwich the best for their next 250 years.●

THORNTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to recognize of the 250th anniversary of Thornton, NH. Nestled in the beautiful Pemigewasset River Valley in the White Mountains, the land that became Thornton was originally granted to a small group of settlers on July 6, 1763 and subsequently incorporated in 1781. Thornton is named for one of those original settlers, Matthew Thornton, who would later become the first speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives and New Hampshire's delegate to the Continental Congress. Thornton, who signed Declaration of Independence, was an early and vocal advocate for complete independence from England.

Thornton was also the birthplace of Moses Cheney, an abolitionist and conductor on the Underground Railroad. Cheney founded and oversaw the printing of the Morning Star, an abolitionist Freewill Baptist newspaper distributed in New England from 1833 to 1874. Cheney's two sons added to their father's legacy through their own notable contributions to New England. Elder son Oren Cheney was the founder and first president of Bates College in Maine, and his younger brother Person Cheney served as a U.S. Senator and Governor of New Hampshire.

Thornton's original colonial meetinghouse, built in 1789, still stands in the center of town. Meetinghouses like this are considered the birthplace of small town democracy. This building hosted town meetings from 1790 to 1954. Today, it is being painstakingly restored by the Thornton Historical Society for future use as a museum to house the town's artifacts and documents from its long and proud history.

I honor this town's strong heritage and wish its citizens a wonderful sescentennial celebration.●

WARREN, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, today I wish to celebrate the 250th anniversary of Warren, NH. Situated in the White Mountain region just south of Franconia Notch, residents of Warren are surrounded by stunning wooded scenery that is quintessential North Country. Warren is a truly perfect example of small town New Hampshire.

In 1763, Gov. Benning Wentworth granted a tract of land to John Page, who settled on this land 4 years later. The area would be officially incorporated in 1770 by Benning Wentworth's nephew and successor, Gov. John Wentworth. Warren is one of two towns in New England that were named for Admiral Sir Peter Warren of County Meath, Ireland. Admiral Warren, a high ranking officer in the British Royal Navy, commanded a fleet that joined forces from Massachusetts to lay siege and capture the fort at Louisbourg, Nova Scotia in 1745. This victory united the colonies against Canada, as well as providing them with crucial fishing and fur trading rights.

For the better half of the 20th century, the Glencliff State Sanatorium operated in the village of Glencliff in Warren. Before the advent of antibiotics, it was thought that the thin, pure mountain air of the North Country could cure tuberculosis, and nearly 4,000 patients sought respite and cure in the White Mountains facility until its closing and conversion to Glencliff Home for the Elderly in 1970. While modern medicine has advanced by leaps and bounds, we certainly understand why a patient would seek the serene beauty of the North Country as a cure for any ill.

Warren's most famous landmark is a Redstone Ballistics Missile, which stands in the center of the village green today. These missiles were commissioned by the U.S. Army in West Germany during the Cold War as defense against the former Soviet Union and were the first to carry live nuclear warheads. This decommissioned missile was placed in the center of town to honor Senator Norris Cotton, a Warren native who served a long career in both the New Hampshire General Court and the United States Congress.

I honor Warren's sestercentennial and congratulate its residents on this important milestone.●

WOODSTOCK, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, today I wish to congratulate the town of Woodstock, NH, on their sestercentennial anniversary.

Woodstock actually began as Peeling, NH, as decreed by Governor Benning Wentworth's 1763 charter. After a number of controversial name changes, the town eventually became known as Woodstock in 1840, possibly thanks to inspiration from the name of a novel

by Sir Walter Scott. Appropriately, logging was thickly-forested Woodstock's primary industry, aided by the Pemigewasset River's power to run their saw mills and transport timber down to Lowell, MA. The arrival of the Gordon Pond Railroad helped the industry but also leveled thousands of acres of Woodstock forest.

These areas have long since recovered and 80 percent of Woodstock's land area is now protected under the White Mountain National Forest, which draws droves of tourists each year. In fact, Woodstock's and neighboring Thornton's forests make up Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest, one of the world's longest running ecosystem studies. For 50 years, Hubbard Brook has provided scientists and researchers with critical data and resources that identify and address environmental issues.

Woodstock is also home to local favorite Woodstock Inn Station and Brewery, a five time regional restaurant winner of New Hampshire Magazine's "Best of New Hampshire" feature. I was pleased to welcome this business to Washington in June for our annual Experience New Hampshire reception, where they shared their delicious craft beers and other products with Senators and their fellow Granite Staters.

I congratulate Woodstock on this important milestone and wish the community continuing success for their next 250 years.●

DELAWARE'S DREAM TEAM

• Mr. COONS. Madam President, Delaware is known as the First State, and I rise today to commemorate a first in my State. Forty years ago, the Howard High men's basketball team became the first boys' basketball team in the State-tournament era to complete an undefeated season. The 1973 Wildcats were honored for that achievement in Wilmington earlier this year, but today I would like to honor them on the Floor of the Senate.

You see, the story of the '73 Wildcats tells you something about my home State. They were never the tallest team out there—the tallest player was Lonnie Sparrow at 6 feet 3 inches—and they were never considered the team to beat. They were not even considered the best team at Howard High. The highly touted '72 squad had included John Irving who is still one of only two players in Hofstra University history to accumulate 1,000 points and 1,000 rebounds, and led them to their first two NCAA tournament appearances. They could only draw from a small student body of about 700 to 800 students, in contrast to some of the other local high schools.

But what Sparrow, Mike Miller, Eric Fuller, Kenny Hynson, Wayne Parson, Dave Roane, Istavan Norwood, Lemuel

Glover, Rich Miles, Joe Robinson, Isaiah Reason, and Ernest Coleman had was better than height or the praise of outsiders. They had coaches that believed in them in Jay Thomas and Stan Hill, and they had a tight-knit group of supporters in the school and the community. Most of all, they had each other, and by playing ball together, they accomplished what no other team had done in Delaware history. Their amazing story includes last-minute buzzer shots to make it to the championships, and even a climactic showdown with long-time rivals Wilmington High, who had ended the school's dreams of a championship the previous year. It is a story made for Hollywood. In a fitting epilogue, they each continue their tradition of quality through teamwork as teachers, coaches, counselors, ministers, businessmen, members of the Armed Services, and civil servants.

But there is one more thing that must be noted. Named after the same Civil War general that Howard University honors and built around the same time, Howard was the first—and for many years only—African-American high school in Delaware. During the 1950's the shameful neglect towards the institution led to a court case challenging separate-but-equal laws that went on to become one of the five decided in the Brown v. Board Supreme Court decision. By the time of the '73 Wildcats, schools were desegregated but the poison of decades of racism persisted.

It was in this context that the all-black Howard team relied on each other, and did the impossible in Delaware. As such, they are an example to all of us—especially, I think, to those of us in the Senate faced with tough challenges for the future. You see, when everyone is betting against us, when it seems like we somehow lack the stature to get the job done, or when the world around us is tumultuous and seems more than any one of us alone can handle, we need to join together, find ways to trust each other, and get the job done. The 1973 Howard High Wildcats just wanted to play great basketball, and they did in storybook fashion. But in doing so, they became an inspiration to their friends, family, community, and at least one U.S. Senator.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations

and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:15 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 313. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to institute spending limits and transparency requirements for Federal conference and travel expenditures, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1660. An act to require the establishment of Federal customer service standards and to improve the service provided by Federal agencies.

H.R. 2768. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are familiar with and act in accord with certain taxpayer rights.

H.R. 2769. An act to impose a moratorium on conferences held by the Internal Revenue Service.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1911) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

At 11:43 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 850. An act to impose additional human rights and economic and financial sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the termination of employment of employees of the Internal Revenue Service who take certain official actions for political purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution encouraging peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 8162 of Public Law 106-79, as amended, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 1:00 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 2611. An act to designate the headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia as the "Douglass A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building", and for other purposes.

H.R. 2167. An act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish additional requirements to improve the fiscal safety and soundness of the home equity conversion mortgage insurance program.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1911. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 313. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to institute spending limits and transparency requirements for Federal conference and travel expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 850. An act to impose additional human rights and economic and financial sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1660. An act to require the establishment of Federal customer service standards and to improve the service provided by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the termination of employment of employees of the Internal Revenue Service who take certain official actions for political purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2768. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are familiar with and act in accord with certain taxpayer rights; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2769. An act to impose a moratorium on conferences held by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with

accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2490. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations; Dinghy Poker Run, Middle River; Baltimore County, Essex, MD" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0489)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2491. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations; Revision of 2013 America's Cup Regulated Area, San Francisco Bay; San Francisco, CA" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2011-0551)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2492. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Tall Ships Celebration Bay City, Bay City, MI" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0368)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2493. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations; Red Bull Flugtag National Harbor Event, Potomac River; National Harbor Access Channel, MD" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0114)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2494. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Naval Exercise; Pacific Ocean, Coronado, CA" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0482)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2495. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Connect America Fund" ((RIN3060-AF85) (FCC 13-73)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2496. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Review of Wireline Competition Bureau Data Practices, Computer III Further Remand Proceedings: Bell Operating Company Provision of Enhanced Services; 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review—Review of Computer III and ONA Safeguards and Requirements" ((RIN3060-AK03) (FCC 13-69)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2497. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Facilitating the

Deployment of Text-to-911 and Other Next Generation 911 Applications Framework for Next Generation 911 Deployment" (FCC 13-64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2498. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulated Navigation Areas; Bars along the Coasts of Oregon and Washington" ((RIN1625-AC01) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0216)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2499. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Navigation and Navigable Waters; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments" ((RIN1625-AC06) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0397)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2500. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Outer Banks Bluegrass Festival; Shallowbag Bay, Manteo, NC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0330)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2501. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Venetian Fireworks; Kalamazoo Lake, Saugatuck, MI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0539)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2502. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Feast of Lanterns Fireworks Display, Pacific Grove, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0238)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2503. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; City of Menominee 4th of July Fireworks, Green Bay, Menominee, MI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0540)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2504. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Summer in the City Water Ski Show; Fox River, Green Bay, WI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0541)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2505. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant

to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Sugar House Casino Fireworks Display, Delaware River; Philadelphia, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0495)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2506. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Fifth Coast Guard District Fireworks Displays, Delaware River; Philadelphia, PA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0493)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2507. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Grand Haven 4th of July Fireworks; Grand River; Grand Haven, MI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0547)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2508. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Margate Mother's Association Fireworks Display, Atlantic Ocean; Margate, NJ" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0494)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2509. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Fort Monroe Fireworks Display, Chesapeake Bay, Hampton, VA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0443)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2510. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Big Bay Boom, San Diego Bay; San Diego, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0059)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2511. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; National Cherry Festival Air Show and Fireworks Display, West Grand Traverse Bay, Traverse City, MI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0189)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2512. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones; Annual Independence Day Fireworks Displays, Skagway, Haines, and Wrangell, AK" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0078)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2513. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Execpro Services Fireworks Display, Lake Tahoe, Incline Village, NV" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0383)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2514. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; San Diego Symphony Summer POPS Fireworks 2013 Season, San Diego, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0388)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2515. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; City of Martinez Fourth of July Fireworks Display, Carquinez Strait, Martinez, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0345)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2516. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; City of Vallejo Fourth of July Fireworks Display, Mare Island Strait, Vallejo, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0355)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2517. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Fifth Coast Guard District Firework Display, Pagan River; Smithfield, VA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0473)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2518. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Tennessee River, Mile 625.5 to 626.5" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0408)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2519. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Northside Park Pier Fireworks Display, Assawoman Bay, Ocean City, MD" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0439)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2520. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; America's Cup Safety Zone and No Loitering Area, San Francisco, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0551)) received in the Office of the President

of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2521. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; South Park Bridge Construction, Lower Duwamish Waterway, Seattle, WA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0452)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2522. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pilot Certification and Qualification Requirements for Air Carrier Operations" ((RIN2120-AJ67) (Docket No. FAA-2010-0100)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2523. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adoption of Statutory Prohibition on the Operation of Jets Weighing 75,000 Pounds or Less That Are Not Stage 3 Noise Compliant" ((RIN2120-AK25) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0503)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2524. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Flight Data Recorder Airplane Parameter Specification Omissions and Corrections" ((RIN2120-AK27) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0579)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2525. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Combined Drug and Alcohol Testing Programs" ((RIN2120-AK01) (Docket No. FAA-2012-0688)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2526. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-345 in the Vicinity of Ashland, WI" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0236)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2527. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Restricted Area R-2504A and R-2504B; Camp Roberts, CA, and Restricted Area R-2530; Sierra Army Depot, CA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0515)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Com-

mittee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2528. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Restricted Areas R-2907A and R-2907B, Lake George, FL; and R-2910, Pinecastle, FL" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2010-1146)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2529. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (53); Amdt. No. 3543" ((RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2530. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (78); Amdt. No. 3542" ((RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2531. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Presidio, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-0770)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2532. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Colt, AR" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1281)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2533. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Elbow Lake, MN" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1121)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2534. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Sanibel, FL" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1334)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2535. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of

a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Grand Canyon, AZ" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0163)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2536. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Worthington, MN" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1139)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2537. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Ogallala, NE" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1138)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2538. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Class D and E Airspace; Twin Falls, ID" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0258)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2539. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Parkston, SD" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1282)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2540. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-0864)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2541. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0302)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2542. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1230)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2543. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2008-0620)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2544. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0214)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2545. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0598)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2546. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0522)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2547. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0018)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2548. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1206)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2549. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0535)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2550. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dowty Propellers Propellers" ((RIN2120-

AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2009-0776)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2551. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; DASSAULT AVIATION Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1067)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2552. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1039)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2553. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1035)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2554. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1305)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2555. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland (Eurocopter) Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0520)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2556. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1034)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2557. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1330)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2558. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Adminis-

tration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0553)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2559. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0223)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2560. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1327)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2561. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Forchlorfenuron; Temporary Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9391-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2562. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sorbitan monooleate ethylene oxide adduct; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9389-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2563. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Complex Polymeric Polyhydroxy Acids; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9391-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2564. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Releasing Information; General Provisions; Accounting and Reporting Requirements; Reports of Accounts and Exposures" (RIN3052-AC76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2565. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Handling of Animals; Contingency Plans; Stay of Regulations" ((RIN0579-AC69) (Docket No. APHIS-2006-0159)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2566. A communication from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, (6) reports relative to vacancies in the

Department of Defense, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2567. A communication from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Navy, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2568. A communication from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Air Force, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2569. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the review of internal records to verify employment of Iraqi nationals by the U.S. Government and request from each prime contractor or grantee that has performed work in Iraq information that can verify the employment of Iraqi nationals by such contractor or grantee; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2570. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2012 Purchases from Foreign Entities"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2571. A communication from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to the 2013 Mortgage Rules Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)" ((RIN3170-AA37) (Docket No. CFPB-2013-0010)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2572. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 12947 with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2573. A communication from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Electronic Fund Transfers (Regulation E)" ((RIN3170-AA33) (Docket No. CFPB-2012-0050)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2574. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Broker-Dealer Reports" (RIN3235-AK2574) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2575. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Financial Responsibility Rules for Broker-Dealers" (RIN3235-AJ85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2576. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pyrooxasulfone; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9393-6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2577. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Trifluralin; Pesticide Tolerance" (FRL No. 9393-5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2578. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Significant New Uses of Ethaneperoxoic Acid, 1,1-Demethylpropyl Ester" (FRL No. 9392-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2579. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Montana; Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS" (FRL No. 9839-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2580. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Quality Designations for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9841-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2581. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter and 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9841-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2582. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second Ten-Year Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Greeley" (FRL No. 9840-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2583. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Colorado Springs" (FRL No. 9840-7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2584. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans, State of California, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, New Source Review" (FRL No. 9837-5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2585. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 9811-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2586. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Permit Exemption Rule" (FRL No. 9834-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2587. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Conditional Exclusions from Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste for Solvent-Contaminated Wipes" (FRL No. 9838-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2588. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Software Requirement Specifications for Digital Computer Software used in Safety Systems for Nuclear Power Plants" (Regulatory Guide 1.172, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2589. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Developing Software Life Cycle Processes for Digital Computer Software used in Safety Systems for Nuclear Power Plants" (Regulatory Guide 1.173, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2590. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Safety Evaluation of Westinghouse Electric Company Topical Report WCAP-12610-P-A and CENPD-404-P-A, Addendum 2/WCAP-14342-A and CENPD 404-NP-A, Addendum 2, 'Westinghouse Clad Corrosion Model for ZIRLOTM and Optimized ZIRLOTM'" (Project No. 700) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2591. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Applications"

(Regulatory Guide 4.2, Supplement 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2592. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Verification, Validation, Reviews, and Audits for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants" (Regulatory Guide 1.168, Revision 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2593. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Configuration Management Plans for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems for Nuclear Power Plants" (Regulatory Guide 1.169, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2594. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Software Unit Testing for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants" (Regulatory Guide 1.171, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2595. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Software Unit Testing for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems for Nuclear Power Plants" (Regulatory Guide 1.171, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2596. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Montana" (FRL No. 9839-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2597. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to entering into a Memorandum of Understanding Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Belize Concerning the imposition of import restrictions on categories of archaeological material representing the cultural heritage of Belize from the pre-ceramic, pre-classic, classic, and post-classic periods of the pre-Columbian era through the early and late colonial periods; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2598. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System—Update for Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2013 (FY 2014)" (RIN0938-AR63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2599. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch,

Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Recognizing Advance Payments for Gift Cards that are Redeemable for Goods and Services from an Unrelated Entity" (Rev. Proc. 2013-29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2600. A communication from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of the Peace Corps, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2601. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "U.S. Department of State, Category Rating Report"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2602. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-109); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2603. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-108); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2604. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-015); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2605. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2606. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "ATF 2013 PACT Act Report"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2607. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for a report entitled "Transforming Today's Vision Into Tomorrow's Reality"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2608. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patient Access to Records" (RIN2900-AO61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-118. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the President of the United States and Congress of the United States to adopt the Veterans Remembered Flag in honor of all veterans; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, there are flags for all branches of the Armed Forces of the United States and there is a flag for prisoners of war and those missing in action, but there is no flag to honor the millions of former military personnel who have served our nation; and

Whereas, a flag is a symbol of recognition for a group or an ideal, and veterans compose a group, certainly represent an ideal and surely deserve their own symbol; and

Whereas, the estimated 20,400,000 veterans, affiliated and unaffiliated with veterans' organizations, who have served in our nation's military compose a significant portion of our nation's population; and

Whereas, there is now a flag that has been designed and created to honor the veterans of the United States called the Veterans Remembered Flag, and displaying and flying a Veterans Remembered Flag would honor the lives of millions of individuals who have served our country in times of war, peace and national crisis; and

Whereas, a Veterans Remembered Flag would memorialize and honor past, present and future veterans and provide an enduring symbol to support tomorrow's veterans today; and

Whereas, displaying and flying a Veterans Remembered Flag would fill the need for a flag honoring all veterans who have served in our nation's armed forces; and

Whereas, the symbolism of this unique flag's design would be all-inclusive, would pay respect to all branches of the military and to the history of our nation and would honor those who have lived, and died, serving our nation; and

Whereas, the design of the flag honors the founding of our nation through the 13 stars that emanate from the hoist of the flag and lead to the large red star that represents our nation and the five branches of our nation's military, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines and the Coast Guard; and

Whereas, the white star on the flag symbolizes veterans' dedication to service, the blue star on the flag honors all the men and women who have served in our nation's military and the central gold star on the flag memorializes those who have fallen defending our nation; and

Whereas, the blue stripe that bears the title of the flag honors the loyalty of veterans to our nation, flag and government, and the green field on the flag represents the hallowed ground where fallen veterans rest eternally; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, request that the President of the United States and the United States Congress work together to support adoption of the Veterans Remembered Flag to honor our nation's veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Barack H. Obama, President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM-119. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the federal government of the

United States to prioritize distribution of veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the members of the Armed Forces of the United States, including active duty members of the Massachusetts National Guard, have honorably and with great distinction served their country and have earned the right to be welcomed home with all honors and benefits prescribed by law by a grateful nation; and

Whereas, the words of our first president, George Washington, are a reminder of the importance of honoring promises made to our veterans and their families, when he said, "the willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their nation"; and

Whereas, veterans' benefits must be delivered in a timely fashion out of respect for the significant sacrifice and valiant service of those to whom such benefits are owed, especially given the fact that today's veterans urgently need jobs, health care, housing, education and training in order to successfully re-enter civilian life; and

Whereas, the United States Department of Veterans Affairs is reported to be unable to keep up with a torrent of benefits claims, and the backlog leaves many service members waiting for well over a year after first filing their forms, according to a report from the Center for Investigative Reporting; and

Whereas, according to the center's report, the average wait time for veterans benefits is 273 days, and that veterans filing their first claim, including those who served in Iraq and Afghanistan, wait nearly two months longer, between 316 and 327 days, and in some major population centers wait up to twice as long—642 days in New York, 619 days in Los Angeles and 542 days in Chicago; and

Whereas, the ranks of veterans waiting more than a year for their benefits grew from 11,000 in 2009 to 245,000 in December 2012, an increase of more than 2,000 per cent, and the Veterans Administration is predicting that the situation will get worse, as the number of veterans waiting on the Department to process their claims is expected to reach 1 million by the end of March, 2013: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate hereby requests that the Federal Government of the United States provide sufficient funding and personnel to process veterans' claims in a more timely manner so that the tangible gratitude of the nation can be promptly distributed to all who have earned such recognition; and be it further

Resolved, That resolved, that a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Senate to the President of the United States, the leaders of the Congress of the United States and to each United States senator and representative from Massachusetts.

POM-120. A communication from citizens of the State of Hawaii petitioning for verification and tabulation of State applications for an Article V Convention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-121. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida urging the United States Food and Drug Administration to repeal their longstanding prohibition on men who have sex with men from donating blood; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

POM-122. A resolution adopted by the Lawrence City Council of the City of Lawrence, Massachusetts supporting comprehensive immigration reform and urging action from the 113th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-123. A resolution adopted by the City Electors of Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin seeking to reclaim democracy from the expansion of corporate personhood rights and the corrupting influence of unregulated political contributions and spending; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-124. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Orange County, New York opposing the enactment of any legislation that would infringe upon the right of people to bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-125. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Webster, Texas protecting and defending the constitutional right to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-126. A resolution adopted by the Blount County Board of Commissioners of the State of Tennessee protecting and defending the constitutional right to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-127. A resolution adopted by the New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs urging the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation regarding gun control; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-128. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Edgewater, New Jersey expressing its condolences and support for the victims of gun violence and their families in Newtown, CT, Aurora, CO, Blacksburg, VA, Oak Creek, WI, Tucson, AZ, and other communities throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-129. A resolution adopted by the City of River Oaks, Texas supporting the Constitution of the United States and defending the constitutional right to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-130. A resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Tupper Lake, New York opposing any legislation infringing upon the right of the people to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-131. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Naples, Florida urging Congress and the President to protect the constitutional right of the people to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-132. A resolution adopted by the Catlin Town Board of the State of New York calling for the repeal of the New York SAFE Act of 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-133. A resolution adopted by the Northwest Municipal Conference supporting immigration reform that provides a clear and earned path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, clears immigration backlogs, addresses the current labor market needs and improves state and local economic competitiveness, provides for effective employment verification, promotes immigrant integration, and enhances national security and safety with a sensible enforcement policy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-134. A resolution adopted by the Alabama Town Board of the State of New York opposing the Early Voting Proposal; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1429. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-85).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 933. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations. Steve A. Linick, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of State.

*Matthew Winthrop Barzun, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Nominee: Matthew Winthrop Barzun.

Post: United Kingdom.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$215, 2/23/2009, Democratic National Committee; \$2,500, 9/12/2011, Chandler; \$5,000, 9/8/2011, Tim Kaine/Virginia; \$35,800, 9/9/2011, Obama Victory Fund; \$2,500, 10/10/2011, Yarmuth; \$5,000, 12/15/2011, DWS for Congress Weston FL; \$9,200, 12/31/2011, Swing State Victory Chicago; \$30,800, 1/13/2012, Obama Victory Fund; \$5,000, 1/30/2012, Mark Warner/Senator-Virginia; \$5,000, 3/10/2012, Claire McCaskill/Senator-Missouri; \$2,500, 3/24/2012, Yarmuth; \$2,500, 6/29/2012, Chandler, Ben for Congress; \$2,500, 7/26/2012, Russ Carnahan/U.S. Senate; \$2,500, 8/2/2012, Jon Tester/U.S. Senate; \$100,000, 9/12/2012, Committee for Charlotte 2 NC; \$2,500, 9/25/2012, Kentucky Hse Dem Caucus; \$2,500, 10/30/2012, Shelli Yoder/Congress.

2. Spouse: Brooke Browne Barzun: \$35,800, 9/9/2011, Obama Victory Fund; \$2,500, 10/10/2011, Yarmuth; \$9,200, 12/31/2011, Swing State Victory Chicago; \$30,800, 1/13/2012, Obama Victory Fund; \$2,500, 3/24/2012, Yarmuth; \$5,000, 6/30/2012, Elizabeth Warren for Massachusetts; \$2,500, 8/28/2012, Chandler, Ben for Congress; \$2,500, 9/24/2012, Kentucky Hse Dem Caucus; \$2,500, 10/25/2012, Shelli Yoder/Congress.

3. Children and Spouses: Charles Winthrop Barzun, None; Eleanor C. Barzun, None; Jacques M. Barzun, None.

4. Parents: Roger Barzun: \$700, 10/7/2011, Obama for America; \$700, 10/7/2011, Obama Victory Fund; \$250, 10/29/2012, House Majority PAC; \$338, 10/31/2012, Barack Obama For America. Serita Winthrop: \$500, 5/30/2011, Bill Nelson for U.S. Senate; \$10,000, 11/17/2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$2,500, 11/17/2011, Obama for America; \$2,500, 11/17/2011, Obama for America; \$5,000, 11/17/2011, DNC Services Corp./Democratic National Committee.

5. Grandparents: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Charles Barzun: \$250, 3/15/2012, John Douglass for Congress; \$250, 9/9/2012, John Douglass for Congress; \$500, 2/8/2010, Thomas Perriello for Congress; \$500, 3/22/2010, Thomas Perriello for Congress; \$250, 6/4/2010, Thomas Perriello for Congress; \$2,100, 10/12/2011, Obama for America; \$2,500, 10/12/2011, Obama for America; \$4,600, 10/12/2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012. Emily Little Barzun (sister-in-law): None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Mariana Mensch (sister), None; Jon Mensch (brother-in-law), None; Lucretia Barzun Donnelly (sister), None; Robert Donnelly (brother-in-law), None.

*David Hale, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon

Nominee: David Hale.
Post: Beirut, Lebanon.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: N/A.
2. Spouse: N/A.
3. Children and Spouses: N/A.
4. Parents: Marjorie Freeman: \$25, 5/20/10, RNC; \$25, 2/19/12, RNC; \$10, 4/12/12, RNC; \$20, 8/15/12, RNC; \$20, 9/21/12, RNC; \$25, 9/27/12, Romney Victory Fund.
5. Grandparents: N/A.
6. Brothers and Spouses: John Hale: \$50, 5/20/10, Bridgewater, NJ Republican Municipal Committee.
7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

*Liliana Ayalde, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federative Republic of Brazil.

Nominee: Liliana Ayalde.
Post: State/WHA.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: Luis Jorge Narvaez: None.
3. Children and Spouses Names: Stefanie Narvaez: None. Natalia Narvaez: None.
4. Parents Names: Jaime Ayalde: None. Mercedes Ayalde: None.
5. Grandparents Names: Fernando Ayalde: Deceased; Elvia Ayalde: Deceased; Max Llorente: Deceased; Mercedes Llorente: Deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses Names: Jaime Ayalde: None. Julie Ayalde: None.
7. Sisters and Spouses Names: Gloria Perez-Ayalde: Deceased; Gustavo Perez: None. Maria Eugenia Ayalde: None. Sergio Romero: None.

*Kirk W.B. Wagar, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Singapore.

Nominee: Kirk W.B. Wagar.
Post: Singapore.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$5,000, 9/30/10, Democratic Congressional Campaign Cmte; \$2,500, 4/29/11, Obama, Barack; \$2,500, 4/29/11, Obama, Barack; \$2,300, 3/15/07, Obama, Barack; \$2,300, 11/14/07, Wexler, Robert; \$2,300, 5/7/07, Kerry, John; \$1,500, 12/25/07, Loeb sack, David; \$1,000, 10/5/07, Democratic Party of Iowa; \$1,000, 2/26/08, Warner, Mark; \$1,000, 1/15/10, Coakley, Martha; \$500, 4/25/08, Carson Andre; \$500, 7/10/08, Clinton, Hillary; \$400, 3/19/08, Montana Democratic Central Cmte; \$250, 11/9/11, McCaskill, Claire; \$1,000, 3/30/11, American Assn for Justice; \$1,000, 7/31/12, American Assn for Justice; \$1,000, 7/6/07, American Assn for Justice; \$2,500, 11/21/11, Kaine, Tim; \$250, 12/7/11, Kaine, Tim; \$250, 11/9/11, Tester, Jon; \$250, 11/30/11, Brown, Sherrod; \$30,800, 4/29/11, DNC Services Corp; \$15,200, 3/31/10, DNC Services Corp; \$5,000, 10/31/09, DNC Services Corp; \$5,000, 10/31/09, DNC Services Corp; \$1,000, 7/1/09, DNC Services Corp; \$28,500, 6/16/08, DNC Services Corp.
2. Spouse: \$2,195, 2/19/12, Obama, Barack; \$1,000, 10/7/12, Obama, Barack; \$305, 2/19/12, Obama, Barack; \$250, 3/29/12, Jacobs, Kristin; \$200, 11/2/11, Obama, Barack; \$1,000, 6/8/11, Obama, Barack; \$290, 9/19/12, Obama, Barack; \$500, 6/17/09, Gibson, Shirley; \$500, 8/20/08, Obama, Barack; \$250, 9/30/09, Meek, Kendrick; \$250, 3/31/07, Obama, Barack.

*Terence Patrick McCulley, of Washington, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cote d'Ivoire.

Nominee: Terence Patrick McCulley.
Post: Republic of Côte d'Ivoire.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.
2. Spouse: none.
3. Children and Spouses: Sean Patrick McCulley: none; Liam Tyler McCulley: none.
4. Parents: William M. McCulley—deceased; Doris J. McCulley: none.
5. Grandparents: Roy Millage—deceased; Grace Millage Smith—deceased; Jesse McCulley—deceased; Elzie McCully—deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Larry A. McCulley, none; Karen McCulley (sister-in-law), none; Stephen W. McCulley, none; Christine McCulley (sister-in-law), none.
7. Sisters and Spouses: none.

*James C. Swan, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Nominee: James Swan.

Post: Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by

them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.
2. Spouse: none.
3. Children and Spouses: Mitchell Henry Swan (Minor): none; Garner Victoria Swan (Minor): none.
4. Parents: Harold Frank Swan—deceased; Corinne Anne Waltham—deceased.
5. Grandparents: James Swan—deceased; Ethel Victoria Swan—deceased; Bertha Chamberlain—deceased; Donald Waltham—deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: (no brother).
7. Sisters and Spouses: Carol Anne Swan: none; Wolf Reade (husband): none.

*John R. Phillips, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Italian Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of San Marino.

Nominee: John R. Phillips.
Post: U.S. Ambassador to Italy.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$2,500, Summer 2012, Friends of Joe Kennedy; \$2,500, 11/02/2012, Friends of Lois Capps for Congress (California); \$2,500, October 2012, Chris Murphy (Connecticut); \$2,500, October 2012, Richard Carmona (Arizona); \$2,500, October 2012, Shelley Berkley (Nevada); \$2,500, October 2012, Tammy Baldwin (Wisconsin); \$2,500, October 2012, Joe Donnelly (Indiana); \$2,500, October 2012, Jon Tester (Wyoming); \$2,500, October 2012, Claire McCaskill (Missouri); \$2,500, September 2012, Elizabeth for Mass.; \$2,500, 8/21/2012, Act Blue; \$2,500, 8/19/2012, Berman for Congress; \$2,500, 4/02/2012, Friends of Joe Kennedy; \$2,500, 3/28/2012, Elizabeth for Mass.; \$30,800, 3/27/2012, Obama Victory Fund; \$2,500, 3/06/2012, Kaine for Virginia; \$9,200, 12/14/2011, Swing State Victory Fund; \$2,500, Fall 2011, Berman for Congress; \$35,800, 5/18/2011, Obama Victory Fund; \$2,500, 4/26/2011, Kaine for Virginia; \$35,800, 4/7/2011, Obama Victory Fund; \$16,000, 12/22/2010, DNC; \$2,500, Summer 2012, Friends of Joe Kennedy; \$2,600, May 2013, Markey for Senate.
2. Spouse: Linda D. Douglass: 0.
3. Children and Spouses: Katherine D. Byrd (daughter); Keith Byrd (son-in-law); 0.
4. Parents: Hilda M. Phillips—deceased; William E. Phillips—deceased.
5. Grandparents: Lucy Colussi—deceased; Angelo Filippi—deceased.
6. Brother: Ernest A. Phillips: Denise Phillips (sister-in-law): 0.
7. Brother: William Phillips: telephone response indicated contributions to several people but he has no records available to him. He has not responded further to my written request.
8. Sisters and Spouses: none.

*Kenneth Francis Hackett, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

Nominee: Kenneth Francis Hackett.
Post: Ambassador to the Holy See.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I

have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$250, 8/05/12, B. Obama; \$250, 10/04/12, B. Obama.
2. Spouse: Joan: 0.
3. Children and Spouses: Jennifer: 0; Michael: 0.
4. Parents: Francis Mitchell: 0.
5. Grandparents: None.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Francis X. Hackett: 0; Joseph & Ellie Hackett: 0.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Mary & Philip Rowlinson: 0; Kathryn Hackett: 0; Marjorie & David Weeks: 0.

Alexa Lange Wesner, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Austria.

Nominee: Alexa Lange Wesner.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Austria.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: \$5,000, 06/27/13, Progress Texas PAC; \$5,000, 05/29/13, Battleground Texas PAC; \$1,000, 03/14/13, Udall for Colorado; \$10,000, 03/12/13, Progress Texas PAC; \$10,000, 03/08/13, Progress Texas PAC; \$10,000, 12/13/12, Progress Texas PAC; \$10,000, 11/14/12, Progress Texas PAC; \$2,000, 09/30/12, Carmona for Arizona; \$1,000, 09/30/12, Martin Heinrich for Senate; \$2,500, 08/21/12, McCaskill for Missouri; \$2,500, 05/15/12, Elizabeth for MA; \$2,500, 05/15/12, Elizabeth for MA; \$30,800, 02/29/12, DNC Services Corp; \$2,000, 01/09/12, Al Franken for Senate; \$1,012, 12/30/11, Dem Party of Virginia; \$1,012, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Colorado; \$552, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Nevada; \$1,012, 12/27/11, Dem Party of North Carolina; \$552, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Wisconsin; \$276, 12/27/11, N.H. Dem. State Cmte.; \$1,564, 12/27/11, Dem. Exec Cmte of Fld.; \$1,472, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Ohio; \$1,196, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Pennsylvania; \$276, 12/27/11, MI Dem. State Central Cmte; \$2,500, 09/23/11, Kaine for Virginia; \$2,500, 06/28/11, Kaine for Virginia; \$2,500, 05/03/11, Klobuchar, Amy; \$2,500, 04/04/11, Obama, Barack; \$2,500, 04/04/11, Obama, Barack; \$400, 04/04/11, DNC Services Corp; \$2,500, 04/04/11, Gillibrand, Kirsten; \$2,500, 03/30/11, Cantwell, Maria; \$2,500, 03/25/11, McCaskill, Claire; \$2,400, 01/17/11, Friends of Sherrod Brown; \$30,400, 01/07/11, DNC Services Corp; \$500, 07/08/10, Bennet for Colorado; \$2,400, 05/27/10, Friends of Mark Warner; \$2,400, 05/27/10, Friends of Mark Warner; \$500, 05/06/10, Mark Critz for Congress; \$30,400, 03/24/10, DNC Services Corp; \$2,400, 03/24/10, Robin Carnahan for Senate; \$-2,400, 03/10/10, Friends of Chris Dodd; \$1,400, 03/02/10, Chet Edwards for Congress; \$1,500, 01/21/10, Travis Cnty Dem Party; \$-2,400, 01/20/10, Jack McDonald for Congress; \$-2,400, 01/20/10, Jack McDonald for Congress; \$1,000, 01/15/10, Martha Coakley for Senate; \$1,000, 11/17/09, Rob Miller for Congress; \$9,100, 09/30/09, DCCC; \$1,000, 08/03/09, Annie's List; \$2,500, 07/30/09, Moving Wilco Forward; \$5,000, 06/30/09, Annie's List; \$2,400, 06/30/09, Robin Carnahan for Senate; \$1,000, 06/26/09, Chet Edwards for Congress; \$500, 05/25/09, Franken Recount Fund; \$500, 05/14/09, Murphy, Scott; \$30,400, 04/30/09, DNC Services Corp; \$2,400, 03/31/09, Ciro

D. Rodriguez for Congress; \$2,400, 03/31/09, Jack McDonald for Congress; \$2,400, 03/31/09, Jack McDonald for Congress; \$2,400, 03/30/09, Friends of Chris Dodd; \$2,400, 03/30/09, Friends of Chris Dodd; \$2,400, 02/26/09, Friends of Harry Reid; \$2,400, 02/26/09, Friends of Harry Reid.

Spouse: Blaine Fleming Wesner: \$2,773, 11/07/12, National Venture Cap. Assn.; \$578, 10/26/12, Democratic Party of Virginia; \$771, 10/20/12, Dem Party of Wisconsin; \$964, 10/20/12, Dem Executive Cmte of Fld.; \$449, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of CO; \$642, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of Iowa; \$642, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of Nevada; \$449, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of North; \$1,542, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of Ohio; \$2,300, 07/25/12, Clinton, Hillary; \$30,800, 02/29/12, DNC Services Corp; \$2,773, 12/21/11, National Venture Cap. Assn; \$2,500, 09/23/11, Kaine, Tim; \$2,500, 09/23/11, Kaine, Tim; \$30,800, 05/02/11, DNC Services Corp; \$2,500, 05/02/11, Obama, Barack; \$2,500, 05/02/11, Obama, Barack; \$2,773, 11/16/10, National Venture Cap. Assn; \$2,400, 05/27/10, Warner, Mark; \$2,400, 05/27/10, Warner, Mark; \$2,400, 03/02/10, Edwards, Chet; \$-2,400, 01/20/10, McDonald, Jack; \$-2,400, 01/20/10, McDonald, Jack; \$5,000, 01/14/10, Forward Together PAC; \$2,773, 12/22/09, National Venture Cap. Assn; \$2,400, 03/31/09, McDonald, Jack; \$2,400, 03/31/09, McDonald, Jack.

Children and Spouses: Natalie Keep Wesner: None; Tennyson Lange Wesner: None; Livia Hawk Wesner: None.

Parents: Per Lange: \$1,000, 10/28/12, Obama, Barack; \$250, 02/02/12, DNC Services Corp; \$2,500, 12/31/11, Obama, Barack; \$250, 04/15/11, DNC Services Corp; \$250, 02/22/11, DNC Services Corp; Brigitte Lange: None.

Grandparents: Gertrude Bruecher-Herpel, Herald Bruecher-Herpel—Deceased.

Brothers and Spouses: (I have no brothers), NA.

Sisters and Spouses: (I have no sisters), NA.

*Daniel A. Sepulveda, of Florida, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Communications and Information Policy in the Bureau of Economic, Energy, and Business Affairs and U.S. Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy.

*Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2013.

*Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2016.

*Matthew C. Armstrong, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

*Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

*Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Patricia Ann Millett, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Gregory Howard Woods, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Debra M. Brown, of Mississippi, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Elizabeth A. Wolford, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed sub-

ject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1417. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1418. A bill to require the Attorney General to make competitive grants to State, tribal, and local governments to establish and maintain witness protection and assistance programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1419. A bill to promote research, development, and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1420. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for transparency of payments made from the Judgment Fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 1421. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable tax credit for the installation of sprinklers and elevators in historic structures; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KING, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1422. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 respecting the scoring of preventive health savings; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1423. A bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to strengthen the quality control measures in place for part B lung disease claims and to establish the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health for the contractor employee compensation program under subtitle E of such Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1424. A bill to require the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1425. A bill to improve the safety of dietary supplements by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require manufacturers of dietary supplements to

register dietary supplements with the Food and Drug Administration and to amend labeling requirements with respect to dietary supplements; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1426. A bill to prohibit employers from compelling or coercing any person to authorize access to a protected computer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1427. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1428. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide for wildfire mitigation grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1429. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1430. A bill to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1431. A bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1432. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating portions of the Ka'u Coast in the State of Hawaii as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 1433. A bill to require that members of the Armed Forces who were killed or wounded in the attack that occurred at a recruiting station in Little Rock, Arkansas, on June 1, 2009, are treated in the same manner as members who are killed or wounded in a combat zone; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1434. A bill to designate the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1435. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide certain port authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1436. A bill to prevent a fiscal crisis by enacting legislation to balance the Federal budget through reductions of discretionary and mandatory spending; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1437. A bill to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed in 1954 by the United States, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to the State of Oregon for the establishment of the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center of Oregon State University in Hermiston, Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1438. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to provide that military technicians (dual status) shall be included in military personnel accounts for purposes of any order issued under that Act; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1439. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for advanced illness care coordination services for Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1440. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow the use of physical damage disaster loans for the construction of safe rooms; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1441. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate water leasing and water transfers to promote conservation and efficiency; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1442. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the minimum low-income housing tax credit rate for unsubsidized buildings and to provide a minimum 4 percent credit rate for existing buildings; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1443. A bill to facilitate the remediation of abandoned hardrock mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1444. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under part A of the Medicare Program on a reasonable cost basis for anesthesia services furnished by an anesthesiologist in certain rural hospitals in the same manner as pay-

ments are provided for anesthesia services furnished by anesthesiologist assistants and certified anesthetists in such hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRYOR:

S. 1445. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1446. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the affordability of the health care tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1447. A bill to make technical corrections to certain Native American water rights settlements in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1448. A bill to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1449. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that income attributable to certain passenger cruise voyages beginning or ending in the United States shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1450. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an ad valorem excise tax on certain passenger cruise voyages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. REID, Mr. HELLER, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1451. A bill to provide for environmental restoration activities and forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation or shipment of quagga mussels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1452. A bill to enhance transparency for certain surveillance programs authorized by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1453. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish an interagency coordinating committee on pulmonary hypertension to develop recommendations to advance research, increase awareness and education, and improve health and health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1454. A bill to authorize the Small Business Administrator to establish a grant program to empower encore entrepreneurs; to

the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. BARASSO, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1455. A bill to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income is operational; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1456. A bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1457. A bill to exempt the aging process of distilled spirits from the production period for purposes of capitalization of interest costs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1458. A bill to establish the Daniel Webster Congressional Clerkship Program; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1459. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. TESTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1460. A bill to create two additional judge positions on the court established by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and modify the procedures for the appointment of judges to that court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1461. A bill to establish a National Catastrophe Risks Consortium and a National Homeowners' Insurance Stabilization Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. McCASKILL, and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 1462. A bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. VITTER):

S. 1463. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1464. A bill to facilitate and enhance the declassification of information that merits declassification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1465. A bill to ensure that persons who form corporations in the United States dis-

close the beneficial owners of those corporations, in order to prevent the formation of corporations with hidden owners, stop the misuse of United States corporations by wrongdoers, and assist law enforcement in detecting, preventing, and punishing terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, and other criminal and civil misconduct involving United States corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1466. A bill to establish a regulatory review process for rules that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency plans to propose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1467. A bill to establish the Office of the Special Advocate to provide advocacy in cases before courts established by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1468. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1469. A bill to provide higher-quality, lower-cost health care to seniors; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1470. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the guidelines for specification of certain disposal sites for dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. BURR):

S. 1471. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider decisions to inter or honor the memory of a person in a national cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1472. A bill to create a division within the Congressional Budget Office that would perform regulatory analysis; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 1473. A bill to develop a model disclosure form to assist consumers in purchasing long-term care insurance; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1474. A bill to encourage the State of Alaska to enter into intergovernmental agreements with Indian tribes in the State relating to the enforcement of certain State laws by Indian tribes, to improve the quality of life in rural Alaska, to reduce alcohol and drug abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1475. A bill to establish the position of National Nurse for Public Health, to be filled

by the same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1477. A bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1478. A bill to provide that certain uses of a patent or copyright in compliance with an order of the Federal Communications Commission for emergency communications services shall be construed as use or manufacture for the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. BARASSO, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 1479. A bill to address the forest health, public safety, and wildlife habitat threat presented by the risk of wildfire, including catastrophic wildfire, on National Forest System land and public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to expedite forest management projects relating to hazardous fuels reduction, forest health, and economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1480. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide assistance for condominiums and housing cooperatives damaged by a major disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 1481. A bill to require issuers of long term care insurance to establish third-party review processes for disputed claims; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 1482. A bill to recognize the primacy of States, provide for the consideration of the economic impact of additional regulations, and provide for standards and requirements relating to certain guidelines and regulations relating to health and the environment; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1483. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to establish the Federal Oil Spill Research Committee, and to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to include in a response plan certain planned and demonstrated investments in research relating to discharges of oil and to modify the dates by which a response plan must be updated; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1484. A bill to provide for an exchange of land between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Sabine River Authority of Texas; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1485. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an income tax credit for eldercare expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1486. A bill to improve, sustain, and transform the United States Postal Service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 212. A resolution commending David J. Schiappa; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. NELSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. KIRK):

S. Res. 213. A resolution expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela and condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 214. A resolution designating the week of October 13, 2013, through October 19, 2013, as "National Case Management Week" to recognize the value of case management in improving healthcare outcomes for patients; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. SHELBY):

S. Res. 215. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should not bail out any State; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. Res. 216. A resolution electing Laura C. Dove, of Virginia, as Secretary for the Minority of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 217. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 6, 2013, through October 10, 2013, as "American College of Surgeons Days" and recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of the organization; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID:

S. Con. Res. 22. A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. Con. Res. 23. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the Reverend Doctor Leon Sullivan and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 15

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 15, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 132

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 132, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union.

S. 183

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. KAINE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 316, a bill to recalculate and restore retirement annuity obligations of the United States Postal Service, to eliminate the requirement that the United

States Postal Service prefund the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund, to place restrictions on the closure of postal facilities, to create incentives for innovation for the United States Postal Service, to maintain levels of postal service, and for other purposes.

S. 323

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 323, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients and other renal dialysis provisions.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 420

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 420, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the logical flow of return information between partnerships, corporations, trusts, estates, and individuals to better enable each party to submit timely, accurate returns and reduce the need for extended and amended returns, to provide for modified due dates by regulation, and to conform the automatic corporate extension period to long-standing regulatory rule.

S. 424

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 424, a bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a National Pediatric Research Network, including with respect to pediatric rare diseases or conditions.

S. 462

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 501

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 501, a bill to amend the

Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and increase the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 623, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services.

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make the provision of technical services for medical imaging examinations and radiation therapy treatments safer, more accurate, and less costly.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. MORAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 686

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 686, a bill to extend the right of appeal

to the Merit Systems Protection Board to certain employees of the United States Postal Service.

S. 689

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 689, a bill to reauthorize and improve programs related to mental health and substance use disorders.

S. 695

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 695, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay a monthly assistance allowance to disabled veterans training or competing for the Paralympic Team and the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide assistance to United States Paralympics, Inc., and for other purposes.

S. 710

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 710, a bill to provide exemptions from municipal advisor registration requirements.

S. 719

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 719, a bill to provide for the expansion of Federal efforts concerning the prevention, education, treatment, and research activities related to Lyme and other tick-borne diseases, including the establishment of a Tick-Borne Diseases Advisory Committee.

S. 723

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 723, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 783

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to amend the Helium Act to improve helium stewardship, and for other purposes.

S. 798

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 798, a bill to address equity capital requirements for financial institutions, bank holding companies, subsidiaries, and affiliates, and for other purposes.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 862, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate.

S. 878

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 878, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

S. 917

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 917, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 971

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 971, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements.

S. 981

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 981, a bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules prohibiting deceptive advertising of abortion services, and for other purposes.

S. 1048

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1048, a bill to revoke the charters for the Federal National Mortgage Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation upon resolution of their obligations, to create a new Mortgage Finance Agency for the securitization of single family and multifamily mortgages, and for other purposes.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S.

1056, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program.

S. 1068

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1068, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 1075

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1075, a bill to extend the phase-in of actuarial rates for flood insurance for certain properties under the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012.

S. 1088

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1114

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1114, a bill to provide for identification of misaligned currency, require action to correct the misalignment, and for other purposes.

S. 1118

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1118, a bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent sex trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1118, *supra*.

S. 1123

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1123, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 1143

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota

(Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1143, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1181

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1181, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1235

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1235, a bill to restrict any State or local jurisdiction from imposing a new discriminatory tax on cell phone services, providers, or property.

S. 1254

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1254, a bill to amend the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia

Research and Control Act of 1998, and for other purposes.

S. 1269

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1269, a bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to support community college and industry partnerships, and for other purposes.

S. 1272

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1272, a bill to provide that certain requirements of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act do not apply if the American Health Benefit Exchanges are not operating on October 1, 2013.

S. 1282

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1282, a bill to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting banks' ability to engage in certain risky activities and limiting conflicts of interest, to reinstate certain Glass-Steagall Act protections that were repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1300, a bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to provide for the conduct of stewardship end result contracting projects.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1313

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1313, a bill to promote transparency, accountability, and reform within the United Nations system, and for other purposes.

S. 1320

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1320, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the armed forces.

S. 1335

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr.

RISCH) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1335, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to protect the information of livestock producers, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1351

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1351, a bill to provide for fiscal gap and generational accounting analysis in the legislative process, the President's budget, and annual long-term fiscal outlook reports.

S. 1385

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1385, a bill to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 13

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 13, a concurrent resolution commending the Boys & Girls Clubs of America for its role in improving outcomes for millions of young people and thousands of communities.

S. RES. 206

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 206, a resolution designating September 2013 as "National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month".

S. RES. 208

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 208, a resolution designating the week beginning September 8, 2013, as "National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1419. A bill to promote research, development, and demonstration of

marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today Senator MURKOWSKI and I are introducing legislation to promote a new form of hydropower, marine hydrokinetic renewable energy, or MHK. An MHK project generates energy from waves, currents, and tides in the ocean, an estuary or a tidal area as well as from the free-flowing water in a river, lake, or stream.

Our bill will help commercialize MHK technologies through research and development and a more efficient and timely regulatory process for the siting of pilot projects intended to demonstrate the viability of these technologies. It is an ideal follow-up to a pair of bills, H.R. 267 and H.R. 678, to streamline the regulatory process for low-impact conventional hydropower that were reported by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources by unanimous bipartisan votes a few months ago. Considered together, the two conventional hydropower bills approved by the Committee along with this MHK legislation are a major step forward in advancing carbon-free hydropower technologies.

MHK has tremendous potential to generate a substantial amount of clean renewable energy in the United States and across the globe. It is poised to be a key participant in the transition to a low carbon economy.

What distinguishes MHK from conventional hydropower is that it generates energy without the use of a dam or other impoundment. This gets MHK off on the right foot in terms of minimizing any adverse environmental impact. Investments to capture our nation's rich domestic marine energy resources can also play a major role in the creation of essential domestic engineering and manufacturing jobs.

The energy contained in predictable waves, tidal flows and currents is the basis for worldwide investments in this emerging industry. Water is approximately 800 times denser than air, providing great potential power density along with predictability. These characteristics mean that MHK technologies could provide predictable base-load renewable power in the future.

At the present time there are many different types of MHK technologies with multiple applications under development that are intended to capture the power contained in waves, tides and currents.

Wave energy devices capture the heave and/or surge power of waves and convert them via hydraulic or geared direct drive systems into electricity. Some of these devices are moored to the ocean floor, some are floating on the surface, while others are attached to breakwaters near shore. By last

count, there are over 100 wave energy devices under development worldwide. Tidal energy technologies capture the ebb and flow of tides. It is estimated that 60 different tidal energy technologies are under development worldwide. There are other technologies that include run-of-river systems and off-shore ocean current technologies. Most of these technologies under development capture uni-directional water flows and look similar to the tidal devices.

The United States has not been a world leader in the development of these cutting edge technologies to date. Instead, our country is seen as a huge potential market for our international competitors in this new industrial sector. The United States has significant wave, tidal, current and in-stream energy resources. The Electric Power Research Institute has estimated that the commercially available wave energy potential off the coast of the United States is roughly 252 million megawatt hours—equal to 6.5 percent of today's entire generating portfolio. This is approximately the amount of electricity presently being produced by the existing fleet of American conventional hydroelectric dams.

The Department of Energy, DOE, has released two nationwide resource assessments that indicate the waves, tides, and ocean currents off the nation's coasts could contribute significantly to the United States' total annual electricity production. DOE is currently developing an aggressive strategy to support its vision of producing at least fifteen percent of our nation's electricity from water power, including conventional hydropower, by 2030.

Our goal should be the establishment of a commercially viable U.S. MHK renewable energy industry, supported by a robust domestic supply chain for fabrication, installation, operations and maintenance of MHK devices. The development of a substantial marine hydrokinetic industry in the U.S. could drive billions of dollars of investment in heavy industrial and maritime sectors, as well as in advanced electrical systems and materials common to many renewable technologies. Federal investments would stimulate private funds and jobs in the construction, manufacturing, engineering, and environmental science sectors.

I am very pleased that my home State of Oregon has made a strategic decision to be an international leader in the commercialization of the marine renewable energy industry. Led by the Oregon Wave Energy Trust, the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center co-located at Oregon State University, and several private companies that are part of the MHK supply chain, Oregon is positioning itself to be a leading force supporting this newly emerging industry.

Unfortunately, the U.S. is falling behind in the race to capture the rich energy potential of our oceans and the jobs that will come with this new industry. The United Kingdom, Ireland, Portugal, Scotland, Australia, and other countries are committed to producing emission-free, renewable energy from MHK sources. Scotland has had a grid-connected, wave energy converter unit in operation since 2001 and maintains a national goal of producing 2 GW of generation capacity from MHK renewable energy. The U.K. and Ireland have also set aggressive goals for MHK generation by 2020.

The Ocean Renewable Energy Coalition, the industry's trade group here in Washington DC, calculates that more than \$782 million has been spent by the UK government on wave energy R&D over the past 10 years. That total approaches \$1 billion over the same period if you add in the commitments to ocean energy R&D from France, Portugal, Spain, Norway, and Denmark.

Early funding support, along with development of full-scale device testing centers, demonstrates that the significant technological advances and the competitive advantages in this industry are trending in Europe's direction. As an example of the disparity in investments, Europe currently has several wave and tidal energy test facilities, led by the European Marine Energy Center in Scotland, that are helping technology developers commercialize their wave and tidal energy converters. The United States clearly has a need for such infrastructure. I know that Oregon State University has a strong desire to compete for funding to help establish a testing center in the Pacific Northwest. Unfortunately, recent funding levels have not supported development of such offshore testing infrastructure in the U.S. to date.

Given this internationally competitive situation, I believe that Congress must make targeted Federal investments to close the gap. Commercialization of technologies to harness marine renewable energy resources will require Federal funding to augment research and development efforts already underway in the private sector. Just as the wind and solar industries have received DOE funding support for over 3 decades, which has resulted in the rapid deployment of these technologies in recent years, the nascent marine energy industry seeks similar Federal assistance to develop promising technologies that are on the verge of commercial viability.

Unfortunately, in addition to the limited private sector funding available to these startup companies, permitting and regulatory obstacles are tremendous disincentives to technology developers of marine energy projects in the United States. While other countries have adopted permitting and regulatory regimes that ap-

pear to be more efficient, the United States is still struggling with how to permit and regulate these technologies. I cannot overstate the seriousness of this problem. To give just one example, it took one MHK developer 5 years and \$2 million to obtain a license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a 1.5 megawatt project.

The regulatory situation is simply unacceptable and is greatly slowing progress in the MHK industry. Until companies get projects in the water, Congress and the public will not learn about the environmental impacts, engineering challenges or the true costs of offshore renewables.

Capturing the benefits of our vast marine-based renewable resources will require a mix of new incentives, updated regulatory regimes and general outreach and education. However, the most important actions that can be taken by the Federal Government in the short term are to provide the necessary resources for research, development and demonstration of various marine renewable energy technology platforms and a workable and efficient regulatory process. Increased federal support will accelerate deployment of these technologies, create thousands of high paying jobs, give confidence to investors, and help attract private capital.

The Marine and Hydrokinetic Renewable Energy Act of 2013 helps accomplish these goals in a number of ways. It reauthorizes the DOE's MHK research, development and demonstration 3 programs, including the National Marine Renewable Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Centers.

Increased resources for the DOE Water Power Program will enable the United States to leverage its technological superiority in shipbuilding and offshore oil and gas production. This will create jobs and diversify these maritime industries. In the absence of such funding, however, the United States will have to depend on foreign suppliers for ocean energy technologies, and will have missed a significant opportunity to expand our economic competitiveness in this renewable energy sector.

The regulatory component of the bill makes the regulatory process for MHK of not more than 10 MW more efficient and timely. It modifies and improves the FERC "pilot license" process in many ways. Improvements include a goal to complete the pilot license process in 12 months or less; a designation of FERC as the "Lead Agency" for the purpose of coordinating environmental review; a clarification that any shut down requirement be "reasonable," and a clarification that an MHK project does not need to be removed when it is shut down if FERC deems leaving it in place is preferable for environmental and other reasons.

MHK is a clean, home-grown, emissions-free source of electricity that can improve the security and reliability of the electric grid. Investing in MHK research, development and demonstration today will pay great dividends in the future. MHK has tremendous potential to benefit the United States and the entire world. Now is the time to move forward on MHK and the Marine and Hydrokinetic Renewable Energy Act is the way to do it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1419

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Marine and Hydrokinetic Renewable Energy Act of 2013".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

Sec. 101. Definition of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy.

Sec. 102. Marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy research and development.

Sec. 103. National Marine Renewable Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Centers.

Sec. 104. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE II—MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY REGULATORY EFFICIENCY

Sec. 201. Marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy projects and facilities.

TITLE I—MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

SEC. 101. DEFINITION OF MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY.

Section 632 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17211) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "electrical".

SEC. 102. MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 633 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17212) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 633. MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

"The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, shall carry out a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application to expand marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy production, including programs—

"(1) to assist technology development to improve the components, processes, and systems used for power generation from marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy resources;

"(2) to establish critical testing infrastructure necessary—

"(A) to cost effectively and efficiently test and prove marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy devices; and

“(B) to accelerate the technological readiness and commercialization of those devices;

“(3) to support efforts to increase the efficiency of energy conversion, lower the cost, increase the use, improve the reliability, and demonstrate the applicability of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies by participating in demonstration projects;

“(4) to investigate variability issues and the efficient and reliable integration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy with the utility grid;

“(5) to identify and study critical short- and long-term needs to create a sustainable marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy supply chain based in the United States;

“(6) to increase the reliability and survivability of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, including development of corrosion-resistant and anti-fouling materials;

“(7) to verify the performance, reliability, maintainability, and cost of new marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy device designs and system components in an operating environment;

“(8) to coordinate and avoid duplication of activities across programs of the Department and other applicable Federal agencies, including National Laboratories;

“(9) to identify opportunities for joint research and development programs and development of economies of scale between—

“(A) marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies; and

“(B) other renewable energy and fossil energy programs, offshore oil and gas production activities, and activities of the Department of Defense; and

“(10) to support in-water technology development with international partners using existing cooperative procedures (including memoranda of understanding)—

“(A) to allow cooperative funding and other support of value to be exchanged and leveraged; and

“(B) to encourage the participation of international research centers and companies in the United States and the participation of research centers and companies of the United States in international projects.”.

SEC. 103. NATIONAL MARINE RENEWABLE ENERGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION CENTERS.

Section 634 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17213) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) **PURPOSES.**—The Centers (in coordination with the Department and National Laboratories) shall—

“(1) advance research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies;

“(2) support in-water testing and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, including facilities capable of testing—

“(A) marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy systems of various technology readiness levels and scales;

“(B) a variety of technologies in multiple test berths at a single location; and

“(C) arrays of technology devices; and

“(3) serve as information clearinghouses for the marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy industry by collecting and disseminating information on best practices in all areas relating to developing and managing marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy resources and energy systems.”.

SEC. 104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 636 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17215) is

amended by striking “2008 through 2012” and inserting “2014 through 2017”.

TITLE II—MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY REGULATORY EFFICIENCY

SEC. 201. MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS AND FACILITIES.

Part I of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 34. PILOT LICENSE FOR MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS.

“(a) **DEFINITION OF HYDROKINETIC PILOT PROJECT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In this section, the term ‘hydrokinetic pilot project’ means a facility that generates energy from—

“(A) waves, tides, or currents in an ocean, estuary, or tidal area; or

“(B) free-flowing water in a river, lake, or stream.

“(2) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘hydrokinetic pilot project’ does not include a project that uses a dam or other impoundment for electric power purposes.

“(b) **PILOT LICENSES AUTHORIZED.**—The Commission may issue a pilot license to construct, operate, and maintain a hydrokinetic pilot project that meets the criteria listed in subsection (c).

“(c) **LICENSE CRITERIA.**—The Commission may issue a pilot license for a hydrokinetic pilot project if the project—

“(1) will have an installed capacity of not more than 10 megawatts;

“(2) is for a term of not more than 10 years;

“(3) will not cause a significant adverse environmental impact or interfere with navigation;

“(4) is removable and can shut down on reasonable notice in the event of a significant adverse safety, navigation, or environmental impact;

“(5) can be removed, and the site can be restored, by the end of the license term, unless the project has obtained a new license or the Commission has determined, based on substantial evidence, that the project should not be removed because it would be preferable for environmental or other reasons not to; and

“(6) is primarily for the purpose of—

“(A) testing new hydrokinetic technologies;

“(B) locating appropriate sites for new hydrokinetic technologies; or

“(C) determining the environmental and other effects of a hydrokinetic technology.

“(d) **LEAD AGENCY.**—In carrying out this section, the Commission shall act as the lead agency—

“(1) to coordinate all applicable Federal authorizations; and

“(2) to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(e) **SCHEDULE GOALS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Commission receives a completed application, and following consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies with jurisdiction over the hydrokinetic pilot project, the Commission shall develop and issue pilot license approval process scheduling goals that cover all Federal, State, and local permits required by law.

“(2) **COMPLIANCE.**—Applicable Federal, State, and local agencies shall comply with the goals established under paragraph (1) to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with applicable law.

“(3) **1-YEAR GOAL.**—It shall be the goal of the Commission and the other applicable agencies to complete the pilot license process by not later than 1 year after the date on which the Commission receives the completed application.

“(f) **SIZE LIMITATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission may grant a pilot license for a project located in the ocean if the project covers a surface area of not more than 1 square nautical mile.

“(2) **EXCEPTION.**—The Commission, at the discretion of the Commission and for good cause, may grant a pilot license for a project that covers a surface area of more than 1 square nautical mile.

“(3) **LIMITATION.**—For proposed projects located in an estuary, tidal area, river, lake, or stream, the Commission shall determine the size limit on a case-by-case basis, taking into account all relevant factors.

“(g) **EXTENSIONS AUTHORIZED.**—On application by a project, the Commission may make a 1-time extension of a pilot license for a term not to exceed 5 years.”.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself,
Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRAPO, and
Mr. RISCH):

S. 1420. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for transparency of payments made from the Judgment Fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to discuss legislation that I am introducing in the U.S. Senate today, the Judgment Fund Transparency Act.

As my colleagues may or may not know, the Judgment Fund is administered by the Treasury Department and is used to pay certain court judgments and settlements against the Federal Government. It is essentially an unlimited amount of money available to pay for Federal Government liability. It is not subject to the annual appropriations process, and even more remarkably, the Treasury Department has no reporting requirements, so these funds are paid out with very little oversight or scrutiny.

This is no small matter, as the Judgment Fund disburses billions of dollars in payments per year. In recent years, Treasury has paid the following from the Fund: fiscal year 2012—\$2.9 billion, fiscal year 2011—\$2.2 billion, fiscal year 2010—\$1.1 billion, fiscal year 2009—\$2.3 billion, fiscal year 2008—\$790 million, fiscal year 2007—\$1 billion, and fiscal year 2006—\$628 million.

Before the Judgment Fund was established, claims against the government were assigned to a Congressional committee that would appropriate funds in order to pay liability, attorneys' fees, and costs associated with the claim. Once the Judgment Fund was established in 1956, however, Congressional committees stopped appropriating funds explicitly for this purpose. Now, if a government agency does not use its own annual budget to cover the costs, Treasury simply pays the bill out of the Fund.

Because the Treasury Department has no binding reporting requirements,

few public details exist about where the funds are going and why, and the information that is readily accessible is only made available at the administration's discretion.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce highlighted the nature of this problem in an article about the Judgment Fund written by Bill Kovacs on February 1, 2013:

Without knowing who is being paid under the Judgment Fund and for what reason, not to mention the validity of the claim, Congress cannot oversee and control the federal governments litigation costs, risks and exposure. Simply, without disclosure Congress is being denied the opportunity to take effective mitigation measures against improper agency action that results in claims against the federal government. Non-disclosure of Judgment Fund payments hides from Congress what might be excessive markers of agency mismanagement and/or structural defects in statutes and programs. And due to a lack of reporting, Congress is denied the opportunity to understand claims against agencies that might shed light on how to improve agency operations.

The National Cattlemen's Beef Association has also decried the lack of oversight of the Judgment Fund by stating, "Certain groups continuously sue the federal government, and Treasury simply writes a check to foot the bill without providing Members of Congress and American taxpayers basic information about the payment."

The Judgment Fund Transparency Act seeks to address these problems by requiring a public accounting of the taxpayer funds distributed via the Judgment Fund to parties who bring successful claims against the Federal government.

The Judgment Fund Transparency Act promotes transparency and oversight by requiring the Treasury Department to post on a publicly accessible website the claimant, counsel, agency, fact summary, and payment amount for each claim from the Judgment Fund, unless a law or court order otherwise prohibits the disclosure of such information.

The Judgment Fund Transparency Act would increase transparency and oversight of the Fund and would provide Members of Congress and the public with the ability to see how taxpayers' dollars are being spent.

I am proud to introduce the Judgment Fund Transparency Act today and invite my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 1421. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable tax credit for the installation of sprinklers and elevators in historic structures; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, each year fire destroys hundreds of vulnerable historic buildings that serve as the anchors of America's vibrant villages and downtowns. These fires leave gaping

holes in Main Streets all across the country. All have destroyed property. Some have taken lives. And many could have been prevented by sprinkler systems. This upfront but costly investment could have helped prevent the loss of life, reduced property damage, and decreased federal expenditures on rebuilding efforts after these fires.

To prevent fires from destroying buildings in historic downtowns and to preserve access to upper-story office, retail, and housing space in these buildings, I am introducing legislation today—the Historic Downtown Preservation and Access Act—that will create a 50 percent refundable tax credit, capped at \$50,000, for the installation of fire sprinklers and elevators in older, multi-use buildings in historic downtowns.

Since 2000, Vermont has had more than a dozen significant downtown fires causing tens of millions of dollars of damage and taking at least three lives. The original owners of at least 8 of these buildings were unable to rebuild—leaving the critical task of rebuilding both the building and the community to nonprofit entities that rely primarily on Federal funds. These 8 projects cost the Federal Government \$20 million in Low Income Housing Tax Credits, Community Development Block-Grant building, and HOME funding. Only one of these 8 buildings had a sprinkler system. If the building owners had installed sprinklers in all eight buildings using the credit created by this legislation, the Federal Government may have saved \$19.6 million, dozens of Vermonters would still be in their homes, more than a dozen businesses would have been spared, and at least three Vermonters might still be alive today.

According to the National Fire Sprinkler Association, housing units with sprinklers receive 69 percent less property damage during a fire than units without sprinklers, the death rate per fire in a home with a sprinkler is 83 percent less than in a home without a sprinkler, and firefighters are 65 percent less likely to be injured in a fire where a sprinkler is present than in a fire where a sprinkler is not present.

This legislation also incentivizes the installation of elevators because too often upper story office, retail, and housing space in historic downtown buildings goes unused due to accessibility requirements.

Financial cost-benefit modeling and existing federal incentives for rehabbing an historic building with sprinklers or an elevator fail to adequately incentivize building owners to install these assets. For instance, the Qualified Rehabilitation Tax Credit requires significant rehabilitation to a building equal to the value of the building before renovation in order to claim the credit. Asset depreciation

tax benefits take decades for a building owner to offset the cost of a sprinkler or elevator system, and building owners who make no profit or minimal profit have no use for existing tax credits.

The new refundable tax credit I am introducing today—modeled after the State of Vermont's highly successful downtown historic tax credit—would allow private entities with little tax liability and nonprofits alike to install these important property- and life-saving devices in historic buildings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1421

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Historic Downtown Preservation and Access Act".

SEC. 2. CREDIT FOR INSTALLATION OF SPRINKLERS AND ELEVATORS IN HISTORIC BUILDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 36B the following new section:

"SEC. 36C. HISTORIC BUILDING EXPENSES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be allowed a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year an amount equal to 50 percent of the qualified historic building expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer during such taxable year.

"(b) LIMITATION.—The credit allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any taxpayer for any taxable year shall not exceed \$50,000.

"(c) QUALIFIED HISTORIC BUILDING EXPENSES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified historic building expenses' means amounts paid or incurred to install in a certified historic structure an elevator system or a sprinkler system that meets the requirements found in the most recent edition of NFPA 13: Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems.

"(2) NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS.—In the case of a certified historic structure that is designated as a National Historic Landmark in accordance with section 101(a) of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470a(a)) and that is open to the public, the term 'qualified historic building expenses' shall not include an expense described in paragraph (1), unless the installation of property described in such paragraph meets the requirements for a certified rehabilitation under section 47(c)(2)(C).

"(3) CERTIFIED HISTORIC STRUCTURE.—The term 'certified historic structure' has the meaning given such term in section 47(c)(3), except that such term shall not include any structure which is a single-family residence."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1324 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting "36C" after "36B".

(2) The table of sections for subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 36B the following new item:

"Sec. 36C. Historic building expenses."

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KING, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1422. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 respecting the scoring of preventive health savings; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation to modernize the Congressional budget scoring process with respect to health spending and the effects of preventive health care.

Although the United States spends more than any other Nation in the world on health care, \$2.6 trillion in 2010, our citizens' health status lags behind that of most developed countries, and we have the highest rate of preventable deaths among 19 industrialized nations. One reason is that the United States' expenditures for the treatment of disease far exceed our investments in preventive health.

Our neglect of prevention has been costly. Spending on the treatment of chronic diseases is overwhelming our health care budgets, particularly those of the Medicare and Medicaid programs. The following statistics come from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: 7 out of 10 deaths among Americans each year are from chronic diseases. Heart disease, cancer and stroke account for more than 50 percent of all deaths each year.

In 2005, 133 million Americans almost 1 out of every 2 adults had at least one chronic illness.

About ¼ of people with chronic conditions have one or more daily activity limitations.

Arthritis is the most common cause of disability, with nearly 19 million Americans reporting activity limitations.

Diabetes continues to be the leading cause of kidney failure, nontraumatic lower-extremity amputations, and blindness among adults, aged 20–74.

Excessive alcohol consumption is the third leading preventable cause of death in the U.S., behind diet, physical activity, and tobacco.

CDC also tells us that four health risk behaviors—lack of physical activity, poor nutrition, tobacco use, and excessive alcohol consumption—are responsible for much of the illness, suffering, and early death related to chronic diseases.

More than ⅓ of all adults do not meet recommendations for aerobic physical activity based on the 2008 Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans, and 23 percent report no leisure-time physical activity at all in the preceding month.

In 2007, 22 percent of high school students and only 24 percent of adults reported eating 5 or more servings of fruits and vegetables per day.

More than 43 million American adults, approximately 1 in 5, smoke. Lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer death, and cigarette smoking causes almost all cases. Compared to nonsmokers, men who smoke are about 23 times more likely to develop lung cancer and women who smoke are about 13 times more likely. Smoking causes about 90 percent of lung cancer deaths in men and almost 80 percent in women. Smoking also causes cancer of the voicebox, mouth and throat, esophagus, bladder, kidney, pancreas, cervix, and stomach, and causes acute myeloid leukemia.

Excessive alcohol consumption contributes to over 54 different diseases and injuries, including cancer of the mouth, throat, esophagus, liver, colon, and breast, liver diseases, and other cardiovascular, neurological, psychiatric, and gastrointestinal health problems.

Binge drinking, the most dangerous pattern of drinking, defined as consuming more than 4 drinks on an occasion for women or 5 drinks for men, is reported by 17 percent of U.S. adults, averaging 8 drinks per binge.

By addressing just these four behaviors, we can alter the trajectory of chronic disease and the health costs associated with them. That is the power of prevention. As Dr. Albert Reece of the University of Maryland School of Medicine once said, "Lifestyle is primary care."

Prevention also means early screening. In addition to increasing survival rates, identifying diseases early reduces health care costs. In the case of colorectal cancer, Medicare will pay under \$400 for a colonoscopy, but if the patient is not diagnosed until the disease has metastasized, the costs of care can exceed \$58,000 over the patient's lifetime. A screening mammography costs the Medicare program a small fraction of the tens of thousands of dollars that treatment of breast cancer costs, depending on when the cancer is found and the course of treatment used. One drug used to treat late stage breast cancer can cost as much as \$40,000 a year.

Research has shown that increasing to 90 percent the number of women aged 40 and older who have been screened for breast cancer in the past two years would save more than 100,000 lives each year in the United States.

One of the most compelling cases for prevention is in the area of oral health. The tragic, preventable death of 12 year-old Marylander Deamonte Driver in 2007 illustrated the consequences of poor access to oral health care. His untreated tooth abscess spread to his brain and after two extensive operations, he died. Although a tooth extraction would have cost about \$80, the final total cost of his medical care exceeded \$250,000.

The American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry tells us that dental decay is

the most common chronic childhood disease among children in the United States. It affects one in five children aged 2 to 4, half of those aged 6 to 8, and nearly ⅓ of 15 year olds. But it is also the most preventable disease if basic oral care is provided starting at an early age.

The good news is that for nearly every category of chronic disease we can reduce its prevalence by making preventive health care a priority. All around us are examples of why prevention is an essential part of health care and why effective use of preventive measures, such as screening and smoking cessation can save lives and lower health care costs in the long run.

But the current Congressional budget process has hindered our ability to get appropriate credit for the cost savings that prevention can bring. For this reason, investing in initiatives that can move our Nation forward toward optimal health often requires us to cut funding in other important areas because of the budget rules.

Today, budget resolutions, budget reconciliation, and CBO scoring analyses use a ten-year "scoring" window. But the research performed at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, MD and at research centers across the nation has demonstrated that some expenditures for preventive services result in cost savings when considered in the long term. Unfortunately, Congressional budget scoring rules only permit taking into account the first ten years, a time frame in which savings may not be apparent.

We want to change that. Today, with Senators MIKE CRAPO, ANGUS KING, TOM UDALL, and JEANNE SHAHEEN, I am introducing the Preventive Health Savings Act of 2013. It would allow the Chairman or Ranking Member of the House or Senate Budget Committee, or the health committees—HELP, Finance, Ways and Means, or Energy and Commerce—to request an analysis of preventive measures extending beyond the existing 10-year window to two additional ten-year periods.

Re-evaluating our budget rules is not a new phenomenon. In recent years, Congress has increasingly looked for ways to assess long-term budget consequences. For example, Congress currently requests that CBO report on measures that would cause a large future increase in the deficit—more than \$5 billion in the following four decades.

The Preventive Health Savings Act would direct CBO to incorporate credible data on prevention. Because we want to ensure that CBO's projections are tied to scientific data, our bill would define preventive health as "an action designed to avoid future health care costs that is demonstrated by credible and publicly available epidemiological projection models, incorporating clinical trials or observational studies in humans, longitudinal

studies, and meta-analysis.” This narrow, responsible approach encourages a sensible review of health policy that Congress believes will promote public health, and it will make it easier for us to invest in proven methods of saving lives and money.

CBO would be required to conduct an initial analysis to determine whether the provision would result in substantial savings outside the 10-year scoring window and to include a description of those future-year savings in its budget projections.

The broad coalition of groups supporting this bill includes: the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, Aetna, Allscripts, American Association of Diabetes Educators, American College of Occupational Medicine, American College of Preventative Medicine, American Diabetes Association, BlueCross BlueShield Tennessee, Building Healthier America, Care Continuum Alliance, Council for Affordable Health Coverage, Dialysis Patient Citizens, The Endocrine Society, Healthcare Leadership Council, Healthways, IHRSA: International Health Racquet & Sportsclub Association, Johnson & Johnson, Marshfield Clinic, Memorial Care Health System, National Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems, National Retail Federation, National Kidney Foundation, Novo Nordisk, the Partnership to Fight Chronic Disease, Sanofi, Texas Health Resources, and Weight Watchers.

I also wish to applaud the bipartisan House sponsors of this legislation—two physicians—Representatives MICHAEL BURGESS of Texas and DONNA CHRISTENSEN of the U.S. Virgin Islands, for their vision in introducing the companion bill, H.R. 2663, which now has 19 cosponsors.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation, which will give our budget process the flexibility needed to dramatically bend the health care cost curve.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1423. A bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to strengthen the quality control measures in place for part B lung disease claims and to establish the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health for the contractor employee compensation program under subtitle E of such Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I rise to speak about bipartisan legislation I am introducing today with Senator ALEXANDER to provide much needed help to our Cold War patriots.

In 2000, Congress passed the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Com-

pensation Program to help Cold War workers like those from Rocky Flats in my home state of Colorado and other nuclear weapons facilities around the country. This effort was designed to get these patriots the help they need to treat cancer and other illnesses they developed as a result of exposure to radiation. Since then, the program has been plagued by procedural inconsistencies and delays preventing former nuclear workers from accessing the benefits they are owed.

In March 2010, the U.S. Government Accountability Office issued a report on the efficacy of EEOICPA, confirming workers' ongoing frustrations with the program and recommending that Congress consider creating an advisory board. More recently, in March 2013, the Institute of Medicine issued a report recommending that an external advisory panel be created to review the health effects of the Department of Labor's approach to awarding benefits.

Today, Senator ALEXANDER and I are reintroducing our bill requiring the President to establish an independent advisory panel to do just that. This advisory board would add much needed transparency and certainty to decisions made affecting workers' compensation and access to benefits.

Some 600,000 Cold War era workers, including thousands of workers at Rocky Flats, put their health on the line to preserve our national security during one of the most uncertain times in our nation's history. They were exposed to radiation and are sick and dying. Our country made a commitment to these patriots, but so far that promise has not been kept. Coloradans find that unacceptable. We cannot let another family suffer through the uncertainty of delays caused by bureaucratic red tape or see their loved ones denied the benefits they deserve. It is time for us to do right by these workers.

I urge my colleagues to join me and Senator ALEXANDER in this fight by cosponsoring this important legislation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1425. A bill to improve the safety of dietary supplements by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require manufacturers of dietary supplements to register dietary supplements with the Food and Drug Administration and to amend labeling requirements with respect to dietary supplements; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1425

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Dietary Supplement Labeling Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. REGULATION OF DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.

(a) REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 415(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 350d(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A facility engaged in manufacturing or processing dietary supplements that is required to register under this section shall comply with the requirements of this paragraph, in addition to the other requirements of this section.

“(B) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A facility described in subparagraph (A) shall submit a registration under paragraph (1) that includes, in addition to the information required under paragraph (2)—

“(I) a description of each dietary supplement manufactured or processed by such facility;

“(II) a list of all ingredients in each such dietary supplement; and

“(III) a copy of the label for each such dietary supplement.

“(ii) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the information provided under clause (i) publicly available, including by posting such information on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration.

“(C) REGISTRATION WITH RESPECT TO NEW, REFORMULATED, AND DISCONTINUED DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date described in clause (ii), if a facility described in subparagraph (A)—

“(I) manufactures or processes a dietary supplement that the facility previously did not manufacture or process and for which the facility did not submit the information required under subclauses (I) through (III) of subparagraph (B)(i);

“(II) reformulates a dietary supplement for which the facility previously submitted the information required under subclauses (I) through (III) of subparagraph (B)(i); or

“(III) no longer manufactures or processes a dietary supplement for which the facility previously submitted the information required under subclauses (I) through (III) of subparagraph (B)(i),

such facility shall submit to the Secretary an updated registration describing the change described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) and, in the case of a facility described in subclause (I) or (II), containing the information required under subclauses (I) through (III) of subparagraph (B)(i).

“(ii) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date described in this clause is—

“(I) in the case of a facility described in subclause (I) of clause (i), 30 days after the date on which such facility first markets the dietary supplement described in such subclause;

“(II) in the case of a facility described in subclause (II) of clause (i), 30 days after the date on which such facility first markets the reformulated dietary supplement described in such subclause; or

“(III) in the case of a facility described in subclause (III) of clause (i), 30 days after the date on which such facility removes the dietary supplement described in such subclause from the market.”.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C.

343) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(z) If it is a dietary supplement for which a facility is required to submit the registration information required under section 415(a)(6) and such facility has not complied with the requirements of such section 415(a)(6) with respect to such dietary supplement.”.

(b) LABELING.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF LABELING REQUIREMENTS.—Chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 341 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 411 the following:

“SEC. 411A. DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.

“(a) DIETARY SUPPLEMENT INGREDIENTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Dietary Supplement Labeling Act of 2013, the Secretary shall compile a list of dietary supplement ingredients and proprietary blends of ingredients that the Secretary determines could cause potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women.

“(b) IOM STUDY.—The Secretary shall seek to enter into a contract with the Institute of Medicine under which the Institute of Medicine shall evaluate dietary supplement ingredients and proprietary blends of ingredients, including those on the list compiled by the Secretary under subsection (a), and scientific literature on dietary supplement ingredients and, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Dietary Supplement Labeling Act of 2013, submit to the Secretary a report evaluating the safety of dietary supplement ingredients and proprietary blends of ingredients the Institute of Medicine determines could cause potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women.

“(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the Institute of Medicine issues the report under subsection (b), the Secretary, after providing for public notice and comment and taking into consideration such report, shall—

“(1) establish mandatory warning label requirements for dietary supplement ingredients that the Secretary determines to cause potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups; and

“(2) identify proprietary blends of ingredients for which, because of potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women, the weight per serving of the ingredient in the proprietary blend shall be provided on the label.

“(d) UPDATES.—As appropriate, the Secretary, after providing for public notice and comment, shall update—

“(1) the list compiled under subsection (a);

“(2) the mandatory warning label requirements established under paragraph (1) of subsection (c); and

“(3) the requirements under paragraph (2) of subsection (c).”.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (q)(5)(F)(ii), by inserting “, and for each proprietary blend identified by the Secretary under section 411A(c)(2), the weight of such proprietary blend,” after “ingredients”;

(B) in paragraph (s)(2)—

(i) in clause (A)(ii)(II), by inserting “, and for each proprietary blend identified by the Secretary under section 411A(c)(2), the weight of each such proprietary blend per serving” before the semicolon at the end;

(ii) in clause (D)(iii), by striking “or” at the end;

(iii) in clause (E)(ii)(II), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) the label does not include information with respect to potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women, as required under section 411A(c)(1); or

“(G) the label does not include the batch number.”.

(c) STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION CLAIMS.—Section 403(r)(6)(B) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343(r)(6)(B)) is amended by inserting “, and provides such substantiation to the Secretary, as the Secretary may require” after “misleading”.

(d) CONVENTIONAL FOODS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and after providing for public notice and comment, shall establish a definition for the term “conventional food” for purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.). Such definition shall take into account conventional foods marketed as dietary supplements, including products marketed as dietary supplements that simulate conventional foods.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1427. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce, along with Senator FRANKEN, the Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013. We introduced similar legislation in the 112th Congress, but the Senate never had a chance to consider the bill. The bill addresses the 2012 United States Supreme Court case *Hall v. United States*. In a 5–4 decision, the Supreme Court ruled that a provision I inserted into the 2005 Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act did not accomplish what we in Congress intended. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013 corrects this and clarifies that bankrupt family farmers reorganizing their debts are able to treat capital gains taxes owed to a governmental unit, arising from the sale of farm assets during a bankruptcy, as general unsecured claims. This bill will remove the Internal Revenue Service's veto power over a bankruptcy reorganization plan's confirmation, giving the family farmer a chance to reorganize successfully.

In 1986 Congress enacted Chapter 12 of the Bankruptcy Code to provide a specialized bankruptcy process for fam-

ily farmers. In 2005 Chapter 12 was made permanent. Between 1986 and 2005 we learned what aspects worked and did not work for family farmers reorganizing in bankruptcy. One problematic area was where a family farmer needed to sell assets in order to generate cash for the reorganization. Specifically, a family farmer would have to sell portions of the farm to generate cash to fund a reorganization plan so that the creditors could receive payment. Unfortunately, in situations like this, the family farmer is selling land that has been owned for a very long time, with a very low cost basis. Thus, when the land is sold, the family farmer is hit with a substantial capital gains tax, which is owed to the Internal Revenue Service.

Under the Bankruptcy Code, taxes owed to the Internal Revenue Service receive priority treatment. Holders of priority claims must receive payment in full, unless the claim holder agrees to be treated differently. This creates problems for the family farmer who needs the cash to pay creditors to reorganize. However, since the Internal Revenue Service has the ability to require full payment, they hold veto power over a plan's confirmation, which means in many instances the plan will not be confirmed. This does not make sense if the goal is to give the family farmer a fresh start. Thus, in 2005 Congress said that in these limited situations, the taxes owed to the Internal Revenue Service would be stripped of their priority and treated as general, unsecured debt. This removed the government's veto power over plan confirmation and paved the way for family farmers to reorganize.

Unfortunately, in *Hall v. United States*, the Supreme Court ruled that despite Congress's express goal of helping family farmers, the language inserted into the Bankruptcy Code in 2005 conflicted with the Tax Code. The *Hall* case was one of statutory interpretation. There is no question what Congress was trying to do; rather, did Congress use the correct language? My goal, along with others at the time, was to relieve family farmers from having their reorganization plans fail because of huge tax liabilities to the federal government. Justice Breyer noted this in the dissent: “Congress was concerned about the effect on the farmer of collecting capital gains tax debts that arose during, and were connected with, the Chapter 12 proceedings themselves. . . . The majority does not deny the importance of Congress' objective. Rather, it feels compelled to hold that Congress put the Amendment in the wrong place.” *Hall v. United States*, 132 S.Ct. 1882, 1897 (2012) (Breyer, J., dissenting) (internal citations and quotations omitted).

As a result of the *Hall* case, family farmers facing bankruptcy now find themselves caught in a tough spot. The

rules have now changed and must be corrected in order to provide certainty and clarity in the law. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013 will provide the clarity needed to help family farmers.

This bill, which has been worked on over the past year to make sure the problem is addressed correctly, adds a new section 1232 to title 11 of the United States Code. This new section, along with other conforming changes to the Bankruptcy Code, will provide clarity to practitioners and courts as to how these claims are to be treated during bankruptcy. I am pleased that what we are introducing today, building from the bill we introduced last Congress, is an improved product that can help family farmers who are facing hard times. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013 will ensure that what Congress sought to do in 2005 actually occurs. In the wake of the Hall decision, clarification is needed to help family farmers reorganize successfully.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1427

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF RULE ALLOWING DISCHARGE TO GOVERNMENTAL CLAIMS ARISING FROM THE DISPOSITION OF FARM ASSETS UNDER CHAPTER 12 BANKRUPTCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation

“(a) Any unsecured claim of a governmental unit against the debtor or the estate that arises before the filing of the petition, or that arises after the filing of the petition and before the debtor's discharge under section 1228, as a result of the sale, transfer, exchange, or other disposition of any property used in the debtor's farming operation—

“(1) shall be treated as an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition is filed;

“(2) shall not be entitled to priority under section 507;

“(3) shall be provided for under a plan; and

“(4) shall be discharged in accordance with section 1228.

“(b) For purposes of applying sections 1225(a)(4), 1228(b)(2), and 1229(b)(1) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the amount that would be paid on such claim if the estate of the debtor were liquidated in a case under chapter 7 of this title shall be the amount that would be paid by the estate in a chapter 7 case if the claim were an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition was filed and were not entitled to priority under section 507.

“(c) For purposes of applying sections 523(a), 1228(a)(2), and 1228(c)(2) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the claim shall not be treated as a claim of a kind specified in section 523(a)(1).

“(d)(1) A governmental unit may file a proof of claim for a claim described in subsection (a) that arises after the date on which the petition is filed.

“(2) If a debtor files a tax return after the filing of the petition for a period in which a claim described in subsection (a) arises, and the claim relates to the tax return, the debtor shall serve notice of the claim on the governmental unit charged with the responsibility for the collection of the tax at the address and in the manner designated in section 505(b)(1). Notice under this paragraph shall state that the debtor has filed a petition under this chapter, state the name and location of the court in which the case under this chapter is pending, state the amount of the claim, and include a copy of the filed tax return and documentation supporting the calculation of the claim.

“(3) If notice of a claim has been served on the governmental unit in accordance with paragraph (2), the governmental unit may file a proof of claim not later than 180 days after the date on which such notice was served. If the governmental unit has not filed a timely proof of the claim, the debtor or trustee may file proof of the claim that is consistent with the notice served under paragraph (2). If a proof of claim is filed by the debtor or trustee under this paragraph, the governmental unit may not amend the proof of claim.

“(4) A claim filed under this subsection shall be determined and shall be allowed under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 502, or disallowed under subsection (d) or (e) of section 502, in the same manner as if the claim had arisen immediately before the date of the filing of the petition.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 1222(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “unless—” and all that follows through “the holder” and inserting “unless the holder”;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) subject to section 1232, provide for the treatment of any claim by a governmental unit of a kind described in section 1232(a).”;

(B) in section 1228—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(aa) by inserting a comma after “all debts provided for by the plan”; and

(bb) by inserting a comma after “allowed under section 503 of this title”; and

(II) in paragraph (2), by striking “the kind” and all that follows and inserting “a kind specified in section 523(a) of this title, except as provided in section 1232(c).”;

(ii) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting “, except as provided in section 1232(c)” before the period at the end; and

(C) in section 1229(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) provide for the payment of a claim described in section 1232(a) that arose after the date on which the petition was filed.”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any bankruptcy case that—

(1) is pending on the date of enactment of this Act and relating to which an order of discharge under section 1228 of title 11, United States Code, has not been entered; or

(2) commences on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1430. A bill to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill called the Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act. This bill is identical to the House version, H.R. 876, which was introduced and carried through the House by my colleague from Idaho, Representative MIKE SIMPSON, who did yeoman's work on pursuing this and putting it together and shepherding it through. It passed unanimously in the House. I thank him on behalf of all Idahoans for his work on this issue.

The need for this legislation is simple. The Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness, which was designated by Congress in 1980, abuts the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness area, which was designated by Congress in 1964. These areas contain some of the largest and most rugged remote tracts of land in the lower 48 States. It is magnificent in its beauty—substantially better, in my opinion, than the Alps.

There are a number of water diversions within the Idaho wilderness areas that have existed since the time of this legislation—since the time these wilderness areas were established. Although the diversions continue to exist, the owners currently lack authority to maintain and repair the facilities.

Predating the existence of these two wilderness areas, private landowners had received permits to maintain and repair water diversions that existed on National Forest System lands. The water is used for a combination of many things, including, but not limited to, drinking water for private cabins and ranches and also for generating electricity in some places on a very small scale. Many of the permits have since expired, leaving those who own the water diversions without any options for mechanically maintaining their water systems. In some cases, this lack of management threatens the

environment and the watersheds in which they exist.

The Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act will give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to reissue and issue special use authorizations to the owners of these diversion facilities within the Frank Church and the Selway Wilderness areas for the continued maintenance of their water facilities. The permits would only be issued if the owner could prove the facility existed prior to those lands being designated as wilderness, the facility has been used to deliver water to the owner's land since the designation, and the owner had a valid water right and it would not be practical to move the facility outside of the wilderness area. Undoubtedly, in exercising the discretion, the Secretary would ensure that in no way would it denigrate these wilderness areas. There are several different individuals or businesses that have water diversions in these wilderness areas that meet the description I have given.

Earlier this week the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources held a hearing on H.R. 876. The U.S. Forest Service appeared at that hearing and testified in support of this bill. I look forward to working with Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI to pass this bill quickly so as to allow for the maintenance of this water infrastructure.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1432. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating portions of the Ka'u Coast in the State of Hawaii as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Ka'u Coast Preservation Act of 2013, a bill directing the National Park Service to assess the feasibility of designating certain coastal lands on the Ka'u Coast of the island of Hawaii as units of the National Park System.

The National Park Service conducted a reconnaissance survey in 2006 that made a preliminary assessment of whether the Ka'u Coast would meet the National Park Service's demanding criteria as a resource of national significance. The reconnaissance survey concluded that "based upon the significance of the resources in the study area and the current integrity and intact condition of these resources, a preliminary finding of national significance and suitability can be concluded." The report goes on to recommend that Congress proceed with a full resource study of the area.

Since the time of the initial reconnaissance report and my introduction of this Act in previous Congresses, two additional properties in the Ka'u that deserve evaluation have come to my

attention: the Kahuku Coastal Property, also known as Sands of South Kona and Road to the Sea, and the Nani Kahuku 'Aina property adjacent to Pohue Bay. I have added these areas to the study area for the full resource study.

The coastline of Ka'u is still largely unspoiled. The study area contains significant natural, geological, and archaeological features. The northern part of the study area is adjacent to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park and contains a number of noteworthy geological features, including an ancient lava tube known as the Great Crack, which the National Park Service has expressed interest in acquiring in the past.

The study area includes both black and green sand beaches as well as a significant number of endangered and threatened species, most notably the endangered hawksbill turtle, at least half of the Hawaiian population of this rare sea turtle nests within the study area, the threatened green sea turtle, the highly endangered Hawaiian monk seal, the endangered Hawaiian hawk, the endangered Hawaiian bat, native bees, the endangered and very rare Hawaiian orange-black damselfly, the largest population in the State, and a number of native birds. Humpback whales and spinner dolphins also frequent the area. The Ka'u Coast also boasts some of the best remaining examples of native coastal vegetation in Hawaii.

The archeological resources related to ancient Hawaiian settlements within the study area are also very impressive. These include dwelling complexes, heiau, religious shrines, walls, fishing and canoe houses or sheds, burial sites, petroglyphs, water and salt collection sites, caves, and trails. The Ala Kahakai National Historic Trail runs through the study area.

The Ka'u Coast is a truly remarkable area: its combination of natural, archaeological, cultural, and recreational resources, as well as its spectacular views, are an important part of Hawaii's and our nation's natural and cultural heritage.

As this process evolves, the successful preservation of this pristine land will depend on the federal government working closely with local stakeholders, seeking their input, and collaborating with them to address concerns as they arise. I encourage the National Park Service to continue working with all involved to ensure this coastline is preserved for decades to come.

I believe a full feasibility study, which was recommended in the reconnaissance survey, will confirm that the area meets the National Park Service's high standards as an area of national significance.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1437. A bill to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed in 1954 by the United States, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to the State of Oregon for the establishment of the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center of Oregon State University in Hermiston, Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce a bill that will give Oregon State University the flexibility to continue its important agricultural work in Hermiston, Oregon. I am pleased to be joined on this bill with my colleague from Oregon, Senator MERKLEY. I look forward to working with Senator MERKLEY, other colleagues, and supporters of the bill to update the federal interests in the land to match current needs and conditions.

The Hermiston Agricultural Research & Extension Center, HAREC, provides support to one of the most unique and important agricultural areas in the world: the Columbia Basin region of Oregon and Washington. As one of Oregon State University's, OSU, 12 Agricultural Experiment Stations, HAREC concentrates on the discovery and implementation of agricultural opportunities while also providing solutions to production issues for regional growers and beyond.

Research at HAREC emphasizes identification of new crop opportunities, improved production practices that save money while reducing inputs, plant breeding and varietal evaluation of cereals and potatoes. Through this work it has developed new lines with higher nutritional value, integrated pest management of insects and insect-transmitted diseases, and provided information related to environmental issues and salmon restoration. In recent years the center provided leadership, research, and new knowledge essential to allow growers to diversify production and convert 30,000 acres of commodity crops to high-value crops. The station has led efforts to cultivate value-added agriculture in Morrow and Umatilla counties, resulting in over \$50,000,000 in annual economic return.

The history of HAREC and a Umatilla agricultural research center spans more than a century. The Federal Government paved the way in the development of farming and ranching in the Umatilla Basin. In 1954, the Bureau of Land Management granted land to the State of Oregon on the condition that the land is used for cooperative agricultural experimental work. Over the past nearly 60 years, OSU has developed a center with state-of-the-art laboratories, irrigation technology abilities, greenhouses, screenhouses and research and extension faculty. HAREC now supports nearly 500,000 acres of irrigated agriculture.

Just as agriculture in the Columbia Basin has grown by leaps and bounds since 1954, so has the community of Hermiston. This bill removes the reversionary clause from the original land grant while conditioning that any consideration gained by OSU from the sale, lease, or other use of the land be put back into agricultural experimental and research work. It gives OSU the flexibility to adapt to the population growth and city expansion that will ultimately necessitate the relocation of HAREC from inside the urban growth boundary to a more rural location. Without this bill, moving the station would mean triggering the federal reversionary clause and losing HAREC land and all the buildings and improvements over nearly six decades to the Federal Government. I'm sponsoring this bill to ensure HAREC can continue for another hundred years.

Regional leaders and Oregon State University support removing the barriers to the continued operation of the center. I express my gratitude for their work with me on this legislation. I also look forward to working with Senator MERKLEY to advance this bill and support the agricultural heart of the regional economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1437

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center Land Conveyance Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **RESEARCH CENTER LAND.**—The term "research center land" means the approximately 290 acres of land in Hermiston, Oregon, identified as the "Reversionary Interest Area" on the map entitled "Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center" and dated July 23, 2013, including any improvements to, and building on, the land.

(2) **PATENT.**—The term "patent" means the patent granted by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management (acting on behalf of the United States) to the State, numbered 130889, and dated September 17, 1954.

(3) **STATE.**—The term "State" means the State of Oregon (acting through the Oregon State Board of Higher Education on behalf of Oregon State University).

SEC. 3. RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST AND RESERVATION OF MINERAL RIGHTS TO BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND CONVEYED TO THE STATE OF OREGON FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF HERMISTON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EXTENSION CENTER.

(a) **RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST AND RESERVATION OF MINERAL RIGHTS.**—Subject to subsection (b), there are released by the United States without consideration—

(1) the reversionary interest retained by the United States to the research center land under the patent; and

(2) the reservation of mineral rights by the United States to the research center land under the patent.

(b) **CONDITION.**—The release of the reversionary interest under subsection (a)(1) is subject to the condition that the State agrees to use any consideration received by the State from the sale, lease, or other conveyance of the research center land after the date of enactment of this Act for agricultural experimental and research work of Oregon State University.

(c) **INSTRUMENT OF RELEASE.**—The Secretary of the Interior (acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management) shall execute and file in the appropriate office a deed of release, amended deed, or other appropriate instrument reflecting the release under subsection (a).

By Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU):
S. 1440. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow the use of physical damage disaster loans for the construction of safe rooms; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak on an issue that is of great importance to my home state of Louisiana: disaster preparedness. As you know, along the Gulf Coast, we keep an eye trained on the Gulf of Mexico during hurricane season. This is following the devastating one-two punch of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita of 2005 as well as Hurricanes Gustav and Ike in 2008. Unfortunately, our region also has had to deal with the economic and environmental damage from the Deepwater Horizon disaster in 2010 and more recently Hurricane Isaac. For this reason, as Chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, ensuring Federal disaster programs are effective and responsive to disaster victims is one of my top priorities. While the Gulf Coast is prone to hurricanes, other parts of the country are no strangers to disaster. For example, the Midwest and Southeast have tornadoes, California experiences earthquakes and wildfires, and the Northeast sees crippling snowstorms. So no part of our country is spared from disasters—disasters which can and will strike at any moment. This certainly hit home when the northeast was struck by Hurricane Sandy in October of last year and when Moore, Oklahoma was hit by a massive tornado earlier this summer. With this in mind, we must ensure that families have the resources they need to be better prepared the next time disasters strike their communities.

In order to give families in tornado prone areas more resources to protect lives and property, I am proud to file the Tornado Family Safety Act of 2013. Representative TOM COLE from Oklahoma is filing the House companion bill today as well. I want to thank him for being my partner in this effort as his district has seen firsthand how destructive these tornadoes can be to homes and businesses. In particular,

our bill would allow U.S. Small Business Administration, SBA, disaster home mitigation loans to go towards the construction of tornado safe rooms. Under current law, SBA can increase the size of a home disaster loan by 20 percent of the total damage to decrease future disaster risk. The Small Business Act lists out examples of mitigation activities such as "... retaining walls, sea walls, grading and contouring land, relocating utilities and modifying structures..." The bill would add safe rooms as an eligible activity so homeowners would have access to these low-interest loans. It does not replace or duplicate other programs, but instead provides a backstop for families in disaster prone areas.

Under guidelines from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, and the International Code Council, ICC, a safe room should withstand 250 mph winds and the impact of a 15-pound plank hitting a wall at 100 miles per hour, according to the Insurance Institute for Business and Home Safety, IBHS. Safe rooms designed to the FEMA and ICC standards are recommended for both tornadoes and hurricanes. For individual homes, a safe room could range anywhere from \$3,000 to \$12,000.

The concept for the bill came about after discussions with the FEMA and the SBA on recent disasters. We learned that safe rooms are not allowable under FEMA preparedness grant programs. Safe rooms would be considered construction and FEMA only allows for limited construction under the preparedness grants for very specific items, such as communications towers, as specified in the appropriations acts. Safe rooms are an eligible activity under the FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, HMGP. States decide how they use their HMGP, and reimbursing safe room construction for homeowners could be eligible. However, given the larger cost involved in reimbursing individual homeowners, HMGP funded safe rooms are oftentimes community-owned not residential.

As I have indicated, FEMA Individual Assistance does not allow the construction of safe rooms. FEMA does allow HMGP grants for safe rooms and states can decide to reimburse safe room construction for homeowners. However, most are typically community-owned not residential since HMGP funds both single and multi-use facilities—schools, community centers, etc. For example, according to FEMA data, out of 21 states funding safe rooms, only four states, Oklahoma, Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas, represent the bulk of residential safe rooms, approximately 21,600 of the 21,880 funded.

But let me give you an example of how the needs for these types of structures are often outpacing the resources

currently available. Following the May 20, 2013 tornado there, Moore, OK, Mayor Glenn Lewis proposed a requirement that all new homes built in the city include a safe room. Oklahoma Governor Fallin also told the Associated Press that only 100 of the 1,752 public schools in Oklahoma have a safe room. In a subsequent June 9, 2013, interview, Albert Ashwood, Director of the Oklahoma Department of Emergency Management, estimated that putting safe rooms in 1,000 Oklahoma schools, via traditional FEMA grant programs, would cost between \$500 million to \$1 billion alone. So in the near future, there is likely to be less, not more, Federal funding available at the State level for these types of residential safe rooms. Our bill would allow a backstop to homeowners in the event that other Federal/State funds are not available for safe rooms for that particular disaster.

In closing, I believe that this commonsense disaster reform will greatly benefit homeowners impacted by future tornadoes and other disasters.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1440

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Tornado Family Safety Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. USE OF PHYSICAL DAMAGE DISASTER LOANS.

Section 7(b)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “the Administration may increase” and inserting “the Administration may, subject to section 18(a), increase”; and

(2) by striking “and modifying structures” and inserting “, and modifying structures (including construction of a safe room or similar storm shelter designed to protect property and occupants from tornadoes or other natural disasters)”.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1443. A bill to facilitate the remediation of abandoned hardrock mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing legislation designed to help promote the cleanup of abandoned and inactive hard rock mines that are a great detriment to the environment and public health throughout the country, but especially to the West. I want to thank my colleague Senator BENNET for joining me in this effort.

For over one hundred years, miners and prospectors have searched for and developed valuable “hard rock” minerals—gold, silver, copper, molybdenum, and others. Hard rock mining

has played a key role in the history of Colorado and other states, and the resulting mineral wealth has been an important contributor to our economy and the development of essential products.

Too often, however, the miners would abandon their work and move on, seeking riches over the next mountain. The resulting legacy of unsafe open mine shafts and acid mine drainages can be seen throughout the country and especially on public lands in the West where mineral development was encouraged to help settle our region.

Unfortunately, many of our current environmental laws designed to mitigate the impact from operating hard rock mines are of limited effectiveness when applied to abandoned and inactive mines. As a result, many of these old mines continue to pollute streams and rivers and pose a risk to the health of people who live nearby or downstream.

The bill I am reintroducing today will help address this impediment and make it easier for volunteers, who had no role in creating the problem, to help clean up these sites and improve the environment. It does so by providing a new permit program under the Clean Water Act whereby volunteers can, under an approved plan, reduce the water pollution flowing from an abandoned mine. At the same time, volunteers will not be exposed to the full liability and ongoing responsibility provisions of the Clean Water Act.

I would be remiss not to thank the Environmental Protection Agency for its work in addressing this issue. Most recently, EPA issued a memorandum on December 12, 2012, to reduce the Clean Water Act legal vulnerability faced by “Good Samaritans” by clarifying that parties who volunteer to clean up these abandoned sites are generally not responsible for obtaining a permit under the Clean Water Act both during and following a successful cleanup. While this was an important step forward, my legislation will provide binding legal protections for Good Samaritans, allowing them to move forward—knowing the long-term certainty of their rights—with the imperative work of mine cleanup.

The new permits proposed in this bill would help address problems that have frustrated federal and state agencies throughout the country. As population growth continues near these old mines, more and more risks to public health and safety are likely to occur. We simply must begin to address this issue—not only to improve the environment, but also to ensure that our water supplies are safe and usable. This bill does not address all the concerns some would-be Good Samaritans may have about initiating cleanup projects and I am committed to continue working to address those additional concerns, through additional legislation and in

other ways. However, this bill can make a real difference, and I think it deserves approval without unnecessary delay.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1444. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under part A of the Medicare Program on a reasonable cost basis for anesthesia services furnished by an anesthesiologist in certain rural hospitals in the same manner as payments are provided for anesthesia services furnished by anesthesiologist assistants and certified anesthetists in such hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President. I am honored to join my colleague from Georgia, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON, in introducing a bill essential to expanding health care options for rural hospitals and beneficiaries living in rural areas, the Medicare Access to Rural Anesthesiology Act.

As it stands today, low Medicare Part B anesthesia payments and low patient volume in rural areas makes it difficult for rural hospitals to attract and retain anesthesiologists. Our legislation would take an important step towards leveling the playing field between urban and rural health care by ensuring that rural Medicare beneficiaries have similar access to anesthesia services.

Generally, Medicare pays for anesthesia services under the Medicare Part B fee schedule, but in order to attract anesthesia providers to rural areas, a statutory exception was created in the 1980s that allows eligible rural hospital to use Part A funds to employ or contract with non-physician anesthesiologist assistants, AAs, or certified registered nurse anesthetists, CRNAs. This policy however, does not permit eligible hospitals to use pass-through funds to pay anesthesiologists. Leaving anesthesiologists out also prevents AAs from receiving pass through payment because AAs must have an anesthesiologist on premises in order to practice. As a result, many folks in rural areas only have access to one type of anesthesia provider compared to folks in urban areas who can easily visit an anesthesiologist, CRNA, or an AA.

Our legislation would allow eligible rural hospitals to use “pass-through” Part A funds to employ CRNAs, AAs, and anesthesiologists. This common sense change would give eligible rural hospitals the power to choose the anesthesia providers that best suit the medical needs of their patients, and would provide these hospitals with another tool to recruit and retain anesthesiology professionals as well as expand the availability of anesthesiology care in medically underserved areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1444

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Medicare Access to Rural Anesthesiology Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. MEDICARE PART A PAYMENT FOR ANESTHESIOLOGIST SERVICES IN CERTAIN RURAL HOSPITALS BASED ON CRNA PASS-THROUGH RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1814 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“Anesthesiologist Services Provided in Certain Rural Hospitals

“(m)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, coverage and payment shall be provided under this part for physicians’ services that are anesthesia services furnished by a physician who is an anesthesiologist in a rural hospital described in paragraph (3) in the same manner as payment is made under the exception provided in section 9320(k) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986, as amended by section 6132 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 1395k note) (relating to payment on a reasonable cost, pass-through basis), for certified registered nurse anesthetist services furnished by a certified registered nurse anesthetist in a hospital described in such section.

“(2) No payment shall be made under any other provision of this title for physicians’ services for which payment is made under this subsection.

“(3) A rural hospital described in this paragraph is a hospital described in section 9320(k) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986, as so amended (42 U.S.C. 1395k note), except that—

“(A) any reference in such section to a ‘certified registered nurse anesthetist’ or ‘anesthetist’ is deemed a reference to a ‘physician who is an anesthesiologist’ or ‘anesthesiologist’, respectively; and

“(B) any reference to ‘January 1, 1988’ or ‘1987’ is deemed a reference to such date and year as the Secretary shall specify.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to services furnished during cost reporting periods beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1449. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that income attributable to certain passenger cruise voyages beginning or ending in the United States shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today I am introducing comprehensive legislation to repeal corporate tax loopholes that allow the cruise industry to avoid paying its fair share of U.S. corporate income taxes.

These bills change the treatment of the revenue that foreign-based cruise lines earn from ships that embark or disembark nearly 15 million passengers a year in the United States. A string of

recent incidents has demonstrated that when cruise ships get into trouble, the companies rely on the resources and assistance of the U.S. Navy and Coast Guard. The industry also uses the services of over 20 other U.S. agencies to the tune of millions of taxpayer dollars every year.

The majority of cruise companies are organized as foreign corporations, even though many of their headquarters and executives are located in the United States. By incorporating in foreign countries, the cruise industry enjoys a special exemption under section 883 of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides that certain foreign corporations are not subject to U.S. taxes on income derived from the international operation of ships, even if the source of the income is in the United States.

Today, I am introducing two bills, S. 1449 and S. 1450. The first would eliminate the section 883 special exemption for cruise industry income derived from passenger cruise voyages that embark or disembark passengers in the United States. This income would be treated as being U.S. sourced and effectively connected with a U.S. trade or business, so it would be subject to U.S. taxes at the same rate as other income.

The second bill would impose a 5 percent excise tax on gross income from cruises where passengers embark or disembark in the United States. Funds generated from the excise tax will help fund a national program to make infrastructure improvements vital to the efficient transportation of goods and services.

For too long, the cruise industry has been able to use taxpayer provided services without actually paying for them. It is time the cruise industry begins to pay for the services it uses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bills be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1449

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TAXATION OF UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME OF NON-RESIDENT ALIENS AND FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.

(a) UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME TREATED AS EFFECTIVELY CONNECTED TO THE CONDUCT OF A TRADE OR BUSINESS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) INCOME FROM SOURCES WITHOUT THE UNITED STATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 864(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C) and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—United States cruise industry income shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States.

“(ii) UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘United States cruise industry income’ means income attributable to any covered passenger cruise (as defined in paragraph (8)), including income directly or indirectly attributable to the carriage of passengers and any on-board or off-board activities incidental to such covered passenger cruise.”.

(B) COVERED PASSENGER CRUISE.—Subsection (c) of section 864 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) COVERED PASSENGER CRUISE.—For purposes of paragraph (4)(C)—

“(A) DEFINITION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered passenger cruise’ means a voyage of a commercial passenger cruise vessel—

“(I) that extends over 1 or more nights,

“(II) during which passengers embark or disembark the vessel in the United States.

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS FOR CERTAIN VOYAGES.—Such term shall not include any voyage—

“(I) on any vessel owned or operated by the United States, a State, or any subdivision thereof,

“(II) which occurs exclusively on the inland waterways of the United States, or

“(III) in which a vessel in the usual course of employment proceeds, without an intervening foreign port of call from one port or place in the United States to the same port or place or to another port or place in the United States.

“(B) PASSENGER CRUISE VESSEL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘passenger cruise vessel’ means any passenger vessel having berth or stateroom accommodations for at least 250 passengers.

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include any ferry, recreational vessel, sailing school vessel, small passenger vessel, offshore supply vessel, or any other vessel determined under regulations by the Secretary to be excluded from the application of this part.

“(iii) DEFINITIONS.—Any term used in this section which used in chapter 21 of title 46, United States Code, shall have the meaning given such term under section 2101 of such title.”.

(C) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (A) of section 864(c)(4) of such Code is amended by striking “subparagraphs (B) and (C)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D)”.

(2) INCOME FROM SOURCES WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.—Paragraph (4) of section 887(b) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

“The preceding sentence shall not apply to with respect to any United States source gross transportation income which is United States cruise industry income (as defined in section 864(c)(4)(C)(ii)).”.

(b) REPEAL OF EXEMPTION FROM GROSS INCOME FOR CERTAIN TAXPAYERS.—

(1) NONRESIDENT ALIENS.—Paragraph (1) of section 872(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “(other than United States cruise industry income (as defined in section 864(c)(4)(C)))” after “or ships”.

(2) FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—Paragraph (1) of section 883(a) of such Code is amended by inserting “(other than United States cruise industry income (as defined in section 864(c)(4)(C)))” after “or ships”.

(c) INCOME TAX TREATIES.—Section 894 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no tax exemption or reduced tax rate shall be permitted under any treaty of the United States with respect to United States cruise industry income (as defined in section 864(c)(4)(C)).”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to income attributable to voyages made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

S. 1450

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXCISE TAX ON GROSS RECEIPTS DERIVED FROM CRUISES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter B of chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 4472 the following:

“PART II—AD VALOREM TAX

“Sec. 4476. Imposition of tax.

“Sec. 4477. Definitions.

“SEC. 4476. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other tax, there is hereby imposed a tax of 5 percent of the allocable amount with respect to any covered passenger cruise.

“(b) BY WHOM PAID.—The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the person providing the covered passenger cruise.

“SEC. 4477. DEFINITIONS.

“For purposes of this section—

“(1) COVERED PASSENGER CRUISE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered passenger cruise’ means a voyage of a commercial passenger cruise vessel—

“(i) that extends over 1 or more nights,

“(ii) during which passengers embark or disembark the vessel in the United States.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS FOR CERTAIN VOYAGES.—Such term shall not include any voyage—

“(i) on any vessel owned or operated by the United States, a State, or any subdivision thereof,

“(ii) which occurs exclusively on the inland waterways of the United States, or

“(iii) in which a vessel in the usual course of employment proceeds, without an intervening foreign port of call from one port or place in the United States to the same port or place or to another port or place in the United States.

“(2) PASSENGER CRUISE VESSEL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘passenger cruise vessel’ means any passenger vessel—

“(i) having berth or stateroom accommodations for at least 250 passengers, and

“(ii) that is used in the business of carrying passengers for hire.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include any ferry, recreational vessel, sailing school vessel, small passenger vessel, offshore supply vessel, or any other vessel determined under regulations by the Secretary to be excluded from the application of this part.

“(C) DEFINITIONS.—Any term used in this section which is used in chapter 21 of title 46, United States Code, shall have the meaning given such term under section 2101 of such title.

“(3) ALLOCABLE AMOUNT.—The term ‘allocable amount’ means—

“(A) in the case in which a majority of the passengers on any covered passenger cruise embark or disembark in the United States, 100 percent of the gross receipts attributable to such covered passenger cruise, and

“(B) in any other case, 50 percent of the gross receipts attributable to such covered passenger cruise.

“(4) UNITED STATES.—The term ‘United States’ includes any possession of the United States.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subchapter B of chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking all preceding section 4471 and inserting the following:

“Subchapter B—Transportation by Water

“PART I—PER PASSENGER TAX

“PART II—AD VALOREM TAX

“PART I—PER PASSENGER TAX

“Sec. 4471. Imposition of tax.

“Sec. 4472. Definitions.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to voyages made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. INTERMODAL INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of Chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 9512. INTERMODAL INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND.

“(a) CREATION OF TRUST FUND.—There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the ‘Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund’, consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund in this section or section 9602(b).

“(b) TRANSFERS TO INTERMODAL INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND.—There are hereby appropriated to the Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund amounts equivalent to the taxes received in the Treasury under section 4471.

“(c) EXPENDITURES FROM INTERMODAL INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND.—Amounts in the Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund shall be available, as provided in appropriations Acts, for transportation improvement, including—

“(1) the construction or improvement of—

“(A) passenger or freight rail lines,

“(B) highways,

“(C) bridges,

“(D) airports,

“(E) air traffic control systems,

“(F) port or marine facilities,

“(G) inland waterways,

“(H) transmission or distribution pipelines,

“(I) public transportation facilities or systems

“(J) intercity passenger bus or passenger rail facilities or equipment, and

“(K) freight rail facilities or equipment, and

“(2) planning, preparation, or design of any project described in paragraph (1).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter A of Chapter 98 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 9512. Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund.”

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself,
Mr. REID, Mr. HELLER, and Mrs.
BOXER):

S. 1451. A bill to provide for environmental restoration activities and forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation or shipment of quagga mussels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to again discuss the need to restore and protect Lake Tahoe. Lake Tahoe is a national treasure. Her alpine beauty has drawn and inspired people for centuries: artists and poets, John Muir and Mark Twain, and countless millions the world over.

As a girl, I went to Lake Tahoe to ride horses through the woods, to swim in the clear blue waters and to bike around the magnificent Basin.

For over 16 years, representatives from different ends of the political spectrum have come together to Keep Tahoe Blue.

The challenges are great. Climate change and drought have created a persistent threat from catastrophic wildfire. Sedimentation and pollution threaten water quality and the lake's treasured clarity. And invasive species threaten the economy of the region.

The time to act is now, and the federal government must take a leading role—78 percent of the land surrounding Lake Tahoe is public land, primarily the Eldorado, Toiyabe and Tahoe National Forests.

That is why today I am reintroducing the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013, which is co-sponsored by Senators HARRY REID, DEAN HELLER and BARBARA BOXER.

The bill would continue the Federal commitment at Lake Tahoe by authorizing \$415 million over ten years to improve water clarity, reduce the threat of catastrophic fire, combat invasive species, and restore and protect the environment in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Specifically, it would do the following:

Provide \$243 million over 10 years for the highest priority restoration projects, according to scientific data. The legislation authorizes at least \$138 million for stormwater management and watershed restoration projects scientifically determined to be the most effective ways to improve water clarity.

This bill also requires prioritized ranking of environmental restoration projects and authorizes \$80 million for State and local agencies to implement these projects with costs being split evenly between the Federal agencies and non-federal partners.

Eligible projects must demonstrate their cost effectiveness, stakeholder support, ability to leverage non-federal contributions and meet environmental improvement goals.

Implementation of priority projects will improve water quality, forest health, air quality and fish and wildlife habitat around Lake Tahoe.

Authorizes \$135 million over ten years to reduce the threat of wildfire in Lake Tahoe. These funds will finance hazardous fuels reduction projects including grants to local fire agencies, who must contribute at least 25 percent of project costs.

The bill also authorizes important restoration work related to the devastating 2007 Angora fire, which destroyed 242 residences and 67 commercial structures. Fuels treatment on Washoe Tribal lands, wildfire prevention planning, and improvements to local water district infrastructure to fight wildfires that reach urban areas are eligible for grant funding.

The bill also creates incentives for local communities to have dedicated funding for defensible space inspections and enforcement.

Protecting Lake Tahoe from the threat of quagga mussels and other invasive aquatic species. Protecting Lake Tahoe from the threat of quagga mussels and other invasive aquatic species is a major priority because of the serious threats posed to Lake Tahoe.

University of California, Davis and University of Nevada, Reno scientists report that they have found up to 3,000 Asian clams per square meter at spots between Zephyr Point and Elk Point in Lake Tahoe. The spreading Asian clam population could put sharp shells and rotting algae on the Lake's beaches and help spread other invasive species such as quagga mussels.

The bill would authorize \$30 million for watercraft inspections and removal of existing invasive species. It would require all watercraft to be inspected and decontaminated if they are determined to be a risk to the lake.

These invasive species threats are serious. For example, one quagga or zebra mussel can lay 1 million eggs in a year. This means that a single boat carrying quagga could devastate the lake's biology, local infrastructure, and the local economy.

The threat to Lake Tahoe cannot be overstated. In 2007 quagga mussels were discovered in Lake Mead. In the 6 years since, their population has swelled exponentially. Today there are more than 3 trillion. The infestation is probably irreversible.

There is good news. There is promising news on this front. Scientists have begun testing a new strategy by placing long rubber mats across the bottom of Lake Tahoe to cut off the oxygen to the Asian clams. Early research suggests that these mats were very effective at killing the clams. We continue to learn from this important research about how best to manage invasive species.

We can fight off these invaders. But it will require drive and imagination and the help authorized within this bill.

Supports reintroduction of the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout. The legislation authorizes \$20 million over 10 years for the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Recovery Plan. The Lahontan Cutthroat Trout is an iconic species that has an important historic legacy in Lake Tahoe.

When John C. Fremont first explored the Truckee River in January of 1844,

he called it the Salmon Trout River because he found the Pyramid Lake Lahontan Cutthroat Trout. The trout relied on the Truckee River and its tributaries for their spawning runs in spring, traveling up the entire river's length as far as Lake Tahoe and Donner Lake, where they used the cool, pristine waters and clean gravel beds to lay their eggs. But dams, pollution and overfishing caused the demise of the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout.

Lake Tahoe is one of the historic 11 lakes where Lahontan Cutthroat Trout flourished in the past, and it's a critical part of the strategy to recover the species.

Funds scientific research. The legislation authorizes \$30 million over ten years for scientific programs and research which will produce information on long-term trends in the Basin and inform the most cost-effective projects.

Prohibiting mining operations in the Tahoe Basin. This legislation would prohibit new mining operations in the Basin, ensuring that the fragile watershed and Lake Tahoe's water clarity are not threatened by pollution from mining operations.

Increases accountability and oversight. Every project funded by this legislation will have monitoring and assessment to determine the most cost-effective projects and best management practices for future projects.

The legislation also requires the Chair of the Federal Partnership to work with the Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency, Fish and Wildlife Service and regional and state agencies, to prepare an annual report to Congress detailing the status of all projects undertaken, including project scope, budget and justification and overall expenditures and accomplishments.

This will ensure that Congress can have oversight on the progress of environmental restoration in Lake Tahoe.

Provides for public outreach and education. The Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency, Fish and Wildlife Service and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will implement new public outreach and education programs including encouraging Basin residents and visitors to implement defensible space, conducting best management practices for water quality and preventing the introduction and proliferation of invasive species. In addition, the legislation requires signage on federally financed projects to improve public awareness of restoration efforts.

Allows for increased efficiency in the management of public land. Under this legislation, the Forest Service would have increased flexibility to exchange land with state agencies which will allow for more cost-efficient management of public land. There is currently a checkerboard pattern of ownership in some areas of the Basin.

Under this new authority, the Forest Service could exchange land with the California Tahoe Conservancy and the California Department of Parks and Recreation of approximately equal value without going through a lengthy process to assess the land.

For example, if there are several plots of Forest Service land that surround or are adjacent to Tahoe Conservancy or California State Parks land, the state could transfer that land to the Forest Service so that it can be managed more efficiently.

This legislation is needed because the "Jewel of the Sierra" is in big trouble. If we don't act now, we could lose Lake Tahoe, lose it with stunning speed, to several devastating threats.

Anyone doubting that climate change poses a severe threat to Lake Tahoe should read an alarming recent report by the UC Davis Tahoe Environmental Research Center.

It was written for the U.S. Forest Service by scientists who have devoted their professional careers to studying Lake Tahoe. And it paints a distinctly bleak picture of the future for the "Jewel of the Sierra."

Among its findings are the Tahoe Basin's regional snowpack could decline by as much as 60 percent in the next century, with increased floods likely by 2050 and prolonged droughts by 2100.

Even "under the most optimistic projections," average snowpack in the Sierra Nevada around Tahoe will decline by 40 to 60 percent by 2100, according to the report.

This would likely bankrupt Tahoe's ski industry, threaten the water supply of Reno and other communities, and degrade the lake's fabled water clarity. It is devastating.

According to the UC Davis report, an all-out attack on pollution and sedimentation may be the lake's last best hope.

Geoff Schladow, director of the UC Davis Tahoe Environmental Research Center and one of the report's authors, noted the need to restore short-term water quality in Lake Tahoe—while there's still time to do it.

"Reducing the load of external nutrients entering the lake in the coming decades may be the only possible mitigation measure to reduce the impact of climate change on lake clarity . . . ," the report said.

Without such an effort, the "internal loading of nutrients" could fundamentally change the lake and fuel algal growth, creating a downward spiral in water quality and clarity.

Water clarity is one of the central problems the legislation would address.

Pollution and sedimentation have threatened Lake Tahoe's water clarity for years now. In 1968, the first year UC Davis scientists made measurements using a device called a Secchi disk, clarity was measured at an average depth of 102.4 feet. Clarity declined

over the next three decades, hitting a low of 64 feet in 1997.

There has been some improvement in this decade. Last year scientists recorded average clarity at 75.3 feet—the clearest readings in a decade. But it is a fragile gain. Sedimentation and stormwater runoff pose a persistent threat.

Climate change has already made itself apparent at Lake Tahoe. It makes the basin dry and tinder-hot, raising the risks of catastrophic wildfire. Daily air temperatures have increased 4 degrees since 1911. Snow has declined as a fraction of total precipitation, from an average of 52 percent in 1910 to just 36 percent in recent years.

Climate change has caused Lake Tahoe's surface water temperature to rise over 2 degrees in 44 years. That means the cyclical deep-water mixing of the lake's waters will occur less frequently, and this could significantly disrupt Lake Tahoe's ecosystem.

This legislation is intended to address these problems.

Last year, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee reported out the bill favorably, but there was not enough time for a floor vote. It is my hope that this legislation can move through committee quickly and be passed later this year.

A lot of good work has been done. But there's a lot more work to do, and time is running out.

Mark Twain called Lake Tahoe “the fairest picture the whole world affords.” We must not be the generation who lets this picture fall into ruin. We must rise to the challenge, and do all we can to preserve this “noble sheet of water.”

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1451

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106-506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 2 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

“(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

“(1) Lake Tahoe—

“(A) is 1 of the largest, deepest, and clearest lakes in the world;

“(B) has a cobalt blue color, a biologically diverse alpine setting, and remarkable water clarity; and

“(C) is recognized nationally and worldwide as a natural resource of special significance;

“(2) in addition to being a scenic and ecological treasure, the Lake Tahoe Basin is 1 of the outstanding recreational resources of the United States, which—

“(A) offers skiing, water sports, biking, camping, and hiking to millions of visitors each year; and

“(B) contributes significantly to the economies of California, Nevada, and the United States;

“(3) the economy in the Lake Tahoe Basin is dependent on the protection and restoration of the natural beauty and recreation opportunities in the area;

“(4) the Lake Tahoe Basin continues to be threatened by the impacts of land use and transportation patterns developed in the last century that damage the fragile watershed of the Basin;

“(5) the water clarity of Lake Tahoe declined from a visibility level of 105 feet in 1967 to only 70 feet in 2008;

“(6) the rate of decline in water clarity of Lake Tahoe has decreased in recent years;

“(7) a stable water clarity level for Lake Tahoe could be achieved through feasible control measures for very fine sediment particles and nutrients;

“(8) fine sediments that cloud Lake Tahoe, and key nutrients such as phosphorus and nitrogen that support the growth of algae and invasive plants, continue to flow into the lake from stormwater runoff from developed areas, roads, turf, other disturbed land, and streams;

“(9) the destruction and alteration of wetland, wet meadows, and stream zone habitat have compromised the natural capacity of the watershed to filter sediment, nutrients, and pollutants before reaching Lake Tahoe;

“(10) approximately 25 percent of the trees in the Lake Tahoe Basin are either dead or dying;

“(11) forests in the Tahoe Basin suffer from over a century of fire suppression and periodic drought, which have resulted in—

“(A) high tree density and mortality;

“(B) the loss of biological diversity; and

“(C) a large quantity of combustible forest fuels, which significantly increases the threat of catastrophic fire and insect infestation;

“(12) the establishment of several aquatic and terrestrial invasive species (including perennial pepperweed, milfoil, and Asian clam) threatens the ecosystem of the Lake Tahoe Basin;

“(13) there is an ongoing threat to the Lake Tahoe Basin of the introduction and establishment of other invasive species (such as yellow starthistle, New Zealand mud snail, and quagga mussel);

“(14) the report prepared by the University of California, Davis, entitled the ‘State of the Lake Report’, found that conditions in the Lake Tahoe Basin had changed, including—

“(A) the average surface water temperature of Lake Tahoe has risen by more than 1.2 degrees Fahrenheit in the past 43 years;

“(B) since 1910, the percent of precipitation that has fallen as snow in the Lake Tahoe Basin decreased from 51 percent to 35.5 percent; and

“(C) daily air temperatures have increased by more than 4 degrees Fahrenheit and the trend in daily maximum temperature has risen by approximately 2 degrees Fahrenheit;

“(15) 75 percent of the land in the Lake Tahoe Basin is owned by the Federal Government, which makes it a Federal responsibility to restore environmental health to the Basin;

“(16) the Federal Government has a long history of environmental preservation at Lake Tahoe, including—

“(A) congressional consent to the establishment of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency with—

“(i) the enactment in 1969 of Public Law 91-148 (83 Stat. 360); and

“(ii) the enactment in 1980 of Public Law 96-551 (94 Stat. 3233);

“(B) the establishment of the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit in 1973;

“(C) the enactment of Public Law 96-586 (94 Stat. 3381) in 1980 to provide for the acquisition of environmentally sensitive land and erosion control grants in the Lake Tahoe Basin;

“(D) the enactment of sections 341 and 342 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-108; 117 Stat. 1317), which amended the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-263; 112 Stat. 2346) to provide payments for the environmental restoration projects under this Act; and

“(E) the enactment of section 382 of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-432; 120 Stat. 3045), which amended the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-263; 112 Stat. 2346) to authorize development and implementation of a comprehensive 10-year hazardous fuels and fire prevention plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin;

“(17) the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works was an original signatory in 1997 to the Agreement of Federal Departments on Protection of the Environment and Economic Health of the Lake Tahoe Basin;

“(18) the Chief of Engineers, under direction from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, has continued to be a significant contributor to Lake Tahoe Basin restoration, including—

“(A) stream and wetland restoration;

“(B) urban stormwater conveyance and treatment; and

“(C) programmatic technical assistance;

“(19) at the Lake Tahoe Presidential Forum in 1997, the President renewed the commitment of the Federal Government to Lake Tahoe by—

“(A) committing to increased Federal resources for environmental restoration at Lake Tahoe; and

“(B) establishing the Federal Interagency Partnership and Federal Advisory Committee to consult on natural resources issues concerning the Lake Tahoe Basin;

“(20) at the 2011 and 2012 Lake Tahoe Forums, Senator Reid, Senator Feinstein, Senator Heller, Senator Ensign, Governor Gibbons, Governor Sandoval, and Governor Brown—

“(A) renewed their commitment to Lake Tahoe; and

“(B) expressed their desire to fund the Federal and State shares of the Environmental Improvement Program through 2022;

“(21) since 1997, the Federal Government, the States of California and Nevada, units of local government, and the private sector have contributed more than \$1,620,000,000 to the Lake Tahoe Basin, including—

“(A) \$521,100,000 from the Federal Government;

“(B) \$636,200,000 from the State of California;

“(C) \$101,400,000 from the State of Nevada;

“(D) \$68,200,000 from units of local government; and

“(E) \$299,600,000 from private interests;

“(22) significant additional investment from Federal, State, local, and private sources is necessary—

“(A) to restore and sustain the environmental health of the Lake Tahoe Basin;

“(B) to adapt to the impacts of changing water temperature and precipitation; and

“(C) to protect the Lake Tahoe Basin from the introduction and establishment of invasive species; and

“(23) the Secretary has indicated that the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit has the capacity for at least \$10,000,000 for the Fire Risk Reduction and Forest Management Program.

“(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

“(1) to enable the Chief of the Forest Service, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in cooperation with the Planning Agency and the States of California and Nevada, to fund, plan, and implement significant new environmental restoration activities and forest management activities to address in the Lake Tahoe Basin the issues described in paragraphs (4) through (14) of subsection (a);

“(2) to ensure that Federal, State, local, regional, tribal, and private entities continue to work together to manage land in the Lake Tahoe Basin and to coordinate on other activities in a manner that supports achievement and maintenance of—

“(A) the environmental threshold carrying capacities for the region; and

“(B) other applicable environmental standards and objectives;

“(3) to support local governments in efforts related to environmental restoration, stormwater pollution control, fire risk reduction, and forest management activities; and

“(4) to ensure that agency and science community representatives in the Lake Tahoe Basin work together—

“(A) to develop and implement a plan for integrated monitoring, assessment, and applied research to evaluate the effectiveness of the Environmental Improvement Program; and

“(B) to provide objective information as a basis for ongoing decisionmaking, with an emphasis on decisionmaking relating to public and private land use and resource management in the Basin.”.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106-506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 3 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

“In this Act:

“(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ‘Administrator’ means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

“(2) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term ‘Assistant Secretary’ means the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.

“(3) CHAIR.—The term ‘Chair’ means the Chair of the Federal Partnership.

“(4) COMPACT.—The term ‘Compact’ means the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact included in the first section of Public Law 96-551 (94 Stat. 3233).

“(5) DIRECTORS.—The term ‘Directors’ means—

“(A) the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

“(B) the Director of the United States Geological Survey.

“(6) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—The term ‘Environmental Improvement Program’ means—

“(A) the Environmental Improvement Program adopted by the Planning Agency; and

“(B) any amendments to the Program.

“(7) ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITY.—The term ‘environmental threshold carrying capacity’ has the meaning given the term in article II of the compact.

“(8) FEDERAL PARTNERSHIP.—The term ‘Federal Partnership’ means the Lake Tahoe Federal Interagency Partnership established by Executive Order 13957 (62 Fed. Reg. 41249) (or a successor Executive order).

“(9) FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY.—The term ‘forest management activity’ includes—

“(A) prescribed burning for ecosystem health and hazardous fuels reduction;

“(B) mechanical and minimum tool treatment;

“(C) road decommissioning or reconstruction;

“(D) stream environment zone restoration and other watershed and wildlife habitat enhancements;

“(E) nonnative invasive species management; and

“(F) other activities consistent with Forest Service practices, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(10) MAPS.—The term ‘Maps’ means the maps—

“(A) entitled—

“(i) ‘LTRA USFS-CA Land Exchange/North Shore’;

“(ii) ‘USFS-CA Land Exchange/West Shore’; and

“(iii) ‘USFS-CA Land Exchange/South Shore’; and

“(B) dated April 12, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of—

“(i) the Forest Service;

“(ii) the California Tahoe Conservancy; and

“(iii) the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

“(11) NATIONAL WILDLAND FIRE CODE.—The term ‘national wildland fire code’ means—

“(A) the most recent publication of the National Fire Protection Association codes numbered 1141, 1142, 1143, and 1144;

“(B) the most recent publication of the International Wildland-Urban Interface Code of the International Code Council; or

“(C) any other code that the Secretary determines provides the same, or better, standards for protection against wildland fire as a code described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

“(12) PLANNING AGENCY.—The term ‘Planning Agency’ means the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency established under Public Law 91-148 (83 Stat. 360) and Public Law 96-551 (94 Stat. 3233).

“(13) PRIORITY LIST.—The term ‘Priority List’ means the environmental restoration priority list developed under section 8.

“(14) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

“(15) STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONE.—The term ‘Stream Environment Zone’ means an area that generally owes the biological and physical characteristics of the area to the presence of surface water or groundwater.

“(16) TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD.—The term ‘total maximum daily load’ means the total maximum daily load allocations adopted under section 303(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(d)).

“(17) WATERCRAFT.—The term ‘watercraft’ means motorized and non-motorized watercraft, including boats, seaplanes, personal watercraft, kayaks, and canoes.”.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN MANAGEMENT UNIT.

Section 4 of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106-506; 114 Stat. 2353) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3), by striking “basin” and inserting “Basin”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) TRANSIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit shall, consistent with the regional transportation plan adopted by the Planning Agency, manage vehicular parking and traffic in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, with priority given—

“(A) to improving public access to the Lake Tahoe Basin, including the prioritization of alternatives to the private automobile, consistent with the requirements of the Compact;

“(B) to coordinating with the Nevada Department of Transportation, Caltrans, State parks, and other entities along Nevada Highway 28 and California Highway 89; and

“(C) to providing support and assistance to local public transit systems in the management and operations of activities under this subsection.

“(2) NATIONAL FOREST TRANSIT PROGRAM.—Consistent with the support and assistance provided under paragraph (1)(C), the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, may enter into a contract, cooperative agreement, interagency agreement, or other agreement with the Department of Transportation to secure operating and capital funds from the National Forest Transit Program.

“(d) FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) COORDINATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In conducting forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, the Secretary shall, as appropriate, coordinate with the Administrator and State and local agencies and organizations, including local fire departments and volunteer groups.

“(B) GOALS.—The coordination of activities under subparagraph (A) should aim to increase efficiencies and maximize the compatibility of management practices across public property boundaries.

“(2) MULTIPLE BENEFITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In conducting forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, the Secretary shall conduct the activities in a manner that—

“(i) except as provided in subparagraph (B), attains multiple ecosystem benefits, including—

“(I) reducing forest fuels;

“(II) maintaining or restoring biological diversity;

“(III) improving wetland and water quality, including in Stream Environment Zones; and

“(IV) increasing resilience to changing water temperature and precipitation; and

“(ii) helps achieve and maintain the environmental threshold carrying capacities established by the Planning Agency.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding clause (A)(i), the attainment of multiple ecosystem benefits shall not be required if the Secretary determines that management for multiple ecosystem benefits would excessively increase the cost of a project in relation to the additional ecosystem benefits gained from the management activity.

“(3) GROUND DISTURBANCE.—Consistent with applicable Federal law and Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit land and resource management plan direction, the Secretary shall—

“(A) establish post-project ground condition criteria for ground disturbance caused by forest management activities; and

“(B) provide for monitoring to ascertain the attainment of the post-project conditions.

“(e) WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LAND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and paragraph (2), the Federal land located in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit is withdrawn from—

“(A) all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

“(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

“(C) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—A conveyance of land shall be exempt from withdrawal under this subsection if carried out under—

“(A) the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106-506; 114 Stat. 2351); or

“(B) the Santini-Burton Act (Public Law 96-586; 94 Stat. 3381).

“(f) ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITY.—The Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit shall support the attainment of the environmental threshold carrying capacities.

“(g) COOPERATIVE AUTHORITIES.—During the 4 fiscal years following the date of enactment of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013, the Secretary, in conjunction with land adjustment projects or programs, may enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with States, units of local government, and other public and private entities to provide for fuel reduction, erosion control, reforestation, Stream Environment Zone restoration, and similar management activities on Federal land and non-Federal land within the projects or programs.”.

SEC. 5. CONSULTATION.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106-506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 5 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 5. CONSULTATION.

“In carrying out this Act, the Secretary, the Administrator, and the Directors shall, as appropriate and in a timely manner, consult with the heads of the Washoe Tribe, applicable Federal, State, regional, and local governmental agencies, and the Lake Tahoe Federal Advisory Committee.”.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZED PROJECTS.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106-506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 6 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 6. AUTHORIZED PROJECTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, the Directors, and the Administrator, in coordination with the Planning Agency and the States of California and Nevada, may carry out or provide financial assistance to any project or program that—

“(1) is described in subsection (d);

“(2) is included in the Priority List under section 8; and

“(3) furthers the purposes of the Environmental Improvement Program if the project has been subject to environmental review and approval, respectively, as required under Federal law, article 7 of the Compact, and State law, as applicable.

“(b) RESTRICTION.—The Administrator shall use not more than 3 percent of the funds provided under subsection (a) for administering the projects or programs described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d).

“(c) MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT.—All projects authorized under subsection (d) shall—

“(1) include funds for monitoring and assessment of the results and effectiveness at the project and program level consistent with the program developed under section 11; and

“(2) use the integrated multiagency performance measures established under section 13.

“(d) DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) STORMWATER MANAGEMENT, EROSION CONTROL, AND TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD IMPLEMENTATION.—Of the amounts made available under section 17(a), \$75,000,000 shall be made available—

“(A) to the Secretary or the Administrator for the Federal share of stormwater management and related projects and programs consistent with the adopted Total Maximum Daily Load and near-shore water quality goals; and

“(B) for grants by the Secretary and the Administrator to carry out the projects and programs described in subparagraph (A).

“(2) STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONE AND WATERSHED RESTORATION.—Of the amounts made available under section 17(a), \$38,000,000 shall be made available—

“(A) to the Secretary or the Assistant Secretary for the Federal share of the Upper Truckee River restoration projects and other watershed restoration projects identified in the priority list established under section 8; and

“(B) for grants by the Administrator to carry out the projects described in subparagraph (A).

“(3) FIRE RISK REDUCTION AND FOREST MANAGEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts made available under section 17(a), \$135,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out, including by making grants, the following projects:

“(i) Projects identified as part of the Lake Tahoe Basin Multi-Jurisdictional Fuel Reduction and Wildfire Prevention Strategy 10-Year Plan.

“(ii) Competitive grants for fuels work to be awarded by the Secretary to communities that have adopted national wildland fire codes to implement the applicable portion of the 10-year plan described in clause (i).

“(iii) Biomass projects, including feasibility assessments and transportation of materials.

“(iv) Angora Fire Restoration projects under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

“(v) Washoe Tribe projects on tribal lands within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

“(vi) Development of an updated Lake Tahoe Basin multi-jurisdictional fuel reduction and wildfire prevention strategy, consistent with section 4(d).

“(vii) Development of updated community wildfire protection plans by local fire districts.

“(viii) Municipal water infrastructure that significantly improves the firefighting capability of local government within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

“(B) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—Of the amounts made available to the Secretary to carry out subparagraph (A), at least \$80,000,000 shall be used by the Secretary for projects under subparagraph (A)(i).

“(C) PRIORITY.—Units of local government that have dedicated funding for inspections and enforcement of defensible space regulations shall be given priority for amounts provided under this paragraph.

“(D) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—As a condition on the receipt of funds, communities or local fire districts that receive funds under this paragraph shall provide a 25 percent match.

“(ii) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal share required under clause (i) may be in the form of cash contributions or in-kind contribu-

tions, including providing labor, equipment, supplies, space, and other operational needs.

“(II) CREDIT FOR CERTAIN DEDICATED FUNDING.—There shall be credited toward the non-Federal share required under clause (i) any dedicated funding of the communities or local fire districts for a fuels reduction management program, defensible space inspections, or dooryard chipping.

“(III) DOCUMENTATION.—Communities and local fire districts shall—

“(aa) maintain a record of in-kind contributions that describes—

“(AA) the monetary value of the in-kind contributions; and

“(BB) the manner in which the in-kind contributions assist in accomplishing project goals and objectives; and

“(bb) document in all requests for Federal funding, and include in the total project budget, evidence of the commitment to provide the non-Federal share through in-kind contributions.

“(4) INVASIVE SPECIES MANAGEMENT.—Of the amounts to be made available under section 17(a), \$30,000,000 shall be made available to the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for the Aquatic Invasive Species Program and the watercraft inspections described in section 9.

“(5) SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES MANAGEMENT.—Of the amounts to be made available under section 17(a), \$20,000,000 shall be made available to the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Recovery Program.

“(6) LAKE TAHOE BASIN SCIENCE PROGRAM.—Of the amounts to be made available under section 17(a), \$30,000,000 shall be made available to the Chief of the Forest Service to develop and implement, in coordination with the Tahoe Science Consortium, the Lake Tahoe Basin Science Program established under section 11.

“(7) PROGRAM PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts to be made available under section 17(a), \$5,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out sections 12, 13, and 14.

“(B) PLANNING AGENCY.—Of the amounts described in subparagraph (A), not less than 50 percent shall be made available to the Planning Agency to carry out the program oversight, coordination, and outreach activities established under sections 12, 13, and 14.

“(8) LAND CONVEYANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount made available under section 17(a), \$2,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out the activities under section 3(b)(2) of Public Law 96-586 (94 Stat. 3384) (commonly known as the ‘Santini-Burton Act’).

“(B) OTHER FUNDS.—Of the amounts available to the Secretary under subparagraph (A), not less than 50 percent shall be provided to the California Tahoe Conservancy to facilitate the conveyance of land described in section 3(b)(2) of Public Law 96-586 (94 Stat. 3384) (commonly known as the ‘Santini-Burton Act’).”.

SEC. 7. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PRIORITY LIST.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106-506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended—

(1) by striking sections 8 and 9;

(2) by redesignating sections 10, 11, and 12 as sections 15, 16, and 17, respectively; and

(3) by inserting after section 7 the following:

“SEC. 8. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PRIORITY LIST.

“(a) DEADLINE.—Not later than February 15 of the year after the date of enactment of

the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013, the Chair, in consultation with the Secretary, the Administrator, the Directors, the Planning Agency, the States of California and Nevada, the Federal Partnership, the Washoe Tribe, the Lake Tahoe Federal Advisory Committee, and the Tahoe Science Consortium shall submit to Congress a prioritized list of all Environmental Improvement Program projects for the Lake Tahoe Basin for each program category described in section 6(d).

“(b) CRITERIA.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The priority of projects included in the Priority List shall be based on the best available science and the following criteria:

“(A) The 5-year threshold carrying capacity evaluation.

“(B) The ability to measure progress or success of the project.

“(C) The potential to significantly contribute to the achievement and maintenance of the environmental threshold carrying capacities identified in the Compact for—

“(i) air quality;

“(ii) fisheries;

“(iii) noise;

“(iv) recreation;

“(v) scenic resources;

“(vi) soil conservation;

“(vii) forest health;

“(viii) water quality; and

“(ix) wildlife.

“(D) The ability of a project to provide multiple benefits.

“(E) The ability of a project to leverage non-Federal contributions.

“(F) Stakeholder support for the project.

“(G) The justification of Federal interest.

“(H) Agency priority.

“(I) Agency capacity.

“(J) Cost-effectiveness.

“(K) Federal funding history.

“(2) SECONDARY FACTORS.—In addition to the criteria under paragraph (1), the Chair shall, as the Chair determines to be appropriate, give preference to projects in the Priority List that benefit existing neighborhoods in the Basin that are at or below regional median income levels, based on the most recent census data available.

“(c) REVISIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Priority List submitted under subsection (b) shall be revised—

“(A) every 2 years; or

“(B) on a finding of compelling need under paragraph (2).

“(2) FINDING OF COMPELLING NEED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary, the Administrator, or the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service makes a finding of compelling need justifying a priority shift and the finding is approved by the Secretary, the Executive Director of the Planning Agency, the California Natural Resources Secretary, and the Director of the Nevada Department of Conservation, the Priority List shall be revised in accordance with this subsection.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—A finding of compelling need includes—

“(i) major scientific findings;

“(ii) results from the threshold evaluation of the Planning Agency;

“(iii) emerging environmental threats; and

“(iv) rare opportunities for land acquisition.

“(d) FUNDING.—Of the amount made available under section 17(a), \$80,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out this section.

“SEC. 9. AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES PREVENTION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in coordination with the Planning Agency, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the Nevada Department of Wildlife, shall deploy strategies consistent with the Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan to prevent the introduction of aquatic invasive species into the Lake Tahoe Basin.

“(b) CRITERIA.—The strategies referred to in subsection (a) shall provide that—

“(1) combined inspection and decontamination stations be established and operated at not less than 2 locations in the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

“(2) watercraft not be allowed to launch in waters of the Lake Tahoe Basin if the watercraft has not been inspected in accordance with the Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan.

“(c) CERTIFICATION.—The Planning Agency may certify State and local agencies to perform the decontamination activities described in subsection (b)(3) at locations outside the Lake Tahoe Basin if standards at the sites meet or exceed standards for similar sites in the Lake Tahoe Basin established under this section.

“(d) APPLICABILITY.—The strategies and criteria developed under this section shall apply to all watercraft to be launched on water within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

“(e) FEES.—The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service may collect and spend fees for decontamination only at a level sufficient to cover the costs of operation of inspection and decontamination stations under this section.

“(f) CIVIL PENALTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person that launches, attempts to launch, or facilitates launching of watercraft not in compliance with strategies deployed under this section shall be liable for a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed \$1,000 per violation.

“(2) OTHER AUTHORITIES.—Any penalties assessed under this subsection shall be separate from penalties assessed under any other authority.

“(g) LIMITATION.—The strategies and criteria under subsections (a) and (b), respectively, may be modified if the Secretary of the Interior, in a nondelegable capacity and in consultation with the Planning Agency and State governments, issues a determination that alternative measures will be no less effective at preventing introduction of aquatic invasive species into Lake Tahoe than the strategies and criteria.

“(h) SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY.—The authority under this section is supplemental to all actions taken by non-Federal regulatory authorities.

“(i) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this title shall be construed as restricting, affecting, or amending any other law or the authority of any department, instrumentality, or agency of the United States, or any State or political subdivision thereof, respecting the control of invasive species.

“SEC. 10. CORPS OF ENGINEERS; INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary may enter into interagency agreements with non-Federal interests in the Lake Tahoe Basin to use Lake Tahoe Partnership-Miscellaneous General Investigations funds to provide programmatic technical assistance for the Environmental Improvement Program.

“(b) LOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing technical assistance under this section, the As-

sistant Secretary shall enter into a local cooperation agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for the technical assistance.

“(2) COMPONENTS.—The agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) describe the nature of the technical assistance;

“(B) describe any legal and institutional structures necessary to ensure the effective long-term viability of the end products by the non-Federal interest; and

“(C) include cost-sharing provisions in accordance with paragraph (3).

“(3) FEDERAL SHARE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of project costs under each local cooperation agreement under this subsection shall be 65 percent.

“(B) FORM.—The Federal share may be in the form of reimbursements of project costs.

“(C) CREDIT.—The non-Federal interest may receive credit toward the non-Federal share for the reasonable costs of related technical activities completed by the non-Federal interest before entering into a local cooperation agreement with the Assistant Secretary under this subsection.

“SEC. 11. LAKE TAHOE BASIN SCIENCE PROGRAM.

“The Secretary (acting through the Station Director of the Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station), the Administrator, the Planning Agency, the States of California and Nevada, and the Tahoe Science Consortium, shall develop and implement the Lake Tahoe Basin Science Program that—

“(1) develops and regularly updates an integrated multiagency programmatic assessment and monitoring plan—

“(A) to evaluate the effectiveness of the Environmental Improvement Program;

“(B) to evaluate the status and trends of indicators related to environmental threshold carrying capacities; and

“(C) to assess the impacts and risks of changing water temperature, precipitation, and invasive species;

“(2) produces and synthesizes scientific information necessary for—

“(A) the identification and refinement of environmental indicators for the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

“(B) the evaluation of standards and benchmarks;

“(3) conducts applied research, programmatic technical assessments, scientific data management, analysis, and reporting related to key management questions;

“(4) develops new tools and information to support objective assessments of land use and resource conditions;

“(5) provides scientific and technical support to the Federal Government and State and local governments in—

“(A) reducing stormwater runoff, air deposition, and other pollutants that contribute to the loss of lake clarity; and

“(B) the development and implementation of an integrated stormwater monitoring and assessment program;

“(6) establishes and maintains independent peer review processes—

“(A) to evaluate the Environmental Improvement Program; and

“(B) to assess the technical adequacy and scientific consistency of central environmental documents, such as the 5-year threshold review; and

“(7) provides scientific and technical support for the development of appropriate management strategies to accommodate changing water temperature and precipitation in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

“SEC. 12. PUBLIC OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, the Administrator, and the Directors will coordinate with the Planning Agency to conduct public education and outreach programs, including encouraging—

“(1) owners of land and residences in the Lake Tahoe Basin—

“(A) to implement defensible space; and

“(B) to conduct best management practices for water quality; and

“(2) owners of land and residences in the Lake Tahoe Basin and visitors to the Lake Tahoe Basin, to help prevent the introduction and proliferation of invasive species as part of the private share investment in the Environmental Improvement Program.

“(b) SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL GUIDANCE.—The Director of the United States Geological Survey shall provide scientific and technical guidance to public outreach and education programs conducted under this section.

“(c) REQUIRED COORDINATION.—Public outreach and education programs for aquatic invasive species under this section shall—

“(1) be coordinated with Lake Tahoe Basin tourism and business organizations; and

“(2) include provisions for the programs to extend outside of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

“SEC. 13. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

“Not later than February 15 of each year, the Secretary, in cooperation with the Chair, the Administrator, the Directors, the Planning Agency, and the States of California and Nevada, consistent with section 6(d)(6), shall submit to Congress a report that describes—

“(1) the status of all Federal, State, local, and private projects authorized under this Act, including to the maximum extent practicable, for projects that will receive Federal funds under this Act during the current or subsequent fiscal year—

“(A) the project scope;

“(B) the budget for the project; and

“(C) the justification for the project, consistent with the criteria established in section 8(b)(1);

“(2) Federal, State, local, and private expenditures in the preceding fiscal year to implement the Environmental Improvement Program and projects otherwise authorized under this Act;

“(3) accomplishments in the preceding fiscal year in implementing this Act in accordance with the performance measures and other monitoring and assessment activities; and

“(4) public education and outreach efforts undertaken to implement programs and projects authorized under this Act.

“SEC. 14. ANNUAL BUDGET PLAN.

“As part of the annual budget of the President, the President shall submit information regarding each Federal agency involved in the Environmental Improvement Program (including the Forest Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the United States Geological Survey, and the Corps of Engineers), including—

“(1) an interagency crosscut budget that displays the proposed budget for use by each Federal agency in carrying out restoration activities relating to the Environmental Improvement Program for the following fiscal year;

“(2) a detailed accounting of all amounts received and obligated by Federal agencies to achieve the goals of the Environmental Improvement Program during the preceding fiscal year; and

“(3) a description of the Federal role in the Environmental Improvement Program, in-

cluding the specific role of each agency involved in the restoration of the Lake Tahoe Basin.”.

SEC. 8. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.

Section 16 of The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106-506; 114 Stat. 2358) (as redesignated by section 7(2)) is amended by inserting “, Director, or Administrator” after “Secretary”.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106-506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 17 (as redesignated by section 7(2)) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 17. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$415,000,000 for a period of 10 fiscal years beginning the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013.

“(b) EFFECT ON OTHER FUNDS.—Amounts authorized under this section and any amendments made by this Act—

“(1) shall be in addition to any other amounts made available to the Secretary, the Administrator, or the Directors for expenditure in the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

“(2) shall not reduce allocations for other Regions of the Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency, or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

“(c) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and section 6(d)(3)(D), the States of California and Nevada shall pay 50 percent of the aggregate costs of restoration activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin funded under section 6.

“(d) RELOCATION COSTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the Secretary shall provide to local utility districts two-thirds of the costs of relocating facilities in connection with—

“(1) environmental restoration projects under sections 6 and 8; and

“(2) erosion control projects under section 2 of Public Law 96-586 (94 Stat. 3381).

“(e) SIGNAGE.—To the maximum extent practicable, a project provided assistance under this Act shall include appropriate signage at the project site that—

“(1) provides information to the public on—

“(A) the amount of Federal funds being provided to the project; and

“(B) this Act; and

“(2) displays the visual identity mark of the Environmental Improvement Program.”.

SEC. 10. ADMINISTRATION OF ACQUIRED LAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(b) of Public Law 96-586 (94 Stat. 3384) (commonly known as the “Santini-Burton Act”) is amended—

(1) by striking “(b) Lands” and inserting the following:

“(b) ADMINISTRATION OF ACQUIRED LAND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Land”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) CONVEYANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the State of California (acting through the California Tahoe Conservancy and the California Department of Parks and Recreation) offers to donate to the United States acceptable title to the non-Federal land described in subparagraph (B)(i), the Secretary—

“(i) may accept the offer; and

“(ii) not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary receives acceptable title to the non-Federal land described in subparagraph (B)(i), convey to the State of California, subject to valid existing rights and for no consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land that is acceptable to the State of California.

“(B) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—

“(i) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The non-Federal land referred to in subparagraph (A) includes—

“(I) the approximately 1,981 acres of land administered by the Conservancy and identified on the Maps as ‘Conservancy to the United States Forest Service’; and

“(II) the approximately 187 acres of land administered by California State Parks and identified on the Maps as ‘State Parks to the U.S. Forest Service’.

“(ii) FEDERAL LAND.—The Federal land referred to in subparagraph (A) includes the approximately 1,995 acres of Forest Service land identified on the Maps as ‘U.S. Forest Service to Conservancy and State Parks’.

“(C) CONDITIONS.—Any land conveyed under this paragraph shall—

“(i) be for the purpose of consolidating Federal and State ownerships and improving management efficiencies;

“(ii) not result in any significant changes in the uses of the land; and

“(iii) be subject to the condition that the applicable deed include such terms, restrictions, covenants, conditions, and reservations as the Secretary determines necessary to—

“(I) ensure compliance with this Act; and

“(II) ensure that the development rights associated with the conveyed parcels shall not be recognized or available for transfer under section 90.2 of the Code of Ordinances for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.”.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1457. A bill to exempt the aging process of distilled spirits from the production period for purposes of capitalization of interest costs; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1457

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Aged Distilled Spirits Competitiveness Act”.

SEC. 2. PRODUCTION PERIOD OF DISTILLED SPIRITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 263A(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5), and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) EXEMPTION FOR AGING PROCESS OF DISTILLED SPIRITS.—For purposes of this subsection, the production period shall not include the aging period for distilled spirits (as described in section 5002(a)(8)).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to the production of distilled spirits that begins on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1465. A bill to ensure that persons who form corporations in the United States disclose the beneficial owners of those corporations, in order to prevent

the formation of corporations with hidden owners, stop the misuse of United States corporations by wrongdoers, and assist law enforcement in detecting, preventing, and punishing terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, and other criminal and civil misconduct involving United States corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, today, along with my colleagues, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator FEINSTEIN, and Senator HARKIN, I am reintroducing the Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act, a bill designed to combat terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, and other wrongdoing facilitated by U.S. corporations with hidden owners. This commonsense bill would end the practice of our States forming about 2 million new corporations each year for unidentified persons, and instead require a list of the real owners to be submitted so that, if misconduct later occurred, law enforcement could access the owners list and have a trail to chase, instead of confronting what has all too often been a dead end.

Our bill is supported by key law enforcement organizations, including the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys, and the Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as well as by Manhattan District Attorney Cyrus Vance. It is also endorsed by a number of small business, public interest, and good government groups, including the Main Street Alliance, American Sustainable Business Council, National Money Transmitters Association, AFL-CIO, SEIU, Global Financial Integrity, Global Witness, U.S. Public Interest Research Group, Transparency International, Public Citizen, Project on Government Oversight, Jubilee USA Network, Tax Justice Network USA, Human Rights Watch, Friends of the Earth, Open Society Policy Center, Revenue Watch Institute, the FACT Coalition, and more.

This is the fourth Congress in which this bill has been introduced to provide a solution to a problem that has gained only more urgency with time. In 2008, when the bill was first introduced, President Obama was a member of the U.S. Senate and an original cosponsor. In 2013, President Obama stood with other international leaders at a G8 summit in June to condemn corporations with hidden owners who commit crimes, tax evasion, and other wrongdoing. The G8 leaders made a joint commitment to combat that problem. President Obama immediately responded with a U.S. action plan that, among other measures, calls for enacting legislation to end the shameful practice in this country of forming U.S. corporations with unnamed own-

ers and unleashing them on, not only our own communities, but the international community as well.

A World Bank study found that the United States forms more corporations per year than all the rest of the countries in the world put together. Under current law, those U.S. corporations can be established anonymously, by hidden owners who don't reveal their identity. According to another recent study by Griffith University examining multiple jurisdictions, it is easier to obtain an anonymous shell company in the United States than almost anywhere else in the world. That study also found that "only a tiny portion of U.S. providers of any kind met the international standard of requiring notarized identity documents."

Right now, in the United States, it takes more information to get a driver's license or to open a U.S. bank account than to form a U.S. corporation. Our bill would change that by requiring any State that accepts crime-fighting grants from the Department of Justice to add one new question to their existing incorporation forms asking applicants to identify the company's true owners.

That is it. One new question on an existing form. It is not a complicated question, yet the answer could play a key role in helping law enforcement do their jobs. Our bill would not require States to verify the information, but penalties would apply to persons who submit false information. States, or licensed formation agents if a State has delegated the task to them, would supply the ownership information to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons.

The Problem. We have all seen the news reports about U.S. corporations involved in wrongdoing—from facilitating terrorism to money laundering, financial fraud, tax evasion, corruption, and more. Let me give you a few examples that indicate the scope of the problem.

We now know that some terrorists use U.S. corporations to carry out their activities. Viktor Bout, an arms dealer who was found guilty in November 2011 of conspiring to kill U.S. nationals and selling weapons to a terrorist organization, used corporations around the world in his work, including a dozen formed in Texas, Delaware, and Florida. At the time of Mr. Bout's extradition to face justice here in America, Attorney General Eric Holder stated: "Long considered one of the world's most prolific arms traffickers, Mr. Bout will now appear in federal court in Manhattan to answer to charges of conspiring to sell millions of dollars worth of weapons to a terrorist organization for use in trying to kill Americans." It is unacceptable that Mr. Bout was able to set up corporations in three of our States and use them in illicit activities without ever being asked for the names of the corporate owners.

In another case, a New York company called the Assa Corporation owned a Manhattan skyscraper and, in 2007, wire transferred about \$4.5 million in rental payments to a bank in Iran. U.S. law enforcement tracking the funds had no idea who was behind that corporation, until another government disclosed that it was owned by the Alavi Foundation which had known ties to the Iranian military. In other words, a New York corporation was being used to ship millions of U.S. dollars to Iran, a notorious supporter of terrorism.

U.S. corporations with hidden owners have also been involved in financial crimes. In 2011, a former Russian military officer, Victor Kaganov, pled guilty to operating an illegal money transmitter business from his home in Oregon, and using Oregon shell corporations to wire more than \$150 million around the world on behalf of Russian clients. U.S. Attorney Dwight Holton of the District of Oregon used stark language when describing the case: "When shell corporations are illegally manipulated in the shadows to hide the flow of tens of millions of dollars overseas, it threatens the integrity of our financial system."

Another financial fraud case involves Florida attorney Scott Rothstein who, in 2010, pled guilty to fraud and money laundering in connection with a \$1.2 billion Ponzi investment scheme, in which he used 85 U.S. limited liability companies to conceal his participation and ownership stake in various business ventures. In still another case earlier this year, the Securities and Exchange Commission suspended trading in 61 shell corporations suspected of being misused to defraud investors.

Shell corporations are also notorious for their role in health care fraud. One example involves an individual named Michel Huarte who formed 29 shell companies in several states including Florida, Louisiana, and North Carolina, used them to make fraudulent health care claims, and bilked Medicare out of more than \$50 million. In 2010, he was sentenced to 22 years in prison. He is one in a long line of fraudsters who have hidden behind U.S. corporations to defraud Medicare and Medicaid.

Tax evasion is another type of misconduct which all too often involves the use of U.S. corporations with hidden owners. One Subcommittee investigation showed, for example, how Kurt Greaves, a Michigan businessman, worked with Terry Neal, an offshore promoter, to form shell corporations in Nevada, Canada, and offshore secrecy jurisdictions, to hide more than \$400,000 in untaxed business income. Both Mr. Greaves and Mr. Neal later pled guilty to federal tax evasion. The Subcommittee also showed how two brothers from Texas, Sam and Charles Wyly, created a network of 58 trusts

and shell corporations to dodge the payment of U.S. taxes, including using a set of Nevada corporations to move offshore over \$190 million in stock options without paying taxes on that compensation.

Still another area of abuse involves corrupt foreign officials using U.S. corporations to hide and spend their illicit funds. One example involves Teodoro Obiang, who is the son of the President of Equatorial Guinea, holds office in that country, and has purchased luxury homes, cars, and even a personal jet here in the United States. A Subcommittee investigation disclosed that, as part of his actions, Mr. Obiang used U.S. lawyers to form several California shell corporations with names like Beautiful Vision, Unlimited Horizon, and Sweet Pink to open bank accounts in the names of those corporations, move millions of dollars in suspect funds into the United States, and use those funds to support an affluent lifestyle. The Department of Justice has since filed suit to seize his U.S. property, alleging that Mr. Obiang acquired it through corruption and money laundering.

One last example involves 800 U.S. corporations whose hidden owners have stumped U.S. law enforcement trying to investigate their suspect conduct. In October 2004, the Homeland Security Department's division of Immigration and Customs Enforcement or ICE identified a single Utah corporation that had engaged in \$150 million in suspicious transactions. ICE found that the corporation had been formed in Utah and was owned by two Panamanian entities which, in turn, were owned by a group of Panamanian holding corporations, all located at the same Panama City office. By 2005, ICE had located 800 U.S. corporations in nearly all 50 states associated with the same shadowy group in Panama, but was unable to obtain the name of a single natural person who owned any one of the corporations. ICE had learned that the 800 corporations were associated with multiple U.S. investigations into tax fraud and other wrongdoing, but no one had been able to find the corporate owners. The trail went cold, and ICE closed the case. Yet it may be that many of those U.S. corporations are still engaged in wrongdoing.

These examples of U.S. corporations with hidden owners facilitating terrorism, financial crime, health care fraud, tax evasion, corruption, and other misconduct provide ample evidence of the need for legislation to find out who is behind the mayhem. That's why law enforcement officials are among the bill's strongest supporters.

The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association or FLEOA, which represents more than 26,000 Federal law enforcement officers, has explained its strong support for the bill as follows:

Suspected terrorists, drug trafficking organizations and other criminal enterprises con-

tinue to exploit the anonymity afforded to them through the current corporate filing process in a few states. Hiding behind a registered agent, these criminals are able to incorporate without disclosing who the beneficial owners are for their company(s). This enables them to establish corporate flow-through entities, otherwise known as shell companies, to facilitate money laundering and narcoterrorist financing.

Even through the due process of proper service of a court order, law enforcement officers are unable to determine who the beneficial owners are of these entities. This has to stop. While we fully recognize and respect the privacy concerns of law abiding citizens, we need to install a baseline of checks and balances to deter the criminal exploitation of our corporate filing process.

The Fraternal Order of Police, which has 330,000 members across the country, offers a similar explanation for its support of the bill:

For years corporations have been used as front organizations by criminals conducting illegal activity such as money laundering, fraud, and tax evasion. . . . This bill is critical to our work because, all too often, investigations are stymied when we encounter a company with hidden ownership. . . . [T]he sharing of beneficial ownership information with law enforcement will greatly assist our investigations. When we are able to expose the link between shell companies and drug trafficking, corruption, organized crime and terrorist finance, the law enforcement community is better able to keep America safe from these illegal activities and keep the proceeds of these crimes out of the U.S. financial system.

The National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys, which represents more than 1,500 federal prosecutors, has urged Congress to take legislative action to strengthen inadequate state incorporation practices: "[M]indful of the ease with which criminals establish 'front organizations' to assist in money laundering, terrorist financing, tax evasion and other misconduct, it is shocking and unacceptable that many State laws permit the creation of corporations without asking for the identity of the corporation's beneficial owners. The legislation will guard against that and no longer permit criminals to exploit the lack of transparency in the registration of corporations."

Manhattan District Attorney Cyrus Vance Jr. has publicly urged Congress to enact this bill. He wrote: "I have spoken with many colleagues in the law enforcement community, and every one of us supports the bill as a simple and common sense movement to help prevent white collar crime. . . . Because there is no national standard requiring disclosure of beneficial ownership, criminals can set up U.S. corporations anonymously and use them as fronts for all kinds of illicit activity without having to identify who actually controls and profits from the activity. In a simple stroke, the proposed bill would eliminate this needless barrier to the detection and prosecution of financial crimes."

Some members of the U.S. financial industry with obligations under U.S. anti-money laundering laws to know their customers, including when doing business with a shell corporation, support the legislation because it will help them know who is behind U.S. corporations seeking to open accounts with them. The National Money Transmitters Association, NMTA, for example, which represents state-licensed money transmitters, has written in support of the bill, explaining: "The NMTA urges you to give us the KYC, know-your-customer, tools we need to do our job efficiently and make sure that our nation's standards are brought up to a level equal to that of other advanced countries."

We need legislation not only to stop the abuses being committed by U.S. corporations with hidden owners, but also to meet our international commitments. In 2006, the leading international anti-money laundering body in the world, the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering—known as FATF—issued a report criticizing the United States for its failure to comply with a FATF standard requiring countries to obtain beneficial ownership information for the corporations formed under their laws. This standard is one of 40 FATF standards that this country has publicly committed itself to implementing as part of its efforts to promote strong anti-money laundering laws around the world.

FATF gave the United States two years, until 2008, to make progress toward complying with the FATF standard on beneficial ownership information. But that deadline passed five years ago, with no real progress. Enacting the bill we are introducing today would help bring the United States into compliance with the FATF standard by requiring the States to obtain beneficial ownership information for the corporations formed under their laws. It would help ensure that the United States meets its international anti-money laundering commitments.

Combating the misuse of corporations with hidden owners has increasingly become a global priority. In a letter to President Obama earlier this year, prominent prosecutors and corruption hunters from across the globe urged the United States to collect company beneficial ownership information to fight wrongdoing. According to the letter: "Grand corruption would not be possible without the help of the global financing system—in particular, banks that accept corrupt assets and secrecy rules that allow money launderers to disguise their activity. . . . We believe that part of the solution is for governments to require existing company registers to collect information on the ultimate owners of companies."

As I mentioned earlier, countries around the world have begun to take

action to tackle the problem. Just last month, during the G8 summit in Northern Ireland, leaders announced their commitment to ending the practice of establishing anonymous shell companies and declared: "Companies should know who really owns them and tax collectors and law enforcers should be able to obtain this information easily." To implement that principle, the G8 leaders pledged to publish national Action Plans outlining the concrete steps each country will take to ensure that law enforcement and tax authorities have ready access to information on who owns and controls the companies formed under their laws.

In announcing the U.S. Action Plan, the White House expressed its commitment to ensuring that law enforcement and tax authorities have access to ownership information for companies formed within U.S. borders. The Plan explicitly calls for enactment of legislation that meets certain principles, all of which are met by the bill introduced today. Those principles are the following:

"Requirements for covered legal entities to disclose beneficial ownership to states or regulated corporate formation agents at the time of company formation.

"Requirements for verification of the identity of the beneficial owner.

"Options for covering legal entities depending on whether the applicant forms the legal entity directly or uses a regulated company formation agent.

"Requirements for law enforcement authorities, including tax authorities, to be able to access beneficial ownership information upon appropriate request through a central registry at the state level.

"An extension of anti-money laundering obligations to company formation agents, including an obligation to identify and verify beneficial ownership information.

"A mandate that entities provide updated information when changes of beneficial ownership occur within 60 days; and

"The imposition of civil and criminal penalties for knowingly providing false information."

The White House and the international community have made the collection of beneficial ownership information for corporations a global priority this year. It is time for Congress to step up to the plate and take the necessary action.

The bill introduced today is the product of years of work by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair. Over twelve years ago, in 2000, the Government Accountability Office, at my request, conducted an investigation and released a report entitled, "Suspicious Banking Activities: Possible Money Laundering by U.S. Corporations Formed for Russian Entities." That report revealed

that one person was able to set up more than 2,000 Delaware shell corporations and, without disclosing the identity of any of the beneficial owners, open U.S. bank accounts for those corporations, which then collectively moved about \$1.4 billion through the accounts. It is one of the earliest government reports to give some sense of the law enforcement problems caused by U.S. corporations with hidden owners. The alarm it sounded years ago is still ringing.

In April 2006, in response to a second Subcommittee request, GAO released a report entitled, "Corporation Formations: Minimal Ownership Information Is Collected and Available," which reviewed the corporate formation laws in all 50 States. GAO disclosed that the vast majority of the States do not collect any information at all on the beneficial owners of the corporations and limited liability companies, or LLCs, formed under their laws. The report also found that several States had established automated procedures that allow a person to form a new corporation or LLC in the State within 24 hours of filing an online application without any prior review of that application by State personnel. In exchange for a substantial fee, at least two States will form a corporation or LLC within one hour of a request. After examining these State incorporation practices, the GAO report described the problems that the lack of beneficial ownership information caused for a range of law enforcement investigations.

In November 2006, our Subcommittee held a hearing on the problem. At that hearing, representatives of the U.S. Department of Justice, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Department of Treasury's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network or FinCEN testified that the failure of States to collect adequate information on the beneficial owners of the legal entities they form had impeded federal efforts to investigate and prosecute criminal acts such as terrorism, money laundering, securities fraud, and tax evasion. At the hearing, the Justice Department testified: "We had allegations of corrupt foreign officials using these [U.S.] shell accounts to launder money, but were unable—due to lack of identifying information in the corporate records—to fully investigate this area." The IRS testified: "Within our own borders, the laws of some states regarding the formation of legal entities have significant transparency gaps which may even rival the secrecy afforded in the most attractive tax havens." As part of its testimony, FinCEN described identifying 768 incidents of suspicious international wire transfer activity involving U.S. shell corporations.

The next year, in 2007, in a "Dirty Dozen" list of tax scams active that year, the IRS highlighted shell cor-

porations with hidden owners as number four on the list. It wrote:

4. Disguised Corporate Ownership: Domestic shell corporations and other entities are being formed and operated in certain states for the purpose of disguising the ownership of the business or financial activity. Once formed, these anonymous entities can be, and are being, used to facilitate under-reporting of income, non-filing of tax returns, listed transactions, money laundering, financial crimes and possibly terrorist financing. The IRS is working with state authorities to identify these entities and to bring their owners into compliance.

In 2008, we first introduced our bipartisan legislation to stop the formation of U.S. corporations with hidden owners. It was a Levin-Coleman-Obama bill, S. 2956, back then. When asked about the bill in 2008, then DHS Secretary Michael Chertoff wrote: "In countless investigations, where the criminal targets utilize shell corporations, the lack of law enforcement's ability to gain access to true beneficial ownership information slows, confuses or impedes the efforts by investigators to follow criminal proceeds."

In 2009, the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee held two hearings which examined not only the problem, but also possible solutions, including our revised bill, S. 569. At the first hearing entitled, "Examining State Business Incorporation Practices: A Discussion of the Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act," held in June 2009, DHS testified that "shell corporations established in the United States have been utilized to commit crimes against individuals around the world." The Manhattan District Attorney's office testified: "For those of us in law enforcement, these issues with shell corporations are not some abstract idea. This is what we do and deal with every day. We see these shell corporations being used by criminal organizations, and the record is replete with examples of their use for money laundering, for their use in tax evasion, and for their use in securities fraud."

At the second hearing, "Business Formation and Financial Crime: Finding a Legislative Solution," held in November 2009, the Justice Department again testified about criminals using U.S. shell corporations. It noted that "each of these examples involves the relatively rare instance in which law enforcement was able to identify the perpetrator misusing U.S. shell corporations. Far too often, we are unable to do so." The Treasury Department testified that "the ability of illicit actors to form corporations in the United States without disclosing their true identity presents a serious vulnerability and there is ample evidence that criminal organizations and others who threaten our national security exploit this vulnerability."

The 2009 hearings also presented evidence of dozens of Internet websites advertising corporate formation services that highlighted the ability of corporations to be formed in the United States without asking for the identity of the beneficial owners. Those websites explicitly pointed to anonymous ownership as a reason to incorporate within the United States, and often listed certain States alongside notorious offshore jurisdictions as preferred locations in which to form new corporations, essentially providing an open invitation for wrongdoers to form entities within the United States.

One website, for example, set up by an international incorporation firm, advocated setting up corporations in Delaware by saying: "DELAWARE—An Offshore Tax Haven for Non US Residents." It cited as one of Delaware's advantages that: "Owners' names are not disclosed to the state." Another website, from a U.K. firm called "formacorporation-offshore.com," listed the advantages to incorporating in Nevada. Those advantages included: "Stockholders are not on Public Record allowing complete anonymity."

During the 2009 hearings, I presented evidence of how one Wyoming outfit was selling so-called shelf corporations—corporations formed and then left "on the shelf" for later sale to purchasers who could then pretend the corporations had been in operation for years. A June 2011 Reuters news article wrote a detailed expose of how that same outfit, Wyoming Corporate Services, had formed thousands of U.S. corporations all across the country, all with hidden owners. The article quoted the website as follows: "A corporation is a legal person created by state statute that can be used as a fall guy, a servant, a good friend or a decoy. A person you control . . . yet cannot be held accountable for its actions. Imagine the possibilities!"

The article described a small house in Cheyenne, Wyoming, which Wyoming Corporate Services used to provide a U.S. address for more than 2,000 corporations that it had helped to form. The article described "the walls of the main room" as "covered floor to ceiling with numbered mailboxes labeled as corporate suites." The article reported that among the corporations using the address was a shell corporation controlled by a former Ukrainian prime minister who had been convicted of money laundering and extortion; a corporation indicted for helping online-poker operators evade a U.S. ban on Internet gambling; and two corporations barred from U.S. federal contracting for selling counterfeit truck parts to the Pentagon. The article observed that Wyoming Corporate Services continued to sell shelf corporations that existed solely on paper but could show a history of regulatory and tax filings, despite having had no real

U.S. operations. That's the type of deceptive conduct going on right now, here in our own backyard, with respect to U.S. corporations with hidden owners.

Despite the evidence of U.S. corporations being misused by organized crime, terrorists, tax evaders, and other wrongdoers, and despite years of law enforcement complaints, many of our States are reluctant to admit there is a problem in establishing U.S. corporations and LLCs with hidden owners. Too many of our States are eager to explain how quick and easy it is to set up corporations within their borders, without acknowledging that those same quick and easy procedures enable wrongdoers to utilize U.S. corporations in a variety of crimes and tax dodges both here and abroad.

Beginning in 2006, the Subcommittee worked with the States to encourage them to recognize the law enforcement and national security problem they'd created and to come up with their own solution. After the Subcommittee's 2006 hearing on this issue, for example, the National Association of Secretaries of State or NASS convened a 2007 task force to examine state incorporation practices. At the request of NASS and several States, I delayed introducing legislation while they worked on a proposal to require the collection of beneficial ownership information. My Subcommittee staff participated in multiple conferences, telephone calls, and meetings on the issue.

In July 2007, the NASS task force issued a proposal. Rather than cure the problem, however, the proposal had multiple serious deficiencies, leading the Treasury Department to state in a letter that the NASS proposal "falls short" and "does not fully address the problem of legal entities masking the identity of criminals."

Among other shortcomings, the NASS proposal would not require States to obtain the names of the natural individuals who would be the beneficial owners of a U.S. corporation or LLC. Instead, it would allow States to obtain a list of a corporation's "owners of record" who can be, and often are, offshore corporations or trusts with their own hidden owners. The NASS proposal also did not require the States to maintain the beneficial ownership information, or to supply it to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons. Instead, law enforcement would have to get the information from the suspect corporation or one of its agents, thereby tipping off the corporation to the investigation. The proposal also failed to require the beneficial ownership information to be updated over time. These and other flaws in the proposal were identified by the Treasury Department, the Department of Justice, and others, but NASS continued on the same course.

NASS enlisted the help of the National Conference of Commissioners on

Uniform State Laws or NCCUSL, which produced a proposed model law for States that wanted to adopt the NASS approach. NCCUSL presented its proposal at the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee's June 2009 hearing, where it was subjected to significant criticism. The Manhattan District Attorney's office, for example, testified: "I say without hesitation or reservation—that from a law enforcement perspective, the bill proposed by NCCUSL would be worse than no bill at all. And there are two very basic reasons for this. It eliminates the ability of law enforcement to get corporate information without alerting the target of the investigation that the investigation is ongoing. That is the primary reason. It also sets up a system that is time-consuming and complicated."

The Department of Justice testified: "Senator, I would submit to you that in a criminal organization everyone knows who is in control and this will not be an issue of determining who is in control. What we are concerned about here from the law enforcement perspective are the criminals and the criminal organizations and so what we are asking is that when criminals use shell companies, they provide the name of the beneficial owner. That is the person who is in control, the criminal in control, as opposed to the NCCUSL proposal where they are suggesting that instead two nominees are provided—two nominees between law enforcement and the criminal in control."

Despite these criticisms, NCCUSL finalized its model law in July 2009, issuing it under the title, "Uniform Law Enforcement Access to Entity Information Act." At the November 2009 hearing, law enforcement again criticized the NCCUSL model for failing to provide the names of the true owners of the corporations being formed. The Justice Department testified: "To allow companies to provide anything less than the beneficial owner information merely provides criminals with an opportunity to evade responsibility and put nominees between themselves and the true perpetrator." With regard to NCCUSL's proposal, Treasury testified: "[T]here is not an obligation for that live person to not be a nominee. And what I think is important in the legislation is that we get at the true beneficial owner and not someone who may be a nominee."

In addition to its flaws, the NCCUSL model law has proven unpopular with the States for whom it was written. Despite the effort and fanfare attached to the uniform model, after four years of sitting on the books, not a single State has adopted it or given any indication of doing so.

It is deeply disappointing that the States, despite the passage of many years, have been unable to devise an effective proposal to stop the formation

of corporations with hidden owners. One key difficulty is that the States are competing against each other to attract persons who want to set up U.S. corporations. That competition creates pressure for each individual State to favor procedures that allow quick and easy incorporations, with no questions asked. It's a classic case of competition causing a race to the bottom, making it difficult for any one State to do the right thing and ask for the identity of the persons behind the corporations being formed.

That is why Federal legislation in this area is critical. Federal legislation is needed to level the playing field among the States, set minimum standards for obtaining beneficial ownership information, put an end to the practice of States forming millions of legal entities each year without knowing who is behind them, and bring the United States into compliance with its international commitments.

The bill's provisions would require the States to ask incorporation applicants for a list of the beneficial owners of each corporation or LLC formed under their laws, to maintain this information for a period of years after a corporation is terminated, and to provide the information to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons. The bill would also require corporations and LLCs to update their beneficial ownership information on a regular basis. The ownership information would be kept by the State or, if a State maintains a formation agent licensing system and delegates this task, by a State's licensed formation agents.

The particular information that would have to be provided for each beneficial owner is the owner's name, address, and a unique identifying number from a State driver's license or a U.S. passport. The bill would not require States to verify this information, but penalties would apply to persons who submit false information.

In the case of U.S. corporations formed by individuals who do not possess a driver's license or passport from the United States, the bill would permit them to submit their names, addresses, and identifying information from a non-U.S. passport to a formation agent residing within the State. They would have to include a copy of a passport photograph. The incorporation application would have to include a written certification that the formation agent had obtained the information and verified the identity of the non-U.S. corporate owners. The formation agent would have to retain the information in the State for a specified period of time and produce it upon receipt of a subpoena or summons from law enforcement.

To ensure that its provisions are tightly targeted, the bill would exempt a wide range of corporations from the disclosure obligation. It would exempt,

for example, virtually all highly regulated corporations, because we already know who owns them. That includes all publicly-traded corporations, banks, broker-dealers, commodity brokers, registered investment funds, registered accounting firms, insurers, and utilities. The bill would also exempt corporations with a substantial U.S. presence, including at least 20 employees physically located in the United States, since those individuals could provide law enforcement with the leads needed to trace a corporation's true owners. In addition, the bill would exempt businesses set up by governments, churches, charities, and non-profit corporations, since disclosure of their beneficial ownership information would not advance the public interest or assist law enforcement. These exemptions dramatically reduce the number of corporations who would actually have to file beneficial ownership information on state incorporation forms in order to ensure that the bill's disclosure obligations focus only on owners whose identities are currently hidden.

The bill does not take a position on the issue of whether the States should make beneficial ownership information available to the public. Instead, the bill leaves it entirely up to the States to decide whether, under what circumstances, and to what extent to make beneficial ownership information available to the public. The bill explicitly permits the States to place restrictions on providing beneficial ownership information to persons other than government officials. The bill focuses instead on ensuring that law enforcement with a subpoena or summons is given ready access to the beneficial ownership information.

Relative to the costs of compliance, the bill provides States with access to two separate funding sources, neither of which involves appropriated funds. For the first three years after the bill's enactment, the bill requires both the Justice and Treasury Departments to make funds available from their individual forfeiture programs to States incurring reasonable expenses to comply with the Act. These forfeiture funds do not contain taxpayer dollars; instead they contain the proceeds of forfeiture actions taken against persons involved in money laundering, drug trafficking, or other wrongdoing. The bill would direct a total of \$40 million over 3 years to be provided to the States from the two funds to carry out the Act. These provisions would ensure that States have adequate funds for the modest compliance costs involved with adding a new question to their incorporation forms requesting the names of the covered corporations' beneficial owners.

The compliance costs would be modest, because the bill does not require any State to change its laws, set up new forms, create new databases of in-

formation, or verify the information provided. To the contrary, the only steps that a State would need to take would be to add one question to its existing incorporation form asking for the corporation's beneficial owners, keep that incorporation application on file which all States do already, and make the ownership information available to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons.

It is common for bills establishing minimum Federal standards to seek to ensure State action by making some Federal funding dependent upon a State's meeting the specified standards. Our bill, however, states explicitly that nothing in its provisions authorizes the withholding of federal funds from a State for failing to modify its incorporation practices to meet the beneficial ownership information requirements of the act. Instead, the bill calls for a GAO report within 5 years of enactment to identify any States that had failed to strengthen their incorporation practices as required by the act. After getting this status report, a future Congress can decide what steps to take in the event there are any non-compliant States.

The bill also contains a provision that would require corporations bidding on federal contracts to provide the same beneficial ownership information to the federal government as provided to the relevant State. The Subcommittee has become aware of instances in which the federal government has found itself doing business with U.S. corporations whose owners are hidden, including owners under investigation for suspect conduct. It is important that when the federal government contracts to do business with someone, it knows who it is dealing with.

Finally, the bill would require the Treasury Department to issue a rule requiring U.S. formation agents to establish anti-money laundering programs to ensure they are not forming U.S. corporations or LLCs for wrongdoers. The bill requires the programs to be risk based so that formation agents can target their preventative efforts toward persons who pose a high risk of being involved with wrongdoing. GAO would also be asked to conduct a study of existing State formation procedures for partnerships, trusts, and charitable organizations to see if additional ownership disclosure requirements are warranted.

We have worked with the Departments of Justice, Treasury, and Homeland Security to craft a bill that would address, in a fair and reasonable way, the significant law enforcement problems created by States allowing the formation of millions of U.S. corporations and LLCs with hidden owners. When those corporations commit crimes, they affect not only interstate commerce with U.S. victims, but also

our relationships with other countries whose citizens may become victims of U.S. corporate wrongdoing. What the bill comes down to is a simple requirement that States strengthen their incorporation applications to add a single question requesting identifying information for the true owners of the corporations they form. That is not too much to ask to protect this country and the international community from wrongdoers misusing U.S. corporations.

For those who say that, if the United States tightens its incorporation rules, new corporations will be formed elsewhere, it is appropriate to ask exactly where they will go. A recent report found that virtually every other country is already tougher than the United States in terms of demanding and verifying beneficial ownership information. Most offshore tax havens, for example, already require this information to be collected, including the Bahamas, Cayman Islands, and the Channel Islands. Countries around the world already request beneficial ownership information, in part because of their commitment to FATF's international anti-money laundering standards. Our 50 States should be meeting the same standards, but there is no indication that they will, unless required to do so.

I wish Federal legislation weren't necessary. I wish the States could solve this law enforcement problem on their own, but ongoing competitive pressures make it unlikely that the States will do the right thing. It's been nearly seven years since our 2006 hearing on this issue and more than four years since the States came up with a model law on the subject, with no progress to speak of, despite repeated pleas from law enforcement.

Federal legislation is necessary to reduce the vulnerability of the United States to wrongdoing by U.S. corporations with hidden owners, to protect interstate and international commerce from criminals misusing U.S. corporations, to strengthen the ability of law enforcement to investigate suspect U.S. corporations, to level the playing field among the States, and to bring the United States into compliance with its international anti-money laundering obligations.

There is also an issue of consistency. For years, I have been fighting offshore corporate secrecy laws and practices that enable wrongdoers to secretly control offshore corporations involved in money laundering, tax evasion, and other misconduct. I have pointed out on more than one occasion that corporations were not created to hide ownership, but to protect owners from personal liability for corporate acts. Unfortunately, today, the corporate form has too often been corrupted into serving those who wish to conceal their identities. It is past time to stop this misuse of the corporate form. But if we

want to stop inappropriate corporate secrecy offshore, we need to stop it here at home as well.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation and putting an end to incorporation practices that promote corporate secrecy and render the United States and other countries vulnerable to abuse by U.S. corporations with hidden owners.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**SUMMARY OF INCORPORATION TRANSPARENCY
AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT**

To protect the United States from U.S. corporations being misused to support terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, and other misconduct, the Levin-Grassley-Feinstein-Harkin Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act would:

Beneficial Ownership Information. Require the States directly or through licensed formation agents to obtain the names of beneficial owners of the corporations or limited liability companies (LLCs) formed under State law, ensure this information is updated, and provide the information to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons.

Shelf Corporations. Require formation agents who sell "shelf corporations"—corporations formed for later sale to third parties—to identify the beneficial owners who buy them.

Federal Contractors. Require corporations or LLCs bidding on federal contracts to provide beneficial ownership information to the federal government.

Identifying Information. Require the provision of beneficial owners' names, addresses, and a U.S. drivers license or passport number, or information from a non-U.S. passport.

Penalties for False Information. Establish penalties for persons who knowingly provide false information, or willfully fail to provide required information, on beneficial ownership.

Exemptions. Exempt from the disclosure obligation regulated corporations, including publicly traded companies, banks, broker-dealers, insurers, and accounting firms; corporations with a substantial U.S. presence; and corporations whose beneficial ownership information would not benefit the public interest or assist law enforcement.

Funding. Provide \$40 million over three years to States from existing Justice and Treasury Department forfeiture funds to pay for the costs of complying with the Act.

State Compliance Report. Specify that funds may not be withheld from any State for failure to comply with the Act, but also require a GAO report in five years identifying any States not in compliance so a future Congress can determine if additional steps are needed.

Transition Period. Give the States two years to begin requiring existing corporations and LLCs to provide beneficial ownership information.

Anti-Money Laundering Safeguards. Require paid formation agents to establish anti-money laundering programs to guard against supplying U.S. corporations or LLCs to wrongdoers. Attorneys using paid formation agents would be exempt from this requirement.

GAO Study. Require GAO to complete a study of existing beneficial ownership information requirements for partnerships, charities, and trusts.

By Mr. KAINÉ (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1470. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the guidelines for specification of certain disposal sites for dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, today, my colleague Senator MARK WARNER and I are introducing the Commonsense Permitting for Job Creation Act of 2013, a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation to address an aspect of water permitting law that has touched several economic development projects.

In my home State of Virginia, there is a county that has been working on securing a permit for the proposed site of a business center, where one or multiple firms could establish job-creating manufacturing plants. This area—Henry County, on the North Carolina border, has seen profound economic challenges in recent years. The county's 5-year average unemployment rate is 11 percent. In the county's largest city, Martinsville, the 5-year average unemployment rate is over 17 percent. This part of Virginia would benefit greatly from the jobs this site could bring.

Henry County has worked with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on site preparation. However, the Corps has been reluctant to issue the permit because no company has yet committed to the site and prepared detailed blueprints. The problem is that a company will not relocate to the site without an approved permit, but a permit cannot be approved without a company willing to relocate.

Henry County, the Martinsville-Henry Co. Economic Development Corp., and the Commonwealth of Virginia have together devoted more than \$16 million to this project. They have worked in good faith, at great cost in money and personnel hours, to promote economic development in line with environmental protection and all requirements of the law. Yet due to this regulatory ambiguity, this process is unable to move forward.

Our legislation clarifies that ambiguity. It specifies that the lack of a committed end-user shall not be a reason to deny a Corps permit that meets all other legal requirements. I believe this bill will allow the site in Henry County, and similar sites elsewhere, to move forward, while maintaining all environmental protections.

Senator WARNER and I have introduced this legislation in partnership with our friends and Virginia colleagues in the House, U.S. Representatives ROBERT HURT and MORGAN GRIFITH. We believe this will expedite the approval of important economic development projects, and we are proud to

be able to work across the aisle and with state and local officials on this commonsense, bipartisan solution.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am introducing, along with Senator BLUMENTHAL, the Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act. This bill closes a loophole that allows publicly traded corporations to deduct an executive's pay over \$1 million from their tax bill.

Under current tax law, when a public corporation calculates its taxable income, generally it is permitted to deduct the cost of compensation from its revenues, with limits up to \$1 million for some of the firm's most senior executives. However, a loophole has allowed many public corporations to avoid such limits and freely deduct excessive executive compensation. For example, because of this loophole, if a CEO receives \$15 million in compensation in a given year, that amount can cause the corporation's taxable income to decline by \$15 million. With the current corporate tax rate at 35 percent, the corporation in this case would pay less tax to the U.S. Treasury, up to 35 percent of \$15 million, leaving the corporation's shareholders to bear only \$9.75 million of the \$15 million cost of executive pay, while U.S. taxpayers foot the remaining \$5.25 million.

The Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act would allow a public corporation to deduct compensation up to only \$1 million. Using the same example, this would mean that corporate shareholders would bear \$14.65 million of the \$15 million in compensation.

Over a ten-year window, the Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated this legislation would close a loophole that costs U.S. taxpayers over \$50 billion by making some simple changes to existing law.

First, our legislation extends section 162(m) of the tax code to all employees of publicly traded corporations so that all compensation is subject to a deductibility cap of \$1 million. Publicly traded corporations would still be permitted to pay their executives as much as they want, but compensation above and beyond \$1 million would no longer be bankrolled, in part, through our tax code.

Second, our bill removes the exemption for performance-based compensation, which currently permits compensation deductions above and beyond \$1 million when executives have met performance benchmarks set by the corporation's Board of Directors. As a

result, publicly traded corporations would still be able to incentivize their executives, but all such incentives would be subject to a corporate deductibility cap of \$1 million.

Finally, our legislation makes a technical correction to ensure that all publicly traded corporations that are required to provide quarterly and annual reports to their investors under Securities and Exchange Commission rules and regulations are subject to section 162(m). Currently, this section of the tax code only covers some publicly traded corporations who are required to provide these periodic reports to their shareholders. Discouraging unrestrained compensation packages shouldn't hinge on whether a publicly traded corporation falls into one SEC reporting requirement or another, and my bill closes this technical loophole.

With this legislation, we aim to put an end to some of the extravagant tax breaks that exclusively benefit public corporations. This is simply a matter of fairness at a time of fiscal belt tightening, when so many of our constituents have already sacrificed.

I want to thank Senator BLUMENTHAL and his staff for working with me on this issue, and I urge our colleagues to join us by cosponsoring this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 212— COMMENDING DAVID J. SCHIAPPA

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr.

TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 212

Whereas, David Schiappa has loyally served the Senate for 29 years, his entire professional career, starting in the Senate in December 1984;

Whereas, David Schiappa grew up in Maryland and graduated from DeMatha Catholic High School, the University of Maryland, and Johns Hopkins University;

Whereas, David Schiappa rose through all the positions in the Republican Cloakroom finally serving as either Secretary for the Majority or Secretary for the Minority for the last three Republican Leaders;

Whereas, David Schiappa has at all times discharged the duties of his office with great dedication, diligence, and sense of service, thus earning the respect of Republican and Democratic Senators alike, as well as their staffs; and

Whereas, his good humor, storytelling ability, and easy-going manner have made him an invaluable member of the Senate family. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate expresses its appreciation to David Schiappa and his family and commends him for his outstanding and faithful service to the Senate.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to David J. Schiappa.

SENATE RESOLUTION 213—EX- PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE FREE AND PEACEFUL EXERCISE OF REPRESENTATIVE DEMOC- RACY IN VENEZUELA AND CON- DEMNING VIOLENCE AND INTIMI- DATION AGAINST THE COUN- TRY'S POLITICAL OPPOSITION

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. NELSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. KIRK) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 213

Whereas the National Electoral Council (CNE) of Venezuela declared Nicolás Maduro to be the winner of Venezuela's April 14, 2013, presidential election, after crediting him with receiving 50.6 percent of votes cast;

Whereas Venezuela's political opposition has highlighted widespread incidents of potential electoral irregularities, voter intimidation, and other abuses perpetrated by the Government of Venezuela in favor of the candidacy of Nicolás Maduro;

Whereas the Organization of American States and other multilateral institutions called for a full recount and audit that addresses all claims by participants in the electoral process in Venezuela;

Whereas the Senate of the Republic of Chile, the Christian Democratic Organization of the Americas, the Socialist International, the Union of Latin American parties, and other political organizations in the region have issued declarations recognizing the alleged irregularities documented by the opposition in Venezuela and urged a complete audit of the election results;

Whereas the CNE has denied the political opposition's request for a full and comprehensive audit of the election results that

includes the review and comparison of voter registry log books, vote tallies produced by electronic voting machines, and the paper receipts printed by electronic voting machines;

Whereas the Preamble of the Charter of the Organization of American States affirms that "representative democracy is an indispensable condition for the stability, peace and development of the region," and Article 1 of the Inter-American Democratic Charter recognizes that "the people of the Americas have a right to democracy and their governments have an obligation to promote and defend it";

Whereas the republican form of government prescribed in the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela has its legislative branch in the National Assembly, where the free participation and deliberation of its democratically elected representatives is essential to legislate and check the powers of the executive branch;

Whereas the President of the National Assembly denied opposition parties the right to speak in the legislature from April 16 to May 21, 2013, and removed them from key committees in response to their refusal to recognize Nicolás Maduro as president;

Whereas members of the ruling United Socialist Party of Venezuela (PSUV) violently assaulted opposition legislators on April 16 and April 30, 2013, in the National Assembly, causing lacerations, broken bones, and other injuries to members of the political opposition;

Whereas the Department of State responded to the violence against opposition legislators in Venezuela by declaring that "violence has no place in a representative and democratic system, and is particularly inappropriate in the National Assembly";

Whereas the Secretary General of the Organization of American States (OAS) has repudiated the incident by stating that it "reflects, in a dramatic manner, the absence of a political dialogue that can bring tranquility to the citizens and to the members of the different public powers to resolve in a peaceful climate and with everybody's participation the pending matters of the country";

Whereas the Congress of the Republic of Peru passed a resolution rejecting the use of violence against opposition parties in the Venezuelan National Assembly and expressing solidarity with those injured by the events of April 2013; and

Whereas, as a member of the Organization of American States and signatory to the Inter-American Democratic Charter, the Bolivarian Government of Venezuela has agreed to abide by the principles of constitutional, representative democracy, which include free and fair elections and adherence to its own constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the people of Venezuela in their pursuit of the free exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela;

(2) calls for greater dialogue between all political actors in Venezuela and strongly deplores the undemocratic denial of legitimate parliamentary rights to members of opposition parties in the National Assembly and the inexcusable violence perpetrated against opposition legislators inside the legislative chambers of Venezuela;

(3) commends legislators from other nations in the Americas who have declared their opposition to political irregularities and the use of violence against opposition parliamentarians in Venezuela;

(4) urges the Organization of American States to issue a detailed report on any and

all irregularities resulting from the April 14, 2013, presidential election in Venezuela;

(5) urges the United States Ambassador to the Organization of American States to work in concert with other member states to use the full power of the organization in support of meaningful steps to ensure full parliamentary democracy and the rule of law in Venezuela in accordance with the Inter-American Democratic Charter, including invoking articles related to unconstitutional interruptions of the democratic order in a member state; and

(6) urges the United States Ambassador to the Organization of American States to work in concert with other member states to strengthen the ability of the Organization to protect democratic institutions and to respond to the erosion of democracy in member states.

SENATE RESOLUTION 214—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 13, 2013, THROUGH OCTOBER 19, 2013, AS "NATIONAL CASE MANAGEMENT WEEK" TO RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF CASE MANAGEMENT IN IMPROVING HEALTHCARE OUTCOMES FOR PATIENTS

Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 214

Whereas case management is a collaborative process of assessment, education, planning, facilitation, care coordination, evaluation, and advocacy;

Whereas the goal of case management is to meet the health needs of the patient and the family of the patient, while respecting and assuring the right of the patient to self-determination, through communication and available resources in order to promote quality, cost-effective outcomes;

Whereas case managers are advocates who help patients understand their current health status and ways to improve their health, and in this way serve as catalysts who guide patients and provide cohesion with other professionals in the healthcare delivery team;

Whereas case managers are an important link to quality healthcare;

Whereas the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America work diligently to bring awareness to the broad range of services case managers offer and to educate providers, payers, and regulators on the improved patient outcomes that case management services can provide;

Whereas, through National Case Management Week, the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America hope to continue to educate providers, payers, regulators, and consumers about the value case managers bring to the successful delivery of healthcare;

Whereas the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America will celebrate National Case Management Week during the week of October 13, 2013, through October 19, 2013, in order to recognize case managers as an essential link to quality healthcare; and

Whereas it is appropriate at that time to recognize the many achievements of case managers in improving healthcare outcomes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 13, 2013, through October 19, 2013, as "National Case Management Week";

(2) recognizes the value of case management in providing successful and cost-effective healthcare; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Case Management Week and learn about the field of case management.

SENATE RESOLUTION 215—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT BAIL OUT ANY STATE

Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. SHELBY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

S. RES. 215

Whereas every State in the United States is a sovereign entity with a constitution and the authority to issue sovereign debt;

Whereas the legislature of every State in the United States has the authority to reduce spending or raise taxes to pay the obligations owed by the State;

Whereas officials in every State in the United States have the legal obligation to fully disclose the financial condition of the State to investors who purchase the debt of the State;

Whereas Congress has rejected prior requests from creditors of a State for payment of the defaulted debt of a State; and

Whereas, during the financial crisis in 1842, the Senate requested that the Secretary of the Treasury report any negotiations with creditors of a State to assume or guaranty any debt of a State, to ensure that promises of Federal Government support were not proffered: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Federal Government should take no action to redeem, assume, or guarantee any debt of a State; and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury should report to Congress any negotiations to engage in actions that would result in an outlay of Federal funds on behalf of creditors of a State.

SENATE RESOLUTION 216—ELECTING LAURA C. DOVE, OF VIRGINIA, AS SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 216

Resolved, That Laura C. Dove of Virginia be, and she is hereby, elected Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, effective Friday, August 2, 2013.

SENATE RESOLUTION 217—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 6, 2013, THROUGH OCTOBER 10, 2013, AS “AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SURGEONS DAYS” AND RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE ORGANIZATION

Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 217

Whereas the American College of Surgeons is the largest surgical organization in the world and remains steadfast in its mission to improve the care of the surgical patient and to safeguard standards of care in an optimal and ethical practice environment;

Whereas the American College of Surgeons continues its work into the 21st century to sustain and develop relevant programs that are inspired by quality;

Whereas the 100th anniversary celebrations serve as a testament that the American College of Surgeons is fulfilling its mission of engaging surgeons as leaders and educators, and developing initiatives that improve surgery and the quality of care for surgical patients;

Whereas the 2013 American College of Surgeons Clinical Congress is the most prestigious international surgical conference, bringing together thousands of Fellows of the College and other health care professionals who each year rely on the Clinical Congress to learn about the latest surgical advances, practice management methods, and health policy issues; and

Whereas October 6, 2013, through October 10, 2013, would be appropriate dates to designate as “American College of Surgeons Days” to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American College of Surgeons, the achievements of which continue to significantly influence the course of surgery in the United States and around the world, and which was established as an advocate for all surgical patients: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of “American College of Surgeons Days”;

(2) recognizes the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American College of Surgeons; and

(3) recognizes the many important contributions of the American College of Surgeons to the welfare of surgical patients and the health care system of the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22—PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. REID submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 22

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, August 1, 2013, through Sunday, August 11, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or

adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, August 12, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Monday, August 12, 2013, it stand adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, September 9, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Friday, August 2, 2013, through Friday, September 6, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE SHOULD ISSUE A COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP HONORING THE REVEREND DOCTOR LEON SULLIVAN AND THAT THE CITIZENS’ STAMP ADVISORY COMMITTEE SHOULD RECOMMEND TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL THAT SUCH A STAMP BE ISSUED

Mr. CASEY submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 23

Whereas the Reverend Doctor Leon Sullivan impacted millions of people throughout the world, particularly throughout the United States and in Africa, by advocating self-help principles of empowerment, community development, and self-reliance;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan founded the Opportunities Industrialization Centers (commonly referred to as the “OIC”), a skills training program providing training and retraining on a massive scale;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan founded Opportunities Industrialization Centers International (commonly referred to as “OICI”) and the International Foundation for Education and Self-Help (commonly referred to as “IFESH”);

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan made a substantial impact on the lives of the people in Africa through the actions of OICI and IFESH;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan founded the Progress Investment Associates (commonly referred to as the “PIA”) and the Zion Nonprofit Charitable Trust (commonly referred to as the “ZNCT”), which was established to fund housing, shopping, human services, educational, and other nonprofit ventures for inner-city dwellers;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan established inner-city retirement and assisted living complexes for the elderly and disabled in Philadelphia and other cities throughout the United States, named Opportunities Towers;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan was able, as the first African-American member on the board of General Motors Corporation, to secure the support of the other board members to back him in the development of the unprecedented Global Sullivan Principles, a code of conduct written in 1977, for United States businesses operating in South Africa;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan has been the recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Notre Dame Award, the Eleanor Roosevelt Human Rights Award, the NAACP Spingarn Award, the Kappa Alpha Psi Laurel Wreath, and more than 50 doctoral degrees;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan economically empowered individuals and combated poverty wherever he implemented programs;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan established the African-American American summits to bring together the leaders of African countries, the United States, and other countries; and

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan established the Global Sullivan Principles (for Corporate Social Responsibility) in the late 1990s to apply the same type of principles for countries and businesses throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the Reverend Doctor Leon Sullivan; and

(2) the Citizens’ Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1840. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1841. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1842. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1843. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1844. Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1845. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1846. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1847. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1848. Mr. REID (for Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1344, to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1840. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. USE OF ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES IN FEDERAL BUILDINGS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) Private sector funding and expertise can help address the energy efficiency challenges facing the United States.

(2) The Federal Government spends more than \$6 billion annually in energy costs.

(3) Reducing Federal energy costs can help save money, create jobs, and reduce waste.

(4) Energy savings performance contracts and utility energy savings contracts are tools for utilizing private sector investment to upgrade Federal facilities without any up-front cost to the taxpayer.

(5) Performance contracting is a way to retrofit Federal buildings using private sector investment in the absence of appropriated dollars. Retrofits seek to reduce energy use, improve infrastructure, protect national security, and cut facility operations and maintenance costs.

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION OF IDENTIFIED ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES.**—Section 543(f)(4) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253(f)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

“(4) **IMPLEMENTATION OF IDENTIFIED ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the completion of each evaluation under paragraph (3), each energy manager shall consider—

“(i) implementing any energy- or water-saving or conservation measure that the Federal agency identified in the evaluation conducted under paragraph (3) that is life cycle cost-effective; and

“(ii) bundling individual measures of varying paybacks together into combined projects.

“(B) **MEASURES NOT IMPLEMENTED.**—The energy manager, as part of the certification system under paragraph (7) and using guidelines developed by the Secretary, shall provide reasons for not implementing any life cycle cost-effective measures under subparagraph (A).”

(c) **ANNUAL CONTRACTING GOAL.**—Section 543(f)(10)(C) of the National Energy Con-

servation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253(f)(10)(C)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Each Federal agency” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each Federal agency”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new clauses:

“(ii) **TRACKING.**—Each Federal agency shall use the benchmarking systems selected or developed for the agency under paragraph (8) to track energy savings realized by the agency through the implementation of energy- or water-saving or conservation measures pursuant to paragraph (4), and shall submit information regarding such savings to the Secretary to be published on a public website of the Department of Energy.

“(iii) **CONSIDERATION.**—Each Federal agency shall consider using energy savings performance contracts or utility energy service contracts to implement energy- or water-saving or conservation measures pursuant to paragraph (4).

“(iv) **CONTRACTING GOAL.**—It shall be the goal of the Federal Government, in the implementation of energy- or water-saving or conservation measures pursuant to paragraph (4), to enter into energy savings performance contracts or utility energy service contracts equal to \$1,000,000,000 in each year during the 5-year period beginning on January 1, 2014.

“(v) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than September 30 of each year during the 5-year period referred to in clause (iv), each Federal agency shall submit to the Secretary information regarding progress made by the agency towards achieving the goal described in such clause. Not later than 60 days after each such September 30, the Secretary, acting through the Federal Energy Management Program, shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report describing the progress made by the Federal Government towards achieving such goal.”

SA 1841. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 401, insert the following:

SEC. . EXTENSION OF PUBLICLY TRADED PARTNERSHIP OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE TO ENERGY POWER GENERATION PROJECTS, TRANSPORTATION FUELS, AND RELATED ENERGY ACTIVITIES.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act”.

(b) **GENERAL RULE.**—Subparagraph (E) of section 7704(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “income and gains derived from the exploration” and inserting “income and gains derived from the following:

“(i) **MINERALS, NATURAL RESOURCES, ETC.**—The exploration”;

(2) by inserting “or” before “industrial source”;

(3) by inserting a period after “carbon dioxide”; and

(4) by striking “, or the transportation or storage” and all that follows and inserting the following:

“(ii) **RENEWABLE ENERGY.**—The generation of electric power exclusively utilizing any resource described in section 45(c)(1) or en-

ergy property described in section 48 (determined without regard to any termination date), or in the case of a facility described in paragraph (3) or (7) of section 45(d) (determined without regard to any placed in service date or date by which construction of the facility is required to begin), the accepting or processing of such resource.

“(iii) **ELECTRICITY STORAGE DEVICES.**—The receipt and sale of electric power that has been stored in a device directly connected to the grid.

“(iv) **COMBINED HEAT AND POWER.**—The generation, storage, or distribution of thermal energy exclusively utilizing property described in section 48(c)(3) (determined without regard to subparagraphs (B) and (D) thereof and without regard to any placed in service date).

“(v) **RENEWABLE THERMAL ENERGY.**—The generation, storage, or distribution of thermal energy exclusively using any resource described in section 45(c)(1) or energy property described in clause (i) or (iii) of section 48(a)(3)(A).

“(vi) **WASTE HEAT TO POWER.**—The use of recoverable waste energy, as defined in section 371(5) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6341(5)) (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act).

“(vii) **RENEWABLE FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE.**—The storage or transportation of any fuel described in subsection (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 6426.

“(viii) **RENEWABLE FUELS.**—The production, storage, or transportation of any renewable fuel described in section 211(o)(1)(J) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)(J)) (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act) or section 40A(d)(1).

“(ix) **RENEWABLE CHEMICALS.**—The production, storage, or transportation of any renewable chemical (as defined in paragraph (6)).

“(x) **ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDINGS.**—The audit and installation through contract or other agreement of any energy efficient building property described in section 179D(c)(1).

“(xi) **GASIFICATION WITH SEQUESTRATION.**—The production of any product from a project that meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 48B(c)(1) and that separates and sequesters in secure geological storage (as determined under section 45Q(d)(2)) at least 75 percent of such project’s total qualified carbon dioxide (as defined in section 45Q(b)).

“(xii) **CARBON CAPTURE AND SEQUESTRATION.**—The generation or storage of electric power produced from any facility which is a qualified facility described in section 45Q(c) and which disposes of any captured qualified carbon dioxide (as defined in section 45Q(b)) in secure geological storage (as determined under section 45Q(d)(2)).”

(c) **RENEWABLE CHEMICAL.**—Section 7704(d) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) **RENEWABLE CHEMICAL.**—The term ‘renewable chemical’ means a monomer, polymer, plastic, formulated product, or chemical substance produced from renewable biomass (as defined in section 9001(12) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8101(12)), as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act).”

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date.

SA 1842. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

Subtitle B—Weatherization Enhancement and Local Energy Efficiency Investment and Accountability

SEC. 411. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the State energy program established under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) (referred to in this section as “SEP”) and the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons established under part A of title IV of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6861 et seq.) (referred to in this section as “WAP”) have proven to be beneficial, long-term partnerships among Federal, State, and local partners;

(2) the SEP and the WAP have been reauthorized on a bipartisan basis over many years to address changing national, regional, and State circumstances and needs, especially through—

(A) the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.);

(B) the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.);

(C) the State Energy Efficiency Programs Improvement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-440; 104 Stat. 1006);

(D) the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13201 et seq.);

(E) the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801 et seq.); and

(F) the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17001 et seq.);

(3) the SEP, also known as the “State energy conservation program”—

(A) was first created in 1975 to implement a State-based, national program in support of energy efficiency, renewable energy, economic development, energy emergency preparedness, and energy policy; and

(B) has come to operate in every sector of the economy in support of the private sector to improve productivity and has dramatically reduced the cost of government through energy savings at the State and local levels;

(4) Federal laboratory studies have concluded that, for every Federal dollar invested through the SEP, more than \$7 is saved in energy costs and almost \$11 in non-Federal funds is leveraged;

(5) the WAP—

(A) was first created in 1976 to assist low-income families in response to the first oil embargo;

(B) has become the largest residential energy conservation program in the United States, with more than 7,100,000 homes weatherized since the WAP was created;

(C) saves an estimated 35 percent of consumption in the typical weatherized home, yielding average annual savings of \$437 per year in home energy costs;

(D) has created thousands of jobs in both the construction sector and in the supply chain of materials suppliers, vendors, and manufacturers who supply the WAP;

(E) returns \$2.51 in energy savings for every Federal dollar spent in energy and nonenergy benefits over the life of weatherized homes;

(F) serves as a foundation for residential energy efficiency retrofit standards, technical skills, and workforce training for the emerging broader market and reduces residential and power plant emissions of carbon dioxide by 2.65 metric tons each year per home; and

(G) has decreased national energy consumption by the equivalent of 24,100,000 barrels of oil annually;

(6) the WAP can be enhanced with the addition of a targeted portion of the Federal funds through an innovative program that supports projects performed by qualified nonprofit organizations that have a demonstrated capacity to build, renovate, repair, or improve the energy efficiency of a significant number of low-income homes, building on the success of the existing program without replacing the existing WAP network or creating a separate delivery mechanism for basic WAP services;

(7) the WAP has increased energy efficiency opportunities by promoting new, competitive public-private sector models of retrofitting low-income homes through new Federal partnerships;

(8) improved monitoring and reporting of the work product of the WAP has yielded benefits, and expanding independent verification of efficiency work will support the long-term goals of the WAP;

(9) reports of the Government Accountability Office in 2011, Inspector General’s of the Department of Energy, and State auditors have identified State-level deficiencies in monitoring efforts that can be addressed in a manner that will ensure that WAP funds are used more effectively;

(10) through the history of the WAP, the WAP has evolved with improvements in efficiency technology, including, in the 1990s, many States adopting advanced home energy audits, which has led to great returns on investment; and

(11) as the home energy efficiency industry has become more performance-based, the WAP should continue to use those advances in technology and the professional workforce.

PART I—WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 421. REAUTHORIZATION OF WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 422 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6872) is amended by striking “appropriated—” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “appropriated \$450,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.”.

SEC. 422. GRANTS FOR NEW, SELF-SUSTAINING LOW-INCOME, SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTIFAMILY HOUSING ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS TO ELIGIBLE MULTISTATE HOUSING AND ENERGY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

The Energy Conservation and Production Act is amended by inserting after section 414B (42 U.S.C. 6864b) the following:

“SEC. 414C. GRANTS FOR NEW, SELF-SUSTAINING LOW-INCOME, SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTIFAMILY HOUSING ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS TO ELIGIBLE MULTISTATE HOUSING AND ENERGY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

“(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

“(1) to expand the number of low-income, single-family and multifamily homes that receive energy efficiency retrofits;

“(2) to promote innovation and new models of retrofitting low-income homes through new Federal partnerships with covered orga-

nizations that leverage substantial donations, donated materials, volunteer labor, homeowner labor equity, and other private sector resources;

“(3) to assist the covered organizations in demonstrating, evaluating, improving, and replicating widely the model low-income energy retrofit programs of the covered organizations; and

“(4) to ensure that the covered organizations make the energy retrofit programs of the covered organizations self-sustaining by the time grant funds have been expended.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘covered organization’ means an organization that—

“(A) is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under 501(a) of that Code; and

“(B) has an established record of constructing, renovating, repairing, or making energy efficient a total of not less than 250 owner-occupied, single-family or multifamily homes per year for low-income households, either directly or through affiliates, chapters, or other direct partners (using the most recent year for which data are available).

“(2) LOW-INCOME.—The term ‘low-income’ means an income level that is not more than 200 percent of the poverty level (as determined in accordance with criteria established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget) applicable to a family of the size involved, except that the Secretary may establish a higher or lower level if the Secretary determines that a higher or lower level is necessary to carry out this section.

“(3) WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR LOW-INCOME PERSONS.—The term ‘Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons’ means the program established under this part (including part 440 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations).

“(c) COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall make grants to covered organizations through a national competitive process for use in accordance with this section.

“(d) AWARD FACTORS.—In making grants under this section, the Secretary shall consider—

“(1) the number of low-income homes the applicant—

“(A) has built, renovated, repaired, or made more energy efficient as of the date of the application; and

“(B) can reasonably be projected to build, renovate, repair, or make energy efficient during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the application;

“(2) the qualifications, experience, and past performance of the applicant, including experience successfully managing and administering Federal funds;

“(3) the number and diversity of States and climates in which the applicant works as of the date of the application;

“(4) the amount of non-Federal funds, donated or discounted materials, discounted or volunteer skilled labor, volunteer unskilled labor, homeowner labor equity, and other resources the applicant will provide;

“(5) the extent to which the applicant could successfully replicate the energy retrofit program of the applicant and sustain the program after the grant funds have been expended;

“(6) regional diversity;

“(7) urban, suburban, and rural localities; and

“(8) such other factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(e) APPLICATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall request proposals from covered organizations.

“(2) ADMINISTRATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an applicant shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(3) AWARDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of a request for proposals, the Secretary shall award grants under this section.

“(f) ELIGIBLE USES OF GRANT FUNDS.—A grant under this section may be used for—

“(1) energy efficiency audits, cost-effective retrofit, and related activities in different climatic regions of the United States;

“(2) energy efficiency materials and supplies;

“(3) organizational capacity—

“(A) to significantly increase the number of energy retrofits;

“(B) to replicate an energy retrofit program in other States; and

“(C) to ensure that the program is self-sustaining after the Federal grant funds are expended;

“(4) energy efficiency, audit and retrofit training, and ongoing technical assistance;

“(5) information to homeowners on proper maintenance and energy savings behaviors;

“(6) quality control and improvement;

“(7) data collection, measurement, and verification;

“(8) program monitoring, oversight, evaluation, and reporting;

“(9) management and administration (up to a maximum of 10 percent of the total grant);

“(10) labor and training activities; and

“(11) such other activities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(g) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant provided under this section shall not exceed—

“(1) if the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year is \$225,000,000 or more, \$5,000,000; and

“(2) if the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year is less than \$225,000,000, \$1,500,000.

“(h) GUIDELINES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue guidelines to implement the grant program established under this section.

“(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The guidelines—

“(A) shall not apply to the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons, in whole or major part; but

“(B) may rely on applicable provisions of law governing the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons to establish—

“(i) standards for allowable expenditures;

“(ii) a minimum savings-to-investment ratio;

“(iii) standards—

“(I) to carry out training programs;

“(II) to conduct energy audits and program activities;

“(III) to provide technical assistance;

“(IV) to monitor program activities; and

“(V) to verify energy and cost savings;

“(iv) liability insurance requirements; and

“(v) recordkeeping requirements, which shall include reporting to the Office of Weatherization and Intergovernmental Programs of the Department of Energy applicable data on each home retrofitted.

“(i) REVIEW AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall review and evaluate the performance of any covered organization that receives a grant under this section (which may include an audit), as determined by the Secretary.

“(j) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND LOCAL LAW.—Nothing in this section or any program carried out using a grant provided under this section supersedes or otherwise affects any State or local law, to the extent that the State or local law contains a requirement that is more stringent than the applicable requirement of this section.

“(k) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress annual reports that provide—

“(1) findings;

“(2) a description of energy and cost savings achieved and actions taken under this section; and

“(3) any recommendations for further action.

“(l) FUNDING.—Of the amount of funds that are made available to carry out the Weatherization Assistance Program for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 under section 422, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section—

“(1) for fiscal year 2014—

“(A) 1 percent of the amount if the amount is less than \$200,000,000;

“(B) 2 percent of the amount if the amount is \$200,000,000 or more but less than \$225,000,000;

“(C) 5 percent of the amount if the amount is \$225,000,000 or more but less than \$260,000,000;

“(D) 10 percent of the amount if the amount is \$260,000,000 or more but less than \$400,000,000; and

“(E) 20 percent of the amount if the amount is \$400,000,000 or more; and

“(2) for each of fiscal year 2015 through 2018—

“(A) 2 percent of the amount if the amount is less than \$225,000,000;

“(B) 5 percent of the amount if the amount is \$225,000,000 or more but less than \$260,000,000;

“(C) 10 percent of the amount if the amount is \$260,000,000 or more but less than \$400,000,000; and

“(D) 20 percent of the amount if the amount is \$400,000,000 or more.”.

SEC. 423. STANDARDS PROGRAM.

Section 415 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6865) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) STANDARDS PROGRAM.—

“(1) CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATION.—Effective beginning January 1, 2015, to be eligible to carry out weatherization using funds made available under this part, a contractor shall be selected through a competitive bidding process and be—

“(A) accredited by the Building Performance Institute;

“(B) an Energy Smart Home Performance Team accredited under the Residential Energy Services Network; or

“(C) accredited by an equivalent accreditation or program accreditation-based State certification program approved by the Secretary.

“(2) GRANTS FOR ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under section 414C, a covered organization (as defined in section 414C(b)) shall use a crew chief who—

“(i) is certified or accredited in accordance with paragraph (1); and

“(ii) supervises the work performed with grant funds.

“(B) VOLUNTEER LABOR.—A volunteer who performs work for a covered organization that receives a grant under section 414C shall not be required to be certified under this subsection if the volunteer is not directly installing or repairing mechanical equipment or other items that require skilled labor.

“(C) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall use training and technical assistance funds available to the Secretary to assist covered organizations under section 414C in providing training to obtain certification required under this subsection, including provisional or temporary certification.

“(3) MINIMUM EFFICIENCY STANDARDS.—Effective beginning October 1, 2015, the Secretary shall ensure that—

“(A) each retrofit for which weatherization assistance is provided under this part meets minimum efficiency and quality of work standards established by the Secretary after weatherization of a dwelling unit; and

“(B) at least 10 percent of the dwelling units are randomly inspected by a third party accredited under this subsection to ensure compliance with the minimum efficiency and quality of work standards established under subparagraph (A); and

“(C) the standards established under this subsection meet or exceed the industry standards for home performance work that are in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.”.

PART II—STATE ENERGY PROGRAM

SEC. 431. REAUTHORIZATION OF STATE ENERGY PROGRAM.

Section 365(f) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6325(f)) is amended by striking “\$125,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2012” and inserting “\$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018”.

SA 1843. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 188, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 422. Funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for grants to be awarded by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or the Secretary of Transportation shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this title, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Development shall conduct audits of any grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspectors General shall determine the appropriate number of such audits to be conducted each year.

(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term “unresolved audit finding” means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspectors General of the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost

that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(C) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this title during the following 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described under subparagraph (A).

(D) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act, the Secretary of Transportation or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall give priority to eligible entities that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years prior to submitting an application for grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act.

(E) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an entity is awarded grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (B), the Secretary of Transportation or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(2) **NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this paragraph and any grant programs described in this Act, the term “nonprofit organization” means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) **PROHIBITION.**—The Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not award any grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Each nonprofit organization that is a recipient of grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Secretary of Transportation or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make the information disclosed under this paragraph available for public inspection.

SA 1844. Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. ENHANCED ENERGY EFFICIENCY UNDERWRITING.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COVERED AGENCY.**—The term “covered agency”—

(A) means—

(i) an executive agency, as that term is defined in section 102 of title 31, United States Code; and

(ii) any other agency of the Federal Government; and

(B) includes any enterprise, as that term is defined under section 1303 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4502).

(2) **COVERED LOAN.**—The term “covered loan” means a loan secured by a home that is issued, insured, purchased, or securitized by a covered agency.

(3) **HOMEOWNER.**—The term “homeowner” means the mortgagor under a covered loan.

(4) **MORTGAGEE.**—The term “mortgagee” means—

(A) an original lender under a covered loan or the holder of a covered loan at the time at which that mortgage transaction is consummated;

(B) any affiliate, agent, subsidiary, successor, or assignee of an original lender under a covered loan or the holder of a covered loan at the time at which that mortgage transaction is consummated;

(C) any servicer of a covered loan; and

(D) any subsequent purchaser, trustee, or transferee of any covered loan issued by an original lender.

(5) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(6) **SERVICER.**—The term “servicer” means the person or entity responsible for the servicing of a covered loan, including the person or entity who makes or holds a covered loan if that person or entity also services the covered loan.

(7) **SERVICING.**—The term “servicing” has the meaning given the term in section 6(i) of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2605(i)).

(b) **FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(A) energy costs for homeowners are a significant and increasing portion of their household budgets;

(B) household energy use can vary substantially depending on the efficiency and characteristics of the house;

(C) expected energy cost savings are important to the value of the house;

(D) the current test for loan affordability used by most covered agencies, commonly known as the “debt-to-income” test, is inadequate because it does not take into account the expected energy cost savings for the homeowner of an energy efficient home; and

(E) another loan limitation, commonly known as the “loan-to-value” test, is tied to the appraisal, which often does not adjust for efficiency features of houses.

(2) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this section are to—

(A) improve the accuracy of mortgage underwriting by Federal mortgage agencies by ensuring that energy cost savings are included in the underwriting process as described below, and thus to reduce the amount of energy consumed by homes and to facilitate the creation of energy efficiency retrofit and construction jobs;

(B) require a covered agency to include the expected energy cost savings of a homeowner as a regular expense in the tests, such as the debt-to-income test, used to determine the ability of the loan applicant to afford the

cost of homeownership for all loan programs; and

(C) require a covered agency to include the value home buyers place on the energy efficiency of a house in tests used to compare the mortgage amount to home value, taking precautions to avoid double-counting and to support safe and sound lending.

(c) **ENHANCED ENERGY EFFICIENCY UNDERWRITING CRITERIA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the advisory group established in subsection (f)(2), develop and issue guidelines for a covered agency to implement enhanced loan eligibility requirements, for use when testing the ability of a loan applicant to repay a covered loan, that account for the expected energy cost savings for a loan applicant at a subject property, in the manner set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3).

(2) **REQUIREMENTS TO ACCOUNT FOR ENERGY COST SAVINGS.**—The enhanced loan eligibility requirements under paragraph (1) shall require that, for all covered loans for which an energy efficiency report is voluntarily provided to the mortgagee by the mortgagor, the covered agency and the mortgagee shall take into consideration the estimated energy cost savings expected for the owner of the subject property in determining whether the loan applicant has sufficient income to service the mortgage debt plus other regular expenses. To the extent that a covered agency uses a test such as a debt-to-income test that includes certain regular expenses, such as hazard insurance and property taxes, the expected energy cost savings shall be included as an offset to these expenses. Energy costs to be assessed include the cost of electricity, natural gas, oil, and any other fuel regularly used to supply energy to the subject property.

(3) **DETERMINATION OF ESTIMATED ENERGY COST SAVINGS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1) shall include instructions for the covered agency to calculate estimated energy cost savings using—

(i) the energy efficiency report;

(ii) an estimate of baseline average energy costs; and

(iii) additional sources of information as determined by the Secretary.

(B) **REPORT REQUIREMENTS.**—For the purposes of subparagraph (A), an energy efficiency report shall—

(i) estimate the expected energy cost savings specific to the subject property, based on specific information about the property;

(ii) be prepared in accordance with the guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1); and

(iii) be prepared—

(I) in accordance with the Residential Energy Service Network’s Home Energy Rating System (commonly known as “HERS”) by an individual certified by the Residential Energy Service Network, unless the Secretary finds that the use of HERS does not further the purposes of this section; or

(II) by other methods approved by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the advisory group established in subsection (f)(2), for use under this section, which shall include a third-party quality assurance procedure.

(C) **USE BY APPRAISER.**—If an energy efficiency report is used under paragraph (2), the energy efficiency report shall be provided to the appraiser to estimate the energy efficiency of the subject property and for potential adjustments for energy efficiency.

(4) **REQUIRED DISCLOSURE TO CONSUMER FOR A HOME WITH AN ENERGY EFFICIENCY REPORT.**—If an energy efficiency report is used under paragraph (2), the guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1) shall require the mortgagee to—

(A) inform the loan applicant of the expected energy costs as estimated in the energy efficiency report, in a manner and at a time as prescribed by the Secretary, and if practicable, in the documents delivered at the time of loan application; and

(B) include the energy efficiency report in the documentation for the loan provided to the borrower.

(5) **REQUIRED DISCLOSURE TO CONSUMER FOR A HOME WITHOUT AN ENERGY EFFICIENCY REPORT.**—If an energy efficiency report is not used under paragraph (2), the guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1) shall require the mortgagee to inform the loan applicant in a manner and at a time as prescribed by the Secretary, and if practicable, in the documents delivered at the time of loan application of—

(A) typical energy cost savings that would be possible from a cost-effective energy upgrade of a home of the size and in the region of the subject property;

(B) the impact the typical energy cost savings would have on monthly ownership costs of a typical home;

(C) the impact on the size of a mortgage that could be obtained if the typical energy cost savings were reflected in an energy efficiency report; and

(D) resources for improving the energy efficiency of a home.

(6) **LIMITATIONS.**—A covered agency shall not—

(A) modify existing underwriting criteria or adopt new underwriting criteria that intentionally negate or reduce the impact of the requirements or resulting benefits that are set forth or otherwise derived from the enhanced loan eligibility requirements required under this subsection; or

(B) impose greater buy back requirements, credit overlays, insurance requirements, including private mortgage insurance, or any other material costs, impediments, or penalties on covered loans merely because the loan uses an energy efficiency report or the enhanced loan eligibility requirements required under this subsection.

(7) **APPLICABILITY AND IMPLEMENTATION DATE.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and before December 31, 2016, the enhanced loan eligibility requirements required under this subsection shall be implemented by each covered agency to—

(A) apply to any covered loan for the sale, or refinancing of any loan for the sale, of any home;

(B) be available on any residential real property (including individual units of condominiums and cooperatives) that qualifies for a covered loan; and

(C) provide prospective mortgagees with sufficient guidance and applicable tools to implement the required underwriting methods.

(d) **ENHANCED ENERGY EFFICIENCY UNDERWRITING VALUATION GUIDELINES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) in consultation with the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council and the advisory group established in subsection (f)(2), develop and issue guidelines for a covered agency to determine the maximum permitted loan amount based on the value of

the property for all covered loans made on properties with an energy efficiency report that meets the requirements of subsection (c)(3)(B); and

(B) in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, issue guidelines for a covered agency to determine the estimated energy savings under paragraph (3) for properties with an energy efficiency report.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The enhanced energy efficiency underwriting valuation guidelines required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a requirement that if an energy efficiency report that meets the requirements of subsection (c)(3)(B) is voluntarily provided to the mortgagee, such report shall be used by the mortgagee or covered agency to determine the estimated energy savings of the subject property; and

(B) a requirement that the estimated energy savings of the subject property be added to the appraised value of the subject property by a mortgagee or covered agency for the purpose of determining the loan-to-value ratio of the subject property, unless the appraisal includes the value of the overall energy efficiency of the subject property, using methods to be established under the guidelines issued under paragraph (1).

(3) **DETERMINATION OF ESTIMATED ENERGY SAVINGS.**—

(A) **AMOUNT OF ENERGY SAVINGS.**—The amount of estimated energy savings shall be determined by calculating the difference between the estimated energy costs for the average comparable houses, as determined in guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1), and the estimated energy costs for the subject property based upon the energy efficiency report.

(B) **DURATION OF ENERGY SAVINGS.**—The duration of the estimated energy savings shall be based upon the estimated life of the applicable equipment, consistent with the rating system used to produce the energy efficiency report.

(C) **PRESENT VALUE OF ENERGY SAVINGS.**—The present value of the future savings shall be discounted using the average interest rate on conventional 30-year mortgages, in the manner directed by guidelines issued under paragraph (1).

(4) **ENSURING CONSIDERATION OF ENERGY EFFICIENT FEATURES.**—Section 1110 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 3339) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and” and inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) that State certified and licensed appraisers have timely access, whenever practicable, to information from the property owner and the lender that may be relevant in developing an opinion of value regarding the energy- and water-saving improvements or features of a property, such as—

“(A) labels or ratings of buildings;

“(B) installed appliances, measures, systems or technologies;

“(C) blueprints;

“(D) construction costs;

“(E) financial or other incentives regarding energy- and water-efficient components and systems installed in a property;

“(F) utility bills;

“(G) energy consumption and benchmarking data; and

“(H) third-party verifications or representations of energy and water efficiency performance of a property, observing all financial privacy requirements adhered to by cer-

tified and licensed appraisers, including section 501 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801).

Unless a property owner consents to a lender, an appraiser, in carrying out the requirements of paragraph (4), shall not have access to the commercial or financial information of the owner that is privileged or confidential.”.

(5) **TRANSACTIONS REQUIRING STATE CERTIFIED APPRAISERS.**—Section 1113 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 3342) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, or any real property on which the appraiser makes adjustments using an energy efficiency report”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting after “atypical” the following: “, or an appraisal on which the appraiser makes adjustments using an energy efficiency report.”.

(6) **PROTECTIONS.**—

(A) **AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE LIMITATIONS.**—The guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1) shall include such limitations and conditions as determined by the Secretary to be necessary to protect against meaningful under or over valuation of energy cost savings or duplicative counting of energy efficiency features or energy cost savings in the valuation of any subject property that is used to determine a loan amount.

(B) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.**—At the end of the 7-year period following the implementation of enhanced eligibility and underwriting valuation requirements under this section, the Secretary may modify or apply additional exceptions to the approach described in paragraph (2), where the Secretary finds that the unadjusted appraisal will reflect an accurate market value of the efficiency of the subject property or that a modified approach will better reflect an accurate market value.

(7) **APPLICABILITY AND IMPLEMENTATION DATE.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and before December 31, 2016, each covered agency shall implement the guidelines required under this subsection, which shall—

(A) apply to any covered loan for the sale, or refinancing of any loan for the sale, of any home; and

(B) be available on any residential real property, including individual units of condominiums and cooperatives, that qualifies for a covered loan.

(e) **MONITORING.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the enhanced eligibility and underwriting valuation requirements are implemented under this section, and every year thereafter, each covered agency with relevant activity shall issue and make available to the public a report that—

(1) enumerates the number of covered loans of the agency for which there was an energy efficiency report, and that used energy efficiency appraisal guidelines and enhanced loan eligibility requirements; and

(2) includes the default rates and rates of foreclosures for each category of loans.

(f) **RULEMAKING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the advisory group established in paragraph (2), which may contain such classifications, differentiations, or other provisions, and may provide for such proper implementation and appropriate treatment of different types of transactions, as the Secretary determines are necessary or proper to effectuate

the purposes of this section, to prevent circumvention or evasion thereof, or to facilitate compliance therewith.

(2) **ADVISORY GROUP.**—To assist in carrying out this section, the Secretary shall establish an advisory group, consisting of individuals representing the interests of—

- (A) mortgage lenders;
- (B) appraisers;
- (C) energy raters and residential energy consumption experts;
- (D) energy efficiency organizations;
- (E) real estate agents;
- (F) home builders and remodelers;
- (G) State energy officials; and
- (H) others as determined by the Secretary.

(g) **ADDITIONAL STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall reconvene the advisory group established in subsection (f)(2), in addition to water and locational efficiency experts, to advise the Secretary on the implementation of the enhanced energy efficiency underwriting criteria established in subsections (c) and (d).

(2) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—The advisory group established in subsection (f)(2) shall provide recommendations to the Secretary on any revisions or additions to the enhanced energy efficiency underwriting criteria deemed necessary by the group, which may include alternate methods to better account for home energy costs and additional factors to account for substantial and regular costs of homeownership such as location-based transportation costs and water costs. The Secretary shall forward any legislative recommendations from the advisory group to Congress for its consideration.

SA 1845. Mr. UDALL, of Colorado (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.

Section 392 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6371a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.**—

“(1) **DEFINITION OF SCHOOL.**—In this subsection, the term ‘school’ means—

“(A) an elementary school or secondary school (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801));

“(B) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a));

“(C) a school of the defense dependents’ education system under the Defense Dependents’ Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.) or established under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code;

“(D) a school operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

“(E) a tribally controlled school (as defined in section 5212 of the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2511)); and

“(F) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b))).

“(2) **DESIGNATION OF LEAD AGENCY.**—The Secretary, acting through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall

act as the lead Federal agency for coordinating and disseminating information on existing Federal programs and assistance that may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools.

“(3) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In carrying out coordination and outreach under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

“(A) in consultation and coordination with the appropriate Federal agencies, carry out a review of existing programs and financing mechanisms (including revolving loan funds and loan guarantees) available in or from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, the Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate Federal agencies with jurisdiction over energy financing and facilitation that are currently used or may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools;

“(B) establish a Federal cross-departmental collaborative coordination, education, and outreach effort to streamline communication and promote available Federal opportunities and assistance described in subparagraph (A), for energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects that enables States, local educational agencies, and schools—

“(i) to use existing Federal opportunities more effectively; and

“(ii) to form partnerships with Governors, State energy programs, local educational, financial, and energy officials, State and local government officials, nonprofit organizations, and other appropriate entities, to support the initiation of the projects;

“(C) provide technical assistance for States, local educational agencies, and schools to help develop and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects—

“(i) to increase the energy efficiency of buildings or facilities;

“(ii) to install systems that individually generate energy from renewable energy resources;

“(iii) to establish partnerships to leverage economies of scale and additional financing mechanisms available to larger clean energy initiatives; or

“(iv) to promote—

“(I) the maintenance of health, environmental quality, and safety in schools, including the ambient air quality, through energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofit projects; and

“(II) the achievement of expected energy savings and renewable energy production through proper operations and maintenance practices;

“(D) develop and maintain a single online resource Web site with contact information for relevant technical assistance and support staff in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for States, local educational agencies, and schools to effectively access and use Federal opportunities and assistance described in subparagraph (A) to develop energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

“(E) establish a process for recognition of schools that—

“(i) have successfully implemented energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

“(ii) are willing to serve as resources for other local educational agencies and schools to assist initiation of similar efforts.

“(4) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the implementation of this subsection.”

SA 1846. Mr. UDALL, of Colorado (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 301 and insert the following:

SEC. 301. ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND ENERGY-SAVING INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.

Section 543 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (f) (relating to large capital energy investments) as subsection (g); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **FEDERAL IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY FOR ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND ENERGY-SAVING INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, each Federal agency shall collaborate with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Director’) to develop an implementation strategy (including best-practices and measurement and verification techniques) for the maintenance, purchase, and use by the Federal agency of energy-efficient and energy-saving information and communications technologies and practices.

“(2) **CONTENT.**—Each implementation strategy shall be flexible, cost-effective, and based on the specific operating requirements and statutory mission of the agency.

“(3) **ADMINISTRATION.**—In developing an implementation strategy, each Federal agency shall—

“(A) consider information and communications technologies (referred to in this subsection as ‘ICT’) and related infrastructure and practices, such as—

“(i) advanced metering infrastructure;

“(ii) ICT services and products;

“(iii) efficient data center strategies and methods of increasing ICT asset and related infrastructure utilization;

“(iv) ICT and related infrastructure power management;

“(v) building information modeling, including building energy management; and

“(vi) secure telework and travel substitution tools; and

“(B) ensure that the agency realizes the savings and rewards brought about through increased efficiency and utilization.

“(4) **PERFORMANCE GOALS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Director, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish performance goals for evaluating the efforts of Federal agencies in improving the maintenance, purchase, and use of energy-efficient and energy-saving information and communications technology systems and practices.

“(B) **BEST PRACTICES.**—The Director shall supplement the performance goals established under this paragraph with recommendations on best practices for the attainment of the performance goals, to include a requirement for agencies to evaluate

the use of energy savings performance contracting and utility energy services contracting as preferred acquisition methods.

“(C) ADMINISTRATION.—The performance goals established under this paragraph shall—

“(i) measure information technology costs over a specific time period of 3 to 5 years;

“(ii) measure cost savings attained via the use of energy-efficient and energy-saving information and communications solutions during the same time period; and

“(iii) provide, to the maximum extent practicable, a complete picture of all costs and savings, including energy costs and savings.

“(5) REPORTS.—

“(A) AGENCY REPORTS.—Each Federal agency subject to the requirements of this subsection shall include in the report of the agency under section 527 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17143) a description of the efforts and results of the agency under this subsection.

“(B) OMB GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY REPORTS AND SCORECARDS.—Effective beginning not later than October 1, 2013, the Director shall include in the annual report and scorecard of the Director required under section 528 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17144) a description of the efforts and results of Federal agencies under this subsection.

“(C) USE OF EXISTING REPORTING STRUCTURES.—The Director may require Federal agencies to submit any information required to be submitted under this subsection through reporting structures in use as of the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013.”

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 304. ENERGY EFFICIENT DATA CENTERS.

Section 453 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17112) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, the Secretary and the Administrator shall—

“(A) designate an established information technology industry organization to coordinate the program described in subsection (b); and

“(B) make the designation public, including on an appropriate website.”;

(2) by striking subsections (e) and (f) and inserting the following:

“(e) STUDY.—The Secretary, with assistance from the Administrator, shall—

“(1) not later than December 31, 2013, make available to the public an update to the Report to Congress on Server and Data Center Energy Efficiency published on August 2, 2007, under section 1 of Public Law 109-431 (120 Stat. 2920), that provides—

“(A) a comparison and gap analysis of the estimates and projections contained in the original report with new data regarding the period from 2007 through 2012;

“(B) an analysis considering the impact of information and communications technologies asset and related infrastructure utilization solutions, to include virtualization and cloud computing-based solutions, in the public and private sectors; and

“(C) updated projections and recommendations for best practices; and

“(2) collaborate with the organization designated under subsection (c) in preparing the report.

“(f) DATA CENTER ENERGY PRACTITIONER PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c) and in consultation with the Administrator for the Office of E-Government and Information Technology within the Office of Management and Budget, shall maintain a data center energy practitioner program that leads to the certification of energy practitioners qualified to evaluate the energy usage and efficiency opportunities in data centers.

“(2) EVALUATIONS.—Each Federal agency shall have the data centers of the agency evaluated every 4 years by energy practitioners certified pursuant to the program, whenever practicable using certified practitioners employed by the agency.”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (j); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) OPEN DATA INITIATIVE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c) and in consultation with the Administrator for the Office of E-Government and Information Technology within the Office of Management and Budget, shall establish an open data initiative for Federal data center energy usage data, with the purpose of making the data available and accessible in a manner that empowers further data center innovation while protecting United States national security interests.

“(2) ADMINISTRATION.—In establishing the initiative, the Secretary shall consider use of the online Data Center Maturity Model.

“(h) INTERNATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS AND METRICS.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c), shall actively participate in efforts to harmonize global specifications and metrics for data center energy efficiency.

“(i) ICT ASSET UTILIZATION METRIC.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c), shall assist in the development of an efficiency metric that measures the energy efficiency of the overall data center, including information and communications technology systems and related infrastructure.”.

SA 1847. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

Subtitle C—Energy Efficiency Measures in Commercial Buildings

SEC. 121. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 424. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term ‘high-performance energy efficiency measure’ means a technology, product, or practice that will result in substantial operational cost savings by reducing energy consumption and utility costs.

“(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term ‘separate spaces’ means areas within a commercial building that are leased or otherwise occu-

pied by a tenant or other occupant for a period of time pursuant to the terms of a written agreement.

“(b) STUDY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall complete a study on the feasibility of—

“(A) significantly improving energy efficiency in commercial buildings through the design and construction, by owners and tenants, of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

“(B) encouraging owners and tenants to implement high-performance energy efficiency measures in separate spaces.

“(2) SCOPE.—The study shall, at a minimum, include—

“(A) descriptions of—

“(i) high-performance energy efficiency measures that should be considered as part of the initial design and construction of separate spaces;

“(ii) processes that owners, tenants, architects, and engineers may replicate when designing and constructing separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures;

“(iii) standards and best practices to achieve appropriate energy intensities for lighting, plug loads, pipe loads, heating, cooling, cooking, laundry, and other systems to satisfy the needs of the commercial building tenant;

“(iv) return on investment and payback analyses of the incremental cost and projected energy savings of the proposed set of high-performance energy efficiency measures, including consideration of tax and other available incentives;

“(v) models and simulation methods that predict the quantity of energy used by separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures and that compare that predicted quantity to the quantity of energy used by separate spaces without high-performance energy efficiency measures but that otherwise comply with applicable building code requirements;

“(vi) measurement and verification platforms demonstrating actual energy use of high-performance energy efficiency measures installed in separate spaces, and whether the measures generate the savings intended in the initial design and construction of the separate spaces;

“(vii) best practices that encourage an integrated approach to designing and constructing separate spaces to perform at optimum energy efficiency in conjunction with the central systems of a commercial building; and

“(viii) any impact on employment resulting from the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

“(B) case studies reporting economic and energy saving returns in the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

“(3) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register requesting public comments regarding effective methods, measures, and practices for the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

“(4) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the study on the website of the Department of Energy.”.

SEC. 122. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) (as amended by section 121) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 425. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term ‘high-performance energy efficiency measure’ has the meaning given the term in section 424.

“(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term ‘separate spaces’ has the meaning given the term in section 424.

“(b) TENANT STAR.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary shall develop a voluntary program within the Energy Star program established by section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a), which may be known as Tenant Star, to promote energy efficiency in separate spaces leased by tenants or otherwise occupied within commercial buildings.

“(c) AGREEMENTS.—Responsibilities under the program developed under subsection (b) shall be divided between the Secretary and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency in accordance with the terms of applicable agreements between the Secretary and the Administrator.

“(d) EXPANDING SURVEY DATA.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall—

“(1) collect, through each Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey of the Energy Information Administration that is conducted after the date of enactment of this section, data on—

“(A) categories of building occupancy that are known to consume significant quantities of energy, such as occupancy by law firms, data centers, trading floors, restaurants, retail outlets, and financial services firms; and

“(B) other aspects of the property, building operation, or building occupancy determined by the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to be relevant in lowering energy consumption; and

“(2) make data collected under paragraph (1) available to the public in aggregated form and provide the data, and any associated results, to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for use in accordance with subsection (e).

“(e) RECOGNITION OF OWNERS AND TENANTS.—

“(1) OCCUPANCY-BASED RECOGNITION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the data described in subsection (d) is received, the Secretary and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, following an opportunity for public notice and comment—

“(A) in a manner similar to the Energy Star rating system for commercial buildings, develop voluntary policies and procedures to recognize tenants that voluntarily achieve high levels of energy efficiency in separate spaces;

“(B) establish building occupancy categories eligible for Tenant Star recognition based on the data collected under subsection (d)(1) and any associated results; and

“(C) consider other forms of recognition for commercial building tenants or other occupants that lower energy consumption in separate spaces.

“(2) DESIGN- AND CONSTRUCTION-BASED RECOGNITION.—After the study required under section 424(b) is completed and following an

opportunity for public notice and comment, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection and the Secretary may develop a voluntary program to recognize commercial building owners and tenants that use high-performance energy efficiency measures in the design and construction of separate spaces.”.

SA 1848. Mr. REID (for Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1344, to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Helping Heroes Fly Act”.

SEC. 2. OPERATIONS CENTER PROGRAM FOR SEVERELY INJURED OR DISABLED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND SEVERELY INJURED OR DISABLED VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 44927. Expedited screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans

“(a) PASSENGER SCREENING.—The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and organizations identified by the Secretaries of Defense and Veteran Affairs that advocate on behalf of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, shall develop and implement a process to support and facilitate the ease of travel and to the extent possible provide expedited passenger screening services for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans through passenger screening. The process shall be designed to offer the individual private screening to the maximum extent practicable.

“(b) OPERATIONS CENTER.—As part of the process under subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary shall maintain an operations center to provide support and facilitate the movement of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans through passenger screening prior to boarding a passenger aircraft operated by an air carrier or foreign air carrier in air transportation or intrastate air transportation.

“(c) PROTOCOLS.—The Assistant Secretary shall—

“(1) establish and publish protocols, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the organizations identified under subsection (a), under which a severely injured or disabled member of the Armed Forces or severely injured or disabled veteran, or the family member or other representative of such member or veteran, may contact the operations center maintained under subsection (b) and request the expedited passenger screening services described in subsection (a) for that member or veteran; and

“(2) upon receipt of a request under paragraph (1), require the operations center to notify the appropriate Federal Security Director of the request for expedited passenger screening services, as described in subsection (a), for that member or veteran.

“(d) TRAINING.—The Assistant Secretary shall integrate training on the protocols established under subsection (c) into the training provided to all employees who will regularly provide the passenger screening services described in subsection (a).

“(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the Assistant Secretary to require additional screening of a severely injured or disabled member of the Armed Forces, a severely injured or disabled veteran, or their accompanying family members or nonmedical attendants, if intelligence, law enforcement, or other information indicates that additional screening is necessary.

“(f) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section. Each report shall include each of the following:

“(1) Information on the training provided under subsection (d).

“(2) Information on the consultations between the Assistant Secretary and the organizations identified under subsection (a).

“(3) The number of people who accessed the operations center during the period covered by the report.

“(4) Such other information as the Assistant Secretary determines is appropriate.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 44926 the following new item:

“44927. Expedited screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2013, at 10:15 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2013, at 9:30 a.m. in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL AND
CONTRACTING OVERSIGHT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight be authorized to meet during the session

of the Senate on August 1, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Mismanagement of POW/MIA Accounting."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT, FEDERAL
RIGHTS, AND AGENCY ACTION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Sub-

committee on Oversight, Federal Rights, and Agency Action, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2013, at 2 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Justice Delayed: The Human Cost of Regulatory Paralysis."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION AND FORESTRY FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jonathan Cordone:									
United States	Dollar				8,641.70				8,641.70
Australia	Dollar		800.00						800.00
New Zealand	Dollar		1,281.64						1,281.64
Vietnam	Dong		1,028.01						1,028.01
* Delegation Expenses:									
Australia	Dollar						576.63		576.63
New Zealand	Dollar						160.65		160.65
Vietnam	Dong						67.32		67.32
Senator William Cowan:									
Israel	New Shekel		476.00						476.00
Turkey	Lira		426.00						426.00
Jordan	Dinar		382.52						382.52
Valerie Young:									
Israel	New Shekel		476.00						476.00
Turkey	Lira		426.00						426.00
Jordan	Dinar		382.52						382.52
* Delegation Expenses:									
Israel	New Shekel						638.20		638.20
Turkey	Lira						1,615.61		1,615.61
Jordan	Dinar						586.70		586.70
Total			5,678.69		8,641.70		3,645.11		17,965.50

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR DEBBIE STABENOW,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, July 29, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Hoeven:									
Jordan	Dinar		382.52						382.52
Israel	Shekel		476.00						476.00
Turkey	Lira		426.00						426.00
Don Larson:									
Jordan	Dinar		382.52						382.52
Israel	Shekel		476.00						476.00
Turkey	Lira		426.00						426.00
Timothy Rieser:									
Cuba	Peso				449.00		20.00		469.00
United States	Dollar				599.80		25.00		624.80
Senator Thad Cochran:									
Israel	Shekel		1,092.00						1,092.00
Oman	Rial		837.67						837.67
Azerbaijan	Manat		782.76						782.76
Romania	Leu		286.44						286.44
Czech Republic	Koruna		457.19						457.19
Kay Webber:									
Israel	Shekel		1,092.00						1,092.00
Oman	Rial		837.67						837.67
Azerbaijan	Manat		782.76						782.76
Romania	Leu		286.44						286.44
Czech Republic	Koruna		457.19						457.19
Paul Grove:									
Iraq	Dinar		35.00						35.00
Turkey	Lira		759.30						759.30
United States	Dollar				3,622.00				3,622.00
Adam Yezerski:									
Iraq	Dinar		35.00						35.00
Turkey	Lira		759.30						759.30
United States	Dollar				3,976.00				3,976.00
Paul Grove:									
Afghanistan	Afghani		84.00		300.00				384.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Pakistan	Rupee		200.00						200.00
United States	Dollar				6,860.40				6,860.40
Adam Yezerksi:									
Afghanistan	Afghani		84.00		300.00				384.00
Pakistan	Rupee		200.00						200.00
United States	Dollar				6,860.40				6,860.40
Senator Richard Shelby:									
England	Pound Sterling		2,687.10						2,687.10
France	Euro		1,907.74						1,907.74
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Senator Thad Cochran:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,230.00						1,230.00
France	Euro		1,120.00						1,120.00
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Stewart Holmes:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,343.56						1,343.56
France	Euro		899.57						899.57
United States	Dollar				13,323.80				13,323.80
William Duhnke:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,395.15						1,395.15
France	Euro		1,747.55						1,747.55
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Anne Caldwell:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,395.15						1,395.15
France	Euro		1,747.55						1,747.55
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Kay Webber:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,230.00						1,230.00
France	Euro		1,120.00						1,120.00
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Senator Richard Shelby:									
France	Euro		4,681.34						4,681.34
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Senator Thad Cochran:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				11,474.10				11,474.10
Senator Barbara Mikulski:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Senator Tom Harkin:									
France	Euro		948.00						948.00
United States	Dollar				11,794.54				11,794.54
Gabrielle Batkin:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Stewart Holmes:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Brian Potts:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				11,474.10				11,474.10
Jacqui Russell:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Jeremy Weirich:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Anne Caldwell:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,722.70				10,722.70
Kay Webber:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
* Delegation Expenses:									
France	Euro				21,757.30		22,093.40		43,850.70
Iraq	Dinar				2,050.00				2,050.00
Israel	Shekel				241.70		396.50		638.20
Jordan	Dinar				86.10		70.20		156.30
Turkey	Lira				865.20		1,072.90		1,938.10
Total			76,022.47		247,273.84		23,678.00		346,974.31

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR BARBARA MIKULSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, July 30, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael J. Kuiken:									
United States	Dollar				9,507.72				9,507.72
Germany	Euro		245.00						245.00
Mali	Franc		478.14						478.14
Djibouti	Franc		614.08		8.48		281.21		903.77
Thomas W. Goffus:									
United States	Dollar				9,417.72				9,417.72
Germany	Euro		270.00						270.00
Mali	Franc		498.17						498.17
Djibouti	Franc		614.08						614.08
Senator Kirsten Gillibrand:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				9.60		120.87

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jordan	Dinar		154.35				7.36		161.71
Israel	Shekel		133.05						133.05
Turkey	Lira		140.37						140.37
Elana Broitman:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				7.36		118.63
Jordan	Dinar		141.09						141.09
Israel	Shekel		133.05						133.05
Turkey	Lira		152.64				10.59		163.23
Jess Fassler:									
United States	Dollar		118.18				7.36		125.54
Jordan	Dinar		133.18						133.18
Israel	Shekel		133.05						133.05
Turkey	Lira		155.87						155.87
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				7.36		118.63
Jordan	Dinar		133.18						133.18
Israel	Shekel		156.77						156.77
Turkey	Lira		130.00						130.00
Matthew Rinkunas:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				22.36		133.63
Jordan	Dinar		133.18						133.18
Israel	Shekel		156.77						156.77
Turkey	Lira		130.00						130.00
Andrew King:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				22.36		133.63
Jordan	Dinar		133.18						133.18
Israel	Shekel		156.77						156.77
Turkey	Lira		130.00						130.00
* Delegation Expenses:									
Jordan	Dinar				258.24		210.67		468.91
Turkey	Lira				900.15		1,384.66		2,284.81
Israel	Shekel				725.09		1,189.51		1,914.60
William G. P. Monahan:									
United States	Dollar				5,497.80				5,497.80
Turkey	Lira		196.31						196.31
Jordan	Dinar		255.69						255.69
Iraq	Dinar		111.00				15.00		126.00
Thomas W. Goffus:									
United States	Dollar				3,155.48				3,155.48
Turkey	Lira		707.86						707.86
Jordan	Dinar		285.96						285.96
Iraq	Dinar		111.00						111.00
Senator Joe Donnelly:									
Turkey	Lira		313.00						313.00
Pakistan	Rupee		180.00						180.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		78.00						78.00
Germany	Euro		194.00						194.00
Marta McLellan Ross:									
Turkey	Lira		313.00						313.00
Pakistan	Rupee		180.00						180.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		78.00						78.00
Germany	Euro		180.00						180.00
* Delegation Expenses:									
Turkey	Lira				181.16		761.13		942.29
Pakistan	Rupee				78.32		167.11		245.43
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				10,573.20				10,573.20
Germany	Euro		206.00						206.00
Senator Roger Wicker:									
France	Euro		729.91		20.99				750.90
Joseph G. Lai:									
France	Euro		613.10						613.10
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
France	Euro		298.68						298.68
* Delegation Expenses:									
France	Euro				4,242.90		4,588.20		8,831.10
Senator John McCain:									
Jordan	Dinar		25.80						25.80
Turkey	Lira		395.94						395.94
Yemen	Rial		130.00						130.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		273.26						273.26
United States	Dollar				20,733.20				20,733.20
Christian D. Brose:									
Jordan	Dinar		897.90						897.90
Turkey	Lira		458.74						458.74
Yemen	Rial		290.00						290.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		465.26						465.26
United States	Dollar				18,112.70				18,112.70
Margaret Goodlander:									
Jordan	Dinar		868.83						868.83
Turkey	Lira		458.74						458.74
Yemen	Rial		290.00						290.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		431.48						431.48
United States	Dollar				18,112.70				18,112.70
* Delegation Expenses:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham				209.92		734.00		943.92
Turkey	Lira				350.00		4,876.71		5,226.71
Jordan	Dinar				571.12		4,834.89		5,406.01
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				11,399.20				11,399.20
Mali	Franc		215.64						215.64
Tunisia	Dinar		445.36						445.36
Christian D. Brose:									
United States	Dollar				12,259.20				12,259.20
Mali	Franc		162.00						162.00
Tunisia	Dinar		149.00						149.00
Libya	Dinar		149.00						149.00
Margaret Goodlander:									
United States	Dollar				11,173.80				11,173.80
Mali	Franc		385.00						385.00
Tunisia	Dinar		220.00						220.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
* Delegation Expenses:									
Tunisia	Dinar				311.60		1,101.67		1,413.27
Mali	Franc				583.79				583.79
Total			17,673.96		138,384.48		20,239.11		176,297.55

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, July 25, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Isaiah Akin:									
Angola	Kwanza		604.00						604.00
Gabon	Dollar		904.79						904.79
Republic of Congo	Dollar		1,070.00						1,070.00
United States	Dollar				16,752.12				16,752.12
John Dickas:									
Angola	Kwanza		476.00						476.00
Gabon	Dollar		787.79						787.79
Republic of Congo	Dollar		971.00						971.00
United States	Dollar				16,752.12				16,752.12
Clayton Allen:									
Angola	Kwanza		614.00						614.00
Gabon	Dollar		805.75						805.75
Republic of Congo	Dollar		1,080.00						1,080.00
United States	Dollar				16,752.12				16,752.12
* Delegation Expenses:									
Gabon	Dollar						352.82		352.82
Republic of Congo	Dollar						540.00		540.00
Total			7,313.33		50,256.36		892.82		58,462.51

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR RON WYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, July 18, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Bruce Hirsh:									
Australia	Dollar		744.43						744.43
New Zealand	Dollar		553.05						553.05
Vietnam	Dong		1,017.18						1,017.18
United States	Dollar				23,532.20				23,532.20
Hun Quach:									
Australia	Dollar		663.17						663.17
New Zealand	Dollar		636.34						636.34
Vietnam	Dong		904.54						904.54
United States	Dollar				40,427.30				40,427.30
Chelsea Thomas:									
Australia	Dollar		732.05						732.05
New Zealand	Dollar		624.53						624.53
Vietnam	Dong		1,043.00						1,043.00
United States	Dollar				21,666.30				21,666.30
Paul Poteet:									
Australia	Dollar		753.70						753.70
New Zealand	Dollar		504.77						504.77
Vietnam	Dong		876.75						876.75
United States	Dollar				38,792.30				38,792.30
Erin Gulick:									
Australia	Dollar		766.85						766.85
New Zealand	Dollar		568.59						568.59
Vietnam	Dong		993.43						993.43
United States	Dollar				21,857.30				21,857.30
Mark Libell:									
Australia	Dollar		651.78						651.78
New Zealand	Dollar		523.83						523.83
Vietnam	Dong		981.50						981.50
United States	Dollar				23,507.20				23,507.20
Chris Slevin:									
Australia	Dollar		701.31						701.31
New Zealand	Dollar		558.20						558.20
Vietnam	Dong		852.25						852.25
United States	Dollar				33,475.40				33,475.40
Ann Hawks:									
Australia	Dollar		746.19						746.19
New Zealand	Dollar		587.30						587.30
United States	Dollar				5,630.00				5,630.00
Chris Sullivan:									
Australia	Dollar		795.84						795.84

August 1, 2013

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 159, Pt. 9

13043

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
New Zealand	Dollar		479.88						479.88
Vietnam	Dong		951.30						951.30
United States	Dollar				32,562.40				32,562.40
Amber Sechrist:									
Australia	Dollar		744.08						744.08
New Zealand	Dollar		594.54						594.54
Vietnam	Dong		925.29						925.29
United States	Dollar				27,588.20				27,588.20
Eric Toy:									
Australia	Dollar		696.04						696.04
New Zealand	Dollar		524.50						524.50
Vietnam	Dong		984.82						984.82
United States	Dollar				31,324.50				31,324.50
William Ghent:									
Australia	Dollar		682.24						682.24
New Zealand	Dollar		568.81						568.81
Vietnam	Dong		881.58						881.58
United States	Dollar				23,532.20				23,532.20
Katherine Monge:									
Australia	Dollar		757.02						757.02
New Zealand	Dollar		593.20						593.20
Vietnam	Dong		975.80						975.80
United States	Dollar				23,597.30				23,597.30
Gregory Kalbaugh:									
Australia	Dollar		737.14						737.14
New Zealand	Dollar		538.64						538.64
Vietnam	Dong		863.27						863.27
United States	Dollar				34,785.30				34,785.30
Jennifer McClosky:									
Australia	Dollar		759.12						759.12
New Zealand	Dollar		610.17						610.17
Vietnam	Dong		933.85						933.85
United States	Dollar				27,581.50				27,581.50
* Delegation Expenses:									
United States	Dollar				9,506.22		3,299.88		12,806.10
Total			32,581.87		419,365.62		3,299.88		455,247.37

* Delegation expenses include, transportation, security, embassy overtime, official functions, as well as other official expenses in accordance with the responsibilities of the host country.

SENATOR MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, June 17, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Barrasso:									
Israel	Shekel		1,108.29						1,108.29
Oman	Rial		627.36						627.36
Azerbaijan	New Manat		544.63						544.63
Romania	New Leu		151.22						151.22
Republic of Czechoslovakia	Koruna		352.76						352.76
* Delegation Expenses:									
Israel	Shekel					500.63			500.63
Oman	Rial					431.84			431.84
Azerbaijan	New Manat					390.89			390.89
Romania	New Leu					443.84			443.84
Republic of Czechoslovakia	Czech Koruna					294.16			294.16
Senator Benjamin Cardin:									
China	Yuan		1,013.83						1,013.83
Korea	Won		498.52						498.52
Japan	Yen		918.66						918.66
United States	Dollar				17,719.70				17,719.70
Algene Sajery:									
China	Yuan		1,318.20						1,318.20
Korea	Won		651.36						651.36
Japan	Yen		760.86						760.86
United States	Dollar				17,719.70				17,719.70
* Delegation Expenses:									
China	Yuan					3,561.93			3,561.93
Korea	Won					667.71			667.71
Japan	Yen					4,479.69			4,479.69
Senator Robert Casey:									
Turkey	Lira		521.51						521.51
Egypt	Pound		185.88						185.88
Israel	Shekel		824.00						824.00
United States	Dollar				11,591.97				11,591.97
Damian Murphy:									
Turkey	Lira		475.26						475.26
Egypt	Pound		174.00						174.00
Israel	Shekel		824.00						824.00
United States	Dollar				12,763.97				12,763.97
* Delegation Expenses:									
Turkey	Lira					3,132.09			3,132.09
Egypt	Pound					339.00			339.00
Israel	Shekel					6,873.17			6,873.17
Senator Robert Menendez:									
El Salvador	Dollar		341.00						341.00
Honduras	Lempira		273.90						273.90
Guatemala	Quetzal		397.08						397.08
United States	Dollar				2,641.13				2,641.13
Daniel O'Brien:									
El Salvador	Dollar		531.00						531.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Honduras	Lempira		240.90						240.90
Guatemala	Quetzal		547.57						547.57
United States	Dollar				1,285.13				1,285.13
Jodi Herman:									
El Salvador	Dollar		396.80						396.80
Honduras	Lempira		223.90						223.90
Guatemala	Quetzal		175.93						175.93
United States	Dollar				1,590.13				1,590.13
Emily Mendrala:									
El Salvador	Dollar		411.00						411.00
Honduras	Lempira		273.90						273.90
Guatemala	Quetzal		471.54						471.54
United States	Dollar				1,285.13				1,285.13
* Delegation Expenses:									
El Salvador	Dollar					1,845.61			1,845.61
Honduras	Lempira					1,046.06			1,046.06
Guatemala	Quetzal					2,627.00			2,627.00
Senator Robert Menendez:									
Jordan	Dinar		896.73						896.73
Israel	Shekel		1,950.19						1,950.19
United States	Dollar				9,131.97				9,131.97
Daniel O'Brien:									
Jordan	Dinar		913.42						913.42
Israel	Shekel		2,252.00						2,252.00
United States	Dollar				9,329.97				9,329.97
Ilan Goldenberg:									
Jordan	Dinar		913.42						913.42
Israel	Shekel		2,049.00						2,049.00
United States	Dollar				9,329.97				9,329.97
Jodi Herman:									
Jordan	Dinar		882.73						882.73
Israel	Shekel		2,014.87						2,014.87
United States	Dollar				9,329.97				9,329.97
* Delegation Expenses:									
Jordan	Dinar					5,406.01			5,406.01
Israel	Shekel					9,701.97			9,701.97
Senator Christopher Murphy:									
Turkey	Lira		340.20						340.20
Afghanistan	Dollar		36.00						36.00
Pakistan	Rupee		36.00						36.00
Germany	Euro		89.25						89.25
Jessica Elledge:									
Turkey	Lira		531.20						531.20
Pakistan	Rupee		127.00						127.00
Afghanistan	Dollar		27.00						27.00
Germany	Euro		180.25						180.25
* Delegation Expenses:									
Turkey	Dollar					942.29			942.29
Pakistan	Rupee					184.51			184.51
Jamil Jaffer:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		861.00						861.00
Yemen	Rial		392.00						392.00
Qatar	Riyal		503.62						503.62
United States	Dollar				4,825.10				4,825.10
Tamara Klajn:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		748.00						748.00
Yemen	Rial		420.00						420.00
Qatar	Riyal		606.00						606.00
United States	Dollar				4,205.10				4,205.10
* Delegation Expenses:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal					374.59			374.59
Qatar	Riyal					147.24			147.24
Caleb McCarr:									
Guatemala	Dollar		841.00						841.00
United States	Dollar				754.50				754.50
Caroline Vik:									
Guatemala	Dollar		882.00						882.00
United States	Dollar				754.50				754.50
* Delegation Expenses:									
Guatemala	Dollar					3,248.00			3,248.00
Stacie Oliver:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		976.99						976.99
Republic of Czechoslovakia	Dinar		100.00						100.00
United States	Dollar				4,091.40				4,091.40
* Delegation Expenses:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham					467.31			467.31
Michael Schiffer:									
Taiwan	TWD		596.71						596.71
Philippines	PHP		422.48						422.48
Singapore	Dollar		1,912.13						1,912.13
Indonesia	IDR		773.12						773.12
United States	Dollar				4,922.10				4,922.10
Carolyn Leddy:									
Taiwan	TWD		393.69						393.69
Philippines	PHP		313.74						313.74
Singapore	Dollar		1,602.40						1,602.40
Indonesia	IDR		562.37						562.37
United States	Dollar				6,016.30				6,016.30
* Delegation Expenses:									
Taiwan	TWD					408.08			408.08
Indonesia	IDR					389.00			389.00
Total			41,381.37		129,287.74		47,902.62		218,571.73

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, July 25, 2013.

August 1, 2013

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 159, Pt. 9

13045

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
* Senator Heidi Heitkamp:									
Turkey	Lira		378.20						378.20
Pakistan	Rupee		81.17						81.17
Afghanistan	Afghani		6.00						6.00
Germany	Euro		127.61						127.61
Senator Tammy Baldwin:									
Turkey	Lira		517.20						517.20
Pakistan	Rupee		200.31						200.31
Afghanistan	Afghani		64.00						64.00
Germany	Euro		188.00						188.00
Rory Steele:									
Turkey	Lira		317.20						317.20
Pakistan	Rupee		140.31						140.31
Afghanistan	Afghani		6.00						6.00
Germany	Euro		117.18						117.18
Will Hansen:									
Turkey	Lira		517.20						517.20
Pakistan	Rupee		200.31						200.31
Afghanistan	Afghani		38.00						38.00
Germany	Euro		94.40						94.40
Total			2,993.09						2,993.09

* The CODEL traveled via military air.

SENATOR THOMAS R. CARPER,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs,
July 29, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM APRIL 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Amy Klobuchar:									
Jordan	Dinar		355.72						355.72
Israel	Shekel		487.76						487.76
Turkey	Lira		517.73						517.73
Brian Burton:									
Jordan	Dinar		342.46						342.46
Israel	Shekel		449.35						449.35
Turkey	Lira		517.73						517.73
* Delegation Expenses:									
Jordan	Dinar		156.30						156.30
Israel	Shekel		1,656.86						1,656.86
Turkey	Dinar		652.81						652.81
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse:									
United States	Dollar				12,233.20				12,233.20
Mali	Franc		211.64						211.64
Tunisia	Dinar		751.30						751.30
* Delegation Expenses:									
Mali	Franc		194.60						194.60
Tunisia	Dinar		471.09						471.09
Libya	Dinar		273.01						273.01
Total			7,038.36		12,233.20				19,271.56

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, July 25, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Dianne Feinstein			65.00						65.00
Senator Saxby Chambliss			750.50						750.50
David Grannis	Dollar		499.30		9,126.50				9,126.50
Martha Scott Poindexter	Dollar		1,649.82		11,212.27				11,212.27
Senator Saxby Chambliss	Dollar		3,456.06		10,713.27				10,713.27
Senator Richard Burr			3,456.06						3,456.06
Martha Scott Poindexter			3,456.06						3,456.06
Kate Vickers			3,456.06						3,456.06
Tyler Stephens			3,456.06						3,456.06
Christian Cook			3,456.06						3,456.06
Brian Miller			1,289.26						1,289.26
Total			24,990.24		31,052.04				56,042.28

SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, July 11, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Shelly Han:									
Australia	Dollar		2,180.00						2,180.00
United States	Dollar				1,907.10				1,907.10
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,467.35						1,467.35
United States	Dollar				2,474.30				2,474.30
Janice Helwig:									
Austria	Euro		4,580.53						4,580.53
Allison Hollabaugh:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		926.01						926.01
United States	Dollar				2,481.10				2,481.10
Alex Johnson:									
Albania	Lek		858.00						858.00
United States	Dollar				1,266.90				1,266.90
Albania	Lek		1,340.00						1,340.00
United States	Dollar				1,266.90				1,266.90
Austria	Euro		22,092.71						22,092.71
United States	Dollar				3,785.90				3,785.90
Winsome Packer:									
Austria	Euro		2,320.00						2,320.00
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mark		585.00						585.00
Serbia	Dinar		216.00						216.00
United States	Dollar				3,653.50				3,653.50
France	Euro		1,728.09						1,728.09
United States	Dollar				3,782.10				3,782.10
Erika Schlager:									
Austria	Euro		1,011.24						1,011.24
Bulgaria	Lev		1,012.00						1,012.00
United States	Dollar				3,094.90				3,094.90
Mischa Thompson:									
Belgium	Euro		649.63						649.63
France	Euro		324.82						324.82
United States	Dollar				1,873.80				1,873.80
Total			41,291.38		25,586.50				66,877.88

SENATOR BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
July 17, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas Hawkins:									
Israel	Shekel		356.00			720.00			1,076.00
Oman	Rial		261.93			459.64			721.57
Azerbaijan	Manat		278.00			499.87			777.87
Romania	Leu		140.00			148.31			288.31
Czech Republic	Crown		186.00			275.00			461.00
Dr. Brian Monahan:									
Israel	Shekel		69.00			720.00			789.00
Oman	Rial		91.02			459.64			550.66
Azerbaijan	Manat		278.00			499.87			777.87
Romania	Leu		140.00			148.31			288.31
Czech Republic	Crown		186.00			275.00			461.00
Total			1,985.95			4,205.64			6,191.59

SENATOR MITCH MCCONNELL,
Republican Leader, July 23, 2013.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREE-
MENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, September 9, 2013, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 184 and 185; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements

be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, an example of the work done by others, I will read this material—I will read it and people see me making this consent request. But people have spent weeks arriving at this. That is what I talked about a few minutes ago. It is remarkable, the work done for us by others.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 199, 200, 202, 210 through 218, 222, 225 through 240, 243 through 247, 249 through 302, 304, 305, 306, 308 through 326, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed

in the RECORD; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Janet Lorraine LaBreck, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration, Department of Education.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

Cynthia L. Attwood, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for a term expiring April 27, 2019.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Stuart F. Delery, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Richard T. Metsger, of Oregon, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring August 2, 2017.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Jason Furman, of New York, to be a Member and Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mary Jo White, of New York, to be Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2019.

Kara Marlene Stein, of Maryland, to be Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2017.

Michael Sean Piwowar, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2018.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Gerald Lyn Early, of Missouri, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

Daniel Iwao Okimoto, of California, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Daniel Brooks Baer, of Colorado, to be U.S. Representative to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador.

Douglas Edward Lute, of Indiana, to be United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Catherine M. Russell, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Women's Issues.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Katherine H. Tachau, of Iowa, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

Stephen J. Hadley, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term of four years.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

John Unsworth, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Council on the Hu-

manities for a term expiring January 26, 2016.

Dorothy Kosinski, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2016.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Davita Vance-Cooks, of Virginia, to be Public Printer.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

F. Scott Kieff, of Illinois, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the term expiring June 16, 2020.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

Joseph W. Nega, of Illinois, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

Michael B. Thornton, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Robert Bonnie, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.

Krysta L. Harden, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Agriculture.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

Timothy Hyungrock Haahs, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Institute of Building Sciences for a term expiring September 7, 2014.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Jannette Lake Dates, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2016.

Bruce M. Ramer, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2018.

Brent Franklin Nelsen, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2016.

Howard Abel Husock, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2018.

Loretta Cheryl Sutliff, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mark E. Schaefer, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Thomas C. Carper, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Pursuant to the authority of Section 271(d), Title 14, U.S. Code, the following officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be rear admiral

Bruce D. Baffer
Mark E. Butt
David R. Callahan
Stephen P. Metruck
Joseph A. Servidio

Pursuant to the authority of Section 12203(a), Title 10, U.S. Code, the following officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve:

To be rear admiral

Kurt B. Hinrichs

The following officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard pursuant to the authority of Section 271(d), Title 14, U.S. Code:

To be rear admiral

Richard T. Gromlich
Susan J. Rabern, of Kansas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.
Dennis V. McGinn, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

ARMY

The following named officer for reappointment as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 152 and 601:

To be general

Gen. Martin E. Dempsey

NAVY

The following named officer for reappointment as the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 154:

To be admiral

Adm. James A. Winnefeld, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be admiral

Adm. Cecil E.D. Haney

ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Curtis M. Scaparrotti

AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Stephen W. Wilson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10 U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Robin Rand

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Russell J. Handy

The following Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Roger L. Nye

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C. section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. David L. Mann

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Raymond A. Thomas, III

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Marion Garcia

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. John W. Lathrop

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Edward C. Cardon

The following named officer for appointment as the Deputy Judge Advocate General, United States Army, and for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated in accordance with title 10, U.S.C., sections 3037 and 3064:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Thomas E. Ayres

The following named officer for appointment as the Judge Advocate General, United States Army and for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while serving as the Judge Advocate General in accordance with title 10, U.S.C., sections 3037 and 3064:

To be lieutenant general

Brig. Gen. Flora D. Darpino

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Michael S. Tucker

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624, 3037, and 3064:

To be Brigadier General, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Col. Charles N. Pedre

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Carl A. Alex
Colonel Christopher F. Bentley
Colonel James R. Blackburn
Colonel William M. Burleson, III
Colonel Christopher G. Cavoli
Colonel Paul A. Chamberlain
Colonel William E. Cole
Colonel Richard B. Dix
Colonel Jeffrey A. Farnsworth
Colonel Bryan P. Fenton
Colonel Patricia A. Frost
Colonel Douglas M. Gabram

Colonel Jeffrey A. Gabbert
Colonel John A. George
Colonel Randy A. George
Colonel Maria R. Gervais
Colonel David P. Glaser
Colonel Thomas C. Graves
Colonel John F. Haley
Colonel Peter L. Jones
Colonel Richard G. Kaiser
Colonel John S. Kem
Colonel Robert L. Marion
Colonel Dennis S. McKean
Colonel Frank M. Muth
Colonel Leopoldo A. Quintas, Jr.
Colonel Kurt J. Ryan
Colonel Mark C. Schwartz
Colonel Scott A. Spellmon
Colonel John P. Sullivan
Colonel Clarence D. Turner
Colonel Michael J. Warmack
Colonel Eric J. Wesley

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Kenneth E. Tovo

The following named officer appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Robert B. Abrams

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Kevin L. McNeely

MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Thomas D. Waldhauser

NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Deborah P. Haven

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601; and for appointment as a Senior Member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations under title 10, U.S.C., Section 711:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Frank C. Pandolfe

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Harry B. Harris, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Naval Personnel, United States Navy, and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of im-

portance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5141:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. William F. Moran

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. James F. Caldwell, Jr.

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) David F. Baucom

Rear Adm. (lh) Vincent L. Griffith

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Colin G. Chinn

Rear Adm. (lh) Elaine C. Wagner

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Paul B. Becker

Rear Adm. (lh) Matthew J. Kohler

Rear Adm. (lh) Jan E. Tighe

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) David H. Lewis

Rear Adm. (lh) Thomas J. Moore

Rear Adm. (lh) James D. Syring

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) John C. Aquilino

Rear Adm. (lh) Peter J. Fanta

Rear Adm. (lh) David J. Gale

Rear Adm. (lh) Philip G. Howe

Rear Adm. (lh) William K. Lescher

Rear Adm. (lh) Mark C. Montgomery

Rear Adm. (lh) Frank A. Morneau

Rear Adm. (lh) Jeffrey R. Penfield

Rear Adm. (lh) Frederick J. Roegge

Rear Adm. (lh) Phillip G. Sawyer

Rear Adm. (lh) Michael S. White

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Russell E. Allen

Capt. William M. Crane

Capt. Thomas W. Marotta

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Kurt W. Tidd

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Kenneth J. Iverson

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Morrell John Berry, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

Patricia Marie Haslach, of Oregon, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.

Reuben Earl Brigety, II, of Florida, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Daniel A. Clune, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

Patrick Hubert Gaspard, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

Stephanie Sanders Sullivan, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo.

Joseph Y. Yun, of Oregon, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malaysia.

Linda Thomas-Greenfield, of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (African Affairs), vice Johnnie Carson.

James F. Entwistle, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

David D. Pearce, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece.

John B. Emerson, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

John Rufus Gifford, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark.

Denise Campbell Bauer, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

James Costos, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

James Costos, of California, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Andorra.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Avi Garbow, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

James J. Jones, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances of the Environmental Protection Agency.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

Robert F. Cohen, Jr., of West Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2018.

William Ira Althen, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Catherine Elizabeth Lhamon, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Education.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

John H. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Census for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 2016.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Harry R. Hoglander, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2014.

Linda A. Puchala, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2015.

Nicholas Christopher Geale, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Matthew Winthrop Barzun, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

David Hale, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

Liliana Ayalde, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federative Republic of Brazil.

Kirk W.B. Wagar, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Singapore.

Terence Patrick McCulley, of Washington, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cote d'Ivoire.

James C. Swan, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

John R. Phillips, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Italian Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of San Marino.

Kenneth Francis Hackett, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

Alexa Lange Wesner, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Austria.

Daniel A. Sepulveda, of Florida, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Communications and Information Policy in the Bureau of Economic, Energy, and Business Affairs and U.S. Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2013.

Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2016.

Matthew C. Armstrong, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN278 AIR FORCE nominations (192) beginning WENDY J. BEAL, and ending JARED K. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 9, 2013.

PN617 AIR FORCE nomination of Peter C. Rhee, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 26, 2013.

PN698 AIR FORCE nomination of Joseph M. Markusfeld, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN699 AIR FORCE nominations (15) beginning DEONDRA P. ASIKE, and ending GREGORY C. TROLLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

IN THE ARMY

PN580 ARMY nomination of Ronald E. Beresky, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20, 2013.

PN581 ARMY nomination of James B. Collins, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20, 2013.

PN584 ARMY nominations (2) beginning JONATHAN H. CODY, and ending JUSTIN M. MARCHESI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20, 2013.

PN609 ARMY nominations (4) beginning JOSEPH L. BIEHLER, and ending BIENVENIDO SERRANOCASTRO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 24, 2013.

PN652 ARMY nomination of Dean C. Anderson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN653 ARMY nomination of Christopher D. Perrin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN654 ARMY nominations (61) beginning SHEENA L. ALLEN, and ending MIAO X. ZHOU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN655 ARMY nominations (305) beginning COURTNEY L. ABRAHAM, and ending D011476, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN656 ARMY nominations (309) beginning CHRISTOPHER L. AARON, and ending NATHAN P. ZWINTSCHER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN657 ARMY nominations (333) beginning RICHARD R. ABELKIS, and ending G001407, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN658 ARMY nominations (536) beginning JOSEPH H. ALBRECHT, and ending D011309, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN700 ARMY nomination of Karl F. Meyer, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN701 ARMY nomination of Stephanie M. Price, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN702 ARMY nomination of Gregory C. Pedro, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN703 ARMY nomination of John H. Seok, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN704 ARMY nomination of Frederick C. Lough, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN705 ARMY nominations (2) beginning ADMIRAL A. LUZURIAGA, and ending JON KIEV, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN706 ARMY nominations (5) beginning WILLIAM G. HUBER, and ending MARK L. LEITSCHUH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN707 ARMY nomination of Curtis J. Alitz, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN709 ARMY nominations (5) beginning GUY R. BEAUDOIN, and ending REBECCA A. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

IN THE NAVY

PN610 NAVY nomination of Jackie S. Fantes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 24, 2013.

PN625 NAVY nomination of Doran T. Kelvington, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 2013.

PN626 NAVY nominations (30) beginning ORENTAL G. ADDERSON, and ending JOHN F. WARNER, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 2013.

PN659 NAVY nominations (17) beginning PHILIP B. BAGROW, and ending DAVID M. TODD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN660 NAVY nominations (20) beginning TANYA CRUZ, and ending JEANINE B. WOMBLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN661 NAVY nominations (21) beginning RENE J. ALOVA, and ending JOYCE Y. TURNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN662 NAVY nominations (28) beginning JAMES ALGER, and ending JASON N. WOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN663 NAVY nominations (33) beginning CHRISTOPHER W. ABBOTT, and ending LORENZO TARPLEY, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN664 NAVY nominations (46) beginning MARY R. ANKER, and ending GEORGINA L. ZUNIGA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN665 NAVY nominations (47) beginning LILLIAN A. ABUAN, and ending CHRISTOPHER R. ZEGLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN666 NAVY nominations (144) beginning ERIN G. ADAMS, and ending LUKE A. ZABROCKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN710 NAVY nomination of Timothy C. Moore, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN711 NAVY nomination of Pierre A. Pelletier, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate consider the following nominations under the Privileged section of the Executive Calendar: Nominations PN 631, PN 632, and PN 667; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

PRIVILEGED NOMINATIONS

Ellen C. Herbst, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice Scott Boyer Quehl, resigned.

Ellen C. Herbst, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Commerce, vice Scott Boyer Quehl, resigned.

Margaret Louise Cumisky, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice April S. Boyd, resigned.

NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA POWER TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 221; that the Senate proceed to vote with no intervening action or debate; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Nomination of Samantha Power to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Samantha Power to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

IMPROVE HYDROPOWER ACT AND HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT UNDER FEDERAL RECLAMATION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bills en bloc: Calendar No. 71, H.R. 267, and Calendar No. 72, H.R. 678.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 267) to approve hydropower, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 678) to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the bills en bloc.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the bills be read a third time and passed en bloc, and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bills (H.R. 267 and H.R. 678) were ordered to a third reading, were read the third time, and passed.

FOR VETS ACT of 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 155, H.R. 1171.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the title of the bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1171) to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1171) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HELPING HEROES FLY ACT

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1344, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1344) to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I further ask that the Pryor substitute amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be read the third time and passed, and that any motions to reconsider be considered made, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1848) was agreed to, as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Helping Heroes Fly Act".

SEC. 2. OPERATIONS CENTER PROGRAM FOR SEVERELY INJURED OR DISABLED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND SEVERELY INJURED OR DISABLED VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 44927. Expedited screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans

"(a) PASSENGER SCREENING.—The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and organizations identified by the Secretaries of Defense and Veteran Affairs that advocate on behalf of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, shall develop and implement a process to support and facilitate the ease of travel and to the extent possible provide expedited passenger screening services for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans through passenger screening. The process shall be designed to offer the individual private screening to the maximum extent practicable.

"(b) OPERATIONS CENTER.—As part of the process under subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary shall maintain an operations center to provide support and facilitate the movement of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans through passenger screening prior to boarding a passenger aircraft operated by an air carrier or foreign air carrier in air transportation or intrastate air transportation.

"(c) PROTOCOLS.—The Assistant Secretary shall—

"(1) establish and publish protocols, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the organizations identified under subsection (a), under which a severely injured or disabled member of the Armed Forces or severely injured or disabled veteran, or the family member or other representative of such member or veteran, may contact the operations center maintained under subsection (b) and request the expedited passenger screening services described in subsection (a) for that member or veteran; and

"(2) upon receipt of a request under paragraph (1), require the operations center to notify the appropriate Federal Security Director of the request for expedited passenger screening services, as described in subsection (a), for that member or veteran.

"(d) TRAINING.—The Assistant Secretary shall integrate training on the protocols established under subsection (c) into the training provided to all employees who will regularly provide the passenger screening services described in subsection (a).

"(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the Assistant Secretary to require additional screening of a severely injured or disabled member of the Armed Forces, a severely injured or disabled veteran, or their accompanying family members or nonmedical attendants, if intelligence, law enforcement, or other information indicates that additional screening is necessary.

"(f) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section. Each report shall include each of the following:

"(1) Information on the training provided under subsection (d).

"(2) Information on the consultations between the Assistant Secretary and the organizations identified under subsection (a).

"(3) The number of people who accessed the operations center during the period covered by the report.

"(4) Such other information as the Assistant Secretary determines is appropriate."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 44926 the following new item:

"44927. Expedited screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans."

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 1344), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

PIPELINE SAFETY REGULATORY DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2576.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2576) to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2576) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ENCOURAGING PEACE AND REUNIFICATION ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H. Con. Res. 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 41) encouraging peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 41) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 93-435

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 109, S. 256.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 256) to amend Public Law 93-435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment, as follows:

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section and section 2 of Public Law 93-435 (48 U.S.C. 1705, 1706) are amended by inserting "the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands," after "Guam," each place it appears.

Section 8103(b)(1)(B) of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 (29 U.S.C. 206 note; Public Law 110-28) is amended by striking "2011" and inserting "2011, 2013, and 2015".

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and

the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 256), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 256

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section and section 2 of Public Law 93-435 (48 U.S.C. 1705, 1706) are amended by inserting “the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Guam,” each place it appears.

(b) REFERENCES TO DATE OF ENACTMENT.—For the purposes of the amendment made by subsection (a), each reference in Public Law 93-435 to the “date of enactment” shall be considered to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this section.

SEC. 2. ADJUSTMENT OF SCHEDULED WAGE INCREASES IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.

Section 8103(b)(1)(B) of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 (29 U.S.C. 206 note; Public Law 110-28) is amended by striking “2011” and inserting “2011, 2013, and 2015”.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 156 through 160, all post office naming bills en bloc.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills be read a third time and passed en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIALIST CHRISTOPHER SCOTT POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 233), to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the “Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building,” was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 233

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SPECIALIST CHRISTOPHER SCOTT POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, shall be known and designated as the “Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building”.

STAFF SERGEANT NICHOLAS J. REID POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 668), to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the “Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building,” was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 668

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. STAFF SERGEANT NICHOLAS J. REID POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, shall be known and designated as the “Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building”.

JAMES R. BURGESS JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 796), to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the “James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building,” was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 796

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JAMES R. BURGESS JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the “James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building”.

THADDEUS STEVENS POST OFFICE

The bill (S. 885), to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, as the “Thaddeus Stevens Post Office,” was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 885

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. THADDEUS STEVENS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, shall be known and designated as the “Thaddeus Stevens Post Office”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Thaddeus Stevens Post Office”.

FIRST LIEUTENANT ALVIN CHESTER COCKRELL, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 1093), to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, as the “First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building,” was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1093

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FIRST LIEUTENANT ALVIN CHESTER COCKRELL, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, shall be known and designated as the “First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building”.

CELEBRATING THE 200TH AUGUST QUARTERLY FESTIVAL IN WILMINGTON, DELAWARE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 199, and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 199) celebrating the 200th August Quarterly Festival taking place from August 18, 2013, through August 25, 2013, in Wilmington, Delaware.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 199) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of July 25, 2013, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ELECTING LAURA C. DOVE AS SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 216.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 216) electing Laura C. Dove, of Virginia, as Secretary for the Minority of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 216) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SURGEONS DAYS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 217.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 217) expressing support for the designation of October 6, 2013, through October 10, 2013 as "American College of Surgeons Days" and recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of the organization.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 217) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—H.R. 2642

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand the Chair, as previously authorized, is now ready to appoint the conferees to H.R. 2642.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Under the order of July 18, 2013, the Chair appoints Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. HOEVEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 99-498, as amended by Public Law 110-315, appoints the following individuals to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance: Michael Poliakoff of Virginia, vice David Gruen and Andrew Gillen of Washington, DC, vice William Luckey.

APPOINTMENTS AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the upcoming recess or adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses or by order of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the Senate's recess, committees be authorized to report legislative matters and executive matters on Wednesday, September 4, from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment or recess of the Senate Thursday, August 1, through Monday, September 9, Senators CARDIN and LEVIN be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPRESSIONS OF APPRECIATION

Mr. REID. Madam President, there are two things I wish to mention before we close.

First, the Presiding Officer has worked for years on an energy efficiency bill. We are finally going to be able to get to that. This is the first Energy bill we have had in, I think, 5 years.

It is a bipartisan piece of legislation, but the impetus behind this legislation is this Presiding Officer. I commend her, applaud her, and recognize how fortunate the people of New Hampshire are to have her as a Senator.

I also wish to mention the pages. This is their last day here. They have done a wonderful job. They do so much for us. There isn't a day goes by that they don't do something for me. I am sure the Senate feels the same way. I hope it has been a good experience for them.

I have had three grandchildren who have been pages, and it a great experience for them. I am confident the others feel the same way.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, 2013, THROUGH MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn and convene for pro forma sessions only with no business conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, August 2 at 11:45 a.m.; Tuesday, August 6 at 10:30 a.m.; Friday, August 9 at 12 p.m.; Tuesday, August 13 at 12 p.m.; Friday, August 16 at 12 p.m.; Tuesday, August 20 at 11 a.m.; Friday, August 23 at 12 p.m.; Tuesday, August 27 at 9 a.m.; Friday, August 30 at 2 p.m.; Tuesday, September 3 at 9:15 a.m.; and Friday, September 6 at 5 p.m.; and that the Senate adjourn on Friday, September 6, until 2 p.m.; that on Monday, September 9, 2013, unless the Senate receives a message from the House that it has adopted S. Con. Res. 22, the adjournment resolution, and that if the Senate receives such a message, the Senate adjourn until 12 p.m. on Monday, August 12, for a pro forma session only with no business conducted, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 22, and that following the pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013; that on Monday, following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar Nos. 184 and 185, under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. The next rollcall vote will be 5:30 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, 2013, AT 11:45 A.M.

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:45 p.m., conditionally adjourned until Friday, August 2, at 11:45 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

MICHELLE T. FRIEDLAND, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, VICE RAYMOND C. FISHER, RETIRED.

NANCY L. MORITZ, OF KANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT, VICE DEANELL REECE TACHA, RETIRED.

JOHN B. OWENS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, VICE STEPHEN S. TROTT, RETIRED.

CHRISTOPHER REID COOPER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, VICE ROYCE C. LAMBERTH, RETIRED.

DANIEL D. CRABTREE, OF KANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS, VICE JOHN W. LUNGSTRUM, RETIRED.

SHERYL H. LIPMAN, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE JON P. MCCALLA, RETIRED.

GERALD AUSTIN MCHUGH, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE HARVEY BARTLE, III, RETIRED.

M. DOUGLAS HARPOOL, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, VICE RICHARD E. DORR, DECEASED.

EDWARD G. SMITH, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE BERLE M. SCHILLER, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GARY BLANKINSHIP, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RUBEN MONZON, RESIGNED.

ROBERT L. HOBBS, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOHN LEE MOORE, TERM EXPIRED.

AMOS ROJAS, JR., OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CHRISTINA PHARO, TERM EXPIRED.

PETER C. TOBIN, OF OHIO, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CATHY JO JONES, RESIGNED.

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

J. CHRISTOPHER GIANCARLO, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING APRIL 13, 2014, VICE JILL SOMMERS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEBORAH LEE JAMES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE MICHAEL BRUCE DONLEY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

FRANK G. KLOTZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY, VICE THOMAS P. D'AGOSTINO, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

CHRISTOPHER A. HART, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2017. (RE-APPOINTMENT)

DEBORAH A. P. HERSMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS. (RE-APPOINTMENT)

DEBORAH A. P. HERSMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2018. (RE-APPOINTMENT)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

MICHAEL P. O'RIELLY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2014, VICE ROBERT M. MCDOWELL, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

KATHRYN D. SULLIVAN, OF OHIO, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE, VICE JANE LUBCHENCO, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

STEVEN CROLEY, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE GREGORY HOWARD WOODS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

KAREN DYNAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE JANICE EBERLY.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

R. GIL KERLIKOWSKIE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE ALAN D. BERSIN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

JOHN ANDREW KOSKINEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE FOR THE TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 12, 2017, VICE DOUGLAS H. SHULMAN, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MATTHEW T. HARRINGTON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF LESOTHO.

ANNE W. PATTERSON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER AMBASSADOR, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS), VICE JEFFERY D. FELTMAN, RESIGNED.

PAMELA K. HAMAMOTO, OF HAWAII, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN GENEVA, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE BETTY E. KING.

SARAH SEWALL, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (CIVILIAN SECURITY, DEMOCRACY, AND HUMAN RIGHTS), VICE MARIA OTERO, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

RICHARD F. GRIFFIN, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RONALD E. MEISBURG, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

STEVAN EATON BUNNELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE IVAN K. FONG, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

PATRICK PIZZELLA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JULY 1, 2015, VICE THOMAS M. BECK, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

SUZANNE ELEANOR SPAULDING, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE RAND BEERS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

PETER JOSEPH KADZIK, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE RONALD H. WEICH, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

LINDA A. SCHWARTZ, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE RAUL PEREA-HENZE, RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 1, 2013:

THE JUDICIARY

RAYMOND T. CHEN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

JANET LORRAINE LABRECK, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF THE REHABILITATION SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

CYNTHIA L. ATTWOOD, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 27, 2019.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

STUART F. DELERY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

RICHARD T. METSGER, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 2, 2017.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

JASON FURMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER AND CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

MARY JO WHITE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2019.

KARA MARLENE STEIN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2017.

MICHAEL SEAN PIOWAR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2018.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

GERALD LYN EARLY, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018.

DANIEL IWAO OKIMOTO, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DANIEL BROOKS BAER, OF COLORADO, TO BE U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

DOUGLAS EDWARD LUTE, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE ON THE COUNCIL OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

SAMANTHA POWER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY, AND THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

SAMANTHA POWER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

CATHERINE M. RUSSELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR AT LARGE FOR GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

KATHERINE H. TACHAU, OF IOWA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

STEPHEN J. HADLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

JOHN UNSWORTH, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2016.

DOROTHY KOSINSKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2016.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

DAVITA VANCE-COOKS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE PUBLIC PRINTER.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

F. SCOTT KIEFF, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 16, 2020.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

JOSEPH W. NEGA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

MICHAEL B. THORNTON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ROBERT BONNIE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT.

KRYSTA L. HARDEN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

TIMOTHY HYUNGROCK HAAHS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 7, 2014.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

JANNETTE LAKE DATES, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2016.

BRUCE M. RAMER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION

FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2018.

BRENT FRANKLIN NELSEN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2016.

HOWARD ABEL HUSOCK, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2018.

LORETTA CHERYL SUTLIFF, OF NEVADA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MARK E. SCHAEFFER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

THOMAS C. CARPER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

IN THE COAST GUARD

PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF SECTION 271(D), TITLE 14, U.S. CODE, THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD:

To be rear admiral

BRUCE D. BAFFER
MARK E. BUTT
DAVID R. CALLAHAN
STEPHEN P. METRUCK
JOSEPH A. SERVIDIO

PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF SECTION 12203(A), TITLE 10, U.S. CODE, THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD RESERVE:

To be rear admiral

KURT B. HINRICH

THE FOLLOWING OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF SECTION 271(D), TITLE 14, U.S. CODE:

To be rear admiral

RICHARD T. GROMLICH

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SUSAN J. RABERN, OF KANSAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

DENNIS V. MCGINN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 152 AND 601:

To be general

GEN. MARTIN E. DEMPSEY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS THE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 154:

To be admiral

ADM. JAMES A. WINNEFELD, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

ADM. CECIL E.D. HANEY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. CURTIS M. SCAPAROTTI

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN W. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ROBIN RAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RUSSELL J. HANDY

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROGER L. NYE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID L. MANN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RAYMOND A. THOMAS III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MARION GARCIA

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN W. LATHROP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. EDWARD C. CARDON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE DEPUTY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN ACCORDANCE WITH TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 3037 AND 3064:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. THOMAS E. AYLES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 3037 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant general

BRIG. GEN. FLORA D. DARPINO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL S. TUCKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624, 3037, AND 3064:

To be brigadier general, judge advocate general's corps

COL. CHARLES N. PEDE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL CARL A. ALEX
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER F. BENTLEY
COLONEL JAMES R. BLACKBURN
COLONEL WILLIAM M. BURLSON III
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER G. CAVOLI
COLONEL PAUL A. CHAMBERLAIN
COLONEL WILLIAM E. COLE
COLONEL RICHARD B. DIX
COLONEL JEFFREY A. FARNSWORTH
COLONEL BRYAN P. FENTON
COLONEL PATRICIA A. FROST

COLONEL DOUGLAS M. GABRAM
COLONEL JEFFREY A. GABBERT
COLONEL JOHN A. GEORGE
COLONEL RANDY A. GEORGE
COLONEL MARIA R. GERVAIS
COLONEL DAVID P. GLASER
COLONEL THOMAS C. GRAVES
COLONEL JOHN F. HALEY
COLONEL PETER L. JONES
COLONEL RICHARD G. KAISER
COLONEL JOHN S. KEM
COLONEL ROBERT L. MARION
COLONEL DENNIS S. MCKEAN
COLONEL FRANK M. MUTH
COLONEL LEOPOLDO A. QUINTAS, JR.
COLONEL KURT J. RYAN
COLONEL MARK C. SCHWARTZ
COLONEL SCOTT A. SPELLMON
COLONEL JOHN P. SULLIVAN
COLONEL CLARENCE D. TURNER
COLONEL MICHAEL J. WARMACK
COLONEL ERIC J. WESLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KENNETH E. TOVO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT B. ABRAMS

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. KEVIN L. MCNEELY

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. THOMAS D. WALDHAUSER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DEBORAH P. HAVEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601; AND FOR APPOINTMENT AS A SENIOR MEMBER OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 711:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. FRANK C. PANDOLFE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. HARRY B. HARRIS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL, UNITED STATES NAVY, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5141:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. WILLIAM F. MORAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JAMES F. CALDWELL, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID F. BAUCOM
REAR ADM. (LH) VINCENT L. GRIFFITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) COLIN G. CHINN

REAR ADM. (LH) ELAINE C. WAGNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PAUL B. BECKER
REAR ADM. (LH) MATTHEW J. KOHLER
REAR ADM. (LH) JAN E. TIGHE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID H. LEWIS
REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS J. MOORE
REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES D. SYRING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN C. AQUILINO
REAR ADM. (LH) PETER J. FANTA
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID J. GALE
REAR ADM. (LH) PHILIP G. HOWE
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM K. LESCHER
REAR ADM. (LH) MARK C. MONTGOMERY
REAR ADM. (LH) FRANK A. MORNEAU
REAR ADM. (LH) JEFFREY R. PENFIELD
REAR ADM. (LH) FREDERICK J. ROEGGE
REAR ADM. (LH) PHILLIP G. SAWYER
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL S. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. RUSSELL E. ALLEN
CAPT. WILLIAM M. CRANE
CAPT. THOMAS W. MAROTTA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. KURT W. TIDD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KENNETH J. IVERSON

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MORRELL JOHN BERRY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO AUSTRALIA.

PATRICIA MARIE HASLACH, OF OREGON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA.

REUBEN EARL BRIGETY, II, OF FLORIDA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE AFRICAN UNION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

DANIEL A. CLUNE, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC.

PATRICK HUBERT GASPARD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA.

STEPHANIE SANDERS SULLIVAN, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO.

JOSEPH Y. YUN, OF OREGON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO MALAYSIA.

LINDA THOMAS-GREENFIELD, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (AFRICAN AFFAIRS).

JAMES F. ENTWISTLE, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA.

DAVID D. PEARCE, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO GRECE.

JOHN B. EMERSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY.

JOHN RUFUS GIFFORD, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO DENMARK.

DENISE CAMPBELL BAUER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BELGIUM.

JAMES COSTOS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO SPAIN.

JAMES COSTOS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ANDORRA.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

AVI GARBOW, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

JAMES J. JONES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

ROBERT F. COHEN, JR., OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2018.

WILLIAM IRA ALTHEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

CATHERINE ELIZABETH LHAMON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

JOHN H. THOMPSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2016.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

HARRY R. HOGLANDER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2014.

LINDA A. PUCHALA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2015.

NICHOLAS CHRISTOPHER GEALE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MATTHEW WINTHROP BARZUN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND.

DAVID HALE, OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LEBANON.

LILIANA AYALDE, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC OF BRAZIL.

KIRK W.B. WAGAR, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE.

TERENCE PATRICK MCCULLEY, OF WASHINGTON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF COTE D'IVOIRE.

JAMES C. SWAN, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO.

JOHN R. PHILLIPS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SAN MARINO.

KENNETH FRANCIS HACKETT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE HOLY SEE.

ALEXA LANGE WESNER, OF TEXAS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF AUSTRIA.

DANIEL A. SEPULVEDA, OF FLORIDA, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION POLICY IN THE BUREAU OF ECONOMIC, ENERGY, AND BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND U.S. COORDINATOR FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION POLICY.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

RYAN CLARK CROCKER, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2013.

RYAN CLARK CROCKER, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2016.

MATTHEW C. ARMSTRONG, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2015.

JEFFREY SHELL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS.

JEFFREY SHELL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2015.

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WENDY J. BEAL AND ENDING WITH JARED K. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 9, 2013.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF PETER C. RHEE, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOSEPH M. MARKUSFELD, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DEONDR P. ASIKE AND ENDING WITH GREGORY C. TROLLEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 24, 2013.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF RONALD E. BERESKY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JAMES B. COLLINS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JONATHAN H. CODY AND ENDING WITH JUSTIN M. MARCHESI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 20, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH L. BIEHLER AND ENDING WITH BIENVENIDO SERRANOCASTRO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DEAN C. ANDERSON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER D. PERRIN, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHEENA L. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH MIAO X. ZHOU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH COURTNEY L. ABRAHAM AND ENDING WITH D011476, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER L. AARON AND ENDING WITH NATHAN P. ZWINTSCHER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD R. ABELKIS AND ENDING WITH G001407, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH H. ALBRECHT AND ENDING WITH D011309, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KARL F. MEYER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF STEPHANIE M. PRICE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF GREGORY C. PEDRO, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOHN H. SEOK, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF FREDERICK C. LOUGH, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ADMIRADO A. LUZURIAGA AND ENDING WITH JON KIEV, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 24, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM G. HUBER AND ENDING WITH MARK L. LEITSCHUH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 24, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CURTIS J. ALITZ, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GUY R. BEAUDOIN AND ENDING WITH REBECCA A. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 24, 2013.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF JACKIE S. FANTES, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DORAN T. KELVINGTON, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ORENTHAL G. ADDERSON AND ENDING WITH JOHN F. WARNER III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 27, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PHILIP B. BAGROW AND ENDING WITH DAVID M. TODD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TANYA CRUZ AND ENDING WITH JEANINE B. WOMBLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RENE J. ALOVA AND ENDING WITH JOYCE Y. TURNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES ALGER AND ENDING WITH JASON N. WOOD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER W. ABBOTT AND ENDING WITH LORENZO TARPLEY, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARY R. ANKER AND ENDING WITH GEORGINA L. ZUNIGA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LILLIAN A. ABUAN AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER R. ZEGLEY,

WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIN G. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH LUKE A. ZABROCKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TIMOTHY C. MOORE, JR., TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF PIERRE A. PELLETIER, TO BE CAPTAIN.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ELLEN C. HERBST, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

ELLEN C. HERBST, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

MARGARET LOUISE CUMMISKY, OF HAWAII, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive message transmitted by the President to the Senate on August 1, 2013 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

LAFE E. SOLOMON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RONALD E. MEISBURG, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MAY 23, 2013.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE EXTRAORDINARY LIFE OF ED SIMMONS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the extraordinary life of Edward S. Simmons, who passed away on July 16, 2013 at the age of 62.

Edward or "Ed" served in Vietnam as a medic where he was injured, and never forgot his fellow soldiers as he spent the rest of his life organizing benefits for unemployed and disabled veterans.

Ed was responsible for organizing and obtaining over 500 job pledges for Veterans from the UAW and United Steelworkers of America during the "Who Dares Win" relay race from Buffalo to Washington, D.C., Baltimore, Boston, Pittsburgh and Philadelphia to call attention to the need for jobs for veterans. The runs concluded in a cross-country relay to San Francisco in 1996.

Ed was the retired deputy director of the New York State Division of Veteran's affairs as well as being one of the founding members and serving on the board of directors as a co-chair at the Veteran's One-Stop Center of Western New York.

This spring, I was proud to join with Ed and many others to officially open the One Stop Center on Main Street in the City of Buffalo. No one fought harder to make the idea of having a single location with many services to help veterans a reality than Ed Simmons and despite his own physical struggle, no one's smile was brighter as he cut the ceremonial ribbon to officially open this comprehensive and caring site.

It was said that the legacy of Western New Yorkers putting veterans first through the Veterans One-stop Center began that day. I would like to add that the legacy of Ed Simmons' vision, commitment and dedication to putting veterans first now lives on everyday.

He is survived by his loving wife, Onda, sisters Dianne, Marie and Mary, and many nieces and nephews as well as beloved by his late sisters Patricia and Kathleen.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a moment to remember the life of this remarkable man. I ask my colleagues to join me in offering our sincere condolences to his family and our deepest gratitude for his service to our country.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF BORIS WOLPER

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Boris Wolper, a distinguished constituent who died on July 22, 2013, not long after celebrating his 89th birthday. He was born to Marian and Mordecai Wolper on April 8, 1924, in San Francisco, California.

Boris Wolper was a man of many interests. He enjoyed a successful career as a commercial and industrial real estate broker, and served his community as a member of the Woodside Planning Commission. He loved to travel and was a supporter of many causes and institutions. He loved friends, food, wine, sports, and cultural events. He was a proud graduate of Sanford University and its Graduate School of Business, and attended every Big Game from 1942 until 2011. He was a skier and tennis player, and he loved to hike with his friends Howard Eisenberg, Bob Kohn, Dick Zukin, Paul Kaplan, Roy Goldberg and Joe Samson.

Boris leaves his loving wife of sixty-four years, Marilyn; two daughters, Julie Brenner and Andrea Wolper; sons-in-law Ellis Brenner and Ken Filiano; and his grandchildren Sharon and Elliott Brenner. He is also survived by his sister and brother-in-law, Malkah and Don Carothers, and many cousins, nieces and nephews.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our condolences to Boris Wolper's family and pay tribute to his long and productive life. He will be missed by all who had the good fortune to know him, and those of us who called him friend will never forget him. Our community has lost a favorite son, and our country has lost a model citizen.

ST. MARY OF THE ASSUMPTION CATHOLIC CHURCH

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to St. Mary of the Assumption Catholic Church in my district. I ask the House of Representative to join me in congratulating the parish on celebrating 140 years of worship and outreach in the Saginaw Bay Region of Michigan. On Saturday, August 3, 2013, the parishioners and community will recognize this milestone during an anniversary program.

St. Mary of the Assumption Parish, under the leadership of Father Henri Nouvel, held their first religious mass in the Saginaw Valley

on Christmas Eve in 1675 on the banks of the river near Saginaw. The existing parish, located in Bay County, was built by Father Martin Godfriend Canters and dedicated in 1874.

It is a true honor, Mr. Speaker, that St. Mary of the Assumption has called the Fifth Congressional District home for 140 years. Our community has been very fortunate to have had such an established institution located in the heart of our region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives join me in applauding the clergy, staff and congregation of St. Mary of the Assumption Catholic Church and wish them continued success for many years to come.

RECOGNIZING JEWISH B2B NETWORKING FOR CONNECTING PEOPLE AND STRENGTHENING OUR COMMUNITY

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of Jewish B2B Networking (B2B) and its founder, Shalom Klein, for his tireless work to connect people and promote the benefits of professional networking in the Jewish community.

Still early in his career, Mr. Klein has developed a reputation for bringing people together and forging relationships. B2B began in 2010 and has achieved great success. Mr. Klein understood that in times of economic contraction, building relationships is just as important as having the right skills.

By setting out to build powerful professional networks, Mr. Klein has offered help to thousands searching for jobs, employees or new resources.

At any one of the many B2B-sponsored networking events, you may find hundreds of professionals—young and experienced—looking to make meaningful contacts. I am pleased that many of these events take place throughout my district.

Even with B2B's incredible success already, Mr. Klein has not slowed his initiative. He is constantly looking for new ways to expand and new tools and resources to share.

Mr. Klein has worked so hard to ensure that the success of B2B is enjoyed by the entire community.

After all, fostering these connections not only helps the jobseekers and businesses, but strengthens the whole community by bringing all of its members together. I congratulate Shalom Klein and B2B on its success and look forward to following its future.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

CONGRATULATING EDWARD F. WALSH JR. AS THE RECIPIENT OF THE 2013 RED JACKET AWARD

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Edward F. Walsh Jr. as he has been named the recipient of the 2013 Red Jacket Award.

A Buffalo native, Ed is devoted to civic progress in his hometown. An active community volunteer for over 35 years, Ed has held leadership positions with various organizations including the United Way of Buffalo and Erie County, Nichols School, Kaleida Health, and the Center for Hospice & Palliative Care.

Ed currently serves as the President and Chief Operating Officer of Walsh Duffield Companies, Inc., a fourth-generation family-owned insurance agency that is based here in Buffalo.

Presented by the Buffalo History Museum, the Red Jacket Awards are based on a medal given by President George Washington to Seneca leader Red Jacket in 1792. The award was established by the museum in 1957 to honor those who exhibit quiet, unbroken devotion to our region's enrichment. Ed will be presented with the Red Jacket Award at the annual Red Jacket Awards Dinner on September 26, 2013 in the History Museum.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to recognize Mr. Edward Walsh's great contributions and admirable generosity. I congratulate him on this incredible honor, thank him for his continued dedication to our community, and wish him the absolute best in all his future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF KIP TOKUDA

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to honor the life of Kip Tokuda, and pay tribute to his leadership, service, and dedication to the citizens of the State of Washington.

Kip was a Seattle native and a graduate of the University of Washington. Following completion of his graduate studies in social work in 1969, Kip entered public service as a social worker with the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services and gained a reputation for being a strong advocate for children and individuals with disabilities. He was later named to the Washington Council for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect.

The second son of parents who were incarcerated at the Minidoka Relocation Center, Kip possessed an unwavering sense of justice and equality. A prominent figure within the Asian American community, he served as the president of Seattle's chapter of Japanese American Citizens League (JACL)—an organization which is the oldest and largest Asian Amer-

ican civil rights organization. In 1998, Kip went on to found the Asian Pacific Islander Community Leadership Foundation, a non-profit organization that focuses on social justice, community empowerment, and public service.

Beginning in 1994, Kip served as a Representative for Washington State's 37th Legislative District. During his four terms in the Washington State Legislature, he enjoyed many legislative successes. He introduced his first Day of Remembrance resolution in 1997, which has since become an annual tradition in the Legislature. He served as the co-prime sponsor, along with Representative Mike Wensmen of House Bill 1572, which created the Washington Civil Liberties Public Education fund in 2000. Kip also secured passage of the Special Needs Adoption bill, which helped adoption of special-needs children. He was a strong advocate who helped to pass the Homeless Children's Lawsuit legislation, which provided services for over 60,000 homeless families with children.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that we recognize the life of Kip Tokuda—a true trailblazer. We ask our colleagues to join us in honoring a long career of selfless and inspired service to his community, the State of Washington, and our Nation.

HONORING THE SMALL BUSINESS ADVOCACY COUNCIL FOR ITS COMMITMENT TO STRENGTHENING OUR COMMUNITY

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Small Business Advocacy Council (SBAC) on the occasion of its 4th Annual Golf Outing, hosted in Riverwoods, IL, in my district.

The SBAC is a strong and clear voice for small businesses in the Chicagoland area and an important advocate for the interests of those companies and the working families they employ. The SBAC has been speaking up for these businesses for almost four years.

In 2010, with the country still mired in an economic downturn, the SBAC was established as a way to buoy many of the smaller businesses that were struggling. By providing advocacy, support services and educational programs, the SBAC has become a critical resource for our small businesses.

Our business community in the Tenth District is strong because it is just that: a community.

Working together and sharing strategies, being inspired by the innovation of fellow small businesses, companies in the Tenth District have fostered a community of mutual success and prosperity. It is this type of activity that the SBAC promotes and is so important to our economic success in the 21st Century.

Through a tightly-knit network of member organizations, the SBAC builds partnerships and facilitates cooperation, making our community stronger.

Mr. Speaker, advocacy organizations like SBAC are integral to driving the success of

small businesses throughout our nation, which in turn will lift the rest of our economy. I thank the SBAC for its work, and I wish only great success for this year's golf outing and SBAC's future.

HONORING THE RE-DEDICATION OF THE E.B. GREEN MAUSOLEUM

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the re-dedication of the E.B. Green Mausoleum on the occasion of its 100th anniversary. Designed by legendary architect Edward Brodhead Green, the mausoleum opened in 1913 in Oakwood Cemetery in Niagara Falls, New York.

E.B. Green, for whom the Mausoleum is named, is one of our Nation's most prolific and admired architects. During his 72-year career, he designed over 360 structures, many of which are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Over 160 of his Western New York works remain standing, including the Mausoleum which we honor today.

The E.B. Green Mausoleum is an architectural and historical wonder. Stately columns and gray Vermont marble produce its majestic exterior. Inside, the Mausoleum contains white Vermont marble and stained glass windows, one of which is a signed Tiffany. One of the only two Mausoleums designed by E.B. Green, its design evokes the reflective act of remembering our dead.

The Mausoleum magnifies the already significant historical legacy of Oakwood Cemetery. Oakwood was established in 1852, when Lavinia Porter, daughter of Niagara Falls founder Augustus Porter, donated the land that would become the burial site. Theodore Dehone Judah, one of the central figures in the establishment of America's Transcontinental Railroad, designed the cemetery's original landscape. Locally, General Parkhurst Whitney of Niagara Falls and his three daughters were laid to rest at Oakwood. Celinda, Angelina, and Asenath Whitney are the three sisters for which the Three Sisters Islands are named. In 1882, their nephew Drake Whitney engineered improvements to Oakwood Cemetery.

Oakwood Cemetery's historical significance has been regionally recognized. The cemetery has received numerous awards, including the Preservation Buffalo Niagara Award in 2013, a \$5000 grant from the Niagara Falls Preservation League in 2011, a City of Niagara Falls Preservation Citation and designation as a Niagara Falls National Heritage Area.

Many programs are in place to educate the public about the history of the Oakwood Cemetery. The cemetery offers community activities such as guided tours, events that are open to the public, and educational workshops for students. The volunteer group "Friends of Oakwood" dedicates their efforts to the upkeep, preservation, restoration, and education of the cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize the historical and

architectural significance of the E.B. Green Mausoleum and Oakwood Cemetery. I thank all those who worked to put together this lovely event, and sincerely appreciate their work every day to promote the incredible history and legacy of Oakwood Cemetery.

ON THE RETIREMENT OF SHERIFF
WARDIE PERNELL VINCENT, SR.

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate my good friend, constituent, and public servant, Sheriff Wardie Pernell Vincent, Sr. upon his retirement from service as Sheriff for Northampton County, North Carolina.

Wardie Vincent was born on November 4, 1947, to Eugene and Norene Vincent in the town of Henrico, North Carolina. He attended Northampton County public schools and graduated in 1966 from historic Gumberry High School. On October 5, 1967, Wardie enlisted in the United States Army and courageously served the United States of America for two years. He was Honorably Discharged from military service and returned to his hometown where he and his wife Betty would rear three wonderful children.

Wardie Vincent's service in the United States Army introduced him to the important work of law enforcement and the value in maintaining safe communities. He applied the skills learned in the Army to excel in his desire to be a law enforcement officer and pursue training at Halifax Community College where he received a degree in Criminal Justice.

Wardie Vincent's first job out of college was as security guard with the Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers' Association in the Town of Rich Square. He later became an undercover officer working with Bertie, Hertford, Warren and Martin Counties on a variety of critical assignments targeting drug use and gang activity. It would become clear that Wardie Vincent's unmatched skills and experience would lead him to seek the office of Sheriff for Northampton County.

At age 51, Wardie Vincent was elected Sheriff of Northampton County. He would be reelected three more times to this high office, most recently in November 2010 when he ran unopposed. Sheriff Vincent has served a total of fourteen years as the High Sheriff of Northampton County and has overseen the expansion of this office through the hiring of additional Deputy Sheriffs and a strategic crack-down on illegal drugs through the county's drug taskforce. He also modernized the Sheriffs office by securing grants and improved budgeting for updated technology and law enforcement tools. There is no doubt that the Northampton County has been made safer through the visionary leadership of Sheriff Wardie Vincent.

Sheriff Vincent and his wife Betty look forward to spending more time with their three children—Kimberly, Kenisha, and Wardie, Jr. and their five grandchildren—Sage, Kai, Omani, Myles, Caleb, and Kenadi.

Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Sheriff Wardie Pernell Vincent, Sr. will leave a great

void in Northampton County. But I know he will continue to play a vital role in his community as a leader, advocate, and friend to his fellow citizens. I ask my colleagues to join me in offering our sincere appreciation for Sheriff Vincent's forty years of public service and best wishes upon his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO LILLIAN KAWASAKI

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, this month, the Los Angeles Area lost a wonderful leader, the environmental community lost a true champion, and I lost a dear friend. Lillian Kawasaki had served the city of Los Angeles since the early 1990s, and while she wore many hats throughout her years in public service, one thing remained constant among them all—she fought to make life better for those around her.

An elected member of the WRD Board of Directors since 2006, Lillian was the first Asian-American ever appointed a department chief in Los Angeles. Lillian began heading the Los Angeles City Environmental Affairs Department in 1990 under Mayor Tom Bradley, and she worked tirelessly to improve the air quality in Los Angeles, spearheading the Los Angeles City Clean Air Plan and the City CEQA Thresholds Guidelines and Environmental Justice Program. In addition, Ms. Kawasaki served on the California State University LA Foundation Board for more than 5 years. She had recently joined the California Small Business Development Center Network Advisory Board.

Lillian was determined to clean up the city that she loved. Beginning as a researcher at UCLA, she worked on wastewater nutrient recycling programs before moving over to the Port of Los Angeles's Environmental Management Division. As a scientist, Lillian understood that the air we breathe and the water we drink affects our communities, our children, and our future, and her passion for a higher quality of life of Los Angelinos is what drove her to public service. She dedicated her life to cleaning up the Los Angeles Area, and her work will be felt for generations to come.

The daughter of Japanese-Americans who were interned during World War II, Lillian was determined to commemorate this part of American history, and served as the co-chair of the Friends of Manzanar, a National Historic Site. Lillian was determined to give back to her community, and was a member of the Women's Foundation Donor's Circle, where she championed financial literacy for women and girls in her community.

Lillian left us not long ago, but her impact lives on. The lives she touched are forever changed for the better, as are the communities she dedicated her life to improving. Her life's work provides an inspiration for all of us. So, today, I bid farewell to a friend, a community leader, and a true role model to so many.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF STRATFORD LANDING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Stratford Landing Elementary School in Alexandria, which is proudly celebrating 50 years of providing an excellent education to the students of Fairfax, Virginia.

Built on land once owned by George Washington, Stratford Landing Elementary School officially opened its doors with Principal Eleanor N. Hollandsworth on September 3, 1963 with an initial enrollment of 301 students in grades one through six. This student population would more than double the next year.

In response to a rapidly growing community and an influx of military families the following year, Stratford Landing underwent its first renovation in 1966, adding an additional hallway of classrooms.

As schools across the Nation began to implement kindergarten classes to comply with the Federal Head Start initiative, Stratford Landing opened its first half-day kindergarten program in 1968.

During the 1970s, Stratford Landing initiated one of the first Gifted and Talented Centers in Fairfax County Public Schools, developed to offer a unique academic program to qualifying students in grades three through six from multiple local elementary schools. Stratford Landing also expanded to include two preschool programs, which supported early intervention for young children identified with autism and developmental delays.

Over the years, the school underwent other renovations to add a gym, music room, day care facility, playground, 10-classroom modular unit, and seven learning environment trailers. It also created an English as a Second Language program to better meet the needs of students.

In 2009, Stratford Landing developed and continues to refine a Discovery Garden, supporting environmental and science studies. The school also began offering a full-day kindergarten program with the last phase-in by Fairfax County Public Schools for the 2011–2012 school year.

Stratford Landing continues to stay abreast of technological changes by adding Smart Board technology to all classrooms, increasing the number of mobile laptop carts, investing in hands-on voting systems, and using other technology tools to support the needs of 21st century learners.

Stratford Landing Elementary School, the parent-teacher association, and the school community continue to work in partnership to benefit student success and achievement both in the classroom, on the school grounds, and through diverse after-school programs. And while the school mascot and student fashions have changed over the years, Stratford Landing Elementary School has remained committed to providing an academically challenging and positive learning environment in which all students thrive.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to commend Stratford Landing Elementary School as it marks 50 years of providing educational opportunities to the children of Fairfax County.

THE WATER FOR THE WORLD ACT
OF 2013

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as America prepares for the holiday season, it is important to pause and reflect on what we can do for others as well as ourselves. I hope that Congress will give a gift of life, health and hope by helping people around the world with something that most Americans take for granted—safe drinking water.

Nearly 900 million of the world's poorest do not have clean drinking water, and fully 2.6 billion lack access to improved sanitation. This shortfall poses a significant challenge for development and security around the world, reinforcing a cycle of poverty and instability that represents both a humanitarian disaster and a national security threat.

Water-related diseases are particularly brutal in how they target children: 90 percent of all deaths caused by diarrheal diseases are children under 5 years of age, mostly in developing countries. In all, 1.8 million children under the age of 5 die every year, more than from AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria combined. The economic impacts are devastating—inadequate sanitation in India alone costs that country \$53.8 billion, or 6.4 percent of its GDP every year.

What's more, dirty water directly affects every area of development. Children cannot attend school if they are sick from dirty water, and adults suffering from water-borne illnesses overwhelm hospitals and cannot go to work. Hours spent looking for and collecting clean water mean hours not spent adding to a family's economic well-being. In short, the best intentioned efforts at development fail if the basic necessity of clean water is not met.

In this period of good tidings, there is good news with water. The solution to this problem is cheap and relatively straightforward. We don't have to spend millions searching for a cure. Sometimes something as simple as teaching the value of hand washing, or providing access to technology we already have is all it takes to save millions of lives and increase economic development. What we lack is leadership and accountability.

It is time for Congress to act again. The Water for the World Act of 2013 builds on current U.S. efforts to provide those in need with greater access to clean water and sanitation. And in this period of tight budgets, it is important that the Water for the World Act doesn't ask for any increase in funding, but rather improves the effectiveness, transparency and accountability of international aid programs. Given the strains on Federal resources and the depth of need, it is essential that we are able to target our efforts more efficiently.

The Water for the World Act also gives the State Department and U.S. Agency for Inter-

national Development the tools needed to leverage the investments they are already making by elevating the current positions within the State Department and USAID to coordinate the diplomatic policy of the U.S. on global freshwater issues and to implement country-specific water strategies.

There is nothing more fundamental to the human condition and global health than access to clean water and sanitation. More needs to be done, and it needs to be done well. Taxpayers are rightly demanding better results and greater transparency from foreign aid. This bill provides the tools and incentives to do just that.

MCT INDUSTRIES

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman BEN RAY LUJÁN, to honor a great New Mexican business, MCT Industries, for its forty-year contribution to the manufacturing infrastructure of the American economy. On this day, we also honor Ted Martinez, the founder of MCT Industries, and the entire Martinez family for their substantial contributions and service to New Mexico and to the United States of America.

To truly comprehend the success of MCT Industries, it is important to first understand the remarkable people behind the company. Born on September 18, 1947, Ted Martinez and his five brothers and sisters grew up in a home with no indoor plumbing. Just like his ancestors who homesteaded the Trujillo land on which he grew up, Ted began working on a ranch at 5 a.m. each morning.

Ted learned of the importance of hard work from his parents, Manuel and Isabel. He watched his parents each work several jobs to support the family. Together, Manuel and Isabel ran a general store, while Isabel also served as the postmaster of the only post office in the area. When Manuel was not working in the general store or on the ranch, he also drove a school bus.

From a young age, Ted had big dreams. Knowing he wanted to do more than run the ranch, he decided to leave home and get trained in welding at the Job Corps in San Antonio, Texas. Although he completed the 12-month program in just six months, Ted could not find a job because of his youth. While looking for work, he lived in his car behind a gas station and ate only one meal a day. Finally, he came upon Eidson Metal in Albuquerque and applied for a job. After a great deal of persuasion and negotiation, the foreman hired Ted. Just two months later, Ted became the foreman of the water tank crew at Eidson Metal.

In 1969, Ted married Anedina, a woman from nearby Garita, New Mexico, whom Ted had known since he was 12. Dina's father, Benerito, served as the foreman of the New Mexico State Highway Department, and kept a ranch of his own, while his wife, Mary, worked

as a nurse's aide in Las Vegas, New Mexico. Although Ted and Dina did not have much, their future looked bright. Dina soon became pregnant with their first child.

Even though Ted was working 60 hours a week at Eidson Metal and Dina had a job at the Department of Agriculture, times were tough. Wanting a better life for his family, Ted quit his job when Dina was eight months pregnant with their daughter, Claudine, to start his own business. With \$200 and a welding machine, Ted and Dina set out on their own.

As their workload steadily grew, they decided to formally incorporate a business. On June 8, 1973, Ted and Dina founded Martinez Custom Trailers. Having saved up \$42,000 they were able to purchase five acres of land. It would be another two years before they saved up enough money to construct a building. Living at the shop in their mobile home, Ted and Dina were able to monitor business around the clock. It was during this time that they welcomed to their home their precious son Bennie. A year after Bennie was born, Dina quit her job at the Department of Agriculture to work full time at the family business.

By 1980, Martinez Custom Trailers ran full-scale production lines of various commercial trailers, and employed 25 people. Ted soon decided to expand from building commercial trailers to building trailers for the federal government. Driven by his profound respect for the military, Ted bid for and won his first federal contract for the Army M353 general-purpose trailer.

Using his Army contracting experience, he bid jobs with Sandia and Los Alamos National Laboratories and successfully landed contracts in the nuclear transportation industry. Martinez Custom Trailers proudly contributed to the nuclear disarmament effort in the USSR by collaborating with Sandia on an inspection trailer for USSR nuclear warheads.

In recognition of Martinez Custom Trailers' success, in 1984, President Ronald Reagan recognized Ted as New Mexico's Small Business Person of the Year.

Business was so successful that, in 1987, Martinez Custom Trailers evolved into a more expansive enterprise, MCT Industries, Inc. Ever eager to expand his federal client base, Ted won a major contract to produce a self-propelled diesel powered U.S. Air Force Maintenance Stand that was slated to be deployed worldwide to service the largest aircraft in the Air Force. With this contract, MCT was able to create even more New Mexican jobs, reaching a height of 240 dedicated employees.

In 1992, 28 years after he had taken a risk by leaving the ranch to enter the Job Corps training program, Ted was inducted into the Job Corps Hall of Fame to celebrate his exceptional career.

After the tragic attacks of September 11, 2001, and the ensuing overseas military involvements, MCT was quickly able to develop and build trailers to support these campaigns. To enable soldiers to rapidly extinguish a fire during convoy operations, the Army needed to field-test two different types of foam fire suppression systems to verify they could perform in combat. In less than four months, MCT designed, built, tested and deployed trailers to Iraq that accommodated both fire suppression systems. Program leaders informed MCT that

in less than a week, these systems saved \$1 million in Mine-Resistant Ambush Protected, MRAP, vehicles and more importantly, protected the lives of soldiers.

Ted and the Martinez family have always displayed a fierce commitment to the wellbeing of their employees. In 2003, MCT hosted President George W. Bush. Just before President Bush addressed 4,000 people and honored MCT as an exemplary small business, the family joined him in a roundtable discussion on the vital impact small businesses have on the U.S. economy. When President Bush asked Ted about the secret of his success, without missing a beat, Ted said "my employees."

The new millennium continued to bring blessings to the Martinez family with the birth of the third MCT generation when Diego Dylan Martinez was born on April 21, 2007. His brother Dyson Cruz Martinez quickly followed 22 months later on February 13, 2009.

Today, Bennie and Claudine carry on their parents' legacy, with Bennie leading the commercial division of MCT Industries and Claudine leading the government division.

MCT's commercial division provides the same support as the government division to its diverse client base which ranges from a local neighbor coming in for truck and trailer customization, to deploying truck fleets of state, local, and tribal governments. In an effort to reduce its carbon footprint, in 2012, MCT installed over 500 solar panels on both the Commercial and Government plants.

MCT's successes have resulted in national recognition of its contribution to America's manufacturing base. In March 2013, Claudine accepted her appointment by the Secretary of Commerce to serve as one of 25 members of the Department of Commerce Manufacturing Council. The Council advises the Secretary of Commerce on ensuring regular communication between the federal government and the manufacturing sector, providing a forum for discussing and proposing solutions to industry-related problems, and ensuring that the United States remains the world's preeminent destination for investment in manufacturing.

To ensure he can continue to provide for MCT's team for years to come, Ted founded We The People, LLC, a real estate development company co-owned by the Martinez Family and MCT team members who choose to join. Four years ago, the Martinez family announced that they would provide \$250,000 in capital to the employee shareholders of We The People, and continue making yearly contributions to the company.

In honor of the 40-year anniversary of MCT Industries, we congratulate the Martinez family and the MCT employees for their numerous and longstanding contributions to the state of New Mexico and the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO MYKE REID

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Myke Reid and commemo-

rate his recent retirement from the American Postal Workers Union (APWU). Serving as Legislative Director of the APWU since 2004, Mr. Reid has been a tireless advocate for our Nation's postal workers and the postal service. He has worked tirelessly benefitting countless numbers of my constituents and many others across the country.

While Mr. Reid has spent many years in the halls of Congress, his life and career began much more humbly. After growing up in a blue-collar family and receiving a Bachelor of Arts degree from Norfolk State University, he began his postal career in 1976 as a clerk in Norfolk, Virginia. He became involved in the union right away, working his way up from newsletter editor, steward, local business agent, state legislative director and state president.

In 1984, Mr. Reid came to Washington to work on a legislative campaign to protect Social Security. He never left. The next year, he was appointed as a Special Assistant to then-President Moe Biller, working on legislative matters. In 1992, he was selected to fill the newly created position of Assistant Legislative Director, which he held until being promoted to Legislative Director in 2004.

Mr. Reid's career is replete with many legislative accomplishments. He played a major role in the enactment of the Family and Medical Leave Act; and reforms to the Hatch Act, the Federal Employees Retirement System Act, the Spouse Equity Act, the Postal Employees Safety Enhancement Act, and the Veterans Employment Opportunities Act. Postal workers have had no stronger advocate, and his successors have big shoes to fill.

In addition to his professional accomplishments, Mr. Reid has been active in the communities of Northern Virginia and Washington, DC. He has served on the Virginia Employment Commission Advisory Board, the Virginia Community College Board, the Alexandria Human Rights Commission, and the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority Board. He has also been active in advocacy; serving on the boards of the National Consumers League and Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington. Mr. Reid's impact has been felt beyond our shores as well. He served as an international observer during the historic election of Nelson Mandela as President of the Republic of South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House join me in congratulating Mr. Myke Reid on this well-deserved retirement. I wish him good health and Godspeed.

THE SUPREME COURT ETHICS ACT OF 2013

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the Code of Conduct for United States Judges is a set of ethical guidelines, created in the wake of judicial scandals, to protect public confidence in the judiciary. Yet shockingly, the Code of Conduct applies to all federal judges except those on the Supreme Court, our nation's most important legal institution.

In just the last four years, Supreme Court Justices have been engaged in ethically dubious conduct at least eight times—conduct that is explicitly forbidden among all other federal justices. Yet, because the Supreme Court does not adhere to the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, they have granted themselves immunity from the standards of behavior that apply to every other justice in the land.

The guidelines contained in the Code exist to ensure that the public has faith that judicial decision-making is based on the facts and the law, not politics and outside interests. Their intent is to uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary by demonstrating that those meting out justice are scrupulous in staying free of even the appearance of outside influence or bias. Public confidence in the judiciary suffers when our nation's highest court appears not to be governed by the same clear ethics rules that apply to all other judges.

The Supreme Court's greatest assets are its integrity and the public trust, yet the Court continues to operate without a binding code of ethics. It is troubling that the highest court in the land does not follow the same standards as the other federal courts, and it is long past time to address this shortcoming.

To that end, today I am introducing the Supreme Court Ethics Act of 2013, legislation to apply the Code of Conduct for United States Judges to justices of the Supreme Court. Formal adoption of the Code of Conduct by the Court would begin to restore the public's faith in our judicial system and help ensure the integrity of our country's highest court. Many of the Supreme Court justices were required to follow these basic rules when they were district or court of appeals judges. Accordingly, adoption of an identical Code by the members of the Supreme Court should not unduly burden members of that Court and certainly would not serve as any impediment to their complete and robust service on the Court.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation that will help protect the public's confidence in the integrity of our nation's judiciary.

RECOGNIZING CARL DOUGLAS WEEKS

HON. VERN BUCHANAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Carl Douglas Weeks, who will retire this month from his position as President of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Manatee County.

For more than 42 years, Carl has dedicated himself to the Boys and Girls Club movement, holding several positions before being named Executive Director of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Manatee County in 2000 and President in 2011.

Carl is living proof of the Boys and Girls Clubs' slogan, "Great Futures Start Here." He joined the Bradenton Boys Club at the age of eight and began working there before graduating high school.

During his career, Carl has tirelessly dedicated himself to developing innovative and effective partnerships that have allowed the non-profit organization to serve more children, more often. Under his leadership, the Boys and Girls Club of Manatee County has become the preeminent children's service organization in the community, serving over 6,000 youth in 2012.

I had the honor of meeting Carl when I visited the Boys and Girls Clubs of Manatee County in 2006. He shared with me an adage that I have often repeated: children are just 25 percent of our population but 100 percent of our future.

His passion and the mission of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Manatee County is to enable all young people, especially those who are most in need, to become productive, caring, responsible citizens.

He has also given time, energy and talents to other community service organizations, including the United Way of Manatee County, South County Community Redevelopment, the Bradenton Kiwanis Club, and the American Red Cross.

I appreciate this opportunity to recognize Carl for all he has done to help young people reach their full potential and his involvement in community service.

RECOGNIZING SIMPSON AND THE 25TH YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE ST. PAUL WATERWAY RESTORATION PROJECT

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 25th anniversary of the St. Paul Waterway Project and the leading role that Simpson, a Pacific Northwest forest products company in operation since 1890, played in this effort.

In 1985, the Simpson company purchased a paper mill in Tacoma, Washington along the St. Paul Waterway and developed a plan to revive and clean up the area. At the time, there were 17 acres of underwater sediment to be cleaned up and seven acres of marine habitat in need of restoration.

Located at the Commencement Bay Superfund site, Simpson's plan became the St. Paul Waterway Restoration Project. Simpson collaborated with the Audubon Society, the Puyallup Tribe, the City of Tacoma, the Sierra Club, and the Washington Environmental Council (WEC) Region 10, among others, in the successful restoration of this critical coastal habitat.

The Commencement Bay Superfund project was the first of its kind in the U.S. and has since become a model for industrial and environmental partnership.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize the 25th anniversary of the St. Paul Waterway Restoration Project. Since its completion, we have seen significant improvement in the habitat and in the St. Paul Waterway and Commencement Bay.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 31, 2013, I missed two roll-call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on No. 426 and No. 427.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on July 31, 2013, I inadvertently cast a "nay" vote on agreeing to the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1911. I intended to vote "yea."

On July 31, 2013, I was not present to vote on passage of H.R. 850. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of July 22, 2013. If I were present, I would have voted on the following:

Rollcall No. 375: H.R. 1542—WMD Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2013 (Rep. Meehan—Homeland Security), "yea."

Rollcall No. 376: H. Con. Res. 44—Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run, "yea."

Rollcall No. 377: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 2397 and H.R. 2610, "nay."

Rollcall No. 378: H. Res. 312—Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 2397 and H.R. 2610, "no."

Rollcall No. 379: Gabbard of Hawaii Amendment No. 3, "no."

Rollcall No. 380: Blumenauer of Oregon Amendment No. 10, "aye."

Rollcall No. 381: Polis of Colorado Amendment No. 14, "aye."

Rollcall No. 382: Blumenauer of Oregon Amendment No. 15, "no."

Rollcall No. 383: Nugent of Florida Amendment No. 17, "no."

Rollcall No. 384: Nadler of New York Amendment No. 20, "aye."

Rollcall No. 385: Moran of Virginia Amendment No. 23, "no."

Rollcall No. 386: Poe of Texas Amendment No. 25, "no."

Rollcall No. 387: Walberg of Michigan Amendment No. 27, "aye."

Rollcall No. 388: Cicilline of Rhode Island Amendment No. 28, "no."

Rollcall No. 389: Cohen of Tennessee Amendment No. 29, "aye."

Rollcall No. 390: Coffman of Colorado Amendment No. 30, "aye."

Rollcall No. 391: Garamendi of California Amendment No. 33, "no."

Rollcall No. 392: Fleming of Louisiana Amendment No. 35, "no."

Rollcall No. 393: Rigell of Virginia Amendment No. 36, "no."

Rollcall No. 394: Flores of Texas Amendment No. 41, "no."

Rollcall No. 395: DeLauro of Connecticut Amendment No. 44, "aye."

Rollcall No. 396: Lee of California Amendment No. 45, "no."

Rollcall No. 397: Quigley of Illinois Amendment No. 46, "no" (check past).

Rollcall No. 398: Denham of California Amendment No. 47, "no."

Rollcall No. 399: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question of H.R. 2218 and H.R. 1582, "nay."

Rollcall No. 400: H. Res. 315, "no."

Rollcall No. 401: Jones of North Carolina Amendment No. 48, "no."

Rollcall No. 402: LaMalfa of California Amendment No. 51, "no."

Rollcall No. 403: Mulvaney of South Carolina Amendment No. 55, "aye."

Rollcall No. 404: Stockman of Texas Amendment No. 60, "no."

Rollcall No. 405: Walorski of Indiana Amendment No. 62, "no."

Rollcall No. 406: Bonamici of Oregon Amendment No. 65, "no."

Rollcall No. 407: Kilmer of Washington Amendment No. 67, "aye."

Rollcall No. 408: Nadler of New York Amendment No. 69, "aye."

Rollcall No. 409: Nadler of New York Amendment No. 70, "aye."

Rollcall No. 410: Schiff of California Amendment No. 73, "no."

Rollcall No. 411: Pompeo of Kansas Amendment No. 99, "aye."

Rollcall No. 412: Amash of Michigan Amendment No. 100, "no."

Rollcall No. 413: Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 2397, "aye."

Rollcall No. 414: Final Passage of H.R. 2397—Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014, "yea."

Rollcall No. 415: Waxman of California Part A Amendment No. 2, "aye."

Rollcall No. 416: Tonko of New York Part A Amendment No. 3, "aye."

Rollcall No. 417: Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 2218, "aye."

Rollcall No. 418: Final Passage of H.R. 2218—Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act of 2013, "no."

HONORING OTTO PORTER, JR.

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a Morley, Missouri native—first round Washington Wizards NBA draft pick Otto Porter, Jr. Mr. Porter is not only known for his outstanding athletic abilities as a versatile small forward, but also for his

achievements off the court. Otto's parents, both of whom won state championships at Scott County Central High School, instilled commendable values in their son. In particular, the importance of education and holding onto his small-town roots has motivated Otto's strong work ethic and his ability to succeed on and off the court. Instead of focusing his time on the national AAU circuit in high school, Otto Porter worked a summer job, advanced his individual game with the help of his father and participated in select events with his high school team. As a Scott County Central high school senior, Mr. Porter led the Braves to a 29–2 record, averaging 30 points and 14 rebounds a game.

After graduating, Mr. Porter signed a letter of intent with the Georgetown Hoyas. Although he dazzled fans off the bench as a freshman, it wasn't until his exceptional sophomore season that his name was pushed towards the top of the NBA lottery. After averaging 16.2 points, 7.5 rebounds per game his sophomore season and shooting 42.2 percent from the three-point range, Otto was unanimously voted Big East Player of the Year by league coaches. Otto's excellent basketball IQ, high motor skills and improved shooting range make him a strong asset to the Washington Wizards for the upcoming NBA season and years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF DEAN MATHISEN

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dean Mathisen for 10 years of service to Nebraska's Second District. Dean is a tireless and devoted public servant to the Second Congressional District of Nebraska and specifically to the veterans in the metro area.

Dean Mathisen serves as a Senior Constituent Liaison in my Omaha Congressional Office and handles military and veteran's affairs. As a former U.S. Army officer and combat veteran of the Cold and First Gulf Wars, his personal experiences aid him in understanding and helping those now serving and returning from the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. Dean is equally committed to assisting the other "Band of Brothers" from our Nation's other wars. Over these past 10 years, his efforts found solutions and answers to complex requests for help with "government bureaucracy" by service members, veterans and family members. His counsel has been instrumental in helping me identify the need for and communicate with the Department of Veterans Affairs about bringing a National Veterans Cemetery to the Second Congressional District of Nebraska. Thanks to Dean's efforts, this project is now a reality and will soon break ground providing a final resting place for the 112,000 underserved veterans in the Omaha area that is worthy of the sacrifices they made.

Dean and I first met as members of the Omaha Young Republicans. He also served on the Douglas County Republican Central Committee as a tireless advocate for the Re-

publican Party's message of lower taxes and a strong national defense. In his free time, he has stayed engaged within the veterans' community by being an active member of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars. He also assists the metro area Boy Scouts with review of rank advancements and other scouting activities.

I offer Dean my sincere appreciation for his dedication and years of service to both our country and to Nebraska's Second Congressional District. I am extremely proud of his accomplishments and am thankful for his years of counsel. Omaha's veterans are better off because of Dean's service.

PHILIPPINES GENEROSITY TO JEWISH REFUGEES

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a remarkable story, previously lost to history. Namely, how the Philippines generously opened its doors to Jewish refugees fleeing Nazi persecution, when all other nations barred their entry.

I would like to posthumously commend Manuel Quezon, President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines (1935–1944) for his resolve to lobby for immigration rights for Jewish refugees even at great political risk. He saved the lives of 1,305 Jews by allowing them entry into the Philippines and would have saved thousands more had the U.S. State Department had allowed its commonwealth to do so.

An extraordinary tale, President Quezon collaborated with his high-profile associates, U.S. High Commissioner Paul McNutt, Colonel (and future president) Dwight D. Eisenhower, and the Frieders, four Jewish businessmen from Ohio who had a cigar business in Manila, to overcome the huge bureaucratic and logistical challenges of saving people from the Holocaust.

I would like also to recognize the U.S. Philippines Society for giving this story a resurgent voice and hosting a round table on June 10, 2013 titled "Holocaust Haven in the Philippines" which focused on an upcoming film documenting this story, *An Open Door*. The U.S. Philippines Society, which recently opened its offices in Washington, D.C. on May 1, 2012, is a non-profit, non-partisan, and independent organization whose mission it is to build on the rich and longstanding historical ties between the United States of America and the Philippines.

An Open Door was produced and directed by award-winning filmmaker Noel M. Izon. This is the third film in his World War II trilogy *Forgotten Stories*. The film was co-produced by author and professor at St. John Fisher College, Sharon Delmendo.

The Filipino people extended a warm welcome to those who undoubtedly would have faced horrible atrocity if stranded in Europe. I hope that this story of human generosity and duty to help those in peril may find an audience among the U.S. public so we can appre-

ciate the ingenuity and heroic risks taken by Manuel Quezon to protect victims of the Holocaust.

HONORING RICK SHIOMI'S 20 YEARS AS ARTISTIC DIRECTOR OF MU PERFORMING ARTS

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the inspiring career of Mr. Rick Shiomi, a leader for Asian-American actors and artists, as he retires as Artistic Director from Mu Performing Arts in Saint Paul, Minnesota.

Rick Shiomi co-founded Mu Performing Arts in 1992 and served as Artistic Director for the next 20 years. Finding that Asian-American theater did not exist in the Twin Cities at the time, Rick worked to bring community voices to the stage. He helped form Mu Daiko, a taiko drumming ensemble, which later became Mu Performing Arts to reflect the broad artistic base of theater, taiko and artistic development. Today, because of Rick's extraordinary leadership and energy, Mu is increasing the size of Asian-American audiences and the number of Asian-American performers who flourish in the Twin Cities.

Thanks to Rick's vision, Mu Performing Arts has become one of the largest pan Asian-American performing arts companies in the United States. He has been recognized numerous times for his outstanding work. His many awards include a 2012 Ivey Award for Lifetime Achievement in Twin Cities theater and a 2007 Sally Award for Vision from the Ordway Center for the Performing Arts. Mu is also a leader in the local and national development of Asian-American theater and taiko. Rick and Mu Performing Arts have helped develop and support the work of local and national playwrights, actors, directors, and musicians by premiering many new works, fostering a new generation of Asian-American artists. Through educational, community and corporate outreach programs the company has provided access to Asian-American culture and arts to communities who otherwise may not have the opportunity to experience it.

Rick's influence has brought Asian-American actors into nontraditional roles in other theaters and helped elevate the recognition of the Asian-American community. Mu Performing Arts is a Minnesota treasure and the legacy of Rick will live on in Mu Performing Arts' work bringing Asian-American voices to the stage in the Twin Cities.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of Mr. Rick Shiomi, a visionary for Asian-American performing art and artists, I am pleased to submit this statement to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in recognition of his retirement as Artistic Director from Mu Performing Arts.

COMMEMORATING THE RETIREMENT OF AMBASSADOR ALLAN KATZ

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today alongside my colleagues, Representatives DAVID VALADAO, JIM COSTA, and DAVID CICILLINE, to commemorate the retirement of U.S. Ambassador to Portugal Allan Katz.

A lawyer by training, Ambassador Katz worked on the staffs of Congressmen Bill Gunter and David Obey before serving as General Counsel of the U.S. House of Representatives Commission on Administrative Review. He then moved to Florida, where he served as Assistant Insurance Commissioner and General Counsel for the State of Florida Insurance Department. Afterward he went into private practice.

In March 2010, Allan Katz was confirmed by the U.S. Senate as U.S. Ambassador to Portugal. A capable and gifted representative of our Nation, Ambassador Katz served with distinction, upholding the United States' long friendship with the Portuguese people. We recognize and commend his fine service on the occasion of his retirement.

ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER'S FAILURE TO PROTECT AMERICA'S CHILDREN

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to submit a letter I sent earlier this week to Attorney General Eric Holder once again urging that the Department of Justice prioritize the issue of human trafficking and specifically go after Web sites like Backpage.com which serve as a conduit for the buying and selling of human beings.

In multiple letters to the Department over the last year I've implored the Attorney General to tell Congress if federal law enforcement does not have the necessary tools to take legal action against such web sites—sites which time and again feature prominently in horrific stories of abuse and exploitation of the most vulnerable among us.

These requests have gone unanswered. The exploitation persists. Attorney General Holder is failing.

Hon. ERIC H. HOLDER, JR.,
Attorney General, Department of Justice,
Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER: Many Americans were undoubtedly heartened to learn yesterday that authorities rescued 105 children from 76 different cities across this nation who had been forced into prostitution, and arrested 150 pimps who were intimately involved in the exploitation of these minors—children ranging in age from 13 to 17. But I suspect that just as many Americans were shocked to learn of the scope and reach of human trafficking in our own back

yard. For under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act any minor used in a commercial sex act is a victim of human trafficking.

I applaud the impressive work of the FBI; its local, state, and federal law enforcement partners, including the Fairfax County Police Department and the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC). As you know, I have long supported efforts locally and in the annual Commerce-Justice-Science (CJS) appropriations bill to elevate this issue as a law enforcement priority. In fact in the CJS bill which recently passed the House Appropriations Committee included language instructing U.S. Attorneys to maintain their human trafficking task forces and undertake proactive investigations of persons or entities facilitating trafficking in persons through the use of classified advertising on the Internet. The bill also directs the U.S. Attorney General to submit a comprehensive report on all DOJ anti-trafficking activities, including legislative proposals that may advance any efforts, no later than 60 days after the bill is signed into law.

While the details of this campaign, Operation Cross Country, are still emerging, not unsurprisingly, Backpage.com featured prominently in the announcement of the crack-down. In fact, a CNN story this morning cited the assistant director of the FBI's criminal investigative division, as saying, "This seventh iteration of Operation Cross Country also was the most successful, with a 30% to 40% increase in 'identifying both victims and pimps' compared with previous operations." The story continued, "He credited the success in part to an expansion of the probe to websites such as www.backpage.com, which he called a forum 'where pimps and exploiters gather.'"

An NBC news story following the raid reported, "Search for 'Backpage.com' on the FBI's main website and up pops eight whole pages of press releases and public announcements naming the classified advertising site as a tool for sex criminals, particularly those selling children, sex and prostitution." Case after case shows that as long as web sites like Backpage.com operate with impunity, impervious to public shame, law enforcement will simply be playing catch up.

In that vein, just last week, an overwhelming majority of state and territorial attorneys general sent a letter to the chair and ranking members of the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and House Committee on Energy and Commerce. The letter indicated that "Federal enforcement alone has proven insufficient to stem the growth of internet-facilitated child sex trafficking," and pleaded that, "Those on the front lines of the battle against the sexual exploitation of children—state and local law enforcement—must be granted the authority to investigate and prosecute those who facilitate these horrible crimes."

I couldn't agree more, which is why in April 2012, well over a year ago, I wrote you a letter making clear that classified Internet advertising was the latest front in the battle against sexual exploitation and trafficking of minors. Specifically I wrote, "... if DOJ is of the mind that there are insufficient laws on the books to prosecute this activity, I respectfully request a broader legal analysis and recommendations to Congress of legislative initiatives that may be undertaken to fully equip law enforcement to tackle this problem." This was the first of several letters I've written on the topic.

On June 8 2012, I wrote, "... I continue to believe that unless there is the very real

prospect of criminal liability that Backpage.com will fail to change ... I recognize that these are complex legal questions but surely we can agree that this is not a complex issue. Children ought not to be bought and sold online. Those who facilitate and enable this practice should have to face consequences. I welcome the best legal analysis the Department can provide in how to ensure that this happens."

And again, on March 27, 2013 I wrote you, this time including a series of recommendations provided by NCMEC that Backpage.com and similar Web sites used for trafficking could voluntarily adopt to reduce the sexual exploitation of children online. I urged you, as the nation's chief law enforcement officer, to press Backpage.com to immediately adopt these practices and said that if they fail to do so you should "... take legal action against Backpage.com."

These last two letters have gone unanswered. The legal analysis has never been provided and the exploitation of innocents continues.

Human trafficking has rightly been deemed the slavery issue of our time. It isn't simply an international tragedy, it's a national and local outrage. For years, the back of my office door featured a giant picture of William Wilberforce—the remarkable abolitionist, and man of faith, who labored tirelessly for decades to ban the slave trade in the British Empire. Wilberforce was part of a broader transatlantic abolition movement dating back to the 1700s. He served as an inspiration for the abolitionist cause on our own shores, laying the foundation for the likes of Frederick Douglass, Harriet Beecher Stowe and even Abraham Lincoln, who 150 years ago this year issued the Emancipation Proclamation.

Wilberforce, famously said, "Having heard all this, you may choose to look the other way, but you can never again say that you do not know." We know that our nation's children are at risk of horrific exploitation that almost defies imagination. We know how pimps and johns use specific Web sites to profit from and prey on their vulnerability. Will you continue to look the other way?

Best wishes.

Think of all the women and children that could be helped. You could make a difference if you act.

IN RECOGNITION OF BAYAUD ENTERPRISES

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bayaud Enterprises, a non-profit organization dedicated to instilling hope, opportunity, and choice into Colorado's disabled community by providing unparalleled job training and placement services.

Founded in 1969, Bayaud Enterprises has been an invaluable resource to the community. This year alone, they have placed over 600 Colorado citizens into competitive positions. Bayaud uses an integrated approach to help find suitable employment for individuals with disabilities who have struggled to find work on their own. They conduct a comprehensive vocational evaluation to assess an

individual's knowledge, skills, and abilities, and then, if needed, provide additional workplace training.

Bayaud continues their commitment to our citizens in need by providing job placement and coaching to our community's disabled population. I applaud Bayaud's commitment to working with Colorado's business community and our government agencies to locate suitable employment for those that previously were unable to do this on their own.

Bayaud's services lessen the impact on Colorado community's social systems and provide positive economic results. Most importantly, employment leads to a sense of accomplishment and the satisfaction that one is contributing to their community.

Mr. Speaker, I know that individuals with disabilities and the economy alike have benefited greatly from the excellent work Bayaud Enterprises has done over the last 44 years.

CONGRATULATING BERWYN SOUTH
SCHOOL DISTRICT 100 FOR ITS
EXCELLENCE IN PROMOTING
HEALTHY SCHOOL ENVIRON-
MENT

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and personally congratulate Stan Fields, District 100 Superintendent, Jim Swicionis, School Board President, as well as the administrators, teachers and students of Berwyn South School District 100 for their amazing commitment to and success in implementing healthy school environments for their students through the promotion of nutrition and physical activity.

I applaud Berwyn South School District 100 for taking bold and robust steps to change the way students approach exercise and nutrition. A clear testament to its extraordinary work is the fact that each of its eight schools in District 100—six elementary schools and two middle schools—received awards from the Healthier U.S. School Challenge operated by the United States Department of Agriculture. The Healthier U.S. School Challenge is a voluntary certification initiative by the federal government that recognizes schools that provide innovative healthy nutrition options and physical activity opportunities for their students. In 2010, First Lady Michelle Obama incorporated the Healthier U.S. School Challenge awards into her Let's Move campaign, awarding monetary prizes for four levels of performance: Bronze; Silver; Gold; and Gold Award of Distinction, the highest level. Berwyn South School District 100 won six Gold Awards of Distinction and two Silver Awards. Impressively, only 12 Gold Awards of Distinction were awarded in the state of Illinois, and Berwyn South School District 100 won half of them. These well-deserved honors reflect the tremendous dedication of the administrators, teachers, and staff of these schools and of the District and its School Board to improving and sustaining the health and nutrition of the students and the community.

To receive awards from the Healthier U.S. Schools Challenge, schools must demonstrate improvements to the nutrition and physical activity of their students across multiple domains, including breakfast foods, lunch foods, nutrition education, physical education, and physical activity. I wish to highlight some of the changes that schools in Berwyn South 100 adopted to improve the health of their students. Perhaps the greatest achievements are the dramatic improvements to the nutritional quality of the school breakfast and lunch menus. Beginning in November 2010, the District 100 Superintendent, School Board, administrators, principals, and food vendor—Aramark—partnered to ensure that each meal served exceeds the nutrition guidelines for sugar and fat content set by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. To complete this task, school stakeholders met with contracted meal providers to eliminate high sugar options and replace them with whole grains, fresh fruit, and vegetables. In addition, the District instituted a "Breakfast in the Classroom" program as a part of a district-wide policy in elementary classrooms during school hours, reducing school tardiness while increasing student focus. Schools further improved the nutrition of foods during holiday celebrations. For example, classes are encouraged to forgo candy during Halloween celebrations and focus on physical activities that celebrate the holiday and fellowship among classmates. Some schools also created various Parent Universities during the evenings that provide family-based experiences, such as Zumba and yoga, designed to educate and motivate the community to engage in physical activity. Beyond simply implementing these changes, the District 100 Initiative partners monitored the changes to evaluate the success and implementation of the initiative.

I am deeply impressed by the committed partnership among an array of school stakeholders in the Berwyn South District 100 that resulted in such positive systemic change in the nutrition and physical activity of the schools. I commend the following schools and their principals for receiving the Healthier U.S. School Challenge Gold Award of Distinction: Freedom Middle School, Principal James Calabrese; Heritage Middle School, Principal Laura LaSalle; Hiawatha Elementary School, Principal Marilyn McManus; Komensky Elementary School, Principal Jeremy Majeski; Pershing Elementary School, Principal Marilyn McManus; and Piper Elementary School, Principal John Fontanetta. I also praise the following schools for receiving the Healthier U.S. School Challenge Silver Award: Emerson Elementary School, Principal Beatriz Lopez; and Irving Elementary School, Principal Mary Havis. I laud Superintendent Fields and School Board President Swicionis for encouraging and supporting these schools in their efforts to improve the physical well-being of their students.

In closing, I recognize Berwyn South School District 100 for its excellence in promoting nutrition and physical activity, and I praise its Superintendent, School Board President, School Board, administrators, teachers, staff, and parents for their commitment to improving the health of our students and communities.

THANKING MR. ALESSANDRO
"ALEX" CUSATI FOR HIS SERVICE
TO THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the entire U.S. House of Representatives, today I pay tribute to Alessandro "Alex" Cusati, the Chief Engineer at the U.S. House of Representatives. Alex was born in Eboli, Italy and first came to the United States as a young man in the Italian Air Force. After his exchange program, he worked for a CBS affiliate in Alabama where he met his wife Tallulah. Alex and Tallulah have two children, Jerry and Genoveffa, and a grandson, Stephen Benny.

Alex has been a dedicated House employee for 36 years and has had an impact not only on the employees working on the Hill, but also on the public at large. Starting as an Engineer in the House Recording Studio, he rose to the position of Chief Engineer in 1995. He was instrumental in running the House's first TV broadcasts in 1979 and bore the daunting task of maintaining and upgrading the data, audio, and video capabilities of all offices within the U.S. House of Representatives. Alex has been responsible for coordinating and overseeing the transition from analog to digital data usage and the implementation of High Definition TV.

Alex was also responsible for the Recording Studio Media Center, which allows remote broadcasts from committee hearings. Additionally, he oversaw the design and opening of the House Floor Broadcasting Control Room in the Capitol Visitor Center. His personnel file, teeming with letters of gratitude for his efforts from Committee Chairmen, House Officers, and staff from foreign dignitaries, is a prime indication of his commitment to the House and his tireless worth ethic. He is commended by his colleagues for his institutional knowledge, positive attitude, and uncanny ability to resolve any unpredictable issue.

Alex Cusati will be missed throughout this institution. He is a shining example of the committed men and women who quietly and without fanfare, serve the American people in unique and invaluable ways. Their commitment and unwavering work ethic make it possible for us to conduct the vital work of this nation. Please join me in commending his outstanding service and wishing him continued success as he takes on new challenges in his retired life.

HONORING ERNEST "JUGGIE"
HEEN, JR.

HON. TULSI GABBARD

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Ernest "Juggie" Heen, Jr., an iconic son of Hawai'i. "Uncle Juggie," as he was known by everyone who loved him, often shared his gift

for story-telling, his sense of humor, keen intellect, and love of Native Hawaiian customs and traditions. He was an accomplished musician who performed Hawaiian songs that are rarely heard today.

Born on August 31, 1930, to one of Hawai'i's most prominent political families, Uncle Juggie was the seventh of nine children. Uncle Juggie learned of Hawai'i's unique multi-cultural traditions and political dynamics at a young age. It was with his friends, many of whom were children of plantation workers, that he began the lifelong embrace of people from all heritages and his passion for service.

Uncle Juggie would often tag along with his father who became increasingly immersed in Hawai'i's political scene. One particular event where his father brought food to striking dock workers in the 1940s made a lasting impression on Juggie as a child. From that moment, he committed himself to organized labor in Hawai'i. In the 1960s, Uncle Juggie later went on to serve three terms in the Hawai'i State Legislature.

Uncle Juggie was a mentor to many, especially those engaged in the political process. In 2012, Uncle Juggie was honored with the prestigious Lifetime Achievement award from the Democratic Party of Hawai'i. He was also honored by the Honolulu City Council, the Hawai'i State Office of Veterans Services, and the Department of Defense during the commemoration of the 60th Anniversary of the Korean War.

His older brother, Judge Walter Heen, described Uncle Juggie as "a true character" and one who "had the keen ability to perceive underlying issues that people were glossing over and was able to express the essence of those issues very clearly and succinctly." Always an advocate, in his final years he became a strong and visible proponent for Hawai'i's Death with Dignity movement—giving the terminally ill in Hawai'i complete autonomy over their end-of-life decisions and care.

Uncle Juggie was diagnosed with lung cancer in 1998. Although it went into remission, it returned to his liver and pancreas a few years later. After fighting courageously for more than two years with the support of the many people he mentored, Uncle Juggie passed away on June 30, 2013.

Uncle Juggie, thank you very much (mahalo nui loa) for your service to Hawai'i and our nation. Your legacy lives on in all of us. Love to you. (Aloha oe.)

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF PROPER SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

HON. RICHARD L. HANNA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today in support of K–12 education and our national public school system. I recently voted in favor of H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, as an imperfect but essential piece of legislation to move forward the necessary reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Had the opportunity been

presented, I would have supported measures to strengthen The Student Success Act by supporting altered Title I funding allocations as well as reiterating the importance of STEM education at a young age.

The intent of Title I funding within the original ESEA was, and should continue to be, to provide federal funding to public schools with the highest concentrations of poverty. Supporting our most vulnerable populations provides impoverished communities and students with some of the largest barriers to educational success an enhanced opportunity to flourish and reach their full potential.

The State of New York alone is home to thousands of public schools receiving Title I funding. We know that in order to prepare our students to succeed in a globally competitive environment, we need to equip them with the most relevant and enhanced resources available to expand their knowledge of 21st century demands. By supporting schools and students who wouldn't otherwise have the resources to improve efforts in early childhood education and emphasizing learning in in-demand subjects like science and math, we can truly support our future.

I will continue to advocate for an enhanced reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that fully supports our public school system, teachers, and students for a better America.

WINDI AKINS PASTORINI

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to honor Windi Akins Pastorini, for being named the 2012 Texas Criminal Defense Lawyer of the Year and the 2012 Harris County Criminal Lawyer of the Year. This is the latest in a long line of awards given to this extraordinary lawyer. I have known Windi for over 20 years in my work as a judge and prosecutor in Texas. I witnessed first hand Windi's passionate dedication to the law and to her clients. Those who know her best describe her as dedicated, powerful, and relentless.

After graduating from the University of Texas at Arlington, Windi earned her law degree from the University of Texas in Austin. Windi began her legal career as a prosecutor for the Harris County District Attorney's office, and then she became a trial lawyer where she has served for over 25 years. She is an advocate in every sense of the word who works passionately to defend those who are accused of crimes.

Windi's extensive knowledge of the justice system and her incredible work ethic quickly gained her respect from her colleagues in the law profession and citizens of Harris County. Over her career, Windi has a history of victories defending those charged with drug related crimes, white collar crimes, fraud and violent offenses. Her success in defending her clients has led to her inclusion into a selective group of lawyers certified to represent indigent defendants in death penalty cases in Texas.

Windi has changed many lives. The fact that she was the defense lawyer has made the difference in the outcome of numerous cases.

Windi has a long history of advocating for victims. Recently, Windi defended the rights of a young 12-year old girl who had been repeatedly sexually abused by her father since she was just 6 years old. One evening, the young girl finally stood up for herself and told her father to leave her alone. After receiving threats by her father that she would "regret her actions", the young girl shot and killed her father later that night in fear for her life. Ms. Pastorini stood by her client and successfully fought for her right of self defense. The young girl was acquitted of murder, providing an invaluable win for abused victims everywhere.

Besides being an excellent trial lawyer, Windi drives Jeep Renegades/Wranglers. Being a Jeep owner myself, I appreciate others who drive such rugged, superior vehicles!

On behalf of the Second Congressional District of Texas, I commend this remarkable Texan for her exemplary service and dedication to Harris County and to the State of Texas. Thank you, Windi, for a lifetime of remarkable achievements within the legal community and for your steadfast commitment to representing the accused citizens of Texas in the court room.

And that's just the way it is.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,599,194,294.87. We've added \$6,111,722,145,381.79 to our debt in 4 and a half years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING CARL FISHER

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the outstanding public education career of Carl Fisher.

Carl has been recognized as one of five 2013 Pioneers in Education in Missouri for his commitment and contributions to public education in Missouri. Since he was just 16 years old, Carl has been serving the children in Pleasant Hope as their school bus driver. Now 83, Carl has transported three generations of students to and from school for 66 extraordinary years.

This remarkable feat makes Carl a Guinness World Record holder for the longest career as a school bus driver. However, Carl

isn't the only one in his family with experience behind the wheel. Carl comes from a family of bus drivers where four out of five brothers, their father, uncle, and brothers-in-law all have served the community by safely getting students to and from school every day.

I am extremely proud of the work Carl has done for the children and families of the Pleasant Hope community over the past 66 years. His steadfast determination of truly doing what he loves is admired by all. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Carl Fisher, recipient of the 2013 Pioneers in Education award in Missouri.

A TRIBUTE TO THE MILWAUKEE
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING UNDERWATER ROBOTICS TEAM

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of the Milwaukee School of Engineering (MSOE). MSOE recently earned the top engineering evaluation score in this year's Marine Advanced Technology Education Center's International competition for Remotely Operated Vehicles (ROV). This year marks the first time MSOE has participated in this competition, and I am proud to support this great achievement.

For the past 11 years, Marine Advanced Technology Education (MATE) Center, which is funded by the National Science Foundation, has used its underwater robotics competition to help students obtain hands on science, technology, engineering and math experience, thereby preparing them for careers in the STEM fields. Through the ROV competition, students gain specialized knowledge and apply their skills in a teamwork oriented setting. Students produce technical reports as well as presentations and displays to showcase their engineering work to competition judges currently in the field. In addition, each team is required to exemplify an entrepreneurial spirit in each stage of the competition. The benefits of participating are far reaching.

A total of 53 teams participated in the 2013 international competition, and 23 teams entered MSOE's competition category. As the theme was ocean observing systems, MSOE's competition mission was to create technology that would assist in installing and maintaining instrumentation to monitor ocean activity in real time to then determine the ocean's impact on the weather. In successfully doing so, they earned the top engineering evaluation score. They demonstrated exemplary efforts and should be proud of their accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the Milwaukee School of Engineering Underwater Robotics team. Through their ability and diligence, they have distinguished their school and the district. I am honored to pay tribute to MSOE.

CONGRATULATING KAZAKHSTAN
ON CONSTITUTIONAL DAY

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kazakhstan on its Constitution Day. Kazakhstan celebrates Constitution Day on August 30.

Constitution Day is one of the most important state holidays in the country. On August 30, 1995, as a result of a nationwide referendum, Kazakhstan's Constitution—the supreme national law—was adopted establishing the rules and principles of building Kazakhstan as an independent, sovereign, and economically liberal, democracy.

All internationally recognized rights and freedoms are enshrined in the Constitution, thus making it a modern and progressive basis for a sustainable movement towards a full-fledged democratic system. Democracy is a gradual process and so I commend President Nursultan Nazarbayev for his extraordinary leadership in bringing about equality and unity, and in guaranteeing the growth and well-being of every citizen of the country.

Constitutional amendments approved in May 2007 will cede the powers of the President to the Parliament in a thoughtful way that protects the country's sovereignty and the rights of its citizens. The Constitution allows for accelerated economic reform while maintaining political and social stability and the Constitution consolidates the values the people of Kazakhstan have held for many centuries. It also consolidates unity among more than 120 nationalities of Kazakhstan.

In tribute to President Nazarbayev and all that he has accomplished for and on behalf of the people of Kazakhstan, I enter this statement for the historical record. President Nazarbayev has spared no effort in securing the rights to life and liberty for all Kazakhstanis. Because of his vision, Kazakhstan is also Central Asia's leader and a global leader on issues of importance, including nuclear non-proliferation.

So, once more, I congratulate the people of Kazakhstan on Constitution Day, and I send them my very best wishes for a peaceful and prosperous future.

NATIONAL HEALTH CENTER WEEK

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge August 11 through 17, 2013, as National Health Center Week. America's community health centers are at the core of our health care system; the nation's safety net, delivering accessible, high quality, cost effective primary and preventative care to all individuals regardless of their ability to pay.

Health centers, located in medically underserved areas and locally-controlled by patient-majority boards, make each health center re-

sponsive to the needs of the individual community it serves. Currently, there are more than 1,200 health centers serving as health homes for more than 22 million individuals at more than 9,000 locations across the country.

Health centers offer patient-focused, coordinated health care—preventive and primary care that families and individuals need, where and when they need it.

Health centers employ more than 9,500 physicians and more than 6,300 nurse practitioners, physician assistants, certified nurse midwives, social workers, case managers, and community health workers. These employees are part of a multi-disciplinary clinical team designed to treat the whole patient; coordinating care and managing chronic disease, at the same time reducing unnecessary, avoidable and wasteful use of health resources.

The health home model that health centers use is at the forefront of pioneering and goes beyond primary medical care. They provide behavioral health and dental services, case management and enabling services to ensure care is provided in an efficient and timely manner.

The health center model has proven to be an effective means of overcoming access barriers for the medically underserved. In doing so, health care outcomes are improved and health care costs are reduced. This unique model allows health centers to save the healthcare system approximately \$24 billion annually by keeping patients out of costlier health care settings, such as emergency rooms.

As locally owned and operated small businesses, health centers serve as critical economic engines helping to power local economies, particularly in times of recession. In these difficult economic times, health centers are economic drivers in their communities. In 2009 alone, health centers generated \$20 billion in combined economic impact and were responsible for creating nearly 200,000 jobs in areas hit hardest by the recession.

This year, over 400 communities nationwide submitted applications seeking a health center with only 25 new centers anticipated, demonstrating an overwhelming demand for access to comprehensive primary care across the nation. Health centers are expected to become the health care home for many new patients, but the demand for health centers continues to outpace growth, considering many existing health centers are already at capacity. Health centers are committed to expanding and meeting the needs of the communities they serve in order to grow their reach to more individuals who lack regular access to a health care home.

National Health Center Week offers the opportunity to recognize America's health centers, their staff, board members, and all those responsible for the continued success and growth of the program since its creation almost 50 years ago. During this National Health Center Week, we recognize the multitude of ways in which America's Health Centers transform care in local communities by delivering comprehensive, high quality, cost effective, and accessible health care.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating the community health centers in recognizing August 11 through 17, 2013 as National

Health Center Week. I encourage everyone to visit their local health center and celebrate the important partnership between America's Health Centers and the communities they serve.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COUNCIL FOR RESPONSIBLE NUTRITION

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Council for Responsible Nutrition (CRN) on its 40th Anniversary.

CRN is the leading trade association representing dietary supplement manufacturers, ingredient suppliers, and companies that supply services for the supplement industry—all of which are committed to responsible industry.

CRN was formed in 1973 by three companies, with the primary objective to establish an association of dietary supplement companies with a strong commitment to science, research and a collaborative approach to working with Congress and government agencies on issues that affect dietary supplements and nutrition.

As the respected voice of the dietary supplement industry, CRN has been at the forefront of supporting landmark legislation and regulation that benefit consumers; playing a key role in the passage of the Nutrition Labeling Education Act of 1990 and the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act of 1994 (DSHEA).

CRN worked collaboratively with the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission on the implementation of DSHEA, urging the creation and promulgation of Good Manufacturing Practices specific to dietary supplements, and created a voluntary, self-regulatory advertising review program to monitor false, deceptive and misleading dietary supplement advertising.

For consumers, the "Life . . . Supplemented" campaign exemplifies CRN's commitment to helping individuals create a healthier lifestyle by offering actionable suggestions and educational information about the three pillars of a smart wellness regimen: healthy diet, exercise and dietary supplements.

Mr. Speaker, CRN has created an environment that allows companies to responsibly develop, manufacture and market dietary supplements and nutritional ingredients that enable consumers to live healthier lives. It continues to serve as a credible and respected scientific resource for Congress, regulators, scientists, journalists and consumers on all matters related to dietary supplements, including demonstrating the health-related and economic benefits that dietary supplements can provide.

As a co-chair of the Dietary Supplement Caucus, it is my pleasure to congratulate the Council for Responsible Nutrition on its anniversary, as well as the influence it has had on the dietary supplements over its 40-year history, and the promise it gives for industry and consumers alike in the years to come.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE DECREASE UNSAFE TOXINS ACT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (D.U.S.T.) Act, which would ban children's cushioned products that contain an unacceptable level of toxic flame retardant chemicals. In doing so, this bill would reduce infant and children exposure to these harmful chemicals.

This bill would set a maximum level of 1,000 parts per million for the toxic chemicals in the filling materials used in products, such as high chairs, strollers, bouncers, infant walkers, changing pads, and baby carriers.

Studies clearly show that exposure to these toxic chemicals may be associated with cancer, birth defects, immune disruption, reproductive disorders, hormonal imbalances, and neurologic and mental development disorders. Toddlers who crawl in the dust and put their hands in their mouths have three to four times the levels of toxic flame retardants in their bodies compared to their parents. This is at an age when their neurological and reproductive organs are still developing and they are the most vulnerable to the toxic effects of the chemicals.

In addition to the potential health hazards, flame retardants have not been found to significantly improve fire safety or prevent ignitions from small flame sources. According to data from fire protection groups, such as the National Fire Protection Association, no fire safety benefit exists from including flame retardant chemicals in these products.

Our current regulatory system does not protect our children from such toxic chemicals. We must act now to help reduce our exposure and protect our most vulnerable, our children.

The legislation has been endorsed by the Green Science Policy Institute, Women's Voices for the Earth, Clean Production Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, First Focus, Environmental Working Group, Zero to Three, IKEA North America Services, and the U.S. Public Interest Research Group (PIRG), Children's Defense Fund, and Alaska Community Action on Toxins. I hereby submit for the RECORD letters of support from these organizations and urge the House of Representatives to consider this bill to improve the health of infants and kids in communities across America.

GREEN SCIENCE POLICY INSTITUTE,
Berkeley, CA, July 17, 2013.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DeLAURO: The Green Science Policy Institute is writing in support of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act seeks to amend the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardant chemicals from use in resilient filling materials in children's products.

At Green Science Policy Institute independent research and scientific integrity guide our mission to promote responsible use of chemicals, ensuring a healthy planet for current and future generations. We provide unbiased scientific data to facilitate informed decision-making about the use of

chemicals in consumer products. We encourage scientists to use their research in the public interest. We are currently focusing on reducing the use of unnecessary flame retardants due to their adverse impacts on human and environmental health.

Flame retardant chemicals are currently added to the foam of baby products and furniture to meet California Furniture Flammability Standard Technical Bulletin 117 (TB117). Flame retardant use in California furniture and juvenile products to meet TB117 has not led to a measurable improvement in fire safety. The use of some halogenated flame retardants may actually decrease fire safety since they can increase the amount of soot, smoke, carbon monoxide and other toxic gases produced when a product does burn. The soot and smoke can impede escape and toxic gases, rather than flames, are the largest cause of fire deaths. Importantly, baby products do not pose a fire hazard.

TB117 is scheduled to be updated on January 1, 2014 so flame retardants will no longer be needed in children's product foam in California. DUST Act legislation will align with this important change.

Working in collaboration with researchers at Duke University and the San Francisco Estuary Institute, Green Science Policy Institute collected foam samples from baby products and found that 80% of products tested contained chemical flame retardants which are either known to be associated with adverse health effects or lack adequate health information.

Children and infants are most sensitive to the adverse health effects of these chemicals, some of which have been linked with reduced IQ, learning disorders, reduced fertility, thyroid disruption and cancer. Babies are born with these chemicals in their bodies and get a further dose from their mother's milk and exposure to baby products.

The average American home can contain pound levels of these chemicals. Flame retardant chemicals leak from products into dust. Dust gets on hands and food. Babies and children crawl, sit and play on the floor where dust settles. They explore the world by putting things in their mouths.

We urge Congress to adopt the DUST Act to protect infants and children from these unnecessary harmful toxins.

Sincerely,

DR. ARLENE BLUM,
Executive Director.
DR. VEENA SINGLA,
Associate.

PHYSICIANS FOR SOCIAL
RESPONSIBILITY—LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, CA, July 30, 2013.

Re Support the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act.

Congresswoman ROSA DeLAURO,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DeLAURO: On behalf of Physicians for Social Responsibility—Los Angeles, we write to express our strong support for the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act amends the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardant chemicals from use in the resilient filling materials in infant and children's products.

PSR-LA is a 5,000 member strong organization representing physicians and other health professionals dedicated to promoting healthy communities and advocating for social and environmental justice. We have a

long history of educating the medical community about the gravest environmental threats to human health, and working to eliminate health inequalities caused by environmental exposures.

Flame retardants chemicals have been added to the filling materials of children products and furniture to meet the California Standard Technical Bulletin (TB) 117, which has become the de facto national standard for furniture manufacturers. Flame retardant chemicals continuously migrate out of household products and settle into dust, which is inhaled and ingested by people and pets.

Research shows that exposure to toxic flame retardant chemicals can be associated with increased cancer, neurological deficits, developmental problems and reduced fertility. Although some flame retardants were removed from children's sleepwear in the 1970s, similar flame retardants continue to be used in children products such as nursing pillows, car seats, sleeping wedges, portable crib mattresses, baby carriers, strollers and changing table pads, despite the fact that these products do not pose a fire hazard. Toddlers who crawl in the dust and put their hands in their mouths have the some of the highest levels of toxic flame retardant chemicals in their bodies. This is at an age when their neurological and reproductive organs are still developing and they are highly vulnerable to the toxic effects of the chemicals.

California is revising its TB 117 because of the strong evidence that flame retardants used to meet the standard have not provided greater protection from fires, and can in fact make fires more dangerous. While this standard revision is a positive change, companies will not be required to abandon the use of flame retardant chemicals. For that reason, the DUST Act is necessary to protect children from toxic chemicals, and we urge its immediate passage.

Sincerely,

ANA MASCAREÑAS,
Policy & Communications Director.
MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO,
Executive Director.

PUBLIC INTEREST RESEARCH GROUP
(PIRG), FEDERATION OF STATE
PIRGs,

Washington, DC, July 26, 2013.

Hon. ROSA DELAURIO,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURIO: We write in support of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act amends the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban toxic flame retardant chemicals from use in the resilient filling materials in infant and children's products. Accumulation of flame retardant chemicals in humans and animals and adverse health effects in animals have been well documented in a large body of peer reviewed literature. Studies have found associations between high levels and reduced IQ in children, endocrine and thyroid disruption, changes in male hormone levels and reduced fertility, increased time to become pregnant in women, adverse birth outcomes, impaired development, and cancer. Children are especially at risk for exposure to flame retardants in household dust because they crawl on floors and have the tendency to put hands, toys, and other objects in their mouths. In addition to the potential for adverse health effects from expo-

sure to toxic flame retardants, infants and children to have critical periods of development during which exposure to toxic substances can cause increased susceptibility to disease, which might not become apparent until later in life.¹ Finally, adding flame retardant chemicals to baby products has not been shown to be effective in saving life or property.

Manufacturers put flame retardant chemicals into baby products to meet Technical Bulletin 117 (TB 117), a unique California flammability standard for foam in juvenile products and upholstered furniture implemented by the California Bureau of Electronic and Appliance Repair, Home Furnishings and Thermal Insulation (the Bureau) that has recently been revised to address concerns about flame retardants in children's products.

Recent research has detected flame retardants in the majority of baby products tested. A 2011 study identified flame retardants in 80 of 101 baby products from across the U.S. and from Canada.² Another study released in January 2012 found flame retardants in 17 of 20 tested baby products.³ These tests indicated that chlorinated Tris is the most prevalent flame retardant in children's products in concentrations ranging up to five percent. The most prevalent chemical found is TDCPP, or Tris (1,3-dichloro-2-propyl) phosphate, which was removed from children's pajamas in the 1970s when it was discovered to be mutagenic. TDCPP was designated as a carcinogen by the State of California under Proposition 65 in October 2011 based on laboratory studies finding increases in kidney, liver, and testicular tumors as well as evidence of mutagenicity. Previously, a Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) assessment designated the chemical as a probable carcinogen. A 2011 study tested the chemical's effects on the development of brain cells and compared its effects to those of chlorpyrifos, a pesticide known to be toxic to the nervous system. By some measures, TDCPP was even more toxic to the cells than chlorpyrifos, with effects on cell development, number, and DNA synthesis.⁴

Adding flame retardant chemicals to baby products has not been shown to be effective in saving life or property. An analysis of fire data from 1980 to 2005 by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)—years when TB 117-compliant furniture containing these chemicals was sold much more in California than in other states—does not show a greater reduction in the rate of fire deaths in California compared to that of other states where the chemicals were used less frequently.

Fire prevention is the first step in avoiding the unnecessary and excessive use of harmful flame retardant chemicals. Fire-safe cigarettes, sprinklers, and smoke detectors, along with the enforcement of improved building codes, are all proven to be effective in reducing fire-related deaths. Good product design can also reduce and eliminate the need for chemical flame retardants by using less flammable materials or by placing a physical barrier between the flammable component and outside materials. Finally, safer alternatives to chlorinated and brominated flame retardants that still meet applicable flammability standards have been identified. The EPA recently acknowledged that there is no evidence to substantiate claims that the use of certain flame retardants has resulted in a reduced incidence of fires.

Thank you for your leadership in protecting America's consumers and children

from toxic flame retardants. We urge the Congress to adopt the DUST Act to protect infants and children from these dangerous chemicals.

Sincerely,

JENNY LEVIN,

U.S. PIRG Public Health Advocate.

¹Growing Up Toxic: Chemical Exposures and Increases in Developmental Disease. Frontier Group, U.S. PIRG Education. 2011

²Hidden Hazards in the Nursery. Washington Toxics Coalition/Safer States. 2012.

³Identification of Flame Retardants in Polyurethane foam Collected from Baby Products. Heather M. Stapelton, Susan Klosterhaus, Alex Keller, P. Lee Ferguson, Saskia van Bergen, Ellen Cooper, Thomas F. Webster, and Arlene Blum. Environmental Science & Technology.

⁴Hidden Hazards in the Nursery. Washington Toxics Coalition/Safer States. 2012.

WOMEN'S VOICES FOR THE EARTH,

Missoula, MT, July 24, 2013.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURIO: We write in support of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act amends the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardants chemicals from use in the resilient filling materials in infant and children's products.

Flame retardants chemicals have been added to the filling materials of children products and furniture to meet the California Standard Technical Bulletin (TB) 117, which has become the de facto national standard for furniture manufacturers. Flame retardant chemicals continuously migrate out of household products and settle into dust.

Research shows that exposure to toxic flame retardant chemicals can be associated with increased cancer, neurological deficits, developmental problems and reduced fertility. Although some flame retardants were removed from use in children sleepwear in the 1970s, similar flame retardants continue to be used in children products such as nursing pillows, car seats, sleeping wedges, portable crib mattresses, baby carriers, strollers and changing table pads. Toddlers who crawl in the dust and put their hands in their mouths have the highest levels of toxic flame retardant chemicals in their bodies. This is at an age when their neurological and reproductive organs are still developing and they are the most vulnerable to the toxic effects of the chemicals.

Based on recent studies and laboratory research, the California standard TB 117 has not been found to significantly improve fire safety or prevent ignitions from small flame sources. Furthermore, such baby products do not pose a fire hazard. According to fire protection groups, flame retardants have not led to improvements in fire safety and pose an unnecessary health hazard.

We urge the Congress to adopt the DUST Act to protect innocent infants and children from these harmful toxins.

Sincerely,

JAMIE MCCONNELL,

Director of Programs and Policy.

IKEA NORTH AMERICA SERVICES, LLC,

Conshohocken, PA.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURIO, We are contacting you as a follow-up on the letter addressed to you that I gave to Ms. Treefa Aziz when I met her in your office on April 26th, 2013. Please find the letter enclosed. We are wondering if your office is following the CPSC NPR for the 16 CFR 1634 Rulemaking?

Please let us know if you have any questions in this regard. IKEA has extensive experience with flammability testing of upholstered furniture, both here in the US and in Europe.

We also write in support of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act amends the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardants chemicals from use in the resilient filling materials in infant and children's products. IKEA actively work to eliminate, replace and reduce environmentally hazardous substances in our products and manufacturing processes. Our focus is to minimize the impact IKEA products have on humans and the environment.

Sincerely,

MALIN NÄSMAN,
Product Requirements &
Compliance Specialist.

FIRST FOCUS CAMPAIGN FOR CHILDREN,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2013.

Hon. ROSA DELAURO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO: I am writing on behalf of the First Focus Campaign for Children, a bipartisan advocacy organization committed to making children and their families a priority in federal policy and budget decisions, to express our support for the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act to be introduced in the 113th Congress.

The First Focus Campaign for Children is a strong advocate for banning flame retardant chemicals from being used in filling materials in children's products. Flame retardant chemicals have been found in over 80 percent of children's cushioned products, such as strollers, changing pads, and high chairs, according to a 2011 study published in Environmental Science and Technology. These chemicals, such as organohalogen and organophosphorous, are toxic and lead to problems like reduced IQ hyperactivity, and birth defects. Other flame retardant chemicals found in children's products have been linked to cancer, immune and endocrine disruption, developmental impairment, and reproductive dysfunction.

Flame retardant chemicals are known to settle in the dust on the ground, making toddlers at greatest risk of being exposed. Toddlers play on the floor and put their hands in their mouth, ingesting the contaminated dust. Studies have shown that flame retardant chemicals are not necessary and do not significantly improve fire safety, nor do they reduce the risk of ignition from small flame sources.

The Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act helps to ensure the safety of children and infants by banning the use of flame retardant chemicals in the resilient filling materials in children's products. This Act would deem any children's product with flame retardant chemicals as a "banned hazardous substance" under the Federal Hazardous Substances Act if it is manufactured a year after the passage of the Act.

First Focus Campaign for Children applauds the introduction of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act and we look forward to working with your office to help ensure that products are safe for children.

Sincerely,

BRUCE LESLEY,
First Focus Campaign for Children.

ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP,
Washington, DC, July 29, 2013.

Hon. ROSA DELAURO,
Rayburn House Office Building,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO, Environmental Working Group is pleased to support your Decrease Unsafe Toxic Chemicals (DUST) Act. The DUST Act is an important piece of legislation that would amend the Consumer Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban the use of certain flame-retardants in the padding and foam parts of children's products. The use of these chemicals is unsafe and exposes children to unnecessary health risks.

Many chemical fire retardants used in children's items can be toxic to human health. Maternal exposure to a type of chemical fire retardant known as polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) alters thyroid hormone levels and affect children's neurodevelopment. PBDEs were withdrawn from commerce in the mid-2000s due to toxicity concerns, but replacement chemicals show worrisome signs of toxicity to human health.

Fire retardant chemicals have been added to products because of a nationally recognized safety standard set by California known as the Furniture Flammability Standard Technical Bulletin (TB117). But as evidence has mounted on the toxicity of PBDEs and replacement chemicals, experts have concluded that children's products do not pose a significant fire hazard, and TB117 is being revised.

Infants and children are especially vulnerable to chemical exposure, and coupled with the significant amount of time spent crawling and playing on the ground where dust accumulates only increases their direct exposure through inhalation and hand to mouth contact. A 2008 study of PBDE concentrations in American families found that young children had much higher concentrations of these chemicals than their mothers, presumably due to greater contact with fire retarded furniture and contaminated house dust.

The DUST Act would work to reduce the number of unnecessary health risks posed to young children by banning the use of certain flame-retardants in children's products. It would also treat any product manufactured on or after one year after the enactment of the DUST Act with more than 1,000 parts per million of a flame-retardant as a banned hazardous substance.

The commonsense proposals in the DUST Act will protect public health and our most vulnerable populations. EWG strongly supports the bill and looks forward to working with you to ensure its enactment.

Sincerely,

KENNETH A. COOK,
President.

CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND,
July 30, 2013.

Hon. ROSA L. DELAURO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO: The Children's Defense Fund applauds your effort to protect infants and young children from harmful chemicals during their critical developmental years. We offer our support of your "Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act", which will ensure companies do not use toxic flame retardants in the production of cushioned children's products. By classifying products created with such chemicals as "banned hazardous substances," the DUST Act will prevent children from harmful tox-

ins via car seats, nursing pillows, strollers and other items.

For forty years, the Children's Defense Fund has worked to ensure all children in America get the healthy start they need to survive and thrive. This includes paying attention to environmental health hazards that threaten their health and development. Preventing the exposure of infants and young children to harmful chemicals during their early years is critical to their development. A recent study conducted by the Pediatric Academic Societies demonstrated that prenatal exposure to flame retardant chemicals is associated with hyperactivity and lower intelligence in early childhood. Yet toddlers have been proven to have the highest levels of flame retardant chemicals in their systems—higher even than adults. The developmental consequences of this continue after exposure; the largest cognitive deficits were observed in children over age five.

By reducing the amount of toxins young children are exposed to during their critical early years and preventing developmental delays, your bill strengthens the foundation necessary for children to succeed later in life. We commend you for encouraging congressional action to allow all infants and young children a healthy start in life and so appreciate your ongoing leadership on behalf of children and families.

Sincerely yours,

MARIAN WRIGHT EDELMAN.

CLEAN PRODUCTION ACTION,
July 26, 2013.

Re Support the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act.

Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO: We write in support of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act amends the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardants chemicals from use in the resilient filling materials in infant and children's products.

Flame retardants chemicals have been added to the filling materials of children products and furniture to meet the California Standard Technical Bulletin (TB 117), which has become the de facto national standard for furniture manufacturers. Flame retardant chemicals continuously migrate out of household products and settle into dust, which is inhaled and ingested by people and pets.

Research shows that exposure to toxic flame retardant chemicals can be associated with increased cancer, neurological deficits, developmental problems and reduced fertility. Although some flame retardants were removed from children's sleepwear in the 1970s, similar flame retardants continue to be used in children products such as nursing pillows, car seats, sleeping wedges, portable crib mattresses, baby carriers, strollers and changing table pads, despite the fact that these products do not pose a fire hazard. Toddlers who crawl in the dust and put their hands in their mouths have the some of the highest levels of toxic flame retardant chemicals in their bodies. This is at an age when their neurological and reproductive organs are still developing and they are highly vulnerable to the toxic effects of the chemicals.

California is revising its TB 117 because of the strong evidence that flame retardants used to meet the standard have not provided greater protection from fires, and can in fact

make fires more dangerous. While this standard revision is a positive change, companies will not be required to abandon the use of flame retardant chemicals. For that reason, the DUST Act is necessary to protect children from toxic chemicals, and we urge its immediate passage.

Sincerely,

BEVERLEY THORPE.

ALASKA COMMUNITY ACTION ON TOXICS,

Anchorage, AK, July 29, 2013.

Re Support the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act.

Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN DELAURO: We write today on behalf of the members of Alaska Community Action on Toxics ("ACAT") in support of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act amends the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardants chemicals from use in the resilient filling materials in infant and children's products. ACAT is a statewide non-profit public interest environmental health research and advocacy organization dedicated to protecting environmental health and achieving environmental justice. Our mission is to assure justice by advocating for environmental and community health. We believe that everyone has a right to clean air, clean water and toxic-free food. We work to stop the production, proliferation, and release of toxic chemicals that may harm human health or the environment.

Flame retardants chemicals have been added to the filling materials of children products and furniture to meet the California Standard Technical Bulletin (TB) 117, which has become the de facto national standard for furniture manufacturers. Flame retardant chemicals continuously migrate out of household products and settle into dust, which is inhaled and ingested by people and pets.

Research shows that exposure to toxic flame retardant chemicals can be associated with increased cancer, neurological deficits, developmental problems and reduced fertility. Although some flame retardants were removed from children's sleepwear in the 1970s, similar flame retardants continue to be used in children products such as nursing pillows, car seats, sleeping wedges, portable crib mattresses, baby carriers, strollers and changing table pads, despite the fact that these products do not pose a fire hazard. Many times, the chemicals used to treat the foam in children products are not identified on the product labels or elsewhere. Toddlers who crawl in the dust and put their hands in their mouths have some of the highest levels of toxic flame retardant chemicals in their bodies. This is at an age when their neurological and reproductive organs are still developing and they are highly vulnerable to the toxic effects of these chemicals.

California is revising its TB 117 because of the strong evidence that flame retardants used to meet the standard have not provided greater protection from fires, and can in fact make fires more dangerous. While this standard revision is a positive change, companies will not be required to abandon the use of flame retardant chemicals.

Alaska Community Action on Toxics has been a leader in the campaign for effective fire safety without harmful flame retardant chemicals, through education, advocacy, supporting legislative measures in Alaska

and working to reform national and international chemicals policy. For these reasons, we believe the DUST Act is necessary to protect children from toxic chemicals, and we urge its immediate passage.

Sincerely,

PAMELA MILLER,

Executive Director.

MARICARMEN CRUZ-

GUILLLOT,

Environmental Health
and Justice Coordinator.

ZERO TO THREE: NATIONAL CENTER
FOR INFANTS, TODDLERS, AND
FAMILIES,

Washington, DC.

Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO,

Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR ROSA: On behalf of ZERO TO THREE (ZTT): National Center on Infants, Toddlers, and Families, I am writing to express our support of the Decrease Unsafe Toxins (DUST) Act that will be introduced in the 113th Congress. The DUST Act amends the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardants chemicals from use in the resilient filling materials in infant and children's products (e.g. high chairs, car seats, changing pads and others).

ZERO TO THREE's mission is to ensure that all babies and toddlers have a strong start in life. For over thirty years, we have focused on translating the science of early brain development for parents, practitioners, and policymakers. We take an interdisciplinary approach and seek to underscore the fact that domains of development in very young children are inextricably related. We believe that "good health," as defined and included in our policy framework and priorities, is crucial for children to be able to develop, learn, and be ready for school. A baby's good health begins with her caregiver's ability to make sound choices about child rearing practices and use of baby products that can positively or negatively impact their child's development. In order to make these choices, caregivers need guidance resulting from evidence-based information about exposure to environmental and synthetic toxins.

This farsighted legislation will help prevent developmental delays in children that may be stemming from or linked to flame retardants. Research is showing that flame retardants chemicals are toxic to all human beings. However, the removal of such toxins is especially critical for pregnant mothers as well as infants and toddlers because they are more vulnerable to the effects of toxin exposure because of their rapid rate of growth. These stages are marked by rapid cell division and differentiation, organ formation, and brain development. This growth rate renders the systems particularly vulnerable to disruption. In fact, studies show that flame retardants have been correlated with negative effects to motor performance (coordination, fine motor skills), cognition (intelligence, visual perception, visual-motor integration, inhibitory control, verbal memory, and attention), and behavior (e.g. hyperactivity). Moreover, prenatal exposure to such toxins can result in miscarriage, birth defects, low birth weight, and preterm birth. In the longer-term, such exposure poses increased risk for development of childhood cancer, widespread disorders like asthma and obesity, infertility, and other child- and adult-onset diseases.

Flame retardants chemicals are added to the filling materials of children products and

furniture to meet the California Standard Technical Bulletin (TB) 117. While California is the only state following TB 117, it has become the de facto national standard. Many national furniture manufacturers use this standard for all their furniture across the U.S. to avoid double inventory. Flame retardant chemicals continuously migrate out of household products and settle into dust.

Research shows that exposure to toxic flame retardant chemicals can be associated with increased cancer, neurological deficits, developmental problems and reduced fertility. Although some flame retardants were removed from use in children sleepwear in the 1970s, similar flame retardants continue to be used in children products such as nursing pillows, car seats, sleeping wedges, portable crib mattresses, baby carriers, strollers and changing table pads. Toddlers who crawl in the dust and put their hands in their mouths have the highest levels of toxic flame retardant chemicals in their bodies. This is at an age when their neurological and reproductive organs are still developing and they are the most vulnerable to the toxic effects of the chemicals.

Based on recent studies and laboratory research, the California standard TB 117 has not been found to significantly improve fire safety or prevent ignitions from small flame sources. Furthermore, such baby products do not pose a fire hazard. According to fire protection groups, flame retardants have not led to improvements in fire safety and pose an unnecessary health hazard.

We urge the Congress to adopt the DUST Act to protect innocent infants and children from these harmful toxins. The DUST Act translates the compelling research into preventive policy and legislation that helps promote positive, healthy development that will resonate throughout a child's school career and life, increasing their individual well-being and future contributions to society.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW MELMED,

Executive Director.

RECOGNIZING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUT TROOP 401 OF AUBURN, WASHINGTON

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 90th anniversary of Boy Scout Troop 401 of Auburn, Washington on August 10, 2013. Troop 401 is one of the longest running Boy Scout Troops in its council and in the state. Beginning as Troop 1, under Scoutmaster Harlan R. Stone 90 years ago, they remain a strong and visible presence in the Auburn community.

On this momentous occasion, I'd like to personally thank Boy Scout Troop 401 for its outreach to the community and its service to the Auburn area. Each time I return to my District, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the incredible work of the Boy Scout Troops in our communities. For almost a century, Troop 401 has helped make future leaders of this country by combining educational activities with lifelong values of service and ensuring they have fun in the process. Investing in our youth is the key to building a more conscientious, responsible, and productive society.

Mr. Speaker, Boy Scout Troop 401 is a unique and dedicated group of young men. Their true impact is immeasurable and their outreach and accomplishments are legendary. Here's to the next 90 years, Mr. Speaker.

Special recognition belongs to the current Scouts and Scout Leaders of Troop 401. They are listed below.

Scouts: Andrew Armatas, Andrew Fischer, Brandon Griffin, Brandon Clark, Conner Whitlock, Connor Perius, Dalton Blair, D'Angelo Washington, David Barnett, Dennis Nugent, Dominic Nelson, Gavin Skaar, George Gibson, Gunter Rice, Guy Adamo, Hunter Danz, Hunter Whitlock, Isaac Park, Jacob Wheeler, Jarrett Floyd, Joey Cushing, Joshua Blair, Judah Stelzer, Justin Higginson, Kaelub Graevell, Kolby McCue, Kyle Wilkins, Lee Vandenberg, Marshall Barnhart, Matthew Higdon, Mikko Holcomb, Nicholas Mayer, Noah Koester, Spencer Jones, Steven Ernst, Steven Frank, Thomas Snyder, Tyler Cushing, Tyler Hayes, Tyler Schef, Wyatt Bishop, and Zane Barnhart.

Scout Leaders: Chris Cushing, Craig Koester, Daniel Whitlock, Dave Bishop, Gordon Blair, Holly Jones, James Nannery, John Wilson, Julie Fischer, Kevin Fischer, Kim Cushing, Laura Higdon, Laura Whitlock, Margrett Everitt, Michael Jones, Mitchell Gering, Nick Perius, Rex Frank, Sharon D'Adams, Stacey Bishop, Terri Danz, Tiffany Hopkins, and Will Cadra.

MONTESSORI ACADEMY OF
PEMBROKE PINES

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the newly expanded Montessori Academy in Pembroke Pines, FL.

As the 2013–2014 academic term commences, the Montessori Academy will educate students from infancy through middle school, with the goal of preparing them to be lifelong learners and responsible citizens of the world community.

A quality education equips our youth with the skills they need to succeed in life, including critical thinking skills for inside and outside the classroom. Students attending the Montessori Academy will be able to take advantage of the new elementary and middle school classrooms, labs, arts and media centers, computer labs, and gymnasium.

As a parent of three students in Broward County schools, I am grateful for every fantastic teacher, school leader, and professional working to make a difference in the lives of our children. Education is not only the right of every child; it is the cornerstone of America's future.

I wish the Montessori Academy the best as faculty, staff, students, and parents prepare for a successful school year. Go Eagles!

HONORING MEDICARE'S 48TH
BIRTHDAY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 48 years of Medicare's existence.

The benefits Medicare has brought to older Americans are almost boundless. Millions of Americans have lived longer, more productive, healthier lives because of the medical care they received under this program. Many would have incurred financial ruin, suffered needlessly and died prematurely otherwise.

I voted for Medicare during my first summer as a congressman, back in 1965, during a time that was very different from the America of today.

For several years, President Lyndon Johnson had been calling for Congressional action to address the overwhelming need to extend medical care to all seniors, as only half of older adults had any health insurance during that era.

Responding to President Johnson's call for a Medicare bill, and following my own convictions, I joined with Rep. Cecil King of California and introduced in January of 1965, as my very first piece of legislation, a bill that would have provided hospital care under Social Security and an increase of benefits.

I said, at the time, "Our senior citizens have far too long been neglected in this the most prosperous of societies on earth. Many of them, after leading productive lives prior to their twilight years, have been so overburdened with medical costs that they have been denied the rewards that should come with retirement."

We have five decades of evidence that indicates the solution to our nation's healthcare crisis isn't cutting Medicare. It's strengthening Medicare and expanding it to cover everyone.

However the Affordable Care Act ultimately plays out, we know two things for certain: Millions of Americans will remain uncovered and the for-profit insurance industry will remain in charge of prices and life-and-death treatment decisions. The only way to ensure everyone is covered is with Medicare-for-All, single payer system.

The richest country in the history of humanity has a moral obligation to cover all of its inhabitants with health care coverage. We believe health care is a right, and should not be treated as a benefit reserved for the privileged.

Mr. Speaker, today, as we celebrate Medicare's birthday, I urge Congress to fulfill Medicare's promise and enact H.R. 676, single-payer legislation and enshrine health care as a fundamental right recognized by our great nation.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF CORAL SPRING, FLORIDA

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 50th Anniversary of the great City of Coral Spring, Florida. Incorporated on July 10th, 1963, the City of Coral Springs has grown from little more than a patch of marshland in southern Florida into the 13th largest city in the state and the first state-level recipient of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. Today I recognize Coral Springs for its remarkable transformation from town with a single covered bridge to a city of more than 120,000 residents.

Whether it be its top-rated public schools and city government, large and robust park and recreation system, myriad of shops, delicious restaurants and entertaining nightlife, Coral Springs truly has something for everyone. If you are looking to raise a family or are a young professional looking to enjoy one of the top 100 cities in the Nation for young people, the city's vibrant economy and high quality of living make Coral Springs a wonderful place to call home.

I join today with my family in wishing Coral Springs many more years of prosperity. On the 50th Anniversary of its inception, I urge all cities across of this great country to follow Coral Spring's footsteps.

IN RECOGNITION OF GREATER SHADY GROVE MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my sincere congratulations to the congregation of Greater Shady Grove Missionary Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia as the church's membership and leadership celebrates a remarkable 150 years. The congregation of Greater Shady Grove Missionary Baptist Church will celebrate this very significant anniversary with a Sesquicentennial Celebration on Sunday, August 4, 2013 at the Columbus Convention and Trade Center in Columbus, Georgia.

Tracing its roots back to the Civil War era, the church was founded in 1863 on the eastern bank of the Chattahoochee River, under a grape arbor in an oak grove. During a meeting at the house of Brother Boston Miles and Sister Mary Moore, the first members of the church, the church was named "Shady Grove Baptist Church."

From its inception through 1932, the church was served by its first sixteen ministers, each leaving their lasting mark on the church in some form or fashion. Perhaps the most notable, Reverend L.F. O'Bryant, served eleven years as the seventh pastor of the church and

instituted a large renovation program to expand the size and reach of the church.

In 1932, Reverend W.A. Reid began his service as the church's seventeenth minister, and would go on to serve until his death in 1942. Under Rev. Reid's careful eye, the church expanded again, adding an annex and instituting the Vacation Bible School.

In 1949, under the Reverend J.J. Ivey, the eighteenth pastor, more renovations were made, which included the purchase of new pews and pulpit furniture, the installation of hardwood floors, and the purchase of an organ to enhance church service. Rev. Ivey would serve the church for seventeen years before retiring from the pastorate.

One of the most significant moments in the church's history occurred under Reverend Rudolph Carter Allen in August 1967, when the First Baptist Church of Columbus, Georgia awarded the full Title and Deeds of the building in which Shady Grove worshipped to the congregation of the church. The church was then renamed to Greater Shady Grove Baptist Church to distinguish the congregation from other similarly named churches in Georgia. Less than a year later, the Superior Court of Muscogee County incorporated the Greater Shady Grove Baptist Church.

Throughout the years, the church would be remodeled and renovated several times. With these aesthetic changes came changes to the church mission. After creating several new committees, programs, and outreach ministries and increasing focus on the community, the Church was renamed for a second time to Greater Shady Grove Missionary Baptist Church, as it is called today. In addition to the new name, the church became a tithe-and-offering church, eliminating the need for assessments and fundraising. Today, under the leadership of Reverend Marcus J'uan Gibson, the church continues to grow and change with the vision of holistic transformation and continual improvement in Christ.

The story of Greater Shady Grove Missionary Baptist Church, which began as a small group of people worshipping in the shade of a grape arbor 150 years ago and has grown into an expansive and successful church, is truly an inspiring one of the dedication and perseverance of a faithful congregation of people who put all their love and trust in the Lord.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Greater Shady Grove Missionary Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia for their long history of coming together through the good and difficult times to praise and worship our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

APPLAUDING THE SUPREME COURT DECISION REAFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize that the Supreme

Court's recent decision in *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin* represents an important milestone for our nation as we build a more inclusive, diverse America. The Court's decision reaffirms that universities may consider racial and ethnic diversity as one factor among many in a carefully-crafted admissions policy. This ruling represents a victory for equal opportunity in education and helps prepare our citizens to compete in the diverse, global economy of the 21st century.

The historical structure of the House of Representatives exists to represent our nation's vast geographic diversity as well as to value the diverse opinions of each constituency to set the national agenda of progress. Serving in the House for nine terms, I am happy to say that I continue to learn from the diverse pool of people and ideas that comprise the House of Representatives. For the first time in our nation's history, women and minorities constitute the majority of the House Democratic Caucus. This diverse environment plays a critical role in the health and responsiveness of our Caucus. Indeed, diversity is considered by many as one of the most valuable assets to assuring success in business, the arts, science, and sports.

Similarly, a diverse environment on college and university campuses strengthens our nation by providing equal educational opportunity and promoting the creative thinking needed for innovation. I am a strong supporter of the holistic admission process. By promoting inclusivity and diversity on the campuses of our nation's higher education institutions via the admissions process, we recognize that students' successes are characterized by much more than their grade point averages alone. A carefully-crafted admissions policy that considers a wide-array of characteristics—such as leadership experiences, socioeconomic status, racial or ethnic background, athletic skills, and artistic abilities helps our educational institutions provide a diverse learning environment that reflects the diversity of our nation, enhances the ability of students to engage with persons from different backgrounds and cultures to better prepare them for our global economy, and improves access to higher education. As the global marketplace grows more interconnected, it is crucial that the United States remains an active leader in the new global economy by training a workforce prepared to engage with those from different cultures.

I am pleased that the Supreme Court recognized the ability of our nation's colleges and universities to consider racial and ethnic diversity as one factor among many in a carefully-crafted admissions policy. This decision will help promote access to higher education and enrich our country.

HONORING ELVIN HAYES ON BEING INDUCTED INTO THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE BASKETBALL HALL OF FAME

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Elvin Hayes,

"The Big E", on his induction into the National Collegiate Basketball Hall of Fame and numerous accomplishments as a professional athlete. Mr. Hayes, a fellow University of Houston Cougar, is today considered one of the 50 Greatest Players in NBA History.

In 1966, Elvin Hayes, along with Don Chaney, became the first African American basketball players for the University of Houston. During his sophomore year, Hayes led the Cougars to victory in the "Game of the Century"; an upset win, played in the Houston Astrodome, against the UCLA Bruins. While at U of H, Hayes was a 2-time NCAA First Team All-American, leading the Cougars to back-to-back NCAA Final Four appearances. In 1968, Hayes was the UPI, Sporting News, and the Associated Press' College Player of the Year. To this day, Elvin Hayes holds the University of Houston's single-game, single-season, and career records in scoring and rebounding.

With his early departure from college, Mr. Hayes was the first overall pick in the 1968 NBA Draft by the San Diego Rockets, who later became the Houston Rockets. During his illustrious NBA career Mr. Hayes played 1,303 games over 16 seasons accruing a number of accomplishments: 12 NBA All Star (1969–1980), NBA Scoring Champion (1969), and finally NBA Champion (1978). He is 8th all time in NBA scoring and 4th all time in NBA rebounding.

After his retirement from the NBA, Mr. Hayes returned to the University of Houston to finish up his Bachelors degree, an example for all athletes who are called into professional sports before graduating. In 2010, Mr. Hayes again returned to the University of Houston where he now serves as an analyst for radio broadcasts of the Cougars' games.

It is with great pleasure that I recognize Mr. Elvin Hayes, for his service to the city of Houston, and I congratulate him on his induction into the National Collegiate Basketball Hall of Fame.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S FREEDOM ACT OF 2013

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to reintroduce the International Women's Freedom Act with my colleagues, Representatives BARBARA LEE and ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. This bill is a comprehensive piece of legislation which will increase awareness of human rights violations against women, as well as provide a set of mechanisms for the U.S. to address the violations of women's human rights abroad.

The bill is modeled after the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (IRFA). IRFA created the U.S. Commission on Religious Freedom which has been successful in identifying violations of religious freedom abroad and recommending actions to Congress, the Secretary of State, and the President.

It has been clear for many years that expanding opportunities for women not only improves their position in society, but also has a

positive impact on economic growth and burgeoning democracies. And yet around the world, many countries relegate women to second-class status, denying them the right to vote, restricting their travel, and limiting their access to education and health care.

The International Women's Freedom Act would ensure we have the tools to empower women on a global level. The bill would establish a Commission on International Women's Rights and would expand the duties of the existing Office of International Women's issues in the State Department and rename it, the Office on International Women's Rights. Both the Commission and the Office on International Women's Rights would be granted the responsibilities of issuing a report on the status of women's rights abroad and advising the President and Secretary of State regarding matters affecting these issues.

We need to work harder to ensure women's full participation in society. This legislation would move us closer to achieving this foreign policy imperative.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 426, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

RE-INTRODUCING THE STRENGTHENING MEDICARE ANTI-FRAUD MEASURES ACT

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleague Ways and Means Health Subcommittee Ranking Member JIM McDERMOTT (D-WA) to re-introduce the Strengthening Medicare Anti-Fraud Measures Act.

This bipartisan legislation is part of our commitment to efforts to reduce fraud, waste and abuse in Medicare.

This legislation was previously introduced by our former colleagues Wally Herger (R-CA) and Pete Stark (D-CA). This bill provides Medicare with important fraud-fighting tools and so we are continuing their mission to strengthen anti-fraud efforts in the Medicare program.

Currently, the Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, Office of the Inspector General, OIG, lacks authority to exclude an individual or entity that is affiliated with an entity that has been sanctioned for fraud. This enables individuals and entities to continue to receive Medicare payments even if they contributed to the sanctioned behavior.

It is important that we change the law to provide the Inspector General with these additional, requested tools to better protect Medicare.

The legislation would provide OIG with two important authorities:

First, the OIG would have the authority to prevent individuals involved with fraudulent entities from receiving Medicare payments. This would essentially ban executives whose companies have been convicted of Medicare fraud from the program. These executives currently defraud Medicare, then circumvent exclusion by moving to another company. I believe we can all agree these individuals should not be allowed to use this loophole to steal from the program that serves seniors' medical needs.

The OIG would also have the authority to prevent entities involved with other fraudulent entities from receiving Medicare payments. This would ban the use of shell companies by corporations engaging in fraudulent activities. It is irrational to think that while these shell corporations are engaged in illegal activities their parent companies hold zero liability. Where individuals and entities are involved with fraudulent entities, they should not be permitted to continue to defraud the Medicare program.

This legislation passed the House of Representatives in 2010 by voice vote. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to act on it.

We encourage our colleagues to cosponsor this common sense legislation so we can add simple, anti-fraud tools to better protect Medicare beneficiaries and American taxpayers.

RECOGNIZING MAJOR ROBERT S. SWENSON, USAFR, RETIRED

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Major Robert S. Swenson, USAFR, Retired, for being honored with the Bronze Star Medal in recognition of his actions during World War II. Following the recovery of lost records recommending this honor, the Bronze Star was presented to Major Swenson in July 2013 at Joint Base Lewis-McChord.

In 1945, as a glider pilot in the 435th Troop Carrier Group, 75th Squadron, Major Swenson and his fellow airmen distinguished themselves when enemy infantry mounted a counter attack. The 435th Troop Carrier Group fought and repelled the attack of approximately 200 enemy soldiers, a tank, a self-propelled artillery, and two 20 mm flak guns.

After the battle, a request was made by Major Charles O. Gordon that all members of the 435th Troop Carrier Group be given due recognition. However, at the end of the war, the order was lost and went unfulfilled. It was not until July 2013, at the Trigger Time Forum at Joint Base Lewis-McChord, that Major Swenson, now living in Washington State, was awarded the Bronze Star.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize Major Robert S. Swenson, USAFR, Retired, for his inspiring bravery and dedication to serving his country.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CIDER INDUSTRY DESERVES EQUAL REGULATION OR "CIDER" ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing bipartisan legislation—the "Cider Industry Deserves Equal Regulation" or "CIDER" Act—to update the provisions of the tax code that relate to the cider industry.

Across the country, cidemakers large and small are developing their craft, establishing businesses and brands, and providing new markets for our nation's apple and pear orchards. As they pursue this work; they do so in an uncertain tax and regulatory environment, one where slight variations in the fermenting process can cause them to run afoul of narrow tax and alcohol regulatory rules. Congress, by enacting this legislation, would support this growing industry and ensure that it is treated fairly by regulatory agencies.

During the fermentation process a variety of factors can lead to small changes in the composition of a cider's alcohol content and carbonation. Because of the narrow way that hard cider is currently defined in the tax code, these small variations can lead to cider being taxed at a rate fifteen times higher than what the statute clearly intended. This legislation would broaden this definition to include pear as well as apple cider and would greatly reduce the chance that improper taxation would occur. The legislation also aligns the U.S. cider definitions more closely with global definitions for these products, and helps ensure that American-made cider is competitive on international markets.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to support the American cider industry.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF WLNG

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate WLNG 92.1 FM as the station celebrates its 50th anniversary on the air. Broadcasting from its studio in Sag Harbor New York, WLNG is known and loved throughout eastern Long Island for its oldies format, local news and sports, and personality disc jockeys like Gary Sapiene, Rusty Potz and the late Paul Sydney. WLNG may well be a one-of-a-kind radio station. Since 1963 the station has stuck to its popular oldies format playing hits from the 1950's, 60's, 70's and 80's, mixed with lots of old-style jingles, birthday announcements and live remote broadcasts from local events.

Perhaps more importantly, WLNG has served as the pulse of the community connecting friends and neighbors in good times and in bad. The station can be found doing a remote broadcast from a local fundraiser for cancer or providing life-saving information during an emergency. The station served as a reliable resource for the latest on Hurricane

Irene in 2011, and during Hurricane Sandy in 2012 WLNG continued broadcasting and streaming online using generator power and flashlights as the storm surge rose to "ankle deep" in the studio. One of its mainstay programs is the ever-popular "Swap and Shop," a kind of on-air ebay in which residents can sell used or unwanted items to their neighbors. Listeners also rely on WLNG for the latest in school closings during a snow storm or the scores of local high schools sports events—even for finding a lost dog.

Radio junkies love WLNG for the retro jingles and reverb—the sound of radio the way it used to be. Its DJs are happy to dedicate songs in honor of listeners. Independently-owned, WLNG has remained steadfastly the same in times of huge and sometimes overwhelming changes in communication technology and format, and maybe that is the key to its success. It can be relied upon like a good neighbor. Perhaps Paul Sydney summed it up best when he was quoted in an interview with the Sag Harbor Express saying, "WLNG is like a person. You're with it. It's your friend. We're talking to one person at a time. I know there is no other station in the world like it. Even if you want to avoid it, you always come back. Whether it's Sag Harbor or Norman, Oklahoma, Main Street is Main Street."

It gives me great pleasure to congratulate WLNG radio on its 50th anniversary and wish the station many more years of successful broadcasting.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF KIP TOKUDA

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I along with Representatives SMITH of Washington, rise today to honor the life of Kip Tokuda, and pay tribute to his leadership, service, and dedication to the citizens of the State of Washington.

Kip was a Seattle native and a graduate of the University of Washington. Following completion of his graduate studies in social work in 1969, Kip entered public service as a social worker with the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services and gained a reputation for being a strong advocate for children and individuals with disabilities. He was later named to the Washington Council for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect.

The second son of parents who were incarcerated at the Minidoka Relocation Center, Kip possessed an unwavering sense of justice and equality. A prominent figure within the Asian American community, he served as the president of Seattle's chapter of Japanese American Citizens League (JACL)—an organization which is the oldest and largest Asian American civil rights organization. In 1998, Kip went on to found the Asian Pacific Islander Community Leadership Foundation, a non-profit organization that focuses on social justice, community empowerment, and public service.

Beginning in 1994, Kip served as a Representative for Washington's State 37th Legislative District. During his four terms in the

Washington State Legislature, he enjoyed many legislative successes. He introduced his first Day of Remembrance resolution in 1997, which has since become an annual tradition in the Legislature. He served as the co-prime sponsor, along with Representative Mike Wensmen of House Bill 1572, which created the Washington Civil Liberties Public Education fund in 2000. Kip also secured passage of the Special Needs Adoption bill, which helped adoption of special-needs children. He was a strong advocate who helped to pass the Homeless Children's Lawsuit legislation, which provided services for over 60,000 homeless families with children.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that we recognize the life of Kip Tokuda—a true trailblazer. We ask our colleagues to join us in honoring a long career of selfless and inspired service to his community, the State of Washington, and our nation.

HONORING MR. TOM MILLER

HON. KRISTI L. NOEM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a truly outstanding individual and his lifelong commitment to public service, Mr. Tom Miller. Tom has two passions: first and foremost, his two daughters; and second, advocacy on behalf of individuals with disabilities. His lifelong service on behalf of this population has not only earned him recognition within the disability community throughout South Dakota, but also high honors within our great state as the recipient of the 2011 Governor's Award for an Outstanding Citizen with a Disability.

Tom has also had great impact on a national level, working within the AbilityOne® Program through his service on the SourceAmerica™ Board for the past 15 years. His dedication and commitment to the employment of people who have disabilities has opened the doors of opportunity to tens of thousands of deserving Americans, making their own dreams of becoming productive citizens become a reality. Tom has personally educated hundreds of his peers on self-advocacy, helping these individuals visit Capitol Hill and ensure we know what is important to them. Words like fearless, straight talking, devoted, mentor, father and advocate begin to capture the essence of Tom. He is a true leader.

As an AbilityOne Congressional Champion, I am honored to recognize Tom for his lifetime commitment to service. South Dakota is a better state, and America a better nation thanks to people like Tom Miller.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVEN A. HORSFORD

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, on consideration H.R. 1911, I am not recorded because I

was absent due to medically mandated recovery. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on final passage of the bill (rollcall No. 426).

On rollcall No. 353 on final passage of H.R. 850, I would have voted "aye" on final passage of the bill.

CONGRATULATING LYNN FORNEY YOUNG ON HER ELECTION AS PRESIDENT GENERAL OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lynn Forney Young on her election as President General of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Lynn, a fourth generation DAR member, joined the Tejas Chapter in Texas in 1977 as a Junior member and throughout her thirty-six years of continuous membership has distinguished herself at every level of service in the National Society.

She served her chapter in seven offices including Chapter Regent and in thirteen committee chairmanships. In addition to holding nine state chairmanships in the Texas State Society, she served as State Parliamentarian, State Recording Secretary, State Chaplain, State Vice Regent, and State Regent. She was appointed to six National Vice Chairmanships, has held three National Chairmanships including Americanism, Printing and Publications, and State Regents' Dinners, and has served on the national Investment and Personnel Committees. She attended the Volunteer Field Genealogy Course, served as a DAR Museum Correspondent Docent, and currently serves as a VAVS Deputy Representative.

Lynn has attended every Continental Congress since 1980, serving as a Congressional page for eight years and on three Congressional Committees. Honored by the Texas Daughters as their State Outstanding Junior Member, State Outstanding Chapter Regent, and State Outstanding Conference Page, she is the only member in the state to be so recognized. She holds membership in the Executive Club, National Officers' Club, State Regents' and State Vice Regents' Clubs, National Chairmen's and National Vice Chairmen's Associations, Outstanding Junior Club, Heritage Club, 1890 Giving Circle, and Founders' Club. She has served on the Advisory Boards of Crossnore School and Kate Duncan Smith DAR School as well as on the Tamassee DAR School Regents' Council.

Each year during Lynn's term as State Regent, Texas recorded a net gain in membership. Additionally, she encouraged, and Texas Daughters enthusiastically embraced and supported, four major projects: an exhibition of DAR Museum quilts at the International Festival in Houston, the erection of a monument at the Texas State Cemetery to the patriots of the American Revolution buried in Texas, and major financial support for the restoration of the historic Texas Governor's Mansion. Her

State Regent's Project brought together the State and National Societies in a cooperative effort to produce a new membership recruitment video, "Today's DAR," which celebrates the work of the chapters on the local level and highlights the variety of programs and opportunities for service that make the DAR relevant in today's society.

Through the years, Lynn has been an avid supporter of the National Society Children of the American Revolution, having served as Senior Society Treasurer and President, Senior State Registrar, First Vice President, and President and Senior National Vice President of the South Central Division.

Lynn received a B.S. degree from the University of Houston, worked as a Legal Secretary and Paralegal for seventeen years, was a law firm administrator and bookkeeper for three years, and currently serves as the bookkeeper for the family cattle ranch.

A pillar of her church and community, Lynn served the Presbyterian Church as an Elder, Lay Minister and Clerk of the Session. She has served on the Steering Committees of both the DAR Houston Fisher House and Homes for Our Troops. She was named one of the Outstanding Young Women of Montgomery County, Texas and in 2007 received the Inspire Women Outstanding Community Leader Award. Married to Steve Young, she is the mother of one DAR daughter and one son and the loving grandmother of two grandsons.

Lynn's devotion to DAR and unwavering commitment to its ideals and mission are evidenced by her many years of service. Her experience, keen sense of business, proven leadership abilities and vision, together with her beautiful style and grace, will certainly help to strengthen the organization and ensure that it will continue to grow and prosper.

Please join me and the Texas Daughters of the American Revolution as we congratulate Lynn Forney Young on her recent election as the first DAR President General from the great state of Texas.

SUPPORTING H.R. 2009, "KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT"

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the "Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act." This bill authored by my friend, Dr. PRICE, will prohibit the IRS from implementing any provisions of the President's health care law.

The IRS is an agency plagued by a multitude of scandals and significant misuses of taxpayer funds. The IRS is probably the worst government agency that we would want to have involved with Americans health care.

The IRS cannot fulfill its current core missions. With this in mind, we should not allow them to hire thousands of new employees to oversee our health care. The IRS cannot even properly supervise many of its current employees. We cannot trust the IRS with our health care. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill.

CONGRATULATING THE NATIONAL BLACK DATA PROCESSING ASSOCIATES

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the National Black Data Processing Associates (BDPA) on its 35th anniversary of service to the residents of the District of Columbia and, the national capital region and its 45 active chapters across the United States.

Founded in May 1975 by Earl Pace and the late David Wimberly, BDPA was formed out of a concern shared by both men that minorities were not adequately represented in the information technology industry. The first BDPA chapter was organized in Philadelphia, PA in 1977. A year later, the second chapter was organized in Washington, D.C., and shortly thereafter, the third chapter was organized in Cleveland, OH. In 1979, BDPA was restructured as a national organization.

As the oldest and largest African American information technology (IT) organization, comprised of over 2,000 African-American IT professionals as well as, science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) college students, BDPA's vision is to be a powerful advocate for their stakeholders' interests within the global, technology industry. Its mission is to be a global member-focused technology organization that delivers programs and services for the professional well-being of its stakeholders.

BDPA continues to promote professional growth and technical development for the young people and those entering into information and communication technology (ICT) in academia and corporate America. We also appreciate BDPA and its 45 chapters for continuing to provide ICT opportunities for STEM students and professionals.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the 35th anniversary of the National Black Data Processing Associates, in congratulating them on their outstanding accomplishments and commitment to the residents of the District of Columbia and around the country, and in welcoming those attending the BDPA Annual National Technology Conference and Career Fair titled "Diverse Opportunities In The Age of Convergence by Bringing Jobs Back to D.C.," on August 14-17, 2013, at the Washington Hilton Hotel.

INTRODUCTION OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has been forty-one years since Congress passed the Equal Rights Amendment (also known as the Women's Equality Amendment). This historic amendment was in-

tended to affirm in our United States Constitution fundamental equality based on sex in all areas of society.

In 1972, Congress passed the ERA with a measure that it had to be ratified by the necessary number of states (38) within 7 years. Though this deadline was extended, it was only for 10 short years. With this narrow time limit, the ERA was unfortunately just three states shy of full ratification when the deadline passed in 1982. Other constitutional amendments were given much wider deadlines for ratification. One example is the 27th amendment, concerning Congressional pay raises, which was accepted after a 203 year ratification period.

This Congress I intend to finally add the word "women" to the constitution. It is time for our nation to understand the necessity of equality for women based on the way it has been deprived of them. While we have made cracks in the glass ceiling many times before, we have yet to shatter it. I believe that this amendment provides that recognition to women without taking equality rights away from others.

Over the past several decades, legislative efforts have increased women's rights—but these strides toward achieving equality are not irreversible. Without the ERA, women have often been denied the ability to seek justice when they have experienced discrimination. Though certain court decisions, such as the Supreme Court decision in the Virginia Military Institute case (Virginia v. United States), helped to clarify that gender cannot be used to keep women from achieving social, legal and economic gains, important decisions like this can also be overturned. In addition, laws can still perpetuate gender classifications that keep women from achieving their full potential. Passage of the ERA would provide a Constitutional affirmation of the Supreme Court decision.

Our democracy rests on the principle of "liberty and justice for all." We need the ERA to ensure that this concept applies equally to all.

I am pleased to introduce this bill with ninety-three of my bipartisan colleagues, Representatives CYNTHIA LUMMIS, RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, JERROLD NADLER, KAREN BASS, JOYCE BEATTY, XAVIER BECERRA, SANFORD BISHOP, TIMOTHY BISHOP, EARL BLUMENAUER, CORRINE BROWN, G.K. BUTTERFIELD, LOIS CAPPS, MICHAEL CAPUANO, TONY CÁRDENAS, KATHY CASTOR, DAVID CICILLINE, YVETTE CLARKE, WM. LACY CLAY, JAMES CLYBURN, STEVE COHEN, JAMES COOPER, JAMES COSTA, JOSEPH COURTNEY, JOSEPH CROWLEY, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, DANIEL DAVIS, SUSAN DAVIS, PETER DEFazio, DIANA DEGETTE, CHARLIE DENT, JOHN DINGELL, TAMMY DUCKWORTH, KEITH ELLISON, SAM FARR, CHAKA FATTAH, WILLIAM FOSTER, MARCIA FUDGE, TUSLI GABBARD, JOHN GARAMENDI, ALAN GRAYSON, AL GREEN, RAÚL GRIJALVA, MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, LOUIS GUTIÉRREZ, BRIAN HIGGINS, JAMES HIMES, RUBÉN HINOJOSA, STEVE ISRAEL, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, HAKEEM JEFFRIES, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, HENRY "HANK" JOHNSON, MARCY KAPTUR, WILLIAM KEATING, JOSEPH KENNEDY, DANIEL KILDEE, BARBARA LEE, SANDER LEVIN, JOHN LEWIS, DAVID LOESBACK, ZOE LOFGREN, STEPHEN LYNCH, BETTY MCCOLLUM, JAMES McDERMOTT, JAMES MCGOVERN, GRACE

MENG, GWEN MOORE, GRACE NAPOLITANO, WILLIAM PASCRELL, EDWARD PERLMUTTER, CHELLIE PINGREE, MICHAEL QUIGLEY, CHARLES RANGEL, RAUL RUIZ, TIMOTHY RYAN, LINDA SÁNCHEZ, SCOTT DAVIS, TERRI SEWELL, CAROL SHEA-PORTER, BRAD SHERMAN, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, BENNIE THOMPSON, DINA TITUS, PAUL TONKO, NIKI TSONGAS, CHRISTOPHER VAN HOLLEN, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, MAXINE WATERS, MELVIN WATT, HENRY WAXMAN, PETER WELCH, and FEDERICA WILSON. I urge my fellow Members of Congress to join in support.

REUNIFICATION ON THE ISLAND OF CYPRUS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage renewed efforts to bring about reunification on the island of Cyprus.

In 2004, the inhabitants of the island participated in a referendum put forward by the United Nations under Secretary-General Kofi Annan. The proposal known as the Annan Plan foresaw a bi-communal, bi-zonal federation based on political equality. Unfortunately, it was overwhelmingly rejected by Greek Cypriots in 2004 despite vast support by Turkish Cypriots. Had it been accepted, it would have brought about a resolution to this longstanding separation of the island and contributed to political stability in this region of the world.

In 2008, the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot leaders reaffirmed their commitment to a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation with political equality as defined by relevant Security Coun-

cil resolutions. These talks proceeded through May 2012, often being guided by former United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. The framework included a federal government with a single international personality as well as a Turkish Cypriot constituent state and a Greek Cypriot constituent state, both of equal status. Unfortunately, this process has been put on hold for more than a year, as Cyprus has dealt with serious economic crises and political reforms.

The time has come for both sides to resume this process and seek long-term solutions that will bring peace and prosperity to the island. On July 28, Turkish Cypriots successfully completed elections, advancing the cause of democracy on the island. I congratulate the Turkish Cypriots for holding free and fair elections, and wish them well as they endeavor to form a new government. But a broader solution, involving the participation of both sides of the island, is essential to Cyprus's long-term success. It is my strong hope that economic conditions have stabilized sufficiently on the island to allow this process to move forward. The United States should do all it can to support this process.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 24, 2013, due to unforeseen illness, I missed rollcall votes No. 411, on the Pompeo amendment, and No. 412, on the Amash amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Pompeo amendment, and "nay" on the Amash amendment.

ENCOURAGING PEACE AND REUNIFICATION ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 41, a bill encouraging peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula, I rise to encourage my colleagues to join me in support of the bill.

This month, hundreds of Korean War veterans will gather in the nation's capital to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Korean War Armistice. In recognition of their service and for those who continue to serve on the peninsula to this day, we pause to express our appreciation and support.

The Korean War began when North Korea invaded the South on June 25, 1950. A peace treaty was never signed, only an armistice marking the end of hostilities. Today, Korea remains a divided nation, separating more than 10 million South Koreans, including 100,000 Korean-Americans, from their families in the North. As we pause to recognize the sacrifice of those who fought and died in the conflict, we must also remember all the others who were affected as well. This resolution reaffirms the commitment of the U.S. to our alliance with South Korea and our commitment to working with South Korea to encourage the North to cease its nuclear proliferation activities so that talks to reunify the peninsula can commence.

SENATE—Friday, August 2, 2013

The Senate met at 11:45 and 59 seconds a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable MARK R. WARNER, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, August 2, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK R. WARNER, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LEAHY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY,
AUGUST 6, 2013, AT 10:30 A.M.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10:30 a.m., Tuesday, August 6, 2013.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:46 and 29 seconds a.m., adjourned until Tuesday, August 6, 2013, at 10:30 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, August 2, 2013*

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We come to You as a Nation in the midst of great uncertainty and worry. As people look for causes and solutions, the temptation is great to seek ideological position.

We ask that You might send Your spirit of peace and reconciliation, that instead of ascendancy over opponents, the Members of this people's House, and all elected to represent our Nation, might work together, humbly, recognizing the best in each other's hopes, to bring stability and direction toward a strong future.

This Chamber will soon be silent, Members gone for the August recess. The weather continues to damage crops, the economy continues to struggle, sequestration threatens interests of all Americans from a myriad of points of view.

During these coming weeks, may all Americans find respite from their struggles, and may all Members of this people's House find rest and resolve to return to the service of these United States as citizens empowered by their constituents to address the needs of the Nation.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SHIMKUS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IN MEMORY OF CARLA ANDERSON

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember and recall the life of Carla Anderson. Carla passed away on July 23 after a month-long fight against an infection. She was 52, a loving mother, devoted wife, and the successful deputy executive director of the Next Generation 9-1-1 Institute. It was in this capacity that I had the real privilege to work with her.

The 9-1-1 Institute became the Next Generation 9-1-1 Institute as technology continued to move forward. Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO and I worked closely with the institute in our position as coauthors of the congressional E911 Caucus.

Carla's hard work played a vital role in the passage and enactment of significant legislation passed by Congress to advance 911 services. In so doing, many lives have been saved, as first responders throughout the country cannot only receive calls, but identify the location of the call. In the first responder community, time saves lives; and as technology improved, Carla ensured that the legislation and education of Members improved with it.

Carla was laid to rest in her beloved North Dakota. She will be missed by us and the first responder community throughout this country.

IN TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN PATRICK LEFERE

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Captain Lefere, who recently retired after 27 years of service in the United States Navy.

Captain Lefere has a proven commitment of valor to his country by fighting for freedom and democracy throughout the world. In his 27 years of service, he completed four different deployments and will be remembered in the service for his strong character, work ethic, and love of country.

It is with pleasure that we can say that Captain Lefere will continue his

career in public service as a director of operations and planning in the Monroe County School Board.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my best wishes to Captain Lefere on his retirement and in particular to his family and to his wife, Wendy. Our thanks for his continuing contribution to our country and our community.

COMBATING SEX TRAFFICKING

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the sad truth about sex trafficking in the United States. The Department of Justice reports that between 2008 and 2010, 83 percent of sex trafficking victims found in this country were U.S. citizens and 40 percent of cases involved the sexual exploitation of children. Just this week, the FBI rescued 105 children from exploitation in 76 U.S. cities, including one from my home State in Minnesota.

Sadly, this is an all-too-common occurrence. The FBI has identified the Twin Cities as one of the Nation's 13 largest centers for child prostitution.

That is why I've introduced the Child Sex Trafficking Data and Response Act with Congresswoman SLAUGHTER, my colleague. We need to improve data systems that track missing children, as well as provide proper designation to ensure that the victims receive the care and help they need.

Through increased awareness and a better understanding of this issue, as well as compassion for the victims of sex trafficking, we can take real steps to make sure we stop the abuse of our most vulnerable.

GOING HOME IS UNACCEPTABLE

(Mr. WALZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a simple question: Why are we going home in August? It's really not a rhetorical question.

All across southern Minnesota and across this country, farmers and ranchers have been up for hours quietly going about their business of feeding, clothing, and powering the world; and here we sit a year later without a farm bill to give them the certainty they've asked for.

We disagreed on how the farm bill was done here, but this House passed one, the Senate passed one; and just like that Saturday morning cartoon, "I'm just a bill sitting on Capitol Hill," we have to get together to finish that. That's called a conference. The Senate appointed their conferees. All you have to do, Mr. Speaker—very seldom do you get this simple choice—is appoint conferees and finish our business for America or go on vacation. That's the choice you get today.

I taught sixth grade for many years. The rule in our class was you don't go to recess until you finish your work. I often hear from my friends that we need to run government like a business. What business owner shuts the door and goes home before finishing critical work?

Appoint conferees, finish the farm bill, give certainty, do your work that we're being paid for, and finish the farm bill.

ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS DESTROY JOBS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, overreaching regulations are stifling economic growth and destroying jobs. Last year, the administration enacted 1,172 new regulations, which is 16 percent more than 2011. At the current rate the administration operates, increasing regulations have become the new normal.

House Republicans have a plan to stop the record-breaking volume of red tape on small businesses. This week, House Republicans passed legislation to address this government abuse. America's job creators should be more concerned about creating jobs than worrying about complying with confusing mandates. American taxpayers should be able to keep their hard-earned money, provide for their families rather than facing the burden of higher taxes.

It's time to put our economy back on track to job creation. It's my hope that the President and Senate will join with us to make full-time job creation the new normal.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

MEDICARE

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago this week, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law legislation that formally established Medicare and Medicaid—promises to seniors that following a lifetime of hard work, they'd

be able to retire with economic security and peace of mind and always have access to the guarantee of quality, affordable health care.

For nearly half a century, Medicare has provided critical benefits and health care services for seniors in my home State of Rhode Island and all across this country. Today, nearly 200,000 Rhode Islanders receive Medicare benefits. Despite its remarkable success, the promise made through Medicare has come under attack in recent years from my friends on the other side of the aisle.

This week, instead of working with Democrats to address the many challenges facing our country, House Republicans are holding their 40th vote to undermine the Affordable Care Act, a historic health care reform that strengthens Medicare and ensures it can continue to serve seniors today and for generations to come.

Our constituents deserve better. Let's set aside partisan politics and commit to preserving Medicare so it will continue to provide critical benefits for hardworking seniors in my home State of Rhode Island and all across this great Nation.

CITIZEN HERO AWARD

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great privilege I rise today to announce the very first recipient of my Citizen Hero Award. I'm so blessed to represent the great people of the 14th District of Illinois.

I created this award to honor exemplary constituents in my district who inspire others with their meritorious actions. It's my distinct pleasure to announce Pingree Grove's Adam Castellanos as the award's first recipient. For over 6 years, he has served as a TSA officer at Chicago O'Hare International Airport.

While on duty last month, Adam Castellanos, along with his Transportation Security Administration colleagues, Jacob Neal and Marvin Jackson, helped save a passenger's life. Upon discovering the passenger had passed out and was unconscious, Adam grabbed the closest AED unit and brought it to the man's side while his colleagues called paramedics and performed CPR. I commend their quick-thinking teamwork to save the man's life.

Mr. Castellanos, thank you for your service. It is my pleasure to represent you, and I extend my heartfelt gratitude with this award.

JOBS AND JUSTICE

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this month, America celebrates the 50th anniversary of the historic March on Washington where men and women of all backgrounds rallied for the cause of jobs and freedom.

The march proved instrumental in advancing civil rights in America and helped in passing the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

In remembering that the march was about jobs, it's important that we remember that this Congress has yet to bring a jobs bill to the floor. As we recall what the march did to advance freedom, we should remember that the recent Supreme Court ruling on voting rights left it up to Democrats and Republicans in Congress to work out a bipartisan path to protect voters from discrimination and from being disenfranchised.

The need for folks to come together on behalf of jobs and justice is as important now as it was 50 years ago. Our Nation is made better when we march together to overcome the challenges of our times. I urge my colleagues to unite and pass a jobs bill that is good for American workers and to take the steps necessary to protect every American's right to vote.

The march continues.

JOBS

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in the President's pivot back to jobs last week, he told a crowd that America has fought its way back 5 years after the start of the Great Recession.

Five years ago, unemployment was at 5 percent; today it's at 6½. Five years ago, the national poverty rate was at 12½ percent; today it exceeds 15 percent. Five years ago, 30 million Americans received food stamps; today 47.8 million are enrolled.

We are no way back to where we were before the 2008 collapse, and it's the President's economic agenda that is pushing us further into danger.

As a business owner for 42 years, I've been on the receiving end of these job-killing policies, and I know what it will take to get the economy back on track. We need true tax reform, we need to get the government out of health care, we need to energize the energy business, and we need to make sure our military remains fully funded, well equipped, and the best in the world.

We should never accept 7.6 percent as the normal level for unemployment or a 15 percent poverty rate; and we should never accept an economy that creates more food stamps than jobs.

In God we trust.

SHARED ACT

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, last year I met with a fourth grade constituent named Lily McSheffery. Lily was concerned about the impact of oil and gas drilling on sources of drinking water, and she was determined to do something about it. She urged me to introduce a law that would protect consumers from contamination associated with drilling operations.

Today, I will introduce the Safe Hydration is an American Right in Energy Development, or SHARED, Act. The bill would require testing of water sources near hydraulic fracturing operations and the public disclosure of the results of that testing. The SHARED Act would improve the lives of people all over this country, making sure Lily and future generations of kids have access to safe, clean water.

I am inspired by Lily's dedication to this issue, and I urge my colleagues to join as cosponsors of the SHARED Act.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to House Resolution 322 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 367.

Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) kindly take the chair.

□ 0914

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, with Mr. WOMACK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, August 1, 2013, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 113-187, offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113-187 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. SCALISE of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. LATHAM of Iowa.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 8 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 12 by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 176, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

AYES—237

Aderholt	Denham	Huizenga (MI)
Alexander	Dent	Hultgren
Amash	DeSantis	Hunter
Amodei	DesJarlais	Hurt
Bachmann	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Bachus	Duffy	Jenkins
Barber	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Barletta	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Barr	Ellmers	Jones
Barrow (GA)	Enyart	Jordan
Benish	Farenthold	Joyce
Bentivolio	Fincher	Kelly (PA)
Bilirakis	Fitzpatrick	King (IA)
Bishop (GA)	Fleischmann	King (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Fleming	Kingston
Black	Flores	Kinzing (IL)
Blackburn	Forbes	Kline
Bonner	Fortenberry	Labrador
Boustany	Fox	LaMalfa
Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Bridenstine	Frelinghuysen	Lance
Brooks (AL)	Gardner	Lankford
Brooks (IN)	Garrett	Latham
Broun (GA)	Gerlach	Latta
Buchanan	Gibbs	LoBiondo
Bucshon	Gibson	Long
Burgess	Gingrey (GA)	Lucas
Calvert	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Camp	Goodlatte	Lummis
Cantor	Gosar	Marchant
Capito	Gowdy	Marino
Carter	Granger	Massie
Cassidy	Graves (GA)	Matheson
Chabot	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (CA)
Chaffetz	Griffin (AR)	McCauley
Coble	Griffith (VA)	McClintock
Coffman	Grimm	McHenry
Cole	Guthrie	McIntyre
Collins (NY)	Hall	McKeon
Conaway	Hanna	McKinley
Cook	Harper	McMorris
Cotton	Harris	Rodgers
Cramer	Hartzler	Meadows
Crawford	Hastings (WA)	Meenan
Crenshaw	Heck (NV)	Messer
Cuellar	Hensarling	Mica
Culberson	Holding	Miller (MI)
Daines	Hudson	Miller, Gary
Davis, Rodney	Huelskamp	Mullin

Mulvaney	Rogers (KY)	Stutzman
Murphy (PA)	Rogers (MI)	Terry
Neugebauer	Rohrabacher	Thompson (PA)
Noem	Rokita	Thornberry
Nugent	Rooney	Tiberi
Nunes	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton
Nunnelee	Roskam	Turner
Olson	Ross	Upton
Palazzo	Rothfus	Valadao
Paulsen	Royce	Vela
Pearce	Runyan	Wagner
Perry	Ryan (WI)	Walberg
Peterson	Salmon	Walden
Petri	Sanford	Walorski
Pittenger	Scalise	Walz
Pitts	Schock	Weber (TX)
Poe (TX)	Schweikert	Webster (FL)
Pompeo	Scott, Austin	Wenstrup
Posey	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland
Price (GA)	Sessions	Whitfield
Radel	Shimkus	Williams
Rahall	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Reed	Sinema	Wittman
Reichert	Smith (MO)	Wolf
Renacci	Smith (NE)	Womack
Ribble	Smith (NJ)	Woodall
Rice (SC)	Smith (TX)	Yoder
Rigell	Southerland	Yoho
Roby	Stewart	Young (IN)
Roe (TN)	Stivers	
Rogers (AL)	Stockman	

NOES—176

Andrews	Grijalva	Owens
Bass	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Beatty	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hanabusa	Payne
Bera (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Higgins	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Himes	Peters (MI)
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Honda	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Bustos	Israel	Quigley
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Capps	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Carney	Keating	Rush
Carson (IN)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Kildee	T.
Castro (TX)	Kilmer	Sánchez, Loretta
Chu	Kind	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Clarke	Kuster	Schiff
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Connolly	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Conyers	Levin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Lewis	Scott, David
Costa	Lipinski	Serrano
Courtney	Loebach	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Lowenthal	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Sires
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter
DeFazio	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
DeLauro	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Lynch	Takano
Deutch	Maffei	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Carolyn	Tierney
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Edwards	Matsui	Tonko
Ellison	McCollum	Tsongas
Engel	McDermott	Van Hollen
Eshoo	McGovern	Vargas
Esty	McNerney	Veasey
Farr	Meeks	Velázquez
Fattah	Meng	Visclosky
Foster	Michaud	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Schultz
Fudge	Moran	Waters
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Watt
Gallego	Nadler	Waxman
Garamendi	Napolitano	Welch
Garcia	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Negrete McLeod	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Nolan	
Green, Gene	O'Rourke	

NOT VOTING—20

Barton	Herrera Beutler	Miller, George
Campbell	Holt	Pallone
Cleaver	Horsford	Richmond
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Simpson
Collins (GA)	Langevin	Young (AK)
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Doyle	Miller (FL)	

□ 0941

Ms. BONAMICI, Messrs. CARNEY, RANGEL, and WELCH changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. WEBSTER, SCHWEIKERT, and ALEXANDER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 185, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

AYES—227

Aderholt	Culberson	Harper
Alexander	Daines	Harris
Amash	Davis, Rodney	Hartzler
Amodei	Denham	Hastings (WA)
Bachmann	Dent	Heck (NV)
Bachus	DeSantis	Hensarling
Barletta	DesJarlais	Holding
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Barrow (GA)	Duffy	Huelskamp
Benishek	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Bentivolio	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Bilirakis	Ellmers	Hunter
Bishop (UT)	Farenthold	Hurt
Black	Fincher	Issa
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins
Bonner	Fleischmann	Johnson (OH)
Boustany	Fleming	Johnson, Sam
Brady (TX)	Flores	Jones
Bridenstine	Forbes	Jordan
Brooks (AL)	Fortenberry	Joyce
Brooks (IN)	Fox	Kelly (PA)
Broun (GA)	Franks (AZ)	King (IA)
Bucshon	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Burgess	Gardner	Kingston
Calvert	Garrett	Kinzinger (IL)
Camp	Gerlach	Kline
Cantor	Gibbs	Labrador
Capito	Gingrey (GA)	LaMalfa
Carter	Gohmert	Lamborn
Cassidy	Goodlatte	Lance
Chabot	Gosar	Lankford
Chaffetz	Gowdy	Latham
Coble	Granger	Latta
Coffman	Graves (GA)	Lipinski
Cole	Graves (MO)	LoBiondo
Collins (NY)	Griffin (AR)	Long
Conaway	Griffith (VA)	Lucas
Cook	Grimm	Luetkemeyer
Cotton	Guthrie	Lummis
Cramer	Hall	Marchant
Crawford	Hanna	Marino

Massie	Posey
Matheson	Radel
McCarthy (CA)	Reed
McCaul	Reichert
McClintock	Renacci
McHenry	Ribble
McIntyre	Rice (SC)
McKeon	Rigell
McKinley	Roby
McMorris	Roe (TN)
Rodgers	Rogers (AL)
Meadows	Rogers (KY)
Messer	Rogers (MI)
Mica	Rohrabacher
Miller (MI)	Rokita
Miller, Gary	Rooney
Mullin	Ros-Lehtinen
Mulvaney	Roskam
Murphy (PA)	Ross
Neugebauer	Rothfus
Noem	Royce
Nugent	Runyan
Nunes	Ryan (WI)
Nunnelee	Salmon
Olson	Sanford
Palazzo	Scalise
Paulsen	Schock
Pearce	Schweikert
Perry	Scott, Austin
Peterson	Sensenbrenner
Petri	Sessions
Pittenger	Shimkus
Pitts	Shuster
Poe (TX)	Simpson
Pompeo	Smith (MO)

NOES—185

Andrews	Gabbard	Meeks
Barber	Gallego	Meng
Bass	Garamendi	Michaud
Beatty	Garcia	Moore
Becerra	Gibson	Moran
Bera (CA)	Grayson	Murphy (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Nadler
Bishop (NY)	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Neal
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Negrete McLeod
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Nolan
Braley (IA)	Hanabusa	O'Rourke
Brown (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Brownley (CA)	Heck (WA)	Pascrell
Bustos	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Butterfield	Himes	Payne
Capps	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Capuano	Honda	Perlmutter
Cardenas	Hoyer	Peters (CA)
Carney	Huffman	Peters (MI)
Carson (IN)	Israel	Pingree (ME)
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Polis
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Cicilline	Kaptur	Rahall
Clarke	Keating	Rangel
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Kennedy	Ruiz
Connolly	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Conyers	Kilmer	Rush
Cooper	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda
Courtney	Kuster	T.
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Cummings	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Davis (CA)	Levin	Schiff
Davis, Danny	Lewis	Schneider
DeFazio	Loeb	Schrader
Delaney	Lofgren	Schwartz
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
DelBene	Lowe	Scott, David
Deutsch	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
Dingell	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Shea-Porter
Duckworth	(NM)	Sherman
Edwards	Lynch	Sinema
Ellison	Maffei	Sires
Engel	Maloney,	Slaughter
Enyart	Carolyn	Smith (WA)
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Esty	Matsui	Swalwell (CA)
Farr	McCollum	Takano
Fattah	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Foster	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Frankel (FL)	McNerney	Tierney
Fudge	Meehan	Titus

Smith (NE)	Tonko	Visclosky	Waxman
Smith (NJ)	Tsongas	Walz	Welch
Smith (TX)	Van Hollen	Wasserman	Wilson (FL)
Southerland	Vargas	Schultz	Yarmuth
Stewart	Veasey	Waters	
Stivers	Velázquez	Watt	

NOT VOTING—21

Barton	DeGette	Miller (FL)
Buchanan	Doyle	Miller, George
Campbell	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Cleaver	Holt	Price (GA)
Clyburn	Horsford	Richmond
Collins (GA)	Langevin	Young (AK)
Crenshaw	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 0946

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 438, I was unavoidably detained and not able to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall vote No. 438, I voted “nay.” It was my intention to vote “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LATHAM

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 263, noes 152, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

AYES—263

Aderholt	Bucshon	Denham
Alexander	Burgess	Dent
Amash	Calvert	DeSantis
Amodei	Camp	DesJarlais
Bachmann	Cantor	Diaz-Balart
Bachus	Capito	Duckworth
Barber	Carney	Duffy
Barletta	Carter	Duncan (SC)
Barr	Cassidy	Duncan (TN)
Barrow (GA)	Chabot	Ellmers
Barton	Chaffetz	Eshoo
Benishek	Coble	Farenthold
Bentivolio	Coffman	Fincher
Bilirakis	Cole	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (GA)	Collins (NY)	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Fleming
Black	Cook	Flores
Blackburn	Costa	Forbes
Bonner	Cotton	Fortenberry
Boustany	Cramer	Foster
Brady (TX)	Crawford	Fox
Braley (IA)	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Bridenstine	Cuellar	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (AL)	Culberson	Gabbard
Brooks (IN)	Daines	Gallego
Broun (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Garcia
Buchanan	Delaney	Gardner

Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Marino
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei

Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher

Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schraeder
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—152

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)

Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Israel

Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng

Michael
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger

Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano

NOT VOTING—18

Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Langevin
Larson (CT)
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Richmond
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 0950

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall votes 437, 438, and 439. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on each of those questions.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 229, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

AYES—186

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney

Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny

DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren

Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger

Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schraeder
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—229

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodel
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson

Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding

Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)

Miller, Gary	Roe (TN)	Stockman	Edwards	Levin	Roybal-Allard	McKeon	Renacci	Smith (NJ)
Mullin	Rogers (AL)	Stutzman	Ellison	Lewis	Ruiz	McKinley	Ribble	Smith (TX)
Mulvaney	Rogers (KY)	Terry	Engel	Lipinski	Rush	McMorris	Rice (SC)	Southerland
Murphy (PA)	Rogers (MI)	Thompson (PA)	Enyart	Loebbeck	Ryan (OH)	Rodgers	Rigell	Stivers
Neugebauer	Rohrabacher	Thornberry	Eshoo	Loftgren	Sánchez, Linda T.	Meadows	Roby	Stockman
Noem	Rokita	Tiberi	Esty	Lowenthal	Meehan	Roe (TN)	Roe (TN)	Stutzman
Nugent	Rooney	Tipton	Farr	Lowe	Messer	Rogers (AL)	Rogers (AL)	Terry
Nunes	Roskam	Turner	Fattah	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Mica	Rogers (KY)	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Nunnelee	Ross	Upton	Foster	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Miller (MI)	Rogers (MI)	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Olson	Rothfus	Valadao	Frankel (FL)	Maloney	Miller, Gary	Rohrabacher	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Palazzo	Royce	Wagner	Fudge	Maloney, Carolyn	Mullin	Rokita	Rokita	Tipton
Paulsen	Ryan (WI)	Walberg	Gabbard	Maloney, Sean	Mulvaney	Rooney	Rooney	Turner
Pearce	Salmon	Walden	Gallego	Matheson	Murphy (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Perry	Sanford	Walorski	Garamendi	McIntyre	Neugebauer	Roskam	Roskam	Valadao
Peterson	Scalise	Weber (TX)	Garcia	McDermott	Noem	Ross	Ross	Wagner
Petri	Schock	Webster (FL)	Gibson	McGovern	Nugent	Rothfus	Rothfus	Walberg
Pittenger	Schweikert	Wenstrup	Grayson	McIntyre	Nunes	Royce	Royce	Walden
Pitts	Scott, Austin	Westmoreland	Green, Al	McNerney	Nunnelee	Runyan	Runyan	Walorski
Poe (TX)	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield	Green, Gene	Meeks	Olson	Ruppersberger	Ruppersberger	Weber (TX)
Pompeo	Sessions	Williams	Grijalva	Meng	Palazzo	Ryan (WI)	Ryan (WI)	Webster (FL)
Posey	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)	Gutiérrez	Michaud	Paulsen	Salmon	Salmon	Wenstrup
Price (GA)	Shuster	Wittman	Hahn	Moore	Pearce	Sanford	Sanford	Westmoreland
Radel	Simpson	Wolf	Hanabusa	Moran	Perry	Scalise	Scalise	Whitfield
Reed	Smith (MO)	Womack	Hastings (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Peterson	Schock	Schock	Williams
Reichert	Smith (NE)	Woodall	Heck (WA)	Nadler	Pittenger	Schrader	Schrader	Wilson (SC)
Renacci	Smith (NJ)	Yoder	Higgins	Napolitano	Pitts	Schweikert	Schweikert	Wittman
Ribble	Smith (TX)	Yoho	Himes	Neal	Poe (TX)	Scott, Austin	Scott, Austin	Wolf
Rice (SC)	Southerland	Young (AK)	Hinojosa	Negrete McLeod	Pompeo	Sensenbrenner	Sensenbrenner	Womack
Rigell	Stewart	Young (IN)	Honda	O'Rourke	Posey	Sessions	Sessions	Woodall
Roby	Stivers		Hoyer	Pascarell	Price (GA)	Shimkus	Shimkus	Yoder
			Huffman	Pastor (AZ)	Radel	Shuster	Shuster	Yoho
			Israel	Payne	Reed	Simpson	Simpson	Young (AK)
			Jeffries	Pelosi	Reichert	Smith (MO)	Smith (MO)	Young (IN)
			Johnson (GA)	Perlmuter		Smith (NE)	Smith (NE)	
			Johnson, E. B.	Peters (CA)				
			Kaptur	Peters (MI)				
			Kelly (IL)	Pingree (ME)				
			Kennedy	Pocan				
			Kildeer	Polis				
			Kilmer	Price (NC)				
			Kind	Quigley				
			Kirkpatrick	Rahall				
			Kuster	Rangel				
			Langevin					
			Larsen (WA)					
			Larson (CT)					
			Lee (CA)					

NOT VOTING—18

Black	Doyle	Miller (FL)
Campbell	Herrera Beutler	Miller, George
Cleaver	Holt	Pallone
Clyburn	Horsford	Perlmutter
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Richmond
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 0953

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 235, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

AYES—182

Andrews	Capuano	Costa
Barber	Cárdenas	Courtney
Bass	Carney	Crowley
Beatty	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Becerra	Cartwright	Cummings
Bera (CA)	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Bishop (NY)	Chu	DeFazio
Bonamici	Cicilline	Delaney
Brady (PA)	Clarke	DeLauro
Braley (IA)	Clay	DelBene
Brown (FL)	Cohen	Deutch
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	Dingell
Bustos	Conyers	Doggett
Capps	Cooper	Duckworth

Aderholt	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
Alexander	Culberson	Heck (NV)
Amash	Daines	Hensarling
Amodei	Davis, Rodney	Holding
Bachmann	Denham	Hudson
Bachus	Dent	Huelskamp
Barletta	DeSantis	Huizenga (MI)
Barr	DesJarlais	Hultgren
Barrow (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Barton	Duffy	Hurt
Benish	Duncan (SC)	Issa
Bentivoglio	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins
Bilirakis	Ellmers	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Farenthold	Johnson, Sam
Black	Fincher	Jones
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Jordan
Blumenauer	Fleischmann	Joyce
Bonner	Fleming	Keating
Boustany	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Brady (TX)	Forbes	King (IA)
Bridenstine	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Brooks (AL)	Fox	Kingston
Brooks (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Kinzing (IL)
Broun (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Buchanan	Gardner	Labrador
Bucshon	Garrett	LaMalfa
Burgess	Gerlach	Lamborn
Butterfield	Gibbs	Lance
Calvert	Gingrey (GA)	Lankford
Camp	Gohmert	Latham
Cantor	Goodlatte	Latta
Capito	Gosar	LoBiondo
Carter	Gowdy	Long
Cassidy	Granger	Lucas
Chabot	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Chaffetz	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Coble	Griffin (AR)	Lynch
Coffman	Griffith (VA)	Maffei
Cole	Grimm	Marchant
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	Marino
Conaway	Hall	Massie
Cook	Hanna	McCarthy (CA)
Cotton	Harper	McCauley
Cramer	Harris	McClintock
Crawford	Hartzler	McHenry

NOES—235

NOT VOTING—16

Campbell	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Cleaver	Holt	Richmond
Clyburn	Horsford	Stewart
Collins (GA)	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
DeGette	Miller (FL)	
Doyle	Miller, George	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 0956

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 232, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

AYES—185

Andrews	Braley (IA)	Castor (FL)
Barber	Brown (FL)	Castro (TX)
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Chu
Beatty	Bustos	Cicilline
Becerra	Butterfield	Clarke
Bera (CA)	Capps	Clay
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Cohen
Bishop (NY)	Cárdenas	Connolly
Blumenauer	Carney	Conyers
Bonamici	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Brady (PA)	Cartwright	Courtney

Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallo
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee

NOES—232

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook

Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)

Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri

Campbell
Cleaver
Clyburn
Collins (GA)
DeGette
Doyle

Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster

NOT VOTING—16

Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George

Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallo
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries

Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter

NOES—226

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole

Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte

Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 0959

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 226, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]

AYES—190

Andrews
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bass
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bustos
Butterfield

Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)

Labrador	Pearce	Shimkus
LaMalfa	Perry	Shuster
Lamborn	Peterson	Simpson
Lance	Petri	Smith (MO)
Lankford	Pittenger	Smith (NE)
Latham	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
Latta	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)
LoBiondo	Pompeo	Southerland
Long	Possey	Stewart
Lucas	Price (GA)	Stivers
Luetkemeyer	Radel	Stockman
Lummis	Reed	Stutzman
Marchant	Reichert	Terry
Marino	Renacci	Thompson (PA)
Massie	Ribble	Thornberry
McCarthy (CA)	Rice (SC)	Tiberi
McCaul	Rigell	Tipton
McClintock	Roby	Turner
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Upton
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Valadao
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Wagner
McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Walberg
Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Walden
Meadows	Rokita	Walorski
Meehan	Rooney	Weber (TX)
Messer	Ros-Lehtinen	Webster (FL)
Mica	Roskam	Wenstrup
Miller (MI)	Ross	Westmoreland
Miller, Gary	Rothfus	Whitfield
Mullin	Royce	Williams
Mulvaney	Runyan	Wilson (SC)
Murphy (PA)	Ryan (WI)	Wittman
Neugebauer	Salmon	Wolf
Noem	Sanford	Womack
Nugent	Scalise	Woodall
Nunes	Schock	Yoder
Nunnelee	Schweikert	Yoho
Olson	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)
Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	Young (IN)
Paulsen	Sessions	

NOT VOTING—17

Burgess	Doyle	Miller (FL)
Campbell	Franks (AZ)	Miller, George
Cleaver	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Clyburn	Holt	Richmond
Collins (GA)	Horsford	Young (FL)
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1003

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOMACK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, and, pursuant to House Resolution 322, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Ms. KUSTER. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Kuster moves to recommit the bill H.R. 367 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendments:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 6. PROTECTING JOBS, ECONOMIC GROWTH, AND THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC.

The exemption for certain classes of major rules (special rules) created under section 804(3) of title 5, United States Code (as amended by this Act), is intended to protect rules that create jobs or economic growth, reduce the deficit, and protect the health and safety of the American public.

Page 20, line 10, insert after "means any rule" the following: "(other than a special rule)".

Page 21, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: ", and includes any special rule".

Page 22, after line 8, insert the following:

"(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that would—

"(A) create jobs or economic growth;

"(B) reduce the deficit and long-term debt;

"(C) prevent the outsourcing of United States jobs;

"(D) protect Medicare guaranteed benefits and Medicaid;

"(E) protect the health and safety of children, women, seniors, and veterans;

"(F) guarantee equal pay for women;

"(G) restrict exposure to toxic substances, protect safe drinking water, or promote the safe disposal of hazardous waste;

"(H) close corporate tax loopholes;

"(I) prevent waste, fraud, and abuse in government contracts;

"(J) prevent financial or health care fraud;

"(K) prevent child sex trafficking and child pornography;

"(L) protect the American public from terrorist attacks; or

"(M) prevent discrimination based on race, religion, national origin, or any other legally protected characteristic."

Ms. KUSTER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to the committee. If adopted, the bill will

immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, we can all agree on the need for targeted regulatory relief. Too often, well-intentioned rules lead to harmful, unintended consequences for our constituents. We need Congress and the Federal agencies to work together to thoughtfully tailor new rules and to review, revise, or repeal regulations that impose an undue burden on our economy.

With today's divided government, this collaborative approach is the only way to move forward—not by scoring political points or passing bills that will go nowhere, but by working together. That's what the American people expect, and that's what the American people deserve. That's exactly what we did in New Hampshire when my constituents raised concerns with the impact that new regulations could have on our small State's family and organic farms.

As we speak, the Food and Drug Administration is developing new rules to improve the safety of our food supply, a goal that we can all support. But the FDA needs to work with Congress to ensure that these rules do not burden farmers with a one-size-fits-all mandate that does not make sense for New England farms. That's why I led 20 Senators and Representatives, both Republicans and Democrats, in pushing the FDA to work with farmers and find common ground. Because of our efforts, the agency will soon be holding a forum in New Hampshire to hear from local farmers about ways to improve these rules. That is the right approach: bringing people together from both parties to thoughtfully solve problems, not thoughtlessly obstructing reforms across the board.

The bill we will soon vote on would hold progress hostage by requiring additional acts of Congress for new major rules, even though this Congress has seen more gridlock than almost any other.

After partisanship led to the doubling of student loan rates on the 1st of July, it took a full month for this Congress to provide students and middle class families with the relief that they deserve. Do we want to subject economic opportunity for the middle class to that same partisan gridlock? What about Medicare protection for our seniors? What about the health and safety of our veterans? What about the safety and well-being of our children? No, we certainly do not.

We don't need more gridlock. We need bipartisan solutions. That's why I am offering my amendment, which would exempt rules from this bill if they would advance the priorities that we can all support, like creating jobs and economic growth, reducing the deficit and long-term debt, and protecting the health and safety of America's children, our seniors, and our veterans.

Surely we can all agree that reforms to advance these priorities should not face additional hurdles in Congress.

I urge support for my amendment to improve this bill and ensure that it does not harm job creation, economic growth, the health and well-being of our constituents, or other bipartisan priorities that we can all agree upon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on the floor of this House in 2011, the President of the United States promised the American people that “to reduce barriers to growth and investment . . . when we find rules that put an unnecessary burden on businesses, we will fix them.”

That very month, the President issued an executive order that said “our regulatory system . . . must promote economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation.” He said our regulatory system “must identify and use the . . . least burdensome tools for achieving regulatory ends.” He said our regulatory system “must take into account benefits and costs.”

He was right. When our regulatory system doesn’t do these things, it kills jobs, suppresses growth, and locks us ever further into economic stagnation. But, Mr. Speaker, those were just the President’s words. His actions have been starkly different.

Since 2011—indeed, throughout the President’s administration—a flood of new major regulations have been burying America’s job creators and households at record levels. As a result, economic growth is down; America’s competitiveness is down; job creation is down. Regulatory costs are up.

The President isn’t reducing barriers to growth and investment. He isn’t fixing unnecessary burdens on business. He’s piling them on. To make matters worse, when Congress now declines to legislate the President’s misguided policies for him, he increasingly is resorting to unilateral regulatory actions to legislate by executive fiat.

Mr. Speaker, the time is right to pass the REINS Act. The REINS Act, in one fell swoop, assures that Congress—the body to which the Constitution assigns the power to legislate—will at last stand accountable for the most significant legislative decisions imposed on the American people through regulation. And in that same fell swoop, the REINS Act puts an end to Presidential end runs around Congress through legislation cloaked as regulation.

Instead of helping REINS Act supporters to seize this moment for the benefit of Main Street families and small businesses, opponents of the bill offer this motion to recommit.

□ 1015

But the motion seeks only to distract from the need to reform our regulatory system and reduce unnecessary burdens on the public.

Worse, it seeks to distract from the need for Members of Congress to stand accountable for the regulatory actions committed in its name. I ask my colleagues: Why should any Member of Congress be afraid to stand accountable for the most costly legislative decisions that the government imposes on the American people?

This motion to recommit represents the politics of diversion and division. It takes virtually every major legislative area off the table from the REINS Act. It weakens the country. The politics of courage and accountability is what is needed to build this country up.

I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) for sponsoring this legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, reject this motion to recommit, and show America that Congress can act for the good of job creators and Main Street Americans who desperately want and need jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 229, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 444]

AYES—185

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu

Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cueellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart

Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer

Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebuck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern

McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O’Rourke
Owens
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff

Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—229

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodel
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buchson
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)

King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)

Radel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford

NOT VOTING—19

Campbell
Cleaver
Clyburn
Collins (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Doyle

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1022

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 183, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 445]

AYES—232

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodel
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito

Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton

Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Pallone
Rahall
Reed
Richmond
Young (FL)

Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huiizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon

NOES—183

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blum
Blum
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capper
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth

Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff

NOT VOTING—18

Bachmann
Campbell
Cleaver
Clyburn
Collins (GA)
DeGette
Doyle

Doyle
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)

Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1028

Mr. VEASEY changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, had I been present on rollcall No. 445, passage of H.R. 367, the Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013, I would have voted “aye.”

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 267. An act to improve hydropower, and for other purposes.

H.R. 678. An act to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1171. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property.

H.R. 2576. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1344. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2642. An act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other

Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb
Loeb
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)

programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) "An Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints, on August 1, 2013, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. HOEVEN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution.

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent Resolution encouraging peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 233. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the "Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building".

S. 256. An act to amend Public Law 93-435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

S. 668. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building".

S. 796. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the "James R. Burgess, Jr. Post Office Building".

S. 885. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, as the "Thaddeus Stevens Post Office".

S. 1093. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, as the "First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building".

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 666

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 666, a bill originally introduced by Representative MARKEY of Massachusetts, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2134

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the name of Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2134.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE LONG-TERM PARTNERSHIP AND FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND JORDAN

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 222) recognizing the long-term partnership and friendship between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, working together towards peace and security in the Middle East, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 222

Whereas the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan have maintained official diplomatic relations since 1949, and during this partnership spanning over 6 decades, the United States and Jordan have developed a close relationship in security, economic development, and counterterrorism cooperation;

Whereas a United States-Jordanian Joint Military Commission facilitates bilateral consultations between the United States Department of Defense and Jordanian Armed Forces since 1974, and has led to increased cooperation in regional and global counterterrorism efforts;

Whereas Jordan has provided key security and humanitarian support in both Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas Jordan hosted a United States-developed training program for the Palestinian National Security Forces on human rights, proper use of force, and civil disturbances to further enhance peace and security in the West Bank;

Whereas in 1996, the United States designated Jordan as a major non-NATO ally, recognizing Jordan as a close ally with a strategic working relationship;

Whereas the Jordanian Armed Forces are a proven reliable contributor to the international community, particularly as a member of the United Nations, contributing 57,000 troops to 18 different United Nations peacekeeping missions, most notably in Haiti where Jordan endured multiple casualties during such missions;

Whereas Jordan signed the historic Jordan-Israel Peace Treaty on October 26, 1994, normalizing relations between Jordan and Israel by resolving territorial disputes and establishing a partnership towards peaceful relations;

Whereas King Abdullah II has been a key advocate of peace between the Israelis and Palestinians, often reiterating the urgent need for peaceful reconciliation and offering to serve as a mediator and host for peace negotiations;

Whereas Jordan is a leader for progress and tolerance in the Arab world and recently held parliamentary elections, as part of a political reform movement;

Whereas the economic partnership between the United States and Jordan was further strengthened through the signing of the United States-Jordan Free Trade Agreement by President Bill Clinton and King Abdullah II on October 24, 2000, and fully implemented on January 1, 2010;

Whereas in 2008, the United States and Jordan signed a 5-year Memorandum of Understanding in the amount of \$360,000,000 in economic support funds and \$300,000,000 per year in foreign military financing to further bolster the United States-Jordan strategic relationship;

Whereas the United States is strongly committed to the continued development and progress of the Jordanian people, civil society, and political institutions, specifically in the areas of democracy assistance, water and energy preservation, education services, and economic development;

Whereas the al-Assad regime continues to fuel a humanitarian crisis within the region through attacks against innocent civilians, resulting in the loss of approximately 70,000 Syrian lives and the displacement of approximately 5,500,000 civilians and over 1,300,000 women, children, and men who have fled Syria;

Whereas the international community, led by the United Nations, has issued dire warnings regarding the severity of the growing humanitarian crisis, calling for the international community to use all available resources to end the crisis that is destroying families, homes, and cities;

Whereas the Government of Jordan has maintained open borders with Syria, despite a heavy burden of hosting and providing for the security and basic needs of approximately 500,000 refugees, with that number growing by 2,000 to 4,000 persons per day;

Whereas three-quarters of the refugees are women and children, and 1 in 5 refugees is under the age of 4; and

Whereas the Government of Jordan has worked in partnership with the international community, particularly the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to provide for the needs of vulnerable refugee populations, including clean water, food, shelter, health care, and education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the people and Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan for their continued friendship with the United States and commitment to peace, security, and stability in the Middle East;

(2) commends the Government of Jordan for its response to the Syrian humanitarian crisis by hosting and caring for refugees fleeing violence from the conflict with the al-Assad regime; and

(3) expresses a firm commitment to support the Government of Jordan as it faces regional challenges and works toward a more peaceful and stable Middle East.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the text of the resolution at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the people and Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan for their continued friendship with the United States and commitment to peace, security, and stability in the Middle East;

(2) commends the Government of Jordan for its response to the Syrian humanitarian crisis and encourages its continued hosting and caring for refugees fleeing violence from the conflict with the al-Assad regime; and

(3) expresses a firm commitment to support the Government of Jordan as it faces regional challenges and works toward a more peaceful and stable Middle East.

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY
MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan have maintained official diplomatic relations since 1949, and during this partnership spanning over 6 decades, the United States and Jordan have developed a close relationship in security, economic development, and counterterrorism cooperation;

Whereas a United States-Jordanian Joint Military Commission facilitates bilateral consultations between the United States Department of Defense and Jordanian Armed Forces since 1974, and has led to increased cooperation in regional and global counterterrorism efforts;

Whereas Jordan has provided key security and humanitarian support in both Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas Jordan hosted a United States-developed training program on human rights, proper use of force, and civil disturbances to further enhance peace and security in the West Bank;

Whereas in 1996, the United States designated Jordan as a major non-NATO ally, recognizing Jordan as a close ally with a strategic working relationship;

Whereas the Jordanian Armed Forces are proven reliable contributors to the international community, particularly as a member of the United Nations, contributing 57,000 troops to 18 different United Nations peacekeeping missions, most notably in Haiti where Jordan endured multiple casualties during such missions;

Whereas Jordan signed the historic Jordan-Israel Peace Treaty on October 26, 1994, normalizing relations between Jordan and Israel by resolving territorial disputes and establishing a partnership towards peaceful relations;

Whereas King Abdullah II has been a key advocate of peace between the Israelis and Palestinians, often reiterating the urgent need for peaceful reconciliation and offering to serve as a mediator and host for peace negotiations;

Whereas Jordan is a leader for progress, tolerance, and moderation in the Arab and Muslim worlds;

Whereas the economic partnership between the United States and Jordan was further strengthened through the signing of the United States-Jordan Free Trade Agreement by President Bill Clinton and King Abdullah II on October 24, 2000, and fully implemented on January 1, 2010;

Whereas in 2008, the United States and Jordan signed a 5-year Memorandum of Understanding in the amount of \$360,000,000 in economic support funds and \$300,000,000 per year in foreign military financing to further bolster the United States-Jordan strategic relationship;

Whereas the United States is strongly committed to the continued development and progress of the Jordanian people, civil society, and political institutions, specifically in the areas of democracy assistance, water and energy preservation, education services, and economic development;

Whereas the al-Assad regime, backed by Iran and Hizballah, has brutally suppressed dissent, conducting a campaign of violence that has fueled sectarian tensions and sparked a civil war in Syria;

Whereas the conflict in Syria has resulted in the loss of nearly 100,000 Syrian lives and the displacement of approximately 4,250,000 civilians, including nearly 1,800,000 who have fled Syria;

Whereas the Syrian conflict has contributed to sectarian conflict, extremism, and instability throughout the region;

Whereas the Government of Jordan has accepted a heavy burden of hosting and providing for the security and basic needs of approximately 500,000 refugees, with that number growing every day;

Whereas three-quarters of the refugees are women and children, and 1 in 5 refugees is under the age of 4;

Whereas the severity of the humanitarian crisis and the large number of refugees in Jordan places significant economic and social hardships on the country; and

Whereas the Government of Jordan has worked in partnership with the international community to provide for the needs of vulnerable refugee populations, including clean water, food, shelter, health care, and education: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2013

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 322, I call up the bill (H.R. 2009) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care

Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2009

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) On May 10, 2013, the Internal Revenue Service admitted that it singled out advocacy groups, based on ideology, seeking tax-exempt status.

(2) This action raises pertinent questions about the agency’s ability to implement and oversee Public Law 111-148 and Public Law 111-152.

(3) This action could be an indication of future Internal Revenue Service abuses in relation to Public Law 111-148 and Public Law 111-152 given that it is their responsibility to enforce a key provision, the individual mandate.

(4) Americans accept the principle that patients, families, and doctors should be making medical decisions, not the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITING ENFORCEMENT OF PPACA AND HCERA.

The Secretary of the Treasury, or any delegate of the Secretary, shall not implement or enforce any provisions of or amendments made by Public Law 111-148 or 111-152.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2009.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I come to the floor today in support of H.R. 2009, legislation that will prevent the IRS from getting involved in Americans’ health care.

The IRS is already out of control, abusing its power to tax and to audit the activities of honest, hardworking Americans. The IRS has betrayed the trust of the American people. Yet ObamaCare granted the IRS 47 new powers, including giving confidential taxpayer information to other departments and applying new taxes and penalties. Well before the IRS started getting involved in your health care and sharing your information and forcing people to pay even more taxes, let’s first look at the job the IRS is already doing.

Back in 2011, I investigated claims that the IRS was threatening with higher taxes donors to conservative causes. It turned out to be true. The IRS was abusing its authority, and it was harassing conservatives; but that was just the tip of the iceberg. We soon learned of more accusations about how the IRS was targeting Americans for their political beliefs. What we have found so far—and we just have 3 percent of the documents from the IRS that we have requested—is that the IRS did leak confidential taxpayer information, that they did delay applications of groups supporting conservative causes, and that they did threaten conservatives with higher taxes.

And Democrats want to give this agency more power and authority? They want this agency involved in Americans' health care? No way.

Even the agency's own watchdog says the IRS cannot handle the job. Less than 2 weeks ago, the independent Treasury Inspector General stated that they are not confident about the IRS's ability to protect confidential taxpayer information or to prevent fraud. Well, neither am I; and by every indication, neither are the American people.

It has been 3 years since the health care law was passed, and in less than 2 months, the administration claims it will be fully ready to implement the law; but in the face of all of these failures, of all of these breaches of the public trust, more Americans than ever want this law to be repealed.

Why? It's simple: ObamaCare has brought increased health care costs to families and individuals; it has stifled businesses from expanding; and it has forced American job creators to cut jobs, wages, and hours.

Just yesterday, at a hearing in the Ways and Means Committee, a key official from Health and Human Services could not confirm that the health care law would lower the health care costs for hardworking families in my home State of Michigan.

But wasn't this the signature promise of this administration, that premiums would be \$2,500 lower? And now the administration cannot make good on that promise.

With so little time before the exchanges are set to open and for families to plan their health care spending for next year, it is extremely concerning that the administration cannot tell the American people what their health insurance will look like or what it will cost. Simply put, this law is a failure and ought to be repealed, but it didn't have to be this way.

The House Republican alternative to the Democrats' health care law, which I authored, was the only legislation scored by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office as meeting the top health priority of American families because it was the only bill that actually lowered the cost of health insur-

ance premiums, and it didn't give the IRS a single new power. It kept the IRS out of your health care, which is exactly what this bill will do—keep the IRS off and out of your health care.

We should be cutting the IRS, not expanding it. We should reduce its power and authority and its ability to harass and abuse Americans. That's exactly what this bill does. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are now 7 months into this House Republican session. It has been nothing more than a bridge to nowhere. Nowhere on jobs. Nowhere on immigration reform. Nowhere on a budget agreement. Nowhere on most appropriations bills.

Instead, House Republicans today continue their obsession—so vividly embraced by the chairman of our committee in his words—with trying to destroy the bridge built by the President and the Democratic Congress to somewhere vital—putting all Americans in charge of their own health care.

This bill before us is nothing more than a continuation of the Republicans' blind obsession with repealing the Affordable Care Act. This is how Republicans have chosen to spend the last day here before they recess this House for 5 weeks.

It's so clear. The Republican mission is to destroy, not implement, health care reform. Rather than help leading on the issue, House Republicans have spent the last 2-plus years trying to mislead Americans about health care rights under the ACA. Now we can expect more misinformation, and the statement of our chairman is loaded with it.

Thirteen States, for example, published preliminary premiums for marketplace coverage. Within those States, Americans will be able to purchase insurance at a price that is, on average, 20 percent below what the CBO estimated; and in Michigan, there will be 14 insurance carriers in the marketplace—and someone comes up here and says health care reform is failing.

So, to the American people, be prepared for more scare tactics and other misguided efforts from Republicans to convince constituents that applying for health care coverage will be time-consuming and cumbersome, and be prepared for all kinds of misstatements about the powers and the role of the IRS.

This should be said categorically. Neither the IRS nor the Department of Health and Human Services will have access to medical records or other personal history—no access whatsoever.

Five weeks of recess await Republicans when they adjourn this House today. I hope when they return they

will at last turn their attention to the pressing economic issues that Americans expect the Congress to address.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) control the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I want to commend the chairman for his work on this and in so many vital areas of the issue of health care on our committee, and I want to thank him for the time and the opportunity to bring this bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans' goal in health care is to make certain that we have the highest quality health care in the world. That's our desire. We simply want it to be patient-centered health care, not government-centered health care. We believe that patients and families and doctors ought to be making medical decisions, not Washington, D.C. So this bill, H.R. 2009, grows out of the IRS's activities that have come to light in this country over the past number of months. As the chairman mentioned, we've been doing a lot of oversight hearings in our committee.

The American people have drawn a conclusion about the IRS at this point, and that conclusion is that it cannot be trusted now. The chairman mentioned that the IRS has targeted groups that have come to the IRS asking for a tax-exempt status. It has targeted groups for their political ideology. The IRS has leaked donor information to those groups, and many of us believe—and I think it will come out—that the IRS has, in fact, targeted donors to those groups for audits to those individual Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this is chilling activity from the Internal Revenue Service, so the American people have lost their faith and trust in the Internal Revenue Service. That's why this bill is so important.

This is a very simple piece of legislation—two pages, in fact. All it says, simply, is what the American people believe, and that is that the IRS should not be charged and have the authority to either implement or enforce the Affordable Care Act. I want to commend over 140 Members from this House of Representatives for being cosponsors, and we have hundreds of citizen cosponsors from across the country.

Some say that this isn't necessary, that it is not going to accomplish anything, that there is no reason the IRS would want that information anyway. The fact of the matter is that that's

exactly what they said about what they did for the tax-exempt groups. They said, Well, it wasn't necessary for them to get that information about political ideology or beliefs or prayers that prayer groups were offering. That wasn't necessary either.

So, if that were not necessary, Mr. Speaker, how can the American people have faith and confidence that the IRS won't do something that also is unnecessary, and that is to engage in implementing themselves into that trusted relationship between patients and physicians?

□ 1045

Then another piece of evidence, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest is the individual who's running the IRS division that is charged with the enforcement of the Affordable Care Act. Mr. Speaker, that individual is Sarah Hall Ingram. You don't have to look too far back in her biography to recognize that she was the individual who was, in fact, in charge of the tax exempt group in the IRS at the time when the challenges to the IRS had been focused.

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming percent of the American people understand and appreciate that the IRS should not be involved in the health care of this Nation. We believe patients and families and doctors ought to be making medical decisions, not Washington, D.C., and certainly not the Internal Revenue Service.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), another member of the committee.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would remind my distinguished colleague from Georgia of a story in the Bible about a king who was very famous and one day noticed on the wall some writing. He had someone come in and interpret for him, and the writing said: "Your days are numbered upon the Earth."

Your days are numbered on this issue. You have 59 more days. I'm sure you can bring up a bill every single day to try and repeal it. The Speaker has announced there will be two more, but it will not work. This is going to be the law on 1 October, and it's going to go into effect. The Supreme Court has spoken. The Speaker has actually said, "It's the law of the land." Yet we see this hopeless strategy—it's worse than hopeless. It's weak and it's mean. What you're saying is you want to take away from people what they already have, guaranteed issue, coverage for their kids to age 26, and lifetime limits will be gone. All of that you want to take away.

Have a great break, because you're going to go back to your districts and explain for 38 days why you will not provide health care coverage for the people of America. I hear there's a

mythical bill with 141 signatures. The Republicans have been running the Ways and Means Committee for 16 out of the last 18 years, and we have never had a bill put in front of us for a vote. It's never been through the Rules Committee. It's never been out to the floor.

You have no plan. You have a piece of paper that you wave around, but you won't go out and defend it. The President came and put a bill out here, and we passed it, and we're defending it, and it's going to go into effect and provide what all Americans want: security if they get sick; they want to know they'll be covered; they want to know they won't be bankrupted.

Vote "no" again today, and we'll be back after the break for a few more "no" votes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a letter from The Seniors Coalition in support of H.R. 2009.

THE SENIORS COALITION,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2013.

Hon. DR. TOM PRICE,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PRICE: I am writing to you today on behalf of the over four million members and supporters of The Seniors Coalition in support of your bill H.R. 2009, "The Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act." The Seniors Coalition was originally founded as a public advocacy group fighting to repeal the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act. Since 1990, TSC has grown rapidly and expanded its advocacy to include any issue that concerns America's senior citizens. Today the Coalition is one of the largest grassroots advocacy organizations in Washington, D.C. in terms of number of supporters nationwide. TSC currently has over four million supporters representing every state in the union.

The Obama Administration, including the IRS, has betrayed the trust of the American people. Allowing the IRS to enforce ObamaCare is opening up the door to more abuse, more targeting and more harassment of American citizens. The vast majority of the American people do not support ObamaCare, and President Obama is ignoring the will of the people.

That is why The Seniors Coalition is writing today to fully support H.R. 2009. Clearly, the IRS has proven itself either unwilling or unable to prudently and impartially enforce the law, and we certainly cannot trust them with our health care.

Thank you for all your hard work Dr. Price, and please don't hesitate to contact me directly if there is anything that The Seniors Coalition and its over four million members and supporters in all 50 states can do to assist you in your effort to de-fund/repeal ObamaCare.

Sincerely,

SEAN FERRITOR,
Executive Director.

I'm now pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for bringing this bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, I'd be willing to bet if you took a poll in any household in America and asked, Who do you trust, the IRS or your doctor, doctors would overwhelmingly be trusted; the IRS would be overwhelmingly distrusted.

I don't understand when we actually pass laws in this Congress restricting the access to health care information and putting severe penalties on our health care providers for releasing health care information and these HIPAA laws—they've been around a while now, I'd say—and then we write a bill that turns the entire health care system administration over to the one agency that the American people hate more than any other agency.

Some of the Democrats like it because they like to get other people's money and spend it. The reality is the IRS is not trusted, and it wasn't trusted before the events that have been described here today. Today they're totally distrusted. In fact, they are totally feared because of what they can do to the private lives of American citizens. This bill speaks for the American people, and they say don't let the IRS get their hands on our health care. They will destroy us.

Remember, they're the one agency that doesn't have to meet a burden of proof. They require the public to meet the burden of proof.

Don't let the IRS get their hands on our health care.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Saying that the entire administration of health care is turned over to the IRS is a big lie. The IRS will not have access to the medical records or personal health history of a single American.

I now yield 2 minutes to a distinguished colleague of mine from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this is a fitting conclusion to a week that has shown the collapse of the Republican legislative agenda. Remember, this is the time we were supposed to be voting on budgets, but the Republicans cannot even bring themselves to allow a vote on the budget that they themselves have mandated. We're not voting on the Transportation-HUD; we're not voting on Interior. They refuse to allow a conference committee to be appointed so that we can reconcile differences on the budget, setting up a showdown over a shutdown of the government next month.

Now we're dealing with health care for arguably the 40th time that they are going to "repeal" it. The bill is not going anywhere. They repeatedly demonstrated at our hearing yesterday in Ways and Means that my Republican colleagues don't even understand how the bill that they are so adamantly opposed to works.

We have not seen any attempt to improve, to refine. What we have seen is

an unprecedented effort to sabotage legislation, to make it not work for the American people, to confuse, to undercut. This is something that is unprecedented, to the best of my knowledge, in what we have had in Congress in the past. What more fitting illustration of a group that's bankrupt of ideas and bent on simply attempting to force their way for an agenda that is so extreme that they cannot agree to bring it to the floor to vote on it.

I urge rejection of this charade.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I now insert into the RECORD a letter from the group Let Freedom Ring that endorses H.R. 2009.

LET FREEDOM RING,
July, 2013.

DEAR FRIEND: You have no doubt heard by now that senior members of the United States Internal Revenue Service were involved in a politically-motivated effort to blunt the impact of the tea party movement and other organizations not in sync with President Barack Obama's agenda for America.

We don't yet know all the facts but we do know that some groups had their applications for non-profit status "slow walked" through the process, existing groups were subjected to comprehensive audits, many were loaded down with intrusive and inappropriate questions about the prayers of their members and other activities, and that tax returns of major donors and conservative operatives were audited.

Things are so bad that one senior IRS official who appears to have been involved "took the fifth" before a congressional investigating committee.

If that were not enough, some of the same people that look to have been involved in the effort to politically harass potential opponents of the president's agenda have now been put in charge of expansion of the IRS's role in monitoring individual and corporate compliance with Obamacare.

Our good friend Dr. Tom Price, who represents Georgia's 6th Congressional District, is taking the bull by the horns—but he needs our help. He has introduced a bill—H.R. 2009—that would prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from implementing or enforcing any provisions of the president's health care law.

Congress needs to act—now—and they need pressure from you to do so. They need to get behind Dr. Price's bill before the IRS can do even more damage. Will you please take a moment to write to your member of Congress and your two Senators and urge them to support Dr. Price's legislation? Tell them to cut off funding for the expansion of the IRS for Obamacare unless and until the American people have all the answers about how President Obama and his subordinates politicized the IRS to harass their political opponents.

The whole business is suspicious, especially since the IRS has for the last three years been denying to Congress that any such activity or any activity like it was occurring. Congress is now asking questions and the Obama Administration has become evasive—despite a report by the IRS's own inspector general that the agency had committed wrongdoing.

The IRS can no longer be trusted to behave in a non-partisan manner. It should not be given extra authority until it can prove once again that it will not abuse the public trust.

Thank you for all you do on behalf of freedom.

Sincerely,

COLIN HANNA,
President.

I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to a Member from the great State of Michigan, Dr. BENISHEK, and a fellow physician.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, and urge my colleagues to support this necessary legislation.

The bill will keep the Internal Revenue Service from implementing any aspect of the President's health care law. With the recent revelations that employees of the IRS targeted U.S. citizens based on their political views, it's imperative that we keep the IRS from being further involved than it already is in the lives of the American people.

This legislation would repeal both the individual mandate and the employer mandate, while at the same time helping to shrink the IRS.

As a doctor, I've been taking care of patients for the last 30 years. I know that putting the Federal Government between patients and doctors will be disastrous. Many families in northern Michigan agree, and they want to see this law repealed. This legislation is a good step toward rolling back this massive expansion of Federal Government power.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of it.

Mr. LEVIN. It's now a special pleasure for me to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman who presided over the passage of Medicare 48 years ago and has worked on health care issues his entire historic career, Mr. DINGELL from the State of Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my beloved friend for yielding me this time, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to ask: Aren't you embarrassed to go a 40th time in a fruitless, hopeless act? This is the 40th time we've tried to kill the legislation. It costs us \$1.5 million every time, none of which have been successful.

My Republican colleagues have never come forward with a proposal which they have presented to this House, but they sit over there railing and complaining about what is going on. They're going to take the rights of the American people for protection against preexisting condition, bans on their insurance. They're going to take away from the American people all kinds of protections which we have in the Affordable Care Act.

The Speaker the other day said the Republicans were the party of repeal. I think he's right. I suspect we don't want to call them the Republicans any-

more, but I think we ought to call them the "Repealicans" or perhaps the "Repealican'ts," because they've never been able to repeal anything, and they can't enact legislation.

There have been 12 bills, I think, that this Congress has sent to the White House, and there is small prospect of anything more coming from here. It's interesting to note they can't move a budget; they can't do legislation on jobs; they're incapable of seeing to it that we do the other things that are necessary to help the middle class. Yet we keep coming over here with nonsense like this.

The Republican Party is like the Bourbons of France: they forget nothing because they never learned anything.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I now insert into the RECORD a letter from the group Americans for Prosperity which endorses H.R. 2009.

AMERICANS FOR PROSPERITY,
Arlington, VA, July 15, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PRICE: On behalf of more than two million Americans for Prosperity activists in all 50 states, I applaud you for introducing the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act (H.R. 2009), which would prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from implementing the President's health care law.

The health care law grants the IRS an alarming expansion of new power, essentially granting the agency the authority to oversee every American's health insurance decisions. The IRS will be responsible for enforcing the health insurance mandates on individuals and employers, collecting the 21 new taxes created in the law, and cross-referencing individuals' health insurance exchange applications with IRS records.

AFP is deeply concerned that all Americans will now be asked to turn over the private health insurance information about their children and families to a disgraced organization that has admitted to abusing its power and processing applications in a biased, political manner. How can the American people trust that the IRS won't also target American citizens who disagree with the President when enforcing the health care law?

Your legislation also affirms the commonsense principle that control over health care decisions should remain between American families and their doctors, not Washington bureaucrats like the IRS. Americans for Prosperity is proud to support H.R. 2009, your legislation to prohibit the IRS from enforcing provisions of the health care law. I urge your colleagues to support its passage, and I look forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely,
CHRISTINE HARBIN HANSON,
Policy Analyst, Americans for Prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), a gentleman who's a member of the Appropriations Committee, a fellow who has led on this issue for his entire career.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman from Georgia filing this important legislation. I feel my day is not complete if we don't get a chance to vote to cut spending and abolish ObamaCare.

We were sent here by our constituents to protect the Treasury and do everything we can to keep the government out of their lives and out of their pockets. Yet ObamaCare contains more than 20 tax increases and gives the IRS unprecedented authority to collect personal health information from more than 300 million Americans.

ObamaCare requires all insurance companies to report to the IRS the name, address, identification number, and type of insurance policy purchased by every customer, along with a determination of whether or not the insurance was "government approved."

I'm very proud to be a co-author of Dr. PRICE's legislation that will prohibit the IRS from collecting our personal health care information. The IRS has proven they cannot be trusted by targeting organizations based on their political affiliation. Since the IRS has admitted this, I've heard from so many constituents who are members of patriotic organizations. They've stepped up for the first time in their lives to get involved in politics and organizations like the Texas Tea Party, the Katy Tea Party, and the King Street Patriots. For standing up as patriots and trying to do the right thing for the right reasons, they were targeted by the IRS and harassed.

Today the IRS is spending 80 percent of its budget trying to implement ObamaCare, and Treasury Secretary Jack Lew recently testified the IRS has approximately 700 full-time staff working on ObamaCare implementation. Now the IRS wants to hire an additional 2,000 bureaucrats to continue to implement ObamaCare.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), who has been a leader on this issue.

□ 1100

Mr. ANDREWS. Colleagues, somewhere in America today a family is going to get the devastating news you all dread about your children: they're going to hear that that lump in their daughter's stomach is cancer. And they're going to go home and they're going to have all the agony and they're going to have all of the unthinkable thoughts that parents are going to have in that situation, but they are going to be faced with another problem because they have no health insurance. Both the mom and the dad work. They make about \$40,000 a year between the two of them. They don't get coverage at work, and they can't afford health insurance. So their agony is not just being worried about the health of their child, they are worried about the fact that if they give the child the care that she needs, they'll lose everything that they have and wind up in bankruptcy court.

The Affordable Care Act says to that couple that starting January 1, for about \$40 a week, they can have health insurance coverage as good as Members of Congress do. That's what the Affordable Care Act says.

This bill repeals that for that family. Those who are prepared to vote for this bill should also be prepared to answer the following question: If you want to say to that family that their concern isn't important enough, what's your plan? What's your answer to them?

Now, we'll hear that people have introduced bills and sent around letters. Here are the facts. It has been almost 1,000 days that the Republican Party has been back in control of the House of Representatives. The number of bills they have voted on to replace this law is zero. Zero. Forty times to repeal it; zero times to replace it.

This debate is not about Republicans and Democrats; it's about that family with that daughter that has no health insurance if you repeal this law and pass this bill. This is no plan, this is no responsibility, and this is no way to deal with the concerns of middle class Americans.

Vote "no."

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a letter of support for H.R. 2009 from the organization Restore America's Voice.

RESTORE AMERICA'S VOICE
FOUNDATION,
Houston, TX, July 12, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PRICE: Our more than two million supporters are grateful for your efforts to strip the IRS of any authority over the Affordable Care Act as embodied in H.R. 2009 which you have introduced. Our organization fully endorses this legislation.

We note with discomfort that this agency seems not only beyond the control of those tasked with oversight but willfully resists full disclosure of questionable practices and abusive methods in Congressional testimony. We have concluded, based on the evidence at hand, that this agency is being cynically used for political purposes to frustrate and intimidate law-abiding citizens who disagree with Administration policies.

This distortion of the proper role and functioning of the IRS makes turning over responsibility for the Affordable Care Act subsidies, penalties and, significantly, access to private insurance and medical records, a frightening prospect. We are therefore in complete agreement with the purpose of H.R. 2009 and fully support passage as the only responsible and prudent course of action.

Thank you for leadership and hard work in developing this legislation and for representing the best interests of not only your constituents but the American people.

Respectfully and gratefully yours,
KEN HOAGLAND,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, and I want to congratulate the

gentleman from Georgia in his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. I think it is not only a timely bill, but a bill that is essential to the health and well-being of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's assertions, the prior gentleman who spoke from New Jersey, I would simply say those scare tactics do not have a place in legitimate debate on this floor. Scare tactics to say that somehow Republicans on our side of the aisle don't care about people's health care are just not true. We don't believe in omnibus Washington-engineered health care. That's what's going on here—Washington bureaucrats deciding what kind of health care you can have, which doctors you can see, how much those doctors and hospitals are going to get paid, and how the insurance companies have to act. All of that is in the hands of Washington bureaucrats under ObamaCare, which is why this bill and this law is suffering so much in the minds of the public. This is not the right way to go.

We believe in patient-centered care. Republicans believe that it ought to be about the doctor-patient relationship, not between the bureaucrats and the doctor. It ought not be about the bureaucrats and the insurance companies. It ought to start with the patients and their families.

So these scare tactics, really, Mr. Speaker, are not relevant to this discussion; and they are just that, scare tactics. We care about the health and well-being of the American people, which is why this bill is coming to the floor.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, we've learned that the IRS has been abusing its power by targeting and punishing American citizens for their political beliefs and then recklessly spending taxpayer dollars on lavish conferences and bonuses for its employees. This kind of government abuse must stop. The last thing we should do now is to allow the IRS to play such a central role in our health care.

The IRS has a role in nearly 50 different aspects of ObamaCare. The agency's involvement is so extensive that there is a designated office within the IRS just to implement ObamaCare. The IRS will have access to the American people's protected health care information. Given that this same agency has illegally disclosed protected taxpayer information, the privacy concerns raised by many are legitimate. This is nothing short of an unwelcome, Big Government overreach into the most personal aspect of our lives.

ObamaCare is bad for the economy and for working middle class families. It increases costs, impedes innovation, and we know is now turning full-time jobs into part-time jobs, which is why so many on both sides of the political spectrum are now beginning to realize, in the words of three Democratic union

leaders, that this law is creating nightmare scenarios in the health and well-being of millions of hardworking Americans.

The legislation before us today will at least prevent the unnecessary intrusion of the IRS into our health care. Members of both parties should be focused on removing the Federal bureaucracy from the everyday lives of the American people, and this act will do just that.

Again, I'd like to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) for his hard work on this issue, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. The majority leader is absolutely right about scare tactics. If you are an uninsured American and you get a diagnosis of cancer this morning or you are hit in a head-on collision this afternoon or you have a child born with a disability, you ought to be very scared. He's also absolutely right about the need for patient-centered health care. We're concerned about that. We're concerned that patients without insurance today are centered—they're centered right into bankruptcy court. More and more Americans are faced with a health care crisis.

This bill has nothing to do with the Internal Revenue Service or the Treasury Department or restricting their rights. It's about restricting your rights. Now that we finally have a chance to protect Americans from insurance monopoly price gouging, from fine print in the contract for those who do have insurance that denies rights at the very time that you need them the most, that kind of protection about to go into effect, along with the right of so many Americans who are uninsured to go to a competitive private insurance marketplace and pick the policy that is best for their family, and for many Americans to have a premium tax credit, a tax credit that they want to deny to you.

And what alternative do they offer? Well, the best source is the official Republican Web site. I urge you—although you will find plenty of misinformation there—to go to GOP.gov because you'll find one very revealing fact. When you look there to see what the Republicans have to offer as an alternative to ObamaCare, it says two words: "in progress." It's been in progress since 2 and a half years ago, when they voted the first time to repeal ObamaCare, right up to today, when they vote for the 40th time to do it.

They have only one alternative to ObamaCare, and it's called NothingCare. It's called do nothing but allow these insurance monopolies to continue to deny rights to our people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DOGGETT. The folks that I represent, the working families from San Antonio to Austin, they deserve to have some assistance. We have provided it to them with guaranteed rights. Some are in effect now, and some are about to go into effect. Don't let these Republicans deny those rights to our families and replace it with NothingCare.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I include for the RECORD a letter endorsing and supporting H.R. 2009 from the group FreedomWorks.

FREEDOMWORKS,
Washington, DC,

DEAR FREEDOMWORKS MEMBER: As one of our millions of FreedomWorks members nationwide, I urge you to contact your representative and urge him or her to co-sponsor H.R. 2009, the "Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act". Introduced by Rep. Tom Price (R-GA), this bill would stop the Internal Revenue Service or any other Treasury department from enforcing any part of ObamaCare.

Currently, the IRS will be the most crucial department for actually enacting and enforcing ObamaCare. The premium subsidies that are supposed to help individuals purchase health insurance through the exchanges are actually tax credits, distributed by the IRS. And most significantly, the IRS is responsible for administering the "tax" upon individuals who refuse to purchase a government-approved insurance plan—the individual mandate.

More ominously, ObamaCare requires the IRS to collect a vast amount of sensitive information about the kind of insurance coverage you have, and will store this information in a massive new database.

ObamaCare's supporters, of course, claim that the IRS would never share the medical information they collect, and that the agency would only collect the exact data necessary to determine eligibility for premium subsidies. And yet, a lawsuit filed in California alleges that the IRS illegally seized the medical records of 10 million individuals in that state.

Having the same organization that is both targeting political opponents and stealing people's medical records in charge of people's health care seems like a recipe for disaster. Rep. Price's bill would stop the IRS in its tracks, completely erasing their role in ObamaCare.

I urge you to contact your representative and urge him or her to co-sponsor H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act today.

Sincerely,

MATT KIBBE,
President and CEO,
FreedomWorks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a fellow member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the health decisions of individual Americans should be made between patients and their doctors.

The Internal Revenue Service should not be a part of that equation.

We all know, all Americans know now, that the IRS has inappropriately used its authority to target and intimidate certain individuals and organizations based on their personal beliefs. With 2,000 more IRS agents, more Washington bureaucrats, we'll open the door to more abuse under ObamaCare—more targeting, more harassment of American citizens.

Physicians know the best care for their patients, not unelected bureaucrats in Washington. We should be encouraging patients to take control of their own health care through consumer-directed health care plans, not ceding control to the government.

I would encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, protect the doctor-patient relationship, and do what is needed to make sure that government overreach is not involved in American health care.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip, who has devoted so much time to health care during his career.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What a perfect bill this is. Our Republican friends don't like taxes, they don't like the collection of taxes, and, of course, none of us do. And they don't like affordable care for our citizens, quality care for our citizens, accessible care for our citizens. So, with this stroke, they can attack both.

The gentleman who just spoke asserts that the American people know. Republicans have made an assertion about the oversight of taxpayers to see whether or not they are committing fraud, i.e., claiming to be social welfare organizations when everybody in America knows they are solely political organizations; and the Republicans never mention it was across the board, not targeted. And the Affordable Care Act, they don't like that either. They would, as my friend from Texas said, still like to have the insurance companies in charge—not the patient, not the doctor, but the insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker, less than 2 weeks ago, Republicans were on this floor for the 38th and 39th times to repeal the Affordable Care Act, the accessible care act, the quality care act. Now we have the 40th time we've been at this.

The American people, of course, want to see us working on jobs. They want to see us working on investment and education. They want to see us being able to compete with the world. But what do we do? We continue to beat this horse. And contrary to my Republican friends' assertion, Americans say, overwhelmingly, when asked do you want repeal or do you want a fix, make it better, do things better, make it more efficient, they opt for the latter overwhelmingly.

But as the gentleman from Texas just said, you go to the Web site—and not 2½ years; not 2½ years, I tell my friend from Texas, it has been 7 years, since 2006 when we started working on this—but there's no fix, no fix on the Web site, no fix on this floor.

Today, their newfound populism is nowhere to be seen as they vote to repeal tax credits and subsidies designed to make health care more affordable for those same people—working families and small businesses—who haven't been able to get insurance and are left at risk without the security of it.

Suddenly, the party that never met a tax break it didn't like is pursuing a tax increase of more than \$1 trillion on small businesses and the middle class. As a result, they are making health care more expensive, and millions of Americans will no longer be able to access affordable health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this bill makes all those folks pawns in Republicans' single-focused quest to undo health care reform at the expense of every other pressing challenge we face as a Nation.

It's shameful, Mr. Speaker, that this House continues to waste the American people's times on health care repeal votes that won't go anywhere, and they know it. The Senate will not pass this bill and the President will not sign it.

We have pressing business before us that needs immediate attention: finishing appropriations bills, completing our work on the budget that provides a balanced alternative to the sequester, ensuring America can pay its bills, and taking action to create jobs. That's what we ought to be doing, not this continued foolishness.

□ 1115

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), a freshman Member.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the minority whip would like Republicans to help in fixing this bill, considering that they weren't interested at all in Republican input when they passed it in the middle of the night with a pure party-line vote.

I think everybody understood that the promise of ObamaCare has been thoroughly discredited, but the worst is yet to come.

The authors of the bill promised that it would bring down the cost of health

care, but premiums have gone up substantially. They promised that if you like your health care plan and the doctor you have, you can keep it.

Now, when you go to the President's healthcare.gov Web site, it says that "Depending on the plan you choose in the marketplace, you may be able to keep your current doctor."

Many supporters promised that the bill would actually create jobs, but even Teamsters Union President James Hoffa has now said that the bill will "destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek."

A small group of Members, in 2010, led by former Congressman Bart Stupak, had the chance to inviolably prohibit any funds in ObamaCare from being used to pay for abortions or abortion-inducing drugs. Unfortunately, they caved.

And now, companies like Hobby Lobby are being forced into court to prevent ObamaCare from requiring that they provide health care services which directly violate their conscience and their religious principles, values and rights that are enshrined in the First Amendment.

The IRS, too, has irrefutably proven the political nature and intimidation tactics of the work it performs every day, an attitude that will, beyond a shadow of a doubt, carry over into its tag-team partnership with HHS in enforcing ObamaCare.

Let's pass H.R. 2009 and start putting a stop to this madness before it gets even worse.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what turned out to be a silly exercise has suddenly turned into an insane exercise. We find ourselves, for the 40th time in the House of Representatives, debating repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

We understand they don't like it. But I beseech my colleagues on the other side to start working with us to improve a system that's in desperate need of reform, and make changes and adjustments along the way as we learn what's working and what isn't. That's the only way this can work.

But let me just inject a few facts into this debate, especially for the benefit of the previous speaker. Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, U.S. health care spending grew at 3.9 percent for the last 3 years, the lowest growth rate in over 50 years.

Medicare per beneficiary spending rose just 0.4 percent last year, the lowest rate since it was created in 1965. Medicaid per beneficiary spending dropped by 1.9 percent in 2012. And according to the Congressional Budget Office, Medicare and Medicaid will now spend \$1 trillion less over the next 10 years than previously projected.

Nearly \$15 billion in fraudulent Medicare payments have been recovered and recaptured under the Affordable Care Act. Hospital readmissions under Medicare have fallen for the first time on record, resulting in 70,000 fewer readmissions in the second half of last year alone.

And more than 250 new Accountable Care Organizations, under the Affordable Care Act, serving over 4 million Medicare beneficiary enrollees are getting paid now according to the quality of health care being delivered, and no longer the quantity of services being rendered.

Finally, the growth in private plan premiums has also slowed, Mr. Speaker. Annual premiums for employer-sponsored family health care increased by only 4 percent in 2012, the smallest increase in the last 13 years.

We still have more work to do, but this debate and effort to delay and to defund and to dismantle and to destroy the Affordable Care Act is not where we need to go as a nation.

I encourage my colleagues to once again vote "no" on this ill-conceived legislation.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments from my friend from Wisconsin. His chastising us for voting to repeal or change portions of the Affordable Care Act is curious, in light of the fact that the gentleman, himself, I believe, supported one of our efforts just 2 weeks ago on delaying the employer mandate. But hope springs eternal that he'll be able to support our efforts in this endeavor on H.R. 2009.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this misnamed piece of legislation. It actually should be called The 40th Time We've Wasted the Taxpayers' Time and Money Act.

This is a bill that's not new to us. We've seen it before. We've seen this movie before, 39 times as a matter of fact, and we know how it ends.

This is just another attempt to dismantle the Affordable Care Act, and we've wasted too much time and too much money on this already. What we should be doing is working to make the ACA better, or spending our time trying to help pass some jobs legislation.

This bill is particularly cruel because it hits the poorest among us the hardest, and we've seen that movie before also. And we saw it play out—that's why we have this piece of legislation.

This is in response to a national crisis. This just didn't come about by itself. Hospitals and doctors and clinics in all of our districts, they provided \$100 billion a year in uncompensated

care. Families were one layoff away from not having access to health care. People with preexisting conditions that occurred through no fault of their own, maybe they had bad luck with having cancer, or gave birth through a C-section, a preexisting condition, and they could not get coverage. People in all of our districts were hitting the lifetime cap on their health care.

This was no accident. It was in response to a crisis.

Let's get to work. Let's get this thing improved. Let's put people back to work and stop messing around with this foolishness.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will insert a letter in support of H.R. 2009 from the Americans for Tax Reform into the RECORD.

I reserve the balance of my time.

[From Americans for Tax Reform, June 20, 2013]

ATR SUPPORTS H.R. 2009, THE "KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2013"

(By Ryan Ellis)

ATR supports H.R. 2009, the "Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act of 2013," sponsored by Cong. Tom Price (R-Ga.)

ATR is pleased to announce its support for H.R. 2009, the "Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act of 2013." The bill is sponsored by medical doctor and Congressman Tom Price (R-Ga.) We would urge all Congressmen to co-sponsor and support the bill.

GAO has reported that there are 47 new powers the IRS has acquired under the Obamacare law. We here at ATR have pointed out time and again the 20 new or higher taxes that are contained in Obamacare. With a new scandal coming out of the IRS seemingly every day, the last thing that agency should be doing is snooping into the personal health care lives of over 300 million Americans.

Yet that's just what the IRS is about to do. They will be the agency tasked with implementing the individual mandate and the employer mandate. They will force all of us to disclose our personal health identification information to them when we file our 1040s every April. They will be talking to our insurance companies and the Department of Health and Human Services about our health insurance packages.

This is outrageous. The IRS should have nothing to do with our health care. Passage of H.R. 2009 would ensure that the agency which gave us Star Trek videos and Tea Party harassment keeps its hands off our health care.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), another member of our committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of America's working families, and against this bill.

I'm just baffled as to why we would take away tax credits that help working families, for the first time in many instances, afford insurance, particularly as this majority seems to have never met a tax break they didn't like. Well, at least not until today.

Time after time, the Republican majority defends special interest tax breaks, tax breaks provided to owners

of corporate jets, subsidies for Big Oil, tax writeoffs for big corporations, even as they're laying off American workers, and moving more of their operations overseas.

But where is that same zeal today in defending middle class tax cuts for middle class Americans?

Maybe I shouldn't be surprised. After all, this majority has repeatedly tried to undermine this tax credit since its inception. They've even sought to require hardworking Americans to pay the entire credit back if they get a slight increase in pay or a bonus for good work.

My colleagues, the majority has crossed some bizarre threshold today, going from principled opposition to dangerous obsession.

Now, I know some Republicans will say they're doing this because they have issues with the IRS. Should we expect a bill on the floor when we come back after the August break to stop the IRS from sending people their income tax refunds?

No, because this is just an excuse they're using.

This bill is 100 percent about denying Americans access to affordable health care.

In New York 1.5 million people will be denied tax credits if this bill is enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CROWLEY. My colleagues, I am tired of this dog-and-pony-show. Yes, Members return to their districts for a few weeks, but political red meat is not what this country needs.

We need a Congress with a vision for tomorrow, a vision focused on creating jobs and strengthening our economy, not a 40th vote on a new, even more dangerous way to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will include into the RECORD a letter endorsing H.R. 2009 from a group of six taxpayer advocate organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

AUGUST 2, 2013.

Hon. TOM PRICE,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PRICE, We the undersigned groups, representing millions of Americans, strongly support your legislation, H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act of 2013. This bill would prohibit the U.S. Treasury Department from enforcing any provision of the Affordable Care Act (aka Obamacare), ensuring that the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) would be removed from implementing or enforcing any component of Obamacare.

The last several months have proven to be an eye opening experience for those who are concerned with the growing power of the federal government, especially the IRS. Repeated and systemic encroachment into the lives of American citizens by targeting the

very thing they cherish the most, the freedom of speech, is a cause of great concern among many people from all sides of the political spectrum. It is imperative to take steps to ensure we rein in the power of an organization that has proven to be incapable of handling the authority they have right now with the responsibility and dignity the American people expect. New developments on the unnerving offenses have been uncovered on a regular basis for the last few months and it is time to make certain that the IRS is unable to extend these offenses into the lives of citizens when it comes to their health care.

This legislation makes explicitly clear that the neither the Treasury Department, nor "any delegate" shall have the power to enforce any provision or amendment from Obamacare at anytime going forward as the Administration moves to implement the law. It is paramount that this legislation passes, with overwhelming support, as it is clear that the American people have no desire to have the IRS involved in the decisions they and their families are making when it comes to their health care. We have already seen the consequences of the President's health care law on premiums and job creation and it would be catastrophic to allow the IRS to contribute to the chaos, considering their recent record of abuses and mismanagement.

The American people deserve to be trusted with their own decision making when it comes to their lives, including their health care choices. The last thing anyone wants is to have an agency they are already afraid of to be granted more.

We thank you for offering this common-sense language and we urge all members of Congress to vote "yes" on H.R. 2009.

Sincerely,

DAVID WILLIAMS,
President, Taxpayers
Protection Alliance.

GROVER NORQUIST,
President, Americans
for Tax Reform.

JEFF MAZZELLA,
President, Center for
Individual Freedom.

CARRIE LUKAS,
Managing Director,
Independent Women's Forum.

SETON MOTLEY,
President, Less Government.

PETE SEPP,
Executive Vice President,
National Taxpayers Union.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, could I ask for the amount of time on both sides, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman that I have other speakers that may be coming, but at this point, I have no other speakers on the floor. I am prepared to close at any point.

Mr. LEVIN. Okay. We have other speakers. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), who is the ranking member on the Small Business Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill before us today. Sadly, we find ourselves in another redundant and unproductive debate over the Affordable Care Act. The estimated cost of today's vote is over \$1 million, paid by hard-working taxpayers. But instead of focusing on jobs and economic growth, we're wasting time and money on denying health coverage to small businesses and their employees.

Not even half of the appropriations bills have been passed, and yet, Republicans continue their attempt to undermine health reform. This obsession must end. It is time to move on and start tackling the challenges the American people care about—jobs, jobs, jobs, the economy.

Blocking the IRS from implementing provisions of the Affordable Care Act does nothing to help our Nation's small businesses. Rather, today's bill will keep small employers from taking advantage of the small business health care tax credit, which has already helped over 360,000 small employers and 2 million workers.

This bill prevents these businesses from utilizing the 50 percent tax credit in the new SHOP exchanges next year. That is why today's vote is irresponsible and out of touch with American firms.

We must continue to ensure quality health coverage is available and utilized by the businesses that are the cornerstone of the American economy.

I urge Members to vote "no."

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it's now my special privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the person who led our efforts, and the health care reform is a testimony to her career, our leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and for his leadership of importance to the American people, the creation of jobs, growing our economy and, in the case of what is on the floor today, the 40th attempt—the 40th attempt—to harm the health and financial well-being of the American people.

Forty is a number that is fraught with meaning in the Bible: 40 hours, 40 days, 40 years in the desert, but it's fraught with nothing when it comes to overturning the Affordable Care Act, as they're trying to do for the 40th time today.

When our Republican colleagues vote for this bill, they will vote to put insurance companies back in charge of people's health. When they vote for this bill, they will be voting for an initiative that deprives patients of their rights, of making a preexisting condition a reason for discrimination. That's what a vote for this does.

That's the joy of the Affordable Care Act. No longer will being a woman be a

preexisting condition. People with preexisting conditions can no longer be denied coverage. Annual or lifetime limits are eliminated.

□ 1130

Insurance companies must spend their money on insurance, and they must do it in a way that focuses on health care, not on CEO pay, advertising, and the rest. It's an 80–20 ratio. Many people in our country have received some of the money insurance companies have had to refund because they were spending too much on themselves and not enough on policyholders.

So here we are for the 40th time. What is really sad about it is the violence that it does to the health of the American people and to a policy that enables them to have prevention and wellness. It's about the health of America, not just the health care. What's sad about it is that for those 40 times we've lost the opportunity to bring a jobs bill to this floor—a jobs bill that is very needed—a jobs bill that says, Let's make it in America, manufacture in America, build the infrastructure of America, strengthen our communities with education and public safety.

Instead of even passing appropriations bills, the Republicans are on this aimless path of taking us into chaos as we go into August. In September, the moment of truth will be here. The fiscal year will end on September 30. Instead of preparing for that, the Republicans are, once again, on this fools' errand of making matters worse for the American people, putting insurance companies in charge of people's health, and depriving patients of their rights.

This budget challenge that we have is a very serious one. We shouldn't even be leaving here today because we haven't done the work necessary to prepare us for the end of the fiscal year. Instead, we are wasting the taxpayers' time and money.

I urge our colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation. I urge the American people to insist that we get down to the people's business of job creation and to find a budget that will not destroy and question the full faith and credit of the United States of America; to find a budget that will create jobs, grow the economy, and reduce the deficit.

If we shut down government, as some on the Republican side have said, unless we repeal the Affordable Care Act, what does that mean to you? It means to you that the success of your 401(k) is in jeopardy. It means if you have mortgage interest payments, you will probably pay more. Your credit card bills will probably go up because of the increase in interest.

It's just not right for what it does. It does not understand the economic challenges faced by America's families who want jobs, want to educate their children, want to maintain their homes,

and want to have secure pensions for the future. It's just silliness, and it does not deserve even the time we're taking on the floor, much less rise to the dignity of deserving a vote by Members of Congress.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as I think everybody knows, the two committees, Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means, work closely together, and as chairs, Mr. WAXMAN and I were able to, with others, work so closely.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a do-nothing Congress. It is absolutely pathetic. There are millions of people unemployed. Are we working to create jobs for them? No. If they don't have jobs, we're not trying to help them. But what we're doing today for the 40th time is to make sure they can't get health insurance.

This is an obsession on the part of the Republicans. I was commenting on it the other day in committee, and I said there's such opposition that the law has become the Republicans' great white whale. They'll stop at nothing to kill it.

And so here we are with their 40th attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I think it's a disgrace. Is this all we have to do—spend 40 separate times trying to repeal a law that is going to bring health care to millions of Americans who have been denied health care opportunities because of preexisting conditions, because their employer doesn't provide it to them, or because they otherwise couldn't afford it? It will give people in the middle class choices. And with competition between choices of health insurance, the prices will drop, the quality will improve.

This whole health care bill was based on Republican ideas, including a requirement that everybody get health insurance. That was endorsed by The Heritage Foundation.

So I'm astounded that we're back here today and this is the last thing we're going to do before we go take our recess, our vacation, and go home and tell people, Sorry, we can't help you. We're trying again in the House of Representatives to repeal one bill that has been passed that can mean so much to so many.

I urge that we defeat this legislation.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), the ranking member on the Health Subcommittee of our committee.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to Mr. WAXMAN, it's clear he was talking about obsession. And you

might ask, Well, why is this happening here and what's going on?

This has happened before. This is the worst nightmare for the Republican Party. In 1964, the American Medical Association was flat out against the institution of Medicare. When I was in medical school, the president said, Boys, there isn't going to be any medicine in this country. We're having that socialized medicine come in. It's a terrible thing.

And you know what happened? They made the people so afraid that when they went out to enroll people in Medicare, people said, Well, I don't want any of that government medicine in my house. Look at Medicare today. Nobody on that side would dare take out Medicare because the American people found out that what they were told in the advertising campaign leading up to it was not true. And that's what you are getting here today—untruths.

Vote "no" on this.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will submit a letter from 22 organizations from around the country endorsing H.R. 2009, and I reserve the balance of my time.

AUGUST 1, 2013.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: We, the undersigned organizations and free market leaders write in united support of House efforts this week to get the IRS out of Obamacare.

The House will consider a measure on Friday sponsored by Congressman Tom Price (R-Ga.) to remove the IRS from any role in the implementation of the Obamacare law.

It's a basic belief of most Americans that patients, families, and doctors—not IRS bureaucrats—should be making health care decisions. While this has always been the case, its importance has been heightened in recent months by the uncovered political targeting by the IRS of Tea Party and other free market groups. The IRS should not be anywhere near people's medical decisions until this black cloud of political scandal has been lifted.

Unfortunately, the GAO reports that the IRS has no fewer than 47 powers to implement Obamacare. That's 47 too many. Allowing the IRS to enforce Obamacare is opening up the door to more abuse, more targeting, and more harassment of American citizens. The myriad of new taxes the IRS will impose under the guise of health care reform will destroy jobs, stifle economic growth, and impede medical innovation in this country.

With Obamacare coming fully online in 2014, now is the time to stop the IRS from becoming a full partner in our families' healthcare decisions. House efforts to prevent this from happening are welcome and all Members of Congress should support these efforts.

Sincerely,

Grover Norquist, Americans for Tax Reform; Dean Clancy, Freedom Works; Al Cardenas, American Conservative Union; Amy Kremer, Tea Party Express; Jenny Beth Martin, Tea Party Patriots; Heather Higgins, Independent Womens' Voice; Steven J. Duffield, Crossroads GPS; Brandon Arnold, National Taxpayers Union; Colin Hanna, Let Freedom Ring; Jim Martin, 60 Plus Association; Grace-Marie Turner, Galen Institute; Phil Kerpen, American

Commitment; Penny Nance, Concerned Women for America; Ken Hoagland, Restore America's Voice; John Tate, Campaign for Liberty; Peter Ferrara, National Center for Policy Analysis; Ari Winkour, Harbour League; Gregory T. Angelo, Log Cabin Republicans; Mark Schiller, MD, Doctor-Patient Medical Association; Betsy McCaughey, Ph.D, author of Beating Obamacare; Brian Baker, Ending Spending; David Wallace, Restore America's Mission.

(Signatures are for information purposes only).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I've sat and listened to the debate this morning and heard a lot of the slogans that we hear on this repeated again and again and again. I would simply return to the point that I made earlier: for a family that makes \$40,000 a year, has two adults working, and two children, that doesn't get coverage at work, which is true for many, many Americans—maybe 35 million Americans have a situation something like that—the Affordable Care Act says that starting January 1, for about \$40 a week they can buy health insurance from a private insurance company as good as the Members of Congress have.

What is the plan from the other side, since they're repealing this? This bill takes that away. What is the plan from the other side to provide for that family?

Now, they'll talk about bills they have introduced and letters they have written. There's not been one bill, one vote, one day that would answer that question. After a thousand days of the Republican majority, the American people eagerly await that answer.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

From the outset, I made clear my reaction to IRS mismanagement that called for relieving of duties of two people. But what the Republicans today are doing is using the IRS as a bootstrap to express their hatred of health care reform.

I want to say this and challenge anybody to refute it: assertions that the IRS will have access to personal health information are wrong and are deliberately misleading. The IRS will only receive routine information—name, address, family size, incomes, coverage status—needed to provide tax credits. That's it. The rest are falsehoods.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, it's important for folks to appreciate that the Republican goal in health care is to make certain that every single American has the highest quality health care. We simply believe it ought to be patient-centered health care. And my friends on the other side of the aisle talk about patient-centered health care, but what they support is health care with Washington making decisions. We believe patients and families and doctors ought to be making medical decisions.

Now, what have we heard in opposition to this piece of legislation today? We've heard that Republicans have no plan. Well, on the contrary, Mr. Speaker, we have multiple pieces of legislation. I, in fact, have H.R. 2300, which is a patient-centered bill that makes certain that everybody has affordable coverage; that they are able to have the financial feasibility to purchase the coverage that they want, not that the government forces them to buy. And portability is solved. You don't lose your insurance if you change your job or you lose your job. We solve the whole challenge of preexisting illnesses and injuries, but in a patient-centered way, not a way that the government forces you to purchase what they want you to purchase. And it would provide insurance for every single American.

Second, we've heard this isn't a responsible piece of legislation. Mr. Speaker, let me suggest that the American people think this is a responsible piece of legislation, where over 80 percent don't think the IRS ought to have a thing to do with their health care.

We've heard that this bill isn't going anywhere at all. Why do it? It's a futile attempt. Well, I'll remind my colleagues of seven pieces of legislation—bills passed in this House, bills passed by the United States Senate, and signed into law by President Obama—that either repealed or defunded portions of his own health care law.

H.R. 4 repealed the small business paperwork mandate; H.R. 1473 cut \$2.2 billion from the "stealth public plan" and froze the IRS budget; H.R. 674 saved taxpayers \$13 billion by adjusting eligibility for ObamaCare programs; H.R. 2055 made more reductions to the Independent Payment Advisory Board and the IRS; H.R. 3630 slashed billions of dollars from ObamaCare slush funds; H.R. 4348 saved another \$670 million from the boondoggle, "the Louisiana Purchase," that was included in the original bill; and H.R. 8 repealed the unsustainable CLASS programs.

All of those repealed or changed portions of the Affordable Care Act signed into law by the President of the United States.

We've heard heart-wrenching stories from our friends on the other side about health challenges and illnesses. And, yes, Mr. Speaker, there are real challenges out there. As a physician, I can attest to that, having spent over 20

years taking care of patients. But the American people don't want Washington deciding what kind of health care they must have or can't have. We need patients and families and doctors making those medical decisions.

And then there's the preposterous assertion from the other side that Republicans don't like affordable care, quality care, accessible care. Nonsense, Mr. Speaker. Nonsense. What we want is the highest quality of care that respects the principles of affordability and accessibility and quality and choices and responsiveness and innovation. We simply want patients and families and doctors to be in charge of health care, not Washington, D.C., and not the IRS.

I urge support of H.R. 2009, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act of 2013. The IRS was granted 46 new powers in Obamacare including the collection of 21 new taxes, the distribution of 13 new subsidies, 6 new information collection responsibilities, and an additional 6 new powers to enforce compliance. As the Treasury Inspector General said earlier this year, "It is unprecedented in recent history, the amount of responsibility the IRS is being given in an area that most people don't think of as an IRS function."

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today will seek to rectify this situation and force this Congress to think of better options to reform our health system. Obamacare has given the American people the largest tax increase in our country's history and will take over 80 million hours annually to follow the law. This bill will get the IRS out of health care, thereby allow businesses to focus on creating jobs and succeeding as opposed to trying to comply with overreaching regulatory enforcement by the federal government, and stop the implementation of the misguided health care bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2009.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1145

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NOLAN. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Nolan moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2009 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

SEC. 4. PROTECTING MIDDLE CLASS FAMILIES AND SMALL BUSINESSES FROM TAX INCREASES.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter, impact, delay, or weaken—

(1) section 1401 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that provides tax credits for middle class families (earning up to \$94,200 for a family of four) for the purchase of health insurance coverage in Exchanges; and

(2) section 1421 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that provides tax credits to small businesses (up to 50 percent of the cost of coverage for two years beginning in 2014; up to 35 percent for prior years) for the purchase of health insurance coverage for employees.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes on his motion to recommit.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, my final amendment would protect important tax credits and tax breaks for middle-income families and for small businesses. It will not kill or send this bill back to committee. It will allow us to proceed with final passage, should it pass.

Now, to the heart of what this is really all about, I thought our colleague from California (Mr. THOMPSON) here a few minutes ago characterized it quite well when he said this should be called the "40th Waste of Taxpayers Time and Money Act," not an alternative to the Affordable Care Act.

The fact is that the Republican opposition here is engaged in their 40th political attempt to undo the Affordable Care Act and offering us no alternatives to the time when 46 million Americans have no insurance, when health care and insurance rates were rising at a rate of 20 percent per year.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, "no" is not a plan; "no" is not an answer.

President Harry Truman was fond of saying—and forgive me for quoting him directly, but he used to like to say, "Any jackass can tear down a barn, but it takes a carpenter to build one." I'm challenging my colleagues: Are you here to tear down the barn or are you here to build one?

Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to ask, are you really serious when you come before us here and you say you really, truly want to increase taxes on families and small businesses, as this bill would do? Are you really serious when you say you want to take away from students the right to stay on their parents' insurance policy while they're struggling with the difficulties of the increased cost of education? The American people don't want that. What is your plan?

Mr. Speaker, are you really serious when you say you want to deny people with preexisting conditions the right to have health insurance? The Amer-

ican public doesn't want that. What is your plan?

Are you really serious when you want to continue this de facto notion that women somehow, by definition, are living with preexisting conditions and are charged more for the exact same policies as men would pay for? The American people are not. What is your plan?

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, are you really serious when you want to vote to eliminate free prevention care, which saves lives, which helps save costs in our medical system? The American people are not. What is your plan?

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, are you really serious when you say you want to remove the cap on insurance companies' liabilities, the very cap that forces people with serious accidents and illnesses into bankruptcy? The American people don't want that. What is your plan?

Last but not least, Mr. Speaker, are you prepared to vote to deny senior citizens the relief from the increased costs in pharmaceuticals as a result of that doughnut hole? The seniors in this country are not. Again I ask you, what is your plan?

Mr. Speaker, that's what's at heart here. We have had 40 attempts to repeal this bill, and we haven't seen one single plan offered forward here.

This is a waste of time. Let us get serious. Let us start to show some bipartisanship. And let's start with it here today by passing my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it's no secret; the public has weighed in on this. This Congress is acknowledged by all parties and all spectrums as the most unproductive Congress in the history of this country. That's shameful. Polls show us 25 points behind cockroaches in popularity, 23 percentage points behind—what was the last one?—oh, root canals. We're just slightly ahead of Genghis Khan and the Communist Party in popularity.

It's time that we put an end to this nonsense, put this Congress to work, postpone/cancel this recess. Let's put an end to this nonsense, get America working again, and get this country working again.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and seek time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say there's nothing in this bill that prevents middle class families or individuals from receiving subsidies to which they're entitled. So I think it's just important to understand what the facts are. But what we want to do is keep the IRS out of control of your health care. Talk about unpopular items.

Look, businesses have gotten a waiver from the mandate—1,300 organizations, businesses, unions have gotten waivers from this law. What about individuals? What about American families?

If you want to keep the IRS out of control of your health care, vote “no” on this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 230, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]

AYES—186

Andrews	Enyart	Lujan Grisham
Barber	Eshoo	(NM)
Barrow (GA)	Esty	Lujan, Ben Ray
Bass	Farr	(NM)
Beatty	Fattah	Lynch
Becerra	Foster	Maffei
Bera (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Maloney,
Bishop (GA)	Gabbard	Carolyn
Bishop (NY)	Gallagher	Matheson
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Matsui
Bonamici	Garcia	McCollum
Brady (PA)	Grayson	McDermott
Braley (IA)	Green, Al	McGovern
Brown (FL)	Green, Gene	McNerney
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Meeks
Bustos	Gutiérrez	Meng
Butterfield	Hahn	Michaud
Capps	Hanabusa	Moore
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Moran
Cárdenas	Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)
Carney	Higgins	Nadler
Carson (IN)	Himes	Napolitano
Cartwright	Hinojosa	Neal
Castor (FL)	Honda	Negrete McLeod
Castro (TX)	Hoyer	Nolan
Chu	Huffman	O'Rourke
Cicilline	Israel	Owens
Clarke	Jackson Lee	Pascarella
Clay	Jeffries	Pastor (AZ)
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Peters (CA)
Conyers	Kaptur	Peters (MI)
Cooper	Keating	Peterson
Costa	Kelly (IL)	Pingree (ME)
Courtney	Kennedy	Pocan
Crowley	Kildee	Polis
Cuellar	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Cummings	Kind	Quigley
Davis (CA)	Kirkpatrick	Rahall
Davis, Danny	Kuster	Rangel
DeFazio	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Rush
DelBene	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Deutch	Lewis	Sánchez, Linda
Dingell	Lipinski	T.
Doggett	Loebach	Sanchez, Loretta
Duckworth	Lofgren	Sarbanes
Edwards	Lowenthal	Schakowsky
Ellison	Lowey	Schiff
Engel		Schneider

Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)

Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey

Vela
Velázquez
Viscosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Titus
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)

Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi

Perlmutter
Richmond
Young (FL)

□ 1216

Messrs. NUGENT, DENHAM, SANFORD, and BISHOP of Utah changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. VISCOSKY and HUFFMAN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 185, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 447]

AYES—232

Aderholt	Farenthold	Labrador
Alexander	Fincher	LaMalfa
Amash	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Amodei	Fleischmann	Lance
Bachmann	Fleming	Lankford
Bachus	Flores	Latham
Barletta	Forbes	Latta
Barr	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Barrow (GA)	Foxo	Long
Barton	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Benishke	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Bentivolio	Gardner	Lummis
Bilirakis	Garrett	Marchant
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Marino
Black	Gibbs	Masie
Blackburn	Gibson	Matheson
Bonner	Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Boustany	Gohmert	McCaul
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	McClintock
Bridenstine	Gosar	McHenry
Brooks (AL)	Gowdy	McIntyre
Brooks (IN)	Granger	McKeon
Broun (GA)	Graves (GA)	McKinley
Buchanan	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Bucshon	Griffin (AR)	Rodgers
Burgess	Griffith (VA)	Meadows
Calvert	Grimm	Meehan
Camp	Guthrie	Messer
Cantor	Hall	Mica
Capito	Hanna	Miller (MI)
Carter	Harper	Miller, Gary
Cassidy	Harris	Mullin
Chabot	Hartzler	Mulvaney
Chaffetz	Hastings (WA)	Murphy (PA)
Coble	Heck (NV)	Neugebauer
Coffman	Hensarling	Noem
Cole	Holding	Nugent
Collins (NY)	Hudson	Nunes
Conaway	Huelskamp	Nunnelee
Cook	Huizenga (MI)	Olson
Cotton	Hultgren	Palazzo
Cramer	Hunter	Paulsen
Crawford	Hurt	Pearce
Crenshaw	Issa	Perry
Culberson	Jenkins	Peterson
Daines	Johnson (OH)	Petri
Davis, Rodney	Johnson, Sam	Pittenger
Denham	Jones	Pitts
Dent	Jordan	Poe (TX)
DeSantis	Joyce	Pompeo
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Posy
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Price (GA)
Duffy	King (NY)	Radel
Duncan (SC)	Kinzing (IL)	Reed
Duncan (TN)	Kline	Reichert
Ellmers		Renacci

NOT VOTING—17

Campbell
Cleaver

Clyburn
Collins (GA)

Doyle
Fudge

Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock

Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner

Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Miller (FL)
Miller, George

Pallone
Perlmutter

Richmond
Young (FL)

□ 1224

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker: I was unavoidably absent during the week of July 29, 2013. If I were present, I would have voted on the following:

Rollcall No. 419: Gallego of Texas Amendment, "aye";

Rollcall No. 420: Young of Alaska Amendment, "aye";

Rollcall No. 421: Grayson of Florida Amendment, "no";

Rollcall No. 422: McClintock of California Amendment No. 4, "no";

Rollcall No. 423: First Hastings of Florida Amendment, "aye";

Rollcall No. 424: Second Hastings of Florida Amendment, "no";

Rollcall No. 425: Third Hastings of Florida Amendment, "no";

Rollcall No. 426: Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1911—Smarter Solutions for Students Act, "yea";

Rollcall No. 427: H.R. 850 Nuclear Iran Prevention Act, "yea";

Rollcall No. 428: Waxman of California Amendment No. 1, "yea";

Rollcall No. 429: Connolly of Virginia Amendment No. 3, "yea";

Rollcall No. 430: Murphy of Pennsylvania Amendment No. 6, "nay";

Rollcall No. 431: Motion to Recommit with Instructions for H.R. 1582, "yea";

Rollcall No. 432: Final Passage H.R. 1582—Energy Consumers Relief Act, "nay";

Rollcall No. 433: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2879, H.R. 367, and H.R. 2009, "nay";

Rollcall No. 434: H. Res. 322—Rule Providing for consideration of H.R. 367, H.R. 2009, and H.R. 2879, "nay";

Rollcall No. 435: H.R. 1897—Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2013, "yea";

Rollcall No. 436: H.R. 2879—Stop Government Abuse Act, "nay";

Rollcall No. 437: Scalise of Louisiana Amendment, "no";

Rollcall No. 438: Smith of Missouri Amendment, "no";

Rollcall No. 439: Latham of Iowa Amendment, "no";

Rollcall No. 440: Nadler of New York Amendment, "aye";

Rollcall No. 441: Johnson of Georgia Amendment, "aye";

Rollcall No. 442: Jackson-Lee of Texas Amendment, "aye";

Rollcall No. 443: Moore of Wisconsin Amendment, "aye";

Rollcall No. 444: Motion to Recommit With Instructions for H.R. 367, "aye";

Rollcall No. 445: Final Passage of H.R. 367, "no";

Rollcall No. 446: Motion to Recommit with Instructions for H.R. 2009, "aye";

Rollcall No. 447: Final Passage of H.R. 2009, "no";

BENEFITS OF NATURAL GAS DEVELOPMENT FOR PENNSYLVANIANS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, I have shared multiple accounts of testimony delivered before the bipartisan Natural Gas Caucus during a field hearing last week in Williamsport, Pennsylvania. While I have discussed the extensive job growth and revenue increases for the Commonwealth, today I rise to share the benefits to property owners who have leases above the vast Marcellus natural gas play.

Between 2008 and 2010, landowners in two rural, northern tier counties in Pennsylvania earned over \$550 million. As of July 2013, the lifetime royalties for wells already drilled in these counties are projected to exceed \$7 billion. Property values in these counties have increased to a level greater than 47 percent of the national average increase between 2006 and 2012, which was during the height of the recession.

Perhaps most importantly, there are now, more than ever, greater prospects for future generations of Pennsylvanians. Natural gas development has allowed Pennsylvania's young workers to find high-paying, family sustaining jobs in the Keystone State, where they can continue to live and build stronger communities.

□ 1230

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Safe Climate Caucus to once again direct our attention to the serious threat of climate change. Republicans continue to ignore this issue and instead waste our valuable time once again attempting to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Yesterday, our Interior appropriations markup ended up with no real timetable for when we can finish this bill. Worse yet, the funding levels in the Interior bill were absolutely irresponsible. The Republican bill would abandon our commitment to the environment, to our national parks, to the public health and safety, and most important to climate change mitigation programs.

It is sad and shameful that we are about to adjourn for a 5-week district work period leaving critical business to create jobs, pass comprehensive immigration reform, and fight climate change.

The time to act is now. I encourage my colleagues to begin to address this issue right away.

NOES—185

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke

Owens
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swallow (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Campbell
Clever
Clyburn
Collins (GA)

Doyle
Fudge
Herrera Beutler
Holt

Horsford
McCarthy (NY)

PROMOTING CIVIC EDUCATION

(Mr. GIBSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, during my time in the military, I had the privilege of serving as an assistant professor of American Government at the United States Military Academy at West Point. The opportunity to educate young minds about our democracy, our Constitution, our exceptional way of life was one of the greatest privileges I ever had.

The continuation of our Nation relies upon the engagement of an informed citizenry. In a time when education funding is being stretched thin at the Federal, State, and local levels, civics and history are often among the first subjects to be pared down or even eliminated.

I'm proud of the work of my colleagues such as Representative HONDA and Representative COLE and what they're doing to promote civic education. One of my own constituents, Jonathan Estrin from Columbia County, has been helping them. I'm proud of him, as well.

Though it is the role of the State and local governments to establish curricula, I support Federal efforts to assist States and localities who wish to empower their students by civic education.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure future generations come to learn about our Nation's history and remain engaged as citizens.

GIVE ME A BREAK

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, reportedly the Republican leadership has drafted a bill that doubles the level of cuts to food stamps over what was included in the farm bill that failed to pass this House in June.

That's right: it doubles the cuts. More than 50 million people are hungry in America, 17 million are kids, and the Republicans think cutting \$40 billion from the most important program that prevents mass hunger in America is somehow a good thing? Give me a break.

They have already tried to cut \$20 billion from food stamps. They failed. Any rational person would say they went too far, we need to compromise. Instead, the Republican leadership decided to double down on the crazy.

If House Republicans insist on moving forward with this awful proposal, I will fight it with every ounce of energy I can muster. We should not, we must not, we cannot allow this mean-spirited, cold-hearted proposal to pass.

REINS ACT

(Mr. DAINES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I held a tele-townhall meeting and had the opportunity to talk with several thousand Montanans about the House's efforts to bring needed accountability to Washington and the regulatory burdens that are hurting Montana families and job creators.

Montanans are tired and frustrated by the EPA's ever-changing rules and unreasonable compliance costs. The status quo is not acceptable. That's why I'm proud to have voted in support of the REINS Act, which will bring much needed accountability to the regulatory process.

This isn't a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. This is about doing the right thing for the American people and the future of our country.

It's time to rein in Washington's overbearing, costly regulations and provide Montana families, business owners, and hardworking taxpayers with the relief they deserve.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. WAXMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, in an op-ed in The New York Times this morning, four former EPA administrators appeal for action on climate change, stating:

The United States must move now on substantive steps to curb climate change.

I think this House could learn a thing or two from the authors of this article.

These former EPA administrators worked for four Republican Presidents: Nixon, Reagan, George Bush, and George W. Bush. They say that "there is no longer any credible scientific debate" about climate change, and they also point out that our window for action is shrinking.

They say they support the actions that the President is now taking under the Clean Air Act to reduce carbon pollution, and they call on Congress to start the overdue debate about what bigger steps are needed domestically and internationally.

They conclude with this very powerful statement:

The only uncertainty about our warming world is how bad the changes will get, and how soon. What is most clear is that there is no time to waste.

HOLDING ATTORNEY GENERAL
HOLDER ACCOUNTABLE

(Mr. GOSAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address Attorney General Holder's misinterpretation of federalism and his disregard for our system of checks and balances.

The Supreme Court was clear in *Shelby v. Holder* that States have the ability to run fair elections. Did anybody tell Attorney General Holder?

I can't say it better than Texas Governor Rick Perry, whose efforts to implement commonsense election standards are under attack from Mr. Holder:

Once again, the Obama administration is demonstrating utter contempt for our country's system of checks and balances, not to mention the U.S. Constitution.

If Holder continues to go unchecked and if he is not held accountable, what sort of precedent does that set? As Supreme Court Justice Brandeis said:

In a government of laws, the existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. If government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law: it invites every man to become a law unto himself. It invites anarchy.

So I ask you, has the Attorney General invited anarchy? I will continue to make my case here in the people's House at the people's pulpit.

I will be back.

LET THE PEOPLE DRAW THE
LINES ACT

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to introduce my first bill as a Member of Congress. It's Let the People Draw the Lines Act, or H.R. 2978.

My bill does exactly what that title says: it lets people, not politicians, draw the district lines for the United States House of Representatives. My bill empowers the States to create independent redistricting commissions, much like we have in my home State of California.

The Let the People Draw the Lines Act will remove redistricting from the political process. It will provide clear and uniform redistricting criteria that give all communities a fair and equal voice in the political process. This entire process will be transparent and open to the public, the way it should be.

If my bill becomes law, Mr. Speaker, political gerrymandering will finally become a closed chapter in our Nation's journey towards a more perfect democracy.

Let the people draw the lines, Mr. Speaker. America deserves true representation.

DEFUNDING OBAMACARE

(Mr. PALAZZO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I'm not a fan of government mandates, and neither are my constituents in Mississippi. There is one mandate that the people of Mississippi sent me to Washington with: to repeal, replace, dismantle, delay, and defund ObamaCare.

I've heard from families, small businesses, and hardworking Americans across my district who all have the same message—this law is a train wreck.

That is why one of my very first votes in Congress was to repeal ObamaCare. That's why I've voted to repeal it nearly 40 times over the last 3 years. That is why I introduced a constitutional amendment to restore the right of the American people to refuse this bad law. That is also why I firmly believe we must defund ObamaCare in a continuing resolution this body will take up later this year.

I believe this is a fight worth fighting for Mississippi, and I believe it's a fight worth fighting for the American people.

I'm calling on my colleagues to join me in this fight to stand strong, to stand together, and let's defund ObamaCare.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT ADJOURN

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, here we are Friday afternoon. We have a lot of people around the country who are going home for the weekend, but expecting to go back to their workplace on Monday. Congress is not coming back until September.

Did we get everything done? No, we did not. We did manage to vote against ObamaCare 40 times, and basically that means we have voted against the people of this country and their right to health insurance 40 times.

We did not cancel the sequester, which is hurting people. I delivered meals last week to a 101-year-old man who has had his meals cut because of sequester. We didn't pass any jobs bill, not one, not a single jobs bill. All we've managed to do in this body is to try to take health care away from American citizens.

I urge Congress to stay here. I urge the Speaker to call us back and make us do the job the American public sent us here to do.

IRS: LAWS FOR THEE, BUT NOT FOR ME

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every year, millions of Americans across the

fruited plains send their tax returns to the IRS. Some claim exemptions so they can keep more of their money; now the IRS wants an exemption of its own.

IRS employees want an exemption from participating in—guess what—ObamaCare. That's right. The IRS workers have asked for an exemption from ObamaCare. They like their current health plan, and they just want to keep it.

These are the same people in charge of enforcing ObamaCare and penalizing Americans that are forced to be under ObamaCare. This is the same abusive, scandalous IRS that uses power to punish political opponents.

The IRS taxocrats don't want the law to apply to them; they want it to apply to us. More arrogance of power. Their policy is: laws for thee, but not for me. Irony, don't you think?

The real truth, to be clear, Mr. Speaker, is the IRS wants to be exempted from ObamaCare and so do Americans.

And that's just the way it is.

CALLING FOR THE RESIGNATION OF ATTORNEY GENERAL ERIC HOLDER AND DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE JAMES CLAPPER

(Mr. FLORES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the delicate yet much-needed balance between our national security and the constitutionally protected liberties of our citizens. In order to maintain those liberties, I call for the immediate terminations of Director of National Intelligence James Clapper and Attorney General Eric Holder. To that extent, I am sending a letter to President Obama asking that he immediately call for their terminations and/or resignations.

Mr. Speaker, I do believe that our Nation's surveillance programs have helped thwart terrorist attacks because of the NSA and FBI personnel that work on these security activities every day and who are working hard to comply with the law to protect our constitutional liberties and to keep America safe.

In contrast to the efforts of those hardworking, law-abiding personnel, Americans have serious reservations about Attorney General Holder and DNI Clapper, who are ultimately responsible for the management of these programs. We remain gravely concerned about their lack of commitment to follow the law, to be forthright with the American people and with Congress, and their commitment to protect our constitutionally guaranteed liberties.

Continued congressional oversight coupled with the terminations of Clap-

per and Holder will help restore trust in these important programs to fight terrorism without compromising our liberties or creating gaps in our intelligence structure. In addition, their removal may start the healing process to restore American trust in our Federal Government.

□ 1245

TRIBUTE TO STAFF SERGEANT SONNY C. ZIMMERMAN

(Mr. JORDAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a brave young Ohio soldier who made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of this great country, Army Staff Sergeant Sonny C. Zimmerman.

Sonny graduated from Waynesfield-Goshen High School in 2005 and served his first tour in Afghanistan 2006. His fellow soldiers knew him as a leader and spoke freely of the times he helped them, stood up for them, and sacrificed for them.

Chaplain Brian Fruchey mentioned how Sonny always said, "I have to bring my guys home," and noted that he always put himself last.

Sonny Zimmerman was a decorated hero who served with courage and honor. He died on Tuesday, July 16, 2013, in Afghanistan. He is survived by his wife, Morgan; daughter, Riley; parents, Chris and Michelle; stepfather, David; two sisters; and other loving family.

I was touched to see how many of Sonny's friends, family, and neighbors came together in his hometown of Waynesfield to honor his life and sacrifice.

He volunteered to serve. He loved the Army, loved his country, and fought to promote freedom. For this, each and every American owes him and his family a debt of gratitude.

Sonny Zimmerman will be deeply missed, but the strength of his character and the courage he demonstrated through his service will live on.

WORKING TOGETHER FOR SOLUTIONS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the American people want us to work together. You can poll any one of them that is coming through these halls as tourists, as Americans, and I know they want us to work together.

I think it is important that we announce to the American people that we will immediately get rid of sequester and stop the laying off of valuable Defense Department workers and Health and Human Services workers, people

who help generate the economy because of the work that they do in places beyond the beltway, government workers who are servants of the people.

We need to get rid of sequester and begin to fund those child care seats that have been lost, those Meals on Wheels, and Medicare resources for our seniors. We need to stop playing around with the budget.

We need to insist that the bills of the American people be paid through raising the debt ceiling, and not in an angry manner, but recognizing our responsibilities.

We know that the NSA has been looked at. I stand here as someone who will stand on behalf of the civil liberties and civil rights of Americans. I have introduced an intelligence bill to review the enormous number of contractors that are being used to give top secret credibility and, as well, to do our outsourcing of our work.

I have introduced a bill dealing with the FISA Court, to release the FISA Court opinions, because I believe it is important for the American people to know and be protected in their civil liberties.

Finally, ObamaCare is one that I am proud to be supporting because it helps small businesses. It helps those who don't have care, and it provides for young people to have health coverage. ObamaCare serves the American people.

SUPPORT HELPING HEROES FLY ACT

(Mr. HUDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently heard a story about one of our wounded soldiers being forced to participate in a lengthy and uncomfortable security screening at the airport. I immediately contacted the head of the TSA to express my outrage and disappointment that one of our Nation's heroes would be forced to go through such an ordeal.

I believe one of the most solemn responsibilities of our government is to care for our veterans and those who have been injured in the line of duty. We must remember that even little things can be cumbersome and difficult. The last thing our heroes need is to face a long line or be forced to answer endless questions about their conditions when all they want to do is board a plane and fly home to be with their loved ones.

As chairman of the Transportation Security Subcommittee, I've had an active role in working with TSA, the administrator, and my colleague, Ms. GABBARD, the author of this legislation, to adopt protocols that will increase accessibility and privacy and offer less invasive screening for those with severe combat-related injuries.

I urge my colleagues to help pass the Helping Heroes Fly Act, as amended, by unanimous consent today. I am proud of this legislation because it shows an example of Republicans and Democrats working together to find solutions for the American people.

REINS ACT

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, we are at a point where an unannounced, unplanned, and largely unconstitutional fourth branch of government has taken root. Dominated by unelected bureaucrats, these Federal departments and agencies are churning out rules and regulations at an unprecedented pace.

According to one study, Federal agencies finalized nearly 3,000 rules and over 60 major regulations in 2007. That same year, Congress enacted 138 public laws.

To this end, one of the first bills I cosponsored upon being sworn in as a Member of Congress was the REINS Act, H.R. 367, and I'm pleased to have voted for it today. The bill increases accountability and creates transparency in the Federal regulatory process by requiring Congress to approve all new major regulations. With the REINS Act, no longer will bureaucrats in the fourth branch go unchecked, and the constitutional balance our Founders deliberately drafted would be restored.

I will continue to fight for a government that is smaller, more efficient, more streamlined, and more responsive to hardworking taxpayers.

HELPING HEROES FLY ACT

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1344) to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Helping Heroes Fly Act".

SEC. 2. OPERATIONS CENTER PROGRAM FOR SEVERELY INJURED OR DISABLED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND SEVERELY INJURED OR DISABLED VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§44927. Expedited screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans

"(a) PASSENGER SCREENING.—The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and organizations identified by the Secretaries of Defense and Veteran Affairs that advocate on behalf of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, shall develop and implement a process to support and facilitate the ease of travel and to the extent possible provide expedited passenger screening services for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans through passenger screening. The process shall be designed to offer the individual private screening to the maximum extent practicable.

"(b) OPERATIONS CENTER.—As part of the process under subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary shall maintain an operations center to provide support and facilitate the movement of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans through passenger screening prior to boarding a passenger aircraft operated by an air carrier or foreign air carrier in air transportation or intrastate air transportation.

"(c) PROTOCOLS.—The Assistant Secretary shall—

"(1) establish and publish protocols, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the organizations identified under subsection (a), under which a severely injured or disabled member of the Armed Forces or severely injured or disabled veteran, or the family member or other representative of such member or veteran, may contact the operations center maintained under subsection (b) and request the expedited passenger screening services described in subsection (a) for that member or veteran; and

"(2) upon receipt of a request under paragraph (1), require the operations center to notify the appropriate Federal Security Director of the request for expedited passenger screening services, as described in subsection (a), for that member or veteran.

"(d) TRAINING.—The Assistant Secretary shall integrate training on the protocols established under subsection (c) into the training provided to all employees who will regularly provide the passenger screening services described in subsection (a).

"(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the Assistant Secretary to require additional screening of a severely injured or disabled member of the Armed Forces, a severely injured or disabled veteran, or their accompanying family members or nonmedical attendants, if intelligence, law enforcement, or other information indicates that additional screening is necessary.

"(f) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section. Each report shall include each of the following:

"(1) Information on the training provided under subsection (d).

"(2) Information on the consultations between the Assistant Secretary and the organizations identified under subsection (a).

“(3) The number of people who accessed the operations center during the period covered by the report.

“(4) Such other information as the Assistant Secretary determines is appropriate.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 44926 the following new item:

“44927. Expedited screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged concurrent resolution.

S. CON. RES. 22

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, August 1, 2013, through Sunday, August 11, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, August 12, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Monday, August 12, 2013, it stand adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, September 9, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Friday, August 2, 2013, through Friday, September 6, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO CONGRESSIONAL AWARD BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's ap-

pointment, pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 803(a)), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Congressional Award Board:

Mr. HUDSON, North Carolina

DIRECTION OF OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and to be able to cover some of the subject matter that sets the stage and the tone and some of the things that I think we should be thinking about as we take this traditional August work period and go back to our individual districts and hear from our constituents.

There are a number of us that have constituents that have guided this country in the right direction, that have given considerable contribution to this Nation, and I think it is an appropriate time for us to commemorate some of those individuals as well as highlight some important agenda moving into the other side of Labor Day.

To begin that process, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) to address this topic matter.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, our Nation lost Ronnie Jackson, a community treasure of Bryan, Texas. Mr. Jackson was a long-time public servant in the role of Neighborhood and Youth Services Director for our city. Mr. Jackson passed away at the age of 63 after fighting lung cancer for 17 months.

Mr. Jackson spent his life as an educator and worked tirelessly for many organizations, including the MHMR Authority of Brazos Valley, the Boys and Girls Club of Brazos Valley, Big Brothers and Big Sisters of Brazos Valley. He also spent time volunteering at programs for youth, seniors, and in neighborhoods throughout the community. Mr. Jackson was recognized for his service when he was a 2010 national finalist for the Jefferson Award, which is the Nobel Prize for community and public service.

He was well known in Bryan and impacted the lives of many throughout the community. Ever selfless, even while battling cancer, Mr. Jackson still made time to work and serve in his community. He was described by many as hardworking, devoted, and a kind man. In fact, Bryan City Secretary Mary Lynne Stratta said in a newspaper interview earlier this summer

that Mr. Jackson was the heartbeat of the programs that he led.

My thoughts and prayers are with the family and friends of Mr. Ronnie Jackson. He will forever be remembered as an outstanding husband and a community servant. Bryan, Texas, and all of the Brazos Valley are a better community because of him. God bless his family and our community as we mourn his passing.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country during these difficult times and for our military and first responders who protect us abroad and at home.

Mr. Speaker, on July 26, our Nation lost a great American, Mr. George P. Mitchell. Mr. Mitchell was a revolutionary energy pioneer, philanthropist, and Texas A&M graduate, class of 1940. He was 94 years old and passed away on July 26, 2013.

Mr. Mitchell was a native of Texas, born in Galveston, and later attended Texas A&M University, where he worked his way through school, studied petroleum engineering and geology, and graduated top of his class. Throughout his life, Mr. Mitchell upheld the Aggie core values of excellence, integrity, leadership, loyalty, respect, and selfless service.

After attending Texas A&M University, Mr. Mitchell served as a captain in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers during World War II. He later built his own company, Mitchell Energy & Development, which was responsible for over 550 significant oil and gas discoveries.

Mr. Mitchell led the way in the energy business with his groundbreaking innovations which contributed to the expanded application of hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling. In addition, he is the catalyst behind many significant improvements to these technologies for over three decades. He is the man behind this energy revolution we have today that is putting us on the path to energy security in America.

In addition to his pioneering influence in the energy sector, Mr. Mitchell provided leadership in community development and service. He developed the Woodlands, a 27,000-acre community north of Houston. He used \$50 million of his personal money to renovate landmarks in Galveston and founded the Houston Advanced Research Center, which is a nonprofit scientific and research facility. He has also benefited higher education through his family's gifts of tens of millions of dollars to our alma mater, Texas A&M University.

My thoughts and prayers are with the family and friends of Mr. George Mitchell. He will forever be remembered as an outstanding husband, outstanding father, an outstanding Texas

Aggie, a Texas businessman, an American energy leader, and a community servant.

□ 1300

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing these two individuals before this Congress and commemorating their contributions and their lives to this country.

And one individual that has been making a contribution in each of his days and years here in Congress is the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who, Mr. Speaker, has taken the lead on the Benghazi issue. And he has consistently, persistently and relentlessly illuminated the reasons for us to take a much closer look and dig into the bottom of Benghazi.

I'd be happy to yield as much time as the gentleman from Virginia may consume to address that topic.

Mr. WOLF. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for the time. I am very grateful. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, last evening, CNN reported startling new revelations about efforts by the CIA to prevent agency employees and contractors from speaking to the press and Congress about the terrorist attacks in Benghazi last September.

According to CNN:

Since January, some CIA operatives involved in the agency's missions in Libya have been subjected to frequent, even monthly polygraph examinations, according to a source with deep inside knowledge of the agency's workings. The goal of the questioning, according to sources, is to find out if anyone is talking to the media or talking to Congress.

This report confirms what I have been saying for months: survivors of the attack are being silenced. By failing to have public hearings over the last year, the Congress has empowered the government to silence the eyewitnesses from the attack. This is unacceptable.

The CIA says that the agency "employees are always free to speak to Congress if they want." However, the reported monthly polygraphs clearly contradict these assertions.

Just listen to the following comments reported by CNN. "You don't jeopardize yourself, you jeopardize your family as well," one CIA source told CNN.

"You have no idea the amount of pressure being brought to bear on anyone with knowledge of this operation," another said.

According to a separate report by Fox News this morning, "At least five CIA employees were forced to sign additional nondisclosure agreements this past spring in the wake of the Benghazi attack," confirming what I said on the House floor on July 18.

Four Americans were killed in a terrorist attack on two U.S. facilities. Seven Americans were wounded, some

severely. Another two-dozen could have been killed that night, but for the sacrifices made by Ty Woods, Glen Doherty, Dave Ubben and untold others who deserve to be recognized for their heroic acts.

Why are these heroes being told not to talk?

What is the administration afraid of?

What is it protecting?

Nearly 6 months ago, I wrote Secretary Kerry, asking for the names and contact information of the State Department employees who were in Benghazi last September. The Department refused to provide this information, or even confirm the number of those wounded and the nature of their injuries.

I again made this request to Secretary Kerry earlier this month and, once again, the Department refused. During a July 24 State Department press briefing, the Department spokesman again made excuses for not providing this information to Congress and, once again, used the FBI as an excuse not to cooperate, stating, "we have serious concerns about the survivors' welfare and want to be careful not to interfere with the FBI's investigation of the attack."

And then asserting, "There are no Department employees who want to tell their story that are being obstructed from doing so by the leadership of the State Department."

How can the Congress know the survivors don't want to speak with Congress if they can't learn who they are and ask them?

Are we really to take the administration's word for it?

Nearly every day, for the past 3 weeks, I've come to the floor to ask questions that should be answered by now. These have ranged from whether there was an intelligence failure that night to who was responsible for the U.S. response—the State Department, Defense Department, or the CIA, to just why we had such a large CIA presence operating in Benghazi in the first place.

The failure to provide answers to the American people, despite nearly a year of investigations, makes clear the need for a new approach. I believe the best path forward is a dedicated, bipartisan House select committee with full subpoena authority to hold public hearings and issue a public final report.

One hundred sixty-two of our colleagues, nearly three-quarters of the majority, agree, and that is why they have cosponsored H. Res. 36, to create a bipartisan select committee.

This effort has been supported by the family members of the Benghazi victims, the special operations community, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, which represents the diplomatic security officers that were in Benghazi, as well as the editorial page of *The Wall Street Journal*.

With such a broad range of support, it begs the question, why not?

What are we afraid of from a full investigation and public hearings?

The House "interim progress report" on Benghazi was released on April 23. When will the final report be released?

H. Res. 36 would mandate a final report within 90 days. It would also have full subpoena authority to compel sworn testimony from all witnesses. It would bring together the best investigators from all the committees in the House, and it would use existing resources.

It would not duplicate effort. It would build on the work that's already been done over the past year. Iron sharpens iron.

When we return from August recess there will only be 2 days, 2 days until the 1-year anniversary of the Benghazi attacks. Can any Member here confidently say they know what happened that night?

Can any Member honestly say, with reports like the one CNN did yesterday, that this Congress has done everything it can to allow the survivors to come forward and tell their story?

Witnesses need to be subpoenaed. I'm talking about friendly subpoenas to the survivors and those career Federal employees in theater and in Washington who witnessed the response or lack thereof that night.

Some have argued we shouldn't issue subpoenas until we know what a witness will say. That won't work, especially given the nondisclosure agreements and polygraphs being deployed to silence them. And they need to speak publicly, because speaking behind closed doors offers them no protection.

My congressional district includes the CIA and a number of other intelligence agencies. Throughout my career, I have talked to and worked with countless career Federal employees and contractors working for intelligence agencies. I know the pressure they're under to stay silent, even if they have information that the Congress and the American people need to hear.

They need the protection of a subpoena. There is no other way.

Until we hear in public from these witnesses what happened that night, we'll never be able to answer the many unanswered questions I have raised daily on the House floor over the past 3 weeks, which I'm submitting together today for the RECORD.

September 11 is fast approaching. Will we continue on our current path and learn from forthcoming books written by survivors and sanitized by the CIA?

Or will we create a select committee to subpoena witnesses to testify under oath at public hearings?

I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF COLONEL
GEORGE "BUD" DAY

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, and this time here today, I've switched to a topic.

But first I want to address that I've been very, very supportive of Congressman WOLF's initiative for a select committee and bringing these witnesses in under subpoena so that we can get to the bottom of this, because America's legacy and America's history is at stake.

And when I think about America's legacy and America's history, this day I come to the floor with my eyes and my memory and my heart full of the last 2 days of saying goodbye to America's greatest living hero, up until the time of his death, Colonel Bud Day.

Colonel Bud Day, this is one image I would point out, Mr. Speaker, of the Bud Day that I knew, the man that I had the privilege to call a friend, the man that I admired.

In our time, a living American hero, Colonel Bud Day was, up until the time of his death, the most decorated living American hero. I believe we had to go back to General MacArthur to find someone who was more decorated than Bud Day.

To put this in a short capsule, Mr. Speaker, Colonel Bud Day served in three wars. He volunteered as a high school senior when he heard that there was going to be a draft. He abhorred the thought of having to draft people to serve our country in a time of war, and he immediately went down to the courthouse to see the Marine recruiter.

He served in World War II, he served in the Korean War, he served in the Vietnam war, he became a prisoner of war, and was repatriated and brought back to the United States and to his family in 1973.

Bud Day received the Medal of Honor, he received 70-some other medals. Every available combat medal that was available to him in the theaters that he fought in in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam had been awarded to Bud Day.

Bud Day was the one who, in the Hanoi Hilton—his and one other POW's cell is where they brought JOHN MCCAIN when JOHN MCCAIN was in a body cast, and, as has been expressed, was rattling around inside a body cast, weighing about 75 pounds. They brought JOHN MCCAIN in and threw him on Bud Day's bunk. And the two individuals began to heal JOHN MCCAIN back to health.

This life of this man is full of service, service in three wars, and he served our country through, as I add them up, through the decade of the forties, in World War II, the decade of the fifties, in the Korean War, the decade of the sixties and the early seventies, in the Vietnam war.

He came back and continued to serve his country up until nearly the eighties

in the service, and then went back, went into service in practicing law in Florida. So that would be through the nineties.

And as recently as just a few days ago, he won another case shortly before he died.

Bud Day was a fighter. He was a scrapper. He was an American patriot.

And, Mr. Speaker, I come here to the floor today to tell a more thorough narrative of Colonel Bud Day. And I want to point out first that much of that narrative is in one of two books that are of and about Bud. This one is by him. And when you read it, it's "Duty, Honor, Country: Colonel George Bud Day, Warrior, Lawyer."

And when you read "Duty, Honor, Country," you hear the flavor and the thread of his conversation. You know, you'll see and read books that are written by ghost writers, and they'll go in and interview the extraordinary person and put that into a narrative form. And you can read the book, and when you read that you don't always get the feel and the favor of the character.

In this one I see the language that Bud Day used constantly coming up. And it's flowery language. It's actually almost always very tasteful language. But he saw images that were, I'll say captured in his mind's eye that he kept in his memory for years, and he expressed them in this book.

Going back to read it a second time upon the occasion of his death, the personality of Bud Day emerges in this book, Mr. Speaker.

And so I'd like to go down through the history and the life of Colonel Bud Day. And I was able to, as I said, call him a friend. We were hunting buddies. We spent a lot of time out in the fields of Iowa together with a shotgun, stopping to rest, talking politics, talking history, talking the history of war, re-fighting some wars while we were at it.

But the beginning of his life was February 24, 1925. Colonel Day was then, of course, George Bud Day, born in Riverside, Iowa, which is a suburb of Sioux City. And he went to Central High School in Sioux City.

When he learned that the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, and he saw that in 1942—remember that was December 7, 1941. In 1942, when he heard there was going to be a draft, Bud Day decided that he would go down and sign up. And he saw the Marine recruiter and became a Marine.

And then from that point, he served 2½ years in the South Pacific. And he came back home in 1945 and went to college at Morningside College there in Sioux City. And shortly after that, went up to the University of South Dakota in Vermillion, South Dakota, and received his law degree up there.

By 1949, Marine Bud Day had an undergraduate degree at Morningside College and a juris doctorate law degree from the University of South Dakota,

where he thought he would go and practice law.

But he also served in the Iowa National Guard from 1950, then he attended flight school because he wanted to fly. So therefore, in 1951, the Air Force called Bud Day to active duty, and he was a fighter pilot in the Korean War.

□ 1315

He served two tours as a fighter pilot in the Korean war. That experience growing up in Sioux City anchored him to the 185th Air Guard that is based today in Sioux City. He maintained his relationships with the airmen that served out of the 185th in Sioux City. Sioux City was always his home. He kept his contacts there; but he transferred his family down to the area of Pensacola, Florida, because there's a lot of military down there and it's a great place to live. I came back from there last night, having joined in the funeral and the procession to the cemetery for Colonel Bud Day.

After his Korean war experience, where he served two tours, he decided to make the Air Force a career. One of the things he did was be deployed to a base at Niagara, New York, which he euphemistically called "Nigeria." But they loved it up there and he built good, strong bonds with people. He took his flying hours up. With those flying hours that he had, he became one of the most experienced pilots to be deployed to Vietnam.

He anticipated that he would retire in 1968; but then-Major Day volunteered for a tour in Vietnam and was assigned to the 31st Tactical Fighter Wing at Tuy Hoa Air Base. That was in April of 1967. There, he commanded the wing called the Misty Wing. That was because Bud Day named them so. "Misty" was his favorite song. They flew missions over North and South Vietnam. The most dangerous missions, by far, were over North Vietnam.

On a mission over North Vietnam in an F-100, they were spotting and locating Russian surface-to-air missiles that had freshly been placed there that had the capability of taking down B-52s. As they located the Russian surface-to-air missile site, they were hit by enemy fire. Some say it was an enemy missile. In Bud's book, he says he thinks he took a direct hit from a 37-millimeter antiaircraft weapon.

In any case, it hit the fuselage of the F-100 and took their flight down. And he had to, as he said, "punch out." There, he was imprisoned. He was immediately captured by the North Vietnamese and was imprisoned for 5 years and 7 months. He became the highest ranking officer in that prison. He commanded people like JOHN MCCAIN during that period of time.

Throughout that long ordeal that our American prisoners of war served in what they used to euphemistically call

the Hanoi Hilton, Bud maintained his spirit and strength. He gave encouragement to the others who were there. He defied his captors in a way that I think amazed the people that served there with him.

When he was released on March 14, 1973, he was reunited with his wife, Dorie, and their four children, Steven, George, Jr., Sandra, and Sonja. Then he was presented the Medal of Honor by President Ford in 1976. In all, as I said, he received over 70 medals. He had a combat medal from each field that he served in, each war, each theatre, and he was the only person to be awarded both the Medal of Honor and the Air Force Cross.

Bud Day then retired from active duty in 1977 and resumed practicing law in Florida. One of the issues that he took on was TRICARE. In the nineties, he saw that the Clinton administration was starting to back away from the commitment that if you served 20 years in the Armed Forces, you would receive half your pay as your pension for life and medical care for life. That was the deal. That was the agreement, and he was appalled that the Federal Government was starting to move away from that agreement.

So Bud Day, ever the fighter, ever the scrapper, ever the lawyer, went to court and put together a class action lawsuit to force the Federal Government to keep their word with our warriors. Most of that was designed to benefit America's Greatest Generation, the World War II veterans. We've lost so many of them since that period of time.

But Bud Day drove that lawsuit and worked his way up through the courts. He got all the way to the Supreme Court, where they refused to hear the case. They refused to grant cert, as the ruling was. So the indomitable Colonel Bud Day, Medal of Honor recipient, decided, Okay, if we can't get what's right done in the courts, I'll go to Congress. So he took this argument to Congress. And if I have my dates right, it was in 2002 that Congress passed TRICARE. We've had a good number of debates on TRICARE since then. I don't believe we would have TRICARE at all if it weren't for Colonel Bud Day.

Yesterday, I parted with his wife, Dorie, whom he affectionately called "the Viking." I read in his book when he talked about her ice blue eyes. I saw them sad yesterday, but they're still bright and they're still ice blue and there's still a sparkle behind the tears. The family is strongly together, with Steve, George, Jr., Sandra, Sonja, and fourteen grandchildren. It was a ceremony and a service like no other for a man that there will never be another like Colonel Bud Day.

I've looked through a number of articles, and recognizing, Mr. Speaker, that I probably can't be the best author to commemorate the life of a great

iconic man that has captured this country, but I will take you down through a bit of a narrative from his story.

Here's one of the things that Bud Day did. I'll just take you through the narrative of the way he treated death multiple times.

Remember, this is a man that signed up for the Marine Corps in 1942, Mr. Speaker, and was able to come back from 2½ years of being deployed in the South Pacific and get his college under-grad degree and his law degree. He went into the Iowa Guard because he wanted to fly. He did fly. He volunteered to go to Korea. There, he served two tours flying a bomber over Korea. Then, while he was flying training missions, he was deployed different places like Georgia, for example, and at a base in England. And here are the number of times that Bud Day cheated death.

The first one that I recall is when he was flying out of a base in Georgia. The fighter aircraft had the fuel doors open, and he had a leak. There was a plane that was flying next to him that said, You've got a leak. It looked like it was a fatal mechanical error. He didn't have enough altitude to bail out, and he didn't have enough power to land. He wasn't going to be able to sustain his power to land.

And I'll give you an example of what he was going to be able to do for a lifetime and, that is, quick thinking. It's the kind of thing that pilots would likely be trained on this after they found out what Bud Day had done. He did the only thing he could do that would save his life. He put the nose of that plane down, knowing that if he could get to 170 knots, those "sucker doors" would close. And if they closed, it would shut off the risk of the fire.

So he put that nose down in a courageous way; and right before he got to the treetops, he was able to reach 170 knots. In doing so, the sucker doors closed, and he was able to stabilize the aircraft and land it safely.

That was the first time that's recorded that Colonel Bud Day cheated death.

Not very long after that, he was flying out of a base in England. The name of the base, I think, is a pretty important one. The name of the base was Wethersfield Station in England. The uniqueness of that was pretty interesting.

As Bud Day flew out of England, he had another situation where he had an engine fire at low altitude. There was no ability to set the plane down. He got it on a course where it would be away from a populated area. As he was at a lower altitude—around 500 or so feet—the only choice he really had was to eject.

So he ejected. And he looked up and he said, Where's the chute? There was no chute, no opening, no orange blossom. He joked that fighter pilots or

plane pilots will often argue if your shoot doesn't work, just take it back. And here is a man in a no-chute bailout of a jet aircraft, trailing down through skies with the chute not opening, with no blossom, and just trailing down. He went through the pine timber in England.

If any of us, Mr. Speaker, remember when Rambo jumped out of the helicopter and went through the trees and survived that fall, I don't know where the inspiration came from that scene in Rambo, but I think of this happening to Colonel Bud Day, and this man survived a no-chute bailout. As the chute wouldn't open and as it strung down through the skies, he went into the pine trees and bounced off the branches. And as those branches began to break his fall, some of the cords slowed down a little bit on the branches and he hit the ground hard. He broke his ankle. He was injured in other places. But he was alive.

He was the first person to survive a no-chute bailout of a jet aircraft. He did so in England in 1957. It was the second time he cheated death.

The third time he cheated death was in a zero-zero landing. It was only 5 months after he had gone through his no-chute bailout. Remember, this is a man that had the presence of mind to put the nose down in a fighter aircraft and head toward the ground, knowing that if he didn't reach that speed—170 knots—he was not going to be able to survive that flight. And he had to pull it up right above the trees and have the air speed that he needed to get the sucker doors closed to stabilize the aircraft and to land it.

And then here we are, not that much later, flying in England, and having to bail out of a burning aircraft and go through not having your chute open. And what did he say? Well, he expressed that it was an old Royal Air Force expression. He said:

I thought I bought the farm. What a lousy way to go.

But he went through the trees. And he said that flyers have an old, bad joke about parachutes. If it doesn't open, take it back. There are not many members of that take-it-back club. Colonel Bud Day was one of those members.

The ejection was from an F-84. It was the first in Air Force history that anyone survived. Colonel Bud Day said, God must be saving me for something. In fact, his wife said, God must be saving you for something.

It was less than 6 months later that he was flying out of Wethersfield Royal Air Force Station in England. They took off to go get some parts. The weather cleared. It was supposed to open up and stay open across Europe at the alternate landing forces they had. Instead, the fog socked in. The visibility went down to zero. The ceiling went to zero. Bud Day said the weather

was so bad, not even the birds flew. But they flew that F-80C and were hoping the weather would reverse itself. His copilot was Bill Moore, known affectionately as Billy Moore.

So they had a choice. With everything soaked in, they decided to go back to the Wethersfield air strip because that's the one they knew the best. That's the one that didn't have a lot of urban areas or housing around it. They had pretty much clear approach to landing. And if they didn't make it, it was less likely that they would kill other people other than themselves.

So they turned and went back to Wethersfield. Bud Day is thinking, I don't want to bail out of this plane again. My ankle is just healing up from the last time my chute didn't open. I want to come in and land this, and Billy Moore agreed that it was the best choice that they could make.

So they approached the landing strip. This is a complete instrument landing, with zero visibility and zero ceiling. It was black as it could be. On the first approach, Bud said to his copilot, Billy Moore, You take the controls, I'll watch. And if I can see the runway, I'll take the controls from you the instant right before we land, and I'll land it. Because Bud, sitting in the front, was the one that can see the runway.

And so as they made that first approach, right before touch down on impact was unknown, right before they touch down, Bud Day saw they were off the side of the runway. He saw a light on the side of the runway and said, Pull it back up. So they pulled it back up and they went back around again and they adjusted their radar again. As they approached, it was a complete instrument landing, zero ceiling, zero visibility. Right before impact, right before they touched, Bud said to Billy Moore, Pull it back up. That instant he realized they were lined up and within just an instant of making contact with the runway, Bud Day took the controls and set that plane down. And it was the first zero-zero landing that they had survived.

He said to Bill Moore, his copilot:

Good show, pal. That was about as scary as it's going to get. I think we owe the radar controllers a beer.

That tells you something about the spirit of this man.

□ 1330

He said: I didn't want to bail out again; my leg and back are still sore from the last bailout. And you know, Bill, we may be the only pilots living today that have made a zero visibility, zero ceiling landing.

And I think that turned out to be true.

Later on, Bud Day volunteered then for combat duty in Vietnam, where we went on to command the squadron there. As they were flying over that SAM site—that service-to-air missile

site—his captain was Corwin Kippenharn of Amana, Iowa—two Iowans together in that flight as they were hit and shot down on that date. They punched out, but Day was taken prisoner immediately.

That was the third time he cheated death, when they took a direct hit on the fuselage of that plane. As he bailed out, this time his chute did open, but when it opened, it settled him down in the location where he was immediately taken captive.

His copilot—Kip, as he was known—was rescued right away. And as Bud Day is on the ground looking up, there was an American helicopter that was hovering off at a close distance. They were looking for him. He was in the trees and they couldn't see him, but Bud could see the helicopter. And standing in the side of that helicopter door was his copilot with a rifle in his hand. They were looking to go get Bud Day. If they would have seen him, they would have been able to recover him. But of course that didn't happen, and he was put into captivity.

So three times he cheated death. As they beat him and as they tortured him, as they put him in a hole, he had his arm broken in three places. He had other injuries from the bailout. He had hit the side of the plane on the way out and suffered those injuries. But they drove him and marched him through the villages in what they would liked to have called a "march of shame."

But he was put under guard by a young Vietnamese teenager whom Bud Day feigned that he was—he was hurt badly and it was hard for him to walk; his knee was bad; his arm was broken in three places. But he feigned that he was worse than he was. He noticed that his captor would go off and talk to another guard because he believed that Bud could not move, could not get out of the hole that he was in, and that he wouldn't be able to travel. So he was a relaxed kind of a guard that wasn't really paying attention. Bud recognized that, he exploited that, and he feigned his injuries to be—it was bad, but he feigned them to be worse than they were. As he did so, the guard got more and more relaxed. And after several days, Bud saw his opportunity.

They were going to move him then on up to North Vietnam to the Hanoi Hilton is what it sounded like. There was some expression; the guard had drawn a picture into the dirt of a jeep, and that said that they were going to transport him. So they went in and tied his legs together with a cord and they left him there. Bud Day knew that within hours, or a day or so, they were going to come and get him. And once he went to the next stage of his captivity, each day that goes by gets harder and harder to escape.

So as the guard went over to talk to his friend and had his back turned, Bud Day was able to untie the cords that

tied his legs together, even though he only had one arm to do it and the other one broken in three places. When he did that, he had to pick a time that he thought the guard was as relaxed as possible. He got out of that hole, and he headed out through the jungle to try to get down to the DMZ—the demilitarized zone—and to try to get, then, across the DMZ, cross a river, swim across a river, and then try to get into American hands. That looked like it was going to be a long trip, and it was.

Bud Day had a canteen. He had some water in it. He was able to refill that sometimes from water that was captured from rainwater and banana leaves when he would stop and refill his canteen. He went for days without eating, days without thinking about eating. He was so focused on avoiding "the V," as he called them, the North Vietnamese military, but also the Viet Cong.

As he's traveling through North Vietnam, traveling through enemy territory, he had to be ever alert to maintain hiding and travel at night part of the time for the first couple, three days of his trip because that was the only way it would be safe. But to try to navigate at night through the canopy of the jungle and try to follow trails that you don't know where they go is a very, very difficult task.

To keep his mind on task as he got weaker and weaker was a struggle. That is something that is so impressive to see that he was able to hold it together. And he wouldn't have said that he held it together. He went up and down through delirium. He would discipline his mind back to focusing on staying alive because he remembered his beloved wife, Dorie. He remembered his children. He remembered the people that he flew with—the Misty pilots and the Misty team that was out there.

He prayed to God to come and save him. The 23rd Psalm was his favorite Psalm. When he didn't know what else to pray, he prayed the 23rd Psalm. It happens to also be my mother's and mine.

As he worked his way down south and was able to build himself the equivalent of a little bamboo raft and go into that river—and the river that he said was equivalent to—and Bud Day grew up on the Missouri River and played out there on the Missouri River, where I've spent a fair amount of time, outside of Sioux City. But he said the river was equivalent to the Missouri River at St. Louis. It had a lot of water. It was flowing fast when he put into it. He thought that it would be slower than it was. It was flowing more than 7 or 8 miles an hour. That's about what the river flows around up in Sioux City, Iowa, today.

It took him downstream fast, but he was able to get across the other side with arm broken in three places and all. As he emerged from the river, he

had to struggle his way through the jungle, starving, hungry, weak from hunger. He found a cache of U.S. military—we would call them today MREs. He thought: I found the mother lode of food; now I can reenergize myself. I can store up with food. I can get my energy back, and I'll be able to go on.

But each can that he picked up had been bayoneted because it was likely U.S. Marines who couldn't carry all of the food with them; they ate their fill. And in that jungle, if you poke a hole in a can, it only takes a little while and that food is spoiled. So it was all spoiled. But he was glad to see that the marines were following the due diligence in their combat training that they'd had.

Throughout this, you will hear his voice kind of go up in despair, and then he would check himself and say: What are you complaining about, Bud? It's a great day. The sun came up in a bright way this morning. You had good weather to travel with.

He found a way to find a blessing in thing after thing. He was shelled and escaped death then. U.S. bombs were dropping around him at a close area. He escaped death then. He had to go barefoot across the craters of a bomb field where some of the sand turns into glass. It cut his feet. His feet were swollen. He was wounded from some of that. And of course an arm broken in three places.

Ten to 12 days he wandered across the desert, always re-navigating, always resetting himself, always disciplining himself to stay on task: Stay on task. God is saving you for something.

Throughout those days, those days of courage, he was faced multiple times with North Vietnamese military that, at any slipup—if he hid in the wrong place, if they looked in the wrong place, if he made a motion, he would have been captured.

Outside of Khe Sanh, which was a marine base about 2 kilometers or perhaps 2 miles from there, Bud Day's luck ran out. He was encountered by a couple of young North Vietnamese who were either preparing to assault Khe Sanh or trying to assault any supply chains that would be coming to it. They discovered Bud Day, who then, when he realized he was discovered—now, remember, he lost about 25 pounds. He went into this weighing about 150. Maybe at this time it's less than 125 pounds. He's weak from hunger. He's eaten frogs and drank some water and a little bit of pulp from a banana tree that he took apart, and that's about it. So you can imagine how weak he must have been, how wounded he was, with a bad knee and an arm broken in three places, but he got up to run.

As he ran—he made it a ways. He got through the jungles a ways, but as they shot at him, he took a bullet through the thigh and a bullet through the

hand. He continued to run to evade his captors, who nearly didn't find him, but at the last minute, as they happened to find themselves standing next to him, not realizing it, they captured him. They captured him and they pressed him back again and sent him back to Hanoi to the Hanoi Hilton, where all of these days of disciplining his mind and himself, the resolve that was there went away, because he lost all of those days and went back into the Hanoi Hilton.

This is the man whose spirit held together. And when they began to torture him in an even more sophisticated and even more relentless fashion—they would hang him by his feet for hours. They would beat him with fan belts. He said that—here's an expression from the 15th chapter of his autobiography. This chapter is titled, "Crucifixion." He vividly details the most violent and barbaric tortures he endured. He called them "rope tricks." That gives you a sense of Bud Day's sense of humor.

There were "rope tricks" that literally dislocated shoulders and tore muscles, flesh-piercing leg irons, torture cuffs, and kneeling on sharp objects for days on end until the knees became raw, bloody stumps.

They beat him with fan belts. And he would pray, "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil."

This is something that I think needs to go into the RECORD verbatim, Mr. Speaker. Bud Day, ever the warrior, prayed:

Jesus, if I survive this nightmare, I will have divine understanding. I am your brother, in blood and deed. I am being crucified! I know Satan. I have seen the deepest rings of hell. I am in the pit, Lord, and I am fading. My strength is waning. Give me strength, Dear God, strength. I cannot bear the thought of my wife or children hearing that I am a traitor. I cannot live in disgrace with my fellow prisoners.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the spirit of a man who feared he would disgrace his fellow prisoners? He couldn't bear the thought of becoming a traitor. He couldn't bear the thought of not seeing his beloved wife, Dorie, and the kids again. This was Colonel Bud Day. This is the spirit of the man who gave courage and inspiration to all of those in the Hanoi Hilton.

I recall the day we commemorated the statue of Bud Day at the airport in Sioux City, where we got together and named the airstrip after Colonel Bud Day. There's a statue there of Bud Day—it's a bronze statue that I'll describe in a moment, Mr. Speaker.

Bud Day's defiance to his captors—they would point a rifle at his head and threaten to execute him, and Bud Day would stand there and sing the national anthem. There was another prisoner of war who was first blamed for organizing a prayer session. A number of them took the oath, essentially an oath that they would hold their ground and insist that they were going to do

prayer sessions. As the Vietnamese marched them off, the first one to be marched off was beaten and bloodied and being hauled off, and what does Bud Day do? Stood up on his bunk and sang the national anthem at the top of his lungs. That voice of him singing the national anthem echoed across these cellblocks. They couldn't all see each other, Mr. Speaker, but they could hear. They echoed it across the cellblocks. They all stood up and sang the national anthem at the top of their lungs.

They asked that prisoner, What did that make you feel like? And he said, It made me feel like I was 9 feet tall, ready to hunt bear with a switch. And the statue of Bud Day that commemorates the Bud Day Airstrip in Sioux City is a bronze statue, 9 feet tall.

I remember the day that his twin daughters unveiled that statue from the roof of the airport building, where they pulled the tarp off and showed us the statue of Colonel Bud Day, the man who cheated death time after time after time, the man whom a lot of us wouldn't have believed that his life would end, even that he could cheat nature. I thought he might have been able to do that.

I listened to the remarks made by JOHN MCCAIN on the floor of the Senate this Monday, and I was impressed by that delivery, by the poignant moments that JOHN MCCAIN captured. I will just hit some of those highlights because I think it's so important and I was so impressed with his presentation. I think it's very close to the delivery that he gave yesterday at the service.

He said that Bud's lifetime "could have supplied enough experiences, excitement, and satisfaction for 10 lifetimes."

"He knew terror and suffering. He knew joy and deliverance. He knew solidarity, self-respect, and dignity."

This is JOHN MCCAIN still:

"We met in 1967 when the Vietnamese left me to die in the prison cell Bud shared with Major Norris Overly. Bud and Norris wouldn't let me die. They bathed me, fed me, nursed me, encouraged me, and ordered me back to life."

Norris did much of the work because Bud had healing of his own to do, to paraphrase. But to continue the quote:

"Bud showed me how to save my self-respect and my honor, and that is a debt I can never repay." From JOHN MCCAIN.

Continuing to quote:

"Bud was a fierce—and I mean really fierce—resister. He could not be broken in spirit no matter how broken he was in body."

"He defied men who had the power of life and death over us. To witness him sing the national anthem in response to having a rifle pointed at his face—well, that was something to behold."

"In 1967, then-Major Bud Day commanded a squadron of F-100s that

served as forward air controllers over North Vietnam and Laos. They were called the Mistys, named for Bud's favorite song." On August 26, 1967, Bud Day was one of the casualties over Vietnam.

□ 1345

Continuing the quote of Senator MCCAIN:

Bud was the bravest man I ever knew, and I have known more than a few. He was great company too and made it possible to actually have fun in prison once in a while.

An extraordinary statement to make, knowing the pain, the agony, and the torture that they all went through there in Hanoi Hilton, in that prisoner of war camp.

Mr. Speaker, I want to relate, though, the Bud Day that I knew. We see him here, the Bud Day of his later years—the happy face, the sparkle in his eyes, that look, that smile. Anybody that knew Bud Day understood this man by looking at this picture. It captured him. It literally actually captured the real man that was there. This is the Bud Day that I knew.

He loved to hunt and fish; he loved the outdoors. As busy as he was and as active in his law practice up until the last day's of his life, he still made time to go out to the field. He made time to come back to Iowa and South Dakota, that area that he grew up in that he knew so well and loved so much. He always kept his home connections with his home territory.

As we went out in the field year after year and hunted pheasants together primarily—South Dakota and Iowa—I will tell a little narrative. Now, think of this fighter pilot who has been through so much, who could fly up through that Valley of Death and tell you the narrative of all the anti-aircraft that was being fired at them and the surface-to-air missiles that were fired at them and, of course, small arms fire that they would fire at them constantly. Here is how Bud Day would explain it: It was really exciting. Can you imagine a man with the kind of courage that would be facing death by expressing, It was really exciting?

This is a man that loved the outdoors, he loved to hunt, he loved to shoot. We would put together hunts—and we'll do another one this fall—it's going to be the "Bud Day Pheasant Hunt."

But this is the sparkle in his eye—he always wore the sunglasses out there—but I know this sparkle in his eye. That smile on his face anybody would know. The people that knew Bud Day would smile.

If you hold your hand like this and you stretch it out, you know that's the action of him stretching the tendons in his injured hand that he did constantly at rest. That hand would always be stretching those tendons back out.

In that ceremony yesterday, there was eulogy after eulogy by other true

American heroes, other Medal of Honor recipients, others that flew and fought with him, or part of the Misty Squadron, and the families, the military wives that were there, the people in that room, the four stars on shoulders time after time. And as I looked around that room and I saw all that brass, I thought: there are at least enough stars here for a constellation at this funeral, probably enough for a galaxy if you look at all the people whose lives he touched. And in the four legs of my journey down there, in three of them someone approached me and said: Did you know Bud Day? Are you on your way to the funeral, are you from the funeral? Here is how he touched my life.

In the last leg of the journey, a young man across the aisle from me asked me if I was on my way back from the funeral. I said yes, and we talked a little bit. I don't know that he knew I'm a Member of Congress. I asked him what he did. He said, I'm an aviator. A little bit later he pulled up a picture of some of the pilots standing there together with Colonel Day in the middle taken recently, within the last couple of years, with a great big beaming smile on the face of Bud Day and those proud pilots all standing in a row.

We exchanged cards as we stepped off the plane. I put it in my pocket, my front pocket, so I would look at it later, because without my glasses it's better to shake hands and smile and read it later. When I got home last night, I pulled it out. This man is a Blue Angels pilot, proud and honored to have his picture taken with Colonel Bud Day. I'm proud and honored to have had the privilege of knowing him, admiring him, stepping up to do some work to honor him.

The honor that they gave him yesterday as we went on a 48.1-mile procession from the funeral service to the cemetery in Pensacola, every mile had mourners standing out there. For the first 15 or so miles it was almost shoulder to shoulder. I have never, Mr. Speaker, seen so many flags and umbrellas in the same place in my life. You would see families, full families, standing there holding flags, waving them, hands over their hearts. You might see someone in shorts and a T-shirt standing at full salute as the procession went by—hundreds of cars on the way to the cemetery.

When we entered the cemetery, there stood airmen in full salute for the first leg down through the cemetery, perhaps a half of mile of airmen stretched out. That is something that grabs your heart. When we turned the corner, we turned the corner and then it was marines in full dress saluting all the way down to the burial ceremony. It was something that puts your heart up in your throat and moved people to tears and to emotions that they had not seen all day by that great, great level of

love, appreciation, and respect for America, up until the moment of his death, America's greatest living hero, Colonel Bud Day.

As I've said, I've had the privilege to walk the Iowa—and South Dakota—Iowa cornfields with Bud Day and to hunt and to shoot and to stop and rest and talk philosophy and history and politics and what we need to do.

I would like to put into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, that the rallies that we did here to battle ObamaCare were inspired by Bud Day, on top of one of the bluffs up in Plymouth County, Iowa, where he said: Call everybody into the Capitol, surround the place, jam the place, don't let anybody in, don't let anybody out. If you just get so many people there that say: Keep your hands off my health care, they will have to give up. That was Bud Day. That brought tens of thousands of people here.

But in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to put JOHN MCCAIN's description of heaven into the RECORD, because I see it the same way. I'm glad he said it, and I'm glad he wrote it. He said, speaking of Bud Day, Colonel Bud Day:

But he's gone now to a heaven I expect he imagined would look like an Iowa cornfield in early winter filled with pheasants.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a shot, I believe, of the last hunt in Iowa as Colonel Bud Day walked off the field, taken by my youngest son, Jeff, who did so because he wanted to commemorate that moment fearing that it might be the last time. As I look at this picture of Colonel Bud Day, America's greatest hero, Medal of Honor recipient, 70-some other medals, every combat medal available to him in three wars, serving our country, giving us TRICARE, giving us inspiration to battle ObamaCare, with a smile on his face and a glint in his eye and a sense of humor and a way to express that extraordinary life that he lived, JOHN MCCAIN said, as I do:

I will hunt the field with him again. God bless his life.

I yield back the balance of my time.

JULY WRAP-UP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as the Speaker knows, I am also the minority whip. As the minority whip, at the close of the week we normally have a colloquy between the majority leader and myself. That colloquy is to discuss the schedule for the week to come; it is to discuss the priorities that each side believes ought to be considered by this House. We do not have that colloquy when the week to come does not have a session.

We have now adjourned, or will soon adjourn, for a period of 5 weeks when we will not be in session. We have adjourned without doing the people's business. We have adjourned without resolving some of the most vexing challenges that confront this Congress and confront our country. We have adjourned without addressing some of the priorities that the Senate has acted upon and sent to this House, or if they haven't sent them to this House have passed them and are ready to respond to our initiatives. Mr. Speaker, that's unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I will be talking about in this hour—and I probably won't take the whole hour—but I will be talking about some of the things that we have not done that we ought to be doing, some of the things that we ought to be doing rather than taking a 5-week break.

But let me quickly add: I'm one of the Democratic leaders. I do not criticize the Republicans for this 5-week break, because we normally take a break in August so that Members and their families can take some time, so that Members can be home to talk to their constituents, seek their advice, seek their counsel, explain what is happening here in Washington to, at this point in time, a rightfully angry group of Americans who see their board of directors that we call the Congress of the United States not working very well, not attendant to the significant issues that confront us.

The House passed a budget. It passed a budget about 125 days ago. The Senate passed a budget about 123 days ago. The way the process is supposed to work is the way it works in your families, Mr. Speaker, and in my family. When we have a dispute, we sit down, we talk about it and we try to come to a resolution. Some call that resolution a "compromise," a recognition that you have a perspective, I have a perspective; if we are going to move forward, we need to harmonize those perspectives. That is what democracy is all about—bringing together disparate views from various geographic locations with various interests at heart and try to resolve those differences and move our country forward.

Notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that the Speaker says that—and said during the campaign—he wanted to make sure that: a) the House worked its will; b) that we pursued regular order; and c) that he wanted the Senate to pass a budget, they did so. But the House has refused to go to conference. That's unfortunate, but it is not unique in this House.

The Senate also passed an immigration bill. That immigration bill tries to deal with one of the most vexing challenges that confronts our country. It is an issue that has a large amount of agreement outside this institution. The

United States Chamber of Commerce, representing much of business in America, and the AFL-CIO, representing organized labor, have agreed that this immigration bill should be supported. The agriculture community from California to Florida to Maine to Arizona have essentially agreed this is a bill which will move us forward. Essentially, there is a broad-based agreement that the Senate bill is something that will create jobs, grow our economy, and make our country more stable.

□ 1400

There is a general agreement—I would say an almost unanimous agreement—that we need to keep our borders secure, that people whom we do not authorize should not be allowed to come into the country. We all agree on that. So we are working to make sure that our borders are even more secure. There is unanimity on that issue. In fact, the Senate appropriated a large number of dollars to accomplish that objective. We have not taken up an immigration bill in this House; and, certainly, because we have not, we haven't gone to conference.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we took up a farm bill on the floor of this House, significantly, after the Senate had passed a bipartisan bill dealing with agriculture and dealing with assistance to those in America—the richest country on the face of the Earth—who are going hungry, a large number of whom are children who live in America. The Committee on Agriculture passed out a bipartisan bill in the last Congress, and it was never brought to the floor by my Republican friends. This year, the committee also passed out a bipartisan bill that was brought to this floor. It could have and should have been passed with a bipartisan vote, not because I agreed with all of it, but because it was appropriate to have a bill to go to conference with on this important subject. Our Republican friends added three amendments which we thought were clearly harmful to those in need in America.

As a result, we didn't vote for it, but that's not why it failed, Mr. Speaker. It failed because 62 Republicans voted against the bill reported out with every Republican voting in committee for it; but as Mr. LUCAS, the chairman of the committee observed, it apparently wasn't good enough for those 62 Republicans. Compromise seems very difficult for some people in this House, but I again remind us all it is absolutely essential.

We then passed a farm bill which said, unlike the last half a century, we would drop food assistance to the needy in America. Mr. Speaker, my faith tells me to try to feed the hungry, house the homeless, clothe the naked, attend the least of these. The bill that we passed for the first time in a half a century left out the neediest in America.

In the course of passing that bill, the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, said we are passing this bill so that we can go to conference with the clear implication at that point in time—because the Senate bill does take care of the neediest who are hungry, adults and children, along with the needs of our farmers, who produce our food and fiber on which all of us rely—that, with this bill, we can go to conference. Mr. Speaker, you and I both know we haven't gone to conference. So we leave here with much of the business of America undone, unattended, without an effort to reach compromise.

Mr. Speaker, additionally, as you know, on September 30, the authorization for the operations of government and the funding thereof will come to an end, so it will be necessary for us to come to an agreement. I hope—but I know of none—that there are being plans made to utilize these next 5 weeks to try to reach a compromise, an agreement, a way forward to ensure the funding of our government and the operations so critical to so many millions not only here but around the world.

Mr. Speaker, we began the July work period with a measure of optimism. With 4 full weeks of session in July and the first few days of August, we have not met that optimism. There was much reason to hope that this House could make serious headway on appropriations bills and reach a compromise on student loans. Now, we passed that student loan compromise this Wednesday. That was a good thing to do, and it was along the lines that the President proposed some months ago. My Republican colleagues would rightfully say it was along the lines that they had proposed and passed this House, and of course our Senate colleagues will say it is the compromise that the Senate formed and that we passed.

But in this time, the majority's strategy for moving appropriations bills through this House has utterly and completely failed. The Ryan budget—or the "Ryan retreat," as I call it—has failed. With 4 full, consecutive weeks in which to get things done, we have not enacted a single appropriations bill that was consistent with either the Budget Control Act of 2011 or this year's Ryan budget.

In fact, we haven't enacted a single appropriations bill—period. Now, we've passed bills through this House, but we haven't been able to get to compromise, and that's not unusual. We've found the appropriations process difficult over the past few years, but it is still an indication of failure to attempt to reach compromise that we have not gone to a budget conference to determine what numbers we will use, because, if you can't agree on a number or numbers, it is impossible to agree on legislation.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I sadly note that my friends in the majority have not even had the courage or, in my opinion, the intellectual honesty to go to conference on the budget to resolve these differences. Why? Because I believe that Mr. RYAN believes that any compromise he would make would not be supported by his party because they don't want to compromise, which is anathema to many of our Republican colleagues. "Regular order," it seems, means simply "their order."

Now, as I've said, we are leaving for the August recess with just 9 legislative days remaining until the end of the fiscal year—9 days. That's what is scheduled for legislative business between now and September 30—9 days. As I said, not a single appropriations bill has been sent to the President's desk. A bill that we were considering this week, which was supposed to be the principal item of business this week, was taken from the floor because it did not have the support of the majority party. This is not a recipe for responsible governance by the majority. It is a recipe for another manufactured crisis and threat of a government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, our economy, our businesses, and our middle class families cannot and ought not endure further uncertainty as a result of this Congress' failure to do its job. The most egregious manifestation of the majority's failure to govern has been the irrational sequester policy that they not only refused to prevent but have now fully embraced. Why do I say they've fully embraced it? Because it gets to their number included in the Ryan budget without their having to make one single choice of cutting a single item. It simply says, This is the number. Meet it—no prioritization, no choice, no decision. The Ryan budget passed this House in March without a single Democratic vote—an endorsement, in theory, of this Republican Congress of cuts even deeper than the sequester imposes.

Now, let me say parenthetically that a lot of my Republican colleagues will stand at that podium or at one of these podiums and say, This is the President's sequester. Mr. Speaker, America needs to know that is not true, and I believe too many who make that statement know it not to be true. We passed legislation in this House in the middle of July of 2011 which said we're going to reach certain numbers, and if we don't, we're going to have a sequester. Mr. Speaker, you may recall that that was the Republican Cut, Cap, and Balance bill, whose policy was to have a sequester if the numbers set forth were not reached. That was before it was included in the bill which was a compromise to reach resolution so that America did not default on its bills.

I was not for the sequester. The President was not for the sequester,

and we Democrats voted overwhelmingly—almost unanimously, perhaps unanimously—against that Cut, Cap, and Balance bill and its sequester. Why? Because cutting across the board the highest priority and the lowest priority by exactly the same percentage is an irrational policy. No family in America would do it.

Mr. Speaker, the example I use is that somebody in the family loses his job. The family income goes down. They have a budget. They have a budget for food, and they have a budget for movies. The sequester says take 10 percent from food and 10 percent from movies. There is no rational family in America that would do that. They would say, This month or this 6 months or this year, we're not going to the movies, but we're going to keep food on the table. That's the rational judgment that we would make, but that's not what the sequester says.

Having said that, we have offered amendments seven times in the last 6 months to set aside the sequester while, at the same time, reducing the deficit by the same amount. Seven times we were refused by the majority party the opportunity to even offer that amendment to have, as the Speaker says he wants, the House work its will. If they didn't agree with our amendment, they could have voted against it; but they didn't want to deal with our amendment because they like the sequester, because the sequester gets them to their number without their having to make a decision on cutting a single thing.

As I predicted then, when theory turns to practice in the Ryan budget, even Republicans, themselves, cannot live with the policies. Their own chairman of the Appropriations Committee characterized just the other day—this was Chairman ROGERS of Kentucky, a conservative Republican, my friend with whom I've worked for many, many years as a member of the Appropriations Committee—he characterized the cuts included in the Ryan budget as "unrealistic and ill-conceived."

□ 1415

That's the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee saying of the Republican budget, known as the Ryan budget, "unrealistic and ill-conceived." Their policy of sequester remains, Mr. Speaker, an albatross around the neck of the American people and of our economy.

If there were not a single Democrat in this House or in the Senate, not a single Democrat, Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the Ryan budget could not pass this Congress.

The Republican pro-sequester spending-cuts-only approach simply does not work, and this week's Transportation-HUD appropriation debacle proves it. I want to quote again the chairman of the committee:

With this action, the House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted just 3 months ago.

Let me make it clear. No Democrat had the opportunity to vote on this; no Democrat voted against this. We weren't for it—make no mistake—but the decision was made completely on the majority side of the aisle that they didn't have the votes for their bill. They could not implement the very budget that was adopted just 3 months ago.

"Thus, Mr. Speaker, I believe the House has made its choice," said Chairman ROGERS. "Sequestration and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts must be brought to an end," so said HAL ROGERS, Republican, conservative from Kentucky, chairman of the Appropriations Committee. "Sequestration must be brought to an end."

As I've said, Mr. Speaker, those are the words of HAL ROGERS. Not my words, his words. I know that Chairman ROGERS is not the only Member of his party who is fed up with the Tea Party faction and their extreme agenda. As we prepare to go home to our districts over the month of August and hear their concerns about jobs and our economy and the pain of sequester's senseless cuts, I have spoken to hundreds of employees who work in our defense establishment who are lamenting the fact that not only are they being forced to take off 1 day a week for no pay and they can't even volunteer to work, who are lamenting the fact that those at the point of the spear in Afghanistan and other troubled parts of the world, they cannot take off Friday. They need the support that we give them from here in this country and, indeed, around the world in the civilian workforce, in DOD, the Department of Defense, all the time, not just 4 days a week.

As we prepare to go home to our districts over the month of August, as I said, and hear their concerns and the pain of the sequester's senseless cuts, I hope that we can turn the page of the July work period and return in a different spirit. See, September need not be July's second act.

In the short time we have left, just 9 legislative days before the fiscal year ends, I would urge the Speaker to take a different path. Instead of taking the familiar road of partisanship, posturing and spin, let us embrace the path of compromise and shared accomplishment, one we in this Congress might call, as the poet Robert Frost said, the road less traveled by. It's a wonderful poem by one of America's greatest poets. He said:

I shall be telling this with a sigh
Somewhere ages and ages hence:
Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—I took
the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference.

We have difficult and pressing challenges to address in a short time: passing a budget; replacing the sequester with a balanced alternative; and averting a default on our debt, a default which would be catastrophic for America, for its people, for its economy, and would have ramifications throughout the world.

We can begin, Mr. Speaker, by going to conference on the budget and allowing both sides to sit down and start working on an agreement. That seems to be, Mr. Speaker, the road less traveled by; a road forward; a road that leads to positive, constructive, supportable results, not backward; a road to constructive compromise, not destructive confrontation; and to results that benefit our people and our economy. Mr. Speaker, such a road would surely make all the difference for this Congress and for this country.

Mr. Speaker, we need to work together. Newt Gingrich, a former Speaker with whom I served, reached a compromise with President Clinton. There were a lot of people on his side of the aisle that didn't want to see an agreement between President Clinton and Speaker Gingrich. It was on the funding of government, the basic responsibility this Congress has, or any board of directors of any enterprise has.

Mr. Gingrich stood at that podium, Mr. Speaker, and talked to what he referred to as his perfectionist caucus, people who wanted it their way and were not prepared to compromise from a road other than their way. He said, Mr. Speaker, to that perfectionist caucus, Look, I know this is not exactly what you want, but the American people have elected a President of another party, Bill Clinton, and they've elected a Senate with a lot of Democrats in there who don't agree with us, and, yes, some Republicans who don't agree with us. They also elected a lot of Democrats to the House of Representatives. He said, Obviously, a majority of the Members of the House were Republicans. But if the country was going to move forward, if there was going to be a positive resolution to the conflict that existed between differing points of view, that there would need to be compromise. He admonished that perfectionist caucus to understand that this was a democracy, not a dictatorship, and that agreement and compromise was the essence of what democracy meant.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that over the 5 weeks that are to come that Members will reflect, communicate with our citizens, and come to an understanding of the necessity to act not just our way or my way, not just to reflect what I want, but to reflect what we as a country working together can accomplish. Mr. Speaker, if we do that, America will continue to be the greatest country on the face of the Earth, providing opportunity for our children and our

families, our workers and our seniors, and continuing to be that shining city on a hill of which Ronald Reagan spoke so glowingly.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope in these 5 weeks we learn how to work together. That's what our people want. As importantly, that is what our people need.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IN REGARDS TO BIPARTISANSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it's always such an honor to speak here on the floor. Some have said that you'll regret being in Congress. Well, it's where the fight for America is.

I appreciated so much the comments, as I sat here for some time listening to the former majority leader of the House, talking about the need for bipartisanship, the importance of working together. The deepest regret I experienced in listening to that wonderful speech by my friend from Maryland was that I didn't have a transcript of that speech to read him every single week that the Democrats were in the majority here on this floor and every single time that they came forward with a closed rule allowing no amendments. In fact, each time that it came to the floor, the Democratic majority, during those 4 years between January of 2007 and January of 2011, it was the most closed Congress in the history of the country, with the least number of open rules, the least amount of bipartisanship. They rammed through the most destructive bill in American history in the last 100 years, that being the ObamaCare bill, without a single Republican vote. There was no bipartisanship.

Anyway, I thoroughly enjoyed the comments from my friend, the former majority leader. Gosh, I wish I could have read that back to him over and over during the 4 years they were in the majority. He has such a great sense of humor, Mr. Speaker. I know he would have laughed over and over as I read it to him. In fact, there was a time that the majority leader was coming down the aisle and we were about to vote on the card check bill, which was going to eliminate secret ballots for elections. The secret ballot would have been eliminated for elections to be a unionized group or not to be. I was kidding around with my friend from Maryland as he came by, and I said, Word here on the floor is that you're about to vote against your party and against the card check bill so that you're not going to be in agreement to eliminate secret ballots. He's so intelligent and has such a great sense of

humor. He said, The odds of that happening are infinitesimal. I said, It's just that everybody here on the floor knows that before NANCY PELOSI became Speaker, she had promised John Murtha would be the majority leader. And if you hadn't had a secret ballot, John Murtha would have been the majority leader instead of you. He laughed. He has a great sense of humor.

So I'm sure if I were able to go back in time and read our former majority leader's comments today about the importance of bipartisanship, he would probably laugh as he did when he voted to end the secret ballot for union elections, even though the secret ballot is what got him elected as majority leader.

□ 1430

But are some amazing things going on. It was huge when this Congress did something a few weeks ago that people said couldn't be done and that was with regard to the agriculture bill and that was many years ago, the agriculture bill, which was quite small, comparatively, combined with the food stamp bill. And I wondered when I got here 8½ years ago why was food stamps part of the agriculture bill. It was explained to me that this is strictly for political purposes, because there are not enough farmers that have enough representation in Congress to ever get a farm bill passed by itself, and that there's enough people concerned about the waste in the food stamp program and the abuses in the food stamp program that it might have a hard time just passing on its own without having a lot of restructuring and efforts to clean up the waste, fraud, and abuse. So by putting them together, you combine enough votes from both sides of the aisle to get a farm bill with food stamps passed. But if you separate them, you won't pass either one, at least not in that current form.

So it was really historic what was done and why a number of us voted for the agriculture bill without the food stamps attached. But we kept making it very clear, we're not out to end the food stamp program. We know there are people who need food help and we want to help them, so we are not for taking food out of the mouths of children that can't feed themselves, even though we were continually told that by people on the other side of the aisle. It broke my heart because I had a bunch of good friends, even though they're at one end of the political spectrum and I'm at the other, but they'd come to the floor and say something that they surely, surely, I hope they didn't mean. But they did say it, that Republicans are trying to take food out of the mouths of children. Well, that was rather tragic of them to say that since that was simply not true. And the heartbreak of having friends come down and make allegations that absolutely, unequivocally were not true

came rushing back as I heard our former majority leader say that we were trying to eliminate food to the hungry when we made the point over and over.

I know it is tough being in the leadership of either party. You're constantly doing stuff. He probably didn't hear where we said over and over, We're not eliminating the food stamp program; we're separating it from the ag bill, that's all. So I will make sure that our friend understands and gets the message. We actually were not out to eliminate the food stamp program, but we sure do need to clean it up.

I took grief for just telling of a constituent that had mentioned that he was standing in line at the grocery store behind somebody who had crab legs, and he was wishing he could afford to have crab legs and he was looking at his ground meat. Anyway, then when that person in front of him got ready to pay for the crab legs, he pulled out a food stamp card.

I forget which Washington rag it was, but one of them—and it may not have been a Washington rag. But the left wing went nuts talking about how I am accusing people of squandering precious food stamp money on crab legs when that was not the case at all. Then right after that, one of the Washington papers did have a front page story, and in part of that story was a picture out here where seafood is sold, a massive amount of crabs for sale with a big red sign saying, "Food stamp cards welcome."

Breitbart, I've got so many great friends there, brilliant people, and even though they're really brilliant, they like me okay. They ran with the story about how the left wing made a big deal out of it, and all they had to do was go to a seafood place.

Anyway, I also saw a picture that was not in the paper, massive crab legs, and there was that red sign that they take food stamps. So, obviously, it would seem that the left wing blogs, in their attempt to smear me, actually exposed, once again, their ignorance.

So there are a lot of things that need to be fixed up. We want to help people that need food that can't provide for themselves. But if they can work, it is a good thing to push people to reach their God-given potential.

The problem with that, especially for African Americans—and I think they're the worst hit group in all of America with regard to unemployment. This President's policies have absolutely devastated African American communities in this country with a massive, high unemployment rate. And so I sure hope that we can change things because the unemployed of whatever race, creed, color, gender, they deserve an opportunity. They deserve a chance at pursuing happiness. But these policies of this administration are making that increasingly difficult.

That's why it really focused people's attention recently when the President came out in full support and actually made it happen and said: You know what, I am just going to speak into being new law and cancel old law. I've said before, some of the things that this administration, this President have done are so unconstitutional. One of the things that ought to end up resulting is a massive class action by all of the people who took his constitutional law course to want their money back, because for any President to say I rammed through ObamaCare without a single Republican vote, we didn't get any input from those people, we didn't want it. But you know what, it is such a disaster, and I'm hearing from people that I've called fat cats before, big business folks, they're saying it's going to devastate their businesses. So tell you what, I am going to postpone for a year the big business requirement, big business being anything over 50 employees, I'm going to postpone their requirements to follow the law, just choose not to enforce the law so they can get away with not following it for a year.

Well, I have listened to some of the President's incredible, amazing eloquence, some right here from this second podium here, expressing concerns for Americans, but especially the poor and downtrodden. Now to me, somebody that's making \$11,000 has got it tough. It's tough to live on \$11,000 right now, but that's considered the poverty rate. It's right about \$11,000. So under the ObamaCare bill that was shoved through the House and Senate, unconstitutionally because it included a tax and raised revenue that did not originate in the House, and hopefully we'll get the Supreme Court's action on that and they'll do the right thing unless somebody knows something about Chief Justice Roberts that I don't. Anyway, it didn't originate in the House. I think we should ultimately get it struck down for that reason. They took a bill from the House, deleted every single word and substituted therein about 2,500 pages is what my copy was, for a tax credit for first time home buyers who were veterans or in the military. So, obviously, it was not germane, and hopefully the Supreme Court will still do the right thing and strike it down.

But in the meantime, people are having to make preparation to live under it. That includes Congress. Except for the leaders and the committee staff members, all of us in Congress are going to be forced into the ObamaCare exchanges come January.

So I've heard the President's speeches about caring so deeply about the middle class, and our former majority leader was talking about the middle class and what we need to do for them. But here again, I keep coming back to ObamaCare. I was shocked when I read

in the ObamaCare bill that if you cannot afford to buy the minimum health care mandated by the Federal Government in ObamaCare, then you're initially going to have a 1 percent income tax, but then it is going to go to 2.5 by 2016. I thought, that's crazy. My friends across the aisle, President Obama, they're always talking about how they care so deeply about those who are struggling and doing everything they can to get by. It just is shocking to come to realize they have no clue about the suffering that somebody making \$14,000 is going to have thrust on them by ObamaCare when they can't—if they're only making \$14,000, it is unlikely their employer is going to be able to pay \$7,000 for an insurance policy, so they will be on their own.

We have heard over and over that employers are trying to get down below 50 employees. I know a restaurant back in Tyler, my hometown, they indicated they are going to sell off a couple of their restaurants to get under 50 because they can't afford to meet the mandate. So a lot of people are losing their insurance, despite the President's assurance you wouldn't. That's happening all over the place.

And it is happening, ironically—and this is kind of rich. It really is rich, and I hope America can see the humor. So many of our friends across of the aisle said over and over at these microphones, If you like your insurance, you can keep it. And then they passed a bill without a single Republican vote that says all those people that said that, you can keep your insurance, they're not keeping, not one of them is going to keep their insurance. So it's kind of rich. It's a little humorous if you like sick irony. All these speeches about if you like your insurance—they're just quoting the President—you can keep it, turns out they're all wrong and every Member of Congress is going to lose their insurance come January 1, unless they retire before January 1, then they actually can keep their insurance.

And then we find out today that actually there is an issue because the way ObamaCare was addressed, it did prevent the leaders of both parties, as I read it, and committee staffs from having to be under ObamaCare. So the leaders, they're protected. They don't have to be under ObamaCare, and the committee staffs won't have to. But all the rest of us, all the rest of the Members of Congress, the rank and file, we'll be under it.

And now we find out there is a huge ambiguity because it doesn't say whether or not the Federal Government can continue to pay the 72 percent of the health care costs, the health insurance costs for Members of Congress. Right now Members of Congress, we are on Social Security, despite what the email that has been going around for 20 years says. We pay

Social Security tax. Despite all this stuff about a golden parachute and you can retire and get every dime you make, I think that changed during Ronald Reagan's time as President. So you don't have a golden parachute. I think most Members have a 401(k)-type thing where the government will match up to 5 or 6 percent of what you put in, but it is the same retirement program that every single Federal worker across America has.

People forget that Newt Gingrich—and I appreciate my friend from Maryland bringing up Newt Gingrich. He's an amazing guy. He is a big idea guy, and I like the way he thinks. We don't agree on all his big ideas, and he doesn't agree with all of my big ideas, but he comes up with some good ideas. In the Contract With America, one of the big ideas that was immensely popular, way over 70 percent popular, was that Members of Congress ought to live under the same laws that everybody else in America does. And that passed. That was part of the contract, and they lived up to it. It became law, and so Members of Congress have to live under the same laws as everybody else does.

That's why, after I've been cooking ribs to share in a bipartisan manner—and not many days go by when I don't have somebody on either side of the aisle ask, LOUIE, when are we going to get ribs again? Well, the Architect of the Capitol found out. I thought he was a little overzealous, but he feels like I violate some of the codes that everybody else in America has to live under, and so I can't cook ribs. We've had all kinds of things. The media wanted to come do something on me cooking ribs. President Bush liked my ribs.

□ 1445

People on both sides of the aisle do. They may not vote for anything I'm for, but they love my ribs. And it was a nice time.

But the reason I can't cook ribs anymore is because we're living under the same laws as everybody else did. And apparently there's a law that said you can't have a fire within 10 feet of wood in a building structure, so they shut me down. We're living under the same law as everybody else is.

And then it comes to ObamaCare, and the decision by the—and it wasn't by Congress. I was grilling our Republican leaders just earlier about exactly what's happening.

The Office of Personnel Management, under the Obama administration, has decided that the Federal Government will go ahead and, come January, we won't keep our same insurance. I've got a health savings account. They made sure I'm not going to get to keep my insurance, and we can't figure out what happens to the HSA.

I'd like to drop ObamaCare insurance and just put money into a health savings account. But they've even screwed

us over with ObamaCare to prevent that kind of thing from happening.

So, anyway, it looks like the decision by the Obama administration will be that Members of Congress will have 72 percent of our health insurance paid by the taxpayers, and what we have to borrow from China, of course, or other places.

Well, that's nice, but if America is not playing under those same rules, it doesn't seem fair for us. And I'm hopeful, when we get back, maybe we can get a bipartisan bill through that just says everybody in America can opt out of ObamaCare and not pay a fine, not pay a tax or whatever you want to call it, and provide what they feel like is appropriate. But it all ought to be fair across the board.

And now, the issue has gotten rather large since we find out the IRS truly has been targeting, after 2010, when the President said, you know, how much they wanted to stop the Tea Party; he felt they were a threat to America. They were a blessing to America. They were a threat to an oppressive government, because everybody I've run into, I've talked to people of all kinds of national origins, all races, from both genders, I mean, all kinds of folks at Tea Party events. And the only thing I can find they have in common: they're all paying income tax. They're all paying income tax.

And the President felt like this group needed to be gone after, and he made comments to that effect. And somebody, and we need to find out whom, was the top person in the administration, but it appears it at least goes back to the President's own hand-picked council, as far as who knew, who participated.

And of course there's been a denial, just like there was during Watergate, but we'll see what the truth is, even though there's a lot of obfuscation in the process.

But with regard to the IRS, the thing's very clear: we should not have the IRS involved in our health care at all, ever. And yet they are a central part of ObamaCare.

And then we find out this week, reading the story, it's changed some, but basically, a couple were wondering why law enforcement showed up at their home, when they had just looked online for a pressure cooker and a backpack. Turns out, apparently, at work one of them had looked at something else. They were no threat to anybody.

But the question keeps arising, wait a minute; who's monitoring every Web site that every American goes to?

Well, must be the NSA, apparently. But I did attend a classified briefing, so I can't go into anything there.

But it appeared, before the briefing, very clear to me, and I still feel this way, that when you blind yourself as to who the enemy is, as we have, purging all kinds of material from our FBI

training material, State Department, intelligence material, as to who radical Islamists really are and what they actually believe, you blind our law enforcement, our security people, from the ability to see our enemy, we're not protected.

And then when you have an open border where people are coming across at will, and Border Patrolmen have told us three to five times faster than they ever have since we started talking about just handing out legal status, anybody that happened to be here by a certain date, all this talk about amnesty, citizenship, all these other things being talked, do they get benefits, not get benefits, all this talk has increased the number of people coming in by about three to five times.

The border's not secure. When you don't control what kind of terrorists may be coming into your country, and you don't train your law enforcement, your terrorist-discerning folks who it is that are the terrorists, and you keep pulling back our ability to see who our enemy really is, then it appears the solution is to have the Federal Government more intrusive than any of us ever dreamed it would be.

And then, you couple that with what we found out yesterday, and this article's dated August 1, 2013, and it's titled "Exclusive: Dozens of CIA Operatives on the Ground During Benghazi Attack." And in part it points out CNN has learned the CIA is involved in what one source calls an unprecedented attempt to keep the spy agency's Benghazi secrets from ever leaking out:

Since January, some CIA operatives involved in the agency's mission in Libya have been subjected to frequent, even monthly polygraph examinations, according to a source with deep inside knowledge of the agency's workings. The goal of the questioning, according to sources, is to find out if anyone is talking to the media or to Congress.

It is being described as pure intimidation, with the threat that any unauthorized CIA employee who leaks information could face the end of his or her career.

In an exclusive communications obtained by CNN, one insider writes, "You don't jeopardize yourself, you jeopardize your family as well."

Another says, "You have no idea the amount of pressure being brought to bear on anyone with knowledge of this operation."

Agency employees typically are polygraphed every 3 or 4 years, never more than that," said former CIA operative and CNN analyst Robert Baer. In other words, the rate of the kind of polygraphs alleged by sources is rare.

So says the CNN article.

"If somebody is being polygraphed every month or every 2 months, it's called an issue polygraph, and that means the polygraph division suspects something, or they're looking for something, or they're on a fishing expedition, but it's absolutely not routine at all to be polygraphed monthly or bimonthly," said Baer.

A source now tells CNN that the number, talking about the number of people at Benghazi mission, was 35, with as many as seven wounded, some seriously. While it is still not known how many of them were CIA, a source tells CNN that 21 Americans were working in the building known as the annex, believed to be run by the agency, talking about the CIA.

He goes down, and he talks about Congressman FRANK WOLF, a dear friend. He says, WOLF has repeatedly gone to the House floor asking for a select committee to be set up, a Water-gate-style probe involving several Intelligence Committee investigators assigned to get to the bottom of the failures that took place in Benghazi, and find out just what the State Department and CIA were doing there.

More than 150 fellow Republican Members of Congress have signed his request. And just this week, eight Republicans sent a letter to the new head of the FBI, James Comey, asking that he brief Congress within 30 days.

In the aftermath of the attack, WOLF said he was contacted by people closely tied with the CIA operatives and contractors who wanted to talk. Then suddenly, there was silence. And I can verify that problem as well from some of the people that were going to talk to me and then all of a sudden they went silent and said, no, I'm not going to talk.

"Initially they were not afraid to come forward. They wanted the opportunity, and they wanted to be subpoenaed, because if you're subpoenaed it sort of protects you. You're forced to come before Congress. That's all changed," said WOLF.

Speculation on Capitol Hill has included the possibility that U.S. agencies operating in Benghazi were secretly helping to move surface-to-air missiles out of Libya, through Turkey, and into the hands of the Syrians rebels. It's clear that two U.S. agencies were operating in Benghazi. One was the State Department. The other was the CIA.

The State Department told CNN in an email that it was only helping the new Libyan government destroy weapons deemed "damaged, aged, or too unsafe to retain," and that it was not involved in any transfer of weapons to other countries.

But the State Department also clearly told CNN they "can't speak for any other agencies." And the CIA would not comment on whether it was involved in the transfer of weapons or not.

So perhaps that was going on, but we still have got to get to the bottom of why four great, heroic Americans were allowed to be killed, were put in a situation like that.

What difference does it make at this point?

It makes a difference at this point, or a year from now, or 2 years from now,

or 3½ years from now because people need to understand, they need to understand clearly.

When somebody's life is taken, normally, if a criminal law is involved, the statute of limitations are a lot longer. And Eric Holder, I can assure you, will not be Attorney General for the next 4 years. Three and one-half years from now we'll have a new administration. And we will hopefully get to the bottom of these scandals.

And they're not phony. We know that because the President has assured us, back when they first arose, he was going to get to the bottom of it. And unlike what one of the family members of those killed at Benghazi told me, there, at the ceremony, Secretary Clinton said we're going to get the guy that did the video. And all they wanted was to get justice from those who caused the death of their loved one.

We owe that to them, Mr. Speaker.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 233. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the "Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 256. An act to amend Public Law 93-435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 668. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 796. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the "James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 885. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, as the "Thaddeus Stevens Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 1093. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, as the "First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution

22, 113th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Monday, September 9, 2013, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2551. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Regulation Revision: Removal of the Pesticide Discharge Permitting Exemption in Response to Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals Decision [EPA-HQ-OW-2003-0063; FRL-9829-2] received June 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2552. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Streptomycin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0852; FRL-9385-3] received May 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2553. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dinotefuran; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions; Technical Amendment [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0755; FRL-9384-9] received August 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2554. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Data Requirements for Antimicrobial Pesticides [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0110; FRL-8886-5] (RIN: 2070-AD30) received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2555. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-QPP-2012-0204; FRL-9387-9] received June 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2556. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for fiscal year 2014 and the OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2014; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2557. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral William E. Landay III, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2558. A letter from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Amendments to the 2013 Mortgage Rules Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) [Docket No. CFPB-2013-0010] (RIN: 3170-AA37) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2559. A letter from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Electronic Fund Transfers (Regulation E) [Docket No.: CFPB-2012-0050] (RIN: 3170-AA33) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2560. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Broker-Dealer Reports [Release No.: 34-70073; File No. S7-23-11] (RIN: 3235-AK56) received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2561. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Financial Responsibility Rules for Broker-Dealers [Release No.: 34-70072; File No. S7-08-07] (RIN: 3235-AJ85) received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2562. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Community Services Block Grant Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2563. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report to the President and the Congress on Medicaid Home and Community-Based Alternatives to Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities Demonstrations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2564. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2012 Performance Report to Congress for the Food and Drug Administration's Office of Combination Products required by the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act of 2002; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2565. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Third Progress Report of the Implementation of Section 3507 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2566. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Turtles Intrastate and Interstate Requirements [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-0639] received August 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2567. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on Premarket Approval of Pediatric Uses of Devices — FY 2009-2011; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2568. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Final Listing of 2014 Light Duty Truck Lines Subject to the Requirements of This Standard and Exempted Vehicle Lines for Model Year 2014 [Docket No.: NHTSA-2013-0027] (RIN: 2127-AL42) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2569. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Montana; Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0347; FRL-9839-1] received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2570. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Modification of Significant New Uses of Ethaneperoxy Acid, 1,1-Dimethylpropyl Ester [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2012-0864; FRL-9392-4] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2571. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Montana [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-0724; FRL-9839-2] received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2572. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyrooxasulfone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0439 and EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0514; FRL-9393-6] received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2573. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trifluralin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0304; FRL-9393-5] received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2574. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Small Container Exemption from VOC Coating Rules [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0073; FRL-9790-4] received April 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2575. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Alaska; Mendenhall Valley Nonattainment Area PM10 Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request [EPA-R10-OAR-2009-034 0; FRL-9794-2] received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2576. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; State Board Requirements [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0091; FRL-9803-3] received April 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2577. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; The 2002 Base Year Emissions Inventory for the West Virginia portion of the Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0369; FRL-9803-2] received April 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2578. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's final rule — Designation of Area for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Nevada; Total Suspended Particulate [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-014; FRL 9802-6] received April 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2579. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methyl Jasmonate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0134; FRL-9382-6] received April 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2580. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Louisiana; Approval of Section 110(a)(1) Maintenance Plan for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard for the Parish of Pointe Coupee [EPA-R06-OAR-2007-0206; FRL-9809-4] received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2581. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Charlotte, Raleigh/Durham and Winston Salem Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0961; FRL-9802-8] received April 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2582. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Prevention of Significant Deterioration [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0113; FRL-9810-7] received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2583. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Imazosulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0419; FRL-9390-2] received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2584. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Control Techniques Guidelines and Reasonably Available Control Technology [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0140; FRL-9810-8] received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2585. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Mancozeb; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0628; FRL-9393-2] received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2586. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Preventions of Significant Deterioration Requirements for PM2.5 Increments and Major and Minor Source Baseline Dates; State Board Requirements; North Dakota [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-0726; FRL-9839-9] received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2587. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2013-0100; FRL-9384-8] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2588. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Spirotetramat; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0107; FRL-9382-8] received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2589. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of North Dakota; Interstate Transportation of Pollution for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0348; FRL-9839-8] received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2590. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sulfoxaflor; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0889; FRL-9371-4] received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2591. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Guar hydroxypropyltrimethyl ammonium chloride; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0558; FRL-9387-2] received May 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2592. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee: New Source Review-Prevention of Significant Deterioration [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0894; FRL-9837-1] received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2593. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Atlanta, Georgia 1997 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area; Reasonable Further Progress Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0223; FRL-9837-2] received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2594. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oklahoma: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R06-RCRA-2012-0821; FRL-9817-6] received May 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2595. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Disapproval of PM_{2.5} Permitting Requirements [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0502; FRL-9838-1] received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2596. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of California; Redesignation of San Diego County to Attainment for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0971; FRL-9818-1] received May 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2597. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Update to Materials Incorporated by reference [WV104-6042; FRL-9828-8] received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2598. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerance; Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0283; FRL-9387-4] received May 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2599. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Disapproval of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Arizona; Regional Haze and Interstate Transport Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0904; FRL-9838-4] received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2600. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Volatile Organic Compounds Emissions Reductions Regulations [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0965; FRL-9806-6] received April 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2601. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Administrative Revisions to EPAAR [EPA-HQ-OARM-2013-0294; FRL-9837-4] received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2602. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon: Open Burning and Enforcement Procedures [EPA-R10-OAR-2008-0903; FRL-9793-5] received April 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2603. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee: New Source Review-Prevention of Significant Deterioration [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0894; FRL-9837-1] received July 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2604. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment for the Sacramento Nonattainment Area for the 2006 Fine Particle Standard;

California; Determination Regarding Applicability of Clean Air Act Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0799; FRL-9833-2] received July 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2605. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — State of Kansas; Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R07-RCRA-2013-0447; FRL-9833-7] received July 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2606. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hexythiazox; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0412; FRL-9391-3] received July 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2607. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0282; FRL-9384-2] received April 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2608. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Priorities List, Final Rule No. 56 [EPA-HQ-SFUND-2012-0064, 0598, 0599, 0600, 0601, 0602, 0603, 0604, 0606, 0607, and 0647; FRL 9815-1] received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2609. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Bacillus mycoides* isolate J; Time-Limited Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0397; FRL-9833-1] received April 23, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2610. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 1-Naphthaleneacetic acid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0203; FRL-9386-1] received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2611. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Air Quality Standards Revision [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0540; FRL-9805-5] received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2612. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Federal Plan Requirements for Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators Constructed On or Before December 1, 2008, and Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources: Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0405 and EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0534; FRL-9802-3] (RIN: 2060-AR11 and RIN: 2060-A004) received April 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2613. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting The Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California

State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0728; FRL-9799-2] received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2614. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Prevention of Significant Deterioration Greenhouse Gas Tailoring and Biomass Deferral Rule [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0467; EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0538; FRL-9808-9] received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2615. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arizona; Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Programs [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0552; FRL-9780-9] received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2616. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 1,3-Propanediol; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0921; FRL-9386-8] received June 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2617. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Atlanta, Georgia 1997 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area; Reasonable Further Progress Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0147; FRL-9816-6] received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2618. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Low Emission Vehicle Program [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0511; FRL-9822-6] received June 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2619. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Triforine; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0780; FRL-9387-1] received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2620. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methyl 5-(dimethylamino)-2-methyl-5-oxopentanoate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0461; FRL-9385-9] received May 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2621. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dinotefuran; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0092; FRL-9381-5] received April 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2622. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision;

Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Ohio Portion of the Wheeling Area [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0969; FRL-9821-3] received June 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2623. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Connecticut; 111(d)/129 Revised State Plan for Large and Small Municipal Waste Combustors [EPA-R01-OAR-2013-0109; A-1-FRL-9800-1] received April 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2624. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Oregon; Eugene-Springfield PM10 Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request [Docket No.: EPA-R10-OAR-2012-0193; FRL-9738-5] received April 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2625. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Lima 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0050; FRL-9821-5] received June 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2626. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Ohio; Volatile Organic Compound Emission Control Measures for the Cleveland Ozone Nonattainment Area [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0595; FRL-9790-3] received April 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2627. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revision to the Classification and Implementation of the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards for the Northern Virginia Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0289; FRL-9822-3] received June 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2628. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Maryland; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan Approved by EPA through Letter Notice Actions [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0033; FRL-9822-5] received June 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2629. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Direct Final Approval of Sewage Sludge Incinerators State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Indiana [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0372; FRL-9821-1] received June 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2630. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Indiana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R05-RCRA-2012-0377; FRL-9817-9] received June 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2631. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Designations for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0233; FRL-9841-4] (RIN: 2060-AR18) received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2632. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [PA200-4204; FRL-9811-9] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2633. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Colorado Springs [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-0659; FRL-9840-7] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2634. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second Ten-Year Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Greeley [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-0658; FRL-9840-9] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2635. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Permit Exemption Rule [EPA-R05-OAR-2080-0402; FRL-9834-4] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2636. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of California; San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, New Source Review [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0062; FRL-9837-5] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2637. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter and 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2011-0884; FRL-9841-1] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2638. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Complex Polymeric Polyhydroxy Acids; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-

2009-0917; FRL-9391-2] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2639. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Conditional Exclusions from Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste for Solvent-Contaminated Wipes [EPA-HQ-RCRA-2003-0004; FRL-9838-2] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2640. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Forchlorfenuron; Temporary Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0010; FRL-9391-9] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2641. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sorbitan monooleate ethylene oxide adduct; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0908; FRL-9389-8] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2642. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality: Revision to Definition of Volatile Organic Compounds — Exclusion of trans 1-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoroprop-1-ene [Solstice 1233zd(E)] [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0393; FRL-9800-8] (RIN: 2060-AQ38) received April 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2643. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Particulate Matter Air Quality Standards [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0083; FRL-9804-6] received April 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2644. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Consumer Products and AIM Rules [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0394; EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0786; FRL-9436-2] received April 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2645. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Propiconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0246; FRL-9381-8] received April 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2646. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0960; FRL-9799-3] received April 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2647. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Supplemental Determination for Renewable Fuels Produced Under the Final RFS2 Program From Grain Sorghum; Correction [EPA-HQ-OAR; FRL-9803-6]

received April 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2648. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; District of Columbia; Control of Emissions from Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerator Units [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0434; FRL-9829-6] received June 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2649. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Delegation of Authority to the Southern Ute Indian Tribe to Implement and Enforce National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants and New Source Performance Standards [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0764; FRL-9828-6] received June 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2650. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ethalfuralin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0303; FRL-9391-7] received June 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2651. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0343; FRL-9824-9] received June 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2652. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; South Coast Air Basin; Approval of PM10 Maintenance Plan and Redesignation to Attainment for the PM10 Standard [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0007; FRL-9826-4] received June 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2653. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Removal of Consumer and Commercial Products Rules [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0376; FRL-9828-2] received June 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2654. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sulfoxaflor; Pesticide Tolerances; Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0889; FRL-9391-4] received June 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2655. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle, and Nonroad Technical Amendments [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0102; NHTSA-0152; FRL-9772-3] received May 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2656. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia; State Implementation Plan Miscellaneous Revisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0223; FRL-9813-8] received May 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2657. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee; Transportation Conformity Revisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0044 (a); FRL-9814-5] received May 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2658. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Tennessee; Revisions to Volatile Organic Compound Definition [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0888; FRL-9814-3] received May 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2659. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenpyroximate; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0716; FRL-9388-2] received July 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2660. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Bacillus pumilus* strain BU F-33; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0264; FRL-9389-2] received July 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2661. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Infrastructure SIP for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter Standards [EPA-R02-OAR-2013-0130; FRL-9824-1] received July 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2662. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee; 110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0582; FRL-9820-7] received July 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2663. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — North Carolina: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R04-RCRA-2012-0173; FRL-9823-1] received July 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2664. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Method for the Determination of Lead in Total Suspended Particulate Matter [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0210; FRL-9822-1] (RIN: 2060-AP89) received June 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2665. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Delegation of New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0981; FRL-9806-3] received August 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2666. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenbuconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0520; FRL-9390-5] received June 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2667. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for Tennessee: Revisions to Volatile Organic Compound Definition [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0888; FRL-9802-9] received April 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2668. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Novaluron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0291; FRL-9387-7] received June 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2669. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Consent Decree Requirements [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0650; FRL-9809-1] received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2670. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Approval of Texas Low Emission Diesel Fuel Rule Revisions [EPA-R06-OAR-2012-0766; FRL-9808-4] received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2671. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to Control of Air Pollution from Nitrogen Compounds from Stationary Sources [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0494; FRL-9808-2] received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2672. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Georgia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R04-RCRA-2009-0961; FRL-9806-9] received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2673. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0132; FRL-9384-3] received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2674. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rule on Ethoxylated, Propoxylated Diamine Diaryl Substituted Phenylmethane Ester with Alkenylsuccinate, Dialkylethanolamine Salt [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-0577; FRL-9385-1] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2675. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acetamiprid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0626; FRL-9391-2] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2676. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Charlotte, Raleigh/Durham and Winston-Salem Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0961; FRL-9824-5] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2677. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R01-OAR-2009-0449; A-1-FRL-9797-2] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2678. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York; Infrastructure SIP for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter Standards [EPA-R02-OAR-2013-0274; FRL-9825-1] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2679. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon; Heat Smart Program and Enforcement Procedures [EPA-R10-OAR-2012-0494; FRL-9802-7] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2680. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revised Format for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference for Florida; Approval of Recodification of the Florida Administrative Code; Correcting Amendments [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0385; FRL-9824-2] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2681. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Kansas; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R07-OAR-2013-0233; FRL-9825-6] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2682. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R07-OAR-2013-0208; FRL-9825-7] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2683. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky: Kentucky Portion of Cincinnati-Hamilton, Revision to the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0062; FRL-9820-1] received June 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2684. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chance of Address for Region 7; Technical Correction [EPA-R07-OAR-2013-0410; FRL-9825-5] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2685. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Propamocarb; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0887; FRL-9388-1] received June 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2686. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Diisopropyl adipate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0469; FRL-9387-8] received June 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2687. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cyproconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0177; FRL-9387-3] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2688. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Allegheny County Reasonably Available Control Technology Under the 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0055; FRL-9820-3] received June 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2689. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Interim Final Determination to Defer Sanctions; California; South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0384; FRL-9826-3] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2690. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia; Removal of Obsolete Regulations and Updates

to Citations to State Regulations Due to Recodification [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0955; FRL-9819-6], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2691. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From Petroleum Refineries [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0146; FRL-9751-4] (RIN: 2060-AP84) received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2692. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sedaxane; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0704; FRL-9386-9] received June 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2693. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2010-0279; FRL-9390-6] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2694. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation, San Diego Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0362; FRL-9815-5] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2695. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Triforine, Pesticide Tolerances; Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0780; FRL-9389-9] received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2696. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting A Memorandum of Justification regarding Cooperative Threat Reduction activities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2697. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. DDTC 13-086); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2698. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-109, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2699. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-102, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2700. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-065, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2701. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department

of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-033, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2702. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-099, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2703. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-094, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2704. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-106, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2705. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-097, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2706. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-093, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2707. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-015, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2708. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-108, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2709. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-048, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2710. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. RSAT-12-3037); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2711. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Libya and UNSCR 2095 (RIN: 1400-AD41) received August 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2712. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-119, "Telehealth Reimbursement Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2713. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting

Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-120, "Testing Integrity Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2714. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-121, "Closing of a Public Street and Alley and Elimination of Building Restriction Lines in and abutting Squares 5641 and N-5641, S.O. 07-2117, Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2715. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-122, "Delta Sigma Theta Way Designation Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2716. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-123, "Atlas Court Alley Designation Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2717. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-134, "Board of Elections Petition Circulation Requirements Amendment Act of 2013"; pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2718. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-135, "Dimitar Peshev Plaza Designation Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2719. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-136, "Capitol Hill Business Improvement District Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2720. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-112, "Vending Regulation Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2721. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-118, "Workers' Compensation Statute of Limitations Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2722. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — EPAAR Clause for Printing [EPA-HQ-OARM-2012-0196; FRL-9008-6] received April 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2723. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Application Procedures, Execution and Filing of Forms: Correction of State Office Address for Filings and Recordings, Including Proper Offices for Recording of Mining Claims; New Mexico/Oklahoma/Texas/Kansas [LLNM910000-L102000000, H0000] (RIN: 1004-AE33) received August 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2724. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adoption of Statutory Prohibition on the Operation of Jets Weighing 75,000 Pounds or Less that are not Stage 3 Noise Compliant [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0503; Amdt. No. 91-328] (RIN: 2120-AK25) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2725. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Flight Data Recorder Airplane Parameter Specification Omissions and Corrections [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0579; Amendment Nos. 91-329, 121-364 and 125-62] (RIN: 2120-AK27) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2726. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pilot Certification and Qualification Requirements for Air Carrier Operations [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0100; Amdt. Nos. 61-130; 121-365; 135-127; 141-1; 142-9] (RIN: 2120-AJ67) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2727. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Combined Drug and Alcohol Testing Programs [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0688; Amdt. No. 120-1] (RIN: 2120-AK01) received August 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2728. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Nonpoint Source Program and Grants Guidelines for States and Territories received April 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2729. A letter from the Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Patient Access to Records (RIN: 2900-AO61) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2730. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Prospective Payment System for Federal Fiscal Year 2014 [CMS-1448-F] (RIN: 0938-AR66) received August 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2731. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's final sequestration report for fiscal year 2013; (H. Doc. No. 113-53); to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

2732. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the verification of employment of Iraqi nationals; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

2733. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System and Consolidated Billing for Skilled Nursing Facilities for FY 2014 [CMS-1446-F] (RIN: 0938-AR65) received August 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

2734. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; FY 2014 Hospice Wage Index and Payment Rate Update; Hospice Quality Reporting Requirements; and Updates on Payment Reform [CMS-1449-F] (RIN: 0938-AR64) received August 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

2735. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems for Acute Care Hospitals and the Long-Term Care Hospital Prospective Payment Systems and Fiscal Year 2014 Rates; Quality Reporting Requirements for Specific Providers; Hospital Conditions of Participation; Payment Policies Related to Patient Status [CMS-1599-F] [CMS-1455-F] (RIN: 0938-AR53 and 0938-AR73) received August 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1407. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs; with amendments (Rept. 113-188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 2978. A bill to require States to conduct Congressional redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BASS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2979. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to preserve the eligibility of a child for kinship guardianship assistance payments when the guardian is replaced by a successor legal guardian named in the kinship guardianship assistance agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2980. A bill to require certain certifications before funds may be awarded for the operation of a Navigator program under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BUSHON, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2981. A bill to support innovative approaches to technology transfer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2982. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants to State educational agencies to develop comprehensive plans to strengthen elementary and secondary computer science education, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 2983. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require testing of underground sources of drinking water in connection with hydraulic fracturing operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 2984. A bill to rename the Bureau of Prisons as the Bureau of Corrections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 2985. A bill to amend section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide incentives for the development of new combination drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2986. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the temporary Medicare payment rate floor for primary care services of primary care physicians to nurse practitioners, clinical nurse specialists, physician assistants, and certified nurse-midwives under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2987. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phasedown the credit for electricity produced from wind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2988. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FARR, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 2989. A bill to suspend the authority for the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (the successor institution to the United States Army School of the Americas) in the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEFazio, Ms.

DEGETTE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BASS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 2990. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce tobacco smuggling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 2991. A bill to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 2992. A bill to regulate certain State taxation of interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 2993. A bill to require States to report information on Medicaid payments to abortion providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. KIND, Mr. NEAL, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. WATT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 2994. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for 1 year the exclusion from gross income of discharges of qualified principal residence indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 2995. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to eliminate the limitation on deductibles for employer-sponsored health plans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 2996. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McCAUL (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 2997. A bill to require each agency to repeal two existing regulations before issuing a new regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and

Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2998. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit mandatory pre-dispute arbitration agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 2999. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for procedures ensuring accuracy in employment-related exchanges of records and information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 3000. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for additional investment visas for aliens investing in rural areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3001. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to permit commercial applicators of pesticides to create, retain, submit, and convey pesticide application-related records, reports, data, and other information in electronic form; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. CONAWAY):

H.R. 3002. A bill to prohibit the provision of Federal funds to State and local governments for payment of obligations, to prohibit the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System from financially assisting State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ENYART, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 3003. A bill to amend the State Small Business Credit Initiative Act of 2010 to allow participating States to provide program funds to small businesses for development of affordable housing; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BERA of California:

H.R. 3004. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to ensure that each Federal agency participating in the International Trade Data System develops and maintains the necessary information technology infrastructure to support the operation of the System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 3005. A bill to amend chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the sale of, and access to, "research use only" products in diagnostic tests; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 3006. A bill to authorize a land exchange involving the acquisition of private

land adjacent to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona for inclusion in the refuge in exchange for certain Bureau of Land Management lands in Riverside County, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 3007. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require States to recognize the military experience of veterans when issuing licenses and credentials to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 3008. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in Los Padres National Forest in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 3009. A bill to protect investors in futures contracts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 3010. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to require that repurchase-to-maturity transactions be treated as secured borrowings; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 3011. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to require any person subject to accounting principles or standards under the securities laws to show all transactions of such person on the balance sheet of such person; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 3012. A bill to establish the Securities and Derivatives Commission in order to combine the functions of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission in a single independent regulatory commission; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. JONES, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 3013. A bill to reform the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3014. A bill to permit expungement of records of certain nonviolent criminal offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3015. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the establishment of supermarkets in certain underserved areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3016. A bill to provide grants to cities with high unemployment rates to provide job training, public works, and economic development programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOK (for himself and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 3017. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the energy credit for certain property under construction; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 3018. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the excise tax and special occupational tax in respect of firearms and to increase the transfer tax on any other weapon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 3019. A bill to amend chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to enhance the requirements for pharmacies that compound drug products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DENT (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 3020. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide parity under group and individual health plans and group and individual health insurance coverage for the provision of benefits for prosthetics and custom orthotics and benefits for other medical and surgical services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 3021. A bill to provide for the personal liability of certain Federal officers and employees of the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3022. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to include national discovery trails, and to designate the American Discovery Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 3023. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate water leasing and water transfers to promote conservation and efficiency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 3024. A bill to establish a smart card pilot program under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 3025. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of

the low-income housing credit that may be allocated in States damaged in 2011 by Hurricane Irene or Tropical Storm Lee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SALMON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FLEMING):

H.R. 3026. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the continuance of pay and allowances for members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, during lapses in appropriations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BARBER, Mr. ISSA, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SALMON, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 3027. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 Miller Valley Road in Prescott, Arizona, as the "Barry M. Goldwater Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 3028. A bill to amend the hold harmless provision for career and technical education assistance grants to States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HURT (for himself and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 3029. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise certain rules relating to the status of qualified prepaid tuition programs under the securities laws; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 3030. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat Indian tribal governments in the same manner as State governments for certain Federal tax purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 3031. A bill to require a portion of closing costs to be paid by the enterprises with respect to certain refinanced mortgage loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 3032. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to create the National Office for Cyberspace, to revise requirements relating to Federal information security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LONG, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan):

H.R. 3033. A bill to enhance energy security by expanding access to domestic energy resources, boost employment opportunities in the energy sector, and provide consumers relief from artificial price increases; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 3034. A bill to establish a National Flood Research and Education Center to provide research, data, and recommendations on physical science, social science, economic analysis, policy analysis, risk analysis, monitoring, predicting, and planning as they relate to flooding and flood related issues; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POLIS, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 3035. A bill to permit periodic public reporting by electronic communications providers and remote computer service providers of certain estimates pertaining to requests or demands by Federal agencies under the provisions of certain surveillance laws where disclosure of such estimates is, or may be, otherwise prohibited by law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 3036. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. STEWART, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 3037. A bill to amend titles 5 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the award of fees and other expenses in cases brought against agencies of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California (for himself and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 3038. A bill to streamline the process of commercial space launch licensing and to establish demonstration projects involving the use of experimental aircraft in direct and indirect support of commercial space launch activities; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that the Secretary of the Treasury provide a Tax Receipt to each taxpayer who files a Federal income tax return; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 3040. A bill to provide for the minimum size of crews of freight trains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3041. A bill to prevent the Internal Revenue Service from unnecessarily seizing protected health information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3042. A bill to prohibit the use of the social cost of carbon in any regulatory impact analysis until a Federal law is enacted authorizing such use; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. KIND, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. COLE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 3043. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUNNELEE (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 3044. A bill to approve the transfer of Yellow Creek Port properties in Iuka, Mississippi; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. STEWART, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SABLON, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 3045. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that the Secretary of Defense provides each member of the Armed Forces, before the member separates from the Armed Forces, with an electronic copy of the medical records of the member and a physical examination; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3046. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and simplify the credit for employee health insurance expenses of small employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 3047. A bill to authorize borrowers of loans under the William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program to modify the interest rate of such loans to be equal to the interest rate for such loans at the time of modification; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3048. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a study of economically beneficial uses of the rights-of-way associated with certain highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROONEY (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 3049. A bill to treat members of the Armed Forces who were killed or wounded in the November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas, or the June 1, 2009, attack at Little Rock, Arkansas, as if the members were awarded the Purple Heart, to clarify the eligibility of such members for combat-related special compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MORAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CHU, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LOfGREN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HOLT, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. FARR, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. TITUS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 3050. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of permanent partnerships between individuals of the same gender as marriage for purposes of determining entitlement to benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 3051. A bill to extend State jurisdiction over submerged lands and to allow States to grant oil and natural gas leases in the extended area; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3052. A bill to require that the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached, to require the sale of Federal assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Financial Services, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 3053. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Professional Scholarship Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 3054. A bill to establish a health and education grant program related to autism spectrum disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. KINGSTON):

H.R. 3055. A bill to reform the Federal supplemental nutrition assistance program (SNAP) so that States have the option of conducting pilot projects to require that able-bodied individuals participate in work activities as a condition of receiving benefits under such program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 3056. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on the provision of outreach and support services to veterans pursuing higher education under the Post 9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 3057. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the credit for qualified fuel cell motor vehicles and to allow the credit for certain off-highway vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 3058. A bill to provide for additional Federal district judgeships for the eastern district of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 3059. A bill to provide a biennial budget for the United States Government; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMBERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HALL, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SAM

JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEUGBAUER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 3060. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 232 Southwest Johnson Avenue in Burleson, Texas, as the "Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOEBACK, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 3061. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for the establishment of Youth Corps programs and provide for wider dissemination of the Youth Corps model; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WOLF, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 3062. A bill to require assurances that certain family planning service projects and programs will provide pamphlets containing the contact information of adoption centers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 3063. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to require the Secretary of Commerce to develop a plan to conduct stock assessments for all stocks of fish for which a fishery management plan is in effect under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H. Res. 326. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any immigration reform proposal adopted by Congress should not legalize, grant amnesty for, or confer any other legal status condoning the otherwise unlawful entry or presence in the United States of any individual; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H. Res. 327. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding China's membership in the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. MENG, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GABBARD, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. HAHN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RUSH, Mr.

ISRAEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KIND, Mr. SIREs, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. SWALLOW of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H. Res. 328. A resolution condemning the discrimination, hate crimes, racism, bigotry, bullying, and brutal violence perpetrated against Sikh-Americans, and all acts of vandalism against Sikh Gurdwaras in the United States, and remembering the tragedy that occurred at the Sikh Gurdwara of Wisconsin one year ago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. SIREs, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. HOLT):

H. Res. 329. A resolution calling for the support of the fundamental rights of all Egyptian citizens, equal access to justice and due process of law, and transparent and accountable governance in Egypt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. YOHO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. McCLINTOCK, and Mrs. BACHMANN):

H. Res. 330. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that until the United States southern border is secured as confirmed by the governors and the legislatures jointly of the four southern border states, the House of Representatives shall not bring any legislation including any conference report regarding immigration to the floor of the House for a vote; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H. Res. 331. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 18 as "National Innovation in Education Day"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. GIBSON):

H. Res. 332. A resolution recognizing the 200th anniversary of the Howard Flats Farm in Hornell, New York; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. Res. 333. A resolution expressing the firm conviction of the House of Representatives that any continuing resolution or debt ceiling increase it may approve for the duration of the 113th Congress shall affirmatively include a provision specifically prohibiting the expenditure of any federal funds in support of or in implementation or effectuation or enforcement of any provision of the Affordable Care Act ("ObamaCare"); to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined

by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Ms. CHU, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COSTA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOLT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. KIND, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H. Res. 334. A resolution condemning the attack that occurred at the Oak Creek Sikh Gurdwara on August 5, 2012, and honoring the memory of those who died in the attack; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

125. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 290 urging the Congress, the Department of the Army, and the Department of Defense to again review Captain Albracht's heroic actions at Firebase Kate; to the Committee on Armed Services.

126. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Ohio, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 15 urging the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology to hold regular hearings regarding the nationwide broadband public safety network; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 2978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) the authority granted to Congress under article I, section 4 of the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the power to enact laws governing the time, place, and manner of elections for Members of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the authority granted to Congress under section 5 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution gives Congress the power to enact laws to enforce section of such amendment, which requires Representatives to be apportioned among the several States according to their number.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 2979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8,

clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CARDENAS:

H.R. 2982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 2984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 2985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 2986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 2989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 14 and 18

By Mr. DOGETT:

H.R. 2990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 2991.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2992.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, including, but not limited to, Clauses 1, 3 and 18.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 2993.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. (Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers.)

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2994.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, which states "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes,"

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2995.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8; The Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2996.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8; The Congress shall have a Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for The Congress shall have the power for the common defense and general welfare of the United States

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 2997.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2998.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2999.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following clause of the United States Constitution:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 3000.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3001.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 3002.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, clause 7, which states that, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by the law."

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 3003.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BERA of California:

H.R. 3004.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3005.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached bill is constitutional under Article I, Section VIII: "The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States."

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 3006.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 and clause 18, and Article IV, section 3, clause 2.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 3007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 3008.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 3009.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 3010.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 3011.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 3012.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 3013.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18). Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of

the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3014.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3015.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to interstate commerce).

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3016.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, known as the General Welfare Clause." This provision grants Congress the broad power "to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 3017.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 3020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 3021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 3022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 3023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution which reads:

"The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 3024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 3025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 3026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution sets forth the power of appropriations and states that "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ."

In addition, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 states that "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ."

Also, Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12 and 13 states that Congress shall have power "to raise and support Armies . . ." and "to provide and maintain a Navy."

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds in order to ensure that U.S. servicemembers will not lose pay.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 3027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the express constitutional authority pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution. This clause provides: The Congress shall have Power "To establish post offices and post roads"

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 3028.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. HURT:

H.R. 3029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 3030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 3031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 3032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make all laws necessary and proper for executing powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 3033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, cl. 3

The Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the states, and with Indian Tribes;

Article IV, Section 3, cl. 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States;

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 3034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 3035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 3036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests lies in Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to repeal any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

Additionally, the Constitution grants to Congress the explicit power to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 3037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

Article 4, Section 3: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California:

H.R. 3038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 3039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 3040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8,

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 3043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 2 of Article I of the United States Constitution

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

Section 2 of the XIV Amendment to the United States Constitution

By Mr. NUNNELEE:

H.R. 3044.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, clause 18.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 3045.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3046.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 3047.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3048.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8; The Congress shall have a Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for The Congress shall have the power for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 3049.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8: to make rules for the government and Regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 3050.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 3051.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section. 3. "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

The clause is relevant to the "Coastal States Extension Act of 2013" because it involves an adjustment in determining states' rights in the Territory belonging to the United States.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3052.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 3053.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make

all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof; as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3054.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND:

H.R. 3055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in Article I Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution which grants Congress the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 3056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 3057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 3058.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 9 and Article III Section 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 3059.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 3060.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is power of Congress to establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 3061.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 3062.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 3063.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 23: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 25: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 32: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 36: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 46: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 60: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 107: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 127: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 147: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 148: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 166: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 198: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 259: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. RADEL, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 262: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 269: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 274: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 279: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 301: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 310: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 333: Mr. HECK of Washington and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 351: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 354: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 401: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 436: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 460: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 495: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 506: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 508: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 526: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 543: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 556: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 589: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 610: Mr. KEATING and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 611: Mr. KEATING and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 628: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 630: Mr. DINGELL and Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 647: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 664: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 679: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 683: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 685: Mr. KEATING, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 688: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 713: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. COOK, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 721: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 763: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 764: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 776: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 778: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 792: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 794: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 795: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 845: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 847: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 851: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 853: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

- H.R. 855: Mr. GALLEG0.
- H.R. 858: Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 863: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
- H.R. 901: Mr. MAFFEI.
- H.R. 903: Mr. POMPEO.
- H.R. 924: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 938: Ms. KUSTER.
- H.R. 942: Mr. NUNES, Mr. CLAY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
- H.R. 946: Mr. HOLDING, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. RIBBLE.
- H.R. 949: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 952: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 956: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. VALADAO.
- H.R. 961: Ms. WATERS.
- H.R. 984: Mr. GIBSON.
- H.R. 997: Mr. SCALISE.
- H.R. 1014: Mrs. NOEM.
- H.R. 1015: Mr. GIBSON.
- H.R. 1019: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. ESTY.
- H.R. 1020: Mr. MEEKS.
- H.R. 1027: Ms. CHU.
- H.R. 1030: Mr. MCINTYRE.
- H.R. 1077: Mrs. WAGNER.
- H.R. 1091: Mr. HARPER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. BACHUS.
- H.R. 1094: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 1095: Mr. NUNNELEE.
- H.R. 1098: Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 1101: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 1125: Mr. OWENS.
- H.R. 1143: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 1146: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
- H.R. 1148: Mr. NOLAN.
- H.R. 1173: Mr. ELLISON.
- H.R. 1175: Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 1179: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 1180: Mr. NADLER, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. MENG, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
- H.R. 1186: Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
- H.R. 1199: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 1201: Mr. OLSON.
- H.R. 1250: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 1252: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. NOLAN.
- H.R. 1284: Ms. KUSTER.
- H.R. 1309: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
- H.R. 1321: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
- H.R. 1337: Mr. POMPEO.
- H.R. 1354: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. PEARCE.
- H.R. 1426: Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 1428: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 1429: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. ENYART.
- H.R. 1461: Mr. DENT.
- H.R. 1462: Mr. DENT.
- H.R. 1473: Mr. VARGAS.
- H.R. 1528: Ms. ESTY.
- H.R. 1531: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 1551: Mr. SHUSTER.
- H.R. 1552: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
- H.R. 1563: Mr. ENYART, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. DUFFY.
- H.R. 1590: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 1591: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
- H.R. 1601: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. ENYART.
- H.R. 1620: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
- H.R. 1645: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
- H.R. 1661: Mr. NOLAN.
- H.R. 1666: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
- H.R. 1667: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 1690: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 1717: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. REED, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Ms. ESTY.
- H.R. 1726: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
- H.R. 1731: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. GRIMM.
- H.R. 1733: Mr. MARINO and Mr. CAMP.
- H.R. 1739: Ms. TSONGAS.
- H.R. 1750: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
- H.R. 1761: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Ms. TSONGAS.
- H.R. 1771: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
- H.R. 1773: Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 1775: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 1779: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
- H.R. 1780: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
- H.R. 1787: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. NOLAN.
- H.R. 1795: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 1796: Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 1801: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 1812: Mr. ISRAEL.
- H.R. 1821: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico.
- H.R. 1824: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
- H.R. 1825: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
- H.R. 1827: Mr. ISRAEL.
- H.R. 1837: Mr. PAYNE and Ms. ESTY.
- H.R. 1838: Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 1851: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 1869: Mr. BARR and Mr. HULTGREN.
- H.R. 1878: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. LOEBSACK.
- H.R. 1890: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 1900: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
- H.R. 1905: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 1906: Mr. MORAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. HOLT.
- H.R. 1907: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. TIERNEY.
- H.R. 1910: Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 1920: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
- H.R. 1921: Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 1940: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
- H.R. 1943: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H.R. 1962: Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 1971: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
- H.R. 1984: Mr. LOEBSACK.
- H.R. 1991: Mr. ENGEL.
- H.R. 1995: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 1998: Ms. CHU and Mr. ISRAEL.
- H.R. 2000: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 2013: Mr. POMPEO.
- H.R. 2016: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 2019: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. LONG.
- H.R. 2026: Ms. KUSTER.
- H.R. 2028: Mr. COHEN and Mr. DEFazio.
- H.R. 2041: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
- H.R. 2044: Ms. CHU and Mr. SCHIFF.
- H.R. 2051: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 2053: Mrs. ELLMERS.
- H.R. 2084: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
- H.R. 2085: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. HECK of Washington.
- H.R. 2107: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 2116: Mr. COHEN and Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 2119: Ms. TSONGAS.
- H.R. 2134: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 2146: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. HIMES.
- H.R. 2189: Mrs. WALORSKI.
- H.R. 2199: Mr. KEATING.
- H.R. 2201: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H.R. 2203: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MICA, Mr. BARR, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATTI, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. GIBBS.
- H.R. 2241: Mr. POSEY and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 2273: Mr. LIPINSKI.
- H.R. 2283: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. MEEHAN.
- H.R. 2288: Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 2302: Mr. ELLISON.
- H.R. 2305: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 2309: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
- H.R. 2311: Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 2315: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
- H.R. 2324: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
- H.R. 2328: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. OLSON.
- H.R. 2330: Mr. WITTMAN.
- H.R. 2346: Mr. POMPEO.
- H.R. 2368: Ms. CHU.
- H.R. 2399: Mr. BARTON, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 2408: Mr. POMPEO.
- H.R. 2415: Mr. OLSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. RANGEL.
- H.R. 2419: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CHU, and Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 2422: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 2424: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 2429: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
- H.R. 2439: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 2445: Mr. YOHO.
- H.R. 2446: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
- H.R. 2453: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
- H.R. 2454: Mr. LIPINSKI.
- H.R. 2456: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
- H.R. 2457: Mr. KILMER and Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 2463: Mr. WELCH.
- H.R. 2474: Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 2475: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 2479: Mr. HIMES, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. BASS, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
- H.R. 2480: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. SCHRADER.
- H.R. 2483: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 2502: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. TITUS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
- H.R. 2504: Ms. NORTON, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 2506: Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 2510: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
- H.R. 2512: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 2523: Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 2537: Mr. LONG.
- H.R. 2542: Mr. LONG.
- H.R. 2560: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 2561: Mr. WALBERG and Ms. LEE of California.
- H.R. 2575: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 2578: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 2582: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2588: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2591: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 2607: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 2614: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2653: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 2656: Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2663: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2671: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 2679: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2682: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. LATTI, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HURT, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 2686: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2692: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2700: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2702: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2717: Mr. BENTIVOLIO and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2720: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2725: Mr. OLSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 2727: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2738: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2740: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2757: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. WATT.
H.R. 2761: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2764: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2765: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2766: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2770: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2772: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2773: Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 2774: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2775: Mr. MARINO, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. JONES, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LANCE, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2776: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2780: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2785: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2789: Mr. JONES, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2797: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 2799: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 2801: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 2805: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2806: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2809: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. COTTON, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 2810: Mr. BARTON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 2821: Ms. CHU, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2822: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2823: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2824: Mr. CRAMER and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 2825: Mr. KILMER and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2826: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 2837: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 2839: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 2845: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2848: Mr. FALCOMAVALGA.
H.R. 2849: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2851: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 2852: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2854: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2865: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2870: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 2875: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2878: Mr. COHEN and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2882: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2884: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2887: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2889: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2901: Ms. BASS, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2907: Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2913: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 2917: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2924: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2925: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2931: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2932: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2933: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2936: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2937: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 2939: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2955: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2956: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2958: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2967: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 2975: Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2976: Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. POMPEO.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. POMPEO.
H.J. Res. 16: Mr. YOHO.
H.J. Res. 43: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.J. Res. 46: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.J. Res. 55: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr.

CRAWFORD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. SALMON.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. PALLONE.

H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H. Res. 36: Mr. SIMPSON.

H. Res. 72: Mr. OLSON.

H. Res. 101: Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Res. 109: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H. Res. 112: Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 119: Mr. HURT.

H. Res. 147: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H. Res. 188: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 208: Mr. POLIS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 218: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H. Res. 231: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Res. 250: Mr. GOHMERT.

H. Res. 254: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. BACHUS.

H. Res. 281: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. POSEY.

H. Res. 285: Mr. POLIS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. SERRANO.

H. Res. 293: Mr. VARGAS.

H. Res. 301: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H. Res. 302: Mr. TURNER and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H. Res. 304: Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Res. 307: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H. Res. 308: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Res. 313: Mr. HARPER.

H. Res. 314: Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 319: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. NADLER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2134: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 4, July 30, 2013, by Mr. STEVE STOCKMAN on House Resolution 306, was signed by the following Members: Steve Stockman, Paul C. Broun, and Louie Gohmert.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 3 by Mr. VAN HOLLEN on House Resolution 174: Walter B. Jones.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO CHEF VINCENT HENDERSON, MOBILE'S CULINARY AMBASSADOR

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a local legend, who—through his many talents—introduced the culinary treasures of Mobile, Alabama to the world. On July 5, 2013, we lost Chef Vincent Henderson, but we will always fondly remember his warm smile, passion for living and the best creole cooking on the Gulf Coast.

A native of Mobile, "Vince" Henderson grew up surrounded by an appreciation for cooking. His father owned the original Best Grill in Mobile. In an account published in the Mobile's Lagniappe newspaper, Chef Henderson talked about those early days that had such an influence upon his life as Mobile's culinary ambassador. "As a young child, on Saturdays some of my brothers and sisters, we would sit down with a 100-pound box of shrimp. It would take us all day, outside, to wash and sort the shrimp into three sizes. We knew which ones to put aside for frying, for gumbo and other uses."

Not only did Vince continue to glean cooking knowledge from his father's restaurant business throughout his childhood, but he also widened his experience by engaging in various other jobs, ranging from waiting at multiple restaurants to washing dishes in Mobile's first Chinese restaurant. He managed to have multiple side jobs throughout his vigorous pursuit of the math and chemistry degree he earned during college, showing his determination and his love for the culinary world. These jobs were merely the beginning for Vince.

Due to his persistence and his vast gustatory experience, Vince rapidly ascended up the ranks of the culinary world. His exquisite Cajun cooking allowed him to quickly become a notable name, particularly in Washington, D.C. Alexis Herman, former Secretary of Labor and friend of Vince's, commissioned him to cater events for the Democratic National Committee. This entre gave Vince the opportunity to expose many other prominent figures and organizations to his authentic, creole cooking. He was hired to prepare his unique Gulf Coast delicacies for the events of the Congressional Black Caucus, the former First Lady Hillary Clinton, and a famous basketball player, Dikembe Motombo. One of the most notable highlights of Vince's career, he was the first African American caterer to serve inside the White House.

Vince eventually returned to his native Mobile after distinguishing himself as one of the most prominent chefs the city has ever seen. Requests for his culinary talents were unceasing upon his return, and he was even commis-

sioned to return to D.C. in 2010 to cater a meal for Surgeon General Regina Benjamin. These prestigious examples of Vince's work are merely a scratch on the surface of all of the people who had the privilege of enjoying Vince, and his delectable meals, throughout his years.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of South Alabama, I would like to personally extend my condolences to Vince's beloved brothers, sisters, nieces, nephews, and multitudes of friends for their loss. You are all in our thoughts and prayers.

CONGRATULATIONS TO HEALTH DELIVERY INC. FOR 44 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE—HEALTH DELIVERY, INC. IS RECOGNIZED DURING NATIONAL HEALTH CENTER WEEK FOR 44 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating and recognizing a locally-owned small business in my district, Health Delivery Inc., for 44 years of dedicated service.

Health Delivery Inc. is a community health center located in the Fifth Congressional District. For 44 years this community health center has helped many residents of the Fifth Congressional District and I ask the 113th Congress to join me in recognizing them for their hard work and dedication.

Health centers are located in underserved areas and locally-controlled by patient-majority boards, making each health center responsive to the needs of the individual community it serves. The health center model has been proven to be an effective means of overcoming barriers to access for the medically underserved and in doing so, improving health care outcomes and reducing health care costs.

As locally owned and operated small businesses, health centers also serve as critical economic engines helping to power local economies. In these difficult economic times, health centers are economic drivers in their communities. This year, over 400 communities nationwide submitted applications seeking a health center, for an anticipated 25 awards. This vividly demonstrates an overwhelming demand for access to comprehensive primary care across the nation.

The services provided by Health Delivery Inc. greatly benefit Michigan and the Fifth Congressional District by delivering comprehensive, high quality and accessible health care. Health Delivery Inc., is committed to expanding to meet the needs of the communities

they serve and to grow their reach to serve every individual who currently lacks regular access to a health care home.

It is fitting, Mr. Speaker, that Health Delivery's anniversary falls close to National Health Center Week. National Health Center Week offers the opportunity to recognize America's health centers, their staff, board members, and all those responsible for the continued success and growth of the program since its creation almost 50 years ago.

During National Health Center Week, we recognize the multitude of ways in which America's Health Centers are transforming care in local communities. I encourage every Member of Congress to visit their local health centers and celebrate the important role they play in serving our communities.

CONGRATULATING DR. CHRIS COOPER ON RECEIVING THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA BOARD OF GOVERNORS AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Chris Cooper, associate professor and head of the Department of Political Science and Public Affairs at Western Carolina University (WCU), for receiving the University of North Carolina Board of Governors Award for Excellence in Teaching.

A faculty member at WCU since 2002, Dr. Cooper regularly wins rave reviews from his students and praise from his faculty colleagues for his engaging and dynamic teaching style.

In addition to his innovative teaching techniques in the classroom, Dr. Cooper is known for playing an instrumental role in implementing a new master's-level capstone experience at WCU where students demonstrate their competence in public affairs by working directly with community partners.

An active researcher, Dr. Cooper has written numerous articles, including editorial columns for newspapers across the state, and made many television and radio appearances due to his expertise on political issues.

Dr. Cooper won the WCU Distinguished Scholar Award in 2011 and the WCU Chancellor's Award for Engaged Teaching in 2007.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the entire 11th District of North Carolina, I congratulate Dr. Cooper on being named one of the best teachers in the University of North Carolina system and thank him for his commitment to the students of Western Carolina University.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

RECOGNIZING THE HEROIC SERVICE AND COMMITMENT OF PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JAMES CHESTER MOHN

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Private First Class James Chester Mohn who went missing in action in the Himalayan Mountains on June 6, 1943. I am honored to share these brief remarks as part of his final farewell, today, August 4, 2013.

James Chester Mohn was a Tacoma area native. Growing up in the Fern Hill area, he graduated from Lincoln High School with the class of 1939. Shortly thereafter, he was drafted in the Army Air Corps and worked as a radioman on C47-A cargo transport planes. Loaded with munitions, Mohn and his crew left Lalmanirhat, India on the 25th of May, 1943 and they were reported missing in action on June 6, 1943.

In November of 2010, nearly 70 years after the cargo plane was last seen, remnants of the plane were discovered and the plane was identified. Now, we join Gladys Terry, the sister of James Mohn and Virgil James Holman, Mohn's nephew, in celebration of his life while paying respect for his ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to help VFW Post 91 and the greater Tacoma community in their acknowledgement of this local serviceman. In addition, I am grateful to the Lincoln High School R.O.T.C. and the Puyallup Tribe Veterans Committee for their participation on this occasion.

With the final farewell of James Mohn, we are reminded of the enormous sacrifices that the servicemen and women of our armed forces make each day for the safety of Americans at home and abroad. While it is with heavy hearts that we recognize this unfortunate loss of life, this occasion also gives us the opportunity to again thank the men and women who help protect and defend our nation and our way of life.

I am pleased to recognize James Chester Mohn and all of our servicemen and women today, who continue to honor our nation with their bravery, loyalty, and devotion.

CONGRATULATING MR. AND MRS. MARCINE AND NITA LOU WEBB

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary accomplishments of Mr. and Mrs. Marcine and Nita Lou Webb of San Angelo, Texas. Over the past three decades, Mr. and Mrs. Webb have made it their mission to visit all 50 state capitol buildings throughout the United States. Their 35-year journey culminated in June when they traveled to Augusta, Maine.

Their adventure took them from the dusty West Texas plains to every corner of this na-

tion. It has given them the opportunity to witness firsthand the vast beauty found throughout our country and experience the people, traditions, and history that make America great.

The most endearing part of their story is that they made this journey together, side by side, with the help and support of their family and friends. The latest visit to Augusta was an early wedding anniversary gift from their loving children Becky, Penny, Dennis, and Marcie to help them celebrate their 65th anniversary together on August 28, an astonishing feat on its own.

Their devotion over the years is a testimony to their love of our country, to each other, and their family. As they gather with family and friends to celebrate this occasion, may they be blessed by their wisdom and learn from their experiences. I congratulate them on their accomplishing their long sought-after goal and their many years together. I wish them many more.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT GENERAL DOUGLAS H. OWENS ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AFTER MORE THAN 33 YEARS OF FAITHFUL SERVICE

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and congratulate Lieutenant General Douglas H. Owens on the occasion of his retirement from the United States Air Force after more than 33 years of faithful service. Lieutenant General Owens will retire on October 1, 2013, concluding his duty as the Vice Commander of Air Education and Training Command, Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph, Texas.

General Owens is a command pilot with more than 3,100 hours in various aircraft, including the T-37, T-38, T-41, T-6 and A/OA-10. He flew combat missions in the first A-10 squadron deployed to operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. He has commanded at the squadron, group and wing levels, and served in a variety of operational and staff positions. These include assignments in the Headquarters U.S. Air Force Checkmate Division and Operations Directorate on the Joint Staff, supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and other operations worldwide. He has also served as a numbered air force vice commander and as deputy commander of a joint task force for Pacific Command. General Owens has served five tours in the Pacific, including an assignment as the Vice Commander of Pacific Air Forces supporting combat readiness, theater security cooperation, enhanced force posture and presence throughout the theater.

General Owens is a 1980 graduate of the U.S. Air Force Academy, and obtained his Masters Degree from the University of Phoenix in 1988. He is a graduate of Squadron Officer School, Air Command and Staff College,

and National War College where he earned a second Masters degree in 1998. General and Mrs. Owens have two adult children: John and Michael, and four grandchildren. Both John and Michael have continued the family tradition of service and are also currently serving as officers in the Air Force.

Among his many military duties that spanned his career and included 18 Permanent Change of Station moves, General Owens served as the 36th Wing Commander at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam. It is during this assignment that I had the opportunity to get to know both General Owens and his wife Teresa. During his tenure as the Wing Commander he was responsible for the conduct of the Pacific Command's Continuous Bomber Presence, Theater Security Packages, numerous exercises supporting the region, and contingency response operations from Andersen Air Force Base. General Owens was responsible for the well-being of more than 8,000 military and civilian personnel on Andersen AFB and also was tasked to ensure the successful employment, deployment, integration, and enabling of air and space forces from the most forward sovereign U.S. Air Force base in the Pacific. His leadership was critical during the stand-up of Joint Region Marianas and during the planning phases for the realignment of Marines from Okinawa to Guam. He also continued to ensure successful implementation of certain portions of the current Pacific Airpower Resiliency strategy. Additionally, his support of the local community on Guam was extraordinary, and I am very thankful for the lasting relationships he built between the military and civilian community which remain strong today.

I again congratulate Lieutenant General Owens on the occasion of his retirement. I join the people of Guam in commending him for his exceptional service to our great nation and thanking him for his contributions to our community. Although General Owens and Teresa will be greatly missed, I wish them both all the best as they transition to the next stage of their life and enjoy a long and happy retirement together.

IN HONOR OF THE APTOS HIGH SCHOOL ROBOTICS CLUB

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Aptos High School Robotics Club—winners of the 2013 International Marine Advanced Technology Education (MATE) Underwater Robotics Competition. The club, which independently designed, built, operated, and competed with their remote operated vehicle (ROV) in this year's competition, has won the MATE competition for the second time in three years. This year's original design, "The Kracken", is a deep-water ROV engineered to maintain ocean observing systems. This fully functional submersible, a collaborative effort by fourteen bright and young scientific minds, demonstrates that people of all ages have much to contribute to the science and technology necessary to better understand our treasured oceans.

The MATE competition challenges K–12, community college, and university students from all over the world to design and build ROVs to tackle missions modeled after real world modern science scenarios. The competition requires students to think of themselves as “entrepreneurs” and transform their teams into companies that manufacture, market and sell “products.”

In addition to engineering their ROVs, the students are required to prepare technical reports, poster displays and engineering presentations that are delivered to working professionals. This structure allows competitors to experience the “real world” aspects of bringing such products to the marketplace; not only highlighting the importance of ocean observation and exploration, but also the intrapersonal and professional skills needed to effectively contribute in a professional environment.

Mr. Speaker, I am immensely proud of these talented and hardworking young oceans leaders from my congressional district and congratulate them on their remarkable achievement. These students have proven, on an international level, that the innovative mind and entrepreneurial spirit is alive and well in all generations of Americans. Constituents in my district have long recognized the value of our oceans and coasts and the Aptos High Robotics Team has developed an important prototype that will help scientists gather more ocean observing data. I commend the team for their efforts and encourage them to continue to pursue their passion for ocean science and exploration.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FARMER'S MARKET WEEK

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Farmer's Market Week, which will take place August 4, 2013 through August 10, 2013.

In New Hampshire, the agricultural industry contributes nearly one billion dollars to our local economy every year. With over 400,000 acres of land across the Granite State devoted to everything from timber operations and greenhouses to dairy farms and apple orchards, agriculture is an integral part of our landscape and history. I am proud to be the first Representative from New Hampshire to serve on the House Agriculture Committee in seventy years.

Farmer's markets are a vital part of our communities in New Hampshire, connecting the farmers who grow our food with the families who consume it. In fact, farmer's markets could be found in New England all the way back to colonial times. Currently, there are nearly one hundred farmer's markets throughout the Granite State, from small summertime gatherings to year-round markets—and the number is still growing. Many of these markets were created by individual citizens with a passion for serving their community and the willingness to roll up their sleeves and make it happen.

Farmer's markets strengthen our communities by supporting local farmers and providing consumers with fresh, nutritious food. It's a win for our economy, a win for our health, and a win for the environment. That's the New Hampshire way.

The growing number and popularity of these markets is truly a testament of the commitment that Granite Staters have to our communities. National Farmer's Market Week recognizes the important role that farmer's markets play in our food system, and I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the nearly 8,000 farmer's markets across our great nation.

SEQUESTRATION'S EFFECT ON PANCREATIC CANCER RESEARCH

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year President Obama signed into law The Recalcitrant Cancer Research Act. This law takes an important step to accelerate research on pancreatic cancer and other cancers with the highest mortality rates and for which there has been little progress on diagnosis or treatment. In recent decades, steady progress has been made in improving the survival rate for many forms of cancer, but today only 6% of individuals diagnosed with pancreatic cancer will survive more than five years. This staggering statistic, which has not improved in 40 years, only begins to tell the story of the enormous toll this disease has taken on these patients and their families.

Under the new law, the National Cancer Institute at the NIH will develop a scientific framework to attack pancreatic, lung and other deadly cancers. The NCI has started this process by convening a working group of experts in the field of pancreatic cancer research and releasing an initial report with recommendations about high-priority research areas. When fully implemented, this law holds promise to lay the foundation for the development of better diagnostics and treatments that pancreatic cancer patients desperately need.

Now, sequestration is putting this progress in doubt. In one fell swoop, the sequester chopped \$1.55 billion from the NIH budget. Even before these cuts took effect in the middle of this fiscal year, the threat of the sequester caused NIH to delay or trim down the size of research grants. Now that it is in effect, the sequester has impacted every area of medical research and every Institute and Center within NIH. NIH-funded researchers in labs across the country will receive 700 fewer research grants this year than last year. And the bite of the Budget Control Act's cuts to NIH could deepen next year if Congress does not correct it.

The Director of NIH, Dr. Francis Collins, has said that “if the Budget Control Act—imposed caps on discretionary programs continue, and NIH funding is reduced proportionally over the next 10 years, funding will decline by about \$19 billion. The consequences will be harmful to scientific progress and to American leadership in science.”

The erosion of NIH's budget represents bad policy and missed opportunities. Advancements in science and health care take time and sustained funding. Breakthroughs occur only after years of incremental gains. The sequester is disrupting and delaying the efforts of our nation's leading researchers and scientists who are toiling to understand complex and unsolved medical problems. The squeeze of the sequester is also jeopardizing the future biomedical research workforce by making it more difficult to recruit and train the next generation of scientists and bio-engineers.

The science and research community is sounding the alarm. Congress needs to provide strong, stable funding for NIH in order for our global leadership in science and biomedical research to continue and for our researchers' discoveries to benefit patients as soon as possible. Let's not allow ideological budget battles to jeopardize our country's investments in the health of our citizens any longer. I urge my colleagues to listen to the experts, work together, and take action to replace the arbitrary cuts of sequestration with a balanced plan that reflects public priorities and common sense.

RECOGNIZING THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE OF THE HONORABLE JO BONNER

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished service of my good friend and colleague from Alabama, JO BONNER. Both JO and I are privileged to represent portions of the Gulf Coast. Our constituents in Alabama's First Congressional District and Florida's First Congressional District share inextricable bonds built on family, friendship and faith.

I have had the opportunity to work closely with JO over the past decade, and I can truly say that he is one of the hardest working lawmakers here in Washington. He is also a man of unimpeachable character, and his integrity as a public servant was reflected in his tenure as Chairman of the House Ethics Committee. Serving as Chairman of such an important House committee is a great challenge, but JO has served in some of the most challenging roles here in the House, including as a member of the Appropriations Committee and as Assistant Whip.

Despite taking on demanding leadership roles in Congress, JO has never stopped fighting on behalf of his constituents to help lure economic development to the Gulf Coast. JO helped lead the Gulf effort to bring the newly opened Airbus A320 assembly plant to Mobile, which is the company's first American production facility. The thousands of jobs that the Airbus plant has brought to the Gulf Coast come on top of other efforts led by JO to promote the Gulf Coast as a region open for business. In 2007, JO was a crucial figure in the construction of the \$4.8 billion ThyssenKrupp Steel plant, which brought thousands of jobs to the area, and he has also helped already

established businesses, such as Austal USA, expand and create new jobs. JO's unwavering efforts helped businesses create thousands of jobs for both his constituents and mine, and the entire Gulf Coast region will continue to benefit from these projects for decades to come.

JO has been a leader in the Gulf community in good times, helping to promote economic growth and job creation; however, he has also been there during devastating disasters such as the recovery from Hurricane Ivan in 2005, and, most recently, the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill in 2010. JO worked closely with federal, state, and local authorities to coordinate the emergency response efforts, while simultaneously working to hold BP accountable through the Gulf Coast Claims Facility. Here in Washington, JO and I worked closely with other members from the Gulf states to draft and pass the RESTORE Act, which will bring billions of dollars of fine money from the oil spill back to the impacted communities for economic and ecological restoration. JO's constant leadership and work on behalf of his constituents have left an indelible mark on his district, and his tireless work has helped assure a more prosperous future for citizens along the Gulf.

We will all be sad to see JO leave the House, and I will particularly miss his commonsense approach to legislating, but we also know that his service to the people of the State of Alabama is far from over. JO's new position as vice chancellor of government relations and economic development for the University of Alabama System will allow him to continue his distinguished service to the people of Alabama. Although as a University of Florida graduate, I think I can speak for the entire SEC, when I say that the last thing that the University of Alabama needs is more world-class talent. JO's track record of success here in the House will no doubt be an invaluable asset to the University of Alabama system and its students.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the whole House I extend my deep gratitude to JO for his years of distinguished service on behalf of his constituents and the entire Gulf Coast that we call home. My wife Vicki and I wish JO, his wife Jane, their daughter Lee, and their son Robins all the best as they begin this new chapter in their lives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHELE BACHMANN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, during roll No. 445, on the passage of H.R. 367, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013, I was called away from the floor for official business and was unable to vote on the final passage. I intended to vote "aye."

RECOGNIZING JIM CARMICHAEL'S COMMITMENT AND SERVICE TO THE KITSAP COUNTY REGION OF WASHINGTON STATE

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jim Carmichael, a recent recipient of the Kitsap Economic Development Alliance's Lifetime Achievement Award. For 30 years, Mr. Carmichael has worked to advance the economic interests of Kitsap County through steadfast service to his community. As a result of his dedication, Mr. Carmichael has had a profound influence on the economic development of Kitsap County and the surrounding region.

Mr. Carmichael began his work in the county in 1977, when he was hired as the chief lender for Kitsap Bank. By 1985, he was its President and Chief Operating Officer. Kitsap Bank has thrived under his stewardship, expanding throughout the region and creating good, living-wage jobs. Due to the foresight and judgment of Jim Carmichael, Kitsap Bank successfully navigated the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression.

Mr. Speaker, as an active member of the Kitsap Economic Development Alliance, and as its former board president, Mr. Carmichael worked to foster local entrepreneurship, attract business to the region, and educate the community about the benefits of development. As a board member of the YMCA, he worked to promote the well-being of some of our most vulnerable citizens. As the head of Kitsap Bank, Mr. Carmichael ensured the availability of lending opportunities, making our communities stronger, healthier, and more self-reliant.

Mr. Carmichael has always been someone that leaders throughout our community and state—including yours truly—could contact to better understand financial issues, economic development opportunities, or other civic matters.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of these great accomplishments that he has received this special award. Today, I can say with confidence that the careful judgment of Mr. Carmichael, and his extraordinary commitment to the promotion of the public good, has made our state a better place to live and do business. I am pleased to recognize his service today.

THE 40TH VOTE TO REPEAL AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, there is something extraordinary taking place. Not only are we implementing the Affordable Care Act across 50 states benefitting hundreds of millions of people in our country, but there is simultaneously an effort in the House of Representatives to repeal the law for the 40th time.

Imagine ... this is not the fourth time, but the 40th time that Republicans are moving to take away rights to which Americans are legally entitled. These are the rights signed into law by the President and confirmed by the United States Supreme Court.

There's never been such an effort in Congress in the history of our country where a measure has been taken up 40 times. I believe my friends on the other side of the aisle are on the wrong side of history.

I would like to highlight this phenomenon through the lens of constituents and the rights they have and the rights that my Republican colleagues want to take away from them.

They want to reopen the prescription drug donut hole that was created through the program that they supported, costing seniors thousands of out-of-pocket expenses a year.

They want to take away from children the ability to stay on their parents' insurance policy up to the age of 26.

They want to take away lifetime limit caps on insurance policies. How can anyone argue that lifetime limit caps were ever good policy?

They want to take away preventive services from Americans like mammograms and colonoscopies.

They want to take away health care premiums that are actually spent on medical care instead of advertising.

They want to take away the right to plain language explanations of plan benefits.

And most of all, they want to take away the rights of my constituents to health insurance for those with preexisting conditions.

Thomas Jefferson said in 1808 that "great innovations should not be forced on slender majorities." I think an overwhelming number of American people would say they are in favor of the rights they have under the Affordable Care Act, versus going back to a time of discriminatory practices of private insurers.

THE IMPACT OF U.S. INTERNATIONAL WATER PROGRAMS ON HEALTH

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, two years ago, the subcommittee that I chair held a hearing on U.S. Africa programs and found that the unitary water budget line item had been "zeroed out." Needless to say, members of our subcommittee were astonished that such an important segment of our foreign policy was seemingly being abandoned. We were assured that the money for international water programs did not disappear, but was merely redistributed among several programs. The hearing that we held yesterday was intended to look at how effective this strategy has been and to look at how our government's international water programs will be implemented in the future.

Water is undeniably important to health and the very survival of human beings. Water comprises more than two thirds of human body weight, and without water, we would die in a few days. The human brain is 95% water,

blood is 82% and lungs 90%. A mere 2% drop in our body's water supply can trigger signs of dehydration: fuzzy short-term memory, trouble with basic math, and difficulty focusing on smaller print, such as a computer screen. Water is important to the mechanics of the human body. The body cannot work without it, just as a car cannot run without gas and oil.

It is, therefore, troubling that so many people in the world do not have ready access to water. According to a 2012 report released by the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Children's Fund, roughly 780 million people around the world lack access to clean drinking water, and an estimated 2.5 billion people (roughly 40% of the world's population) are without access to safe sanitation facilities. Tainted water and unsanitary practices are at the root of many health problems in the developing world and are hindering U.S. and international global health efforts.

In a June 27th hearing on neglected diseases, the subcommittee heard testimony on the WHO list of 17 neglected tropical diseases—three of which are primarily water-borne. However, there are dozens of other diseases transmitted through contaminated water, including botulism, cholera, dysentery, hepatitis A, polio and SARS.

WHO estimates that more than 14,000 people die daily from water-borne illnesses, which cause:

More than 1 billion cases of intestinal worms, 1.4 million child diarrheal deaths and 500,000 deaths from malaria.

Moreover, water is at the root of international conflict. A growing number of conflicts are exacerbated by limited access to water. Increasing demand and greater variability in rainfall can inflame tensions, such as the concern Egypt has expressed about the impact of the Nile's flow due to Ethiopia's proposed Grand Renaissance Dam.

Although water circulates, returning to availability through various natural processes as evaporation, clouds and rain, only about 2.5 percent of the planet's water is fresh rather than salty, and less than half that amount is available in rivers, lakes and underground aquifers. Pollution consumes some of the available water from industrial or agricultural runoff. An estimated 40 percent of U.S. rivers and 46 percent of U.S. lakes are considered unfit for fishing, swimming or drinking, and we are a developed country with significant resources. Developing countries too often don't keep adequate track of the extent of pollution nor have the ability to adequately do something about it. Other constraints on the global supply of water include efforts to privatize water systems in the developing world and the encroachment of salt water into fresh water systems.

The challenges to ensuring that clean water is available to people in developing countries are serious. That is why new legislation is being developed—The Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013—intended to support the original 2005 act by strengthening and refining its implementation. The new bill calls on USAID to continue to observe the Water for the Poor Act of 2005 in the implementation of its Water and Development Strategy. The bill would elevate the positions of our first two witnesses today—the USAID Global

Water Coordinator and the State Department Special Advisor for Water Resources to report directly to the Administrator of USAID and Secretary of State respectively. Among other provisions, the bill requires local consultation on water management and usage and encourages local contracting on water, sanitation and hygiene projects. I am co-sponsoring this legislation because water is life, and we must be as efficient as possible in our efforts to provide clean water to those in need worldwide.

RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a special occasion for the University of Central Florida (UCF). The University of Central Florida celebrated their 50th anniversary on June 10, 2013.

On June 10, 1963, during the state of Florida's thirty-ninth legislative session, Florida Governor Farris Bryant signed Legislative Bill 125 that officially created a new state university in the east central section of Florida. The Board of Controls approved the site for the university near the Orange and Seminole Counties' line on January 24, 1964. However, the future site of the university would remain untouched for years as the Florida legislature struggled to provide construction funds.

In December 1965, Dr. Charles Millican became the university's first and only employee. Dr. Millican and the university's first offices were above a drugstore located in downtown Orlando at the corner of Church Street and Orange Avenue. On January 17, 1966, the university was named Florida Technological University (FTU), and three days later on January 20, 1966, the first prospective student inquiry arrived via postcard from Gaithersburg, Maryland. The following year on March 19, 1967, Florida Governor Claude Kirk and over 2,000 supporters formally inaugurated the groundbreaking of FTU.

In April 1968, the official seal, the Pegasus, was approved as the university's logo and FTU received their first research grant from NASA for \$12,500. Opened on June 24, 1968, FTU's library became the first functioning building on campus and housed the administration, staff offices, library and classrooms. In the fall of 1968, the first four residence halls opened to 432 students. The Student Union would not be constructed until twelve years later in 1980.

On January 31, 1968, FTU's first catalog was published. A few months later on October 7, 1968, FTU's first edition of their student newspaper, later named "The FuTUre," published that FTU had fifty-five degree programs, 1,948 enrolled students, 90 instructors and 150 staff members. The Orlando Sentinel went on to report that October 7, 1968, will forever be remembered as the day that changed Orlando and Central Florida. In 1969, the university received its first computer, a "Model 1200," that was operated by Dr. Harry Poole.

Walter Komanksi ran unopposed and was elected as the first Student Government President on March 9, 1969. In November 1969, the first formal Greek life rush was held for FTU's first sorority, Phi Beta Phi, and first fraternity, Pi Kappa Epsilon. On November 21, 1969, the university's basketball team recorded its first win when they defeated Massey Institute, 99–38. The following summer, on June 14, 1970, FTU conducted their first commencement ceremony for 423 graduating seniors.

On December 7, 1970, FTU changed their logo and announced that the Knights of the Pegasus would become the university's new mascot. The Alumni Association was established the following year on March 5, 1971, and the first Distinguished Alumni Award would be awarded eight years later in March 1979 to Dick Batchelor, Class of 1971. Six days after the Alumni Association was established, on March 11, 1971, FTU celebrated its first homecoming at a basketball game against the Florida Institute of Technology. Five years later, on December 1, 1976, students buried a bicentennial time capsule on campus. The time capsule is to be opened in 2026.

Florida Governor Reubin Askew signed legislation on December 6, 1978, which changed the name of FTU to the University of Central Florida (UCF). Following the university's name change, on January 15, 1979, Trevor Colbourn was inaugurated as UCF's second president. During President Colbourn's first months, he and Athletics Director Jack O'Leary approved the development of the UCF football program to become part of NCAA Division III. On September 22, 1979, UCF traveled to play its first football game against St. Leo University and won 21–0. Continuing UCF's intercollegiate athletic development, the Wayne Densch Sports Center was dedicated to UCF on October 22, 1986. Years later, in 1996, UCF's athletics would move to NCAA Division I–A. And, ten years after moving to NCAA Division I–A, the University of Central Florida Cheerleading Squad would become National Champions.

In March of 1992, Dr. John C. Hitt became the third President of the University of Central Florida, and has been serving the UCF community as President for over 20 years. I had the personal honor of working with Dr. Hitt while serving as a member of the Board of Trustees for UCF. Under Dr. Hitt's leadership, UCF has planned and won approval for a new college of medicine, doubled enrollment while enhancing the quality of academic offerings, increasing the number of doctoral degrees awarded each year, and expanded research funding.

Continuing their development, on May 1, 1993, UCF became an official member of the nation's oldest higher education association, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. In 1994, President Hitt formed a committee to create a new design for UCF's mascot, and thus "Knightro" was born. "Knightro" made his first appearance as the university's new mascot at a football game on November 19, 1994. The following November, the first UCF Spirit Splash would take place when students entered the forbidden Reflecting Pond on campus during homecoming festivities. Today, the UCF Spirit

Splash is considered to be one of the best collegiate traditions in Florida.

At the new student convocation in August 2001, President John C. Hitt debuted the University of Central Florida Creed and began a new tradition for the university. The UCF Creed developed a value system for the students, faculty and staff to adopt, share and incorporate into all aspects of university life. Six years later in September 2007, the grand openings of the UCF Arena and the Bright House Networks Stadium took place just in time for the 2007–2008 athletic seasons.

During the 2013 State of Florida Legislative Session, Florida Senate Resolution 1780 extended congratulations to the faculty, administration, staff, student, and alumni of the University of Central Florida on the occasion of their 50th anniversary and recognized March 20, 2013, as "UCF Day" in Florida.

Today, with over 190,000 alumni and as a leader in academics and research, the University of Central Florida is the largest university in the state of Florida and the second largest university in the United States. UCF students and alumni have come from all fifty states nationwide and over 145 countries. As one of the nation's most dynamic universities offering 212 degree programs and 18 study abroad programs, the University of Central Florida's quality of academic offerings is remarkable.

I commend UCF for their leadership, dedication and accomplishments. On behalf of the people of Central Florida, it is my pleasure to recognize and congratulate UCF on this momentous occasion. May their 50 years of dedication to the classroom and the community inspire many to follow in their footsteps.

CONGRATULATING THE VAIL SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR THEIR STRAIGHT A REPORT CARD

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Vail School District on the high honor of receiving a "Straight A" report card from the Arizona Department of Education. This is an extraordinary accomplishment.

Vail School District was founded over one hundred years ago as a one-room schoolhouse in the middle of a ranching community at a water stop on the Southern Pacific Railroad. Over the last century, the district has grown to serve a population over a four hundred square mile area in southern Arizona. It currently serves twelve thousand and continues to expand, with an eighteenth school under construction.

The Vail community has shown strong support of its schools, staff, and teachers. This has played an important role in helping the district achieve its remarkable success.

The mission of the Vail School District is to provide parents with safe and nurturing school communities where their children can obtain a quality education. Such a dedication to proven instructional practices and great care for the students has led to the accolades we celebrate today.

This success would not have been possible without the exceptional leadership of Superintendent Calvin Baker; the school board, Claudia Anderson, Randy Kinkade, Margaret Burkholder, Jim Coulter, and Debbie King; and the dedicated staff and teachers of the district. I am proud to represent such an outstanding public school district which is a model of what can be accomplished by providing an environment and education that prepares our children for future success.

ON THE OCCASION OF ALLAN GILMOUR'S RETIREMENT FROM THE PRESIDENCY OF WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, Allan Gilmour, the President of Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan, for his lifetime of service to the people of Michigan in both the public and private sectors. In August, Allan will be stepping down from the presidency of Wayne State, where he has been since his appointment as Interim President on January 18, 2011.

In his more than two-year tenure as Wayne State's President, he has focused on transforming the school's position within the Greater Detroit community. Among his top initiatives have been to enhance the quality of education both in academic and practical settings, increase interdisciplinary research, and strengthen Wayne State's ties to Michigan's business community. Having worked in the private sector for many decades, Allan understands the significant connections between academic institutions that develop the leaders and researchers of the future and the business community that relies on the talent, innovative thinking, and dedication of young adults as they join the workforce. The construction of a state-of-the-art Multidisciplinary Biomedical Research Building, where researchers from the entire spectrum of natural scientific fields can interact to solve complex biological questions, is just the latest example of projects that have occurred under Allan's leadership.

While Allan's work at Wayne State is impressive, it is just his most recent endeavor; prior to his tenure as Wayne State's President, Allen worked for Ford Motor Company for almost forty years. Allan's story is one of dedication and hard work, that saw him grow from a Financial Analyst when he joined Ford in 1960 to become Ford Motor Company's Chief Financial Officer from 1986 to 1987 and then again from March 2002 to July 2003. During his time at Ford he also served as its President from March 1990 to January 1993. In his leadership positions at Ford, Allan made a tremendous impact on an organization whose products are vital to continued economic vitality of our nation.

Even with all of his professional success and the impact he has made on Michigan in his professional roles, nowhere has Allan's commitment to his neighbors, friends, and his state been greater than in his philanthropic en-

deavors. Currently, Allan serves a Chairman for the Community Foundation of Southeast Michigan, taking a leadership role in a non-profit that has invested substantial resources into the revitalization of the Greater Detroit region. Allan also serves on boards for the Detroit Regional Chamber of Commerce, the Downtown Detroit Partnership, the Detroit Zoo, the Karmanos Cancer Institute, and Midtown Detroit. Each of these organizations is dedicated to improving the lives of Michigan residents and vitality of Southeast Michigan. With his experience and expertise, Allan continues to be a strong and effective advocate for the people, businesses and communities of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the profound impact Allan Gilmour has made on Michigan and, specifically, the Greater Detroit region. I am fortunate to count Allan as a friend, and even more fortunately as a trusted advisor. I wish Allan and his partner, Eric Jergens, well as he enters a new chapter in his life, and I know that he will continue changing the lives of Michigan residents for many years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DENNIS A. ROSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit clarification for the Official Record regarding my recorded vote for Amendment No. 6, offered by my colleague Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, to H.R. 1582 on Thursday August 1, 2013. My recorded vote was "no", which was done in error. I would like to clarify that my intended vote on Amendment No. 6 to H.R. 1582, the Energy Consumers Relief Act, was a "yes".

RECOGNIZING ED STERN'S COMMITMENT AND SERVICE TO KITSAP COUNTY REGION OF WASHINGTON STATE

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ed Stern, Kitsap Economic Development Alliance's 2013 Economic Development Champion of the Year. Mr. Stern's vision and tireless service have created substantive opportunities for local, regional and statewide development.

Mr. Stern has spent his entire adult life working for the benefit of his community. For over 25 years, he has spearheaded economic development in the region. Mr. Stern currently serves on Poulsbo's City Council, sits on the boards of the Kitsap Economic Development Alliance and the Association of Washington Cities, and serves the Puget Sound Regional Council as chair of the Central Puget Sound Economic Development District.

Mr. Speaker, 2012 was a busy year for Mr. Stern. He led a large, active delegation of

Kitsap leaders in crafting the Regional Economic Strategy, a comprehensive blueprint for economic reform and development aimed at securing long term, sustainable economic health in the region. He championed state legislation that would revitalize local retail cores by helping cities renovate abandoned buildings. He also worked to provide citizens of Poulsbo with free, high-speed internet, courtesy of a large antenna on Fourth Avenue. It is precisely because of these accomplishments that Ed Stern has received this award from the Kitsap Economic Development Alliance. He has driven real change for his community members, for their regional neighbors, and for the citizens of Washington State.

As I close, I can say with confidence that Ed Stern, with his limitless energy, has made significant contributions to our region and its citizens. I am pleased to recognize his service today in the United States Congress.

A TRIBUTE TO LINDA
GRANDQUIST

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Linda Grandquist for being named a 2013 Women of Influence honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Each year, Business Record undertakes an exhaustive review to identify a standout group of women in the Greater Des Moines area who, as the publication notes, "have made a difference." An impressive group of inspiring female leaders are selected annually for this prestigious distinction, which is based on combined criteria of community involvement, career success, and being a role model for other women to emulate. The 2013 Women of Influence honorees join an impressive roster of more than 130 women who have changed and are continuing to change our communities for the better.

Linda Grandquist has never forgotten the inspiration and influence derived from her grandmother's place as a female doctor. It was this that led Ms. Grandquist and a friend to start a business in the 1960s that was essentially a temp service for female medical assistants or dental assistants—a rare venture. In the late 1970s, she embarked upon a real estate career and had a sales volume exceeding a million dollars her first year, cementing her as one of the few women in the "million dollar club." Additionally, Ms. Grandquist recently has joined the Prairie Meadows board of directors, where she serves on the legacy grant committee and reads each of the some 500-plus grant applications the organization receives. She also serves on the board at UnityPoint Health, volunteers with the Animal Rescue League of Iowa, and serves on the Blank Park Zoo board. She prefers to do it all without seeking the spotlight.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Linda Grandquist in the United States Congress, and I am pleased to recognize her for working to better both her

community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Women of Influence class continued success.

CONGRATULATING SHERIFF KEVIN
FRYE FOR BEING ELECTED
PRESIDENT OF THE NORTH
CAROLINA SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sheriff Kevin Frye on being elected president of the North Carolina Sheriffs' Association.

His new role as president follows years of service to the North Carolina Sheriffs' Association, as Sheriff Frye has served as both the second vice president and first vice president for this esteemed body.

Sheriff Frye is an outstanding leader, father, and public servant. He has dedicated himself to serving the people of Avery County, and now he will serve our great state of North Carolina with distinction.

The North Carolina Sheriffs' Association is the statewide organization of our state's 100 sheriffs. Through this association, the sheriffs work to strengthen the professional law enforcement services their offices provide to the people of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the entire 11th District of North Carolina, I congratulate Sheriff Frye on his new position as president of the North Carolina Sheriffs' Association and thank him for his years of service to the people of Avery County.

RECOGNIZING AUGUST 7TH AS
NATIONAL LIGHTHOUSE DAY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize August 7th as National Lighthouse Day, and to stress the important role of lighthouses in our Nation's history and the values that they represent.

On August 7th, 1789, Congress passed an Act regarding the establishment and support of lighthouses, beacons, buoys, and public piers. This early acknowledgement of their significance demonstrates the central part lighthouses play in America's growth and development, from its inception to the present.

Throughout our Nation's history, lighthouses have provided guidance for ships carrying economic goods and hopeful travelers into and out of the country, and protected our largest entry point, our coasts, from danger. Their shining lights embrace newcomers as they arrive on shore, and wish those departing farewell.

In my hometown of Buffalo, we are fortunate to have lighthouses that remain standing today. "Chinaman's Lighthouse" is Buffalo's oldest building still standing on its original foundation. Lit in 1833, our Buffalo Light is one of the oldest on the Great Lakes and is a landmark along Buffalo's Outer Harbor Waterfront.

Buffalo's lighthouses are key cultural components of our efforts to revitalize our region's waterfront as a destination for western New Yorkers and tourists alike. The light that once welcomed immigrants as they landed on the shores of Lake Erie now serves to encourage people to enjoy the new recreational opportunities on the waterfront.

The Buffalo Light like many others had fallen into disrepair for years. To save this important structure, the Buffalo Lighthouse Association was established in 1985 dedicated to restoring and promoting this vital link to our history, heritage, and future.

Due to post-9/11 security requirements the Buffalo Lighthouse, which sits on land adjacent to the U.S. Coast Guard Sector Buffalo station, was not accessible to the public for over a decade. Working in conjunction with then-Senator Hillary Clinton, we secured \$6.1 million to upgrade and consolidate Coast Guard facilities while opening up access to the historic lighthouse once again.

Restoration, including masonry repair and stonework, was completed in 2011 on the Lighthouse with funding I was pleased to play a part in securing through the New York Power Authority relicensing agreement funds awarded by the Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation.

The dedicated volunteers at the Buffalo Lighthouse Association are now focusing their attention on its recently acquired Buffalo South Entrance Light Station, more commonly known as the South Buffalo Lighthouse. This station dates back to 1903 and while its condition is deteriorating, the Buffalo Lighthouse Association is bringing its expertise and commitment to pursuing the resources necessary to restore and repurpose the station for public tours with historic interpretation, educational opportunities for our youth, and a facility for shoreline and bird habitat studies.

We owe a sincere debt of gratitude to the Buffalo Lighthouse Association for its stewardship and vision because when the South Buffalo Lighthouse project is completed it will be paired with the restoration of the 1833 Buffalo Lighthouse at the northern end of the harbor, providing local, national, and international visitors the unique chance to tour cultural and historic bookends along Western New York's Outer Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to appreciate the function and beauty of the lighthouse and the good works of those dedicated to these structures. These structures and their legacy deserve to be honored for their historical and symbolic significance in our national narrative. I recognize August 7th as National Lighthouse Day, and commend the efforts of the Buffalo Lighthouse Association and all those who strive to preserve, restore, and educate the public about these magnificent structures.

HONORING THE CAREER OF JOHN
PILIOS

HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my good friend, John Piliros, who will be retiring as news director at KGET Channel 17 in Bakersfield, California after dedicating 35 years of his life to the California broadcast industry.

Joining the world of radio broadcasting in 1977 as a Disc Jockey with KSEE Radio in Santa Maria, John has done it all. From Program Director with KLOM Radio in Lompoc to News Anchor with KSMA Radio, John eventually went on to serve as a reporter with KCOY and, in 1990, became its News Director. In 1999, he joined the KGET family and in 2001 became the News Director.

As one of the longest serving news directors in California, John is well known for his impeccable character and carries a reputation for high standards—standards that have helped make KGET the most watched station in the region. Yet, beyond these accomplishments is a truly admirable quality: his passion and commitment to community service.

It is clear to me and thousands of Kern County residents that John's love for the Bakersfield community is genuine. Under his leadership at KGET, the station's viewers have raised hundreds of thousands of dollars that went to those most in need. From assisting our veterans and the elderly, to finding lost animals and helping the homeless, to his support for the annual Red Cross Real Heroes event, John's efforts have made our community healthier and stronger.

I firmly believe that John's commitment to the highest standards of journalism has not only enriched our community, but carries on the American ideal that an informed public is the most important element of a free society.

Though John's tenure at KGET is coming to an end, his ideas, values, and standards can be found in the work of reporters and journalists across the country who credit their success to him. And, as he enters this new chapter in his life, I know he is looking forward to spending more time with his wife, Cindy, daughter Dawn, and grandchildren, Landen and Paige. I know I join thousands of others in thanking John for his contribution to our community and wish him well in retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 31, 2013, I cast a "no" vote on the Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1911—Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013 (roll call vote 426). While I was pleased that there was a bipartisan effort to maintain low interest rates on subsidized student loans, unfortunately this

compromise will ultimately increase interest rates on all Federal Direct Loans, including subsidized loans. As a proud original co-sponsor of H.R. 1979, the Bank on Students Loan Fairness Act, I believe students should be allowed to borrow funds at the same low rate that banks borrow from the Federal Reserve. It's essential that our students come out of college with not only good skills, but without the burden of manageable debt so that they can get good jobs and truly thrive. I look forward to working to make college more affordable and financial aid more accessible for students.

HONORING DR. JULIET V. GARCIA

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Juliet V. Garcia who is being honored with the 9th annual Award of Distinction from the Girl Scouts of Greater South Texas. This award recognizes her service and commitment to making the local community a better place, most notably as an advocate for increased access to higher education.

Dr. Garcia became the first Mexican-American woman in the nation to serve as the president of a college or university when she was named president of Texas Southmost College in 1986. She is now president of the University of Texas at Brownsville where she continues to exemplify an extraordinary commitment to both the university and the community.

A tireless advocate, Dr. Garcia's public service includes chairing the Advisory Committee to Congress on Student Financial Assistance as well as serving on the White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans. She is currently a member of the boards of the Ford Foundation, the Public Welfare Foundation, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Humanities Texas, and Raise Your Hand Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having this opportunity to honor Dr. Juliet V. Garcia, one of the remarkable people I have the privilege of representing.

IN RECOGNITION OF DENSO INTERNATIONAL AMERICA FOR TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF OPERATION
IN MICHIGAN

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Denso International America as it celebrates twenty-five years of operation. Two and a half decades ago, Denso opened the doors of its North American Headquarters and Technical Center in the heart of Southfield, Michigan, and became part of the business community in the Greater Detroit region.

Founded internationally in 1949, the heart of Denso's business strategy is its work force, which it describes as a core element of its global organization. In its primary function, Denso believes that its first business is the development of people and from the development of people it achieves its goal of making products which improve the world. As a firm that is heavily invested in its work force, Denso seeks to ensure that it achieves excellence by encouraging its employees to harness their creative power and work cooperatively to achieve personal growth.

With a commitment to its employees' development serving as the foundation of its organization, Denso is committed to creating high quality products for use in automobiles. The extent of Denso products to the automotive industry include radiators, driving control systems, fuel pumps, electronic fuel injection systems, and wiper systems, all manufactured with the principle of smaller, lighter and more efficient design. As its business has grown, Denso has dramatically increased its footprint in North America, bringing high skilled jobs to communities in Michigan, where it currently operates five major facilities, and across the United States, with twenty-five facilities in total.

Denso's commitment to excellence for employees is one that it also extends into its own activities in the communities where it operates. On numerous occasions Denso has been cited as a model for implementing environmentally conscious policies, while creating manufacturing techniques that increase productivity. In 1993, Denso was recognized for its work by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as a corporate leader in protecting the ozone layer with the Stratospheric Ozone Protection Award. Just five years later, Denso voluntarily moved to ISO 14001 certification for its manufacturing in Michigan, choosing to adhere to a high standard of excellence to decrease its environmental impact. As further recognition of its efforts to be a good corporate partner and custodian to the communities it employs, Denso was awarded the EPA's Climate Protection Award in 2002.

Denso's leadership has not only been recognized by the government, but also by many of its business partners. In 2012, it was recognized by Caterpillar as a Platinum Supplier and by John Deere with its Achieving Excellence Award. Over the last few years Denso has been recognized by each of the Big 3: Ford, General Motors and Chrysler for its outstanding work as a supplier to each of them. In addition to its recognition from its corporate partners, Denso has been recognized by communities that have benefited from the work of its foundation, which supports disaster relief and science education programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Denso International America for twenty-five years of excellence in manufacturing, in leadership on being a corporate steward of the environment and on the tremendous impact it has made in each of the communities its facilities call home. I am honored to have such an outstanding company headquartered in my district, and I look forward to continuing my work with Denso to support advanced manufacturing techniques that will revitalize the economy of Michigan.

RECOGNIZING THE EFFORTS OF
THE QUINAUT INDIAN NATION
IN HOSTING THE "PADDLE TO
QUINAUT" 2013 CANOE JOURNEY

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Quinault Indian Nation and the Quinault Canoe Society in their efforts to host the 2013 Canoe Journey. This annual event revitalizes the cultural practice of canoeing for Indian Nations and communities throughout the Salish Sea Region. Our region is a stronger region because of its diversity and its rich history. It is important to come together to celebrate not only what we do but who we are and where we've been.

In 1989, Emmitt Oliver, a Quinault Tribal elder, organized the "Paddle to Seattle" as a part of the Washington State Centennial Ceremony. This event celebrated Tribal canoe cultures that once traveled and hunted using dugout canoes. The success of the event inspired the annual Canoe Journey, which officially began in 1995. Since then, Tribal leaders and community members have traveled from along the West Coast each year to continue this celebration of past traditions. Today, I am honored to help Quinault Indian Nation President Fawn Sharp in welcoming the 2013 fleet of canoes into Point Grenville.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the effort to revitalize and maintain the cultural practices of Indian Nations. This year, Tribal delegations hailing from the Western United States, Canada, Hawaii, and New Zealand will take part in this historic journey. Upwards of 10,000 people are estimated to await the incoming paddlers and partake in the subsequent ceremonies. The festivities will serve to teach younger generations the skill of canoeing, to strengthen and instill pride, and reinforce cultural knowledge. I applaud all the efforts of members of the Quinault Indian Nation, neighboring Tribes, and the greater Grays Harbor Community who have made this year's Canoe Journey possible.

As I close, I can say with certainty that the "Paddle to Quinault" has greatly benefited our community and I am pleased to recognize the efforts of all involved during this weeklong celebration, today, in the United States Congress.

A TRIBUTE TO SHARON KRAUSE

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Sharon Krause for being named a 2013 Women of Influence honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Each year, Business Record undertakes an exhaustive review to identify a standout group of women in the Greater Des Moines area who, as the publication notes, "have made a

difference." An impressive group of inspiring female leaders are selected annually for this prestigious distinction, which is based on combined criteria of community involvement, career success, and being a role model for other women to emulate. The 2013 Women of Influence honorees join an impressive roster of more than 130 women who have changed and are continuing to change our communities for the better.

Sharon Krause has been a do-it-all professional—and it stems from her commitment to turning her passions into her livelihood. She became Des Moines' Firestone Agricultural Tire Co.'s first female engineer, helped coordinate Metro Waste Authority's Curb It! recycling program, worked in business development at Kum & Go LC, and has gone on to lead a mostly one-person ranch operation, Dalla Terra Ranch LLC, where she runs livestock and tends to the ample plant life. Given her varied interests and work ethic, it should come as no surprise that she turned a long series of violin lessons into a guest orchestra performance at this year's annual Bravo Greater Des Moines Gala—which she chaired and for which she helped set a record number of tables sold.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Sharon Krause in the United States Congress, and I am pleased to recognize her for working to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Women of Influence class continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF SHARON
WILLIAMS

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the remarkable Sharon Williams, the long-time director of Menlo Park-based JobTrain. Sharon is retiring after forty years of instilling optimism in each JobTrain client and building life skills amongst an entire community. I have watched with amazement over these many years as Sharon has guided the JobTrain organization.

Sharon earned her BA in English from the University of the Pacific in 1965 and her teaching credential from San Francisco State University in 1968. She joined JobTrain in 1973 as a GED teacher. She became Director of Development in 1978 and a short time later took over as Executive Director. Conducting job training classes and connecting people with jobs was very difficult in the late 1970s. Sharon guided JobTrain and its clients through difficult financial times and built a stunningly successful career and job education center.

With Sharon's outstanding leadership, JobTrain has offered cutting-edge and traditional job training, everything from solar panel installation classes to computer repair to culinary arts to laboratory technician training for

biotechnology facilities. Knowing that life skills are a large component of the training done by JobTrain, Sharon and her staff insist that clients learn how to show up on time to work, become team members in the modern work environment, and learn how to balance work and the demands of a family.

Mr. Speaker and Members, Sharon Williams has infused JobTrain with the same "can do" attitude that she insists from her clients. I've witnessed JobTrain on several occasions, most recently in the last few months.

It's a very busy place. JobTrain helps 8,000 persons per year, and 600 of them receive full-time vocational training. At least 85 percent of those who enroll complete their training. 75 percent of those persons are placed in jobs, and 12 months after placement, 84 percent are still working. JobTrain's success is spelled out in these numbers. Sharon's contributions to the Peninsula are not limited to JobTrain. She currently serves on numerous boards, including the Center for Excellence in Nonprofits, and East Palo Alto Digital Village. She has also previously served on the boards of the East Palo Alto Senior Center, the Boys and Girls Club of the Peninsula, Leadership Mid-Peninsula, and the San Mateo County Workforce Investment Board.

After forty years at the helm of JobTrain, it is time for Sharon Williams to bid her beloved nonprofit goodbye and to head off in new directions. The only thing missing from JobTrain's smorgasbord of classes at the moment is a class on how to make eyeglasses. That's not surprising. Sharon sees quite clearly the need for human dignity through productive work. Why would she believe that anyone else in the community needs glasses when her own sight is both perfect and prescient? Let us give Sharon the highest compliment that any employer can offer an employee. Let us say, "Job well done."

RECOGNIZING THE OLALLA COMMUNITY CLUB AND THE OLALLA BLUEGRASS & BEYOND FESTIVAL IN THE SOUTH KITSAP REGION OF WASHINGTON STATE

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of the Olalla Community Club for their unwavering support of the Olalla community through the continuation of the Olalla Bluegrass & Beyond Festival into its 22nd year.

In 1906, the Olalla Hall was built to foster community involvement. It was deeded to the Olalla Community Club in 1937 and served the community for 45 years as a site for socials, dances, and meetings. Unfortunately, the hall closed in the 1980's due to disuse and disrepair.

The Olalla Community Club was called to action in 1992 in response to the struggle to save the Banner Forest from residential development. As a result of that victory, the small force of the Olalla Community Club continued its tireless work in an effort to reinvigorate the

community by restoring its local hall. The establishment of the Olalla Bluegrass & Beyond Festival in 1992 helped attain this goal. Today, all proceeds from the festival go right back into the Olalla community. This helps to maintain the 107-year old Olalla community hall. Also, the festival supports music programs at South Kitsap and Peninsula High Schools, the Little League, local PTA, two food banks and other local service organizations in the region.

The word "Olalla," derived from the native Chinook word "olallie," loosely translates to "the place with many berries." The community celebrates its roots by hosting the legendary berry pie contest alongside family entertainment, such as local and national bluegrass, folk music, and handmade crafts for all festivalgoers to enjoy. I can say with firsthand knowledge that this is a terrific—and tasty—tradition.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by again applauding the dedication of the Olalla Community Club in their effort to preserve and further enrich the community of Olalla. I am pleased to recognize the work of community members for their ongoing support of the Olalla Bluegrass & Beyond Festival today in the United States Congress.

HONORING JOE'S STONE CRAB'S
100TH YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOE GARCIA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a legendary eatery serving the people of South Florida and beyond.

For over 100 years, Joe's Stone Crab has been a prominent institution honored for its unparalleled customer service and quality food. Started by Joseph Weiss in 1913, Joe's Stone Crab was one of the first eating establishments on Collins Avenue in Miami Beach. Over the years, Joe's has hosted a list of the "who's who" of the world including celebrities, politicians, and the like.

The love of food, friends, and family has brought a countless number of people together, making this restaurant a "must" on the list of places to visit in Miami. Joe's Stone Crab is the epitome of top notch restaurant service and food, and is undoubtedly one of our community's most revered culinary institutions.

RECOGNIZING THE UNBREAKABLE
FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN THE
UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in unwavering support of our nation's great friend and ally, the State of Israel. On July 31, 2013, I voted in favor of H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, which overwhelmingly passed in the House of Rep-

resentatives by a vote of 400–20. I would like to take this opportunity to commend my colleagues, Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ED ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL, for introducing this important legislation, of which I am a proud co-sponsor. The bill targets human rights violators while increasing effective sanctions to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons capability.

For more than half a century, the United States and Israel have shared the common bonds of democracy, economic vitality, and cultural affinity. These ties remain as strong today as when President Harry Truman first recognized the creation of a Jewish State in 1948. From religious kinships to shared interests, and from military strengths to commercial relations, the enduring friendship between the United States and Israel is unbreakable.

However, Israel continues to face serious regional threats, concerns which are also shared by the United States. A nuclear-armed Iran represents a direct threat to Israel's existence, the stability of the region, and the security of the entire global community. That is why we must stand firmly with Israel in the struggle against the Iranian regime's ongoing pursuit of nuclear weapons and support for terrorism. Its peace-threatening actions and statements should be taken seriously, and the international community has a responsibility to act.

I have long supported sanctions efforts in Congress, and will continue to do so as long as Iran insists on pursuing its dangerous course of action. Together with the international community, we must increase the pressure on Iran's authoritarian government to give up its nuclear ambitions. Existing United States and European Union measures have already reduced Iran's oil exports by more than half from pre-sanction levels of about 2.2 million barrels per day, bpd. This new round of sanctions cuts that number to near zero within a year, further crippling Tehran's ability to fund its nuclear program.

The United States must work with Iran's neighbors and our allies to hold a hard line against the acquisition of these dangerous, destabilizing weapons. At the same time, we must continue to support the Iranian people's efforts to reform their government to respect the rights of all citizens. Finally, it is essential that the United States remain supportive of Israel's absolute right to defend itself and protect its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, a nuclear-armed Iran is unacceptable. It is my sincere hope that one day all people in the region can live with dignity and freedom in peace. Iran's continued pursuit of nuclear weapons threatens that future.

RECOGNIZING DR. KENNETH
MOSSMAN

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Dr. Kenneth L. Mossman for nomination to membership of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

Dr. Mossman has served for 23 years as Professor of Health Physics at Arizona State University and is internationally renowned as an expert in the field of ionizing radiation exposure. He has served in an advisory capacity to the National Institutes of Health, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the National Research Council of the National Academies, the Nuclear Energy Agency in Paris, and the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna. Dr. Mossman presently serves as an Administrative Judge for the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board provides a uniquely valuable service to the American people as an independent watchdog over the safety consequences of developments in the Department of Energy's defense nuclear facilities. I can think of no better candidate than Dr. Mossman to advise our nation's leaders of contingencies to protect public health and safety. I am proud that Dr. Mossman represents my alma mater and my district at the highest level of competence and governance in his field.

I have no doubt that Dr. Mossman will faithfully serve the public interest in his role as member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing his dedication and accomplishment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 435, I was unavoidably detained at a personal doctor's appointment.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast rollcall votes on May 23rd. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes:

On rollcall 180, I would have voted "no;" on rollcall 181, I would have voted "no;" on rollcall 182, I would have voted "yes;" on rollcall 183, I would have voted "no."

A TRIBUTE TO ALBA PEREZ

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Alba Perez for being named a 2013 Women of Influence honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Each year, Business Record undertakes an exhaustive review to identify a standout group of women in the Greater Des Moines area who, as the publication notes, "have made a difference." An impressive group of inspiring female leaders are selected annually for this prestigious distinction, which is based on combined criteria of community involvement, career success, and being a role model for other women to emulate. The 2013 Women of Influence honorees join an impressive roster of more than 130 women who have changed and are continuing to change our communities for the better.

In her work, Alba Perez, presently the Executive Officer of the Office of Latino Affairs at the Iowa Department of Human Rights, has been inspired by advice she received as a child from her mother: "Leave things better than how you found them." Ms. Perez has spent much of her career trying to help Latinos and other underrepresented communities, advocating for what she calls meaningful inclusion or helping Latina women who struggle with English. In her 12 years at the Greater Des Moines Partnership, she managed the diversity committee tasked with helping make Des Moines a more inclusive community. She also has helped launch Alianza: Latino Business Association, and the dance instruction organization now known as Salsa Des Moines. Ms. Perez has been heavily involved in the League of United Latin American Citizens of Iowa, and the Latina Leadership Initiative of Greater Des Moines.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Alba Perez in the United States Congress, and I am pleased to recognize her for working to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Women of Influence class continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 428, I was unavoidably detained in a meeting off the Hill at the White House with the President.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

CELEBRATING NATIONAL HEALTH CENTER WEEK, 2013

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to recognize National Health Center Week, celebrating the more than 1,200 health centers providing vital health care for

22 million individuals at more than 9,000 locations across the country. During the week of August 11–17th, celebrations of National Health Center Week will be taking place at West County Health Centers and Petaluma Health Center in my Congressional district.

America's community health centers are the core of our health care system and the nation's social safety net, delivering high quality, cost-effective, and accessible primary and preventative care to individuals regardless of their ability to pay. Health centers are located in medically underserved areas and controlled locally by patient-majority boards, making each health center responsive to the needs of the individual community it serves.

From the Marin Community Clinic to Crescent City Health Care Center, California's Second Congressional District, which I am honored to represent, is served by a network of vibrant community health centers offering patient-focused, coordinated healthcare that families and individuals need.

National Health Center Week offers us the opportunity to recognize all those responsible for the continued success and growth of community health centers nationwide. Since this program's inception 50 years ago, health centers have served those in need with comprehensive, high quality, cost effective, and accessible health care, and I am grateful for their role in the North Coast community.

My staff and I look forward to participating in community celebrations of National Health Center Week, and I ask my colleagues to join me in marking the occasion and sending America's health centers our best wishes for another successful 50 years.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES KENDRICK BAKER

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute a remarkable individual, James Kendrick Baker, who passed away on July 24, 2013. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for his leadership and service to our country.

Mr. Baker, a born and bred Hoosier, graduated cum laude from DePauw University where he served as president of Sigma Chi fraternity. He also served our nation in the U.S. Army before earning his Masters from Harvard Business School. Mr. Baker spent his entire career at Arvin Industries where he rose to President and CEO and eventually Chairman of the Board. Under his leadership, Arvin transferred from a domestic conglomeration of separate businesses into a global leader in the automobile parts industry.

Mr. Baker loved Indiana and the community of Columbus. He was active on many boards including, but not limited to: Indiana National Bank, PSI Resources, NBD First Chicago, Cinergy Company, and DePauw University. He was elected Chairman of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and donated his time to improving the U.S. educational system. Mr. Baker earned the Trailblazer Award from The

Tindley Accelerated School in Indianapolis, and jointly received the Simms Leadership Award from IUPUC with his wife, Beverly. He also received 4 Sagamores of the Wabash for the Indiana Governor's Office. Sigma Chi honored him by naming him a Significant Sig and later to the Order of the Constantine.

Mr. Baker is a fraternity brother of mine, one who I consider a mentor and friend. I would often seek his counsel while serving as Indiana Secretary of State and as a Member of Congress. He has helped me tremendously in my service to Indiana, and for that I will be forever grateful. He was a captain of industry, a Hoosier whom Indiana was lucky to have.

Mr. Baker always bestowed his wife of 54 years, their three children and seven grandchildren with love and respect. This is James Kendrick Baker: a man truly committed to his family, his community, his faith, and his country. Thank you, and rest in peace Mr. Baker.

CELEBRATING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOROUGH OF BADEN

HON. KEITH J. ROTHFUS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Borough of Baden on the 175th anniversary of its founding. I join residents of Baden and citizens from across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in celebrating this historic event.

The Borough of Baden has a rich history. Long before Christian Burkhardt founded it in 1838, settlers and Native Americans gathered there to draft early treaties and hold councils. The area also welcomed many French, English, and colonial traders as they traveled to Pittsburgh to sell their wares. Baden grew from a small village with only two boat-building yards and quarries into a bustling town with steel mills, coal mines, and oil and gas wells.

Today, more than four thousand hard-working men and women call the Borough of Baden home. It is also home to an exceptional volunteer fire department, a thriving American Legion Post 641, and the Sisters of St. Joseph who continue to serve folks in need in the greater Pittsburgh area.

Mr. Speaker, fellow Members, please join me in extending warm regards to residents of the Borough of Baden on the historic occasion of its 175th anniversary.

IN RECOGNITION OF CLARK E. GUINAN

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Clark E. Guinan, better known as Gus, who is retiring after a remarkable legal and public service career that spanned over three decades. Gus was the City Attorney of the City of Burlingame for the last four years. His devotion to justice and the Bay Area are reflected in his work and passion for life.

Gus, a native San Franciscan and third generation Californian, was raised in Los Altos. He enrolled in the seminary in Menlo Park at the young age of 13 and studied there through high school and college until he was 24 years old. He received his B.A. in Philosophy from St. Patrick's College.

After eleven years in the seminary, Gus realized that he had a different calling. He wanted to follow in the footsteps of his grandfather who was his hero and a prominent attorney in the California Attorney General's office. Gus started law school and earned his J.D. from the University of Santa Clara.

Upon earning his degree, Gus became a deputy public defender in San Joaquin County from 1974–1984. Then he accepted the position of Senior Assistant City Attorney in Palo Alto where he served for five years.

In 1989, he faced a difficult decision. He and his wife Signe Harnett had adopted infant twin girls. They still lived in Stockton and the daily commute to Palo Alto would prevent Gus from seeing his two babies grow up. He left public service and became a litigation attorney with the law offices of Rishwain, Kakim and Ellis in Stockton from 1989–1991. Gus' love for San Francisco drew the family back to the Bay Area and in 1991 they moved to Berkeley and he joined the law office of Barry Balamuth in Orinda.

In 1993, Gus returned to public service and accepted the position of Assistant City Attorney for the City of San Rafael where he stayed until 2008 when he was appointed to his most recent position of City Attorney of Burlingame.

Gus is a member of the Public Law Section of the California State Bar Association, the Bay Area City Attorneys Association, the Mann Public Agency Attorneys and an alternate board member of the California Joint Powers Risk Management Authority. In the past, he served as a delegate at the State Bar Convention in Sacramento, as a section editor of the Municipal Law Handbook of the League of California Cities and as a member of the board of governors of the San Joaquin County Bar Association. Gus has also lectured at the Delta Community College in Stockton and in the "Bridging the Gap" program. Last but not least, he has been a proud member of the San Rafael Elks Club since 2006.

In his well deserved retirement, Gus is looking forward to spending more time with his wife of 25 years, their now 24-year-old twin daughters Kate and Lindsey and their stepson Chris. He will finally have more time to lose himself in his passion for California history, hiking, travel, photography, reading and swimming.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representative to rise with me to honor Clark E. Guinan, a man with a brilliant legal mind and a big heart who has protected the rights and safety of the residents of Burlingame and other Bay Area communities.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT "BOBBY" BRAMLETT

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my good friend and fellow Sooner, Mr. Robert "Bobby" Bramlett, as he nears the end of his term as the 108th chairman of the nation's largest insurance association, the Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America, also known as the Big "I". He was installed as chairman of the Big "I" last September in Atlanta where I was personally present for the ceremony, and over the past year he has done an amazing job of piloting the association as the top agent in the nation.

Bobby has spent his career in the family insurance business, starting with The Bramlett Agency in 1975. He has since purchased the agency, which was founded in 1948, from his parents, Jim and Janie Bramlett, and has served as its president and CEO since 1983.

He is a graduate of St. John's Military Academy, Delafield, Wis., and earned his Bachelor of Business Administration degree from the University of Oklahoma in 1974. He bleeds OU crimson, and is a fixture in Norman on football game days.

Bobby married Nanette Potts in 1973. Together they have strongly supported their community of Ardmore, the state of Oklahoma, small businesses, and the insurance industry by serving in many capacities. He is past president of the Independent Insurance Agents of Oklahoma (IIAO) and past Big "I" director from Oklahoma. In 2008, Bobby received the association's highest government affairs award, "The Sydney O. Smith National Legislative Award." He also was given IIAO's highest award, "The Eagle of Excellence Award," in 2009. Also an avid golfer, he has been heavily involved in the Trusted Choice Big "I" National Championship golf tournament which is one of the pre-eminent junior golf events in the country.

In his community, Bobby serves as a First National Bank and Trust Company director, trustee of The Glen Foundation, and trustee of St. John's Northwestern Military Academy.

Bobby and Nanette are the proud parents of son, Jake, who is an agent in the agency; daughter-in-law, Jennifer; and grandson, Bryce. They reside in Ardmore, Oklahoma.

The state of Oklahoma is proud of Bobby Bramlett and wishes him well following his successful year as chairman of the Big "I."

RECOGNIZING THE ZANIOS FAMILY

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor several generous New Mexico residents who provided a boy from Peru with the opportunity to receive a life-saving heart surgery in Albuquerque.

In true New Mexico spirit, Pamela Zanios, her husband James and their sons, Andres and James, opened up their Los Ranchos home to 14-year-old Flavio Liberti Gutierrez while he was in Albuquerque for the heart procedure. The Zanios family gave Flavio the comfort he needed while he was away from his own home in Calca, Peru. Heart surgery is a frightening experience for anyone, especially for a teenager in a foreign country. But the Zanios family provided Flavio with the love and moral support he needed to help him through the ordeal.

Flavio got the opportunity for the heart surgery through the Healing the Children program, which arranges for medical care to children who otherwise would not receive it. I want to recognize this wonderful program, along with Dr. Carl Lagerstrom and his team at the Presbyterian Heart Group, which volunteered to perform the successful procedure. I would also like to thank the staff at Presbyterian for donating the hospital care, including operating staff, nursing staff and medications. American Airlines generously provided the air travel for Flavio as part of the company's longtime commitment to Healing the Children.

I appreciate the generosity of all New Mexicans who go above and beyond to help their family, neighbors and especially a child from a foreign land who needed a helping hand. The Albuquerque Journal's Joline Gutierrez Krueger eloquently shared Flavio's story with the community. As a result, I was made aware of the actions of the Zanios family, Dr. Lagerstrom and many others who deserve this special recognition.

A COMPILATION OF UNANSWERED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE BENGHAZI TERRORIST ATTACK

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I submit a compilation of the questions I have asked about the Benghazi terrorist attack over the past three weeks. These questions remain unanswered despite nearly a year of investigations and that is why I continue to believe that a Select Committee is the only way to fully understand what happened in Benghazi that night and the response that followed. The Congress owes it to the families of the victims, the survivors of the attack and the American people to find these answers once and for all. It's time for a Select Committee.

QUESTION OF THE DAY #1 (DELIVERED ON JULY 16, 2013)

1. Why has not one person who was in Benghazi the night of the attack been subpoenaed to testify publicly before Congress, and instead, some of the survivors will tell their stories through multi-million dollar book deals?

2. Will any of the \$3 million they are earning from the book deal be shared with Ty Woods widow and child or the parents of Glen Doherty?

3. Why has the Congress not asked, or subpoenaed, these individuals to testify before

House committees that have been investigating over the past year?

QUESTION OF THE DAY #2 (SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD ON JULY 17, 2013)

1. Was there an intelligence failure in vetting the true loyalty of the Libyan security guards for the U.S. consulate? Which agency was responsible for vetting the militias?

2. Who provided the terrorists with details of the consulate property? Was it the security guards or someone in the Libyan government who was notified about the ambassador's visit?

3. Why did the guards in the car outside the consulate not warn the U.S. staff of the gathering terrorists as they drove away a minute before the assault began? Were they complicit in the plot?

QUESTION OF THE DAY #3 (DELIVERED ON JULY 18, 2013)

1. How many Benghazi survivors, including federal employees, military personnel or contractors, have been asked to sign additional Non-Disclosure Agreements by the different agencies relating to what happened in Benghazi?

2. Do these NDAs apply only to those under cover, or have non-covert State Department and Defense Department employees been directed to sign them too?

QUESTION OF THE DAY #4 (DELIVERED ON JULY 19, 2013)

1. Reports indicate that upwards of 100 terrorists may have attacked the consulate and annex. After nearly a year of FBI investigations, why has the U.S. not located, apprehended and brought to justice a single terrorist responsible for killing four Americans, including a sitting U.S. ambassador?

2. Why has the Obama Administration not taken any apparent steps to apply pressure to countries that have refused to allow the FBI access to terrorists responsible for the Benghazi attacks? Has the FBI had access to any other suspects, in any country, other than their brief interview with Ali Harzi?

QUESTION OF THE DAY #5 (DELIVERED ON JULY 22, 2013)

1. Why was the CIA's security team repeatedly ordered to "stand down" for more than 30 minutes after the attack began?

2. Where did the order to stop the team from responding originate? Was it directed by the CIA or someone else in Washington?

3. If the team had been allowed to respond immediately, could the lives of Ambassador Stevens and Sean Smith have been saved?

4. Has anyone been held accountable for obstructing the security team for so long?

QUESTION OF THE DAY #6 (DELIVERED ON JULY 23, 2013)

1. Doesn't it bother any of my colleagues that Gen. [Carter] Ham can speak publicly about the military's response at a forum in Aspen, Colorado—where tickets start at \$1,200—yet his testimony before Congress was behind closed doors? (Gen. Ham, who was the head of U.S. forces in Africa the night of attack, appeared at the Aspen Security Forum last weekend and spoke openly about the U.S. response to the Benghazi attack.)

2. If Gen. Ham's command required no additional authority to respond to what he then believed to be a hostage rescue situation, why did it take another seven hours before AFRICOM ordered a C-17 aircraft in Germany to prepare to deploy to Libya to evacuate Americans? Why did that plane not leave Germany for another eight hours after that?

3. If the situation appeared to be deteriorating throughout the night at the annex,

why wasn't there any additional effort to accelerate air support or even planes to evacuate American personnel directly from Benghazi?

4. Given the betrayal by our supposed allied Libyan militia forces when calls to defend the consulate went unheeded, why would the Pentagon not move even faster to ensure there was a reliable evacuation and hostage response force to assist the Americans in Benghazi?

5. Given that no American plane arrived in Benghazi to support the evacuation, just what planes were used to evacuate the Americans the morning of Sept. 12?

6. The State Department's Accountability Review Board said two planes were used to transport Americans from Benghazi to Tripoli. We know that one was a Libyan Air Force C-130 that brought back the bodies of Ambassador Stevens, Sean Smith, Ty Wood and Glen Doherty, but the first to depart was a private, "chartered" jet. It took off at 7:40 a.m. with "evacuees, including all wounded personnel," according to the unclassified version of the report.

7. Just who owned that jet?

8. Was it the same jet that brought in the seven-person response team from Tripoli earlier that night?

9. Was it really chartered or was it commandeered?

10. How many wounded were evacuated on that jet?

11. Of the wounded, how many were State Department employees, CIA employees or security contractors?

QUESTION OF THE DAY #7 (DELIVERED ON JULY 24, 2013)

1. According to an excerpt of the new book *Under Fire: The Untold Story of the Attack in Benghazi*, which was published in this month's *Vanity Fair* magazine, on the night of the attack, Ambassador Stevens made several calls for help after reaching what he believed was a safe room on the consulate compound. Some of those calls were made to "nearby consulates." Assuming the authors are correct, the government should have the phone records from that night. Which foreign consulates did he call? How did those consulates respond?

2. If Stevens was calling foreign consulates, did U.S. officials in Tripoli or Washington call any allies with assets in Libya to help respond to the attack?

3. Did the Pentagon contact any NATO allies with military assets in the region that could have provided assistance that night?

4. Given how close many of our European allies are to the Mediterranean, wouldn't they have planes or response teams stationed in locations in or nearby the region that could have been mobilized upon request from Washington?

5. And speaking of force posture, what have we done to ensure that if another incident were to happen this September 11 that we're prepared to respond?

QUESTION OF THE DAY #8 (SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD JULY 25, 2013)

1. A U.S. consulate is under attack. A U.S. Ambassador is missing. A State Department Diplomatic Security Agent is dead. Are the American people to believe the president is briefed only once that entire night, at 5 p.m. Eastern Standard Time?

2. Where was the president the rest of the night?

3. Did his national security team, including John Brennan, Sec. Panetta and Gen. Dempsey, ever go back and brief the president when the annex came under attack? If so, what steps did he direct at that time?

4. Did the president ever step foot in the White House Situation Room that night?

5. Did he ever see the footage from the unarmed drone stationed over Benghazi monitoring the attacks?

6. Last evening, Fox News' Catherine Herridge reported how Diplomatic Security Agent David Ubben is still recovering at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center—more than 10 months after the attack—for injuries he sustained while repeatedly risking his life to save others that night. Has the president ever called or met with David Ubben to thank him for his sacrifice? Has he ever called the others who were seriously wounded that night, including the former Navy SEAL on the security team who sustained significant injuries?

7. To Secretary of State John Kerry's credit, I know that he has visited with Ubben at Walter Reed. But did former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton ever meet with him during the six months she was still in office after the attack?

8. Did the president and his team ever even consider cancelling his political fundraiser in Las Vegas the day after the attack to monitor the situation in Benghazi?

9. That night, when the ambassador was considered a potential hostage and nearly 30 Americans were under sustained attacks at the CIA annex, did the president's staff ever notify the campaign that he might not be leaving the White House the next day?

10. When he boarded Air Force One for Las Vegas, did the president know about the serious injuries that some of the survivors had sustained? Did he know what hospitals they were being taken to?

11. Is there a parallel in American history when the U.S. was under attack, Americans were killed and a sitting U.S. ambassador was considered a potential terrorist hostage, but the president was not engaged with his national security team?

QUESTION OF THE DAY #9 (DELIVERED ON JULY 30, 2013)

1. Who are the anonymous senior administration officials who admitted "mistakes" in their handling of the attack to CBS?

2. Why haven't they testified to Congress about these mistakes?

3. Why wasn't the Foreign Emergency Support Team (FEST) deployed immediately?

4. Last week, Gen. Ham admitted that he believed Ambassador Stevens may have been taken hostage by terrorists. Given the FEST team's terrorism and hostage negotiation expertise, who made the decision not to deploy them?

5. Why didn't the White House convene the Counterterrorism Security Group (CSG) that night to coordinate the interagency response to the attack? If that group wasn't responsible for coordination, who was?

6. Which agency was leading the response that night?

7. Was the State Department directing the Pentagon not to deploy its planes or response teams while also not sending the FEST team?

QUESTION OF THE DAY #10 (DELIVERED ON JULY 31, 2013)

1. When was the CIA annex in Benghazi established?

2. How many people worked at the annex—of these, how many were direct agency employees and how many were contractors?

3. What was the ratio of CIA staff to security contractors?

4. Above all, why was there a facility operated by the CIA in Benghazi?

5. If indeed the CIA facility in Benghazi involved in the collection of \$40 million in

weapons from the U.S., as first reported by National Journal in 2011, where are they?

6. The \$40 million promised by Secretary Clinton would buy a very large quantity of weapons. Were they shipped out of Benghazi? Are they in warehouses on U.S. soil? Are they in other allied countries? Or did they end up elsewhere?

7. Is it possible that the president's intelligence finding included an authorization for the weapons collected in Libya to be transferred to Syrian rebels? Was the CIA annex being used to facilitate these transfers? If so, how did the weapons physically move from Libya to Syria? By plane? By ship?

8. And, again, I ask, if these weapons were not being transferred to other countries like Syria, where exactly did they end up?

9. Was the CIA annex being used as a logistics center to track and transfer these weapons?

10. Was Ambassador Stevens' visit to the CIA annex on September 10 associated with these operations?

11. And if these activities were taking place, was this consistent with the president's intelligence finding? Was the Congress notified?

QUESTION OF THE DAY #11 (DELIVERED ON
AUGUST 1, 2013)

1. Who in the White House knew what was going on in the [CIA] annex [in Benghazi]? The president? The chief of staff? Then-deputy national security advisor and current CIA director John Brennan?

QUESTION OF THE DAY #12 (DELIVERED ON
AUGUST 2, 2013)

1. Why are these heroes being told not talk? What is the administration afraid of? What is it protecting?

2. How can the Congress know the survivors don't want to speak with Congress if they can't learn who they are and ask them?

3. Are we really to take the administration's word [that they aren't being silenced]?

4. With such a broad range of support [for a Benghazi Select Committee], it begs the question: why not? What are we afraid of from a full investigation and public hearings?

5. The House "interim progress report" on Benghazi was released on April 23. When will the final report be released?

6. Can any member here confidently say that they know what happened that night?

7. Can any member honestly say—with reports like the one CNN did yesterday—that this Congress has done everything it can to allow the survivors to come forward and tell their story?

8. September 11 is fast approaching. Will we continue on our current path and learn from forthcoming books written by the survivors and sanitized by the CIA, or will we create a Select Committee to subpoena witnesses to testify under oath at public hearings?

9. With news reports this morning that the U.S. will be closing all embassies in the Middle East this weekend due to a suspected terrorist threat, are we better prepared now to respond to an attack? We still don't know.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 434, I was unavoidably detained in

a meeting off the Hill at the White House with the President.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

A TRIBUTE TO PATTY COWNIE

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Patty Cownie for being named a 2013 Women of Influence honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Each year, Business Record undertakes an exhaustive review to identify a standout group of women in the Greater Des Moines area who, as the publication notes, "have made a difference." An impressive group of inspiring female leaders are selected annually for this prestigious distinction, which is based on combined criteria of community involvement, career success, and being a role model for other women to emulate. The 2013 Women of Influence honorees join an impressive roster of more than 130 women who have changed and are continuing to change our communities for the better.

As a leading community volunteer, Patty Cownie has come to personify the idea of "giving back" and working to help Des Moines provide quality educational experiences for children and young adults. After college, Mrs. Cownie worked for two years as a social worker, before parenting nine children became a full-time job. But she always has remained highly active in the community, spending 10 years on the Drake University board of trustees and being involved at Dowling Catholic High School, which her children attended, as well as St. Augustin School, where she was the foundation board chair. She also has been president of the Des Moines Metro Opera board, and she has served on the Des Moines Arts Festival committee, Civic Music Association board and Des Moines Performing Arts board.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Patty Cownie in the United States Congress, and I am pleased to recognize her for working to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Women of Influence class continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF STEPHEN S.
PEARCE

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Dr. Stephen S. Pearce, the Richard and Rhoda Goldman Senior Rabbi, who is retiring

after serving Congregation Emanu-El for 20 years. Rabbi Pearce's inexhaustible empathy and commitment to others has touched and inspired thousands of people across this country. It is for good reason that Newsweek has recognized him as one of the 50 most influential rabbis in the U.S. on three successive occasions.

One of the issues Dr. Pearce is determined to solve is hunger in the Bay Area. He recently received an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters at the University of San Francisco for challenging the Emanu-El congregation and the community to address this pressing topic by reflecting on how faith is translated into action. Dr. Pearce took on hunger soon after he joined Emanu-El in July 1993. In September 1994, he initiated the High Holy Day food drive benefitting the San Francisco Food Bank. In April 1995, the Pe'ah Garden started raising vegetables for the Food Bank, Hamilton Family Center, Dream House and Raphael House. In February 2013, the Emanu-El Food Pantry on Geary Boulevard opened. In April 2004, he began a partnership with Dr. William Cobb elementary school to improve literacy and later expanded it to a food pantry. As you can see, once Dr. Pearce takes on an issue, his commitment is lasting.

He also joined and won a drawn-out fight in 1997 to preserve one of the last remaining old-growth redwood groves in California. He organized an interfaith task force to help save the Headwaters Forest in Humboldt from chain saws. The effort won him the nick name "Redwood Rabbi."

Under Rabbi Pearce's long and distinguished leadership, congregation Emanu-El established a preschool and an adult education center, held fundraising concerts for victims of Hurricane Katrina, and for the work of American Jewish World Service in Darfur, helped young adults transition out of foster care, participated in the Pride Parade, launched a pulpit exchange with the Muslim community, and was involved in countless other projects.

Stephen Pearce was born in Manhattan in 1946 and grew up in Brooklyn. He graduated with a BA in Psychology from City College of New York in 1967 and was ordained at the New York School of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in 1972. He earned his PhD in Counselor Psychology at St. John's University in 1978 and was awarded an honorary DD by the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in 1997.

Before Rabbi Pearce joined Congregation Emanu-El, he served at Temple Sinai of Stamford, Connecticut for 16 years and Temple Isaiah of Forest Hills, New York for five years. He was a faculty member at the Rabbinic School of the Hebrew Union College for 20 years and has also taught at the University of Connecticut, St. John's University and the University of San Francisco.

He is a board member of Palo Alto University and an advisory board member of the Taube Foundation for Jewish Life and Culture. He formerly served on the board of the Graduate Theological Union and is a past president of the Northern California Board of Rabbis.

Rabbi Pearce is a renowned lecturer and has written a tremendous number of articles and poems for publications such as the New

York Times, the San Francisco Chronicle and the Jewish Spectator. He is the author of *Too Short and Sweetness of Honey*, two children's books, a psychology textbook, and the co-author of *Building Wisdom's House*. He is the former editor of the *Journal of the Central Conference of American Rabbis*, wrote a column for the *Jewish News Weekly of Northern California* and produced a weekly radio show for KUSF.

His tireless engagement inside and outside his congregational duties has earned him universal admiration, utmost respect and many awards, including the San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association's Silver Spur Award for interfaith community dialogue and engagement; the national Jefferson Award for inspiring worshippers to fight hunger; the San Francisco Food Bank Community Partner Award for inspiring member of Congregation Emanu-El to donate over 90,000 pounds of food in the last two decades; and the San Francisco Interfaith Council's recognition for encouraging green sustainability at the temple.

Rabbi Pearce has been married to his wife Dr. Laurie Pearce for 36 years and they have two children, Sarah and Michael Pearce.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor an exceptional human being, someone I admire greatly. His influence will forever be felt in San Francisco, the Bay Area and across the country. Rabbi Pearce has shaped his congregation and created a haven for collaborative worship, lifelong education, social welfare and cultural offerings. He is retiring, but Rabbi Pearce is the type of leader who never truly retires. We wish him well in his next adventure in life.

IN RECOGNITION OF COLONEL
ALAN ORR

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a true patriot and mentor, not only to myself, but to all the Marines that served with him, Colonel Alan Orr. Col Orr recently retired from the United States Marine Corps last week on July 26, 2013. While he may be hanging up his service uniform, Col Orr will continue to serve those who have sacrificed so much in defense of our country in his role as President and Founder of Combat Marine Outdoors.

Col Orr graduated from the University of Michigan and then went off to Officer Candidate School where upon completion he was commissioned as an officer in the United States Marine Corps. Col Orr was an outstanding artillery officer, commanding several Firing Batteries, a Marine Corps Recruiting Station, an Artillery Battalion, and an Artillery Regiment. It was during this period that I had the distinct honor of serving with Col Orr when he was my Battalion Commander in 2004.

Col Orr went on to graduate from the Marine Amphibious Warfare School in Quantico, Virginia, and the Field Artillery Officer Advanced Course in Fort Sill, Oklahoma. He is also a graduate, with honors, from the Marine

Corps Command and Staff College, the Army War College in Carlisle, PA, and holds several Masters degrees. In addition, Col Orr has numerous combat tours from Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, to Somalia and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

But just as he has distinguished himself in combat and with his Marines in distant battlefields, his love for our Marines, sailors and soldiers extended from the front lines to the hospitals where our wounded warriors recover, and to life after the fighting has ended. Col Orr, along with a group of devoted hunters, ranch owners and patriots, has shown to our wounded heroes that excitement and adventure doesn't end with their battle wounds.

In 2005, after visiting wounded Marines from the 1st Marine Division at Brooke Army Medical Center, Col Orr and other founding members created Combat Marine Outdoors, an organization that not only accelerates the recovery process, but restores hope in our servicemen and women. In collaboration with thousands of contributors and over 50 ranches, the Combat Marine Outdoors has provided well over 200 wounded veterans from Balboa Hospital to Walter Reed with the opportunity to hunt and fish. These outdoor experiences foster the opportunity to engage in a challenging experience that promotes teamwork and camaraderie. In many cases, these excursions facilitated a turning point in emotional recovery through a challenging experience that helps our wounded military men and women regain confidence through a sense of accomplishment.

Col Orr is an accomplished professional, the most knowledgeable artillery officer I have ever known. But his impact to those Marines on and off the battlefield is immeasurable. I am honored to have served with Col Orr, a man who not only personifies military discipline, but exudes the compassion and love for our young warriors through a life of service above self.

I ask my colleagues join me in recognizing the exemplary military service of Col Alan Orr and his continued dedication to the young men and women of our Armed Forces.

IN TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR
LINDY BOGGS, DIPLOMAT,
EQUAL RIGHTS ACTIVIST, AND
FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great American and a former member of this House. Ambassador Corrine "Lindy" Boggs was a diplomat, equal rights champion, and a former Member of Congress from Louisiana. Lindy Boggs, who died on Saturday, July 27, 2013, was one of the most admired members of this body and was beloved by all who knew her. She will be truly missed. All of us mourn her loss and extend our condolences to her family and loved ones.

Born Marie Corinne Morrison Claiborne Boggs on March 13, 1916 on a sugar plantation in Louisiana, Lindy Boggs attended

Sophie Newcomb College at Tulane University in New Orleans, where she met and later married her husband Hale Boggs. After graduation, Lindy Boggs became a history and English teacher in Romeville, Louisiana. Her husband attended law school before being elected to Congress in 1940, rising to become Majority Leader of the House of Representatives.

On October 16, 1972, a tragic event occurred. A plane carrying Congressmen Nick Begich of Alaska and Majority Leader Hale Boggs perished in the Alaska wilderness. Both were presumed dead, as their bodies were never recovered. Lindy Boggs won the special election and succeeded her husband in Congress, becoming the first woman from Louisiana to be elected to the House. Mrs. Boggs was then elected to a full term in 1974 and re-elected seven times before retiring at the end of her term in January 1991. In 1976, Lindy Boggs became the first woman to preside over a Democratic National Convention.

The velvet Southern charm she had refined while growing up in Louisiana enabled her to become a very effective legislator. It was because of her amendment that discrimination on the ground of "sex or marital status" is prohibited by the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974. Mrs. Boggs also pushed for other women's economic concerns, like equal pay for government jobs and equal access to government business contracts.

In addition to champion equal rights, Lindy Boggs was a strong supporter of historic preservation. She also supported civil rights legislation at a time when such support often met with hostility in the part of the country she represented. Lindy Boggs also strongly supported and defended antipoverty programs. She said:

You couldn't want to reverse the injustices of the political system and not include the blacks and the poor; it was just obvious.

In 1991, a room that was being used as the House speakers' office in the 19th century was named in her honor as the "Lindy Claiborne Boggs Congressional Women's Reading Room." In 1994, Lindy Boggs was admitted to the Louisiana Political Museum and Hall of Fame and in 1997, President Bill Clinton appointed her Ambassador to the Holy See. In 2006, she was awarded the Congressional Distinguished Service Award for her outstanding service in the House of Representatives.

In addition to her remarkable career in public service, perhaps Lindy Boggs' greatest accomplishment are the wonderful children she raised, each of whom has been quite successful in continuing the family legacy of service: Cokie Roberts, a Washington journalist for ABC and National Public Radio; Thomas Hale Boggs Jr., a leading lawyer and chairman of the noted firm of Patton Boggs; and Barbara Boggs Sigmund, who served as Mayor of Princeton, New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, a great lady has finished her course, run the great race, and gone on to claim her great reward. We are deeply saddened by the loss of this tireless champion for equal and civil rights. But her good works will be with us for eternity. For that we can all be grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I ask a moment of silence in memory of Lindy Boggs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSONOF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*Friday, August 2, 2013*

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 434 I was unavoidably detained at a personal doctor's appointment.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*Friday, August 2, 2013*

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance at a meeting with President Barack Obama at the White House, I missed eight recorded votes on August 1, 2013. I submit how I would have voted had I been present for those votes.

On rollcall No. 428, the Waxman (CA) Amendment to H.R. 1582, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 429, the Connolly (VA) Amendment to H.R. 1582, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 430, the Murphy (PA) Amendment to H.R. 1582, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 431, the Motion to Recommit for H.R. 1582, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 432, Final Passage of H.R. 1582, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 433, Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 322, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 434, Agreeing to H. Res. 322, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 435, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1897, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CONGRATULATING THE ALPHA EPSILON PI INTERNATIONAL FRATERNITY

HON. ELIOT L. ENGELOF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*Friday, August 2, 2013*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I extend my congratulations to the Alpha Epsilon Pi International Fraternity on the celebration of its centenary. With more than 177 active chapters across the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, France, and Israel, and over 9,000 undergraduate brothers, there is certainly much to celebrate.

The fraternity is celebrating the largest event in its history—the Centennial Celebration on August 8th honoring the first 100 years of its existence and its success in cultivating generations of Jewish leaders on college campuses across the world.

The first 100 years are said to be the hardest, but the success of Alpha Epsilon Pi is a wonderful start.

I wish the fraternity every success in the future and look forward to seeing more leaders from Alpha Epsilon Pi take their place in the world.

AEPi was founded in 1913 at New York University, initially as a brotherhood of young men from similar backgrounds, but expanded in time with the goal of giving them the best college and fraternity experience. Since then approximately 100,000 men have been members of the fraternity.

More important is the leadership training provided by AEPi. Its members include Wolf Blitzer, Mark Zuckerberg, former Florida Congressman Ron Klein, National Hockey League Commissioner Gary Bettman, James Brooks, a producer/director of The Simpsons, Paul Simon and Art Garfunkel, and architect Frank Gehry, plus numberless more.

Celebrating a Centennial is a rare event. AEPi has contributed to the nation and the world for 100 years and if past performance is any indication, this will continue for many generations to come.

KIDNEY AWARENESS WEEK

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENSOF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*Friday, August 2, 2013*

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the great work of the American Nephrology Nurses Association (ANNA) and their efforts to raise awareness about chronic kidney disease (CKD). From August 5–9, the ANNA is hosting Kidney Disease Awareness and Education week, where ANNA members are holding a series of events raising awareness of the growing health problems associated with kidney disease.

CKD's onset usually stems from the improper treatment of diabetes and high blood pressure, when the kidneys fail to filter blood properly. Overtime, the kidneys can lose their functionality and as a result, increase one's chances of kidney failure, cardiovascular diseases such as heart attacks and heart failure, along with other serious health issues. Unfortunately, CKD impacts over 25 million adults in the United States.

The American Nephrology Nurses Association (ANNA), organized in 1969, is a nonprofit organization made of over 10,000 nephrology nurses whose mission is to educate the public and improve the lives of those with kidney disease. ANNA pursues this mission through educational and advocacy programs encouraging understanding of nephrology nursing.

Much is demanded of nephrology nurses. They are required to handle many tasks at once, while demonstrating extraordinary attention to detail and dedication while also caring and comforting their patients.

I want to thank America's nephrology nurses for all they do, particularly those who serve my constituents in the 21st Congressional district. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the efforts of the American Nephrology Nurses Association and Kidney Disease Awareness and Education week.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGEROF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*Friday, August 2, 2013*

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 429 I was unavoidably detained in a meeting off the Hill at the White House with the President.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

A TRIBUTE TO KAREN SHAFF

HON. TOM LATHAMOF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*Friday, August 2, 2013*

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Karen Shaff for being named a 2013 Women of Influence honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Each year, Business Record undertakes an exhaustive review to identify a standout group of women in the Greater Des Moines area who, as the publication notes, "have made a difference." An impressive group of inspiring female leaders are selected annually for this prestigious distinction, which is based on combined criteria of community involvement, career success, and being a role model for other women to emulate. The 2013 Women of Influence honorees join an impressive roster of more than 130 women who have changed and are continuing to change our communities for the better.

Karen Shaff began her career at what was then known as Bankers Life Co. in 1982. In the three decades since, she has ascended the ladder to become executive vice president and general counsel at Principal Financial Group Inc., making her the highest ranking female officer of an organization whose reach spans the globe. Coming from a family of public servants, she was well-acquainted with community involvement from an early age—and it's shown. Mrs. Shaff is president of the Animal Rescue League of Iowa's advisory council, has led the fundraising efforts for the construction of the Science Center of Iowa, and is a member of the Grinnell College board of trustees. She's also involved with such organizations as Bravo Greater Des Moines and Hospice of Central Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Karen Shaff in the United States Congress, and I am pleased to recognize her for working to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Women of Influence class continued success.

RECOGNIZING JORDAN

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, today I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 222, recognizing the long-term partnership and friendship between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, working together towards peace and security in the Middle East. I would like to recognize the bipartisan support of my colleagues, including House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ED ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL. This resolution comes at a time of extreme unrest and conflict in the region.

Since taking up the post of our country's top diplomat in February, Secretary of State John Kerry has traveled to Amman over six times. Close cooperation between our two nations is critical to meet the challenges of the Middle East region. Jordan plays a key role as the host and mediator in Middle East peace negotiations between the Israelis and Palestinians. Jordan has maintained full, normalized diplomatic relations with Israel for almost 20 years since signing the historic 1994 Jordan-Israel Peace Treaty. As an advocate for progress in the Middle East peace process, Jordan is a stabilizing force for the region.

The horrific violence in neighboring Syria threatens to destabilize an entire region. The al-Assad regime continues to fuel a humanitarian crisis through attacks against innocent civilians. Over 100,000 Syrian lives have been lost and approximately 1.8 million refugees have fled Syria. Jordan is hosting over half a million refugees, which is almost 10% of Jordan's population. The government of Jordan is partnering with the international community to care for the needs of this vulnerable population, providing shelter, food, water, health care and education. The burden of caring for such a large number of refugees places enormous economic and social pressures on the country.

The United States has enjoyed a strong alliance with Jordan for over six decades. The Jordanians work closely with the United States in multiple areas, from cooperation in regional and global counterterrorism efforts, to economic development and humanitarian assistance. King Abdullah II is an advocate for modernization in the Arab world, and recognizes the potential opportunity for political reform in Jordan. U.S.-Jordan relations are a key element of U.S. strategic interests in the Middle East. I am pleased to offer this resolution commending the people and Government of Jordan for their continued friendship with the United States and commitment to peace, security and stability in the Middle East.

IN RECOGNITION OF DON DORNELL

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Fire Chief Don Dornell, who is retiring after

nearly four decades of service to the people of Burlingame and San Mateo County. His dedication to public service is a credit to his community and to his character as a leader.

Don Dornell is a Peninsula native, born in San Francisco in 1951 and raised in Millbrae as the second of five children, and one of a pair of twins. He attended Capuchino High School in San Bruno, then earned his associate degree in Political Science at the College of San Mateo in 1971.

It was then that Chief Dornell's career in public service began. He served in the Army National Guard for six years, until 1977. During that time, Chief Dornell trained as a plumber, and he began working for the San Carlos Parks Department. But from his first day, he knew that the Parks Department was not for him—his real goal was serving as a firefighter.

After a brief stint in Piedmont, Chief Dornell was hired as a firefighter for the City of Burlingame in March 1977, a community he has served diligently ever since. He has risen swiftly through the ranks, earning a promotion to Fire Captain in 1985, and serving as the B-Shift Training Officer from 1985 to 1997 and codirector of the San Mateo County Fire Recruit Academy from 1996 to 1997. In January 1997, he became Assistant Chief, and he took over responsibility for training and overseeing line personnel.

More recently, Chief Dornell has worked tirelessly to ensure successful transitions as local agencies consolidate fire protection to strengthen the cohesiveness of service and promote administrative efficiency. When the City of Burlingame and the Town of Hillsborough merged fire services in 2004, becoming the Central County Fire Department, he became the first Deputy Fire Chief of the new agency. This is a role he has embraced, as he became the agency's second Fire Chief in December 2006. Last year he took over responsibility for fire departments in Millbrae and San Bruno as well.

Chief Dornell's service to the community has taken other forms as well. He is a long-standing Fire Technology Instructor at College of San Mateo, administrator of the San Mateo County Fire Recruit Academy from 1997 to 2006, and a Member of the San Mateo County Fire Chiefs Association, where he serves as liaison to a number of adjunct groups. Chief Dornell is also the first inaugural chairman of the Burlingame Adopt-a-Unit program, which since 2004 has supported hundreds of U.S. soldiers through their deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan.

In his retirement, Chief Dornell will be relocating to Calaveras County to enjoy hiking and outdoors activities in the Central Sierra, to continue work on the home he has been rebuilding, and to spend some time travelling around the country with his wife Debra. He will also continue his work as a volunteer for the Calaveras County Sheriffs Search and Rescue Team.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in congratulating Fire Chief Don Dornell on a remarkable career. His contributions to our community are an example of the best in public service, and his leadership and dedication will be missed. We wish him the best in his retirement.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,599,194,294.87. We've added \$6,111,722,145,381.79 to our debt in 4 and a half years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE S.A.F.E. COMPOUNDED DRUG ACT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Supporting Access to Formulated and Effective Compounded Drugs Act, or the S.A.F.E. Compounded Drug Act. My colleagues Congresswoman NITA LOWEY of New York, Congressman CONYERS of Michigan, and Congressman HONDA of California are cosponsors of this legislation and I thank them for their work on this issue.

This bill seeks to ensure that patients and health care providers across the country have access to safe compounded drug products.

As you know, a devastating fungal meningitis outbreak last year was associated with contaminated products from a compounding facility in Massachusetts. Nearly 750 Americans became ill from these products and 61 perished. Unfortunately, this tragic outbreak and the others we have seen since are not anomalies. They are the result of a broken system. My thoughts and prayers are with the individuals and families whose lives have been affected by these contaminated products.

Earlier this week the Government Accountability Office released a report on drug compounding. That report noted that "lack of consensus and differing FDA authority to oversee compounded drugs across the country has resulted in gaps in oversight." Gaps that clearly risk the public health.

Just this week a compounding pharmacy announced the recall of more than 125 different types of sterile compounded products distributed nationally. Five days after the company began notifying its customers of the recall, a recall notice was published by the FDA. These products are being recalled because of a "question of sterility assurance." Thankfully no illnesses have been identified, but it is imperative that we act now and not wait for another heart wrenching outbreak and ask ourselves if we could have prevented it in the first place.

The bill I am introducing today should be part of our work to fix the system. It would do five things: clarify Federal authority of compounding pharmacies, improve patient and

provider notification with accurate labeling, improve communication between Federal and state regulators, seek additional information to improve our understanding of the complexities related to compounded products, and strengthen penalties.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

PROMOTE PROGRESS IN
DUCHENNE MUSCULAR DYS-
TROPHY RESEARCH

HON. SPENCER BACHUS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to talk about an opportunity before us to help some courageous children with Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy.

Duchenne affects nearly 20,000 babies a year, arresting proper muscle development during childhood.

Children with Duchenne, like young Gabe Griffin of Birmingham who I have personally met, are full of strength, spirit, and hope. They are an inspiration to all of us.

Thanks to medical research and the advocacy of Gabe's parents, Scott and Traci Griffin, and many other parents including Joel and Dana Wood here in Washington, new therapies and treatments are being developed for children with Duchenne.

But we all want progress to come even faster.

The Food and Drug Administration is considering whether to allow accelerated use of a potential breakthrough therapy. It is a drug called Eteplirsen.

While properly taking safety into account, it is important for the FDA to reach a timely decision on making this drug available to the children who would benefit from it.

When you have had the privilege to be with wonderful kids like Gabe, you know that we must do everything possible to help them progress through a healthy and happy childhood.

HONORING INDUCTEES INTO THE
SOUTH JERSEY FOOTBALL HALL
OF FAME

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the seven new members of the South Jersey Football Coaches Association Hall of Fame. The inductees were Reggie Lawrence, Phil Costa, Todd McNair, Brian Matera, Arnold Byrd, Mike McDevitt, and Jim Doyle.

Reggie Lawrence has been a high school coach for sixteen years and is currently coaching at Willingboro. He has rebuilt the Willingboro program, which previously had a 0-10 record, into a local power which last year qualified for the South Jersey Group 2 playoffs. Mr. Lawrence has earned more than 100 victories during his coaching career at Cam-

den, Pennsauken, Jackson Liberty, and Willingboro. Coach Lawrence has not only had an extremely successful coaching career, but he was also a star athlete at Camden High School.

Phil Costa starred at Holy Cross High School and was named to the All South Jersey team. He later excelled at the University of Maryland and now plays for the Dallas Cowboys. He started in every game for the Cowboys in 2011 and was one of the best centers in the NFL. Although he was injured for the majority of the 2012 season, he recently signed a two-year contract extension and will be back on the field for the 2013 season.

Todd McNair played at Temple University and then professionally for the Houston Oilers and the Kansas City Chiefs. In his career, McNair caught 254 passes with seven receiving touchdowns, and rushed for 803 yards and three touchdowns. He also averaged 18.6 yards per kickoff return. McNair ranks in the top 20 among Chiefs receivers with over 1,800 receiving yards. After retirement from professional football, McNair coached at Camden High School and was the running backs coach for both the Cleveland Browns and the University of Southern California. During his time at USC, he was widely recognized as one of the most effective recruiters in college football.

Brian Matera is one of Pennsauken's legendary players. He was the Indians starting linebacker for three years, earned All South Jersey honors, and was nominated by *Scholastic Magazine* as an All American.

He also played for the University of Maryland in three bowl games. In 1980, he even earned a tryout with the Philadelphia Eagles. Tragically, Brian Matera passed away in 1990 but his accomplishments will not be forgotten.

Arnold Byrd earned the Oaks Award, one of the highest academic awards for a male student. He was also a member of the National Honor Society, and made All State and All South Jersey for football. He received both athletic and academic scholarship to Rutgers and in 1960 he was recognized as their most valuable football player.

Mike McDevitt is known as one of South Jersey's top coaches. He currently serves as line coach at Haddonfield Memorial. He was previously an assistant line coach at Cherry Hill East, Pitman and Gloucester Catholic dating back to 1987. Coach McDevitt also served as Gloucester Catholic head coach from 1989-1993, making two appearances in state championship games.

Finally, I would like to personally congratulate Jim Doyle, a dear friend and coach of my Alma Mater, Triton Regional High School. I am pleased to honor Coach Doyle for his distinguished service as coach and athletic director. For 35 years he coached football and track at Glassboro, Lenape, and Triton. As football coach, he earned a career record of 91-63-7 at Glassboro and Triton, including a perfect 8-0 record in the 1968 season at Triton. Two of his top high school players went on to play football at the collegiate level for the University of Virginia and Rutgers University.

Mr. Speaker, the contributions of these seven inductees to the football community and to South Jersey should not go unrecognized. I join all of South Jersey in expressing our

gratitude for Reggie, Phil, Todd, Brian, Arnold, Mike, Jim, and their families as they celebrate their induction into the South Jersey Football Coaches Association Hall of Fame.

HONORING MR. SIMMIE JESSE
HILL, JR. OF MIDLAND, PENN-
SYLVANIA

HON. KEITH J. ROTHFUS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Simmie Jesse Hill, Jr. of Midland, Pennsylvania. He was born on November 14, 1946 and grew up to become one of the greatest basketball players to come from Western Pennsylvania.

Simmie Hill starred on the 1965 Midland High School men's basketball team, considered by many to be one of the best in Pennsylvania's history. The Midland Leopards won the State title that year, finishing the season 28-0. Mr. Hill scored over 650 points that season, and he led the team to victory with his thirty-one points in the championship game.

The Sporting News named Mr. Hill a First-Team All-American when he was a senior at West Texas State University. Following his college career, Mr. Hill played four seasons of professional basketball in the American Basketball Association and retired in 1974. In 2010, he was inducted into the Midland Sports Hall of Fame.

Simmie Hill passed away in Pittsburgh on July 14, 2013 at the age of sixty-six. He is survived by four daughters and nine grandchildren, and our thoughts and prayers are with his family.

Mr. Speaker, Western Pennsylvania has a strong sports legacy, and I am pleased to honor the memory of one of our greatest basketball players.

CONGRATULATING HON. B. TODD
JONES ON HIS CONFIRMATION
BY THE U.S. SENATE AS THE DI-
RECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF AL-
COHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS
AND EXPLOSIVES

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to congratulate my constituent and friend, the Honorable B. Todd Jones, on his confirmation by the United States Senate to be the director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF). As the first permanent director since 2006, Director Jones knows the job well; he has been leading this important federal law enforcement agency as "acting director" since 2011. While serving as acting director, Mr. Jones has also been serving as the United States Attorney for Minnesota. The hefty and time consuming responsibility of leading two important federal offices has proven to be a testament to Mr.

Jones' commitment to public service, his stamina, and the gracious support of his wife, Margaret, and his children.

Nominated by President Obama to serve as ATF's permanent director in January 2013, Mr. Jones endured a Senate confirmation process that too often neglected the gun violence crisis in this country and instead degenerated into a partisan political smear campaign with unfounded attacks on an outstanding public servant. The Senate vote to confirm Mr. Jones was very partisan. The six Republicans who voted for cloture thus allowing an up or down vote on this nomination deserve to be commended for their fairness. I also want to commend Minnesota's two Senators, AMY KLOBUCHAR and AL FRANKEN, for shepherding this nomination through very difficult political terrain.

There is no doubt that President Obama got it right when he tapped Mr. Jones to lead the ATE. Todd's career in public service is stellar—a Marine Corps infantryman, Marine Corps Judge Advocate, federal prosecutor, and the U.S. Attorney for Minnesota in both the Clinton and Obama administrations. This is a man of integrity, character, and determination who has never hesitated to serve his country when called upon.

As the director of ATF, B. Todd Jones will have the opportunity to strengthen and offer much needed stability to an agency that has been denied a permanent director by Republicans in Congress even when a nominee was put forth by President Bush. Both ATF staff and law enforcement officials all across the U.S. will have a partner and an advocate in the new director. As gun violence continues to plague America's cities, towns, families, and, most tragically, our schools, ATF needs a leader who will respect gun rights, but champion gun safety and safe communities. That's the kind of leader Todd Jones will be and I am very proud of his on-going service to our country.

A TRIBUTE TO DIANE BRIDGEWATER

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Diane Bridgewater for being named a 2013 Women of Influence honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Each year, Business Record undertakes an exhaustive review to identify a standout group of women in the Greater Des Moines area who, as the publication notes, "have made a difference." An impressive group of inspiring female leaders are selected annually for this prestigious distinction, which is based on combined criteria of community involvement, career success, and being a role model for other women to emulate. The 2013 Women of Influence honorees join an impressive roster of more than 130 women who have changed and are continuing to change our communities for the better.

Diane Bridgewater has always wanted her work to benefit the community. And so since

she began her career at KPMG Peat Marwick in 1985, she has held numerous positions and board memberships to accomplish her goal. Once at DuPont Pioneer for 18 years and now executive VP and chief financial and administrative officer for LCS, in which role she has worked to improve the lives of senior citizens, this successful business executive also has served as a director at the United Way of Central Iowa, ChildServe, Make-A-Wish Foundation of Central Iowa, Hospice of Central Iowa, the UNI College of Business dean's advisory board, Casey's General Stores Inc., and Bankers Trust Co.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Diane Bridgewater in the United States Congress, and I am pleased to recognize her for working to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Women of Influence class continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 433 I was unavoidably detained at a personal doctor's appointment. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF EAST PALO ALTO

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 30th anniversary of the City of East Palo Alto. I am proud to represent the 28,000 residents of this city in the 14th Congressional District of California. The small community, which has a land area of only 2.5 square miles, was incorporated on July 1, 1983 and became the 20th city of San Mateo County. Voters elected the first city council of Barbara Mouton—the first mayor—Gertrude Wilks, Frank Omowale Satterwhite, Ruben Abrica—the current mayor—and James Blakely, Jr.

I remember the days when the creation of the city was quite uncertain. I was on the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors at the time and supported incorporation. We had events in East Palo Alto to educate the public in advance of the vote. We had rallies and voter registration drives. The election's outcome is testament to the work of hundreds who went into their neighborhoods to explain why creating a city would help the residents of East Palo Alto to improve their lives.

East Palo Alto has made great progress in the three decades since its residents choose to create their own path to a better future. The town has many wonderful institutions such as

its improving schools, social service agencies, churches, and an outstanding public medical clinic, the Ravenswood Family Health Center. Residents are very engaged in street improvement, school safety and beautification projects. The wisdom of residents, local officials, and law enforcement helped the city overcome a spike in crime in the 1980s and 90s.

What has not changed in the past 30 years is the fact that people are attracted to the area because of its centralized location, its proximity to San Francisco Bay, its desirable weather and its family-centered churches and schools.

For centuries, the original inhabitants were Ohlone Native Americans who lived along the coast from San Francisco to Monterey Bay. In 1849, when the town was founded as Ravenswood, Isaiah Woods tried to make it a major shipping town. In 1868 he sold his operation to Lester Cooley who built a brick factory. After the brick factory, the city became a farming community, largely based upon growing flowers. A large Japanese population dominated the flower growing market until the shameful World War II decision that forced 120,000 Japanese-Americans into internment camps.

After the war, many African-Americans moved to East Palo Alto and made it the largest African American community on the peninsula. In fact, during the civil rights movement in 1968, the city was almost renamed Nairobi. Today, the city has a multi-ethnic population that is over 60% Hispanic, about 15% African American, 7% Asian, 7% Caucasian and 11% Pacific Islander.

Since the late 1990s, East Palo Alto has experienced significant economic development. A quarter of the city's buildings have been replaced with new housing and retail space. This development is what the founders of the city hoped for—a chance to create jobs for residents within the community. In 2008, another step was taken as residents and local businesses established the East Palo Alto Community Farmers Market. The market is allied with the health center, providing wholesome food for residents at affordable prices. In 2009, the first full service supermarket opened in the Ravenswood 101 shopping center. Once again, the residents of East Palo Alto demonstrated that theirs is a community that knows how to get things done.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor the 30th anniversary of East Palo Alto as the city is celebrating this occasion with a parade, community festival and fireworks. This diverse Bay Area community welcomes all residents and neighbors with warmth and optimism—today and every day.

INTRODUCTION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION CONDEMNING THE ATTACK AT THE OAK CREEK SIKH GURDWARA ON AUGUST 5, 2012

HON. PAUL RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today, my colleagues and I introduced a

House Resolution condemning the attack that occurred at the Oak Creek Sikh Gurdwara on August 5, 2012, and honoring the memory of those who died in the attack. We remember all those affected by the senseless act of violence that occurred one year ago in Oak Creek, Wisconsin. We call to mind the heroic efforts of Lieutenant Brian Murphy and all the medical and law-enforcement officials who responded to the scene. We also recognize the public servants who helped our community heal during this trying time.

Since that fateful day, the people of Oak Creek have come together. They refuse to let violence shake their community. My thoughts and prayers are with the victims and their families, and I'm committed to continuing to help the community overcome this tragedy.

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following exchange of correspondence between myself and Agriculture Committee Chairman FRANK LUCAS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2013.

Hon. FRANK LUCAS,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LUCAS, I write today to highlight a program of significance to rural Alaska and many of our Alaska Native villages. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), through the Rural Utilities Service, helps provide financing for the construction of water and waste water systems in remote Alaska villages that face unique, significant obstacles to providing residents with potable water and safe sanitation systems. These obstacles include Alaska's extreme climate and geography as well as the fact that most villages are not connected to the road system and are only accessible by air. The water systems assisted by the program are not a matter of convenience for these communities, but meet a critical public health need.

Currently, more than 30 villages in Alaska still use "honeybuckets" as their method of waste collection. A honeybucket is a five gallon bucket used as a toilet by everyone in a household and emptied by the family on a daily basis. Honeybuckets are a reality for many communities in my state and pose serious health risks for residents, particularly children. Thankfully USDA, the State of Alaska, and the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium are working together through the program to create better sanitation facilities in rural Alaska and help make honeybuckets a relic of the past.

I would like to bring this issue to your attention and would greatly appreciate your assistance in Farm Bill conference negotiations with the Senate to help reauthorize this important program.

Thank You,

DON YOUNG,
Congressman for all Alaska.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2013.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YOUNG, Thank you for your letter regarding the United States Department of Agriculture program that helps provide financing for water and waste water systems in remote Alaska villages. I appreciate you bringing this issue to my attention. Given the urgency that you describe in your letter, I would be happy to work with you during the Farm Bill conference regarding this public health need.

Sincerely,

FRANK D. LUCAS,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DESERT VISTA H.S. HEALTH OCCUPATIONS STUDENTS OF AMERICA CLUB

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Desert Vista High School's Health Occupations Students of America Club for their achievement in the HOSA-Future Health Professionals National Leadership conference.

Desert Vista students won first place in three events and two national service awards, and took home numerous other top ten finishes. Their record is astonishing for one school, and is a testament to their school's leadership and the students' effort. Katelyn Miyaski and Gen Fitzgerald won national championships in pharmacology and medical terminology, respectively, and the team of Jing Liang, Anshuman Bakshi, Sung Kwon Park, and Sanjeev Murty were national champions in biomedical debate. Alex Burton won the Barbara James Service Gold Award and the President's Volunteer Service Award.

The students, many of whom hope to pursue higher education in the medical, healthcare, and biotechnology industries, are to be commended and encouraged in their pursuit of science and service, as well as for their comprehensive knowledge in their fields of interest. Their dedication is reason for faith in our country's future, guided by such innovators and leaders. They represent their state and school well, and I am proud to represent them in Congress.

Given their record of accomplishment, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Desert Vista High School's Health Occupations Students of America Club for their dedication and achievement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 435 I was unavoidably detained in a meeting at the White House with the President.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

A TRIBUTE TO MARGARET BORGEN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Margaret Borgen for being named a 2013 Women of Influence honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Each year, Business Record undertakes an exhaustive review to identify a standout group of women in the Greater Des Moines area who, as the publication notes, "have made a difference." An impressive group of inspiring female leaders are selected annually for this prestigious distinction, which is based on combined criteria of community involvement, career success, and being a role model for other women to emulate. The 2013 Women of Influence honorees join an impressive roster of more than 130 women who have changed and are continuing to change our communities for the better.

Mrs. Borgen is part owner of Borgen Systems, a family-owned small business that manufactures display cases for a variety of products—but her professional pursuits hardly end there. Her lifelong passion, improving education, has led her to be a teacher, an administrator and a school board member, and in addition to holding state and national leadership positions in education, she currently is president of the Des Moines Public Schools Foundation. She also founded the FINE Education Research Foundation in 2003, which leveraged \$100,000 into \$3 million of state funding and matching private contributions for education research. In the community, she has served on the boards for the Des Moines A.M. Rotary Club, Employee & Family Resources Foundation and the Greater Des Moines Leadership Institute.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Margaret Borgen in the United States Congress, and I am pleased to recognize her for working to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Women of Influence class continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. GREGORY LUKASZEWICZ

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Dr. Gregory Lukaszewicz for his service as president of the San Mateo County Medical Association, which represents and educates

physicians and promotes quality medical care for the people of San Mateo County. Throughout his career, Dr. Lukaszewicz has been a staunch advocate for preventative care and patients' access to care.

Gregory Lukaszewicz grew up near Buffalo, New York. He earned his BA at Dartmouth College and his medical degree at Harvard Medical School. After completing his General Surgery Residency at the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston, he was awarded a Fellowship in Vascular Surgery at UCSF.

Dr. Lukaszewicz then joined Kaiser Permanente in South San Francisco where he is a vascular and general surgeon. He is also the smoking cessation champion at the hospital. Three years ago he became a part-time specialist in venous and lymphatic disorders, a change he calls transformative. He says his experience has shown him just how complex these diseases are and how much the medical knowledge lags behind patients' needs. Determined to close this gap, he launched a pilot program to detect Peripheral Arterial Disease in its earliest stages.

It was Dr. Lukaszewicz's strong interest in public policy that got him involved in the San Mateo County and California Medical Associations. He works closely with county and state health care leaders to find remedies to public health issues that affect patients beyond his individual clinical practice. For example, he is committed to the Association's active role in eradicating Hepatitis B in the Asian and Pacific Islander communities by providing regular screenings and vaccinations.

Dr. Lukaszewicz is married to Nicole Moayeri, a neurosurgeon at Kaiser's Redwood City facility. They have two children, Leila, 12, and Gabriel, 10. As a devoted family man, he works part-time so that he can remain involved in his children's scholastic and athletic activities. To stay physically and mentally healthy, he enjoys hiking, cycling, sailing, kayaking, gardening, cooking and reading.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor an exceptional physician and human being. Dr. Lukaszewicz's work continues to benefit thousands of people in San Mateo County and beyond and sets an admirable example of innovative, patient-centered care.

RETIREMENT OF FBI DIRECTOR ROBERT MUELLER

HON. FRANK R. WOLF
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and thank Robert Mueller for his service to our country. Mr. Mueller has served as director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) since September 4, 2001, and will be retiring before the Congress returns in September. I have had the privilege of working with Director Mueller as the chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee that funds the FBI and firmly believe he is the best director in the more than hundred-year history of the Bureau.

I want to also recognize his wife, Ann, and his two daughters, Melissa and Cynthia, for

their sacrifice in countless nights and weekends their husband and father spent serving our country over the last twelve years.

Director Mueller deserves much credit for skillfully responding to the 9/11 terrorist attacks after just a week on the job and leading the FBI's transformation into an intelligence-driven and threat-focused national security organization. The FBI today is a remarkably different agency than the one the director inherited in 2001. The changes made during his tenure have made our country safer and stronger, while also upholding and respecting our Constitution. He has always been honest and forthright with the Congress and the American people.

It is hard to quantify the many lives that have been saved thanks to FBI actions that disrupted terror plots and other threats against the American people. I want to recognize the thousands of hard working and vigilant men and women of the bureau, including the agents, analysts and support staff who serve our country. Under the director's leadership, the men and women of the FBI have effectively prevented many attacks against our country.

Bob Mueller's service to our country began long before he was sworn in as FBI Director. He has had a long career of distinguished service to our country. He served as an officer in the Marine Corps, leading a rifle platoon in Vietnam. He is the recipient of the Bronze Star, two Navy Commendation Medals, the Purple Heart and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry. He later served in several U.S. Attorneys' offices and in private practice before being appointed as the U.S. Attorney in San Francisco in 1998.

I wish the director and his family all the best in his next endeavors and thank him again for his service and sacrifice. He is a true patriot and a model public servant.

COMMEMORATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HOWARD FLATS FARM

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of the 200th Anniversary of the Howard Flats Farm in Hornell, New York. As agriculture is a foundational part of our American heritage, I am honored to recognize such a longstanding farm family. Agriculture is an important industry for New York as well as the country as a whole, providing a stable, safe food supply. It is essential to recognize the milestones of those families who have made substantial contributions to the economic vitality of the Empire State.

The diversified farming operation at the Howard Flats Farm, owned by Phil Bennett and his wife Juanita Bennett, includes a log home and nearby camping site that is rented as lodging during hunting season and throughout the year for recreational activities. Mr. Bennett is an active Rotarian and Farm Bureau member. He and his family also volunteer their time to many of Howard's community events and activities.

The farm has been in the Bennett family for five generations and is now managed by Phil and Juanita's son, Jay Bennett. Howard Flats Farm totals around 700 acres and is the home to an average milking-herd of 150 cows. The farm has and continues to change and expand with time and is poised for success for many years to come.

With great pleasure, I acknowledge the success of this exceptional family and its contributions to the local and State economies, fully confident that it will continue to enjoy the success it has experienced thus far.

HONORING DON HADAD

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Don Hadad, superintendent of the St. Vrain Valley School District in Longmont, Colorado. Don was recently named "National Superintendent of the Year" by the National Association of School Superintendents.

For the last 29 years Don has dedicated his life to improving our children's education. He began his career as a physical education teacher, and has since held the positions of assistant principal, high school principal, executive director of secondary education, assistant superintendent, deputy superintendent, and most recently, superintendent of the St. Vrain Valley School District.

As Superintendent, Don has led by example. His visionary leadership and ideas have helped significantly develop the public schools in my district by championing educational reforms that included teacher evaluations and expanding public charter schools. He established the "Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics" Academy at Skyline High School and opened the Medical and Science Academy at Longmont High School to help advance students to secondary education.

His reforms are an example of the common sense solutions school districts across the country can implement to better serve their students and families.

Please join me today in congratulating Don Hadad on his award and on his success as superintendent of the St. Vrain Valley School District.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 429 I had to step out of the chamber and missed the opportunity to vote on this amendment.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 432 I was unavoidably detained at a personal doctor's appointment.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

REGARDING REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY'S (PA) AMENDMENT NO. 6 TO H.R. 1582 ON INTENDING TO VOTE NAY ON ROLL 430 ON AUGUST 1, 2013

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express that I intended to vote "nay" but was recorded as yea on Roll 430 on August 1, 2013 on Representative MURPHY'S (PA) Amendment No. 6 to H.R. 1582.

The Rules of the House of Representatives prevent Members from changing votes after the fact, but I wish to state for the record that I fully intended to vote "nay" on Representative MURPHY'S Amendment.

If enacted in law, Representative MURPHY'S amendment would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and other federal agencies from using the social cost of carbon (SCC) to estimate the climate benefits of rulemakings. Contrary to the intentions of the amendment, I fully support the use of the SCC by the EPA and other federal agencies to estimate the climate benefits of rulemakings. The SCC is important to interpret the impact of carbon dioxide emissions on agricultural productivity, human health, increased flood risk, and other factors which are important to my constituents in eastern North Carolina.

RECOGNIZING JESSICA BELMARES-ORTEGA

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor, Jessica Belmares-Ortega, an exceptional young New Mexican student. This summer, Jessica, a recent graduate of Albuquerque High School, was awarded a prestigious Ronald McDonald House HACER scholarship to attend the University of New Mexico. One of only four students in the nation to receive this scholarship, she plans to use her \$100,000 award to study medicine so she can give back to her community and help the less fortunate in our state.

A first-generation American who grew up in a Spanish-speaking environment, Jessica plans to use her bilingual skills to improve health care access and delivery in rural com-

munities. As a volunteer at a local hospital, Jessica frequently saw Spanish-speaking families wait hours for a translator to arrive before getting a diagnosis or treatment. She believes that having more bilingual medical professionals will help mitigate this problem and improve the overall health of patients all over New Mexico.

Education has always played an important role in the Belmares-Ortega home. Although Jessica's parents, who are originally from Mexico, did not attend college, they worked hard so that their children would have the opportunity to pursue their dreams. They enrolled Jessica and her two older siblings in United States of America preschool so they would learn English at a young age. They also closely tracked their children's progress to ensure they succeeded in school.

Considering Jessica's academic achievements, strong leadership skills and dedication to her community, I am not surprised that the Ronald McDonald House chose to recognize her success with this scholarship. At Albuquerque High School, Jessica enrolled in the dual-language program, took advantage of numerous Advanced Placement and honors courses and participated in a gifted mentorship program. In college, she plans to maintain her busy schedule by enrolling in a medical laboratory program and working to advance her Spanish fluency skills.

I'm honored to represent Jessica in the United States House of Representatives, and I wish her success in her college career and in all of her future endeavors.

IN HONOR OF SUSAN FEISTNER

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the accomplishments of Susan Feistner. Susie recently retired from my congressional staff after 13 years of dedicated and excellent service to the constituents of the Second Congressional District of Nebraska. I wish Susie all the happiness in the world as she embarks on the next stage of her life.

Susie served as my Senior Constituent Liaison in my Omaha Congressional Office. Susie handles immigration issues, and this was no small task. Over the years, she muddled through mounds of paperwork to find solutions for people and in many cases reunited families, helped with adoptions of foreign-born children and obtained last-minute visas and passports. She also referred people to attorneys for help in becoming legal citizens and helped many constituents navigate through the tangle of U.S. Immigration laws. Her tireless service made a difference in thousands of lives.

Over the years, Susie has also been active in Republican Party politics and has worked for candidates up and down and the ballot. Her involvement in our political process to spread the Republican message of lower taxes and a strong national defense has been greatly appreciated. She has also been a steady hand in my District Office and the constituents of Nebraska's Second Congressional District have benefitted greatly.

I offer you a heartfelt thank you to Susie for her dedication. I am extremely proud of her contributions over the past 13 years and I am blessed to have had such a professional and hard working individual on my team.

It is a privilege and an honor to have Susie as a part of Team Terry.

IN RECOGNITION OF HELEN HAUSMAN

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Helen Hausman who has dedicated her life to education and served on the San Mateo County Community College District Board of Trustees for 23 years and before that on the Sequoia Union High School Board for 13 years. Helen represents the best that San Mateo County has to offer in education leadership.

Helen is the current board president and was a past president for four terms. During her many years at the community college district, she has always made it her priority to provide students with high-quality classroom instruction and an environment that nurtures learning. Helen was instrumental in getting bond measures passed to update the aging facilities and to create three state-of-the-art campuses. She firmly believes that education and opportunities should be accessible to everyone.

Helen has also served during some of the most tumultuous times in the history of California's higher educational systems, making difficult choices on funding due to state funding cuts. Helen and her colleagues successfully navigated these challenges, retaining the core purpose of the district to prepare students for four-year colleges and universities. San Mateo County has a stellar community college district because of Helen Hausman's dedication to educational quality and inclusiveness.

Helen, a native of New York, earned her BA in Education from George Washington University where she was the only woman in her class. After graduation, she taught at a grammar school in Maryland.

While in Washington DC in 1945, Helen met Arthur Hausman who was in the Navy and who would soon become her husband. The two of them moved to California in 1960 because Arthur received what he calls "an offer he couldn't refuse."

Helen became heavily involved with PTAs and held several leadership positions. Because of her outstanding reputation she was invited to fill a vacancy on the Sequoia Union High School Board and held that position for 13 years.

She also has served on committees of the Association of Community College Trustees, Community College League of California and the San Mateo County School Boards Association. She is currently a member of American Association of University Women. Helen is listed in Who's Who of American Women, was inducted into the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame, and was elected to Pi

Lambda Theta, a national honor society for educators.

Helen is a longtime member of the San Mateo County American Red Cross Council and serves as chair on the Bay Area Red Cross International Committee to help trace and reunite families separated as a result of armed conflict or disasters. Her passion for this work started with the tracing project which reunited family members of Holocaust survivors.

In her retirement, Helen is looking forward to spending more time with her husband Arthur, son and daughter-in-law Ken and Hilary, daughter Catherine and grandchildren Sam and Sarah.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor Helen Hausman, a woman I have known and admired for decades, for her common sense and no nonsense leadership. She has shaped education in the Bay Area for a generation and helped thousands of students build a foundation for successful careers. Her retirement is well deserved, and her impact upon our lives will be enduring.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast rollcall votes on July 17th. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes:

On rollcall 357, I would have voted "no"; on rollcall 358, I would have voted "no"; on rollcall 359, I would have voted "no"; on rollcall 360, I would have voted "yes"; on rollcall 361, I would have voted "no"; on rollcall 362, I would have voted "yes"; and on rollcall 363, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 430, I was unavoidably detained in a meeting off the Hill at the White House with the President.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

50TH ANNIVERSARY FOR THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON FOR JOBS AND FREEDOM

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate and celebrate the 50th anniversary for the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom (August 28, 1963), we do so

with deep appreciation and profound gratitude to those who sacrificed and made true their promise of working to make America a better place for everyone.

With the march taking place during the 100th year anniversary of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. delivered his famous "I Have a Dream" speech on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial to over 250,000 people. As a result, the March on Washington remains one of the largest demonstrations for civil rights and economic rights in American history. Not only was the crowd large on that day, but the enormous impact it had on the struggle for equality and social justice is immeasurable.

As the concept for a march of its magnitude began to unfold, American civil rights leaders as James Farmer, John Lewis, Martin Luther King, Jr., Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young, and Bayard Rustin all joined a broader coalition responsible for organizing the march under the leadership of its chairman, A. Phillip Randolph.

Randolph, a onetime resident of Jacksonville, FL, had been selected to lead this effort as he was one of the most widely known spokespersons for black working class interests in the country. Just over twenty years prior he planned to use the support of nearly 100,000 loyal Black citizens to march on Washington, D.C., to protest President Franklin D. Roosevelt's refusal to issue an Executive Order to ban discrimination against black workers in the defense industry. However, just six days before the march was scheduled, Roosevelt issued Executive Order No. 8802 declaring "there shall be no discrimination in the employment of workers in defense industries or government because of race, creed, color, or national origin".

During the march on Washington in 1968, the coalition presented a list of comprehensive goals which included, a push to get passage of meaningful civil rights legislation, immediate elimination of school segregation, a program of public works, increased job training for the unemployed, a Federal law prohibiting discrimination in public or private hiring, a \$2-an-hour minimum wage nationwide, withholding Federal funds from programs that tolerate discrimination, enforcement of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution by reducing congressional representation from States that disenfranchise citizens, a broadened Fair Labor Standards Act to currently excluded employment areas, and authority for the Attorney General to institute injunctive suits when constitutional rights are violated.

While we have made significant progress since the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, we find ourselves dealing with many of the same issues that participants of the demonstration dealt with years ago. Today we see unemployment in the African American community over 10%, today we see conservative state legislatures across the country passing restrictive laws that make it more difficult for Americans to have access to the ballot box, today we see people judge each other based on the color of their skin, and as a result an unarmed teen in Florida lost his life, and today, we find ourselves trying to piece back what is left of the dismantled Voting Rights Act of 1965, as the United States Supreme Court has struck down Section 4 of the

law, leaving the prized legislative victory of the Civil Rights movement without much power.

While we must take this time to celebrate and appreciate the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, we must also continue to ensure that the goals of the march are fulfilled and Dr. King's Dream becomes a reality. For there is much work to be done, and if we all join together, I am hopeful we can make social justice and equality real in America, and all across the globe.

A TRIBUTE TO BARBARA CROWLEY

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Barbara Crowley for being named the 2013 Women of Influence Business Owner of the Year by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Each year, Business Record undertakes an exhaustive review to identify a standout group of women in the Greater Des Moines area who, as the publication notes, "have made a difference." An impressive group of inspiring female leaders are selected annually for this prestigious distinction, which is based on combined criteria of community involvement, career success, and being a role model for other women to emulate. The 2013 Women of Influence honorees join an impressive roster of more than 130 women who have changed and are continuing to change our communities for the better.

When she joined her late father in the insurance brokerage business in 1978, Ms. Crowley notes that there were few women in the industry. Today, as President and CEO of West Des Moines-based Brokers Clearing House Ltd., she leads a team of about 25 employees that is known widely for its expertise in underwriting and works with nearly 70 insurance carriers. Her leadership in the industry is set to be rewarded in November as she assumes the chairmanship of the National Association of Independent Life Brokerage Agencies. She also is a founding partner of LifeMark Partners Inc., one of the largest and most prestigious marketing groups in the insurance industry. In the community, Ms. Crowley is a generous supporter of the Des Moines Performing Arts, in addition to Hope Ministries, Embrace Iowa, Iowa State University, the University of Iowa, the John Stoddard Cancer Center, and the Iowa State Fair Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Barbara Crowley in the United States Congress, and I am pleased to recognize her for working to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Women of Influence class continued success.

HONORING LANCE CORPORAL
WILLIAM RAYMOND PROM

HON. KEITH J. ROTHFUS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the exemplary military service of Lance Corporal William Raymond Prom. Lance Corporal Prom gave his life in service to our nation in Vietnam.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania recently renamed Pittsburgh's 31st Street Bridge the William Raymond Prom Memorial Bridge in a fitting tribute to his sacrifice.

Lance Corporal Prom began his tour of duty in the Vietnam war on June 13, 1968, when he was twenty years old. He served as a Machine Gun Squad Leader with Company I, Third Battalion, Third Marines, Third Marine Division.

On February 9, 1969, Lance Corporal Prom was participating in Operation Taylor Common near An Hoa, Vietnam when his platoon came under intense fire, wounding many. Without concern for his own safety, Lance Corporal Prom provided cover fire while others administered vital first aid to his fellow Marines.

Soon afterwards, his platoon came under attack again. A wounded Lance Corporal Prom returned fire, coming to the aid of a fellow Marine who was critically wounded. Unable to effectively return fire because of his wounds, Lance Corporal Prom courageously advanced, in full view of the enemy, to direct other Marines until he was killed. His heroic actions inspired his fellow Marines to launch a successful assault that crushed the enemy.

For his exemplary service and heroic sacrifice, Lance Corporal Prom received the Medal of Honor, the Purple Heart, the National Defense Service Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal, and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

Mr. Speaker, we name our buildings, bridges, and monuments after those who have served and sacrificed for our nation in extraordinary ways, and the William Raymond Prom Memorial Bridge is a fitting tribute to one of these courageous Americans. I join all Western Pennsylvanians in honoring Lance Corporal William Raymond Prom, a Marine who went above and beyond the call of duty in giving his life for his fellow Marines and his country.

TRIBUTE TO PAT WORLEY

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of Pat Worley of Fort Lupton, Colorado and congratulate her on her retirement.

Since 1992, Pat has served as Assignable Clerk for the Colorado State House of Representatives and has served as the Chief Assignable Clerk since 2000.

Throughout her career, Pat has been dedicated to ensuring the successful functioning of

the Colorado General Assembly. Her determined work ethic and passion for her job were critical to the successful operation of state government.

I know many of my former colleagues in the legislature would agree that when Pat tells you to do something, you listen. And for all of us from "the other Colorado," we appreciate her passion for all of Colorado.

Not only is Pat an esteemed public servant, her service to Colorado extends well beyond her official job functions. While the Colorado House of Representatives convenes on the floor, Pat and her clerks devote their free-time to sewing lap robes for disabled veterans. Her generosity and commitment to helping those who served our country have had an immeasurable impact on our State.

I congratulate her on her impressive career, and wish her all the best in the coming years of her well-deserved retirement. I join the people of Colorado in thanking her for her dedication, hard-work, compassion, and exemplary career in public service.

TRIBUTE TO SOUTH NASHVILLE
LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL TEAM

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the South Nashville Little League baseball team. This past week, they became the 2013 Tennessee State Champions, and today they are currently representing Tennessee in Warner-Robbins, Georgia.

The South Nashville Little League team's goal is to provide the youth of Middle Tennessee with a safe, clean, and fun environment in which to learn the fundamentals of baseball, with an emphasis of good sportsmanship and fair play. These skills taught and learned will be useful in many aspects of the lives of these young men, beyond their baseball careers.

We are very proud of these champions, and cheer them on as they represent Tennessee today. Go get 'em!

IN RECOGNITION OF KITTY LOPEZ

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a remarkable leader in San Mateo County, Kitty Lopez, as she leaves Samaritan House, the linchpin of nonprofit social services in central and southern San Mateo County.

For 12 years Kitty Lopez has guided Samaritan House placing it on solid footing and expanding its efforts to help those who are struggling. Under her leadership over 12,000 residents receive assistance with food, medical services, clothing, and counseling annually. Kitty shepherded the expansion of a dental clinic, and she has been equally adept at ex-

panding the number of appointments available through the medical clinic at Samaritan House. This expansion took pressure off of the emergency room of our county hospital and delivered quality examinations to thousands.

Kitty's spirit never seems to wane. She can always be found smiling and trying to figure out a way to stretch a penny, even when it's someone else's penny. For example, Kitty forged a partnership between Samaritan House and the United Way of the Bay Area to provide tax preparation services to low income residents of our county through volunteer tax preparers. She helped residents stretch their pennies when she allowed Samaritan House to organize an online listing of apartments and shared homes. Through the leadership team at Samaritan House, these online listings are gradually becoming the go-to place for residents who struggle to find a place for themselves and their families. Of course, each day the food pantry of Samaritan House helps residents feed themselves and their children. Many who use the food pantry are elderly, and during the recession many newcomers made their way to the door's of Kitty's facility, having heard that food and dignity were offered for free within its walls.

One of the most significant undertakings of Samaritan House is the operation of our county's homeless shelter located in South San Francisco. A 90 beds facility is available nightly for persons who wish to make progress towards self-sufficiency. Kitty's dedication to sheltering the homeless is made concrete in the way in which her team runs the shelter. This homeless shelter has rules and it is safe and orderly.

All services of Samaritan House are provided free of charge to clients. Kitty insists upon accountability, and her staff tracks the outcomes of efforts to help residents find jobs, housing and to become self-sufficient. The \$9 million annual budget she has responsibility over performs the work of an \$18 million budget in any other organization, and her team of 41 full-time staff and 31 part-time, seasonal employees make every client feel welcomed. Kitty has consistently shown vision and accountability in operating this magnificent program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor Kitty Lopez, the Executive Director of Samaritan House who leaves the helm after 12 years of energetic and creative leadership. We wish Kitty continued inspiring success as she moves on to lead First 5 San Mateo County. Her imprint on the community will only grow larger. Her legacy is therefore enduring, and this is perhaps her greatest contribution of all to the community.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE EDWARD
HUGGINS JOHNSTONE

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a beloved Kentuckian, Judge Edward Huggins Johnstone, who passed away on June 26th of this year.

When people speak of "The Greatest Generation," they speak of men like Judge Johnstone. During World War II, Judge Johnstone served with honor and distinction, seeing combat in the Battle of the Bulge and returning with a Bronze Star and a Silver Star for gallantry while an infantry sergeant in Europe.

Following his return, Johnstone married, earned his law degree from the University of Kentucky College of Law, and raised four children in the small town of Princeton, Kentucky. After 27 years in private practice, he was appointed in 1976 as a state Circuit Judge, and 16 months later was nominated by President Jimmy Carter and confirmed to serve as a United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

Having long been woefully underserved by the federal judiciary, Judge Johnstone brought a welcome change to the Western District of Kentucky by ending the long-accepted tradition of cases being heard in Louisville. Before him, federal judges preferred to live and hear cases far away from much of the Western District which stretched from just east of Louisville all the way to Tennessee.

Judge Johnstone's dedication to public service perhaps is best exemplified by his landmark efforts to improve living conditions for inmates serving time in Kentucky prisons. In his book *Voices from a Southern Prison*, Lloyd Anderson quotes Judge Johnstone describing his philosophy, "Even in the worst of people there is a good side. If we treat them with dignity and respect it brings out the good and suppresses the bad."

As public servants we all strive to make our communities and our country a better place. Judge Johnstone certainly demonstrated that desire and managed to revitalize the Kentucky prison system along the way.

"Big Ed" Johnstone's size 14 shoes will be hard to fill, but with a long line of people he has influenced both inside and outside of the legal profession, and with the example of a life lived well and with the highest integrity to guide many more, I am sure Judge Johnstone would agree that the goodness of Man will continue to shine through.

INDIA REGULATIONS HURT AMERICAN BUSINESS

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, over the last year, the Indian Government has taken troubling actions which have come at the expense of American jobs and Indian consumers. India in an important strategic partner and that's why what has happened of late has been so concerning.

India has not only imposed regulations that prevent many American businesses from entering the Indian market but has failed to respect internationally recognized intellectual property rights.

These policies hinder a growing trade relationship that holds significant potential. For Washington, goods exports to India reached

\$1.3 billion in 2012. If current barriers to trade are removed, this number would be much higher.

India represents a great opportunity, but investment cannot come at such a high cost to American businesses, farmers, and workers.

A level playing field is truly in the best interest of both of our economies.

IT'S TIME TO FIND COMMON GROUND IN CYPRUS

HON. STEVE CHABOT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring renewed attention to the ongoing difficulties taking place on the island of Cyprus.

This decades-long struggle to find common ground for an agreement between the two people on the island—Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots—has frustrated many in the United States and the international community. Cyprus occupies an important geo-political, economic and strategic region for the United States.

As a member of the European Union, the island of Cyprus remains divided. This is in spite of the Turkish Cypriots approving 3 to 1, and the Greek Cypriots defeating by a similar margin, the United Nations Peace Plan of 2004—which foresaw a comprehensive settlement to the decades-old dispute through a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation based on the political equality of both sides. Instead of a fair and prosperous agreement for both sides, the Turkish Cypriots remain isolated from the international community.

Almost ten years have elapsed. And leaders on both sides of the island offer promising hope for serious and substantial talks to take place. Although previous talks were outlined with difficulties, and a major push for peace failed in 2004, we must not let this deter our will to resolve an issue that is so important to American interests.

An agreement will take political courage from both sides. But the United States should do—everything it can—to support both sides in this process. The Eastern Mediterranean is a region of key strategic importance to U.S. interests, and a settlement in Cyprus with active American involvement and contribution will no doubt set a long-deserved example of peaceful relations and economic cooperation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 431, I was unavoidably detained at a personal doctor's appointment.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

A TRIBUTE TO LAURA JACKSON

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Laura Jackson for being named a 2013 Women of Influence honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, *Business Record*.

Each year, *Business Record* undertakes an exhaustive review to identify a standout group of women in the Greater Des Moines area who, as the publication notes, "have made a difference." An impressive group of inspiring female leaders are selected annually for this prestigious distinction, which is based on combined criteria of community involvement, career success, and being a role model for other women to emulate. The 2013 Women of Influence honorees join an impressive roster of more than 130 women who have changed and are continuing to change our communities for the better.

Laura Jackson is motivated by the responsibility of other people counting on her. As Executive Vice President of Wellmark Blue Cross and Blue Shield, she takes this attitude with her every day on the job while also focusing on being the best team player she can be. At each stage of her thriving career, Mrs. Jackson can think of key advice from mentors that guided her own decisions—which in turn has helped her guide others as a human resources professional. She currently chairs the Wellness Council of Iowa and co-chairs the Capital Crossroads Wellness Capital working group. She also serves on the boards of the Iowa Healthcare Collaborative, the Healthiest State Initiative and the YMCA of Greater Des Moines.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Laura Jackson in the United States Congress, and I am pleased to recognize her for working to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at *Business Record* for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Women of Influence class continued success.

IRS EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 2013

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my bill, the IRS Employee Responsibility Act of 2013, which requires IRS employees who violate the law to be personally responsible for their own legal fees and personally responsible for any legal judgment awarded. The hard-working American taxpayer should not be responsible for the cost of defending IRS employees who break the law and are shouldn't be responsible for any legal judgment awarded in a civil suit.

My legislation simply requires IRS employees to take responsibility for their actions in the same manner any private employee has to when they are sued in civil court.

Mr. Speaker, despite what the President has said, the targeting of conservative organizations for extra scrutiny is a real scandal and is simply reprehensible. The thin line of trust between the individual and their government has been broken and we must work to rebuild it. I am strongly urging Congress to continue its investigation into the IRS and to make sure those responsibly are held accountable to the fullest extent of the law. I am also joining other Members of Congress calling on Treasury Secretary Jack Lew to investigate the actions of the IRS. I am committed to making sure the IRS is never again used as a political weapon against any group, conservative or otherwise and my bill will ensure that if any employees violate the law they are personally responsible for their own legal fees and any judgment.

It is unfortunate that we have seen very little action from the Administration to punish these employees with at least one on paid leave. This body must Act to ensure this never happens again.

Simply put, I believe when IRS employees are on the hook for their actions and know there are real consequences, they make better decisions. As a farmer and owner of a business, I am responsible for my own actions and work to ensure I am following the law. It's time the IRS does the same.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House (and Senate) to support me in passing the IRS Employee Responsibility Act of 2013 in order to ensure American families and taxpayers have trust in their government.

IN RECOGNITION OF LARRY BUCKMASTER

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Larry Buckmaster who is retiring as the President and CEO of the Redwood City-San Mateo County Chamber of Commerce after 30 years of outstanding service to our community.

Larry is the type of person who creates a community through performing multiple acts of stewardship each and every day—he has done so for decades. Let me give you just a few examples.

When Larry Buckmaster took over the Redwood City-San Mateo County Chamber of Commerce it had a deficit and membership lagged. He almost immediately turned it around and led the board to boost both membership and participation by members in various chamber events.

Second, America needs leaders. It's tough to find them. Leadership means putting your neck on the line and exposing yourself to criticism. Larry Buckmaster knew that Redwood City and the San Francisco Peninsula needed a new generation of leadership. He founded the Leadership Redwood City/San Carlos/Belmont program so that business and government professionals would learn from each

other and hear from current leaders about issues that are shaping the community. Most importantly, Larry Buckmaster wanted students to be inspired to step up and become community leaders in their own right. The proof of Larry's wisdom and his success is around us each day. Over 800 students have heard from state legislators, members of Congress, city council members, as well as the staff of local and state governments. Many members of city councils, commissions, the Board of Supervisors and the State Legislature were first inspired to public service by the leadership class created by Larry Buckmaster.

Leadership by example is Larry Buckmaster's creed. Kainos is a non-profit dedicated to helping those with developmental disabilities, and Larry's leadership is exemplified by the \$750,000 raised over the years through a golfing tournament held annually to benefit Kainos. Larry, an avid golfer with a hole in one to his credit, brought his love of people and his skill as a golfer together to create this community benefit event.

The Progress Seminar is an annual event at which community leaders spend a weekend together thinking and talking about the major issues impacting our region. Larry Buckmaster has grown this seminar into a sold-out event for many years, and ideas that sprout from the seminar often become solutions via city council and other activities, both public and private.

Mr. Speaker and members, Larry Buckmaster has his quirks. He loves reading his emails and rarely responds. His filing system is a mess yet he can find everything. He is an avid reader who consumes one book per week, often military histories. Unfortunately, Larry roots for the Chicago Bears. We in the San Francisco Bay Area adore Larry so much that we will forgive his choice of football teams. It's only explicable when you realize that Larry was raised in Illinois and thus never really understood our wonderful 49ers until it was too late in life to surgically correct his unfortunate allegiance to a different team. Thankfully, Larry has shown great judgment in other matters, eschewing party politics, petty politics and self-aggrandizement. In fact, Larry Buckmaster always points to the accomplishments of his staff rather than to his own, demonstrating that he really is a great leader even if he is a poor judge of quality football teams.

Larry Buckmaster is a natural athlete and has coached over 500 children in softball and soccer. He is proud when one of the former players says that Larry saw something great in them as a child and that this turned around the life of the child. Larry and Joan, his wife of 48 years, have three children and six grandchildren. It is said that his grandchildren turn him to mush, not too surprising given his love of children.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I know that we often recognize Americans who have left their mark upon their communities and it is appropriate to do so. It is also appropriate to recognize that some persons provide decades of exemplary service to this nation not merely because they are paid to do their job but because they are in love with their work and receive payment many times over by watching the fruits of their efforts flower for future generations. Larry Buckmaster loves his job and has now chosen to retire. I find it hard to be-

lieve that we are going to let him leave. Let us honor a wonderful American, a great father and husband, and a civic treasure. Larry Buckmaster will be remembered for the lives that he improved, the leaders he inspired and the smiles that he brought to our faces. Let's wish him well on the golf course. He deserves a second hole in one.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following votes during this week:

On rollcall vote No. 419, On agreeing to the Gallego Amendment to H.R. 2610, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 420, On agreeing to the Young Amendment H.R. 2610, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 421, On the Grayson Amendment to H.R. 2610, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 422, On the McClintock Amendment to H.R. 2610, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 423, On the Hastings of Florida Amendment to H.R. 2610, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 424, On the Second Hastings of Florida Amendment to H.R. 2610, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 425, On the Third Hastings of Florida Amendment to H.R. 2610, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 426, On the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1911, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 427, On the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 850, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 428, On the Waxman Amendment to H.R. 1582, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 429, On the Connolly Amendment to H.R. 1582, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 430, On the Murphy of Pennsylvania Amendment to H.R. 1582, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 431, On the Motion to Recommit to H.R. 1582, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 432, On Passage of H.R. 1582, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 433, On Ordering the Previous Question to H. Res. 322, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 434, On Agreeing to H. Res. 322, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 435, On the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 1897, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 436, On Passage of H.R. 2879, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 437, On the Scalise Amendment to H.R. 367, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 438, On the Smith of Missouri Amendment to H.R. 367, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 439, On the Latham Amendment to H.R. 367, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 440, On the Nadler Amendment to H.R. 367, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 441, On the Johnson of Georgia Amendment to H.R. 367, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 442, On the Jackson-Lee Amendment to H.R. 367, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 443, On the Moore Amendment to H.R. 367, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 444, On the Motion to Recommit H.R. 367, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 445, On Passage of H.R. 367, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 446, On Passage of H.R. 2009, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 431 I was unavoidably detained in a meeting at the White House with the President. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to attending the funeral of Colonel George E. "Bud" Day, I missed the following rollcall Votes: No. 428–447 on August 1, 2013 and August 2, 2013.

If present, I would have voted:

Rollcall Vote No. 428—Waxman of California Amendment to H.R. 1582, "nay".

Rollcall Vote No. 429—Connolly of Virginia Amendment to H.R. 1582, "nay".

Rollcall Vote No. 430—Murphy of Pennsylvania Amendment to H.R. 1582, "aye".

Rollcall Vote No. 431—H.R. 1582, Motion to Recommit, "nay".

Rollcall Vote No. 432—H.R. 1582, Energy Consumers Relief Act, "aye".

Rollcall Vote No. 433—H. Res. 322, On Ordering the Previous Question, "aye".

Rollcall Vote No. 434—H. Res. 322, Resolution Providing for the Consideration of H.R. 367, H.R. 2009, and H.R. 2879, "aye".

Rollcall Vote No. 435—H.R. 1897—Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2013, as amended, "aye".

Rollcall Vote No. 436—H.R. 2879, Stop Government Abuse Act, "aye".

Rollcall Vote No. 437—Scalise of Louisiana Amendment to H.R. 367, "aye".

Rollcall Vote No. 438—Smith of Missouri Amendment to H.R. 367, "aye".

Rollcall Vote No. 439—Latham of Iowa Amendment to H.R. 367, "aye".

Rollcall Vote No. 440—Nadler of New York Amendment to H.R. 367, "nay".

Rollcall Vote No. 441—Johnson of Georgia Amendment to H.R. 367, "nay".

Rollcall Vote No. 442—Jackson Lee of Texas Amendment to H.R. 367, "nay".

Rollcall Vote No. 443—Moore of Wisconsin Amendment to H.R. 367, "nay".

Rollcall Vote No. 444—H.R. 367, Motion to Recommit, "nay".

Rollcall Vote No. 445—H.R. 367, Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013, "aye".

Rollcall Vote No. 446—H.R. 2009, Motion to Recommit, "nay".

Rollcall Vote No. 447—H.R. 2009, Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act of 2013, "aye".

ENHANCING THE U.S.-INDIA TRADE PARTNERSHIP

HON. MIKE KELLY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, India has been our strategic partner for years and we should continue to strengthen this relationship. One way to do so is by enhancing our trade partnership. U.S.-India bilateral trade is nearly \$100 billion—up from barely \$15 billion in 2000, but we can do better. Unfortunately, India's recent trend towards raising trade barriers has hampered this relationship, and both American firms and American workers have been on the losing end of these policies.

These discriminatory policies jeopardize manufacturing and other jobs back at home in Pennsylvania. For example, India's system of cascading tariffs, taxes, and other import charges is often cost-prohibitive. The pronounced disparity between bound rates (rates that generally cannot be exceeded under WTO rules) and applied rates (the actual rates charged) means that India's average applied rate is among the highest in the world. Furthermore, India's trade-weighted average tariff rate is 8.2 percent versus the U.S. rate of 1.6 percent, burdening U.S. manufacturers and making U.S. exports cost-prohibitive for Indian consumers. Lastly, India's tariff schedule is hard to find in one public place and this lack of transparency and accessibility is also burdensome.

By resolving these issues and seeking greater market-based reforms, we can strengthen the U.S.-India trade relationship and unleash the economic energy that will create prosperity for both the U.S. and India. This is a future worth striving towards.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, due to family commitment, I was unable to vote on H.R.

1897. Had I been present I would have voted "aye".

Due to this commitment, I was unable to vote on H.R. 2879. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

Had I been present for votes on H.R. 367, I would have voted "no" on Amendment 1, "no" on Amendment 3, "no" on Amendment 4, "aye" on Amendment 6, "aye" on Amendment 7, "aye" on Amendment 8, "aye" on Amendment 12, "aye" on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 367, and "no" on H.R. 367.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 2009 and "no" on H.R. 2009.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on August 1 and 2, I was absent for personal reasons and missed roll Nos. 428 through 447. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on roll Nos. 428, 429, 431, 435, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, and 446. I would have voted "nay" on roll Nos. 430, 432, 433, 434, 436, 437, 438, 439, 445, and 447.

IN RECOGNITION OF OLIVE G. MAYER

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the late Olive G. Mayer, a dear friend and a pioneer in the environmental community of California. She was one of the passionate driving forces in protecting open spaces in San Mateo County.

Sadly, Ollie missed the completion of one of her biggest achievements. She passed away five days before the opening ceremony of the Devil's Slide Tunnel on the San Mateo coast, a project she and her fellow tunnelistas had been advocating for decades. The engineering marvel that most people said couldn't be done is now reality thanks in huge part to Ollie's passion and persistence.

An engineer by training and Sierra Club member, she got her hands on the original construction plans for the massive seven mile long, six-lane wide highway bypass that Caltrans had proposed to build across Montara Mountain—plans Caltrans never released to the public. Ollie shared them with other environmentalists who formed a grassroots movement determined to stop the bypass and urban sprawl along the scenic coastal hills.

The idea for a tunnel was born in the early 70s when a USGS geologist responded to a Montara resident inquiring about solutions for Devil's Slide. He outlined several options, including boring a tunnel. Ollie presented the idea to Caltrans engineers in 1973, but they dismissed it. The tunnel idea continued its

lengthy legal and rocky path. In 1995, Devil's Slide lived up to its name and slid down five feet. The road stayed closed for five months making life miserable for coastal residents and forcing local businesses to close.

The tunnelistas jumped into high gear, collected 34,000 signatures and put the issue on the county ballot. San Mateo County was blanketed in yellow and black "Think Tunnel" bumper stickers. In 1996, Measure T passed with 74% of the vote. Seventeen years and countless hurdles later, the tunnel is finally reality. David beat Goliath. Ollie's good friend and tunnelista Zoe Kersteen-Tucker put it perfectly at the opening ceremony: "It took an up-rising of the people to think tunnel, vote tunnel, build tunnel and today, at last, to open tunnel."

Devil's Slide was but one of many battles Ollie took on. She was a lifelong activist, visionary and intellectual. Born Olive Graham Hendricks in New Jersey in 1918, she was the only woman in her class at Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania to earn her BS in engineer. She later received her Master's degree from the University of Michigan. Ollie was an ardent fighter for equal treatment of women and freedom of speech. During the McCarthy era, she provided support for victims of blacklisting and was under surveillance and investigated by the FBI. She was among the early peace activists opposing the war in Vietnam. She fought for racial and civil equality in the 50s and 60s. In short, she was fearless and determined to make the world a better place for everyone to enjoy.

Ollie loved the outdoors and science. She met her late husband, Dr. Henry Mayer, while hiking in Colorado. They married in 1941 and after World War II moved to Woodside, California. Ollie opened a machine shop in San Carlos and founded a business that made and distributed model science projects, such as dams and power plants, for middle and high school students.

Ollie was a tireless supporter of the Peninsula Open Space Trust and played a significant role in keeping areas on the Peninsula undeveloped and accessible to the public. She was the president of the Loma Prieta Chapter of the Sierra Club and was honored with the John Muir Award for her lifetime work for conservation. She was also named a "Legend" by the Club, and she was appointed to the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame, among a long list of other awards.

Ollie is survived by her daughter Judith O'Brien; son Robert Mayer; and four grandchildren: Connor and Lauren O'Brien and Reid and Drew Mayer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor one of the most extraordinary and giving environmentalists and human beings—a woman who found her true north.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BETO O'ROURKE INTRODUCING THE HEALTHY TRANSITIONS FOR VETERANS ACT

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce bipartisan legislation that will assist servicemembers as they transition back to civilian life. We have a fundamental responsibility to provide for the needs of our veterans who have sacrificed their comfort and safety for ours. The Healthy Transitions for Veterans Act will help us meet that responsibility by requiring the Department of Defense (DoD) to perform two simple and common sense tasks:

1. Provide a comprehensive physical examination to all servicemembers of the active, guard, and reserve components when they separate from military service.

2. Provide separating servicemembers with an electronic copy of their complete medical records.

Currently, servicemembers in the Guard and Reserve are not required to have physical examinations when separating from military service. This can result in a lack of documentation of service-connected injuries and medical conditions and is one of the reasons that former Guard and Reserve members who file disability claims with the VA are 4 times more likely to get an unfavorable decision than their active duty counterpart.

Providing all servicemembers the ability to take ownership of their complete health record will also ensure a smoother transition into the VA health care system as DoD and VA struggle to make their systems interoperable. For veterans who may apply for VA benefits, having their full medical record from the military will make the application process more efficient. VA employees would not have to track down evidence or engage in time consuming correspondence with the applicant to locate medical records from the DoD. This is good not just for the individual veteran, but for the entire VA system that continues to struggle to reduce the claims backlog.

I have the honor of representing Fort Bliss and the 33,000 active duty soldiers stationed there. I also represent nearly 80,000 veterans. All of these individuals, at one point in his or her life, wrote a blank check made payable to "The United States of America" for an amount of "up to and including my life." Our responsibility to these men and women does not end when we bring them home from war. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation and help guarantee our servicemembers make a healthy transition back to civilian life.

CONCERNING JOHN R. PARKER

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate John R. Parker on his retirement

and honor his thirteen years of service as Chairman of the Jones County, Mississippi Republican Party.

Mr. Parker began his Chairmanship in 2000 and has since worked diligently to protect and to promote conservative ideals and values in South Mississippi. He has proved to be not only an outstanding Chairman, but also an asset in helping to grow the Republican Party. From local elections to the Governor's race, Mr. Parker is well known throughout the State for his key involvement and noteworthy enthusiasm.

Outside of his political work, Mr. Parker is notorious within his community for his continued support of local charities and willingness to lend a hand to those in need.

Mr. Parker is a true public servant and strong community leader dedicated to providing a better future for our country. He has been an invaluable part of the fabric of the Jones County Republican Party, and his leadership will be truly missed.

Mr. Parker, on behalf of the United States Congress, thank you for your hard work and commitment as Chairman of the Jones County Republican Party. I wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 430, I was unavoidably detained at a personal doctor's appointment.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

CELEBRATING HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY'S CENTENNIAL YEAR

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to recognize Humboldt State University's Centennial Year. Founded in 1913, Humboldt State University is the only state university in coastal Northern California and in my Congressional District. The university has made major contributions to the intellectual life, culture and economy of the North Coast, California and the nation.

One hundred years ago, on June 16, 1913, North Coast citizens had the foresight to help formally establish Humboldt State Normal School and to pledge \$12,000 and 12 acres of land to the school. Humboldt State University formally opened on April 6, 1914, and has since awarded more than 55,000 degrees to students from diverse economic and ethnic backgrounds.

Humboldt State University offers a broad array of academic programs and an outstanding college experience for 8,000 students each year, while contributing greatly to the regional community. The annual economic impact of Humboldt State University is estimated

to be \$190 million on the North Coast and \$400 million statewide.

Humboldt State University is widely known for the personal attention faculty provide to students, and for the hands-on experiences which complement classroom learning. The Humboldt State University faculty has established a strong reputation for excellence in teaching and research.

A longstanding commitment to environmental and social responsibility permeates the Humboldt State University curriculum and campus culture, which has enabled its alumni to make a difference wherever they live.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Humboldt State University for its many academic achievements and for the services it provides to many students throughout the state and nation. I encourage my colleagues and the North Coast community to join me in celebrating the university's centennial and in offering best wishes for its next 100 years.

WHAT IS THIS ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY IN SUDAN?

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit a letter I sent today to President Obama regarding Sudan as well as a copy of my Darfur trip report which I issued in July 2004 after having been a part of the first Congressional delegation to the region. Just months later then-Secretary of State Colin Powell described what was happening as genocide—a descriptor that President Obama himself used as recently as 2009.

And yet, the Sudan Special Envoy position remains vacant after nearly five months. Violence, displacement and atrocities continue in Darfur and the Nuba Mountains. And Sudanese President Bashir continues to travel the globe with virtual impunity.

What is this administration's policy in Sudan?

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 2, 2013.

Hon. BARACK H. OBAMA,
The President, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have written you on more than one occasion about the persistent vacancy of the Sudan Special Envoy post, which has been unfilled for nearly five months. This is indefensible given the current state of affairs in Sudan.

I enclose for your reference a recent piece that Sudan expert and advocate Professor Eric Reeves authored for the Washington Post. He paints a grim picture about the situation in Darfur, lamenting that this genocide, which once captured our collective national outrage, now seems to have disappeared from public view leaving us with the misperception that the violence has subsided and the crisis resolved. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Reeves writes "... the slaughter has continued in Darfur: Some 500,000 people have died in the past 10 years from war-related causes. In 2009, as president, Obama again declared that 'genocide' was occurring in

Darfur, yet little followed from this." He continued, "But the people of Darfur have been left defenseless largely because of an unforgivable lack of attention and leadership by the United States. The policies of Obama's administration have hardly matched his rhetoric. Indeed, in a bizarre reprise of policies for which Obama had sharply criticized the Bush administration, on Nov. 8, 2010, senior administration officials explicitly 'decoupled' Darfur from the largest bilateral issue between Washington and Khartoum: the latter's place on the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism."

While Reeves' focus in the enclosed editorial is on Darfur—that region is far from being the only humanitarian and human rights catastrophe in Sudan. Last year I visited Yida refugee camp in South Sudan. I heard harrowing stories from a growing refugee population that had fled the Nuba Mountains, including indiscriminate aerial bombardments aimed at civilian populations, the use of food as a weapon of war, people driven from their homes and targeted for killing because of the color of their skin. In short I heard echoes of my time spent in Darfur as the first member of the House of Representatives to visit in July 2004.

Last year I offered an amendment to the State and Foreign Operations Appropriations bill which would have cut non-humanitarian foreign assistance to any nation that allowed Sudanese President Omar Bashir, an internationally indicted war criminal, into their country without arresting him. The amendment was adopted with bipartisan support by voice vote.

The amendment I proposed would have effectively isolated Bashir and made him an international pariah as is befitting a man with blood on his hands. It is noteworthy that the amendment garnered the support of 70 prominent Holocaust and genocide scholars. Dr. Rafael Medoff, director of the Wyman Institute, which initiated a letter of support to the administration from these scholars, said: "Halting aid to those who host Bashir would be the first concrete step the U.S. has taken to isolate the Butcher of Darfur and pave the way for his arrest. If the Obama administration is serious about punishing perpetrators of genocide, it should support the Wolf Amendment."

Sadly that support never materialized. In fact your administration actively sought to remove this language from the final bill. Meanwhile, Bashir remains free to travel where he pleases, and the people of Sudan see no end in sight to their suffering and U.S. policy is in tatters.

The FY 2014 State and Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, which just last week passed out of the full committee, included language consistent with the amendment I offered last year. In seeking to isolate Bashir, our options are limited but far from nonexistent.

Will your administration support this effort? Will Bashir be made to face some modicum of consequence for his actions? Will the special envoy position be filled before the fall?

Professor Reeves' piece featured this quote from you: "We can't say 'never again' and then allow it to happen again, and as a president of the United States, I don't intend to abandon people or turn a blind eye to slaughter." I wish, and more importantly the suffering people of Sudan wish, we had seen an ounce of that moral clarity and conviction since you took office. Sudan has historically been a bipartisan issue. We may be from different parties but I had thought, based on

your campaign rhetoric, that this might be an area of common cause.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

[From the Washington Post]

CIVILIANS IN SUDAN'S DARFUR REGION FACE WHOLESALE DESTRUCTION

(By Eric Reeves)

After years of obscurity and little reliable international reporting, the vast human catastrophe in Sudan's Darfur region is again in the news. It was regularly making headlines before 2008, when the then-five-year-old genocide in Darfur had claimed hundreds of thousands of African lives, but a lack of sustained mainstream attention meant that the surging violence fell off the radar.

Few could have predicted that this remote and obscure region in western Sudan would galvanize American civil society. Then again, how could the loss of attention have been so rapid?

The United Nations recently estimated that 300,000 Darfuris had been displaced in the first five months of this year; more than 1 million civilians have been displaced since the fall of 2008. Human Rights Watch recently reported that "satellite images confirm the wholesale destruction of villages in Central Darfur in an attack in April." The attacks were directed by Ali Kushayb, who was indicted in 2007 by the International Criminal Court for crimes against humanity.

Radio Dabanga—an extraordinary news network organized by Darfuris both displaced and still in the region—provides daily, highly detailed accounts of events in Darfur. Although rarely cited by news organizations, which themselves have no access to Darfur, Radio Dabanga has long reported brutal assaults on camps for the displaced, chronic breakdowns in the vast humanitarian effort in Darfur, an epidemic of rape and the appropriation of African lands by Arab militias, which ensures continued instability and displacement.

The ethnic animus in the assaults remains clear, although in recent years, conflicts among Arab tribes have become increasingly destructive. The regime in Khartoum, which cannot defeat the Darfuri rebels militarily and chooses not to address their legitimate grievances, has resumed its scorched-earth campaign, using Arab and non-Arab militias against anyone thought to be providing support to the rebels. Central Darfur's Jebel Marra region has been the site of a three-year humanitarian blockade and endless aerial bombardment by Russian-built cargo planes that have been crudely retrofitted to drop shrapnel-loaded barrel-bombs. Useless against military targets, these attacks have caused countless civilian casualties while also destroying property and livestock among the region's primarily non-Arab Fur people.

Although violence has ebbed and flowed over the past decade, it has accelerated sharply in the past year. Yet until recently, news coverage has been paltry and often deeply misleading. In February 2012, the New York Times declared from western Darfur that "one of the world's most infamous conflicts may have decisively cooled," citing "returns" by the displaced as evidence. In fact, half a million people had been displaced in the preceding two years and violence was unrelenting. Last August, western North Darfur became another arena of violence during a tribal-based land grab for the Jebel Amir gold mines. The major town of Kutum

was overrun by Arab militias that looted humanitarian resources. Nearby Kassab camp was also overrun and emptied of some 30,000 people within a day.

As a senator in 2004, Barack Obama called the atrocities in Darfur "genocide." He said so again as a presidential candidate in 2007 and chided the Bush administration for its accommodation of Khartoum. Invoking Rwanda and Bosnia as justification for humanitarian intervention in Darfur, Obama said, "We can't say 'never again' and then allow it to happen again, and as a president of the United States, I don't intend to abandon people or turn a blind eye to slaughter."

But the slaughter has continued in Darfur: Some 500,000 people have died in the past 10 years from war-related causes. In 2009, as president, Obama again declared that "genocide" was occurring in Darfur, yet little followed from this. To be sure, much has intervened in the years since Obama was elected, including the Arab Spring, the drawdown from Afghanistan, rising tensions with China and a collapsing world economy. These issues, which impinge more directly on U.S. interests and obligations than does Darfur, have consumed much of the administration's energies.

But the people of Darfur have been left defenseless largely because of an unforgivable lack of attention and leadership by the United States. The policies of Obama's administration have hardly matched his rhetoric. Indeed, in a bizarre reprise of policies for which Obama had sharply criticized the Bush administration, on Nov. 8, 2010, senior administration officials explicitly "decoupled" Darfur from the largest bilateral issue between Washington and Khartoum: the latter's place on the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism. That marked a shift in attention to South Sudan and implementation of the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement, but the signal sent to Khartoum was that the regime could resume genocidal counterinsurgency warfare in Darfur. The campaign has been more chaotic than the early years of the genocide (2003 to 2005) but no less destructive, and with the continuing collapse of humanitarian efforts because of growing insecurity, civilian destruction could be wholesale.

It's time to "re-couple" Darfur to all bilateral issues between Washington and Khartoum.

CONGRESSMAN FRANK R. WOLF DARFUR TRIP
REPORT (JULY 2004)

It was just 10 years ago—in 1994—when the world stood by and watched as more than 800,000 ethnic Tutsis were systematically murdered in Rwanda by rival extremist Hutus.

When the killing finally ended after 100 days—and the horrific images of what had taken place were broadcast around the globe—world leaders acknowledged it was genocide, apologized for failing to intervene, and vowed "never again."

That pledge from the international community is being put to the test today in western Sudan, where an estimated 30,000 black African Muslims have been murdered and more than 1 million have been driven from their tribal lands and forced to live in one of 129 refugee camps scattered across the western provinces of Darfur. More than 160,000 have fled across the border to Chad.

The United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide describes genocide as acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, national, ethnic, racial or religious groups, as such:

Killing members of the group;

Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;

Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about physical destruction in whole or in part;

Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;

Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

After just returning from spending three days and two nights (June 27–29) in Darfur, we believe what is happening there may very well meet this test.

During our trip we visited five refugee camps: Abu Shouk; Tawilah; Krinding; Sisi and Morney—all sprawling tent cities jam-packed with thousands of displaced families and fast becoming breeding grounds for disease and sickness.

We drove past dozens of pillaged villages and walked through what was left of four burned to the ground.

We heard countless stories about rape, murder and plunder.

We even watched the barbarous men—Arab militiamen called Janjaweed—who are carrying out these attacks sitting astride camels and horses just a short distance from where young and old have sought what they had hoped would be a safe harbor.

Janjaweed is roughly translated in Arabic as "wild men on horses with G-3 guns."

Ruthless, brutal killers, the Janjaweed have instigated a reign of terror on Darfur—a region about the size of Texas—for more than a year. They kill men. They rape women. They abduct children. They torch villages. They dump human corpses and animal carcasses in wells to contaminate the water. Their mandate is essentially doing whatever necessary to force the black African Muslims from their land to never return.

It is clearly the intent of Janjaweed to purge the region of darker-skinned African Muslims, in particular members of the Fur, Zaghawa, and Massaleit tribes.

From where does this mandate come? The Government of Sudan disavows supporting the Janjaweed. Some officials in Khartoum even deny the existence of a humanitarian crisis in the region. Yet the facts prove otherwise. We witnessed the destruction. We heard horrific accounts of violence and intimidation. We talked to rape victims. We saw the scars on men who had been shot. We watched mothers cradle their sick and dying babies, hoping against all odds that their children would survive. We saw armed Janjaweed waiting to prey on innocent victims along the perimeter of refugee camps.

To hear the vivid, heartrending descriptions of the attacks it is clear the Janjaweed have the support—and the approval—of the Government of Sudan to operate with impunity. The same stories were repeated at every camp we visited. The raids would happen early in the morning. First comes the low rumble of a Soviet-made Antonov plane—flown by Sudanese pilots—to bomb the village. Next come helicopter gunships—again, flown by Sudanese pilots—to strafe the village with the huge machine guns mounted on each side. Sometimes the helicopters would land and unload supplies for the Janjaweed. They would then be reloaded with booty confiscated from a village. One man told us he saw cows being loaded onto one helicopter. Moments later, the Janjaweed, some clad in government uniforms, would come galloping in on horseback and camels to finish the job by killing, raping, stealing and plundering.

Walking through the burned out villages we could tell the people living there had lit-

tle or no time to react. They left everything they owned—lanterns, cookware, water jugs, pottery, plows—and ran for their lives. There was no time to stop and bury their dead.

The Janjaweed made certain that there would be nothing left for the villagers to come home to. Huts were torched. Donkeys, goats and cows were stolen, slaughtered or dumped into wells to poison the water. Grain containers destroyed. In one village we saw where the Janjaweed even burned the mosque.

Only the lucky ones—mostly women and children—made it out alive.

ETHNIC CLEANSING

What is happening in Darfur is rooted in ethnic cleansing. Religion has nothing to do with what unfolded over the last year.

No black African is safe in Darfur. Security is non-existent. The Janjaweed are everywhere. Outside the camps. Inside the camps. They walk freely through the marketplace in Geneina, a town in far western Darfur, with guns slung over their shoulders. One shopkeeper, we were told, was shot in the head by a Janjaweed because he wasn't willing to lower the price of a watermelon.

The Government of Sudan military and security forces also are omnipresent. At each of the places we visited we were either trailed or escorted by a mixture of military regulars, police forces and government "minders." There have been reports that the government has been folding the Janjaweed into its regular forces as a way to disguise and protect them. At two of the camps we visited, we were told the government had inserted spies to report on what was said or to threaten those who talked. We were told the "minders" repeatedly scolded refugees and told them in Arabic to shut up. Yet, even with these restrictions, refugees in every camp we visited were eager to tell their stories.

It should be understood that the Janjaweed are not "taking" the land from the black Muslim farmers they are terrorizing. The Janjaweed, whose historical roots are part of the region's roving nomads who have battled with the African farmers for generations, are employing a government-supported scorched earth policy to drive them out of the region—and perhaps to extinction. It also was clear that only villages inhabited by black African Muslims were being targeted. Arab villages sitting just next to African ones miles from the nearest towns have been left unscathed.

On our first day in the region, we met with local Government of Sudan officials in the town of El Fasher, a two-hour plane ride west of Khartoum. They blame the crisis in the region on two black African rebel groups—the Sudan Liberation Army (SLA) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM)—who started an uprising in February 2003 over what they regarded as unjust treatment by the government in their struggle over land and resources with Arab countrymen. The rebel forces actually held El Fasher for a short period last year. A cease-fire was agreed to in April 2004 between the rebel groups and the Government of Sudan, but the Janjaweed have continued to carry out attacks with the support and approval of Khartoum.

While local government officials in El Fasher were adamant in saying there is no connection between the Government of Sudan and the Janjaweed, whom they called "armed bandits," the militiamen we saw did not look like skilled pilots who could fly planes or helicopters.

We also were told the Janjaweed are well armed and well supplied. If they are traditional nomads, how are they getting modern

automatic weapons, and, more importantly, from whom? They also are said to have satellite phones, an astonishing fact considering most of the people in the far western provinces of Darfur have probably never even seen or walked on a paved road.

The impunity under which the Janjaweed operate was most telling as we approached the airport in Geneina on our last day in the region for our flight back to Khartoum. In plain sight was an encampment of Janjaweed within shouting distance of a contingent of Government of Sudan regulars. No more than 200 yards separated the two groups. Sitting on the tarmac were two helicopter gunships and a Russian-made Antonov plane.

WORLD'S WORST HUMANITARIAN CRISIS

The situation in Darfur is being described as the worst humanitarian crisis in the world today. We agree. But sadly, and with a great sense of urgency, things are only going to worsen. Some say that even under the best of circumstances, as many as 300,000 Darfuris forced from their homes are expected to die from malnutrition and diarrhea or diseases such as malaria and cholera in the coming months. Measles have already spread through Abu Shouk, a large refugee camp outside of El Fasher.

According to some predictions, the death toll could reach as high as 1 million by next year. The Dafuri farmers have missed another planting season and will now be dependent on grain and other food stuffs provided by the international community for at least another year. The impending rainy season presents its own set of problems, making roads impassable for food deliveries and the likelihood of disease increasing dramatically with the heavy rains.

The potential for a crisis of catastrophic proportions is very real, especially since none of the villagers we talked to at the refugee camps believed they will be able to go back to their homes anytime soon. Having been brutally terrorized by the Janjaweed and fearing for their lives, they do not believe Government of Sudan officials who say it is safe to return to their villages. We heard stories of some families who went back to their villages only to return to the camps a week later for fear of being attacked again.

The attacks have traumatized thousands of young children. In an effort to cope with what they have endured, programs have been established in the camps to help the young boys and girls deal with their psychological scars. Part of the program encourages them to draw pictures of what they have seen. The crayon drawings are chilling. Huts on fire, red flames shooting through the roof. Planes and helicopters flying overhead shooting bullets. Dead bodies, depictions, perhaps, of their mother or father.

We also saw a group of children who had made clay figures of men on camels and horseback attacking villages. There is no way to measure the impact of these atrocities on the thousands of children living in these camps. Their lives are forever scarred.

The first step in resolving this crisis is disarming the Janjaweed. It must be done swiftly and universally. If not, the Janjaweed will just bury their weapons in the sand, wait for the pressure from the international community to lift, then reinitiate their reign of terror.

A system of justice overseen by outside monitors must also be implemented. The heinous, murderous acts carried out by the Janjaweed cannot go unpunished. War crimes and crimes against humanity clearly have been—and continue to be—committed. Those responsible must be brought to justice.

DIFFICULT LIFE IN IDP CAMPS

Abu Shouk was the first of five IDP (Internally Displaced People) camps we visited. More than 40,000 people live in this sprawling tent city, created in April after El Fasher was overrun with displaced families. Methodically laid out with water stations, a health clinic, a supplemental feeding station and crude latrines, it is being hailed as a "model" by humanitarian relief workers in the region.

However, aid workers at Abu Shouk are deeply concerned. They observe that the malnutrition rate at this "model" camp is a staggering eight to nine deaths every day, and fear what is happening at the other camps, especially in the more remote areas of Darfur that have not been reached by humanitarian groups.

Life in the camps is difficult. Crude shelters made from straw and sticks and covered with plastic sheeting stretch as far as the eye can see. Families arriving at the camps—almost all after walking for days in the hot sun from their now abandoned villages—are only given a tarp, a water jug, cookware and a small amount of grain.

The sanitary conditions are wretched. The sandy conditions make building latrines difficult. At Mornay, the largest of the IDP camps in Darfur with more than 70,000 inhabitants, it was hard not to step in either human or animal feces as we walked. In a few weeks, when the heavy rains begin, excrement will flow across the entire camp. Mortality from diarrhea, which we were told represents one-third of the deaths in the camps, will only increase.

To their credit, all the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that have been allowed to operate in Darfur have done—and continue to do—a tremendous job under extremely trying circumstances. The Government of Sudan has repeatedly thrown up roadblocks to bringing in aid. It has denied or slowed visa processing for relief workers. It has kept aid vehicles locked up in customs for weeks at a time. It has blocked relief groups from bringing in radios. It has limited access to certain regions of the country. All this has made getting medicine, food and other humanitarian supplies like plastic sheeting and water jugs an uphill battle. While the Government of Sudan plays its games, people are dying as needed aid sits on tarmacs.

As we approached the Mornay camp on the last day of our three-day trip, we were stopped by Government of Sudan soldiers and security officers. They followed us throughout the camp, watching with whom we talked. Amazingly, their presence did not inhibit the refugees from recanting the horrors from which they escaped—and for some, mostly women, continue to endure.

The men said while they feel somewhat secure inside the confines of the camps, they dare not venture outside for fear of being shot or killed by the Janjaweed. They showed us scars on their arms and legs of the gunshot wounds they received while escaping from their villages. They are despondent over the fact that they are unable to provide food for their families because they cannot farm their fields. They expressed utter sadness and outrage about their wives and daughters who venture outside the borders of the camp to collect firewood and straw, knowing the fate that awaits them at the hands of the Janjaweed. Life and death decisions are made every day: send the men out and risk death or send the women out and risk rape.

Rape is clearly another weapon being used by the Janjaweed. Rapes, we were told, hap-

pen almost daily to the women who venture outside the confines of the camps in search of firewood and straw. They leave very early in the morning, hoping to evade their tormentors before they awake. With the camps swelling in size and nearby resources dwindling, they often walk several miles. The farther the women go from the camp, the greater the risk of being attacked by the Janjaweed. As we approached Mornay, we saw a number of Janjaweed resting with their camels and horses along the perimeter of the camp, easily within walking distance.

We heard the horrific story of four young girls—two of whom were sisters—who had been raped just days before we arrived. They had left the camp to collect straw to feed the family's donkey when they were attacked. They said their attackers told them they were slaves and that their skin was too dark. As they were being raped, they said the Janjaweed told them they were hoping to make more lighter-skinned babies.

One of the four women assaulted, too shy to tell her story in front of men, privately told a female journalist traveling with us that if anyone were to find out she had been raped, she would never be able to marry.

We were told that some of the rape victims were being branded on their back and arms by the Janjaweed, permanently labeling the women. We heard the chilling account of the rape of a 9-year-old girl.

We also received a letter during our trip from a group of women who were raped. To protect them further attacks, we purposely do not mention where they are from or list their names. The translation is heart-breaking:

"Messrs Members of the US. Congress

"Peace and the mercy and the blessings of God be upon you.

"We thank you for your help and for standing by the weak of the world, wherever they are found. We welcome you to the (. . .) region, which was devastated by the Janjaweed, or what is referred to as the government 'horse- and camel-men,' on Friday (. . . 2004), when they caused havoc by killing and burning and committing plunder and rape. This was carried out with the help of the government, which used the (. . .) region as an airport and supplied the Janjaweed with munitions and supplies. So we, the raped woman of the (. . .) region, would like to explain to you what has happened and God is our best witness.

"We are forty-four raped women. As a result of that savagery, some of us became pregnant, some have aborted, some took out their wombs and some are still receiving medical treatment. Hereunder, we list the names of the raped women and state that we have high hopes in you and the international community to stand by us and not to forsake us to this tyrannical, brutal and racist regime, which wants to eliminate us racially, bearing in mind that 90 percent of our sisters at (. . .) are widows."

"(Above) are the names of some of the women raped in the (. . .) region. Some of these individuals are now at (. . .), some are at Tawilah and some are at Abu Shouk camps. Everything we said is the absolute truth. These girls were raped in front of our fathers and husbands.

"We hope that you and the international community will continue to preserve the balance of the peoples and nations.

"Thank you.

From: The raped women at (. . .)."

These rape victims have nowhere to turn. Even if they report the attacks to the police, they know nothing will happen. The police,

the military and the Janjaweed all appear to be acting in coordination.

DIRE SITUATION IS MAN-MADE

The situation in Darfur is dire, and from what we could see, it is entirely man-made. These people who had managed to survive even the severest droughts and famines during the course of their long history are now in mortal danger of being wiped out simply because of the darker shade of their skin color.

Over the course of three days, we saw the worst of man's inhumanity to man, but we also saw the best of what it means to be human: mothers waiting patiently for hours in the hot sun so that they could try to save their babies; NGO aid workers and volunteer doctors feeding and caring for the sick and the dying, and the courage and bravery of men, women and children eager to talk to us so that we would know their story.

The world made a promise in 1994 to never again allow the systematic destruction of a people or race. "Never again"—words said, too, after the Holocaust. In Darfur, the international community has a chance to stop history from repeating itself. It also has a chance to end this nightmare for those who have found a way to survive. If the international community fails to act, the next cycle of this crisis will begin. The destiny facing the people of Darfur will be death from hunger or disease.

When will the death of innocent men, women and children who want nothing more in this world than to be left alone to farm their land and provide for their families—be too much for the conscience of the international community to bear?

We sat with the victims. We heard their mind-numbing stories. We saw their tears. Now the world has seen the pictures and heard the stories. We cannot say we did not know when history judges the year 2004 in Darfur.

RECOMMENDATIONS

THE GOVERNMENT OF SUDAN

The Government of Sudan should immediately implement key provisions of the April 8 cease-fire agreement, including: the cessation of attacks against civilians; disarming the Janjaweed; and removing all barriers to the admittance of international aid into Darfur. There should be a strict timetable holding the Government of Sudan accountable for implementing these provisions.

The Government of Sudan should renew a dialogue with the Sudan Liberation Army and the Justice and Equality Movement to discuss the political, economic and social roots of the crisis.

THE AFRICAN UNION

Additional cease-fire observers should be deployed and violations of the cease-fire reported immediately. The current number of 270 is inadequate to monitor the activity of an area the size of Texas.

THE UNITED STATES

The United States should publicly identify those responsible for the atrocities occurring in Darfur, including officials and other individuals of the Government of Sudan, as well as Janjaweed militia commanders, and impose targeted sanctions that include travel bans and the freezing of assets.

The President should instruct the U.S. Representative to the United Nations to seek an official investigation and hold accountable officials of the Government of Sudan and government-supported militia groups responsible for the atrocities in Darfur.

THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations should pass a strong Security Council Resolution condemning the Government of Sudan. It should call for: an immediate end to the attacks; the immediate disarming of the Janjaweed; the immediate protection of civilians by beginning a review of the security of refugees in Darfur; the determination of the feasibility of sending in UN protection forces; an immediate review of bringing legal action against those responsible for the policies of ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity and war crimes in Darfur; and the imposition of targeted sanctions that include travel bans and the freezing of assets.

The United Nations should immediately deploy human rights monitors to Darfur.

The protection of civilians and access to humanitarian aid should be a primary concern; the Security Council must be prepared to establish a no fly zone if the cease-fire continues to be violated.

The United Nations together with other organizations should continue to coordinate a relief strategy for getting aid into those regions of Darfur that have yet to receive humanitarian assistance. Alternative routes and means of delivering aid should be considered if the Government of Sudan continues to impede deliveries.

The United Nations should take immediate steps to seek the removal of Sudan from the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

The United Nations should set a deadline for the Government of Sudan to comply to all obligations under the cease-fire and prepare contingency plans in the event those deadlines are not met.

We would like to thank everyone involved in organizing, coordinating and implementing our trip. Representatives from the State Department, USAID and the NGOs both in Washington and Sudan deserve special thanks. We would also like to thank Sean Woo, general counsel to Senator Brownback, and Dan Scandling, chief of staff to Rep. Wolf, for accompanying us on the trip. They played a critical role in writing this report and took all the photographs. We would also like to thank Janet Shaffron, legislative director, and Samantha Stockman, foreign affairs legislative assistant, to Rep. Wolf, and Brian Hart, communications director, and Josh Carter, legislative aide, of Senator Sam Brownback, for editing the report. Colin Samples, an intern in Rep. Wolf's office, did the design and layout.

We also want to extend out thanks to Secretary of State Colin Powell and UN Secretary General Kofi Annan for visiting the region. Their personal involvement in working to resolve this crisis is critically important.

IN RECOGNITION OF PHILIP D. WHITE

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Fire Chief Philip D. White on the occasion of his retirement after more than 30 years of excellent service at the South San Francisco Fire Department, ten of them as chief. Chief White has saved many lives—human and animal—and brought safety and peace of mind to all residents.

He came to the South San Francisco Fire Department as a paramedic and firefighter in 1983. In 1992 he was promoted to Fire Captain and in 1999 he advanced to Provisional Battalion Chief and Battalion Chief. In 2002 he was promoted to Deputy Chief and then finally to Fire Chief in 2003.

During his distinguished career, Chief White has served with contagious enthusiasm and earned a long list of awards and acknowledgments. For example, he was named 1992 Firefighter of the Year by the South San Francisco Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He received a commendation from FEMA for urban search and rescue deployments during Hurricane Iniki, the Northridge earthquake, the World Trade Center and Hurricane Katrina. He received a service award from the Peninsula Council of Lions Clubs in 2001 and was named the 2003 City of South San Francisco Employee of the Year. Also in 2003, he received a special commendation from the United States Marine Corps for the "Yellow Ribbon" resolution passed in support of military families. In 2011 he was honored with the California Commendation Medal for meritorious service and support of soldiers and airmen of the California Army and Air National Guard.

This long list of honors demonstrates Chief White's tireless energy and commitment to others. He has made South San Francisco a better place to live by introducing ordinances and programs that will serve residents for decades to come. Chief White was instrumental in developing technical rescue, maritime and emergency response programs. He helped make new buildings safer by requiring sprinkler systems. His colleagues can also thank him for a state-of-the-art live fire training tower complex, multipurpose classrooms and an emergency operating center.

Chief White also obtained regional training center status for trench rescue, confined space rescue, rescue systems 1 & 2, authored the San Francisco Bay Area Maritime Fire, Rescue and EMS Automatic Aid Agreement, and he promoted the department's participation in Urban Shield.

Chief White applied his "can do" attitude to his volunteer and community service as well. He served on several county committees reviewing pre-hospital care issues at the advanced life support level. Chief White also coordinated CPR training for citizens and he promoted outreach programs such as Day In The Park, Fire Prevention Week, Junior Fire Academy, Christmas Toy Drives, Jazz by the Bay and USO Bay Area.

His hard work and optimism have earned him the utmost respect and gratitude at the South San Francisco Fire Department. His fellow fire fighters credit him with the prevention of layoffs and fire station closures, top-notch training facilities and outstanding morale. I was told they even promised Chief White that his fire station will be number 1 in Urban Shield next year.

In his well-deserved retirement, Chief White is looking forward to spending more time with his wife of 32 years, Donna, their four children, three grandchildren and his beloved Labrador retriever Bella. He will also enjoy more trips to our national parks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor Chief Philip D.

White for his generous contributions and deep commitment to South San Francisco residents. He will be missed but never forgotten.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast rollcall votes on August 1st. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes:

On rollcall No. 428, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall No. 429, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall No. 430, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 431, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall No. 432, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 433, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 434, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 435, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall No. 436, I would have voted "no."

HONORING MR. EMMIT ELLIS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Emmitt Ellis, Jr., professionally known as "Bobby Rush", an award-winning rhythm and blues artist—composer, musician, singer; and I'm proud to say a resident of the Second Congressional District of Mississippi.

Emmitt Ellis, Jr. was born in the small town of Homer, Louisiana to father Emmitt Sr. and mother Mattie Ellis. Emmitt Ellis, Jr. later adopted his stage name "Bobby Rush" out of respect for his father standing in the community as a minister.

Bobby's passion for music began early during his childhood, as he built his first primitive guitar from a broom. At age 13, his family moved to Chicago, IL, where he formed his own band and performed locally at "juke joints" playing the guitar. He later incorporated the harmonica into his repertoire of singing and guitar playing, thereby creating his own unique musical flair dubbed "folk-funk" music.

His zeal for music and innate talent afforded him the opportunity to perform with musical legends such as Muddy Waters, Howling Wolf, and Ray Charles. His colorful style in music was recognized when he became the only Blues artist to win the highest honor in both "Best Acoustic Artist of the Year" at the Blues Music Awards for his album *Rush*, and "Best Soul Blues Artist."

Mr. Rush also became a Grammy nominee in 2000 for his album *Hoochie Mama*. His pop-

ularity continues to this day: this year, he was again nominated for "Male Soul Blues Artist" at the Blues Music Awards.

He is also an internationally recognized artist, and, in fact, was the first artist to perform Blues at the Great Wall of China to an audience of 40,000. His dedication to promote peace through the language of music has not gone unnoticed. He was recognized as the Friendship Ambassador and Spokesperson to the Great Wall of China Foundation; and referred to as the "International Dean of the Blues".

In addition to performing at the Great Wall of China and other international venues, he has also performed in the most esteemed concert halls in the United States including the Kennedy Center and Carnegie Hall.

Mr. Rush maintains strong relationships with his fans, often performing to purely share his passion for music with others. He has demonstrated his patriotism and charity by performing for our troops in Iraq, Kuwait and Afghanistan, and has supported projects for prisons and at-risk youth. He also annually entertains veterans and active servicemen through his own Red, White and Blues Jam where he gives more than 2,000 free tickets to veterans to attend.

He continues to perform locally, and plays for charity events and mentors other artists. The compassion and generosity that Mr. Rush consistently expresses are truly commendable.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Emmitt Ellis, Jr. (Bobby Rush) for his outstanding talent, community service, and dedication to sharing the Blues with the world.

75TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE THOUSAND ISLANDS INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th Anniversary Celebration of the Thousand Islands International Bridge.

After 16 months of construction, 20,700 cubic yards of concrete, 798 tons of reinforcing steel, 6,550 tons of structural steel, 555 tons of cable materials and 575,000 man hours of labor, the bridge system opened 10 weeks ahead of schedule, on August 18, 1938. At the dedication ceremony, with 25,000 onlookers lining along the border, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Canadian Prime Minister Mackenzie King shared the stage, highlighting the unique and special relationship of the U.S. and Canada.

The U.S.-Canada relationship is not only an economic one, but one shared in common principles. While the U.S.-Canada trade relationship is the largest one in the world, accounting for nearly \$700 billion in goods and services, our nations share representative democracy, individual liberty, and a common interest of opportunity for all. With nearly 2,000,000 crossings annually along the Thousand Islands International Bridge System, tourists from both the U.S. and Canada can

explore the region's unique geographic and cultural offerings. Today, the bridge system continues to demonstrate the rare and long-standing common bond shared between the two countries.

I rise today to recognize this time in history, and to also congratulate the Thousand Islands Bridge Authority on this achievement and their excellent work.

HONORING RICHARD ("RICK") FOSTER

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with my colleague the Ranking Member of the Ways and Means Committee SANDER LEVIN to recognize and thank Richard ("Rick") Foster, the Chief Actuary at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), for his service to the nation. Rick retired this year after nearly 40 years of public service, including the last 18 years as the chief actuary.

Mr. Foster and his colleagues in the Office of the Actuary (OACT) have provided valuable guidance through the years to Members of Congress and their staffs on both sides of the aisle as we have worked to improve Medicare, Medicaid, and the Children's Health Insurance Program. OACT's estimates are used to calculate key indices and other measures used throughout Medicare's payment systems. OACT also manages the widely used and often cited National Health Expenditure (NHE) account data and projections, which measure national health spending trends in both public programs and the private sector. Whether responding to technical or confidential requests or engaging in the annual tasks required by law and custom, Mr. Foster and his staff were responsive and thoughtful as they offered their best professional efforts.

Mr. Foster began his career in the Federal government in 1973 at the Social Security Administration (SSA), working on the development of Medicare payment rates for health maintenance organizations when Medicare was managed through the SSA. He later served as Deputy Chief Actuary at SSA for 13 years before being selected as the CMS Chief Actuary in 1995.

OACT's role is often behind-the-scenes, but critically important. Mr. Foster has been widely recognized for his tireless efforts to ensure that Congress and the Administration have access to high-quality, objective actuarial, economic, and statistical assistance, provided independently and on a nonpartisan basis and often with a dose of good humor. His adherence to the highest levels of professional independence and ethical conduct has been widely acclaimed and is deeply appreciated.

In addition to his exceptional actuarial and other technical skills, Mr. Foster was an accomplished leader at CMS. He led OACT's implementation of team-based operations in 1995, based on the successful model developed by General Electric. He emphasized professional development for all staff, continuous improvement in all projects, a cordial, cooperative work environment and a multi-disciplinary

approach to work. Under his guidance, the Office of the Actuary achieved the highest or second-highest results in the annual human capital survey every year since its inception.

During his career, Mr. Foster has earned numerous prestigious awards, including the University of Maryland, Baltimore County Outstanding Alumnus of the Year in 1997, the Presidential Meritorious Executive Award in 1998 from President Clinton, the Presidential Distinguished Executive Award in 2001 from President Bush, the Secretary's Award for Distinguished Service in 2004, the College of Wooster Distinguished Alumni Award in 2006, the Robert J. Myers Public Service Award from the American Academy of Actuaries in 2006, and the Society of Actuaries President's Award in 2010. The readers of *Modern Healthcare* magazine voted him one of the 100 most influential persons in health care in the U.S. for the last six years.

We are pleased to honor and commend Rick Foster for his distinguished career in public service and wish him all the best in retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 429, I was unavoidably detained at a personal doctor's appointment. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

RECOGNIZING ALEX BREGMAN

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Alex Bregman, an exceptional New Mexican, for his outstanding athletic achievements and for his contributions to the Albuquerque community. An Albuquerque Academy graduate, Alex recently completed his freshman year at Louisiana State University, where he was a standout on the baseball team.

After a stellar career at Albuquerque Academy, Alex was selected by the Boston Red Sox in the 2012 MLB Draft, but chose instead to attend LSU. From the moment he stepped on the field in Baton Rouge, Alex has made a tremendous impact.

As the starting varsity shortstop this past season, Alex batted .369, with 18 doubles, seven triples, six home runs and 52 RBI, helping lead the LSU Tigers to a berth in the College World Series. His 104 base hits ranked second in the entire nation. After a season like that, it is no wonder that the honors and awards started piling up for Alex. He was selected as a first-team All-American and the SEC Freshman of the Year. Baseball America, Collegiate Baseball Magazine and the National Collegiate Baseball Writers Association each named Alex as their National Freshman of the

Year. The College Baseball Hall of Fame recognized Alex as the 2013 Brooks Wallace National Shortstop of the Year.

This summer, Alex played with the USA Baseball Collegiate National Team, where he batted .361, led the team in hits and total bases, and tied for the lead in doubles.

Players, coaches, scouts and even opponents are quick to praise Alex's incredible work ethic and his insatiable desire to become a better ballplayer. He will often go out to the baseball field at 10 o'clock at night to practice.

Alex is not only a fantastic athlete; he is a fine young man. After winning the National Shortstop of the year award, Alex, ever humble, remarked, "This is a team award and I have to thank all of my great teammates." Because of his commitment to setting and achieving high educational and personal goals, Alex serves as an unparalleled role model for other young people and for the entire Albuquerque community.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent Alex in the United States House of Representatives, and I am proud to consider the entire Bregman family my dear friends.

IN RECOGNITION OF RITA GLEASON

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Rita Gleason, the Principal of Notre Dame High School in Belmont California, upon her retirement after 22 years of service to the school and to our community. During her tenure, Ms. Gleason has been an inspiration to 3,500 girls who have been educated at Notre Dame.

I am a graduate of a Catholic girl's high school and I deeply believe that these institutions build character, leadership abilities and self-esteem. Ms. Gleason shares those values and works tirelessly to ensure that every young woman who goes to Notre Dame achieves her fullest potential. Students are encouraged to become deeply involved in community service and Ms. Gleason models that commitment through her work with immigrants and the economically challenged. The young women of Notre Dame benefit from a rigorous curriculum sustained in part by the generosity of its alumni. These graduates give because Ms. Gleason is a continuing force in their own lives many years after they leave the campus.

Rita Gleason is known as a person who listens closely to students. The young women of Notre Dame know that they have a confidante in Ms. Gleason, and a supporter who will work with them if they want to work through their difficult problems. At a recent conference that I helped to convene on the subject of gun violence within communities, experts noted how important it is for students to have an adult in whom they can confide. At Notre Dame High School, the go-to adult is Rita Gleason. Every parent can have confidence that she will offer wisdom, compassion, and a steady set of values that will empower students through their difficult moments.

Great leaders have great staff and Ms. Gleason is no exception. Teachers want to teach at Notre Dame because they know that they will be supported by a professionally-trained educator. Ms. Gleason has a credential in K-12 and adult education, a community college credential, and a credential in History, English and the Humanities. She graduated with a BA from the College of Notre Dame and with two Master's degrees—one in Educational Administration and the other in Counseling. Her resume reads like a famous musician's—every box indicating genius was checked during Ms. Gleason's passionate pursuit of knowledge.

Befitting the Principal of a private high school, Ms. Gleason has long been involved in the credentialing organization for private schools, governing councils for the schools of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, and has served in administrative and guidance positions at several Catholic schools in five states and the District of Columbia. In our community from 1992 to the present, she has received no less than seven honors or awards for community service, including the Jefferson Award for Outstanding Public Service, an award given only to those who go well above and beyond ordinary public service.

Mr. Speaker, Notre Dame High School will soon be without the sight of Ms. Gleason's Navy Blue VW Bug in the parking lot, but what she stood for—Christian values, social justice, women's leadership—will live on in all the young women who were educated at NDHS during her tenure. There are some who warm a seat and call themselves a leader, but there are others who lead by never being in their seat. Rita Gleason is the leader who never sits and the listener who never hesitates to open her heart. Notre Dame High School will long remember Rita Gleason, Principal for 22 years and a leader for all time.

IN RECOGNITION OF CONGRESSMAN JO BONNER OF THE FIRST DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

HON. SPENCER BACHUS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my delegation colleagues—Congressman ROBERT ADERHOLT, Congressman MO BROOKS, Congresswoman MARTHA ROBY, Congressman MIKE ROGERS, and Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL—it is with great respect and admiration that we recognize the service of Congressman JO BONNER to the First District of Alabama, his state, and his country. A determined and effective advocate for the people of Alabama, JO BONNER has distinguished himself through his accomplishments in office, his integrity, and his deep humility. The members of the Alabama delegation have always worked together when the best interests of our state are involved and JO BONNER has been integral to our cohesiveness. We have been honored to serve with him as a colleague and count him as a friend.

Jo's calling to serve began early. The ethic was instilled by a close-knit family that valued

the principles of hard work, honesty, and fair play. The many public officials and community leaders in his extended family included his father, Judge Josiah Robins Bonner of Wilcox County, and his mother Imogene, who was an Army nurse during World War II.

The decision JO made to attend the University of Alabama, where he earned a journalism degree, began a love affair with a great institution that has only strengthened over the years. An internship with Congressman Jack Edwards gave JO his first intimate exposure to the U.S. House of Representatives. In a few years, JO would return with Congressman Edwards' successor, Sonny Callahan, ascending to the position of Chief of Staff.

Perhaps because he served for 18 years as a staff member himself, JO BONNER has always been known for hiring excellent people and treating his staff with professionalism and respect. By doing so, he has developed a loyal and experienced team—led most recently by Chief of Staff Al Spencer—widely acknowledged as one of the hardest-working and most effective on Capitol Hill.

Upon his election to the House in 2002, JO faced enormous expectations in continuing the legacy established by his two outstanding predecessors and mentors. But JO had listened and observed closely over the years and quickly established himself as a leader in our state's delegation and the House, achieving influence through his knowledge, attention to detail, diligence, and ability to form personal relationships.

A constant passion of JO BONNER has been to promote economic opportunity and thereby improve the quality of life for citizens in the First District and the State of Alabama. He played a key role in such seminal economic development victories as the ThyssenKrupp steel complex, the Austal contract for construction of new ships for the U.S. Navy, and the decision by Airbus to build its new plant in Mobile. These transformational projects will provide a solid foundation for the South Alabama economy and indeed the economy of our entire state for decades to come.

JO is keenly aware of the importance of the Gulf to the economy and identity of the Mobile area. He has been an ardent supporter of the Port of Alabama. After the devastation caused by Hurricanes Ivan and Katrina, JO mobilized the full resources of his office to bring needed relief to storm victims and accelerate economic recovery. Our delegation turned to him for guidance after the disastrous BP-Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. JO's skillful leadership in navigating the RESTORE Act into public law was a testament to his successful ability to move complex legislation in a thoughtful and inclusive manner. The RESTORE ACT is a signature accomplishment that will have long-lasting benefits for the Gulf Coast economy and help assure the environmental protection of the Gulf waters.

JO has taken special pride in providing the best level of service to his constituents. His high school workshops have touched thousands of students in South Alabama. A stalwart supporter of veterans, JO helped establish the Alabama State Veterans Cemetery in Spanish Fort to honor the service of our men and women in uniform. He has placed an emphasis on open communications with his constituents and the news media.

For the many of us who deeply care about this institution, JO has stood out as a Member dedicated to making the House of Representatives work as the American people rightfully expect. A principled conservative, he commitment has been to a fair legislative process, to bridging political divides, and to civility. JO was appointed to the important Appropriations Committee and entrusted to serve in the position of Chairman of the Ethics Committee during the 112th Congress. We have all gained enormously from his sound judgment and wise advice.

JO will be the first to admit that none of his achievements would have been possible without the support of his lovely wife Janee and his children, Robin and Lee. We thank them for sharing JO with us and our nation.

Now, JO will be entering a new phase in public life as the Vice Chancellor for Economic Development and Government Relations for the University of Alabama System. His presence and counsel will further strengthen an educational institution in which Alabamians rightly take tremendous pride and which is an asset of incalculable value to our beloved state.

We will greatly miss JO BONNER as a colleague and friend, but know that he will continue to work with all of his considerable talents and energy to improve the lives of the people of Alabama.

Our tribute today is just a small way of showing how much we appreciate JO and how much he has meant to us and to the institution to which he has devoted so much of his life, the United States House of Representatives. On his last day of service representing Alabama's First Congressional District, we want JO to know that he and his family have our most heartfelt best wishes and will continue to be in our prayers as they enter an exciting new chapter in their lives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

July 31—Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 426 on H.R. 1911—Motion to Concur with the Senate Amendment, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 427 on passage of H.R. 850, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

August 1—Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 428 on the Waxman amendment to H.R. 1582, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "no". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 429 on the Connolly amendment to H.R. 1582, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "no". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 430 on the Murphy amendment to H.R. 1582, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emer-

gency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 431 on the Capps motion to recommit H.R. 1582, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "no". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 432 on passage of H.R. 1582, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 433 ordering the previous question on H. Res. 322, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 434 on adoption of H. Res. 322, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 435 on H.R. 1897, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 436 on passage of H.R. 2879, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

August 2—Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 437 on the Scalise amendment to H.R. 367, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 438 on the Smith amendment to H.R. 367, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 439 on the Latham amendment to H.R. 367, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 440 on the Nadler amendment to H.R. 367, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "no". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 441 on the Johnson amendment to H.R. 367, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "no". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 442 on the Jackson Lee amendment to H.R. 367, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "no". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 443 on the Moore amendment to H.R. 367, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "no". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 444 on the Kuster motion to recommit H.R. 367, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "no". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 445 on passage of H.R. 367, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 446 on the Nolan motion to recommit H.R. 2009, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "no". Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 447 on passage of H.R. 2009, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF THE NANTY GLO
VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. KEITH J. ROTHFUS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Nanty Glo Volunteer Fire Department on its one hundredth anniversary, and to thank our brave volunteers for their service.

The Nanty Glo Volunteer Fire Department was founded on June 14, 1913 in a garage with only a two-wheeled, hand-drawn cart. In the one hundred years since its founding, the fire department has grown to six vehicles and many more volunteers. These volunteers provide critical services to their community including fire prevention, fire suppression, and emergency rescue.

Mr. Speaker, it is truly an honor to recognize the Nanty Glo Volunteer Fire Department on its one hundredth year of service. I join the residents of Nanty Glo, Pennsylvania in remembering the firefighters who have served with this fire department through the past century, and I extend my thanks, best wishes and congratulations to the brave men and women who continue to serve their community with pride, selflessness, and dedication.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 432, I was unavoidably detained in a meeting at the White House with the President. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

CELEBRATING 80TH BIRTHDAY OF
DR. PAUL PAYNE

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 80th birthday of Dr. Paul Payne, and thank him for his medical service to the community of Marietta, Georgia.

Dr. Payne has led a most storied and purposeful life. In 1933, Dr. Payne was born in New York, before moving to China at the age of two and starting school in Korea. But with threats of war, he boarded the last boat back to America before China entered World War II in 1941. He settled in Atlanta, where he would finish high school at age 16, and finished his undergraduate degree at Maryville College in Tennessee in only three years before attending the Medical College of Georgia.

After becoming an orthopedic surgeon, Dr. Payne helped to found Marietta Orthopedics in 1964, which was renamed Pinnacle in 1997. Throughout his career, he has worked tire-

lessly and passionately to help the sick get back to full health. With a truly inspiring attitude, he maintains that the most gratifying part of his job is to fix people and watch them get well. Notably, he loves working with children, and said that "when you love the work you do, then it is not considered work."

Among his many accomplishments, Dr. Payne performed the first total hip replacement in Cobb County, was named to the Wellstar Kennestone Hospital Board of Directors in 1984—where he remains today—received the NRCC Georgia Physician of the Year award in 2006, and received the 2007 Congressional Order of Merit.

But aside from his impressive professional life, he has remained one of the finest citizens and fathers that I know, and is a great community role model. He has instilled great values in his four wonderful children, and has remained an active Rotary Club member for several years.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 11th District of Georgia, I would like to extend a very happy birthday to Dr. Payne, recognize him for his exceptional work in the medical field, and thank him for being a great role model for others in the community.

RECOGNIZING 95TH ANNIVERSARY
OF MURPHY THEATRE IN WIL-
MINGTON, OHIO

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 95th anniversary of the Murphy Theatre in Wilmington, Ohio.

The Murphy Theatre was financed by Chicago Cubs owner and Wilmington native Charles Webb Murphy. Many thought the construction of a 1,000 seat theatre was much too large for a town of 5,000, but the theatre soon became a hub of activity for the area. After its completion in 1918, the Murphy Theatre hosted many traveling shows and performers. Its popularity quickly grew, and the Murphy Theatre began hosting additional community events—soon finding itself as a focal point in the Wilmington community.

Throughout its history, the Murphy Theatre has hosted plays, musicals, and graduations in addition to other events. In the early 1990s, the Murphy Theatre was the set location for the film *Lost in Yonkers*. The renovations from the set creation allowed for the theatre to begin hosting movies. The theatre now serves as a community center hosting weekly movie nights, traveling shows, plays, and musicals.

Again, I offer my congratulations to the Murphy Theatre for celebrating its 95th anniversary. The members of the community in Wilmington have worked hard to preserve the theatre throughout time and have played a crucial role in helping the theatre adapt to the changing forms of entertainment throughout history. It is my honor to represent in Congress such dedicated members of the community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE MICHAEL
LOYDS' 29 YEARS OF SERVICES
IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Michael Loyd for the outstanding commitment and dedication he has demonstrated to the community and our nation throughout his 29 years of service in law enforcement. Michael Loyd began his law enforcement career as a police officer with the El Cajon Police Department. Soon after, Michael Loyd joined the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control as an investigator, where he was one of the original investigators assigned to the Specialized Drug Enforcement Narcotics Team. In 1994, Michael Loyd joined the Attorney General's office as a Special Agent with the Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement, first in the Orange County office, and later in the San Diego office. In 2001, Michael Loyd began serving on the Imperial County Narcotics Task Force, where he is currently the Senior Commander. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Michael Loyd for his selfless commitment to protecting and serving our nation and commend him for his long and distinguished service in law enforcement.

IN RECOGNITION OF RITA
WILLIAMS

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Rita Williams, an exceptional journalist whose image and voice have been beamed into Bay Area living rooms for four decades. She is retiring from KTVU after 35 years at the station.

Rita is a top-notch reporter and superb storyteller. I know from first-hand experience that she is fair, professional and that she won't give any elected official a pass. Rita has earned the adoration and admiration from her colleagues, her interviewees and her viewers.

But don't just take my word for it; this is what other people are saying: Greg Suhr, the San Francisco Police Chief says, "If there was a 'how to' book on how to be the most gracious fair objective 'cool under fire' reporter in the world, Rita Williams' picture would be on the cover." Ed Chapuis, her news director for over 10 years says, "Her stories were always the hardest for her editors to edit, because each word was placed with such purpose and precision." Bill Drummond, journalist and husband of the late Faith Fancher, Rita's longtime friend and colleague, says, "With Rita the reporting came first, and because of that commitment, her stories transcended the usual limitations of the television news medium."

Rita grew up in Lubbock, Texas. She was the first in her family to earn a college degree. After she graduated from Texas Tech University with a B.A. in journalism, she worked as the press secretary for the late Texas Congressman George Mahon, chairman of the

House Appropriations Committee. She then earned her Master's degree in political science/international affairs from George Washington University.

Rita worked as a news reporter at KSAT-TV in Texas from 1975-1978 and then moved to California. She was a reporter for KQED-TV before she joined KTVU in 1980. From 1985-86, she was also a Knight Fellow and taught broadcast news writing at Stanford.

When Rita entered the broadcast world, it was dominated by men. Surviving and even thriving in this testosterone-driven environment was no small accomplishment, but Rita did it with grace and tenacity. She calls herself the "first broadcast broad." She opened KTVU's San Francisco bureau in the Hall of Justice. Rita has reported thousands of social, economic and political stories, treating each one as the most important story at the time. Her work has earned her several Emmies, Tellies, a PASS award from the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, a public service award from the Society of Professional Journalists and many other awards. She was one of the lead investigative reporters in the Oakland BART shooting stories that contributed to a prestigious Peabody award and Edward R. Murrow award to KTVU.

While Rita takes utmost pride in her profession and work, she views her family as her biggest accomplishment. Rita and her husband of 37 years, Lindsey, are the proud parents of Brad who is now a law student in San Francisco. Brad and my children grew up around the same time, so Rita and I often compared notes and shared school referral options.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor one of the finest journalists and human beings I know. On her last day on the air at KTVU, Rita humbly thanked her viewers and said, "You have entrusted me with one of the biggest responsibilities anybody could ever have, to be a reporter and to be your eyes and ears. I hope that I have used that trust well and that you have learned something in return." The answer to that hope is a resounding yes!

ENERGY DIVERSIFICATION

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, energy is of vital importance to our Nation. It is the cornerstone of our economy, allowing for the everyday happenings of our lives to go uninterrupted. Because it is so critically important, we must have steady and abundant sources of energy for our consumption. This is crucial not only to our economy, but to our national security.

Investments in our resources must be strategic, well thought out, and establish a stable supply for our future. The only way to ensure both stability and abundance is through diversification of our varying resources. Any financial expert would advise their clients that diversification is key when investing funds in our financial system. The same is true in regard to our energy sector. While Republicans continue

to push bills targeted to a single resource, they fail to come up with a strategic plan that will encompass all forms of energy resources including hydrocarbons and renewables.

While I believe that we cannot leave out any source in attempting to attain our energy goals, bills such as H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act leverage all our activity to one type of fuel, analogously, putting all of our eggs in one basket. I believe oil and gas will continue to play a role in our economy in the near future. I agree that responsible and sensible drilling should continue to take place. If we look at my home State of Texas, we can see that oil and gas have been key to keeping our economy strong through the tumultuous years of the Great Recession. But, oil and gas are not the only fuel source we are able to utilize for energy production in Texas. In western Texas, winds howl through the fields and we have made use of this great natural resource by placing wind farms on land to collect this type of kinetic energy. This is an example of how we can utilize hydrocarbon resources and take advantage of clean renewable resources at our disposal.

Let's put aside partisan bickering and come together on a true energy plan that will address our country's future needs. Bills that simply give lip-service to increasing our energy supply such as the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, will never be signed into law, and are not plausible for us to be considering. My no vote for the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act was not a condemnation of drilling activities off of our shores, but rather a recognition that we need a comprehensive, responsible, and environmentally sound energy plan for our future that can be passed by the Senate and signed by the President.

THE TAXPAYER RECEIPT ACT OF 2013

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, taxes are a civic duty essential to governance, yet very little information about how that tax money is spent is ever sent back to the American people. The awareness gap results in significant misinformation and disengagement. For example, a 2005 Washington Post/Kaiser Foundation poll found that by a margin of two to one, Americans believe that the federal government spent more on foreign aid than on either Social Security or Medicare.

For that reason, I am introducing the Taxpayer Receipt Act of 2013 to help clarify misconceptions. The Taxpayer Receipt Act requires the Treasury Secretary to provide each taxpayer with an annual itemized "receipt" explaining how his or her tax liability was spent and include: tables reflecting the taxpayer's income tax liability, the amount of the liability spent on each category, and the actual federal outlays for each category; a table containing the 10 costliest tax expenditures; and, an annual budget review using CBO budget projections.

For an example of what a Taxpayer Receipt would look like, go to: <http://mcdermott.house.gov/images/pdttaxpayerreceiptmockupv3.pdf>.

mcdermott.house.gov/images/pdttaxpayerreceiptmockupv3.pdf.

Nina Olson, the Taxpayer Advocate who is an independent advocate for taxpayers within the IRS, supports this reform and the Washington Post and the New York Times have both featured articles that support the taxpayer receipt. In 2010, Third Way released an idea brief explaining the benefits of such a taxpayer receipt. You can find the entire Third Way idea brief here: http://content.thirdway.org/publications/335/Third_Way_Idea_Brief_A_Taxpayer_Receipt.pdf.

Providing a receipt to taxpayers would be inexpensive and simple to implement and similar to the existing Social Security Administration statement provided each year. Most importantly, this information provides the clarity and transparency that the American people want and deserve.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEBRASKA COLLEGE OF TECHNICAL AGRICULTURE

HON. ADRIAN SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture as they celebrate a Century of Ag Education.

Established in 1913 as the Nebraska Agriculture School, high school age students from across the state lived and learned in Curtis, Nebraska. By 1968, the school had transitioned to a post-secondary agriculture technical school.

Despite years of uncertainty and state funding cuts, the NCTA has emerged as a one of the state's most valued resources, serving not only the students and people of Nebraska, but also the nation and the world.

Today the campus is located on 72-acres, in addition to a 562-acre farm which serves as a field laboratory, complete with grain storage facilities, cattle production facilities, and a completely diversified Maryland and irrigated farming operation.

The "ag school at Curtis" fortifies students with an appreciation of Nebraska's agriculture industry and its role in the global economy, and imparts on its students the value of the applied of agriculture science and technology, entrepreneurship, and rural communities.

I am proud to honor their dedication to education, innovation, and preservation in Nebraska's dynamic agriculture industry.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall no. 428, I was unavoidably detained at a personal doctor's appointment. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ROBERT PELTON

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the remarkable career and outstanding community involvement of a great Texan, devoted public servant and my good friend, Robert Pelton. It is an honor for me to recognize Robert, not only for his numerous professional accomplishments and many contributions to our Houston community and the great state of Texas, but also for his service to our country.

Robert and I met many years ago while I was working in the Harris County District Attorney's Office as a prosecutor. Our friendship may have seemed unlikely as Robert, a criminal defense attorney, was more often than not defending the people I was prosecuting. Even though we were on opposing sides, there was a mutual admiration among us that to this day, has not wavered. I am grateful to call Robert a friend.

Robert's humble nature comes from his small town roots and strong patriotic upbringing in Abilene, Texas. As a child growing up in West Texas, Robert had a passion for reading. The books Robert read made Texas history come alive and his fascination with Texas legends and lawyers took root. He began to notice how folks less fortunate were mistreated and taken advantage of in his small town. So, at the young age of 14, he made up his mind to become a great lawyer, like the heroes he read about in his books. Robert still likes classic old west movies about good guys and outlaws.

His West Texas roots taught him that his word was his bond. He lives by that character trait.

Like many honorable men, Robert wanted to serve our nation and enlisted with the Texas Army National Guard. He trained as a combat infantryman, a job that is not for the weak of heart, with the 36th Infantry Division. After honorably serving from 1966 to 1972, Robert was discharged with the rank of Sergeant (E-5). Still determined to become a lawyer, Robert enrolled with South Texas College of Law after graduating from McMurry College in Abilene. During law school, he served as Chief Prosecutor of the Honor Court and as a Justice on the Honor Court. And the rest is history.

During his internship with the famous attorney Jim Skelton, Robert worked on a case where Mr. Skelton represented David Owen Brooks—a defendant in the largest mass murder case in the United States at the time. After helping with this case, Robert realized that his calling was to defend those accused of crimes.

Since May 1975, Robert has represented numerous people during his legal career. Of all of his clients, a highlight in Robert's legal career was representing the late Marvin Zindler, as his personal lawyer for over 30 years. Marvin Zindler was known for his consumer reporting—on ABC News on channel 13—one of the first in the business to do so—letting the unsuspecting public in on the down

and dirty dealings of local businesses throughout Southeast Texas. Marvin was a fighter for the little man and defended those who were swindled or scammed—seeking retribution the best way he knew how, with a bright light, an all-seeing camera lens, and a television audience. It makes sense that Robert represented this local legend.

Robert's extensive knowledge of the justice system and his incredible work ethic earned the respect of his colleagues in the law profession. Over 50 of Robert's felony criminal cases have resulted in no-bills due to the Grand Jury Defense presentations that his team worked on. In 2012, he helped prove a wrong man had been arrested, which resulted in another capital murder case being dismissed. The impact of Robert's work is far reaching.

Over his career, Robert has maintained a strong focus on ethics and has received numerous accolades. He is the Founder and Chairman of the Ethics Committee for the Texas Criminal Defense Lawyers Association and the Harris County Criminal Lawyers Association. In 2011, he recognized a need for criminal defense attorneys to have access to an ethics hotline and urged the Texas Criminal Defense Lawyers Association to create one. In addition, Robert has been named by H-Texas Magazine as one of Houston's Best Criminal Defense Lawyers each year from 2004 to 2010 and as well as one of Houston's "Top Lawyers for the People" each year from 2004 to 2010. In 2012 and 2013, Robert received the President's Award from the Texas Criminal Defense Lawyers Association in recognition of his excellent work during those years. In addition to these honors, Robert has recently been named by the College of the State Bar of Texas as the recipient of the Jim D. Bowmer Professionalism Award for 2012. This high honor is awarded annually to an outstanding College member based on achievement or contribution to professionalism. Robert continues to contribute to the legal profession by authoring monthly columns in *The Defender* and *The Voice for Defense Magazines*. He also serves on the faculty of the Center for American and International Law.

In addition, there are books written about several of his high profile cases, including *Ashes to Ashes*, and another book about Pam Perillo, who was eight hours away from execution, but because of a writ hearing in Federal Court that Robert filed, her life was spared. Several of his well-known cases, were documented on national TV specials: "Women on Death Row" and "Caught on Camera".

As a former prosecutor and then judge, I know how consuming this career can be. But, I also know how meaningful and rewarding it can be. Robert's innovation, determination and compassion for helping others makes him one of the best attorneys in the nation. I am truly blessed to consider him one of my dearest friends and am honored to give him the recognition that he deserves.

And that's just the way it is.

IN RECOGNITION OF SEPI
RICHARDSON**HON. JACKIE SPEIER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Sepi Richardson who is retiring after 15 years of service on the Brisbane City Council, including two terms as mayor. Sepi may be leaving the council, but her spirit and impact on our city and community will be felt for many years to come.

As mayor, Sepi was very involved in all aspects of planning and policy-level decisions while always looking after the financial health and welfare of the city. She oversaw the remodeling of the community center, the community park and playground, Brisbane's marina, the skate park, the teen center and the Mission Blue Performing Art Center. She also dedicated much of her time and energy to preserving open space and to creating recreational and public spaces that benefit everyone in the community, such as the community garden, the swimming pool, school fields, Bayshore bike lane, the community meeting room in City Hall and the farmer's market. Sepi has been a tireless advocate for seniors and children. Under her leadership, Brisbane built the Senior Sunrise Room and senior housing.

Sepi is a familiar face to most Brisbane residents having served on about 20 county boards and commissions. She was a board member on the Airport Community Roundtable and the Association of Governments (C/CAG) and a chair or vice chair on four committees within those associations. In those capacities she was a leader on issues such as revenue and taxation, employee compensation, benefit administration, transportation, energy efficiency, sustainability, emergency preparedness and education.

In addition to her county and region-wide accomplishments, Sepi has left her mark on the city of Brisbane. She served on the Finance/Labor Negotiations, Public Information/Technology, Planning, Parks and Recreation, Open Space and Ecology committees, was a liaison to the Chamber of Commerce and worked on education and arts funding and recognition.

To understand how one person can be involved and effective in so many aspects of public service, you must know Sepi. Her energy, enthusiasm and dedication are endless. She loves her community and never hesitates to serve others.

Sepi was born as the first of six siblings in Tehran, Iran. She came to the United States in 1972. From 1975 to 1979 she went to Germany where she earned her BA in Business Management from the University of Maryland on its Germany campus. She received her Master's Degree in Educational Counseling and Psychology from California State University San Bernardino.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor an outstanding public servant and friend. Sepi Richardson will be missed and appreciated for all the lasting contributions she has made to the residents of Brisbane and beyond.

THE DEATH OF GEORGIA STATE
REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM
QUINCY MURPHY

HON. JOHN BARROW

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge with sadness the passing of Representative William Quincy Murphy. Mr. Murphy served Augusta, Georgia, for 11 years in the Georgia State House of Representative.

He was a lifelong public servant, a true statesman, and a good friend.

Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife Dianne, his son Quincy III, and his daughter Jennifer Murphy Morgan.

THE TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH
ACCELERATING NATIONAL SEC-
URITY AND FUTURE ECONOMIC
RESILIENCY (TRANSFER) ACT OF
2013

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Technology and Research Accelerating National Security and Future Economic Resiliency Act of 2013—or the TRANSFER Act, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of this legislation. It is a good bill that represents a bi-partisan effort to accelerate the transfer of technology from our universities and federal laboratories to the market—creating jobs from federally funded research.

The federal government has strategically invested in R&D with the confidence derived from decades of results that it will yield back a return in the public good that betters the lives of Americans. We cannot minimize the role R&D has played in the prosperity of the United States and we must continue these critical investments.

The next great idea with applications in advanced energy, aeronautics, life sciences, and defense technologies could be sitting on a shelf, and this bill will help the academic community and start-ups to bridge the gap between an innovative idea and a commercially viable technology.

One of the ways this bill helps bridge that gap is by supporting translational research activities such as proof of concept. It will also help to bridge the gap by providing advice, mentoring, and entrepreneurial education to our scientists and engineers. As one would expect, most of our researchers do not have the project management and technology and business development expertise needed to run a business and exposure to this type of expertise is important to creating a successful company.

We need to build innovation ecosystems that sustain long-term and mutually beneficial collaborations between the public and private sectors. Just as we are seeking to commer-

cialize innovative ideas, we have to be willing to take innovative approaches to accelerate technology transfer of federally funded research. As the title of this bill states, accelerating technology transfer and research are key to sustaining our national security and future economic vitality.

This is a good bipartisan bill that should assist universities, research institutions, and national labs help turn R&D into successful, profitable, and sustainable small businesses.

I urge my colleagues to support the TRANSFER Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall no. 433, I was unavoidably in a meeting off the Hill at the White House with the President. Had I been present, I would have voted “no”.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for votes on Tuesday, July 30. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 419, “yea” on rollcall vote 420, and “nay” on rollcall vote 421, “nay” on rollcall vote 422, “yea” on rollcall vote 423, “yea” on rollcall vote 424, and “yea” on rollcall vote 425.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR
FISCAL YEAR 2014, H.R. 2397

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, although the legislation before us today is far from perfect, I rise in support of its passage. The Fiscal Year 2014 Defense Appropriations Act (H.R. 2397) will ensure that our brave men and women in uniform have the resources they need to keep our country safe and secure. The bill also provides funding to support the U.S. industrial base. Lastly, H.R. 2397 includes important provisions to assist our troops and their families, including a pay-raise of 1.8 percent, and strengthens the health care services available to all our service members.

As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, I have worked diligently this past year to ensure funding for members of the U.S. Military, preserve our military readiness, and target wasteful Pentagon programs. While I am in favor of the underlying legislation, I am deeply disappointed

that nearly all of the mandated across-the-board cuts were shifted to other parts of our Federal budget, leaving the Pentagon relatively unscathed. In fact, the bill provides more funding than originally requested in the President's budget proposal, which further demonstrates the House Republicans' misplaced budget priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I am serious about confronting the fiscal crisis facing America. Being an Appropriator, I take seriously my job of eliminating unnecessary spending and ineffective programs in every appropriations bill within every federal agency—including the Pentagon. This year's process was unlike past budgeting years. The House Appropriations Committee operated under the unreasonable constraints of the funding allocations imposed by House Republicans, which needlessly starve the discretionary budget. These allocations force Congress to make reckless trade-offs between adequately funding the Pentagon and providing sufficient funding for the rest of our Federal government. This is not only economically harmful, but also an irresponsible way to operate as a legislative body.

The exponential growth of the Pentagon Budget since 2001 is due primarily to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Now that the Iraq War has ended and as we withdraw our combat troops from Afghanistan next year, it is time to significantly reduce the size of the Pentagon budget in a responsible way. During consideration of this bill, I voted in favor of numerous common-sense amendments aimed at saving the government hundreds of billions of dollars. With my support, the House passed two separate amendments that reduced the Afghanistan Security and Afghanistan Infrastructure funds by nearly a half a billion dollars. In addition, I voted in favor of an amendment offered by Congressman VAN HOLLEN, which reduces the Pentagon's war funding account by \$3.5 billion over the next year.

We also debated and voted on important amendments related to national security and civil liberties. The most notable of these being measures to curb the National Security Agency's (NSA) blanket collection of Americans' telephone records. Since the Patriot Act originally passed under former President George W. Bush, Congress has regularly reauthorized it without subjecting the NSA and other government agencies to proper oversight. This enabled the NSA to abuse two of its provisions, Sections 702 and 215, by using them to justify unwarranted surveillance of law-abiding U.S. citizens both domestically and abroad. This is simply unacceptable. Congress has an obligation to conduct strong oversight of our national security policies and when necessary, take corrective action through the legislative process.

That is why I welcomed the floor debate and supported the “Amash-Conyers” amendment, which aimed to restrict the NSA's ability to collect bulk telecommunications records pursuant to Section 215 of the Patriot Act. Furthermore, it would have imposed stricter, more robust judicial oversight of the Federal government's surveillance programs. Even though the amendment narrowly failed by a vote of 205–217, its strong bipartisan support sends a clear message to the White House that Congress is ready and willing to implement much

needed reforms. It is absolutely essential that we preserve Americans' privacy and civil liberties in our efforts to keep America safe from terrorist attacks.

Mr. Speaker, this bill in its totality provides adequate funding for all our military personnel and their families. Moreover, it includes several necessary reforms to help eliminate the scourge of sexual assault in the military. I was proud to work with my colleagues on the Subcommittee to fully fund the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response programs at \$157 million and add an additional \$25 million above the request to implement a Sexual Assault Special Victims Program. The bill also reaffirms numerous provisions that were included in the FY 2014 National Defense Authorization Act, including those increasing penalties for sexual assault, requiring trial by court-martial for such offenses, and limiting convening authority discretion regarding court-martial findings and sentencing.

Congress has a duty to take care of our men and women in uniform and as a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, I urge my colleagues to support the underlying legislation.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. MATTHEW CATHOLIC CHURCH

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 150th anniversary of St. Matthew Catholic Church in San Mateo, California. Since its founding in 1863 the buildings, parishioners and pastors have changed, but the church has always been a place for comfort, solace, community and friendship for everyone.

A century and a half ago, Archbishop Alemany sent Father Denis Dempsey to San Mateo to establish the first parish in the county. A small wooden-steeple church was built on the corner of Third Avenue and A Street—today Ellsworth Avenue—on a piece of land donated by Charles B. Polhemus, an investor in the San Francisco—San Jose Railroad. Father Dempsey was the pastor for 18 years and earned the admiration and love of his parishioners. It is said that his funeral mass was attended by local officials and dignitaries from throughout the state.

Sadly, the next pastor, Father William Bowman, only had a tenure of seven months before he passed away. He was followed by Father Peter Birmingham who presided for three years until he was transferred to San Francisco. Longevity was the signature of the fourth pastor, Father Timothy Callaghan. He served St. Matthew Church for 53 years. During his tenure, a parish cemetery was established and a new church was built. The congregation was growing and the threat of a fire destroying the old wooden church led to a fire resistant brick church on Ellsworth between Second and Third Avenues. The dedicating mass was held in September of 1900. Father Callaghan was elevated to Right Reverend and witnessed continual growth of the parish.

Father Henry J. Lyne became the fifth pastor and established a parish school in 1931. Seven Sisters of the Holy Cross taught 140 students in the first year. He is credited with starting Catholic formal education in the Archdiocese of San Francisco on the peninsula. In 1947, Pope Pius XII appointed him a Domestic Prelate with the title Monsignor.

Father Edward J. Meagher, the sixth pastor, saw unprecedented growth of the Catholic population after World War II. In 1952, total enrollment from Kindergarten to the 8th grade had grown to 861. Father Meagher raised funds to build an independent parish in Shoreview which was named St. Timothy as a tribute to Monsignor Timothy Callaghan. Soon after that, the Western portion of St. Matthew parish was detached with the establishment of Bartholomew parish. Father Meagher's successor, Father Bernard C. Cronin, oversaw the building of a new St. Matthew Church and Rectory at Ninth Avenue and El Camino Real which opened in May 1966. The downtown church also remained open. Father Cronin was elevated to Right Reverend Monsignor in 1972.

In 1979, Father James Ward, a graduate of St. Matthew School, class of 1937, became its eighth pastor. Father James Ward was devoted to the school and the students. During his tenure, the downtown church was demolished after suffering seismic damage. He and the archdiocese fought hard, yet unsuccessfully, for the vacated property that was eventually leased to Walgreen Drug. Father Ward died from a leg infection in 1995. Monsignor James McKay succeeded him and oversaw fundamental renovations of the newer church at El Camino Real and Ninth Avenue that are still in place today.

In 2004, the tenth and current pastor replaced Monsignor McKay. Father Anthony McGuire now oversees the St. Matthew parish of 2,500 and is credited with growing the diverse parish and attracting an ever increasing number of Hispanic and Asian families.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor the rich history of St. Matthew Church in San Mateo which has been a place of spiritual and social growth for thousands of families for 150 years.

OPENING OF THE NEW PAUL LAURENCE DUNBAR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the opening of the new Paul Laurence Dunbar Senior High School in the District of Columbia. Dunbar High School was the first public high school for African Americans in the United States, and has educated students in the District of Columbia for more than 140 years.

Dunbar started in a church basement and had no formal home for its first 20 years. The new Dunbar High School is a green, state-of-the-art building that will inspire the new strides

the school is making. Dunbar today is a neighborhood high school in a tough D.C. neighborhood, unlike the magnet school that attracted students from across the city to come to a high school known for its college preparatory curriculum. However, the school's rich history is an inspiration to the leaders of the school, students, and parents today.

Dunbar was instrumental in making the District of Columbia a bulwark of education for almost a century, despite its segregated school system until the District of Columbia became one of the six Brown v. Board of Education cases. Children from all of the city's neighborhoods came to Dunbar, drawn by its storied reputation. That reputation was reinforced by Dunbar's record of graduating more distinguished African Americans than any high school in the country. Among them were Edward Brooke, the first black popularly elected United States Senator; Robert C. Weaver, the first black Cabinet member; Benjamin O. Davis, the first black general; Wesley Brown, the first black graduate of the Naval Academy; Charles R. Drew, the discoverer of blood plasma; and Mary Jane Patterson, the first African American to achieve a college degree. Dunbar also drew teachers with advanced degrees who would have been college professors, but for segregation. The school's reputation for excellence, in turn, attracted the most prominent colleges and universities annually to visit Dunbar to recruit students. Dunbar is facing its challenge with unflinching energy, but its new facility will ease the way, and its proud history will guide Dunbar to new accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the opening of the new Paul Laurence Dunbar High School on August 19, 2013, and in wishing the school success in continuing its proud legacy in the District of Columbia.

HONOR FLIGHT NORTHERN COLORADO

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished veterans of Honor Flight Northern Colorado as they make their 10th trip to Washington, D.C. to visit the memorials that stand in our nation's capital. This group includes veterans from multiple wars and different generations, linked together by their service to our nation.

Founded in 2005, The Honor Flight program was originally formed to honor veterans of WWII but has since expanded to include those who have served in all other American engagements. This program provides an opportunity for veterans to fly to Washington, D.C. free of cost to them and their families so that they may visit the national memorials dedicated to their service. Of the 122 veterans visiting with its next flight; 51 will have served in WWII, 62 in Korea, and 9 in other conflicts.

Though these memorials will honor our veterans' service for centuries to come, no statue or monument can truly express the level of gratitude we hold for those who courageously

risked their life to preserve our inherent rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We stand here today as a nation of laws, freedom, and liberty because our veterans answered the call of duty when our country needed them the most. Today we honor those who risked their lives to secure the blessings endowed by our Creator for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Donald Benson, Joe Blossom, Hobert Bodkins, Robert Bueker, George Carlson, Wayne Clausen, Maurice Dragoo, Homer Dye, Karl Easterly, James English, George Flaig, Stuart Gordon, Dale Gruber, Frank Gunter, Vern Hammond, Robert Henderson, Otto Hindman, Lawrence Jackson, John Jobson, Elvin Kahl, Doward Kilmer, Thomas Kokjer, Edward Kooper, Raymond Kusmirek, Ralph Leckler, George Lichter, Lyle Lukas, Alfred Marez, Richard Marquart, Maregito Martinez, LeRoy Marx, Hugh McGinty, Damon McMahan, Robert Minnick, Allen Oakley, Gerald Oakley, Vernon Rand, Gerald Rennels, Carol Rhoades, Elmer Rose, Donald Smith, Walter Sparrow, George Stager, Clarence Streit, Richard Tedesco Sr., Rueben Ulrich, Howard Walter, Raymond Yost, Robert Yost, Thomas Youree, Joseph Zito, Charles Adams, Joseph Beaulieu, David Beldusm, John Bevins, James Blue, William Cecil, Thomas Clements, Clifford Closson, Donald Dalton, Stanley Davies, Jerry Delcamp, Leonard Dickey Jr., Robert Eddy, Dale Erickson, Ann Evans, Lemuel Evans, Frank Faucett, Byron Foster, Kent Foutz, Jerry Galpern, Wayne Gibb, Thomas Gordon, Oscar Haake, Doyle Hall, William Harte, William Hitchcock, Claire Hoffman, Raymond Horton, Carl Houkom, Bennett Houston, Eugene Johnson, Richard Kekar, Marvin Kembel, Ralph Knoll, Tom Mandis, George Mason, Alvin Mosch, Doyle Myers, Richard Oversteg, David Owen, Johnnie Prock, Duane Purcell, Herbert Reimer, John Rinne, John Rust Jr., Darrel Shafer, Leonard Schmitz, Virgil Scott, Robert Scott, Herbert Shevins, Wayne Small, Frank Stiver, Robert Stoll, Bernard Streit, Ernest Stumpf, Walter Sutton, Norman Swanson, Arthur Trevarton, Junior Weisshaar, Raymond Williams, George Willson, Harry Wisell, Jerol Arguello, Zachary Dinsmore, William Frank, Allen Laible, Dennis Lee, Lonnie Sebold, Allan Silk, Saxton Wiley and Salvador Velasquez.

THE SITUATION IN CYPRUS

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

There is much happening in Cyprus. Turkish Cypriots completed their elections on Sunday, July 28, and a new government must now be formed.

I congratulate them for this exercise in the democratic process, which has been a major focus on the northern part of the island. Meanwhile, the Greek Cypriot government has been going through a period of economic turmoil

and restructuring that has dominated public debate.

It is my hope that when matters settle down in the months ahead, the two sides will be able to resume productive reunification talks that resolve longstanding issues about the structure of government and the quality of life on the island of Cyprus.

From March 2008 through May 2012, serious reunification talks occurred, often under the direct supervision of former United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. These talks have been suspended for more than a year through the economic crises faced by the island, but there is some room for hope that discussions can restart this fall.

I rise today to urge this Administration to promote such discussions and join in the efforts to reach a reunification agreement on the island of Cyprus that benefits both Cypriot communities.

Such progress will be of great benefit to the world community. It will also directly serve to remove a source of friction between two NATO allies, Turkey and Greece. It is my hope that a bizonal, bicomunal federation agreement that establishes a strong, functioning democracy can be reached in the near future.

IN RECOGNITION OF WILLY CAHILL

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Willy "Clipper" Cahill who is being honored today with a USA Judo Lifetime Achievement Award. I can't think of a more deserving person to receive this exceptional honor. Willy has empowered thousands of children and adults through an ancient art form that builds confidence and enhances independence.

I was one of those lucky children. Willy was my judo teacher from third through sixth grade. He was a fantastic role model, the embodiment of discipline, humility and grace.

His teachings have served me well throughout my life. A few years ago, Stephen Colbert of Comedy Central's Colbert Report came to Capitol Hill to interview me. He was, of course, not interested in ordinary footage, instead he made me get on a skateboard and cruise through the halls of Congress. He goaded me about my judo experience and dared me to throw him onto the marble floor in the Capitol. Colbert ended up on the floor and so did the footage—on the cutting room floor. Without my early lessons and Willy's guidance who knows what would have happened?

Willy was born in 1935 in Honolulu, Hawaii. He started his martial arts education under his father, Professor John Cahill, Sr. who had studied under Professor Okazaki's Kodokan System of Jujitsu in Hawaii. When Willy was 12 years old, he was treated and cured of Polio. He walked out of the hospital—a miracle for which he credits Professor Okazaki.

After graduating from South San Francisco High School, Willy attended San Mateo Junior

College. His father founded Cahill's Judo Academy in Daly City in 1948. Professor Cahill's dream was to get one of his students to the Olympics. That dream was cut short by his tragic and premature death at age 50.

Willy had big shoes to fill, but he lived up to the challenge and beyond. In honor of his dad, Willy opened a new Cahill's Judo Academy Dojo in San Bruno in 1963. Setting the highest standards and goals for himself and his students, Willy has surpassed his father's dream. His coaching and mentorship has produced 1,200 national and international medal winners. He accepted the position of U.S. Olympic Judo Coach in 1988 and of U.S. Paralympic Judo Coach in 1999. In the 2000 Paralympic Games in Sidney, his team made world history and brought home two gold medals, one silver medal and one bronze medal. Four years later at the games in Athens, his team won two silver and one bronze medals. It is important to point out that since judo was introduced as an Olympic discipline in 1964, no team—sighted or not sighted—had ever won gold. Coach Cahill's students have won 75% of all medals in judo on the Olympics and Paralympics level.

Willy has been successful in making judo accessible to people of all ages and abilities. In 2003, he cofounded the Blind Judo Foundation. The non-profit provides blind and visually impaired athletes the chance to train and compete in judo. To advance to the Paralympic Games these athletes often have to compete with sighted competitors. In judo, the same rules apply to the Olympics and the Paralympics.

In addition, Willy has trained U.S. Army Green Berets, Navy Seals, U.S. Secret Service, and Homeland Security. He is the judo coach at Stanford and San Francisco State Universities and of the Junior Pan American Championships and Goodwill Games.

Willy has always led by example. He is a 10th Degree Black Belt in Jujitsu, the highest rank, and an 8th Degree Black Belt in Judo. He has been inducted into the Black Belt Hall of Fame and the Black Belt Coaches Hall of Fame. He was recognized by three presidents at the White House. He received the U.S. Jujitsu President's Leadership Award and earned the title of Professor Willy Cahill from the U.S. Jujitsu Federation. None of these prestigious awards and accomplishments has tainted his humility. He will not let others call him Professor or Sensei, he simply wants to be called Coach. His 10th Degree Black Belt entitles him to a red belt, but Coach always competes in a black belt. The tenets of judo define Willy's life. He has practiced for 65 years and at age 77 still does so five to six days a week.

He has been married to his wife Ellie for 24 years. He is the proud father of two children from his first marriage, Carin Lockwood and Curtis Cahill, who have given him four grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor Coach Willy Cahill, an extraordinary teacher and human being whose physical and spiritual embrace has enlightened thousands. Because of Willy, the world is a better place.

SENATE—Monday, August 12, 2013

The Senate met at 12 p.m., and was called to order by the Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, a Senator from the State of Maryland.

**APPOINTMENT OF ACTING
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, August 12, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, a Senator from the State of Maryland, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CARDIN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
SEPTEMBER 9, 2013, AT 2 P.M.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, and pursuant to the provisions of S. Con. Res. 22, the Senate stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:00 and 35 seconds p.m., adjourned until Monday, September 9, 2013, at 2 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Monday, September 9, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 10

10 a.m.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Ann Miller Ravel, of California, and Lee E. Goodman, of Virginia, both to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission.

SR-301

2:30 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts

To hold hearings to examine an original bill entitled, "Federal Judgeship Act of 2013".

SD-226

SEPTEMBER 11

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2014 for the Federal Communications Commission.

SD-138

SEPTEMBER 12

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 987, to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media, and S. 357, to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty.

SD-226

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

SENATE—Friday, September 6, 2013

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the Honorable AL FRANKEN, a Senator from the State of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the authority granted by section 2 of S. Con. Res. 22 of the 113th Congress, the majority leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, acting jointly in consultation with the minority leaders of the Senate and House respectively have determined that the public interest warrants the convening of the Senate at this time, notwithstanding the previous orders.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Immortal, invisible God only wise, we look to You today for wisdom as our lawmakers seek to do what is best for our Nation and world. Lord, we admit that our human intellects have limits, for we know not what tomorrow holds, but You do. So guide us, sovereign king. We are pilgrims on planet Earth. We are weak but You are mighty; lead us with Your powerful hand. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, DC, September 6, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable AL FRANKEN, a Senator from the State of Minnesota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. FRANKEN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, I appreciate very much the presiding officer's willingness to come in today. I was all prepared this coming Monday to tell everybody "welcome back". But I do that a few days early. So welcome back everyone. I hope you had a good break. I hope it was as productive as mine. I am grateful for everyone's cooperation in getting us to this point.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter of notification relating to section 2 of S. Con. Res. 22 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, September 5, 2013.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Pursuant to section 2 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 of the 113th Congress, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, we hereby notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble at 12:00 noon on Friday, September 6, 2013, and the Members of the House of Representatives to reassemble at 12:00 noon on Friday, September 6, 2013.

Sincerely,

HARRY REID,
Majority Leader of the Senate.
JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we convened the Senate today in order to enable the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to put a joint resolution in the RECORD which authorizes the use of military force, limited in nature against Syria, in response to the Syrian regimes and their use of chemical weapons.

As we know, many, many people have been killed, including almost 500 children. The reported resolution was signed by committee leaders Senators MENENDEZ and CORKER. They have set a tremendous model of bipartisanship and cooperation for the Senate. I admire both of these good men for the work that they have done, the leadership that they have showed in allowing us to be at the point where we are now in this difficult situation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S.J. Res. 21. An original joint resolution to authorize the limited and specified use of the United States Armed Forces against Syria; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; placed on the calendar.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S.J. Res. 21. An original joint resolution to authorize the limited and specified use of the United States Armed Forces against Syria; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; placed on the calendar.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 21

Whereas Syria is in material breach of the laws of war by having employed chemical weapons against its civilian population;

Whereas the abuses of the regime of Bashar al-Assad have included the brutal repression and war upon its own civilian population, resulting in more than 100,000 people killed in the past two years, 2,000,000 Syrian refugees in neighboring countries, and 4,500,000 internally displaced persons in Syria, creating an unprecedented regional crisis and instability;

Whereas the Assad regime has the largest chemical weapons programs in the region and has demonstrated its capability and willingness to repeatedly use weapons of mass destruction against its own people, including the August 21, 2013, attack in the suburbs of Damascus in which the Assad regime murdered over 1,000 innocent people, including hundreds of children;

Whereas there is clear and compelling evidence of the direct involvement of Assad regime forces and senior officials in the planning, execution, and after-action attempts to cover-up, the August 21, 2013, attack, and hide or destroy evidence of such attack;

Whereas the Arab League has declared with regards to the August 21, 2013, incident to hold the "Syrian regime responsible for this heinous crime";

Whereas the United Nations Security Council, in Resolution 1540 (2004), affirmed that the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons constitutes a threat to international peace and security;

Whereas in the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-175), Congress found that Syria's acquisition of weapons of mass destruction threatens the security of the Middle East and the national security interests of the United States;

Whereas the actions and conduct of the Assad regime are in direct contravention of Syria's legal obligations under the United Nations Charter, the Geneva Conventions, and the Protocol to the Hague Convention on the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, done at Geneva June 17, 1925, and also violate the standards set forth in the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction, done at Paris January 13, 1993;

Whereas Syria's use of weapons of mass destruction and its conduct and actions constitute a grave threat to regional stability, world peace, and the national security interests of the United States and its allies and partners;

Whereas the objectives of the United States use of military force in connection with this authorization are to respond to the use, and deter and degrade the potential future use, of weapons of mass destruction by the Government of Syria;

Whereas, on May 21, 2013, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate passed by a 15-3 vote the Syria Transition Support Act (S. 960), which found that the President's goals of Assad leaving power, an end to the violence, and a negotiated political settlement in Syria are prerequisites for a stable, democratic future for Syria and regional peace and security, but absent decisive changes to the present military balance of power on the ground in Syria, sufficient incentives do not yet exist for the achievement of such goals; and

Whereas the President has authority under the Constitution to use force in order to defend the national security interests of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against the Government of Syria to Respond to Use of Chemical Weapons".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The President is authorized, subject to subsection (b), to use the Armed Forces of the United States as the President determines to be necessary and appropriate in a limited and specified manner against legitimate military targets in Syria, only to—

(1) respond to the use of weapons of mass destruction by the Government of Syria in the conflict in Syria;

(2) deter Syria's use of such weapons in order to protect the national security interests of the United States and to protect United States allies and partners against the use of such weapons;

(3) degrade Syria's capacity to use such weapons in the future; and

(4) prevent the transfer to terrorist groups or other state or non-state actors within Syria of any weapons of mass destruction.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR DETERMINATION THAT USE OF MILITARY FORCE IS NECESSARY.—Before exercising the authority granted in subsection (a), the President shall make available to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate the President's determination that—

(1) the United States has used all appropriate diplomatic and other peaceful means to prevent the deployment and use of weapons of mass destruction by Syria;

(2) the Government of Syria has conducted one or more significant chemical weapons attacks;

(3) the use of military force is necessary to respond to the use of chemical weapons by the Government of Syria;

(4) it is in the core national security interest of the United States to use such military force;

(5) the United States has a military plan to achieve the specific goals of—

(A) responding to the use of weapons of mass destruction by the Government of Syria in the conflict in Syria;

(B) deterring Syria's use of such weapons in order to protect the national security interests of the United States and to protect United States allies and partners against the use of such weapons;

(C) degrading Syria's capacity to use such weapons in the future; and

(D) preventing the transfer to terrorist groups or other state or non-state actors within Syria of any weapons of mass destruction; and

(6) the use of military force is consistent with and furthers the goals of the United States strategy toward Syria, including achieving a negotiated political settlement to the conflict.

(c) WAR POWERS RESOLUTION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) SPECIFIC STATUTORY AUTHORIZATION.—Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(a)(1)), Congress declares that this section is intended to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(b)), within the limits of the authorization established under this section.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this resolution supercedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

SEC. 3. LIMITATION.

The authority granted in section 2(a) does not authorize the use of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Syria for the purpose of combat operations.

SEC. 4. TERMINATION OF THE AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

The authorization in section 2(a) shall terminate 60 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, except that the President may extend, for a single period of 30 days, such authorization if—

(1) the President determines and certifies to Congress, not later than 5 days before the date of termination of the initial authorization, that the extension is necessary to fulfill the purposes of this resolution as defined by section 2(a) due to extraordinary circumstances and for ongoing and impending military operations against Syria under section 2(a); and

(2) Congress does not enact into law, before the extension of authorization, a joint resolution disapproving the extension of the authorization for the additional 30-day period; provided that any such joint resolution shall be considered under the expedited procedures otherwise provided for concurrent resolutions of disapproval contained in section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 5. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

(a) CHANGING OF MOMENTUM ON BATTLEFIELD.—It is the policy of the United States to change the momentum on the battlefield in Syria so as to create favorable conditions for a negotiated settlement that ends the conflict and leads to a democratic government in Syria.

(b) DEGRADATION OF ABILITY OF REGIME TO USE WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.—A comprehensive United States strategy in Syria should aim, as part of a coordinated international effort, to degrade the capabilities of the Assad regime to use weapons of mass destruction while upgrading the lethal and non-lethal military capabilities of vet-

ted elements of Syrian opposition forces, including the Free Syrian Army.

SEC. 6. SYRIA STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this resolution, the President shall consult with Congress and submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives an integrated United States Government strategy for achieving a negotiated political settlement to the conflict in Syria, including a comprehensive review of current and planned United States diplomatic, political, economic, and military policy towards Syria.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the provision of all forms of assistance to the Syrian Supreme Military Council and other Syrian entities opposed to the government of Bashar Al-Assad that have been properly and fully vetted and share common values and interests with the United States;

(2) the provision of all forms of assistance to the Syrian political opposition, including the Syrian Opposition Coalition;

(3) efforts to isolate extremist and terrorist groups in Syria to prevent their influence on the future transitional and permanent Syrian governments;

(4) security coordination with allies and regional partners including Israel, Jordan and Turkey;

(5) efforts to limit support from the Government of Iran and others for the Syrian regime;

(6) planning for securing existing chemical, biological, and other weapons supplies; and

(7) efforts to address the ongoing humanitarian challenges presented by 2,000,000 Syrian refugees in neighboring countries, and 4,500,000 internally displaced persons in Syria, and related humanitarian needs.

SEC. 7. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION AND REPORTING.

(a) NOTIFICATION AND PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Upon the President's determination to use the authority set forth in section 2, the President shall notify Congress, including the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, of the use of such authority and shall keep Congress fully and currently informed of the use of such authority.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than 10 days after the initiation of military operations under the authority provided by section 2, and every 20 days thereafter until the completion of military operations, the President shall submit to Congress, including the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, a report on the status of such operations, including progress achieved toward the objectives specified in section 2(a), the financial costs of operations to date, and an assessment of the impact of the operations on the Syrian regime's chemical weapons capabilities and intentions.

SEC. 8. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

The authority set forth in section 2 shall not constitute an authorization for the use of force or a declaration of war except to the extent that it authorizes military action under the conditions, for the specific purposes, and for the limited period of time set forth in this resolution.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 21. An original joint resolution to authorize the limited and specified use of the United States Armed Forces against Syria.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
SEPTEMBER 9, 2013, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate adjourn until 2 p.m. Monday, September 9, 2013.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:04 p.m., adjourned until Monday, September 9, 2013, at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, September 6, 2013

Pursuant to section 2 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, 113th Congress, the House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 6, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF DENHAM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

NOTICE OF REASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the text of the formal notification sent to Members on Thursday, September 6, 2013, of the reassembly of the House.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, September 5, 2013.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Pursuant to section 2 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 of the 113th Congress, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, we hereby notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble at 12:00 noon on Friday, September 6, 2013, and the Members of the House of Representatives to reassemble at 12:00 noon on Friday, September 6, 2013.

Sincerely,

HARRY REID,
Majority Leader of the Senate.
JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:
Almighty God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the tensions of violence continue to mount, we turn to You, Lord God, as our hope and salvation.

The darkness of military action seems to be descending upon us once again. We ask that You might bless all efforts at diplomatic resolution concerning violations of human decency recognized by all nations.

Renew America in confident faith, and deepen our commitment to seek peace as soon as possible. Keep our focus on a full recovery of healthy relationships and leadership in the Middle East, so that further bloody hemorrhaging might be forestalled.

Help us to realize it is never too late nor too early to engage in a dialogue with opponents and that all our efforts should be in search of the way to a stable peace.

Bless and guide our Nation's leaders, for we are a people of faith across this country, who claim You as sovereign Lord over this Nation and all the nations of the world.

May all that we do this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 322, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BONNER), the whole number of the House is 433.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 2, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 2, 2013 at 3:18 p.m.:

Appointments: Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
August 8, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Washington, DC.

SPEAKER BOEHNER: I cannot express what a tremendous honor it has been to serve the people of Louisiana's Fifth Congressional District, and from the bottom of my heart, I am eternally grateful and I thank them for the trust they have placed in me.

I write to you today to officially let you know that, effective September 27, 2013, I will be resigning as a Member of the United States Congress.

I am honored that Governor Jindal has given me the opportunity to serve as a member of his cabinet as his Secretary of Veterans Affairs. I am eager to get started and begin reaching out to our state's veterans in order to make sure they know that our state and nation are grateful for their service.

I look forward to continue serving the great state that I love and the men and women who have given us so much.

Sincerely,

RODNEY ALEXANDER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
August 8, 2013.

Governor BOBBY JINDAL,
State Capitol, 20th Floor, 900 North Third Street, Baton Rouge, LA.

GOVERNOR JINDAL, I cannot express what a tremendous honor it has been to serve the people of Louisiana's Fifth Congressional District, and from the bottom of my heart, I am eternally grateful and I thank them for the trust they have placed in me.

I write to you today to officially let you know that, effective September 27, 2013, I will be resigning as a Member of the United States Congress.

I am honored that you have given me the opportunity to serve as a member of your cabinet as your Secretary of Veterans Affairs. I am eager to get started and begin reaching out to our state's veterans in order to make sure they know that our state and nation are grateful for their service.

I look forward to continue serving this great state that I love and the men and women who have given us so much.

Sincerely,

RODNEY ALEXANDER.

COMMUNICATION FROM CONSTITUENT SERVICES LIAISON, THE HONORABLE BRAD WENSTRUP, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Teresa Lewis, Constituent Services Liaison, the Honorable BRAD WENSTRUP, Member of Congress:

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
August 20, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a third-party subpoena, issued by the Hamilton County Municipal Court, Hamilton County, Ohio for documents and testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

TERESA LEWIS,
Constituent Services Liaison.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on August 1, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 1092. To designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center".

H.R. 1911. To amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2167. To authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish additional requirements to improve the fiscal safety and soundness of the home equity conversion mortgage insurance program.

H.R. 2611. To designate the headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia as the "Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building", and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on August 6, 2013, she

presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 1344. To amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 678. To authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes.

H.R. 267. To improve hydropower, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1171. To amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property.

H.R. 2576. To amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 322, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Monday, September 9, 2013, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2736. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule—Federal Pell Grant Program [Docket ID: ED-2012-OPE-0006] (RIN: 1840-AD11) received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2737. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory

Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule—Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2013 [NRC-2012-0211] (RIN: 3150-AJ19) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2738. A letter from the President Of The United States, transmitting Draft Legislation Regarding Authorization for Use of United States Armed Forces in Connection with the Conflict in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2739. A letter from the President Of The United States, transmitting the Continuation of the National Emergency with respect to Export Control Regulations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2740. A letter from the President Of The United States, transmitting An Executive Order prohibiting the importation into the United States of any jadeite or rubies mined or extracted from Burma; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 915: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1020: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1094: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 1148: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1201: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1386: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1732: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1814: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2053: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2073: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2305: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2870: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2939: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 3045: Mr. JONES, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H. Res. 131: Ms. LOFGREN.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE VAN DUZER FOUNDATION AND SCOTT VAN DUZER

HON. PATRICK MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 2013

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work of the Van Duzer Foundation and its founder, Mr. Scott Van Duzer of Port Saint Lucie, Florida, in honor of his philanthropic efforts, which have touched many lives across the Treasure Coast.

Scott started the Van Duzer Foundation in 2008 to help families and individuals impacted by tragic and often unforeseen circumstances. Since its inception, the foundation has organized blood drives garnering more than 7,000 pints of blood and raising over \$800,000 for families and individuals in need. The Foundation's family-friendly fundraising events are well attended by many in the community and positively serve as a model of civic engagement.

A few years ago, Scott learned about two boys who were in desperate need of a blood transfusion. Because of a shortage, one of the boys waited nine hours for life-saving blood to arrive. Rising to the call of activism, Scott collaborated with his board of directors to partner with Florida's Blood Centers to host a blood drive where initially over 300 pints of blood were collected. The Foundation later hosted their inaugural Be a Hero Day where 1,000 pints of blood were donated. Having hosted several blood drives since, the 7,000 pints of blood collected by the Van Duzer Foundation have impacted over 21,000 lives, a figure of three lives per donation of blood. In recognition of the work of the Van Duzer Foundation, last year Scott was honored by a visit from President Obama at his local pizza shop where he gave the President a much-publicized bear hug. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the great work of the Van Duzer Foundation and to call Scott not only a constituent, but a friend. In today's busy, complex world we must recognize the depth of philanthropy and its impact. We better ourselves by improving our communities and being our neighbor's keeper. As evidenced through Scott Van Duzer and the Van Duzer Foundation, it is through these means in which all Americans can participate in perpetuating a prosperous pathway for our Nation.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF RUTH ASAWA

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 2013

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on August 6th San Francisco lost a visionary artist, educator, community activist, civic leader and beloved friend. Ruth Asawa was an internationally recognized sculptor who will be long remembered for her public works of art, her extraordinary wire sculptures, and her commitment to the people of San Francisco, especially our children. Her memory will embolden future generations to devote their passions to the freedom of self-expression and public betterment.

The story of Ruth Asawa is the story of America, of great patriotism and ethnic pride, as reflected in her life and work. She earned the recognition she deserved, conquering discrimination as a female in a male-dominated discipline, and during and after World War II when our government incarcerated Ruth, then 16 years old, her family, and about 110,000 fellow Japanese Americans in internment camps throughout the United States.

Ruth and her family were first sent to Santa Anita Race Track in Los Angeles, California, housed in horse stables for six months before being transferred to a barbed wire enclosed camp in Rohwer, Arkansas. After the war, lingering ill will against Japanese Americans prevented her from securing a teaching position and completing her degree. She decided to study art at Black Mountain College in North Carolina where she studied with painter Josef Albers, dancer Merce Cunningham and architect/inventor Buckminster Fuller and met her husband Albert Lanier. They decided to live in San Francisco because of its vibrant arts community and respect for diversity as the Laniers were an interracial couple. In Noe Valley, one of many neighborhoods in San Francisco, they raised their six children.

As a trustee of the San Francisco Fine Arts Museums, Ruth influenced the evolution of the new de Young museum and was a strong supporter of the museum's innovative architecture. More than 150 of her works are preserved at the de Young where her gorgeous hanging wire sculptures are permanently displayed.

Ruth's public works include such recognizable San Francisco landmarks as the Andrea Mermaid Fountain at Ghirardelli Square, the Hyatt on Union Square Fountain, the Buchanan Mall Fountains in Japan town, the Aurora Fountain at Bayside Plaza and the Garden of Remembrance at San Francisco State. Other great works in the San Francisco Bay Area include the Japanese American Internment Memorial in front of the Federal Building in San Jose, California.

Ruth will be forever remembered for her dedication to our children and her loving work

to make our schools and City more joyful learning environments. Her legacy will live on in the young artists who attend Ruth Asawa School of the Arts which she founded. She also founded the Alvarado Arts Workshop which established the artist-in-residence model of public arts education. It is a national model. Ruth helped organize the Music, Dance, Drama and Science (MADDS) Festival, now an annual city-wide youth event sponsored by schools, civic leaders, neighborhood groups, and museums.

It was a great honor for me to be asked to say a few words at the celebration of Ruth's life on August 27th in San Francisco's beautiful Golden Gate Park. I spoke about our City's great love for Ruth and her tremendous impact on the Bay Area, and I learned about talents beyond Ruth's art, her love of gardening and sharing her bounty, most particularly her famous ginger garlic salad dressing, with her friends and loved ones. To Ruth's children Xavier, Aiko, Hudson, Addie and Paul, her ten grandchildren, and four great grandchildren I extend my deepest sympathy. I hope it is a comfort to them that Ruth will forever be remembered, not only for her work that so lovingly adorns our City, but also for her activism and leadership that showed us how to mentor generations to come.

CELEBRATING 30 YEARS OF FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN HENDER- SONVILLE, TENNESSEE AND TSURU, JAPAN

HON. DIANE BLACK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 2013

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, this year, Hendersonville, Tennessee celebrates thirty years of friendship with its sister city, Tsuru, Japan. At a time when news headlines each day remind us of discord among other nations, the lasting relationship between these two cities stands as a reminder that when individuals and communities reach out across cultural boundaries, they can build meaningful bonds that stand the test of time.

First established on May 18, 1983 by former Hendersonville mayor T.W. Patterson and former Tsuru mayor Michimasa Tahabe, this relationship has truly lived up to its original purpose: "To serve as a perpetual symbol for mutual hospitality for the exchange of ideas and visitors between the cities of Tsuru and Hendersonville, and as a welcoming beacon to travelers from both communities."

The Tsuru-Hendersonville relationship has yielded many years of student exchange trips and delegation visits from parents, teachers, and community leaders that have enhanced the lives of our cities' people. Host families in both countries have generously opened up

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

their homes to visitors and learned from their unique experiences.

Later this month, city officials, civic group representatives, local students, and members of the Tsuru-Hendersonville Friendship Committee will travel to Tsuru, Japan, to commemorate this special anniversary. As they join together with the Tsuru people to celebrate three decades of honor and goodwill, I join them in wishing for a prosperous future for both communities and many years of continued friendship.

HONORING THE ROCKWALL WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR 40 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 2013

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an invaluable group of selfless women, the Rockwall Women's League, for their 40 years of charitable service in the Rockwall community.

This non-profit organization was chartered in Rockwall, Texas, on November 27, 1973, with a group of 50 women volunteers. The bold vision of these women now is being cultivated with over 125 active and associate members.

The Rockwall Women's League is committed to unite and promote the Rockwall area through community service and through the initiation and support of civic, educational, and social events. Funds for these service projects are raised largely through an annual Charity Ball, which has to-date raised almost 3 million dollars and has become a gala fundraiser due to generous community support.

The League contributes greatly to educational initiatives through its monthly programs, including serving over 35 charitable organizations and awarding scholarships to graduating seniors at all three Rockwall County high schools. Bolstering civic and social life, the Rockwall Women's League has graciously supported and initiated programs such as the Helping Hands Children's Clinic for low income children, arts in the Rockwall school system, and the annual tree lighting event, co-hosted with the city of Rockwall. These women also provide hands-on service in a myriad of ways from providing hot meals for senior citizens and volunteering in nursing homes, to selling pumpkins in the local pumpkin patch.

The work of this league has not only strengthened the community of Rockwall for the past 40 years, but has also developed enduring friendships among its members. Mr. Speaker, I commend the Rockwall Women's League for their dedicated service to their community and ask my colleagues to join me in honoring these remarkable women on the occasion of their 40th anniversary.

COMMENDING MARTIN COUNTY NORTH LITTLE LEAGUE ALL-STARS 2013 FLORIDA STATE LITTLE LEAGUE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. PATRICK MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 2013

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Martin County North Little League All-Stars and their accomplish-

ment in winning the 2013 Florida State Little League Championship.

As a baseball player and former Little Leaguer myself, I am very proud that my district is home to this year's state champions. Not only did these athletes compete to make it to the Florida State Tournament; but once there, they bested seven other teams, which is no easy feat. After four rounds of competition, Martin County North made it to the title game on July 29th where they defeated Sarasota American, in a 7-1 victory.

I would like to take this moment to also reflect on the inspiring nature of the team's manager, Mark Rodgers. Coach Rodgers successfully led his team to victory through hard work and dedication as well as a love of the game. He was able to instill in these twelve year-olds that with a supportive community, the goal of winning the Florida State Little League Championship was more than possible. He taught them "pride, passion, and purpose." As the mentors of my youth also did, Coach Rodgers laid the foundation in understanding how these are essential elements of success and how to always go after your dreams.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to have this opportunity to recognize Coach Tom Galinis, Blaine Kilbreth, Zach Galinis, Cam Provines, Payton McIntosh, Hunter Wentworth, Tibur Rivero, Richie Pfluger, Wyatt Menendez, Jacob Rader, Dominick Thompson, Justin Altieri, Taylor Higgins, Marcus Mastellone, Coach Andrew Rodgers, and Manager Mark Rodgers on being the Sunshine State's 2013 Little League champions. I am proud that they represent my district and wish them continued success both on and off the field.

SENATE—Monday, September 9, 2013

The Senate met at 2:00 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TIM Kaine, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Shepherd of our souls, the center of our joy, we look to You today for strength and wisdom. Lord, we acknowledge that unless You guard our Nation, our efforts to find security are futile.

Today illuminate the minds of our Senators with the light of Your insights, enabling them to act decisively. As they anticipate the forces that threaten freedom in our world, lead them on the path that will bring life, liberty, and joy.

We pray in Your merciful Name.
Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter.

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TIM Kaine, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. Kaine thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

THE CHAPLAIN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I just had a brief conversation with the Chaplain,

who came down to wish me well on my return. He indicated he was going to do a special prayer this afternoon for the Senate in this time of crisis. I am always aware of how he looks out for us spiritually. The prayer is for Democrats, Republicans—all of us. His prayers are very heart-warming. Not only is he our chaplain, but he is a retired admiral in the U.S. Navy. He has been all over the world in that capacity. We appreciate him very much. We don't acknowledge him as often as we should. I appreciate how he is always available and so kind and thoughtful to everyone.

AUTHORIZING THE LIMITED AND SPECIFIED USE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AGAINST SYRIA—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to consider S.J. Res. 21.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 21 to authorize limited and specified use of the United States Armed Forces against Syria.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this evening the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider a couple of would-be judges, Caproni and Broderick, both from the Southern District of New York, at 5:30 p.m., and then there will be two rollcall votes on the confirmation of those nominations. We may only have one rollcall vote and one voice vote, but we will get both of them done today.

I just moved to proceed to the joint resolution reported last week by the Foreign Relations Committee to authorize the limited use of force against Syria. This matter demands the attention of the Senate and this country. It is this resolution the Senate will turn to. Regardless of where Senators stand on the merits of this issue, we should have this debate. I hope all Senators will support proceeding to this measure. That vote will occur sometime on Wednesday on the motion to proceed.

Under a previous order, at 11 tomorrow morning, the Senate is to have a motion to proceed to the energy efficiency bill. It is obvious we are not going to be able to do that. I will work with the Republican leader to reach a consent agreement to defer consideration of that bill to a later time.

On the Syria resolution, I intend that the Senate should have a full and open debate. I encourage Senators to come to the floor to begin that debate.

Also this week, President Obama will come to the Capitol to address the Democratic caucus. He has also extended his invitation to the Republicans. I have not heard back from the Republicans as to whether they wish to hear from the President.

President Obama will address the Nation tomorrow evening. Senior administration officials will brief all Senators in a classified session on Wednesday. There will be other meetings in the White House today with Democratic and Republican Senators. The Senate will give this matter the serious attention it deserves.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS

Mr. President, the first large-scale military use of deadly military weapons occurred almost 100 years ago when the Germans deployed chlorine gas during World War I. During that war, World War I, there were 1,200,000 casualties from attacks with deadly toxins—chlorine gas, mustard gas, and other deadly and destructive chemical agents. Great Britain, Austria, Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, and the United States all suffered losses.

"This is a horrible weapon," wrote German Major Karl von Zinger, who reported a firsthand battlefield account of the carnage to his superior officers.

One hundred thousand soldiers died, and most of the other casualties were debilitated for life by the exposure to these deadly toxins. The effects of these killers were horrific. Those who didn't die suffered blindness, burns, blisters, and labored breathing. For those dying, it was as terrible as anyone could imagine. The great World War I era poet Wilfred Owen from Great Britain wrote that gassed soldiers cried out like men on fire as they drowned in air thick with poison. The world was horrified by the gruesomeness of these new evil weapons of war, and so, as a global community, we agreed these weapons should be banished from the battlefield forever.

Despite the success of global efforts to eliminate their use, today the Syrian Government is the second largest holder of chemical weapons in the world—only shortly behind North Korea. The well-documented use of these toxic and unsavory stockpiles by President Bashar al-Assad's regime is a certain violation of the overwhelming international consensus forged against these weapons nearly 10 decades ago. It is a clear violation of human decency. This is not the first time Assad has used chemical weapons against his own citizens. We all heard in our classified briefings that these weapons have been used a number of times, but this is the most gruesome and extensive.

This morning I watched some film in my office. The film takes about 13 minutes. It was pictures that were taken following the dropping of those horrible weapons. I will never get that out of my mind. There were little baby boys and girls dressed in colorful play clothes. Some of the boys and girls looked like teenagers. They were retching and had spasms with their arms. Of course there were older people as well. These poisons kill the kids first. Their little bodies cannot take this as well as older folks. It kills the older people also but more slowly.

The well-documented use of these unsavory stockpiles by Asad is a certain violation, I repeat, of the overwhelming international consensus forged against these weapons 10 decades past. I have talked about human decency. It is a clear violation of human decency.

The August 21 attacks killed more than 1,000 civilians—including hundreds of these children. This week we will further examine the evidence that is growing which proves the viciousness of these attacks and discuss their brutal results.

The innocent civilians who were killed by the Syrian Government during those attacks died terrible deaths. Their death was just as painful and shocking as those suffered on the battlefields of World War I. These deaths were just as terrible as those that convinced the global community to outlaw the use of such brutal tactics against soldiers, and, of course, against innocent civilians such as those Asad murdered last month.

The evidence of the Asad regime, and their using outlawed nerve agents against its own citizens, is clear and very convincing. The Syrian Government has worked to hide the gruesome evidence. They have done it a number of different ways. After the bodies had been cleared away, they sent a barrage of weaponry in there—artillery and tanks—and blasted the ground and destroyed the evidence. They couldn't destroy it; it is still there, but they did try. They worked very hard to hide these gruesome attacks by repeatedly bombing the site of these grisly and unforgettable occurrences. Without question, this brutality demands a response. The satellite imagery and amateur video shot by eyewitnesses—and I talked about that—paint a clear picture of the brutality of this awful regime.

President Obama sought approval 2 weeks ago for targeted military action—action that will hold President Asad accountable for these heinous acts. Congress has done its due diligence. Since President Obama announced he would seek congressional approval for the limited military action against Syria, the Senate has held many committee hearings and briefings as well as five classified all-Mem-

bers briefings. There are more briefings and much debate to come this week—including open debate here in the Senate.

On a bipartisan basis the Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed a resolution that restricts the use of military force to 60 days, with a single 30-day extension. The resolution reflects President Obama's proposal for limited military action—including strikes of limited duration and limited scope.

The resolution plainly states there may be no U.S. military boots on the ground. America's intention, as specified in the resolution, is not to engage in an open-ended conflict or invasion. Nor is it the Commander in Chief's intention to commit ground troops to this conflict or to effect regime change. Rather, the Senate will be voting to uphold the century-long international consensus that chemical weapons have no place on the battlefield and certainly no place in attacking innocent civilians. This standard demands any government—a dictator or any other government—that has used chemical weapons to be held accountable.

Some may disagree with my conclusions. I don't expect everyone to agree with the statement I am giving here today, as is anyone's right, but this is my firm conviction.

Today, many Americans say that these atrocities are none of our business, that they are not our concern. I disagree. Anytime the powerful turn such weapons of terror and destruction against the powerless it is our business.

The weapons in question are categorically different. Chemical weapons, we know, can kill not just dozens or hundreds of people but tens of thousands of innocents in a single attack—tens of thousands. These weapons don't just pose a threat to the Syrian people or to our allies in the region; they pose a threat to every one of us, every American, and, in particular, every member of the U.S. Armed Forces.

If we allow Asad's use of chemical weapons to go unchecked and unanswered, hostile forces around the world will also assume that these terrible tactics of demons such as Asad are permissible, that they are OK. That America cannot allow. That is why the massacres in Syria are our business and our concern, both as humans and as Americans. America's willingness to stand for what is right should not end at its borders.

Our intervention on behalf of those in danger hasn't always been popular. Look back at history. There has always been part of our society that prefers isolation. Look prior to World War I. Look prior to World War II. Some prefer isolation. That is the easy thing to do. But sitting on the sidelines isn't what made the United States of America the greatest Nation in the world in

years past and, yes, today, and sitting on the sidelines won't make us a better Nation tomorrow.

As America faces yet another crisis of conscience, another opportunity to intervene on behalf of humanity, my mind returns to that turning point in the world's history when the United States of America faced down an evil regime that murdered millions of innocent citizens. Millions of civilians and prisoners of war were murdered by gas in Nazi death camps—Belsen, Treblinka, Auschwitz. Never again, swore the world. Never again would we permit the use of these poisonous weapons of war.

Fourteen blocks from here, down Constitution Avenue, is the Holocaust Museum. We walk in there and see a quote on the wall from Dante's famous "Inferno." Here is what it says: "The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who, in times of great moral crisis, maintain their neutrality." I repeat: "The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who, in times of great moral crisis, maintain their neutrality." I have thought about those words very often—and very often lately—as I have considered whether America should take action to avert further atrocities in Syria.

In Europe, in World War II, far too many were neutral. Far too many around the world were neutral. Far too many in America were neutral, and in Europe, in World War II. Six million Jews and tens of thousands of gypsies, disabled people, gay people, and political dissidents were murdered. Never again.

Now we are faced with that choice again. Some say it is not our fight. Some say Syria is too far away. Some say it is not in our security interest. Russia, China, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and the United States—we should all remember our history. There were 1.2 million casualties in World War I from these poisons.

We should remember our history. Rabbi Hillel, a respected and famous scholar, said more than 2,000 years ago: "If I care only for myself, what am I? If not now, when?"

I, HARRY REID, say: If not now, when?

I believe America must set the example for the rest of the world. If America must once again lead—as we have before and we will again—to set an example for the world, so be it. This is America. It is who we are as a country. That is what we do as a country. That is where we stand as a country. That is the American tradition of which I am proud and a tradition which I have faith will continue.

We are the United States of America.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is an order outstanding. I ask unanimous consent that the order until 5 o'clock today be modified on the motion to proceed, with the other aspects of the order remaining in place.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of debate on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 21 until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak to the issues the majority leader just addressed. I don't anticipate speaking for more than 12 to 15 minutes. I know the minority leader is delayed in being able to be here. I would be happy to defer to him when he arrives or I would be happy to defer to someone coming back to speak on the business of the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, President Obama will finally make his case to the American people tomorrow, explaining why he wants to take military action against Syria. His explanation is long overdue.

I think I have a pretty good idea of what I expect he will say. First, he will explain that we have compelling evidence that it was Asad himself who used long-banned chemical weapons to murder his own people. This is not seriously contested. Neither I nor perhaps I think any of my colleagues here dispute these sad facts. It has been well documented by our intelligence sources. As a member of that committee, I have had access to those sources, and I don't doubt the conclusion of the President and others that Asad is responsible for this attack.

The President will also most likely explain that such a horrendous violation of international norms deserves a worldwide response of condemnation. Who could possibly look at those standards and those rooms full of dead children and not agree that the perpetrators have to face consequences for their crimes?

The President will also surely discuss the issue of credibility. He is likely to maintain, as he did recently in Stockholm, that it is not his own credibility at stake, nor even American credibility, but the credibility of the international community that will be harmed by inaction.

I agree with those who say the President's credibility and our Nation's credibility are linked. They are. However, with his now notorious and, I believe, ill-considered "red line" comment, President Obama has forced us to debate a military attack in yet another Middle Eastern country. Unfortunately, it appears that the purpose of this military attack first and foremost

is perhaps to defend his own credibility. I am certain that if the President had not drawn his red line, we would not be having this discussion. In that case, Asad's use of such weapons would be roundly condemned as yet another example of his horrendous brutality, but we would be no more eager to engage militarily in his civil war than we have been as the other 100,000 Syrian people were being slaughtered by more conventional means.

Make no mistake—it is the credibility issue that has brought us to this pass, and the credibility issue is of President Obama's own making—his and his alone.

So tomorrow evening the President will need to explain to the American public exactly what will be achieved by this limited, focused attack, as described by the administration, beyond simply a token punishment for a horrendous crime in defense of his credibility. The President has said the proposed limited attack is to be a "shot across the bow." His Secretary of State, Secretary Kerry, has said it is going to be unbelievably small. We need to know what the plan is, and will be, should President Asad be undeterred by this unbelievably small, shot-across-the-bow attack. What if he isn't? What then? What do we do next? The President needs to explain that.

We need to know how this escalation is likely to influence extremist radical fighters now active in Syria—extremist radical fighters. There is not a line between good guys and bad guys here. There is the infiltration of Al Qaeda, al-Nusra, and other terrorist organizations and individuals with those seeking to overturn Asad. So it is not clear just how Syria will turn out should Asad be deposed. I don't think these extremist fighters will be overly concerned with an "unbelievably small, shot across the bow" response by the United States.

What will Hezbollah and Hamas and Al Qaeda affiliate fighters do when this "show of force" is over? What is the President's plan of action if the chemical weapons fall into the hands of these anti-American jihadists? And how about the always-threatened spillover of the Syria conflict into Lebanon or Turkey or Jordan? Will an attack intended to slap Asad's wrist while defending President Obama's credibility make expansion of the conflict more likely or less likely? Most importantly, the President needs to explain to the American people more thoroughly exactly how America's national security and best interests will be served by this response.

The President, in my opinion, must also address additional concerns that are widely—almost universally—shared by the American people. We all know that taking America to war without support from the people is the surest path to disaster. I suggest this must be

avoided, and the President is going to have to make his case as to how to avoid that.

Over this last week I visited with Hoosiers from across Indiana to gather their input. Through these visits, as well as calls and e-mails by the thousands, the vast majority—shockingly, the majority of Hoosiers I have heard from are opposed to U.S. military engagement in Syria. As all conscientious lawmakers, I know I have to balance the views of my constituents with my own judgment on how best to represent their interests and the interests of our country.

In this case, I must first ask myself, what do the people back home in my State know that many of the rest of us here in Washington perhaps do not, or at least have expressed?

First, the people back home know that America has been at war in far-off lands for more than a decade—12 years on. They have seen long repeated deployments of their loved ones, and they have seen the body bags come home. They are aware of sacrifices that have been made in the name of protecting our interests, but they are less aware of positive results of those sacrifices.

They see Iraq descending again into conflict as its own citizens continue to slaughter one another because of different interpretations of the Koran or different political motivations or just pure outright quests for power. They see a corrupt government there that authorizes overflights of Russian aircraft bringing modern weapons to Syria to fuel a similar conflict.

Hoosiers see an Afghanistan so deeply corrupt and ungrateful to the United States that the current regime tries to extort huge ransom payments simply to permit us to remove equipment and personnel from that sorry country. They do not see meaningful progress toward a democratic, stable, and humane government that was to be the objective of American sacrifice of blood and treasure. They do not see how our 12 years of effort have contributed to our own national security interests.

Hoosiers look at the spiraling disaster in Egypt, where the choices have been an extremist, deeply anti-American Islamic radicalism or a brutal and undemocratic military dictatorship, both benefiting from billions of American taxpayer dollars spent on weapons or lining uniform pockets. In the meantime, fellow Christians are being killed in their churches.

Simply put, the people of Indiana do not see that American policy and action have attained meaningful results in the Middle East. Instead, they see a region of continuing and increasing violence, chaos, and disintegration. They are war weary and they are discouraged after more than a decade of wars that have not produced the desired outcomes.

What they do not see is an articulate response. They do not know what our

regional strategy is in the Middle East because no one is explaining it, much less pursuing it. They cannot measure progress because they do not know the destination. And they cannot evaluate this latest proposal for a fourth military engagement in the Middle East because they cannot see how it contributes to our own security here at home.

More importantly, they worry that a focused, limited attack on Syria will end up being something else entirely because so little thought has been devoted to potential unintended consequences. Yes, they are war weary, but the American people are also war wise.

In addition to the above unanswered questions, for me, one of the most important questions is how this proposed limited strike will affect Iran's perception of our resolve and our ability to prevent that country from acquiring nuclear weapons capability. It is not so much what we do or how we do it but how Iran perceives the action we take. This may be the most significant question of all because, unlike Syria, Iran poses threats to our core national security interests.

Part of the administration's argument is that to do nothing would embolden the Iranian regime as they pursue their own weapons-of-mass-destruction programs. But I think we have to raise the question, is that really so, or is it, perhaps, the reverse? Will a limited punitive attack discourage the mullahs in Iran because of some degree of destruction—remember, unbelievably small—or will it actually encourage the Iranians because there is no followup option or broader strategic context informing our policy? If an attack is ineffective in altering Asad's behavior or fortune, will it not actually encourage Iran in pursuing its own weapons program? I have not heard the administration address this question.

Also, will a fourth military engagement in the Middle East make it harder to assemble popular and political support for action should Iran's behavior make that necessary? My constant fear here during the past several years, as I have been engaged on the Iranian issue of the pursuit of nuclear weapons, has been that our country will be too militarily, politically, and economically exhausted to confront the real strategic enemy when our core interests require it. I fear a Syria attack will make this problem even more difficult. To my knowledge, no one has yet to address this question within the administration, which President Obama, like the previous three Presidents, has declared a nuclear-weapons-capable Iran to be "unacceptable."

I think this is a critical question we must have to ask ourselves. For all of those who are saying: We will change the perception of Iran to the point where they will change their behavior in the pursuit of nuclear weapons by a,

quote, unbelievably small shot across the bow or a military response that could lead us into further conflict in the Middle East—I think this undermines our credibility. I think the question has to be asked: Is the reverse going to happen as a consequence of all of this?

This is a deeply historic and profound moment for our Nation. It carries an importance that goes well beyond Syria or even the Middle East. This debate carries important consequences for the relationship between the executive and legislative branches of our government.

To refuse the Commander in Chief war-making authorities when he has asked for them is not a decision any of us can take lightly.

We must all balance the views of the people we represent—even when they have been nearly unanimous—with other elements, such as the abstract, unknowable geostrategic factors that could carry profound consequences not just for this year or next year, for this generation, but for many generations; and such as the compelling moral arguments that resonate with special strength in our unique Nation guided from birth by moral principles; and now even the constitutional challenges that could affect the delicate balance we have maintained for two centuries.

I will weigh all I have said before I announce how I intend to vote on the resolution before us. I will defer to the President's request to address the Nation. In my opinion, consequential actions proposed by the President need to be clarified and numerous questions need to be answered before we grant the authority to the President to engage America in yet another Middle East conflict.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to address the subject of Syria.

First of all, I wish to commend to anyone who is listening to my voice to view the videos the intelligence community has released. They came from social media. There are 13 videos that came from a body of in excess of 100 videos, but they show the horror of what happens to the human body with an attack by a weapon of mass destruction—in this case, chemical weapons, a gas called sarin.

It is my hope the President, when he speaks to the Nation on Tuesday, will show clips of those videos because I think very few Americans have seen

the extent of those videos, even though they have been shown on some cable shows in some limited amounts. They could see the range of why, almost a century ago, in 1925, the nations of the world came together in a treaty after the use of chemical weapons in World War I. This treaty banned the use of chemical weapons anywhere, any time, including in war, because of the horrific nature their use causes. In the 1990s this was subsequently reaffirmed in a convention or some kind of conclave which the nations of the world—I believe in excess of 180 nations—signed banning the use of chemical weapons.

If you watch the videos, you will see why. You will see what happens to innocent human beings as they struggle for life before the throes of death overtake them. You will see this on the videos. Of course, parents may wish to use discretion because it is going to make a lasting impression. You will see how the body starts to shut down by the nerves being attacked.

Interestingly, for the first time in a CBS interview today, President Asad of Syria has said, has admitted, today, that Syria has chemical weapons. Up to this point that was denied. No wonder he would want to deny, because when you see what happens in the use of them and what it does to the human nervous system—and I don't wish to be graphic, because I want anybody listening to what I am saying to watch them. I hope the President will show them Tuesday night, to see how the human body convulses when it attacks the nervous system—the convulsions, the twitching, what happens to the face, the respiratory system, and all of the evidence that comes from that.

The American people need to know what we are dealing with, not only in Syria but in other nations that possess chemical weapons. This is not only sarin, which was the gas used here, but also mustard gas and a toxin called VX that directly attacks the nervous system. It does not have to be inhaled, like mustard gas or sarin, to do its evil deed. Instead, VX can be absorbed through the skin.

If the American people understand the consequences of the use of this, they will understand why it is classified as a weapon of mass destruction, along with biological weapons of mass destruction introducing some plague among a community of innocents and, of course, the weapon of mass destruction that most everybody recognizes, the nuclear weapon.

There are three weapons of mass destruction: chemical, biological, and nuclear. This is why, in the family of civilized nations, we have said their use is so abhorrent that civilized humans say they should be banned. But they weren't. They were used extensively on August 21.

Before I give the unclassified evidence, I wish to point out that maybe

there is a little opening on the occasion of the Russian Foreign Minister today, since our Secretary of State, almost in an offhanded comment a few days ago, said it would certainly be a game changer if he, Asad, would allow the international community to come in and take control of his Syrian chemical weapons. The Russian Foreign Minister today picked that up. Supposedly there is a comment by an official out of Syria who says that is worth looking into. I can't speak to the authenticity of that comment. I have heard it was said.

Whatever it is, of course, Asad is the decisionmaker and it is ultimately going to come down on him. But in the meantime, what the United States ought to do—and the Congress of the United States ought to authorize what the President of the United States has requested, that the Congress back him in giving him the authority to use a limited, short duration retaliation in degrading Asad's capability of utilizing these weapons in the future.

If Congress will give the President that authority, it may well be the additional incentive for the ultimate decisionmaker, President Asad, to do what the Russian Foreign Minister has suggested. That would be a good thing.

In the meantime, they are going to be debating this and we are going to be put to the question: Do we support the President in this time of peril?

Let us look at the facts. I think when you see the videos, clearly, most every reasonable human being is going to conclude chemical weapons were used on innocents in the Damascus suburbs on the night of August 21.

The question then, of course, is, is there a chain of custody to show in fact they came from the Syrian army? There is an unclassified body of evidence that clearly shows, to put it in the speak of the intelligence community, we have high confidence. That means it happened.

How did that happen? The assessment is the Syrian chemical weapons personnel, who are associated with the chemical weapons part of the Syrian command, were preparing chemical munitions prior to the attack. This is all unclassified. There were streams of data of human signals and geospatial intelligence that revealed regime activities that were associated with the preparations for that chemical weapons attack. Syria chemical weapons personnel, we know, were operating in the Damascus suburb from August 18 all the way through August 21. That was the suburb that was attacked. Multiple streams of intelligence indicate the Syrian army executed the rocket and artillery attack against those suburbs in the early morning hours of August 21. We have satellite detections that corroborate those attacks from a regime-controlled neighborhood to where the attacks landed. At the same time,

social media reports started exploding about a chemical attack in the Damascus suburbs. Those social media reports started coming at 2:30 in the morning. Three hospitals in Damascus received approximately 3,600 patients displaying the symptoms of a nerve agent exposure, and they received them in less than 3 hours on the morning of August 21.

As I said earlier, there have been over 100 videos attributed to the attack. This has been distilled down into 13 videos, many of them showing large numbers of bodies exhibiting the physical signs of nerve agent exposure. Any Member of the Senate will have access to the classified information that shows the Syrian opposition does not have the capability to fabricate those videos or the physical symptoms verified by the medical personnel.

So when we put all of this together, with past Syrian practice and some of the small-scale attacks they have done previously, the conclusion is obvious: The Syrian regime of Bashar Asad was willing and directed the attack on August 21.

To this Senator, who has had the privilege of seeing and hearing classified information—and I have visited with President Asad three times, the last time being 6 years ago where the two of us had a sharp exchange over what was happening in Lebanon and the fact he was harboring Hamas and Hezbollah, which of course he denied—the conclusion is obvious: There is a substantial body of information that corroborates that the Syrian Government was responsible for the chemical weapons attack on August 21.

There is additional information for the Senators to see, but the question is, Are we going to agree to the President's request that we authorize him to attack? If we don't, where does that leave the President on any kind of negotiations in the future? If the President decides to go ahead and attack, we automatically give to the opponents in these countries—especially President Asad and North Korea and Iran—the obvious scenario that the American people are so divided that they won't support the President. So if he were to decide to attack—knowing it is his responsibility to provide for the national security, and he has sworn to provide for that national security—we will look so divided at that point, whatever the scenario is for the future.

What about the mindset of other people who want to do harm to the United States? Does it give additional license to North Korea if we were to do nothing? North Korea is sitting on a huge stockpile of chemical weapons, not to mention their nuclear weapons. What about Iran? We are very concerned as they continue to energize weapons material and march down the road perhaps to building a nuclear weapon. What kind of message does it send to

Iran? Just game that out. If Iran had a nuclear weapon or felt free to use chemical weapons, what would that do to the interests of the United States in that region of the world, not to mention our allies in the region, of which there are many.

So it is clear to this Senator. I will admit I don't know why the President did not keep his own counsel and make the decision without saying he wanted to come to Congress, but he made that decision, and now it is up to us.

Hopefully, there may be some validity to this report coming from the Russian Foreign Minister, but we won't know that for a long while, until, as we say, the proof is in the pudding with Asad turning over control of all the chemical weapons to an international body. In the meantime, are we going to support the President? Clearly, in the interest of the national security of this country and our allies, I think that is a position we must take. I will vote yes on the resolution.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 21.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Which is?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Syria resolution.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, it is to that ominous resolution that I would like to speak.

Within a few days the Senate will be called upon to vote on whether to give the President of the United States limited authority to use military action in response to Syrian President Asad's use of chemical weapons against his own people. It is an enormous and grave decision. It is the most serious vote I can take.

When a U.S. Senator is called upon to authorize America's use of military action or military might, it calls for the most sober reflection, the most due diligence analysis of the facts and the compelling need because once you vote to authorize the use of military might, you cannot take it back. It is one of the few votes you can't take back. We can vote on our budget this year, but there will be another vote next year. You can vote to confirm a member of the Cabinet, but they serve at the pleasure of the President. But once you vote to use military might or military action, it is irrevocable, so I take it very seriously.

I say to the men and women of our military that we owe them a tremendous debt of gratitude. I think that should not only be with yellow ribbons, but we also owe it to them to do the due diligence to choose the wisest, most prudent course.

This is what I have done as I have contemplated my vote on the Syria resolution. I went to numerous briefings before Asad used chemical weapons, and I have gone to all of the briefings since then. I participated as a member of the Intelligence Committee in a variety of meetings. I went to a classified House and Senate briefing. I have listened carefully to the President, to the Secretary of State, to the Secretary of Defense, and even had the opportunity to sit with the Vice President of the United States in the Situation Room at the White House to go over this situation and what options are available to the United States of America.

In addition to listening here in Washington, I have also listened to my Marylanders, whether at events or meetings going around the State, whether it has been grocery shopping or just being out in the Maryland community. I have also gotten thousands of e-mails and calls from Maryland constituents, and I want to thank them for their civic engagement. They overwhelmingly oppose military action in Syria. My constituents have spoken loudly and clearly. They don't want a war. They don't want boots on the ground. They don't want an all-in effort. They don't want to use or expend America's talent and treasure on another military expedition. They don't want war, and neither do I.

Yet the use of chemical weapons—a weapon of mass destruction—grim and ghoulis, mandates a response. The use of chemical weapons flies against all international law and international norms. It is an act that should have consequences or I believe it surely will happen again—in Syria, possibly in Korea, possibly used by Iran.

Since the attack, I have been waiting and hoping for a worldwide reaction because if it is serious enough for the world to be aghast, then it is serious enough for them to respond.

I have been waiting to hear from the 189 countries that are signatories to the Chemical Weapons Convention. I believe if you sign a treaty or a convention, you sign up for the responsibility that comes with that, which means stop proliferation of the weapons you signed against; stop the proliferation of chemical weapons; also, if necessary, to take action if mandated.

I am waiting to hear from the Arab League. I wanted to hear from the Arab League, beyond: Yes, we want Asad to be accountable. I don't know what that means—hold him accountable. What does that mean? Does it mean if we use missiles they will send in Arab men to

defend Arab women and children? I have not quite heard that.

I have waited to hear from our allies, and there are a hearty, reliable few who have supported us. Are they going to help support the chemical weapons treaty? Are they going to help support the moderates in the opposition? Have they called for a donor conference on refugees? Hello out there.

Then there is the U.N. Security Council. By the way, I applaud the work of the U.N. weapons inspectors and the U.N.'s work on refugees, but where is the Security Council? People will say: Oh, we can't act unless the Security Council acts. Three times Asad enablers at the U.N., Russia and China, have vetoed every effort to move to a political solution—vetoed three times efforts to move to a political solution. The U.N. seems paralyzed in this effort.

In deciding my vote, I had to be sure that chemical weapons were used by the Asad regime. I was 1 of 19 Senators who voted against going to war in Iraq. I did vote after 9/11 to use lethal action against the Taliban, but when it came to the Iraq war, as a member of the Intelligence Committee I had reviewed these briefs and I did not believe Saddam Hussein had nuclear weapons so I voted no. I was right.

This time is different because, after extensive briefings and the evidence that has been outlined to members of the Intelligence Committee, I am satisfied that, indeed, chemical weapons were used in Syria and I am satisfied the Asad regime gave the order to do so.

There are those who say to me: Senator BARB, aren't you concerned about the risks and the retaliations if we take action? You bet I am. I worry about that. I worry about my own country. I worry about our own military. I worry about treasured allies such as Jordan, Israel, Turkey. But I also worry about the risk of doing nothing because, as I weigh this, I believe the risk and retaliatory possibilities are the same even if we do not act because if they do not use them in retaliation against us there is a very good chance that if we leave it unresponded to, they will use them anyway. There is no guarantee that by doing nothing the bad guys, who have chemical weapons, will do nothing. In fact, I fear that Asad, Iran, and North Korea will be further emboldened.

Last, I had to review the President's resolution that is pending before us, that came out of the Foreign Relations Committee, modified, and the President's plan. The President's plan is very straightforward, his proposal is very straightforward, a targeted limited attack. His purpose is to deter and to degrade; to deter Asad from using those weapons again and to degrade Asad's capability and capacity to use them.

I also listened to the President's promise—and I take him at his word—that any action would not be boots on the ground; that it is not an extended air campaign; that it is not another Iraq or Afghanistan; that we are not in it to try to do regime change. That must come from the Syrian opposition themselves, and I hope others help do that. It is meant to deter the use of chemical weapons and to degrade Asad's capability.

I believe the President's plan is the best response to protect U.S. security interests in the region and to show commitment to our common security interests with allies such as Turkey, Jordan, and Israel. Therefore, after great reflection and as much due diligence as I could do, I want to announce today to my colleagues, and most of all to the people of Maryland who supported me, that I will support the President's request for a targeted, limited military action against the Syrian President Bashar Asad's regime in response to the horrific, grim, and ghoulis use of chemical weapons.

Let me be clear: I have no grand hopes or illusions about what this strike will do. I do not believe this strike will stop Syria's brutal civil war. I do not believe this strike will stop Asad from being a ruthless, brutal dictator. I do not believe a strike will eliminate all of his chemical weapons. But I do believe it will deter and degrade his capability to strike again, and I do believe when you sign up for a convention to ban the use of chemical weapons, the United States of America acts in accordance with its responsibility.

Syria is one of the toughest foreign policy issues on which we have focused; there are not many good options. Yet I believe the President's plan is the best way and, as of this moment, the only way forward. He has my support.

In today's late-breaking news, I understand Russia has now said: Oh, let's put these weapons under international control. Where were the Russians during the U.N. Security Council meetings on those three other occasions? Is this another tactic for delay? Is this just another tactic to enable Asad to have more time to focus?

I remain skeptical, but I will leave that to the President to analyze the Russians' intent about what their followthrough is on that. Today is not to mandate the strike. My vote does not mandate a strike. But my vote is to say: Mr. President, you are the Commander in Chief. We can only have one at a time. You analyze the situation and if you think it is necessary to protect the security of the United States of America and to fulfill our responsibilities under the conventions we have signed on chemical weapons, you have my support to act in what you think is the best way and in our best interests.

I look forward to additional debate with my colleagues and also further in this debate, in coming to closure, hopefully this week.

I yield the floor.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the situation in Syria and the historic choice facing this Congress and America. I have been deeply concerned about the situation in Syria since March of 2011, when thousands of Syrians from all backgrounds peacefully protested for a change in the politics and the economy of their country. I think many of us believed these peaceful protests would lead to the end of an autocratic Asad regime, just as other despots have fallen in other parts of the Arab world.

Yet President Bashar al-Asad, like his father before him, Hafez al-Asad, instead responded with horrific violence to suppress the aspirations of his own people. With the disturbing help of Russia, Hezbollah, and Iran, Asad has managed to hang on to power and turn his country into a humanitarian nightmare.

I met with the Russian Ambassador to the United States here in my office in Washington on this issue. I visited the refugee camps along the Turkish border. I talked with the moderate Syrian opposition in Istanbul. I discussed this situation with the Turkish President, Mr. Gul, and their Foreign Minister, Davutoglu, and met with many Chicago-area Syrian Americans.

I hoped diplomatic and economic pressure would bring an end to the mayhem and human suffering in Syria. I know the American people feel a responsibility for those overseas in need and those who are struggling to find freedom. But I also know something else about the people of my State of Illinois, and I believe of this country: They are weary of war.

Then came the August 21 chemical attack in the suburbs of Damascus in the middle of the night. At that moment an important challenge was thrown down to the international community. That is not in any way to diminish the violence that has taken place in Syria over the last several years. Over 100,000 died in that violence.

But when it comes to the use of chemical weapons, the world made a decision almost 100 years ago about their use—even in war. How did we reach this international consensus on this horrible weapon? We saw firsthand

what it could do. The large-scale use of chemical weapons in World War I killed many and left many wounded and disabled.

Those who have some memory of this war—either from a history class or having spoken to someone who served there—understand what it meant. These photos can't do justice to the devastation of chemical weapons and poison gas, but this is a German gas attack on the Eastern Front in World War I. We can see that as the gas billowed, the victims were anyone who happened to be in its wake.

This is also a photograph of British troops from World War I who were subjected to the poison gas, the chemical weapon of the day, and blinded during the battle of Estaire in 1918. These photos show just a snapshot of the use of poison gases which don't reach the level of virulence of those used today. Yet maybe even more poignant are the audio recordings of the actual former World War I British soldiers maintained by the BBC for generations so the experience would not be forgotten.

This is one excerpt of British troops struggling to cope with the effects of chemical warfare:

Propped up against a wall was a dozen men—all gassed—their colours were black, green and blue, tongues hanging out and eyes staring—one or two were dead and others beyond human aid, some were coughing up green froth from their lungs—as we advanced we passed many more men lying in the ditches and gutterways—shells were bursting all around.

This BBC report went on to say:

My Respirator fell to pieces with the continual removal and readjustment—the gas closed my eyes and filled them with matter and I could not see. I was left lying in the trench with one other gassed man and various wounded beings and corpses and forced to lie and spit, cough and gasp the whole of the day in that trench.

Another soldier recorded by the BBC said:

... the faces of our lads who lay in the open changed colour and presented a gruesome spectacle. Their faces and hands gradually assumed a blue and green color and their buttons and metal fittings on their uniform were all discoloured. Many lay there with their legs drawn up and clutching their throats.

As a result of the horrors of World War I, in 1925 the Geneva Protocol prohibited the use of chemical and biological weapons in war. It was drawn up and signed at a conference held in Geneva under the auspices of the League of Nations, the precursor of the United Nations. This happened in June of 1925, and it became a force of law in February of 1928. Syria was a signatory to this agreement.

Let me read the opening of this protocol. It is even relevant today.

Whereas the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of all analogous liquids, materials or devices, has been justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilized world; and

Whereas the prohibition of such use has been declared in Treaties to which the majority of Powers of the world are Parties; and

To the end that this prohibition shall be universally accepted as a part of International Law, binding alike the conscience and the practice of nations.

What the world was saying in 1925 was clear: These chemical weapons would never, ever be accepted in the civilized world. This message was reaffirmed by the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling, and Use of Chemical Weapons, which went into effect in 1997 and to which almost every country in the world has signed—almost every country. Those who have not signed: Angola, Egypt, North Korea, South Sudan, and Syria.

While not completely taken off the world's battlefields—notably in the case of Iraq, which used poison gas against Iran and its own Kurdish people in the 1980s—the global prohibition against using chemical weapons has been largely upheld for almost a century, that is, until last month in Damascus, Syria. Syria has one of the largest stockpiles of chemical weapons in the world.

At our hearing last week, I asked General Dempsey whether the reports which we have from the French were accurate. They reported the Syrians now have almost 1,000 tons of chemical agents and hundreds of tons of the deadly gas sarin, which has been detected in the pathological investigation of those who were victims on August 21 in Damascus, Syria.

Despite all international warnings not to do so—the Syrian Government is literally a superpower when it comes to chemical weapons and has an arsenal on such a large scale—on August 21, in the desperation of war, Bashar Asad unleashed these chemical weapons in his own city on his own people.

These are horrible pictures of what happened as a result of that attack. I have seen worse. One room of children stacked like cordwood—victims of these chemical weapons. We don't believe it was the first time he has used them, and his father used them before him. But it is the largest scale we have ever seen of the use of chemical weapons by Asad in Syria.

Syria has crossed the line the civilized world said must never be crossed. Not only has the community of nations agreed that such weapons are never to be used but other regimes with weapons of mass destruction or plans for such weapons—including North Korea and Iran—are undoubtedly watching to see what the world will do now.

Now that Bashar Asad has used chemical weapons in Syria, now that the world has reported it, now that the photos are there for the world to see, and now that the pathological investigations are completed, what will the world do? Ideally there is a place to resolve it—the U.N. Security Council.

But, sadly, both Russia and China have said they will veto not only any effort to hold Asad to account, they have literally vetoed efforts to even pass resolutions condemning the use of chemical weapons without specificity in Syria.

Russia's behavior is incredible and particularly perverse given the thousands of Russian soldiers who were victims of chemical weapon attacks in World War I. In May 1915 alone, Russian soldiers on the Eastern Front suffered 9,000 casualties—1,000 of them fatalities—as a result of German chemical weapons.

Today I was in the airport in Chicago, and the news was flashing about an overture made by President Putin to try to put an end to this controversy. I, of course, salute and applaud any effort to resolve this the right way and verifiable way, and to do it with dispatch.

What I understand this proposal to be is that the Syrians will somehow destroy their cache of chemical weapons and, of course, forswear never to use them. That would be a good opportunity, but it will be a difficult outcome because investigating with a third party, such as the United Nations, verifying where these weapons are, removing them from Syria in the midst of a civil war, is particularly challenging. If there is a way to do this diplomatically, safely, and to do it in a fashion where we can be certain this type of atrocity will not occur again, we absolutely have a responsibility to pursue it.

I don't understand how Russia and China can be signatories to the 1925 Geneva Protocols and the Convention on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, and then turn around and protect Syria in the Security Council of the United Nations. If there is one international agency that should be involved in any major diplomatic effort to resolve this peacefully, it should be the United Nations.

We should call on Mr. Putin to step forward with the leaders in China and say they will work with the Security Council to execute any diplomatic policy that can avoid further military confrontation. Until then, make no mistake, President Putin's proposal today, and the activities we are seeing and hearing from Syria, are a direct result of President Obama's leadership. He has stepped up—even though it is an unpopular position with some in this country—and said we cannot ignore this redline created by the world when it came to chemical weapons. It is time for others to stand and join us in stopping the advancement and use of chemical weapons once and for all.

I have been listening to this Syria debate, and I cannot say how many times I have harkened back to that time 12 years ago when we debated entering the war in Iraq. It was another one of

those votes that come along in the course of a congressional career that keeps you awake at night.

I was serving on the Intelligence Committee in the Senate. I sat through hour after hour of hearings about the suspected weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, but it never came together in a credible way as far as I was concerned. There was such a rush to war 12 years ago. Twenty-three of us voted no—22 Democrats and 1 Republican. I can recall the scene. It was late at night, after midnight, right here in the well of the Senate when three of us were left. It was Kent Conrad of North Dakota and, of course, from Minnesota our friend, the late Senator who served with so much distinction and spoke out so many times on issues of morals and ethics. We cast the vote no and waited in this empty Chamber.

I thought about that vote so many times. I think it was the right vote to vote no, but there comes a moment in history when we have to stand as civilized nations and say to those who are willing to ignore the rules and to break the rules that a line cannot be crossed. I hope we can get that done, and not just for the memory of Senator Wellstone and Senator Conrad, but in memory of so many who served here and faced these challenges in the past in our history. I hope we can find a diplomatic solution that will avoid any military use, but I know the reason we have reached this point in diplomacy with this Putin overture has more to do with the President being determined to stand for a matter of principle than almost anything else. We have to continue to make it clear that we find it unacceptable to use these chemical weapons. We paid a bitter price for the war in Iraq as a nation when we were misled as to weapons of mass destruction.

I have seen the evidence in briefings of this deadly attack in Damascus. I think the evidence is overwhelming and convincing. I think at this point many Americans are reluctant to even consider the use of military force. So we sat down and drew up a resolution in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week. There are strict limitations within this resolution about the President's authority and power. He has 60 days to execute a military strategy—if nothing else intervenes, 60 days. He can extend it 30 days, but even Congress can object to that if it wishes. He can use military weapons but only for the purposes specified. No troops on the ground. No troops in combat operations. As Senator MCCAIN said yesterday, that will be part of the law. The President has already said that is his standard as well. So for those who are worried about mission creep and where this might lead us, if, God forbid, we are faced with that possibility, this resolution strictly limits what the President can do.

It was about 8 days ago that I got a phone call I will never forget at my home in Springfield late on a Sunday night from the President himself. We talked for about half an hour. We talked about a lot of things because we go back a long way. He talked to me about his thought process and what he is taking under consideration in trying to lead the world in this response to chemical weapons.

I was one of the early supporters of this President. I believe in him. I believe in his values. I believe he has been honest with me and with the American people about the situation we face. I know the options are not good. They never are under these circumstances. But I also know that if we turn our backs on this situation, there will be some dictator in Iran or North Korea who will be emboldened to do even more—to perhaps use not just chemical weapons but even nuclear weapons. There comes a point when we have to take a stand.

I understand when the people I represent across Illinois have said to me so many times in the last week: Why is it always the United States? Why is it that we have to be involved in this so many times? Why do we have to be the policemen to the world?

Well, there is a basic answer to that. I would like to believe we have values the rest of the world looks up to. Oh, we have stumbled in our own history, and we will continue to do so, but we continue to fight for those basic values all around the world.

Secondly, if someone is in trouble in their country somewhere in the world and they have one 9-1-1 call to make, they pray to God the United States will answer because we have the best military in the world. We have responded to challenges around the world throughout history, and seldom do we leave a residual power base behind. We go in, we do the job, we come home. That is something we can't say for a lot of nations. It is an awesome responsibility.

I think the President is doing the right thing. I think his appeal to the leaders around the world and his appeal to the American people is consistent with our values as a nation.

The President doesn't come quickly to war. He is a person who understands, as I do, the heavy price that has to be paid, and he understands there are moments when a leader—a commander in chief, a person with the responsibility of protecting his nation in a dangerous world—has to step forth and lead. If the United States did not take this onerous leadership role, I doubt anyone else would have.

I take very seriously the President's promise that he won't be putting boots on the ground in Syria. I have been to too many funerals and visited too many disabled veterans to ever want to see us do that again, except when it is

absolutely necessary for America's survival.

I think what we are doing this week in the Senate is a step in the right direction, and I believe it is a step that can move us toward a safer world. If we can find, because of the President's leadership, a diplomatic response that avoids further military conflict but keeps us safe from these deadly chemical weapons, we should pursue it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, almost all of this week on the floor of the Senate will be dedicated to one of the most serious, if not the most serious, matters this body ever considers—that of war and peace and the question of whether we engage American military assets in conflicts across the globe. I am sure I will be back to the floor later this week to speak on that weighty matter. I appreciate the very passionate remarks of the Senator from Illinois on this subject.

Almost every week over the last several months when the Senate has been in session, I have come to the floor to talk about another subject of life-and-death consequence; that is, the growing number of individuals across this country who have been killed by guns. We are going to debate life and death on the Senate floor this week as we try to figure out what the course of American intervention may or may not be in a place on the other side of the Earth in which far too many innocent people, little babies and adults alike, are being killed. We also need to debate what we are going to do to prevent the fact that babies and teenagers and adults right here in the United States of America are being killed. So I have brought this poster down—or a variant of it—a couple of times a month every single month since about April of this year, and it shows a number. The number is a pretty simple number. It represents the number of people in the United States who have been killed by guns since December 14.

As we get further away from that date, maybe people forget what it is, but in Connecticut we will never, ever forget what that date means. December

14 is the date on which 20 little 6- and 7-year-old boys and girls were killed inside Sandy Hook Elementary School, along with 6 teachers and professionals who protected them, as well as the gunman and his mother. Twenty-eight people in all were killed that day. It has lit a spark under the American consciousness about this issue, which has frankly been lingering for far too long.

Twenty-eight people died in Newtown on December 14, but every day across this country, on average, 30 people die due to homicide from guns. So I am back here today to try to tell the stories of just a handful of the 7,907 people who have been killed at the hands of gun violence since December 14. When I started back in April, I think this number was somewhere around 4,000. It has marched upward and almost doubled since then.

This has been a really bad summer in Connecticut. For instance, in places such as New Haven and Hartford and Bridgeport, we thought we were making some real progress when it came to the number of homicides by guns. This summer, unfortunately, we saw far too many, people such as Devaante Jackson, 18 years old, who was killed on August 15 of this year in New Haven. He was killed in a driveby shooting while simply standing on a sidewalk just after 8 o'clock on the evening of August 15. A friend of Devaante's said:

I don't understand why somebody would do this to him. He's real good. I never knew he had any problems with anybody because he always (got) along with everybody.

Another friend said:

He wasn't a bad kid; he was just in the wrong spot at the wrong time . . . everybody should know . . . stop the violence, put the guns down.

A few days later in Hartford, at the same nightclub, in two separate incidents, two young men—Miguel Delgado, age 21, and Brian Simpe, age 19—were killed. Disputes started in the nightclub and spilled out onto the streets of Hartford—two different disputes, two different incidents, and both of these boys were killed.

Brian was 19 years old. He graduated from Manchester High School and attended Manchester Community College. He worked at ShopRite in order to make enough money to go to community college. He wanted to start his own business. He was a kid who wanted to do something great with his life. Before he headed out that night, he tweeted, "Just another summer night out." Unfortunately, in places such as Hartford and New Haven and Bridgeport and Baltimore and Chicago and Los Angeles, this is just another summer night out. Too many people are being killed simply as a result of common disputes, this time happening in a nightclub in Hartford.

Domestic violence, as we know, unfortunately, often leads to tragic homi-

cidal incidents. Janice Lesco, from Coventry, CT, died on August 24—just a few weeks ago—from a gunshot wound to the chest. Her husband, who shot her, then committed suicide. Her husband had a well-documented and decade-long history of threats and abuse. Ms. Lesco was a mother and a grandmother. She had lived in Coventry for most of her life.

Luckily, in Connecticut we have an agreement that people who have a history of domestic violence shouldn't get their hands on a gun, but they can if they walk into a gun show or if they buy their gun on the Internet. We can't simply make the decision here that if a person buys a gun online or a person buys a gun at a gun show, they should be stopped from doing so if they have a history of domestic violence.

Frankly, I was struck by this one newspaper article describing one night in New Haven. This is even earlier—on August 11, 2013. It starts by talking about Torrance Dawkins, a 22-year-old Waterbury man who was celebrating his birthday in a New Haven nightclub when he was shot and killed at about 1:30 on August 11.

The article goes on and sort of casually says that later that day New Haven police responded to more gun violence. A local rapper was putting up sheets on an upcoming concert he was going to be holding in town, and he suffered a single gunshot wound to his neck. Davon Goodwin, who was 18 years old, was later that day shot in the thigh on Hamilton Street. And just before 5 p.m. that day, police were called to an area near Dixwell Avenue and found out that Jermaine Adams, 41, had received a gunshot wound to his face. Those last three people miraculously survived. But we can see how casual gun violence can be on a summer Sunday in New Haven, CT. One young man died as a consequence of a dispute at a nightclub, and three other people luckily survived who were shot later in the day.

Every single day in this country—in the United States of America—30 people are dying due to gun violence. Almost 8,000 people have died since the tragedy in Sandy Hook, and this body has done nothing to stop it. We have had commonsense legislation before this Senate that would just say: You know what. If you have a criminal history, you should not be able to buy a gun, no matter where you buy it—at a gun show, from a gun dealer, online.

We have had commonsense bipartisan legislation on the floor saying: You know what. It should be a crime to buy a whole mess-load of guns from a gun store and then go out and intentionally sell them to criminals. We cannot get that passed either.

We even tried to just say: Let's beef up our mental health system to make sure people who have serious mental illnesses get the treatment they need

so they do not resort to violence—the very few who do. That was part of the bill we could not get passed.

So I am going to continue to come down to the floor to give voices to these victims, to talk about the real people, the stories behind the dozens of people who are killed every day by guns and the 8,000 people who have been killed since Sandy Hook. We are going to make an important decision this week about whether we are going to commit military assets to the Middle East, and maybe that debate will stretch into next week and the week after. But we should not forget that while people are dying overseas, people are dying due to gun violence right here in the United States, and before it is too late—before another 8,000 people die from guns in this country—we should do something about it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, we come to this Chamber as we have many times before—to make one of the most difficult decisions we are tasked to make: the authorization of the use of American military power—this time in Syria, to respond to the horrific attack, including the use of chemical weapons, of August 21 that took the lives of 1,429 Syrians, including at least 426 children.

The world is watching, America is waiting to see what we do in this Chamber in response to the threat the world faces from those who cross the line of human decency and use chemical weapons against anyone, anywhere in the world.

The images of August 21 were sickening and, in my view, the world cannot ignore the inhumanity and horror of what Bashar al-Assad did.

As I have had to say too many times before as a Member of Congress: I do not take the responsibility to authorize military force lightly or make such decisions easily. I voted against the war in Iraq when it was popular, according to the polls, to vote for the war and strongly supported the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Afghanistan. But today I urge my colleagues to support this tightly crafted, clearly focused resolution to give the President authorization to use military force in the face of this horrific crime against humanity.

Yes, there are clearly risks to any action we authorize, but the consequences of inaction—the consequences of standing down from fully upholding the norms of international

behavior—are greater and graver still: further humanitarian disaster in Syria, regional instability, the loss of American credibility around the world, an emboldened Iran and North Korea, and the disintegration of international law.

This vote will be among the most difficult any of us will be asked to make. But the American people expect us to make the hard decisions and take the hard votes. They expect us to put aside political differences and personal ideologies, forget partisanship and preconceptions, forget the polls and personal consequences.

This is a moment for a profile in courage—a moment for each of us to do what we know is right—based on what we know is in the best interest of the United States, regardless of the polls or pontifications of political pundits.

To be clear, the authorization Senator CORKER and I seek is for focused action, with a clear understanding that American troops will not be on the ground in combat.

We have worked closely to put politics aside, weigh the facts, search our consciences, and pass a resolution in committee that we believe is in the national security interest of the American people.

I have said before and will say again: This is not a declaration of war but a declaration of our values to the world.

I want to thank Senator CORKER for being a close partner in helping to tailor and focus the language of this resolution so it reflects the will of the committee, the interests of the American people, and gives the President the authority he needs to respond to Syria's use of chemical weapons against its own people.

What we know. What we know is clear, notwithstanding Assad's interview and his denials.

According to the declassified intelligence assessment, we know—with high confidence—that the Syrian Government carried out a chemical weapons attack in the Damascus suburbs on August 21.

We know that the buck stops with Assad—his interview-denials aside. We know that he controls the regime's stockpiles of chemical agents, including mustard, sarin, and VX gas, and has thousands of munitions capable of delivering them, again, under his control.

It is inconceivable—and defies all logic—that he would not know about the preparations and deployment of these horrific weapons.

We know that personnel involved in the program are carefully vetted to ensure loyalty to the regime and the security of the program.

We know that chemical weapons personnel from the Syrian Scientific Studies and Research Center, subordinate to the regime's Ministry of Defense, were operating in the Damascus suburb of 'Adra from Sunday, August 18 until

early in the morning on Wednesday August 21 near an area the regime uses to mix chemical weapons including sarin.

Human intelligence, as well as signal and geospatial intelligence have shown regime activity in the preparation of chemicals prior to the attack, including the distribution and use of gas masks.

Some may still be skeptical about Assad's direct involvement, but clearly the buck stops with Assad when it comes to the use of these weapons.

Some may also be skeptical that we have not done enough to allow diplomacy to work, but the fact is we have tried diplomacy. We have gone to the UN on many occasions, and it has only bought Assad more time.

Notwithstanding Russia's belated offer today to take action, which, by the way, will only be on the table today specifically because of the threat of the use of force, let us not forget it has been their intransigence that brought us to this point in the first place.

The fact is, on August 28, a week after the attack, Russia blocked a UN Security Council resolution that called “for all necessary measures” to be taken, and simply called for any state that used chemical weapons to be held accountable.

On the day of the attack, August 21, Russia blocked a Security Council press statement simply expressing “concern” that chemical weapons might have been used.

On August 6, Russia blocked another press statement welcoming the news that a UN investigations team would investigate three sites, and calling for their full and unfettered access to those sites.

Russia has also vetoed a Security Council resolution enshrining the June 30 Geneva Communiqué brokered by Kofi Annan, vetoed a resolution calling for an end to violence in Syria, vetoed a draft resolution endorsing the Arab League's plan of action that would have condemned human rights violations.

They blocked a press statement calling for humanitarian access to the besieged city of Homs, and one calling for Syrian authorities to provide the UN with humanitarian access.

Over the course of the conflict in Syria, the United States Government, specifically the State Department, has met consistently with its close allies and partners, as well as with Syria's neighbors, to help prepare the region to detect, prevent, and respond to potential use or proliferation of chemical weapons.

As Ambassador Power acknowledged in her remarks at the Center for American Progress on September 6, the United States has regularly engaged with the Russians and Iranians to attempt to get them to use their influence to stop the Assad regime from using chemical weapons.

The same day, September 6, the United States and 10 other countries issued a joint statement condemning the Assad regime's use of chemical weapons. They were: Australia, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Turkey, and Great Britain. Since then 14 other nations have also signed onto that statement: Albania, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Morocco, Qatar, Romania, and the United Arab Emirates.

It is only the threat by the President, and this resolution, that would drive both Russia and Syria to the negotiating table.

The facts are clear. We have tried diplomacy.

Let us understand that this action is not a choice of force or diplomacy. It is about both.

It is about enforcing international norms that will, at the end of the day, leverage necessary UN action and help bring about a political solution.

For those who want to see UN Security Council action, those who want to push Syria to sign a chemical weapons agreement and give up their weapons, this resolution is the best path to getting there.

Let me say to my colleagues who believe that the authorization of the use of military force will be nothing more than a pin-prick. This resolution will have clear and verifiable consequences.

It will help keep these weapons in check, degrade Assad's ability to deploy them, and prevent the proliferation of chemical weapons and their use by anyone, anywhere in the world.

The resolution will have clear consequences, but it is also not opened.

It appropriately narrows the scope, duration, and breadth of the authority granted to meet Congressional concerns, and the concerns of the American people.

It is tightly tailored to give the President "necessary and appropriate" authority to use military force to respond to the use of weapons of mass destruction by the Syrian government; protect the national security interests of the United States and our allies and partners; and degrade Syria's capacity to use such weapons in the future.

It has a requirement for determination that the use of military force is necessary, that appropriate diplomatic and other peaceful means to prevent the deployment and use of chemical weapons by Syria have been used, and that the United States has both a specific military plan to achieve the goal of responding to the use of weapons of mass destruction by the Syrian government and that the use of military force is consistent with the broader goals of U.S. strategy toward Syria, including achieving a negotiated settlement to the conflict, and a limitation that

specifies that the resolution "does not authorize the use of United States Armed Forces on the ground in Syria for the purposes of combat operations" assuring there will be no "boots on the ground."

The authorization would end after 60 days, with the President having the ability to request and certify for another 30 days, and with Congress having an opportunity to pass a resolution of disapproval. It provides for an integrated United States Government strategy for Syria, including a comprehensive review of current and planned U.S. diplomatic, political, economic and military policy towards Syria, and requires a Report to Congress on the status of the military operations. I know my colleagues on both sides will want to offer a range of amendments.

Let me say in conclusion, history has taught us harsh lessons when it comes to the use of chemical weapons.

The images we saw of children lined on the floor on August 21 were not the first images the world has ever seen of the horrors of chemical attacks.

We saw them almost 100 years ago in World War I.

If we do not learn from and live by the lessons of the past, if we fail the test of history then we are destined and doomed to repeat it.

If we allow the use and proliferation of chemical weapons despite the world's horror at the gruesome and horrific use of mustard gas, phosgene, and chlorine at the beginning of last century, then we risk the same horrors again in this century.

Let us not fail the test of history.

Let us say to the world that we cannot allow anyone to use chemical weapons again, and that we can never allow such weapons to fall into the hands of stateless-actors and terrorists who would unleash them against America or American interests around the world.

I repeat what I said earlier: Let us understand that this action is not about force or diplomacy. It is about both. It is about enforcing international norms that will, at the end of the day, leverage necessary UN action and help bring about a political solution.

For those who want to see UN Security Council action, those who want to push Syria to sign a chemical weapons agreement and give up their weapons, this is the best path to getting there.

Make no mistake, the use of chemical weapons by the Syrian regime ultimately represents a national security threat to the United States, a global security threat we cannot ignore.

Let me read what our former colleague and respected Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Lugar, recently said in the press: "We are talking about weapons of mass destruction. We are talking about chem-

ical weapons in particular which may be the greatest threat to our country of any security risk we have—much more than any other government, or another nation—because they can be used by terrorists, by very small groups.

The use of those weapons has got to concern us to the point that we take action whenever any country crosses that line and use these weapons as we have seen in Syria."

Senator Lugar is right. We must be concerned—deeply concerned—and that is why we must act. The danger of proliferation is too great—too much of a risk—for us to stand silent and stand down.

I urge my colleagues to put aside politics, polls, and preconceptions and do what we know, at the end of the day, is in the national security of the American people.

Again, I want to thank Senator CORKER and members of the committee for working quickly together to respond to this crisis with a well-crafted resolution that is a declaration of our values and will send a clear message that we—and the world—cannot and will not tolerate the use of chemical weapons anywhere—by anyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I would like to thank the chairman for his comments for a historical analysis of what has occurred and his comments regarding our ability to work together. I do wish to reiterate a point that the chairman made partially through his comments. I do not think any of us know at this time whether the offers that today have been made from Russia and responses that have been given from Syria, I do not think we have any idea whether there is credibility at present.

What I do know is there would be absolutely zero conversation about that had our committee not passed an authorization out on a 10-to-7 vote and if we were not taking this up this week. So I wish to commend the chairman for his leadership on this issue. I have enjoyed working with him. I have enjoyed working with him on all the issues relative to Syria and all the other things we have done in a bipartisan way.

I think it has been the tradition—I know it has been the tradition of this body, when it comes to issues beyond our shorelines, to set aside partisanship, as was mentioned a moment ago, and do things that are in the best interests of our Nation. There is nothing more important than that each Member of this body will take up than the authorization for the use of military force. I sensed it the other day in our committee. I have sensed it with those whom I have talked to since. Each Member is looking at this with a sense of humility and soberness. I truly believe it is up to each Member to make this decision.

I will say the issues of Syria are something I am familiar with. I have traveled to the region, as I know the chairman and many others have. I have traveled three times this year. I wrote an op-ed in the New York Times in April regarding what our response to Syria should be. Our committee thankfully passed, on a 15-to-3 vote on May 21, with the chairman's leadership, the Syria Transition Support Act.

This was to support the vetted moderate opposition and require the administration to develop a comprehensive strategy. I know Members of this body know I support this authorization. I helped write it with the chairman. I am very comfortable with my position in supporting this and believe what we have done with this authorization we have done in the right and correct way.

I will say I have been very dismayed at the administration's lack of response after stating publicly that they were going to support the vetted moderate opposition in certain ways. I have been very frustrated at the response and the lack of support in that way. As I mentioned, I was just in the area 3 weeks ago. I visited the same refugee camp in Turkey on the Syrian border and in Jordan on the Syrian border. I saw some of the same refugees whom I saw there less than 1 year ago.

Candidly, I am dismayed we have not supported the vetted opposition in a better way. I know we have urged out of our committee that we have a much more comprehensive strategy. I wish that bill had come to the floor. I wish the Senate had taken action. But, candidly, I also am dismayed this administration has not taken action to do something in a more comprehensive way.

No question the introduction of chemical weapons has changed the dynamic tremendously. I think the chairman was very articulate in explaining why this is important. I wish to say to everybody in this body, to me an equally important issue for our Nation is the credibility of the United States of America. I believe our President, whether you support him, whether you like him, I believe the President spoke for our Nation when he established a red line some months ago regarding the use of chemical weapons.

I believe it is very important for our Nation's credibility in the region and in the world that we have an appropriate response when we have a dictator such as Asad take the actions he has taken against international norms the way he has but especially when the Commander in Chief of our Nation has spoken the way he has about this issue. To me this is twofold. Certainly, it is about the international norms that have been spoken to eloquently by many, but to me it is also an issue of this Nation's credibility of the response as people are looking on to what we are going to do.

That is why I support this authorization. I do wish to go back over a couple points the chairman referred to relative to the substance of the authorization. I think most people know the White House sent over an authorization that to me was very broad. It did not define what we were going to do in a specific way.

I know the chairman just talked about the fact that this authorization is tailored. It is specific. Let me go over again specifically what this authorization does. It is specific purposes only: to respond to the use of weapons of mass destruction to dissuade future use, degrade ability, and to prevent transfer, no boots on the ground for combat operations.

I know there have been some discussions about that in our committee. Very emphatically, this authorization eliminates and keeps any boots on the ground for combat operations from occurring.

This has a time limit of 60 days with a 30-day extension which Congress can disapprove. It is geographically limited to Syria only, which the original authorization was not. It is against legitimate military targets only, which again the original authorization was not.

There are a series of determinations the President has to make prior to taking action with this authorization, including that it is in the core national interests of the United States and that he has a military plan to achieve the objectives.

In addition, this authorization requires a comprehensive strategy for a negotiated end to this conflict.

I wish to refer to something else the chairman mentioned; that is, the type of activity. I know there have been a number of editorial comments in papers and publications around the country referring to this as a pinprick. There have been other concerns by Members of this body as to the duration of this effort, as to how long it will be.

I have had the privilege, because of the position I serve in on the Foreign Relations Committee, to be involved in multiple phone calls and personal meetings. There was one last night that lasted at great length with the President and Vice President.

I wish to say to every person in this body, I have no belief whatsoever that if military action is taken, it is going to be a pinprick—none. The American military has incredible ability to deal with issues in a forceful way but also do so in a very short timeframe.

I do believe, based on the many meetings we have had, both with military and civilian leadership, that to characterize what is proposed as a pinprick or to characterize what is proposed as inserting ourselves into a long-term civil war, I think both of those characterizations are wrong.

Obviously, one of the dilemmas people here deal with is that we write policy and then it is up to the administration to carry that out—and no question, none of us will be involved in the direct carrying out. But it is my firm belief that there is not a thread of thinking by the administration that what they are considering is a pinprick.

On the other hand, I have not a thread of thought that they are also considering doing something that is going to involve us in a long-term civil war. Obviously, conflicts such as this are complex.

In closing, let me say this. Each Senator has to make their own decision. This is one of those things where lobbying is not something that is going to make up the minds of Senators. I think each Senator has to make up their own hearts and minds.

What I can say is we are going to have an open process. I know we have talked about the process going forward. I hope Senators will keep their amendments germane. I hope we have a sober debate about an issue that is the most important type of decision any Senator will make.

I am thrilled the President decided to come to Congress for an authorization. I know a lot of people have made many comments regarding this. Candidly, I am pleased the President has come to us for a debate. It is my hope the Senate, after hearing the facts and after having a thoughtful debate, will approve the authorization for the use of military force.

I couldn't agree more with the chairman that if people wish to see a diplomatic solution—which is the only way we are going to end this conflict—I do not think this conflict ends militarily. I believe we have learned a lot from the last two episodes we have been through.

I believe it is important for us to have this authorization because I believe it is the only thing at this point, the fact that we passed it out of committee, the fact that it is on the floor, that might possibly lead to a diplomatic settlement.

I also believe it is time for the President to lead. I know there have been a lot of statements over the last week, and the President had multiple audiences in which to speak. I understand this, and I understand reports out of these meetings can come in many ways not to be accurate.

The President is coming to the Hill tomorrow. He will be making a major speech to the United States, the citizens of our country, tomorrow night. I know many of them have lives, where all of them, most of them, get up in the mornings, go to work, they raise their families, and they haven't had the opportunity to spend as much time on these issues. That is why we are elected to do this.

I will say this. It is very important for the President of the United States to come to Congress and for the President of the United States to make his case to the American people.

He is asking for this authorization. I believe it is important for us to give him this authorization.

Again, I wish to thank the chairman for working with us to make sure we have narrowed this authorization in such a way that I think it meets the test of what the American people and what all of us wish to see happen. But I do believe now it is up to the President, over the next several days and this week, to make his case to the American people as to why the Senate should give him this authorization for the use of military force, which I hope we will do.

I thank you for the time, and I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF VALERIE E. CAPRONI TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

NOMINATION OF VERNON S. BRODERICK TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Valerie E. Caproni, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and Vernon S. Broderick, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask that all time during this debate on the Executive Calendar be equally divided on both sides and any quorum call that is called be equally divided as well in terms of charging time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today we will be voting on just 2 of the 11 district and circuit nominees left pending on the Senate floor prior to the August recess. Ten of these nominees had been reported by voice vote, and there was no good reason we could not have confirmed them then and allowed them to get to work on behalf of the American

people. I hope that Senate Republicans will not seek to drag out the nominees who will be left pending on the floor after today, as they did for the nominations left pending at the end of last year. It took us until May of this year to confirm 9 of the 10 circuit and district nominations that were ready for votes last year, and it will likely take us another month or two to work our way through this new backlog.

One effect of this obstruction is that for the first time in nearly 2 years, our Federal district courts are again facing what the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service calls "historically high" vacancies. This could have been avoided if Senate Republicans had simply followed Senate tradition and allowed votes on the nine consensus district nominees before the recess.

The Republicans' effort to obstruct and delay the confirmations of nominees means that over the course of President Obama's administration the number of judicial vacancies nearly doubled. In January 2009, there were 53 Federal district and appellate court vacancies. Today, there are 94 Federal district and appellate court vacancies—37 of which have been designated as judicial emergency vacancies by the nonpartisan Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. This is unacceptable. We have the nominees we need to make progress, but we do not have the consent we need from Senate Republicans.

Republicans have argued that we do not need to pick up the pace of confirming Federal judges, because we have confirmed more of President Obama's nominees than at the same point in 2005, the fifth year of George W. Bush's Presidency. The facts tell a different story. President Bush made just 5 new circuit and district nominations in 2005, compared to 43 new circuit and district nominations by President Obama this year. With more nominees to consider, it only makes sense that we have held more hearings and confirmed more judges this year than in 2005.

Today the Senate will vote on the nominations of Valerie Caproni and Vernon Broderick to fill vacancies in the Southern District of New York. Since the time of her nomination until today, the seat to which Ms. Caproni is nominated has been added to the list of judicial emergency vacancies by the nonpartisan Administrative Office of the Courts. Ms. Caproni is currently vice president and deputy general counsel for Northrop Grumman Corporation. She has served the public in various capacities, including as General Counsel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation from 2003 to 2011, as Regional Director of the Securities and Exchange Commission's Pacific Regional Office from 1998 to 2001, and as a Federal prosecutor in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of New York from both 1985 to 1992 and

1998 to 2001. During her tenure as a Federal prosecutor, she served as Chief of the Criminal Division, Chief of the Organized Crime & Racketeering Unit, and Chief of the Special Prosecutions Unit. Ms. Caproni also has extensive experience in private practice, having served as counsel in the New York office of Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett and as an associate at the law firm Cravath, Swaine & Moore. Following law school, Ms. Caproni clerked for the Honorable Phyllis Kravitch of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.

Mr. Broderick has split his career between Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP, where he is currently a partner and was previously counsel and an associate, and the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York, where he was an assistant U.S. attorney. A graduate of Yale University and Harvard Law School, Mr. Broderick has extensive experience in Federal court. He has also tried 11 jury cases to verdict. Since he was appointed in 2003 by Mayor Bloomberg, Mr. Broderick has served on the Commission to Combat Police Corruption.

Both nominees have the support of their home State Senators, Senator SCHUMER and Senator GILLIBRAND. Both nominees were also unanimously rated "well qualified" by the nonpartisan ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary, its highest rating. They were reported by the Judiciary Committee by voice vote nearly 3 months ago.

I hope the Senate moves to confirm these nominees, but reducing Federal judicial vacancies from 94 to 92 is not enough. It is well past time for the Senate to get serious about giving our Federal courts the resources they need to provide justice for the American people. In July the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts held a hearing on the impact of sequestration that highlighted the damage that these senseless cuts are doing to our justice system. Tomorrow, Senator COONS will chair another hearing in that subcommittee to evaluate the judgeship needs of Federal courts across the country and hear testimony on the Coons-Leahy Federal Judgeship Act of 2013, which would implement the judicial conference's recommendations for desperately needed new judgeships. I hope that Senators from both sides of the aisle will support this bill, which is based on what judges across the Nation believe they need to administer justice effectively. Addressing the resources of a coequal branch of our government should not be politicized. We need to end sequestration and act responsibly in addressing the staffing needs of our justice system so that it can continue to serve the American people and be a model for other countries.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I will not support the nomination of Valerie

E. Caproni to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of New York. However, I expect that she will likely be confirmed, as will Mr. Broderick. These will be the 30th and 31st judicial confirmations this year. With today's confirmations, the Senate will have confirmed 202 lower court nominees; we have defeated 2. That is 202-2 for President Obama. That is an outstanding record. That is a success rate of 99 percent. I think we have had a pretty outstanding record this Congress.

And we have been doing that at a fast pace. During the last Congress we confirmed more judges than any Congress since the 103rd Congress, which was 1993-94.

So far this year, the first of President Obama's second term, we have already confirmed more judges than were confirmed in the entire first year of President Bush's second term.

At a similar stage in President Bush's second term, only 10 judicial nominees had been confirmed. So we are now at a 31 to 10 comparison, with President Obama clearly ahead of where President Bush was at a similar time frame.

And, as I said, we have already confirmed more nominees this year—31—than we did during the entirety of 2005, the first year of President Bush's second term, when 21 lower court judges were confirmed.

So I just wanted to set the record straight—again—before we vote on these nominations.

I also want to explain why I oppose the confirmation of Ms. Caproni. From 2003 to 2011, she served as the General Counsel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. During that time, she was involved in the national security letters—NSL—program at the FBI. This program was the subject of a report by the Office of Inspector General—OIG—within the Department of Justice—DOJ, published in 2010.

In that report, the FBI was criticized for its role in the potential abuse by the FBI's use of national security letters. The report also detailed her office's knowledge of the use of exigent letters to short-circuit the NSL process. The IG also found problems regarding the inaccurate reporting of NSLs.

When the Committee reported out her nomination earlier this year, I voiced my concern over the fact that I had made a request to the FBI over 6 years ago, asking for documents regarding exigent letters.

In March 2007, Chairman LEAHY and I requested copies of unclassified emails related to the use of national security letters issued by the FBI. I only received a few of these emails, and they were heavily redacted, so in 2008 I asked for the rest.

Ms. Caproni was general counsel of the FBI at the time and told me that the documents I was waiting for were on her desk, awaiting her review. Well,

in 2013 as we approached her hearing, I still had not received those documents.

I asked Ms. Caproni about this in her hearing and she had no specific recollection of this request. So, I asked her again in writing. This led to a set of FOIA documents being produced, which are a poor substitute for properly answering a Committee request. It also raises further questions as to why it took 6 years and why Ms. Caproni told me years ago that she was working on responding to our request.

I subsequently followed up with the FBI with specific requests regarding Ms. Caproni's involvement in the matter. The FBI has not responded to my requests.

I also made requests from the DOJ Inspector General. While the IG did make some materials available to me, there are outstanding requests to which they have not responded.

At issue is the correspondence between Ms. Caproni and OIG about the OIG's draft report. These are not "internal documents" as the IG has claimed which relate to the internal deliberative process of the OIG. They are not "internal" communications because the Inspector General's office is supposed to be separate and independent from the FBI, and Ms. Caproni was the FBI's counsel.

They are, however, a critical component required both for oversight of the underlying program as well as to ensure that the back-and-forth between an independent IG and the agency is transparent and arms-length.

At the time we reported her nomination out of Committee, I stated that while I would not hold her nomination in Committee, I reserved my right to do so on the Senate floor. So now, even though I have consented to the vote going forward, I will not support the nomination.

Ms. Caproni received her B.A. at Tulane in 1976 and her J.D. from the University of Georgia School of Law in 1979. Upon graduation, she clerked for 1 year for the Honorable Phyllis Kravitch, United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. Following her clerkship, she entered private practice as a civil litigator for Cravath, Swaine & Moore focusing on defense work on behalf of large companies primarily with respect to libel, antitrust, and securities matters. She was in this position from 1980 to 1985.

In 1985 Ms. Caproni became an Assistant U.S. Attorney where she prosecuted a number of narcotics and other criminal cases. In 1989, Ms. Caproni became the General Counsel of the Urban Development Corp—now Empire State Development. There her primary responsibility was to provide legal advice to the executives and directors of the corporation, focusing on administrative law, banking and bankruptcy law, environmental and land use, real estate, and products liability. She re-

turned to the U.S. Attorney's Office in 1992 where she prosecuted criminal cases and became part of the administration of the Criminal Division. She served as Chief of the Criminal Division from 1994 to 1998. In 1998 Ms. Caproni became the regional director of the SEC's Pacific Regional Office where she worked on enforcement of Federal securities laws.

From 2001 to 2003, she returned to private practice at Simpson Thacher & Bartlett where she worked on white collar criminal defense. After this she became General Counsel of the FBI where her primary responsibility was to provide legal advice to executive management. She served there from 2003 to 2011.

In 2011 Ms. Caproni was hired by Northrop Grumman to be vice president and deputy general counsel where she remains today. She is currently responsible for supervision of all litigation and internal investigations, specializing in civil litigation and investigations and setting strategy in cases and investigations that affect the corporation. The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave her a unanimous "Well Qualified" rating.

Vernon S. Broderick is also nominated to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of New York. Mr. Broderick received his B.A. from Yale University in 1985 and his J.D. from Harvard Law School in 1988. Upon graduation, he joined Weil, Gotshal & Manges as an associate. His practice there mainly focused on civil litigation, specifically large commercial disputes that involved breach of contract, products liability, patent and bankruptcy.

In 1994, he joined the United States Attorney's Office, first in the General Crimes Unit, then in the Narcotics Unit and the Violent Gangs Unit. He was Chief of the Violent Gangs Unit from 1999-2002.

Mr. Broderick rejoined Weil, Gotshal & Manges as a Counsel in 2002 and was made a Partner in 2005. His practice focused on white collar criminal investigations and prosecutions, regulatory investigations and proceedings, and business litigation. The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave him a unanimous "Well Qualified" rating.

Mr. MENENDEZ. In view of the fact I don't see any Members at this point, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support Valerie

Caproni for U.S. district judge for New York's Southern District. I know Ms. Caproni to be a woman with impeccable credentials, incredible intellect, and the kind of fair-minded judgment we need on the Federal bench.

Ms. Caproni serves as vice president and general counsel for Northrop Grumman Corporation, where she leads all aspects of litigation. Ms. Caproni joined Northrop Grumman from her former position as general counsel to the FBI, a position Director Robert Mueller personally asked Ms. Caproni to serve in, in the wake of the horrific attacks of September 11. Ms. Caproni knows full well the task at hand for the FBI is never easy—from protecting America from terror and other attacks—a balance of defending our civil liberties and civil rights. But as she puts it:

They always strive to do the right thing, and to maintain as a loadstar fealty to the Constitution and the rule of law.

That is what Ms. Caproni believes to her very core.

Ms. Caproni also served in the Securities and Exchange Commission, where she enforced regulatory programs in the nine-State Pacific region. She and her staff strengthened cooperation between the SEC and the U.S. Attorney's Offices to crack down on financial fraud.

Ms. Caproni also served as Chief of the Criminal Division for the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of New York and in private practice at several top firms.

Through her breadth of experience, her talent, her intellect, and her strong character, I know Ms. Caproni will be an outstanding jurist.

I strongly believe this country needs more women such as she serving in the Federal Judiciary, an institution that I believe needs more exceptional women.

I have no doubt that having Ms. Caproni serve in the Federal Judiciary will bring us closer to achieving that goal of a Federal judiciary that reflects our Nation.

I was honored to recommend her for this position, and I urge all my colleagues to vote in support of her confirmation.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of another outstanding New Yorker, Vernon Broderick, to also be a U.S. district judge for the Southern District of New York.

Mr. Broderick served as an assistant U.S. attorney in the Southern District of New York, where he helped protect New Yorkers by prosecuting cases involving organized crime, international narcotics trafficking, and violent crimes. I urge the Senate to vote in full support of Mr. Broderick's nomination.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the nomination of Valerie Caproni to serve as a judge on the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York.

When the Senate Judiciary Committee considered Ms. Caproni's nomination on June 13 and reported her nomination out of committee, I asked to be recorded as a "pass" on the vote. I did so because I wanted to meet in person with Ms. Caproni to discuss matters that she worked on when she served as general counsel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation from 2003 to 2011.

During Ms. Caproni's tenure, the FBI adopted controversial new investigative policies and implemented sweeping new surveillance authorities granted by the USA PATRIOT Act.

For example, revised Attorney General's guidelines for FBI investigations and the FBI's Domestic Investigations and Operations Guide allow the FBI to conduct "assessments" using intrusive surveillance techniques on innocent Americans with no indication of wrongdoing or other factual predicate. And while the Justice Department's "Guidance Regarding the Use of Race by Federal Law Enforcement Agencies" prohibits the use of profiling by Federal law enforcement in "traditional law enforcement activities," this ban does not apply to profiling based on religion and national origin, and it does not apply to national security and border security investigations.

The Justice Department's Inspector General concluded that the FBI was guilty of "widespread and serious misuse" of the National Security Letter authority when Ms. Caproni was general counsel. Also during Ms. Caproni's tenure, the FBI interpreted section 215 of the PATRIOT Act to permit the collection of noncontent "metadata" on every phone call of every American, including the numbers of both callers and the time and duration of the call.

As general counsel, Ms. Caproni would have been the final word in the FBI on the legality of these and all other Bureau activities.

As a result of my concerns about Ms. Caproni's involvement in these activities, I asked for her commitment, if confirmed, to recuse herself from matters on which she had been involved or provided legal advice while working for the FBI or on which her impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

I met in my office with Ms. Caproni on June 25, and on July 8, Ms. Caproni sent me a letter memorializing her commitment to recuse herself from such matters. I appreciated receiving this letter, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

In light of our meeting and Ms. Caproni's commitments to me, I will not oppose her nomination to the district court.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Washington, DC, July 8, 2013.

Hon. RICHARD DURBIN,
Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DURBIN: Thank you for the opportunity to meet with you to discuss my nomination as a judge for the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. It was a pleasure to meet with you and your staff.

As I indicated in my Senate Judiciary Committee Questionnaire, if confirmed, I would follow the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, as well as any other applicable ethics rules or federal statutes to resolve any potential conflicts of interest. As I further stated, if I had personal or supervisory involvement in a matter while at the FBI or Northrop Grumman, I would not participate in it as a judge.

To follow up on our conversation and to be more specific, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 455, I would recuse myself from any case in which my impartiality could reasonably be questioned. I would certainly recuse myself if I were presented with a case that would require me to rule on the legality of a national security program as to which I provided legal advice while I was a government employee, unless there were controlling precedent already in place regarding such a program. If such precedent did exist, I nonetheless would consider recusal on a case-by-case basis, carefully considering any arguments and consulting with appropriate experts on judicial ethics and, if appropriate, my colleagues. In those cases in which I did not recuse, I would apply controlling law.

Please let me know if you have any other questions or matters you would like to discuss.

Very truly yours,

VALERIE CAPRONI.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Valerie E. Caproni, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York?

Mr. CARDIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) would vote "yea."

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 24, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 201 Ex.]

YEAS—73

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Baucus	Graham	Nelson
Begich	Hagan	Portman
Bennet	Harkin	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Boxer	Heinrich	Reid
Brown	Heitkamp	Rockefeller
Burr	Hirono	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johanns	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Sessions
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Chambliss	King	Stabenow
Chiesa	Klobuchar	Tester
Coats	Leahy	Thune
Collins	Levin	Toomey
Coons	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Corker	Markey	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	McCain	Vitter
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Fischer	Mikulski	Wyden
Flake	Murkowski	
Franken	Murphy	

NAYS—24

Ayotte	Enzi	Merkley
Barrasso	Grassley	Moran
Blunt	Heller	Paul
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Coburn	Inhofe	Roberts
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Crapo	Kirk	Scott
Cruz	Lee	Shelby

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Landrieu	Warner
-----------	----------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON VERNON S. BRODERICK

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Vernon S. Broderick, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The majority leader is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SYRIA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, tomorrow the President is going to brief the Democratic caucus and the Republican caucus separately. He is going to address the Nation tomorrow night. As we all know, there are international discussions relevant to the matter in Syria.

Normally what I would do in a situation such as this is file cloture today, but I don't think that is to our benefit. I don't think we need to see how fast we can do this; we have to see how well we can do this, so I will not file cloture this evening on the Syria resolution.

I have spoken to the Republican leader. I have talked to virtually all of my Democratic Senators. We have enough votes to get cloture, but I don't think we should be counting numbers tonight. I think what we need to do is to make sure the President has the opportunity to speak to all 100 Senators and all 300 million American people before we do this.

As I have said before, when we get on this, we are going to deal with this in a manner that is dignified and move forward in a way that is expeditious, yet thorough.

I have discussed this with the President and other people in the administration. I repeat: I wish to make sure the President has a full opportunity to make his case to the Senate and the American people before we vote on this matter.

As always, I will continue to discuss this with Senator MCCONNELL, and we will see if we can reach some kind of agreement to move forward without cloture. If that doesn't work out, I will file cloture when it is appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for up to 15 minutes. After I conclude my remarks, I ask that Senator INHOFE of Oklahoma and Senator CASEY of Pennsylvania be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

LABOR DAY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, most of us were in our States over Labor Day. I usually come to the floor a few days after Labor Day to talk about the importance of Labor Day and what it means to working Americans, what it has meant to our country, and what it has meant to building a strong middle class.

I would like to read a letter sent to me by Bill Ross, who is an Ohio business leader. Mr. Ross writes:

I grew up in a first generation immigrant family in a small Ohio town.

My father, who obtained only an 8th grade education (not uncommon for his generation), worked hard in an industrial job.

My mother worked at home to care for our family of 5 children. When able to do so, she went to work outside the household too.

We rented a home for \$25 a month, ate nutritious meals at home, and all walked to school with clean clothes each day.

All five children went to college, obtained post-graduate professional degrees, and pursued rewarding professional careers in law, education and business.

How did that happen?

Because, first and foremost, my father had a job with a living wage and health care for his family that his union protected. Because we had access to good quality public education. Because we had access to affordable state universities and student loan programs that we could later afford to repay. Because blue collar working people had a chance.

I hope we can restore all that in America again.

Bill Ross's story is very much like my wife Connie's story. Bill Ross was born in Ashtabula a bit before my wife who was also born there. Bill Ross's dad carried a union card and his mother went to work when she could. My wife's father carried a utility worker's union card for more than 30 years in Ashtabula, OH. Her mother was a home care worker who worked, when she could, after the children were a little older.

My wife, as did Bill Ross, was able to go to school with minimal debt. She graduated from Kent State University in the 1970s with not much more than \$1,200 in student debt.

The ability of a living wage and carrying a union card gave them a reason to celebrate Labor Day because it gave so many working families a chance.

The Presiding Officer comes from a State much like mine. He understands the importance of carrying a union card and getting a living wage gives people the kind of opportunity that people in this country deserve.

For generations hard-working Americans left their homes every morning, and some at night, to earn an honest living. They bent with swollen knees to put on steel-toed work boots to provide for loved ones. They put up with calloused hands to build a better life for their children.

Middle-class Americans and people struggling to enter the middle class labored to ensure that children have enough food and clean clothes and an adequate education to thrive.

We know steelworkers, nurses, mechanics, teachers, and plumbers are not always treated with the dignity they deserve—especially, far too often, from our elected officials.

American history is a history of struggle for working people—fighting for representation and fair wages, for access to good-paying jobs, and for the dignity every human being deserves. It is about fighting for democracy and civil rights—as we were reminded a few

days ago when we marked the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington for jobs and freedom.

More than a century ago, when John Patterson Green, an Ohioan, and Cedarville native John Henderson Kyle introduced a bill to establish Labor Day as a State holiday in Ohio, they were not thinking of any one segment of the population. They were focused on the rights of all Americans who work hard and play by the rules.

Since then, we have seen how the middle class grew when we ensured that hard work is rewarded with fair pay and decent benefits.

Seventy-five years ago, President Roosevelt signed the Fair Labor Standards Act, which ultimately ensured that American workers would receive a minimum wage, reasonable work hours, and an end to child labor.

One of the authors of that bill, Senator Hugo Black, sat at this specific desk in the Senate and supported Social Security, minimum wage, and paying for overtime. He initially introduced that legislation in 1932.

President Roosevelt led us to decades of prosperity by ensuring that hard work is met with fair wages and decent working conditions. A minimum wage helped to lift millions of Americans from poverty and allowed them to join the middle class.

Today workers face new challenges. While corporate executives and Wall Street banks are earning record profits, too many families in Ohio, Indiana, Oklahoma, and across the country are still struggling. Some politicians have used the recession and the budget crisis it created as grounds for attacking worker's rights. We have seen vicious attacks on workers' rights across the country. We have seen it in North Carolina. We saw it last year in Indiana and Michigan. We have seen it over the last 3 years in Ohio.

Ohio passed one of the worst attacks on collective bargaining rights in Ohio's history, trying to convince people that public employees caused the financial crisis, not Wall Street. Workers fought back and shattered a record for signatures needed to establish a ballot initiative and energized 2 million voters who came out to overturn that wrong-headed law.

Today, because the unity of not just labor union members but the huge majority of voters in Ohio, police officers, firefighters, sanitation workers, teachers, and other public sector workers continue to have the right to bargain and work with management through collective bargaining to ensure safety and fairness on the job.

In Akron, OH, UAW workers at Meggitt do high-quality and efficient work which allows them to be competitive with workers in Mexico and has prevented operations from being outsourced and helped to attract new investment in Ohio.

In Toledo, Youngstown, Cleveland, and beyond, union autoworkers helped bring back the American auto industry. They are building the cars of the future that people want to drive. I met with business owners across Ohio over this August and the month before and the month before and the month before that—during my 7 years in the Senate—Ohio business owners who want to pay their workers a fair wage and have joined in efforts to raise the minimum wage. They know increasing the minimum wage to \$10.10 per hour will increase domestic production by nearly \$33 billion over 3 years as workers spend their raises in their local businesses and communities. This economic activity would generate 140,000 new jobs over the course of 3 years.

It is no surprise that the American public is anxious about our place in an increasingly multipolar, complicated, dynamic global economy. People know that after NAFTA and CAFTA and permanent China trade relations were passed, plants closed and we lost 5 million good manufacturing jobs. Never in history has company after company implemented a business plan where they close down production in Stuebenville or Toledo or Dayton, OH, to move overseas to Wuhan or Shanghai, China, and sell the products back to the United States. That business plan led us to this.

In 1977 manufacturing was 20 percent of our GDP and financial services represented significantly less. That flipped by 2010, where manufacturing is now only about 11 percent of GDP. Between 2000 and 2010, because of wrong-headed trade agreements, because of tax policy that has given incentives to move offshore, our country lost 5 million manufacturing jobs and 60,000 plants closed down.

Since 2010 we have seen manufacturing jobs grow by more than 500,000. That is not good enough. We have to enact an agenda that includes the best trained workers, the most developed and sophisticated infrastructure, the most robust manufacturing base, and the strongest defense against currency manipulation. Until every American worker is able to rise out of poverty, we still have work to do. Labor Day, celebrated last week, shouldn't simply mark the end of summer; it should mark the beginning of a renewed commitment to fighting for American workers, American businesses, and strengthening our middle class.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

SYRIA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, let me thank my friend the distinguished Senator from Ohio for including me in his unanimous consent request. I will briefly speak about an amendment.

We all understand that the issue is going to come before this body to send activity into Syria. I am very much opposed to any kind of force in Syria, but if it happens, we want to be sure there is some protection there. So I have an amendment that even if my amendment passes, I will still oppose the effort of this President to send activity into Syria, and I believe it would precipitate a war.

My amendment is very simple. If the President takes military action against Syria, sequestration of our Armed Forces would be delayed for 1 year. We are talking about the fiscal year where we would take another \$52 billion out of our military.

What Assad has done and continues to do is reprehensible, but the United States can't afford another war given the current state of our military. The threats from Syria and the Middle East are not emerging threats. These threats have been around for decades. We knew they were there. There is nothing new about them. Yet the readiness capabilities of our military continue to be decimated by drastic budget cuts.

Sixteen Air Force combat flying squadrons have been grounded. We finally, after 3 months, put them back in the air again, and right now we know it costs more to get them back in a state of readiness than the money we saved from grounding them for 3 months. Our naval fleet has been reduced to historically low levels, the end strength of our ground forces has been cut by more than 100,000 personnel, and hundreds of thousands of DOD civilian employees have been furloughed. Just in my State of Oklahoma, in one of my installations, 14,000 civilian employees have been furloughed.

We can't have it both ways—continuing to cut the funding of our military while still expecting to meet our national security requirements. As military readiness and capabilities decline, we accept greater risk, and, as I have always said, risk equals lives. Every time we have a hearing, we have our combatant commanders come in and talk about the risks. Risk means lives. As I have always said, risk equals lives, and allowing these cuts to continue while proposing to send our forces into harm's way is immoral and reprehensible.

Over the last week I have heard a lot from the President and his administration about how any action in Syria will be limited. I suggest there is no such thing as limited war. Once we decide to strike, we can't predict where it will end or how the situation might escalate. Let's not forget that we have troops currently on the ground in Jordan and Turkey, marines guarding our Embassies, and sailors and airmen stationed around the region. We have already heard that Iran is ordering its

terrorist proxies to retaliate by attacking U.S. interests in the region, including our Embassy in Iraq. The State Department has ordered nonessential personnel to evacuate our Embassy in Lebanon. The threats to our forces are real.

I wish to read for my colleagues excerpts from a letter that was written by two ladies, Rebekah Sanderlin and Molly Blake. These are spouses of two of our servicemen. They are responding—much more eloquently than I could ever hope to—to the immense hardship our military is enduring under sequestration and to the misguided belief that a military strike on Syria can be done in isolation—that it won't affect our troops and their families.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CNN REPORTER BARBARA STARR

[From The Huffington Post, posted Sept. 4, 2013]

DEAR MS. STARR: We are writing to let you in on a secret. It's a big one—so get to a fresh page in your reporter notebook and have your pen poised and ready.

You told your viewers last Thursday that there was “no question” that the military could afford to go into Syria and that you “don't think it's really going to affect military families at all.”

Here's some inside information for you: There is no such thing as a person-less war. Our military cannot afford for Americans to forget that wars and battles and military strikes are fought by troops, that troops are people, and that those people have families.

In our military communities this summer we couldn't even afford to pay federal employees for a five-day work week. Military families can't get doctors' appointments and can't get the counseling services needed to grapple with the problems we already have, problems largely created by almost 12 years of war. And while Congress was busy sending a warning letter to the president to ensure they get to sign off on whether or not we go to war, they managed to ignore military families when the sequester hit. Today clinic hours are being slashed—along with pretty much every other service military families need. Walking around our communities lately, it doesn't look like we can afford much of anything—and certainly not a whole new war.

And that's just taking ‘afford’ literally.

Figuratively, the picture is even grimmer. An entire generation of military kids have grown up with a parent they know primarily through Skype. Couples are trying to piece together marriages that have been badly fractured by more years spent apart than together. We grew hopeful that better days were coming as we watched the end of the Iraq war, and we're thrilled that the end of our involvement in Afghanistan is nigh, and yet now all of cable news is breathless and giddy with talk of war in Syria.

You boast, in your bio, that you have exclusive access to Lt. Gen. Russel Honore and you've interviewed several secretaries of defense and other important people at the CIA. You may very well have Sec. Hagel on speed dial—but that doesn't give you the right to

toss around your thoughts on how military families may or may not be affected by military action. Not until you've stood in our shoes for longer than a three-minute live shot.

You see, Barbara, there's no such thing as ‘no boots on the ground.’ We in the military community sigh and shake our heads when we hear talk like that from the people on TV. Perhaps you consider a relatively small number of troops to be the same as zero—but we don't. We know that each of those service members is somebody's somebody.

As journalists, we like to show both sides of the story. So we would like to also voice our thanks. For your careless words have aimed a giant floodlight on the military-civilian divide. Blue Star Families Director of Research and Policy, Vivian Greentree said it best:

We hear a sense of angst in our membership and throughout the military community. How can we be in the middle of the fall out of sequestration—furloughs, program cuts, loss of mission readiness—we have families who can't get medical appointments. They are all wondering how they will manage if the situation in Syria continues to escalate. They wonder how will it affect them. Not, if it will affect them. But, how.

“That statement, in all its small-minded glory, captures the civilian-military divide more clearly than any survey ever could.”

And maybe someday we will be able to fight whole wars without using a single human . . . And Rosie the Robot will clean our kitchens while we tackle our morning commutes in flying cars. But today, in 2013, we can't have a ‘surgical strike’ without someone saying where to drop the bombs or where to aim those missiles. And those planes that drop the bombs? The destroyers that carry the missiles? They have pilots, captains and crews. All humans. Even the “unmanned” drones have human pilots, and the psychological wear and tear on them is staggering. Planes take off from airfields in foreign lands or from aircraft carriers, both of which are staffed by thousands of American somebodies, just like those destroyer ships. At every turn in a military operation you will find people. Intel analysts, linguists, flight crews, and cooks. Even war plans, regardless of whether they were, as you stated, “on deployment anyway” rely on thousands of people who will be pulled to a new duty, which causes reshuffling far and wide in the military community.

And this, most definitely, affects military families.

The big question is, as you said, “will it work?” and, as we learned from the most recent wars, it bears recalling that things don't always go as planned. But that's not the only question. Do not kid yourself, Barbara, and don't you dare kid the viewers who trust your reporting.

Sincerely,

REBEKAH SANDERLIN and MOLLY BLAKE,
Military Spouses.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to quote from the letter I just submitted for the RECORD, and I ask my colleagues to listen to the quote. These are two ladies who are spouses of servicemen. They said:

There is no such thing as a person-less war. Our military cannot afford for Americans to forget that wars and battles and military strikes are fought by troops, that troops are people, and that those people have families. In our military communities this summer we couldn't even afford to pay Federal employ-

ees for a five-day work week. Military families can't get doctors' appointments and can't get counseling services needed to grapple with the problems we already have, problems largely created by almost 12 years of war. Today clinic hours are being slashed—along with pretty much every other service military families need. Walking around our communities lately, it doesn't look like we can afford much of anything—and certainly not a whole new war.

I am still quoting now these wives of our military men:

And maybe someday we will be able to fight whole wars without using a single human, but today, in 2013, we can't have a surgical strike without someone saying where to drop the bombs or where to aim those missiles. And those planes that drop the bombs? The destroyers that carry the missiles? They have pilots, captains, and crews. All humans. Even the “unmanned” drones have human pilots, and the psychological wear and tear on them is staggering. Planes take off from airfields in foreign lands and from aircraft carriers, both of which are staffed by thousands of American somebodies, just like those destroyer ships. At every turn in a military operation you will find people. Intel analysts, linguists, flight crews, and cooks. Even war plans . . . rely on thousands of people who will be pulled to a new duty, which causes reshuffling far and wide in the military community. And this, most definitely, affects our military families.

Again, that is a quote from two of the wives of our current servicemen. I hope all of my colleagues will read this letter. I hope they understand that the decisions we make this week about whether to go to war in Syria have a human dimension.

If we expect the brave men and women in our military to go to foreign lands and risk their lives on our behalf, we have a moral obligation to ensure that they and their families have the support and the resources that are required. Sequestration has already inflicted severe damage on our military, and we are now only a couple of weeks from another \$52 billion being slashed from an already devastated military budget.

I have been clear that I don't support the President's call for military action in Syria. He still hasn't presented Congress and the American people with a plan for what he wants to accomplish, how he intends to accomplish it, or how he intends to pay for it. Will the President pay for this operation with more furloughs and by grounding more squadrons again? The CNO has already come forward and stated that if operations against Syria extend into October, he won't be able to afford it and will likely require supplemental funding from Congress.

Furthermore, the President hasn't told us how a strike in Syria fits into a broader strategy for the Middle East. What we decide to do is not just about Syria. It is bigger than that. This is about the growing threat from Iran, stability in the Middle East, and our commitment to Israel and allies and

our ability to respond to other contingencies that are there.

I recall knowing what was going to happen. This is 4½ years ago, back when President Obama was first elected, his first election. I knew that when he came out with his first budget, he was going to do something devastating to the military. So I put myself into Afghanistan, knowing, with the tanks going back and forth, that I would be able to get the interest and the attention of the American people, and it worked. So in that very first budget 4½ years ago, he did away with the early fifth-generation bomber then, the F-22; did away with our future combat system—the first ground capability increase in about 50 years; did away with our lift capacity, the C-17. Then, the worst thing, which I hope doesn't turn out to create the worst problem for America, he did away with the ground-based operation in Poland. That was just the first budget. That was 4½ years ago. Since that time, in his extended budget, he has taken \$487 billion out of the military, and with sequestration it will be another \$½ trillion. This just can't happen.

It is not just me who is saying this. People would expect it more from me. I am the ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Committee. I have gone there and worked with these guys and noticed the problems they have. I would suggest that not just me but Admiral Winnefeld, who is the second highest military guy, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said:

There could be, for the first time in my career—An admiral speaking now, the second highest person in our military—instances where we may be asked to respond to a crisis and we will have to say we cannot.

And then we go to the very top person, General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who said, "Our military force is so degraded, so unready, it would be immoral to use force."

I only say this because we are going to be facing this, and I would be opposed to this even with my amendment to postpone the sequestration of the military for 1 year. However, if that passes, I will still oppose this taking place. I don't think many people in America realize what has happened to our military under the Obama administration.

Well, I have just stated what has happened. This is certainly not a time when we would use force in Syria. Keep in mind that General Dempsey said it would be immoral to use force, we are so degraded, and that is exactly what we will be voting on in the next couple of days.

With that, I yield the floor.

CHIRIBIQUETE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. LEAHY. Mr President, I want to speak briefly about a recent develop-

ment in Colombia of which many Senators may not be aware.

Colombia is ranked as the second most biologically diverse country in the world. The variety of plant and animal life is staggering, which reflects its similarly diverse geography—from Amazon rainforest to glacier-covered mountains, and Caribbean and Pacific coastlines.

To its credit, Colombia has an extensive system of national parks and biological reserves. I have long been convinced that as security improves in that country and long after the oil wells are depleted, its national parks and other protected areas will be among Colombia's greatest resource, attracting eco-tourists from around the world.

On August 21 President Santos took an historic leap forward by doubling the size of Chiribiquete National Park, which is home to a myriad of species including jaguars and is comprised of extraordinary rock formations and dense jungle. Chiribiquete was already Colombia's largest park, and it has now become the size of Belgium.

There is more that needs to be done to protect Colombia's environment, particularly from the damage caused by mining and other extractive industries which has often occurred in, or adjacent to, environmentally fragile areas or indigenous reserves.

But President Santos' single stroke of the pen has done more for environmental conservation and species protection than what most heads of state do in a lifetime. I commend him for it and congratulate the Colombian people. Colombia has set an example for all of us who care about the environment and recognize that we have a responsibility to protect it for future generations.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH ROBERTS

• Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, Today I wish to recognize one of my staff members who is currently battling cancer. Joseph F. Roberts has worked in my Rapid City congressional district office since September 2002. Combined with service in the Peace Corps and the U.S. Air Force, Joe has served our Nation for approximately 19 years in Federal and military service.

As a member of my staff, Joe has provided exemplary constituent service to veterans and their families, as well as servicemembers and constituents facing numerous issues. He has always approached his work with a high degree of professionalism and a genuine caring attitude. That caring attitude stems from years of therapy and counseling services in the private sector he provided to the people of western South Dakota.

His service in the U.S. Air Force has served him well in working with veterans, and he has taken particular interest with veterans who suffer from military sexual assault, Traumatic Brain Injuries, and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. Veterans and their families know they have a true advocate with Joe in their corner when it comes to obtaining answers and decisions on claims, searches for records and medical care issues. Joe's time in the Peace Corps brought him to Romania and Guyana where he served in a number of capacities including education and training on domestic violence, sexual abuse, substance abuse and communication, as well as working on infrastructure issues and providing psychotherapy and other counseling assistance. These experiences helped him greatly in my district office as he assisted constituents with local, State and Federal issues and problems, including a wide array of immigration and passport issues.

I have always been impressed by Joe's sense of dedication and commitment to helping people. One of the great rewards in life is helping others and whether it has been his work in the Peace Corps, his private work as a therapist and counselor, or his work in constituent service in my office, Joe has helped many people. Over the years, I have received numerous thank you notes and letters from constituents praising the work of Joe Roberts.

And he has approached his battles with cancer over the years with commitment, humor and perspective, always sharing, teaching and counseling despite the challenges of the disease.

I take this opportunity to thank Joe for his service and his work on my behalf with the people of South Dakota. I congratulate him on his many years of service to the people of South Dakota and to his country and commend him for a job well done.●

RECOGNIZING THE ORPHEUM THEATER CENTER

• Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the Orpheum Theater Center in Sioux Falls, SD on its centennial anniversary. Since 1913, the Orpheum Theater has established itself as a place of excellence in the arts.

On a breezy Thursday evening in October, exactly 100 years ago today, the Orpheum Theater opened its doors and charged patrons an unheard of price of \$5 per seat. The opening night performances stunned the audience with a broad spectrum of entertainment including the Orpheum Concert Orchestra, two comedy acts, and headlines from around the world via a state-of-the-art newsreel.

Over the past 100 years, the Orpheum Theater has changed owners several times and has undergone many renovations, most recently in 2009. Thanks to

its dedicated staff and exceptional volunteers the Orpheum Theater has consistently provided a superb place to experience performing arts and annually 100,000 people visit this world-class venue.

South Dakotans have congregated at the Orpheum Theater for elegant performances by entertainers both from within our community and around the world. I congratulate the Orpheum Theater Center on reaching this milestone, and wish it continued success. Encore!•

U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY CHAPEL DEDICATION

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the dedication of the Cadet Chapel at the U.S. Air Force Academy. In the half century since its founding, the Cadet Chapel has become a National Historic Landmark and the most popular manmade attraction in Colorado. Each year more than 750,000 visitors explore this iconic and unique building.

Today, the Cadet Chapel is a multifaith house of worship specifically designed to provide multiple distinct worship areas under a single roof, meeting the spiritual needs of the Academy's cadets. The chapel's aluminum, glass and steel structure features 17 spires that soar 150 feet toward the Colorado sky.

Annually, over 4,000 cadets are provided 850 religious worship and educational opportunities to practice their personal faith. The chapel also provides religious rites and observances such as baptisms and dedications, weddings, funerals and memorial services. Most worship services are open to the general public and thousands of visitors each year attend worship.

The Cadet Chapel fosters outstanding civic involvement by partnering with the local community to host four annual free concerts with over 2000 attendees. The U.S. Air Force Academy Cadet Chapel is truly unique. Its iconic architectural structure serves as a symbol of the Academy and is recognized worldwide. Most important, the Cadet Chapel enables the free exercise of religion for cadets in this unique campus setting and aids the Chaplain Corps at the Air Force Academy to inspire men and women to become leaders of character through spiritual formation.

In the 50 years since the Cadet Chapel was dedicated our Nation has sent Air Force Academy graduates to serve in the skies and jungles of Vietnam and the deserts of Iraq. Those that once bowed their head beneath the spires of the Chapel served our country in the former Yugoslavia and in the mountains of Afghanistan, and they continue to serve the cause of freedom around the globe today. We thank them for their service, and we con-

gratulate the Air Force on the 50th anniversary of the dedication of the Air Force Academy's Cadet Chapel.•

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 367. An act to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

H.R. 1582. An act to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy.

H.R. 1897. An act to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam.

H.R. 2009. An act to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

H.R. 2879. An act to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 803(a)), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Congressional Award Board: Mr. Hudson of North Carolina.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on August 2, 2013, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1344) to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on August 2, 2013, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 267. An act to improve hydropower, and for other purposes.

H.R. 678. An act to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1171. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property.

H.R. 1344. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2576. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the enrolled bills were subsequently signed on August 6, 2013, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. LEVIN).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 367. An act to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1582. An act to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 1897. An act to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2879. An act to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2609. A communication from the Program Manager, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health

and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Practitioner Data Bank and Privacy Act; Exempt Records System; Technical Correction" (RIN0906-AA97) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2610. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Appeals Settlement Guideline—New Qualified Plug-In Electric Drive Motor Vehicle Credit (Revision)" (UIL: 30D.00-00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2611. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2013 Section 43 Inflation Adjustment" (Notice 2013-50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2612. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Branded Prescription Drug Fee; Guidance for 2014 Fee Year" (Notice 2013-51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2613. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates" (Notice 2013-52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2614. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Deadline to Submit Opinion and Advisory Letter Applications for Defined Benefit Mass Submitter Plans is Extended to January 31, 2014" (Announcement 2013-37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2615. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Certain Transfers of Property to Regulated Investment Companies (RICs) and Real Estate Investment Trusts" (RIN1545-BI84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2616. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reimbursed Entertainment Expenses" (RIN1545-BI83) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2617. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Applicable Federal Rates—September 2013" (Rev. Rul. 2013-18)

received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2618. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulations Pertaining to the Disclosure of Return Information to Carry Out Eligibility Requirements for Health Insurance Affordability Programs" (RIN1545-BK87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2619. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Uniform Late S Election Relief Revenue Procedure" (Rev. Proc. 2013-30) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2620. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Requirement of a Section 4959 Excise Tax Return and Time for Filing the Return" (RIN1545-BL58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2621. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System and Consolidated Billing for Skilled Nursing Facilities for FY 2014" (RIN0938-AR65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2622. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Prospective Payment System for Federal Fiscal Year 2014" (RIN0938-AR66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2623. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; FY 2014 Hospice Wage Index and Payment Rate Update; Hospice Quality Reporting Requirements; and Updates on Payment Reform" (RIN0938-AR64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2624. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems for Acute Care Hospitals and Long Term Care Hospital Prospective Payment System and Fiscal Year 2014 Rates; Quality Reporting Requirements for Specific Providers; Hospital Conditions of

Participation; Payment Policies Related to Patient Status" (RIN0938-AR53) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2625. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, a legislative proposal regarding Authorization for the Use of United States Armed Forces in connection with the conflict in Syria, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 31, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2626. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Sequestration Update Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committees on the Budget; and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2627. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Disapproval of State Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS" (FRL No. 9844-9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2628. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Alaska; Fairbanks Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan and State Implementation Plan Revision" (FRL No. 9844-8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2629. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Partial Disapproval of State Implementation Plan; Arizona; Regional Haze Requirements" (FRL No. 9843-7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2630. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update of the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Lancaster 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Area" (FRL No. 9841-8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2631. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Victoria County 1997 8-Hour Ozone Section 110 (a) (1) Maintenance Plan" (FRL No. 9842-6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2632. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances" (FRL No. 9393-4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2633. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Disapproval of State Implementation Plan; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard; Montana" (FRL No. 9843-2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2634. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9845-2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2635. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Reconsideration of Certain Provisions of New Source Performance Standards" (FRL No. 9844-4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2636. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Wyoming; Revised General Conformity Requirements and an Associated Revision" (FRL No. 9846-8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2637. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 9845-5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2638. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Disapproval of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Arizona; Regional Haze and Interstate Transport Requirements" (FRL No. 9845-5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2639. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Standards and Prac-

tices for All Appropriate Inquiries" (FRL No. 9845-9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2640. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards" (FRL No. 9834-5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2641. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Electronic Reporting of Toxics Release Inventory Data" (FRL No. 9835-5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2642. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Nevada; Regional Haze Federal Implementation Plan; Extension of BART Compliance Date for Reid Gardner Generating Station" (FRL No. 9843-8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2643. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa" (FRL No. 9900-39-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2644. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Ohio Portions of the Parkersburg-Marietta and Wheeling Areas to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard" (FRL No. 9900-28-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2645. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Disapproval of PM2.5 Permitting Requirements; Correction" (FRL No. 9900-30 - Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2646. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program: Final Amendments and Confidentiality Determinations for Subpart I" (FRL No. 9845-6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate

on August 22, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2647. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle and Nonroad Technical Amendments" (FRL No. 9900-11-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 27, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2648. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Virginia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions" (FRL No. 9900-47-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2649. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; NOx Emission Trading Orders as Single Source SIP Revisions" (FRL No. 9900-63-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2650. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Attainment for the West Central Final Nonattainment Area for the 2006 Fine Particle Standard; Arizona; Determination Regarding Applicability of Clean Air Act Requirements" (FRL No. 9900-58-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2651. A communication from the Division Chief of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Minerals Management: Adjustment of Cost Recovery Fees" (RIN1004-AE32) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 16, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2652. A communication from the Division Chief of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Application Procedures, Execution and Filing of Forms: Correction of State Office Address for Filings and Recordings, Including Proper Offices for Recording of Mining Claims; New Mexico/Oklahoma/Texas/Kansas" (RIN1004-AE33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 02, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2653. A communication from the Deputy Secretary, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Commercial Filming and Similar Projects and Still Photography Activities" (RIN1004-AD30) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 27, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2654. A communication from the Director, Office of the Secretary, Department of

the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Freedom of Information Act Regulations" (RIN1093-AA15) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2655. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for *Sphaeralcea gieriichii* (Gierish Mallow) Throughout Its Range" (RIN1018-AY58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2656. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for *Sphaeralcea gieriichii* (Gierish Mallow)" (RIN1018-AZ46) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2657. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Diamond Darter" (RIN1018-AY12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2658. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Branch of Recovery and State Grant, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Topeka Shiner (*Notropis topeka*) in Northern Missouri" (RIN1018-AY45) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2659. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Branch of Recovery and State Grant, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reclassification of *Acmispon dendroideus* var. *traskiae* (= *Lotus d. subsp. traskiae*) and *Castilleja grisea* as Threatened Throughout Their Ranges" (RIN1018-AY04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2660. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance for Assessment of Flooding Hazards Due to Dam Failure" (JLD-ISG-2013-01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2661. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, Nuclear Regulatory Com-

mission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance for Assessment of Flooding Hazards Due to Dam Failure" (JLD-ISG-2013-01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 16, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2662. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Administration, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "The Rulemaking Process" (Management Directive 6.3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2663. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Abnormal Occurrences: Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 Revision 1"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2664. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Secretary of the Army's recommendation to increase the authorized total project cost of the Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Texas, Deep-Draft Navigation and Ecosystem Restoration Project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2665. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-69; Introduction" (FAC 2005-69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2666. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Iran Threat Reduction" (RIN9000-AM44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2667. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Definition of Contingency Operation" (RIN9000-AM48) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2668. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Documenting Contractor Performance" (RIN9000-AM09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2669. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Least Developed Countries that are Designated Countries" (RIN9000-AM62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Com-

mittee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2670. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Update to Biobased Reporting Requirements" (RIN9000-AM63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2671. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-69, Technical Amendments" (FAC 2005-69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2672. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-69, Small Entity Compliance Guide" (FAC2005-69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2673. A communication from the Associate Attorney General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2674. A communication from the General Counsel, Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Office of Management and Budget, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 27, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2675. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pay Under the General Schedule and Recruitment, Relocation, and Retention Incentives" (RIN3206-AM13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2676. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-112, "Vending Regulation Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2677. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-119, "Telehealth Reimbursement Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2678. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report

on D.C. Act 20-118, "Workers' Compensation Statute of Limitations Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2679. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-121, "Closing of a Public Street and Alley and Elimination of Building Restriction Lines in and abutting Squares 5641 and N-5641, S.O. 07-2117, Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2680. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-122, "Delta Sigma Theta Way Designation Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2681. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-123, "Atlas Court Alley Designation Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2682. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-134, "Board of Elections Petition Circulation Requirements Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2683. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-135, "Dimitar Peshev Plaza Designation Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2684. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-136, "Capitol Hill Business Improvement District Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2685. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2013 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals through the 2nd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2686. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Report on The Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2687. A communication from the Executive Director for Operations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Commission's commercial activities inventory; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2688. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2012 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2689. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-120, "Testing Integrity Act of

2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of August 1, 2013, the following reports of committees were submitted on September 4, 2013:

By Mr. SANDERS, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 572. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the conditions under which certain persons may be treated as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes (Rept. No. 113-86).

S. 893. A bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2013, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-87).

By Ms. STABENOW, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:

Report to accompany S. 954. An original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018 (Rept. No. 113-88).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 1487. A bill to limit the availability of tax credits and reductions in cost-sharing under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to individuals who receive health insurance coverage pursuant to the provisions of a Taft-Hartley plan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ISAKSON, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1488. A bill to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. NELSON:

S. Res. 218. A resolution honoring the legacy of A. Philip Randolph and saluting his efforts on behalf of the people of the United States to form "a more perfect union"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. Res. 219. A resolution calling for Syrian President Bashar al-Assad and others to be tried before the International Criminal Court for committing war crimes and crimes against humanity; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 220. A resolution to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of *Wade v. Miller, et al.*; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 54

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 54, a bill to increase public safety by punishing and deterring firearms trafficking.

S. 119

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 119, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 122

At the request of Mr. CHAMBLISS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 122, a bill to promote freedom, fairness, and economic opportunity by repealing the income tax and other taxes, abolishing the Internal Revenue Service, and enacting a national sales tax to be administered primarily by the States.

S. 123

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 123, a bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

S. 264

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 264, a bill to expand access to community mental health centers and improve the quality of mental health care for all Americans.

S. 314

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, *supra*.

S. 346

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 346, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit veterans who have a service-connected, permanent disability rated as total to travel on

military aircraft in the same manner and to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces entitled to such travel.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 373

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 373, a bill to amend titles 10, 32, 37, and 38 of the United States Code, to add a definition of spouse for purposes of military personnel policies and military and veteran benefits that recognizes new State definitions of spouse.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 398

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 398, a bill to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum, and for other purposes.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 412

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 412, a bill to authorize certain major medical facility leases for the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cospon-

sors of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 623, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 641, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 709

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, leading to better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 783

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to amend the Helium Act to improve helium stewardship, and for other purposes.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 917

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 917, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 955

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 955, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide liability protections for volunteer practitioners at health centers under section 330 of such Act.

S. 1007

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1007, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property.

S. 1012

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1012, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve operations of recovery auditors under the Medicare integrity program, to increase transparency and accuracy in audits conducted by contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 1053

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1053, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen and protect Medicare hospice programs.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program.

S. 1069

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1069, a bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved.

S. 1114

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1114, a bill to provide for identification

of misaligned currency, require action to correct the misalignment, and for other purposes.

S. 1130

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1130, a bill to require the Attorney General to disclose each decision, order, or opinion of a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court that includes significant legal interpretation of section 501 or 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 unless such disclosure is not in the national security interest of the United States and for other purposes.

S. 1149

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1149, a bill to reauthorize the ban on undetectable firearms, and to extend the ban to undetectable firearm receivers and undetectable ammunition magazines.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1204, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1217

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1217, a bill to provide secondary mortgage market reform, and for other purposes.

S. 1226

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1226, a bill to promote industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker training, retention, and advancement, and for other purposes.

S. 1228

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1228, a bill to establish a program to provide incentive payments to participating Medicare beneficiaries who voluntarily establish and maintain better health.

S. 1271

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1271, a bill to direct the President to establish guidelines for the United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1292

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Alabama

(Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1292, a bill to prohibit the funding of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1300, a bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to provide for the conduct of stewardship end result contracting projects.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1310

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1310, a bill to require Senate confirmation of Inspector General of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes.

S. 1320

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1320, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the armed forces.

S. 1406

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1406, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1423

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1423, a bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to strengthen the quality control measures in place for part B lung disease claims and to establish the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health for the contractor employee compensation program under subtitle E of such Act.

S. 1455

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1455, a bill to condition the provision of pre-

mium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income is operational.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNES) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S.J. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 2, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. RES. 213

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 213, a resolution expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela and condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 218—HONORING THE LEGACY OF A. PHILIP RANDOLPH AND SALUTING HIS EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES TO FORM "A MORE PERFECT UNION"

Mr. NELSON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 218

Whereas A. Philip Randolph was born on April 15, 1889, and grew up in Jacksonville, Florida;

Whereas Mr. Randolph attended the Cookman Institute, one of the first high schools for African Americans in the United States, located in Jacksonville, Florida, and graduated valedictorian of his class in 1907;

Whereas Mr. Randolph was an inspirational person who demonstrated an unyielding struggle for human rights on behalf of marginalized groups in society;

Whereas Mr. Randolph was active in both the civil rights movement and the labor movement in the United States;

Whereas Mr. Randolph was a tireless and highly effective advocate for African-American rights during the 1930s and 1940s, focusing particularly on employment rights;

Whereas Mr. Randolph led the effort to organize the porters of the Pullman Company, one of the largest railroad car companies in the United States at that time;

Whereas Mr. Randolph founded the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, an organization that advanced the rights of African-American workers to dignity, respect, and a decent livelihood;

Whereas Mr. Randolph urged President Franklin Roosevelt to end employment discrimination against African Americans in the Federal Government;

Whereas, after the urging of Mr. Randolph, President Roosevelt issued Executive Order 8802 (6 Fed. Reg. 3109) on June 25, 1941, declaring that "there shall be no discrimination in the employment of workers in defense industries and in government because of race, creed, color, or national origin" and established the Fair Employment Practices Commission to oversee that order;

Whereas Mr. Randolph urged President Harry Truman to end segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas, after the urging of Mr. Randolph, President Truman issued Executive Order 9981 (13 Fed. Reg. 4313) on July 26, 1948, declaring that "[T]here shall be equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion or national origin. This policy shall be put into effect as rapidly as possible, having due regard to the time required to effectuate any necessary changes without impairing efficiency or morale." and closed the segregated Marine Corps boot camp at Montford Point in Jacksonville, North Carolina;

Whereas Mr. Randolph was actively involved in the planning and organization of many civil rights efforts, including the prayer pilgrimage for freedom in 1957, the marches for school integration in 1958 and 1959, and the March on Washington in 1963;

Whereas Mr. Randolph was the first speaker of the day at the March on Washington on August 28, 1963, during which Dr. Martin Luther King delivered his famous "I Have a Dream" speech;

Whereas the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-352; 78 Stat. 241), the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-110; 79 Stat. 437), and the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-284; 82 Stat. 73) are the fruits of the seeds that Mr. Randolph and others like him sowed many years before;

Whereas Mr. Randolph helped to found the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights;

Whereas Amtrak named one of its luxury sleeping cars, the Superliner II Deluxe Sleeper 32503, the "A. Philip Randolph" in honor of Mr. Randolph;

Whereas a bust in the likeness of Mr. Randolph stands in Union Station in Washington, DC, as a tribute to his work on behalf of African-American rail workers;

Whereas, in 1964, Mr. Randolph was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Lyndon Johnson;

Whereas the civil rights revolution was launched, in no small part, based on the efforts of Mr. Randolph and the work of statesmen like him; and

Whereas, upon the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington in 2013, it is fitting to honor the work of Mr. Randolph and his commitment to a better United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the legacy of A. Philip Randolph and salutes his efforts on behalf of the people of the United States to form "a more perfect union".

SENATE RESOLUTION 219—CALLING FOR SYRIAN PRESIDENT BASHAR AL-ASSAD AND OTHERS TO BE TRIED BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT FOR COMMITTING WAR CRIMES AND CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY

Mr. CARDIN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 219

Whereas the United States intelligence community assessed with high confidence that the Government of Syria carried out a chemical weapons attack in the Damascus suburbs on August 21, 2013, killing 1,429 Syrians;

Whereas the United Nations estimates that, since the uprising in Syria began in March 2011, more than 100,000 people, mainly civilians, have been killed;

Whereas Syria and neighboring countries are facing a growing humanitarian crisis, with 2,000,000 Syrians having fled the country, and millions more being displaced internally;

Whereas, under the command of President Bashar al-Assad, Syrian government forces and shabiha forces have been accused of gross human rights violations, including heavy shelling of civilian areas, widespread pillaging and the burning of homes, denial of basic human needs such as food, water, and medical care, mass torture and arrests, unlawful detention, and brutal execution-style killings;

Whereas terrorist groups operating in Syria have reportedly engaged in kidnapping for ransom, violence, summary executions, torture, and other gross human rights violations against civilians;

Whereas the United States has implemented a series of sanctions through five Executive orders pertaining to the situation in Syria;

Whereas the United Nations Human Rights Council has held four special sessions, issued four reports of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, and adopted seven resolutions devoted to the situation in Syria;

Whereas the United Nations Security Council has adopted three resolutions authorizing an advance team to monitor the ceasefire in Syria and a short-lived United Nations Supervision Mission in Syria (UNSMIS);

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly has adopted five resolutions regarding human rights and the situation in Syria;

Whereas the situation in Syria continues to deteriorate despite such actions by the international community;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 1540 (2004) prohibits all United Nations member states, including Syria, from providing any form of support to non-state actors that attempt to develop, acquire, possess, transfer, or use chemical weapons or other weapons of mass destruction, and it reaffirms that weapon of mass destruction proliferation "constitutes a threat to international peace and security";

Whereas, on February 22, 2012, the United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic found in its second report that, after further review, "a reliable body of evidence exists that, consistent with other verified circumstances, provides reasonable grounds to believe that particular individuals, including

commanding officers and officials at the highest levels of Government, bear responsibility for crimes against humanity and other gross human rights violations";

Whereas, on February 5, 2013, the United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic found in its report that Syrian forces and affiliated militia committed crimes against humanity, war crimes, and gross violations of international human rights and that anti-government forces committed war crimes;

Whereas the February 5, 2013, United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic found that government forces, affiliated militia, and anti-government forces have violated the rights of children and that government forces and affiliated militia have committed widespread sexual violence;

Whereas the report recommends that the United Nations Security Council "take appropriate action and commit to human rights and the rule of law by means of referral to justice, possibly to the International Criminal Court, bearing in mind that, in the context of the Syrian Arab Republic, only the Security Council is competent to refer the situation to the Court";

Whereas the United Nations conducted an investigation into the alleged August 21, 2013, chemical weapons attack in the Damascus suburbs;

Whereas the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights has repeatedly called on the United Nations Security Council to consider referring the situation of Syria to the International Criminal Court; and

Whereas the International Criminal Court is an independent body whose mission is to investigate and prosecute individuals for crimes within its jurisdiction, including crimes against humanity, war crimes, and genocide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) strongly condemns the ongoing violence, the use of chemical weapons, and the systematic gross human rights violations carried out by Syrian government forces under direction of President Bashar al-Assad as well as abuses committed by other groups involved in the civil war in Syria;

(2) expresses its support for the people of Syria seeking peaceful democratic change; and

(3) calls on the United Nations Security Council, based on evidence that war crimes and crimes against humanity have been perpetrated in Syria, to refer the situation of Syria to the International Criminal Court.

SENATE RESOLUTION 220—TO AUTHORIZE REPRESENTATION BY THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL IN THE CASE OF WADE V. MILLER, ET AL

Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 220

Whereas, ninety-five current and former Senators are named as defendants in the case of Wade v. Miller, et al., No. 13-708, now pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(1), the Senate may direct its counsel to defend current and former Members of the Senate in

civil actions relating to their official responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent the ninety-five current and former Senators named as defendants in the case of *Wade v. Miller*, et al.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1849. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 21, to authorize the limited and specified use of the United States Armed Forces against Syria; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1849. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 21, to authorize the limited and specified use of the United States Armed Forces against Syria; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . TERMINATION OF THE PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY TO USE FORCE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authority to use force resides in Congress, and the President does not have authority to carry out the military action set forth in this resolution absent passage of the resolution.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a legislative hearing to receive testimony on the following bills: S. 1448, to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes; S. 1219, to authorize the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement, and for other purposes; and S. 1447, to make technical corrections to certain Native American water rights settlements in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224-2251.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during

the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting to authorize expenditures by the Committee through February of 2015.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224-2251.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in open session on Thursday, September 12, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Dental Crisis in America: The Need to Address Cost."

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Sophie Kasimow of the committee staff on (202) 224-5480.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet at 10 a.m., on Tuesday, September 10, 2013, to consider the nominations of Ann Miller Ravel and Lee E. Goodman to be members of the Federal Election Commission and to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration for the remainder of the 113th Congress.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Adam Topper at the Rules and Administration Committee at 202-224-6352.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 220 which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 220) to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of *Wade v. Miller*, et al.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to,

and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 220) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2011

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, September 10, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that at 11 a.m. the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 21, and the time until noon be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; finally, that the Senate recess from 12 p.m. until 2:15 to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:59 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 10, 2013, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 9, 2013:

THE JUDICIARY

VALERIE E. CAPRONI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

VERNON S. BRODERICK, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, September 9, 2013

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

September 9, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. As the tensions of violence continue to mount, we turn to You, Lord God, as our hope and salvation.

Critical moments in the life of any person or any nation, as well as momentous undertakings, O Lord, bring us to our knees before You. We humbly seek Your guidance and rely on Your faithfulness.

Be with us in the days ahead. Bless the Members of the people's House, all who work here, and our guests. Listen to our heartfelt prayers.

We seem to be entering a passageway of darkness which may fill us with fear and anxiety. Bring us safely to the light at the end of the tunnel. Help all Members of this assembly attend to the voices of wisdom and of the American people as matters of great import and danger are considered in these coming days.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HOLDING led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

PRESIDENT'S POLICY DEEPLY UNSERIOUS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, over the past month, I have traveled by bus and car across all five counties I represent in the Second District of South Carolina, where I found my constituents agree with Charles Krauthammer in his column yesterday in The State newspaper of Columbia, South Carolina.

Mr. Krauthammer is recognized for his extraordinary insight and has identified the President's policy as "stunning zigzag, following months of hesitation, ambivalence, contradiction, and studied delay"; the President "having yet done nothing but hesitate, threaten, retract, and wander . . . claiming . . . not his own red line but the world's . . . a transparent attempt at offloading responsibility."

"There's no strategy, no purpose here other than helping Obama escape self-inflicted humiliation.

"This is deeply unserious."

The White House announced April 25 that Syria had chemical weapons, but only after 4 months of serious scandals, ObamaCare destroying jobs, and the upcoming debt debate vote, did it seek action. On my tour, I was inspired at the North Augusta Rotary Club by the four-way test: Is it the truth?

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the

11th, 2001, and September the 11th, 2012, at Benghazi in the global war on terrorism.

MILITARY ACTION IN SYRIA

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, before I returned to Washington last week, I was skeptical of the President's proposal for military action in Syria. After classified briefings and hearing directly from Secretaries Kerry and Hagel, I am more skeptical than ever.

This administration has done nothing to convince me and the American people that they have a focused, effective plan for military action in Syria, or really any true plan at all. These strikes, like the administration's Middle East policy of the last 4½ years, lack coherence and fail to support a long-term strategy.

Additionally, they have not adequately considered the risk of retaliation from Assad's allies, Russia and Hezbollah.

Madam Speaker, the test of a successful foreign policy is that our friends trust us and our enemies fear us. President Obama has failed in this regard, and a military strike will fail to benefit the United States' broader strategy or international interests.

USE POWER OF THE PURSE TO STOP OBAMACARE

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, how do Yucca Mountain, Iran Contra, and the Vietnam war relate to the Affordable Care Act? All of those represent legislative limitations of funding to counter decisions made by the executive branch. In each instance, Congress used its authority provided under the Constitution to place limits on Presidential decisions. We need to use those constitutional powers again.

The Affordable Care Act is lurching toward an uncertain start and is dramatically different than what was signed into law over 3 years ago. Gone are the CLASS Act and the 1099 business activity reporting requirement. What about the Federal preexisting program? It hasn't accepted a new patient since February of this year.

How unfair is it that the large corporations in this country received an

11th-hour Presidential exemption and Members of Congress receive a subsidy? None of this is available to the average American.

I look at all of this and I ask: What tools are available to prevent this disaster? And the answer is provided in the historical record when previous Congresses used the one trump card they have available. All that is required is the courage and the clarity of vision to alter history.

GREECE V. GALLOWAY

(Mr. COLLINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to promote the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, specifically, the right of all citizens to freely express their religion.

This November, the Supreme Court is scheduled to hear oral arguments in the case of *Town of Greece v. Galloway*. The town of Greece, located just outside of my district in western New York, is accused of violating the First Amendment because the vast majority of volunteers who opened town meetings, they opened them with a prayer using Christian references.

Legislative and communal prayer has a rich tradition in this country and should not be curtailed by illegitimate fears of religious overreach in the United States. We must remain a Nation that does not force a religion on any person but is accepting of those who wish to profess their faith.

MILITARY RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, the constitutional right to religious liberty is, with increasing frequency, being denied to the men and women in our military who swore to support and defend the Constitution when they enlisted.

Within the past month, we have seen a new case of an Air Force veteran who says he was relieved of duty by his commander because he would not champion same-sex marriages. This senior master sergeant with 19 years of service to his country has now been entangled in the military justice system, not for anything he has done or said, but for refusing a commander's order to make a statement that would violate his deeply held religious beliefs.

What's happening in this case violates current statutes, not to mention the First Amendment. That's why it's so crucial that Congress protect military religious freedom and its expression. My amendment to do that was passed in this House, and we need the Senate to act and the President to stop his threat to veto.

FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in defense of the First Amendment right to free exercise of religion.

Thomas Jefferson once asked:

Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are a gift from God?

The clear answer is no.

If freedom of religion is not protected in the very places where laws are crafted, how can we expect the laws enacted to respect each individual's freedom of religion?

As a pastor and a chaplain, I believe that freedom of religion isn't some mere abstract concept to be debated in the Halls of Congress or before the Supreme Court. Religious freedom gave me the ability to preach God's word in Georgia, and religious freedom allowed me to give faith-based encouragement to soldiers while I served alongside them in Iraq.

It is a precious liberty our Founders fought and died to protect, and I will not allow freedom and free exercise of religious liberties to be undermined here or anywhere.

GREECE V. GALLOWAY

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the First Amendment as well—as a patriot, as a pastor, as a Member of Congress.

Joseph Stalin, an enemy of America, once said it this way:

America is like a healthy body and its resistance is threefold: its patriotism, its morality, its spiritual life. If we can undermine these three areas, America will collapse from within.

President Eisenhower, a patriot, said it this way in October of 1954:

Atheism substitutes men for the Supreme Creator, and this leads inevitably to domination and dictatorship. We must jealously guard our foundation in faith, for on it rests the ability of the American individual to live and thrive in this blessed land and to be able to help other less fortunate people to achieve freedom and individual opportunity. These we take for granted, but to others they are often only a wistful dream. "In God We Trust," often have we heard the words of this wonderful American motto. Let us make sure that familiarity has not made them meaningless for us. We carry the torch of freedom as a sacred trust for all mankind. We do not believe that God intended the light He created to be put out by men.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following

enrolled bills were signed by the Speaker on Friday, August 2, 2013:

H.R. 2576, to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1171, to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property;

H.R. 678, to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes;

H.R. 267, to improve hydropower, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by Speaker pro tempore THORNBERRY on Tuesday, August 6, 2013:

H.R. 1344, to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

GLOBAL INVESTMENT IN AMERICAN JOBS ACT OF 2013

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 2052) to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to conduct an interagency review of and report to Congress on ways to increase the global competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2052

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Global Investment in American Jobs Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) It remains an urgent national priority to improve economic growth and create new jobs.

(2) National security requires economic strength and global engagement.

(3) Businesses today have a wide array of choices when considering where to invest, expand, or establish new operations.

(4) Administrations of both parties have consistently reaffirmed the need to promote an open investment climate as a key to domestic economic prosperity and security.

(5) The United States has historically been the largest worldwide recipient of foreign direct investment but has seen its share decline in recent years.

(6) The United States faces increasing competition from other countries as it works to recruit investment from global companies.

(7) Foreign direct investment can benefit the economy and workforce of every State and Commonwealth in the United States.

(8) According to the latest Federal statistics, the United States subsidiaries of companies headquartered abroad contribute to the United States economy in a variety of important ways, including by—

(A) providing jobs for an estimated 5,600,000 Americans, with compensation that is often higher than the national private-sector average, as many of these jobs are in high-skilled, high-paying industries;

(B) strengthening the United States industrial base and employing nearly 15 percent of the United States manufacturing sector workforce;

(C) establishing operations in the United States from which to sell goods and services around the world, thereby producing nearly 18 percent of United States exports;

(D) promoting innovation with more than \$41,000,000,000 in annual United States research and development activities;

(E) paying nearly 14 percent of United States corporate income taxes; and

(F) purchasing goods and services from local suppliers and small businesses worth hundreds of billions of dollars annually.

(9) These companies account for 5.8 percent of United States private sector gross domestic product.

(10) The Department of Commerce has initiatives in place to increase foreign direct investment.

(11) The President issued a statement in 2011 reaffirming the longstanding open investment policy of the United States and encouraged all countries to pursue such a policy.

(12) The President signed an executive order in 2011 to establish the SelectUSA initiative and expanded its resources and ac-

tivities in 2012, so as to promote greater levels of business investment in the United States.

(13) The President’s Council on Jobs and Competitiveness in 2011 recommended the establishment of a National Investment Initiative to attract \$1,000,000,000,000 in foreign direct investment over five years.

(14) Sound transportation infrastructure, a well-educated and healthy workforce, safe food and water, stable financial institutions, a fair and equitable justice system, and transparent and accountable administrative procedures are important factors that contribute to United States global competitiveness.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the ability of the United States to attract foreign direct investment is directly linked to the long-term economic prosperity, global competitiveness, and security of the United States;

(2) it is a top national priority to enhance the global competitiveness, prosperity, and security of the United States by—

(A) removing unnecessary barriers to foreign direct investment and the jobs that it creates throughout the United States; and

(B) promoting policies to ensure the United States remains the premier global destination in which to invest, hire, innovate, and manufacture products;

(3) maintaining the United States’ commitment to open investment policy encourages other countries to reciprocate and enables the United States to open new markets abroad for United States companies and their products;

(4) while foreign direct investment can enhance the Nation’s economic strength, policies regarding foreign direct investment should reflect national security interests and should not disadvantage domestic investors or companies; and

(5) United States efforts to attract foreign direct investment should be consistent with efforts to maintain and improve the domestic standard of living.

SEC. 4. FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT REVIEW.

(a) REVIEW.—The Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the Federal Interagency Investment Working Group and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall conduct an interagency review of the global competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment.

(b) SPECIFIC MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The review conducted pursuant to subsection (a) shall include a review of—

(1) the current economic impact of foreign direct investment in the United States, with particular focus on manufacturing, research and development, trade, and jobs;

(2) trends in global cross-border investment flows and the underlying factors for such trends;

(3) Federal Government policies that are closely linked to the ability of the United States to attract and retain foreign direct investment;

(4) foreign direct investment as compared to direct investment by domestic entities;

(5) foreign direct investment that takes the form of greenfield investment as compared to foreign direct investment reflecting merger and acquisition activity;

(6) the unique challenges posed by foreign direct investment by state-owned enterprises;

(7) ongoing Federal Government efforts to improve the investment climate and facilitate greater levels of foreign direct investment in the United States;

(8) innovative and noteworthy State, regional, and local government initiatives to attract foreign investment; and

(9) initiatives by other countries in order to identify best practices for increasing global competitiveness in attracting foreign direct investment.

(c) LIMITATION.—The review conducted pursuant to subsection (a) shall not address laws or policies relating to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States.

(d) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Prior to—

(1) conducting the review under subsection (a), the Secretary shall publish notice of the review in the Federal Register and shall provide an opportunity for public comment on the matters to be covered by the review; and

(2) reporting pursuant to subsection (e), the Secretary shall publish the proposed findings and recommendations to Congress in the Federal Register and shall provide an opportunity for public comment.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the Federal Interagency Investment Working Group and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall report to Congress the findings of the review required under subsection (a) and submit recommendations for increasing the global competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment without weakening labor, consumer, financial, or environmental protections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. TERRY. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2052, the Global Investment in American Jobs Act of 2013.

Now, we recently saw the latest job numbers. While somewhat positive, the reality is that we have more people out of the workforce than since 1978. People are giving up looking for work, and it doesn’t have to be and shouldn’t be that way.

There are many foreign companies who want to “in-source” their jobs to America, but there have been many barriers standing in their way. There are many foreign companies who should and want to come here. These are good, high-paying jobs that many Americans are looking for.

In 2010 alone, U.S. affiliates of foreign firms employed an estimated 5.6 million Americans. These Americans also made, on average, \$77,000 per year.

These U.S. subsidiaries invested \$41.3 billion in research and development

and made \$149 billion in capital expenditures in the United States that same year. In the manufacturing sector alone, FDI inflows were nearly \$84 billion in 2012, according to the National Association of Manufacturers.

Unfortunately, according to the testimony of the Organization for International Investment at our legislative hearing last spring, the United States' share of foreign direct investment dropped from 41 percent at its high in 1999 to just 17 percent in 2011. Today, we're here to reverse that trend.

My bill, H.R. 2052, and also, with the gentlelady, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BARROW on the other side of the aisle, this is a bipartisan piece of legislation that instructs the Department of Commerce to conduct an interagency review geared to identifying those barriers to foreign investment to the United States. It also instructs the Department of Commerce to make recommendations on ways to lower or eliminate those same barriers.

The United States should be the leader in attracting foreign investment. We have a stable government, safe working conditions, and the most skilled workforce in the world. I believe that our long-term global competitiveness and economic success as a nation is directly tied to our ability to attract foreign investment.

By creating an environment where foreign companies want to move their manufacturing operations or distribution centers to the United States, we are fostering an environment or atmosphere of organic, government stimulus-free economic growth.

We must be aware of the potential impact on the U.S.' ability to attract foreign direct investment when considering new laws and regulations.

We want these companies to come here and help us grow our economy. But there are a number of areas within the purview of the Federal Government where we can improve the domestic climate for foreign direct investment.

It's my hope that the report at the heart of this legislation will highlight those areas, both for the administration, where it can act on its own authority, and for Congress, where the administration lacks the authority.

I would also like to thank some individuals who helped get this legislation off the ground and to the House floor today. First off, I'd like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), who has championed this issue for several years.

I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the ranking member of this subcommittee, as well as our friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW), for his leadership.

I believe we can all agree that we shouldn't stop our efforts to put America back to work until every American who wants a job can find one. This leg-

islation is a step in the right direction, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2052, the Global Investment in American Jobs Act, because it will encourage the growth of good, American jobs.

Every time I go home, I'm reminded of how investors overseas spur jobs here at home by tapping into the talent of America. Dutch companies like DSM in Augusta, French companies like Alstom in Waynesboro, and Japanese companies like YKK in Dublin could invest in any country in the world. They're proud to invest in Georgia's 12th District because the families who work for them take pride in their work.

This bill requires the Department of Commerce to investigate how it can be an attractive investment for foreign-owned companies. The United States still has the best workers in the world, and they deserve every opportunity to offer their skills to companies looking to expand.

I'm proud that this bill also enjoys broad bipartisan support. This is how Congress can and should work, Democrats and Republicans coming together to get Americans back to work.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I look forward to building a stronger future for American workers by passing H.R. 2052.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I'll continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the patience and understanding, just coming from a classified hearing.

I want to first thank the chairman and his staff, as well as committee Democratic staff, for working so hard and so diligently and collaboratively to come to an agreement on legislation that will help guide American job and economic growth.

There is a strong incentive to invest in America, which remains the best place on Earth to find talented, motivated employees who are the core of the middle class.

My home State of Illinois ranks number one in the Midwest in terms of foreign direct investment, with nearly 1,600 foreign-based firms employing more than 300,000 Illinois residents. In attracting the investment, Illinois has

showcased its world-class transportation infrastructure, its diversified economy, its productive workforce, and its cultural diversity and attractions.

It has also maintained its strong labor, health, and environmental standards that helped build the middle class, which I believe is the key to successful foreign direct investment.

Some companies are working to respect the rights of workers as they invest in the United States. On Friday, it was announced that Volkswagen is working collaboratively with the United Auto Workers to unionize its Chattanooga, Tennessee, plant. That will help to ensure that the best interests of American workers are a major consideration at the plant and the company as it continues its investment in the United States.

That being said, it is important that the study authorized in this legislation examine both the benefits and the costs of foreign direct investment. Doing so will allow us to determine the ways to drive investment that maintains high labor, health, environmental, and national security standards.

And on that subject, I'd like to enter into a colloquy on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. TERRY. While I will not oppose this amendment, I must express my reservations.

Mr. Chairman, you worked with me in a very collegial and bipartisan manner to craft a bipartisan bill. H.R. 2052 is a good product.

Now we have before us an amendment that makes three changes that could be perceived to weaken important provisions of the bill. I have concerns about each of them, but I would like to focus on the elimination of cost-benefit language regarding the bill's required review of the current economic impact of foreign direct investment.

During our negotiations, I suggested that language because I believed that we needed to ensure that the review be balanced, and you agreed.

In addition, some of the language in the findings and in the sense of Congress could be read as if there are only benefits of FDI, and we wanted to be evenhanded. While I do believe that there are benefits to FDI, there are also costs that must be considered.

Regardless of the amendment before us now, can you assure me that the bill's requirement of a review of the current economic impact of foreign direct investment required under this bill will include a review of both the benefits and costs of foreign direct investment?

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. TERRY. Yes, I can assure you. I agree with the gentlelady that it

should include both benefits and costs, as we have suggested. And I do want to state that I appreciate working with you. And you have shown great collegiality as well in our negotiations, and I want to thank you for that.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Thank you so much.

Reclaiming my time, if I could just say, I will not oppose the amendment, but I do expect to work with you to ensure that the review, should this bill become law, is balanced and to ensure that any report of this committee on H.R. 2052 include the clarification that you just made.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, having the right to close, I am going to reserve the balance of my time and allow them to finish their time, if they have any.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

We have no further speakers on our side and, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I want to close by saying that this truly has been a bipartisan effort. Both sides of the aisle want the U.S. to be in a better position to attract the foreign direct investment which does create jobs in the United States. That has been on the decline. We need to reverse that.

And this is one of those times when you go home and you hear, at your townhall meeting, Why don't you work together? The people need to see how we worked together on this bill and resolved the differences between each other on this. Today we're here to have what I think will be an overwhelmingly positive vote.

With that, I will submit a couple of letters for the RECORD. One is about 150 entities that signed on to a letter for the Organization for International Investment, and then also another letter from Sanofi dated September 9, 2013.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ORGANIZATION FOR INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT

OFII is the only business association in Washington D.C. that exclusively represents U.S. subsidiaries of foreign companies and advocates for their non-discriminatory treatment under state and federal law.

MEMBERS

ABB Inc.; ACE INA Holdings, Inc.; Ahold USA, Inc.; Airbus North America Holdings; Air Liquide USA; Akzo Nobel Inc.; Alcatel-Lucent; Allianz of North America; ALSTOM; Anheuser-Busch; APG; APL Limited; AREVA, Inc.; Arup; Astellas Pharma US, Inc.; AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals; BAE Systems; Balfour Beatty; Barclays Capital; Barrick Gold Corp. of North America.

BASF Corporation; Bayer Corp.; BG Group; BHP Billiton; BIC Corp.; Bimbo Foods, Inc.; bioMérieux, Inc.; BMW of North America; BNP Paribas; Boehringer Ingelheim Corp.; Bombardier Inc.; BOSCH; BP; Bridgestone Americas Holding; Brother International Corp.; BT; Bunge Ltd.; Bunzl USA, Inc.; Case New Holland; Cobham.

Covidien; Credit Suisse Securities (USA); Cristal USA Inc.; Daiichi Sankyo, Inc.; Daimler; Dassault Falcon Jet Corp.; Deutsche Telekom; Diageo, Inc.; EADS, Inc.; Electrolux North America; EMD Serono Inc.; E.ON North America; Ericsson; Evonik Degussa Corporation; Experian; Flextronics International; Food Lion, LLC; France Telecom North America; FUJIFILM Holdings America; Garmin International, Inc.

GDF SUEZ Energy North America, Inc.; Generali USA; GKN America Corp.; GlaxoSmithKline; Hanson North America; Henkel Corporation; Holcim (US) Inc.; Honda North America; HSBC North America Holdings; Huhtamaki; Hyundai Motor America; Iberdrola Renewables; ING America Insurance Holdings; InterContinental Hotels Group; JBS USA; John Hancock Life Insurance Co.; Kering; Kia Motor Corporation; Lafarge North America; Logitech Inc.

L'Oréal USA, Inc.; Louisiana Energy Service (LES); Louis Dreyfus Commodities; Louisville Corporate Services, Inc.; LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton; Macquarie Aircraft Leasing Services; Maersk Inc.; Magna International; Mallinckrodt; Marvell Semiconductor; McCain Foods USA; Michelin North America, Inc.; National Grid; Nestlé USA, Inc.; Nissan; Nomura Holding America, Inc.; Novartis Corporation; Novo Nordisk Pharmaceuticals; Oldcastle, Inc.; Panasonic Corp.; of North America.

Pearson Inc.; Pernod Ricard USA; Philips Electronics North America; QBE the Americas; Randstad North America; Reed Elsevier Inc.; Research in Motion; Rexam Inc.; Rinnai; Rio Tinto America; Roche Holdings, Inc.; Rolls-Royce North America Inc.; Royal Bank of Canada; SABIC Innovative Plastics; Samsung; Sanofi US; SAP America; Sasol; Schlumberger.

Schneider Electric USA; Schott North America; Shell Oil Company; Siemens Corporation; Smith & Nephew, Inc.; Societe Generale; Solvay America; Sony Corporation of America; Sprint; Sumitomo Corp.; of America; Swiss Re America Holding Corp.; Syngenta Corporation; Takeda North America; Tate & Lyle North America, Inc.; TD Bank; TE Connectivity; Teva Pharmaceuticals USA; Thales USA, Inc.; The Tata Group; Thomson Reuters.

ThyssenKrupp North America, Inc.; Tim Hortons; Toa Reinsurance Company of America; Tomkins Industries, Inc.; TOTAL Holdings USA, Inc.; Toyota Motor North America; Transamerica; Tyco; UBS; UCB; Umicore USA; Unilever; Vivendi; Vodafone; Voith Holding Inc.; Volkswagen of America, Inc.; Volvo Cars North America; Volvo Group North America, Inc.; Westfield LLC; White Mountains, Inc.; Wipro Inc.; Wolters Kluwer U.S. Corporation; Wolseley; WPP Group USA, Inc.; XL Global Services; Zurich Insurance Group.

ORGANIZATION FOR

INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT,

Washington, DC, September 9, 2013.

Re OFII Support of H.R. 2052, the "Global Investment in American Jobs Act of 2013".

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Energy and Commerce Committee,
Washington, DC.

Hon. LEE TERRY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade, Washington, DC.

Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,
Ranking Member, Energy and Commerce Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. JAN SCHAKOWSKY,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON, RANKING MEMBER WAXMAN, CHAIRMAN TERRY AND RANKING MEMBER SCHAKOWSKY: On behalf of the Organization for International Investment (OFII) and its member companies, I write in strong support of H.R. 2052, the "Global Investment in American Jobs Act of 2013" and commend the Energy and Commerce Committee for its leadership on this important bipartisan legislation. As the United States continues to confront significant economic challenges, this legislation is critical to enhancing our nation's efforts to attract global business investment and the jobs and economic growth it generates.

OFII is a business association comprised of over 160 U.S. subsidiaries of companies headquartered abroad (membership list is included). OFII works to ensure a level playing field for its member companies and promote policies which increase U.S. competitiveness in attracting foreign direct investment (FDI).

U.S. subsidiaries of global companies play a major role in the national economy, directly employing 5.6 million Americans, supporting an annual U.S. payroll of more than \$408 billion, and employing 17 percent of the U.S. manufacturing workforce. In addition, these companies account for a significant share of U.S. research and development activities, purchase goods and services worth hundreds of billions of dollars every year from U.S. suppliers and small businesses, and produce nearly 18 percent of all U.S. exports, which provide hundreds of billions of dollars in American goods and services annually to customers around the world.

However, the United States faces an increasingly competitive global environment for job-creating FDI. Now more than ever before, companies have an unprecedented array of options when looking to invest, expand, or establish new operations, including into emerging economies such as China and Brazil. While the United States remains the world's leading recipient of FDI, its share of global investment has dropped significantly from 41 percent in 1999 to just 17 percent in 2011. It is no longer enough for the U.S. to merely be "open" to global investment; we must be ready to compete in a challenging global marketplace.

OFII and its member companies believe the "Global Investment in American Jobs Act" is a critical step in ensuring the U.S. remains the world's most attractive location for global businesses to invest, grow, and create jobs. The bill directs the Secretary of Commerce to lead the first-ever comprehensive interagency review of U.S. competitiveness for FDI. This examination of economic trends, best practices from around the world, and key policies will result in recommendations to Congress outlining a new roadmap for attracting and retaining top tier global

businesses. In addition, the legislation explicitly recognizes the importance of FDI to the U.S. economy by expressing the sense of Congress that remaining competitive in attracting such investment is directly linked to our nation's long-term economic strength and security.

Passage of the "Global Investment in American Jobs Act" would send a powerful and bipartisan message that America is ready to compete in a new way for global investment.

Thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,

NANCY L. McLERNON,
President & CEO, Organization
for International Investment.

SANOFI,

Washington, DC, September 9, 2013.

Hon. LEE TERRY,

House of Representatives, Chairman, Energy
and Commerce Committee, Subcommittee on
Commerce, Manufacturing & Trade, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TERRY: Sanofi is a leading global and diversified healthcare company which discovers, develops and distributes therapeutic solutions focused on patients' needs. Sanofi has core strengths in the field of healthcare with seven growth platforms: diabetes solutions, human vaccines, innovative drugs, rare diseases, consumer healthcare, emerging markets and animal health.

On behalf of Sanofi, I would like to thank and commend you and your colleagues and express our strong support for your bill, H.R. 2052, the "Global Investment in American Jobs Act of 2013." As you know, the "Global Investment in American Jobs Act" is bicameral and bipartisan legislation aimed at improving America's ability to attract job-creating foreign direct investment (FDI) from businesses around the world. The bill requires the Secretary of Commerce to implement a comprehensive review of the United States' ability to attract foreign direct investment. The review will look at what we are doing right and what we are doing wrong. It will also look at what other countries are doing that we should follow and what other countries are doing that we should avoid. Following this review, the Secretary will issue recommendations for all agencies of government setting out a comprehensive plan for improving U.S. global competitiveness for attracting foreign investment.

FDI in the United States has been an engine for economic growth, fueling U.S. manufacturing, innovation, trade, and overall job creation. U.S. subsidiaries of foreign-headquartered companies account for 5.8 percent of U.S. private sector GDP and employ 5.6 million American workers, including two million in the manufacturing sector. In addition, these companies produce 18 percent of all U.S. exports, fund 14 percent of annual research and development activities, and support a diverse supplier network throughout the country, purchasing goods and services worth hundreds of billions of dollars every year from thousands of small and medium-sized American companies.

While the U.S. remains the world's leading recipient of foreign direct investment, our global share of such investment has dropped significantly since the turn of the 21st century, from 41 percent in 1999 to just over 17 percent in 2011. In March, the Department of Commerce released new data showing the U.S. received \$174.7 billion in global investment for 2012, a decrease of 25% compared

with \$234 billion the previous year. Foreign-headquartered companies, such as Sanofi, have many options when looking to invest, expand, or establish new operations, including into emerging economies. In this challenging global environment, the U.S. must position itself to compete for job-creating FDI.

Sanofi has made a significant investment in the U.S. Sanofi employs more than 17,000 through our U.S. affiliates in pharmaceuticals, vaccines, animal health, consumer health and rare diseases. Sanofi has R&D facilities in 8 states (AZ, CA, GA, MA, MD, MO, NJ, and PA) and important R&D partnerships with organizations such as Harvard, MIT and Dana-Farber, reflecting the importance of research and development to the company in the U.S. Our U.S. affiliates have manufacturing, packaging or distribution sites in 9 states (MO, PA, TN, MA, NJ, MN, NC, GA, MD and NV). Our U.S. affiliates export products from 7 states (GA, PA, MA, MO, NJ, TN, and MN). And we have more than \$4 billion in contracts with over 15,000 vendors and suppliers throughout the U.S.

H.R. 2052 has the support of a broad range of cosponsors who understand that investment from around the globe is important to every state and region across this country. As a result, H.R. 2052 was unanimously approved by the Energy and Commerce Committee on July 17, 2013. The House of Representatives passed similar legislation during the 112th Congress with strong bipartisan support. Passing this legislation will be an important step in enhancing U.S. competitiveness and reinvigorating job growth in our country.

Thank you once again for your work and commitment to incentivize FDI in the United States to expand the job market and strengthen our economy.

Sincerely,

PATRICK McLAIN,
Vice President, Federal Government
Affairs, Policy & Issues Management.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2052, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1615

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COM- MISSION CONSOLIDATED RE- PORTING ACT OF 2013

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2844) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2844

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Communications Commission Consolidated Reporting Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. COMMUNICATIONS MARKETPLACE REPORT.

Title I of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 14. COMMUNICATIONS MARKETPLACE REPORT.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In the last quarter of every even-numbered year, the Commission shall publish on its website and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the state of the communications marketplace.

"(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall—

"(1) assess the state of competition in the communications marketplace, including competition to deliver voice, video, audio, and data services among providers of telecommunications, providers of commercial mobile service (as defined in section 332), multichannel video programming distributors (as defined in section 602), broadcast stations, providers of satellite communications, Internet service providers, and other providers of communications services;

"(2) assess the state of deployment of communications capabilities, including advanced telecommunications capability (as defined in section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. 1302)), regardless of the technology used for such deployment, including whether advanced telecommunications capability is being deployed to all Americans in a reasonable and timely fashion;

"(3) assess whether laws, regulations, or regulatory practices (whether those of the Federal Government, States, political subdivisions of States, Indian tribes or tribal organizations (as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)), or foreign governments) pose a barrier to competitive entry into the communications marketplace or to the competitive expansion of existing providers of communications services;

"(4) describe the agenda of the Commission for the next 2-year period for addressing the challenges and opportunities in the communications marketplace that were identified through the assessments under paragraphs (1) through (3); and

"(5) describe the actions that the Commission has taken in pursuit of the agenda described pursuant to paragraph (4) in the previous report submitted under this section.

"(c) EXTENSION.—If the President designates a Commissioner as Chairman of the Commission during the last quarter of an even-numbered year, the portion of the report required by subsection (b)(4) may be published on the website of the Commission and submitted to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate as an addendum during the first quarter of the following odd-numbered year.

"(d) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) ASSESSING COMPETITION.—In assessing the state of competition under subsection (b)(1), the Commission shall consider all forms of competition, including the effect of intermodal competition, facilities-based competition, and competition from new and emergent communications

services, including the provision of content and communications using the Internet.

“(2) **ASSESSING DEPLOYMENT.**—In assessing the state of deployment under subsection (b)(2), the Commission shall compile a list of geographical areas that are not served by any provider of advanced telecommunications capability.

“(3) **INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS AND DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION.**—The Commission may use readily available data to draw appropriate comparisons between the United States communications marketplace and the international communications marketplace and to correlate its assessments with demographic information.

“(4) **CONSIDERING SMALL BUSINESSES.**—In assessing the state of competition under subsection (b)(1) and regulatory barriers under subsection (b)(3), the Commission shall consider market entry barriers for entrepreneurs and other small businesses in the communications marketplace in accordance with the national policy under section 257(b).”

SEC. 3. CONSOLIDATION OF REDUNDANT REPORTS; CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) **ORBIT ACT REPORT.**—Section 646 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 765e; 114 Stat. 57) is repealed.

(b) **SATELLITE COMPETITION REPORT.**—Section 4 of Public Law 109-34 (47 U.S.C. 703) is repealed.

(c) **INTERNATIONAL BROADBAND DATA REPORT.**—Section 103 of the Broadband Data Improvement Act (47 U.S.C. 1303) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b); and
(2) by redesignating subsections (c) through (e) as subsections (b) through (d), respectively.

(d) **STATUS OF COMPETITION IN THE MARKET FOR THE DELIVERY OF VIDEO PROGRAMMING REPORT.**—Section 628 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 548) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g);
(2) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (g); and
(3) by transferring subsection (g) (as redesignated) so that it appears after subsection (f).

(e) **REPORT ON CABLE INDUSTRY PRICES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 623 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 543) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (k); and
(B) by redesignating subsections (l) through (n) as subsections (k) through (m), respectively.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 613(a)(3) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 533(a)(3)) is amended by striking “623(l)” and inserting “623(k)”.

(f) **TRIENNIAL REPORT IDENTIFYING AND ELIMINATING MARKET ENTRY BARRIERS FOR ENTREPRENEURS AND OTHER SMALL BUSINESSES.**—Section 257 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 257) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(g) **SECTION 706 REPORT.**—Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. 1302) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the last sentence, by striking “If the Commission’s determination is negative, it” and inserting “If the Commission determines in its report under section 14 of the Communications Act of 1934 that advanced telecommunications capability is not being deployed to all Americans in a reasonable and timely fashion, the Commission”; and
(B) by striking the first and second sentences;
(2) by striking subsection (c);
(3) in subsection (d), by striking “this subsection” and inserting “this section”; and
(4) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(h) **STATE OF COMPETITIVE MARKET CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO COMMERCIAL MOBILE RADIO SERVICES.**—Section 332(c)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C.

332(c)(1)(C)) is amended by striking the first and second sentences.

(i) **PREVIOUSLY ELIMINATED ANNUAL REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 154) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (k); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (l) through (o) as subsections (k) through (n), respectively.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—The Communications Act of 1934 is amended—

(A) in section 9(i), by striking “In the Commission’s annual report, the Commission shall prepare an analysis of its progress in developing such systems and” and inserting “The Commission”; and
(B) in section 309(j)(8)(B), by striking the last sentence.

(j) **ADDITIONAL OUTDATED REPORTS.**—The Communications Act of 1934 is further amended—

(1) in section 4—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)(B)(ii), by striking “and shall furnish notice of such action” and all that follows through “subject of the waiver”; and
(B) in subsection (g), by striking paragraph (2);

(2) in section 215—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and
(B) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b);

(3) in section 227(e), by striking paragraph (4);

(4) in section 309(j)—

(A) by striking paragraph (12); and

(B) in paragraph (15)(C), by striking clause (iv);

(5) in section 331(b), by striking the last sentence;

(6) in section 336(e), by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) **REPORT.**—The Commission shall annually advise the Congress on the amounts collected pursuant to the program required by this subsection.”;

(7) in section 339(c), by striking paragraph (1);

(8) in section 396—

(A) by striking subsection (i);

(B) in subsection (k)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (F); and

(ii) in paragraph (3)(B)(iii), by striking subclause (V);

(C) in subsection (l)(1)(B), by striking “shall be included” and all that follows through “The audit report”; and

(D) by striking subsection (m);

(9) in section 398(b)(4), by striking the third sentence;

(10) in section 624a(b)(1)—

(A) by striking “REPORT; REGULATIONS” and inserting “REGULATIONS”;
(B) by striking “Within 1 year after” and all that follows through “on means of assuring” and inserting “The Commission shall issue such regulations as are necessary to assure”; and

(C) by striking “Within 180 days after” and all that follows through “to assure such compatibility.”; and

(11) in section 713, by striking subsection (a).

SEC. 4. EFFECT ON AUTHORITY.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to expand or contract the authority of the Federal Communications Commission.

SEC. 5. OTHER REPORTS.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to prohibit or otherwise prevent the Federal Communications Commission from producing any additional reports otherwise within the authority of the Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The legislation before the House this afternoon, H.R. 2844, the FCC Consolidated Reporting Act, is a bipartisan bill that seeks to provide flexibility and relief to both our job creators as well as the Federal Communications Commission. This bill is another step in the process of streamlining government so that businesses can focus their time and resources on growing our economy and creating jobs instead of complying with outdated and burdensome mandates from the Federal Government. Every dollar spent on outdated FCC reporting mandates is a dollar that could otherwise be spent creating more high-paying jobs and investing in new infrastructure.

H.R. 2844 also recognizes the reality that our Nation is in a fiscal crisis and that we must find ways to do more with less. By consolidating eight annual and tri-annual reports into a single biannual Communications Marketplace Report, not only do we recognize this new budget reality by giving the FCC more flexibility and tools to drive greater efficiencies but we can usher in a platform to analyze the converged nature of today’s highly competitive intermodal communications industry, which has moved beyond the traditional confines of the 1992 and 1996 Cable and Communications Act.

This simple, commonsense measure will also ensure that Congress has timely access to the Commission’s best analysis of the communication’s landscape at the beginning of each Congress by requiring that the Communications Marketplace Report be published in the last quarter of an even-numbered year. This will allow Congress to better use findings to inform our legislative activities.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a great example of lawmakers from both sides of the aisle coming together to reform outdated government mandates that were created by Congresses of the past. I applaud Chairmen UPTON and WALDEN, as well as Ranking Member ESHOO, for working so closely and cooperatively with me on this legislation; and I strongly encourage my colleagues to join in supporting passage of this commonsense measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 2844, a bill to streamline many of the outdated reporting requirements that Congress has placed on the Federal Communications Commission. At a time when agency resources are limited, this bill, I think, is an example of how to make the FCC's reporting obligations more efficient, which in turn will ensure that the agency can focus on its mission to protect the public interest and promote competition across the communications marketplace.

The bill also ensures that the FCC has the flexibility to continue assessing the state of competition, which is so essential and so important in our country across the entire communications marketplace, including particular submarkets like wireless, cable, and satellite. This data is vital to both consumers and to policymakers.

I want to thank Chairman WALDEN; certainly the chairman of the full committee, Chairman UPTON; and most especially, Representative SCALISE, for pursuing this legislation in a bipartisan manner and for working with me to ensure that the expert agency, the FCC, was included in our deliberations.

Mr. Speaker, the House passed a similar bill in the last Congress. So I recommend to all of our colleagues this very sensible bill that, again, is something that all Members can stand for, and that is to streamline a Federal agency and kind of get rid of some of the weeds of the past and clear a better path for the agency to continue, again, assessing the state of competition across the entire communications marketplace.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe I have any speakers on this side. I urge my colleagues—everyone in the House—to support the bill. I think it deserves that kind of support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank the gentlady from California, again, for her hard work on this and the good bipartisan cooperation that we've had in making these reforms.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), chairman of the Telecommunications Subcommittee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentlady from California for their great work on this, I think, really good bill.

I was in small business for more than 22 years with my wife, and these are the sorts of odds and ends that can eat a small business alive. It can eat an agency alive as well. These are silly mandates that get put on, often for a good reason initially; but then nobody ever goes back and says, Why are we still asking for a report on the status of the telegraph industry, or whatever else. We went back and did that.

This is the kind of nuts-and-bolts work that I think helps clean up government, helps make it more efficient, makes it more productive, makes it more affordable, and gets out of the way and helps stop doing things it doesn't need to do. Too often, we don't do that.

I think one of the hallmarks of our subcommittee has been a real bipartisan effort to make sure that when we create programs, we then follow and make sure they're working, like we're doing with FirstNet and the Incentive Auctions, to try and track and make sure it's working and then to dig deeper and look for those things that aren't working or they're outdated, yet put a burden on an agency and cost either those who pay for that agency through their taxes or through fees, or whatever. It's all coming out of the private economy into the government economy. We need to stop that.

So this bill consolidates eight separate congressionally mandated reports on the communications industry into a single comprehensive report. As my colleague from Louisiana said, it changes the timeline so that Congress can get the information in a better and timely manner. And it cuts cost. I hope this bill will receive strong bipartisan support in the House. I assume it will. And I hope that our friends across the building will in this Congress take it up and pass it as well.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the bipartisan work of my friends from California and from Louisiana. I urge the House to approve this measure and send it expeditiously over to the Senate.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, as we heard from our constituents, as we just got back from this August work period where many of us held townhall meetings throughout our district, people are frustrated with why Congress can't work together to get things done. I think this is a good example of how both parties came together and looked at some very outdated laws.

People also ask, Why are you always passing laws and why don't you actually get rid of some of the laws on the books that don't make any sense? Well, that's what we're doing here with H.R. 2844. We're actually going through and repealing laws that are burdens to our small businesses that are out there trying to create jobs in the technology industry. One of the great growing segments of our economy is the telecommunications industry; and yet look at some of these reports that they're required and mandated to compile, many of which have no real bearing on the marketplace today. As the chairman of the subcommittee mentioned, we actually do repeal the telegraph report. Why we still have a law on the books that requires a report issued on competitiveness in the telegraph indus-

try—that goes to show how we have so many of these outdated laws on the books still to this day. And Congress from time to time needs to go and repeal outdated rules and regulations like this. That's what we're doing in this legislation.

It's a good, commonsense piece of legislation that we worked on in a bipartisan way to bring to the floor. I urge all my colleagues to pass the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2844, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1845

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2052, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2844, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

GLOBAL INVESTMENT IN AMERICAN JOBS ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2052) to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to conduct an

interagency review of and report to Congress on ways to increase the global competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 379, nays 32, answered “present” 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 448]

YEAS—379

Aderholt	Crowley	Hastings (WA)
Alexander	Cuellar	Heck (NV)
Amodei	Culberson	Heck (WA)
Andrews	Cummings	Hensarling
Bachus	Daines	Higgins
Barletta	Davis (CA)	Himes
Barr	Davis, Danny	Hinojosa
Barrow (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Holding
Barton	DeFazio	Holt
Bass	DeGette	Honda
Beatty	Delaney	Horsford
Becerra	DeLauro	Hoyer
Benishek	DelBene	Huffman
Bera (CA)	Denham	Huizenga (MI)
Bilirakis	Dent	Hultgren
Bishop (NY)	DesJarlais	Hunter
Bishop (UT)	Deutsch	Hurt
Black	Diaz-Balart	Israel
Blackburn	Dingell	Issa
Blumenauer	Doggett	Jeffries
Bonamici	Doyle	Jenkins
Boustany	Duckworth	Johnson (GA)
Brady (TX)	Duffy	Johnson (OH)
Braley (IA)	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, E. B.
Brooks (AL)	Edwards	Johnson, Sam
Brooks (IN)	Ellison	Joyce
Brown (FL)	Ellmers	Keating
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Kelly (IL)
Buchanan	Enyart	Kelly (PA)
Burgess	Eshoo	Kennedy
Bustos	Esty	Kildee
Butterfield	Farenthold	Kilmer
Calvert	Farr	Kind
Camp	Fattah	King (IA)
Campbell	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Cantor	Fleischmann	Kinzinger (IL)
Capito	Flores	Kirkpatrick
Capps	Forbes	Kline
Capuano	Fortenberry	Kuster
Cárdenas	Foster	Lamborn
Carney	Frankel (FL)	Lance
Carson (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Langevin
Carter	Fudge	Lankford
Cartwright	Gabbard	Larsen (WA)
Cassidy	Gallego	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	Latham
Castro (TX)	Garcia	Latta
Chabot	Gardner	Lee (CA)
Chaffetz	Garrett	Levin
Chu	Gerlach	Lewis
Cicilline	Gibbs	Lipinski
Clarke	Gibson	LoBiondo
Clay	Goodlatte	Loeb
Cleaver	Gosar	Lofgren
Clyburn	Gowdy	Long
Coble	Granger	Lowenthal
Coffman	Graves (GA)	Lowe
Cohen	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Cole	Grayson	Luetkemeyer
Collins (GA)	Green, Al	Lujan Grisham
Collins (NY)	Green, Gene	(NM)
Conaway	Griffin (AR)	Lujan, Ben Ray
Connolly	Griffith (VA)	(NM)
Conyers	Grimm	Lummis
Cook	Guthrie	Lynch
Cooper	Hahn	Maffei
Costa	Hall	Maloney,
Cotton	Hanabusa	Carolyn
Courtney	Hanna	Maloney, Sean
Cramer	Harper	Marchant
Crawford	Hartzler	Marino
Crenshaw	Hastings (FL)	Matheson

Matsui	Pocan	Smith (NE)
McCarthy (CA)	Polis	Smith (NJ)
McCaul	Pompeo	Smith (TX)
McCollum	Price (GA)	Smith (WA)
McDermott	Price (NC)	Southerland
McGovern	Quigley	Speier
McHenry	Radel	Stewart
McIntyre	Rahall	Stivers
McKeon	Rangel	Stutzman
McKinley	Reed	Swalwell (CA)
McMorris	Reichert	Takano
Rodgers	Renacci	Terry
McNerney	Rice (SC)	Thompson (CA)
Meehan	Richmond	Thompson (MS)
Meeks	Rigell	Thompson (PA)
Meng	Roby	Thornberry
Messer	Roe (TN)	Tiberi
Mica	Rogers (AL)	Tierney
Michaud	Rogers (KY)	Tipton
Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Titus
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Tonko
Miller, E. Gary	Rokita	Tsongas
Moore	Rooney	Turner
Moran	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Mulvaney	Roskam	Valadao
Murphy (FL)	Ross	Van Hollen
Murphy (PA)	Rothfus	Vargas
Napolitano	Roybal-Allard	Veasey
Neal	Ruiz	Vela
Negrete McLeod	Runyan	Visclosky
Neugebauer	Ruppersberger	Wagner
Noem	Ryan (OH)	Walberg
Nolan	Ryan (WI)	Walden
Nugent	Sanchez, Loretta	Walorski
Nunes	Sarbanes	Walz
Nunnelee	Scalise	Wasserman
O'Rourke	Schakowsky	Schultz
Olson	Schiff	Waters
Owens	Schneider	Watt
Palazzo	Schock	Waxman
Pallone	Schrader	Webster (FL)
Pascarella	Scott (VA)	Welch
Pastor (AZ)	Scott, Austin	Wenstrup
Paulsen	Scott, David	Westmoreland
Payne	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Pearce	Serrano	Williams
Pelosi	Sessions	Wilson (FL)
Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (SC)
Perry	Shea-Porter	Wittman
Peters (CA)	Shimkus	Wolf
Peters (MI)	Shuster	Womack
Peterson	Simpson	Woodall
Petri	Sinema	Yarmuth
Pingree (ME)	Sires	Yoder
Pittenger	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Pitts	Smith (MO)	Young (IN)

NAYS—32

Amash	Hudson	Poe (TX)
Bachmann	Huelskamp	Posey
Bentivolio	Jones	Ribble
Bridenstine	Jordan	Royce
Broun (GA)	Kingston	Salmon
DeSantis	Labrador	Sanford
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Fincher	Massie	Stockman
Fleming	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Foxx	Meadows	Yoho
Harris	Mullin	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Kaptur
NOT VOTING—20

Barber	Grijalva	Rush
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Sánchez, Linda
Brady (PA)	Herrera Beutler	T.
Bucshon	Jackson Lee	Schwartz
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (NY)	Sherman
Gingrey (GA)	Miller, George	Velázquez
Gohmert	Nadler	Young (FL)

□ 1911

Messrs. MEADOWS, FLEMING, HUELSKAMP, DeSANTIS, RIBBLE, FINCHER, JORDAN, POSEY, KINGSTON, SALMON, BROUN of Georgia, WEBER of Texas, and SANFORD changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FRANKS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 448, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION CONSOLIDATED REPORTING ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2844) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 449]

YEAS—415

Aderholt	Capuano	Delaney
Alexander	Cárdenas	DeLauro
Amash	Carney	DelBene
Amodei	Carson (IN)	Denham
Andrews	Carter	Dent
Bachmann	Cartwright	DeSantis
Bachus	Cassidy	DesJarlais
Barber	Castor (FL)	Deutsch
Barletta	Castro (TX)	Diaz-Balart
Barr	Chabot	Dingell
Barrow (GA)	Chaffetz	Doggett
Barton	Chu	Doyle
Bass	Cicilline	Duckworth
Beatty	Clarke	Duffy
Becerra	Clay	Duncan (SC)
Benishek	Cleaver	Duncan (TN)
Bentivolio	Clyburn	Edwards
Bera (CA)	Coble	Ellison
Bilirakis	Coffman	Ellmers
Bishop (NY)	Cohen	Engel
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Enyart
Black	Collins (GA)	Eshoo
Blackburn	Collins (NY)	Esty
Blumenauer	Conaway	Farenthold
Bonamici	Connolly	Farr
Boustany	Conyers	Fattah
Brady (TX)	Cook	Fincher
Braley (IA)	Cooper	Fitzpatrick
Bridenstine	Costa	Fleischmann
Brooks (AL)	Cotton	Fleming
Brooks (IN)	Courtney	Flores
Broun (GA)	Cramer	Forbes
Brown (FL)	Crawford	Fortenberry
Brownley (CA)	Crenshaw	Foster
Buchanan	Crowley	Foxx
Burgess	Cuellar	Frankel (FL)
Bustos	Culberson	Franks (AZ)
Butterfield	Cummings	Frelinghuysen
Calvert	Daines	Fudge
Camp	Davis (CA)	Gabbard
Campbell	Davis, Danny	Gallego
Cantor	Davis, Rodney	Garamendi
Capito	DeFazio	Garcia
Capps	DeGette	Gardner

Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBlundo
Loeback
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)

Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher

Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack

Woodall
Yarmuth
Bishop (GA)
Brady (PA)
Bucshon
Gingrey (GA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez

Yoder
Yoho

Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—17

Herrera Beutler
Jackson Lee
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, George
Perlmutter
Rush
Schwartz
Velázquez
Welch
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

□ 1925

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

ADDRESSING EMPLOYMENT CRISIS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the Department of Labor released figures suggesting that unemployment decreased to 7.3 percent in August, the lowest rate in over 4½ years.

While seemingly good news, if you actually look below the surface, labor force participation fell to its lowest level in 35 years, with only 63.2 percent of working-age Americans being employed. While the unemployment rate declined, it can be attributed to a growing share of individuals giving up on trying to find a job.

Mr. Speaker, it's not that American workers are lazy or reliant upon hand-outs. Over 12 million Americans are struggling to make ends meet, with tens of millions more struggling with underemployment.

The solution to our national employment crisis is straightforward: we must get a handle on out-of-control debt, a cumbersome and out-of-date Tax Code, and limit bloated regulations.

As we continue our work here in the House, I encourage all of my colleagues to focus their work on breaking down these barriers to employment. Our constituents deserve as much.

□ 1930

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF THE HINDU AMERICAN FOUNDATION

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to rise today on the House Floor and recognize the great work of the Hindu American Foundation, which is having its annual Northern California Awareness and Gala Dinner near my congressional district one week from Saturday.

There are over 2 million Hindus in the United States, and the Hindu American Foundation works to educate people about their religious faith and protect the free exercise of it around the Nation and across our globe.

I'm proud to stand as a Member of Congress with the Hindu American Foundation on issues that are important to me and its members. For example, I worked to get the FBI to collect data on anti-Hindu hate crimes, including sending two letters to ask it to do so. Thanks to this advocacy and the Hindus across the Nation, we've achieved this goal.

I've also cosponsored H.R. 717, the Reuniting Families Act, to enable people in the United States to be reunited with family members abroad; cosponsored House Resolution 47, which calls on the Postal Service to adopt a commemorative Diwali holiday; and I also joined the India Caucus.

Saturday's dinner will give the Hindu American Foundation members and supporters a great chance to talk about what we've done together and what the future may bring.

I also look forward to attending the gala and hearing from my colleague here in the House, TULSI GABBARD, from Hawaii, who is the first Hindu ever elected to this body and is, rightfully, being honored by the Hindu American Foundation. I'm sure she'll have a unique and insightful perspective for this occasion.

NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS MONTH

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, after 9/11, September became National Preparedness Month, a month to encourage Americans to take steps to prepare for disasters or emergencies in their homes, businesses and communities.

Recent events such as Hurricane Sandy; the Boston Marathon bombing; the West, Texas, plant explosion; deadly tornados in Oklahoma; and flooding in my own district reinforce the need for preparedness planning.

As chair of the Homeland Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, and as congressional cochair of National Preparedness Month, I urge all Members to promote preparedness activities in their districts. Encourage your constituents to build and maintain emergency kits, develop and exercise emergency plans, and participate in local preparedness activities.

I also urge Members to learn more about how local response organizations are using social media and encourage your constituents to follow local responders on Twitter and Facebook.

National Preparedness Month is also a good time to thank our firefighters, police officers, emergency managers, and their families, whose persistent sacrifices make our country more secure and more prepared.

IT'S TIME FOR THE HOUSE TO TAKE ACTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. McNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, a report released last week by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration examined the relationship between climate change and the extreme weather events from last year. The report found compelling evidence that human-caused climate change contributed to many of the extreme weather events seen around the world last year, including some of the heat waves and droughts seen in the central United States, as well as elevated sea levels that contributed to the unprecedented level of flooding in New York City after Superstorm Sandy.

The report, based on the work of 78 scientists, concluded that climate change has an impact on extreme weather events. These storms and droughts are endangering lives and livelihoods, and costing taxpayers billions of dollars.

Unfortunately, we are failing to address these threats in the House of Representatives. The Republican majority of the House has refused to acknowledge the overwhelming scientific evidence that the planet's climate is changing, and that human activity is a major contributor to this change.

THANKS TO THE MINNESOTA OVARIAN CANCER ALLIANCE

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month.

This past weekend, I joined neighbors to help kick off the annual Minnesota Ovarian Cancer Alliance Walk and Run. Each year, thousands come out to this event in Edina Park to raise awareness of and education on ovarian cancer, to raise funds for research, and to give support and hope to local women and their families that are touched by this devastating disease.

In 2013 alone, the American Cancer Society estimates that about 22,000 new cases of ovarian cancer will be di-

agnosed, and 14,000 women will die of ovarian cancer in the United States.

This last March, I met with a group of doctors and nurses from every major health system in the Twin Cities to discuss cancer care and prevention, and I'm pleased to cosponsor legislation that ensures that cancer patients get the care they need.

Mr. Speaker, the powerful stories of hope that I heard this weekend are just a fraction of what we see in our community as we work on our shared goal of making cancer a thing of the past.

LOCAL ISSUES IMPACTING MANY AMERICANS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of serious discussions on America's next step forward on issues involving Syria, I rise simply to talk about local issues and issues impacting many Americans. One of them has to do with foster care and the situation of foster care in my own State, one dealing with children who've aged out in the city of Houston, and there are no facilities for them to be able to utilize, except for a few, like Little Audrey's, which is under siege, and which we're trying to draw the attention of the community to, to be able to help those children or young people that have no place to go, and then to provide more counselors for foster care children so they have a lifeline while they're in the foster care system.

Finally, some good news: I want to salute the Zion Ministries, the church that I joined yesterday, where they received their marker of historic preservation in the Fourth Ward, Freedmen's Town area.

In our local communities, good things are happening and challenges are happening, and I hope that, as we look at these hard decisions, we'll be able to work with our communities as well on some of the important issues they face.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in a classified security briefing on Syria and missed H.R. 2052, the Global Investment in American Jobs Act of 2013, as amended. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On H.R. 2844, the Federal Communications Commission Consolidation Reporting Act, I would have voted "aye," and on the Journal vote, I would have voted "aye."

THE CONGRESSIONAL PRAYER CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2013, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of our Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor tonight to discuss our first freedom, religious liberty, as we recognize the 226th anniversary of the signing of our Constitution on September 17, Constitution Day.

I'm hosting this special order as founder and cochairman of the Congressional Prayer Caucus, a bipartisan group of more than 90 Members of the House of Representatives dedicated to protecting religious freedom in America and preserving our Nation's rich spiritual heritage.

I cochair this caucus with my good friend, Mr. MIKE MCINTYRE, a Democratic Member from North Carolina, who, unfortunately, cannot be with us this evening.

Faith and religious freedom are not party-line issues. Members of the Congressional Prayer Caucus gather each week in the United States Capitol to pray for our Nation. We leave political labels at the door, and we join in prayer for one another and our country.

On September 17, our Nation will mark the 226th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution in Independence Hall, Philadelphia. The Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, was soon to follow.

Religious freedom is the very first thing named in the First Amendment. It is our first freedom, and it's a fundamental human right.

But as President Ronald Reagan so accurately observed, freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. Our freedoms are fragile, and how quickly we forget their importance.

An annual survey by the Newseum Institute's First Amendment Center revealed that only 24 percent of Americans are aware that religious freedom is a First Amendment right. We are forgetting our first freedom. It is this amnesia that results in the subjugation of the fundamental right of religious freedom.

Just last month, a justice of the New Mexico Supreme Court recognized that their decision to uphold fines against a wedding photographer who declined to photograph a same-sex wedding meant that the photographer is now "compelled by law to compromise the very religious beliefs that inspire" her life.

But the justice called this trampling of religious freedom “the price of citizenship.”

The price of citizenship? No. Religious freedom is the very thing the Pilgrims sought when they landed in Plymouth and struggled to survive in a new and unknown world.

Religious freedom was so important to our Founding Fathers that it was the first freedom they named as bearing protection from the government. It's not the price of citizenship; it is the hallmark of the American spirit of freedom.

The American people recognize that the New Mexico Supreme Court's decision is wrong. A recent Rasmussen poll revealed that 85 percent of Americans believe that a wedding photographer who has a deeply held religious belief about marriage has a right to decline to photograph a same-sex ceremony.

Even still, we see weekly reminders that religious freedom is being trampled in the name of tolerance. The Supreme Court's decision in *United States v. Windsor* has given validation to the basely false argument that the only reason anyone has to support traditional marriage is bigotry. We've forgotten President Obama's observation in 2012 that there are people of goodwill on both sides of the marriage debate.

Over the last few months alone, we've seen so many injustices, like the Oregon bakery that's been forced to close its doors because of the visceral hate mail, threats and boycotts they received simply for living their lives according to their faith.

As some workers protest for higher wages, we see businesses like Hobby Lobby that pay their full-time workers significantly more than minimum wage fighting for the ability to keep their doors open and their workers employed because they dare to operate their business according to the dictates of their conscience.

We see an attack on the integrity of the military chaplaincy, an institution that exists to support the free exercise of religion for our brave servicemembers as they leave home and family behind to enter harsh and foreign environments.

And we see servicemembers like Senior Master Sergeant Monk fighting to maintain their careers in the military because they dare to hold a traditional view of marriage.

In Iran, Pastor Abedini languishes in the notorious Evin prison because of his Christian faith. He's an American citizen who has been wrongly sentenced to 8 years in prison because he dared to hold a certain religious belief, torn from his wife and two young children.

As we approach the 1-year anniversary of his incarceration, we need to make sure that we realize that his fight for freedom is a reminder of how important it is that we remain a bea-

con for the fundamental right of religious freedom and the ability to live your life openly and freely on the basis of your convictions. We must defend Pastor Abedini and advocate for his immediate release to the safety of his family.

As we honor Constitution Day, let us remember the fundamental right of religious freedom enshrined in the First Amendment. Members of the Prayer Caucus have not forgotten our first freedom. We stand ready to guard and protect it.

I'm proud to partner with my good friend, Mr. MCINTYRE, in leading this extraordinary group of Members known as the Congressional Prayer Caucus.

I'm so pleased to be joined this evening by my colleagues who are working to protect religious freedom in America and around the world, and at this time I'd like to yield to my good friend, Mr. TIM WALBERG from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank my friend from Virginia and, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on an issue of ultimate importance tonight, the First Amendment liberties.

□ 1945

We go back to those brave men whose shoulders we stand upon, and here in the Chamber today, people like Jonathan Witherspoon, who said:

A republic once equally poised, must either preserve its virtue or lose its liberty.

Congressman FORBES, we are standing for that virtue today. We are standing for that virtue in a country that, sadly, has walked away from accepting it out of hand. And assuming that there will be differences—there will be theological differences, there will be religious differences—America was known from its inception as a place where we could be free to have those foundational principles.

Benjamin Franklin himself said:

This will be the best security for maintaining our liberties. A Nation of well-informed men who have been taught to know and prize the rights which God has given them cannot be enslaved. It is in the religion of ignorance that tyranny begins.

And so I went to some statements that were made in the constitutions of our States—specifically, those States that were our 13 colonies—to look at what our Framers and Founders, those back in the States that said we want a Federal Government, but we want a Federal Government that comes under the control of the States. What did they say about religion and those First Amendment liberties? I picked out three. I picked them out related to the highest offices of our land.

The first was New York. Our Attorney General, Eric Holder, was born, raised, and educated in New York. In its constitution, New York State says:

The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without dis-

crimination or preference, shall forever be allowed in this State to all humankind.

That was New York.

I went then to the State of Delaware, the State of our Vice President. And in that State, the preamble to the constitution starts out by saying:

Through Divine goodness, all people have by nature the rights of worshiping and serving their Creator according to the dictates of their consciences.

That's Delaware.

And so then ultimately I went to the last State that I looked at. And I went to that because our President comes from Illinois. But that wasn't one of the 13 colonies, my friend from Virginia will inform me. So I went to Massachusetts, where he was educated at Harvard Law School. Article II in that constitution says:

It is the right as well as the duty of all men and society, publicly, and at stated seasons to worship the Supreme Being, the great Creator and Preserver of the universe. And no subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshiping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience.

Mr. Speaker, I would say those are the foundational principles that led to the adoption of our Constitution and, ultimately, the First Amendment. And so a danger comes when we come to areas like prayer, where we have a municipality like Greece, New York, that is fighting in the case *Greece v. Galloway* for the opportunity to continue their tradition of opening with prayer.

Patrick Henry said:

An appeal to arms and the God of hosts is all that is left us.

An appeal. Isn't that a prayer? An appeal to God?

An appeal to arms and the God of hosts is all that is left to us. But we shall not fight our battle alone. There is a just God that presides over the destinies of nations. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone. Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?

And then he appeals to God again. A prayer:

Forbid it, almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death.

So today we come to a situation in our country where we have people who are saying, basically, the same thing: give me liberty or give me death. Give me the opportunity to pray. Give me the opportunity to worship without Big Government collapsing on me.

Mr. Speaker, there are enemies of our freedoms. And they have somehow caught it right.

Joseph Stalin said:

America is like a healthy body and its resistance is threefold: its patriotism, its morality, its spiritual life. If we can undermine these three areas, America will collapse from within.

He's right: we are collapsing, to our detriment and to those who yearn for freedom.

I end with this. A patriot, a President, a believer in prayer, a believer in the First Amendment. President Eisenhower stated in 1954:

Atheism substitutes men for the Supreme Creator and this leads inevitably to domination and dictatorship.

He went on to say:

We must jealously guard our foundation in faith. For on it rests the ability of the American individual to live and thrive in this blessed land and to be able to help other less fortunate people to achieve freedom and individual opportunity. These we take for granted, but to others they are often only a wistful dream. In God we trust, our motto. Often have we heard the words of this wonderful American motto. Let us make sure that familiarity has not made them meaningless for us. We carry the torch of freedom as a sacred trust for all mankind.

And then President Eisenhower concluded:

We do not believe that God intended the light that He created to be put out by men.

I thank my friend for allowing me these statements tonight. And may we stand firmly to the point that ultimately our First Amendment liberties—and even more than that—the God-blessed opportunities that come from His truth will be applauded in this land.

Mr. FORBES. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his great leadership on these First Amendment rights and for his words tonight.

We have another great leader on First Amendment rights, Mr. Speaker, and that's DOUG LAMBORN for Colorado.

DOUG, it's a pleasure to have you tonight. I would love to yield to you for any comments you might have.

Mr. LAMBORN. I want to thank my friend and colleague, Representative RANDY FORBES of Virginia, for his leadership in this vital area of religious liberty and for putting this time together.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our constitutionally granted right to religious liberty and in support of our military. I am grateful for our Nation's military, and I feel privileged to represent thousands of men and women in uniform who serve at the five military installations in my district. Our military is made up of brave, peace-loving men and women of all faiths serving to protect our freedom and our way of life. But there is a growing and troubling pattern of religious discrimination against our men and women in arms.

Earlier this year, an Army Reserve training brief listed Catholics, Evangelical Christians, Sunni Muslims and some Jews as "religious extremists," along with groups like al Qaeda, Hamas, and the KKK. Also, in July of this year, a Christian chaplain was ordered to remove a religious column he had written which simply detailed the history of the phrase:

There are no atheists in foxholes.

Furthermore, in drafting religious freedom policies and regulations, offi-

cial within the Pentagon have consulted with radical atheists who once characterized Christians as "monsters who terrorize their fellow Americans who are die-hard enemies of the United States Constitution." This same radical atheist is calling on the Pentagon to prosecute military chaplains who share their faith with servicemembers, claiming that even speaking about your Christian faith amounts to "unconstitutional religious proselytizing and oppression."

Mr. Speaker, this is an affront to our civil liberties and demeaning to this Nation that has always believed in the First Amendment freedom of self-expression. Religious freedom is an integral part of America's greatness and has been a pillar of our Nation from the very beginning. We must remain firmly committed to defending religious freedom.

Mr. FORBES. I thank the gentleman for his hard work in this area and for being with us tonight.

We heard Mr. WALBERG mention Patrick Henry; and from the State that Patrick Henry came from is my good friend, ROB WITTMAN.

ROB, thank you for being here and your fight in all this.

Mr. WITTMAN. Thank you, Representative FORBES. I want to thank you for your leadership in the Congressional Prayer Caucus and for taking the time to make sure we got together today to recognize the importance of today's date and the efforts by our forefathers to make sure that we have those liberties and freedoms to make sure that we can freely practice our religious beliefs here.

I'm pleased to be here as a member of our Prayer Caucus and join with my other colleagues on the Prayer Caucus to honor Constitution Day and the religious freedoms of all our citizens.

September 17, 2013, marks the 226th anniversary of the signing of the greatest governing document the world has ever known: our Constitution. Religious freedom is the very first freedom protected in the First Amendment. And just as Chairman FORBES has spoken of, it was really a discussion that took place years ago in Virginia.

Governor Patrick Henry, there in the church at St. John's in Richmond, got up and spoke about the importance of the individual liberties and freedoms and the importance to make sure that we as a Nation had a Constitution that preserved those. As you know, he led that fight to make sure that James Madison, the author of the Constitution, provided in the Constitution just those individual liberties and freedoms. In fact, I think a lot of folks don't know he actually voted against ratifying the Constitution originally because it did not contain those basic individual liberties and freedoms, and it was his work that made sure that we enjoyed those individual liberties and

freedoms today, based on our Constitution.

It was that First Amendment that read:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

In today's world, there are far too many obstacles for many of our citizens to truly practice what is promised in the First Amendment. There are challenges to religious symbols. Religious freedom for members of our military is under attack.

Air Force Senior Master Sergeant Phillip Monk was recently dismissed from his position and reassigned after he refused to voice his opinion when his commanding officer asked him if he could agree with her belief that openly voicing a religious or moral opposition to same-sex marriage is discrimination. He stood by his beliefs and paid the price professionally for that.

Religious liberties are threatened, for many, each and every day.

The Commonwealth of Virginia, as has been so eloquently stated, has a direct tie to the First Amendment. I stated Governor Patrick Henry's efforts there; but also Thomas Jefferson was very, very adamant and passionate about preserving those religious freedoms.

The Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom was authored by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison in 1779, and it states:

No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities.

Thomas Jefferson, the second President of the United States, and one of our Nation's Founding Fathers, understood the need for protecting our natural rights, those provided to us by our Creator, those protected by our government, all of which were more important to him than any other element of what he espoused in the creation of our government. And we know that none meant more to him or to our Nation than the freedom of religion. The statute declares that compulsory religion is wrong, that no religion should be forced on an individual, and that the freedom of religion is a natural right.

□ 2000

The statute's doctrine and principles have inspired individuals throughout the Commonwealth and across our Nation.

Thomas Jefferson requested that three of his greatest accomplishments be listed on his epitaph. Freedom of religion was so important to him that the Virginia Statute for Religious

Freedom was listed along with the founding of the University of Virginia and the writing of the United States Declaration of Independence as his greatest lifetime achievements. Thomas Jefferson believed deeply in that freedom of religion and wanted to make sure that it was something that our Nation continued to espouse today, and it was his moral foundation.

The statute ultimately facilitated the path to complete religious freedom in the United States. As we know, the discussions that took place took place based upon that Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom. That was eventually included in the First Amendment to our Constitution.

It is our duty to ensure that the Congress continues to protect our First Amendment freedoms for now and for future generations. And I want to thank all of my colleagues in the Congressional Prayer Caucus to make sure that we remember each and every day as we are here the practice of religious freedom, and to make sure that we understand that our projection of that freedom is what makes us the great Nation that we are today.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. WITTMAN, I thank you for your dedication to First Amendment rights and to our military.

One of the deep thinkers that we have in this area in all forms of policy, especially as it comes to First Amendment liberties, is the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD, we are delighted to have you tonight, and I would love to hear some of your thoughts on this.

Mr. LANKFORD. It is absolutely my honor to have the chance to be here as well to be able to speak out on the issue that was critical in the foundation of our own Constitution and of our Nation as a whole, and that is the right to believe.

We in America have this unique thing, the right to believe or the right to not have a belief at all; but if you believe, to also have the right to actually live what you believe. It is this unique American freedom that people around the world sometimes stare at with awe because they are bound to have a certain set of beliefs to be in that country, but not so with us in America. You can have a belief, not have a belief; but if you have one, you may live your faith.

Coptic Christians in Egypt would love to be able to live their faith and not live in fear right now. The Baha'i in Iran would love to be able to live out their faith and not live in fear right now. The Christians in Syria would love to be able to live out their faith and not live in fear. And the multiple religions that try to practice in countries like China and Vietnam and other places that constantly live in fear because of their own faith would love to have that. But not so in America. Whether you be a Member of Congress,

whether you be an individual in the administration, whether you be any person walking down the streets of America, you have the right to be able to live out your faith, and it is essential for us. It's a great value that we share, but it is essential that we also continue to protect. And on days like today, it is ironic that we are discussing again this unique value to say: Can we still live out our faith as Americans?

Let me just give you a couple of examples where the challenge has been put to the test recently. It wasn't but a couple of years ago that the Obama administration challenged the Missouri Synod Church on whether that church and Hosanna-Tabor could choose their own minister or whether they would be fought from the outside, that the government could step into the church and say, No, we have to help be a part of selecting who the minister is. That was argued all the way until it got to the Supreme Court, where they lost 9-0, and the Supreme Court reaffirmed again that a church has the right to select their own minister.

It is ironic that we are dealing with a great business that employs thousands upon thousands of people around the country, called Hobby Lobby, that the founders of that company are Christians, they live out their faith—they practiced their faith from when they were a craft/framing shop in the garage of the family, and they continue to practice that business the exact same way now—to say: Can they live out their faith?

They are currently facing a set of fines right now where the administration has stepped in to say, if you provide health care insurance that we choose, you're fine; if you don't provide any insurance at all, I'm going to fine you \$2,000; but if you provide insurance that doesn't meet the administration's religious belief, you will be fined, as a company, \$36,500 per employee.

Let me run that past you again. In a country where you are free to live out your faith, if this particular company chooses not to provide insurance that violates their faith and it doesn't follow up with the administration's policy, they will be fined \$36,500 per employee per year. And so they changed their insurance to meet the faith of the administration. It's not right. We are a place where we cannot only have a belief in a label, but also choose to live out that label. That's important for us as a Nation.

Two things that I wanted to be able to encourage us as well. One is that students, on September 25—just a few days from now—will stand at flag poles around this Nation. They will gather early in the morning before other kids even get up and stand at a flag pole for an annual celebration called "See You at the Pole," where students will gather to pray. It's not a demonstration;

it's not a declaration. It is just students doing publicly what they do privately every single day, and that's pray for our Nation. They can do that because of our freedom.

Today, I remember three Oklahomans that 2 years ago lost their life in Afghanistan. They are heroes. They were individuals that were protecting the freedom of people they had never met and protecting our Nation. Jane Horton, one of the widows, not long after her husband, Chris, was killed in Afghanistan, dropped by my office and got a chance to visit with me. We talked for a long time, and she handed me a tie that her husband had. I chose to wear it today, 2 years after he was killed, so that we would not forget those who stand for our freedom and that we will not forget what they have done for us and our Nation.

Mr. FORBES. Thank you, Mr. LANKFORD, and for your great work on this subject.

Probably no one has defended the rights of our military and their First Amendment rights and the rights of our chaplains more than the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING, thank you for your efforts in that and for being here tonight. We would love to hear your thoughts on this very special amendment and right for Americans.

Mr. FLEMING. I would like to thank my good friend from Virginia for having this Special Order this evening and the leadership that the gentleman has provided in this area with the Prayer Caucus and so many other things, both on Armed Services and outside of Armed Services, in that realm.

Mr. Speaker, I am greatly inspired and moved this evening with the speeches that I've heard talking about religious liberty and all of the things that we are struggling with right now with religious liberty.

Religious freedom is at the center of who we are as Americans. With foresight and clarity, the Founding Fathers enshrined religious freedom as a First Amendment right. Quote: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof"—the First Amendment.

Despite these undisputed facts, time and again we have witnessed a whitening away of this freedom. The passage of the President's signature legislation, ObamaCare, ushered in a new wave of government oppression for businesses, religious organizations, faith-based schools, charities, and hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned this evening that with ObamaCare and with many other things that we're seeing on the religious front, on the military front, that Washington and this administration is actually substituting its religious beliefs for our own; a very dangerous precedent.

What have we talked about? ObamaCare. You know, we discuss

ObamaCare and all the problems, the cost and the rationing board and all of these things, but what's left out of that discussion are some very, very important points.

ObamaCare's HHS mandate requires that all insurance plans cover various items and services that are in direct conflict with deeply held religious beliefs or moral convictions. Three groups are singled out for this:

Number one is health care providers themselves, who in many cases will be forced to participate in certain techniques, certain types of treatment that are against their deeply held religious beliefs, such as abortion, such as getting abortion pills—what we call abortifacients—sterilization procedures, and such as that.

Another important group is religious institutions. The Catholic Church has, for many decades—really, centuries—gone about the work of the Lord to provide health care to individuals but will be required, under the HHS mandates, to actually provide certain procedures, such as sterilization and birth control pills, that are against their deeply held beliefs. Regardless of whether you agree with that or not is beside the point. According to the First Amendment, the church and its institutions should be allowed to do what is right by their own personal religious beliefs.

The third group is private businesses. You have already heard about Hobby Lobby and many others who, because of the HHS mandate, will have to provide coverage through insurance for certain things, which may include abortions, and yet that's against their own deeply held religious beliefs—and suffering fines of tens of thousands of dollars per episode and per day for having done so. That is not right under the First Amendment.

There are 67 cases and over 200 plaintiffs that have filed suit against the administration to protect the First Amendment right to religious freedom. They are working their way through the courts.

Tyndale House, a Christian publishing company, well known for their production of the Bible, as well as family-owned and operated business Fresh Unlimited, Inc., a fresh produce processing and packing company in Ohio, and Beckwith Electric, a Florida-based electric company, are among the 37 for-profit companies seeking relief from the HHS mandate.

Hospitals, charities, Catholic dioceses, and religious colleges, including Louisiana College in my own State, are at various stages of defending their first freedom against the administration's constitutional HHS mandate.

Instead of supporting publishers, grocers, electricians, doctors, nurses, teachers, and professors, ObamaCare strips away the ability for these individuals to live their lives in a manner consistent with their religious beliefs.

This administration has relentlessly lambasted the religious freedom of hardworking Americans, threatening ruinous fines for noncompliance. And again, companies such as Hobby Lobby, a well-known arts and crafts store that started out just as one single store, faced crippling fines for their religious beliefs.

Congressman FORTENBERRY, Congresswoman BLACK, and myself have put together a compendium of conscience protections through legislation. We've attempted many times to get this up for a vote and passed through the House and through the Senate that would block many of these HHS mandates that come down from ObamaCare. So far we have not gotten the support from the other side of the aisle to get this done, but we will continue until this is completed.

Then, finally, military religious freedom. We know that the military oftentimes is a microcosm of what happens in the demographics across America. And today, religious freedom is under tremendous pressure. We have situations where military members can no longer put a Bible out on their desk, that somehow that's offending someone and that's breaking a statute or a law.

You heard the recent case of Master Sergeant Monk, who, because he wouldn't champion something that was against his religious beliefs—closely held and taught by his own church—is now facing potential court-martial for speaking out against that. The list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker, of what's happening, and it's very recent.

This is not your father's military. This is not really the military you were in even 5 years ago. This is a new military in which religious freedom is being pushed away and substituting Washington's morality, Washington's faith—this administration's faith—instead.

So with that, I do want to thank my colleagues who are here tonight talking about the important things. What could be more important than religious freedoms? I think many would say that's the foundation, the basic foundation upon which this Nation was created and why many people have immigrated over the centuries here and many people even today continue to immigrate to the United States because of its religious freedom.

Let's hold this dear. Let's not let go of the First Amendment, the ability to not only believe what you choose to believe in religion, but also to speak out and express as well, even to take action. All of these are fundamental and very important.

So with that, I thank you again, Mr. FORBES, for the opportunity.

Mr. FORBES. Dr. FLEMING, we thank you for your expertise in both the health care area and the military, and thanks for fighting this fight so well.

One of the truly great champions on religious freedom issues has been the

chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution. He was actually selected as Christian Statesman of the Year because he truly practices what he preaches, and we are delighted to have with us the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) tonight.

Mr. FRANKS, it's good to have you here, and we would love to hear your comments.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, tonight, as we talk about religious freedom, it is especially appropriate that this group is led by one Congressman RANDY FORBES.

Mr. Speaker, I came into Congress approximately 11 years ago, and Mr. FORBES has been a prescient and noble voice among us during that time. I truly believe that as long as there are men like RANDY FORBES in Congress that America will continue to be a great and hopeful Nation.

□ 2015

Mr. FORBES understands the importance of religious freedom. He understands that religious freedom is truly the cornerstone of all other freedoms.

I want to make sort of a layman's analysis of a quote sometime back from a great English statesman. He said:

Out of deep dark bondage arises great faith. And that faith leads to great courage. And courage leads ultimately to freedom. And freedom leads to abundance. And abundance leads to apathy. And apathy leads to dependence. And dependence leads back to bondage.

That has been the litany so often of great countries down through the ages, Mr. Speaker. I would just suggest to you tonight that there is a solution to breaking that pattern. That is for us to hold, as we are trying to do this evening, to the great foundations of religious freedom. Because, as we so clearly see in the insights of this great English statesman, that faith oftentimes is the precursor to all other freedoms. It is vitally important that we protect it, and to fail to do so is to imperil our entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that's exactly where we are in many places today. I want to give one special example tonight:

Saeed Abedini is a United States citizen who has been imprisoned in Iran for exercising his Christian faith in a manner that is both legal and protected under Iranian law and international law.

A few days ago, the 36th branch of the Tehran Court of Appeals confirmed Saeed Abedini's prison sentence and he is expected to serve the rest of the 8-year sentence in a hostile Iranian prison.

The following statement is by Naghmeh Abedini, his wife and a resident of Idaho, in reaction to the news that Iran had upheld her husband's prison sentence. She said:

When I learned that the Iranian Appeals Court confirmed Saeed's 8-year imprisonment I was heartbroken. As tears streamed down my face, I pondered how I could crush the child-like hope with this news as my children tightly closed their eyes and prayed in hope and expectation for their daddy's swift return.

Discouragement and disappointment washed over me. I was discouraged that after a year of travel and numerous media interviews, I felt no closer to Saeed's release. I am also disappointed that the leader of my country, a country founded on religious freedom, has been awkwardly silent when an American citizen is wasting away in an Iranian prison.

For an entire year, my husband has faced threats and abuse daily by radicals in Evin Prison for refusing to deny his Christian faith. And still, President Obama has never spoken a word about him. I am grateful for congressional pressure, but I do hope that as a Nation we realize that if we do not collectively speak out against injustice it will only be a matter of time before all our children will have to face what my children are facing today.

Mr. Speaker, the American people would be outraged to truly know that the Obama administration has responded with deafening silence when an American father, husband, pastor, and an American citizen, Mr. Speaker, was thrown into a harsh prison under an oppressive regime for having the nerve to practice his Christian faith. The Obama administration should be utterly ashamed of its disgusting failure to speak out on behalf of Saeed Abedini and his precious family. No wonder the oppressive Iranian regime holds the Obama administration in such total derision as it arrogantly proceeds to build nuclear weapons with which to threaten the peace and security of the entire free world.

I hope that the American people will hold the Obama administration accountable for its absolutely criminal silence in the face of such heartless injustice forced upon this beloved American pastor, his innocent family, and so many others.

Mr. Speaker, on September 26, Saeed Abedini will have served in Iran's harsh Evin Prison for an entire year. The appeal that Saeed Abedini just lost was his last hope of being released under a heartless and unjust Iranian judicial system that still demands that he serve his 8-year sentence. Now, Saeed's wife, Naghmeh, is faced with "crushing the child-like hope" she speaks of of her two young children who have patiently "prayed in hope and expectation for their daddy's swift return," and telling them that it will be a very long time before they see their daddy again.

Mr. Speaker, when I hear the words of Naghmeh Abedini and I roll them over in my mind and I think of my own two little children at home, I am at once heartbroken for the Abedini family and enraged at the lackadaisical attitude and silence of President Obama.

Iran has demonstrated an utter disregard for fundamental religious free-

dom by continuing to unjustly hold Pastor Abedini, an American citizen, Mr. Speaker—an American citizen—in a hellish Iranian prison for practicing his faith.

Iran's tyrannical attempts to, in the words of Ronald Reagan, "stifle the freedom and muzzle the self-expression of the people" have again been exposed to the world after the imprisonment of this beloved American pastor, who at the time was working to build an orphanage in Iran when he was imprisoned.

Mr. Speaker, Martin Luther King once said: "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere," and Pastor Abedini's case has starkly shown the far-reaching implications of even a single instance of oppressing religious freedom.

By relentlessly refusing to forget this noble and gentle man, Pastor Saeed Abedini, we are upholding the sacred principle of international religious freedom as a "first freedom" that, Mr. Speaker, is fundamental to all of humanity.

Mr. FORBES. Congressman FRANKS, we thank you for speaking out for this great pastor whose big sin was that he loved children who did not have parents and he loved his faith and his God. We just thank you for doing that.

Our next speaker is someone who has been recognized for a lot of things—his fight on the Judiciary Committee—but tonight he's here to share and to stand up for First Amendment rights for religious freedom, LOUIE GOHMERT from Texas.

Congressman GOHMERT, thank you for being here.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, my dear friend, RANDY FORBES, for all that you do on behalf of religious freedom. I know it is not merely Christian freedom, but it is religious freedom, and it is under attack. When we look at what the Constitution says, I know it has already been read, but so often we forget the first word. We just blow right past the first word of the First Amendment, and that is that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Why was it that they singled out Congress, because they mentioned States in some of the other amendments. In the 10th Amendment, anything that is not prohibited to the States, that power is reserved to the States and the people.

So why is it that they singled out Congress? It is because this was intended for Congress and not for the States. Because the people that voted for these amendments knew that every one of the States had some laws that dealt with some aspect of Christianity, whether it was the oath that was required to be taken, or in some cases, a belief in Jesus Christ. There were all kinds of State and local university

laws that had to do with religion, and that, if you wanted to be part of this, you had to believe this way.

It was supposed to be a restriction on Congress. We've gotten so far afield from that now we think that we are not allowed to even bring up a hymn here in Congress. Whereas, my friend RANDY FORBES knows, and TRENT FRANKS—you all know, right down the hall the man who coined the phrase "separation of church and State," Thomas Jefferson, as President came to church every Sunday he was in Washington, and on some occasions he brought the Marine band to play the hymns. It was the biggest church in Washington for much of the 1800s right down the hall in what was the House Chamber back then.

Now look at what has happened. We see these incursions on the freedom of belief, and Christians are persecuted and forced to endure the slams and the arrows that should never be endured. Like SEAL Team 6, for example, those heroic members that were put in harm's way in a situation they should never have been put in in Afghanistan, after SEAL Team 6 was outed as the one that took out Osama bin Laden. You can see the DVD, a recording of the Ramp Ceremony. They have an imam come up in his language and do a Muslim prayer over the American flag-draped caskets, and we know some of those guys were devout Christians. He says a prayer that when you get the interpretation, basically it condemns them to hell, that they will never defeat the Muslims, the followers of Allah.

It turns out today we see persecution after persecution of Christians. When you look at the underpinnings of this Nation, it was Christians. About a third of the people that signed the Declaration of Independence were ordained Christian ministers.

If you look at what drove Lincoln, it was coming closer and closer to a walk with God. Some of the most powerful Christian messages ever delivered include the second inaugural address of Lincoln. Why? Because the Christian faith that he heard John Quincy Adams right down the hall talk about drove him to come back into politics and to get back involved to try to eliminate slavery. He knew that it was difficult for God to bless America when we were treating brothers and sisters by putting them in chains and bondage.

The next big step toward true Christian brotherhood and sisterhood in America came from Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. What was he? He was an ordained Christian minister. And now within 50 years it has become only acceptable to persecute Christians. This administration and so many have taken a stand—yes, it is an outrage that poisonous gas was used by anyone in the Middle East, but you don't hear the administration or others talking

enough, including us in Congress, about the persecution of Christians.

One article here says "Syrian Rebels to Christians: Flee or Die," an article by Bob Unruh, who used to be with the AP. He talks about the report. Over and over Christians were told, you either denounce your Christianity or die, and we've done nothing about it. That was written in June.

We have an article September 9. The village of Maaloula has been taken over by Syrian rebels associated with al Qaeda, who have stormed the Christian center and offered local Christians a choice—conversion or death—as they screamed "Allah Akbar."

Well, there is too much persecution of Christianity. That was never supposed to be the case. That was what so many said would be the salvation of our little experiment in democracy. It is time to stand for freedom of religion, not freedom to persecute Christians from Washington.

I appreciate my friend very much for yielding.

Mr. FORBES. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his words.

The Wall Street Journal has recently written a big article about our next speaker, about how hard he works for constituents, but tonight he's here to work for the First Amendment and for freedom of religion. That is STEVE PEARCE from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for leading this discussion.

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Now, what would be in the minds of the people who wrote those words? It would do well to look at where they came from. They came from countries where kings ruled. The kings could tell you what church you had to be in. They could tell you what you had to believe, what you had to profess. If it conflicted with what you said, they had the ultimate power over you. And so they came here to establish a new government. They wanted this Constitution, this contract with the people and the government that said the government cannot bridge certain lines. And the establishment of religion and the free practice thereof were protected.

The gentleman from Virginia mentioned early in his comments, there was a young couple in Albuquerque, New Mexico, the State that I represent. She had a way with cameras and started a little in-home photography business. Elaine Huguenin and her husband, Jonathan, just wanted to give expression. But they also wanted to defend their rights to believe what they did, so they made a pact between themselves that they would do nothing that compromised their faith, their religious beliefs. The Constitution protects that.

□ 2030

Very soon after establishing their business, they had an inquiry from a gay couple, asking that they photograph their vows. The young couple in the photography studio refused and were surprised when they were taken before the New Mexico Human Rights Commission. They were equally surprised when that commission found they had no rights of religion in this country. The New Mexico Human Rights Commission said that you are guilty of violating a different law, one that did not comport with the Constitution. They fined them \$6,000. The young couple appealed to the New Mexico appeals courts, and just recently, the New Mexico Court of Appeals found also that they were in violation—a court of appeals in this country ignorant of what the Constitution protects.

It's exactly these kinds of things that our Founding Fathers were alarmed about—commissions that would show up and tell you what you had to believe, what you had to profess. Catholics are afraid they're going to have to provide contraceptives from a government of the same mind. Doctors who are opposed to abortion fear that this government is going to tell them what they must do in violation of their consciences.

Are we, the American people, supposed to stand by? I think not. I think it's time for us all—not just Congress, not just your Representatives, but all—to raise their voices and speak out against a government that is too strong and that has forgotten its limitations written into that Constitution, especially under the First Amendment—protecting our free exercise of religion. Speak with us. Stand up and speak with us.

Mr. FORBES. I thank the gentleman for his words tonight.

My dear friend from Virginia, Congressman GRIFFITH, we are glad to have you with us tonight for your comments.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I am so glad to be with you this evening.

So many people in Washington and in other parts of the country believe that it was the intent of the Founding Fathers to bleach from our society our religious beliefs, and you have heard others speak this evening that that is not the case. In particular, I would like to share with you, in the short time that we have remaining, the words of Thomas Jefferson from that famous letter to the Danbury, Connecticut, Baptists, because everybody focuses on one phrase and not the entire letter.

He opens with salutations to the Danbury, Connecticut, Baptists, and then begins the meat of the letter:

Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legitimate powers of government reach actions only and

not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," thus building a wall of separation between church and State. Adhering to this expression of the supreme will of the Nation in behalf of the rights of conscience, I shall see with sincere satisfaction the progress of those sentiments which tend to restore to man all his natural rights, convinced he has no natural right in opposition to his social duties.

Now, the next paragraph—the closing paragraph—of the letter is very instructive because the man who some now say wanted to bleach religion out ends the letter as President of the United States as follows:

I reciprocate your kind prayers for the protection and blessing of the common Father and Creator of man, and tender you for yourselves and your religious association, assurances of my high respect and esteem.

Obviously, it was never his intent to bleach out of our society religion, and the Statute for Religious Freedom today still stands on the wall of the House of Delegates where you and I both served.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, we thank you for the time tonight.

Over your head stands the phrase "In God We Trust." A few years ago, when they opened the Visitors Center, they tried to take that phrase out of it. Members of the Prayer Caucus came here and stood, and because of that it's now written and engraved in the walls over there. We believe that, if you can engrave it there and if you can engrave it here, we can engrave it once again in the hearts of the people in this country.

I want to thank you for the time that you've allowed us today. I want to thank the majority leader for yielding us this time. I want to thank our Founders for giving us this great right of freedom of religion, and my prayer and our prayer tonight is that the American people will be wise enough to keep it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS—AFRICAN AMERICANS AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. It is an honor and a privilege, Mr. Speaker, to once again have this opportunity to stand here on the floor of the House of Representatives and to anchor the CBC Special Order where, for the next 60 minutes, members of the Congressional Black Caucus have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people on an issue of great significance to us, which is the future of the organized labor movement and how that relates to the economic viability of the African American community and to America as a whole.

Now, today, we've all just returned from the August recess. We are here back at the Capitol, and of course we're in the midst of a very robust period of deliberation as it relates to the administration's request for us to grant authorization for this country to strike militarily against Syria for what appears to be the use of chemical weapons, which is in violation of international law, against the Syrian people. That debate will play itself out over the next few days and, perhaps, even the next few weeks; but while we undertake that solemn obligation to make the best decision for this country and for our constituents as it relates to such a critical issue of war and peace and possible military engagement, we also have a similar responsibility to deal with the domestic issues that continue to impact our constituents as well as the American people.

We know that we are still in the midst of a very sluggish economic recovery and that the American worker has fallen behind relative to the position that that worker was in coming out of World War II and through the sixties and the seventies, into the eighties and the nineties. This is a matter of urgent concern to the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and it should be a matter of urgent concern to everyone who is a Member of this august body. Part of the deterioration of the American worker, I believe, empirically can be shown to be directly related to the deterioration of unionized membership here in this great country. So we will explore those topics.

We are a week removed from the Labor Day celebration, and we are also a few weeks removed from the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington, a march that was projected as one both for jobs and for freedom. We often focus on the civil rights aspect of the march—and it produced some tremendous pieces of legislation—but the March on Washington was also about jobs and economic opportunity, and it was put together with the significant assistance of the organized labor movement here in America.

I've been joined by several distinguished colleagues, Members of the House of Representatives, but also of members of the class of 2012—this won-

derful freshman class. I believe the first speaker will be the distinguished gentleman—my good friend from the other side of the Hudson River, the always nattily dressed—Representative DONALD PAYNE, JR.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York for that kind introduction and for his consistent leadership on the CBC's Special Order hours. Tonight's topic is "African Americans and the Labor Movement." It is an American story.

Historically, union members have played a critical role in the civil rights struggles of the past, and the involvement continues today. When Dr. Martin Luther King was jailed for civil disobedience, it was unions and union members who came to the legal and financial aid of Dr. King. African American workers have played a pivotal role in strengthening our unions and our economy. The path to the middle class for African Americans has always been through union jobs. What we see is an erosion of that dream. People's ways of life—what they're used to, the levels at which they're used to living—are eroding. It is because there is an attack on organized labor in this country, for there are forces within this Nation that are eroding the quality of life for hundreds and thousands of Americans throughout this Nation.

So I am really here to say and to point out to this august body that labor has been the pathway for many Americans—not just for African Americans, but for people of all walks of life—to live the American Dream. To own a home, to feed their children, to send them to school, to take care of their parents, to have health care, job security has all been through labor. We stand here today and count the countless number of times that the labor movement has been there for us in America. This is a kinship that you can expect from a fellow union member.

I have been in two unions in my lifetime. Yes, I'm a Member of Congress today, but there have been times in my life during which I've worked hourly jobs, and it was because of the unions I was able to get a living wage and have the resources to raise my family. So I don't come to you, preaching to you, not knowing how it is to have to get up every morning and punch a clock and look for overtime and hope that you can get it in order to increase the wages that you bring home. The reasons to support unions are clear. Union workers are more likely to have health insurance and are more likely to have pension plans. Receiving this preventative care now helps lower health care costs later.

Let me also say something about the Affordable Care Act at this point in time. It is a great piece of legislation. It will go down in history just as Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid have

changed this country, because I can see the goal line. It's going to take some time to get there, and, yes, it will have to be tweaked and looked at and changed in some areas; but it is a monumental piece of legislation that is going to change health care in this Nation for millions of people who have never had health care. To my fellow Americans, that lowers the costs for all of you, because you pay for people who do not have health care.

□ 2045

So now you will have millions of Americans paying into their own system which lowers the cost for you.

Today, labor unions are still at the forefront of improving equality in the workplace. Right now in New Jersey, we're fighting to raise the minimum wage. Despite overwhelming support by the people of New Jersey, the Governor of New Jersey vetoed a bill that would have raised the minimum wage to \$8.25. But our workers will not be deterred. This November, New Jerseyans will have the chance to right that ship at the ballot box and raise the minimum wage for millions of workers.

In Jersey City, the second largest city in the State, in my district, it is expected the city will require paid sick leave to all workers. This is important to our workers and to our economy because it has been proven that paid sick leave reduces turnover, increases productivity, and lowers health care costs for all.

I spoke about my experience in labor. I worked for a manufacturing firm as a young man of 20 or so. It was a business that manufactured computer forms. It was the only African American company of its kind in the United States of America at that time, and I was proud to work there because my vocation was printing in school. So I was very glad to go there and work in that atmosphere.

But as a 20-year-old does sometimes when you're young and you make mistakes, I was fired by that company. The owner of the company that fired me was my uncle. My father was the hearing officer against me, and my grandfather was a witness against me.

Let me say that no one knows how important it is to be represented, because the union got my job back. In spite of everything that I was up against, the union got my job back. I stand here to let you know I understand what it is to be represented firsthand.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country and this great State of New Jersey deserve a wage that they can live on.

Several months ago, colleagues of mine in the Congressional Black Caucus took the SNAP challenge and we lived on what a person would have to live on for a day and try to make ends meet and eat. It was an eye-opening experience. I had two bottles of water, a

microwave macaroni and cheese, and a half a can of tuna fish is what I had for a day. So if we think people are living well on \$4.17 a day, then you have another thought coming.

People need to have a living wage. We know what it costs to live in this Nation. We will continue as the CBC, as a group, to voice our opinion and be heard on these issues that impact our districts, our States, and our Nation.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank my good friend from New Jersey for those very insightful and thoughtful observations.

I think the organized labor movement has a pretty simple objective in that a hard day's work should be compensated by a good day's pay; and anybody that works hard to provide for their family should be able to take care of their family, possibly even with a solidly middle class existence. That seems like that is consistent with the idea of who we are as a country. We, of course, right now have a minimum wage that is so low—\$7.25 an hour—that you can work 40 hours a week and a family of four will still fall below the poverty line.

We've seen income inequality reach levels that are as bad as they were during the Great Depression. Part of the reason for these economic phenomena clearly have to do with the decline of Americans and their participation in the workforce as union members. It's something that we just have to confront here in this country in deciding what type of America we're going to become as we move forward into the future.

I've been joined by another extremely distinguished, eloquent, thoughtful colleague from the great State of Ohio, and I'm pleased to yield the floor now to Representative JOYCE BEATTY.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to join and thank my colleague, Mr. JEFFRIES, for leading the Congressional Black Caucus' important discussion on achieving economic security through the labor movement.

Labor unions played an important role in the civil rights movement. Today, the labor movement continues to be an important issue for African Americans, just as important as it was 50 years ago during the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom.

The labor unions and civil rights groups share the struggles of fighting for better pay and equal rights. The overall goal of this movement remains the same. We must invest in education, fair wages, and workers' rights. We must continue to fight for those in our community who are denied economic opportunity and equality. Labor unions are at the forefront of these endeavors. They ensure the gains that workers have made in the past are maintained and that workers' rights will be protected in the future. Union members

have played a critical role in the civil rights movement, and their involvement continues today.

Historically, the path of the middle class for African Americans was through a union job, and today unions continue to provide African Americans with economic security. You see, 13.3 percent of all union jobs in the United States are African American, despite African Americans only making up 11.4 percent of the overall domestic workforce. African American union jobs earn up to \$10,000, or 31 percent, more per year than nonunion workers.

If we really want to rebuild America's middle class, we need strong unions. Labor unions play a major role in our economy and on behalf of workers. The essence of what labor unions do is to provide workers with a strong voice so they receive a fair share of the economic growth that they help create. They have always been an important player in making sure that the economy works for all Americans.

Labor unions have paved the way for middle class people, for millions of American workers, and pioneered benefits such as paid health care and pensions along the way. Even today, union workers still maintain more benefits and job protection than nonunion workers.

Union jobs continue to offer higher salaries, pensions, health care, and benefits that give families the economic security that they deserve, the security to be able to send their children to college or trade schools. I know this firsthand because my dad was a union worker. Oftentimes I say that I was able to go to college because of union dollars. This is the American Dream, and unions have helped ensure that more Americans have a chance to live it.

In central Ohio, the Third Congressional District of Ohio that I represent, labor unions are strong and a significant part of the community. During my August recess, I had the opportunity to visit the Sheet Metal Workers Union, Local 24, located in Columbus, Ohio. I also had the opportunity to have a labor town hall meeting where I had the opportunity to speak. Whether it's a teacher educating our children, a skilled tradesman improving our infrastructure, police and first responders keeping us safe, electric workers, those working in transportation, the Postal Service, nurses, automotive workers, local, State, Federal, and municipal government employees, these individuals assist us every day and their work improves our communities and our local economy.

It is so important for us to come here today as Members of Congress and, yes, as members of the Congressional Black Caucus. Let me tell you why. In our current economic climate, unions are more important than ever before. We need fair wages. We need a higher min-

imum wage. As our economy continues to recover from the worst recession in 80 years, many workers are experiencing decreased wages, forcing them to spend their savings or try to figure out how to make ends meet.

Yes, unions are a vital part of our society and so important as we continue to rebuild America. We must ensure that workers can retire with dignity. We must preserve the ideals and the principles of the middle class. We must make sure that we preserve the values of that civil rights movement 50 years ago and that labor movement that defines our country. When unions are strong and able to provide a voice to American workers, our communities, our States, and our Nation grows.

So tonight I say "thank you" to all my friends in labor, because you are making us have a better America.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you, Congresswoman BEATTY, for those very comprehensive, thoughtful, and insightful remarks, and for pointing out, of course, the historic connection between the struggle for civil rights here in America and the organized labor movement.

Of course we know that A. Philip Randolph was very central in the 1963 March on Washington, that great labor leader who, in 1937, formed the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters. A. Philip Randolph once made this observation:

The essence of trade unionism is social uplift. The labor movement traditionally has been the haven for the dispossessed, the despised, the neglected, the downtrodden, and the poor.

He echoed those words several decades ago, but I think they ring true today in America in 2013, and we're thankful for that.

I've been joined by another distinguished colleague, a member of the freshman class, my colleague from the Lone Star State. It's now my honor and my privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas, MARC VEASEY.

□ 2100

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. JEFFRIES, thank you very much for having us here to talk about the importance of wages and labor unions in our country. I want to thank my friend from the Empire State of New York for putting this together. This is very important and very timely as we try to pull our country out of the economic glut that it was in, as we are turning things around and we're getting job numbers back and things seem to be getting better slowly but surely. But we want to make sure, as things get better, people have a living wage, one where they can earn a good salary and have dignity and respect and be able to feed their families and take care of them.

I was listening to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) talk

about his life when he was growing up and the importance that labor unions played in his life. I can tell you, when I was in high school, that I worked at a grocery store and it was a union grocery store, probably the only one in the Dallas-Fort Worth metro area. I remember, we had benefits. We had time and a half. We were paid extra on holidays. We were young people, but we were allowed to make a little extra money. No one got rich off it, but at least when we were working extra on those days that people would normally have off, when we worked those extra hours during the summer and when school was out, we were compensated for it and compensated for it fairly. I am really proud of that.

Also, thinking back to my childhood, I often think about the people who would come over to our house and play dominoes and cards on Friday and Saturday night, and when the men would talk about trying to uplift themselves and getting that better job and better salary, and the companies that they often talked about.

How do you get on there? That was a saying back then: Do you have a friend that can get me on over there? When people were talking about getting on someplace that had a good salary, it was a place that had a union. It was a place that had one of our labor forces fighting for good wages, fighting so your family could have health care insurance, fighting so your family could have dental insurance, and just basic things like that that so many people take for granted every day, but it certainly helped shape the person that I am today.

A strong labor force is the key to economic security. Labor unions have historically sought to fight for workers' rights—to increase wages, raise the standard of living for the middle class, ensure safe working conditions, and increase benefits for both workers and their families.

Unionized workers are more likely to receive paid leave, have employer-provided health insurance, and to participate in employer-provided pension plans. They reduce wage inequality by raising wages for low- and middle-wage workers and blue-collar workers without a college degree. And they raise wages of unionized workers by roughly 20 percent and raise compensation, including both wages and benefits, by about 28 percent.

Today, the labor movement is an important tool for African Americans and, as unions, continue to play a pivotal role in both securing legislative labor protections, such as safety and health, overtime, family and medical leave, and making sure that those rights are enforced on the job.

Labor unions are critically vital to the African American community's economic security. They have been historically and will continue to be in the

future. African American union workers' earnings are nearly 24 percent higher than nonunion counterparts, and labor unions provide key bargaining power by organizing the workers to negotiate an agreement with management. This agreement covers things such as a safe place to work, decent wages, and fringe benefits.

Unionized workers are 28 percent more likely to be covered by employer-provided health insurance and are almost 54 percent more likely to have employer-provided pensions and are more likely to receive paid leave.

Fifty years ago, the March on Washington was led with a labor message to increase economic security. Today we must work together to continue that charge. Working people need the collective voice and bargaining power unions provide to keep employers from making the workplace look as it did in the past.

Unions are vital in ensuring that corporations do not focus on creating profits at the expense of their employees.

African Americans are serving in key leadership roles in the larger labor movement. Arlene Holt Baker currently serves as the AFL-CIO's executive vice president, and Lee A. Saunders serves as the president of AFSCME.

Today, labor unions are still on the forefront of efforts to ensure that the gains of the past are maintained and that those who fight for our dignity and equality continue to march on.

I encourage my colleagues in Congress to continue to honor the traditions of the Davis-Bacon wage protections that have helped cement labor agreements and other fair practices that have helped the African American community and all Americans achieve prosperity and economic security.

And as we think about what transpired last month with the March on Washington and as we commemorated 50 years, we think about all of the great things that Dr. King did in his service to our country while God allowed him to live on this Earth, and one of my favorite quotes by Dr. King is, and I'll close out with this:

As I've said many times and believe with all my heart, the coalition that can have the greatest impact in the circle for human dignity here in America is that of the Negro and the forces of labor because their forces are so closely intertwined.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. JEFFRIES, thank you very much for this time. Let's continue to march on.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you, Representative VEASEY, for your very eloquent thoughts and observations.

Of course, we understood that Dr. King was very close with organized labor, with 1199 in New York, with the retail workers, and a variety of other unions. And of course on that tragic day down in Memphis, Tennessee, when he was assassinated in 1968, he was

there in support of striking Black sanitation workers, so he leaves behind a tremendous legacy. Part of that legacy, of course, includes standing up for the rights of workers to organize and fight for decent wages and health care and a pension. These are all things that Dr. King would advocate for were he around today.

We have been joined by one of the leaders of the CBC, someone who was a distinguished civil rights attorney prior to his arrival here in the Congress and a judge, and now he serves as vice chair in the Congressional Black Caucus, one of the most eloquent voices in the CBC, and I am pleased to yield the floor to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Thank you, very much, Mr. JEFFRIES, for those very kind words and thank you for yielding me time this evening to talk about this very important subject. Mr. JEFFRIES, your leadership on this issue, the issue involving strong labor unions and bringing American jobs back to American workers is so critically important, and for that we appreciate your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the economic success of the United States is something that other nations every day try to emulate. The success of our country is not because of us here in Congress, the policymakers, but it is because of the hard work of so many Americans who helped build a strong and resilient Nation.

The role of African Americans has been particularly important over the years. The role African Americans played in the early economic success of our country is one that is not well known to some people, but it was so vital to building the world power that we are today. Even before the Civil War, Black Americans were critical in helping to build ships and other seagoing vessels that were used to move agricultural goods and equipment to the growing Nation by serving as caulkers, a job that was dominated by African Americans.

Those same shipbuilders formed the Caulker's Association back in 1838 to protect African American caulkers by negotiating for higher wages and safer working conditions from their employers. The Caulker's Association counted Frederick Douglass, who worked as a caulker in Baltimore, as one of its members.

After the end of the Civil War, 4 million former slaves were set free. African Americans who were freed found it very difficult to find work because of racial tension. They were often used by White employers as strikebreakers so that their businesses could continue to operate while White employees were on strike.

Well, as time went on, by 1902, at the turn of the century, more than 40 national unions didn't have any members, not a single one, who were African

American. But as the quest for civil rights began in earnest, African Americans would soon find a home—a good home—with labor unions all across the country.

By the 1930s, the Congress of Industrial Organizations welcomed everyone and counted both Blacks and Whites as members and was among the most integrated organizations in the United States at that time. By 1945, more than half a million African Americans were members of unions that comprised the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Labor unions played a critical role—we've heard that tonight—in the civil rights movement, and served as one means by which African Americans could fight for civil rights and fair pay and safe working conditions.

Mr. Speaker, we recently celebrated the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom. On August 28, 1963, more than 300,000 people, including myself, witnessed the call for civil and economic rights for African Americans. And on that hot day in August, we heard Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., deliver his historic "I Have a Dream" speech. The march was one of the largest rallies for civil rights in the history of our country, and it was organized in large part—I want to make this point—it was organized in large part by labor unions, including the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the United Auto Workers.

The large role labor unions played in organizing the March on Washington cemented their place in history in providing for racial and economic equality.

In 2012, more than 14 million people were members of a labor union. But you know what? That is down from almost 18 million 30 years ago. That is very sad. Why is that?

The U.S. economy and Federal and State laws have changed since the heyday of industrial manufacturing where unions could organize with relative ease. Jobs that once required a human being are now being performed by a machine. Good paying American jobs have been relocated overseas where labor is cheap and working conditions are not as heavily regulated. And, perhaps most damaging, have been the onslaught of disgraceful antiunion policies that we have sadly seen on television that have been signed into law in States all across the country.

For African Americans, labor unions continue to be vitally important because they are committed to maintaining the hard-fought gains of opportunity and equality. Since their inception, labor unions have helped African Americans fight for equal rights and equal pay and safe working conditions. Now, African Americans are more likely than any other group to be a union member and earn more than 30 percent more than their nonunion counterparts. Labor unions will continue to be

a vital part of our economy, and we must do all that we can to ensure that the labor movement thrives with the same intensity as it did 60 years ago.

I urge my friends in labor to continue their work. It is appreciated. I recently visited the A. Philip Randolph Institute. Ms. Clayola Brown is the president. I went to their dinner just a few days ago here in Washington, and I wanted to commend them publicly for the work they are doing. I thank them for invoking the name of A. Philip Randolph who, as Mr. JEFFRIES said earlier, founded the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Let me also recognize the important work of the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, headed by my good friend Bill Lucy, who was secretary-treasurer of AFSCME for many years. And now the Reverend Terry Melvin is carrying on the work of Bill Lucy. So I thank my friends in labor and urge them to continue the great work that they are doing in this country.

Mr. JEFFRIES, I thank you for yielding me this time and for your leadership.

□ 2115

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina for those observations and for your continued leadership here in the Congress.

I would ask the Speaker how much time is remaining on this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that's been troubling to me and to many of the people that I represent back home in Brooklyn and parts of Queens has been to witness the attack on organized labor, on unions all across the country. Particularly in 2011, 2012, we witnessed it in Wisconsin, we witnessed it in Ohio, taking place in other parts of the country.

And I think that it's unfortunate that there are some forces out here in the country determined to crush the ability of the American worker to organize and fight collectively for a decent way of life.

And I think it's important to point out some of the reasons why all Americans should be thankful for unions and for the organized labor movement. I'm just going to highlight quickly 10.

We should be thankful to organized labor because of overtime pay.

We should be thankful because of child labor laws.

We should be thankful because we now have the 40-hour workweek. We should be thankful because of workers' compensation, there to provide a safety net for folks who are injured on the job.

We should be thankful because we now have the presence, as a result, in

significant part, of the organized labor movement, for unemployment insurance.

We should of course be thankful because many Americans, as a result of the efforts of organized labor, enjoy pensions, increasingly under assault, increasingly being taken away, but pensions have provided a vehicle for retirement security important to the American way of life and standard of living.

We should be thankful to organized labor because it fought for employer health care insurance coverage, something that many folks in this country still don't have, and that's one of the reasons why I strongly support the Affordable Care Act, an effort to correct that inequity that exists in America. But the fact that many employers do provide health insurance is an outgrowth that resulted from, in large measure, the effort of organized labor.

We should be thankful to organized labor because of the presence of whistleblower protection laws that give, in many instances, workers the capacity to identify something that's wrong, and to be able to move forward and reveal it, often, in some instances, when public funds are being squandered or the law is being broken; to reveal a wrong without having to have the same level of fear that retaliation would take place as a result of simply doing the right thing.

We should be thankful to organized labor because it fought for sexual harassment laws designed to allow the workforce to be an environment where men and women could exist without fear of inappropriate behavior poisoning the atmosphere. We still have a long way to go in that regard, but we've got some good laws on the books designed to protect against repulsive behavior in the workforce.

Lastly, we should be thankful, and this in no way is an exhaustive list, just a representative sample, but we should be thankful for holiday pay, thankful that organized labor fought for the opportunity for many Americans to be able to enjoy Thanksgiving or Christmas or New Year's or other holidays with their families, still have an opportunity to be compensated as a result of the ability to get certain holidays, perhaps most significantly, the Fourth of July, where we celebrate the birthday of this great Nation—off in remembrance of who we are and where we need to go in this country.

We've got a lot of reasons to be thankful to organized labor. Several of my colleagues earlier today referenced their own personal experiences as it relates to the labor movement. And as I was listening to those experiences, from Representative DONALD PAYNE and Representative MARC VEASEY, I thought about the experience of myself and my own family, growing up in Brooklyn to two parents in a working class neighborhood in Crown Heights.

My parents were married in April of 1967. At the time they got married, they were both members of the Social Service Employees Union, SSEU, which subsequently became Local 371 and DC 37. But they were both SSEU members. They got married in April of 1967.

And just a short while thereafter, the union decided to go out on strike because they were fighting for improved conditions, both for the workers and for the clients that Social Service workers served.

My parents, newlyweds at the time, confronted what I imagine was an extremely difficult decision: Do we strike with our union brothers and sisters, even though we'll have no possible means of providing for ourselves, and we don't know how long we'll be out of work, or do we cross that picket line in defiance of the collective action of the SSEU workers who went out on strike?

I'm proud that my parents joined with their union brothers and sisters and went out on strike. And as I look back at that decision, it's a lot of reason for me and for my brother and for our family to be thankful, because when I think about it, in 1973, my younger brother was born with some heart difficulty, and I'm confident, looking back on it, that it was that union-negotiated health care that helped our family get through what was otherwise a very difficult time. And my brother's alive and well and doing wonderful things as a professor at Ohio State University right now.

And then in 1980, my parents bought their first and only home in Crown Heights, the home that my brother and I grew up in, the home that they still live in back in Brooklyn right now. And it was that union-negotiated salary that helped them put together the money to make the down payment and to pay the mortgage all of these years.

Then in 1988, it was time for me to go off to college. And one of the reasons why I was able to come out of college relatively debt-free is because my mother borrowed against her union-negotiated pension in order to send her children to college.

And so the organized labor movement never has to worry about whether I'm going to stand up for them because they've always stood up for me and so many others just like me, as we heard from my colleagues in the freshman class here in the Congress. And that's simply representative of stories that so many folks across America could share.

Now, unfortunately, we know that organized labor is under attack. About 60 years ago, in 1953, about 35 percent of the American workforce had collective bargaining coverage. But as of 2010, we went from about 35 percent in the 1950s to just under 7 percent in 2010.

Where has that gotten us?

I think it's put us, not in a better position, as middle class America or

working families; it's put us in a worse position.

And we saw the attacks in Wisconsin, and we saw the attacks on collective bargaining in Ohio that the folks had to roll back after the people of Ohio rose up in opposition.

I was proud, as a member of the State legislature at the time, in 2012, to support the effort to unionize by a group of very courageous cable workers in Brooklyn. Organized by the Communication Workers of America, they voted, in the face of significant pressure to the contrary, to join the union and to organize a chapter in order to fight for better wages and for stronger health care and the possibility of a better retirement.

Unfortunately, the courageous nature of those workers has not been met with a negotiated contract. The collective bargaining process has failed them to date. In fact, more than 20 of them were unceremoniously terminated earlier this year, and they were only brought back in the face of tremendous pressure by public servants at all levels of government.

But more than 18 months later, from the moment in which they voted to join the union, they still are in limbo. They have no contract, and in many ways, their lives have been turned upside down. In fact, every other worker in the company that employed these cable workers has been granted a substantial raise, while these individuals remain in limbo.

We're hopeful that we can do better, that we can bring the NLRB back to life, that it can serve as an objective entity to regulate the relationship between the workforce and employers across America.

There are a lot of employers who want to do the right thing. We should encourage that because it's good for America. And in this economic recovery that we have right now, there are a lot of companies that are doing pretty well. But there are a lot of workers who are still struggling.

One of the things that I think we have to confront here in the Congress is the fact that we have a very schizophrenic economic recovery. The stock market is way up, corporate profit's way up, the productivity of the American worker is way up, yet, unemployment remains stubbornly high, and wages remain stagnant.

How can that be when corporate America is doing so well, when investors in the stock market are doing so well, when objective measures show that the productivity of the American worker has increased significantly?

But the American worker, in terms of their ability to live and pursue the middle class dream, has, in many ways, been left behind.

These are questions that I'm hopeful this Congress will confront. As we fight our way through sequestration and

deal with the debt ceiling and the potential default, God forbid, that we have to confront next month, and we work our way, deliberatively, through the question of whether a military strike in Syria is appropriate, let's not forget the fact that what makes America great is the capacity for people to work hard, to purchase a home, to raise their family in safety, in security, with the ability to live a life where they provide for themselves and for their families and are able to hand to a generation of Americans that come behind them, hopefully, an America that is more prosperous, not less prosperous.

□ 2130

We in the CBC believe that the best way to get there is not to continue to attack organized labor but to recognize what it has done for this country and to strengthen organized labor as we move forward.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues Congressmen JEFFRIES and HORSFORD for once again leading the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order Hour.

African Americans have had a long history with the labor movement.

Within the labor community, African Americans joined with individuals of other races to advance efforts to create ladders to prosperity in an environment of economic and racial discrimination.

In the 1800s, such efforts led to African American union visionaries, such as Isaac Myers, who realized the collective power of African Americans within the Trade Union movement.

Under Myers, an organized group of ship caulkers purchased and operated the Chesapeake Marine Railway and Dry Dock Company in Baltimore.

Within months, the cooperative employed 300 African American caulkers and received several government contracts.

Nearly 100 years later, A. Phillip Randolph would organize the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Randolph was instrumental in uniting the African American Civil Rights community and the labor movement with the shared ideals of collective prosperity and economic security.

Randolph proposed a 1941 March on Washington that heavily influenced the economic and social themes echoed by Bayard Rustin, Martin Luther King, Jr., and others who were instrumental in making the 1963 March on Washington a success.

During celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington last month, we recalled the message of social and economic justice that union leaders spoke of in 1963.

Dr. King was noted for saying, "it's not enough to have a right to sit at a lunch counter if you can't afford to buy a meal."

This message echoed the call of labor leaders who asked "what good is it to be able to serve at the counter when you can't afford to buy a meal?"

Sadly, today, we must still ask this question.

As the wealth gap continues to grow, income and food insecurity remain prevalent.

The ladders to prosperity that Myers, Randolph and King spoke of are still inaccessible to many in our society—whether they are African American or another race or ethnicity.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle speak of disbanding labor unions and limiting collective bargaining rights.

I proudly stand with our labor allies to fight these efforts because I know weakened organized labor means continued erosion of the middle class.

The Members of the Congressional Black Caucus will continue to oppose devastating cuts to programs that will only increase economic despair.

Together we will continue to propose and support policies that create economic opportunity for all people rather than for a select few.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I join in support of my colleagues Representatives HAKEEM JEFFRIES and STEVEN HORSFORD in leading tonight's Congressional Black Caucus Special Order on the topic of Achieving Economic Security Through the Labor Movement.

I want to offer special recognition for the men and women of labor who are dedicated to the working people of the 18th Congressional District and the Greater Houston area.

I began my remarks with a special tribute to one of the greatest labor leaders that I have known and to honor the memory of Ronnie Raspberry of Houston, Texas. He passed away in April of this year, and he will be remembered as a champion of working people, one of the great community leaders in the cities of Houston and Harris in Texas.

People like Harris County AFL-CIO Council President E. Dale Wortham, IBEW, Local 716, Secretary-Treasurer Richard C. Shaw, Steven Flores, a member of the Latino Labor Leadership Council, Tawn E. MacDonald, CWA, Local 6222, Houston Chapter and Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW), Zeph Cappo, Labor Council for Latin American Advancement (LCLAA) and Scott Vinson, with the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists (CBTU), and Gayle Fallon, President—Houston Federation of Teachers improve the lives of working people in the city of Houston.

This list is not complete with a special mention of Houston Educational Support Personnel Union President Wretha Thomas who works with local school bus drivers to be sure that their rights are included when district negotiate labor agreements.

I want to say a word about Clyde Fitzgerald who was appointed to the Port of Houston Authority Commission by Harris County in June 2013. I cannot complete the list of outstanding labor leaders in Houston with mentioning Dean E. Corgey who was appointed to the Port of Houston Authority Commission in January 2013. He represents the City of Houston, and serves on the Community Relations and Pension and Benefits Committees.

John Bland with the Transport Workers Union (AFL-CIO) and leader of Coalition of Black Trade Unionists (CBTU) is doing outstanding job as well.

My thanks to the unions that represents Houston's First responders. I want to recognize Houston Police Officers Union President

Ray Hunt and the Immediate Past President J.J. Berry.

I count the International Association of Fire Fighters Houston Local 341 President Jeff Caynon and General President Harold Schaitberger as friends and I am like all Houstonians proud of how that serve the fire fighting community and our city as true selfless public servants.

The most important thing to remember about unions is wrapped up in the answer to one question—What does labor want? Samuel Gompers—Founder of the American Federation of Labor provided the answer:

More. We want more school houses and less jails; more books and less arsenals; more learning and less vice; more constant work and less crime; more leisure and less greed; more justice and less revenge; in fact, more of the opportunities to cultivate our better natures, to make manhood more noble, womanhood more beautiful and childhood more happy and bright. These in brief are the primary demands made by the Trade Unions in the name of labor. These are the demands made by labor upon modern society and in their consideration is involved the fate of civilization. (1893)

Quote: Martin Luther King:

Unless man [and women are] . . . committed to the belief that all mankind are [our sisters and] . . . brothers, then [we] . . . labor . . . in vain and hypocritically in the vineyards of equality.

The right to earn a living wage, to work in safe conditions, to enjoy a forty hour work week, have health care, be free of discrimination, have sick leave, receive overtime pay, have a pension, be free of sexual harassment have holiday pay and enjoy countless other protections comes as direct result of what Unions mean to working men and women of this nation.

Some would have you believe that the working life of men and women is just the way it is—but in truth it is what the blood, sweat and tears of working people made it to be.

Labor Day is celebrated in recognition of the toil and trials that millions of workers endured before they earned the right to collective bargaining and with that right the power to change the fate of working people for generations. The fruits of their effort extended to those in management as well as the poorest of the poor.

Unions are the reason that the basic standard of living in the United States has risen, without the protection of unions advocating the behalf of workers those gains would be completely lost.

During the last Congress I introduced the New Jobs for America Act, that directs the Secretary of Labor to make grants to state and local governments and Indian tribes to carry out employment training programs to aid unemployed individuals in securing employment in a new area of expertise, particularly in emerging markets and industries

I also co-sponsored the American Jobs Act of 2011 which would have provided tax relief for American workers and businesses, to put workers back on the job while rebuilding and modernizing America, and to provide pathways back to work for Americans looking for jobs.

I supported the Job Opportunities Between our Shores Act or JOBS Act that Amends the

Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to direct the Secretary of Labor to make grants to or enter into contracts with eligible entities to carry out demonstration and pilot projects that provide education and training programs for jobs in advanced manufacturing.

My heart where Fannie Lou Hamer's was during the civil rights movement—which was really more about economic rights to move up in our nation's socio-economic system. People were held down because they were women, black, Hispanic, Native American, Asian, or poor.

It is not a crime if you sweat when you work for a living and we should end the practice of dividing how workers are treated based on how they earn a living.

Fannie Lou Hamer Quotes:

To support whatever is right, and to bring in justice where we've had so much injustice.

That is the reason, we are here tonight—to bring justice where we've had so much injustice in the unwillingness of the current Republican controlled Congress to acknowledge the value of your worth to the American economy by securing for your labor a living minimum wage.

There is not America without the American worker. This is as true today as it was from the nation's earliest beginnings. At our earliest history workers were indentured servants, bonded persons, or slaves. The sweat of their brow carved a nation out of stone, swamp, and dense wilderness to become one the greatest nation the world has ever known.

Historically, the path to the middle class for African Americans was through a union job. African-American workers are more likely to be union members because they know that acting as one is stronger than acting alone. This is the message of the civil rights movement and one that African Americans have learned well over the decades of struggle for equal rights.

Equality also requires equal access to education, employment and pay.

Coretta Scott King Quotes:

The greatness of a community is most accurately measured by the compassionate actions of its members, . . . a heart of grace and a soul generated by love.

Unionized workers promote greater income equality and prevent wage discrimination.

African American union workers earn up to \$10,000 or 31% more per year than non-union members.

In 2011, nearly 20 percent of employed African Americans worked for state, local, or federal government compared to 14.2% of Whites and 10.4 percent of Hispanics.

African Americans are less likely than Hispanics and nearly as likely as Whites to work in the private sector, not including the self-employed.

Few African Americans are self-employed—only 3.8 percent reported being self-employed in 2011—making them almost half as likely to be self-employed as Whites (7.2 percent).

Unionized workers are more likely to receive paid leave, more likely to have employer-provided health insurance, and are more likely to be in employer-provided pension plans.

The tools of unions must be part of the landscape for poor working Americans and the way forward for equity and fairness in income and the benefits of the success of our society.

Unions play a pivotal role by ensuring workers have continued educational access for their current roles as well as encourage workers to pursue higher education. Nationally, 77 percent of union employees in 2009 were covered by pension plans that provide a guaranteed monthly retirement income. Only 20 percent of non-union workers are covered by guaranteed (defined-benefit) pensions 20 percent.

Union workers are 53.9 percent more likely to have employer-provided pensions. These are not isolated facts, when unions are strong and able to represent the people who want to join them, these gains spread throughout the economy and the overall community.

Unions are not just good for workers. They are the best friend that a successful business can have. When workers form unions they are able to boost wages, which helps attract and retain staff for employers. When non-union companies increase their wages, it gives all workers more purchasing power.

The benefits of unions flow to the entire community with a strong middle class have sufficient tax revenues to support schools, hospitals and roads.

Today, labor unions are still on the forefront of efforts to ensure that the gains of the past are maintained and to fight for those still denied opportunity and equality.

Unions are a great community and I will tell you why you should be standing up with them for your rights.

In 1968, Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King went to Memphis to help sanitation workers who were fighting for their rights and dignity as people who worked hard for a living, but had no living wage.

In 1968 Memphis the color of the skin of two black workers was prevented by Jim Crow laws from finding shelter from a cold rain sought warmth in the back of a sanitation truck and were crushed to death—Martin Luther King could not keep silent nor turn away.

He was killed in Memphis at the Lorraine Motel because of the power of his message to move the hearts and minds of people so that they would fight for the rights and dignity of working people everywhere.

Talking Points:

The 2013 Federal Poverty guidelines stipulate \$23,550 for a family of four as poverty level. A \$7.25 minimum wage earns \$15,080 a year. Even at the poverty level of \$23,550 for a family of four, families are unable to make ends meet and often have to sacrifice basic necessities.

Fast food jobs used to be considered entry level jobs and often held by teenagers but now, in the new economy, the average age of a fast food worker is 28, many of which have families to support. A family living on \$15,000 a year must sacrifice many basic necessities most of us take for granted—like healthcare, transportation, and food—to say nothing of the luxuries many of us enjoy on a regular basis.

In Houston, nearly 500,000 people make poverty wages or less, or nearly one quarter of all Houstonians. The ripple effects of this amount of people given more spending power would create a tremendous amount of economic activity spurring job creation and new markets for small business. Fast food workers paid a living wage of \$15/hr. not only puts

food on their tables but also puts more money into the local economy. This is an economic engine that needs to be started.

With 1.07 million restaurant and food service workers, Texas has the second-largest restaurant workforce in the nation. And it leads the nation in projected restaurant job growth between 2013 and 2023, according to the National Restaurant Association. The trade group predicts a nearly 16 percent jump in Texas restaurant and food service jobs in 10 years.

Texas also had the nation's largest collection of minimum-wage workers last year, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Texas accounted for nearly 13 percent of such workers across the country, the data showed.

My thanks to my colleagues' Representatives HAKEEM JEFFRIES and STEVEN HORSFORD for hosting this important special order.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the working people of this great Nation.

My fellow members of the Congressional Black Caucus and I are here tonight to honor the Labor Movement. We do so one week after our Nation celebrated its 119th Labor Day, and two weeks after we celebrated the 50th Anniversary of the March on Washington for Jobs and Justice. It is only appropriate that we pay homage to both tonight, as the Labor Movement and the Civil Rights Movement are sisters in the fight for dignity, freedom, and justice.

Over the years, Labor Day like many holidays has lost much of its meaning. Today, most Americans simply think of it as the end of summer, or the beginning of school. One last moment to enjoy the beach or the backyard with friends and family.

However, Labor Day is also a day during which we should honor those who paid the ultimate price to secure their children a more perfect union. At Bay View in 1885, at Haymarket in 1886, at Pullman in 1894, and in Memphis in 1968, members of the Labor Movement laid down their lives so that others might earn a living.

My own support for collective bargaining rights started early on with my father, John Conyers Sr., who worked with the United Auto Workers to integrate factories in Detroit, before the Civil Rights Movement took that battle to the buses of Alabama and the lunch counters of North Carolina. His battle—Labor's battle—was one which Dr. Martin Luther King would later recognize as the final frontier for the Civil Rights Movement. Specifically, the availability of jobs that paid a fair wage—wage upon which one could raise a family, plan for old age, and live a life beyond mere survival.

Dr. King once spoke of the Labor Movement as the "first and pioneer anti-poverty program." In his last battle, Dr. King went to Memphis, TN, the city that would claim his life, to stand with the sanitation workers of that city who sought what so many of us take for granted and so many of us only dream of: a fair day's pay, for a fair day's work.

Speaking to the sanitation workers of Memphis, he acknowledged the threats he had received, but he told them that he stood before them unafraid of any man, for he had been to the mountain top, and even if he didn't reach the Promised Land, he knew that others would one day.

Today, we are still on that mountaintop, waiting for the Promised Land. Through the sacrifices of labor and civil rights leaders, we were led out of bondage, but we still have not reached the land promised in the American dream. It is my hope that in the 21st Century, we will see the same progress we saw through the middle part of the 20th Century. I hope to see the middle class prosper, I hope to see management work with labor to produce wonders that we could not hope to achieve without cooperation, and I hope to finally see poverty conquered through the power of fair wages and honest toil. Together, workers can seize the dream that will slip out of any one person's grasp. Together, workers have the power to ford any river, cross any valley, and come down from the mountain where we have been for too long.

AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM IN THE FACE OF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as a former soldier. Like many of my colleagues in this room who served, I took an oath to honor and defend the Constitution of the United States against enemies both domestic and abroad. American soldiers do not swear to defend the President; they don't swear to defend Congress or political parties. They swear to defend the Constitution because this document is the bulwark that protects our freedom.

American soldiers swear to protect this document because our Founding Fathers understood that elected officials, from the President to us here in the House of Representatives, are fallible human beings. They swear to protect this document because they know that the principles it defends are true and its wisdom will last long after we're dead, just as it lasted long before we were born.

The Constitution of the United States of America is the key difference between us and other countries. It is what makes our Nation exceptional. Forged on the anvil of liberty, it has protected our Nation as we have grown from a fledgling Republic into a world superpower. The soldier that we ask to fight on our behalf knows that. We must honor our military by looking to the wisdom of the Constitution whenever we discuss sending our troops to war.

The Constitution itself makes clear that we should go to war "for the common defense." This statement, "for the common defense," was so important that it was used twice by our Founding Fathers: once in the preamble, then again in laying out the duties of Congress.

We live in a fallen world. Bad things happen to innocent people every day

across the globe. Drug cartels behead people in central America, Christians being burned alive in Nigeria, human trafficking in Asia—all of these things are heart-wrenching but none of them involve our common defense.

When I see what is happening in Syria and read the intelligence given to us, I do not see how this terrible civil war involves our common defense. I understand the horrors of the Assad regime and it sickens me. It hurts to see the pictures of dead children brutally gassed by a hateful dictator. Yet the actions our President wishes us to take would do little to prevent such a man from continuing to murder his people, nor would help those our soldiers were sworn to protect—our constituents.

In his farewell address, George Washington said:

We may choose peace or war, as our interest guided by justice shall counsel.

There is nothing just, or in our interest, in lobbing a few bombs into a country and walking away.

The Secretary of State and the President have both stated that we need to go to war because Assad broke a treaty that the entire world supports. The U.N., they say, cannot act. Mr. Speaker, I am asking the same question my constituents are asking: Why do we spend billions of dollars supporting an international organization for peace that cannot enforce a treaty supported by the entire world? If the U.N. is so hamstrung that it cannot rally the world to stop Assad and we have to unilaterally attack Syria, what exactly is the point of having a U.N.?

The Secretary of State also had the gall to tell both the Senate and the House Foreign Relations Committees that bombing Syria is “not a war in the classic sense.” Let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker. If another nation attacked us the way our President wants to attack Syria, everyone in this room would call it war. Let me tell you something else, Mr. Speaker: war has consequences.

The Secretary of State told the House Foreign Relations Committee that the goal of bombing Syria was to “degrade” Assad’s chemical weapons and cause a stalemate in the fighting. In other words, Assad will still have the capability of using chemical weapons and could very well use them again to break the stalemate we create. Does anyone really think that we will just stop with the first round of bombings? That’s not how war works. Wars are a “yes” or “no” question. You cannot, as Secretary Kerry and the White House suggest, only kind of fight a war. If we break it, we’re going to be forced to fix it.

Like I said, I’m an old soldier, and old soldiers need mission plans. When I look at this mission plan, I don’t see anything that suggests we will simply be able to walk away after this bombing campaign.

America’s role in the world is not to play parent to the rest of the nations, chastising bad actors and picking winners and losers in battles that don’t directly threaten us. The point of our Nation is to show the world the wisdom of a free and representative government.

My fellow Members of Congress, we can show that wisdom here today with this vote. We can show the world that our Nation will not plunge itself into war because our President drew an artificial red line and feels embarrassed that a dictator crossed it.

Our military does not belong to the White House. It belongs to the people. I ask you, show the power and wisdom of our Founding Fathers when they granted the representatives of the people with the decision to go to war.

I strongly urge everyone in this room to vote “no” on attacking Syria and involving ourselves in their civil war.

God bless America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and September 10 on account of a family medical emergency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker on Friday, August 2, 2013:

H.R. 267. An act to improve hydropower, and for other purposes.

H.R. 678. An act to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1171. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property.

H.R. 2576. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. THORNBERRY, on Tuesday, August 6, 2013:

H.R. 1344. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o’clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 10, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

2741. A letter from the President Of The United States, transmitting an alternative plan for monthly basic pay increases for members of the uniformed services, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 1009(e); (H. Doc. No. 113-58); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

2742. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-41, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2743. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report identifying, for each of the Armed Forces (other than the Coast Guard) and each Defense Agency, the percentage of funds that were expended during the preceding fiscal year for performance of depot-level maintenance and repair workloads by the public and private sectors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2744. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Rhett A. Hernandez, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2745. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department’s report concerning efforts made by the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies to employ an adequate number of Americans during 2012, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276c-4; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2746. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-36, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2747. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. RSAT-13-3520); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2748. A letter from the Associate Director for PP&I, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Technical Amendments to Counter-terrorism Sanctions Regulations Implemented by OFAC received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2749. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting four reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2750. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of

Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2751. A letter from the President Of The United States, transmitting an alternative plan for locality pay increases payable to civilian Federal employees covered by the General Schedule (GS) and certain other pay systems for 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5305(a)(3); (H. Doc. No. 113-57); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and ordered to be printed.

2752. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Recreational Management Measures for the Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Fishing Year 2013 [Docket No.: 130403319-3545-02] (RIN: 0648-BD13) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2753. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No.: 121210694-3514-02] (RIN: 0648-XC392) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2754. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast (NE) Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 48; Final Rule; Correction [Docket No.: 120814336-3495-03] (RIN: 0648-BC27) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2755. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Amendment 9 [Docket No.: 120919470-3513-02] (RIN: 0648-BC58) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2756. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery off the Southern Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 13 [Docket No.: 120815345-3525-02] (RIN: 0648-BC41) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2757. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab Rationalization Program [Docket No.: 120806311-3530-02] (RIN: 0648-BC25) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2758. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Adminis-

tration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC739) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2759. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2013 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Gray Triggerfish [Docket No.: 100812345-2142-03] (RIN: 0648-XC728) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2760. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Adjusted Closure of the 2013 Gulf of Mexico Recreational Sector for Red Snapper [Docket No.: 130212129-3474-02] (RIN: 0648-XC715) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2761. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revisions to Framework Adjustment 50 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan and Sector Annual Catch Entitlements; Updated Annual Catch Limits for Sectors and the Common Pool for Fishing Year 2013 [Docket No.: 130219149-3524-03] (RIN: 0648-BC97) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2762. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Shark Management Measures; Amendment 5a [Docket No.: 110831548-3536-02] (RIN: 0648-BB29) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2763. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a report on applications for delayed-notice search warrants and extensions during fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2764. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's 2013 annual report on recommendations made by the Intelligent Transportation Systems Program Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2765. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Department of Energy FY 2012 Methane Hydrate Program Report to Congress", pursuant to Section 968 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2766. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Certification of Factual Information to Import Administration During Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings [Docket No.: 0612243022-3538-03] (RIN: 0625-AA66) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2767. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2013-52] received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2768. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 2013 Section 43 Inflation Adjustment [Notice 2013-50] received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2769. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting Third Quarterly Report of FY 2013 under The Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2008; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

2770. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting Second Quarterly Report of FY 2013 on the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of the rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2844. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens; with an amendment (Rept. 113-189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 3064. A bill to establish scientific standards and protocols across forensic disciplines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 3065. A bill to repeal the War Powers Resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COTTON:

H.R. 3066. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to prohibit a government subsidy or contribution for the premiums of a health plan by a Member of Congress or Members' staff or congressional

leadership or committee staff; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BARR, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 3067. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to prohibit a government subsidy for the purchase of a health plan by a Member of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 3068. A bill relating to members of the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians of Michigan; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan):

H.R. 3069. A bill to improve public safety through increased law enforcement presence and enhanced public safety equipment and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 3070. A bill to amend section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to reform access to certain business records for foreign intelligence and international terrorism investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 3071. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide that no Government contribution may be made toward the cost of Exchange coverage for any Member of Congress or congressional staff; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3072. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Local Food for Healthy Families Program; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 58. A joint resolution prohibiting the use of funds available to any United States Government department or agency for the use of force in, or directed at, Syria by the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for investigation and prosecution of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide, whether committed by officials of the Government of Syria, or members of other groups involved in civil war in Syria, and calling on the President to direct the United States representative to the United Nations to use the voice and vote of the United States to immediately promote the establishment of a Syrian war crimes tribunal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H. Res. 335. A resolution to refer H.R. 3068, a bill making congressional reference to the United States Court of Federal Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, the Indian trust-related claims of the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians of Michigan as well as its individual members; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. Res. 336. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week beginning September 8, 2013, as "National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 337. A resolution recognizing the contributions of musician Chuck Brown, the Godfather of Go-Go, to music and to the District of Columbia and expressing support for the designation of a Chuck Brown Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3064.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 3065.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 (The Congress shall have power . . . to declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water).

By Mr. COTTON:

H.R. 3066.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9—No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law;

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 3067.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

No Obamacare Subsidies for Members of Congress Act

Article I Section 1: All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

Article I Section 6 Clause 1: The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Com-

pensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

Article I Section 8 Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 3068.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which allows Congress to regulate trade amongst the Indian Tribes. This bill is enacted pursuant to treaties lawfully entered into and ratified pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article II, Section 2, Clause 2. This bill is enacted pursuant to Article III Section 2 which grants Congress power to regulate jurisdiction in courts inferior to the United States Supreme Court.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3069.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clauses 1 and 18.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 3070.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 3071.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3072.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 gives Congress the power to creates laws that provide for the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 58.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1, 11, and 12

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 23: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 24: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 38: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 73: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 75: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 148: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 176: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 199: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 262: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 301: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. RADEL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 303: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 320: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 383: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 449: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 495: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 508: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

- H.R. 521: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 525: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 565: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 647: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. FARR, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 685: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. YOHO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MARINO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PETRI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. HAHN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 688: Ms. LEE of California and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 690: Mr. WELCH, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 705: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 721: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 725: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 744: Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 755: Mr. RADEL, Mr. YOHO, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 792: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 801: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 833: Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 920: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 946: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 961: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 980: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 984: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 997: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 1008: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1024: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1077: Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1078: Mr. BARR and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1095: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1130: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 1155: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 1173: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1199: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1238: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1239: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1249: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 1250: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1251: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1252: Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1254: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1281: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1286: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1384: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1461: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 1563: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1572: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 1591: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 1598: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1623: Ms. WATERS and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1726: Mr. DENT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1734: Mr. WELCH and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1735: Mr. FLORES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 1771: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1775: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1779: Mr. GOSAR, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. JONES, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MARINO, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1798: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1830: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1842: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1843: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1869: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1890: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 1893: Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1921: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CHU, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1941: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1945: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 1976: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2023: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2030: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 2039: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2043: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2045: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 2046: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2086: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2129: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2146: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2202: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 2224: Mr. HOLT, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 2274: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 2328: Mr. PETRI, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. YOHO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2330: Mr. MARINO and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2347: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 2349: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. ENYART, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2415: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2468: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2478: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 2485: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2495: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 2502: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2504: Mr. HIMES, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 2512: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2520: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2522: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2527: Ms. WATERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 2548: Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 2549: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2557: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 2575: Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. MCKEON, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 2590: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 2591: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2606: Mr. McDERMOTT and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2682: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. COOK, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 2689: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 2697: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2707: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 2717: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 2720: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2728: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 2760: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2772: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 2775: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2805: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 2837: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 2847: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CHU, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2871: Mr. HARPER and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2894: Mr. JOYCE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 2901: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 2916: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 2936: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2967: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 2969: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 2997: Mr. RADEL and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 3023: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 3043: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 3050: Ms. MENG and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.J. Res. 19: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.J. Res. 21: Mr. CLAY and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.J. Res. 55: Mr. CARTER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. BARR.
H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. WALZ.
H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H. Res. 30: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. RENACCI.
H. Res. 35: Mr. PITTENGER.
H. Res. 36: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. REED, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. TERRY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H. Res. 75: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H. Res. 101: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H. Res. 109: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H. Res. 123: Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 131: Mr. PITTENGER.
H. Res. 147: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H. Res. 187: Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 188: Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 227: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H. Res. 238: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H. Res. 254: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H. Res. 293: Mr. JONES, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. WELCH.
H. Res. 302: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H. Res. 313: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 2775, to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 2775 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HOLLYWOOD SIGN

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 90th anniversary of a true California icon—the Hollywood Sign in the hills of Hollywood, California.

First erected in 1923, the Hollywood Sign originally read “Hollywoodland” to advertise the new housing developments that surrounded the Hollywood Hills. In 1949, the sign was changed to simply “Hollywood,” and since then has become a symbol of the vibrant Hollywood movie industry, a beacon attracting talent and tourists to come to Los Angeles from all over the world, and a national treasure.

In 1973, the Hollywood sign was declared a historical and cultural monument of Los Angeles. Thus, the Hollywood Sign Trust was established to protect the icon. Throughout the years, the Hollywood Sign Trust has become an avid supporter of cultural events in and around Hollywood. The Trust’s current mission is to repair, maintain, refurbish, and provide improvements to the Hollywood Sign.

Over the years, the Hollywood Sign has attracted not only those who dream of a career in film and television, but also visitors from every corner of the world. As a symbol of hope, adventure and a bit of glamour, the Hollywood Sign stretches vibrantly across Mount Lee, visible throughout Los Angeles.

I am proud to recognize the Hollywood Sign upon its 90th Anniversary, and I ask all Members to join me today in honoring this historic monument.

RECOGNIZING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. PATRICK’S CHURCH

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 175th anniversary of St. Patrick’s Church, the oldest Roman Catholic Church in the Diocese of Joliet, Illinois.

St. Patrick’s Church dates back to 1838 with the arrival of Reverend John Francis Plunkett, an Irish immigrant who was assigned to provide spiritual needs to the construction workers of the Illinois & Michigan Canal project. As a result of the canal project, many immigrant families migrated to the area and as the community grew, St. Patrick’s Church was born.

Throughout the next 175 years and seventeen pastors, St. Patrick’s Church thrived and

experienced many changes. For the first 81 years of its existence, it was located on Broadway Street, where the current Victory Center now stands. In 1919, it moved to its current location on West Marion Street.

Today, the dedicated parishioners of St. Patrick’s Church continue to extend their commitment to service for their community and beyond. Whether it be from the \$25,000 in aid they were able to distribute to unfortunate families who sought help with bill payments to their impressive Food Pantry program which serves more than 300 families a month, the parishioners of St. Patrick’s Church truly embody the spirit of selfless service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing St. Patrick’s Church on the occasion of their 175th anniversary and I wish them many more years of dedicated service to the community.

TRIBUTE TO THE DEMPSEY FAMILY

HON. HENRY C. “HANK” JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, the birth of Ezekiel Dempsey in the state of North Carolina in the 1800’s began the Dempsey family lineage which has blessed us with descendants that have helped to shape our nation; and

Whereas, the Dempsey Family has produced many well respected citizens and the patriarchs and matriarchs of the Dempsey Family are pillars of strength that have touched many throughout our nation, family members of the past and present such as Rev. Tom Dempsey, Stephen Dempsey, William Dempsey, James Dempsey and Sarah Dempsey; and

Whereas, in our beloved Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, we are honored to have members of the Dempsey family for they are some of our most beloved citizens in our District; and

Whereas, family is one of the most honored and cherished institutions in the world, we take pride in knowing that families such as the Dempsey family have set aside this time to fellowship with each other, honor one another and to pass along history to each other by meeting at this year’s family reunion in DeKalb County, Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Dempsey family;

Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. “HANK” JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim June 8, 2012, as Dempsey Family Reunion Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, This 8th day of June, 2012.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MAY SONG VANG PAO

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay to tribute to the life of May Song Vang Pao, who passed away on August 5, 2013 at the age of 62. Mrs. Gen. Vang Pao was constantly filled with optimism and drive despite her nearly eight year battle with cancer. Although faced with increasingly insurmountable odds, Mrs. Gen. Vang Pao continued to battle the disease to help maintain the legacy of her late husband, General Vang Pao.

May Song was born in Laos on February 5, 1951 to Nhia Chou Moua and Yee Lee. Receiving an education was very important to May even though it went against her father’s beliefs and the gender roles at the time. She became a nurse and focused most of her attention on caring for the disabled. May’s decision to receive an education was the beginning of her lifelong message that it is important for both men and women to be educated.

In 1973, she married General Vang Pao, who was the only ethnic Hmong general in the Royal Lao Army. This achievement earned him worldwide recognition. After aiding the United States forces in the Vietnam War, Mr. and Mrs. General Vang Pao as well as many other Hmong refugees resettled in the United States. Eventually settling in California’s Central Valley, Mr. and Mrs. General Vang Pao continued their roles as leaders in the Hmong community.

Mrs. Gen. Vang Pao was instrumental in helping refugees settle into their new American lives. She inspired many young men and women to strive for greatness and brought the Hmong community together under her benevolent leadership. Mrs. Gen. Vang Pao will remain an inspiration to those in both the American and Asian Hmong communities.

After the passing of General Vang Pao in January 2011, Mrs. Gen. Vang Pao remained strong and unified the entire Hmong community. She helped the community recover from the loss of their mentor and hero. In 2012, she founded the General Vang Pao Foundation in Fresno which aims to help and support disadvantaged Hmong families.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to the life of May Song Vang Pao. She will always be remembered as an influential member of our very important Hmong community.

● This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

IN HONOR OF DR. EDDIE T.
LINDSEY, JR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I pay tribute to a terrific educator and outstanding citizen of Columbus, Georgia, Dr. Eddie T. Lindsey, Jr. Dr. Lindsey passed away on Monday, August 12, 2013. A Homegoing Celebration was held on Friday, August 16, 2013 at 12:00 p.m. at the First African Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia.

Born on January 24, 1932, Dr. Eddie Lindsey grew up in Columbus, Georgia. He was a graduate of Spencer High School, and went on to attend Savannah State University where he found his passion for education. Upon graduating, he began his teaching career first at Carver High School and then taught at his Alma Mater, Spencer High School. From 1964–1966, he served as Assistant Principal of Carver Elementary School before serving as Principal of Marshall Junior High School for one year. Then in 1967, he was named Principal of Spencer High School, where he served for eight more years.

In 1975, Dr. Lindsey made history as the first African-American assistant superintendent in Muscogee County when he was named the Assistant Superintendent for Policy and Procedures for the Muscogee County School District. In 1980, he became the Assistant Superintendent for Policy and Student Services, where he served for over 20 years until his retirement on June 30, 1991.

Dr. Lindsey's impact stretched far beyond his immediate students, however, as he was also the first African-American teacher to get a six-year certificate, and the first African American to serve on the Muscogee County School Board, blazing a trail for many other Black teachers and administrators. He created and published the school district's first policy booklet and student behavior code, a manual that is still being used today.

Dr. Lindsey's commitment to education was reflected in his own academic achievements, as he continued to pursue a higher level of education, receiving a master's degree from Atlanta University and a Doctorate of Education from Auburn University in 1978.

A love for education surrounded Dr. Lindsey outside of the classroom as well. His wife of 57 years, Constance, is a retired educator of the Muscogee County School District. His two sons also followed in his footsteps; his oldest son, Eddie, is Coordinator of Edgewood Alternative School, and his youngest son, Christopher, is Principal of G.W. Carver High School.

George Washington Carver once said, "No individual has any right to come into the world and go out of it without leaving behind distinct and legitimate reasons for having passed through it." We are all so blessed that Dr. Eddie Lindsey passed this way and during his life's journey did so much for so many for so long. He leaves behind a great legacy in education to the thousands of students, teachers, and administrators whose lives he touched and brightened.

On a personal note, Dr. Eddie Lindsey was a close personal friend of mine and one of the first educators I met when I first came to Columbus in 1972. I have truly been blessed by his friendship, counsel and inspiration throughout the years.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 700,000 people of the Second Congressional District salute Dr. Lindsey for his outstanding achievements, service, and public distinction. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest condolences to Dr. Lindsey's family, friends and the Columbus, Georgia community during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

TRIBUTE TO JACK O'NEILL

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Burbank, California resident and hometown hero Jack O'Neill.

Mr. O'Neill started his career at the National Broadcasting Company (NBC) in New York in January of 1967. He rose through the ranks starting as an entry-level cost coordinator and in 2005 retired as NBC's Vice President of Facilities and Corporate Sourcing. His tireless work ethic, charisma, and commitment to the community led him to become the face of NBC in Burbank.

In 1977, Mr. O'Neill transferred from NBC's New York office to KNBC's facility in Burbank, California. In the late 1980's when the City of Burbank initiated its Media District Specific Plan and NBC proposed the NBC Plaza, Mr. O'Neill attended countless meetings with residents, the City Council, and Planning Board answering the difficult questions and creating positive dialogue in the city. Mr. O'Neill was instrumental in keeping NBC in Burbank and saved countless jobs in the Los Angeles region.

After Mr. O'Neill's retirement from NBC, he became Chief Operating Officer of the Bob Hope Family Estate in 2006, where he supervised the family's expansive real estate portfolio and advised the Hope Family businesses throughout the world. Currently, Mr. O'Neill serves as a Principal at the O'Neill Group, a real estate and business consulting firm.

Always willing to serve the community, Mr. O'Neill has volunteered and served as emcee or host at various fundraisers for groups like the Boys and Girls Club of Burbank, Burbank Unified School District, Burbank Temporary Aid Center, Burbank Public Library, and Burbank Sunrise Rotary.

I ask all Members of Congress to join me in honoring Jack O'Neill for his exemplary service to the Burbank community.

HONORING MRS. MARY EDITH
BROWN COLEMAN

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and sincere respect that I congratulate Mrs. Mary Edith Brown Coleman as she is recognized by First Church of God in Gary, Indiana, for 73 years of continuous service to the church. Edith will be recognized for her lifetime of dedicated service on September 22, 2013 at First Church of God.

Edith Brown was born on February 13, 1917 in Muskogee, Oklahoma. She was one of four children born to Luther Albert Brown and Dora Rozolia Draper Brown. Having gone on to live in Kansas City, Kansas, and Chicago, Illinois, Edith finally relocated to Gary, Indiana, in 1940. Quite the accomplished student, Edith completed her Bachelor of Science and Master of Science degrees in education at Indiana University in Bloomington. From there, she decided to go into the teaching profession. As a teacher at Frederick Douglass Elementary School in Gary for over 27 years, Edith was able to enrich the lives of so many young people in the Gary community. For her commitment to the youth of Northwest Indiana, she is worthy of the highest praise.

Equally impressive, Edith has always been seen as the foundation of her family. She and her husband, the late William Henry Coleman, were blessed with the births of two wonderful children: Norma Louise Coleman and the late Merle Jean Coleman. Edith's family, as well as the many people whose lives she has touched, admire her for devoting unselfish love, time, dedication, guidance, and spirit to her family, her students, her church, and her community.

As well as being dearly loved and respected by her family, her students, and her community, Edith is also well known for her involvement with her church, First Church of God. Over the course of seventy-three years, Edith has taught Sunday School, been the director of the Daily Vacation Bible School, held memberships in the local and national Missionary Societies, sung in the church choir, created beautiful and meaningful bulletin board displays, served as a deaconess, and taught a manners class for young children.

For years, Edith has also been a distinguished member of the American Association of University Women, the Women's Association of the Northwest Indiana Symphony Society, the Red Hat Society, and the Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority. Since her arrival in Northwest Indiana, Edith has been known as a good-hearted woman who is always willing to help the people of her church and her community. For her selflessness, she is to be commended and admired.

Mr. Speaker, Mary Edith Brown Coleman has given her time and efforts selflessly to her church and the community in Northwest Indiana throughout her illustrious life. She has taught every member of her family and extended family the true meaning of service to others. I respectfully ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in commending Edith for her lifetime of service.

IN RECOGNITION OF UNITED WAY
OF DENTON COUNTY**HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the United Way of Denton County and its 62 years of service. The mission of the United Way of Denton County is to improve lives in Denton County by mobilizing community resources to address the critical issues of education, income, and health in people's everyday lives. The organization's hard work has taken on many challenges from the 90,000 individuals that don't know where their next meal will come from to the high rate of high school dropouts to the more than 8,000 children under the age of 5 that live in poverty.

United Way has built programs to tackle these problems, and it has made a significant difference in the lives of many people in Denton County. They have mobilized volunteers to mentor children, provided effective training for parents and caregivers, and assisted in supplying critical needs, such as food, clothing, and school supplies. Over the past year, through its Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Program, 612 Federal Tax returns have been prepared, free of charge, for low income Denton County households. Their work returned over \$1 million to the community and saved families \$137,000 in tax preparation fees. In one day alone, the organization's food bank collected more than 40,000 pounds of food donations. They have also rallied community based and faith based organizations to work together to implement Bank On Denton County, a program to provide cost effective financial services to underserved communities.

All totaled, United Way of Denton County volunteers donated more than 19,200 hours this year, valued at more than \$425,000 to help more than 55,000 people in Denton County. Additionally, donors gave \$2,068,024 to the United Way of Denton County to support its mission this year alone.

The United Way of Denton County has an incredible positive effect on the community. It is my pleasure to recognize its 62 years of service to the community, and I am privileged to represent the United Way of Denton County in the U.S. House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING GULFSTREAM
STUDENT LEADERSHIP PROGRAM**HON. JACK KINGSTON**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of the Gulfstream Student Leadership Program and its exceptional efforts to improve high school graduation rates in Savannah, Georgia. The Gulfstream Student Leadership Program summer trip to Washington provides students with the opportunity to see first-hand the inner workings of our government and gain an appreciation of our nation's history and monuments.

The students that I met last week in the Capitol were rising seniors who had completed three years of the Student Leadership Program. The program went into effect five years ago, and 96 percent of the initial class of 150 students went on to graduate. Currently, eleven local high schools participate in the Student Leadership Program, and the 2012–2013 class includes close to 650 students.

This incredible program is made possible through the efforts of the Gulfstream Community Relations Staff, teachers and community advisors. I am pleased to recognize the students and teachers that were a part of this year's Student Leadership trip to Washington, and I look forward to working with them in the future.

CONGRATULATING THE CHICAGO
BOTANIC GARDEN ON SETTING A
NEW ATTENDANCE RECORD**HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Chicago Botanic Garden on setting a new monthly attendance record. In July, the Garden attracted 159,361 people, shattering the previous record by nearly 10,000 visitors. This marks the third consecutive month with more than 100,000 visitors—a streak equaled only twice before.

Since opening its gates 41 years ago, the Botanic Garden has brought joy to hundreds of thousands of people each year. With its fabulously varied grounds, the Chicago Botanic Garden is a natural refuge from the urban environment just outside its walls.

The record-breaking attendance figures are a testament to the Botanic Garden's sustained excellence and prominent position in the community as one of the region's most popular tourist and cultural destinations.

I have visited the Botanic Garden many times with my own family, as have countless other families in our community. Visitors appreciate its beauty, are enriched by its research, and create treasured memories year round.

In its mission to further our understanding of nature and our environment, the Chicago Botanic Garden educates its visitors and the community on the critical importance of conservation efforts. The Botanic Garden has grown our understanding of and appreciation for nature's simple beauty.

Spread across 385 acres, the Botanic Garden features thousands of plant species and hosts more than 100,000 volumes in its library. The Garden offers an abundance of activities for the entire community.

This achievement demonstrates that people with access to inspired institutions like the Chicago Botanic Garden live happier, healthier lives. I congratulate the Garden, and all those who make it a distinctive paragon of the Tenth District. I am grateful it is part of the Tenth District.

CONGRESSIONAL RECOGNITION OF
LARRY WILLIAMS**HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, Larry Williams, the former Director of the FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center, passed away on Friday, August 9, after suffering a heart attack.

Larry Williams served as the director of the Technical Center from 1982 to 1987. After leaving the Center, he went on to work with aviation-related companies in the private sector. He was a consultant for aviation giants such as Booz Allen Hamilton, CSSI, and others. He was part of a small joint team sponsored in part by the FAA and NASA that developed NextGen architecture and related projects. In January 2012, Larry was appointed to the NextGen aviation park board of directors.

The Virginia resident spent many years working for the FAA, between New Jersey and Washington, DC, including 10 years as the automation and surveillance engineering chief. Larry was recognized as an expert in the aviation industry throughout the country.

He came in contact with and touched many people throughout his career in aviation. His dedication and loyalty to the aviation industry and to the ideals of ensuring safer skies for those who fly will be missed. He exemplified the positive human values of kindness, dedication, and dignity, and was an outstanding example to all who knew him. Larry Williams was truly a remarkable gentleman; a loving husband, father, and grandfather; and a great friend to all of us.

COMMEMORATING THE FIFTIETH
ANNIVERSARY OF DR. MARTIN
LUTHER KING, JR.'S "I HAVE A
DREAM" SPEECH**HON. JEFF MILLER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to commemorate the Fiftieth Anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" speech. This incredibly moving oration set the stage to bring equal rights to all people; his words are as poignant and touching today as they were when spoken fifty years ago.

From the steps of the Lincoln Memorial on August 28, 1963, Dr. King delivered this now famous speech while hundreds of thousands of onlookers participated in the March on Washington. The speech began with reference to the Emancipation Proclamation, which ended slavery in the United States and brought about hope for the future; however, Dr. King continued to highlight how there was still more work to be done, even one hundred years after Lincoln made that address. Then, through an artful combination of skilled writing and improvisation, Dr. King delivered what is arguably one of the most memorable speeches of our Nation's history.

In his speech, Dr. King envisioned a Nation where the families of former slaves and those of former slave owners would live together in harmony. He urged people to look past years of racial segregation, injustice, and inequality to join together as one. He did so, as all parents would, with the hope that his children could live in a land free from hatred. Dr. King stated that this was the freedom that our Founding Fathers fought so hard to protect, so we owed it to them and ourselves to create this change.

Perhaps Dr. King did not know how monumental this one speech would become to the American civil rights movement. It allowed many Americans to reflect on years of racial separation and realize that change was on the horizon. Unfortunately, Dr. King did not live to see this dream realized, but his "I Have a Dream" speech helped pave the way for the success of the civil rights movement and remains an important lesson on history and equality to this day.

As organizations throughout our Nation join in commemorating the anniversary of this momentous speech, I would like to recognize and thank Operation People for Peace, and its Chairman Arthur Rocker, Sr., who has partnered with over four hundred churches and organizations throughout the Gulf Coast to collect food donations to help feed thousands of families, as well as, thank the Southern Christian Leadership Conference chapters of the Gulf Coast, the National Congress of Black Women chapters of the Gulf Coast, and all organizations across Northwest Florida for their efforts. We are truly blessed to have these organizations helping to keep the memory of Dr. King's words fresh in the minds of the people in our community.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it gives me great pride to recognize the Fiftieth Anniversary of the "I Have a Dream" speech. My wife Vicki joins me in thanking those throughout Northwest Florida for hosting celebrations along the Gulf Coast to commemorate this incredible speech. Most importantly, we would like to remember Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. for his tremendous service to this Nation and his efforts to put an end to racial inequality.

RECOGNIZING MAJOR ROBERT S.
SWENSON, USAFR, RETIRED

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate and recognize Major Robert S. Swenson, USAFR, Retired. Major Swenson, a World War II veteran who did not receive his Bronze Star Medal for his bravery during the Varsity Operation in 1945, received his medal on August 10, 2013 at the Trigger Time Convention in the City of SeaTac, Washington.

In 1945, as a glider pilot in the 435th Troop Carrier Group, 75th Squadron, Major Swenson and his fellow airmen distinguished themselves when enemy infantry mounted a counter attack. The 435th Troop Carrier Group

fought and repelled the attack of approximately 200 enemy soldiers, a tank, a self-propelled artillery, and two 20 mm flak guns.

After the battle, a request was made by Major Charles O. Gordon that all members of the 435th Troop Carrier Group be given due recognition. However, at the end of the war, the order was lost and went unfulfilled. The records have since been conserved at the Silent Wings Museum Archives and Major General Kenneth Dahl, Deputy Commanding General, I Corps at Joint Base Lewis-McChord, will formally present the Bronze Star Medal to Major Swenson at the convention.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize Major Robert S. Swenson, USAFR, Retired, for his fearlessness and dedication to serving his country.

TRIBUTE TO BOBBY HURD

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present the following U.S. Citizen of Distinction:

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of this one man, Bobby Hurd who has given so much of himself in order for others to stand; and

Whereas, his work is present in the gospel music industry for all to see, and "The Bobby Hurd Show" has been instrumental in spreading the gospel and promoting gospel artists in the Metropolitan Atlanta area and beyond; and

Whereas, this giant of a man accomplished so much during his time on earth, he was an electrician by trade, a promoter by talent, a community advocate by concern and a friend to all; and

Whereas, he gave of himself, his time, his talent and his life to uplift those in need, he never asked for fame or fortune he just wanted to help somebody and to inspire anybody by being involved in community activities and spreading the gospel; he encouraged everybody to do the same by witnessing him walk the walk and talk the talk; and

Whereas, Bobby Hurd led by doing both behind the scenes and on the front lines, he was an ambassador of goodwill who will be truly missed; and

Whereas, Bobby Hurd was a husband, a father, a grandfather, and a friend; he was our warrior, our patriarch, a man of great integrity who remained true to the uplifting of our community until his end; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia recognizes Bobby Hurd as a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction;

Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby attest to the 113th Congress that he is deemed worthy and deserving of this Congressional Honor by declaring Mr. Bobby Hurd U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, This 12th day of July, 2013.

STATEMENT ON THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF BISHOP ERIC R. FIGUEROA, SR.

HON. HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the achievements of Bishop Eric R. Figueroa, Sr. During his 30 years of service, Bishop Figueroa has ministered to thousands and worked tirelessly to improve the lives of all those he encountered. In honor of his three decades of service to our community, Bishop Figueroa was honored at a celebratory banquet on Monday, May 20, 2013 at Russo's on the Bay in Howard Beach, New York.

In 1983, Bishop Figueroa founded New Life Tabernacle, which has been an important part of our community. In addition to his ministry at the church, Bishop Figueroa has demonstrated a strong commitment to improving the lives of the people of Brooklyn through the Family Life Development Center. The Center provides an impressive range of services which include: a food pantry, drug rehabilitation programs, juvenile alternatives to incarceration, mentoring, counseling, college preparation, scholarships, and senior citizen programming. He recognized the needs of the people of Brooklyn and found solutions. His work has provided critical services to those most in need.

Bishop Figueroa's efforts as a founding member of Brooklyn Congregations Together, which united church communities in the borough to best meet the needs of the people, are commendable. The community remains indebted to the New Life Covenant Fellowship, which educates and empowers new leaders. Bishop Figueroa is truly a gifted teacher, preacher, and singer.

He is an inspirational leader whose work would not have been possible without the love and support of his wife Doreen Figueroa and their devoted children and grandchildren. We thank his family for sharing him with us all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating Bishop Figueroa on his 30th pastoral anniversary. For his commitment to the people of Brooklyn and to his service of those less fortunate, he is worthy of the highest praise.

COMMENDING ALPHA DELTA
KAPPA INTERNATIONAL HON-
ORARY ORGANIZATION FOR
WOMEN EDUCATORS

HON. MO BROOKS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Alpha Delta Kappa International Honorary Organization for Women Educators on its sixty-six years of dedicated service and proclaim October 2013 as Alpha Delta Kappa Month. Established in 1947, Alpha Delta Kappa's goals have been to

establish high standards of education, give recognition to outstanding educators, build a fraternal fellowship among educators and to promote educational and charitable projects and activities enriching the lives of individuals everywhere.

With a membership of over 33,000 educators representing all fifty U.S. states, Puerto Rico, Canada, Mexico, Jamaica and Australia, Alpha Delta Kappa is committed to educational excellence, personal and professional growth and for collectively channeling their energies toward the good of their schools, communities, the teaching profession and the world.

Women in education constitute a great portion of the nation's working force and are constantly striving to serve their communities and nation in educational, cultural, and charitable programs leading to harmony, happiness, and peace among all people.

Over the last few years, the members of Alpha Delta Kappa have given altruistically to the communities they serve by raising nearly \$14.5 million dollars and volunteering over 2 million service hours.

I congratulate Alpha Delta Kappa International Honorary Organization for Women Educators on their many years of unparalleled success and wish them well and best wishes as they continue to educate our children.

**RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATED
SERVICE OF VICKIE B. MULLINS
TO NORTHWEST FLORIDA**

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Vickie B. Mullins upon her retirement from UF/IFAS Santa Rosa County Extension as the 4-H Agent for Youth Development. For over forty years, Mrs. Mullins has served the Gulf Coast community, and I am privileged to recognize her success and myriad achievements.

From a very young age, Mrs. Mullins has called Northwest Florida home. Born in Andalusia, Alabama, Mrs. Mullins and her family moved in 1955 to Pensacola, Florida, where she graduated from Woodham High School and Pensacola Junior College. She continued her studies at Florida State University, receiving both a bachelor's and master's degree in Home Economics Education. Upon graduation, Mrs. Mullins performed post graduate work at Mississippi State University and the University of Mississippi.

Leading up to her career as a 4-H Agent, Mrs. Mullins served the Gulf Coast in numerous capacities. She worked in the Escambia County School System from 1972 to 1973, taught in the Armory and Nettleton School Districts, served as the Mississippi State Board of Health Nutritionist, and directed and taught the Nettleton First Baptist Church Weekday Early Education Program. She was also an adjunct instructor at Pensacola Junior College and the University of West Florida and the Culinary Arts Instructor at Locklin Vocational Technical School 1993-1997, where she was selected

as the Locklin Teacher of the Year. In 1973, Mrs. Mullins joined the Escambia County Extension Service and became the first Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program Youth Agent in Escambia County. She later joined the Mississippi Extension Service in 1979, and in 1997, Mrs. Mullins joined the UF/IFAS Santa Rosa County Extension, where she has served the last fifteen years as a 4-H Agent.

If there is one common thread sewn throughout her professional career, it is Mrs. Mullins' passion and dedication for bettering the lives of those around her. The positive impact Mrs. Mullins has made on the lives of our Nation's youth is unquestioned, and it is evidenced by the numerous accolades she has earned over the years. These include the Florida and National Extension Distinguished Service Award, the Florida and National Extension Meritorious Service Award, the Regional and National Power of Youth Award, the State, Regional, and National Beyond Youth Leadership Award, and the National 4-H Program of Distinction Award.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my gratitude to Vickie Mullins for her years of dedicated service to Northwest Florida. She is an inspiration to those around her, and we in Northwest Florida are blessed to have her as part of the community. My wife Vicki joins me in wishing Vickie; her husband Dan; their three children Katie, Sarah, and Jackson; and their entire family all the best for continued success.

**RECOGNIZING THE 100TH YEAR ANNI-
VERSARY OF THE BLESSING
OF THE GRAPES CEREMONY AT
THE HOLY TRINITY ARMENIAN
CHURCH**

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Holy Trinity Armenian Church during their celebration of the 100th Blessing of the Grapes ceremony. This is a very special time for the Armenian community as they gather on this holy day.

The blessing of grapes is a special tradition within the Armenian Church. The ceremony takes place on a major feast day, "Assumption of St. Mary" which is a celebration of St. Mary being assumed into Heaven. Grapes have a symbolic significance in the Christian faith, and on this day they are considered to be forbidden fruit before being blessed by the Priest at the closing of the ceremony.

Holy Trinity Armenian Church is an historical landmark in Fresno, California. The first Armenian Church was destroyed in a fire in 1913, and the Holy Trinity Armenian Church was built at an alternate location. Armenian architect, Lawrence Cone, created the magnificent church as a sacred place for the Armenian community. It was the first traditional Armenian Church in the United States.

The Central Valley is home to thousands of Armenians, and as a community we must also celebrate the 100 year anniversary of the Holy Trinity Armenian Church. They have made ev-

erlasting contributions to the City of Fresno, and our entire country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the 100th Year Anniversary of the Blessing of the Grapes Ceremony at the Holy Trinity Armenian Church. Their mission to provide an infinite amount of faith, hope, and love to the public is highly respected and praised.

**COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF MASONIC LODGE
422**

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Masonic Lodge 422 of Joliet, Illinois. Tracing their founding to the Civil War, the 250 members of Masonic Lodge 422 recently celebrated the longevity of their fraternal organization, and reflected on its early days in the Chicago neighborhood of Hyde Park.

Throughout history, Freemasons have dedicated their lives to cultivating good moral character both within themselves and their communities. They have consistently involved themselves in a variety of charitable causes, in their belief that one of their important roles is to do good for society. The charitable commitments of the Joliet Freemasons include valuable medical services like the Illinois Masonic Medical Center and the Shriners Hospital for Children, as well as contributions to affiliated women and children's advocacy groups.

Over the years, Masonic Lodge 422 has maintained steady membership and has remained devoted to restoring the charitable and philosophic legacy of old Masonic orders. Members of those old orders include our founding fathers George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Benjamin Franklin, whose prominence, accomplishments, and positive influence remain a motivational force for contemporary Freemasons.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in not only honoring Masonic Lodge 422, but also in wishing this shining example of tradition, resilience, and generosity many more years of existence.

**TRIBUTE TO ABBIE BURANNICE
BENN AND JACK BENN**

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, On December 29, 1881, the union of Abbie Burannice Benn and Jack Benn in Morgan County, Georgia, blessed us with descendants that have helped to shape our nation; and

Whereas, to this union fourteen children were born; Carrie Benn, Emma Benn, John Benn, Jack Benn, Willie Benn, Anderson

Benn, Birder Benn, Joseph Benn, Elbert Benn, Lula Benn, Corlor Benn, Mattie Benn, Arthur Benn and Rosey Benn; and from the children of Abbie and Jack Benn, and we have seen and are seeing generations of many well respected citizens, so today we honor all of the matriarchs and patriarchs, who are pillars of strength for the Benn, Brinkley and Randolph families; and

Whereas, in our beloved Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, we are honored to have many members of the Benn, Brinkley and Randolph families who are productive citizens in our District; and

Whereas, family is one of the most honored and cherished institutions in the world, we take pride in knowing that families such as the Benn, Brinkley and Randolph families have set aside this time to fellowship with each other, honor one another and to pass along history to each other by meeting at this year's family reunion in Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Benn, Brinkley and Randolph families;

Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim, July 20, 2013, as Benn, Brinkley & Randolph Family Reunion Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, This 20th day of July, 2013.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 30TH ANNUAL PITTSTON TOMATO FESTIVAL FOR ITS CONTINUED SUPPORT OF NORTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA'S AGRICULTURE AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and congratulate the committee members and volunteers of the 30th Annual Pittston Tomato Festival. The City of Pittston, Pennsylvania has once again staged this remarkable and unique civic event celebrating both the exceptional tomatoes grown throughout the Northeastern Pennsylvania region and the warmth and hospitality of the City of Pittston.

The four-day festival that kicked-off on Thursday, August 15 was designed in part to showcase just how far the festival has come since its humble beginnings thirty years ago. In 1983, Valentine "Val" Delia founded the festival as a way to showcase the produce of his garden. Since then, the festival has grown from a small gathering of local farmers in a parking lot in downtown Pittston to a widely recognized and beloved iconic component of the region's summer entertainment.

With attractions such as local musicians, local vendors, a parade, 5K run, and the renowned "Tomato Fights" that raise money for food-related charities, the Pittston Tomato Festival showcases the best aspects of the community. The festival highlights the city's vibrant Italian-American culture, displays its beautiful and historic revitalization projects, and fosters an atmosphere of community and

sense of service to others in each and every one of the thousands of visitors it brings to the City of Pittston.

In recognition of the 30th Annual Pittston Tomato Festival, I add my congratulations and best wishes for continued success in bringing family recreation and a strengthened sense of community to the City of Pittston and Northeastern Pennsylvania.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE
OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S
ALVIN HENRY ENFINGER

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and service of Northwest Florida's Alvin Henry Enfinger, who passed away on September 2, 2013. Mr. Enfinger spent his entire life serving those around him through his knowledge of medicine and farming and his predisposition to help his fellow man.

Born on September 27, 1925, Mr. Enfinger spent the early years of his life working on his family's farm in Chumuckla, Florida. At the age of 18, he enlisted in the Navy during World War II. After his military service, Mr. Enfinger returned home, married the love of his life Doris Gillman and looked toward his professional future.

Mr. Enfinger graduated from Auburn University in 1951 and then decided to pursue his chosen profession of pharmacy. Only three years into his practice, Mr. Enfinger opened his own pharmacy in West Pensacola named A & E Pharmacy, which is now Northwest Florida's oldest, continuously family-owned and operated pharmacy. A & E Pharmacy has been very successful throughout its nearly 60 years of operation, at one time being the largest pharmacy in Pensacola. Whereas the Gulf Coast has seen an influx of large chain pharmacies as most other areas of the country have over the years, A & E Pharmacy remains a local treasure in our community thanks to Mr. Enfinger's strong leadership.

Mr. Enfinger never veered too far from his upbringing on a farm or from his will to serve the people of Northwest Florida. In 1970, he began raising Red Angus Cattle, a mission that earned him significant recognition for his success and a term as President of The Southeastern Red Angus Association. He was also instrumental in preserving the Coon Hill Cemetery for many years: raising money for its support, restoring its grounds, and acting as steward of the cemetery's history for the entire community. We were very fortunate to have such a talented man as a friend, neighbor, and tireless servant to our community.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to honor the life of Mr. Alvin Enfinger. My wife Vicki and I offer our prayers and sincerest condolences to his five children, Art Enfinger, Rhonda Enfinger, David Enfinger, Beth Orr, and Jan Herrera; eleven grandchildren; and eighteen great grandchildren. He will truly be missed.

HONORING WILLIAM P. CLARK

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the memory of William P. Clark from San Luis Obispo County, who passed away on August 10, 2013.

William Clark was born in Oxnard, California on October 23, 1931. As a fourth-generation Californian, Mr. Clark served on several state courts and as a longtime advisor to President Ronald Reagan. Since 1969, Mr. Clark was appointed to the SLO County Superior Court, the California State Appellate Court in Los Angeles and later to the California State Supreme Court by then Governor Reagan, where he served as an associate justice for eight years.

Recognized for his dedication to public service, he was appointed as the Deputy Secretary of State in 1981 by President Reagan. A year later, he became the National Security Advisor and then served as the Secretary of the Interior until 1985. In his later years, Mr. Clark moved to his ranch in Shandon, California where he and his wife, Joan, built the Chapel Hill that he donated to his local community.

He is survived by his five children.

On a personal note, Mr. Clark was a gracious host when he invited me to visit the beautiful Chapel Hill. He was a kind man of character who proudly served his country and I am honored to have met him.

I offer my most heartfelt condolences to Mr. Clark's family and friends. Please join me in honoring this exemplary American and San Luis Obispo County resident.

IN MEMORY OF PETE MIRELEZ

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Mr. Pete Mirelez, who served as a role model and mentor to his community. He was proud to be the first Hispanic Adams County Commissioner and stated that after his family and friends his second love was Adams County.

Pete Mirelez was born in LaSalle, Colorado and was the first person in his family to receive a college degree, completing his studies at Chadron State College in Chadron, Nebraska. Pete served as Adams County's first Director of the War on Poverty Program and was named Regional Director of the California Migrant Council in 1968. In 1972, Pete was named the National Director of the office of Economic Opportunity Migrant Division in Washington D.C., before becoming an Adams County Commissioner. During Pete's time as Adams County Commissioner, an edition of the Brighton Sentinel named him as "one of the most influential people in Adams County".

After serving Adams County, Pete was appointed by President Jimmy Carter as Representative to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation, Region 8, and

served from 1979 to 1981. Afterwards, Pete served the Colorado Department of Transportation Highway Commission for twelve years until becoming a lobbyist for Adams County School Districts.

Pete was a loving husband, father, grandfather, and mentor of mine who I was proud to also call a friend. He exemplified the American dream by showing that through education and service a person could create positive change in his community. His true public service will be missed.

IN HONOR OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF TEMPLE BETH EL IN SALINAS, CALIFORNIA

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the Fiftieth Anniversary of Temple Beth El in Salinas, California. On behalf of the entire House, I am privileged to extend the gratitude of Congress and the American people for the past and future service of the Beth El congregation.

The First Hebrew Congregation and Community Center of Salinas was established in 1935. During World War II, and for a few years thereafter, Chaplain Hertz of Fort Ord served the congregation as its first religious leader. In 1949, Rabbi Seymour Stern joined the congregation as the synagogue's first Rabbi. Rabbi Abraham Haseklorn took over the rabbinic duties in 1953, and served until his retirement in 1973. He and his wife Alda made an invaluable contribution to the Salinas community. In 1963, the name of Temple Beth El was adopted for the new synagogue building designed by Temple member Jerome Kasavan, and is the home of the current congregation and Rabbi Marcy Delbick.

For several years, Temple Beth El has served members throughout Salinas, Monterey, Prunedale, Gilroy and San Benito County. Their goal has been to provide both a spiritual and social center for members and guests. Its membership has spanned the entire spectrum of Jewish thought and tradition, along with diverse age levels and religious backgrounds. Reform, Conservative, Orthodox as well as unaffiliated members have added a unique variety to their gatherings. Throughout the years they have adapted to the changing needs of the times, while maintaining the respect for the traditions of their ancestors.

The objective of Temple Beth El has been both religious and cultural, providing Sunday and Hebrew school for children as well as education programs for adults. At the start, the religious school began with ten students, though soon outgrew the available space and often spilled into congregants' homes. Today, Temple Beth El offers education programs for children throughout the school year. A vast array of adult education classes are provided, from an introduction to Judaism to the Lunch and Learn program.

Tikkun Olam, "repairing the world", is a major part of the Temple Beth El congregation community outreach. Members often prepare

meals at the homeless shelter for the less fortunate, and are principle bell ringers for the Salvation Army's Red Kettle Drive on Christmas Eve. For over 50 years the yearly Kosher Luncheon is a much heralded community event where corned beef and pastrami sandwiches are served, providing Jewish outreach of the most delicious kind.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I say Mazel Tov to the Temple Beth El congregation for their years of service devoted to the advancement of religious, cultural, and educational opportunities. I know I speak for the House in saluting their dedication, in making the community a better place and congratulating them on the celebration of their Golden Anniversary.

IN HONOR OF THE PERKASIE LIONS CLUB

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, for 75 years, the Perkasio Lions Club has dedicated their time to bettering both the lives of those in their community and disadvantaged individuals abroad. Currently meeting only five blocks from where it first assembled, and the club's reach and positive impact has only grown with its age. Since 1938, they have completed a variety of projects, with their main focus being assistance to the blind. Not only does the Lions Club provide medical equipment and glasses to those unable to afford them, but they also help enrich the lives of children within the community. The members have made comprehensive improvements to Lions Camp Kirby, where hearing and visually impaired children can take part in a variety of activities. From exploring the outdoors to toasting marshmallows around the camp fire, deserving young people are able to enjoy these opportunities regardless of financial standing. The Perkasio Lions Club has an impressive history in Bucks County, and I look forward to their continued contributions to the community.

RECOGNIZING FIRE AND RESCUE AND EMS PERSONNEL OF FLORIDA'S 16TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. VERN BUCHANAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize fire and rescue and EMS personnel who have provided distinguished service to the people of Florida's 16th Congressional District.

As first responders, fire departments and emergency medical service teams are summoned on short notice to serve their respective communities. Oftentimes, they arrive at scenes of great adversity and trauma, to which they reliably bring strength and composure. These brave men and women

spend hundreds of hours in training so that they are prepared when they get "the call."

Last year, I established the 16th District Congressional Fire and Rescue and EMS Awards to honor officers, departments, and units for outstanding achievement.

On behalf of the people of Florida's 16th District, it is my privilege to congratulate the following winners, who were selected by an independent committee comprised of a cross-section of current and retired fire and rescue personnel living in the district.

Battalion Chief Stacey S. Bailey of the East Manatee Fire Rescue received the Career Service Award.

The Sarasota K-9 Search and Rescue Team received the Associate Service Award.

Battalion Chief Russell McCord of the Englewood Area Fire Control received the Career Service Award.

Firefighter/Paramedic Brian Kolesa received the Above and Beyond the Call of Duty Award.

I appreciate this opportunity to recognize 16th District fire and rescue and EMS personnel.

STATEMENT ON THE 114TH BIRTHDAY OF MS. SUSANNAH MUSHATT JONES

HON. HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 114th birthday of Ms. Susannah Mushatt Jones, who is affectionately called Miss Susie. Considered the oldest resident in New York State by the Gerontology Research Group, she is a beloved member of the Brooklyn community I am proud to represent in Congress. In honor of her birthday, Miss Susie was honored on July 12, 2013, at the Vandalia Senior Center in Brooklyn, NY. We revel not just the years since her birth, but the history she has witnessed in three separate centuries. From experiencing segregation in the South to being a first-hand witness of the Civil Rights movement in New York, we commemorate her birthday with awe and inspiration.

Miss Susie was born into a large, loving family on July 6, 1899, in Lowndes County, Alabama as the third of eleven children. In 1923 she moved to New York as part of the Great Migration of African Americans from the rural South to cities in the North, Midwest, and West. Miss Susie dedicated her professional pursuits to children, first as a schoolteacher and then as a childcare provider. At one point, she moved to Hollywood to work for a family in the film industry. During her time on the west coast, she enjoyed socializing with movie stars and attending movie premieres. She fondly remembers meeting Ronald Reagan, Clark Gable, and Cary Grant.

Family has always surrounded Miss Susie: she takes great delight in being an aunt to over 100 nieces and nephews. Throughout her life, she has brightened many lives with her positive attitude and infectious laugh. She resides in Vandalia Houses and was an active

member of the Vandalia Houses Senior Center tenant patrol through her 100th birthday. Miss Susie credits her healthy lifestyle free of smoking and drinking for her longevity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in celebrating Ms. Susannah Mushatt Jones on her 114th birthday.

TRIBUTE TO THE CHARLES FAMILY

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, the birth of Oliver Charles, son of Mr. Handy and Mrs. Alfhosine Batiste Charles in Freetown, Louisiana, on December 27, 1897, began the Charles family lineage which has blessed us with descendants who have helped to shape our nation; and

Whereas, Mr. Oliver Charles united in holy matrimony to Mrs. Laura Livingston Charles on March 18, 1927 in Freetown, Louisiana, their union has produced many well respected citizens and the patriarchs and matriarchs of the Charles Family are pillars of strength who have touched many throughout our nation, family members of the past and present, giving us generations of the Charles family lineage; and

Whereas, in our beloved Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, we are honored to have members of the Charles family for they are some of our most beloved citizens in our District; and

Whereas, family is one of the most honored and cherished institutions in the world, we take pride in knowing that families such as the Charles family have set aside this time to fellowship with each other, honor one another and to pass along history to each other by meeting at this year's family reunion in Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Charles family;

Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim July 6, 2013, as Charles Family Reunion Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, This 6th day of July, 2013.

HONORING SHERIFF JEFF CAPPA

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sheriff Jeff Cappa of Richmond, Indiana.

My friend, Sheriff Jeff Cappa, of the Wayne County Sheriff's Office was recently honored as the Indiana Sheriff's Association 2013 Sheriff of the Year at the Association's annual gathering. Among his many accomplishments

as Sheriff, Jeff returned the department to a true merit-based system for both hiring and promotions, created a 24-hour supervision of the jail and enforcement division, expanded medical coverage at the jail to full-time and around-the-clock service, and launched a strategic plan for the department.

Sheriff Cappa is known throughout the county and region as a Sheriff willing to work with the community to better serve its citizens. His working relationship with the county council and county commissioners is a testament to efficient local government. Jeff's outreach and leadership is a key to the continued growth, safety, and development of the communities throughout Wayne County.

I ask the 6th Congressional District to join me in thanking Sheriff Jeff Cappa and his team for their tireless effort towards increased public safety in Wayne County and in congratulating Jeff for his designation as the 2013 Indiana Sheriff's Association Sheriff of the Year.

COMMEMORATING THE DEDICATION OF THE JOSEPH NAPER STATUE

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Joseph Naper, founder of Naperville, and to commemorate the dedication of a statue in his honor. The statue, which stands at his former homestead, serves as a permanent testament to the strength, compassion, and ingenuity of this pioneer of the West.

Joseph Naper held many diverse professions in life—he was at various times a ship captain, frontiersman, trader, land surveyor, soldier and politician—but to all of them he brought the same care for community. Through hard work and endurance of spirit, Naper raised the physical foundations of the town we know today as Naperville from a spot of land on the West Branch of the DuPage River that he settled in 1831. Equally importantly, Naper built the cultural and spiritual foundations of his community, helping to provide educational, intellectual, and religious opportunities for fellow settlers.

Despite his many achievements, no plaque or monument has been dedicated in Naper's memory since his death in 1862. On August 23, this unfortunate oversight was corrected by the Naperville Heritage Society in partnership with the City of Naperville, who erected a statue in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the legacy of Joseph Naper and commemorating the unveiling of a statue in his honor. Men and Women like Naper helped to build the America we know today, and for that great service they are owed our eternal gratitude and honor.

TRIBUTE TO ARLOENE WATTS

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to a dear friend of mine, Arloene Watts. Arloene passed away on Monday, August 5, 2013. A resident of Corona for over half a century, she was a pillar of the community and will be deeply missed.

Arloene was born August 13, 1922 in Carson, Oregon, before moving with her family to Minnesota. Arloene grew up on the family farm, where her work ethic and values were formed. In 1941, she moved to Auburn, California to attend school at Sierra College. She and her husband, Ed, were married shortly thereafter in 1943. In 1957, the pair packed up and moved to a small town in Southern California—Corona. Arloene began her community work almost immediately, taking on roles with the Girl Scouts and Boys Scouts of America, and in parent-teacher groups.

Arloene's passion for service took shape early, and she became a champion for the development of women's rights in business throughout the community. With experience in personal finance and secretarial training, Arloene started her own business, an employment agency, in 1963. During a time when less than four percent of American businesses were owned by women, Arloene became a pioneer. Her knack for career planning led the business to become very successful, eventually leading to its sale in 1990 after having Arloene at the helm for 27 years. She continued to pave the way for women in the community over the years, becoming the first woman to serve as Corona Planning Commissioner. In addition, she earned a spot by appointment on the Temescal Valley-El Cerrito Community Plan Advisory Committee. Her continued interest in business development within the city led her to become actively involved in the Corona Chamber of Commerce, becoming its first female president in 1974.

It is hard to imagine that Arloene would have any free time on her hands, yet she always found time for her community. She served as Trustee of Circle City Hospital, Director of the local YMCA, and Executive Director of Corona-Norco United Way. In addition, Arloene was President of Soroptimist International of Corona, and President of the Women's Improvement Club. She was also a dedicated member of the Corona-Norco Unified School District's Partner in Education Program and the Inland Empire Better Business Bureau. It is no surprise that Arloene was the recipient of numerous community awards including Corona Citizen of the Year, Award of Merit-Chamber of Commerce, Distinguished Citizen of the Year-Corona Jaycees, Outstanding Citizen-Riverside County Board of Supervisors, Distinguished Citizen of the Year-Boy Scouts, Woman of the Year-73rd Assembly District, YMCA Ira D. Calvert Distinguished Service Award, and the Women of Distinction Award for her achievements in helping advance the status of women in Corona.

Arloene is survived by the love of her life, her husband, and their three children: son,

Edwin, of Massachusetts, and two daughters, Michelle, of Corona, and LaJune Hughes, of Oklahoma.

On Tuesday, August 13, 2013, what would have been her 91st birthday, a memorial honoring Arloene's extraordinary life was held. Arloene will always be remembered for her incredible work ethic, generosity, advancement of women, contributions to the community and love of family. Her dedication to her work and community are a testament to a life lived well and a legacy that will continue. I extend my condolences to Arloene's family and friends; although Arloene may be gone, the light and goodness she brought to the world remain and will never be forgotten.

IN RECOGNITION OF REV. DR.
DWIGHT C. NORTINGTON

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Rev. Dr. Dwight C. Northington on his retirement as Senior Pastor of Calvary Baptist Church in Red Bank, New Jersey. Dr. Northington has led Calvary Baptist Church for over 21 years and his dedication is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

Before entering the ministry, Dr. Northington worked as an executive for Travelers Insurance Company. He was born in Baltimore, Maryland. He is married to his wife Rebecca and together they have two daughters, Bianca and Alisha, a granddaughter Aniya and grandson Nukeil.

In addition to his 21 years of service to Calvary Baptist Church, Dr. Northington is an active member of the community. He has served as the past moderator of the Seacoast Missionary Baptist Association, past member of the Red Bank Board of Education and past president of the Westside Ministerial Alliance.

Dr. Northington is committed to learning and teaching. He graduated from Morgan State University, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary and Drew University and has taught homiletics at New Brunswick Theological Seminary and worked as an Adjunct Professor of the Brookdale Community College Psychology Department.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Dr. Northington on his pastoral retirement and thanking him for his many years of dedicated service and leadership to the Calvary Baptist Church congregation and the greater community.

RECOGNIZING JAMES MARTIN OF
MIRAMAR, FLORIDA AS A HASTINGS
STAR STUDENT

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of James Martin of Miramar, Florida, and to honor him as a Hastings Star Student.

At the age of 17, James recently graduated Suma Cum Laude from Florida Atlantic University with a GPA of 3.9. He earned a Bachelor's of Science in Molecular Biology. Having been home-schooled by his mother from a young age, James started college at the age of 14. He is a shining example of what hard work and dedication can accomplish.

While in college, James worked alongside a Nobel Prize winner Dr. Eric Wieschaus at Princeton University. After graduating, James was offered a job with Dr. Wieschaus as a paid lab assistant while he decides which PhD programs to apply to. His goal is to pursue a career as a professor, and I have no doubt he will contribute greatly to the Molecular Biology field.

I would also like to recognize the dedication of Joan Martin, James' mother, to her son's education. The active participation on the part of one's parents is important to a good education, and Joan has gone above and beyond in that regard and is to be commended.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of James Martin are an inspiration to students everywhere, especially within the minority community. I am proud to honor such an outstanding individual. We can all look forward to the bright future this young man has ahead of him.

IN HONOR OF THE JAMES
MICHENER ART MUSEUM

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, we are proud to recognize the 25th anniversary of Bucks County's cultural treasure—the James A. Michener Art Museum. In the span of 25 years, the museum in Doylestown, Bucks County, Pennsylvania has preserved the artistic heritage of the county through its extensive permanent art collection and by reaching out to diverse audiences with national and regional exhibitions, scholarly publications and educational programs. Its art collection has grown from 115 objects to nearly 3,000, including 182 Bucks County related exhibitions featuring over 300 local artists. The museum is housed in an historic 19th century jail that has been expanded to 72,000 square feet of gallery and event space and two beautiful public gardens. We know that last year nearly 150,000 people visited this outstanding repository of Bucks County's creative tradition. And so we proudly acknowledge the James A. Michener Art Museum as a cultural pillar in Bucks County and congratulate those who gave the museum life and sustain it today.

IN RECOGNITION OF LOUIS
CATALDO AND ALICE GEORGE

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding civic contributions of

Mr. Louis Cataldo and Mrs. Alice George on the occasion of their retirement from the Mercy Otis Warren Woman of the Year Selection Committee.

Mr. Cataldo first conceived the Mercy Otis Warren Award as a way of recognizing the contributions of Cape Cod's women, past and present. The honor has been bestowed upon twelve women since 2002 for their exceptional leadership, involvement in local institutions, and community enrichment. Mr. Cataldo's love of history and the Cape Cod community are evident in the award's namesake, as Mercy Otis Warren was a citizen of Barnstable County and a vocal advocate for civil liberties in the midst of the American Revolution. Mr. Cataldo's initiative has helped preserve the memory of an often-overlooked American patriot while praising the distinguished women who continue Warren's legacy today.

A charter member of the Mercy Otis Warren Woman of the Year Selection Committee, Mrs. Alice George has presided as its chair from the beginning. In partnership with Mr. Cataldo and the Barnstable County Commissioners, Mrs. George has led the charge to bring Cape Cod's most inspiring women to the forefront. She has long been a central figure in Barnstable and actively serves in many charitable and community organizations. Mrs. George also worked with Mr. Cataldo in bringing the Mercy Otis Warren statue to the grounds of the county courthouse.

Following eleven wonderful years at the helm, Mr. Cataldo and Mrs. George will step down from their positions on the selection committee. Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Mr. Louis Cataldo and Mrs. Alice George for over a decade of service to southeastern Massachusetts. I ask that my colleagues join me in applauding them for their selfless advocacy efforts.

BLACK MUSIC DAY

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, many individuals and organizations strive to bring awareness, enlightenment, and entertainment to our community through African American culture and music; and

Whereas, June is recognized as Black Music Month, this is a unique opportunity for our Nation to showcase the different musicians, writers, producers, promoters, performers, managers, attorneys, agents, and accountants who have contributed to making Black Music a heavyweight in the industry of entertainment around the world; and

Whereas, today we celebrate the kickoff of Black Music Month at the Artist Factory in Atlanta, by witnessing the music, dance, food, art, and fashion that Black Music has inspired on an international stage; and

Whereas, our beloved District has found a jewel in the music that touches the minds and souls of untold millions; and

Whereas, our community has been strengthened in times of joy and sorrow through music; putting rhythm in our feet, adrenalin in our blood, and pizzazz in our spirits; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Black Music as a unique and wonderful cultural contribution to our District, the Nation, and the world;

Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim June 4, 2013 as Black Music Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, This 4th day of June, 2013.

HONORING THE CALIFORNIA HISPANIC CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce, CHCC, as it celebrates its 35th anniversary at its annual convention being held at Oakland, California. I commend CHCC for their choice to hold this important event in my congressional district, known for its spirit of diversity and innovation, as well as its proud history of Hispanic and Latino entrepreneurship.

In 1978, a group of local Hispanic chamber leaders from throughout California convened to discuss the lack of representation of Hispanic businesses in State government. These leaders also recognized the need for an organization that would effectively represent the interest of the rapidly growing number of Hispanic-owned businesses in California. From those beginnings, the CHCC has grown into a network of over 65 Hispanic chambers and business associations throughout the State of California. Through its network, the CHCC represents the interest of over 700,000 Hispanic business owners in the State, making it the largest ethnic business organization in the Nation.

As a longtime advocate for the advancement of disadvantaged and minority-owned businesses, I applaud the CHCC's mission to promote, support, and encourage the advancement and development of Hispanic and minority-owned businesses, and to provide an organizational forum for the exchange of ideas, information, technical assistance, procurement opportunities, and any other form of business opportunities that enhance the Hispanic and minority business communities. I also commend its development of a program of advocacy in order to inform and educate elected and appointed officials, legislative bodies, agencies, and public and private organizations about the concerns, needs, and opportunities which affect the Hispanic and minority business communities of California, and to foster unity and communication between organizations, corporations, and individuals who support the goals and objectives of the CHCC.

CHCC's numerous programs are making real impacts in this State. Through their Project Homeowner initiative, CHCC has worked to help borrowers understand their fi-

nancials, and in some cases reach agreements on home loan modifications. The ABC/ETP program works to connect minority and women-owned firms with tools and non-traditional capital streams, while providing educational opportunities to bolster budding businesses through an innovative, original curriculum.

Since 2008, the CHCC Foundation has worked to promote charitable programs to create and develop educational and economic development programs to increase adult leadership for CHCC and its members, and to provide scholarship opportunities for qualified students to attend educational institutions to study business and economic development. The Foundation also partners with the United Health Care Foundation to provide scholarship opportunities to promising students entering the medical field.

Therefore, on behalf of the residents of California's 13th Congressional District, I would like to salute the CHCC, and all of those who have contributed to its 35 years of success. Thank you for your long-term belief in entrepreneurship and for your contributions to our community. Once again, congratulations, and I wish you the very best as you strive for another 35 years of excellence.

IN RECOGNITION OF COL. CHARLES JACKSON

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exemplary career of Col. Charles Jackson who recently retired from his position as Assistant Vice President for Facilities at the University of North Texas (UNT) in Denton, Texas. For over a decade, he has competently overseen the rapid growth of new construction and renovation of numerous campus buildings. Prior to his work at UNT, Col. Jackson spent the majority of his career serving his country on active duty with the United States Air Force (USAF). As a registered professional engineer and member of the Association of Physical Plant Administrators, Col. Jackson has distinguished himself as an accomplished military and civilian engineer through his successful direction of numerous projects and developments, domestically and abroad.

Col. Jackson received a B.A. in civil engineering from the U.S. Air Force Academy and a M.A. in engineering/facilities from the Air Force Institute of Technology. He served as the commander of the 7th Engineering Squadron at Carswell Air Force Base at Fort Worth, Texas. His civil engineer leadership positions include duty assignments stateside in Colorado, Texas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma and overseas in Japan, Germany and Belgium. Col. Jackson dedicated 30 years of his life as a civil engineer in the Air Force and achieved the rank of Colonel upon his retirement in May 1998.

Following his departure from the Air Force, Col. Jackson began employment at UNT as Facilities Maintenance Manager and was selected for his current position in 2005. Since

2000, the UNT campus has rapidly expanded to accommodate the growing number of incoming students. Col. Jackson has overseen the construction of four residence halls, seven major buildings and additional renovation projects. His proudest accomplishments include the Library Mall, the Net Zero Energy Lab, and the recent completion of the SMART project which will have a long-term beneficial impact for the UNT campus. Col. Jackson acted as a vital proponent of this project that will save the University over \$3 million in utility and operation costs annually and ensure reliable systems to support UNT into the future. The SMART project recently received a Green Ribbon Award in the infrastructure category from the U.S. Green Building Council North Texas as the best example of the implementation of sustainable infrastructure design, construction or management practices.

On a personal level, I am grateful to Col. Jackson for his advice and expertise as a member of my Service Academy Board. As a USAF Academy graduate and higher education representative, Col. Jackson's role was to comprehensively screen and interview high school and college applicants wishing to receive a congressional nomination and to advise me upon the selection of qualified service academy candidates.

I join his family, friends and colleagues in congratulating Col. Charles Jackson upon his exemplary service to our community, state and nation and extend my warmest wishes upon a well-earned retirement. His positive contributions and dedicated efforts will continue to enhance the University of North Texas for years to come, and I am privileged to represent the University of North Texas in the U.S. House of Representatives.

STATEMENT ON THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF LUCY T. DAVIS

HON. HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 100th birthday of Mrs. Lucy T. Davis. Mrs. Davis is a beloved member of the community; throughout her life, she has brightened the lives of all she encountered. In celebration of her centennial birthday, Mrs. Davis was honored on May 11, 2013 at the Bishop Hucles Nursing Home in Brooklyn, NY.

Mrs. Davis was born in Macon, Georgia on May 12, 1913, and in 1931 her family moved to Brooklyn, NY as part of the Great Migration of African Americans from the rural South to cities in the North, Midwest, and West. While doing domestic work during the day, Mrs. Davis took night courses to learn office skills. During World War II she moved to Washington, DC to work for the United States Department of Defense as a typist. After World War II, Mrs. Davis returned to Brooklyn, NY where she became a supervisor at the Department of Motor Vehicles.

She has been an active member of Cornerstone Baptist Church since 1950. In 1984, Dr. Harry S. Wright appointed Mrs. Davis as the third chairperson of the Board of Christian

Education at Cornerstone Baptist Church. During her tenure as chairperson, the board sponsored a Youth Speak Out; a Cinema Club; and a series of family activities including an annual family church outing, family night, and a family Sunday where the board honored three families from the congregation—a young family, a middle-aged family, and a senior family. She greatly contributed to the vitality of the Church through the numerous roles that she held. From 1985 to 1993 she led the Tuesday afternoon Bible Study. She also led the Circle South in the Missionary Society. Mrs. Davis was an outstanding Sunday School teacher, who my brother, Hasan, and I were very fortunate to have learned from.

Throughout her life, Mrs. Davis has been an avid student. She took many courses in adult education from the City of New York. She received her first, second, and third certificates of progress from the National Baptist Congress of Christian Education. Mrs. Davis also greatly enjoys reading and painting.

We thank her beloved goddaughter, Rose Davis Utendahl, for traveling from Alabama for this celebration. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating Mrs. Davis on her 100th birthday. For her dedication to the community, she is worthy of the highest praise.

IN RECOGNITION OF BOB DuBOIS

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Bob DuBois as he prepares to step down from his role as Executive Director of the Yarmouth Area Chamber of Commerce.

A longtime fixture on Cape Cod, Mr. DuBois has worked tirelessly to strengthen the Chamber of Commerce, the thriving business community it represents, and the entire Yarmouth community. For the past twenty-three years, Mr. DuBois has served as the Chamber's Executive Director, and he has touched many lives in this role. Many of his colleagues and friends recall the many early mornings and late nights he spent in the Chamber's office, seeing him at countless events and meetings around town, and his diligence in promoting Yarmouth's thriving businesses. His many years of hard work have been invaluable to the town's success, and he will certainly be missed by those who work and live in the community.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to recognize Mr. Bob DuBois for the service that he has given to the Town of Yarmouth. I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking him for all that he has done for the town, and in wishing him well in his future endeavors.

DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY, INC.

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, since 1913, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., has been and continues to be a worthy instrument for good; and

Whereas, the Decatur Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., was chartered on October 5, 1973, in Decatur, Georgia, by sixteen stellar sorors who had the foresight and vision to establish a Delta chapter in DeKalb County, Georgia; and

Whereas, the Decatur Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., is celebrating its forty year anniversary; and

Whereas, its members give of themselves tirelessly and unconditionally to serve our community through projects such as voter registration, health walks, mentorships and scholarships; and

Whereas, the lives of many in our district are touched by the leadership and service given by the ladies of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., our nation and the world are better places due to their commitment to excellence in all of their endeavors; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize their outstanding service to our District for the past forty (40) years and to wish them well on their anniversary;

Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim October 5, 2013 as Decatur Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, This 5th day of October, 2013.

RECOGNIZING DONALD LARSON AS HE CELEBRATES HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Donald Larson as he celebrates his 80th birthday. His many years of dedication to education and service deserve both acknowledgement and appreciation.

Don and his twin brother, Phil, were born on September 5, 1933, to Bengt John and Olive Emmingham Larson. He grew up in Kerman, California, and graduated from Kerman High School in 1951. After attending the College of the Sequoias, Don continued his education at the University of California, Berkeley. Immediately following graduation, Don began his teaching career in Caruthers, California. He taught sixth grade for two years, and then went on to teach at Kerman High School for two years. During his first few years of teaching, Don was also completing a Masters at California State University, Fresno. He taught

six years for Fresno Unified and ended his teaching career after 35 years with Fresno City College.

Staying active and involved in the community has always been very important to Don. He takes great pride in his lifelong membership at the First Covenant Church in Fresno where he has taught Sunday school for over six decades. Don has served at various organizations including Fresno County Housing Authority, Fresno Economic Opportunities Commission, and Fresno County Democratic Central Committee. He has also served on the State Center Community College Foundation and was the co-chair of the Capital Campaign for the Old Administration Building on the Fresno City College campus. In addition to these impressive undertakings, Don also found time to be the scorekeeper at basketball games for Kerman and McLane High Schools, and Fresno City College. He also ran the football chain gang for over fifty years, and taught a current events class to high school seniors from 1965 to 2010.

During Don's retirement he enjoyed spending time with his late wife Carol Kraft Larson. Carol passed away in 2004, but her kindness and love for teaching will always be remembered. They raised one daughter, Lynn, who has furthered the family's tradition by working as an elementary school teacher.

Furthermore, Don has a tremendous interest in the World's Fair. His vast collection of World's Fair memorabilia is housed in the Special Collections Department of the Henry Madden Library at California State University, Fresno. The collection has been named in his honor and is considered second only to that of the Smithsonian in Washington, DC.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to recognize Donald Larson on his 80th birthday. He serves as a pillar in our community, and I thank him for all of his contributions to our education system.

CONGRATULATING JOE A. RAVER

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Joe A. Raver, the incoming president and CEO of Hillenbrand, Inc., headquartered in Batesville, Indiana, in my congressional district.

Mr. Raver is the current president of Hillenbrand's Process Equipment Group and senior vice president of the company. Previously, he had been president of Batesville Casket Company. Joe had also served as vice president and general manager of the respiratory care division of Hill-Rom Holdings, where he first served as vice president of Strategy and Shared Services. Prior to joining Hill-Rom, Joe spent 10 years in a variety of senior leadership positions at Batesville Casket Company and Hillenbrand Industries.

For more than a century, the Hillenbrand companies have served as a staple in the Indiana and American corporate landscape, premiering innovative products in the funeral

services, and process equipment industries. I have no doubt that Hillenbrand will continue to be a dynamic company that Hoosiers can be proud of with Joe at the helm.

I congratulate Joe on this new chapter in his life and wish him the very best as he takes the lead at Hillenbrand.

HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOOKS FOR AFRICA

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to the staff, board, donors, and volunteers of Books for Africa on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of this nonprofit organization based in Saint Paul, Minnesota. Since its founding in 1988, Books for Africa has grown into the largest shipper of donated text and library books to the African continent, having shipped over 27 million books to 48 countries. In 2012 alone, Books for Africa shipped more than 2.2 million books to 22 African countries.

Ending the book famine in Africa is the mission that led Thomas Warth to found Books for Africa. Troubled by a chronic shortage of books in Africa and the reality that 40 percent of school-age children do not attend school, Mr. Warth put his vision and enthusiasm into an ongoing commitment to transform lives by facilitating the shipment of container after container of books that put real books in the hands of real people. By sending textbooks to areas with empty shelves and into the hands of children eager to read, learn, and explore the world of literature, Books for Africa is making a difference in the lives of young people. Books for Africa is promoting literacy, and empowering the next generation to break the endless cycle of poverty that will improve quality of life.

This success would not have been possible without the joint partnership of public and private sectors. Books for Africa frequently works with USAID, Peace Corps, and the Sir Emeka Ofori Foundation to deliver books. Together with the generous support of publishers, schools, libraries, organizations and individuals who donate books, Books for Africa is making a positive impact in the lives of people in African countries.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of Thomas Warth and the dedicated staff, partners, donors, board, and volunteers, I am pleased to submit this statement for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recognizing the 25th anniversary of Books for Africa.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ORLANDO, INC.

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a special occasion

for Orlando, Inc. (Orlando Regional Chamber of Commerce). In 1913, Orlando, Inc. was first established and this year they celebrate their 100th anniversary. It is my pleasure to recognize them on their Centennial.

During the past century, Orlando, Inc. has been through many phases of growth and change to create the longstanding history they have today. From their establishment in 1913 as the Board of Trade, followed by becoming the Downtown Chamber, then as the Greater Orlando Chamber, then the Orlando Regional Chamber of Commerce and now today, Orlando, Inc., their goal and focus of serving the Central Florida region has always remained constant. They have been and continue to be a leader in connecting Central Florida's businesses and communities and maintain success by focusing on what matters most to Central Floridians.

Orlando, Inc. specifically focuses on regional entrepreneurship and is one of four lines of businesses which make up the Central Florida Partnership. The Central Florida Partnership, comprised of Orlando, Inc., BusinessForce, myregion.org and Leadership Orlando, is committed to advancing Central Florida's entrepreneurs and moving "Ideas to Results." In their quest to build the best entrepreneurial environment, Orlando, Inc. is positioned to serve the growing demands of entrepreneurs and businesses throughout the Central Florida region by offering some of the most powerful and influential business programs in Central Florida. After a century, Orlando, Inc. has thousands of member businesses that they serve.

Through the high quality, expertise and strong leadership displayed by Orlando, Inc., they have earned and have been accredited a "Five-Star Chamber" by the United States Chamber of Commerce. This honor is the highest level of achievement awarded by the United States Chamber of Commerce, and with nearly 7,000 Chambers in the U.S., only 217 currently remain accredited.

The excellence with which Orlando, Inc. and the Central Florida Partnership serve Central Florida's business community and enterprises is evident from their history and recognitions. I commend them for their many achievements and I am pleased to congratulate them on the celebration of their 100th anniversary. May their leadership, service and dedication inspire many to follow in their footsteps.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS WESLEY HARRIS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present the following U.S. Citizen of Distinction:

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of this one man, Thomas Wesley Harris, Jr., who has given so much to our state and nation; and

Whereas, Thomas "Tom" Harris has been instrumental as a pioneer in the beauty industry with his artistic talents, his high standards

in creating and innovating cosmetology, being a mentor for hair stylists and in propelling many careers in Atlanta and beyond; and

Whereas, this giant of a man accomplished so much during his time on earth, he served our country honorably in the U.S. Army, he was an entrepreneur, creating Tom Harris Hair Designers, he was a strong community advocate, a motivator and a friend to all; and

Whereas, he gave of himself, his time, his talent and his life to uplift those in need, he never asked for fame or fortune he just wanted to help somebody and to inspire anybody by being involved in community activities and taking the time to encourage and train young stylists into using their skills to impact an industry; and

Whereas, Tom Harris led by doing both behind the scenes and on the front lines, he was an ambassador of goodwill who will be truly missed; and

Whereas, Tom Harris was a husband, a father, a grandfather, and a friend; he was our warrior, our patriarch, a man of great integrity who remained true to the uplifting of our community; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia recognizes Tom Harris as a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction;

Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby attest to the 113th Congress that he is deemed worthy and deserving of this Congressional Honor by declaring Mr. Thomas Wesley Harris, Jr. U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, This 15th day of July, 2013.

HONORING KENNETH A. CAMP

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary accomplishments of Kenneth A. Camp, President and CEO of Hillenbrand, Inc., headquartered in Batesville, Indiana, in my congressional district.

Mr. Camp was elected President and Chief Executive Officer of Batesville Casket Company May 1, 2001, and as President, CEO and Director of Hillenbrand, Inc., March 31, 2008. Previously he had served as senior vice president of Hillenbrand Industries, Inc., and as vice president before that. Mr. Camp joined Hillenbrand in 1981, and has held various positions with both Hillenbrand and Batesville Casket. During the course of his career, Ken has had senior responsibilities in sales, marketing, human resources, manufacturing and logistics. From 1972 to 1978, Ken served his country as a commissioned officer and aviator in the United States Army.

The Hillenbrand companies have been a premier example of corporate success in Indiana by developing and producing innovative products in the funeral services, and process equipment industries. Ken's hard work and leadership within the company has been vital to that success.

Ken soon will retire from his duties leading this dynamic Hoosier company. I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in

thanking Ken for his long career and service to both his business and community.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,932,605,798,305. We've added \$6,305,728,749,392 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF
MARION ALICE FALKNER GASH

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Marion Alice Falkner Gash, who passed away on July 31, 2013, two weeks before her 100th birthday. She had an exceptional spirit with an "I-can-do-it" attitude. Marion inspired others through her military service, professional achievements, excellence in teaching, support of her community, and devotion to family and friends.

Marion Alice Falkner was born at her family's Germania Farm in Yazoo County, Mississippi on August 14, 1913. She was born to Marion and Minniealice Falkner and was the eldest of seven children. Marion graduated from Hinds Junior College in Raymond, Mississippi and continued onto Maryville College in Tennessee to obtain her teaching credential. After graduation, Marion taught for six years in Benton, Mississippi. In 1940, she moved to New Orleans to attend Soule Business College and worked for attorney John Minor Wisdom who later became a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Shortly after Congress declared war, Marion moved to Washington, D.C. to serve her country. She worked at the Pentagon in the Office of the Budget of the War Department. In 1943, she joined the Navy WAVES and rose to the rank of Lieutenant J.G., serving as the Administrative Officer to Admiral W.K. Romoser, Commander of the Naval Training School in Hollywood, Florida.

In 1946, Marion married Navy Lt. Russell Warner Gash, and they raised two sons, Frank and Warner. At the time, Navy policy did not allow female officers to have children so Marion reluctantly resigned her commission and assumed the role of navy wife for the rest of Russell's naval career. Over the next 15 years, the family moved to eight duty stations in six different states and Cuba. In 1961, the family settled in Fresno, California, and Mrs. Gash returned to teaching.

Mrs. Gash taught English and speech, directed plays, coached debate teams, and established a forensics program at Central Union High School. While working full time, she earned her Master's degree in education at California State University, Fresno in 1967. After retiring in 1978, she continued to volunteer in school, church, military, veterans and community activities. Mrs. Gash was a great teacher who positively affected the lives of thousands of students.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to the life of Marion Alice Falkner Gash, a veteran of World War II and a beloved mother, grandmother, aunt, teacher, and friend.

TRIBUTE TO THE JORDAN FAMILY

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, the birth of James Jordan in Jackson County, Georgia on August 15, 1837 began the Jordan family lineage which has blessed us with descendants that have helped to shape our nation; and

Whereas, through the union of James and Dicey Shields Jordan (1858), Summie, John, James, Hilliard (Hill), Mary, Woodie, Henry Arthur, Babe, Alice and Emma were born; In 1885, James was united in marriage to his second wife Nancy Polk Jordan wherein, Bertha, Gilbert, Luther, Pledger, Judson and Lucy were born. The Jordan Family has produced many well respected citizens and the patriarchs and matriarchs of the Jordan Family are pillars of strength that have touched many throughout our nation, family members of the past and present such as Mrs. Janice Anderson Edwards, Rev. Frankie Jordan, Rev. Darrell White, Mrs. Evelyn Boynton, Miss Beverly Gray, Mrs. Annie Ruth Johnson, Mrs. Martha Ann Whitlock, Mr. Jerome Anderson, Mr. Summie Jordan, Ms. Rheba Brackery, Miss Rasheedah Carter, Ms. Vel Ford and Mrs. Ollie Brooks; and

Whereas, in our beloved Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, we are honored to have members of the Jordan family for they are some of our most beloved citizens in our District; and

Whereas, family is one of the most honored and cherished institutions in the world, we take pride in knowing that families such as the Jordan family have set aside this time to fellowship with each other, honor one another and to pass along history to each other by meeting at this year's family reunion in DeKalb County, Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Jordan family; Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim June 28, 2013 as Jordan Family Reunion Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, This 28th day of June, 2013.

IN HONOR OF JOE DUARTE

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise in honor of Joe Duarte, who passed away on July 23 in Sacramento, at the age of 84. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Duarte as his family and friends gather to celebrate his life and legacy.

Mr. Duarte, a former Merchant Marine, devoted his life to helping our community. A lifelong athlete who played professional baseball with the St. Louis Browns, Mr. Duarte was committed to promoting recreational and academic activities for the youth of Sacramento. As a member of the Greater Sacramento Evening Optimist Club, in 1971 Mr. Duarte founded the Optimist All-Star baseball, basketball, and football games. He organized the best high school seniors from the Greater Sacramento area into teams to participate in these games. Not stopping with baseball, basketball, and football, Mr. Duarte also organized girls softball and volleyball games.

Mr. Duarte created and organized the Youth Appreciation Night for Students from more than ten schools, which for over 20 years has recognized students who excel in academic, athletics and community service. In 2005, he created the Respect for Law program which honors seniors from the Criminal Justice Academies at Grant Union, John F. Kennedy, Hiram Johnson, and C. K. McClatchy high schools at a banquet which included their parents and Sacramento law enforcement officers.

Mr. Duarte's honors include inductions into the San Francisco Parks and Recreation Hall of Fame in 1975, the Greater Sacramento Softball Association Hall of Fame, and the LaSalle Club Baseball Hall of Fame at Christian Brothers High School in Sacramento in 2001.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in paying honor to Joe Duarte for being an exemplary member of the Sacramento community. His life and commitment to our community is an inspiration to us all. The Greater Sacramento area has lost a true citizen of the community who always put service above self. I ask that we take a moment and give our utmost respect and condolences to his wife, Phyllis, and their three children.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
KENNETH ABRAHAMIAN

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Kenneth Abrahamian as he receives his World War II (WWII) Medals. He is the recipient of the Philippine Liberation Medal, WWII Victory Medal, WWII Asiatic Pacific Medal, Navy Good Conduct Medal, and American Campaign Medal. Mr. Abrahamian is a source of pride for our Central Valley and our entire nation.

Mr. Abrahamian grew up in the Valley and graduated from Central High School in 1941. Following his graduation, he enlisted in the United States Navy to serve his country in WWII. He served honorably and proudly from 1942 to 1946. Mr. Abrahamian was stationed in the Pacific as a machinist mate aboard the USS *Spangler* and the USS *Ajax*.

Mr. Abrahamian married Isabelle Zadurian at the Holy Trinity Armenian Apostolic Church in Fresno, California. They have three children; Jeanette, Patricia, and Kenneth, daughter-in-law, Sue, and two grandchildren; Kenneth Andrew and Allyson Marie.

The Abrahamians have spent their entire lives in the Rolinda area, a small unincorporated community in Fresno County. They farmed raisins, almonds, alfalfa, barley, black-eyed peas, broccoli, corn, cotton, oats, onions, sugar beets, turkeys, and wheat. Mr. Abrahamian truly understands the importance of hard work and he has shown that through his labor on the farm and service in the military. As a resident of the Rolinda area, Mr. Abrahamian is known to be a great neighbor and friend.

Staying involved and supporting the community has always been very important to Mr. Abrahamian. He is an active member of his church, and he always participates in the annual Rolinda Charity BBQ. Mr. Abrahamian's spirit and drive keep him going every day. A couple months short of 90 years old, Mr. Abrahamian is still out on his farm daily. He is an inspiration for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the service of Mr. Kenneth Abrahamian. He truly is a shining example of a proud American, and we must thank him for his service to our country.

STATEMENT ON 30 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE OF COUNCILMAN ALBERT VANN

HON. HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the achievements of Councilman Albert Vann. During his years of service, Councilman Vann has helped thousands and worked tirelessly to improve the lives of all those he encountered. In celebration of his 30 years of outstanding service, Councilman Vann was honored on May 9, 2013, at Boys and Girls High School in Brooklyn, NY, where the library was renamed in his honor.

As both a teacher and elected official, Councilman Vann has served the people of Bedford-Stuyvesant, Brooklyn, the community in which he was born and raised. Councilman Vann graduated from Franklin K. Lane High School and went on to earn his B.B.A. from Toledo University, his Master's Degree in Education from Yeshiva University, and his Master's Degree in Guidance and Counseling from Long Island University. He served as a sergeant in the United States Marine Corps. Prior to being elected to public office, Councilman Vann taught at PS 256, JHS 35, and JHS 271 in Brooklyn, NY.

Councilman Vann served in the New York State Assembly from 1974–2001. Throughout these years, he continually and fervently represented the needs of his constituents. As Chairman of the New York State Black & Puerto Rican Caucus, he worked to prevent racial gerrymandering of the New York City Council. In 1982 he filed a lawsuit that increased the representation of communities of color—this landmark victory led to the creation of two additional Congressional Districts, three additional State Senate Districts, and six additional State Assembly Districts that represented communities of color in New York State.

In 2001, Mr. Vann was elected to the New York City Council. He has done a tremendous job as Chair of the Council's Committee on Community Development, where he has addressed poverty, foreclosures, and predatory equity. While in the New York City Council, Councilman Vann founded the 36th Council District Katrina Relief Effort, the Black Brooklyn Empowerment Convention, and New York City Works, which strives to reduce the disproportionately high unemployment rate in Black and Latino communities.

Recognizing the importance of empowering residents to improve their communities, he created several taskforces including: Education Taskforce; Senior Taskforce; Community Safety Taskforce; Youth Taskforce; and the Coalition for the Improvement of Bedford-Stuyvesant. Through his leadership with the Council's HIV/AIDS Faith-Based Initiative, Councilman Vann has improved HIV/AIDS prevention outreach throughout New York City. Councilman Vann's vision led to the co-naming of Fulton Street as Harriet Ross Tubman Avenue and New York State's recognition of Harriet Tubman Day.

Councilman Vann has truly been a trailblazer, whose positive influence will have an everlasting effect on the community. His record of achievement would not have been possible without the love and support of his wife, Mildred Vann, their four children and eight grandchildren. We thank his family for sharing him with us all. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating Councilman Vann on his 30 years of outstanding service. For his commitment to the people of Brooklyn, he is worthy of the highest praise.

TRIBUTE TO JORDAN AND SYLVIA WEDLOWE

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, the union of Jordan and Sylvia Wedlowe in Twiggs County, Georgia in the 1800's began the Wedlowe family lineage which has blessed us with descendants that have helped to shape our nation; and

Whereas, the Wedlowe Family has produced many well respected citizens and the patriarchs and matriarchs of the Wedlowe family are pillars of strength that have touched

many throughout our nation, family members of the past and present; and

Whereas, in our beloved Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, we are honored to have members of the Wedlowe family for they are some of our most beloved citizens in our District; and

Whereas, family is one of the most honored and cherished institutions in the world, we take pride in knowing that families such as the Wedlowe family have set aside this time to fellowship with each other, honor one another and to pass along history to each other by meeting at this year's family reunion in DeKalb County, Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Wedlowe family;

Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim June 29, 2013 as Wedlowe Family Reunion Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, This 29th day of June, 2013.

IN MEMORY OF SEAN FRANKLIN SASSER

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Sean Franklin Sasser. Sean was an educator and an activist, and dedicated his life to speaking out about HIV/AIDS. Sadly, Sean passed away on August 7th, 2013 at the age of 44 after a short battle with Mesothelioma.

Sean was diagnosed with HIV in 1988 when he went to enlist in the Navy, and lived for 25 years with the disease. As a young black homosexual man living with HIV, Sean organized support for the HIV/AIDS community. He was active in Bay Positives, an organization established in 1990 as the first peer-run agency in the world for young people living with HIV/AIDS. In 1993, he was photographed by celebrated American photographer Annie Leibovitz as part of one of the first public awareness campaigns about HIV, organized by the San Francisco AIDS Foundation.

In 1993, Sean met Pedro Zamora, who gained fame as part of the cast of MTV Real World, San Francisco. Sean and Pedro's on-air relationship and marriage was thrown into the national spotlight, bringing international attention and putting a human face to the realities of HIV/AIDS. Though Sean's on-air presence was short, the impact of their televised relationship was great, and after Pedro's tragic death from AIDS at the age of 22, Sean went on to become an even greater advocate for the HIV/AIDS community.

Throughout his life, Sean travelled across the country to educate others about HIV/AIDS and living with the disease. He spoke at colleges, universities, and many organizations including the Gay & Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation, the Human Rights Campaign, Health Initiatives for Youth, and the AIDS Alliance for Children, Youth & Families. Sean was also a celebrated pastry chef, and just

last May could be found making homemade ice cream at RIS restaurant in Washington D.C.

Mr. Speaker, this week we lost a great voice for the HIV/AIDS community. There are approximately 50,000 new HIV infections every year, and only through education, public awareness and community outreach can we prevent the spread of the HIV virus. Sean used his voice to bring attention to the HIV community, and as we pay tribute to his life, we must also continue his efforts. One day at a time, we move closer to an AIDS-free generation.

I offer my heartfelt condolences to Sean's family and his partner Michael. Undoubtedly, Sean touched the lives of countless friends and strangers alike. He leaves behind a legacy of activism, bravery, and service to the HIV community. He will be dearly missed.

HONORING THE COURAGEOUS ACTIONS OF SIX INDIVIDUALS

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the courageous actions of four young individuals, and two members of the Aurora Police Department, Sergeants Dan Eppard and Rick Ahlgren. With great valor and heroism, all six individuals, including Sergeants Eppard and Ahlgren risked their lives to save those of others who were trapped in a dam while rafting on the Vermillion River near Oglesby, Illinois.

On June 28, 2013, a 45 year-old man and his 10 year-old son were rafting on the river when they became trapped in a dam. After forty minutes had elapsed, four boys on a second raft came across the two individuals, and demonstrated immense bravery in attempting to rescue them. After successfully bringing the 10 year-old boy aboard the second raft, they unfortunately became caught in the dam, trapping all five boys. The 45-year-old man was able to escape the dam, swim to shore, and dial 9-1-1.

At this same time, off-duty Sergeants Eppard and Ahlgren were kayaking down the river, and in an act of great courage rescued all five boys, whose ages ranged from 10 to 14. Sgt. Eppard has a history of heroism, having once rescued a woman at the exact same dam in 2009.

The selfless heroism of these extraordinary people serves as an example to us all. These individuals put their own lives in harm's way for the well-being of others. While the 10 year-old boy was treated for hypothermia, no one else was injured in an event that could have ended in tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring these brave individuals for their courageous acts and altruistic service.

IN CELEBRATION OF MRS. GRACIE G. SIMPSON'S 85TH BIRTHDAY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a beloved role model and gracious woman of faith, Mrs. Gracie G. Simpson. On Sunday, September 1, 2013, Mrs. Simpson was honored by her family and friends at a birthday celebration at the Howard Community Club in Macon, Georgia.

Gracie Mae Peck was born on August 29, 1928, in Macon, Georgia, to the late Willie B. Peck and the late Claire Mae Fulton. She was the second child, with one older sister, one younger sister, and two younger brothers, all of whom are now deceased.

Back in the days when she was young, many children did not have the opportunity to complete school and had to begin working at a young age. For 43 years of her life, Mrs. Simpson worked at Tom's Foods, Inc., known to many as "the candy company." However, she was able to return to school to take computer classes before retiring.

Mrs. Simpson was married to J. Z. Simpson, Sr., for 54 years until his death in October of 2008. She has three sons, Donald Gibson, Jr., Zebbie Simpson, and Michael Simpson, and one daughter, Jan Simpson Walker.

She has eight grandchildren: Donald, Eunice, Christen, Jerome, Marcus, Marvin, Keisha, and Kelicia. She also has six great-grandchildren: Grace, Hannah, Abigail, Katelynn, DJ, and Christian.

Mrs. Simpson has achieved numerous successes in her life, but none of this would have been possible without the love and support of her adoring family. Voted "Reigning Queen" at Pearl Stephens Village Senior Apartments, she enjoys fishing and going on walks. She loves spending time with her family and is a great cook. She makes a mean sweet potato pie and a delicious peach cobbler. She is full of life and spunk and her family knows very well that "if you don't want to hear the truth, don't ask her a question."

Most important to Mrs. Simpson is her sturdy and enduring relationship with the Lord. She has been a member of Greater Little Rock Baptist Church for over 60 years. She has served on the Mother Board Association, Choir, Deaconesses, Food Bank, Women of Flow Ministry, and Kitchen Ministry.

The race of life isn't given to the swift or to the strong, but to those who endure until the end. Mrs. Simpson has run the race of life with grace and dignity and God has blessed her over her lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Mrs. Simpson for her 85 fruitful and productive years of life.

RUBY MARIE SINGS LANGFORD JOHNSON

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present the following U.S. Citizen of Distinction:

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of this one woman . . . who has given of herself in order for others to stand; and

Whereas, Mrs. Ruby Marie Sings Langford Johnson's work is present in DeKalb County, Georgia for all to see, being an advocate for the youth, the elderly, the poor and ordinary citizens like you and me; and

Whereas, this remarkable woman gave of herself, her time, her talent and her life; she never asked for fame or fortune to uplift those in need, she just wanted to do what was right; and

Whereas, Mrs. Johnson led by doing behind the scenes, front and center for the state of Georgia, DeKalb County, her church, Beulah Baptist Church and for the DeKalb County chapter of the NAACP; this virtuous Proverbs 31 woman was a mother, grandmother, a daughter and a friend; she was our warrior, our matriarch, a woman of great integrity who remained true to the uplifting of our community until her end; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow a Congressional recognition on Mrs. Ruby Marie Sings Langford Johnson for her leadership, friendship and service to all of the citizens in Georgia and throughout the Nation; a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction;

Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby attest to the 113th Congress that Mrs. Ruby Marie Sings Langford Johnson of DeKalb County, Georgia is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honor" Mrs. Ruby Marie Sings Langford Johnson U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, This 28th day of June, 2013.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY BIODESIGN

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Arizona State University president Dr. Michael Crow on the impressive progress that ASU has made since Dr. Crow began leading there in 2002. I would like to recognize the Arizona State University Biodesign Institute, which I was able to visit and tour on July 11th.

The Biodesign Institute is an outstanding example of success in transdisciplinary research, with the Institute's technologies and fields of research coming together to address national and global challenges with "bio-inspired" solutions in: new vaccine discovery and delivery; early detection and treatment of cancer and infectious diseases; techniques for detecting and removing contaminants from air and water and the application of nanotechnology for biomedicine and electronics.

Arizona State University Biodesign researchers generate an average of 50 invention disclosures and patents annually and have

fostered more than a dozen spinout, startup companies. In 2009, the institute won Arizona's "Excellence in Economic Development Award" for its innovative contributions to the state's economic growth.

The Biodesign Institute embodies the guiding principles of the New American University, as defined by Arizona State University President Michael Crow. ASU is a comprehensive metropolitan university that has become the largest in the U.S. and recently ranked among elite 100 world universities. ASU ranked #17 in the country for research expenditures at a university without a medical school. The Wall Street Journal asked corporate recruiters which schools produced the best qualified graduates in the country and they ranked ASU #5. There has been significant progress at ASU.

Congratulations to Dr. Crow and to the Arizona State University Biodesign Institute for successfully fusing intellectual disciplines to conduct use-inspired and impactful research which are advancing our country's technology development and economy.

HONORING FATHER MICHAEL
O'MARA

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute a remarkable Hoosier, Father Michael O'Mara. Father O'Mara is a true leader in his community and the Hoosier state. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for his leadership and service to his country, his community, and the State of Indiana.

Father O'Mara grew up in Greensburg, Indiana and was ordained on June 18, 1988 in the Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul in Indianapolis. Father O'Mara has served dutifully to the church for many years and presided over many congregations over the years. He was appointed as pastor of St. Pius X in Indianapolis in 1990. From 1993 to 1999, he was appointed as pastor and/or co-pastor for the parishes of St. Philip, St. Bernadette, St. Patrick, and St. Mary all in Indianapolis as well as the St. Paul Catholic Center in Bloomington, Indiana. Since then, Father O'Mara has been reappointed as pastor to St. Mary in 2004 and 2011. On July 3, 2013, he was appointed as pastor to the St. Gabriel Parish in Indianapolis.

The commitment that Father O'Mara has made has not stopped at serving the church, but to the community as well. He has also been greatly involved with the Hispanic community in Indianapolis. He immersed himself in the Spanish language and took classes through Indiana University in order to become bilingual so that he could preach to all members of the congregation.

He has committed his life to the church and has served the church for 25 years now. That kind of commitment is not made lightly. Committing your life to the church is one of the greatest sacrifices a person can make and Father O'Mara had to have put in a lot of time, thought, and prayer before deciding to commit himself fully to the church.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF AN ORGANIZED WORKFORCE AND LABOR UNIONS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of an organized workforce, and the critical role that labor unions play in the building of a robust and diverse economy. The United States has benefitted greatly from the labor movement, and protecting workers' rights is more important now than ever before, particularly for African Americans.

Labor unions have provided a range of benefits for working men and women throughout our history, many of which we take for granted as being a normal part of life in the workplace. Simple concepts such as weekends and paid vacation time are thanks to the efforts of labor unions. More complex protections such as workplace safety standards and anti-discrimination laws also are the result of an organized and informed workforce coming together to resist unfair demands by employers.

Within the African American community, labor unions have provided a pathway to greater income equality and fairness in the workplace. While African American union workers can earn up to \$10,000 or 31 percent more than non-union members, workers across all races enjoy better wages when they are a member of a union. More simply, organized labor enables fair wages, safe working conditions, and equality in the workplace.

Mr. Speaker, as our economy continues its recovery, it is important that we preserve a sense of decency and respect among our workers. Fifty years ago, the March on Washington was as much a civil rights movement as it was a labor movement. Labor unions have fought to protect working men and women across all races, and I encourage my colleagues to continue this legacy by standing up for the rights of all working men and women across our great nation.

HONORING MONICA NINO

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Monica Nino, former Stanislaus County Chief Executive Officer, and to thank her for her leadership and dedication to the citizens of Stanislaus County.

After 25 years of devoted service to Stanislaus County, she is now San Joaquin County's new Chief Executive Officer. In her short 18 months as CEO for Stanislaus County, Nino proved herself a very competent executive, providing the thorough information needed for the five elected supervisors to make good decisions, especially on budget matters.

Ms. Nino was born and raised in Stanislaus County. She earned her Associate's degree

from Modesto Junior College, her Bachelor's degree in Accounting from California State University, Fresno and her Master's degree in Public Administration from California State University, Stanislaus.

In 1988, Monica started as an accountant in the Stanislaus County's Auditor-Controller's Office. She joined the executive office in 1991. She helped oversee the budget during heavy cuts to deal with reduced income resulting from the housing crash of the past half-decade and related economic woes.

Ms. Nino was appointed Stanislaus County Chief Executive Officer in January 2012. Prior to her appointment as CEO for Stanislaus County, she had held the position of Assistant Executive Officer with Stanislaus County since 2005. Nino is the first woman and first Latina to hold the permanent post.

As Chief Executive Officer with Stanislaus County, under the direction of the Board of Supervisors, Ms. Nino oversaw all aspects of Stanislaus County government, which included 26 County departments, an operating budget of \$891 million, and over 3,700 employees.

Ms. Nino also sat on the Stanislaus County Animal Services Agency, Joint Powers Agency, Stanislaus Regional 911, and Doctors Medical Center Governing Board.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and commending Monica Nino, former Stanislaus County Chief Executive Officer, for her numerous years of selfless service to the betterment of our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH AN- NIVERSARY OF THE DONOHO SCHOOL

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to honor an extraordinary college preparatory school in my district. The Donoho School, founded in 1963, will celebrate its 50th anniversary this month.

The Donoho School was founded in 1963 as a secondary school and was called the An-niston Academy. In 1976, the name was changed to The Donoho School in recognition of Mrs. Harriet Wallis Donoho, a founder of the school. The Lower Division of the school was founded as The Episcopal Day School in 1961 as an independent elementary school. Housed originally in the facilities of the Church of St. Michael and All Angels, the school moved into Grace Episcopal Church in 1967. In 1976, The Episcopal Day School merged with The Donoho School and became the Lower Division.

The Donoho School currently enrolls more than 400 students in Pre-K through 12th grade. It is an active member of the Alabama Association of Independent Schools, Alabama High School Athletic Association, College Board, National Association for College Admission Counseling, National Association of Independent Schools, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Honor Society and Southern Association of Independent Schools. The school will celebrate its

50th anniversary with an awards ceremony on September 16th.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating The Donoho School's achievements and thanking them for their dedication to providing Anniston's children with a quality education.

CONGRATULATING CHAD RUSSELL

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and congratulate Turlock High School Agriculture Department Chair Chad Russell, upon being awarded the "Instructor Sweepstakes Award" by the California State Fair for a fifth year. This award is a tribute to Mr. Russell's professional accomplishments in the field of education, as well as his dedicated commitment to his students and the art of welding.

Chad Allen Russell was born on May 23, 1982, in Turlock, CA to Bev and Tom Russell. He grew up in Turlock, CA, the second largest city in Stanislaus County, which has a population of 68,549. It is home to California State University, Stanislaus, and has earned the title "Heart of the Valley" for its extensive agricultural production.

As a child, Mr. Russell attended Mt. View-Chatom Schools and from 1996–2000 Mr. Russell was a standout FFA student at Turlock High School, mentored by several renowned agriculture instructors including Dale Pollard, Joe Digrazia, and Lori Marchy. While at THS, Mr. Russell was an active participant in FFA and distinguished himself by winning several awards including the State FFA Star Agribusinessman Award and, in his senior year, Outstanding Project at the CA State Fair.

Mr. Russell's facility with welding led him after high school to a job in that industry, where he worked for three years. Although Mr. Russell's salary as a welder was nearly double what a teacher earns, he felt called to this new profession and moved back to Turlock to begin attending Modesto Junior College, where he earned an A.A. degree in Agriculture. After MJC, Mr. Russell transferred to California State University, Fresno, where he majored in Ag Mechanics. While at Fresno State, Mr. Russell subcontracted for GEA Niro, who flew him around the country on weekends to weld.

With degree in hand, Mr. Russell was hired by Turlock Unified School District in 2006 as a part-time ROP welding instructor and eventually worked his way into a full-time position as an Agriculture teacher. Alice Pollard, former Principal of Adult and Career Education at Turlock Unified School District has praised Mr. Russell's devotion to his students, "Chad selflessly gives up his weekends, his spring and winter breaks, as well as spending more hours that you want to know during the summer helping his students." Cindy Young, Director of Yosemite ROP in Stanislaus County, relayed her awe at his commitment to his students, "When I visit his classroom, I see more than a classroom, I see a business. His students are involved and engaged. They are

committed to excellence. They are respectful and he is respectful of them. Mr. Russell is building tomorrow's workforce."

It didn't take long after starting his career at THS for Mr. Russell to make a reputation as one of the foremost Ag Mechanics instructors in the State as his students began to win award after award at the Stanislaus County and California State fairs. In 2009, Dominic Agresti-Assali, one of Mr. Russell's stand-out welding students, custom-made two 54 foot almond trailers that went on to win 1st place in the State Ag Mechanics over-\$10,000 division, earning Best in Division and Best in Show honors along with two other corporately-sponsored awards.

That same year, eight other THS students earned first place and Best of Show honors at the State Fair. Most recently, in 2013, Mr. Russell earned his 5th Instructor Sweepstakes award at the State Fair based on his students' outstanding performance and THS junior Trey Smith won a Golden Bear Award, the fair's highest honor. Mr. Russell's students are highly sought after for welding jobs at local businesses due to the reputation he has established in the community as a result of his students' extensive accomplishments.

Based in part on his students' numerous accomplishments and his own stellar record as a welding instructor, Mr. Russell was recently awarded the Yosemite Regional Occupation Program (YROP) Teacher of the Year award from Stanislaus County Office of Education. ROP is a program designed to prepare students for a career by providing a wide variety of specialized career education programs for high school students. The goal is for students to develop marketable skills, abilities, attitudes and work habits so that they can secure jobs, upgrade skills, and prepare for advanced careers.

For the past five years, Mr. Russell has served as the Department Chair of the THS Agriculture Department and has overseen its expansion to five teachers. He has been instrumental in helping to secure University of California approval for many of the agriculture courses at THS, allowing students to participate in a Career Technical Education program while maintaining four-year college eligibility. Mr. Russell's long-term plans are to pursue a Master's in Agriculture and continue to build the THS Agriculture Department into one of the premiere programs in the State. With his outstanding commitment to THS students and passion for Agriculture, it is only a matter of time before this dream becomes a reality.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in commending Chad Russell for his hard work and dedicated service at Turlock High School, and congratulating him upon receiving the California State Fair "Instructor Sweepstakes Award" not once but five times.

IN RECOGNITION OF ARKY MARKHAM

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join

me in recognizing Arky Markham of Northampton, Massachusetts.

Ms. Markham has dedicated her entire life and professional career to a simple pursuit: helping those in need, and giving a voice to the voiceless.

As a social worker, she has spent a career protecting and promoting the human rights of vulnerable populations, including war veterans, and those without healthcare.

As a political activist, she has stood up time and again for the causes that matter to her, demonstrating against nuclear weapons, and leading her community for peace, and against wars.

Ms. Markham has routinely volunteered and founded groups on behalf of social justice causes, including the American Friends Service Committee, where she was a co-organizer and chief fundraiser for the first Martin Luther King celebration in Northampton; Social Workers for Peace and Justice; The Middle East Peace Coalition; the Franklin/Hampshire Health Care Coalition which later helped to form Mass-Care, a state-wide organization that continues to advocate for single-payer health care; the Northampton Bill of Rights Defense Committee and the Alliance for Peace and Justice.

As Ms. Markham's community, friends, and colleagues gather this month to celebrate her 98th birthday and her life's work of 'doing good,' I ask that the House of Representatives join me in honoring a true champion of human rights.

TRIBUTE TO DONALD E. HARTMAN, SR.

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and remembrance of a remarkable individual, Donald E. Hartman, Sr., who passed away on August 15, 2013. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for his leadership and service to the state of Indiana.

Throughout his life Mr. Hartman served our country and Indiana with honor. He joined the U.S. Army in 1965 as a member of the military police and served overseas in Heidelberg, Germany. He then gave 26 years to the Indiana State Police. During his career he was recognized numerous times for his dedication to public safety and in 1996 was awarded the Indiana State Police's highest honor, the Gold Star Award for Valor, after saving a woman from a burning vehicle on I-65.

Upon retirement from the police force, Mr. Hartman continued to offer his time and energy to the people of Indiana. He was elected as Sheriff of Newton County and began his first term in 2007, a position he still held at the time of his passing. He was a selfless, respectful, and gracious leader, always putting the people and department before himself and working to provide the best service and safety possible to Newton County residents.

On and off the job, Mr. Hartman was invested in Indiana. He was the Vice-President of the Newton County Fair Board and the

President of the Newton County 4-H Council. In his youth, he was an active member of 4-H as well as Future Farmers of America.

Mr. Hartman was a true family man who is survived by Teri, his loving wife of 41 years, three children, his mother, and his brother. Mr. Donald E. Hartman, Sr. was a man committed to his family, his community, and his country. America is a better nation because of Mr. Hartman. He will be truly missed. Thank you for all you have given to this country and the State of Indiana. Rest in peace, Mr. Hartman.

ACKNOWLEDGING WILLIAM "BILL"
BASSITT

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor William "Bill" Bassitt, President and CEO of the Stanislaus Economic Development and Workforce Alliance on his retirement and to thank him for his dedicated, life-long spirit of community service.

Bill Bassitt holds a Bachelor's Degree from Xavier University and a Master's Degree from Bowling Green State University. He has also completed course work in economic development at the University of Oklahoma and was a graduate of the U.S. Chamber's Institute for Organizational Management from the University of Delaware, as well as the Center for Creative Management. He is a member of numerous professional organizations and has been the keynote speaker at many local, state, regional, and national conferences.

Since 2002, Mr. Bassitt has held the position of President and CEO of the Stanislaus Economic Development and Workforce Alliance. As CEO, Bill Bassitt conducted three private sector fundraising campaigns to provide private sector funding to support the operations of the Alliance. Under his direction, the Stanislaus Economic Development and Workforce Alliance has been successful in bringing public and private sector leaders together to breed change, address systemic issues and market Stanislaus County as a place to do business.

With 28 years experience in the Chamber of Commerce and economic development management in four states, Bill Bassitt has had an exceptional impact on the community. His career includes several years in the international business arena, working in over 24 countries, covering four continents, developing reciprocal trade agreements and seeking to bring direct foreign investment and corporate operations to the United States.

Bassitt previously served as Senior Vice President of the Detroit Regional Chamber and Executive Director of the Detroit Regional Economic Partnership, where he built a large regional organization. In addition, he led numerous highly successful marketing missions involving complex interaction and negotiations with international business and government leaders. Adding to his list of accomplishments is the development and marketing of several business parks.

After working for over 30 years in economic development in 25 countries and on four con-

tinents, and leading six separate economic development organizations, Bill Bassitt and his wife Nancy, will relocate to their home in Ohio. Married for 45 years, they have four children and 7 grandchildren, which they look forward to spending more time with in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Alliance CEO Bill Bassitt on his retirement and in thanking him for his exemplary leadership and service to the community.

HONORING BOBBY E. COLLINS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Bobby E. Collins, the newly appointed Postmaster for the Dallas Post Office. In this new position, Mr. Collins will oversee 1,435 employees across 31 stations, managing more than 540,000 deliveries throughout Dallas and its suburbs.

Mr. Collins spent decades refining his career with the U.S. Postal Service, which dates as far back as 1980 when he started as a letter carrier in Houston, Texas. Throughout his career, Mr. Collins advanced quickly within the Postal Service. He served in a number of supervisory roles in various parts of the country such as Texas, Arizona, and Missouri. Today, after devoting 33 years of service to assist the Postal Service with its mission to reliably deliver mail to every corner of our Nation, Mr. Collins takes this new responsibility with much enthusiasm.

The United States Postal Service is an important American institution that is fortunate to have such dedicated employees on board. Mr. Collins has demonstrated his unwavering commitment to the Postal Service and his fellow neighbors through decades of service and this new position will enable Mr. Collins to achieve even more.

Mr. Speaker, as we work together to address the various issues that the Postal Service currently faces, it is important that we recognize the individuals working diligently behind the scenes to keep postal operations running smoothly. I am proud to congratulate Mr. Collins for achieving this milestone in his career, and I have every confidence that he will serve the Dallas area well as Postmaster.

IN HONOR OF DIANNA RUSKOWSKY
AND HER 25 YEARS OF DEDICATED
SERVICE TO THE HOUSE
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND
THE WORKFORCE

HON. JOHN KLINE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dianna Ruskowsky for her 25 years of dedicated service to the House Committee on Education and the Workforce—and the American people.

In a career spanning the terms of seven Committee Chairmen, Dianna Ruskowsky has distinguished herself as an exemplary steward of Committee resources and a true expert of her craft. She is routinely sought out for guidance and assistance from her colleagues on both sides of the aisle—from fellow Committees to House Leadership offices.

Dianna's contributions take place behind the scenes, but her work does not go unnoticed. Her guidance and advice ensures everyone from our interns to our Staff Director has the knowledge they need to make wise decisions and adhere to the letter of the law.

Dianna's attention to detail and dedication to the successful operation of the Committee are without equal. The American people can rest assured every penny of their tax dollars that flows through the Committee is accounted for and invested in the most efficient manner.

Perhaps even more admirable is Dianna's own investment in the lives of the many young staffers she has taken under her wing over the years. Dianna routinely goes out of her way to help new staff members feel welcome and at home in our Committee family.

Our Committee could—quite literally—not run without Dianna's service, and we continue to be grateful for all she does.

ACKNOWLEDGING DR. CHERYL
DOMENICHELLI

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and congratulate John C. Kimball High School Principal Dr. Cheryl Domenichelli, upon being named the Association of California School Administrators' 2012 Secondary Principal of the Year. This award is a tribute to Dr. Domenichelli's professional accomplishments in the field of education, especially since the recognition is from her peers.

Dr. Cheryl Alexander Domenichelli was born on September 26 in San Francisco, California. She obtained a Bachelor of Fine Arts, Interior Design, from John F. Kennedy University in Orinda, California. She continued her education by earning her Teaching Credential with and emphasis in Art and Introductory Science and Secondary Education and Teaching at California State University, East Bay and a Masters of Education, Educational Leadership and Administration at Saint Mary's College of California. Finally, she completed her education with a Doctorate in Education, Educational Leadership at the University of California Berkeley.

Dr. Domenichelli started her first job in 1978 at GTE Lenkurt in San Carlos, California. She began her teaching career in 1995 as a Teacher of Art and Sciences at Deer Valley High School in Antioch, California. She was a teacher until 2003, when she was named as Vice Principal. In 2008, she accepted the position of Principal at John C. Kimball High School in Tracy, California, where she continues today.

Dr. Domenichelli has received numerous awards, including the Association of California

School Administrators/State of California High School Principal of the Year 2012, the 2001–2002 Internet Institute Award from the National Semiconductor Corporation, and the 1994 Parent Teacher Association/Honorary Service Award.

She is a proud member of the Association of California School Administrators, where she is a Regional Representative to the Equity, Achievement and Diversity for Success Committee. Dr. Domenichelli's memberships also include the National Association of Secondary School Principals and Phi Delta Kappa International, Contra Costa County Chapter 1072.

In addition, she has served her community as a member of the following organizations: Parent Teacher Student Association/Principal; University of the Pacific, Beyond our Gates Advisory Board; Jack and Jill of America, Incorporated/Lifetime Associate; and Parent Teachers Association/Ways and Means Committee Chair 1994.

Cheryl has been married to her husband of 29 years, Ronald Domenichelli and they have two beautiful daughters Angelica Dominique Domenichelli and Vanessa Marie Domenichelli.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Dr. Cheryl Domenichelli upon receiving the 2012 Secondary Principal of the Year by the Association of California School Administrators. This is an outstanding honor and one for which the community should be quite proud.

HONORING JERRY AND ANN
KIVETT

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute a remarkable Hoosier, Jerry Kivett. Jerry is a true leader in his community and the Hoosier state. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for his leadership and service to his country, his community, and the State of Indiana.

Jerry grew up on the family farm owned by his parents, Hugh C. and Martha Kivett, in Hall, Indiana. Jerry attended Martinsville High School and graduated in 1948. He participated in sports and today is still a sports enthusiast. Jerry worked the family farm with his brother, Jack, and father, Hugh, during much of his younger years and was a natural farmer as many generations of Kivetts were farmers.

It was during a youth event in the basement of the Mt. Pleasant Christian Church in Hall that his eyes met those of Mary Ward of Monrovia. It was love at first sight and today this love has lasted 65 years. Jerry and Mary bought a farm of their own in Hall and have resided over it for over sixty years. They still attend Mt. Pleasant Church and are the fifth or sixth generation of Kivetts to do so.

To this union were born Steve, who is a vicar for the Church of England, and has resided in England with his wife, Ann, for nearly 40 years. Jerry's son, Rick, resides in Martinsville with his wife, Vickie, and they both work in their county government. Jerry's

daughter, Jill Kivett, resides in Rensselaer and is a teacher at North Newton High School. Jerry's son, Monte, resides in Camby with his wife, Lisa, and was Chief Deputy Prosecutor for Morgan County. Life has continued to bless Jerry and Mary Kivett with seven grandchildren and four great grandchildren.

Jerry worked at the IBM in Greencastle and worked nights in order to either coach or attend his children's sporting events, rarely missing any of them. Mary spent over twenty years in the Morgan County Clerk's Office. They have done some traveling to England and stateside over the years and still enjoy vacationing. They are members of the Hall Civic Association and are lifelong Republicans. As parents and grandparents they have been excellent role models in family values. They have shared years of watching sports on all levels together and can quote you names, teams, statistics, and events others have long ago forgotten.

HONORING JIM MCCASLAND

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Jim McCasland, recipient of the 2013 Heroes of Labor Award by Dallas American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL–CIO). Mr. McCasland recently retired as the Executive Secretary of the Dallas AFL–CIO, but his contributions to the Dallas labor community will forever stand proud. During his career which spanned over four decades, Mr. McCasland was widely recognized for his steadfast commitment to many Dallas area and national organizations.

Mr. McCasland has been a member of Communications Workers of America since 1969, where he was both a job steward and a chief steward. He also served on the community services committee, public relations committee, and the legislative committee. Mr. McCasland joined the Central Labor Council (CLC) in 1981 and was elected to be the CLC Vice President in 1983. He also proudly served as the Picket Chairman on two occasions. In 1984, Mr. McCasland was elected the State AFL–CIO Vice President from District 7.

Mr. McCasland was also active in the Dallas County Democratic Party serving on multiple committees on different occasions. In 1992, Mr. McCasland was on Bill Clinton's Dallas County steering committee and was previously on the steering committees for Michael Dukakis and Mark White. He also served as a delegate to numerous precinct conventions and State Democratic conventions.

Mr. McCasland served on the Board of Directors for both the United Way and the Dallas County Red Cross. In 1987 Mr. McCasland was the Labor Chair of the Muscular Dystrophy campaign. Mr. McCasland's leadership and dedication to the community have made an impact on the Dallas area and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. McCasland deserves great recognition for his service to our community, as he is a true hero of labor.

CELEBRATING LABOR LEADER
LEROY KING'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 2013

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a distinguished San Francisco labor leader, a civil rights activist, and my dear friend, Leroy King, on the occasion of his 90th Birthday.

Committed to the principles of equality and justice for all people, King has been a fierce advocate for San Franciscans through his union, through city and state government, and through church and community groups. Today, I am proud to honor his decades of work to achieve social justice and a better life for working families in San Francisco.

King served as Northern Regional Director of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) for more than 30 years. He became a member of ILWU Local 6 in 1946 and later led a coalition of members to overturn a discriminatory system that elected only whites to union office. He dedicated years to helping create a fully inclusive, integrated workforce.

King's fire and passion for action in support of his beliefs has never dimmed. While in his 80s, he was arrested for staging an act of civil disobedience with hotel and restaurant workers who were fighting to improve working conditions. He also joined San Francisco teachers and education support professionals when they occupied the offices of the City's Board of Education to dramatize the unmet needs of students.

King was instrumental in the union's creation of the St. Francis Square Cooperative Housing development, which opened in 1963 in the Fillmore District and was a national model for creating racially-integrated housing for working families. King and his family moved into St. Francis Square when it opened, and he continues to live there today.

A staunch supporter of civil rights champion Cesar Chavez, King is often credited for bringing Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to the Bay area for a civil rights rally in 1967. In 2009, the National Education Association honored King with the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Award for promoting peace and advancing social and economic justice by embodying King's inclusive leadership and nonviolent philosophy.

As a long-time civic and public affairs leader, Mr. King served on the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission for over 30 years. As Commissioner, he fought to preserve the African-American and Japanese-American heritage of the Fillmore District.

With great pride, I designated him as my appointee to California's Electoral College. On December 15, 2008, he cast my official vote for Barack Obama as the first African American President of the United States.

From his courageous service in World War II to his extraordinary dedication to the City of San Francisco and the State of California, Leroy King is peerless leader will always be a strong and unwavering voice for the voiceless.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, September 10, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 11

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Department of Homeland Security at 10 years, focusing on examining challenges and achievements and addressing emerging threats.

SD-342

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert Leon Wilkins, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Timothy L. Brooks, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, James Donato, and Beth Labson Freeman, both to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, and Pedro A. Delgado Hernandez, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for

fiscal year 2014 for the Federal Communications Commission.

SD-138

2 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on National Security and International Trade and Finance

To hold hearings to examine assessing the investment climate and improving market access in financial services in India.

SD-538

SEPTEMBER 12

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 113th Congress; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine essential elements of housing finance reform.

SD-538

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Nisha Desai Biswal, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Subcommittee on Primary Health and Aging

To hold hearings to examine dental crisis in America, focusing on the need to address the cost.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 987, to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media, S. 357, to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee for the 113th Congress, and the nominations of Cornelia T. L. Pillard, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Landya B. McCafferty, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Hampshire, Brian Morris, and Susan P. Watters, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Montana, Jeffrey Alker Meyer, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, and Kenneth Allen Po-

lite, Jr., to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Department of Justice.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

SEPTEMBER 16

Time to be announced

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 113th Congress.

S-216

SEPTEMBER 18

2 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine older Americans, focusing on the changing face of HIV/AIDS in America.

SD-562

SEPTEMBER 19

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Deborah Lee James, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Air Force, Jessica Garfola Wright, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, and Marcel J. Lettre II, of Maryland, to be Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Intelligence, all of the Department of Defense, Frank G. Klotz, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Energy for Nuclear Security, and Kevin A. Ohlson, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.

SD-G50

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine wildlife management authority within the State of Alaska under the Alaska National Interest Lands Act and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

SD-366

CANCELLATIONS

SEPTEMBER 11

2:30 p.m.

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the economic outlook.

SD-G50

SENATE—Tuesday, September 10, 2013

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the fountain of every blessing, tune our hearts to pray with power. Bless today the work of our lawmakers, empowering them to accomplish Your purposes on Earth, guided by Your wisdom and courage. Lord, inspire them to act justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with You as You give them the gifts of increasing awareness and openness of heart. Teach them to bring harmony from discord and hope from despair.

We pray in Your eternal Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

AUTHORIZING THE LIMITED AND SPECIFIED USE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AGAINST SYRIA—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 166, S.J. Res. 21.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 21 to authorize the limited and specified use of the United States Armed Forces against Syria.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my and Senator McCONNELL's remarks, there will be a period of morning business until 11 a.m. this morning. At 11 a.m. we will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to the Syria resolution. The time until noon will be divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. The Senate will recess from noon until 2:15 p.m. to allow for our caucus meetings.

The leader and I have talked this morning—and prior to this morning—with regard to the energy efficiency bill. We automatically go to that bill at 11 a.m. We are trying to work out a

way we can go to that bill. Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN have worked for more than a year to come up with a bill. We have not done an energy bill in a long time, so there is a desire on both sides to move forward on this.

Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN have bipartisan amendments they want to offer to their bill, and I have expressed to the Republican leader that we need to move to that when we finish the Syria issue. I would like permission to move to that bill at the appropriate time. Once we get on the bill and we get the CR from the House, for example, I told the Republican leader—and everyone who wants to hear—that we don't have to finish the energy efficiency bill all at one time. We want to have an amendment process, and we will do that. I don't want to file cloture on the motion to proceed again, so we have instructed our staffs to try to come up with something before 11 a.m. that we can agree on.

I repeat. There will be amendments offered, and we will have adequate time to work on this. We may not be able to do it all at one time, but we will do it and finish this legislation.

SYRIA

Mr. President, we are engaged in a very important debate. The Syria debate is one that cannot be taken lightly, and I don't believe anyone has taken it lightly. The discussion and bipartisan resolution under consideration is simply too important to be rushed through the Senate or given short shrift. So it is right and proper that the President be given an opportunity to meet with Senators from both parties, as he will today. He will meet with us at 12:30 p.m. When he finishes with us, it is my understanding he will report to Senator McCONNELL's conference.

In addition to that, he is going to address the Nation tonight. He is going to speak directly to the American people about the potential for limited military action to Syria. He will do that at 9 p.m. tonight.

As I said last night, it is appropriate to allow other conversations to go on. We now have—as a result of some work done by other countries—France, Russia, and we understand Syria is involved in this as well. This is aimed at avoiding military action. We will have to see if this works out.

It is very important to understand that the only reason Russia is seeking an alternative to military action is that President Obama has made it plain and clear that the United States will act, if we must. Our credible threat of force has made these diplo-

matic discussions with Syria possible, and the United States should not withdraw from the direction we are taking as a country.

If there is a realistic chance—and I certainly hope there is—to secure Syria's chemical weapons without further atrocities of the Asad regime, we should not turn our backs on that chance. But for such a solution to be plausible, the Asad regime must act quickly and prove that their offer is real and not merely a ploy to delay military action or action by the body of the Senate.

Any agreement must also assure that chemical weapons in the hands of Syria can be secured and done in an open process, even in the midst of this ongoing war we have in Syria. Any agreement must ensure that Syria is unable to transfer its dangerous chemical weapons to the hands of terrorists in that area. Such an attempt would be met with a rapid and robust response from the United States.

I am pleased the administration is considering this offer. I am pleased other countries are involved in addition to Russia. It is my understanding that France is heavily involved, as of a few hours ago, and I think that is the right direction at this time. We will move forward but under the general criteria I have suggested and outlined.

The Senate should give these international discussions time to play out but not unlimited time. That is why, although there is support to move forward and debate this bipartisan resolution reported by Senators MENENDEZ and CORKER—they did a terrific job for the committee last week—I didn't rush to file cloture, as I indicated last night, on the motion to proceed. We don't need to prove how quickly we can do this but how well we can do this.

The Syrian regime should fully understand that the United States is watching very closely. The Asad regime should be warned our country will not tolerate this breach of human decency and long-held international consensus against the use of chemical weapons.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1392

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order with respect to S. 1392, which is the energy efficiency legislation, be modified so that the motion to proceed be agreed to at a time to be determined by me with the concurrence of the Republican leader—not consultation with him but concurrence with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

SYRIA

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, first, I would like to welcome the President to the Capitol today. Members on both sides of the aisle are eager to hear from him and to share their own thoughts. We look forward to a spirited and constructive exchange.

It is often said that of all the questions we face as lawmakers, none is more serious or indeed more difficult than the question of whether to commit ourselves to military action. That is why it is so important for us to have this debate, to lay out the arguments for and against military action in Syria, to let the public know where we stand on this issue and why.

If debates such as this are always challenging, in some ways this one has been even more difficult, not because of some political calculus—though cynics will always suspect that—no, this debate has been made more difficult because even those of us who truly want to support the Commander in Chief have struggled to understand the purpose of the mission.

Over the past several days I have spoken with a lot of people—a lot of Kentuckians—and most of them are not exactly clear about the mission or shy about saying so. What I have told them is that I understand their concerns, and I share them. I also appreciate the war weariness out there, but then I tell them there are other potential concerns we cannot ignore either. Chief among them is the fact that the credibility of the Commander in Chief matters, and related to that is the fact that we cannot afford, as a country, to withdraw from the world stage. So no one should be faulted for being skeptical about this proposal, regardless of what party they are in, or for being dumbfounded—literally dumbfounded—at the ham-handed manner in which the White House announced it.

There is absolutely no reason to signal to the enemy when, how, and for how long we plan to strike them—none. As I have said before, we don't send out a save-the-date card to the enemy. Yet there are other important considerations to keep in mind as well that go beyond the wisdom or the marketing of the proposal.

I have spent a lot of time weighing all of these things. I thought a lot about America's obligations and the irreplaceable role I have always believed, and still believe, America plays in the world. I have also thought a lot about the context, about this President's vision and his record and what it says about whether we should be confident in his ability to bring about a favorable outcome in Syria because how we got to this point says a lot about where we may be headed. That is why, before announcing my vote, I think it is impor-

tant to look back at some of the President's other decisions on matters of foreign policy and national security and then turn back to what he is proposing now in Syria because, in the end, these things simply cannot be separated.

It is not exactly a State secret that I am no fan of this President's foreign policy. On the deepest level I think it comes down to a fundamentally different view of America's role in the world. Unlike the President, I have always been a firm and unapologetic believer in the idea that America isn't just another Nation among many; that we are, indeed, exceptional. As I have said, I believe we have a duty as a superpower, without imperialistic aims, to help maintain an international order and balance of power that we and other allies have worked very hard to achieve over the years.

The President, on the other hand, has always been a very reluctant Commander in Chief. We saw that in the rhetoric of his famous Cairo speech and in speeches he gave in other foreign capitals in the early days of his administration. The tone, and the policies that followed, were meant to project a humbler, more withdrawn America. Frankly, I am hard pressed to see any good that came from any of that.

Any list would have to start with the arbitrary deadlines for military withdrawal and the triumphant declaration that Guantanamo would be closed within a year, without any plan of what to do with its detainees. There were the executive orders that ended the CIA's detention and interrogation programs.

We all saw the so-called "reset" with Russia and how the President's stated commitment to a world without nuclear weapons led him to hastily sign an arms treaty with Russia that did nothing to substantially reduce its nuclear stockpile or its tactical nuclear weapons. We saw the President announce a strategic pivot to the Asia-Pacific region, without any real plan to fund it, and an effort to end the capture, interrogation, and detention of terrorists, as well as the return of the old idea that terrorism should be treated as a law enforcement matter. After a decade-long counterinsurgency in Afghanistan, we have seen the President's failure to invest in the kind of strategic modernization that is needed to make this pivot to Asia meaningful. Specifically, his failure to make the kind of investments that are needed to maintain our dominance in the Asia-Pacific theater in the kind of naval, air, and Marine Corps forces that we will need in the years ahead could have tragic consequences down the road.

His domestic agenda has also obviously had serious implications for our global standing. While borrowing trillions and wasting taxpayer dollars here at home, the President has imposed a

policy of austerity at the Pentagon that threatens to undermine our stabilizing presence around the globe. Of course, we have seen how eager the President is to declare an end to the war on terror. Unfortunately, the world hasn't cooperated. It hasn't cooperated with the President's vision or his hopes. Far from responding favorably to this gentler approach, it has become arguably more dangerous. We have learned the hard way that being nice to our enemies doesn't make them like us or clear a path to peace.

I understand the President ran for office on an antiwar platform, that his rise to political power was marked by his determination to get us out of Afghanistan and Iraq, and to declare an end to the war on terror. I know he would rather focus on his domestic agenda. But the ongoing threat from Al Qaeda and its affiliates and the turmoil unleashed by uprisings in north Africa and the broader Middle East, not to mention the rise of Chinese military power, make it clear to me, at least, that this is not the time for America to shrink from the world stage.

The world is a dangerous place. In the wake of the Arab spring, large parts of the Sinai, of Libya, of Syria, are now basically ungoverned. We have seen prison breaks in Iraq, Pakistan, Libya, and the release of hundreds of prisoners in Egypt. Terrorists have also escaped from prisons in Yemen, a country that is no more ready to detain the terrorists at Guantanamo now than they were back in 2009. And the flow of foreign fighters into Syria suggests that the civil war there will last for years, regardless of whether Asad is still in power.

Yes, the President deserves praise for weakening Al Qaeda's senior leadership. But the threat we face from Al Qaeda affiliates is very real. These terrorists are adaptable. They are versatile, lethal, resilient, and they aren't going away. Pockets of these terrorists extend from north Africa to the Persian Gulf and it is time he faced up to it.

It is time to face up to something else as well: International order is not maintained by some global police force which only exists in a liberal fantasy. International order is maintained—its backbone is American military might, which brings me back to Syria.

For 2 years now Syria has been mired in a ferocious civil war with more than 100,000 killed with conventional arms. That is according to U.N. estimates. This tragic situation has prompted many to look to the United States for help. So 1 year ago President Obama made a declaration: If Asad used or started moving chemical weapons, he would do something about it.

Well, as we all know, on August 21 of this year, that redline was crossed. The President's delayed response was to call for a show of force for targeted,

limited strikes against the regime. We have been told the purpose of these strikes is to deter and degrade Asad's regime's ability to use chemical weapons. So let's take a closer look at these aims.

First, no one disputes that the atrocities committed in Syria in recent weeks are unspeakable. No one disputes that those responsible for these crimes against the innocent should be held to account. We were absolutely right, of course, to condemn these crimes. But let's be very clear about something: These attacks, monstrous as they are, were not a direct attack against the United States or one of its treaty allies. And just so there is no confusion, let me assure everyone that if a weapon of mass destruction were used against the United States or one of our allies, Congress would react immediately with an authorization for the use of force in support of an overwhelming response. I would introduce the resolution myself. So no leader in North Korea or Iran or any other enemy of the United States should take any solace if the United States were not to respond to these attacks with an action against Syria. We will never—never—tolerate the use of chemical weapons against the United States or any of its treaty allies.

Second, in the course of administration hearings and briefings over the past several days, Secretary of State Kerry has revealed that Asad has used chemical weapons repeatedly—repeatedly—over the last year. So there is a further question here about why the administration didn't respond on those occasions.

Third, Asad, as I have indicated, has killed tens of thousands of people with conventional weapons. Is there any reason to believe he won't continue if the President's strikes are as limited as we are told they would be?

Fourth, what if, in degrading Asad's control of those weapons, we make it easier for other extremist elements such as those associated with the al-Nusra Front and Al Qaeda to actually get hold of them themselves or what if, by weakening the Syrian military, we end up tilting the military balance toward a fractured opposition that is in no position to govern or control anything right now?

I think the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, put this particular best when he recently suggested in a letter to Congress that the issue here isn't about choosing between two sides in Syria, it is about choosing one among many sides; and that, in his estimation, even if we were to choose sides, the side we chose wouldn't be in a position to promote their own interests or ours. That is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs.

Then there is the question of how Asad himself will react to U.S. action in Syria. If Asad views an air campaign

as preparation for regime change, then he may lose all constraint in the use of his arsenal, chemical or otherwise, and lose any incentive whatsoever to move to the negotiating table. It is very clear that the unintended consequences of this strike could very well be a new cycle of escalation, which then drags us into a larger war that we are all seeking to avoid. Some have even suggested that the humanitarian crisis surrounding the Syrian civil war could actually be made worse as a result of even targeted U.S. strikes.

In the end, then, the President's proposal seems fundamentally flawed since, if it is too narrow, it may not deter Asad's further use of chemical weapons. But if it is too broad, it risks jeopardizing the security of these same stockpiles, potentially putting them into the hands of extremists.

That is why I think we are compelled in this case to apply a more traditional standard on whether to proceed with a use of force, one that asks a simple question: Does Asad's use of chemical weapons pose a threat to the vital national security interests of the United States? And the answer to that question is fairly obvious; even the President himself says it doesn't.

One could argue, as I have suggested, that there is an important national security concern at play, that we have a very strong interest in preserving the credibility of our Commander in Chief, regardless of the party in power, and in giving him the political support that reinforces that credibility. This is an issue I take very seriously. It is the main reason I have wanted to take my time in making a final decision. But, ultimately, I have concluded that being credible on Syria requires presenting a credible response and having a credible strategy. For all of the reasons I have indicated, this proposal doesn't pass muster.

Indeed, if, through this limited strike, the President's credibility is not restored because Asad uses chemical weapons again, what then? And new targets aimed at toppling the regime which end up jeopardizing control of these same chemical weapons stash—allowing them to fall into the hands of Al Qaeda and others intent on using them against the United States or our allies. Where would the cycle of escalation end?

Last night we learned about a Russian diplomatic gambit to forestall U.S. military action through a proposal to secure and eventually destroy the Syrian chemical weapons stockpile. This morning there are initial reports that suggest Syria is supportive of them. Let me remind everyone that even if this is agreed to, it is a still a long way off to reaching an agreement at the United Nations, to Syria gaining entry to the chemical weapons convention, and to eventually securing and destroying the stockpile. As we have

seen in my own State of Kentucky where we have been working for 30 years to finally destroy a stockpile of chemical weapons, destroying chemical weapons is extremely challenging and requires a great deal of attention to detail and safety. Nonetheless, this proposal is obviously worth exploring.

But, more broadly—and this is my larger point—this one punitive strike we are debating could not make up for the President's performance over the last 5 years. The only way—the only way—for him to achieve the credibility he seeks is by embracing the kind of serious, integrated, national security plan that matches strategy to resources, capabilities to commitments, and which shows our allies around the world that the United States is fully engaged and ready to act at a moment's notice in all the major areas of concern around the globe, whether it is the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, or in the South China Sea, and, just as importantly, that he is willing to invest in that strategy for the long term.

In Syria, a limited strike would not resolve the civil war there, nor will it remove Asad from power. There appears to be no broader strategy to train, advise, and assist a vetted opposition group on a meaningful scale, as we did during the Cold War. What is needed in Syria is what is needed almost everywhere else in the world from America right now: a clear strategy and a President determined to carry it out.

When it comes to Syria, our partners in the Middle East—countries such as Turkey, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Israel—all of them face real consequences from instability, refugee flows, and the growth of terrorist networks. Responding to this crisis requires a regional strategy and leadership. What we have gotten instead is an administration that seems more interested in telling us what the mission is not—more interested in telling us what the mission is not—rather than what it is. We have gotten the same timid, reluctant leadership that I have seen from the President for nearly 5 years.

As I have said, this decision was not easy. When the President of the United States asks you to take a question like this seriously, you do so. Because just as our credibility in Syria is tied up with our credibility in places such as Iran and North Korea, so too is the credibility of the Commander in Chief tied up, to a large extent, with America's credibility in general. There is no doubt about that. So let me repeat: I will stand shoulder to shoulder with this President or any other in any case where our vital national security interests are threatened, our treaty allies are attacked, or we face an imminent threat.

As for Israel, very few people, if any one, expect that Syria would test its readiness to respond on its own, which

just goes to show you the importance of credibility on the world stage. As Prime Minister Netanyahu put it last week, the enemies of Israel have very good reason not to test its might. But the Prime Minister should know nonetheless that America stands with him.

I have never been an isolationist, and a vote against this resolution should not be confused by anyone as a turn in that direction. But just as the most committed isolationist could be convinced of the need for intervention under the right circumstances when confronted with a threat, so too do the internationalists among us believe that all interventions are not created equal. And this proposal just does not stand up.

So I will be voting against this resolution. A vital national security risk is clearly not at play, there are too many unanswered questions about our long-term strategy in Syria, including the fact that this proposal is utterly detached from a wider strategy to end the civil war there, and on the specific question of deterring the use of chemical weapons, the President's proposal appears to be based actually on a contradiction: either we will strike targets that threaten the stability of the regime—something the President says he does not intend to do—or we will execute a strike so narrow as to be a mere demonstration.

It is not enough, as General Dempsey has noted, to simply alter the balance of military power without carefully considering what is needed to preserve a functioning state after the fact. We cannot ignore the unintended consequences of our actions.

But we also cannot ignore our broader obligations in the world. I firmly believe the international system that was constructed on the ashes of World War II rests upon the stability provided by the American military, and by our commitments to our allies. It is a necessary role that only we can continue to fulfill in the decades to come. And especially in times like this, the United States cannot afford to withdraw from the world stage. My record reflects that belief and that commitment regardless of which party has controlled the White House. We either choose to be dominant in the world or we resign ourselves and our allies to the mercy of our enemies. We either defend our freedoms and our civilization or it crumbles.

So as we shift our military focus to the Asia Pacific, we cannot ignore our commitments to the Middle East, to stability in the Persian Gulf, to an enduring presence in Afghanistan, to hunting down the terrorists who would threaten the United States and its people. And when the Commander in Chief sets his mind to action, the world should think he believes in it. When the Commander in Chief sets his mind to an action, the world should think he

believes in it. Frankly, the President did not exactly inspire confidence when he distanced himself from his own redlines in Stockholm last week.

It is long past time the President drops the pose of the reluctant warrior and lead. You cannot build an effective foreign policy on the vilification of your predecessor alone. At some point, you have to take responsibility for your own actions and see the world the way it is, not the way you would like it to be.

If you wish to engage countries that have been hostile, so be it. But be a realist, know the limits of rhetoric, and prepare for the worst.

For too long this President has put his faith in the power of his own rhetoric to change the minds of America's enemies. For too long he has been more interested in showing the world that America is somehow different now than it has been in the past; it is humbler; it is not interested in meddling in the affairs of others or in shaping events.

But in his eagerness to turn the page, he has blinded himself to worrisome trends and developments from Tunisia to Damascus to Tehran and in countless places in between.

A year ago this month four Americans were senselessly murdered on sovereign U.S. territory in Benghazi. Last month the President ordered the closing of more than two dozen diplomatic posts stretching from west Africa to the Bay of Bengal. As I have indicated, and as the decision to close these embassies clearly shows, the terrorist threat continues to be real. Expressions of anti-Americanism are rampant throughout Africa and the Middle East, even more so perhaps than when the President first took office.

So the President's new approach has clearly come with a cost. And for the sake of our own security and that of our allies, it is time he recognized it. Because if America does not meet its international commitments, who will? That is one question that those on the left who are comfortable with a weakened America cannot answer, because the answer is too frightening. No one will. That is the answer.

If this episode has shown us anything, it is that the time has come for the President to finally acknowledge that there is no substitute for American might. It is time for America to lead again, this time from the front. But we need strategic vision, in the Middle East and in many other places around the world, to do it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be

in a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, and with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Illinois.

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I listened carefully to the statement made by the Republican Senate leader. He is a member of the loyal opposition and it is no surprise that he is critical of the policies of President Barack Obama. That is the nature of the debate, the American debate, which takes place on the floor of this Chamber on a regular basis. But in fairness to this President, there are some things that were not mentioned.

This President, under his leadership, has brought the war in Iraq to a close. This President is bringing the war in Afghanistan to a close. This President, with the best military minds and the best military talent in the world, has made Osama bin Laden a piece of history. He was captured and killed. The man who, sadly, led an attack on the United States that cost almost 3,000 innocent lives has been dispatched because of the leadership of this President and the wonderful abilities and talents and resources of the United States military.

So to stand here and criticize this President as some reluctant warrior is unfair. Yes, I would say in some instances I want a President to be a reluctant warrior, to think twice before America is engaged in a war, to think twice before this country commits its troops to a foreign theater. Certainly, as of this moment, having lost more than 5,000 brave Americans in Iraq and Afghanistan, we know the terrible price that is paid by the men and women who so bravely represent this country. And I would like every President to think twice before committing those troops to battle. Reluctant? Yes. But wise? Yes, I want a wise warrior too.

I listened to the Senator from Kentucky criticize the President because he is, quote, telegraphing his punches when it comes to what is going to happen in Syria. Well, you cannot have it both ways. This President could make a unilateral decision and attack without even consulting Congress and thereby maintain the element of surprise or he could do as this President has done and follow what he considers to be our constitutional requirement of a national debate before we engage in military action.

So I would say to the Senator from Kentucky, do not criticize the President for letting us know what he might do when he turns this over to Congress to debate. It is something most of us in Congress should welcome.

I also take exception to this notion that we have somehow abandoned our commitment to the world—this notion that what we hope to do in the Pacific is unreachable, or the closing of embassies because of danger is problematic or that there is austerity in the Department of Defense.

It is hard to reconcile those statements from the Republican side of the aisle with the fact that repeatedly we have asked for a conference committee on the budget to work out our budget differences when it comes to funding the Department of Defense and our Nation's national defense and time and again the Republicans have objected—objected to even sitting down and trying to work out differences so we can restore some of the funds cut through sequestration.

You cannot have it both ways. Do not criticize the President for not spending enough money when it comes to our Nation's defense and then stand by the sequestration which continues to cut even more from that same Department and many others.

As for the war on terror, what the President has said is there comes a moment, and we have reached it, where we cannot always be on a war footing. It causes a nation to make decisions which in the long haul may not stand the test of time and history. The President has said, yes, there is a war on terrorism, but we have to resume our leadership in this world with the view of a stable nation, not always thinking about the wartime status we face.

I listened to the Senator from Kentucky, who talks about saving money and cutting budgets, trying to hang on to that relic of times gone by at Guantanamo, where we are spending so much money—hundreds of thousands of dollars for each prisoner to be kept at Guantanamo—when we know full well that at least half of them should be released—carefully released—and should not be maintained at Guantanamo.

Today, we have hundreds of convicted terrorists safely incarcerated in the Federal penitentiaries of America, including one in Illinois in Marion, and the people in the nearby community would not even know it because they are safely incarcerated.

Let me say a word too about this issue of Syria. You cannot, on the one hand, criticize this President for stepping up and saying we need to take action, if necessary, to stop the use of chemical weapons and then, on the other hand, say he is a reluctant warrior and that he does not support it. How in the world do you reconcile those two points of view?

The President has shown leadership. What he has asked is for the Congress to follow. What I heard from the Republican Senator from Kentucky is he is not interested in following that leadership.

Let me also add, this Putin overture, that we find some peaceful way to re-

solve this—I hope it turns out to be true and something that works. And if it does, give credit where it is due. This President stepped up and said we have to challenge the use of chemical weapons in Syria. Even if it does not affect the United States directly or its allies directly, we have to stand up to them. And if this Putin overture leads to some containment or destruction of those chemical weapons, give the President credit for it. Do not criticize him for not leading. He has shown more leadership on this issue than, frankly, many politicians of either party wanted to face.

I think when it comes to a credible strategy, this President has one.

It is a strategy which is ending two wars, which has put an end to the leader of that terrible terrorist attack on the United States on 9/11. It is a strategy which has improved the image of the United States since this President has come to power over the last several years. It is a strategy we can build on in the future. But we need to make certain that what we do is done with an eye toward the reality of this world in which we live. It is a dangerous world. It is one where the United States may be called on to lead at times when we do not want to lead. We cannot be isolationist. The United States has a responsibility in this world. That responsibility has to be used very carefully. This President understands that.

I hope that at the end of the day we can, in fact, see a peaceful resolution of the chemical weapons issue in Syria. I hope we can find a way to harken back to Ronald Reagan where we can trust that will happen but verify it as well. That would be the right ending. I think the President has taken the right position.

I would like to add something. When it comes to the nation of Israel, our closest and best ally in the Middle East, they understand what we are trying to do with chemical weapons in Syria. They have made it clear through their friends in the United States and other ways that they support it without fear of retaliation by Syria. They are ready, according to Prime Minister Netanyahu, for whatever Syria chooses to do. We should not be any less forceful or less committed when it comes to ending the threat of chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes and that following my remarks Senator PORTMAN be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SYRIA

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I know that—and what we have heard this morning—what is rightfully at the forefront of all of our minds this week is the debate about whether to authorize the use of force in Syria. This is a very serious matter, as we all know. It raises a number of geopolitical and national security issues.

The decision to undertake military action is not one to be taken lightly. I am very aware that people are war-weary, that they are concerned about the consequences of the use of military force. Consequently, I believe we should pursue every possible diplomatic solution prior to engaging in military action.

I welcome the possibility of international cooperation to secure and destroy Syria's chemical weapons stockpile. I hope that Russia is being serious and that they will take real, legitimate actions to quickly follow through on what they have raised with their effort to try to encourage Asad to give up his chemical weapons to international control. I am working with some of my colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on an amendment to the resolution that would incorporate this new development and pressure the Syrians to ensure that we see credible concrete steps in any possible effort to place their chemical weapons under international inspection. I look forward to hearing from the President today and this evening, and I look forward to the debate later this week as we consider the situation in Syria.

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes this morning to talk about legislation that was previously scheduled to be debated on the Senate floor this week—the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act, also known as Shaheen-Portman. I know the Presiding Officer has been very involved in energy issues for all of his time in public life, and I do appreciate the work he did as a Member of the House. I know he is following this debate very closely. I appreciate that.

This bill is one Senator ROB PORTMAN and I have been working on for 3 years. I appreciate that he has come to the floor today to talk about it as well. We have had 3 years of meetings, negotiations, and broad stakeholder outreach in an effort to craft the most effective piece of energy legislation, with the greatest possible chance of passing both Chambers of Congress and being signed into law.

Shaheen-Portman is a bipartisan effort that reflects an affordable approach to boost the use of energy efficiency technologies. It will help create private sector jobs, save businesses and

consumers money, reduce pollution, and make our country more energy independent. It will have a swift and measurable benefit on our economy and our environment. In the last few weeks we saw a study from experts at the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy which found that this legislation has the potential to create 136,000 domestic jobs by 2025, all while saving consumers billions of dollars and reducing pollution.

Efficiency is the cheapest and fastest approach to reduce our energy use. Energy savings techniques and technologies lower costs and free up capital that allows businesses to expand and our economy to grow. Perhaps equally important, energy efficiency has emerged as an excellent example of a bipartisan and affordable opportunity to immediately grow our economy and improve energy security. In addition to being affordable, efficiency is widely supported because its benefits are not confined to a certain fuel source or a particular region of the country. It is clearly one of the policy areas where we really can come to a common agreement.

It is no wonder that energy efficiency legislation—Shaheen-Portman—enjoys such large and diverse support. It has received more than 250 endorsements from a wide range of businesses, environmental groups, think tanks, and trade associations, from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers to the Natural Resources Defense Council.

I am hopeful the Senate will return to Shaheen-Portman when we have finished debating the serious issue of Syria. I appreciate the commitment of our leadership on both sides of the aisle in the Senate to do so. I recognize this will be the first time a major energy bill has reached the Senate floor since 2007; therefore, it only makes sense for us to have a robust energy debate that allows for amendments from both sides of the aisle to be considered. I look forward to working with my colleagues to find an agreement on the way forward.

I thank my good friend Senator PORTMAN for his partnership in bringing this bill to the floor. I also thank the majority and minority leaders as well as Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI for all of their support as we have gone through this process and hopefully will bring this bill to the floor in the next couple of weeks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

SYRIA

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, we rise at a time of great debate here in this Chamber and in this country about what the appropriate response should be by the United States to the horrific

use of chemical weapons by the Government of Syria. That is a debate which will unfold over the next days here. We will see, as the situation continues to develop, what actually comes to the floor.

But the President of the United States has asked for our input here in the Senate. Today we are focused on really the most important question an elected representative is asked to respond to; that is, whether to commit America to military combat. To that end, we have all spent time looking over intelligence reports. We have participated in classified intelligence briefings. I have also had the opportunity to meet with top members of the administration. From the information I have received, I do believe the Government of Syria used chemical weapons against its own people.

I believe an international response is appropriate, but I do not believe the administration's proposal of a U.S. military strike is the right answer. There is no guarantee it will prevent Assad's use of chemical weapons. I do not believe it will end the senseless bloodshed in Syria. I do not believe it will bring stability to the region that is so critical to our national security. I do not believe it will enhance Israel's security. I do not believe, most fundamentally, that it is nested in a broader strategic plan for the region.

The situation we face in Syria today is partly the result of a failed foreign policy. It is time for a change of course. We need a comprehensive long-term strategy first, not a strike and then the promise of a strategy, which is what the administration has proposed. "Strike first, strategy later" is a recipe for disaster. If the current resolution comes to the floor as a result, the current resolution being considered, I would not be able to support it.

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. America must also look to its interests here at home. Senator SHAHEEN just talked about that. Without a doubt, the ongoing chaos in Syria has served to remind us once again of the volatility and the instability that has plagued the Middle East for many years. It should also serve as a wake-up call.

As a country, we have for way too long been dependent on dangerous and volatile parts of the world for our foreign energy needs, particularly foreign oil. We have seen the impact in the price of oil, even in the last couple of weeks. We certainly have seen it in our economy, the roller coaster we have seen with energy prices up and down. As a result, the need for American energy independence is not just a matter of the economy or economic security or energy security, it is also a matter of national security.

Given these realities, it is incumbent upon us now more than ever to pursue a true "all of the above" domestic energy strategy. We have to find ways to produce more energy here at home. Just as important, we have to figure out how to use less by wasting less. We will save money, we will save energy, we will make our economy more competitive and create more jobs, and, yes, we will reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

The piece of legislation on which I joined with the senior Senator from New Hampshire, which we introduced just before we left for the August recess, takes important steps toward that goal of reducing the amount of energy we waste in this country. Senator SHAHEEN just talked about it. It is called the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act. It was meant to be on the floor today. We were supposed to be debating it. It is absolutely critical that we are debating Syria instead, but I do hope we can take up this legislation after the discussions about what we do with regard to the situation in Syria.

This bill, the energy security bill, is bipartisan. It is bicameral in the sense that there is support in the House and the Senate for it. It is, as Senator SHAHEEN said, a bill that reduces our energy waste and moves us toward energy independence. According to the recent study she talked about, it is estimated to aid in the creation of 136,000 new jobs, saving consumers over \$13 billion a year by the year 2030. That is why it is no surprise that it is supported by such a broad group, as Senator SHAHEEN talked about. That support, by the way, is one big reason it passed the Energy Committee with a strong bipartisan vote of 19 to 3.

Simply put, the legislation we proposed makes good environmental sense, it makes good energy sense, and it makes good economic sense too. It is a rare example around here of bipartisanship, which ought to be encouraged in a number of areas, but certainly this is one where we can find common ground.

I want to thank the majority leader this morning, and the minority leader, for working out a unanimous consent agreement that allows us to move forward on this commonsense approach in the coming days. In that debate, we will talk more about the legislation, how it helps manufacturers on the global stage, and how the savings companies will accrue from energy efficiency will lead to better paying jobs. We will talk about how our legislation helps to train the next generation of workers in the skills they need to compete in the growing energy efficiency field. We will talk about how it makes the Federal Government practice what it preaches, to reduce the waste in the largest user of energy in the world, which is our Federal Government. We will describe how our bill accomplishes

these goals with no new mandates, no mandates on the private sector, no new spending, entirely offset. And again, it is a commonsense approach that is bipartisan. I look forward to that discussion. I look forward to seeing the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act become law so this Nation can take a big step toward achieving the true goal of an “all of the above” energy strategy and indeed make us less dependent on those dangerous and volatile parts of the world.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 191, the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Marilyn A. Brown, of Georgia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2017.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

AUTHORIZING THE LIMITED AND SPECIFIED USE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AGAINST SYRIA—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 21.

Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided

and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum calls, which I will suggest in just a few seconds, be equally divided between the majority and the minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, this week we have a very difficult set of questions to answer relating to Syria and the ongoing crisis there. But in particular we have a question to answer as it relates to what the United States should do. I rise this morning to express strong support for this authorization to degrade Bashar al-Asad's chemical weapons capability and deter the future use of these horrific weapons. I made this determination based upon the evidence and the national security interests of the United States, both our national security interests today as well as in the future.

The resolution that is before the Senate right now does not allow for the deployment of U.S. combat troops on the ground in Syria. I will not support—nor do I think there will be much support in this Chamber—any measure that would involve U.S. boots on the ground in Syria and this resolution specifically speaks to this concern. I am quoting, in part, the resolution:

The authority granted in section 2(a) does not authorize the use of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Syria for the purpose of combat operations.

It is important we make that point.

As we have all seen, especially in the last few days, the situation in Syria is in flux, especially in the last 24 hours. The Russian Government put forth a proposal yesterday which would have international monitors take control of Syria's chemical weapons in order to avert a U.S. military strike. I am open to this diplomatic discussion—however not without caution and not without skepticism. Diplomatic solutions are always a preferred path and military strikes should always be the last resort.

I think prior to this proposal we were at this point of a last resort. But the only reason this proposal is on the table is because of the credible threat of force that is being debated in Washington—but even more significantly being debated across the country. The authorization itself should still go for-

ward because it will keep the pressure on the Syrian regime for a diplomatic solution.

Let's take a couple of minutes on our own national security interests. In March of 2011, as reported by the U.S. State Department, multiple news sources, including CNN, reported—and I will submit for the RECORD a report from CNN—that the Syrian Government authorities had arrested 15 schoolchildren in the city of Daraa for spray-painting antigovernment slogans. These young people were reportedly tortured while in custody and authorities resorted to force when their parents and others in the community called for their release. Within 1 week the police had killed 55 demonstrators in connection with the early efforts to provide opposition to the Asad regime. The regime committed countless atrocities during the next 2 years of this conflict, culminating in the unspeakable use—the indiscriminate use of chemical weapons on August 21.

I submit for the RECORD a report from CNN, dated March 1, 2012, and ask it be printed in the RECORD.

This report is March of 2012, but it looks back in a retrospective fashion on what happened in those early days of the opposition coming together in 2011. I will read a pertinent part, part of what CNN said about what happened when these schoolchildren were demonstrating against the regime. They talked in this report about the young people, as I mentioned, not just protesting but spray-painting their beliefs against the regime. At the time, not a lot of people around the world were focused on what was happening in Syria. Let me quote in pertinent part what at one point one of the citizens on the street was saying, that the people in Daraa:

... didn't want to go against the regime. People thought that this [leader, Mr. Asad] was better than his dad. Nobody wanted to go face-to-face with him.

But then of course it was young people, in this case even schoolchildren, who led the way to take him on. I submit this for the record because this opposition started on the streets of Syria, in this case in Daraa, starting with young people, but it of course continued from there. We know that the regime itself has the largest chemical stockpile in the region, one of the largest in the world. We know Mr. Asad used these weapons against his own people, not only on August 21 but on multiple occasions prior to that in a much more limited way. We also know he has the capacity, the will, and unfortunately the track record to use these weapons against innocent civilians.

We also should remember we have troops and other military and diplomatic personnel in the region, in the Middle East. Even Syria's acquisition—

even Syria's very acquisition of chemical weapons threatens our national security. In 2003, the Congress of the United States—some people have forgotten about this—the Congress of the United States in 2003 passed the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act of that year. This act explicitly states that Congress found—the U.S. Congress made a finding that “Syria’s acquisition”—and I am underlining that word “acquisition”—“of weapons of mass destruction threatens the security of the Middle East and the national security interests of the United States.”

This Congress 10 years ago made a determination that the acquisition of chemical weapons was a threat to our national security. We are in a different world now. Syria not only acquired them but has now used them multiple times on its own people, the most recent being the horrific scenes that we all saw in some of the videos that are now part of the public record. So there is clear and convincing evidence of the direct involvement of the Asad regime, the forces of the Asad regime and senior officials, in the planning, execution, aftermath, and attempts to cover up the August 21 attack. This is graphically evident in the 13 authenticated videos released by the Senate Intelligence Committee compiled by the Open Source Center showing the results of chemical weapons use in the Damascus suburbs on August 21. These videos were shown to the Intelligence Committee on Thursday and played on CNN on Saturday. So many Americans have seen them. If anyone would like more information about those, go to my Web site and I am certain many others as well.

It is clear that the regime violated international law as it relates to chemical weapons. We know the regime committed a barrage of terror across the country with the sole aim of remaining in power. We have to ask ourselves, when a dictator or terrorist organization uses chemical weapons in violation of international law, should that regime or terrorist organization pay a price? I argue that they must pay a price.

We simply can't condemn this crime against humanity; it is in the national security interest of the United States for the administration to have the authorization to act. The regime in Iran, the terrorist organization Hezbollah, and the regime in North Korea are watching very closely, so it is imperative that we take steps to address this threat.

Let me talk about the regime in Iran and Hezbollah. What happens in Syria is of great consequence to our security interest as it relates to that regime in Hezbollah. When I say “that regime,” I am speaking about the Iran regime. Their support for Hezbollah, through Syria, has resulted in constant plotting

against the United States and its allies. The Asad regime in Syria is the conduit of this relationship between Hezbollah and the Iranian regime itself.

I support this authorization of targeted and strategic military action in order to hold the Syrian regime accountable and because it will diminish the ability of Iran and Hezbollah to conduct acts of terror. It will also protect American lives if we hold them accountable, as well as, of course, the Syrian people. Indeed, other than Al Qaeda, Hezbollah has killed more Americans than any other terrorist organization in the world, including 241 marines in 1983. Hezbollah has consistently partnered with Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps to bolster Asad's campaign of repression and violence in Syria, which has further destabilized the region. The regime in Iran has provided funds, weapons, logistical support, tactical advice, and fighters to the Syrian Government forces. Just this year Iran's support to Asad has increased, with reported daily resupply flights to Syria.

The Syrian regime possesses a stockpile of chemical weapons that we cannot allow to fall into the hands of terrorists. Iran and Hezbollah—I think some people in Washington missed this—are not on the sidelines; they are already on the battlefield. I would argue that Iran and Hezbollah are on two battlefields. Certainly, they are on the battlefield in Syria but also the daily battlefield of terrorist acts plotting against the United States and other countries as well.

Failure to bring action and failure to hold Syria accountable after such a horrific crime will only serve to embolden the Iranian regime, to embolden the terrorist organization Hezbollah and others, to expand terror across the world. Iran's status as the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism is well established, and its proxies have perpetuated attacks against the United States, Israel, and our allies.

Emboldened by Iran's support, Hezbollah has conducted terrorist attacks since its inception in the early 1980s—including Western targets. Hezbollah has become more aggressive in the last few years and has executed attacks not only in the Middle East but on two other continents—South Asia and Europe. Just 2 years ago a plot was uncovered to blow up a restaurant in Georgetown—right here in Washington, DC—to kill the Saudi Ambassador to the United States, along with U.S. officials and average citizens who are American. When the Iranian-backed attacker was questioned, he referred to the potential killing of Americans as “no big deal.”

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report by the Department of Justice entitled “Two Men Charged in Alleged

Plot to Assassinate Saudi Arabian Ambassador to the United States.”

The list goes on. We know that in June of 1996 there was the bombing of Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia where 19 U.S. Air Force personnel were killed. That is another example of an Iran-backed terrorist activity. It goes back, as I mentioned, to 1983 when 241 marines were killed by a truck bombing in Beirut. There are also new reports on evidence that strongly suggests that an Iran-backed plot was underway to kill a U.S. Ambassador in 2011. Hezbollah has consistently partnered with Iran to do just that.

The national security interest of the United States is even more significant than that. It is not simply the green light it would send to Iran and Hezbollah as it relates to terrorism. If we don't take the right action here, it would send a message and green light to Iran as it relates to their nuclear program. We know the Iranian regime is intent on developing nuclear weapons capability. I support a variety of measures to prevent Iran from acquiring that capability. Condemnation only of Syria would embolden Iran and undermine our efforts to prevent the Iranian regime from developing and possessing a nuclear weapon.

Every Member of Congress will have to weigh the consequence of giving the green light to the use of chemical weapons and contemplate what it will mean for enemies, such as the Iranian regime and Hezbollah, who plot against the United States every day. I am like a lot of Members of Congress in that after receiving several intelligence briefings, I have more confidence than ever before that we have a significant national security imperative to authorize the President to act as it relates to Syria. I have no doubt that Mr. Asad used the chemical weapons against his people and it is evident that he crossed more than one redline. So I support this limited and proportional scope of authorization for the use of force.

By the way, this authorization would probably be the most limited authorization in recent American history.

I believe Congress must stand united on this issue, and we have to make sure we not only hold the regime accountable but make sure we are doing everything possible to send the right message.

I have two more points before I conclude. One of the best rationales for the reason we are taking the steps I hope we will take was set forth in an op-ed printed in the New York Times last weekend by Nicholas Kristof, and it is dated September 7, 2013. The op-ed is entitled “Pulling the Curtain Back on Syria,” and I ask unanimous consent to have this op-ed printed in the RECORD.

I think one of the most important lines in here—and, of course, I will not read the entire op-ed—is what Mr. Kristof wrote:

In other words, while there are many injustices around the world, from Darfur to eastern Congo, take it from one who has covered most of them: Syria is today the world capital of human suffering.

There are few journalists—there are few Americans—who have more credibility on the issue of what is happening to children and vulnerable populations around the world than Nicholas Kristof. For him to say the world capital of human suffering is in Syria is a powerful and compelling statement.

That brings me back to where I started. I started walking through the early days of this opposition to a repressive regime against Mr. Assad, and the people who led the way and made a case against his regime in large measure were the children or young people. One of the harrowing and very disturbing elements of this entire crisis—this war that has raged on for more than 2 years now—is the impact it has had on children.

I received a report today that came from Save the Children. They have enormous credibility not only on children's issues worldwide, but there are Save the Children personnel on the ground in Syria.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the document entitled "Briefing note: The children crisis in Syria" be printed in the RECORD as well.

That documents in great detail the human suffering of children and the impact this has had on millions of Syrian children. But, of course, maybe the most graphic and disturbing example of that was the footage that virtually every American has had an opportunity to view which shows the hundreds and hundreds of children who were killed instantly in this horrific chemical weapons attack. By one estimate, more than 400—maybe as many as 426—children were killed.

When we confront this issue, we cannot simply say: Oh, this is just another horrific situation around the world. When we consider what this regime did to schoolchildren—arrested them and by many accounts tortured them from the beginning of this opposition all the way through to the attack on August 21—and what will continue to happen to children in Syria and in places around the world, we are summoned by our conscience to act in some fashion and hold this regime accountable.

I want to be open to this possibility that maybe there is a breakthrough, that we can remove this terrible threat from Syria and wipe out the chemical weapons threat by giving total and complete control of chemical weapons to an international force, but the burden of proof is on Syria and the Russian Federation. They have to deliver very specifically in a very short timeframe if they expect us to agree to this. We should be hopeful and consider this opportunity, but at the same time we cannot divorce ourselves from the re-

ality of what happened, the consequence of not acting, and also the long-term and short-term national security interests of the United States, which I think are overwhelming and compelling in this instance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess.

[From CNN.com, Mar. 1, 2012]

DARAA: THE SPARK THAT LIT THE SYRIAN FLAME

(By Joe Sterling)

Syria is burning—scorched for nearly a year by tenacious political resistance, a merciless security crackdown and cries for democracy.

The spark that lit the flame began about a year ago in the southern city of Daraa after the arrests of at least 15 children for painting anti-government graffiti on the walls of a school.

The community's blunt outrage over the children's arrests and mistreatment, the government's humiliating and violent reactions to their worries, and the people's refusal to be cowed by security forces emboldened and helped spread the Syrian opposition.

FATE OF NEIGHBORHOOD UNCERTAIN

Daraa soon became a rallying cry across the country for what began as a rural and provincial-driven uprising.

Syrians compare the dramatic dynamics in the rural city to the moment Tunisian street vendor Mohamed Bouazizi torched himself in December 2010. Bouazizi's act and death spawned demonstrations that led to the grassroots ouster of Tunisian President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali and fueled other protests across the Arab world.

Mohamed Masalmeh—a Halifax, Nova Scotia-based Syrian activist whose family hails from Daraa—said Daraa residents broke the people's "wall of fear" by defying what he and others call a police state and taking to the street.

"What people did in Daraa was unheard of," he said.

Omar Almuqdad, a journalist from Daraa now living in Turkey, said, "They started protesting day after day."

"It was the flame of the revolution."

A SLOW BURN INTO A FIRESTORM

Discontent in Syria has slow-burned for decades.

A clampdown on a Muslim Brotherhood uprising by the current president's predecessor and father—President Hafez Assad—killed thousands in Hama in 1982.

When Bashar al-Assad took the presidency after his father died in 2000, he gave lip service to reforms.

But activists who emerged from the so-called Damascus Spring after the death of Hafez and those in 2005 who urged reforming what they said was an "authoritarian, totalitarian and cliquish regime" found themselves in trouble with the authorities.

There was sectarian and ethnic unrest in the last decade, too, with a Druze uprising flaring in 2000 and a Kurdish rebellion erupting in 2004.

When the Arab Spring unfolded last year, Syrians imbibed the contagious revolutionary fervor spreading across the Middle East.

But the anger smoldered under the surface because of the Goliath-sized, all-seeing and all-knowing security and spying apparatus.

Protests popped up in Syria as video images of public defiance in Egypt, Libya and

Tunisia swept the world—small outpourings seen by observers as tests to build a Syrian nerve to take to the streets.

And then—Daraa.

Remote Daraa sits just a few miles from the Jordanian border. It has had its economic struggles, such as drought and drops in subsidies and salaries. Nevertheless, it had been a reliable bastion of support for the regime and its Baath party.

Tribal and predominantly Sunni, Daraa is like many small towns. People know one another and the relationships are close in the city and in the nearby villages and towns.

When the schoolchildren were arrested in late February 2011, they were accused of scrawling graffiti on a school that said "the people want to topple the regime." Masalmeh, the activist, said security went to a school, interrogated students and rounded up suspects.

It wasn't as if this vandalism was rare. Such graffiti was becoming so common in the region that ID was needed to buy spray cans.

But these arrests struck a chord. Residents found out their boys were being beaten and tortured in prison.

The families of the boys approached authorities and asked for their sons' release. Activists and observers say authorities shunned and insulted the people. One official reportedly said: "Forget your children. If you really want your children, you should make more children. If you don't know how to make more children, we'll show you how to do it."

"At some point, the insult is so far below the belt. People do respond to it. They just don't bow down anymore," Amnesty International's Neil Sammonds said.

PROTESTS GROW

On March 16, a female-led sit-in in Damascus demanded the release of prisoners unfairly jailed. Some of the participants were Daraans, with strong ties back to their home province, and part of the educated, urbanite youth living in Damascus.

"Police dragged protesters by the hair and beat them," said Mohja Kahf, a novelist, professor and activist in Arkansas with contacts across Syria. "This built on the gathering outrage over the Daraa children who are prisoners."

A day later, a sit-in in Daraa, with some detained. The next day, on March 18, a protest against the arrests of the children, according to The Human Rights Watch.

"Security forces opened fire, killing at least four protesters and within days, the protests grew into rallies that gathered thousands of people," the group said.

Activists regard these as the first deaths in the Syrian uprising.

People began rallying in other cities across Syria that day—Jassem, Da'el, Sanamein and Inkhil. Kahf said the government responded with live fire only in Daraa.

But the more people demonstrated in Daraa, the tougher security forces cracked down. And as the crackdown worsened, the more resolute the protesters became.

The people in Daraa "didn't want to go against the regime," Masalmeh said. "People thought this guy—Bashar—was better than his dad. Nobody wanted to go face-to-face with him."

"It's not like they fought with arms at that moment," he said. "They were just defiant. 'All that we want is our children.'"

The youths were eventually freed, but YouTube videos and demonstrations were already spreading.

Al-Assad addressed the Daraa unrest in a March 30 speech before lawmakers, blaming

the unrest on sedition. "They started in the governorate (province) of Daraa," al-Assad said, adding "the conspirators took their plan to other governorates."

"That speech had a catastrophic impact," the International Crisis Group's Peter Harling said. "People who wanted to support the regime at the time were shocked by the speech."

The dismissiveness of al-Assad and the lawmakers who applauded his words awakened many Syrian people, says the Human Rights Watch's Nadim Houry. Two days later, weekly anti-government protests began across Syria.

Calls for reforms soon morphed into calls for the removal of the al-Assad regime.

"Courage is contagious," Houry said.

The government launched a full-scale siege on Daraa April 25, with other towns such as Homs to follow.

Mass arrests unfolded and tales of torture spread across the country. The protest movement grew and solidified into an opposition.

Paul Salem, director of the Carnegie Middle East Center, points out "it's conceivable that if the events didn't happen in Daraa," the uprising "might not have occurred."

But the deep-seated political and economic reasons underlining Syrian discontent was an omen. Protest in Syria was "going to happen" at some point, Salem said.

So, out of Daraa, a spark. And a year later, the uprisings blaze on.

"The impact of small events on history can be huge," Salem said.

The following is an official release from the Department of Justice on the alleged plot.

TWO MEN CHARGED IN ALLEGED PLOT TO ASSASSINATE SAUDI ARABIAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON.—Two individuals have been charged in New York for their alleged participation in a plot directed by elements of the Iranian government to murder the Saudi Ambassador to the United States with explosives while the Ambassador was in the United States.

The charges were announced by Attorney General Eric Holder; FBI Director Robert S. Mueller; Lisa Monaco, Assistant Attorney General for National Security; and Preet Bharara, U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York.

A criminal complaint filed today in the Southern District of New York charges Mansoor Arbabsiar, a 56-year-old naturalized U.S. citizen holding both Iranian and U.S. passports, and Gholam Shakuri, an Iran-based member of Iran's Qods Force, which is a special operations unit of the Iranian Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) that is said to sponsor and promote terrorist activities abroad.

Both defendants are charged with conspiracy to murder a foreign official; conspiracy to engage in foreign travel and use of interstate and foreign commerce facilities in the commission of murder-for-hire; conspiracy to use a weapon of mass destruction (explosives); and conspiracy to commit an act of international terrorism transcending national boundaries. Arbabsiar is further charged with an additional count of foreign travel and use of interstate and foreign commerce facilities in the commission of murder-for-hire.

Shakuri remains at large. Arbabsiar was arrested on Sept. 29, 2011, at New York's John F. Kennedy International Airport and will make his initial appearance today before federal court in Manhattan. He faces

a maximum potential sentence of life in prison if convicted of all the charges.

"The criminal complaint unsealed today exposes a deadly plot directed by factions of the Iranian government to assassinate a foreign Ambassador on U.S. soil with explosives," said Attorney General Holder. "Through the diligent and coordinated efforts of our law enforcement and intelligence agencies, we were able to disrupt this plot before anyone was harmed. We will continue to investigate this matter vigorously and bring those who have violated any laws to justice."

"The investigation leading to today's charges illustrates both the challenges and complexities of the international threat environment, and our increased ability today to bring together the intelligence and law enforcement resources necessary to better identify and disrupt those threats, regardless of their origin," said FBI Director Mueller.

"The disruption of this plot is a significant milestone that stems from months of hard work by our law enforcement and intelligence professionals," said Assistant Attorney General Monaco. "I applaud the many agents, analysts and prosecutors who helped bring about today's case."

"As alleged, these defendants were part of a well-funded and pernicious plot that had, as its first priority, the assassination of the Saudi Ambassador to the United States, without care or concern for the mass casualties that would result from their planned attack," said U.S. Attorney Bharara. "Today's charges should make crystal clear that we will not let other countries use our soil as their battleground."

THE ALLEGED PLOT

The criminal complaint alleges that, from the spring of 2011 to October 2011, Arbabsiar and his Iran-based co-conspirators, including Shakuri of the Qods Force, have been plotting the murder of the Saudi Ambassador to the United States. In furtherance of this conspiracy, Arbabsiar allegedly met on a number of occasions in Mexico with a DEA confidential source (CS-1) who has posed as an associate of a violent international drug trafficking cartel. According to the complaint, Arbabsiar arranged to hire CS-1 and CS-1's purported accomplices to murder the Ambassador, and Shakuri and other Iran-based co-conspirators were aware of and approved the plan. With Shakuri's approval, Arbabsiar has allegedly caused approximately \$100,000 to be wired into a bank account in the United States as a down payment to CS-1 for the anticipated killing of the Ambassador, which was to take place in the United States.

According to the criminal complaint, the IRGC is an arm of the Iranian military that is composed of a number of branches, one of which is the Qods Force. The Qods Force conducts sensitive covert operations abroad, including terrorist attacks, assassinations and kidnappings, and is believed to sponsor attacks against Coalition Forces in Iraq. In October 2007, the U.S. Treasury Department designated the Qods Force for providing material support to the Taliban and other terrorist organizations.

The complaint alleges that Arbabsiar met with CS-1 in Mexico on May 24, 2011, where Arbabsiar inquired as to CS-1's knowledge with respect to explosives and explained that he was interested in, among other things, attacking an embassy of Saudi Arabia. In response, CS-1 allegedly indicated that he was knowledgeable with respect to C-4 explosives. In June and July 2011, the complaint alleges, Arbabsiar returned to Mexico and

held additional meetings with CS-1, where Arbabsiar explained that his associates in Iran had discussed a number of violent missions for CS-1 and his associates to perform, including the murder of the Ambassador.

\$1.5 MILLION FEE FOR ALLEGED ASSASSINATION

In a July 14, 2011, meeting in Mexico, CS-1 allegedly told Arbabsiar that he would need to use four men to carry out the Ambassador's murder and that his price for carrying out the murder was \$1.5 million. Arbabsiar allegedly agreed and stated that the murder of the Ambassador should be handled first, before the execution of other attacks. Arbabsiar also allegedly indicated he and his associates had \$100,000 in Iran to pay CS-1 as a first payment toward the assassination and discussed the manner in which that payment would be made.

During the same meeting, Arbabsiar allegedly described to CS-1 his cousin in Iran, who he said had requested that Arbabsiar find someone to carry out the Ambassador's assassination. According to the complaint, Arbabsiar indicated that his cousin was a "big general" in the Iranian military; that he focuses on matters outside Iran and that he had taken certain unspecified actions related to a bombing in Iraq.

In a July 17, 2011 meeting in Mexico, CS-1 noted to Arbabsiar that one of his workers had already traveled to Washington, D.C., to surveil the Ambassador. CS-1 also raised the possibility of innocent bystander casualties. The complaint alleges that Arbabsiar made it clear that the assassination needed to go forward, despite mass casualties, telling CS-1, "They want that guy [the Ambassador] done [killed], if the hundred go with him f*ck 'em." CS-1 and Arbabsiar allegedly discussed bombing a restaurant in the United States that the Ambassador frequented. When CS-1 noted that others could be killed in the attack, including U.S. senators who dine at the restaurant, Arbabsiar allegedly dismissed these concerns as "no big deal."

On Aug. 1, and Aug. 9, 2011, with Shakuri's approval, Arbabsiar allegedly caused two overseas wire transfers totaling approximately \$100,000 to be sent to an FBI undercover account as a down payment for CS-1 to carry out the assassination. Later, Arbabsiar allegedly explained to CS-1 that he would provide the remainder of the \$1.5 million after the assassination. On Sept. 20, 2011, CS-1 allegedly told Arbabsiar that the operation was ready and requested that Arbabsiar either pay one half of the agreed upon price (\$1.5 million) for the murder or that Arbabsiar personally travel to Mexico as collateral for the final payment of the fee. According to the complaint, Arbabsiar agreed to travel to Mexico to guarantee final payment for the murder.

ARREST AND ALLEGED CONFESSION

On or about Sept. 28, 2011, Arbabsiar flew to Mexico. Arbabsiar was refused entry into Mexico by Mexican authorities and, according to Mexican law and international agreements; he was placed on a return flight destined for his last point of departure. On Sept. 29, 2011, Arbabsiar was arrested by federal agents during a flight layover at JFK International Airport in New York. Several hours after his arrest, Arbabsiar was advised of his Miranda rights and he agreed to waive those rights and speak with law enforcement agents. During a series of Mirandized interviews, Arbabsiar allegedly confessed to his participation in the murder plot.

According to the complaint, Arbabsiar also admitted to agents that, in connection with this plot, he was recruited, funded and directed by men he understood to be senior officials in Iran's Qods Force. He allegedly said

these Iranian officials were aware of and approved of the use of CS-1 in connection with the plot; as well as payments to CS-1; the means by which the Ambassador would be killed in the United States and the casualties that would likely result.

Arbabsiar allegedly told agents that his cousin, who he had long understood to be a senior member of the Qods Force, had approached him in the early spring of 2011 about recruiting narco-traffickers to kidnap the Ambassador. Arbabsiar told agents that he then met with the CS-1 in Mexico and discussed assassinating the Ambassador. According to the complaint, Arbabsiar said that, afterwards, he met several times in Iran with Shakuri and another senior Qods Force official, where he explained that the plan was to blow up a restaurant in the United States frequented by the Ambassador and that numerous bystanders could be killed, according to the complaint. The plan was allegedly approved by these officials.

In October 2011, according to the complaint, Arbabsiar made phone calls at the direction of law enforcement to Shakuri in Iran that were monitored. During these phone calls, Shakuri allegedly confirmed that Arbabsiar should move forward with the plot to murder the Ambassador and that he should accomplish the task as quickly as possible, stating on Oct. 5, 2011, “[j]ust do it quickly, it’s late . . .” The complaint alleges that Shakuri also told Arbabsiar that he would consult with his superiors about whether they would be willing to pay CS-1 additional money.

This investigation is being conducted by the FBI Houston Division and DEA Houston Division, with assistance from the FBI New York Joint Terrorism Task Force. The prosecution is being handled by Assistant U.S. Attorneys Glen Kopp and Edward Kim, of the Terrorism and International Narcotics Unit of the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of New York, with assistance from the Counterterrorism Section of the Justice Department’s National Security Division, The Office of International Affairs of the Justice Department’s Criminal Division and the U.S. State Department provided substantial assistance. We thank the government of Mexico for its close coordination and collaboration in this matter, and for its role in ensuring that the defendant was safely apprehended.

The charges contained in a criminal complaint are mere allegations and defendants are presumed innocent unless and until proven guilty.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 7, 2013]

PULLING THE CURTAIN BACK ON SYRIA

(By Nicholas D. Kristof)

When I was a law student in 1982, I escaped torts by backpacking through Syria and taking a public bus to Hama, where the government had suppressed a rebellion by massacring some 20,000 people.

The center of Hama was pulverized into a vast field of rubble interspersed with bits of clothing, yet on the fringe of it stood, astonishingly, a tourism office. The two Syrian officials inside, thrilled to see an apparent tourist, weighed me down with leaflets about sightseeing in Hama and its ancient water wheels. After a bit of small talk, I pointed out the window at the moonscape and asked what had happened.

They peered out at the endless gravel pit. “Huh?” one said nervously. “I don’t see anything.”

It feels to me a bit as if much of the world is reacting the same way today. The scale of

the slaughter may be five times that of 1982, but few are interested in facing up to what is unfolding today out our window in Hama, Homs, Damascus and Aleppo.

As one woman tweeted to me: “We simply cannot stop every injustice in the world by using military weapons.”

Fair enough. But let’s be clear that this is not “every injustice”: On top of the 100,000-plus already killed in Syria, another 5,000 are being slaughtered monthly, according to the United Nations. Remember the Boston Massacre of 1770 from our history books, in which five people were killed? Syria loses that many people every 45 minutes on average, around the clock.

The rate of killing is accelerating. In the first year, 2011, there were fewer than 5,000 deaths. As of July 2012, there were still “only” 10,000, and the number has since soared tenfold.

A year ago, by United Nations calculations, there were 230,000 Syrian refugees. Now there are two million.

In other words, while there are many injustices around the world, from Darfur to Eastern Congo, take it from one who has covered most of them: Syria is today the world capital of human suffering.

Skeptics are right about the drawbacks of getting involved, including the risk of retaliation. Yet let’s acknowledge that the alternative is, in effect, to acquiesce as the slaughter in Syria reaches perhaps the hundreds of thousands or more.

But what about the United Nations? How about a multilateral solution involving the Arab League? How about peace talks? What about an International Criminal Court prosecution?

All this sounds fine in theory, but Russia blocks progress in the United Nations. We’ve tried multilateral approaches, and Syrian leaders won’t negotiate a peace deal as long as they feel they’re winning on the ground. One risk of bringing in the International Criminal Court is that President Bashar al-Assad would be more wary of stepping down. The United Nations can’t stop the killing in Syria any more than in Darfur or Kosovo. As President Assad himself noted in 2009, “There is no substitute for the United States.”

So while neither intervention nor paralysis is appealing, that’s pretty much the menu. That’s why I favor a limited cruise missile strike against Syrian military targets (as well as the arming of moderate rebels). As I see it, there are several benefits: Such a strike may well deter Syria’s army from using chemical weapons again, probably can degrade the ability of the army to use chemical munitions and bomb civilian areas, can reinforce the global norm against chemical weapons, and—a more remote prospect—may slightly increase the pressure on the Assad regime to work out a peace deal.

If you’re thinking, “Those are incremental, speculative and highly uncertain gains,” well, you’re right. Syria will be bloody whatever we do.

Mine is a minority view. After the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, the West is bone weary and has little interest in atrocities unfolding in Syria or anywhere else. Opposition to missile strikes is one of the few issues that ordinary Democrats and Republicans agree on.

“So we’re bombing Syria because Syria is bombing Syria?” Sarah Palin wrote, in a rare comment that liberals might endorse. Her suggestion: “Let Allah sort it out.”

More broadly, pollsters are detecting a rise in isolationism. The proportion of Americans who say that “the U.S. should mind its own

business internationally” has been at a historic high in recent years.

A Few survey this year asked voters to rate 19 government expenses, and the top two choices for budget cuts were “aid to the world’s needy” and the State Department. (In fact, 0.5 percent of the budget goes to the world’s needy, and, until recently, the military had more musicians in its bands than the State Department had diplomats.)

When history looks back on this moment, will it view those who opposed intervening as champions of peace? Or, when the textbooks count the dead children, and the international norms broken with impunity, will our descendants puzzle that we took pride in retreating into passivity during this slaughter?

Isn’t this a bit like the idealists who embraced the Kellogg-Briand Pact that banned war 85 years ago? Sure, that made people feel good. But it may also have encouraged the appeasement that ultimately cost lives in World War II.

O.K., so I’ve just added fuel to the battle for analogies. For now, the one that has caught on is Iraq in 2003. But considering that no one is contemplating boots on the ground, a more relevant analogy in Iraq may be the 1998 Operation Desert Fox bombing of Iraqi military sites by President Bill Clinton. It lasted a few days, and some say it was a factor in leading Iraq to give up W.M.D. programs; others disagree.

That murkiness is not surprising. To me, the lessons of history in this area are complex and conflicting, offering no neat formula to reach peace or alleviate war. In most cases, diplomacy works best. But not always. When Yugoslavia was collapsing into civil war in the early 1990s, early efforts at multilateral diplomacy delayed firm action and led to a higher body count.

Some military interventions, as in Sierra Leone, Bosnia and Kosovo, have worked well. Others, such as Iraq in 2003, worked very badly. Still others, such as Libya, had mixed results. Afghanistan and Somalia were promising at first but then evolved badly.

So, having said that analogies aren’t necessarily helpful, let me leave you with a final provocation.

If we were fighting against an incomparably harsher dictator using chemical weapons on our own neighborhoods, and dropping napalm-like substances on our children’s schools, would we regard other countries as “pro-peace” if they sat on the fence as our dead piled up?

BRIEFING NOTE: THE CHILDREN CRISIS IN SYRIA

The crisis in Syria is a humanitarian tragedy of a scale that is almost impossible to imagine. The recent chemical attack in Al Ghouta adds to an already too bleak picture; even before the recent massacre, Syria was the most dangerous place to be a civilian.ⁱ

The lack of humanitarian access, and hence of witnesses, makes the human price hard to quantify, but our teams in the region responding to this humanitarian crisis report increasingly dire conditions and the daily arrival of thousands of exhausted and terrified refugees. These data indicate the scale of the crisis:

Altogether at least 100,000 people have been killedⁱⁱ, including more than 7,000 childrenⁱⁱⁱ of whom 1,700 are under the age of 10.^{iv} The fighting continues to take the lives of an average of 5,000 people each month.^v

The UN estimates that today one third of Syrians have been forced to abandon their homes.^{vi} Two million are refugees and another 4.5 million are internally displaced.

Children account for more than half of those displaced.^{vii}

The UN estimates that 8.8 million (including 6.8 million in Syria itself^{viii}) are urgently in need of assistance across the region, predicting 10 million by end 2013.^{ix}

At least four million Syrians—half of them children—are in need of emergency food assistance.^x

In Northern governorates, 80% of school facilities have ceased to function,^{xi} with as many as 3,900 schools damaged or destroyed by the conflict throughout the country.^{xii}

Medical supplies are severely lacking throughout the country and the World Health Organization has warned that disease outbreaks are “inevitable” in the midst of summer heat, with deteriorating access to water and sanitation.^{xiii}

In addition to pervasive insecurity, bureaucratic restrictions imposed by the Government severely limit aid agencies’ ability to reach all civilians in need: between January and July 2013 only 20 UN convoys crossed the conflict lines into opposition-controlled areas.^{xiv} The UN estimates that 6.8 million—one in every three Syrians—are trapped in conflict areas and in need of assistance.^{xv} However, a recent NGO assessment in northern Syria puts the figure much higher, finding that 10.5 million people in these districts alone are not getting enough essential supplies.^{xvi} Despite the huge efforts of humanitarian agencies, the volume of aid crossing Syria’s borders and conflict lines is still not enough and millions are still receiving no assistance. Children are dying as a result.^{xvii}

With price inflation—with basics such as wheat and flour up as much as 100%^{xviii}—the lack of food is reported by Syrian parents as the second biggest source of stress, after insecurity.^{xix} Our teams have heard testimonies of mothers forced to feed their infants with water mixed with sugar due to a lack of baby milk. Other reports testify to the bleak living conditions of those internally displaced in Northern Syria, who have so little resources that they are forced to eat herbs and collect stagnant rainwater to drink and wash.^{xx}

For the sake of the millions of children facing a future of fear and hunger, safe and unimpeded humanitarian access is needed to all areas of Syria by the most effective routes possible. Save the Children calls on governments to:

Build consensus across the international community, including in the UN Security Council, to demand all parties to the conflict fulfill their obligation to allow humanitarian aid—including UN aid—to all areas where children need it, across conflict lines and across Syria’s borders;

Increase funding. Overall the UN is calling for over \$5 billion to meet needs inside Syria and among refugees in neighboring countries. Only 41%^{xxi} of the appeal is funded. Governments must increase support for humanitarian operations throughout Syria by any possible channel, as well as scale up support for refugees and host communities in neighboring countries.

ENDNOTES

i. See Action on Armed Violence: “Civilians killed in 2011 vs 2012.” <http://aoav.org.uk/2013/aoav-find-global-increase-in-civilian-casualties-of-explosive-weapons/#jp-carousel-285> last viewed 22 April 2013.

ii. Al Jazeera: UN: Syria death toll rises above 100,000; <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast/2013/07/2013725142157450141.html> last viewed 28 August 2013.

iii. OHCHR, UN Committee on the Rights of the Child appalled by killing of Syrian

children in alleged chemical attack, 26 August 2013; <http://www.ohchr.org/SP/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=13660&LangID=E> last viewed 28 August 2013.

iv. Updated Statistical Analysis of Documentation of Killings in the Syrian Arab Republic Commissioned by the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, 13 June 2013, available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Countries/SY/HRDAG-Updated-SY-report.pdf>

v. France 24: UN says 5,000 dying each month in the Syrian conflict: <http://www.france24.com/en/20130716-un-says-5000-people-dying-month-syrian-conflict>.

vi. The Telegraph: “One third of Syrians have fled their homes, reports United Nations” <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/syria/10280869/One-third-of-Syrians-have-fled-their-homes-reports-United-Nations.html>

vii. Global News, “1 million children have fled Syria as refugees: UNICEF” <http://globalnews.ca/news/797520/one-million-children-have-fled-syria-as-refugees-unicef/>

viii. OCHA (2013) “Syrian Arab Republic: Humanitarian Dashboard (as of 11 July 2013),” <http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/syria.pdf>, last checked 16th August 2013.

ix. The Guardian: “Half of Syrian population will need aid by end of year”: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/apr/19/half-syrian-population-aid-year>

x. OCHA (2013) “Syrian Arab Republic: Humanitarian Dashboard” (as of 11 July 2013), <http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/2resources/syria.pdf>, last checked 16th August 2013.

xi. Assessment Working Group for Northern Syria (2013) “Joint Regional Assessment of Northern Syria—II 2013, Final Report 2013,” p. 20, http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/JRANS%2011%20-%20Final%20Report_0.pdf, last viewed 28th August 2013.

xii. UNICEF (2013) “UN Emergency Directors shocked by appalling plight of people in Syria,” http://www.unicef.org/media/media_67620.html

xiii. World Health Organisation (2013) “WHO warns of increased risk of disease epidemics in Syria and in neighboring countries as summer approaches,” <http://reliefweb.int/report/syrian-arab-republic/who-warns-increased-risk-disease-epidemics-syria-and-neighbouring>

xiv. OCHA, UN-led relief convoys into hot-spot areas (January to 10 July 2013), updated with field information; http://syria.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/syria.humanitarianresponse.info/files/syria_UN_led_relief_convoys_into_hot_spot_areas_january_to_10_july_2013_en.pdf, last viewed 28 August 2013.

xv. BBC, Syria crisis: UN launches largest ever aid appeal, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-22813207>, last viewed 28 August 2013.

xvi. Assessment Working Group for Northern Syria (2013) “Joint Regional Assessment of Northern Syria—II 2013, Final Report 2013,” p. 36, http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/JRANS%2011%20-%20Final%20Report_0.pdf, last viewed 28th August 2013.

xvii. Col. A/HRC/23/58, p. 16.

xviii. FAO GIEW Country Brief, Syrian Arab Republic, <http://www.fao.org/giews/countrybrief/country.jsp?code=SYR>, last checked 3rd September 2013, and Syria Needs Assessment Project (2013) “Regional Analysis Syria: Part 1—Syria, July 2013,” p. 16.

xix. DRAFT Child Protection Working Group assessment, Syria—publication pending

xx. Global Post: In north Syria, eating herbs to survive; <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/afp/130402/north-syria-eating-herbs-survive-0>

xxi. OCHA, Financial Tracking services, Syrian Arab Republic Civil Unrest, 2013 Humanitarian Funding: Actual <http://fts.unocha.org/pagelocator.aspx?page=emergencyCountryDetails&cc=syr>

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:58 a.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

AUTHORIZING THE LIMITED AND SPECIFIED USE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AGAINST SYRIA—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 5 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, today there are hopeful signs that the international community will act to secure Syria’s chemical weapons which have caused so much pain and so much suffering, including the suffering of little infants and children. A peaceful resolution to the Assad regime’s use of these lethal, outlawed weapons would certainly be the best outcome. I commend the resolve of President Obama, without which we wouldn’t be looking at a potential diplomatic solution.

I wish to lay out for the record why we must act in response to the use of chemical weapons. Of course, I prefer it to be done through the international community. But I wish to be clear: There are certain norms, there are certain rules, there are certain laws that must be respected and obeyed; otherwise, we lose our humanity, and this is an example.

Famous leaders throughout history have called war various things. They have called war a contagion. They have called war hell. They have called war a scourge, murder, a crime, despicable. But even in the chaos and in the darkness of war, there are rules. There are red lines. There are boundaries. There

are limits. There are norms and there are laws. That is why in our Nation, as difficult and as painful as it has been, we have held our servicemembers accountable when they acted outside those norms. We did it just last month with the conviction of a soldier for war crimes committed in Afghanistan.

The use of chemical weapons is way outside international laws, rules, boundaries, limits, and norms, and has been so since the end of World War I, when the world uniformly condemned them. We know—we know without a shadow of a doubt—that they have been used by Syria in a big way, and it is time for all Members of Congress and, frankly, all members of civilized society to look into our hearts, to look into our souls, and to look into our consciences. The painful way to do it is to look at the shocking acts committed against innocent, men, women, and children in Syria. Look at those videos, as difficult as it might be, of children and their families dying horrible, ghastly deaths, writhing in pain, gasping for air, foaming at the mouth as the gas attacks their nervous systems.

Do we have a conscience? I pray we do. Albert Einstein once said: “The world is a dangerous place not because of those who do evil, but because of those who look on and do nothing.”

Let me repeat it. “The world is a dangerous place not because of those who do evil, but because of those who look on and do nothing.”

Doing nothing can sometimes be an attractive alternative. I understand it. But each of us who looks at these videos, who reads about what happened, each of us must ask ourselves, as human beings, as citizens of our great Nation: Can we respond to these atrocities by doing nothing? Can we sit back and do nothing in the face of Syria's use of chemical weapons on its own people, its own children?

When the President said he had a red line on this, he wasn't speaking for himself alone; he was speaking for the world that disavowed these weapons. I have to say that, to me, the Senate has a red line on this. Anyone who voted for the Syria Accountability Act in 2003, be it in the House or Senate, drew a red line, because in it, we condemned and we decried the development of chemical weapons by the Assad regime, and we tied that program to our own national security. There is no way our national security is unaffected when these weapons are used and no one is held accountable.

Did we mean it when we voted for the Syria Accountability Act? Did we mean it when we passed the Chemical Weapons Convention in 1997, which I was proud to vote for. Did we mean it? Words are good, but tyrants do not heed words. History is replete with tyrants who stood in the face of the worst condemnation and annihilated people. If we stand by and do nothing, what

message do we send to those who have these weapons?

I mentioned the ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention in 1997, and I will tell my colleagues, as we look at the world—and there is a lot to complain about and be ashamed of and worry about—one of the good things is that since we passed the Chemical Weapons Convention and ratified it, 80 percent of the chemical weapons of the world have been destroyed.

I think we should listen again to colleagues who spoke during the Senate debate on the Chemical Weapons Convention. Here is what JOE BIDEN, our Vice President, said:

Norms are created so that we have standards for civilized conduct by which to judge others. Without them, we leave the rogue countries to behave as free actors.

Our own PAT LEAHY said:

We will advise and consent so the President can ratify this treaty. I truly believe we will. It will show the moral leadership that the Senate should show and the United States should show. We will act as the conscience of this Nation, and we will advise and consent to this treaty. We will show the moral leadership because we began this by saying we would act unilaterally, if need be, renouncing our own use of chemical weapons with or without a treaty. That was true leadership.

So we hear the words “morality” and “conscience” and “leadership.” These shouldn't be just words. We should show that courage. Here are words from John Warner, our former colleague. He said:

I first learned of chemical weapons at the knee of my father who was a surgeon in the trenches in World War I. He described to me in vivid detail how he cared for the helpless victims of that weapon . . . we cannot turn back now from that leadership role.

Sixteen years later, in this very Chamber where I stood and proudly cast my vote for the Chemical Weapons Convention, we are facing a clear violation of law and humanity.

How do we react? If we do nothing, what is the signal to Assad? What is the signal to Kim Jong Un in North Korea, who has what has been described as a massive array of chemical weapons in an area where we have 28,000 American troops keeping the peace. The message we send if we do nothing is not a good one. It will send a message that says we don't mean what we say; We don't stand behind the laws we pass or the conventions we ratify. These chemical weapons kill people like cockroaches. When we read history, we know these weapons were used on the Iranians by Saddam Hussein and one Iraqi military official called these weapons an “annihilation insecticide.”

That is what they have been called. These weapons cause excruciating death. That is why a monster such as Hitler chose them to wipe out millions of those he considered subhuman. We all know the history. He didn't use them on troops; he used them on those

groups that he considered subhuman. Yet, while the rest of the world was eliminating chemical weapons, Syria was stockpiling precursor chemicals and building one of the largest chemical weapons arsenals in the world.

A Syrian Foreign Ministry spokesman said in 2012 that Syria reserved the right to use these weapons against external forces. His statement already is a violation of international law. He said: We reserve the right to use these weapons against external forces. But he went on to say—and we have his name: “Any stock of WMD or unconventional weapons that the Syrian Army possesses will never, never be used against the Syrian people or civilians during this crisis, under any circumstances.” Remarkably, Syria violated its own red line.

Chris Miller is a U.S. Army veteran and he is an expert in the area of chemical and biological weapons. Here is what he wrote in “The Guardian.” He said we must: “jealously guard what progress has been made in working toward a more peaceful world.”

He added:

The steady worldwide reduction of chemical weapons is a prime example of that progress—one that we cannot allow to be eroded so easily.

I can't underscore this enough. In a world full of challenges and disappointments and for people such as the Presiding Officer and me who believe so much that we can have a peaceful world, this is one of the few areas we can point to—where 80 percent of the world's arsenal of chemical weapons has been destroyed. If we turn our back on this tyrant and on this use, clearly, the chemical weapons will go right back into production. They will be marketing chemical weapons, and we know what will happen when they get into certain hands. We should not ignore history or we are doomed to repeat it.

The British soldier and poet Wilfred Owen wrote this in an effort to depict the horrors of chemical warfare in World War I. This is what he said: “If you could hear, at every jolt, the blood / Come gargling from the froth-corrupted lungs.”

He saw it firsthand in World War I, where 90,000 troops were killed by these heinous weapons, including 6,000 French, British, Canadian, and Belgian troops killed by German forces in one battle alone. Nations flocked to sign the Geneva Protocol after World War I. Syria joined them, and now more than 1,000 Syrian civilians lay dead due to Assad's decision to bring back these horrors.

How will we react?

Our former colleague and respected national security leader Dick Lugar says chemical weapons “may be the greatest threat to our country of any security risk that we have, much more than any other government, for example, or another Nation because they

can be used by terrorists, by very small groups”—Dick Lugar, who played such a great role in securing nuclear weapons after the Cold War; Dick Lugar, who understands what could happen if we turn our back now.

I respectfully say to my colleagues: Don't look away. Don't rationalize inaction. We cannot stay silent. If we fail to act in the face of such a brazen violation of international norms, in the face of an assault on conscience, then outlawing these weapons becomes meaningless and we put the security of all of us at risk. If we fail to act, we make it more likely that these weapons will be used again in Syria and elsewhere. If we fail to act, we send a terrible message to brutal regimes such as North Korea and Iran, which are seeking to develop nuclear weapons. In the case of North Korea, they have what has been described by Secretary Hagel as a massive amount of chemical weapons. If we fail to act, we make it more likely that these horrific weapons could be used against our allies such as Israel and our troops. That is for sure. If we fail to act, we make it more likely that chemical weapons will fall into the hands of terrorists and others who would do us harm. If we fail to act, we send a message that the civilized world will permit the use of these ghastly and inhumane weapons, not just on the battlefield but against children and families sleeping in their beds.

I ask my colleagues and the American people, do not look away. It is easier to look away.

We had a chance to see some of the videos, Madam President, as you know, during our luncheon meeting. We cannot sit by and do nothing in the face of such horror. We cannot.

So here is the thing: We have a chance now—because of President Obama's resolve, because of the resolve of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, because of the resolve of many people inside government and outside government, we have the resolve to do something. And the best something would be an international response.

I am proud of our President for making sure this alternative was in Vladimir Putin's mind when they met. And I am glad Secretary Kerry said: Look, there is an alternative. Let them hand over their weapons. Let's dismantle them and do it right and verify it and hold them accountable, and we get past this. That is the route I believe we all want to see happen. We want to see the world stand up against this inhumanity, but let's not be naive about it. When you are dealing with tyrants, you have to enforce that kind of a plan.

I am hopeful today but not sanguine. I am hopeful that the United Nations will take this as an opportunity to stand firm, to say that the outlawing of chemical weapons meant something in reality, not just on paper. And when we said people should not die like cock-

roaches, we meant it. So I am hopeful we will have a small pause here and we will give diplomacy a chance to work between the nations, and I praise our leadership in the Obama administration and France's leadership and British leadership. I hope the Russians meant it when they said: Let's try to resolve this in a way that will result in the absolute destruction of the chemical weapons Syria has. I hope they mean it.

We cannot walk away from an inhumane act that caused innocent children to die in unspeakable ways because, I will tell you, if we walk away, then I think the message is that there are no limits on gross violations of international norms, there are no limits on gross violations of international laws, and there are no limits on violations of human decency.

I am very pleased the President took this to the Congress. I think it was right. But I want to be clear: The President, as our Commander in Chief, has the authority—if he believes there is an imminent threat or danger to us, he has the authority to act. And I think Richard Lugar is sending us a very powerful message when he says one of our greatest national security threats—he said even greater than a threat posed by any nation—is the possibility that a small terrorist group could get their hands on these weapons. I will tell you, Madam President, that is an unacceptable situation, and I know the President worries about this every day, and every night when he goes to sleep, it is on his mind. One way to make sure the chance of that happening is lessened greatly is to make sure one of the largest caches of these weapons is controlled internationally and then destroyed. That will, in fact, mean we will have a more peaceful world.

There is a civil war going on in Syria. No one wants to get in the middle of it—least of all those of us who voted against the Iraq war because we saw what would happen. And years and years and years later, unfortunately, we were proven right. I was proud to vote no on that war. I think I have a little credibility here for not wanting to go to war, for making sure the intelligence is right, for making sure there is a limited mission, for making sure this is well thought out.

I would say in closing that the best ending to this crisis is for the international community to take hold of this—together, all of us—and work to see that these weapons of mass destruction are first accounted for, then controlled, and then destroyed. If we can do that, then the horrifying deaths we have witnessed and we have seen on tape today and the American people have been witnessing—at least there will be something good that could come out of this because otherwise, if there is no action, their deaths will not mean anything, they will be forgotten.

So we need to keep a credible plan before us, which means we want to see international rules apply, we want to see the international community take hold of this and have a good outcome. But I will tell you this—and I believe this with every fiber of my being—such a gross violation of humanity cannot go unanswered.

Thank you very much.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that time during all the quorum calls be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I wanted to use this opportunity to say a few words about the issue that is on everybody's minds; that is, Syria. I want to tell you that approximately 95 percent of the thousands of e-mails and phone calls my office has received are against U.S. military intervention in the bloody and chaotic civil war in Syria.

The truth is the numbers in Vermont may be higher than the national average in terms of opposition to this war. But there is probably no State in this country where U.S. military intervention in this bloody and complicated civil war in Syria is being supported. It is an interesting phenomenon.

We have a very divided Nation politically, but on this issue it appears the vast majority of Democrats, Republicans, Independents, the vast majority of progressives—I am a progressive—conservatives, moderates, have all come together to express deep concern about the United States being involved in the third military intervention in the Middle East in 12 years.

Let me tell you why I believe the American people feel so strongly against military involvement in Syria. Clearly, it has much to do with the fact that the United States has already been at war for 12 years. There are kids in this country who are halfway through primary school who have never known an America that has not been at war.

What the American people also understand is these wars have been enormously costly in many ways. Not only have these wars in Iraq and Afghanistan cost us the lives of some 4,600 brave American men and women who fought in Iraq and Afghanistan, but as chairman of the Veterans Affairs' Committee I can tell you that today we have tens of thousands of veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan who are dealing with traumatic brain injury, who are dealing with post-traumatic stress disorder, problems they are going to be carrying with them for the rest of their lives.

The human cost of those wars has been enormous. But it is not only the human cost, it is the financial cost as well. Today, at a time when working families are struggling to keep their heads above water economically, we are throwing thousands and thousands of little kids who desperately need preschool education off of Head Start. We should be expanding Head Start. But because of sequestration we are throwing them off of Head Start. We are denying nutrition programs, the Meals on Wheels Programs, that go to some of the most vulnerable and fragile seniors in this country. We are throwing them off basic nutrition programs.

We are forcing massive cuts through furloughs on tens of thousands of Federal employees, including members of the Vermont National Guard. At the end of the day, by the time we take care of the last servicemember who served in Iraq and Afghanistan, those wars will have cost us at least \$3 trillion.

But it is not only the human cost of those wars that troubles the American people. It is not only the financial cost of these wars that troubles the American people. It is the deep sense that exists across the political spectrum that foreign policy and going to war are a lot more complicated and unpredictable and have unintended consequences, far more so than many of our leaders in past years have believed.

Afghanistan is a small country that in 2001 virtually had no army when the United States invaded it; no army against the most powerful military force in the history of the world.

What is the problem? Twelve years later we are still in Afghanistan. All of us remember President George W. Bush standing on an aircraft carrier telling us that in Iraq the mission was accomplished. Mission accomplished.

Well, it didn't turn out quite that way. Thousands of deaths later for American servicemembers, tens of thousands of deaths later for the people of Iraq, peace and democracy in that country has not yet been accomplished. It is a lot more complicated than people thought it would be.

Today people worry what are the long-term implications and what are the unforeseen consequences of the

United States being involved in a horrendous, bloody, and complicated war in Syria. All of us know Asad is a ruthless dictator who has exploited his people terribly and used chemical weapons against them. But not every American knows that some 20 to 25 percent of the opposition to Asad turns out to be Islamic fundamentalists, some of them affiliated with Al Qaeda.

What are the long-term implications and unintended consequences of being involved in a war in that area? I know the President has been very clear about saying he is talking about strikes that are very targeted, very minimal. But once you break the egg, once you get involved, we have to bear and will bear a certain amount of responsibility for what happens during the war and even after the war if Asad is overthrown.

This is why the American people are extremely concerned about the United States unilaterally going into Syria without the support of the international community and without the support of the United Nations.

Having said all of that, in my mind there is another reason, a deeper reason, as to why there is so much opposition to the President's proposal and the proposal that came out of the Foreign Relations Committee, which was more open-ended and spoke about regime change. That has everything to do with the fact that the favorability rating of the Congress is today somewhere between 8 and 15 percent.

The vast majority of the American people don't know. They don't care who controls the Senate, whether it is the Democrats. They don't know who controls the House, the Republicans. By and large, the American people have given up believing that the Congress and the White House are listening to their needs, which are very serious at this moment, or are interested or capable of responding to their needs.

What the American people are saying, and they are saying it very loudly, is we have a Congress and a White House which continues to ignore the enormous crises facing the middle class and working families of our country. What they are saying is: Yes, Mr. President, we agree with you, what Asad is doing in Syria is unspeakable; that he is gassing his own kids is beyond belief. We understand that. We want the international community to address that.

But what they are also saying is: Mr. President, Members of Congress, think about our children, the kids in West Virginia, the kids in California, the kids in Detroit, the kids in Vermont. What about our kids? What kind of future are they going to have in an economy in which the middle class continues to disappear and poverty remains at an almost all-time high for the last 60 years?

Today real unemployment in this country is not 7.4 percent, the official

unemployment rate. Real unemployment is close to 14 percent.

Youth unemployment is a tragedy. Kids are graduating high school, going out and looking for jobs, and they want to get a sense of independence. There are no jobs for them. Youth unemployment in this country is close to 20 percent.

For minorities, the number is considerably higher. Black youth unemployment in this country is close to 40 percent. Parents are worried that their kids are graduating from high school and there are no jobs available to them.

Before I came to Washington the other day, I talked to a physician in the State of Vermont who said: BERNIE, do you know what. In Vermont, beautiful Vermont, rural Vermont, we are facing a heroin epidemic. Kids are shooting up heroin in Vermont, not to mention the rest of the country, because they don't see much of a future facing them.

Parents are worried that their kids are graduating college, often deeply in debt, and that either they can't find a job or the jobs they do obtain often do not require a college degree. The fact is most of the new jobs being created in this country are part-time jobs with minimal benefits, and they are often low-wage jobs.

What the Department of Labor is telling us is that, in fact, most of the new jobs we see coming down the pike for our kids do not require a college degree. They are low-wage jobs.

The people are saying from one end of this country, yes, we are concerned about Syria, but we are also concerned about Los Angeles, Detroit, and St. Johnsbury, VT. Please, Mr. President, create jobs for the working families of this country. What they are begging the Congress to do is to address the needs our people face.

What they understand, and I think this has a lot to do with why there is so much opposition to getting involved in this war in Syria, is that the Congress has virtually done nothing to improve the economy for working families, and they worry very much that if all of our time, energy, and resources are devoted to Syria, we are never going to address the serious problems facing the working families of this country.

Tens of millions of our fellow Americans today are working longer hours for lower wages, and many of them are earning wages that are simply too low to support a family. We have been happy to hear in Michigan, for example, the automobile industry is doing better; more people are being hired. That is the good news.

Do you know what the bad news is. The new jobs in the automobile industry are barely more than 50 percent in pay of what the old jobs were. All over this country the new jobs that are

being created are not paying what the jobs in this country used to pay. We have millions of people working for a disgracefully low minimum wage of \$7.25 an hour.

People are saying: Mr. President, Members of Congress, yes, we are worried about Syria, but why don't you work to make sure every person who has a job in this country can earn a wage which enables him or her to take care of their family?

The media doesn't pay a lot of attention to it, Congress doesn't pay a lot of attention, but the American people also understand it is not only high unemployment and low wages, something else is going on in this country. They know that while the middle class is disappearing and 46 million Americans are living in poverty, they understand the people on top today, the people whose lobbyists surround this institution, the people who make huge campaign contributions to the political parties, are doing very well. They are doing extraordinarily well. Corporate profits are at an all-time high. The people on Wall Street, whose greed, recklessness, and illegal behavior caused the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, well, guess what. They are doing phenomenally well. They are making record-breaking profits. The rich are doing well and corporate America is doing well. They are making all kinds of campaign contributions.

The American people are looking around and saying, What are you doing for us? What are you doing to protect the seniors and their Social Security? What are you doing to protect the children of this country, to make sure they get a decent education? What are you doing to make sure the United States joins the rest of the industrialized world so all of our people have health care as a right?

One of the reasons I think there is so much lack of support for this war is the American people feel it is high time for us to pay attention to their needs.

We have recently heard, and the news is being updated almost momentarily, that Russia, for whatever reasons, has decided finally to play a positive role in this crisis. They are urging Syria to allow the international community to take possession of their chemical weapons. We believe that France right now is prepared to go to the Security Council with a resolution similar to what the Russians are talking about.

I can't tell you how honest the Russians are being in this effort, what their ulterior plans may be. But I think now is the opportunity to work with Russia, to work with China, to work with the Security Council and the United Nations. It would be an extraordinary victory, in my view, for the people of Syria, who are going through horror after horror right now,

for the entire world, and for the future of the world, if we could take those terrible chemical weapons out of Asad's hands and destroy them. I would hope very much the President and our Secretary of State will be working with the international community to make that happen.

Let me conclude. I think we are in a very interesting and, in fact, momentous moment in the history of the United States of America. The people are coming together to say we have enormous crises in our own country and if we don't get our act together, we are going to see the decline of a once-great Nation. We are going to see, for the first time in the modern history of our country, our children having a lower standard of living than we do.

I would hope the lesson we learned of this entire episode is the American people do not want us unilaterally getting involved in another war in the Middle East. I would hope also the lesson we learned is the American people are saying very loudly and clearly this country faces enormous crises: economically, global warming, health care, education, income and wealth inequality, and they want us to start addressing those needs. I hope that out of this very difficult moment the silver lining is we learn something from what the American people want and we begin to do what they say.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN.) The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the very serious vote before us—the vote to authorize force against Syria. Let's be clear: This is a vote to authorize an act of war. The American people are watching. They know what this is—a dilemma with no easy answers. They know it could spiral out of control. It has happened before and it could happen again.

The use of chemical weapons is an outrage. What happened in Syria was despicable. The horror is clear. The world cannot look away. This crime is a crime against humanity. It demands an international response—strong and unequivocal. On this we can all agree. However, what should that response be?

The President has presented a plan for military strikes on the Syrian regime—an attack that has been presented to the American people as limited in scope but with very great consequences. So we are confronted with urgent appeals to strike, but I believe there are strong reasons not to do so.

First, we should pursue all diplomatic and economic options to pressure both Asad and his backers to change course. We have not yet done that to the fullest extent.

We all know the Russian Government is aiding and abetting the criminal regime in Syria, supplying military support, providing diplomatic cover, and preventing an international response to this atrocity. The world is rightly outraged. That outrage should be loud and clear, and the full force of international condemnation must be exerted, not just against Asad.

As of this week there are signs Russia may be getting the message. If their proposal to help secure Syria's chemical weapons is sincere, then we should welcome this opportunity. We should work with the international community to make this a reality. The inability to use chemical weapons in this conflict will restore the international norm we seek to uphold and prevent a recurrence of the horrors we have seen.

If Russia aims to be a responsible world power and not a rogue nation, they will seek solutions, not obstruction. They are a signatory to the Chemical Weapons Convention. Let's hold their feet to the fire to do what is right. The President's mandate is stronger with congressional approval, and the mandate of the United States is stronger with international support. I would urge Ambassador Power and Secretary Kerry to keep up the pressure on Russia. Make the forceful case to the Security Council. Continue to share the evidence with the people of the world.

This situation will not be solved with Tomahawk cruise missiles fired into Syria. It will require a concerted international effort to push Asad and the various rebels to pursue a political solution. For us to go it alone, to take unilateral action, will put us on shaky ground legally and strategically.

Second, the proposal to use military force could embroil the United States in a complex Middle Eastern civil war. There is a cancer in Syria, from Asad to Al Qaeda. The civil war is a twilight zone comprised of multiple players internationally, regionally, and within Syria. Many of the rebels do not share our values. Some—we don't know how many—are enemies of the United States and our allies. Many of these rebel groups have also committed terrible atrocities. Tilting the balance too far in their favor is not in our Nation's interest and will not leave Syria safer for innocent civilians.

These strikes have been presented as limited and targeted, but last week there were reports about expanding military targets, of regime change. Even the resolution we are considering today includes veiled language—the language that could make it the policy of the United States to tilt the momentum in the civil war and endorse the

policy of arming the Syrian rebels—a policy I and others believe is very dangerous—about whom we know too little.

Third, there is a real risk that even limited U.S. military involvement may make Asad feel more desperate, putting our allies—Israel, Turkey, and Jordan—at risk of attack. This could spark a regional war, creating a situation on the ground where Asad may be more, not less, inclined to use chemical weapons.

As with so many elements here, the question occurs, what then? Here is the reality. There is no simple solution, and the American people know this. I understand there is a natural instinct to want to retaliate, to strike out. No one can forget the horrific images, the terrible suffering of the victims. But we need a clear strategy that will not mire the United States in a bloody and uncertain civil war. I remain unconvinced that we have such a strategy in place.

The Iraq war, which I voted against, began as an international effort to kick Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. There followed years of a no-fly zone and airstrikes to prevent Saddam from threatening his neighbors or reconstituting his arsenal of chemical weapons. As we all know, these limited military actions led to one of the biggest blunders in U.S. history.

Americans are understandably skeptical after the fiasco of Iraq. They want to know if we are going down the same path in Syria, into a civil war that is more complex and potentially damaging to the United States and its interests. Limited attack or broader, there is no easy way out of the quicksand. Have we not learned at least that after 12 years of war?

I have listened to the administration's arguments closely, as well as the opinions of New Mexicans. The American people do not believe a limited strike will deter Asad; they fear this strike will just lead us further toward direct involvement. They rightly ask, for what purpose and to what end? Public officials should not always let polls be their guide before making important decisions for our country, but I agree with the majority of Americans and New Mexicans—we must exhaust our political, diplomatic, and economic options first. This is not a lack of resolve. America has the greatest military on Earth. No one should doubt that we will defend our interests and our allies. But a military strike in Syria is the wrong response in the wrong place at the wrong time.

I come to the floor not to push my colleagues one way or another. Each of us must make up his or her own mind. I come here simply to explain my reasons for voting no on this authorization for the use of military force in Syria.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, make no mistake about it, the resolution before us, in my judgment, is one of the most difficult decisions a Member of the Senate will ever have to make. The authorization of force is an awesome responsibility that each of us has. None of us wants to see American troops in harm's way. None of us wants to see the need for the use of military force. This is a difficult judgment for us to make.

The Constitution envisions that both the President and Congress are involved in the deploying of U.S. military. Certainly the President, as Commander in Chief, and the Congress, under the War Powers Act, have a responsibility to authorize the use of force. Today in this country Americans are tired of war. We have been involved in Iraq and Afghanistan for way too long. We thought these campaigns would be short campaigns. They turned out to be very long. There has been a tremendous loss in human life and fiscal resources as a result of the wars in which the United States has participated. But the public also understands that we have a responsibility to use our military to protect the national interests of the people of this country. They understand that America's military strength keeps the people in this country safe, and they expect that the President and the Congress will use that military force in order to protect the national security of the people of this country.

What is in our national security interest and why would the President come to Congress asking us to consider the use of military force in the current circumstances in Syria? People understand, they recognize that if we are about to be attacked, there is a need to use force.

The United States plays a unique role in the international community, for we understand that standing up for basic internationally recognized human rights is a responsibility we all have. I supported President Clinton when he asked for the authorization of force for the United States, along with the international community, to be involved in restoring order in the republics of the former Yugoslavia, where there was ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and Kosovo. But for the leadership of the United States additional communities would have been destroyed and people would have lost their lives. We stood up because it was in the interests of the United States to stand up for the enforcement of basic internationally established human rights.

Let's evaluate what is happening in Syria today and understand that although what is happening there may be far from our shores, the impact very much could be felt here in the United States. I serve on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We were called back into session last week because of the President's request for the Congress to act on his request for the use of force. We held hearings that were open to the public, and we held classified hearings in order to better understand what had happened in Syria.

I think it is now clear beyond any doubt that the Asad regime in Syria used chemical weapons. The evidence is clear. It was not the first occasion they used chemical weapons. They had used chemical weapons in the past but not to the magnitude they did on August 21 of this year which resulted in more than 1,400 deaths, many of whom were children. The videos of that image are now available publicly. People can see the horrific act that was imposed upon the people of Syria by its President, President Asad.

The action of Syria on August 21 violated international norm. Since chemical weapons were used in World War I, the international community has come together and said: Even in war we will not permit the use of chemical weapons. It is so horrific, so indiscriminate in its killing and in its maiming that as an international community we will stand and say: No, you cannot use chemical weapons.

The evidence is clear that President Asad of Syria used chemical weapons in a mass way and killed over 1,400 people. That action requires the response of the international community, for if it goes unchallenged it is more likely President Asad will continue to use chemical weapons. He just considers it one of the weapons in his toolbox, and he will call it out more and more if it goes unchallenged by the international community.

The people of Syria are not the only ones at risk. These chemical weapons could easily be used against American allies in that region. It could be used against Turkey. It could be used against Jordan. It could be used against Israel.

If the use of weapons of mass destruction in Syria goes unchallenged and if President Asad can get away with the use of chemical weapons, what message does that send to the regime in Iran and its ambition to become a nuclear weapons state and perhaps use nuclear weapons? What message does it send to the Government of North Korea, which is openly testing the use of nuclear weapons?

We have a direct interest in preventing the use of weapons of mass destruction, and we have to work with the international community to say this will not go unchallenged. We not only have a moral imperative—and we

do have a moral imperative—but we also have an issue of our national security interest. If these weapons of mass destruction get in the hands of terrorist organizations and groups, it threatens the security of Americans and it threatens the security of our allies. We have a responsibility to protect the national security of the people of this country.

I have engaged many people in Maryland who have talked to me about their concerns about the use of the American military in Syria. They recall what happened when the Congress authorized the use of force in Iraq where there was evidence of chemical weapons, and then we went in and found no chemical weapons. There were statements made about how this would be a limited operation. Our troops were there for a decade. So there is obviously concern about the information being made available to us and what is being asked of the Congress of the United States.

When force was authorized against Iraq and that resolution was pending on the floor, I served in the other body, in the House of Representatives. I had a chance to see firsthand the information about Iraq and its risk factors to the interest of the United States. Some may recall that the popular sentiment was for America to authorize the use of force—for Congress to authorize the use of force. I voted no on that resolution because I was convinced America did not have a national security interest to use military force. So I will explain the difference between the circumstances in Iraq over a decade ago and what we are facing today in Syria.

The original justification for the United States entering its combat troops in Iraq was that Iraq was deeply involved with the then-government of Afghanistan and the attack on our country on September 11. I looked for that information, and I saw no information between the Iraqi Government and the attack on our government. Yet those statements were made and it was used as justification for the use of military force.

Here the justification is the use by Syria of chemical weapons, and that has been established. I believe the international community has now understood the evidence is clear that the Assad regime used chemical weapons in contravention to international norm.

When we were authorizing the Iraq use of force, there were no restrictions on the U.S. military. As everyone knows, we used ground troops. We used hundreds of thousands of ground troops in our campaign in Iraq. American lives were put directly at risk, and it put America directly in harm's way.

The request made by the President of the United States for military action in Syria does not include—and, in fact, the resolution that has come out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee makes it clear that there will be no

ground combat troops from the United States of America. We will not be drawn into a ground war.

The Iraqi resolution that was approved over a decade ago had no time limit on that authorization. As we saw with that authorization and with the Afghanistan authorization, those campaigns went for over a decade, with American troops at risk.

The authorization that has come out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee contains a 60-day limitation on the authorization of the use of force. It can be extended once for an additional 30 days. This is a limited campaign. It is very clear this authorization is restricted to the specific objective to degrade and deter the use of chemical weapons by the Syrian regime and to prevent the transfer of chemical weapons to terrorist organizations.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee recommended resolution is limited. It is limited to that mission. It is limited in the type of military operation—no ground troops. It is limited in time and is not to exceed 60 to 90 days. It is limited to the fact that use of force should be the last option—not the first but the last option.

I have said many times on the floor of the House, and now on the floor of the Senate, that the use of military should be the last resort. There are other options that need to be explored first. So the resolution that has come out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee requires the President to pursue diplomatic ways to resolve the issue before he can use force. He must certify to Congress that he has done that before he can use force.

Mr. President, you understand this directly because you raised some of these issues. We now have an opportunity that we hope will work. We now have the attention of Russia and Syria since they know America is serious about reacting to Syria's use of chemical weapons. They know we will not stand by.

They have now acknowledged that chemical weapons in great numbers exist in Syria. And, quite frankly, I think they have acknowledged the use of chemical weapons in Syria. Of course, the videos speak for themselves and the physical evidence is overwhelming.

Now the suggestion is they will turn over those chemical weapons to the international community. If that is done, we have achieved our objective in the resolution that is before us. The resolution before us is to degrade and deter the use of chemical weapons by Syria. If they turn their chemical weapons over to the international community, we have achieved our objective. However, any such plan must be verifiable, enforceable, and timely.

Excuse me if I seem a little bit suspicious of the suggestions made by Russia and Syria. I want to make sure

they are verifiable, they are enforceable, and that they are timely. We anticipated a diplomatic effort when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recommended this resolution to the floor of the Senate.

There are many Members of the Senate, including the Presiding Officer, who are looking at ways we can come together to support the President's effort to stand up against the use of chemical weapons. I hope we will be able to come together with language in this resolution that will allow the Syrian Government to turn over its chemical weapons in a timely and enforceable way so military force will not be necessary.

Make no mistake about it, but for the leadership of President Obama and their fear of the use of American military force, we would never be at this opportunity right now where we have a viable diplomatic channel we can pursue. I wanted to acknowledge that we anticipated diplomacy would be used, as it always should be, before the use of our military. We hope our military will not be necessary, but we have to react to the use of chemical weapons.

Let me explain some of what we don't want to see happen. Earlier I referenced the hearings we had in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I congratulate Senator MENENDEZ and Senator CORKER, the chairman and ranking Republican on our committee. We had a very open hearing, we had access to classified information, and then we had an open discussion in our committee where all views were heard.

We tried to recommend a resolution we thought was responsible for the Congress to weigh in on. It was not the resolution the President submitted to us. It was one that was much more limited to the authorization we thought was appropriate. I think it has served its purpose from the point of view of putting Syria on notice that the United States is prepared to join the international community to say: Chemical weapons will not be allowed to be used. We also made it clear we will not be drawn into a civil war.

President Assad has done some horrible things in that country. In my view, he has lost the legitimacy of leading the country, but it is up to the Syrians to solve their civil conflict. American troops will not be drawn into the civil problems within Syria itself. They are going to have to resolve that issue.

As the United States has said, and as the international community has said, there needs to be a political solution to the future of Syria. Yes, there are some good people in the opposition and there are some people we are concerned about in the opposition. At the end of the day, it is up to the Syrians, through a political process, to determine their own government. What we should expect is a government that will

respect the human rights of all the people of Syria and will respect the right of Syrians to determine who their leader should be. All ethnic communities should be able to live in peace in Syria, and that is our objective, to get to that political solution. We will not be drawn into a broader conflict.

As I said earlier, the people I have talked to in Maryland don't want war. The people I have talked to in this Nation do not want the United States drawn into another war, and neither do I.

One more point about the response to the use of chemical weapons. Yes, our first priority is to make sure these chemical weapons aren't used again. The best way to do that is to get control of the weapons and make sure they are not used and, hopefully, destroyed.

President Asad needs to be held accountable. He has committed war crimes. He has committed crimes against humanity. He needs to be held accountable for the criminal actions he has perpetrated on the people of Syria. As we know, over 100,000 have lost their lives, many of whom were civilians who were put in harm's way by the Syrian Government against international norms. I encourage my colleagues to join me in the effort of calling on an international tribunal to take President Asad, in this case, and establish the international justice so that he is held accountable for his actions.

One last point about the resolution before us. It is important to work with the international community. I hope we will find more countries standing up for the importance of international participation regarding condemning the use of chemical weapons. One of the hopes we have in this new opportunity for a diplomatic solution is for the United Nations to assume its appropriate role. The United Nations Security Council will have an opportunity as early as today to pass an enforceable resolution condemning what happened in Syria and accepting the offer to take control of all of its chemical weapons and do it in a way that is enforceable and in a way that accomplishes its goal. I hope the United Nations Security Council will act. I hope the international community will join us. United States leadership is needed, and President Obama is providing it. But the key point is we must respond to the use of chemical weapons.

I think this debate is strengthening our country. I understand there are different views. I urge my colleagues to come together to support a resolution that puts America on record supporting President Obama in saying we will not permit the use of chemical weapons to go unchallenged, that our objective is to make sure the world is safer, and we are prepared to work with the international community in order to achieve those objectives.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the time until 7 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with my dear friend Senator HEITKAMP of North Dakota so we can talk about the serious situation we have before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MANCHIN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. MANCHIN and Ms. HEITKAMP pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 22 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. MANCHIN. I thank the Senator and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I come to speak to the important debate we are having about the most sobering issue I face as a Senator, as a Wisconsinite, and as an American—the issue of military action by the United States.

Let me start by saying that the Asad regime's use of chemical weapons against the Syrian people is morally reprehensible and a serious violation of longstanding international law. The various treaties and conventions addressing these issues have been ratified by most of the world's nations. There is a reason why almost the entire world has gathered under the Chemical Weapons Convention to ban these weapons. It is because chemical weapons are truly barbaric in nature. They are a global threat, and they therefore require a global response.

The President has made the right choice to seek congressional authorization for any potential military action in Syria. The gravity of these issues before us is significant and they de-

serve a full debate. President Obama should be praised for understanding and appreciating that fact. We must demand that all Presidents—not just this President—come to Congress to get approval before taking military action in another country in instances where we are not facing an imminent threat. I have made that case with both Democratic and Republican Presidents.

I strongly believe our response to this situation must not be a unilateral military action. This is not America's responsibility alone, and it is not in our interest to set the precedent that it is our responsibility alone.

Syria violated international laws and should be held accountable by the international community. America must not act alone. The use of chemical weapons is a global atrocity that demands a global response, and that is why I oppose going to war in Syria and I oppose authorizing military involvement in Syria's civil war—not for 1 day, not for 60 days, not for a decade. I do not believe we should involve ourselves militarily in the middle of a brutal years-long civil war. That would not strengthen America's national security. But the answer is not to do nothing. The answer, rather, is to create a situation where these violations of humanitarian norms and crimes against humanity can be dealt with effectively by the U.N. and other international institutions.

We must continue to focus on building a global coalition to support the encouraging developments in the past few days and to resolve this crisis without the use of unilateral military engagement in Syria. By working through the United Nations and its institutions, we strengthen international frameworks that can help resolve the conflict in Syria and build a safer and stronger international community moving forward.

I firmly believe that the recent potential for progress in today's U.N. discussions is a testament to American democracy. By President Obama fulfilling his constitutional duties to come to Congress and by our serious debate here on Capitol Hill, I believe America has helped drive a more constructive international debate and engagement on Asad's regime's atrocities. We must now give the opportunity of a path forward without military involvement in Syria a chance to succeed.

Madam President, I yield back my time and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, we are back from the August recess, and I am here now for the 42nd time to try to awaken this body to the threat of climate change. Today I have come to talk about some of what went on during the recess while we were away in my home State of Rhode Island and around the globe.

Here is some of what happened in Rhode Island.

On August 14, Nancy Sutley, Chair of the White House Council on Environmental Quality, joined me in Rhode Island to deliver a clear message. As she said: "Climate change poses a very real threat to public health, both now and in the future."

Warmer temperatures in the Northeast mean harmful ozone can form very quickly. That leads to the bad air days we hear about on the news, when children with asthma and other vulnerable citizens are urged to stay indoors, often on what appear to be beautiful, sunny, summer days. Nancy Sutley and I heard from Nick Friend, a 15-year-old from East Providence, and Kenyatta Richards, an 8-year-old from Warwick, about the six Rhode Island bad air days we have had already this year that threatened Nick's and Kenyatta's health, and thousands more children.

In Narragansett, a lovely Rhode Island beach town, I visited two sites that sustained significant damage during Hurricane Sandy to see how that town is using recovery aid to repair roads and public housing. People in Narragansett realize rebuilding is not enough; that we need to start adapting for future storms.

The oceans are warming, undeniably, and as they warm they expand. So sea levels rise, leading to more erosion and flooding. Tide gauges in Newport show an average sea level increase of nearly 10 inches since 1930. So storm surges such as the damaging surge last year from Hurricane Sandy will batter our shores further inland, and we have to adapt to that.

In Westerly, RI, town officials and the University of Rhode Island's Coastal Resources Center held an informational meeting about the effects of sea level rise on the town's coastal wetlands, planning for 1, 3, and 5 feet of coastal sea level rise, so Westerly can create a communitywide adaptation plan.

Cranston, RI, was hit hard by the floods of 2010. In August, during this recess, demolition crews began tearing down homes in a neighborhood near the Pawtuxet River to buffer the surrounding homes to protect against future flooding. Cranston also announced a series of climate change workshops to increase awareness about the threats facing city residents and to help them plan ahead. So that is some of what happened in Rhode Island.

Nationally, in August the Rim Fire burned in California near Yosemite Na-

tional Park, the third largest wildfire on record in California. No one can say climate change caused this fire. Wildfires have been happening forever. But hotter, drier years make for worse wildfire seasons. Spring and summer temperatures are edging up, snow is melting earlier, wildfire season is lengthening, and the intensity of the wildfire season is increasing, as State and Federal fire and forest managers forewarned our bicameral task force in a hearing just before the recess.

During August, nearly all of New Mexico experienced drought, with the majority of that State in severe, extreme or exceptional drought. In late August, the Bureau of Reclamation announced the first reduction of outflows from Lake Powell since the reservoir was filled in the early 1960s. Tens of millions of people who rely on the Colorado River for water will be affected.

Reports are that a late August heat wave in the Midwest caused school closures in Minnesota, and students were released early from schools in Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Again, it is the loaded dice phenomenon. We can't assign specific blame for this heat wave to climate change, but on a planet with hotter summers, we can expect worse and more frequent heat waves. So that is nationally.

Globally, NOAA announced that July 2013 was the sixth warmest July on record.

I was traveling in Asia during the recess with Senator JOHN MCCAIN immediately following record-setting heat. In mid-August temperatures passed 105 degrees Fahrenheit in Shanghai, China, the hottest temperature measured in the city since records began to be kept about 140 years ago. The temperature in Shimanto, Japan, hit 105 degrees Fahrenheit, the hottest ever recorded in that nation.

South Korea's President Park talked with us about climate change and its importance in Northeast Asia. While we were there in South Korea, the Ministry of Trade, Industry, and Energy had warned of power shortages due to high temperatures, and we met with public officials in rooms with air-conditioners shut off to save power.

Senator MCCAIN and I heard from China's leading climate official, Vice Chairman Xie, about China's plan to invest almost \$475 billion on clean energy and emissions-reducing projects through 2015—nearly \$500 billion between now and 2015 and about seven regional cap-and-trade programs that will eventually include other large cities such as Shanghai, Beijing, and Tianjin. For my colleagues who say China must act first on climate change: They are acting, and we should not look to them for an excuse to delay action here at home.

Indeed, a report recently by the Pew Charitable Trusts described China as—

let me quote this—China: "The epicenter of clean energy finance, attracting \$65.1 billion in investment . . . it garnered 25 percent of all solar energy investment . . . 37 percent of all wind energy investment . . . and 47 percent of the investment in the 'other renewable energy category.'"

That is what the Pew Report said about China.

The report compared that to the "disappointing U.S. performance in the worldwide race for clean energy jobs, manufacturing, and market share." That is not a race we want to lose. Yet we are exhibiting disappointing performance against China.

August was also a month for the usual climate denial. One of our Senate colleagues reportedly self-declared that he was a global warming denier and said he believes evidence points to the Earth entering a mini ice age.

One California Representative told constituents: "Just so you know, global warming is a total fraud."

A conservative Representative from Iowa told his constituents:

[Climate change] is not science. It's more of a religion than science.

A Representative from Florida said: "Our climate will continue to change because of the way God formed the Earth."

August even brought a climate denier opinion piece to my home State "Providence Journal." "Climate science is in turmoil," the piece said, "because global surface temperatures have been flat for 16 years."

Rhode Island's PolitiFact unit quickly determined that this claim "cherry-picked numbers and leaves out important details that would give a very different impression."

In truth, there have been steps in the upward march of global surface temperature before. My skeptical colleagues should read about these steps and what may cause them in mainstream news outlets, which explain that while these pauses do happen, they have not and do not herald the end of climate change. Setting aside surface temperature for a moment, we continue to see warming, rising, and acidifying oceans.

The recess brought the latest issue, for instance, of "National Geographic," whose cover story is "Rising Seas." Let me read two excerpts:

A profoundly altered planet is what our fossil-fuel-driven civilization is creating, a planet where Sandy-scale flooding will become more common and more destructive for the world's coastal cities. By releasing carbon dioxide and other heat-trapping gases into the atmosphere, we have warmed the Earth by more than a full degree Fahrenheit over the past century and raised sea level by about eight inches. Even if we stopped burning all fossil fuels tomorrow, the existing greenhouse gases would continue to warm the Earth for centuries. We have irreversibly committed future generations to a hotter world and rising seas.

Here, focusing on a specific location:

Among the most vulnerable cities is Miami. I cannot envision southeastern Florida having many people at the end of this century, says Hal Wanless, chairman of the department of geological sciences at the University of Miami. We're sitting in his basement office, looking at maps of Florida on his computer. At each click of the mouse, the years pass, the ocean rises, and the peninsula shrinks. Freshwater wetlands and mangrove swamps collapse—a death spiral that has already started on the southern tip of the peninsula. With seas four feet higher than they are today—a distinct possibility by 2100—about two-thirds of southeastern Florida is inundated. The Florida Keys have almost vanished. Miami is an island.

That is from that extremist publication National Geographic.

August also brought news that the IPCC will announce that it is now more certain than ever that human activity is the main cause of recent climate change. Let me be very clear about this: There is a broad and strong scientific consensus that climate change is ongoing and that human actions are a cause. It is a consensus of a breadth and strength that it is disgraceful and stupid for us to ignore it. That consensus should come as no surprise because the science behind it—behind the proposition that carbon dioxide in the atmosphere warms the Earth—dates back to the Civil War. It ain't news. We have known it for more than a century. Even the contrarian scientists brought in by the deniers to testify in Congress agree that carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas that warms the Earth.

The science is credible. The danger is credible. Now it is about time for Congress to become credible. It is time to wake up. It is time to do our duty here in Congress to our country and to our fellow man. It is time for us to get serious and protect Americans from the looming harms of climate change.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

16TH STREET CHURCH BOMBING

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, two weeks ago, thousands of people gathered on the National Mall in front of

the Lincoln Memorial to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington, where Martin Luther King, Jr. gave his historic "I Have a Dream" speech. That remarkable moment in this Nation's history was a peaceful day of unity and we rightfully remember the inspiring words of Dr. King.

We are reminded this week of just how quickly that hope and positive signs of progress were challenged by a stunning act of violence. Just a few days after Dr. King inspired a nation with his dream for his four children, four other children in Birmingham were killed at their church because of the color of their skin. On September 15, 1963, a bomb was planted by members of the Ku Klux Klan at the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama. Addie Mae Collins, 14, Denise McNair, 11, Carole Robertson, 14, and Cynthia Wesley, 14, were innocent victims of racial hatred. The inhumanity of those who conspired and killed children in a church may seem unimaginable in our Nation today, but, as Colbert King of the Washington Post noted recently, "Before al-Qaeda, there was the Ku Klux Klan."

We celebrate the significant strides we have made with determined efforts in forging a more just and equal America since the KKK's reign of terror, and yet we cannot forget that these events occurred just days after the March on Washington. It occurred in the lifetime of 88 of 100 members of this Senate body. It is our recent history, not ancient history.

The tragic deaths of those four little girls, along with the other shining examples of bravery, patriotism and resolve during the Civil Rights movement, catalyzed passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. These laws helped to transform our Nation and ensure that our most basic promises to our citizens are more than just words on a page, honored only in their breach.

The inspiring possibilities described so eloquently by Dr. King, and the depravity and horror of the Birmingham church bombing just weeks later, reveal an important lesson about our history. The path to progress in our Democracy is winding, and sometimes very, very difficult. We know from our shared experience that we cannot be the Nation that we strive to be by setting the dial on autopilot and assuming that all will be well. There are so many reminders of the winding path to progress, and recently we experienced a considerable detour.

Three months ago, a narrow majority of the Supreme Court held that the coverage provision of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act was unconstitutional. Section 5, often called the "heart of the Voting Rights Act," provided a remedy for unconstitutional discrimination in voting by requiring

jurisdictions with the worst histories of discrimination to "preclear" all voting changes before they could take effect. The remedy is both necessary and important because it stops the discriminatory voting practice before our fellow Americans' rights are violated. By striking down the coverage provision for Section 5, the Supreme Court's ruling leaves this vital protection unenforceable.

While certain barriers to participation have been eliminated, we continue to see discriminatory voting measures such as arbitrary registration rules, polling-place manipulation, voter purges, challenges or other devices to deny access to the ballot, as well as vote dilution tactics. Since the Court's recent decision in Shelby County, several states have already decided to impose new barriers to voting, thereby reversing the gains that we have made through the last five decades.

These include measures taken by Texas, North Carolina, and Florida to undermine their citizens' right to vote and to participate in our democracy. But on this day, when we reflect on the contributions of our children to the cause of liberty, perhaps no story is more worth retelling than the story of the Prairie View A&M students. It is a story that bridges the past with both the present and the future. Students from that historically black university have been fighting for their voting rights for more than four decades now, and if not for the Voting Rights Act, many of these students would have been denied their fundamental right to vote.

The history is well-documented in a recent Houston Chronicle article by Renée Lee. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD. In the 1970s, the Justice Department filed an action against Waller County and its state officials for using a questionnaire to deny Prairie View students the right to vote. In 1992, 19 students were indicted for improperly voting, which ultimately led to a U.S. Supreme Court ruling that authorized college students to register and vote in communities where they live while at school.

In 2004, the NAACP and four Prairie View students filed a federal case after the county district attorney tried to enforce residency requirements that would keep students from voting. A Section 5 enforcement suit was filed by civil rights organizations around the same time after county officials shortened the early voting period at the campus in violation of Section 5. This effort to narrow student participation came at a time when a student leader sought elective office. Testimony about this recent chapter at Prairie View A&M was submitted to Congress in support of the 2006 Reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act. It was compelling evidence that voting discrimination persists in that community and

that even a Supreme Court ruling was not sufficient protection.

Two years after the reauthorization of Section 5, in 2008, nearly 1,000 Prairie View students marched in protest for the lack of an early voting place on campus. The county had reduced the number of early voting polling sites from six to one, requiring students to walk miles to the nearest polling location. If you did not know the long and tortured history of the schemes to block Prairie View A&M voters from their constitutionally protected rights, moving a polling place may seem like merely a matter of administrative convenience, but in voting, both history and context matter. The Justice Department under Attorney General Michael Mukasey ultimately entered into a consent decree with Waller County that required officials to restore three polling sites. And now, the students from this historically black university are once again fighting to exercise their fundamental right to vote by demanding an accessible polling place. The Prairie View A&M story illustrates that sometimes discrimination starts early, and that some officials are surprisingly persistent in their efforts to erect barriers in the path of our youngest voters. The Voting Rights Act stands as a guardian against these schemes to discourage young voter participation.

But now, following the Shelby County ruling, and with a college leader seeking elective office in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, local officials have borrowed the Prairie View A&M disenfranchisement playbook. There, a party chairman challenged the eligibility of Montravius King from standing for office by claiming that Mr. King did not meet the residency requirement because he lived in a dorm. The premise of this challenge is flatly contradicted by Supreme Court precedent and the decades of advocacy over Prairie View A&M students' voter access. Nevertheless, North Carolina local officials were initially able to disqualify Mr. King's candidacy. There were also indications that some in Elizabeth City, North Carolina intended to employ new voter challenge procedures in the state to prevent students from the historically black college from voting. It is perhaps no wonder, then, that part of the officials' plan also involved removing the polling place from the campus. Last week, local election board reversed itself only after a huge public outcry, but these events reveal that some things have changed and some, unfortunately, have not. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post by Mary Curtis, which documents the efforts by North Carolina's state officials to infringe on the fundamental right to vote.

When President Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act into law in 1965, he

declared that: "Through this act, and its enforcement, an important instrument of freedom passes into the hands of millions of our citizens." We must remain vigilant and protect the rights of all Americans to exercise this fundamental right.

The recent Supreme Court decision placed the burden on Congress to respond with a legislative fix. It is therefore our duty and constitutional obligation to not waver from the path of greater political inclusion that we have set for ourselves and the Nation through our bipartisan support of the Voting Rights Act.

We must restore the vital protections that were weakened by the Supreme Court's ruling. We must provide additional remedies for states and counties, anywhere in the Nation, that not only have a history of discriminating against their voters, but continue to do so. We must extend the reach of these protections to states that commit serious voting rights violations in the future. We must amend the existing provisions of the Act to make those protections more effective. And we must provide greater transparency for changes to voting procedures so that voters are made aware of these changes. These are the kinds of bipartisan solutions that we should all be able to agree on.

As we continue the fight to combat discrimination, we should remember the words of Dr. King. We should remember the aspirations of students like Montravius King. We should remember the contributions of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and Congressional leader JOHN LEWIS. And we should remember that those four girls who died in the 16th Street Baptist Church Bombing, and who are being posthumously honored today with Congressional Gold Medals, were part of a movement that helped make America better, stronger and more just. The way to truly honor them is not by words alone but through our actions and leadership. While we commemorate the sacrifice of these four girls, our work does not end with this commemoration. Our work is ahead of us and we must act together in a bipartisan manner to protect the fundamental right to vote for all Americans. All of our children are depending on it.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 29, 2013]
PAST IS PRESENT AS NORTH CAROLINA HONORS
1963 MARCH AND BATTLES VOTING LAWS
(By Mary C. Curtis)

CHARLOTTE.—In North Carolina, commemorations of the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington and Martin Luther King's dream credited past struggles while a current battle over voting laws took center stage.

In an uptown Charlotte park Wednesday, the crowd used the examples of civil rights

pioneers in a continuation of the Moral Monday protests against conservative laws from the Republican-controlled state legislature. Similar gatherings were planned in each of the state's 13 congressional districts. While many issues, including education and health care spending, were reflected in comments and emblazoned on signs, the new state voter-ID bill was a unifying cause.

Later Wednesday evening, several Democratic and Republican legislators took questions from their Mecklenburg County constituents in a raucous forum called, ironically as it turned out, "Solving It Together." At the top of the list in hundreds of questions submitted beforehand—voter-ID laws.

The new laws have already garnered national publicity, and not the kind North Carolina likes. At the state CEO Forum in Raleigh last week, former secretary of state Colin Powell criticized the voting legislation, saying, "These kinds of actions do not build on the base." He made those remarks after GOP Gov. Pat McCrory, who had signed the bill into law, addressed the group, though McCrory later said he left before the retired general spoke.

Besides requiring photo ID, the bill shortens early voting by a week, ends preregistration for 16- and 17-year-olds, eliminates same-day voter registration, Sunday voting and straight-ticket voting, prohibits university students from using their college IDs and increases the number of poll watchers who can challenge a voter's eligibility, among other provisions. It is currently being challenged in court and Sen. Kay Hagan (D-N.C.) has asked Attorney General Eric Holder to take action as the Justice Department has in Texas.

Actions of GOP-controlled elections boards in North Carolina have also been grabbing headlines, from the closing of a polling place at Appalachian State University to the ruling that a student at historically black Elizabeth City State University cannot run for city council using his college address to establish residency.

At Charlotte's Marshall Park, a program of speakers and singers, as well as the sunny weather, duplicated the mood of the 1963 Washington march. Under a voter registration tent, a pledge card from the state NAACP urged attendees to be part of the "Forward Together, Not One Step Back" movement voter empowerment effort. The Rev. William Barber, head of the state NAACP, was on the program.

Amy Gollinger, a physician from Davidson, N.C., held a sign reading "Protect every American's Right to Vote," which she alternated with ones that said "Protect women's rights" and "Why deny Medicaid to struggling families?" referencing McCrory's decision to refuse federal Medicaid funds. She said Wednesday was a "perfect time" to protest. "Even though we've come far since 1963, our state legislature has shown we have much further to go," she said. "It's unbelievable we've gone from one of the most progressive states to one of the most regressive. I hope it empowers voters to get out and make a change."

Sitting next to Gollinger with a sign reading "Stop the attacks on public education!" James Davidson of Charlotte said, "I'm here for Martin Luther King," and called proposals from the legislature "going back to Jim Crow." He said he hoped new laws would spur citizens to action. "They went to sleep and didn't get out to vote," he said.

At the Mecklenburg legislators' forum at Central Piedmont Community College, the

crowd in the packed auditorium loudly registered its approval, disapproval or disbelief as representatives of the state House and Senate explained actions on voting, education and the back-and-forth over attempts to change control of Charlotte Douglas International Airport from the city to a state authority to a commission.

In heavily Democratic Charlotte, audience sentiment at the forum, sponsored in part by local media outlets, was loudly skeptical of the Republican-led changes.

Voting rights led the discussion, with one questioner at the microphone asking for data on the fraud that is given as reason for the photo-ID law (the answer came in anecdotal examples) and another quoting former president Bill Clinton's words at the Washington commemoration of the 1963 march, "A great democracy does not make it harder to vote than to buy an assault weapon."

From somewhere in the crowd came the tweet that there was much more debate onstage than in the North Carolina General Assembly, where GOP super-majorities were accused of rushing through bills.

It seemed less Old South vs. New South than voter voices vs. ALEC (the American Legislative Exchange Council), with one question comparing North Carolina's bills to model legislation from the conservative non-profit. State Rep. Bill Brawley, a Republican and active ALEC member, said he believed in the organization's goals of limited government, free market capitalism and federalism; Rep. Ruth Samuelson, a Charlotte Republican, said she has attended one of the group's meetings. All of the legislators said they serve their constituents, not any organization.

State Sen. Dan Clodfelter, a Charlotte Democrat, said he remembered a time when "we weren't afraid in this state to be different from the states around us," when ideas "didn't come out of anybody's play-book."

After the forum, voters lingered to continue the contact with officials some thought had not been listening closely enough during the legislative session. Clodfelter was wistful as he spoke of the times North Carolina passed pioneering laws, such as the Racial Justice Act, which allowed death-row inmates to appeal their sentences and have them converted to life in prison without parole if they could prove racial bias in their cases. (It was repealed this year.) "Now we're known for the wrong kind of things," he said. When one of his Republican colleagues noted that the Democrat had Wednesday's crowd on his side, Clodfelter said he answered, "You made them that way."

State Sen. Jeff Tarte, a Republican who had managed to be conciliatory in his conservatism during the panel, insisted he "loved" the night's verbal battles. "It's what the American system is all about," he said, though since his party passed its legislative agenda, it was easy for him to be magnanimous.

Samuelson sat on the edge of the stage as the crowd filtered out. She defended her support of the voting bill, and noted a New York Times editorial "The Decline of North Carolina" that criticized the general Assembly's actions and caused quite a stir in this image-conscious state. She said studies have found that "after this bill," it's easier to vote in North Carolina than New York.

When asked what she thought of congressman and civil rights veteran John Lewis's attack on voter-ID laws, particularly on the date marking the 50th anniversary of his ap-

pearance with other civil rights leaders at the 1963 March on Washington, she said, "I appreciate the sacrifices they made, I appreciate the emotion around this issue," then added, "I'm trying to protect the integrity of their vote. . . . They worked hard for that vote; I want to make sure it doesn't get stolen."

State Sen. Malcolm Graham, a Charlotte Democrat, had said onstage that in North Carolina you're more likely to get struck by lightning than be affected by voter fraud. He said that when his daughter returned to historically black Winston-Salem State University this year, she and other students were greeted with stories that a county board of elections chair wanted to eliminate the school's early voting site. "Our national brand as a state has been tarnished," he said.

After the forum, Graham said he believed the passion would extend past Wednesday night. "This thing has legs," he said. The test, he said, would be the tough reelection Hagan faces in 2014. "That's the line in the sand the Democrats have to draw."

[From the Houston Chronicle, Aug. 1, 2013]

PRAIRIE VIEW A&M STUDENT FIGHTS FOR VOTING POLL SITE ON CAMPUS

(By Renée C. Lee)

A Prairie View A&M University student leader is calling on officials to add a campus polling place to remedy what she and a civil rights leader described as decades of voter suppression.

Priscilla Barbour, president of the Student Government Association at the historically black university, sent a letter to Texas Secretary of State John Steen and Waller County Registrar Robyn German last week requesting that action be taken by Oct. 1. Barbour says students' voting rights are being violated because the nearest polling location is more than a mile away.

The Oct. 1 first deadline, she said, would allow time to make students aware of the new polling place before the November elections.

Barbour, a senior, hopes her request will end a battle that former Prairie View students have failed to win over the years.

"We've always had problems," said Barbour, who is active with the Texas League of Young Voters. "Voting is supposed to be something that's convenient, something you have the right to do without walking a great distance or standing in line."

The political science major said students were forced during last year's general election to wait in a long line to vote at the polling location at the local community center.

The city of Prairie View accommodates students by placing a polling location on campus, but Waller County officials have refused to do the same, she said.

German, the county's new registrar, could not be reached for comment Wednesday. Steen's spokeswoman, Alicia Pierce, said Steen was drafting a letter to German.

"We don't generally determine polling locations," Pierce said. "That decision is made at the county level, but the secretary is willing to meet with Miss Barbour. We'll be glad to work with her."

Gary Bledsoe, president of the NAACP state chapter, said Waller County has a history of voter intimidation and suppression of black voters.

REPEATED COMPLAINTS

The lack of polling places on campus, lost voter registration applications and problems with ballot boxes are among the many voting issues that have come up time and again in the county, he said.

"Students are entitled to a voting poll on campus," Bledsoe said. "They have been fighting for one for many years. It's a righteous request."

Barbour's action follows a recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling that struck down a key provision in the Voting Rights Act. The law protects minority voters from discrimination at the polls and, until June, required nine states with a discriminatory history, including Texas, to get federal approval before making changes to election laws.

The ruling gave Texas and other states the green light to push through voter ID laws, which civil rights leaders say will inhibit minority voting.

Prairie View has been at the center of voting right issues as far back as the 1970s, when the U.S. attorney general filed action against Waller County and state officials for the use a questionnaire that denied Prairie View students the right to vote.

In 1992, 19 students were indicted for improperly voting, which led to a Supreme Court ruling that authorized students to register and vote in communities where they live.

The NAACP and four students filed a federal lawsuit in 2004 after the county district attorney tried to enforce residency requirements that would keep students from voting. Another suit was filed around the same time after county officials shortened the early voting period at the campus without Justice Department approval.

The district attorney rescinded his action as part of a settlement and county officials added an extra early voting day on campus after being questioned by the Justice Department.

PREVIOUS PROTEST

In 2008, nearly 1,000 Prairie View students marched in protest of the lack of an early voting place on campus. The county, citing budget concerns, reduced the number of early voting polling sites from six to one, requiring students to walk miles to the polling location. The Justice Department instructed county officials to add three polling sites.

Barbour said she was apprehensive about sending her letters but figured she had nothing to lose.

"Even if nothing's accomplished, now the tone is set," she said. "I'm not the first to tackle the issue and I'm sure I won't be the last. This gives students a chance to be knowledgeable and take a stand."

TRIBUTE TO ANDREW WHITEFORD

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I am proud to recognize Andrew Whiteford of Richmond, VT, owner of Andy's Dandys, maker of all-natural dog treats.

Marcelle and I had the pleasure of meeting Andrew and his mother Lucie Whiteford at the bicentennial celebration for Richmond's Old Round Church, and we were so impressed with him. Andrew was born with Down syndrome, and his family started Andy's Dandys as a means for Andrew to have meaningful employment and to provide jobs for other young adults with special needs. His work is in line with the best of Vermont's spirit of service to others, and for that I ask that the article by Lynn Monty from the August 22, 2013, edition of the Burlington Free Press be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press,
Aug. 22, 2013]

RICHMOND BAKERY COOKS UP JOB-TRAINING PROGRAM AND SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS

A mother's creative approach to helping her son transition to adulthood, and all-natural dog treats, are the recipe for success at Andy's Dandys.

Lucie Whiteford launched the Richmond bakery to help her son Andrew (Andy) Whiteford, 21, who was born with Down syndrome, find meaningful employment after high school graduation.

The business was inspired by her boy's affection for his rescued hound named Rosie and his love for reading recipes and baking.

"I hope for him to be fulfilled, happy, healthy, as independent as he wants to be, and to continue to be in a social environment surrounded by people who understand him and love him," Whiteford said of her son.

This Bridge Street bakery is on a mission to illustrate employability, while producing a high-quality Vermont product. The original goal of supporting Whiteford in his growth from high school to adult work life has evolved to serving other young adults with special needs, and teaching them real work-based skills that they can take with them in their job search for future employment.

"The mission of Andy's Dandys is to employ and train people to be employable," business partner Lesha Rasco said. She is Whiteford's special educator at Mount Mansfield Union High School where he will graduate next year.

"It's the revenue stream that makes the mission part possible," Rasco said. "In the future we hope that it will build."

Rasco designs and implements individualized work training programs at Andy's Dandys for other young adults with special needs. She has been an instrumental part of Whiteford's growth and of developing his business.

The business has grown organically, Rasco said. "Lucie has been buying things and paying herself back."

BAKER, DECORATER, DELIVERER

Andrew Whiteford bakes and decorates Andy's Dandy treats and also makes deliveries and works to promote the business at trade shows and seasonal events.

Andy actually goes by Andrew.

"His name is Andrew. We don't call him Andy," Lucie Whiteford said.

"Call me Andy," Andrew Whiteford said with a smile.

"He is yanking my chain," Lucie Whiteford said. "The business was named Andy's Dandys because we wanted some link to Andrew, because this was for him, and because it has a nice ring to it. Should we decide to one day make something other than pet treats, we won't have to change the name."

On a recent morning, a baker's apron was folded in half, and tied around his waist, not around his neck, just the way he requested. Andrew Whiteford was just as meticulous about dipping each one of the many freshly baked molasses dog bones into bright orange yogurt frosting, as he was about donning his apron.

"There are all kinds of colors, like blue, orange, and sometimes brown," he said. "I want to sell these in Las Vegas and on a Hawaii beach someday. I am not joking. It's true."

PRESERVATIVE FREE TREATS

Joking or not, Andy's Dandys has taken off.

The business started in 2008. Andrew Whiteford began by selling the treats in school and at Saint Michaels's College, where his father Tim Whiteford is an associate professor of education.

By fall of that year a few hundred of the colorful dog treats sold from a couple Chittenden County convenience stores. Overall, 8,500 treats sold that year.

The bakery uses human-grade ingredients and the treats are preservative-free.

Today, the bakery turns out thousands of treats each week, which sell at about 95 stores in Vermont, New Hampshire, upstate New York, and Maine. Thirty-two thousand treats sold in 2012.

"This year we are pacing about 20 percent ahead of where we were last year, and last year was a 100 percent increase over 2011," Lucie Whiteford said.

CUSTOM SHAPED FOR YOUR BUSINESS

The bakery has started offering custom-shaped treats that reflect a business' name or product. For example, a flying pig dog treat for the Northfield Savings Bank instead of the standard milk-bone biscuit, she said.

"It's about offering customers a Vermont-made product to demonstrate support for a small Vermont business such as ours," she said. "They gave us a shot, and I understand that customers really love them."

Lucie Whiteford came on staff full-time last month after leaving her position as an account executive at Fox 44 TV. She hopes to begin drawing a salary as the new quarter starts in September.

"It's profitable now which is why I was able to leave my job to do this full time," she said. "Now that I can work on this business full time, I expect to be able to double sales again in a year's time."

THE BIGGEST REWARD

More than revenues, Lucie Whiteford's biggest reward is watching her son succeed in adulthood. She said raising a child with a disability has been enlightening and rewarding.

"We celebrate what most people consider mundane accomplishments, such as learning to speak well enough to be understood, learning to button a shirt or tie a shoe," she said.

Andrew Whiteford has always pushed himself to achieve goals singing a solo at the senior recital, snowboarding down a black diamond trail, and teaching himself how to dip dog treats with two hands at once, his mother said.

"He continues to exceed our expectations, reminding us that we should be mindful about not setting the bar low just because he has a disability," she said. "As a family we have all grown so much in terms of learning patience, patience and more patience."

Andrew Whiteford has come into his own in the past few years, his sister Marie Johnson said. "He has a definite interest in this business now," she said. "He has developed a sense of ownership."

Their mother agreed. "Andrew turned a corner this summer. He decided he wanted to come here and work with me. It was what it was all for, and me sticking with it, and having it be a part of our lives, and having it become the thing he has decided to do it, I couldn't be happier," she said.

Andy's Dandys manufactures and packages the treats at the Bridge Street shop, and will be opening a retail store at that location in mid-September.

CORRECTION

This story has been updated to reflect the following correction: Lucie Whiteford

launched the Richmond bakery Andy's Dandys. Her name was misspelled in two instances in a previous version of this story.

TRIBUTE TO MARK WOODS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to congratulate my good friend Mr. Mark Woods. Mark is currently the superintendent of one of the Commonwealth of Kentucky's most important preserves of natural beauty, the Cumberland Gap National Historic Park, a post he's held for 16 years. The Cumberland Gap National Historic Park sits at the border of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia, although of course, the most breathtaking parts are within the Bluegrass State.

Kentuckians will be sorry to see Mark go due to his recent and much deserved promotion: Later this month, Mark will assume his new duties as superintendent of the Blue Ridge Parkway. The Blue Ridge Parkway runs for over 450 miles through Virginia and North Carolina along the Blue Ridge Mountains. It is the most visited attraction of the entire U.S. National Park Service—more than Yellowstone, Yosemite, or the Grand Canyon.

Mark is a 33-year veteran of the National Park Service and has worked in parks in South Carolina, Tennessee, and Georgia as well as Kentucky. I am sure his family is very proud of him for this career accomplishment. Although I will miss working with Mark in Kentucky, I am pleased that citizens everywhere can still benefit from his knowledge and experience when they visit our national parks.

I know my colleagues join me in congratulating Mr. Mark Woods for this opportunity and thanking him for his dedication to the National Park Service. Mr. Woods's career and accomplishments to date were recently profiled in a newspaper article. I ask unanimous consent that said article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to appear as follows:

[From the Asheville Citizen-Times,
Aug. 7, 2013]

SC NATIVE NAMED NEW PARKWAY SUPERINTENDENT (By Karen Chávez)

ASHEVILLE.—A 33-year National Park Service veteran with Southern Appalachian roots has been chosen as the new superintendent of the Blue Ridge Parkway.

Mark Woods, 53, now superintendent at Cumberland Gap National Historic Park, which sits in Kentucky, Virginia and Tennessee, will take over leadership of the busiest national park site in the country September 22 at parkway headquarters in Asheville.

"Mark has got some great experience," said Bill Reynolds, National Park Service spokesman in Atlanta. "He spent most of his career in the Southeast."

Woods, who was raised in Greenville, S.C., received a bachelor's degree in sociology from Lander University in Greenwood, S.C., in 1982. He is married and has three children.

He began working as an interpretive ranger for the National Park Service in 1980 at parks including Ninety Six National Historic Site (Ninety Six, S.C.), Kings Mountain National Military Park (Blacksburg, S.C.), Andrew Johnson National Historic Site (Greeneville, Tenn.), and Cumberland Island National Seashore (St. Mary's, Ga.)

Woods will replace Phil Francis, who retired as superintendent of the parkway in April. Monika Mayr, deputy superintendent since 2009, has been acting superintendent since April, and had applied for the position.

The parkway has not had a female superintendent in its 78 years.

Mayr, a 30-year park service veteran, said she has known Woods for many years and thinks he will be a good fit.

"He's a very good leader," she said. "He has always wanted to work at the parkway because he loves the resources here and he knows the staff is really good."

Woods also gets a hearty endorsement from Francis, who oversaw the parkway for eight years and still lives in Asheville.

"I've known him over 20 years. He's well respected," Francis said.

"He's a very able leader of Cumberland Gap. It's not as big as the parkway, but he's already had to deal with some of the same issues on a different scale. Sequestration cuts happened at all national parks, so he's had to make those same kinds of decisions."

The federal sequester forced all national parks to reduce their budgets by 5 percent for the remainder of the year, starting in March.

Woods will inherit the aftermath of the nearly \$800,000 budget cut, which was accomplished through facility closures, cuts to seasonal and permanent staff, cutbacks on visitor services such as ranger programs and a decrease in the mowing operation and maintenance of the parkway's scenic overlooks.

He must also contend with a \$450 million deferred maintenance backlog, which has been growing for more than a decade.

"Mark has a tremendous background in working with gateway communities," Reynolds said. "He also has background in facility design and construction, viewshed protection, wilderness management and general management planning. A broad range of excellent knowledge and experience has made him well suited for this job."

SIMILAR PARKS ON DIFFERENT SCALES

Woods has been superintendent of Cumberland Gap, known as the gateway to the western frontier, since 1997.

"Cumberland Gap is the first doorway to the West, the path that Daniel Boone and the pioneers used to access the West," said Carol Borneman, supervisory park ranger at Cumberland.

The park and the parkway have some similarities. Much like the parkway, Cumberland Gap sits in the Appalachian Mountains, and is steeped in Southern Appalachian history and culture.

Cumberland Gap was authorized by Congress in 1940 to preserve the natural gap through the mountain that pioneers used to reach the western frontier centuries ago. It contains 24,000 acres with nearly 85 miles of forested hiking trails. For 50 years, a major highway passed through the Gap.

But in one of the largest restoration projects undertaken by the National Park Service, Borneman said, a highway tunnel was built through the Gap in 1996, the old highway was ripped out and the Gap restored to its Daniel Boone days as a walking path. From one overlook in the park, Borneman said, the Smokies can be seen on a clear day.

The culture, history and views drew 860,000 visitors in 2012.

Things will likely seem a little more crowded for Woods when he gets to the Blue Ridge Parkway. The most visited of the more than 400 units of the National Park Service, including such popular parks as Yellowstone, Yosemite, the Grand Canyon and the Great Smoky Mountains national parks, the parkway had 15.2 million visitors in 2012.

The parkway stretches 469 miles from Shenandoah National Park in Virginia through the Blue Ridge Mountains, ending in Cherokee, and contains 81,000 acres of land and 1,200 miles of boundary.

Established in 1935 as a scenic motor road, cars and traffic continue to be one of its biggest issues. October is generally the busiest month on the parkway, and Woods will arrive just in time for the heavy fall foliage traffic.

He will also face a major closure in one of the parkway's most popular areas in the height of summer tourist season. A 20-mile stretch just north of Asheville, through the Craggy Gardens area to Mount Mitchell State Park, has been closed to traffic since July 12 due to slope failure, presumably from the excessive spring and summer rain, staff say.

Crews are now working on a temporary fix to open the roadway by Labor Day for the fall leaf-peeping traffic, then will close again while the road is permanently fixed.

Borneman said Cumberland Gap is sad to see Woods leave.

"He is an incredible superintendent, so in tune to park resources, and such a proponent of working with local communities," she said. "The parkway is lucky to be getting him."

ARIEL RIOS REFLECTING POOL

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I would like to recognize Ariel Rios, a man who made the ultimate sacrifice while protecting our country and who is being honored today at a special dedication ceremony here in Washington, DC.

On September 10, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives—ATF—is honoring Special Agent Ariel Rios, who gave his life in the line of duty, by dedicating the Ariel Rios Reflecting Pool at the ATF Headquarters in Washington, DC.

On December 2, 1982, while conducting an undercover operation in support of an investigation into illegal drug and firearms violations, Agent Rios was shot and killed. At the time of his death, Agent Rios was 28 years old and had worked for ATF for 4 years. His killers were sentenced to life in prison, plus 50 years. Agent Rios was survived by his wife Elsie and their young children Eileen and Francisco.

Naming the reflecting pool at the ATF Headquarters, which is located at 99 New York Avenue NE, in honor of Agent Rios brings him home to his ATF family. This memorial will forever provide ATF employees with a place to honor and reflect on the life of an agent who made the ultimate sacrifice.

This dedication also provides an opportunity for us to honor all the brave

men and women who wear the badge and put their lives on the line every day to protect this great Nation.

THE MISSING CHILDREN'S ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of the Missing Children's Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2013.

This bill will reauthorize the efforts of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. This legislation will ensure that NCMEC will continue to be able to receive reports of missing children for law enforcement, provide DNA analysis to locate missing children, partner with the FBI and Department of Justice to combat child sex trafficking, fight child pornography. NCMEC also should be allowed to continue to perform its role as the congressionally-authorized national clearinghouse to assist missing and exploited children, working with agents from the FBI, Secret Service, Marshals Service, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the Postal Inspection Service, and the Naval Criminal Investigative Services.

There is a greater need than ever before for transparency and accountability when taxpayer moneys are granted to private, nonprofit, and other governmental agencies. I am pleased that the bill contains the accountability measures that I demand for all grants that are awarded by the Department of Justice. These include two audits of NCMEC use of these funds over the life of the reauthorization, penalties for misuse of funds, prohibition on receipt of funds by an organization that holds offshore accounts to avoid taxes, limitations on conference expenditures, and prohibition of the use of taxpayer funds to lobby for grant funding. These provisions will ensure that taxpayers can have confidence that their money will be used properly and for public purposes.

NCMEC performs important services to combat terrible crimes against vulnerable victims. With the inclusion of transparency and accountability safeguards, I look forward to the enactment of this legislation in advance of the expiration of the current authorization.

TRIBUTE TO NICK GEALE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I am pleased today to praise the service of Nick Geale, who was until July the director of oversight and investigations on the minority staff of the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions—HELP—Committee, of which I am ranking member. In July, Nick was confirmed by this body as a member of the National Mediation Board, where he will surely continue his hard work, thoughtful deliberation, and fair application of the law on behalf of workers

and employers in the railroad and airline industries.

Nick joined the HELP Committee in 2009 under the previous ranking member, Senator MIKE ENZI of Wyoming, for whom he first served as oversight and investigations counsel before becoming director of oversight and investigations. I was fortunate that he agreed to stay when I became the Ranking Member and appreciate his service. In his role here, Nick investigated waste, fraud, and abuse in government programs and agencies, often working with agency inspectors general and the Government Accountability Office in that capacity. He also led the HELP Committee's investigations into the implementation of Federal programs and to ensure proper enforcement of Federal laws. He thoroughly evaluated and advised the HELP Committee on the President's nominees and assisted the HELP Committee's staff in policy matters and hearings.

Nick came to the HELP Committee from the U.S. Department of Labor, where he served as an attorney to the Solicitor and then as counsel to the Deputy Secretary under the leadership of Secretary Elaine L. Chao. In both those roles, he assisted the agency in implementing labor policies for the more than 180 laws under its jurisdiction and helped manage the Department's 15,000 employees. Nick also has a distinguished academic background. He graduated cum laude from Claremont McKenna College in 1996 and received a J.D. from Georgetown University Law Center in 1999.

Maybe more important than noting his worthy accomplishments in public service is to note his character and his attitude toward his work, the taxpayers he served, and the colleagues he worked alongside. Nick worked hard to ensure that every taxpayer is treated fairly. With his practical experience in labor and employment matters, litigation, and alternative dispute resolution, Nick has been an eloquent and effective help to the committee. His dedication and friendship to those he worked with, on both sides of the aisle, is a testament to the character he has and will continue to have as he transitions to this next phase of his career.

I thank him for the passionate service on behalf of the HELP Committee, the U.S. Senate, and the American taxpayer. I wish him the best in his service on the National Mediation Board.

WORLD WAR II VETERANS VISIT

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, today I wish to pay tribute to the outstanding military service of a group of incredible Coloradans. At critical times in our Nation's history, these veterans each played a role in defending the world from tyranny, truly earning their reputation as guardians

of peace and democracy through their service and sacrifice. Now, thanks to Honor Flight, these combat veterans came to Washington, DC, to visit the national memorials built to honor those who served and those who fell. They have also come to share their experiences with later generations and to pay tribute to those who gave their lives. I am proud to welcome them here, and I join with all Coloradans in thanking them for all they have done for us.

I also want to thank the volunteers from Honor Flight of Northern Colorado who made this trip possible. These volunteers are great Coloradans in their own right, and their mission to bring our veterans to Washington, DC, is truly commendable.

I wish to publicly recognize the veterans who visited our Nation's Capital, many seeing for the first time the memorials built as a tribute to their selfless service. Today, I honor these Colorado veterans on their visit to Washington, DC, and I join them in paying tribute to those who made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of liberty.

Veterans from World War II include: Donald Benson, Joe Blossom, Hobert Bodkins, Robert Beuker, George Carlson, Wayne Clausen, Maurice Dragoo, Homer Dye, Karl Easterly, James English, George Flaig, Stuart Gordon, Dale Gruber, Frank Gunter, Vern Hammond, Robert Henderson, Otto Hindman, Lawrence Jackson, John Jobson, Elvin Kahl, Doward Kilmer, Thomas Kokjer, Edward Kooper, Raymond Kusmirek, Ralph Leckler, George Lichter, Lyle Lukas, Alfred Marez, Richard Marquart, Maregito Martinez, LeRoy Marx, Hugh McGinty, Damon McMahan, Robert Minnick, Allen Oakley, Gerald Oakley, Vernon Rand, Gerald Rennels, Carol Rhoades, Elmer Rose, Donald Smith, Walter Sparrow, George Stager, Clarence Streit, Richard Tedesco, Sr., Rueben Ulrich, Howard Walter, Raymond Yost, Robert Yost, Thomas Youree, and Joseph Zito.

Veterans from the Korean War include: Charles Adams, Joseph Beaulieu, David Beldus, John Bevins, James Blue, William Cecil, Thomas Clements, Clifford Closson, Donald Dalton, Stanley Davies, Jerry Delcamp, Leonard Dickey Jr., Robert Eddy, Dale Erickson, Ann Evans, Lemuel Evans, Frank Faucett, Byron Foster, Kent Foutz, Jerry Galpern, Wayne Gibb, Thomas Gordon, Oscar Haake, Doyle Hall, William Harte, William Hitchcock, Claire Hoffman, Raymond Horton, Carl Houkom, Bennett Houston, Eugene Johnson, Richard Kekar, Marvin Kembel, Ralph Knoll, Tom Mandis, George Mason, Alvin Mosch, Doyle Myers, Richard Oversteg, David Owen, Johnnie Prock, Duane Purcell, Herbert Reimer, John Rinne, John Rust, Jr., Darrel Schafer, Leonard Schmitz, Virgil Scott, Robert Scott, Herbert Shevins, Wayne Small, Frank

Stiver, Robert Stoll, Bernard Streit, Ernest Stumpf, Walter Sutton, Norman Swanson, Arthur Trevarton, Junior Weisshaar, Raymond Williams, George Wilson and Harry Wisell.

Veterans from other conflicts include: Jerol Arguello, Zachary Dinsmore, William Frank, Allen Laible, Dennis Lee, Lonnie Sebold, Allan Silk, Saxton Wiley and Salvador Velasquez.

Our Nation asked a great deal of these individuals—to leave their families to fight in unknown lands and put their lives on the line. Each one of these brave Coloradans bravely answered the call. They served our country with courage, and in return, let us ensure they are shown the honor and appreciation they deserve. Please join me in thanking these Colorado veterans and the volunteers of Honor Flight of Northern Colorado for their tremendous service.

RECOGNIZING THE SUMMIT PROJECT

Mr. KING. Madam President, I wish to commend the Summit Project and its leader Maj. David Cote for their meaningful effort to sustain and honor the memories of Maine's veterans who have fallen since September 11, 2001. Founded on Memorial Day, 2013, the Summit Project aims to carry stone memorials representing each of those heroes up mountains in Maine beginning on Memorial Day, 2014, and continuing annually. This thoughtful endeavor is already helping Gold Star families heal and will undoubtedly preserve the memory of their loved ones as the years pass.

Maine servicemembers and their families have made monumental sacrifices during the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq. To date, 68 Mainers or members of the Armed Forces with ties to Maine have made the ultimate sacrifice during the wars in those countries. I am profoundly grateful for the service of these brave Americans and for the service of their fellow soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who continue to protect our freedom on battlefields far from home.

Preserving a living memory of our fallen heroes is especially important in my home State of Maine. As Major Cote writes on the Summit Project's Web site, "Mainers are veterans. Maine's patriotism and commitment to service in our Armed Forces is nothing short of extraordinary."

The Department of Veterans Affairs reports that 130,196 veterans live in our State, which means that nearly one in every ten Mainers is a veteran. These distinguished citizens, their families, and their friends know that, to paraphrase the words of President Kennedy, "A nation reveals itself not only by the men and women that it produces, but also by the men and women it honors,

the men and women it remembers.” The Summit Project reveals the character of Maine: a character notable for its integrity, service to others, honor, and loyalty.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RIIDE OF THE BROTHERHOOD

• Mr. VITTER. Madam President, today I wish to honor a very special organization, Ride of the Brotherhood. Established earlier this year by Air Force veteran and Louisiana native Ed Lewis, Ride of the Brotherhood, seeks to raise funds for our Nation’s veterans and children’s charities. In March 2015, the organization will hold its first major event called “The Return” to honor the 50-year anniversary of those who bravely served in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam war.

On March 8, 1965, American troops landed on China Beach and marched to Da Nang Air Force Base to secure the air base, freeing South Vietnamese troops fighting against the Viet Cong. Those 3,500 Marines were the first combat troops dispatched to support the Saigon government’s efforts to defeat the Communist insurgency.

To mark this occasion, 10 Vietnam veterans will travel on motorcycles from Louisiana to California, fly to Vietnam, and ride along the coast stopping at important locations to pay respects to those lost during the war. On March 8, 2015, the 50-year anniversary, the group intends to be at China Beach before traveling to Da Nang. Upon their return, they will ride cross-country from California to the Vietnam Memorial here in Washington, DC, before returning to New Orleans for a “Welcome Home” celebration.

“The Return” will provide closure for those veterans making the trip, and for some, their only opportunity to see the great memorials dedicated to their service. Because the entire journey will be documented, family, friends, and many others will have an opportunity to witness the experiences of the men who fought in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand. In addition, the trip will highlight the positive relations that now exist between the United States and the Vietnamese people.

I am humbled to have the opportunity to express my appreciation to Mr. Ed Lewis for his service to our country and I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring these great Americans and thanking them for their devotion to our Nation.●

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001—PM 17

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared in Proclamation 7463 with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, is to continue in effect for an additional year.

The terrorist threat that led to the declaration on September 14, 2001, of a national emergency continues. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect after September 14, 2013, the national emergency with respect to the terrorist threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 10, 2013.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:16 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2052. An act to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to conduct an interagency review of and report to Congress on ways to increase the global competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment.

H.R. 2844. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2052. An act to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to conduct an interagency review of and report to Congress on ways to increase the global competitiveness of the United

States in attracting foreign direct investment; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2844. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following measure was discharged from the Committee on Finance and referred as indicated:

S. 1427. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment:

S. 289. A bill to extend the low-interest refinancing provisions under the Local Development Business Loan Program of the Small Business Administration (Rept. No. 113-89).

S. 511. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to enhance the Small Business Investment Company Program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-90).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with amendments:

S. 537. A bill to require the Small Business Administration to make information relating to lenders making covered loans publicly available, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-91).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments and an amendment to the title:

S. 28. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest in Utah to Brigham Young University, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-92).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 155. A bill to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Denali (Rept. No. 113-93).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 159. A bill to designate the Wovoka Wilderness and provide for certain land conveyances in Lyon County, Nevada, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-94).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 255. A bill to withdraw certain Federal land and interests in that land from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and disposition under the mineral and geothermal leasing laws (Rept. No. 113-95).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 285. A bill to designate the Valles Caldera National Preserve as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-96).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 327. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with State foresters authorizing State foresters to provide certain forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration and protection services (Rept. No. 113-97).

S. 340. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-98).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 341. A bill to designate certain lands in San Miguel, Ouray, and San Juan Counties, Colorado, as wilderness, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-99).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 353. A bill to designate certain land in the State of Oregon as wilderness, to make additional wild and scenic river designations in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-100).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 360. A bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service (Rept. No. 113-101).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 486. A bill to authorize pedestrian and motorized vehicular access in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-102).

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 718. A bill to create jobs in the United States by increasing United States exports to Africa by at least 200 percent in real dollar value within 10 years, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-103).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1489. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to notify the taxpayer each time the taxpayer's information is accessed by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1490. A bill to delay the application of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1491. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to improve

United States-Israel energy cooperation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1492. A bill for the relief of Vichai Sae Tung (also known as Chai Chaowasaree); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1493. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage the use of dispensing techniques that foster efficiency and reduce wasteful dispensing of outpatient prescription drugs in long-term care facilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S.J. Res. 22. A joint resolution to promote a diplomatic solution in Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

S. Res. 221. A resolution designating the week of October 7 through October 13, 2013, as "Naturopathic Medicine Week" to recognize the value of naturopathic medicine in providing safe, effective, and affordable health care; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 119

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 150

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 150, a bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes.

S. 168

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 168, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit discrimination in the payment of wages on account of sex, race, or national origin, and for other purposes.

S. 209

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 209, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr.

BEGICH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 313, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 322

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to set the United States on track to ensure children are ready to learn when they begin kindergarten.

S. 325

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 325, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 357

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 403, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 501

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 501, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and increase the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the

consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 602

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 602, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 623, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 669

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 669, a bill to make permanent the Internal Revenue Service Free File program.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 833

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 833, a bill to amend subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to provide education for homeless children and youths, and for other purposes.

S. 915

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 915, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to update reporting requirements for institutions of higher education and provide for more accurate and complete data on student retention, graduation, and earnings outcomes at all levels of postsecondary enrollment.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1181

At the request of Mr. JOHANNES, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1181, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes.

S. 1183

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 1208

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1208, a bill to require meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide certain substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 1251, a bill to establish programs with respect to childhood, adolescent, and young adult cancer.

S. 1306

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1306, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to improve environmental literacy to better prepare students for postsecondary education and careers, and for other purposes.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1441

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1441, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate water leasing and water transfers to promote conservation and efficiency.

S. 1455

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1455, a bill to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income is operational.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1487

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1487, a bill to limit the availability of tax credits and reductions in cost-sharing under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to individuals who receive health insurance coverage pursuant to the provisions of a Taft-Hartley plan.

S. 1488

At the request of Mr. COATS, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were

added as cosponsors of S. 1488, a bill to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 128

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 128, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that supporting seniors and individuals with disabilities is an important responsibility of the United States, and that a comprehensive approach to expanding and supporting a strong home care workforce and making long-term services and supports affordable and accessible in communities is necessary to uphold the right of seniors and individuals with disabilities in the United States to a dignified quality of life.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1491. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to improve United States-Israel energy cooperation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak for a few minutes about an exciting new area of collaboration between the United States and Israel, our critical ally and friend in the Middle East. Especially given the current state of affairs in the Middle East, the United States' clear and unyielding support for Israel is more important now than ever before. For the past few years, I have been a leader in the effort to enhance U.S.-Israel collaboration on energy development, which is why I am excited today to introduce a bill that will expand this critical relationship,

along with Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI.

In December 2010, Israel made the largest natural gas discovery in the world in the past decade off its coast in the Mediterranean. The discovery, known as the Leviathan field, is estimated at 16 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, bringing Israel's total natural gas reserves to an estimated 30 trillion cubic feet. This will likely be able to satisfy Israel's domestic gas demand with enough left over to export for years to come—in fact, it is estimated that if only half of this natural gas was produced, Israel would have 100 years of its natural gas needs met.

Not only is the Leviathan discovery a game changer for Israel, both economically and geopolitically, but it is also an incredible chance for the U.S. to share our energy expertise to support a critical ally while creating economic opportunities here at home. The Gulf Coast, which provides one third of all domestically produced oil in the nation, arguably has the most advanced offshore energy industry in the world; Israel, until very recently has had almost none. With limited domestic production capacity, a non-existent regulatory framework, and a lack of related academic programs, Israel can greatly benefit from collaboration with the U.S., and we are uniquely qualified to lead this effort to help Israel successfully develop this natural resource. As Israel is a leader in the research and development, hi-tech and startup spaces, enhanced collaboration between the two countries can be mutually beneficial.

The United States-Israel Energy Cooperation Enhancement Bill recognizes the important relationship and potential for further collaboration between the United States and Israel on energy development, including natural gas and alternative fuels, and seeks to bolster that relationship by encouraging increased cooperation in the academic, business, governmental, and other sectors.

The bill first recognizes energy collaboration with Israel as a strategic interest of the United States and officially encourages collaboration between the U.S. National Science Foundation and the Israel Science Foundation. It then further encourages cooperation between both countries' academic communities in energy innovation technology, technology transfer, and analysis of the geopolitical implications of new natural resource development. It also urges business development engagement in the private sectors and regular engagement between the two countries' relevant agencies, departments and ministries to share best practices.

Additionally, the United States-Israel Energy Cooperation Enhancement Bill expands two already existing joint grant making programs, the Bi-

national Industrial Research and Development Program, BIRD, and the Binational Science Foundation, BSF. Under the bill, these two programs would now include projects focused on natural gas, which are expected given Israel's recent discoveries, as well as entrepreneurial development and the advanced hi-tech sector. The legislation also reauthorizes the BIRD and BSF programs through fiscal year 2024.

Finally, the bill allows for the authorization of a United States-Israel Offshore Technology Center to further academic and technology research and development collaboration. This is the direct result of numerous conversations, meetings, and visits I have had over the past few years, and I am especially excited about the potential of this type of formal academic collaboration. Israeli universities have some of the world's leading engineering departments, but have no petroleum engineering faculty. Imagine the synergy if we could combine Israeli engineering expertise with our universities, who have the leading petroleum engineering departments in the world.

This bill builds off of my previous efforts to enhance collaboration between the United States and Israel on energy development and exploration. For several years, I have been working to strengthen the relationship between our two countries and to help our domestic energy industry. In October 2011, with the help of the Department of Commerce and the Southwest Louisiana Economic Development Alliance, I organized the first ever oil and gas trade mission to Israel and brought 12 Louisiana oil and gas companies to the region. The mission was such a success that the Department of Commerce and I ran another trip in October 2012 that brought 15 American companies and universities. Additionally, in June of 2012, I hosted a delegation of 10 high-ranking Israeli officials in Washington and Louisiana to meet with US industry experts and federal officials, including then Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar. The delegation also attended the Central Gulf of Mexico oil and gas lease sale in New Orleans and visited Port Fourchon and the Liquefied Natural Gas, LNG, facility in Cameron Parish. By seeing our work first-hand and learning about the US regulatory framework, they left with a keener understanding of our industry.

The United States-Israel Energy Cooperation Enhancement Bill will continue to advance this important goal. Through energy collaboration, academic cooperation, and continued government dialogue, we will create jobs for our domestic oil and gas industry and support a critical ally in the Middle East in its quest for energy independence and security. I thank my colleagues Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI for their leadership on this issue and for cosponsoring

the bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1491

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENERGY CO-OPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 917(a) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “renewable” and inserting “covered”;

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking “possible many” and inserting “possible—

“(A) many”;

(B) by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) significant contributions to the development of renewable energy and energy efficiency through the established programs of the United States-Israel Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation and the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation;”;

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking “renewable” and inserting “covered”; and

(B) by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(4) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking “renewable” and inserting “covered”; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) United States-Israel energy cooperation, and the development of natural resources by Israel, are strategic interests of the United States;

“(9) Israel is a strategic partner of the United States in water technology;

“(10) the United States can play a role in assisting Israel with regional safety and security issues;

“(11) the National Science Foundation of the United States should collaborate with the Israel Science Foundation;

“(12) the United States and Israel should strive to develop more robust academic cooperation in energy innovation technology and engineering, water science, technology transfer, and analysis of geopolitical implications of new natural resource development and associated areas;

“(13) the United States supports the goals of the Alternative Fuels Administration of Israel;

“(14) the United States strongly urges open dialogue and continued mechanisms for regular engagement and encourages further cooperation between applicable departments, agencies, ministries, institutions of higher education, and the private sector of the United States and Israel on energy security issues, including—

“(A) identifying policy priorities associated with the development of natural resources of Israel;

“(B) discussing best practices to secure cyber energy infrastructure;

“(C) best practice sharing;

“(D) leveraging natural gas to positively impact regional stability;

“(E) improving energy efficiency and the overall performance of water technologies through research and development in water desalination, wastewater treatment and reclamation, and other water treatment refineries;

“(F) technical and environmental management of deep-water exploration and production;

“(G) coastal protection and restoration;

“(H) academic outreach and engagement;

“(I) private sector and business development engagement;

“(J) regulatory consultations;

“(K) leveraging alternative transportation fuels and technologies; and

“(L) any other areas determined appropriate by United States and Israel; and

“(15) the United States acknowledges the achievements and importance of the Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation (BIRD) and the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF) and supports continued multiyear funding to ensure the continuity of the programs of the Foundations.”.

(b) TYPES OF ENERGY.—Section 917(b)(2) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) natural gas energy, including natural gas projects conducted by or in conjunction with the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation;

“(I) improvement of energy efficiency and the overall performance of water technologies through research and development in water desalination, wastewater treatment and reclamation, and other water treatment refineries; and

“(J) conventional and unconventional oil and gas technologies.”.

(c) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—Section 917(b)(3) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(b)(3)) is amended by striking “energy efficiency or renewable” and inserting “covered”.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS.—Section 917 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d);

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, subject to appropriations, enter into cooperative agreements supporting and enhancing dialogue and planning involving international partnerships between the Department, including National Laboratories of the Department, and the Government of Israel and its ministries, offices, and institutions.

“(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Secretary may not pay more than 50 percent of Federal share of the costs described in paragraph (1).

“(3) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary may submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an annual report that describes—

“(A) actions taken to carry out this subsection; and

“(B) any projects under this subsection for which the Secretary requests funding.

“(d) UNITED STATES-ISRAEL CENTER.—The Secretary may establish a joint United States-Israel Center based in an area of the United States with the experience, knowl-

edge, and expertise in offshore energy development to further dialogue and collaboration to develop more robust academic cooperation in energy innovation technology and engineering, water science, technology transfer, and analysis of geopolitical implications of new natural resource development and associated areas.”.

(e) TERMINATION.—Subsection (e) of section 917 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337) (as redesignated by subsection (d)(2)) is amended by striking “the date that is 7 years after the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “September 30, 2024”.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S.J. Res. 22. A joint resolution to promote a diplomatic solution in Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, approximately 9 days ago most of us were on call and being briefed by the administration on what was evolving and how desperate and dire the situation was. At the time it was being proposed as an imminent strike that had to be done for the defense of this Nation, and we listened to that.

Immediately after that conversation we had with many Senators and Secretary Kerry, my dear friend Senator HEITKAMP called me and said: I would hope we have another option. We were looking for an option. The only thing we had before us was a vote to either support an imminent strike or not support a strike. It has been proposed if we don't show the strength of this great country of ours that it could weaken our standing in the world and our intentions might not be taken seriously the next time and also weaken the Presidency, which none of us want to do, no matter what side of the fence you might be on.

So we kept looking and talking. I canceled all my appointments in West Virginia and Senator HEITKAMP did the same in North Dakota and we came back as soon as possible. We attended every meeting, every briefing. I went to my Armed Services Committee meeting and also the Foreign Relations Committee meeting to hear the testimony from all of the people in the administration who were making their case.

At the end of the day, it still did not rise to the level, in my mind and I think in the mind of Senator HEITKAMP as well, that we were at a point to where it would be of imminent danger to the United States. So with that, we brought all the people together, and Senator HEITKAMP—and I want her to chime in here—and myself kept pushing and pushing the people who had the knowledge and who had been down that road before—military leaders, past and present, diplomats, and also think tanks—and we finally came up with something that could be done.

I would defer to Senator HEITKAMP on this, but we kept saying if the problem

is chemical weapons, why haven't we addressed that? All we knew was there was an imminent strike. We were not going to be able to take out, nor did we intend to take out or change the regime. We could not put boots on the ground, nor did we have a desire—nobody had a desire—for our military men and women to go back in. So we couldn't secure those weapons.

Senator HEITKAMP might want to say how we came to the position we came to and why we felt it was so important.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I think the first thing to talk about is the ability, first and foremost, to look at the mission and look at the event that led to the need for a discussion in this body and a discussion in this country about our relationship in Syria, and that was the use of chemical weapons by the Asad regime in their own home country against their own people.

We know that activity is not only a crime against the Syrian people, but it is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against an international standard that has been in place since World War I and has been greatly honored because of the devastating effects of using chemical weapons.

So when Senator MANCHIN and I looked at this—and we had long discussions with experts in the region—our first concern was securing those chemical weapons and what we could do to make sure those weapons would never again be used on any citizen of Syria and that we would not encourage or in any way give permission to another country to engage in that activity. That is fundamentally the greatest interest we have in securing some kind of resolution in the Congress—to address that concern.

Unfortunately, what we saw was not a targeted resolution that addressed that specific problem. Plus, what we were presented with when we returned were two options: Do nothing, which both of us concluded we could not let an attack such as this go unresponded to. So do nothing or agree to imminent strikes, and that was not an option either of us saw as appropriate, nor was that an option we could agree to, so we looked for common ground, listening not only to the experts in the administration—the diplomats, the military experts, the national security folks—but also bringing a broader group of people together to discuss what is our mission, how do we accomplish this. The result of all of that is the resolution the Senator has before him, the resolution he and I have advanced for a discussion in this body.

It seems critical to me that 1 week ago the interjecting of the chemical weapons ban and the Chemical Weapons Convention into this discussion in a very meaningful way, looking at what is in fact international law, was absolutely critical. Today, we have a very fluid and much different land-

scape diplomatically. We would like to think these kinds of discussions that have occurred all across the country have driven this, along with the President's discussion with Putin, along with the administration's efforts.

So today we have a situation where we are glad to see some involvement, we are glad to see some movement, but it is absolutely critical we remind everyone that actions speak louder than words. We cannot trust, I don't think, agreements between Russia or Syria until we actually see Syria surrendering these weapons. But today we have an option on the table that is what we call the Manchin-Heitkamp alternative resolution, which can in fact engage us in a broader discussion, engage the international community.

I would say that truly was the motivation behind our work. I think the Senator would agree with that.

Mr. MANCHIN. I sure do. First of all, we all applaud President Obama for bringing it to Congress. We think this is the right place for these types of decisions, with the consequences we are facing and what the repercussions could be. But we have come to a conclusion that any type of imminent strike and the reaction from that would be greater than inaction right now. But doing nothing is unacceptable, which is how we came to this.

Basically, we call this the Chemical Weapons Control Act. The thing about the Chemical Weapons Convention, we felt—and we have heard from diplomats on this—this was the proper course. It was basically giving the Asad regime 45 days. Our resolution is very straightforward. The Asad regime has 45 days to sign and comply, and that means to identify, to secure, and to start eliminating and destroying. He cannot use, nor can he continue to produce, these types of weapons.

Also, in that 45-day period, we have asked the administration and the President to lay forth a plan for Congress to evaluate what Syria would look like at the end. If they do not sign, what are we to do and how would Syria look? If they do sign and that still hasn't brought any peace and an end to a civil war, that needs to be looked at also.

We have all heard from our constituents. In talking to our colleagues we have even heard a lot more. We have had some who have said: Listen, we don't want a strike under any circumstances. No way on God's green Earth do we believe a strike will produce anything but repercussions.

I have said this, and the Senator and I have talked about this: If you believe that money or military might would change the course and direction of that part of the world, which we define as the Middle East or North Africa, then we would have had success by now. We have spent 12 years—the longest war in our history—and we have spent over

\$1.6 trillion and the results have not been beneficial whatsoever and we have lost thousands of lives.

I have also said being a superpower means more than showing the rest of the world we have the super might to use whenever we feel it is necessary. Being a superpower comes with not only having the super military power, it comes with having the super negotiation ability, the super diplomacy, the super patience, and the super humanitarian aid, as needed. We have the ability to do all of that.

That is what we have asked for. Now we are seeing an evolving situation—not only in 24 hours, but with every 24 minutes it seems like something is changing. The Russians have said they would ask Asad's regime in Syria to sign or be involved. Syria says they have accepted. We have heard now they have said they will comply and join the CWC. These are the changes we have to continue to try to bring to fruition.

On that, we are very happy. I know the Senator and I have spoken about that—and our colleagues are looking at different options—that we didn't have different options as of Monday morning. There were no options. It was are you going to vote to strike or not vote to strike. I am pleased we are moving and I think cooler heads will prevail.

I believe the President is open to making sure the players are sincere and real, meaning what they are saying. I believe now that they have announced to the entire world, the international world, that we will sign and be honest brokers, let's put them on the spot and see if they will sign that and be part of this and become part of the 21st century, if you will.

I have and I will continue to work with my colleague. I think the Geneva Protocol of 1925 prohibits the use of chemical and biological weapons in conflict, but it did not go far enough. We know that. Syria signed the Geneva Protocol in December of 1969. They signed that one, but then they would not and have not been a signatory of the Chemical Weapons Convention of 1993. That is what we are speaking of. That one is the modern-day equivalent of the Geneva Protocol. The international community began negotiating the CWC in 1980 to close the loopholes of the Geneva Protocol. The CWC opened for signature in 1963 and after the required 65 ratifications were received, entered into force in 1997. We have, I think, five countries that have not signed. Most countries, 191, have signed. That is what we are asking for them to comply with, which we think is the best way, because there is an implementation organization which oversees it and it is not the United States or Russia or not any other country taking the lead but basically it is a way to have the entire international community come back into play.

Ms. HEITKAMP. To add another point to what Senator MANCHIN has

spoken about, which is that the results have not been satisfactory—I think the other point we need to make is the results of all that interaction over this decade-plus of activity in this region have not been what was promised. It has made the American people perhaps cynical and very hesitant to rely on what is being said today.

As one of the great honors, but also amazing pieces of sadness in my first days of being a Senator-elect, I attended two funerals for two National Guardsmen who were killed in action in Afghanistan. I remember sitting at the funerals and remember telling myself: Before you vote ever to engage in that kind of conflict, you absolutely need to look at alternatives. You owe it to our men and women in uniform. You owe it to the people of this country who have lost not only the lives of their brothers and sisters and family and friends but the people who have also invested American treasure.

What we are seeking is a discussion, a broader discussion beyond two opposite and unacceptable alternatives. What we are seeing this week—much to our appreciation—is in fact not just our proposal but other proposals coming forth, a broader discussion about what all the options are, and taking a look at how we can work together as a United States government, speak with one voice, and walk together to resolve this conflict.

We cannot ignore that we have a national security interest in working together. We have a national security interest in addressing and resolving the current issues in front of us. That discussion cannot be done among a small group of Senators. It cannot be done in back rooms with a promise of “trust us,” because some of that trust has been broken over time. So a broad, open discussion as we are having here today I think is absolutely critical to reestablishing Americans’ trust that we can in fact make the right decision in their interests and really in the interests of protecting our servicemen from chemical weapon attacks.

That is obviously a great concern of ours. We need to continue to have this dialog and we need some kind of response. The question is how measured and what that response should be.

I have very much appreciated the Senator’s willingness to work with me and I thank the rest of the Members who have approached us who want to talk about this proposal and other proposals for their willingness to broaden their thinking about what those options are.

Mr. MANCHIN. I am so proud to be working on this with the Senator. Our staffs have worked well together. They are most competent and they have done a yeoman job. The resolution we have come with basically is the only one out there, an option today that basically controls the chemical weapons.

It actually controls these chemical weapons from ever being used on another human being—which we all deplore. With that, maybe we can help, now, move on to trying to help resolve this civil war. The carnage is unbelievable.

They said there were 99,000 people killed in Syria with conventional weapons and 1,000 with chemicals. To me, every person is a life we could save, we ought to try to save. With that being said, we have to give them a chance to come be involved, and that is what we have done.

At this time last week we never thought we would have been here. This time 2 days ago we would not have thought we could be here. But we are moving in the right direction.

Let me make it clear what the resolution the Senator and our staffs have worked on does. The section, our title, is this, basically:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

The section of our coining, this section of our title

... may be cited as the “Chemical Weapons Control and Accountability Resolution of 2013.”

Basically exactly what it says. The statement of policy is this:

It is the policy of the United States that (1) the Government of Syria must become a signatory to the Chemical Weapons Convention and take concrete steps to comply with the terms and conditions of the Convention;

(2) the failure by the government of Bashar al-Assad to sign and comply with the Convention clearly demonstrates a willful disregard of international norms on the use of chemical weapons; and

(3) if the Government of Syria does not sign and comply with the convention within 45 days after the date of the enactment of this resolution, all elements of national power will be considered by the United States Government.

That reaffirms the war powers the President has. I know there are some who do not believe that is constitutional or do not believe it is law, but we have checked it and researched it, and it is. We reconfirm that. It does not say that imminent strikes will happen at the end of 45 days. It will be up to the President to determine whether negotiations are moving in the right direction, if all players are being sincere in coming on board, but it gives him the chance to be the President, to do whatever he is elected to do. Whomever he or she may be, you want the President’s office to be able to exercise the powers they have by law. That is what we have done here.

Everybody has a different approach. Some may say 45 days or you don’t need that. Fine. We are open to all that. We have said that before. But the experts who helped us put this together put in timetables they believed were reasonable and believed they were attainable.

Ms. HEITKAMP. There are some who may question whether this is capitulation or whether in fact this is a lack of showing of American unity. How would the Senator respond to those concerns?

Mr. MANCHIN. We have heard our colleagues and had some good conversations with our colleagues. We have had other people saying for real, all you are doing is trying to stall.

I said no. I don’t believe anyone really questions the might of the government. I don’t think it weakens the U.S. Government, to show super restraint, knowing the volatility of that part of the world.

Also, past experience in my State of West Virginia—and I know in the great State of North Dakota—we know when you try something and put in so much effort trying to change that part of the world and have not had the success, nowhere near, and spent \$1.6 trillion and the sacrifice of Americans—maybe that is not something we should repeat. We all know that. We get no support basically from our constituents.

Those of us who are privy to all these high-powered meetings, if you will, have not been convinced that there will be change. With that being said, I say to my friends, if you believe anyone would discount the might of this Nation? I don’t think so. The resolve of us to protect our country and our Americans? I don’t think so. Or to support our allies, our true friends and allies? I don’t think so.

But you know, back home we have a saying: Sometimes you don’t have a dog in the fight. We can’t really find a friend in that fight. That is the problem. That is the hard sell. With that being said—I have said this before—the Arab League, they should step forward. That is in their backyard. We should give all the support. We have humanitarian aid. We will give all the support we possibly can, but they need to take the lead. It cannot always be the Americans being the policemen of the world and everyone saying: OK, call 911, which goes right to Washington. They will take care of it.

I discount it when they start saying it doesn’t show your strength, we might not have that strength of reputation or it might weaken the President. No, I don’t think so. Not at all.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I think what we would say to the enemies of this country: Do not take from this democratic process and discussion a lack of resolve. We will stand together shoulder to shoulder. This is the process the Constitution gave us and the President has asked us to engage in. It shows the strength of this country, that we can have open debate, open disagreements, but at the end of the day we will stand together and stand strongly against our enemies. There should be no comfort taken in any way, shape, or form by the enemies of our country that it somehow weakens our country. In fact

it strengthens our country to have this discussion and then stand shoulder to shoulder together.

I do want to mention that during those times last week when we were attending the classified briefings, and a lot of those briefings were bicameral as well as bipartisan—I know we have that reputation today of being hyperpartisan and we cannot have meaningful and open discussion, it degenerates into pettiness and partisanship. I can tell you from my experience of sitting through every one of those briefings what I heard was reasoned discussion. What I heard was rational questioning. What I heard was an equal measure of restraint on both the Democrat and the Republican side and a search for common answers and commonality. It was that discussion that led us to introducing this type of resolution.

For those who say this is just another example of dysfunctionality, it is too bad they could not look in at those discussions because I think they would have seen a Congress that was very engaged. They would have seen individual Members who were not looking to score political points but were looking for information so they could exercise the judgment that their people, their districts, or their States elected them to exercise.

That is the process going through. It is a critical process but it cannot be done yes or no, no other options, and we are not going to have a broader discussion. That is why we are grateful for what is happening on the ground. We will wait to see if it is real. We will wait to see. It is not enough—talk is never enough. We have to see action.

But in the meantime we will continue to have these discussions about what is in America's national security interests and how we exercise our collective will with a resolution that reflects our values and our commitment to this country and its national security.

Mr. MANCHIN. I believe that as the world watches what is unfolding now, they are watching a superpower make a decision. We are using super restraint. We are using super compassion, if you will. But we are super resolved and we have the super might to do what we need to do. I don't think anyone should take that lightly.

I do not think anyone would take for granted that we will not defend this country and every citizen of this country with everything we have and try to spread humanity, if you will, all over the world. But it takes more than us as we move outside the borders of the United States of America. We need an international community working with us. We need some of them stepping to the plate; not just the rhetoric that we hear but basic stuff. We need the United Nations to be functioning again, to have a functioning role and

have a strong support role and be able to step to the plate and do it in a fashion that protects the civilized world. Those are the things we have asked for.

I think this gives it a chance. Today we have seen a breakthrough, if President Asad has said: I will sign and I will be a member and I will comply and I will have inspectors come in and I will make sure these weapons are secure and we will start destroying them, taking them off the shelf. Russia can play a part in that. They can pull their ships up, load them up, take them out, take them to a secured area. That is getting them out of that part of the world, and then hopefully we can get people working together to stop the war we have, to stop the carnage, too.

It starts here. People are looking to the United States and I think they have been looking for the leadership we have been able to give, not just in the military and not just in financial, but in some good, solid, concrete decisions that bring this suffering that is going on in Syria to an end.

I am very proud to work with the Senator from North Dakota on this issue. We are asking all of our colleagues to be involved in any way, shape, or form. We will work with them. If there is anyone who has ideas that can make this better and an even more perfect document, then we are all for that. I know the Senator from North Dakota feels that way, and I know her team feels that way also.

I thank Senator HEITKAMP for the work she has done and also the friend she has been. I believe we are close to getting this in the right direction where cooler heads prevail, and I think the world will be safer.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for the work he has done and the leadership he has shown. I believe that when we work together, collaborate, and actually begin the discussion about what is in America's national security interest and how we can fashion a position and a resolution that reflects that national security interest and open the opportunity for a broader dialog—not just two choices but a broader dialog—we can build consensus in this body. If we can build consensus in this body and if we can work forward to build consensus in America, we can, in fact, move this issue forward, and it might be an example of what we can do with our future.

Again, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his participation, inclusion, and the work he has done. I believe it has not only offered a very significant alternative, but it has also set an example of where we can go.

Mr. MANCHIN. I don't believe military action is going to correct what is going on with Syria. It is going to be diplomacy and democracy that will hopefully work there. We are trying to put that forward first. More people are coming on board, and we appreciate

that. We thank all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

This is not a partisan issue. It truly has not been a partisan issue, and it won't be a partisan issue. This is an American issue that involves all of us, and it is a world issue. The world has great interest, but they also have to have participation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 221—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 7 THROUGH OCTOBER 13, 2013, AS “NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE WEEK” TO RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE IN PROVIDING SAFE, EFFECTIVE, AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE

Ms. MIKULSKI submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 221

Whereas, in the United States, more than 75 percent of health care costs are due to preventable chronic illnesses, including high blood pressure, which affects 88,000,000 people in the United States, and diabetes, which affects 26,000,000 people in the United States;

Whereas nearly two-thirds of adults in the United States are overweight or obese and, consequently, at risk for serious health conditions, such as high blood pressure, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, arthritis, and depression;

Whereas 70 percent of people in the United States experience physical or nonphysical symptoms of stress, and stress can contribute to the development of major illnesses, such as cardiovascular disease, depression, and diabetes;

Whereas the aforementioned chronic health conditions are among the most common, costly, and preventable health conditions;

Whereas naturopathic medicine provides noninvasive, holistic treatments that support the inherent self-healing capacity of the human body and encourage self-responsibility in health care;

Whereas naturopathic medicine focuses on patient-centered care, the prevention of chronic illnesses, and early intervention in the treatment of chronic illnesses;

Whereas naturopathic physicians attend 4-year, graduate level programs that are accredited by agencies approved by the Department of Education;

Whereas aspects of naturopathic medicine have been shown to lower the risk of major illnesses such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes;

Whereas naturopathic physicians can help address the shortage of primary care providers in the United States;

Whereas naturopathic physicians are trained to refer patients to conventional physicians and specialists when necessary;

Whereas the profession of naturopathic medicine is dedicated to providing health care to underserved populations; and

Whereas naturopathic medicine provides consumers in the United States with more choice in health care, in line with the increased use of a variety of integrative medical treatments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 7 through October 13, 2013, as "Naturopathic Medicine Week";

(2) recognizes the value of naturopathic medicine in providing safe, effective, and affordable health care; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to learn about naturopathic medicine and the role that naturopathic physicians play in preventing chronic and debilitating illnesses and conditions.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1850. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1851. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1850. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:
SEC. 4. NATURAL GAS VEHICLES.

(a) MAXIMUM FUEL ECONOMY INCREASE FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL AUTOMOBILES.—Section 32906(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "(except an electric automobile)" and inserting "(except an electric or natural gas automobile)".

(b) AUTOMOBILE FUEL ECONOMY DEFINITIONS.—Section 32901(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by inserting ", but the inclusion of a reserve gasoline tank for incidental or emergency use in the event of alternative fuel depletion shall not detract from the dedicated nature of the automobile" before the period at the end; and

(2) in paragraph (9)(B), by striking "provides equal or superior energy efficiency" and inserting "provides reasonably comparable energy efficiency".

(c) MINIMUM DRIVING RANGES FOR DUAL FUELED PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES.—Section 32901(c)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking "(except electric automobiles)" and inserting "(except electric or natural gas automobiles)"; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking "(except electric automobiles)" each place it appears and inserting "(except electric or natural gas automobiles)".

(d) MANUFACTURING PROVISION FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL AUTOMOBILES.—Section 32905(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

"(1) the percentage utilization of the model on gasoline or diesel fuel, as determined by a formula based on the model's alternative fuel range, divided by the fuel economy measured under section 32904(c); and

"(2) the percentage utilization of the model on gaseous fuel, as determined by a formula based on the model's alternative fuel range, divided by the fuel economy measured under subsection (c)."

SA 1851. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 30. FEDERAL PURCHASE REQUIREMENT.
Section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The term 'renewable energy' means electric or thermal energy, generated from or avoided by solar, wind, biomass, landfill gas, ocean (including tidal, wave, current, and thermal), geothermal (including ground source, reclaimed water, or ground water), municipal solid waste, or new hydroelectric generation capacity achieved from increased efficiency or additions of new capacity at an existing hydroelectric project."; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking "For purposes" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) SEPARATE CALCULATION.—For purposes of determining compliance with the requirements of this section, any energy consumption that is avoided through the use of renewable energy shall be considered to be renewable energy produced."

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Conflicts between State and Federal Marijuana Laws."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013, at 10:15 a.m. in room SD-650 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY AND THE COURTS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Federal Judgeship Act of 2013."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, let me announce now, we had an all-Senators briefing scheduled for 2:30 tomorrow. We are not going to do that. I have just spoken to the President's Chief of Staff. There are too many things moving. There are a lot of moving targets here. I think it will be better for the Senate if we do not have that briefing tomorrow.

There are a lot of things going on. We have had many briefings. We have had committee hearings. But tomorrow I think to have this with what is going on—it is my understanding the Secretary of State is going to be in Geneva to meet with his Russian counterpart. So there are a lot of things going on. I think the briefing tomorrow would be very premature with all of the, as I said before, moving targets.

So everyone should know that the 2:30 all-Senators briefing will not occur. So everyone knows the schedule a little bit tomorrow.

NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE WEEK

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 221.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 221) designating the week of October 7 through October 13, 2013 as "Naturopathic Medicine Week" to recognize the value of naturopathic medicine in providing safe, effective, and affordable health care.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 221) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL— S. 1427

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 1427 and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, September 11, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following the prayer and pledge, there be a moment of silence to pay tribute to the thousands of Americans whose lives were taken on September 11, 2001. Of course, there were other casualties. Some people are still suffering the ravages of that sinister attack; that following any leader remarks, the time until 2:30 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. In addition to the moment of silence at 10 a.m., there will be a bipartisan, bicameral remembrance ceremony of the 12th anniversary of the September 11, 2001, attacks at 11 a.m. tomorrow. Members will gather in the Rotunda at 10:45 a.m. Senators will gather in the Rotunda, but then they will walk out and we will have a few speeches on the east front of the Capitol.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:22 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, September 11, 2013, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 10, 2013:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

MARILYN A. BROWN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, September 10, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 10, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Congress returns to Washington this week after a month connecting with people at home, hopefully with a little time with family and friends.

Some think our overwhelming agenda was made nearly impossible with the Syrian question, which no one expected when we recessed—somewhat ironic—even though 100,000 Syrians have been killed and 2 million refugees are flooding into neighboring countries.

We face a looming budget showdown and a debt ceiling crisis. While we have futile votes to defund ObamaCare, the rest of the country is in the midst of a dramatic change in health care, perhaps the most profound in half a century. The health care reform train has left the station.

What if we took a break from sabotaging ObamaCare and creating a debt ceiling crisis to do our job as representatives of the people and as leaders?

What are we for?

We might start with Syria. I have deep reservations about the use of force, but as one of the people who called upon the President to involve Congress in this decision, I think we have an obligation to at least hear him out. Let's work to refine the Russian proposal, which appears to have had some American origins.

What about the 2 million refugees who need our help, to say nothing of their host countries?

Let's seize upon some of the promising signs out of Iran, from their new leadership, to make progress, both in Syria and with the Iranian nuclear question.

Domestically, let's spend our time rebuilding and renewing America, not just lamenting the poor shape of our infrastructure. Let's work together to support the vision and the resources to rebuild and renew the country and put Americans back to work.

Internationally—I see my good friend and colleague, Congressman TED POE, on the floor. Why don't we zero in on the efforts with our international Water for the World legislation to help deal with sanitation and safe drinking water for poor people around the globe?

Think about those 200 million hours women will spend in sub-Saharan Africa gathering water today, time that they won't spend in school or working for their families.

Let's use the fall to identify and move forward on the vast array of things where we actually agree we can work together and they won't cost very much. America will be the better for it, and so will Congress.

THE WAR ON SYRIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, Russia's diplomatic intervention in the Syrian crisis is indeed welcome news. But whether it is real or illusory, the President needs to step back from the dangerous precipice that he has brought us to.

Certainly, he's made his case for war with Syria very clearly, that the United States must punish the use of chemical weapons, and if we don't, they're more likely to be used again. He assures us that the strike will be limited and that it will aid moderates fighting the regime. He warns that American credibility is at stake. The case is quite clear: it is simply not convincing.

It's possible that an attack on Syria will convince Assad not to use chemical weapons in the future. But it is just as likely to convince him that, being in for a penny, he might as well be in for a pound and unleash his entire chemical arsenal.

It is just as likely that an American strike on Syria will produce a retaliatory strike, possibly by Hezbollah against Israel, requiring a retaliatory strike by Israel, possibly on Iran, in a catastrophic chain reaction.

We don't know where it will lead, but we can be sure that the morning after the attack we would confront a most uncomfortable irony. In retaliation for Assad killing Syrian civilians with chemical weapons, the United States will have killed Syrian civilians with conventional weapons, for civilian casualties are an unavoidable tragedy of war.

Well, who would be our new allies in this war?

They'd be the Islamic forces that are responsible for their own litany of atrocities, including the massacre of Syrian Christians, the beheading of political opponents, summary executions of war prisoners and acts of barbarity too depraved to be discussed in this forum. We would be aiding and abetting those forces.

We're told that al Qaeda's not more than a fourth of our new coalition and that the rest are moderates. Well, we were told the same thing about Libya. We were told the same thing about the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt.

The problem with moderates in the Middle East is that there aren't very many of them, and they're quickly overwhelmed in any coalition they attempt.

Nor can such an attack be limited in duration or scope. The fact is, once you have attacked another country, you are at war with that country and its allies, whatever you wish to call it, and whatever you later decide to do.

And wars have a very nasty way of taking turns that no one can predict or control. World War I began with a series of obscure incidents that quickly escalated into world war. And the Middle East today is a veritable powder keg compared to the antebellum Europe of a century ago.

Finally, we're told American credibility is on the line. Well, chemical weapons are barbaric, but this isn't the first time they've been used in modern times. They were used previously in Syria, in the Yemeni civil war, by Iraq against Iran, by the Vietnamese

against the Cambodians, by Libya against Chad.

The only unique thing about this incident is that it is the first time an American President has declared their use to be a "red line." Our credibility was harmed by a foolish and reckless statement by the President. Let us not further damage it with a foolish and reckless act by Congress.

Wars are not something to be taken lightly. From the podium right behind me, General MacArthur warned that, "In war there is no substitute for victory."

If you're going to start a war, you'd better be prepared to put the entire resources of the country behind it, to endure every setback along the way, to utterly annihilate every vestige of the enemy, and to install, by force, a government of our design and choosing, and to maintain that government until all opposition is ceased. If you are not willing to do that, then you have no business firing the first shot.

More than a decade of irresolute and aimless wars in Iraq and Afghanistan should have taught us this lesson: that victory, and not stalemate, must be the objective of any war. Yet, this would be a war whose avowed objective is stalemate. That is self-defeating. It is immoral.

The President has already made his case very clearly, and he is very clearly wrong.

THE SYRIAN CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank President Obama for his considered judgment in the matter of Syria, and for not headstrong rushing the United States to military action.

I thank him for his consultations with Members of Congress in both Chambers, and for allowing the American people time to express their views. We must all weigh the consequences and repercussions of unilateral U.S. action.

As the world's greatest military power, we must employ our power wisely, and only with good measure. I have every confidence that our U.S. military can perform any task to which they are ordered successfully, and we owe them our deepest respect and gratitude.

I also want to thank and acknowledge the government of Russia for early reports we are learning about regarding discussions under way to rid Syria of weapons caches of danger both to Syria as well as our global community.

Both Russia and the United States, as the world's premier nuclear powers, hold awesome responsibilities to move our world to a more peaceful and stable posture. Surely, we must focus that effort on the very unstable set of states across the Middle East.

Russia and our country both have suffered from terrorist attacks and well understand the consequences of unresolved conflict and terrorists preying on unstable states.

My hope is that the Russian initiative gains momentum. And let all nations of goodwill on our globe find a way forward to address the tragic consequences of the Syrian civil war, starting with greater humanitarian assistance to refugees that have flowed into adjoining nations like Jordan and Lebanon and Turkey, straining some of those nations' abilities to even hold their own internal affairs together.

Surely, our world can better address the human suffering that is evident to anyone who's paying attention. Surely, surely, all reasonable world leaders can find a better way forward for Syria and for us all.

THE NOBEL PEACE PRIZE PRESIDENT BEATS THE DRUMS FOR WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the drums of war are being beaten by the President who, ironically, won the Nobel Peace Prize. The "Peace President" wants to fire missiles into Syria because tyrant Assad is violating the rules of war by allegedly using chemical weapons. The President's goal is not to remove Assad, not to destroy the chemical weapons, but to send Assad a message.

To be clear, there is no imminent national security threat or interest for the United States by us starting this war. And make no mistake, shooting rockets into another country is an act of war.

War has consequences. What if the outlaw Assad chooses then to use chemical weapons again or chooses to shoot back? He could retaliate against the United States, one of our embassies, the Navy that fired the rockets, or other U.S. military installations, or even specific troops, or retaliate against his neighbor, Turkey, or Israel, using our aggression as an excuse. In any of these situations, this limited war escalates with more U.S. response, intervention, and involvement.

Now, who are the players in this war that is taking place already? On one side you have Syria, tyrant Assad, with the aid of Russia, with the aid of Iran that news reports say has 10,000 Iranian troops in Syria, and Hezbollah. Hezbollah, as you remember, Madam Speaker, is a terrorist group.

Then, on the other side, you have the Free Syrian Army. You have patriots. You have mercenaries, paid soldiers from other countries. You have criminals that have come in to just pillage the land and use this as an opportunity. You also have al Nusra, an al

Qaeda affiliate. You also have al Qaeda from Iraq. Now, last time I recall, the United States is already at war with al Qaeda. They are the enemy of the United States.

□ 1015

And it looks like now you've got the terrorist group Hezbollah on one side and the terrorist group al Qaeda on the other side. And we want to get involved in this civil religious war to send a message not to use chemical weapons?

Of course, you not only just have these players, but you've got Turkey, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Qatar lined up on the side of the Free Syrian Army. Turkey is a next-door neighbor to Syria. A year ago, a Turkish F-4 built by the United States was flying along the Syrian border, and it was shot down. We don't know who shot it down.

Meanwhile, the United States already has, along with its NATO parties, patriot batteries on the Syrian border facing Syria that are in Turkey. The Dutch, the Germans, and the Americans have manned those batteries. Why? To make sure that our NATO ally is protected from incoming rockets. If we escalate this regional conflict in one country, it may escalate to other regions, like Turkey. Then we've got real issues because Turkey is a NATO ally. We are obligated to help them if they get into a war with Syria.

And then about the terrorists. As I mentioned, they are really on both sides. And we hear from the administration, with all due respect, that the minority of fighters on the rebel side are al Qaeda. I respectfully disagree with the Secretary of State. What seems to be happening is the Free Syrian Army is going through Syria liberating Syrians, and al Qaeda is in the background, coming in and occupying the territory and imposing strict Islamic sharia law. We can see this play out. If the rebels eventually are successful, then we may have a second civil war between the Free Syrian Army and al Qaeda.

All of that may be down the road. And why would the United States want to get involved in this situation?

So today, Madam Speaker, I have filed a resolution stating that no U.S. funds will be used for this war with Syria. This religious civil war is not our war. So no money for the "Peace President's" war. And if he starts a war with Syria, I suggest the President return the Nobel Peace Prize. If he really wants to send a message, he should follow Samuel Goldwyn's advice: "try Western Union."

And that's just the way it is.

USDA FOOD INSECURITY FIGURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, last week, the United States Department of Agriculture released its annual report on food security in the United States. The report documents the levels of food security and insecurity in this country. In this report, the USDA measured the amount of food available or unavailable to households and individuals. In other words, Madam Speaker, the USDA measured the amount of hunger in the United States. It measured the ability of Americans to put food on their tables.

The good news is that hunger isn't getting worse. The bad news is that there are still 49 million people living in our great country who are food insecure; 49 million people who don't know where their next meal will come from; 49 million people who are forced to choose between basic needs like rent, utilities, and food; 49 million people who don't have the resources necessary to make ends meet; 49 million people who are hungry. That's one out of every six people living in this country who is food insecure—a figure that hasn't changed since 2008.

While it's a good thing that food insecurity isn't getting worse, that's simply not good enough. We must do more to ensure that healthy and nutritious food is available to everyone in America. We must ensure that 49 million people are not left behind when it comes to buying food.

The fact remains that millions of Americans are still struggling to make ends meet. Millions of Americans continue to feel the effects of the worst economic recession since the Great Depression. As a result of the staggering loss of jobs and reduced wages that came from the recession, millions of Americans were forced to turn to the Federal Government's preeminent anti-hunger program, SNAP, formerly known as food stamps, in order to put food on their tables.

SNAP participation rates skyrocketed precisely because of the recession. SNAP is a safety net. It's designed to increase in participation in times of need. That means the cost of the program goes up as more people need help buying food while they're either unemployed or struggling with lower wages. That's precisely what happened during the recession. And that's why there are so many people relying on SNAP today. These food insecurity numbers confirm that hunger is a problem in America; that there are millions of people—49 million—who don't know where their next meals are coming from and need helping buying food for themselves and their families.

This is a sobering report, Madam Speaker, and one that would normally result in congressional hearings on the problem and possible ways to reduce hunger in America. But we're not living in normal times. That's because, Madam Speaker, even with the release

of this report showing that rates of food insecurity are unchanged since the end of the Bush administration, this Republican-controlled House is preparing to consider a bill that would cut at least \$40 billion from the SNAP program. That's right. The response to this report is to make hunger in America even worse than it is today.

I want to remind my colleagues there is not one single town, city, county, or congressional district in America that is hunger free. For the life of me, I can't understand why the Republicans want to cut this program that provides food to millions of Americans. I cannot understand why the Republican leadership wants to balance the budget on the backs of the working poor.

SNAP is not only successful; it's efficient and effective. The error rate for SNAP is among the lowest, if not the lowest, error rates of any Federal program. That's right. Fraud, waste, and abuse in SNAP is at an all-time low, which means that SNAP dollars are going exactly where they should be going—to food-hungry Americans. On top of that, SNAP kept 4.7 million people out of poverty in 2011, including 2.1 million children. That means that cutting SNAP will also result in increased poverty in America. The irony is there are some Members of this House who are collecting millions of dollars in taxpayer-funded farm subsidies while at the same time they vote to take away food from hungry Americans.

Madam Speaker, hunger in America is real. It must be addressed. That's why I've called for a White House conference on food nutrition, a conference where we can explore hunger and nutrition and develop a plan to end this scourge once and for all. We will not end hunger by cutting the most efficient and effective anti-hunger program in the country. We will not end hunger through arbitrary, harmful, and spiteful budget cuts.

We can end hunger now if we decide to take that step. The USDA food security report provides evidence that we're not doing enough to end hunger now. The upcoming vote to cut the anti-hunger safety net shows how truly harmful the Republican leadership is when it comes to the working poor in America. We can do more. We can do better. We can—and we must—end hunger now.

MEDICARE DME-POS MARKET PRICING PROGRAM ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, on August 22, the United States Department of Health and Human Services Inspector General, Daniel Levinson, announced his decision to initiate an investigation into

the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, aka Medicare, and its handling of the Competitive Bidding Program for durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies.

I initiated a request on June 20, 2013, following disclosures that CMS awarded contracts nationwide to suppliers that lacked the proper licensure and accreditation—clear violations of the agency's program guidelines for participation in the Competitive Bidding Program.

The so-called "competitive" bidding model is being used by the government to procure goods and services for our Nation's seniors and those facing life-altering disease and disability. While CMS makes claims the Competitive Bidding Program will increase market competition and lower costs, in practice it's shown to be anything but competitive. Over the past several years, we've seen the program negatively affect seniors and force small medical companies, many that are local and the only entity capable of providing quality goods and a high level of service, out of the market and out of business.

In 2011, more than 240 economists and market auction design experts wrote to President Obama concerning the flawed bidding model. The experts wrote:

The current program is the antithesis of science and contradicts all that is known about proper market design.

These warnings have become reality over the past several years. The licensure and accreditation abuses are just the latest among a long list of program failures.

For many of these reasons, on June 12, 2013, 227 bipartisan Members of the House—a full majority—including 82 Democrats and 145 Republicans, sent a letter to CMS outlining the flaws and abuses in the program, requesting that the agency delay further implementation until such issues are fully addressed and fixed.

Despite the growing number of reported abuses under the program and strong congressional concern about the bidding design and a long overdue need for transparency and accountability, CMS moved forward with the program in 91 new bidding areas on July 1, 2013, bringing the total to 100 areas nationwide.

While CMS has admitted to the abuses, the agency has failed to detail how these failures occurred or offer a plan for corrective action. With any hope, the Office of Inspector General's efforts will shed light on how these failures occurred and impose a new level of transparency at the Medicare agency, CMS, and among the agency's administrators. In the meantime, it will be up to the House of Representatives to take corrective action.

With this said, I respectfully request that each of my colleagues join me in cosponsoring H.R. 1717, Medicare DME-

POS Market Pricing Program Act of 2013. This commonsense measure, authored by my esteemed colleague from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, will apply real market principles to the highly flawed competitive bidding model. Madam Speaker, we owe as much to our constituents, the taxpayers, and our Nation's Medicare beneficiaries.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 27 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Harmon E. Stockdale, Mt. Vernon Missionary Baptist Church, Rochester, New York, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we acknowledge You with adoration and humble gratitude. We pray for Your presence and guidance over this distinguished body before whom we stand.

We thank You for this great land in which we live, the United States of America. And we thank You for all who share in making the policies, laws, and decisions which guide and govern our Nation.

We ask Your blessings upon all of our elected and appointed leaders as they lead us to face the challenges of our day. Grant that we, as a Nation, may be mindful of Your providence and Your grace as we give moral and ethical leadership to the people of our world.

May justice, equality, and compassion always be the guiding principles for our way of life; and may we never forget that to whom much is given, much is required.

In Your Son's name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) come forward

and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIGGINS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

USE OF MILITARY FORCE IN SYRIA

(Mr. GOSAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, this week, all eyes will be upon us as we debate the use of force in Syria. This decision is not one that should be made lightly, as ultimately there are many factors to be weighed.

Make no mistake that what is happening in Syria is truly a human tragedy. That nation has been torn apart by civil war. It is without a doubt that Assad is not a friend or ally of ours. But things are very complicated. A large number of those who oppose the Assad regime are affiliated with al Qaeda. In the case of Syria, Assad, and the rebels, it cannot be said that the enemy of my enemy is my friend. In this dangerous civil war, the enemy of our enemy is still and will always be our enemy.

It is this dynamic which has led to the overwhelming response of people throughout my district and our Nation to say without an imminent threat to national security, without a plan, without a goal, without unified international support from our allies, we must stay out of Syria.

NATION-BUILDING AT HOME

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Syria is that of a national civil war. It's a sectarian and ethnic conflict between two warring factions. This is not about democracy and freedom. There is no social contract. There is no constitution. There is no preamble. There is no unifying vision as to what Syria wants to become. This is a brutal battle between two bad sides for control. Assad is a brutal dictator, for certain; but the opposition's best fighters are al Qaeda and Islamic extremists bent on creating an Islamic state in Syria.

In the international community, 194 countries have said—but for Turkey and France—yes, the United States, go

get them; just don't ask us to participate. So the American people will find themselves, once again, for the third time in a decade, in a region of the Middle East in South Asia in another civil war, essentially alone again.

The American people want nation-building. But they want it right here at home, in America.

ANOTHER SOLUTION IN SYRIA

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the President's action in Syria.

I just returned from the Middle East, meeting with heads of state in Qatar, Egypt, the United Arab Emirates, and our ambassador to NATO. I'm firmly convinced that any action on our part will further destabilize Syria and cause a collapse of the government. What will happen then? What will happen is that country will then fall in the hands of Hezbollah, Hamas, al Qaeda, and the Muslim Brotherhood.

At the end of the day, what's important, Mr. Speaker, is who has control of those weapons of mass destruction. While what Mr. Assad has done has been barbaric and evil, we will never forgive ourselves for the havoc that will be played upon this world if those weapons fall into the hands of Islamic extremists. We need to work together collectively to address the problem of identifying and finding those weapons of mass destruction and securing those for the future.

There are many people who are living outside of their country now as refugees. There are tens of thousands of able men who could be recruited to be a part of that solution.

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD OBESITY AWARENESS MONTH

(Ms. FUDGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, this week, I will reintroduce a resolution recognizing September as National Childhood Obesity Awareness Month. September marks an opportunity for Congress to raise awareness of the issue while also discussing ways we can engage our families and communities on how best to curb this unhealthy trend.

Over the past three decades, childhood obesity rates in the United States have tripled. Today, nearly one in three children are overweight or obese. These numbers are even higher in minority communities, where nearly 40 percent of African American and Hispanic children are overweight. Children today experience a different lifestyle from 30 years ago, when kids ate less and exercised more.

Many groups have stepped up to the plate to improve nutrition and physical activity for our children. Community partners like the Campaign to End Obesity, Cheer for a Healthier America, YWCA, and HealthCorps have taken the charge to achieve the healthiest lives we can give them.

Let us use the month of September to elevate the issue of childhood obesity and recognize our community partners.

VERIFICATION OF OBAMACARE SUBSIDIES

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, after 3½ years, the Obama administration has failed to make its hallmark legislation, ObamaCare, work. Instead, it has delayed or waived key portions, including the so-called “verification system.” This was ObamaCare’s way of ensuring folks who received Federal assistance to buy health insurance met the criteria. Buried within 600 pages of red tape, the administration said it will no longer verify the information provided by individuals, but simply rely on self-reporting.

Mr. Speaker, this opens a wide door to further fraud and abuse in our health care system. This fraud could amount to \$250 billion in taxpayer-funded payments. That’s no pocket change.

That’s why I urge my colleagues to support a commonsense bill, H.R. 2775, No Subsidies Without Verification Act, to protect taxpayer dollars and further chip away at this unworkable law. The American people want, need, and deserve better.

FIXING THE WAR POWER AUTHORITY

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the President has come to Congress, as he should, to ask authority for a discretionary military action. The sad fact is he doesn’t have to because of a defective law passed by Congress in reaction to Nixon’s bombing of Cambodia in 1973. The bill that Congress passed is a shadow of our constitutional authority regarding war and peace.

This President has come to us. That’s good. The result is not yet known. It has already resulted perhaps in a diplomatic breakthrough. That is also good. But in the future we need to make certain that each and every President comes to us when we’re not defending against immediate interests of the United States or against imminent or real attack of our troops or our citizens.

So I’ll be reintroducing legislation to fix the war power authority. In the future, in circumstances such as this, it will require that the President come to the Congress before launching a discretionary military action. We must fix this law. This is a good precedent this President has set. Let’s make it the law of the United States of America.

OPPOSE MILITARY ACTION IN SYRIA

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the President and my colleagues to oppose any U.S. military action in Syria. Based on the evidence given to Congress, I have serious reservations about authorizing the use of military force in another Middle Eastern country. The President has not convinced me that we have vital national security interests at stake in Syria or a clear military objective. There are far too many unanswered questions and unclear objectives.

My constituents in the 24th District of Texas are deeply skeptical about the value of military intervention in Syria. I fully agree with their concerns. On behalf of my constituents and many concerned Americans, I respectfully urge my colleagues to weigh the evidence fully and to be realistic about what can be achieved in military intervention. Let us vote for what’s best for the United States. Keep the U.S. military out of Syria.

THE ALTERNATIVE PLAN IN SYRIA

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Obama administration for its willingness to consider a new alternative proposal for dealing with Syria. The proposal is to hand over all—and I stress all—of Syria’s chemical weapons under the oversight of the international community and to safely and verifiably destroy them. This could actually remove those weapons from the battlefield and peacefully prevent the further use of them against the people of Syria or her neighbors. This idea has gained support from U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki Moon, as well as Russia and France.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal needs to be vigorously pursued. The Syrian regime’s attack against its own people using poisonous gas is morally reprehensible. If this plan is successful, it could produce an outcome that everyone desires: preventing the Assad regime from using chemical weapons.

□ 1215

WILL THE SENATE AND THE PRESIDENT ACT TO GET AMERICANS WORKING AGAIN?

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are still struggling with a shaky economy. During the August district work period, the number one question I heard from my constituents was: Where are the jobs?

Last week we saw the unemployment rate in August drop to 7.3 percent, but for all the wrong reasons. People didn’t find jobs; they stopped looking for them altogether. Between July and August, that amounted to more than 300,000 people.

A smaller percentage of Americans is working or looking for work than at any time in the past 35 years. It is so discouraging to be told the recession is over, but then you look and you look but you can’t find a job.

Employers around my district tell me the best stimulus for hiring is to reduce government regulations, cut taxes, simplify the Tax Code, and push for smaller government. Yet, what do they see ahead? More uncertainty as States race to meet the October 1 deadline to set up expensive and confusing ObamaCare exchanges. No wonder businesses aren’t hiring; the “Unaffordable Care Act” doesn’t give them the confidence that they need to be able to afford hiring new employees.

Let’s restore their confidence to hire and train new workers. The House has passed numerous jobs bills to reduce regulations on businesses. Let’s have the Senate act.

SYRIA

(Mr. VARGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on Syria.

The real issue is that the Assad regime gassed more than 426 children and their parents. Those who perished died a horrific, merciless, and completely unnecessary death. We must come together and act with the President to create a credible threat of force and, thereby, deter the future use of chemical weapons.

Now, I am somewhat optimistic that, as recently reported, Syria is willing to place its chemical weapons under international control. This solution could possibly bring a peaceful resolution. But we must remember that Iran is also watching. The Ayatollah is looking to see if the U.S. is willing to stand up against those who gas their own people. Will they really stand up then against the plan to build nuclear weapons?

We need to stand with the President and send a message to the world that we mean what we say: that we won't allow Assad to keep gassing his own people and that we won't allow Iran to develop a nuclear weapon.

UNIVERSAL LITTLE LEAGUE

(Mr. FARENTHOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to honor, today, a group of hometown heroes from Corpus Christi, Texas, the Corpus Christi Universal Little League team.

Universal made it to the Little League World Series this year in Williamsport, Pennsylvania, after they won the Southwest Regional Tournament. These young men showcased their talents on an international stage, defeating teams from Australia and Canada.

They received a grand welcome back to Corpus Christi along Shoreline Boulevard with a parade, where my district director, Bob Haueter, presented them with a flag flown over the United States Capitol and a letter of congratulations from me. They are an inspiration to young men and women throughout Texas and America.

This summer they saw and demonstrated that hard work pays off. It's a feeling I know they will carry with them for many years to come.

Way to go, Universal.

SEQUESTER

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 5 weeks since the House recessed for a district work period and all of our problems that we put on hold remain right here in front of us. This long list of challenges includes repealing the sequester.

According to the nonpartisan CBO, sequestration will cost us about 750,000 jobs this year alone. Now is the time to act. Instead of messaging bills or playing procedural games in an attempt to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act, we should be addressing unfinished business.

Americans have sent us here to do a job: help put people back to work and grow our economy. I encourage House Republicans to work with Democrats to roll back these mindless, thoughtless sequester cuts. They are the worst way to save a bad program and the most foolish way to cut a good and vibrant one.

STOP OBAMACARE

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, hard-working Americans have called on Congress to stop ObamaCare. While they expect that Washington elites will deride their message and disparage their cause, they are here because they understand the consequences of ObamaCare's oppressive mandates.

Back home, over the month of August, I heard from parents who pay higher premiums only to have health coverage dropped for their spouse. I have talked with Hoosiers who make ends meet with two part-time jobs after their hours were cut. I have seen the discouragement of neighbors who hope this is finally the week they will find work.

Americans know that this isn't what a recovery looks like, but they wonder if Washington even cares. President Obama told them to trust the bureaucrats, the same bureaucrats who gave carve-outs to Big Business and kickbacks to Big Government. Republicans told them we had a different plan. We promised to stop ObamaCare and put patients ahead of politics. As ObamaCare's October 1 deadline approaches, those families wonder if we really mean it.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to keep that promise. Now, when it really matters, we must stop ObamaCare.

HONOR SYSTEM

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, because of ObamaCare, health insurance costs could be increasing more than 80 percent for young North Carolinians. Yes, those who pay just over \$100 a month now may have to pay \$185 for ObamaCare-approved coverage.

The administration has attempted to console us with promises that the blow of such sharp cost increases will be softened for the neediest Americans through income-based taxpayer subsidies. However, there's a problem: it's not just needy Americans who will have access. Because the Obama administration has decided to rely on an "honor system" for subsidy distribution to draw money, income won't have to be verified, and neither will one's access to "affordable" employer-provided health coverage.

We are told this honor system will be temporary, but we are not satisfied. Develop a verification system now or delay the subsidies. Better yet, give every American a break and repeal this law.

"NEW NORMAL"/VERIFICATION BILL I

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, last week we learned even more distressing news about our economy: the labor force participation rate is the lowest since 1979, during Jimmy Carter's Presidency.

We refuse to settle for a "new normal." Americans deserve better. And how do the President and Democrats in Congress plan to make things better? Well, they still insist on the full implementation of ObamaCare, which its own authors already describe as a "train wreck."

But the House is working to dismantle this unworkable law, and we're taking another major step this week. We are introducing legislation that will prevent waste, fraud, and abuse in the distribution of ObamaCare subsidies.

House Republicans will continue to work to protect Americans from the harmful effects of this law. It's all part of our plan to foster a strong economy and a more structured and secure future for all.

"NEW NORMAL" I

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I've spent the last few weeks back home listening to my constituents and hearing their stories of just how tough times are in the Obama economy. And what's the latest economic news? More of the same.

Another disappointing jobs report was issued by the Labor Department last week. We learned that far too many of our fellow Americans have simply given up looking for work—the labor force participation rate is at its lowest since 1979. Is this what Americans should come to expect? Is this the "new normal"?

Americans deserve better than this mediocre economy. House Republicans remain committed to fostering a strong economy and more secure future. Our plan revolves around more jobs and expanding opportunity instead of stifling it. That's how we will get our economy back to work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS REFORM ACT OF 2013

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1155) to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1155

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. REESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title III of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6751 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“Subtitle C—National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers

“SEC. 321. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers (referred to in this subtitle as the ‘Association’).

“(b) STATUS.—The Association shall—

“(1) be a nonprofit corporation;

“(2) not be an agent or instrumentality of the Federal Government;

“(3) be an independent organization that may not be merged with or into any other private or public entity; and

“(4) except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, be subject to, and have all the powers conferred upon, a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29–301.01 et seq.) or any successor thereto.

“SEC. 322. PURPOSE.

“The purpose of the Association shall be to provide a mechanism through which licensing, continuing education, and other non-resident insurance producer qualification requirements and conditions may be adopted and applied on a multi-state basis without affecting the laws, rules, and regulations, and preserving the rights of a State, pertaining to—

“(1) licensing, continuing education, and other qualification requirements of insurance producers that are not members of the Association;

“(2) resident or nonresident insurance producer appointment requirements;

“(3) supervising and disciplining resident and nonresident insurance producers;

“(4) establishing licensing fees for resident and nonresident insurance producers so that there is no loss of insurance producer licensing revenue to the State; and

“(5) prescribing and enforcing laws and regulations regulating the conduct of resident and nonresident insurance producers.

“SEC. 323. MEMBERSHIP.

“(a) ELIGIBILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any insurance producer licensed in its home State shall, subject to paragraphs (2) and (4), be eligible to become a member of the Association.

“(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION OF LICENSE.—Subject to paragraph (3), an insurance producer is not eligible to become a member of the Association if a

State insurance regulator has suspended or revoked the insurance license of the insurance producer in that State.

“(3) RESUMPTION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Paragraph (2) shall cease to apply to any insurance producer if—

“(A) the State insurance regulator reissues or renews the license of the insurance producer in the State in which the license was suspended or revoked, or otherwise terminates or vacates the suspension or revocation; or

“(B) the suspension or revocation expires or is subsequently overturned by a court of competent jurisdiction.

“(4) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUIRED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An insurance producer who is an individual shall not be eligible to become a member of the Association unless the insurance producer has undergone a criminal history record check that complies with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General of the United States under subparagraph (K).

“(B) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUESTED BY HOME STATE.—An insurance producer who is licensed in a State and who has undergone a criminal history record check during the 2-year period preceding the date of submission of an application to become a member of the Association, in compliance with a requirement to undergo such criminal history record check as a condition for such licensure in the State, shall be deemed to have undergone a criminal history record check for purposes of subparagraph (A).

“(C) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUESTED BY ASSOCIATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall, upon request by an insurance producer licensed in a State, submit fingerprints or other identification information obtained from the insurance producer, and a request for a criminal history record check of the insurance producer, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(ii) PROCEDURES.—The board of directors of the Association (referred to in this subtitle as the ‘Board’) shall prescribe procedures for obtaining and utilizing fingerprints or other identification information and criminal history record information, including the establishment of reasonable fees to defray the expenses of the Association in connection with the performance of a criminal history record check and appropriate safeguards for maintaining confidentiality and security of the information. Any fees charged pursuant to this clause shall be separate and distinct from those charged by the Attorney General pursuant to subparagraph (I).

“(D) FORM OF REQUEST.—A submission under subparagraph (C)(i) shall include such fingerprints or other identification information as is required by the Attorney General concerning the person about whom the criminal history record check is requested, and a statement signed by the person authorizing the Attorney General to provide the information to the Association and for the Association to receive the information.

“(E) PROVISION OF INFORMATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Upon receiving a submission under subparagraph (C)(i) from the Association, the Attorney General shall search all criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including records of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the Attorney General determines appropriate for criminal history records corresponding to the fingerprints or other iden-

tification information provided under subparagraph (D) and provide all criminal history record information included in the request to the Association.

“(F) LIMITATION ON PERMISSIBLE USES OF INFORMATION.—Any information provided to the Association under subparagraph (E) may only—

“(i) be used for purposes of determining compliance with membership criteria established by the Association;

“(ii) be disclosed to State insurance regulators, or Federal or State law enforcement agencies, in conformance with applicable law; or

“(iii) be disclosed, upon request, to the insurance producer to whom the criminal history record information relates.

“(G) PENALTY FOR IMPROPER USE OR DISCLOSURE.—Whoever knowingly uses any information provided under subparagraph (E) for a purpose not authorized in subparagraph (F), or discloses any such information to anyone not authorized to receive it, shall be fined not more than \$50,000 per violation as determined by a court of competent jurisdiction.

“(H) RELIANCE ON INFORMATION.—Neither the Association nor any of its Board members, officers, or employees shall be liable in any action for using information provided under subparagraph (E) as permitted under subparagraph (F) in good faith and in reasonable reliance on its accuracy.

“(I) FEES.—The Attorney General may charge a reasonable fee for conducting the search and providing the information under subparagraph (E), and any such fee shall be collected and remitted by the Association to the Attorney General.

“(J) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as—

“(i) requiring a State insurance regulator to perform criminal history record checks under this section; or

“(ii) limiting any other authority that allows access to criminal history records.

“(K) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall prescribe regulations to carry out this paragraph, which shall include—

“(i) appropriate protections for ensuring the confidentiality of information provided under subparagraph (E); and

“(ii) procedures providing a reasonable opportunity for an insurance producer to contest the accuracy of information regarding the insurance producer provided under subparagraph (E).

“(L) INELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Association may, under reasonably consistently applied standards, deny membership to an insurance producer on the basis of criminal history record information provided under subparagraph (E), or where the insurance producer has been subject to disciplinary action, as described in paragraph (2).

“(ii) RIGHTS OF APPLICANTS DENIED MEMBERSHIP.—The Association shall notify any insurance producer who is denied membership on the basis of criminal history record information provided under subparagraph (E) of the right of the insurance producer to—

“(I) obtain a copy of all criminal history record information provided to the Association under subparagraph (E) with respect to the insurance producer; and

“(II) challenge the denial of membership based on the accuracy and completeness of the information.

“(M) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘criminal history record check’ means a national background check of criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(b) **AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA.**—The Association may establish membership criteria that bear a reasonable relationship to the purposes for which the Association was established.

“(c) **ESTABLISHMENT OF CLASSES AND CATEGORIES OF MEMBERSHIP.**—

“(1) **CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP.**—The Association may establish separate classes of membership, with separate criteria, if the Association reasonably determines that performance of different duties requires different levels of education, training, experience, or other qualifications.

“(2) **BUSINESS ENTITIES.**—The Association shall establish a class of membership and membership criteria for business entities. A business entity that applies for membership shall be required to designate an individual Association member responsible for the compliance of the business entity with Association standards and the insurance laws, standards, and regulations of any State in which the business entity seeks to do business on the basis of Association membership.

“(3) **CATEGORIES.**—

“(A) **SEPARATE CATEGORIES FOR INSURANCE PRODUCERS PERMITTED.**—The Association may establish separate categories of membership for insurance producers and for other persons or entities within each class, based on the types of licensing categories that exist under State laws.

“(B) **SEPARATE TREATMENT FOR DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS PROHIBITED.**—No special categories of membership, and no distinct membership criteria, shall be established for members that are depository institutions or for employees, agents, or affiliates of depository institutions.

“(d) **MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Association may establish criteria for membership which shall include standards for personal qualifications, education, training, and experience. The Association shall not establish criteria that unfairly limit the ability of a small insurance producer to become a member of the Association, including imposing discriminatory membership fees.

“(2) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—In establishing criteria under paragraph (1), the Association shall not adopt any qualification less protective to the public than that contained in the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (referred to in this subtitle as the ‘NAIC’) Producer Licensing Model Act in effect as of the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2013, and shall consider the highest levels of insurance producer qualifications established under the licensing laws of the States.

“(3) **ASSISTANCE FROM STATES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Association may request a State to provide assistance in investigating and evaluating the eligibility of a prospective member for membership in the Association.

“(B) **AUTHORIZATION OF INFORMATION SHARING.**—A submission under subsection (a)(4)(C)(i) made by an insurance producer licensed in a State shall include a statement signed by the person about whom the assistance is requested authorizing—

“(i) the State to share information with the Association; and

“(ii) the Association to receive the information.

“(C) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed as requiring or authorizing any State to adopt new or additional requirements concerning the licensing or evaluation of insurance producers.

“(4) **DENIAL OF MEMBERSHIP.**—The Association may, based on reasonably consistently applied standards, deny membership to any State-licensed insurance producer for failure to meet the membership criteria established by the Association.

“(e) **EFFECT OF MEMBERSHIP.**—

“(1) **AUTHORITY OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS.**—Membership in the Association shall—

“(A) authorize an insurance producer to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance in any State for which the member pays the licensing fee set by the State for any line or lines of insurance specified in the home State license of the insurance producer, and exercise all such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry out such activities, including claims adjustments and settlement to the extent permissible under the laws of the State, risk management, employee benefits advice, retirement planning, and any other insurance-related consulting activities;

“(B) be the equivalent of a nonresident insurance producer license for purposes of authorizing the insurance producer to engage in the activities described in subparagraph (A) in any State where the member pays the licensing fee; and

“(C) be the equivalent of a nonresident insurance producer license for the purpose of subjecting an insurance producer to all laws, regulations, provisions or other action of any State concerning revocation, suspension, or other enforcement action related to the ability of a member to engage in any activity within the scope of authority granted under this subsection and to all State laws, regulations, provisions, and actions preserved under paragraph (5).

“(2) **VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994.**—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to alter, modify, or supercede any requirement established by section 1033 of title 18, United States Code.

“(3) **AGENT FOR REMITTING FEES.**—The Association shall act as an agent for any member for purposes of remitting licensing fees to any State pursuant to paragraph (1).

“(4) **NOTIFICATION OF ACTION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Association shall notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when an insurance producer has satisfied the membership criteria of this section. The States (including State insurance regulators) shall have 10 business days after the date of the notification in order to provide the Association with evidence that the insurance producer does not satisfy the criteria for membership in the Association.

“(B) **ONGOING DISCLOSURES REQUIRED.**—On an ongoing basis, the Association shall disclose to the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC a list of the States in which each member is authorized to operate. The Association shall immediately notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when a member is newly authorized to operate in one or more States, or is no longer authorized to operate in one or more States on the basis of Association membership.

“(5) **PRESERVATION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION AND MARKET CONDUCT REGULATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—No provision of this section shall be construed as altering or affecting the applicability or continuing effectiveness of any law, regulation, provision, or other action of any State, including those described in subparagraph (B), to the extent that the State law, regulation, provision, or other action is not inconsistent with the provisions of this subtitle related to market entry for nonresident insurance producers,

and then only to the extent of the inconsistency.

“(B) **PRESERVED REGULATIONS.**—The laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions of any State referred to in subparagraph (A) include laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions that—

“(i) regulate market conduct, insurance producer conduct, or unfair trade practices;

“(ii) establish consumer protections; or

“(iii) require insurance producers to be appointed by a licensed or authorized insurer.

“(f) **BIENNIAL RENEWAL.**—Membership in the Association shall be renewed on a biennial basis.

“(g) **CONTINUING EDUCATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Association shall establish, as a condition of membership, continuing education requirements which shall be comparable to the continuing education requirements under the licensing laws of a majority of the States.

“(2) **STATE CONTINUING EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS.**—A member may not be required to satisfy continuing education requirements imposed under the laws, regulations, provisions, or actions of any State other than the home State of the member.

“(3) **RECIPROCITY.**—The Association shall not require a member to satisfy continuing education requirements that are equivalent to any continuing education requirements of the home State of the member that have been satisfied by the member during the applicable licensing period.

“(4) **LIMITATION ON THE ASSOCIATION.**—The Association shall not directly or indirectly offer any continuing education courses for insurance producers.

“(h) **PROBATION, SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION.**—

“(1) **DISCIPLINARY ACTION.**—The Association may place an insurance producer that is a member of the Association on probation or suspend or revoke the membership of the insurance producer in the Association, or assess monetary fines or penalties, as the Association determines to be appropriate, if—

“(A) the insurance producer fails to meet the applicable membership criteria or other standards established by the Association;

“(B) the insurance producer has been subject to disciplinary action pursuant to a final adjudicatory proceeding under the jurisdiction of a State insurance regulator;

“(C) an insurance license held by the insurance producer has been suspended or revoked by a State insurance regulator; or

“(D) the insurance producer has been convicted of a crime that would have resulted in the denial of membership pursuant to subsection (a)(4)(L)(i) at the time of application, and the Association has received a copy of the final disposition from a court of competent jurisdiction.

“(2) **VIOLATIONS OF ASSOCIATION STANDARDS.**—The Association shall have the power to investigate alleged violations of Association standards.

“(3) **REPORTING.**—The Association shall immediately notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when the membership of an insurance producer has been placed on probation or has been suspended, revoked, or otherwise terminated, or when the Association has assessed monetary fines or penalties.

“(i) **CONSUMER COMPLAINTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Association shall—

“(A) refer any complaint against a member of the Association from a consumer relating to alleged misconduct or violations of State insurance laws to the State insurance regulator where the consumer resides and, when

appropriate, to any additional State insurance regulator, as determined by standards adopted by the Association; and

“(B) make any related records and information available to each State insurance regulator to whom the complaint is forwarded.

“(2) TELEPHONE AND OTHER ACCESS.—The Association shall maintain a toll-free number for purposes of this subsection and, as practicable, other alternative means of communication with consumers, such as an Internet webpage.

“(3) FINAL DISPOSITION OF INVESTIGATION.—State insurance regulators shall provide the Association with information regarding the final disposition of a complaint referred pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), but nothing shall be construed to compel a State to release confidential investigation reports or other information protected by State law to the Association.

“(j) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Association may—

“(1) share documents, materials, or other information, including confidential and privileged documents, with a State, Federal, or international governmental entity or with the NAIC or other appropriate entity referred to paragraphs (3) and (4), provided that the recipient has the authority and agrees to maintain the confidentiality or privileged status of the document, material, or other information;

“(2) limit the sharing of information as required under this subtitle with the NAIC or any other non-governmental entity, in circumstances under which the Association determines that the sharing of such information is unnecessary to further the purposes of this subtitle;

“(3) establish a central clearinghouse, or utilize the NAIC or another appropriate entity, as determined by the Association, as a central clearinghouse, for use by the Association and the States (including State insurance regulators), through which members of the Association may disclose their intent to operate in 1 or more States and pay the licensing fees to the appropriate States; and

“(4) establish a database, or utilize the NAIC or another appropriate entity, as determined by the Association, as a database, for use by the Association and the States (including State insurance regulators) for the collection of regulatory information concerning the activities of insurance producers.

“(k) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall take effect on the later of—

“(1) the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2013; and

“(2) the date of incorporation of the Association.

“SEC. 324. BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a board of directors of the Association, which shall have authority to govern and supervise all activities of the Association.

“(b) POWERS.—The Board shall have such of the powers and authority of the Association as may be specified in the bylaws of the Association.

“(c) COMPOSITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall consist of 13 members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures established under Senate Resolution 116 of the 112th Congress, of whom—

“(A) 8 shall be State insurance commissioners appointed in the manner provided in

paragraph (2), 1 of whom shall be designated by the President to serve as the chairperson of the Board until the Board elects one such State insurance commissioner Board member to serve as the chairperson of the Board;

“(B) 3 shall have demonstrated expertise and experience with property and casualty insurance producer licensing; and

“(C) 2 shall have demonstrated expertise and experience with life or health insurance producer licensing.

“(2) STATE INSURANCE REGULATOR REPRESENTATIVES.—

“(A) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Before making any appointments pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), the President shall request a list of recommended candidates from the States through the NAIC, which shall not be binding on the President. If the NAIC fails to submit a list of recommendations not later than 15 business days after the date of the request, the President may make the requisite appointments without considering the views of the NAIC.

“(B) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Not more than 4 Board members appointed under paragraph (1)(A) shall belong to the same political party.

“(C) FORMER STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If, after offering each currently serving State insurance commissioner an appointment to the Board, fewer than 8 State insurance commissioners have accepted appointment to the Board, the President may appoint the remaining State insurance commissioner Board members, as required under paragraph (1)(A), of the appropriate political party as required under subparagraph (B), from among individuals who are former State insurance commissioners.

“(ii) LIMITATION.—A former State insurance commissioner appointed as described in clause (i) may not be employed by or have any present direct or indirect financial interest in any insurer, insurance producer, or other entity in the insurance industry, other than direct or indirect ownership of, or beneficial interest in, an insurance policy or annuity contract written or sold by an insurer.

“(D) SERVICE THROUGH TERM.—If a Board member appointed under paragraph (1)(A) ceases to be a State insurance commissioner during the term of the Board member, the Board member shall cease to be a Board member.

“(3) PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES.—In making any appointment pursuant to subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), the President may seek recommendations for candidates from groups representing the category of individuals described, which shall not be binding on the President.

“(4) STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘State insurance commissioner’ means a person who serves in the position in State government, or on the board, commission, or other body that is the primary insurance regulatory authority for the State.

“(d) TERMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under paragraph (2), the term of service for each Board member shall be 2 years.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) 1-YEAR TERMS.—The term of service shall be 1 year, as designated by the President at the time of the nomination of the subject Board members for—

“(i) 4 of the State insurance commissioner Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(A), of whom not more than 2 shall belong to the same political party;

“(ii) 1 of the Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(B); and

“(iii) 1 of the Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(C).

“(B) EXPIRATION OF TERM.—A Board member may continue to serve after the expiration of the term to which the Board member was appointed for the earlier of 2 years or until a successor is appointed.

“(C) MID-TERM APPOINTMENTS.—A Board member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the predecessor of the Board member was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term.

“(3) SUCCESSIVE TERMS.—Board members may be reappointed to successive terms.

“(e) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—The appointment of initial Board members shall be made no later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2013.

“(f) MEETINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall meet—

“(A) at the call of the chairperson;

“(B) as requested in writing to the chairperson by not fewer than 5 Board members; or

“(C) as otherwise provided by the bylaws of the Association.

“(2) QUORUM REQUIRED.—A majority of all Board members shall constitute a quorum.

“(3) VOTING.—Decisions of the Board shall require the approval of a majority of all Board members present at a meeting, a quorum being present.

“(4) INITIAL MEETING.—The Board shall hold its first meeting not later than 45 days after the date on which all initial Board members have been appointed.

“(g) RESTRICTION ON CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—Board members appointed pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (c)(1) shall not have access to confidential information received by the Association in connection with complaints, investigations, or disciplinary proceedings involving insurance producers.

“(h) ETHICS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—The Board shall issue and enforce an ethical conduct code to address permissible and prohibited activities of Board members and Association officers, employees, agents, or consultants. The code shall, at a minimum, include provisions that prohibit any Board member or Association officer, employee, agent or consultant from—

“(1) engaging in unethical conduct in the course of performing Association duties;

“(2) participating in the making or influencing the making of any Association decision, the outcome of which the Board member, officer, employee, agent, or consultant knows or had reason to know would have a reasonably foreseeable material financial effect, distinguishable from its effect on the public generally, on the person or a member of the immediate family of the person;

“(3) accepting any gift from any person or entity other than the Association that is given because of the position held by the person in the Association;

“(4) making political contributions to any person or entity on behalf of the Association; and

“(5) lobbying or paying a person to lobby on behalf of the Association.

“(i) COMPENSATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no Board member may receive any compensation from the Association or any other person or entity on account of Board membership.

“(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES AND PER DIEM.—Board members may be reimbursed only by the Association for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates consistent with rates authorized for employees of Federal agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from home or regular places of business in performance of services for the Association.

“SEC. 325. BYLAWS, STANDARDS, AND DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS.

“(a) ADOPTION AND AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS AND STANDARDS.—

“(1) PROCEDURES.—The Association shall adopt procedures for the adoption of bylaws and standards that are similar to procedures under subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Administrative Procedure Act’).

“(2) COPY REQUIRED TO BE FILED.—The Board shall submit to the President, through the Department of the Treasury, and the States (including State insurance regulators), and shall publish on the website of the Association, all proposed bylaws and standards of the Association, or any proposed amendment to the bylaws or standards of the Association, accompanied by a concise general statement of the basis and purpose of such proposal.

“(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Any proposed bylaw or standard of the Association, and any proposed amendment to the bylaws or standards of the Association, shall take effect, after notice under paragraph (2) and opportunity for public comment, on such date as the Association may designate, unless suspended under section 329(c).

“(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to subject the Board or the Association to the requirements of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Administrative Procedure Act’).

“(b) DISCIPLINARY ACTION BY THE ASSOCIATION.—

“(1) SPECIFICATION OF CHARGES.—In any proceeding to determine whether membership shall be denied, suspended, revoked, or not renewed, or to determine whether a member of the Association should be placed on probation (referred to in this section as a ‘disciplinary action’) or whether to assess fines or monetary penalties, the Association shall bring specific charges, notify the member of the charges, give the member an opportunity to defend against the charges, and keep a record.

“(2) SUPPORTING STATEMENT.—A determination to take disciplinary action shall be supported by a statement setting forth—

“(A) any act or practice in which the member has been found to have been engaged;

“(B) the specific provision of this subtitle or standard of the Association that any such act or practice is deemed to violate; and

“(C) the sanction imposed and the reason for the sanction.

“(3) INELIGIBILITY OF PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES.—Board members appointed pursuant to section 324(c)(3) may not—

“(A) participate in any disciplinary action or be counted toward establishing a quorum during a disciplinary action; and

“(B) have access to confidential information concerning any disciplinary action.

“SEC. 326. POWERS.

“In addition to all the powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, the Association shall have the power to—

“(1) establish and collect such membership fees as the Association finds necessary to impose to cover the costs of its operations;

“(2) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, procedures, or standards governing the conduct of Association business and performance of its duties;

“(3) establish procedures for providing notice and opportunity for comment pursuant to section 325(a);

“(4) enter into and perform such agreements as necessary to carry out the duties of the Association;

“(5) hire employees, professionals, or specialists, and elect or appoint officers, and to fix their compensation, define their duties and give them appropriate authority to carry out the purposes of this subtitle, and determine their qualification;

“(6) establish personnel policies of the Association and programs relating to, among other things, conflicts of interest, rates of compensation, where applicable, and qualifications of personnel;

“(7) borrow money; and

“(8) secure funding for such amounts as the Association determines to be necessary and appropriate to organize and begin operations of the Association, which shall be treated as loans to be repaid by the Association with interest at market rate.

“SEC. 327. REPORT BY THE ASSOCIATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, the Association shall submit to the President, through the Department of the Treasury, and the States (including State insurance regulators), and shall publish on the website of the Association, a written report regarding the conduct of its business, and the exercise of the other rights and powers granted by this subtitle, during such fiscal year.

“(b) FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) with respect to any fiscal year shall include audited financial statements setting forth the financial position of the Association at the end of such fiscal year and the results of its operations (including the source and application of its funds) for such fiscal year.

“SEC. 328. LIABILITY OF THE ASSOCIATION AND THE BOARD MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE ASSOCIATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall not be deemed to be an insurer or insurance producer within the meaning of any State law, rule, regulation, or order regulating or taxing insurers, insurance producers, or other entities engaged in the business of insurance, including provisions imposing premium taxes, regulating insurer solvency or financial condition, establishing guaranty funds and levying assessments, or requiring claims settlement practices.

“(b) LIABILITY OF BOARD MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES.—No Board member, officer, or employee of the Association shall be personally liable to any person for any action taken or omitted in good faith in any matter within the scope of their responsibilities in connection with the Association.

“SEC. 329. PRESIDENTIAL OVERSIGHT.

“(a) REMOVAL OF BOARD.—If the President determines that the Association is acting in a manner contrary to the interests of the public or the purposes of this subtitle or has failed to perform its duties under this subtitle, the President may remove the entire existing Board for the remainder of the term to which the Board members were appointed and appoint, in accordance with section 324 and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures established under Senate Resolution 116 of the 112th Congress, new Board members to fill the vacancies on the Board for the remainder of the terms.

“(b) REMOVAL OF BOARD MEMBER.—The President may remove a Board member only for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office.

“(c) SUSPENSION OF BYLAWS AND STANDARDS AND PROHIBITION OF ACTIONS.—Following notice to the Board, the President, or a person designated by the President for such purpose, may suspend the effectiveness of any bylaw or standard, or prohibit any action, of the Association that the President or the designee determines is contrary to the purposes of this subtitle.

“SEC. 330. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

“(a) PREEMPTION OF STATE LAWS.—State laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions purporting to regulate insurance producers shall be preempted to the extent provided in subsection (b).

“(b) PROHIBITED ACTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No State shall—

“(A) impede the activities of, take any action against, or apply any provision of law or regulation arbitrarily or discriminatorily to, any insurance producer because that insurance producer or any affiliate plans to become, has applied to become, or is a member of the Association;

“(B) impose any requirement upon a member of the Association that it pay fees different from those required to be paid to that State were it not a member of the Association; or

“(C) impose any continuing education requirements on any nonresident insurance producer that is a member of the Association.

“(2) STATES OTHER THAN A HOME STATE.—No State, other than the home State of a member of the Association, shall—

“(A) impose any licensing, personal or corporate qualifications, education, training, experience, residency, continuing education, or bonding requirement upon a member of the Association that is different from the criteria for membership in the Association or renewal of such membership;

“(B) impose any requirement upon a member of the Association that it be licensed, registered, or otherwise qualified to do business or remain in good standing in the State, including any requirement that the insurance producer register as a foreign company with the secretary of state or equivalent State official;

“(C) require that a member of the Association submit to a criminal history record check as a condition of doing business in the State; or

“(D) impose any licensing, registration, or appointment requirements upon a member of the Association, or require a member of the Association to be authorized to operate as an insurance producer, in order to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance for commercial property and casualty risks to an insured with risks located in more than one State, if the member is licensed or otherwise authorized to operate in the State where the insured maintains its principal place of business and the contract of insurance insures risks located in that State.

“(3) PRESERVATION OF STATE DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit a State from investigating and taking appropriate disciplinary action, including suspension or revocation of authority of an insurance producer to do business in a State, in accordance with State law and that is not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, against a member of the Association as a result of a complaint or for any alleged activity, regardless of whether the activity occurred before or after the insurance producer commenced doing

business in the State pursuant to Association membership.

"SEC. 331. COORDINATION WITH FINANCIAL INDUSTRY REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

"The Association shall coordinate with the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority in order to ease any administrative burdens that fall on members of the Association that are subject to regulation by the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, consistent with the requirements of this subtitle and the Federal securities laws.

"SEC. 332. RIGHT OF ACTION.

"(a) RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person aggrieved by a decision or action of the Association may, after reasonably exhausting available avenues for resolution within the Association, commence a civil action in an appropriate United States district court, and obtain all appropriate relief.

"(b) ASSOCIATION INTERPRETATIONS.—In any action under subsection (a), the court shall give appropriate weight to the interpretation of the Association of its bylaws and standards and this subtitle.

"SEC. 333. FEDERAL FUNDING PROHIBITED.

"The Association may not receive, accept, or borrow any amounts from the Federal Government to pay for, or reimburse, the Association for, the costs of establishing or operating the Association.

"SEC. 334. DEFINITIONS.

"For purposes of this subtitle, the following definitions shall apply:

"(1) BUSINESS ENTITY.—The term 'business entity' means a corporation, association, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, or other legal entity.

"(2) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term 'depository institution' has the meaning as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

"(3) HOME STATE.—The term 'home State' means the State in which the insurance producer maintains its principal place of residence or business and is licensed to act as an insurance producer.

"(4) INSURANCE.—The term 'insurance' means any product, other than title insurance or bail bonds, defined or regulated as insurance by the appropriate State insurance regulatory authority.

"(5) INSURANCE PRODUCER.—The term 'insurance producer' means any insurance agent or broker, excess or surplus lines broker or agent, insurance consultant, limited insurance representative, and any other individual or entity that sells, solicits, or negotiates policies of insurance or offers advice, counsel, opinions or services related to insurance.

"(6) INSURER.—The term 'insurer' has the meaning as in section 313(e)(2)(B) of title 31, United States Code.

"(7) PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS.—The term 'principal place of business' means the State in which an insurance producer maintains the headquarters of the insurance producer and, in the case of a business entity, where high-level officers of the entity direct, control, and coordinate the business activities of the business entity.

"(8) PRINCIPAL PLACE OF RESIDENCE.—The term 'principal place of residence' means the State in which an insurance producer resides for the greatest number of days during a calendar year.

"(9) STATE.—The term 'State' includes any State, the District of Columbia, any territory of the United States, and Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

"(10) STATE LAW.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'State law' includes all laws, decisions, rules, regulations, or other State action having the effect of law, of any State.

"(B) LAWS APPLICABLE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—A law of the United States applicable only to or within the District of Columbia shall be treated as a State law rather than a law of the United States."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act is amended by striking the items relating to subtitle C of title III and inserting the following new items:

"Subtitle C—National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers

"Sec. 321. National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers.

"Sec. 322. Purpose.

"Sec. 323. Membership.

"Sec. 324. Board of directors.

"Sec. 325. Bylaws, standards, and disciplinary actions.

"Sec. 326. Powers.

"Sec. 327. Report by the Association.

"Sec. 328. Liability of the Association and the Board members, officers, and employees of the Association.

"Sec. 329. Presidential oversight.

"Sec. 330. Relationship to State law.

"Sec. 331. Coordination with regulators.

"Sec. 332. Right of action.

"Sec. 333. Federal funding prohibited.

"Sec. 334. Definitions."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 1155, as amended, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important piece of insurance regulatory reform legislation today.

The most serious regulatory challenges facing insurance agents and brokers are redundant, costly, and sometimes contradictory requirements that arise when they seek licenses on a multistate basis. It has become clear that the main cause of these problems is the failure of many States to issue licenses on a truly reciprocal basis.

On average, multistate agents sell insurance in eight States. That means eight different applications, eight different procedures for admittance, eight separate background checks, and a multitude of inconsistent standards and duplicative processes. These re-

quirements are not only costly and inefficient, but they hinder the ability of insurance agents and brokers to effectively address the needs of their consumers.

Congress recognized the need to reform the insurance industry's licensing system back in 1999 when it incorporated the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers subtitle into the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act. The Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act did not provide for the immediate establishment of NARAB and instead included a series of provisions to encourage States to simplify the licensing process.

Unfortunately, the original NARAB that was passed in 1999 did not work. National nonresident licensing reciprocity has not been achieved, and the burden on insurance agents and brokers and the impact this burden directly has on consumers remains. Despite the best efforts of many stakeholders at making State-level improvements, it has become clear that true licensing reciprocity can be achieved only through additional congressional action.

The bill we are considering today, H.R. 1155, the NARAB Reform Act—or as it is commonly referred, NARAB II—modifies the original NARAB provisions in Gramm-Leach-Bliley and immediately establishes NARAB as a private, nonprofit entity managed by a board composed of eight insurance regulators and five marketplace representatives. NARAB II provides for nonresident insurance agent and broker licensing while preserving the rights of States to supervise and discipline insurance agents and brokers. Overall, this legislation would benefit policyholders by increasing marketplace competition and consumer choice, and by enabling insurance producers to more quickly and responsibly serve the needs of their consumers.

I'd like to thank my colleague from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) who introduced this piece of legislation with me earlier this year.

This bill has almost 90 bipartisan cosponsors and is supported by groups such as the Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, the National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors, the Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers, and major insurance company trades. The legislation has passed this Chamber by voice vote twice before, and the Senate Banking Committee unanimously approved an identical companion legislation.

I ask that my colleagues support this practical and needed insurance regulatory reform by voting for the NARAB Reform Act.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2013.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING, I am writing concerning H.R. 1155, the "National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act," which was referred to your Committee.

As you know, H.R. 1155, contains provisions within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 1155, the Committee on the Judiciary will not assert its jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2013.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Ray-
burn House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for your letter of even date herewith regarding H.R. 1155, the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act.

I am most appreciative of your decision not to assert jurisdiction over H.R. 1155 so that it may be considered under suspension of the Rules this week on the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Judiciary is in no way waiving its Rule X jurisdiction over any subject matter contained in the bill. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I shall be pleased to include your letter and this letter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1155.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to just say I join many people across this Nation and around the world who are prayerful and who are hopeful that this breakthrough—this window of opportunity that we have dealing with the Syrian situation—works.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't tell you what a great joy this is for me. I have worked on this bill for the past 6 years. We have been dealing with many areas

to fix our financial system to make it work. We have a very complex and complicated financial system. There is no industry that has the challenges that are being faced today as the insurance industry.

□ 1230

And the economy, its demands are rapidly changing because of advances in technology, mobility, the narrowing and making the world much smaller.

Essentially, what we have here is a long overdue fix to help these small business owners, because that's what our insurance agents are. H.R. 1155, the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act, or what we affectionately call NARAB, as my distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) has just stated, is very dear to us.

Many of us in the Financial Services Committee have spent years toiling on this issue. So have many in the Senate. As my colleague, Mr. NEUGEBAUER has said, we passed one House in 1999, but look what has happened. We've had terrorist strikes. We've had all kinds of things that have happened. We've had an economy almost on the verge of depression. Standing there in the middle of this storm dealing with the wants and the needs of the American people in all the areas—property damage, health, car insurance, you name it—has been our agents.

I want to just briefly take you through exactly what we are proposing here. H.R. 1155, first of all, creates a streamlined agent and broker licensing system. That's very important. That strengthens the competitive insurance market while maintaining those ever important consumer protection items. It strengthens the business, it strengthens the competitive insurance market—it doesn't weaken it—and at the same time strengthens and protects our consumers.

NARAB will allow agents and brokers to more efficiently operate on a multistate basis. Now, that's so important. Business is no longer conducted around the corner or down the street or just in the next town; it is all over the country. And our insurance agents and brokers need the flexibility and the smoothness in our system to be able to negotiate in the best interest of not just the insurance industry but, most importantly, for the benefit of consumers who move from State to State to city to city.

Next, NARAB would allow our agents and brokers to also address the increasing concern and greater importance of our technological and mobile-connected world. As we know, we are all connected.

Next, our NARAB Reform Act will be a one-stop licensing compliance mechanism for insurance agents and brokers operating out of their home States. Each will have a home State. But

NARAB will work as a one-place clearinghouse to satisfy that, while at the same time preserving the longstanding authority of States to supervise and discipline the insurance producers.

Nothing is being taken from State control in this bill. As a matter of fact, it strengthens State controls. That is why all of the State insurance commissioners support this legislation.

Through a nonprofit board for insurance agents and brokers to obtain approval to operate on a multistate basis, the NARAB Reform Act deals only with marketplace entry and will not impact the day-to-day State regulation of insurance agencies. We sat down, we brought the State insurance agencies in and the commissioners to work with us so that we could have a joint understanding on this bill.

NARAB will be governed by a board dominated by State regulators—again, dominated by State regulators—and would establish standards for the membership that exceed the existing requirements of any State. Again, exceeds the requirements of any State. A prospective NARAB member will be required to be fully licensed in his or her home State and satisfy rigorous membership criteria. An approved NARAB member could utilize the association to obtain the regulatory approval necessary to operate in any other selected jurisdiction.

This is a crucial piece of legislation, an excellently drafted piece of legislation. For those of us who are concerned about small government, it is very important to note that NARAB would not—would not—be a part of a report to any Federal agency and would not have any kind of Federal regulatory power. We are out of the business. Once we pass this bill, it is in the hands, where it belongs, of the State and local level.

The legislation is supported by nearly the entire insurance industry, including all the major agents and brokers associations, as well as the major insurers associations. Additionally, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, NAIC, which represents all State insurance commissioners, has formally—formally—endorsed this version of the legislation.

The State-based reform benefits our consumers first, and that is at the head of the line of our concerns. It benefits our consumers through increased competition among agents and brokers and leads to greater consumer choice at lower prices. That is what the consumer is looking for.

This bill also will assist in an important sector of our economy—small businesses—by streamlining non-resident licensing regulation. The House has twice recognized the need for this commonsense reform by passing nearly this identical legislation, as I said before, subsequent to suspension rules.

Once again, we ask for your support. With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the chairman of our Capital Markets Subcommittee.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership on this legislation today.

I rise in support of H.R. 1155, which is the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act.

This bill is, as we like to say, a commonsense step that will create a clearinghouse, if you will, for insurance agents and brokers alike to obtain approval to operate on a multistate basis.

Under current law, an insurance agent who has clients in more than one State has to obtain licenses in each and every one of those States. The regulatory process, as you can imagine, varies from State to State. Obtaining and maintaining a license is both time-consuming and very expensive.

Having to complete this process over and over and over again basically compounds the difficulty and often proves daunting, quite honestly, to smaller agents who are just trying to do their job and to serve their clients and meet their needs.

What we have here is the NARAB clearinghouse. This would allow the agents to complete the process only twice—once in their home State and then once again for NARAB. Then they would be eligible to sell basically in all the States.

Here is an important point: NARAB is supported by all the stakeholders, including, as the gentleman just said, by the State insurance regulators. It does so because it brings much-needed efficiency to a multistate licensing process.

While doing this, the legislation would also preserve—and to me this is very important—State-based insurance regulation and also consumer protections.

Finally, this legislation would not—as was just pointed out—create a brand new Federal insurance regulator in its place. By law, NARAB would not be a regulator or a part of any Federal agency. It would have no regulatory authority.

With 56—56—different approaches to life insurance, this bipartisan bill would reduce needless red tape and complexity that is out there, and it would help insurance agents better serve their clients.

I urge this House to adopt this legislation today.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER).

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor in support of H.R.

1155, the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2013.

As mentioned, this important legislation strikes the appropriate balance between easing the licensing requirements for insurance agents and preserving State authority to supervise and discipline insurance producers for their actions.

Through this legislation, I hope all consumers, especially the citizens of Tennessee, will benefit from a more competitive insurance market. NARAB is supported by all insurance industry stakeholders, including State insurance regulators, regional and national insurance companies, and trade associations.

H.R. 1155 is seen as the most effective, efficient way to enable insurance agents and brokers to be licensed on a multistate basis while retaining State regulatory authority.

While today's legislation speaks to insurance agents and brokers, similar issues exist for claims adjusters. To address these issues when consumers present a claim, I have introduced the CLAIM Act, H.R. 2156, to streamline the licensing requirements for insurance adjusters operating outside their home States.

My bill would preserve State authority to supervise and discipline adjusters for their actions, while streamlining State licensing regulations.

As we join together today to support H.R. 1155, I call upon my colleagues to similarly support and enact the CLAIM Act to ensure consumers receive the same excellent service when they need their insurance.

I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) for his hard work on this very well-thought-out legislation. I hope it will help the citizens of this country receive excellent insurance products and services.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL).

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill introduced by my colleague Representative NEUGEBAUER.

This bill reduces costs for homeowners and renters not only in my home State of Florida, but for everyone throughout the entire country.

Today, insurance brokers and agents face hurdles when they try to work across State lines. What this bill does is make it easier and less expensive for them to get licensed in multiple States. The best part about this is ultimately it saves you, the consumer, money.

This legislation streamlines the Federal role in real estate licensing while allowing States to continue setting standards for the work that best fits their States because, after all, we know

what's best for our States and our communities.

Lowering costs for insurance agents and brokers means more options and lower prices for consumers. I am glad to support this bipartisan legislation.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for the NARAB Reform Act.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. If the gentleman has no more speakers, I will close and then yield back the balance of my time.

I just want to say what a distinguished pleasure it has been to work with the gentleman from Texas, my good friend on both the Financial Services Committee and the Ag Committee. We do a lot of great work together. It is a great pleasure.

I commend this bill to the full House of Representatives and hope we have a unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Georgia. He has worked tirelessly on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, what I think is nice about this issue is that it's bipartisan. It's a good piece of legislation in that it doesn't expand government, and it doesn't cost the taxpayers any money. Ultimately, I think it's going to bring better choices for consumers and, I hope, for our small business people across the country. For example, in my congressional district, it is closer to three or four other States than it is to some of the cities that are within my State, for example, from Walip to within a hundred miles of Colorado and within 100 miles of Oklahoma and Colorado and these other States. Basically, we have a lot of insurance agencies and agents who now will have the ability to do business in multiple States in a less cumbersome way, so I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1155, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

STREAMLINING CLAIMS PROCESSING FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES ACT

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2747) to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2747

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Streamlining Claims Processing for Federal Contractor Employees Act”.

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY TO THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

(a) AUTHORITY OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL TO PAY WAGES AND LIST CONTRACTORS VIOLATING CONTRACTS.—Section 3144 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “of Comptroller General”; and

(2) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “Comptroller General” and inserting “Secretary of Labor”.

(b) REPORT OF VIOLATIONS AND WITHHOLDING OF AMOUNTS FOR UNPAID CONTRACTS AND LIQUIDATED DAMAGES.—Section 3703(b)(3) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking “Comptroller General” both places it appears and inserting “Secretary of Labor”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2747.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2747, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With our Nation facing difficult challenges at home and abroad, it is important we continue the work the American people sent us here to do. That includes pursuing commonsense reforms that will make the Federal Government more efficient and a better steward of taxpayer dollars. The legislation we are considering today is a small, yet important, part of that effort.

Approximately one out of every five workers is employed by a Federal contractor. Drawing on the strength and expertise of the private sector work-

force to complete Federal projects has helped deliver better results at a more competitive price for taxpayers.

A number of laws govern the wages workers on Federal projects receive. For example, the Davis-Bacon Act requires Federal contractors to pay workers the local prevailing wage. Additionally, the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act ensures these workers receive 1½ times their basic rate of pay for hours worked in excess of 40 hours a week. Both laws have played a central role in Federal contracting for decades. However, both are plagued by inefficiencies. The Department is responsible for enforcing these laws; yet the Government Accountability Office has long been a middleman in an overly bureaucratic claims process.

Here is how the current process works:

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labor first determines whether workers have failed to receive their proper wages, and it calculates the amount of pay they are due. Next, the Department forwards to GAO a report that states the names of underpaid employees and the amounts they are each owed. Funds from the relevant contracting agencies are delivered to GAO, which then deposits the money into an account at the Treasury Department. Based upon claims forms submitted by affected workers, GAO transmits payment requests to Treasury, which disburses directly to workers their unpaid wages. It should be noted that GAO has no authority to overturn or to even challenge the Department's judgment in this area.

As a result of this lengthy back and forth between numerous Federal entities, workers can experience delays in receiving their correct wages, and taxpayers are forced to support an unnecessarily complex process. I think we can all agree we can do better.

H.R. 2747 is commonsense and bipartisan legislation that would transfer GAO's administrative duties under these two laws to the proper Federal agency, which is the Department of Labor. GAO has requested this relief and believes it will encourage more efficiency within the Federal Government. Furthermore, it will free up time and resources at GAO that can be better spent fulfilling its central mission of investigating waste and abuse in the Federal Government.

By moving wage claims adjustments for federally contracted workers to the Department of Labor, we can ensure workers receive their pay in a timelier manner while providing greater efficiency. Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a win for workers and for taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2747, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the pending legislation, H.R. 2747, the Streamlining Claims Processing for Federal Contractor Employees Act, which will transfer the authority for processing claims under the Davis-Bacon Act from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor. As the Department of Labor is already responsible for many aspects of Davis-Bacon, this change will help streamline the process and ensure that workers receive their hard-earned pay in a timelier and more efficient manner.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan for introducing this commonsense fix, which I am pleased to cosponsor. It is time that we transfer this administrative responsibility to the agency that enforces the law, and I hope that this bill will be the first step in a larger effort to allow the Department of Labor to engage in further enforcement actions under the Davis-Bacon Act, including the GAO's current debarment authority.

As a strong supporter of Davis-Bacon and of the protections it provides our contracted workers, I am pleased to see that this bill will help streamline the process and allow our workers access to the prevailing wages they have rightly earned. That's why I rise in support of H.R. 2747, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan for introducing the bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense proposal, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this issue, and I would be glad to close.

I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) as well, not only for his support of the legislation, but for his leadership on this issue. As members of the House Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, we are privileged to oversee a number of Federal laws and agencies that directly affect the lives of workers and their families—the basis for this country's greatness.

The Davis-Bacon Act is one law in particular that I believe is in need of additional reform. Independent reports have highlighted administrative challenges facing the law that result in workers being shortchanged and taxpayers being overcharged on Federal construction projects.

I know there are sharp differences over what, if any, Davis-Bacon reform would look like, but I believe we've demonstrated today, Mr. Speaker, how incremental, yet important, change can occur when we work together in good faith on behalf of the American people. At the very least, I hope we can continue to discuss these issues with one another, thereby bringing us closer to the common ground that is necessary to move this country forward.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 2747, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2747.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1300

POWELL SHOOTING RANGE LAND CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 130) to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 130

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Powell Shooting Range Land Conveyance Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DISTRICT.—The term “District” means the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming.

(2) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Powell, Wyoming Land Conveyance Act” and dated May 12, 2011.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE POWELL RECREATION DISTRICT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall convey to the District, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b).

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subsection (a) consists of approximately 322 acres of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, Wind River District, Wyoming, as generally depicted on the map as “Powell Gun Club”.

(c) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this section.

(2) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(A) the map; or

(B) the legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) USE OF CONVEYED LAND.—The land conveyed under this section shall be used only—

(1) as a shooting range; or

(2) for any other public purpose consistent with uses allowed under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the “Recreation

and Public Purposes Act”) (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The Secretary shall require the District to pay all survey costs and other administrative costs necessary for the preparation and completion of any patents for, and transfers of title to, the land described in subsection (b).

(f) REVERSION.—If the land conveyed under this section ceases to be used for a public purpose in accordance with subsection (d), the land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(g) CONDITIONS.—As a condition of the conveyance under subsection (a), the District shall agree in writing—

(1) to pay any administrative costs associated with the conveyance including the costs of any environmental, wildlife, cultural, or historical resources studies; and

(2) to release and indemnify the United States from any claims or liabilities that may arise from uses carried out on the land described in subsection (b) on or before the date of enactment of this Act by the United States or any person.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 130 directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Powell Recreation District approximately 322 acres of land located in Park County, Wyoming.

The Powell Recreation District will continue to use the land for a public recreational shooting complex, as it has since 1980.

The bill will have no cost to the taxpayer since the Powell Recreation District is required to pay for any administrative costs associated with the conveyance.

This is a noncontroversial bill, Mr. Speaker, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Powell Shooting Range Land Conveyance Act would transfer 322 acres of Bureau of Land Management lands to the Powell, Wyoming, Recreation District. Currently, the Powell Recreation District manages a shooting range on these lands.

We have no objections to this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I urge adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 130.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

DENALI NATIONAL PARK IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 157) to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 157

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Denali National Park Improvement Act”.

SEC. 2. KANTISHNA HILLS MICROHYDRO PROJECT; LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPURTENANCE.—The term “appurtenance” includes—

(A) transmission lines;

(B) distribution lines;

(C) signs;

(D) buried communication lines;

(E) necessary access routes for microhydro project construction, operation, and maintenance; and

(F) electric cables.

(2) KANTISHNA HILLS AREA.—The term “Kantishna Hills area” means the area of the Park located within 2 miles of Moose Creek, as depicted on the map.

(3) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Kantishna Hills Micro-Hydro Area”, numbered 184/80,276, and dated August 27, 2010.

(4) MICROHYDRO PROJECT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “microhydro project” means a hydroelectric power generating facility with a maximum power generation capability of 100 kilowatts.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term “microhydro project” includes—

(i) intake pipelines, including the intake pipeline located on Eureka Creek, approximately ½ mile upstream from the Park Road, as depicted on the map;

(ii) each system appurtenance of the microhydro projects; and

(iii) any distribution or transmission lines required to serve the Kantishna Hills area.

(5) PARK.—The term “Park” means the Denali National Park and Preserve.

(6) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) PERMITS FOR MICROHYDRO PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may issue permits for microhydro projects in the Kantishna Hills area.

(2) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—Each permit under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) issued in accordance with such terms and conditions as are generally applicable to rights-of-way within units of the National Park System; and

(B) subject to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(3) **COMPLETION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which an applicant submits an application for the issuance of a permit under this subsection, the Secretary shall complete any analysis required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) of any proposed or existing microhydro projects located in the Kantishna Hills area.

(c) **LAND EXCHANGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For the purpose of consolidating ownership of Park and Doyon Tourism, Inc. lands, including those lands affected solely by the Doyon Tourism microhydro project, and subject to paragraph (4), the Secretary may exchange Park land near or adjacent to land owned by Doyon Tourism, Inc., located at the mouth of Eureka Creek in sec. 13, T.16 S., R. 18 W., Fairbanks Meridian, for approximately 18 acres of land owned by Doyon Tourism, Inc., within the Galena patented mining claim.

(2) **MAP AVAILABILITY.**—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(3) **TIMING.**—The Secretary shall seek to complete the exchange under this subsection by not later than February 1, 2015.

(4) **APPLICABLE LAWS; TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The exchange under this subsection shall be subject to—

(A) the laws (including regulations) and policies applicable to exchanges of land administered by the National Park Service, including the laws and policies concerning land appraisals, equalization of values, and environmental compliance; and

(B) such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(5) **EQUALIZATION OF VALUES.**—If the tracts proposed for exchange under this subsection are determined not to be equal in value, an equalization of values may be achieved by adjusting the quantity of acres described in paragraph (1).

(6) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The land acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the exchange under this subsection shall be administered as part of the Park.

SEC. 3. DENALI NATIONAL PARK AND PRESERVE NATURAL GAS PIPELINE.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPURTENANCE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “appurtenance” includes cathodic protection or test stations, valves, signage, and buried communication and electric cables relating to the operation of high-pressure natural gas transmission.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term “appurtenance” does not include compressor stations.

(2) **PARK.**—The term “Park” means the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) **PERMIT.**—The Secretary may issue right-of-way permits for—

(1) a high-pressure natural gas transmission pipeline (including appurtenances) in nonwilderness areas within the boundary of Denali National Park within, along, or near the approximately 7-mile segment of the George Parks Highway that runs through the Park; and

(2) any distribution and transmission pipelines and appurtenances that the Secretary determines to be necessary to provide natural gas supply to the Park.

(c) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—A permit authorized under subsection (b)—

(1) may be issued only—

(A) if the permit is consistent with the laws (including regulations) generally applicable to utility rights-of-way within units of the National Park System;

(B) in accordance with section 1106(a) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3166(a)); and

(C) if, following an appropriate analysis prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the route of the right-of-way is the route through the Park with the least adverse environmental effects for the Park; and

(2) shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF THE WALTER HARPER TALKEETNA RANGER STATION.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—The Talkeetna Ranger Station located on B Street in Talkeetna, Alaska, approximately 100 miles south of the entrance to Denali National Park, shall be known and designated as the “Walter Harper Talkeetna Ranger Station”.

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Talkeetna Ranger Station referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Walter Harper Talkeetna Ranger Station”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 157 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits for a natural gas pipeline and a microhydroelectric project within the boundary of Denali National Park in Alaska.

Additionally, S. 157 authorizes a land exchange between Denali National Park and Doyon Tourism, Inc., to facilitate the water project and renames a nearby ranger station in honor of Walter Harper. One hundred years ago, Harper became the first man to reach the summit of Mt. McKinley.

Congressman DON YOUNG, our colleague from Alaska, has sponsored a companion measure to this bill in the House, but to allow this bill to become public law more quickly, I urge adoption of this Senate bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Denali National Park Improvement Act allows the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits for specified small hydroelectric power facilities within the park boundaries. The legislation allows the park service to exchange approximately 18 acres of park land. Finally, the bill provides for right-of-ways for a natural gas pipeline and other natural gas distribution infrastructure.

We have no objections to this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I urge adoption of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 157.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAY LAND CONVEYANCE ACT OF 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 304) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 304

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Natchez Trace Parkway Land Conveyance Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Natchez Trace Parkway, Proposed Boundary Change”, numbered 604/105392, and dated November 2010.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of Mississippi.

SEC. 3. LAND CONVEYANCE.

(a) **CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall convey to the State, by quitclaim deed and without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcels of land described in subsection (b).

(2) **COMPATIBLE USE.**—The deed of conveyance to the parcel of land that is located southeast of U.S. Route 61/84 and which is commonly known as the “bean field property” shall reserve an easement to the

United States restricting the use of the parcel to only those uses which are compatible with the Natchez Trace Parkway.

(b) **DESCRIPTION OF LAND.**—The parcels of land referred to in subsection (a) are the 2 parcels totaling approximately 67 acres generally depicted as “Proposed Conveyance” on the map.

(c) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

SEC. 4. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) **EXCLUSION OF CONVEYED LAND.**—On completion of the conveyance to the State of the land described in section 3(b), the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway shall be adjusted to exclude the conveyed land.

(b) **INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL LAND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway is adjusted to include the approximately 10 acres of land that is generally depicted as “Proposed Addition” on the map.

(2) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The land added under paragraph (1) shall be administered by the Secretary as part of the Natchez Trace Parkway.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLÁN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 304 directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey 67 acres of Natchez, Mississippi, to the State of Mississippi and to adjust the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway.

This property was originally donated to the National Park Service by the State to construct the parkway, but was ultimately unneeded. Rather than lease the property back to Mississippi, this would transfer the title back to the original owner.

This is a commonsense measure, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLÁN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Natchez Trace Parkway Land Conveyance Act of 2013 conveys 67 acres of National Park Service property to the State of Mississippi. We have no objections to this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I urge adoption and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 304.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC LAW 93-435 WITH RESPECT TO NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 256) to amend Public Law 93-435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 256

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The first section and section 2 of Public Law 93-435 (48 U.S.C. 1705, 1706) are amended by inserting “the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Guam,” each place it appears.

(b) **REFERENCES TO DATE OF ENACTMENT.**—For the purposes of the amendment made by subsection (a), each reference in Public Law 93-435 to the “date of enactment” shall be considered to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this section.

SEC. 2. ADJUSTMENT OF SCHEDULED WAGE INCREASES IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.

Section 8103(b)(1)(B) of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 (29 U.S.C. 206 note; Public Law 110-28) is amended by striking “2011” and inserting “2011, 2013, and 2015”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLÁN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 256 would amend the 1974 law to convey certain submerged lands in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Under this bill, the territory would have the administrative authority over lands covered by tidal waters out to 3 nautical miles, giving it parity with the other United States territories of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. Comparable control of the seabed has been also granted to coastal States under the Submerged Lands Act. On May 15, the House passed similar legislation by a voice vote.

S. 256 also contains an amendment to delay in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands an annual minimum wage increase of 50 cents. Under the new formula in this bill, a 50-cent minimum wage bump would still occur in 2014, with annual increases starting in 2016, until the Federal minimum wage is reached. The territory has asked for a deferral on this because its economy cannot currently sustain the minimum wage increases that are current law at this time.

I want to thank Chairman KLINE of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and his able staff for their assistance in scheduling this bill for consideration today as the minimum wage matter is under that committee's jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLÁN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of S. 256. The bill conveys to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands 3 miles of surrounding submerged lands, providing parity with America's other coastal States and territories.

S. 256 also provides for a hiatus in 2013 and 2015 of the annual 50-cent increase in minimum wage in the Northern Marianas, while retaining the mandate to reach the Federal level.

I want to thank the chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, RON WYDEN, and Ranking Member LISA MURKOWSKI for introducing S. 256 at my request. Its companion, H.R. 573, passed the House unanimously in May of this year, as did predecessor bills in the 111th and the 112th Congresses.

Thanks also to leaders and staff from both sides of the aisle: Chairman DOC HASTINGS of the House Natural Resources Committee and Ranking Member PETER DEFazio; Chairman JOHN FLEMING on the Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans, and Insular Affairs Subcommittee; and the chairman on the Education and the Workforce Committee, JOHN KLINE, and Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER. Their assistance reflects a longstanding tradition of treating territorial issues as essentially nonpartisan.

To summarize briefly, the Northern Mariana Islands is the only U.S. coastal jurisdiction that does not have ownership of the submerged lands off its coast. S. 256 corrects that irregularity and provides the same ownership rights over the submerged lands surrounding the Northern Marianas as are provided by Federal law to Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

Additionally, S. 256 reschedules the rate of increase of the minimum wage in the Northern Mariana Islands, but it retains the mandate to reach the Federal minimum wage level, which will occur in 2018. The wage has risen 82 percent since 2007—16.5 percent each year.

The Government Accountability Office has reported uncertainty over how this rapid change affects the local economy, especially given the negative GDP in most of those years. Congress previously provided for the scheduled 2011 increase to be skipped. In light of continuing unpredictability of the impact of annual increases on an economy where as much as 80 percent of the hourly paid workforce will be affected, similar deferrals of the 2013 and 2015 increases are advisable.

I ask for Members to support S. 256 today as the House has supported these same proposals in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER).

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 256, and would like to speak also in support of the bill just considered, S. 304, a bill sponsored by a senior Senator of Mississippi, THAD COCHRAN.

This legislation authorized the transfer of approximately 67 acres of unused Federal land originally envisioned to be part of the Natchez Trace Parkway to the State of Mississippi.

The city of Natchez plans to use 37 acres for recreational purposes. It will improve the quality of life for the city's residents.

□ 1315

Without this legislation, this tract will continue to set idle.

I would like to thank Chairman HASTINGS for his work in bringing this commonsense and worthy legislation to the House floor. I also would like to thank our senior Senator, THAD COCHRAN, for his tireless leadership for the State of Mississippi. There are numerous individuals behind the scenes that have worked tirelessly for the city of Natchez to gain access to and the right to utilize this land over the years, and S. 304 will show that their hard work has finally paid off.

I urge my colleagues to continue to support this legislation.

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield such time as

he may consume to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank and commend the chairman of our Natural Resources Committee, DOC HASTINGS, for his leadership and for his support of this piece of legislation, and especially also my good friend, the gentleman representing the Northern Mariana Islands.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 256, a bill to amend Public Law 93-435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. I want to thank Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources for their work on this bipartisan piece of legislation. I also want to thank the Senate for finally taking action on this issue and passing S. 256 via unanimous consent last month.

As I said earlier, I would be remiss if I did not commend my good friend, Congressman SABLON, for his tireless efforts on this issue and all other matters affecting the Northern Mariana Islands since he took office in 2009.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation will appropriately convey 3 miles of offshore submerged lands to the Northern Mariana Islands. As you may know, submerged lands qualify as lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waves up to but not above the line of high tide. The territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands were granted ownership over our own respective submerged lands when the Congress passed the Territorial Submerged Lands Act in 1974. This was before CNMI became a territory of the United States.

S. 256 is in response to an unfortunate decision by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in 2005 that ruled that the submerged lands off the coast of CNMI did not belong to the Commonwealth but belonged to the Federal Government. The language guarantees that the Federal Government maintains the same rights over navigation, international affairs and commerce. Furthermore, it does not circumvent any actions that may have been taken or regulations that have been put forward by U.S. naval authorities regarding these submerged lands.

This issue is not new to us. The House has passed similar legislation since the 111th Congress. The citizens and officials of CNMI, instead of officials residing thousands of miles away, should be implementing and enforcing laws that apply to their population. We should move forward and allow CNMI to utilize these resources that are rightfully theirs and allow them to engage and promote economic activities in these areas. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend from the Northern Marianas that I have no more requests for time, and I am prepared to yield back if the gentleman is prepared to yield back.

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, but I would like to thank DOC HASTINGS for a wonderful way of managing bills. This is probably at the fastest pace, and we should do this more often.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his compliment, and I urge adoption of the bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 256.

This legislation includes provisions adjusting the minimum wage schedule for the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands in a way that I think is appropriate and fair for both workers and businesses there.

Current law requires CNMI to increase its minimum wage 50 cents a year until it reaches the Mainland's federal minimum wage level of \$7.25. Current law also requires the GAO to regularly report to Congress on economic conditions in Commonwealth over the course of these minimum wage adjustments.

These GAO reports are intended to give the public information so that, based on sound economic analysis, Congress can adjust the minimum wage schedule for the territories if warranted.

The next GAO report is due in April of 2014. Since 2007 the Commonwealth's minimum wage has increased from \$3.05 an hour to \$5.55 an hour, an 82% increase in the past 5 years. This has brought new purchasing power and a higher standard of living for many workers than they could have negotiated on their own.

This bill would skip an increase in the minimum wage in CNMI for 2013 and 2015, while still requiring increases in 2014, 2016 and subsequent years.

This approach was recommended by the Saipan Chamber of Commerce.

The Chamber stated in a May 8th letter that given the fragile economy in CNMI "spreading the wage jumps over a two-year period seems prudent."

This legislation is also recommended by Congressman SABLON, a tireless advocate for workers and for improving the Commonwealth's economy.

Because CNMI's wages had been depressed for so long, it is a long march of nearly a decade to more than double their minimum wage. In a territory like CNMI, we have recognized that we would need to be flexible with the wage rate schedule over that time frame, as conditions warranted.

Today's bill reflects that need for flexibility. It allows us to review the next GAO economic analysis for CNMI before another wage increase takes effect.

Because of CNMI's unique economic circumstances and relatively undiversified economy, it is appropriate for Congress to adjust the minimum wage schedule in response to changing economic conditions, while keeping our long-term commitment to reaching parity with the federal minimum wage.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 256.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 256.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MINUTEMAN MISSILE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 459) to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 459

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Minuteman Missile National Historic Site Boundary Modification Act".

SEC. 2. BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.

Section 3(a) of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site Establishment Act of 1999 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; Public Law 106-115) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) VISITOR FACILITY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SITE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the components described in paragraph (2), the historic site shall include a visitor facility and administrative site located on the parcel of land described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subparagraph (A) consists of—

“(i) approximately 25 acres of land within the Buffalo Gap National Grassland, located north of exit 131 on Interstate 90 in Jackson County, South Dakota, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Minuteman Missile National Historic Site Boundary Modification’, numbered 406/80,011A, and dated January 14, 2011; and

“(ii) approximately 3.65 acres of land located at the Delta 1 Launch Control Facility for the construction and use of a parking lot and for other administrative uses.

“(C) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map described in subparagraph (B) shall be kept on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

“(D) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—Administrative jurisdiction over the land described in subparagraph (B) is transferred from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary, to be administered as part of the historic site.

“(E) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundaries of the Buffalo Gap National Grassland are modified to exclude the land transferred under subparagraph (D).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 459 would authorize an agency-to-agency conveyance of Federal lands to allow for the expansion of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in South Dakota.

The U.S. Air Force administered over 1,000 Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles in silos throughout the Central States. These sites played a critical national security role until they were deactivated following the end of the Cold War.

The Minuteman Missile National Historic Site was established by Congress in 1999 to recognize the importance of the Minuteman ICBM program. S. 459 would convey just under 30 acres of the Buffalo Gap National Grassland to allow for the establishment of a visitor facility, administrative site, and a parking lot. This is good legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 459 transfers administrative jurisdiction of Forest Service lands in South Dakota to the National Park Service. These lands will be used by the Park Service to provide a visitor facility and administrative site for the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in Philip, South Dakota.

We support S. 459 and urge its passage by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and so in record time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I, too, have no more speakers, and so I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 459.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1338

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY) at 1 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1155, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2747, by the yeas and nays;

S. 130, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS REFORM ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1155) to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 6, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

YEAS—397

Aderholt	Barr	Bilirakis
Alexander	Barrow (GA)	Bishop (GA)
Amodei	Barton	Bishop (NY)
Andrews	Bass	Black
Bachmann	Beatty	Blackburn
Bachus	Becerra	Blumenauer
Barber	Benishke	Bonamici
Barletta	Bentivolio	Boustany

Brady (PA) Gabbard
 Brady (TX) Gallego
 Braley (IA) Garamendi
 Brooks (AL) Garcia
 Brooks (IN) Gardner
 Broun (GA) Garrett
 Brown (FL) Gerlach
 Brownley (CA) Gibbs
 Buchanan Gibson
 Bucshon Gingrey (GA)
 Burgess Goodlatte
 Bustos Gosar
 Butterfield Gowdy
 Calvert Granger
 Camp Graves (GA)
 Campbell Graves (MO)
 Cantor Grayson
 Capito Green, Al
 Capps Green, Gene
 Capuano Griffin (AR)
 Cárdenas Grijalva
 Carney Grimm
 Carson (IN) Guthrie
 Carter Gutierrez
 Cartwright Hahn
 Cassidy Hall
 Castor (FL) Hanabusa
 Castro (TX) Hanna
 Chabot Harper
 Chaffetz Harris
 Chu Hartzler
 Cicilline Hastings (FL)
 Clay Hastings (WA)
 Cleaver Heck (NV)
 Clyburn Hensarling
 Coble Higgins
 Coffman Himes
 Cole Hinojosa
 Collins (GA) Holding
 Collins (NY) Holt
 Conaway Honda
 Connolly Horsford
 Cook Hoyer
 Cooper Hudson
 Costa Huelskamp
 Cotton Huffman
 Courtney Huizenga (MI)
 Cramer Hultgren
 Crawford Hunter
 Crenshaw Hurt
 Crowley Israel
 Cuellar Issa
 Culberson Jackson Lee
 Cummings Jeffries
 Daines Jenkins
 Davis (CA) Johnson (GA)
 Davis, Rodney Johnson (OH)
 DeFazio Johnson, E. B.
 DeGette Johnson, Sam
 Delaney Jones
 DeLauro Jordan
 DelBene Joyce
 Denham Kaptur
 Dent Keating
 DeSantis Kelly (IL)
 DesJarlais Kelly (PA)
 Deutch Kennedy
 Diaz-Balart Kildee
 Dingell Kilmer
 Doggett King (IA)
 Doyle King (NY)
 Duckworth Kingston
 Duffy Kingzinger (IL)
 Duncan (SC) Kline
 Duncan (TN) Kuster
 Edwards Labrador
 Ellison LaMalfa
 Ellmers Lamborn
 Engel Lance
 Enyart Langevin
 Eshoo Lankford
 Farenthold Larsen (WA)
 Farr Latham
 Fattah Latta
 Fincher Lee (CA)
 Fitzpatrick Levin
 Fleischmann Lewis
 Fleming Lipinski
 Flores LoBiondo
 Forbes Loeb sack
 Fortenberry Lofgren
 Foster Long
 Foxx Lowenthal
 Franks (AZ) Lowey
 Frelinghuysen Lucas
 Fudge Luetkemeyer

Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maloney, Carolyn
 Marchant
 Marino
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNerney
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascarell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Radel
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross

Rothfus
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ruppensberger
 Rush
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster

Amash
 Bridenstine

Bera (CA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Clarke
 Cohen
 Conyers
 Davis, Danny
 Esty
 Frankel (FL)
 Gohmert
 Heck (WA)

Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Speier
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Swailwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen

NAYS—6

Griffith (VA)
 Massie

NOT VOTING—29

Herrera Beutler
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Larson (CT)
 Maffei
 Maloney, Sean
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 Meeks
 Meng

Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

Sanford
 Smith (NE)

Messer
 Murphy (FL)
 Ruiz
 Ryan (OH)
 Velázquez
 Walz
 Welch
 Yarmuth
 Young (FL)

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 10, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

YEAS—396

Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amash
 Amodei
 Andrews
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barber
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barrow (GA)
 Barton
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Boustany
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Cartwright
 Cassidy
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Connolly
 Cook
 Cooper
 Costa
 Cotton
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Daines
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge

DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge

Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Kuster
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larsen (WA)
 Latham
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer

□ 1404

Mr. BRIDENSTINE changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. DUNCAN of South Carolina and ELLISON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STREAMLINING CLAIMS PROCESSING FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2747) to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

Palazzo	Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)
Pallone	Royce	Takano
Pascarell	Runyan	Terry
Pastor (AZ)	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Paulsen	Rush	Thompson (MS)
Payne	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (PA)
Pearce	Ryan (WI)	Thornberry
Pelosi	Salmon	Tiberi
Perlmutter	Sánchez, Linda	Tierney
Perry	T.	Tipton
Peters (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Titus
Peters (MI)	Sanford	Tonko
Peterson	Sarbanes	Tsongas
Petri	Scalise	Turner
Pingree (ME)	Schakowsky	Upton
Pittenger	Schiff	Valadao
Pitts	Schneider	Van Hollen
Pocan	Schock	Vargas
Polis	Schrader	Veasey
Pompeo	Schwartz	Vela
Posey	Schweikert	Visclosky
Price (GA)	Scott (VA)	Wagner
Price (NC)	Scott, Austin	Walberg
Quigley	Scott, David	Walden
Radel	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Rahall	Serrano	Walz
Rangel	Sessions	Wasserman
Reed	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Reichert	Shea-Porter	Waters
Renacci	Sherman	Watt
Ribble	Shimkus	Waxman
Rice (SC)	Shuster	Webster (FL)
Richmond	Simpson	Wenstrup
Rigell	Sinema	Westmoreland
Roby	Sires	Whitfield
Roe (TN)	Slaughter	Williams
Rogers (AL)	Smith (MO)	Wilson (FL)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Rokita	Smith (WA)	Womack
Rooney	Southerland	Woodall
Ros-Lehtinen	Speier	Yoder
Roskam	Stewart	Yoho
Ross	Stivers	Young (AK)
Rothfus	Stutzman	Young (IN)

NAYS—10

Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Stockman
Broun (GA)	LaMalfa	Weber (TX)
Campbell	McClintock	
Gohmert	Poe (TX)	

NOT VOTING—26

Bera (CA)	Heck (WA)	Meeks
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Meng
Clarke	Kind	Murphy (FL)
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Velázquez
Esty	Maffei	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean	Yarmuth
Garcia	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Gutiérrez	McKeon	

Messrs. POE of Texas and LAMALFA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

□ 1415

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 450—H.R. 1155, and 451—H.R. 2747, I was at meetings on Syria with the Vice President at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance at a White House briefing with Vice President BIDEN on the Syria Resolution, I missed the afternoon series of votes on September 10, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted the following way on these suspension votes:

H.R. 1155—NARAB Reform Act—I would have voted “yea.”

H.R. 2747—Streamlining Claims Processing for Federal Contractor Employees—I would have voted “yea.”

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLINS of Georgia). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

POWELL SHOOTING RANGE LAND CONVEYANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 130) to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

YEAS—408

Aderholt	Bridenstine	Cicilline
Alexander	Brooks (AL)	Clay
Amash	Brooks (IN)	Cleaver
Amodei	Broun (GA)	Clyburn
Andrews	Brown (FL)	Coble
Bachus	Brownley (CA)	Coffman
Barber	Buchanan	Cole
Barletta	Bucshon	Collins (GA)
Barr	Burgess	Collins (NY)
Barrow (GA)	Bustos	Conaway
Barton	Butterfield	Connolly
Bass	Calvert	Conyers
Beatty	Camp	Cook
Becerra	Campbell	Cooper
Benishek	Cantor	Costa
Bentivolio	Capito	Cotton
Bera (CA)	Capps	Courtney
Bilirakis	Capuano	Cramer
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Crawford
Bishop (NY)	Carney	Crenshaw
Bishop (UT)	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Black	Carter	Cuellar
Blackburn	Cartwright	Culberson
Blumenauer	Cassidy	Cummings
Bonamici	Castor (FL)	Daines
Boustany	Castro (TX)	Davis (CA)
Brady (PA)	Chabot	Davis, Rodney
Brady (TX)	Chaffetz	DeFazio
Braley (IA)	Chu	DeGette
Delaney		DeLauro
DeLauro		DelBene
Denham		Denham
Dent		Dent
DeSantis		DeSantis
DesJarlais		DesJarlais
Deutch		Deutch
Diaz-Balart		Diaz-Balart
Dingell		Dingell
Doggett		Doggett
Doyle		Doyle
Duckworth		Duckworth
Duffy		Duffy
Duncan (SC)		Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)		Duncan (TN)
Edwards		Edwards
Ellison		Ellison
Elmers		Elmers
Engel		Engel
Enyart		Enyart
Eshoo		Eshoo
Esty		Esty
Farenthold		Farenthold
Farr		Farr
Fattah		Fattah
Fincher		Fincher
Fitzpatrick		Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann		Fleischmann
Fleming		Fleming
Flores		Flores
Forbes		Forbes
Fortenberry		Fortenberry
Foster		Foster
Fox		Fox
Fox		Fox
Franks (AZ)		Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen		Frelinghuysen
Fudge		Fudge
Gabbard		Gabbard
Gallego		Gallego
Garamendi		Garamendi
Garcia		Garcia
Gardner		Gardner
Gerlach		Gerlach
Gibbs		Gibbs
Gibson		Gibson
Gingrey (GA)		Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert		Gohmert
Goodlatte		Goodlatte
Gosar		Gosar
Gowdy		Gowdy
Granger		Granger
Graves (GA)		Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)		Graves (MO)
Grayson		Grayson
Green, Al		Green, Al
Green, Gene		Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)		Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)		Griffith (VA)
Grijalva		Grijalva
Grimm		Grimm
Guthrie		Guthrie
Gutiérrez		Gutiérrez
Hahn		Hahn
Hall		Hall
Hanabusa		Hanabusa
Hanna		Hanna
Harper		Harper
Harris		Harris
Hastings (FL)		Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)		Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)		Heck (NV)
Hensarling		Hensarling
Higgins		Higgins
Himes		Himes
Hinojosa		Hinojosa
Holding		Holding
Holt		Holt
Honda		Honda
Horsford		Horsford
Hoyer		Hoyer
Hudson		Hudson
Huelskamp		Huelskamp
Huffman		Huffman
Huizenga (MI)		Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren		Hultgren
Hunter		Hunter
Hurt		Hurt
Israel		Israel
Issa		Issa
Jackson Lee		Jackson Lee
Jenkins		Jenkins
Johnson (GA)		Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)		Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.		Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam		Johnson, Sam
Jones		Jones
Jordan		Jordan
Joyce		Joyce
Kaptur		Kaptur
Keating		Keating
Kelly (IL)		Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)		Kelly (PA)
Kennedy		Kennedy
Kildee		Kildee
Kilmer		Kilmer
King (IA)		King (IA)
King (NY)		King (NY)
Kingston		Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)		Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick		Kirkpatrick
Kline		Kline
Kuster		Kuster
Labrador		Labrador
LaMalfa		LaMalfa
Lamborn		Lamborn
Lance		Lance
Langevin		Langevin
Lankford		Lankford
Larsen (WA)		Larsen (WA)
Latham		Latham
Latta		Latta
Lee (CA)		Lee (CA)
Levin		Levin
Lewis		Lewis
Lipinski		Lipinski
LoBiondo		LoBiondo
Loebuck		Loebuck
Lofgren		Lofgren
Long		Long
Lowenthal		Lowenthal
Lowe		Lowe
Lucas		Lucas
Luetkemeyer		Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)		Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)		Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis		Lummis
Lynch		Lynch
Maloney		Maloney
Malone, Carolyn		Malone, Carolyn
Marchant		Marchant
Marino		Marino
Massie		Massie
Matheson		Matheson
Matsui		Matsui
McCarthy (CA)		McCarthy (CA)
McCaul		McCaul
McClintock		McClintock
McCollum		McCollum
McDermott		McDermott
McGovern		McGovern
McHenry		McHenry
McIntyre		McIntyre
McKeon		McKeon
McKinley		McKinley
McMorris		McMorris
Rodgers		Rodgers
McNerney		McNerney
Meadows		Meadows
Meehan		Meehan
Messer		Messer
Mica		Mica
Michaud		Michaud
Miller (FL)		Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)		Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary		Miller, Gary
Miller, George		Miller, George
Moore		Moore
Moran		Moran
Mullin		Mullin
Mulvaney		Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)		Murphy (PA)
Nadler		Nadler
Napolitano		Napolitano
Neal		Neal
Negrete McLeod		Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer		Neugebauer
Noem		Noem
Nolan		Nolan
Nugent		Nugent
Nunes		Nunes
Nunnelee		Nunnelee
O'Rourke		O'Rourke
Olson		Olson
Owens		Owens
Palazzo		Palazzo
Pallone		Pallone
Pascarell		Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)		Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen		Paulsen
Payne		Payne
Pearce		Pearce
Pelosi		Pelosi
Perlmutter		Perlmutter
Perry		Perry
Peters (CA)		Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)		Peters (MI)
Peterson		Peterson
Petri		Petri
Pingree (ME)		Pingree (ME)
Pittenger		Pittenger
Pitts		Pitts
Pocan		Pocan
Poe (TX)		Poe (TX)
Polis		Polis
Pompeo		Pompeo
Posey		Posey
Price (GA)		Price (GA)
Price (NC)		Price (NC)
Quigley		Quigley
Radel		Radel
Rahall		Rahall
Rangel		Rangel
Reed		Reed
Reichert		Reichert
Renacci		Renacci
Ribble		Ribble
Rice (SC)		Rice (SC)
Richmond		Richmond
Rigell		Rigell
Roby		Roby
Roe (TN)		Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)		Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)		Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)		Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher		Rohrabacher
Rokita		Rokita
Rooney		Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen		Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam		Roskam
Ross		Ross
Rothfus		Rothfus
Sánchez, Linda		Sánchez, Linda
T.		T.
Sanchez, Loretta		Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes		Sarbanes
Scalise		Scalise
Schakowsky		Schakowsky
Schiff		Schiff
Schneider		Schneider
Schock		Schock
Schrader		Schrader
Schwartz		Schwartz
Schweikert		Schweikert
Scott (VA)		Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin		Scott, Austin
Scott, David		Scott, David
Sensenbrenner		Sensenbrenner
Serrano		Serrano
Sessions		Sessions
Sewell (AL)		Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter		Shea-Porter
Sherman		Sherman
Shimkus		Shimkus
Shuster		Shuster
Simpson		Simpson
Sinema		Sinema
Sires		Sires
Slaughter		Slaughter
Smith (MO)		Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)		Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)		Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)		Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)		Smith (WA)
Southerland		Southerland
Speier		Speier
Stewart		Stewart
Stivers		Stivers
Stockman		Stockman
Stutzman		Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)		Swalwell (CA)
Takano		Takano
Terry		Terry
Thompson (CA)		Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)		Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)		Thompson (PA)
Thornberry		Thornberry
Tiberi		Tiberi

Tierney	Wagner	Westmoreland
Tipton	Walberg	Whitfield
Titus	Walden	Williams
Tonko	Walorski	Wilson (FL)
Tsongas	Walz	Wilson (SC)
Turner	Wasserman	Wittman
Upton	Schultz	Wolf
Valadao	Waters	Womack
Van Hollen	Watt	Woodall
Vargas	Waxman	Yoder
Veasey	Weber (TX)	Yoho
Vela	Webster (FL)	Young (AK)
Visclosky	Wenstrup	Young (IN)

NAYS—1

Sanford

NOT VOTING—23

Bachmann	Herrera Beutler	Meng
Clarke	Jeffries	Murphy (FL)
Cohen	Kind	Ruiz
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Velázquez
Frankel (FL)	Maffei	Welch
Garrett	Maloney, Sean	Yarmuth
Hartzler	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Heck (WA)	Meeks	

□ 1424

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on September 10, 2013—I was not present for rollcall votes 450–452 due to a meeting at the White House with Vice President JOE BIDEN. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 450, “yea” on rollcall vote 451, “yea” on rollcall vote 452.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in a classified security briefing on Syria and missed rollcall votes No. 450, No. 451, and No. 452.

Had I been present for H.R. 1155, a bill to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, I would have voted “aye.”

On H.R. 2747, a bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title, I would have voted “aye.”

On S. 130, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 450 on H.R. 1155, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained at a White House briefing on Syria. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 451 on H.R. 2747, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained at a White House briefing on Syria. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 452 on S. 130, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained at a White House briefing on Syria. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I was at the White House meeting with the Vice President

and was unable to vote on rollcall votes 450, 451, and 452.

If present, I would have voted “aye” on H.R. 1155, H.R. 2747, and S. 130.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S. 304, by the yeas and nays;

S. 256, by the yeas and nays;

S. 459, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAY LAND CONVEYANCE ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 304) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

YEAS—419

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei

Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus

Barber
Barletta
Barr

Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Billirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)

Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston

Kinzing (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger

Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta

Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry

Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—12

Culberson
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Hurt

Jeffries
McCarthy (NY)
Meeks
Meng

Nadler
Pingree (ME)
Velázquez
Young (FL)

□ 1656

Mr. MEEHAN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 453. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC LAW 93-435 WITH RESPECT TO NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 256) to amend Public Law 93-435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

YEAS—415

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Engel
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney

DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Galleo
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)

Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary

Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta

Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—17

Culberson
Cummings
Fleming
Garamendi
Grimm
Herrera Beutler

Himes
Jeffries
McCarthy (NY)
Meeks
Meng
Nadler

Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Velázquez
Wilson (FL)
Young (FL)

□ 1707

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, on September 10, 2013, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote 454 on S. 256. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

MINUTEMAN MISSILE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 459) to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 5, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 455]

YEAS—414

Alexander	Cuellar	Heck (NV)
Amodi	Cummings	Heck (WA)
Andrews	Daines	Hensarling
Bachmann	Davis (CA)	Higgins
Bachus	Davis, Danny	Himes
Barber	Davis, Rodney	Hinojosa
Barletta	DeFazio	Holding
Barr	DeGette	Holt
Barrow (GA)	Delaney	Honda
Barton	DeLauro	Horsford
Bass	DelBene	Hoyer
Beatty	Denham	Hudson
Becerra	Dent	Huelskamp
Bentivolio	DeSantis	Huffman
Bera (CA)	DesJarlais	Huizenga (MI)
Billrakis	Deutch	Hultgren
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Bishop (NY)	Dingell	Hurt
Bishop (UT)	Doggett	Israel
Black	Doyle	Issa
Blackburn	Duckworth	Jackson Lee
Blumenauer	Duffy	Jenkins
Bonamici	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (GA)
Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (OH)
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (TX)	Ellison	Johnson, Sam
Braley (IA)	Ellmers	Jones
Bridenstine	Engel	Jordan
Brooks (AL)	Enyart	Joyce
Brooks (IN)	Eshoo	Kaptur
Brown (GA)	Esty	Keating
Brown (FL)	Farenthold	Kelly (IL)
Brownley (CA)	Farr	Kelly (PA)
Buchanan	Fattah	Kennedy
Bucshon	Fincher	Kildee
Burgess	Fitzpatrick	Kilmer
Bustos	Fleischmann	Kind
Butterfield	Fleming	King (IA)
Calvert	Flores	King (NY)
Camp	Forbes	Kingston
Campbell	Fortenberry	Kinzinger (IL)
Cantor	Foster	Kirkpatrick
Capito	Fox	Kline
Capps	Frankel (FL)	Kuster
Capuano	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Cárdenas	Frelinghuysen	LaMalfa
Carney	Fudge	Lamborn
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lance
Carter	Gallego	Langevin
Cartwright	Garcia	Lankford
Cassidy	Gardner	Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL)	Garrett	Larson (CT)
Castro (TX)	Gerlach	Latham
Chabot	Gibbs	Latta
Chaffetz	Gibson	Lee (CA)
Chu	Gingrey (GA)	Levin
Cicilline	Gohmert	Lewis
Clarke	Goodlatte	Lipinski
Clay	Gosar	LoBiondo
Cleaver	Gowdy	Loebsack
Clyburn	Granger	Lofgren
Coble	Graves (GA)	Long
Coffman	Graves (MO)	Lowenthal
Cohen	Grayson	Lowe
Cole	Green, Al	Lucas
Collins (GA)	Green, Gene	Luetkemeyer
Collins (NY)	Griffin (AR)	Lujan Grisham
Conaway	Grijalva	(NM)
Connolly	Guthrie	Luján, Ben Ray
Conyers	Gutiérrez	(NM)
Cook	Hahn	Lummis
Cooper	Hall	Lynch
Costa	Hanabusa	Maffei
Cotton	Hanna	Maloney,
Courtney	Harper	Carolyn
Cramer	Harris	Maloney, Sean
Crawford	Hartzler	Marchant
Crenshaw	Hastings (FL)	Marino
Crowley	Hastings (WA)	Massie

Matheson	Pompeo	Sinema
Matsui	Posey	Sires
McCarthy (CA)	Price (GA)	Slaughter
McCaul	Price (NC)	Smith (MO)
McClintock	Quigley	Smith (NE)
McCollum	Radel	Smith (NJ)
McDermott	Rahall	Smith (TX)
McGovern	Rangel	Smith (WA)
McHenry	Reed	Southerland
McIntyre	Reichert	Speier
McKeon	Renacci	Stewart
McKinley	Ribble	Stivers
McMorris	Rice (SC)	Stockman
Rodgers	Richmond	Stutzman
McNerney	Rigell	Swalwell (CA)
Meadows	Roby	Takano
Meehan	Roe (TN)	Terry
Messer	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
Michaud	Rogers (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Thornberry
Miller (MI)	Rokita	Tiberi
Miller, Gary	Rooney	Tierney
Miller, George	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton
Moore	Roskam	Titus
Moran	Ross	Tonko
Mullin	Rothfus	Tsongas
Mulvaney	Roybal-Allard	Turner
Murphy (FL)	Royce	Upton
Murphy (PA)	Ruiz	Valadao
Napolitano	Runyan	Van Hollen
Neal	Ruppersberger	Vargas
Negrete McLeod	Rush	Veasey
Neugebauer	Ryan (OH)	Vela
Noem	Ryan (WI)	Visclosky
Nolan	Salmon	Wagner
Nugent	Sánchez, Linda	Walberg
Nunes	T.	Walden
Nunnelee	Sánchez, Loretta	Walorski
O'Rourke	Sanford	Walz
Olson	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Owens	Scalise	Schultz
Palazzo	Schakowsky	Waters
Pallone	Schiff	Watt
Pascarella	Schneider	Waxman
Pastor (AZ)	Schock	Webster (FL)
Paulsen	Schrader	Welch
Payne	Schwartz	Wenstrup
Pearce	Schweikert	Westmoreland
Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Whitfield
Perlmutter	Scott, Austin	Williams
Perry	Scott, David	Wilson (FL)
Peters (CA)	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)
Peters (MI)	Serrano	Wittman
Peterson	Sessions	Wolf
Petri	Sewell (AL)	Womack
Pittenger	Shea-Porter	Woodall
Pitts	Sherman	Yarmuth
Pocan	Shimkus	Yoder
Poe (TX)	Shuster	Yoho
Polis	Simpson	Young (AK)

NAYS—5

Amash	Griffith (VA)	Young (IN)
Benishak	Weber (TX)	

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt	Jeffries	Pingree (ME)
Culberson	McCarthy (NY)	Velázquez
Garamendi	Meeks	Young (FL)
Grimm	Meng	
Herrera Beutler	Nadler	

□ 1714

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the first series of votes today.

Had I been present, Mr. Speaker, I would have voted “yes” on rollcall No. 450, H.R. 1155, the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2013. I would have voted “yes” on rollcall No. 451, H.R. 2747,

Streamlining Claims Processing for Federal Contractor Employees Act. I would have voted “yes” on rollcall No. 452, S. 130, Powell Shooting Range Land Conveyance Act.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2775, NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-206) on the resolution (H. Res. 339) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TERRORIST ATTACKS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-59)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared in Proclamation 7463 with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, is to continue in effect for an additional year.

The terrorist threat that led to the declaration on September 14, 2001, of a national emergency continues. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect after September 14, 2013, the national emergency with respect to the terrorist threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 10, 2013.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2019

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2019.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

END SCHOOL VIOLENCE NOW

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just last week, the beginning of the school year, in Houston, Texas, we experienced an enormous tragedy in the loss of a young man due to school violence inside one of Houston's Harris County high schools.

I rise today to extend sympathy to the family of Joshua Broussard and his friends, teachers, parents, and administrators, for it is an unspeakable act to have an incident that causes children to fear the very place where they should be safe and secure. I and all of our elected officials and law enforcement have already offered their commitment and time to work with the young people to restore their faith in the sanctity and security of schools, but, more importantly, to speak to the issue of bullying, to speak to the issue of violence, and to work with the parents to be able to say that violence in America's schools must end. We must also end it in terms of knives and guns. Children must feel loved.

And so to Spring ISD, we look forward to coming to your school district and standing with the children to ensure that they know that there are those in the United States Congress like my good friend, Mr. HOYER, and others that have stood against school violence and will stand together to ensure that our children can learn and are safe.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the "Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change" report indicated that there are now dire new estimates for the rate of warming around the planet in the next century. The report represents the latest finding from the international scientific community that not only is the planet warming, but there is a 95 percent certainty that that warming is being caused by human activity.

We've known for over 100 years how greenhouse gases work in the atmosphere to trap heat. It's basic physics. We also know that atmospheric concentrations of heat-trapping gases have been rising, based on decades of direct measurements. As we directly track and measure the human activities that release heat-trapping gases, such as

burning fossil fuels, we understand we are responsible.

Unfortunately, there are some politicians in this body that are content to ignore the overwhelming scientific consensus. That's being done at the bidding of the oil and gas lobby. The House of Representatives has to listen to these experts and take action on climate change.

CONCERNS OVER FOREST FIRES IN THE WESTERN UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as we come back after our August district work period, there have been several major events that have happened and generally do happen in late summer in the western part of the United States. Those events generally revolve around forest fires.

I'm joined on the floor tonight by a number of my colleagues from the western part of the United States in whose districts we've experienced some of these forest fires. But the reason we wanted to have this time, Mr. Speaker, is because this issue about forest management that I'm going to get into and my colleagues will be getting into has been building up for some time.

I have the privilege to chair the House Natural Resources Committee. We have broad jurisdiction over all Federal lands, and that certainly includes our forested lands. And what I have observed in the time that I've had the privilege to be in this body is that our national forests are being badly mismanaged, particularly on Federal lands. They're being badly mismanaged generally because of events and regulations coming from the Federal Government. We'll talk about that a bit tonight. But there is a solution to what we will be discussing tonight for the problems we've had in the western part of the United States with these forest fires—and that's the Healthy Forest Act that we'll have on the floor, hopefully, later on this month.

As the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, I have always felt that all Federal lands, unless otherwise designated, should be for multiple purposes. That includes recreation, that includes commercial activity, and that includes whatever activity would be allowed unless Congress otherwise designates. And those designations could be national parks, they could be wilderness areas, they could be national monuments. But unless Congress otherwise designates, these areas should be for multiple purposes. In many respects, that goes to the crux of the problem that we'll be talking about tonight: the high incidence of forest fires on our Federal lands.

What we propose in the Healthy Forest Act that I hope will be on the floor here later this month and has passed out of committee by a voice vote is that on Federal lands where there is multiple purpose, there should be target dates for harvesting timber. If one looks at timber like any other commercial crop, the only difference is timber harvests happen in a longer period of time—generally, 30 to 40 years. But you should still manage that crop. That means thinning and doing all the things you do with any other commercial crop. This hasn't been done. As a result, this has led to these catastrophic forest fires that we've had.

I know there will be a chart on the floor later on that shows when you reduce harvests, the incidence of wildfires goes up dramatically. But it's gotten to the point where it's getting into the taxpayers' pocket. It's getting into the taxpayers' pocket because when we were properly managing land some 30 years or more ago, for every dollar that the Federal Government spent on managing our forest lands, \$2 would come back in return, generally from the revenue that was realized because of harvesting. But now, Mr. Speaker, that ratio is exactly reversed. For every \$2 spend, we only get \$1 back.

□ 1730

As a result, it is getting into the pocket of the taxpayer when we're running these trillion-dollar deficits. Where we could have a positive cash flow, we don't have a positive cash flow.

So the response to that is to set target dates in various forests for how much timber should be harvested. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not just on the Federal level where there would be a benefit. There is a benefit also to local communities within various counties that are heavily timbered on Federal forest lands.

Back some 100 years ago, when we were looking at using these forests as national assets, there was a promise by the Federal Government to give local counties 25 percent of the revenue that they got for timber. This was their source of income, and it worked well for some 80 years. But because of the regulations that I mentioned in my brief opening remarks, and particularly in the Northwest, and particularly in Washington, Oregon, and in northern California, because of the Endangered Species Act—and specifically within the Endangered Species Act, the spotted owl—timber harvests have dropped off dramatically. That means these counties have lost their revenue. In fact, in Washington, Oregon, and California, in the last 20 years, timber harvest has fallen by 90 percent on Federal lands; and so, as a result, those counties that relied on the revenue from forest activity simply don't have any other means of income.

Unfortunately, that's one of those issues that needs to be addressed. We do address that in the Healthy Forests Act by allowing counties to manage these Federal forests and get a return as they did—it started some 100 years ago—of 25 percent of the harvest.

So these are issues that we will be discussing tonight, some in more detail, how they affect individual districts. And we hope to have this bill on the floor, as I mentioned, later on this month. It did pass out of committee, by the way, on a voice vote. I think that is significant. I think more and more people are understanding the need to properly manage our forests.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize first a gentleman whose district was heavily impacted. We all heard about the forest fires surrounding Yosemite National Park. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to yield back my time but recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS for organizing this discussion and for his work on H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. This act takes on a poignant and crucial importance to my district in the Sierra Nevada Mountains of California where the Yosemite rim fire continues to burn through nearly 400 square miles of forestland.

For years foresters have warned us that the excess timber will come out of the forest one way or another. It will either be carried out or it will be burned out, but it will come out. For generations we carried the excess timber out of our forests through sound forest management practices, leaving room for the remaining trees to grow healthy and strong. We had far less frequent and less intense forest fires, healthy trees that were disease resistant and pest resistant, and a healthier watershed as well as a thriving economy.

But today, extremist environmental regulations have driven that harvest down by more than 80 percent in the Sierras in the past 30 years. We now consign the forests to a policy of benign neglect. And rather than harvesting a small percentage of the trees to keep our forests healthy and fire resistant, we are watching more than 400 square miles of Sierra Nevada incinerated. If we had just harvested a small fraction of those trees, it's quite possible that we could have spared the Sierras from the conflagrations that are now feeding on excessive fuels. It is also likely we could have snuffed out those fires almost immediately after they started.

A generation ago, small harvesting crews operated throughout the mountains and they moved along well-maintained timber roads. When a fire first

broke out, it took no time for a crew with a bulldozer to get to that fire and stop it before it got out of control. Today, those crews are gone, the roads are in disrepair, and so fires that a generation ago consumed just a few acres now consume hundreds of thousands of acres.

The result of these misguided policies is now clear and undeniable: economically devastated communities, closed timber mills, unemployed families, overgrown forests, overdrawn watersheds, jeopardized transmission lines, rampant disease and pestilence, and increasingly intense and frequent forest fires. That is the story of the towns throughout the Sierra Nevada—once thriving and prosperous communities that have been devastated by these policies. This is not environmentalism. True environmentalists recognize the damage done by overgrowth and overpopulation and they recognize the role of sound, sustainable forest management practices in maintaining healthy forests.

If there is any doubt of the connection between the reduction of timber harvesting and the increase in acreage incinerated by forest fires, I ask you to look at this chart. It shows the board feet of timber harvested from our public lands since 1983 and the forest acreage destroyed by fire. There is nothing subtle about these numbers. As the timber harvest has declined, the acreage destroyed by fire has increased contemporaneously and proportionally. It is either carried out or burned out, and at the moment it's being burned out.

They say there isn't enough money for forest thinning. And yet we used to have no problem keeping our forests thinned and healthy when we sold commercially viable timber. The problem is that if they take place at all, timber harvests are restricted to small diameter trees with no commercial value. I mean, can you imagine a fishery or a wildlife policy limited to taking only the smallest juveniles of the species? Thus, the U.S. Forest Service, which once produced revenues through timber sales, now consumes revenues, and even that isn't enough to maintain the acreage the government owns and controls. The mountain communities that once thrived economically are now economically prostrate, with unemployment levels that rival those of Detroit.

This act is long overdue. By streamlining regulations and refocusing the Forest Service's mission on sound forest management practices, H.R. 1526 will mean environmentally healthy forests and economically healthier communities.

Ironically, just 2 weeks before the Yosemite rim fire broke out, Congressman NUNES and I hosted a public meeting on a proposal by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that would add more restrictions on nearly 2 million acres of

the Sierras. Our expert witnesses warned urgently of the fire dangers these policies have created, yet these warnings were actually ridiculed by leftist newspapers like the Sacramento Bee. How sad. Two weeks later, the Yosemite rim fire was burning out of control.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of my district, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington for this important reform. I only wish it had come in time to prevent the environmental devastation we are now suffering this summer in the Sierras.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 48 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to control this next 48 minutes as we explain how significant this Secure Rural Schools fix is and how important it is that we do something on a program that, quite frankly, is not sustainable.

So at this time I would like to recognize, if not the father, the godfather of Secure Rural Schools, the gentleman from Oregon. His State is impacted significantly by this program. It is a significant issue to the school kids of Oregon. Mr. WALDEN of Oregon is someone who has talked about this for many years and knows the significance and the importance of this particular issue. So I gladly yield to the gentleman from Oregon to explain his take on the Secure Rural Schools issue.

Mr. WALDEN. Well, I thank the gentleman from Utah, the chairman of the Forestry Subcommittee, a subcommittee that a number of years ago I had the great privilege and honor to chair when we passed legislation, as we're going to do in this House once again, to not only make America's great forests healthy, but also then to stop the devastation that we heard from the gentleman from California. We have so much work to do to continue the legacy of real environmentalism, which is healthy forests and healthy communities.

When President Theodore Roosevelt created the great forest reserves back in 1905, thereabouts, he said they have to be in partnership with the communities and the communities have to be supportive of this. The great purpose of this creation of forest reserves, in a speech he gave in your home State, as a matter of fact, in Utah, I believe, was wood for woodmaking, for homebuilding, water for agriculture, which means the preservation of healthy forests, in the real term preservation—which is what I want—not what we're seeing in Yosemite National Park and

the surrounding areas, the focus of 400 square miles of devastation, not what we saw in Oregon this summer where the smoke was so thick in the Rogue Valley that they had to cancel performances at the Shakespeare Theater. The restaurants literally shut down. The people had to wear masks. I called into the call center of one of the phone companies and the attendant there said to me, he said, It's smoky in here inside the building.

This is not what we want out of our forests. It's not what our taxpayers want. It's not what the schoolchildren want. Because, you see, we've lost the jobs; we've lost the revenue from the jobs. We've got sheriffs in counties in my district that now have maybe one deputy. We had situations of violence, 911 calls. A woman was being attacked and basically told by the 911 folks, We don't have anybody to send. Can you tell him to go away?

You can't make this stuff up.

I thank Chairman HASTINGS, Chairman BISHOP, and others for bringing this bill forward. Let me tell you what it means in a State like mine.

In 2012, the Oregon Department of Forestry, in collaboration with other State and Federal agencies, issued a report to Oregon Governor John Kitzhaber stating that, over the 20-year period from 1980 to 2000, wildfires in eastern Oregon burned approximately 553,000 acres, with an average fire size of 26,000 acres. Over the last 10 years, in that same area, it has burned 1 million acres, averaging 93,000 acres in size. That means wildfires have tripled in size in the last 30 years. Not all of those are in forests. Some of them are grasslands. But the point is it's out of control and it's very, very deadly and expensive. And it's unacceptable.

The Oregon Forest Resources Institute reported that, since 1990, the timber harvest from Federal forestlands in the great State of Oregon has dropped by more than 90 percent—90 percent reduction since 1990 in harvested timber off Federal lands. In fact, 60 percent of Oregon's forestland is owned/controlled—but not really managed—by the Federal Government. It now contributes less than 12 percent of the State's total timber harvest. Sixty percent owned by and controlled by the Federal Government, 12 percent of timber harvest.

What does that mean for timber dependent communities? Counties that have like 50, 60, 70 percent Federal ownership, my friend who taught school knows you don't have a tax base, and now you don't have jobs because now you're not doing harvest. You can't turn and entice some big company to come in. This is a forested, rural area, a long way from freeways in most cases but not all.

So what does that mean? Nine out of 20 counties I represent face double-digit unemployment today. Sixteen of

the 20 counties I represent have more than 14 percent of their populations living in poverty in America.

Here's a chart that shows what's happening. It shows mill closures in Oregon over the last 30 years. We've lost three-fourths of our mills and 30,000 mill jobs. Just recently, we lost another one. In Josephine County, the Rough & Ready mill closed after nearly 100 years. The owners were ready to invest \$2 million in upgrades, and they said, We can't count on a timber supply off the Federal ground that surrounds them. There went 87 jobs.

I want to show you another picture. I have used it before over the years. It is indicative of what happens in a fire. This is Kaleb and Ashley after the Egley fire, which burned 140,000 acres in Harney County, 2007. It just shows the devastation, these young children out there.

And what does it mean for our kids? The chairman asked about that. The Oregon Department of Education says 60 percent of the schoolchildren in the county where this fire occurred are eligible for free and reduced lunch. There's poverty all over the West, and there's a way to end that and produce jobs and revenue and have healthy forests rather than what we see today.

The chairman's bill would require foresters to look at the sustainable yield a forest could produce and then only seek to harvest half of that, of the sustainable yield, and only on land that is suitable for timber harvest. It says, if you're going to appeal a plan, you had to at least be involved in the process. We put that in the Healthy Forests Restoration Act that passed this body overwhelmingly and I think passed the Senate—huge support—signed by then-President Bush into law. It had great effect, but limited in terms of what we need to do. But it had that provision in there. It strikes a balance. You need to participate in the process in order to have a right to appeal.

□ 1745

It includes a 1-year bridge payment. This gets your schools issue for the counties who currently have lost or will lose their funding for emergency services, for roads, and for schools in the Secure Rural Schools side. This is a bridge to put people back to work in the woods when coupled with active management. This is balance—this is balance.

The bill also has an Oregon-specific provision. Not everything I would necessarily do if I could write it on my own, but do you know what? You don't get that process here. We've put together a good plan with Representatives DEFAZIO and SCHRADER. We've worked through our differences. We forged a balanced plan that would create thousands of new jobs. Creators saved up to 3,000 jobs in Oregon in

these very unique lands called the O&C Lands. It ensures the health of these lands for future generations. It provides long-term management and certainty of funding for our local services and schools and roads and law enforcement that lie within these counties.

According to Governor Kitzhaber's O&C Lands Report, it would generate \$120 million per year in county revenue. We don't come back here to the Federal taxpayer and say, Give us another check, give us another handout. We say, Let us manage our own lands and do it under the Oregon State Forest Practices Act, which is one of the leading environmental laws in the country for balance, for sustainable forest health and management. Do it under that and we'll create the jobs and save them, we'll create the revenue for our schools.

Let me tell you about the protections that you will get. It provides:

Activities near streams, lakes, and wetlands must include water quality protection. Something we all agree on.

Wildlife trees and down logs have to be left in most large clear-cut areas. Clear-cut sizes are limited to 120 acres. Now, some will say, Oh, my gosh, 120 acres. Let me tell you that the Douglas Complex fire that burned this summer burned 48,000 acres. If there isn't a more destructive clear-cut than that, I don't know what it is. And do you know what? After it burns, there's no requirement they go in and replant. If you harvest 128 acres, you're required to go in and replant, and those trees have to survive, and you go in right away.

Let me show you what happens after a fire to the environment. There's no stream setback here. Fire knows no bounds. Our legislation says you can't harvest near that, near a stream, you have to have setbacks. We believe in the environment. This is what you get when you don't manage.

You see, lack of action has an impact in a dynamic forest environment. Doing nothing doesn't mean the forest gets better. It means it gets overcrowded, overstocked, and when you get fire—and we'll always have it—it just won't burn naturally anymore. It will blow up, like my friend and colleague from California has experienced in the Yosemite fire and like we've experienced all over the West this summer and will every summer thereafter.

The Forest Service now spends more fighting fire than anything else. They ought to change their name to the U.S. Fire Service.

We've got to get back to managing these lands, and this legislation does that. I thank the committee for its incredible work. I thank you for bringing this to the floor. I look forward to voting for it when it comes to the floor. Together we'll get back to proper, thoughtful, constructive management of our Federal forests. We'll take care

of that trust the people put in us to take care of their lands, and we'll take care of the people as well.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman for his comments here.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard now from three Members from the west coast—one from California, one from Oregon and one from Washington—who have explained the situation and how this particular act is, indeed, a solution to the problems that those west coast States are finding in their forestry efforts.

But this also impacts the interior of this country, so I would like to yield a few minutes to the representative from the State of Montana, who represents the entire State of Montana, to explain how this has an impact on interior State forests, as well as the coastal State forests.

I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) to explain what's happening in his State.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah, and I thank the chairman for reserving this hour for this very important issue, saving our national forests and our forested communities, which is very important to my home State of Montana.

H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests and Healthy Communities Act is important to Montana because many of our counties in Montana rely on the forest economy or at least the relics of what used to be one. Several decades ago, Montana forests supported local timber jobs and provided a steady revenue stream for our counties and schools.

In fact, I remember growing up when I was riding in the back seat, mom and dad in front in the station wagon and I would be in back with my sisters, we would watch logging trucks drive up and down our highways. Our counties enjoyed the benefits of the receipts from timber sales. It used to help support our schools.

But today, as I now drive around the State representing the State of Montana, most of our forest counties struggle with unemployment. In fact, Lincoln County, the most northwest county of my State, which is comprised mostly of national forest land, it used to generate timber jobs. They now face double digit unemployment.

The Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest faces a very high mortality rate due to beetle kill. The tragedy here as we drive all over the State this time of year, we are seeing forest fires on one hand and then standing dead timber on the other that has died because of beetle kill. We can't even go in and harvest the dead trees, which we have a couple years to do so, because of the onerous process here on our national forest.

Inflexible and outdated Federal laws like the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species

Act have imposed a huge administrative burden on Federal agencies, which limits our timber industry's access to wood and ultimately resulted in the mismanagement of our forests, allowing places where we love to recreate instead to burn up in smoke. And when they burn up in smoke, as the gentleman from Oregon mentioned, it threatens our watersheds as well.

In fact, so far over 100,000 acres in Montana have burned this year. The number of large fires—large fires—has been as high as five just this week. My son last year played high school football his senior year. We had "Friday Night Lights" high school football games in Montana canceled because of air quality, because of forest fires.

Laws like NEPA and the Endangered Species Act are often the basis of lawsuits. These aren't filed by the rank and file Montanans who are working to collaborate to improve access to our national forests, but they're filed by fringe extreme groups to halt healthy timber management projects that could help prevent these fires and, importantly, create hundreds of jobs.

In fact, in one of our hearings in our committee, a top national forest official, Deputy Chief Jim Hubbard, said litigation has played a huge role in blocking responsible timber sales in Montana and other region 1 States, including projects supported by collaborative groups consisting of timber as well as conservation leaders. To quote Mr. Hubbard, he said this: "It has virtually shut things down on the national forest."

As the gentleman from Oregon mentioned, the numbers in Montana are the same. Timber harvests are down 90 percent on our Federal lands from where they were when I was growing up.

Mr. Chairman, something must be done, and I'm glad to join you in introducing this very important bill. H.R. 1526 will help revitalize the timber industry throughout Montana and create thousands of good, high-paying jobs. It also tackles beetle kill, protecting our environment for future generations and reducing the threat of catastrophic wildfires in Montana.

The Restoring Healthy Forests and Healthy Communities Act will cut the red tape that has held up responsible forest management in timber production. It also includes comprehensive reforms to discourage and limit the flood of frivolous appeals and litigation. It requires the Forest Service to increase timber harvest on non-wilderness lands now that it will have much needed latitude to do the work it knows how to do.

This improved management will protect the health of our forests, the health of our watersheds, the safety of our communities, and allow jobs to return to the timber industry. In addition, the legislation restores the Fed-

eral Government's commitment to provide 25 percent of timber sales receipts to timber counties. It extends the Secure Rural Schools program pending the full operation of the new timber program.

SRS has provided crucial stopgap funding to timber counties after timber sales, and the corresponding receipts, after they plunged in recent decades. It is the taxpayer now who is funding that gap when instead we could have the timber industry cutting down trees and supplying jobs and supplying revenue to support our schools.

Recently, we welcomed Chuck Roady, the vice president and general manager of F. H. Stoltze Land and Lumber in Columbia Falls, Montana. He came back to Washington, D.C., as a witness for a House Natural Resources hearing on forest and fire management.

During the hearing, Chuck perfectly summed up the challenges we face. He said:

This is a nonpartisan, nonregional issue. It's simply the case of doing the right thing to manage our public forest. If we don't, Mother Nature is going to do it for us, and when she does it, it's uncontrollable and catastrophic.

Mr. Speaker, I could not have conveyed our challenges any better than that. We all know too well how devastating wildfires can be to our communities and our local economies.

I urge passing the Restoring Healthy Forests and Healthy Communities Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Montana.

Very few people realize the Federal Government actually owns 1 out of every 3 acres in this country, but it is disproportionate. So, of the 13 Western States, 54 percent of the land mass is actually owned by the Federal Government. The 33 States east of the Western States only have 4 percent of their land. Which simply means no one actually east of Denver quite understands how this relationship necessarily works. It also means that the unfortunate truth is, as we've already heard, that private and State forests are today healthier than the Federal forest system. But those of us in the West realize this firsthand because those are our neighbors, those are the areas that surround our communities.

I'm glad to hear from the next two speakers who will be talking—they are from Colorado. The first one is the gentleman from Colorado Springs, who is on the Natural Resources Committee, and he's going to explain the significant situation that they find in Colorado with our forest health situation.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah. It's great to serve on the committee as a subcommittee chairman with him. And we serve with Chairman DOC HASTINGS,

who is doing a great job on these issues.

The bill, H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, is a long-term solution to help put hardworking Americans back to work and ensure that these rural counties have a stable source of revenue to help pay for schools and teachers. It was introduced by my friend and colleague, Representative SCOTT TIPTON, of Colorado, and I am a cosponsor.

Over a century ago, the Federal Government made a promise to actively manage our forests and share 25 percent of the revenues generated from timber sales with counties containing national forest land. This is funding that rural counties depend on to help fund vital services, such as education and roads. But the Federal Government has failed to uphold this commitment and has cut back on active management of our national forests.

This lack of active forest management not only deprives counties of revenue to help fund schools and roads but also inhibits job creation and makes our national forests increasingly susceptible to wildfires and invasive species. Currently, there are over 21 active large wildfires burning right now in eight States. Over 406,000 acres are burning, with only 2 of the 21 fires contained.

This year, to date there have been over 35,000 fires with almost 4 million acres burned. Last year, the tragic Waldo Canyon fire occurred on Federal land in my Colorado district, claiming two lives and destroying almost 500 homes.

H.R. 1526 will help improve forest health and prevent catastrophic wildfires by allowing greater State and local involvement in wildfire prevention on Federal lands. It will help improve local forest management by allowing counties to actively manage portions of national forest land.

Restoring active management of our national forests would ensure a stable, predictable revenue stream for counties and schools. Active management would also promote healthier forests, reduce the risk of wildfires, and decrease our reliance on foreign countries for timber and paper goods.

I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, since Mr. LAMBORN has already introduced the concept of what's taking place in Colorado and the bill for Mr. TIPTON, let's turn now to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) to also explain the significance of why he actually did that particular bill.

Mr. TIPTON. Thank you, Chairman BISHOP. I certainly appreciate your leadership on this issue, along with Chairman HASTINGS.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague had just described some of the challenges that we've been facing in Colorado. I would like to be able to expand upon that.

Not long ago, I was at the incident command centers in Monte Vista, Colorado, on the east side of the Rockies, and also in Pagosa Springs, on the west side of the Rockies, to be able to visit the incident command centers trying to deal with the West Fork Complex fire.

□ 1800

How big is the fire? It's 170 square miles and counting. We are not talking 170 acres. We are talking 170 square miles of forests in my district.

The challenges that this is going to bring in terms of being able to deal with endangered species, in terms of water quality, in terms of tourism and the economy in western Colorado can probably not yet be numbered. That is why the Restoring Healthy Forests Act is a bill whose time has come.

The National Interagency Fire Center reported this week that there have been 35,000-plus fires in the United States in 2013 alone. Devastating bark beetle infestation, prolonged drought conditions, and unnaturally dense forests—these have all combined with ineffective forest management for a devastating fire season. These factors have led to a significant increase in the magnitude and in the number of wildfires in the country over the past decade.

So far this year, 3.9 million acres have already burned, and these figures continue to grow with 21 active, large wildfires. The property damage and costs associated with these wildfires is tremendous; and to date, the Forest Service has already spent over a billion dollars in fire suppression alone. In 2012, the Forest Service spent only \$296 million on hazardous fuels reduction; whereas, they spent \$1.77 billion on wildfire suppression at that same time.

Part of this is a planning process. We have dealt with leadership in the Forest Service. They've talked about computer models which their own folks are telling us simply don't work. We have to be able to get in and effectively manage these forests, to be able to treat them in a responsible way, to be able to build for our communities, and to be able to make sure that our children are able to see the same forests that we grew up living in.

The cost of proactive healthy forest management is, indeed, far less than the cost of wildfire suppression. When it comes to our forests, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure; but instead of ramping up forest management efforts and addressing hazardous conditions in the West, the Interior Department has proposed to cut the budget by 48 percent for hazardous fuels reduction in 2014, and the Forest Service has proposed reducing this proactive management by a further 24 percent. Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have expressed outrage at this approach of further reducing funding for hazardous fuels.

Under the current management system, a cumbersome regulatory framework has further inhibited active forest management while excessive litigation has obstructed projects that would prevent devastating wildfires and protect our vital water supplies and precious species habitats. The status quo is not working, and immediate action is needed to be able to fix this broken system.

Our forest management package, H.R. 1526, would allow greater State and local involvement in wildfire prevention on Federal lands in order to expedite hazardous fuels reduction projects and reduce litigation. In doing so, it would help restore sustainable timber harvesting, create jobs, and provide reliable sources of revenue for rural education and infrastructure.

H.R. 1526 also addresses the shortfall in county revenue for schools and critical services caused by a lack of timber harvest by requiring the Forest Service to produce at least half of the sustainable annual yield of timber required under the 1908 law and to share 25 percent of those receipts with our rural counties.

In order to meet this goal while providing for healthy forests, the bill includes the local management framework by directing the Forest Service to prioritize hazardous fuels reduction projects proposed by Governors and affected counties and tribes. To expedite locally based healthy forest projects, this package builds on the positive streamlining procedures implemented under the bipartisan Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003.

I am pleased to have been able to work with Chairman BISHOP and Chairman HASTINGS on this bill. It's time that we stand together to be able to return health to our forests in a proactive, responsible, and positive way. H.R. 1526 accomplishes that goal.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the last two speakers from Colorado for explaining the situation they are facing within their State on Federal forest land.

Before we turn to somebody from the East who gets what we're talking about here, let's continue with the backbone of the Rocky Mountains by turning some time over to the Representative from the State of Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) in order for her to explain how this impacts her State.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I also thank Chairman HASTINGS of the Natural Resources Committee for bringing this important legislation to the attention of the American people, especially after this tremendous fire season that we've had in the West for the past 3 or 4 years, in which we have lost valuable natural resources, jobs, wildlife, livestock, people, houses. It is an unnecessary devastation that always amazes me as we

would bring about legislation to address regional haze, which has no environmental impact other than to reduce the viewsheds or the damage to the viewshed, when the damage to the viewshed is being caused by our inattentiveness in managing our national forests.

I want to talk, Mr. Chairman, about forest health and about the benefits of logging to have healthy forests, vibrant wildlife, and clean water and air.

The air is cleaner when the West is not on fire. The water is cleaner when protected from the ash that goes down the hills, into the streams, choking the oxygen out of our streams, which then, in turn, kills our fish. That reduces fishing opportunities, and it reduces a vibrant fish population.

In addition to providing clean air by lack of fire, clean water due to lack of fire, by logging, we can actually have more vibrant, widespread wildlife habitat and water for that habitat. When we log and do it in a manner that preserves the natural contours in our forests, we can have high mountain meadows with forages that will keep elk, deer, and other species on those high mountain meadows longer in the year, thereby providing habitat for a vibrant, healthy, diverse, ungulate population and for the species that share that ecosystem habitat. So it's good for wildlife.

Furthermore, it's good for the health of the forests, themselves, because, if you would look, for example, at the Medicine Bow National Forest and the Routt National Forest across the border in Colorado, these two forests have been absolutely denuded of lodgepole pine by the bark beetle with the exception of the young trees in the areas that have previously been logged. The healthy areas of the Medicine Bow National Forest in Wyoming and the Routt National Forest in Colorado are the areas that were previously logged, because there is a diversity of the age of the trees, thereby having a young, more resilient, healthy tree intermingled with stands of medium-maturity and high-maturity trees. The combination of the old growth, the medium-maturity trees, and the young trees makes for a more vibrant, healthy forest that can better withstand an onslaught like the bark beetle epidemic that has devastated so much of the Intermountain West.

So we have addressed clean air, clean water, wildlife habitat through the opportunity for high mountain meadows, and we have addressed the health of the trees, themselves. All this can happen while we have jobs in logging, while we have opportunities for revenues for schools.

The point here is we are all part of this ecosystem—the people, the animals, the air, the water, the trees. All can benefit by this bill. This is a commonsense solution that has taken

Americans decades to understand and appreciate the importance of, but that has never been more apparent than it was this summer.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this important dialogue.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentlelady from Wyoming for being with us and talking about the concepts that are going on and what we can do for our future.

If I could, Mr. Speaker, at the turn of the 20th century, the so-called “progressive era,” there was a paradigm shift that took place in the United States in which the government decided to basically keep all of the land. It was based on three premises:

The first is that the West had to be protected from itself. The second is that only somebody in Washington, D.C., would have the vision to make decisions that could impact the rest of the Nation, and if there were ever a conflict between what local leaders or local officials wanted and what D.C. wanted, D.C. obviously had the better advantage.

The result of that is, as you have heard from the people here today, that our forest system is not as healthy as it used to be or ought to be. The communities that relied upon the timber industry to survive and the school systems in those areas that relied upon the timber industry to survive have been decimated, and our solution as a Congress and as an administration is simply to find a temporary payment to these solutions with actually no revenue source to make them permanent.

What we have now done since 2000, when the Secure Rural School Program started, is spend \$6 billion, which has come from the pockets of those who live in the East, to fund a temporary program when what we actually need is a long-term solution that works—that puts people to work, that finds a real source of funding for education services and provides a real solution for what we need, a solution that will provide for healthy forests, a solution that will provide for vibrant communities and for the support of our public school system. That is, indeed, what this proposal for the Secure Rural School Program attempts to do.

Mr. Speaker, about 20 years ago, a former Democrat Member of this House, who is now part of the Senate leadership—I realize that's an oxymoron, “Senate leadership”—but he was here, and he gave an impassioned speech upon this floor that dealt with the controversial decision of Major League Baseball's potentially switching to aluminum bats. As that Representative from Illinois, who is now a Senator, rose, he said:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to condemn the desecration of a great American symbol. No, I am not referring to flag burning; I am referring to the baseball bat.

Several experts tell us that the wooden baseball bat is doomed to extinction . . .

Please, do not tell me that wooden bats are too expensive . . . Please, do not try to sell me on the notion that these metal clubs will make better hitters . . . If we forsake the great Americana of broken-bat singles and pine tar, we will have certainly lost our way as a Nation.

His conclusion was simply this:

I do not want to hear about saving trees. Any tree in America would gladly give its life for the glory of a day at home plate.

As much as I agree with his statements, I'd like to take his comment one step further and say that, not only would any tree in America gladly give its life for the glory of a day at bat at home plate, but any tree in America would gladly be overjoyed to give its life to help fund the education of our kids.

The solution is that we don't need all trees to provide the bats or the education funding—just some of the trees. In fact, by not cutting them all, you actually save and improve the health of the forests; but if you don't do it, we lose these trees to fire, and every burned tree is a burned baseball bat, and that is not good for the psyche of this particular country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time in order to turn the management time of this Special Order over to Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania so that he may speak and also introduce a couple of more speakers whom we have still to talk about this vital issue of Secure Rural Schools and how this House has finally come up with a solution—a long-term, lasting solution—to this particular problem.

SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 12 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Chairman BISHOP and Chairman HASTINGS.

As an individual from Pennsylvania, from the eastern portion of the United States, I do get it. This is a problem that obviously—as you've heard from my colleagues from the western part of the country—is devastating there. It's devastating in communities in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. We have the Allegheny National Forest there. I have four counties—schools, municipalities—which struggle because of a failed policy in terms of forest management. They struggle economically.

□ 1815

When we do not have healthy forests, we do not have healthy communities. So I stand here very appreciative to Chairman HASTINGS' work and certainly supportive of H.R. 1526.

As chairman of the Agriculture Committee's Forestry Subcommittee, I continually point out that the Forest Service is housed within the USDA—rather than the Interior—and was done so for very specific purposes.

This decision was made long ago because our national forests were intended for multiple use. The most important function of that mission is to properly manage these forests and grasslands in order to retain the ecological health of those resources for sustained economic and recreational use.

You can't adequately manage a forest without harvesting timber. Just look to our private and State forests to see how to manage a forest cost effectively and environmentally responsibly. National forestlands, when managed correctly, will be more ecologically healthy and economically beneficial to the local communities.

Representing a forested district and as an outdoorsman, I've been very alarmed at how precipitously our annual harvests have dropped off in the past 20 years. Between 1960 and 1989, the Forest Service was harvesting roughly 10 billion to 12 billion board feet per year. Since the early nineties, the annual harvest across Forest Service lands fell below 2 billion board feet and hit its bottom in 2002 at 1.7 billion feet. This is about one-fifth of what they've been harvesting in an average year.

We have seen firsthand the economic impacts of reducing our harvesting levels in national forests. Under longtime Federal law, 25 percent of the timber receipts generated on national forests are required to be returned to the county of origin. The purpose of this is that since there is no tax base there for the local government, timber receipts were to provide a consistent source of revenue to the counties to be used for schools, police, and local expenses.

In 2000, this lack of timber dollars plummeted so low that Congress created the now expired Secure Rural Schools program to make up for the loss of the county revenues in the national forestlands. This program simply would not have been needed if the Federal Government was keeping its promise to these rural areas by managing and harvesting the appropriate amount of timber.

In the Allegheny National Forest located in my district, we have slightly inched up in meeting the recommended level of harvest, but we are still nowhere near where we need to be. This is especially true across almost every other national forest around the country where they typically are generating only a few percent of the recommended level.

Too little harvesting will have a significant impact on overall forest health. Decreased timber harvesting means more dead trees and more high-

ly flammable biomaterials that do little more than serve as fuel for wildfires. According to the Forest Service, the instances of wildfires each year have actually decreased in recent years. However, fires that we've been seeing recently are much more intense than they have been in past years. Why? The reason is because of increased flammability in the forests as a result of materials that have been accumulated and not removed through management activities.

According to the U.S. Forest Service, 65 million to 82 million acres of forestland are at high risk of wildfires. Last year, wildfires burned 9.3 million acres while the U.S. Forest Service only harvested approximately 200,000 acres. This means that 44 times as many acres burned as were responsibly managed and harvested.

As an original cosponsor of H.R. 1526, I want to applaud Chairman HASTINGS for his leadership and introduction of the bill. This legislation will provide responsible timber production on forestlands and does so in areas specifically identified by the agency.

Access and retaining the multiple-use mission of the Forest Service is paramount to ensuring that our rural forest communities continue to flourish and be viable.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to recognize my good friend, a Western Caucus colleague, Mr. PEARCE.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding and for his work on behalf of H.R. 1526.

New Mexico is a home to multiple national forests. We see firsthand the effect of our national Forest Service policy. Last year, in the middle of the year, a fire broke out. It was about 4 acres for 2 or 3 days. The Forest Service's policy was basically "let it burn."

They let it burn for 3 or 4 days, had enough people to swat it out with whisk brooms, when suddenly the winds got up, as they do in New Mexico always, and blew that fire into 10,000 acres. It almost immediately started burning down homes, 255 homes. It's at that point we began to speak publicly about the Forest Service policies that would create infernos in our western forests.

Formerly, we had a policy in the Forest Service of the 10 a.m. rule. It was, if you get a fire, you put it out by 10 a.m. tomorrow. If you're not successful by 10 a.m. tomorrow, then it's 10 a.m. the next day. You dedicate all the resources you can to putting out the fire.

Those policies have been amended by current Forest Service Chief Tom Tidwell into saying, We're going to let them burn. We're watching right now wondering if the sequoias will survive this Forest Service policy.

Many of the forests in New Mexico and the West are not surviving. Hundreds of millions of acres are at risk every year. It's not a matter of if they will burn, but when.

As we talked publicly about Forest Service management policies during that fire, then we started getting calls from individuals around the country who had retired out of the Forest Service saying, Yes, keep talking. We, as retired professionals, disagree with the current philosophies in the Forest Service.

We invited one of those 30-year employees—Bill Derr—into our district to run a congressional study and to come up with recommendations. He basically had two, after months of study. He said we should be mechanically thinning our forests—that is, logging in our forests—and, secondly, returning to the 10 a.m. policy.

What are the downstream effects of bad Forest Service management?

First of all, we're losing the habitat for millions of species; we're burning millions of species in the fire. These are endangered species sometimes, but otherwise we're just killing lots of animals.

Also, we're destroying a watershed. In New Mexico, in the Whitewater-Baldy fire, the forest around one of the lakes there that provides drinking water for Alamogordo was at risk. The Forest Service said they should clean it, and instead lawsuits were filed to stop that. The fire burned right up to the edge of the lake, and the lake now has 50 feet of fill in it. All the fish are dead, starved for oxygen, exactly like the gentlelady from Wyoming said. The streams are now filling with silt.

Forest Service personnel tell us we will be having to empty that lake for the next 15 years. That's 15 years of dead fish; 15 years downstream facing flooding; 15 years without the drinking water that sustains a community of about 30,000. These are what we face.

Also, the West is starved for jobs because of Forest Service policy. The original Organic Act, the act that created the U.S. Forest Service, said that they should be logging to create local commerce and jobs and they should be protecting the watershed. The U.S. Forest Service is negligent on both of the underlying reasons for their existence. We in the West are suffering lost education opportunities, destroyed habitat, and destroyed forests. Those forests will not grow back for 100 years according to the Forest Service personnel.

It's time for us to pass H.R. 1526. I support it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I would like to recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, every year, rural America, especially the western States and areas like mine in northern California, are in the news. It's not for something good, but for something like we see going on with so many of the wildfires around the country. There's no reason for this. That's why I support this bill here today that

would actually make our forests perform for us, instead of being a detriment to us and our health in California and the western States.

We can have either the type of air quality problems that are happening—like in the central valley of California, for example, one of my colleagues was talking about, although we've had challenges there in recent years, they've actually improved things. The air quality right now is much worse because of these fires than anything going on by people or after the improvements that have gone on with other air quality issues. In my own part of the State back in 2008, the whole summer and into the fall, brown, dirty—including the areas close to the fire—kids couldn't go outside because the quality was 10 times above health levels for them to be safe.

We see our small communities that are devastated by an economy that has shifted away due to forest management and Forest Service policies that don't work for them. This legislation would allow our forests to perform for us and help these economies, help the health of the forest, the health of the people, and the health of the local economies to be strong once again, and, as was mentioned earlier, our rural schools.

So let's do commonsense legislation instead of watching our forests burn. I urge you to support this.

POTENTIAL U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN SYRIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this is an extraordinarily busy week in Washington as we have all returned from a district work period. There are many issues to discuss, including how we're going to fund the Federal budget, get the fiscal house in order, potentially have the right type of tax reform, and deal with a whole host of other issues, but I felt like it would be very inadequate if the evening went by but did not delve into a little bit deeper of a discussion as to the nature of the Syrian conflict and the potential for United States military involvement.

Mr. Speaker, I wrote my constituents last week as they expressed tremendous concern about the potential for U.S. entanglement in the situation in Syria. In fact, it's overwhelming the number of people who have shared deep, heartfelt concerns. It is overwhelming. I'm hearing that from my colleagues, as well.

This is not some sort of populous reaction to the elites of this institution in government. It is an intuition of the American people who are suggesting to us in leadership that we have poured

ourselves out as a country, sacrificed tremendously, extraordinarily, to give other people a chance for stability, for human rights, for the right forms of development, for political outcomes that uphold just governing structures.

Where have we gotten for our investment? Basically since World War II, the United States has been cast into the role of the superpower being the proprietor of international stability and we've accepted that arrangement, but there are tremendous pressures upon us as we continue to move forward in the 21st century as we've empowered other people and other economies through appropriate development to take responsibilities for themselves.

The United States has not always done this perfectly, but we've fought multiple wars and we've engaged in many areas of the world in order to try to give other people a chance and to stop aggressive ideologies that are inconsistent with basic and fundamental human rights. I've responded to the people of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to share that with you this evening:

Life in Syria today is, as the philosopher Thomas Hobbes once wrote, "nasty, brutish, and short." An ongoing civil war ravishes the country. The oppressive regime of President Bashar al-Assad wages battle against a nebulous, undefined mix of rebels, who have regularly employed the same brutal violence that the government has. The result is that there are more than 100,000 persons dead, including many innocent civilians—mothers, fathers, and children.

In response to the suspected use of chemical weapons by Assad, President Obama is now advocating U.S. military intervention, although, of course, the situation is now fluid. In the past, he has stated that the use of chemical weapons is a "red line" that Assad could not cross without a serious rethinking of American involvement in the conflict, which to this point has included a significant amount of humanitarian aid—and properly so—targeted to those caught in the middle of this violence. The President, to his credit, has rightly asked for a vote of Congress prior to taking military action, and some in Congress are signaling their support.

In recent days, however, I have clearly stated my opposition to this idea. I oppose this action of unilateral military strikes. The United States should not bomb Syria in the name of stopping violence in Syria. While quick, unilateral military strikes might satisfy the President's "red line" rhetoric, the collateral damage and further risk of destabilization is very high.

□ 1830

Now, as Congress has returned to Washington this week, there are hard questions that are in the process of

being asked: What will be the consequences of this bombing? Who's on the other side of this? And how much do we really know of this rebel movement that we will be implicitly aiding if we attack Assad's government? What happens following the military strike? Why not expend the energy of this debate over military involvement on solidifying international outrage and holding particularly Russia, a longtime ally of Syria who's entangled in this situation, holding them accountable?

The international community must work together creatively to stop the savagery of Assad, but it cannot hide behind the United States military might. No longer can it be assumed that the United States is responsible for fixing all aspects of global conflicts, and no longer should the United States accept that framework. For the sake of global stability, a new construct must instead take its place, one in which the responsible Nations of the world are serious about their own defense and stabilization of conflicts within their regions.

In light of the increasing brutality in Syria, the United States should continue to advance its support for the innocent victims of this civil war. Meanwhile, we should also aggressively use this opportunity to facilitate new international partnerships that seek lasting solutions to complicated situations of mass violence.

Until such a united front is achieved, unilateral military action may only introduce further chaos to an already disastrous problem and, as I have said, implicitly put us on the side of a rebel movement who has also shown willingness to murder innocent civilians. And it is not clear whether or not the more moderate elements of that very movement have any capacity to implement governing structures that are just and lasting. So then what happens? Syria, this area degrades into a vast, ungovernable space, ripe for jihadists with no protections for innocent persons or the ancient peoples who call that place home.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other aspects of this that I have written about that I would like to share momentarily, but I would like to turn to my good friend, Congressman CHARLIE DENT from Pennsylvania, as he wishes to share a few concepts and perspectives on this conflict.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for organizing this Special Order this evening to discuss the crisis in Syria. In my view, it is really indisputable that Bashar al-Assad is a villain who has committed heinous, mortal crimes with the use of chemical weapons against his own people.

What is debatable, however, is America's policy on Syria and the broader Middle East. I have raised the issue of Syria with this administration at numerous hearings as a member of the

Appropriations Committee. I have also worked with Syrians in my own community, and I have the largest population of Syrian Americans of any Member of Congress in the United States. I have met with them. They have brought to my attention issues of abducted Christian archbishops who have been abducted in Syrian and whose whereabouts, unfortunately, are unknown. There is a lot of work going on to try to secure their release, but that said, you can understand their concern for that part of the world.

I have spent time, too, in meetings with America's wonderful friend, King Abdullah of Jordan, who has also shared his perspective on the plight of the Syrian people. But what I have observed most of all is a very sad observation, and that is the friends of the Syrian regime—Iran, Russia and Hezbollah—are far more committed to President Assad than the friends of the Syrian people—and that would be the West and the Arab League—are to these moderate opposition forces.

I had asked Secretary Hillary Clinton—former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton—back in February, 2012, if the administration was prepared to provide some type of material support to moderate secular opposition groups given that it looked like Assad's government was very weak, there was a popular uprising, and it seemed there might be a better outcome. She was pretty clear with me at the time that she thought providing light arms would be of little help to the opposition in the face of Assad's substantial military, with all his air assets, artillery and armor. To put it bluntly and short, she really didn't want to get too involved at that time. We really didn't have much of a discussion about the benefits to America, its friends and allies and their interests, if Iran's influence in the region were substantially weakened through the overthrow of Bashar al-Assad.

I thought at the time that the President was maybe more concerned about maintaining his reputation as a Nobel Peace Prize winner antiwar candidate than actually developing what I thought would be a more practical response for Syria. It just seemed that inaction and indecision were, and frankly today, remain the order of the day.

In the meantime, let's fast forward from a year and a half, 2 years ago to today: al-Nusra and other radical Islamist terrorist organizations have rushed into this vacuum and filled the void, so to speak. So really today there aren't any good public policy outcomes for the United States. The time for the United States to more constructively intervene and to reach a more efficacious resolution, the time for that has long passed.

So here we are, over these last 2½ years, this Syrian civil war has descended into both a sectarian and

proxy conflict, and these events have moved well beyond the United States ability to control with Iran, Hezbollah, and Russia fully committed to the Assad government.

I think we all know, as Mr. FORTENBERRY knows, we know we have a very war-weary population which is not going to support a half-hearted, poorly thought out military strike which will only expose the United States and its friends to greater risks, including the possibility of a broader regional conflagration. This could include more chemical weapons attacks against the Syrian people and possibly Israel, potential cyber attacks on American critical infrastructure in both the financial services and energy sectors, an unleashed Hezbollah, and other unforeseen, asymmetrical responses.

I am deeply concerned about this, as we all should be. But we can't just look at Syria in isolation; we have to look at it in the much broader context of the Middle East. Unfortunately, and I'm going to have to be a bit critical of the President at this time, witness how President Obama turned his back on Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak in 2011 after 2 weeks of uprisings. Whatever his faults, whatever his shortcomings, Hosni Mubarak was a loyal, 30-year friend of the United States—a lesson learned by our friends and our allies throughout the region and throughout the world.

Of course, prior to that incident there was the Green Revolution in Iran where we saw a lot of very brave people in Iran stand up to the Ahmadinejad regime in Iran. We witnessed that, and it seemed this administration could barely utter words of support to these very brave people who stood up to a tyrant, Ahmadinejad, who made all sorts of reckless and inflammatory and hateful statements against the West and particularly Israel, and so I was just astounded that the administration could barely utter words of support.

Then, of course, we learned about leading from behind in Libya. Actually, leading from behind the French and the British in Libya, to be precise. I was one of only a handful of Republicans in the House to support the authorization for force in Libya—after the fact, but I supported it. So I'm not an isolationist. I believe that we have an important role internationally with the United States, and we have to be constructively engaged.

But let's move forward to 2013. Bashar al-Assad's government launches chemical attacks against his own people. I believe the intelligence is clear that he did it, or his government did it, so I'm not debating those facts, what appear to be facts. But we witnessed these chemicals attacks in both the late spring and again just a few weeks ago in August, these chemical attacks. We witnessed the trampling of the red line set down by the President not once

but twice, maybe more than that for all I know. And now over 100,000 Syrians have been killed. What is the President's strategy for Syria? I couldn't explain it to anybody if they asked. He talked about pinpricks or his administration has talked about pinpricks, shots across the bow, a military action of days not weeks, and no intention to topple Assad or to degrade his military capacity to make war on his own people, for that matter. I'm learning a lot about what we will not do, but I'm not really sure what we're trying to do or trying to accomplish. So a very limited air strike to punish Mr. Assad is not going to alter the outcome of the Syrian civil war. What is the point or purpose? What is the clarity of mission?

In my view, America's national interest is really twofold in Syria. One, we want to limit Iranian influence in the region, and, two, the other issue deals with securing those chemical weapons, frankly, from both the Assad government and the radical elements of that opposition who would probably be just as inclined to use them. So much so that King Abdullah of Jordan came to Members of Congress to express his real concern about al-Nusra forces getting too close, dangerously close to a chemical site in southern Syria, and that was just a few months ago.

So now we also witnessed, too, there really is not a coalition of the willing to tackle Mr. Assad's crimes. It seems more a coalition of the unwilling. The United Nations really doesn't seem anywhere to be found, although in recent days, in the last 24 hours we're hearing there might be some discussion with the Russians about some kind of a resolution on securing those sites, but the U.N. is really nowhere to be found. NATO does not seem to be fully engaged at all, although maybe some members are supportive. And, of course, we've witnessed what the British Parliament did to Prime Minister Cameron in rebuking him. And so the British, our beloved friends and allies, are not going to be engaged in this one, and so we're pretty much on our own. Again, I've called this a coalition of the unwilling. And so I think it would behoove the United States not to move in what appears to be almost a unilateral manner.

I have read, too, recently, that some of the Arab governments, Saudi Arabia and others, would be willing to help pay for some of this mission should we strike. You know, on the one hand, I appreciate that. On the other, the United States military is really not a mercenary force for anyone. A lot of folks may be encouraging us or cheering us on, but it doesn't seem they are willing to put people in harm's way. So I think we have to keep that in mind as we talk about this.

I'm going to conclude in a moment, but I was one of the folks who said it is

always important for the President to consult with Congress prior to taking any kind of military action. It's important in our system, although I don't believe the President necessarily needs a congressional authorization for what he has called a very limited airstrike. But now that he has asked me to engage in this debate, I owe the President fair consideration of his policy in Syria, whatever it may be.

Again, I said call me skeptical; now you can call me outright opposed. I have said from day one that the President didn't seem to have his heart in this impending military action. He was looking for a way out after the U.N., the U.K., and NATO, a lot of our friends were just not willing to go along, and then the President turned to Congress as a last resort for an authorization where he has, of course, run into very, very heavy skepticism. I just did see any Churchillian resolve in our Commander in Chief. Our men and women in uniform deserve a Commander in Chief who is full-throated in support of what is likely to become a very dangerous military operation and could possibly spiral out of control. But more importantly, we have to be cognizant of the potential consequences and ramifications for that action.

I think the President of the United States owes that to the American people, to make it clear what his policy is, what his mission is, not what he's not going to do, but what he intends to do. After the President really threw this issue to Congress, we witnessed President Assad's jubilant supporters celebrating in the Syrian streets, and I'm sure the corridors of power in Tehran and Moscow, and it seems now that America's friends and allies watched this mystifying failure of Presidential leadership unfold with dismay.

So have our constituents. We have all received these calls. In my view, and I am really sad to say this, Barack Obama may have diminished his own Presidency in the process, but more problematically, diminished America's standing in the world among both friend and foe alike, and that's a real tragedy.

□ 1845

You know, in this upcoming vote in Congress, if it's to come at all at this point, it is really not so much a vote on authorizing a military strike or military intervention in Syria. The stakes have grown beyond that. It's much more a vote of confidence on the President's Syrian and broader Middle East policy. On that score, I have no confidence.

And I just wanted to say one last thing. I mentioned I have a very large Syrian population in my community, Syrian Americans. They're great Americans. They've been part of my community for a long time, largely

Christian, Antioch Orthodox, Greek Orthodox, Presbyterian and other denominations.

They are scared. I think they know what Bashar Assad is, and many are very uncomfortable with what he is. And on the other hand, they have seen al-Nusra and al Qaeda, and are absolutely terrified of that operation.

And so they're caught in this sectarian crossfire. They don't want to be there. They're worried about atrocities, grievous atrocities being committed against the Christian people of Syria.

We just witnessed the other day, there was a story of a small village, I believe not too far from Damascus, where the language of Aramaic is spoken; I guess one of the few places in the world where it is still spoken.

Why is that significant?

Well, if you're a Christian, you know that Aramaic was the language that Jesus Christ spoke. And to know that this ancient community—and of course much of Syria's an ancient civilization—to know that these people could be under attack when you find out that al-Nusra forces had entered and intervened, and I hope they've been cleared out.

But that said, you think about this, and we worry about the history of mankind and the history of the Christian tradition is at risk here, and potentially a great risk of extermination.

And we've witnessed this in Egypt too. I mean, there are lessons to be learned from Egypt. When Mubarak fell, the Christian population, the Coptic Christian population of Egypt, became very vulnerable. We know that—extremely vulnerable. Atrocities committed against Christians, desecration of the churches, burning, other terrible things have happened, and I fear that we might see similar, if not worse, things happen in Syria.

So whatever this country chooses, whatever course of action this country chooses to pursue, I don't believe that a military intervention right now by the United States would advance America's policy objectives; and frankly, I don't think it would change the trajectory of the Syrian civil war.

People have said, well, doing nothing at all is the worst of all possibilities, the worst of all options. Well, I would argue that if we're not certain what this limited, so-called limited military intervention will bring, if we're very unclear about that, then I would argue that no action is better than a limited action which may not do much of anything to alter the course of this civil war. So I think we have to be very cautious and very restrained.

I do appreciate the gentleman from Nebraska allowing me this opportunity to speak on this issue, and for his leadership, and for allowing me this time.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Let me thank you, as well, the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania, my good friend. I've heard you speak behind the scenes in this body, particularly today, with great passion, particularly for the people who are directly impacted by this, people who you represent and are directly connected to the conflict, the ancient Christian community, as you said.

I appreciate your clarity and your resolve on this issue because I know you, as I do, have great respect for the institution of the Presidency. He is our Commander in Chief.

But we also have a responsibility to render to him our judgment in this case; and so my judgment is no, that a unilateral military strike is not going to accomplish an objective of potentially stabilizing, punishing, preventing Assad from doing further harm and stabilizing that situation, versus pulling the United States, as a coalition of one, into a conflict where we are very unclear as to what the collateral damage and destabilization outcome could actually be.

In addition to that, the American people are intuiting that there is a serious, serious problem here with us being drawn into another conflict where the options are all bad, where our hearts are with the innocent victims, and we will continue to provide humanitarian aid.

But we must not allow the international community to simply hide behind our military might; and I think that that is what the people are sensing, that we are being drawn into something that has much broader implications for the entire international community to respond in a constructive, creative way.

And if we would have expended this energy, as I said earlier, on trying to get underneath the problem and perhaps point the finger and lay it at the footsteps of the Russians, who are completely entangled in this situation, maybe we would have had better movement on this question prior to now.

Now, we'll see what the President says tonight. We'll listen with an open mind. I don't know whether he is going to pull back from his intention to potentially strike Syria or not. But I think it is prudent to allow some diplomatic actions to potentially take their course, even though that might be a bit farfetched at the moment.

But, hopefully, that new diplomatic momentum has some good creative elements and stops the situation, pressures Assad, brings about a collective international response that stabilizes the situation and protects innocent people. I think that's the best outcome that we could potentially hope for here.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. It seems that the policy of the United States and Syria, since the beginning of the uprising in Syria,

has largely been one of inaction and detachment. And, in many respects, we outsourced the arming of the opposition forces to many of our good friends: the Turks, the Qataris, the Saudis, and others. And whether we like it or not—and we don't like it in many respects—many of the folks who were armed were people who don't share our interests and values, the al-Nusra forces in particular.

But there are moderate forces, and if the United States had demonstrated some leadership early in this, during that conflict, to help identify moderate secular opposition forces, there probably could have been multi-ethnic again and secular, it could have been Kurdish and Christian and moderate Sunni, that might have helped bring about a more legitimate or a better opposition force that the international community would be rallying around.

But that, unfortunately, has not happened, and now you read about large swaths of territory in Syria dominated by some opposition forces that have been rather radicalized; and that's unfortunate because there are many elements of the Free Syrian Army, of course, who really do want to try to bring about more representative government and, I think, would embrace the values that you and I hold dear.

But, you know, time has passed. Time has passed, and I just don't see a good outcome, as I stated earlier, at this point. And I just wish—I think the American people understand this intuitively.

And it also speaks to NATO. What's happening with NATO?

It's a great organization. I believe in NATO. It's a collective defense organization. I believe in its military value and its political value. But it seems, since the end of the Cold War, maybe it's gone a little bit adrift.

And Turkey has been a loyal friend and NATO ally for decades. They are directly affected by this conflict in Syria. They may make demands of us and NATO at some point, and we're going to have to think that through, as policymakers, what we would do if our good friends, the Turks, make a request of us, and certainly our good friends in Jordan.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Reclaiming my time, it's a good question you raised, and one that I pointed to earlier, new international constructs that might be using templates of old international constructs, but that are revitalized so that we can have collective operations, if necessary, to engage in this type of stopping mass violence.

The NATO allocations for many countries, they don't meet them year after year. In other words, the money they're supposed to contribute, they just don't do it.

So who has to pick up the pieces?

We do. There's a "free rider problem" as we call it here. And you deal in a lot

of international diplomatic circles and you constantly hear it. Oh, the United States is the only one who has the ability. You're the only superpower. You must act, and it is your—you must be compelled morally, based upon who you are, to do something here.

All of those are fine points. But in the 21st century, you have a shift of the global framework for international stability occurring. We have expended ourselves, as a country, for nearly 70 years, providing that framework for global stability, economically and politically protecting human rights, as I said earlier, not always perfectly.

But the United States cannot single-handedly lift this burden for the entire world, particularly for countries that benefited from our past sacrifice, who have the economic wherewithal, and should have the moral compass to be thinking constructively about regional organizations that stop this type of conflict before it starts and demanding just outcomes of sovereign territories.

That is the long-term strategy. I recognize we're in a difficult moment because we're being pressured to decide unilateral military action or not, but this is the type of long-term thinking that I think will help bring about new models of international, multilateral cooperation to prevent this from happening, or when it does happen, to have the right response in place.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I just want to say one more thing. You know, the President has said that this red line that was crossed was not his red line, but the international community's red line. Ninety-eight percent of the world has opposed chemical weapons use and has agreed to the various conventions on chemical weapons.

Unfortunately, 98 percent of the world isn't prepared to help us in this intervention. We're on our own, and I just wanted to point that out.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Well, our time has expired, and I do thank you for the good constructive conversation. I appreciate your insights and clarity on the situation. It's complex, it's difficult; but, again, unilateral military action allows the international community to hide behind our might, and it's simply not the right response at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE SYRIAN CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Missouri). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized

to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. And I appreciate the presentation that's come forward from my colleagues from Pennsylvania and Nebraska with regard to the Syrian situation and the international issue that's in front of all of us.

I don't always find myself in complete agreement with the wisdom that emerges here from this microphone; but, generally speaking, that's where I stand this evening on the Syrian issue.

And I think that it would be of interest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I and a couple of other Members, yesterday morning, perhaps the day before yesterday, in the morning—my days blend together—we sat down with Syrian Christians who were expatriates who had escaped from Syria and are very interested in the cause there. And I understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has a good number of constituents that would be representative of the same cause.

It was a very interesting conversation that we had at breakfast day before yesterday at Brussels. And the concern that they expressed essentially came back to it's hard to choose a good side in Syria, in that Assad, of course, he's an evil dictator. We've known that for a long time.

We have the Free Syrian Army that emerged as a force for good that seems to now be taken over by forces that are not so good. So it appears to them, and it appears to me, that whether it would be the Assad forces that prevail in the end, or whether it would be the forces that are taking over the Free Syrian Army, it's not going to be good for Christians in Syria.

And I'm concerned that, for us to find a way forward, the best hope for Christians in Syria is likely to be the moderate groups that began the Free Syrian Army in the first place, those groups that want to have a secular Syria that respects everyone's right to freedom of religion and freedom to associate, and respects the rights of humanity that we all defend here.

So I reiterate the statements that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made. And we stand, certainly, with the Christians in Syria, but also the secular forces in Syria, however they've been marginalized by the forces of the Muslim Brotherhood, the forces that are Assad, and the anti-freedom forces that seem to want to take Syria over and use it for their own evil aims.

So having traveled, Mr. Speaker, over into that part of the world, not into Syria specifically, but into the Middle East—and we just came back last night from a trip that was to Tokyo. We spent several days there dealing with the top leadership in Japan, including Prime Minister Abe, and then from there to the United Arab Emirates, where we had a meeting set up with a number of officials.

The first meeting was at 11:00 in the morning. We were scheduled to meet with the Crown Prince about 1 or 1:30 in the afternoon. Instead, he gave us a very pleasant surprise and arrived at our 11:00 meeting. And we were able to have a long, engaging conversation, doors closed, which gave us a very good perspective on the Middle East and on Syria.

So I appreciate my colleagues' focus and interest on this, and mine is also focused the same.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for his kind comments about his experiences with various folks who are in Syria.

I just wanted to say one other thing too. This past Sunday I attended a church service at my own church that has a large Syrian community; and a woman made a presentation at the church who represents the Presbyterian Church of Lebanon and Syria, and spoke in my church in very moderate, secular tones about why she thought it was not in anyone's interest for the United States to intervene at this point in the Syrian civil war.

□ 1900

It was a very compelling statement. Then, after that church service, I stopped by another at St. George Antioch Orthodox Church after their services had ended and met with some of the parishioners whose family members are over there, in many cases, and some told me their family members had been killed. And there was a lot of crying and wailing and deep sadness. It's quite emotional for them, as you can well imagine. They feel so strongly that this intervention is only going to make the plight of the Christians that much more dire and difficult in Syria and that it could lead to their ultimate extermination in many cases. This was their term, not mine.

That's how serious this is to them in a country, that I believe, the last I checked, is somewhere between 15 to 20 percent Christian, although the numbers are diminishing, given this turmoil. We've seen that in many Middle Eastern countries. The Christian communities are just not able to endure in this type of environment.

So I appreciate your interest in this issue, Mr. KING, and thank you for allowing me to speak. Keep up the good work.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

I would add that there was some dialogue in that breakfast meeting with the Syrian Christians that took place the day before yesterday, in the morning, about how there was a concerted effort to push and eradicate Christians out of all the areas in the Middle East.

That seems to be something that they have embarked upon. And I know that there's a long history of it of over a thousand years. But it's been accelerated here, I believe, Mr. Speaker, within the last few years. In fact, the date of this meeting goes back to 1982 when that began.

We're hearing similar narratives about Christians that are being persecuted by both sides in this. The population percentage in Syria of around 15 to 20 percent fits with what I'm told. I added up the data that they gave me from different sections of the Syrian Christians and my number came to about 2.6 million Syrian Christians.

There are also about 2 million Syrians that are refugees that have left Syria and that are now housed in refugee camps in the surrounding country. There's about 2 million refugees. There are about 2.6 million Christians in or around Syria altogether. I see that as almost the equivalent of the population of the State of Iowa.

So we've watched as Assad has persecuted his people—the people that were not his. Anybody but his political allies were persecuted by him over the years. I remember that he was identified by the Bush administration as, I believe, an evildoer. I remember some communications being opened up with Bashar al-Assad that took place sometime in 2007 or 2008. I remember some pictures that came back from there. This individual now has been identified as head of the regime that has launched chemical weapons against his own people.

The evidence that we see doesn't necessarily confirm that it would be Assad himself that gave the order, but it does appear that there were chemical attacks. It also appears that there were conventional artillery assaults into the same neighborhood that brought about many casualties. To sort out whether they were chemical casualties or whether they were kinetic action casualties is a question that's not been answered yet.

I'm hesitant to get very far into this from a factual standpoint because of what's classified and what isn't, Mr. Speaker. I want to make this point. It doesn't get brought out in this Congress enough, if at all. The forces are lined up on the side of either Sunni or Shia. Of course, the Alawite sect of the Shia is the sect that is Assad himself. And he's supported by them. When you look at his allies—Hezbollah and Iran—they are Shia. If you look at his enemies, generally speaking, his enemies are al Qaeda and the Muslim Brotherhood. There's a list of those Sunni interests that have poured into Syria.

At the beginning, this was a conflict that was formed by the Free Syrian Army that wanted to unseat Assad and establish a government that would be of, by, and for the people of Syria and consistent with American ideals and

American principles of a government that's empowered by the will of the people instead of by the will of a dictator or a king.

So as the Free Syrian Army began, their forces were growing and they were strong and they were taking over territory. Since that period of time, we've watched as the sometimes-labeled "rebel effect" has diminished. And it's almost been in direct proportion to the influence of the Muslim Brotherhood, al Qaeda, and other radical interests stepping in to take over and pick up some of the resources that are being used to support the opposition to Assad.

As I've watched this and from what I know and from the information that's come to me, continually the Free Syrian Army is more representative of the Muslim Brotherhood than it is of the free Syrian people. And not by a majority of the population of the army itself, but by the leadership, by who commands the resources, by who's being trained. This is now ever more clear that there's not a side that's easy to get on in this conflict and be confident that the forces are the forces of good. In other words, to identify the good guys has gotten ever more difficult month by month. It's more difficult today than it was a month ago or 2 or 3 or 4 or 6 months ago.

But it doesn't mean that there aren't good influences, that there aren't good cores of people that we should be identifying with and that we should be strengthening and empowering. But from my view, anybody that supports al Qaeda or is of al Qaeda is our enemy. Anybody that is Muslim Brotherhood or supports Muslim Brotherhood turns out to be our enemy. The difference between the Muslim Brotherhood and al Qaeda is they both have the same military wing. The Muslim Brotherhood has got a lot broader political approach to this. But in the end, they're looking to establish the Islamic caliphate everywhere in the world they can and establish sharia law everywhere in the world they can. And they don't view individual rights, human rights, or this God-given liberty and freedom here that our Founding Fathers claimed for us here over 200 years ago. They don't have respect for that. They reject it. And their approach is not compatible with human rights.

So we see the sectarian interests in Syria taking over the secular initiatives in Syria. I believe that there's an ability—if we can identify the good guys—to empower them, to train them, to fund them, to supply them. But there's a way to bring this around and bring it to a good conclusion. But the people that need to be empowered in Syria are a long way from power. The people that don't need to be in power, whether it's the Muslim Brotherhood side of this and the Sunni radical Islamists or whether it be the Shia interests and

Assad, they are competing with each other now for dominance. They fought each other for centuries as well.

There's no good result that can come easy in Syria. There is a good result that could come over a long period of time if our administration identified the people that we should be allying ourselves with and if they could emerge as the strong force. But while that's going on, we've been offered something from Putin and the Russians that I don't think anyone expected, a little more than 24 hours ago, and that is a way to avoid a military conflict in engaging U.S. forces in Syria.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that the mail that I'm getting and the phone calls that I'm getting are almost universally in opposition to going into any kind of military action whatsoever in Syria. Almost universal. All of my calls today were against going into Syria. Almost every call the last week were against going into Syria.

It's not that I make decisions exclusively off of constituent input or American communications input. I have an obligation and I owe my constituents and I owe Iowans and the people in this country my best effort and my best judgment. And that includes the input that comes from them, weighed more heavily than if it were not directly from my constituents. And I owe them my best effort and best judgment—and that is to go out and gather information. I have probably the best access to the broadest amount of information, including myself, among my constituents.

So I owe them my best effort. Part of that is to go and see with my own eyes and get into those parts of the world so that I can be fully informed, because this Congress is being called upon to make decisions that redirect the destiny of the United States of America. We should not do that in an uninformed way. We should not do it in a willfully ignorant way.

There are many things going on in the world that you cannot learn by listening to just briefings here or reading the paper. We should know from long history that you've got to drill into these things. You've got to look the right people in the eye and you've got to verify the information that they give you. I've done that. I've done that over the last week. I kept my powder dry on Syria throughout that period of time because I wanted to gather all the information that I could.

I didn't want to take a public position until I had seen as much as I can with my own eyes and hear as much as I can with my own ears. And even though we've done a trip into Cairo and the United Arab Emirates and the Middle East and we had briefings in countries beyond that and briefings from our State Department, we met with, as I said, Syrian Christians and we also

met with refugees from Libya. We met with Special Forces interests and different perspectives on the Middle East entirely and different perspectives on the Syrian operation.

You put that altogether, from the State Department's position on, I came back with stacks of notes on it, Mr. Speaker. But I didn't want to speak on my Syrian position until such time as I had sat through the classified briefing that I knew over a week ago was scheduled for five o'clock yesterday. And that went on from five o'clock until about a quarter to seven last night.

That briefing was useful. The people that were there to brief us were Susan Rice and Director Clapper and Secretary Kerry. We also had Secretary of Defense Hagel and General Martin Dempsey, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Five people of the highest level you could ask for assured the President of the United States. He gave us a briefing with the data that they have and what they know. And they told us what was classified and what wasn't. They told us the conclusions they had drawn and some method about how they arrived at those conclusions.

But my independent assessment doesn't agree with the course of action that seems to be the direction from the President of the United States. It doesn't mean that I disagree with the data that they have, but the conclusion and how to move forward, I do disagree with. And I have taken a position today that if there were a vote on the floor today to authorize military force in Syria, I would not support that. Mr. Speaker, I would vote "no."

I want to make it clear that I believe the President has constitutional authority to order action in Syria or anywhere else. The President of the United States has to have that authority to order our military into action in an instant. Our Continental Congress was not very functional when it came to fighting a war by consensus. When they finally got through the Revolutionary War and put a country together and built a Constitution that could be ratified by the majority of the States—the 13 original colonies—they concluded that we needed to have a President of the United States who was also the Commander in Chief of the United States military who was in full control of the military. And subsequent to that, there was a piece of legislation passed within the 20th century that was the War Powers Act that was designed to restrain the activities of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

Those two conditions were, one, the constitutional authority of the Commander in Chief to order our military into battle in an instant without consulting Congress. And the other, the War Powers Act, requires the President to come back after a period of time and

consult with Congress. Those two, the Constitution and the War Powers Act, are compatible as long as they are respected by the Congress and by the President of the United States.

Anytime we're engaged in a long military engagement, I think the President should come consult with Congress. If it's a short operation and it's over before it can be consulted, that's consistent with the Constitution.

I would point out when President Reagan ordered our military into Grenada, that was an operation that took place quickly. He came before the American people and let us know after it was launched that he had ordered military action in Grenada. It was a successful operation, and we pulled out of there when the objective was achieved. That was Ronald Reagan.

When George Herbert Walker Bush—Bush 41—ordered our military into action in Panama to put an end to dictator and drug smuggler Noriega, that order was issued and our military took to the field. And as that operation was unfolding, then we found out about the order of our Commander in Chief.

This operation that's proposed in Syria is an operation that the President of the United States has the authority to order. He has the constitutional authority to do so. And if he had identified targets in Syria, and was determined that was the right course for America, the President should have then issued the order to engage our military in the fashion that his best judgment said he should.

□ 1915

But what has happened instead is there has been a vacillation that has taken place. He has sought to sell this to the American people while the message and the warning is going out to Assad. The red line that was drawn in the sand back during the Presidential campaign, it appears that the administration thinks that line has been crossed multiple times. And if you cross a red line in the sand enough times, it gets pretty blurry after awhile. Now they've decided that August 21 was the bright red line that was crossed by Assad. And here we are on the eve of the anniversary of the Benghazi attack—tomorrow is September 11—and on the anniversary of course of the September 11, 2001, attack; now we're negotiating with Congress to get support to go into military action in Syria.

My position, Mr. Speaker, is if the President thought it was a good idea, in a very limited way, as Secretary of State Kerry said, he should have done that. He should have issued the order, gotten it over with. If they're right and it's a very narrow operation, he could have pulled back and we would be done by now. But he watched as David Cameron and the United Kingdom took the

issue before the British Parliament. The British Parliament voted down the initiative to strike Syria over the chemical weapons, and that put the brakes on the United Kingdom supporting us or any other entity in an operation in Syria. I think when the President saw that, maybe he concluded, Well, I'll ask Congress. If Congress says no, then I'll have this responsibility, this cup taken from him, so to speak—the one that he asked for when he put out the red line statement during the campaign in a debate with Mitt Romney.

So we're now in this situation where we've had a protracted national and global debate. And each stop around the world where we have gone into—into Tokyo, into the UAE, into Cairo, into Brussels—and met with multiple entities along the way, Syria is the discussion matter. But they look to the United States to lead.

Some of the countries don't think it's a very good idea to go in there, but they say they will support us anyway because they want America to succeed. They understand that if we're not strong in the world, if we don't lead in the world, then this becomes a very precarious place.

I had it expressed to me a number of times: We don't think it's a very good idea, but if you do this, we'll support you; or, We think it's a bad idea; we have to support you anyway. But I didn't find anybody that said that they were really happy about the idea that America might strike someplace inside Syria to send a message to Assad. Some said don't pave the road to Damascus for the Muslim Brotherhood, that the devil we know may not be as bad as the devil we don't know. And we're starting to learn that.

So as this has unfolded—and I heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I believe it was, mention NATO and a NATO operation. We aren't going to have the support of NATO in an operation in Syria. NATO operates off of a consensus. The 28 nations or so that are NATO now have a lot of trouble getting to a consensus. If some of those countries decide they don't want to participate, they will just simply not commit their forces. In the end, it comes down to what will the U.S. do, what won't the U.S. do.

We're not going to have the support of the United Nations. There has already been that effort to bring it before the United Nations, and we've got opposition from Russia and opposition from China. Now, maybe they would reconsider. Maybe China would reconsider; maybe Russia would reconsider. But the United Nations is not going to be there behind us, Mr. Speaker. NATO is not going to be there behind us. We will have perhaps a coalition—not of the willing, but a coalition of the unwilling, those unwilling to allow the United States to, let's say, be embarrassed by this policy.

So the best course forward appears to be the lifeline that was tossed to us within the last 24 hours by Putin from Russia. He said, Let's take you up on your offer, Secretary Kerry, and see if we can gather up these chemical weapons and eradicate them from Syria. If doing so will prevent a military strike, then let's give it a go. That's a British expression, by the way, Mr. Speaker, "give it a go."

Well, I'm for giving it a go. I think that is the best alternative we have. I think the military strike is a mistake because it runs the risk of paving the road to Damascus for Muslim Brotherhood and other radical Islamist entities that are part of that constellation that have been systematically marginalizing the true free Syrian Army and empowering themselves, and some of them with resources that we would see as sourced back to the U.S. taxpayers.

Well, the best course forward now is to work with the Russians and see if we can get the chemical weapons gathered together. I would want Americans involved in any kind of a mission to gather those chemical weapons. I think the United Nations showed an ability to go into Iraq before 2003 and do the nuclear inspection that was there. I was uneasy with their conclusions—in fact, I didn't agree with their conclusions, but they're the force on the planet that has an opportunity to have the global credibility. If they get to that point where they say we've got all these weapons picked up, or they will qualify their answer, that's the kind of thing that should be going on, Mr. Speaker. But in any case, any kind of inspection team, any kind of chemical weapon collection team, under the auspices perhaps of the United Nations so that it isn't directly under, say, Russia or the United States, but with Americans there on the ground to verify the actions that are taking place and give us a sense of credibility and confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I point out that it won't work to go there and just get the job done to eradicate the chemical weapons. We must do so in a way that has credibility so that especially the American people will accept a conclusion and we can perhaps move on. But picking up chemical weapons and gathering up that entire inventory, which is tons and tons of that inventory, if it's done so in a precision way, perhaps doesn't change the balance of the regime versus the forces for good and those evil forces that align themselves with the forces for good, perhaps doesn't change that balance, or changes it in a more minimal way than a military strike would, and it would send the message that we will put an end to the abuse of chemical weapons.

It is also curious to me, Mr. Speaker, that this level of concern and outrage didn't seem to exist when chemical

weapons were being used between Iraq and Iran during the Iraq and Iran war in the eighties. It doesn't mean it's all right. I think it's a good position to take against the abuse and the use of chemical weapons, but the red line itself, as far as a reason for America to put ourselves into a military conflict in a nation that we don't have much strategic interest in is, I think, a mistake and I would oppose that. We should remember, again, who are the forces there, the messages they send to the world.

What have we seen happen in the Arab Spring? An Arab Spring that has emerged now—we are a couple years into that. It looks to me like the forces that have emerged on top have invariably been the Muslim Brotherhood. So it isn't always good to see a change within a regime or administration.

We saw President Carter support the return of the Shah in Iran and support ousting the current power, the power that was in Iran and put the Shah in, thinking that there would be a representation that was a religious movement—excuse me, the opposition to the Shah in Iran. In any case, the Ayatollah was viewed by President Carter as being a religious movement that was a voice for the people. What we ended up with the Ayatollah instead of the Shah was the beginnings of radical Islam within Iran, and the flow that came from 1979 until today might have been different had we taken a different position in Iran. Where we had friends in Iran, now we have enemies in Iran. As we have developed friends in Iraq, we are watching that friendship diminish. As we developed the foundational support in Afghanistan, we are watching that diminish.

As we see, we have strong friends and a military alliance with Egypt. We supported Mubarak and he was our friend. We built military operations going on in the Sinai Desert. That took place with—a good number of Iowans served there and people from probably every State served in the Sinai in operations with the Egyptians. Then Mubarak was essentially pushed out. And the message that came from our administration was he needs to leave yesterday. Well, the Morsi forces were able to push Mubarak out. They held one election. 5.8 million of the 83 million Egyptians voted for Morsi. Morsi came in as an incompetent Muslim Brotherhood, and the Muslim Brotherhood came out of that on top again like every other situation in the Arab Spring that has unfolded in the last couple of years, Mr. Speaker.

Now the best break we've seen in Egypt is that 30 to 33 million Egyptians took to the streets. Their peak day was the 3rd of July. They took their country back; and, yes, they had the support of the military. And some call it a coup, but there is no constitutional provision for them to impeach

the incompetent Morsi. The Egyptian people had had enough. You can't mobilize that kind of support unless there are many good reasons—the economic shambles that they allowed to take place and the injustices that were taking place under the Morsi regime.

So now we have a new leadership that has taken hold in Egypt. I have met with the interim President of Egypt, President Mansour. He makes it clear he is the interim President, that they are going to hand the country of Egypt over to an elective representative government. They're going to pass a constitution that they're busy writing now. And the military will let go of their control over the country and submit to the civilian leadership that emerges in a constitutional fashion. They have laid out a timetable and a roadmap, Mr. Speaker. So this is the best future that Egypt can hope for.

Morsi was a mistake. He is Muslim Brotherhood. These forces are anti-Muslim Brotherhood. They are pro-Egyptian people. I'm supporting the forces that are in place in Egypt now, and I would, face to face, encourage them, move forward with the timetable that you have. It appears to be aggressive and it has some risk. But writing a constitution, ratifying a constitution, having elections and establishing a civilian government in Egypt and then handing the control of the military over to that civilian government is the right thing to do. It sets the right destiny for Egypt. And I think that the United States needs to do a 180 on the support of the people that are now in charge in Egypt.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, your attention and an opportunity to address you here this evening, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after 3 p.m. on account of family business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 11, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2771. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the De-

partment's fiscal year 2012 report on the Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2772. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Qantas Airways Limited of Mascot, Australia, pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2773. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendment to Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries [EPA-HQ-SFUND-2013-0513; FRL-9845-9] received August 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2774. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Disapproval of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Arizona; Regional Haze and Interstate Transport Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0904; FRL-9846-5] received August 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2775. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Wyoming; Revised General Conformity Requirements and an Associated Revision [EPA-R08-OAR-2013-0059; FRL-9846-8] received August 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2776. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Emamectin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0405; FRL-9395-6] received August 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2777. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Imazapic; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0384; FRL-9394-8] received August 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2778. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0394; FRL-9845-5] received August 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2779. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0546; FRL-9834-5] (RIN: 2060-AR43) received August 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2780. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to Procedural Regulations Governing Transportation by Intrastate Pipelines [Docket No.: RM12-17-000; Order No. 781] received August 10, 2013, pur-

suant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2781. A letter from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting the June 2013 Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2782. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2783. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-067, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2784. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2785. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2786. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2787. A letter from the Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 2013 Annual Performance Plan, in accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2788. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's No FEAR Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2789. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Kamchatka Flounder in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC750) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2790. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries in the Western Pacific; Fishing in the Marianas Trench, Pacific Remote Islands, and Rose Atoll Marine National Monuments [Docket No.: 110819515-3563-03] (RIN: 0648-BA98) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2791. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric

Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Dusky Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC741) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2792. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish and Dusky Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC756) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2793. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trip Limit Adjustment for the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 120109034-2171-01] (RIN: 0648-XC737) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2794. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC740) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2795. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Gulf of Mexico Aggregated Large Coastal Shark and Gulf of Mexico Hammerhead Shark Management Groups [Docket No.: 120706221-2705-02] (RIN: 0648-XC748) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2796. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting Activities of the Review Panel on Prison Rape in Calendar Year 2012 and the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Data Collection Activities for 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2797. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's quarterly report from the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties for the second quarter of fiscal year 2013 (January 1, 2013 — March 31, 2013); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2798. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's quarterly report from the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties for the first quarter of fiscal year 2013 (October 1, 2012 — December 31, 2012); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2799. A letter from the Staff Director, Sentencing Commission, transmitting report on the compliance of the federal district courts with documentation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2800. A letter from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting the June 2013 Report to Congress: Medicare and the Health Care Delivery System;

jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 130. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the state of Wyoming (Rept. 113-190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 304. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the state of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 157. An act to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 459. An act to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2650. A bill to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land (Rept. 113-194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2388. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take certain Federal lands located in El Dorado County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 113-195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2337. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado (Rept. 113-196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1964. A bill to amend the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an expeditious program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, including at least one lease sale in the Reserve each year in the period 2013 through 2023, and for other purposes. (Rept. 113-197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1684. A bill to convey certain property to the State of Wyoming to consolidate the historic Ranch A, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1394. A bill to di-

rect the Secretary of the Interior to establish goals for an all-of-the-above energy production plan strategy on a 4-year basis on all onshore Federal lands managed by the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service (Rept. 113-199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 255. A bill to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 555. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct onshore oil and gas lease sales through Internet-based live lease sales, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1818. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow importation of polar bear trophies taken in sports hunts in Canada before the date the polar bear was determined to be a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Rept. 113-202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 740. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 113-203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 553. A bill to designate the exclusive economic zone of the United States as the "Ronald Wilson Reagan Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States" (Rept. 113-204). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2637. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 339. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provisions of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-206). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3073. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require that supplemental nutrition assistance benefits be used to purchase only supplemental foods that are eligible for purchase under section 17 of the

Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (commonly known as the WIC program); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINCHER (for himself and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 3074. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to notify the taxpayer each time the taxpayer's information is accessed by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3075. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of designating the study area as the Black Metropolis National Heritage Area in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. YOH, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. COTTON):

H.R. 3076. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act with respect to health insurance coverage for certain congressional staff and political appointees in the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 3077. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit certain Medicare providers licensed in a State to provide telemedicine services to certain Medicare beneficiaries in a different State; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 3078. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to disregard amounts transferred from a traditional IRA to a Roth IRA in computing income for purposes of determining the income-related premiums under parts B and D of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 59. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H. Res. 338. A resolution recognizing the National Hellenic Museum in Chicago, Illinois, and the contributions of Hellenism to the United States and celebrating Greek and

American democracy; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H. Res. 340. A resolution expressing the support of Congress for National Telephone Discount Lifeline Awareness Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona introduced a bill (H.R. 3079) for the relief of Jesus Garcia Flores; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3073.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 3074.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3075.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 3076.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and 3

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 3077.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 3078.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona:

H.R. 3079.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 4

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 59.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 148: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 207: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 259: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 288: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 335: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 411: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 436: Mr. OLSON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 450: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 460: Mr. BACHUS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 495: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 526: Ms. MOORE and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 565: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 574: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 594: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 596: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 611: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 616: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 679: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 683: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 685: Mr. WELCH, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 688: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 695: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 712: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 792: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 794: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. JONES, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 813: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 820: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 847: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 855: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 858: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 911: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 920: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 928: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1014: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1019: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1037: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1089: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1091: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1102: Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 1146: Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 1154: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1175: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1201: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 1209: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 1250: Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 1276: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1313: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 1339: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 1346: Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 1354: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 1385: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1386: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H.R. 1396: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 1428: Mr. RADEL, Mr. MORAN and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 1526: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. PALAZZO.
 H.R. 1551: Ms. JENKINS.
 H.R. 1587: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1588: Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 1616: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1666: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 1692: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 1701: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 1726: Mr. COLE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 1729: Mr. CASTRO of Texas and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 1750: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 1756: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 1779: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H.R. 1795: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MASSIE, and Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 1796: Mr. MORAN and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 1801: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Ms. ESTY.
 H.R. 1809: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 1812: Mr. YOHO and Mr. REED.
 H.R. 1814: Mr. PETERS of California.
 H.R. 1845: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1851: Ms. FUDGE.
 H.R. 1861: Mrs. BACHMANN.
 H.R. 1875: Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 1905: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BARBER, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1907: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1920: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 1921: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 1940: Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 1980: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 1992: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 2003: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2020: Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 2027: Mrs. ELLMERS.
 H.R. 2028: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2056: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2066: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 2084: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 2088: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 2108: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 2110: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 2111: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 2134: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LANCE, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COLE, and Mr. CUELLAR.
 H.R. 2189: Mr. TURNER, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. MEADOWS.
 H.R. 2194: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 2288: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 2313: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 2315: Mr. NUNES, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 2338: Mr. DELANEY.
 H.R. 2343: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2355: Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 2426: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2453: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2482: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 2483: Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 2506: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. JOYCE.
 H.R. 2510: Mr. McDERMOTT and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 2554: Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 2578: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 2615: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 2619: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 2633: Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 2637: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 2646: Mr. FARR and Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 2654: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2663: Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.R. 2686: Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 2691: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 2702: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MORAN, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2705: Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 2715: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 2725: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 2726: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. NUGENT.
 H.R. 2728: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 2737: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 2744: Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 2750: Mr. PAULSEN.
 H.R. 2765: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H.R. 2773: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 2775: Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 2783: Mr. HARPER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. CLARKE.
 H.R. 2785: Mr. NUGENT.
 H.R. 2788: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 2801: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
 H.R. 2807: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 2823: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2825: Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 2839: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 2845: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2854: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 2904: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 2905: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 2909: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BASS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 2918: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 2936: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 2962: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VELA, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 2983: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3005: Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 3026: Mr. POSEY and Mr. NUNNELEE.
 H.R. 3027: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 3036: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 3040: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H.R. 3045: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
 H.R. 3050: Mr. KIND and Mr. HORSFORD.
 H.J. Res. 44: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.J. Res. 47: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. DAINES.
 H.J. Res. 51: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. DUFFY.
 H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. COOK, Mr. BARR, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MESSER, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
 H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. PAULSEN.
 H. Res. 36: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. HUDSON.
 H. Res. 101: Mr. DOYLE.
 H. Res. 112: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
 H. Res. 227: Mr. MEEHAN.
 H. Res. 254: Mr. KILMER.
 H. Res. 319: Mr. ENYART, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. VARGAS.
 H. Res. 331: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. MCGOVERN.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2019: Mr. MORAN.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EXTENDING RECOGNITION TO THE
BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE BICEN-
TENNIAL CELEBRATION**HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize America's victory at the Battle of Lake Erie during the War of 1812.

On September 10, 1813, Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry led the American Navy into battle against the British Navy. At the beginning of the battle, Perry hoisted his battle flag which read, "Don't Give up the Ship." Commodore Perry along with 557 patriots succeeded with a significant victory which ensured America's control of Lake Erie for the remainder of the war.

200 years later, we are recognizing this battle near Put-In-Bay for securing the Northern Frontier. We gather at Lake Erie to celebrate Commodore Perry's victory, the impact this battle had in the War of 1812, and the long-lasting peace between nations.

We remember that freedom is never free and that many have made the ultimate sacrifice, so that we may enjoy the freedoms our forefathers envisioned. Their service and dedication to country breathes life into the fabric of our nation.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I proudly salute Commodore Perry, the American Navy, and the American people on the Battle of Lake Erie Bicentennial Celebration.

A TRIBUTE TO BARBARA CHASE
RIBOUD**HON. ROBERT A. BRADY**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Barbara Chase Riboud who is truly a renaissance woman. Her talent as a novelist, poet, scholar and artist of the highest order, is recognized around the world. We are happy to claim her as a Philadelphian and are excited about the exhibition of the first comprehensive retrospective of her iconic Malcolm X Steles at the Philadelphia Art Museum. In short, we are deeply honored by her work, accomplishments and presence once again in Philadelphia.

Educated at the Philadelphia High School for Girls', Temple University's Tyler School of Art and the Yale University of Art, she is an internationally acclaimed visual artist whose work has been exhibited throughout Europe and America. Her public sculpture, Africa Rising, at the African Burial Ground National Monument in Lower Manhattan expressed as

poetry, sculpture and historical novel is in tribute to the 17th and 18th century burial ground that yielded the remains of more than 400 mostly enslaved Africans in America.

Among her prestigious awards are the Carl Sandburg Prize for Best American Poet and being knighted in the Order of Arts and Letters by the French government. Her talent is only eclipsed by her career long commitment to make known the story of those who came to America, "... a stunned string of Black pearls like a hundred year centipede: one thousand. One thousand thousand. one million, three, six, nine, thirty million."

IN RECOGNITION OF MARIBEL P.
CHAVEZ**HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished career of Maribel P. Chavez. After committing 31 years to public service with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), Mrs. Chavez retires as Fort Worth District Engineer.

During her tenure, Mrs. Chavez has worked collaboratively with local, state, and federal partners to streamline and implement innovative projects in the Fort Worth District. Her oversight of the combined \$3 billion DFW Connector and North Tarrant Express projects reflects her ability to manage complex regional highway projects through environmental clearance and construction.

Mrs. Chavez was diligent on smaller projects that were no less complex, but every bit as important to Tarrant County communities. Her cooperative effort with the City of Fort Worth to complete the long-awaited widening of East Rosedale, improvements at the Hwy. 287 and Berry St. interchange, and assistance to facilitate completion of Fort Worth's new Veterans Outpatient Clinic on Interstate 20 underscore her commitment and responsiveness.

Mrs. Chavez's career was also notable as she was the first female engineer hired by TxDOT and the first female TxDOT District Engineer. Additionally, she has been recognized for her many achievements including Woman of the Year by the Dallas-Fort Worth Chapter of the Women's Transportation Seminar, Preservation Leadership Award by Historic Fort Worth, Inc., and by the Fort Worth Star-Telegram for her guidance on the DFW Connector Project.

Her invaluable contribution to my annual Transportation Summits will be sincerely missed. It is my privilege to commend Maribel P. Chavez and wish her well in retirement. Her work will stand as a monument to her dedication for years to come.

100 YEARS OF MORONGO BASIN
HISTORY; 2009 IN FOCUS**HON. PAUL COOK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th Anniversary of the Morongo Basin. It is the honor of a life time to be able to serve the people of the Eight Congressional District in Washington, D.C. As seen over the course of the Basin's 100 year history, this region maintains a strong sense of community and upholds many noble traditions. Today I am here to talk specifically about Ms. Mara Cantelo and the strong sense of volunteerism she brings to the community.

Over the past 100 years, there have been many shining moments to which we can remember the Basin. The year 2009 comes to mind when I think of its altruistic spirit. It was in 2009 that Mara Cantelo, a Coachella Valley native, received the Jefferson Award from the American Institute of Public Service in recognition of her steadfast and selfless efforts to help those who are less fortunate. Mara has been a paragon of benevolence in her community since 1984 when she co-founded Tender Loving Christmas with her mother Julie Tunstall.

As the name suggests, Tender Loving Christmas was dedicated to giving care and compassion, in the form of food, to those who needed it most in the holiday season. Since then it has grown to become Tender Loving Cause, and has taken to providing for the poor year round. This charitable labor of love has successfully fed nearly 3,500 impoverished people since its inception, and will undoubtedly serve thousands more in the future.

To the people of the Morongo Basin, thank you for including me in your 100 year project. The sense of volunteerism you and Mara bring to your community is admirable and a true beacon of inspiration to us all.

IN RECOGNITION OF 100TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF THE VILLAGE OF
ORION**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the village of Orion, Illinois on the occasion of the 100th Anniversary of their Central Park Band Shell.

Orion's Central Park Band Shell is the center piece of their village. It is a place where families and friends gather to enjoy the company of each other, their neighbors, and to take part in various events, including outdoor

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

movies and concerts. It has hosted notable guests including Bill Allred's Jazz Band and Chris Vallillo, a nationally recognized folk singer and historian who proclaimed it one of the finest venues he had ever used.

The Central Park Band Shell has twice been threatened by demolition. It has survived all these years and is now listed on the National Register of Historic Places, which has proved to be the catalyst for a community-wide preservation effort. In 2004, the Orion Band Shell was awarded Illinois' highest preservation honor, the Richard Driehaus Project of the Year Award, by Landmarks Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to recognize the village of Orion on this notable event, and am glad that places like this exist, helping to bring people together.

HONORING DR. WILLIAM A. "BILL"
CRAIG

HON. MO BROOKS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to recognize Dr. William A. "Bill" Craig and his many accomplishments during his career.

After receiving a bachelors degree in electrical engineering from Mississippi State University, Dr. Craig began his civil service career in 1960 with Dr. Werhner Von Braun's Astrionics Laboratory before moving to the Army Ballistic Missile Defense Agency in 1970, and then as a charter member to the Army Missile Command's Missile System Software Center when it was established in 1976.

Since 1988, Bill Craig has served as the Director of the U.S. Army Research, Development and Engineering Command, Aviation and Missile Research, Development and Engineering Center, Software Engineering Directorate (SED). Through his leadership, the SED, as an organization, attained a Level 4 rating against the Software Engineering Institute's (SEI's) Software Capability Maturity Model in 2000. During Dr. Craig's tenure, the SED has experienced significant growth, greatly expanding its customer base as well as enlarging its facilities. As one of only three Life Cycle Software Engineering Centers in the Army, the SED provides software and systems engineering support for most of the Army's major weapon and aviation systems. Under the leadership of Dr. Craig, the SED organization is the responsible agent for the development and fielding of numerous Army Systems, including: Joint Battle Command-Platform and the Aviation Mission Planning System. Also, the SED, in partnership with the Program.

Executive Officers and Program Managers, has established numerous Aviation and Missile System Integration Laboratories for the analysis and test of tactical systems and software. These laboratories provide the capability for Joint Services Interoperability Certification as well as Intra Army Certification. The SED also is responsible for development and deployment of the America's Army Program. This program includes the public game, weapon systems trainers, and Army recruiting applications.

The SED collaborates with a number of other organizations/agencies, including: Space and Missile Defense Command for Cyber Security, Jackson State University for Homeland Security, and as a Technology Transition Partner with the Software Engineering Institute. The SED has also made significant progress in workforce development, in partnership with the University of Alabama in Huntsville, including a very robust Co-op Program, and advanced degrees in Software Engineering and Systems Engineering. These opportunities allow the expansion and growth of the SED workforce to remain relevant in the complex areas of the digital world.

Dr. Craig is a highly respected leader and visionary in the community and a strong proponent of the greater Tennessee Valley area. In 2004, he received an honorary doctorate degree from the University of Alabama in Huntsville. Additionally he serves on the advisory board for the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department at the University of Alabama in Huntsville. Other honors include induction into the Order of Saint Barbara, an honorary military society of the United States Field Artillery Association, recognition as supervisor of the year in 1985 by the North Alabama Chapter of Federally Employed Women, and the first recipient of the Joseph C. Moquin Award given by the Huntsville Association of Technology Societies in 2006. In 2010, the Tennessee Valley National Defense Industrial Association presented Dr. Craig with the Medaris Award for demonstrating technical excellence in promoting the defense preparedness for the nation.

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE FIREMAN'S FUND

HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the anniversary of a California company that has dedicated itself to serving the residents of our state for 150 years. Founded in San Francisco, the Fireman's Fund Insurance Company has been protecting the future for individuals, families and businesses since 1863. The Fireman's Fund name, which is well-known across California, emanates from the founder's arrangement to pay 10 percent of the company's profits to support the widows and orphans of firefighters who died in the line of duty. That tradition continues today through the company's Heritage Program, providing fire departments throughout the nation with life-saving equipment and training. Working in combination with its employees, agents and brokers, the company has distributed more than \$30 million to support firefighters for safer communities since 2004, with over \$8 million contributed in California. The company has also been a benefactor for numerous charities in the San Francisco Bay Area and its generosity has added tremendously to the vitality of our communities.

Over the past 150 years, Fireman's Fund's contribution to our nation's history extends far

beyond California. The Fireman's Fund has insured the construction of some of our nation's most treasured landmarks, including the Hoover Dam, the Golden Gate Bridge and even Charles Lindbergh's Spirit of St. Louis. During our nation's most trying times of crisis, the company delivered on its promises. Following the Chicago Fire of 1871 and the San Francisco Earthquake of 1906, the Fireman's Fund played a critical role in rebuilding after the devastation. The company was also present when needed most for many displaced people after the Northridge earthquake of 1994, which devastated much of Southern California.

Throughout its history, the Fireman's Fund has prided itself on also being innovative; it prides itself on being the first insurance provider to write a standing grain policy in the U.S., the first carrier to offer nationwide automobile insurance and standardized homeowners insurance, and the first company to add "green rebuild" insurance to their offerings for homes and businesses. Back in my hometown of Bakersfield, California, Fireman's Fund remains one of our region's largest agricultural insurers, providing essential risk control services to hundreds of farm producers in my Congressional District. Its 150 years of service has established a name and reputation which resonates well with insurance agents and brokers who distribute their product in our local communities.

Today there are more than 1,200 Californians working for Fireman's Fund. Together they make up a great company that remains one of California's most enduring financial institutions. Given the time of rapid change in which we live, it is comforting to know that companies like Fireman's Fund still endure, and I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing them well with the hope that they will still be protecting the future for individuals, families and businesses for another 150 years.

HONORING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY
OF HUMANITIES WASHINGTON
AND THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY
OF ITS BEDTIME STORIES
LITERARY GALA

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 40th anniversary of Humanities Washington and the 15th anniversary of its Bedtime Stories literary gala in Seattle.

Since its founding in 1973, Humanities Washington has served the state with humanities programming, sparking conversation and critical thinking using story as a catalyst, nurturing thoughtful and engaged communities across Washington State. As Washington State's flagship non-profit for the humanities, it plays a critical role in addressing an immediate and growing crisis concerning community identity and understanding, respect for other perspectives, and the ability of communities to work together to shape a better future.

Humanities Washington's work in cultural education—ranging from Speakers Bureau to

Traveling Exhibits to Family Reading—promotes awareness of the history of local communities and its residents, provides opportunities for people to gather and learn more about their unique past and shared present, and nurtures relationships that enable us to move forward towards a more prosperous future.

The humanities—including history, literature, philosophy, ethics, law, and other fields of inquiry—encourage us to investigate, speak, listen, read, reflect, question, think, grow, and act. Using the disciplines of the humanities, Humanities Washington provides programs and experiences of lasting value, creating insight, understanding, wisdom, and a deeper appreciation for a variety of perspectives and all that we share as Washingtonians and Americans.

This year also marks the 15th anniversary of one of Humanities Washington's signature events: Bedtime Stories. Bedtime Stories is an annual literary celebration featuring critically acclaimed Northwest writers unveiling new short stories created specifically for dinner galas in Spokane and Seattle. National Book Award Winner Charles Johnson has called it "the region's premier literary event." Johnson is one of the founders of the gala, and will receive the 2013 Humanities Washington Award at Bedtime Stories in Seattle on October 4.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to convey my congratulations to Humanities Washington for 40 years of excellent, necessary work sharing the humanities with Washingtonians. I salute Humanities Washington as it works to ensure that the humanities are key to civic life for generations to come.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM—
CONGRESSIONAL PRAYER CAUCUS

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about one of our Nation's most coveted rights. The freedom of religion granted to all Americans by the First Amendment. Our Founders knew this was one of the freedoms worth fighting for.

In 1775 the Continental Congress under the advisement of General Washington created the chaplaincy. They knew the war ahead would not only try every Soldier physically, but also spiritually. They knew these Soldiers would need guidance, sound advice, and a helping hand to discharge their duties.

Many times throughout the early beginnings of this nation the Congress has come together to reaffirm the importance of the Chaplaincy. In 1791 the Congress empowered the President to employ a chaplain. Since then the chaplaincy has been an intricate part of our Nation's service men and women. The task of these chaplains has long been to facilitate the religious and spiritual needs of the Armed Services.

Recently members of the House of Representatives repelled an attack on the Chaplain Corps, led by senior leaders in the Pentagon. Leaders in the Pentagon attempted to circumvent current DoD regulations by allow-

ing Atheist Chaplains to serve in the military. Such a policy destroys the historical intent of the Corps, and its current ability to address service member's spiritual needs. Pentagon leadership has no right to bypass DoD regulations as it deems fit.

This episode brings to mind a quote I heard from an Army Soldier, "A Service member's faith is not a weapon but a shield." It is no secret that many people going to war encounter some type of religious conversion. Those already observing a religion attribute their successful return from combat to their deity. Why put someone's religious guidance in the hands of a counselor with indifferent feeling towards a belief system.

A chaplain's duty puts him in the foxhole, the cockpit, or at sea. I listen to a service member's deepest fears and often present when they celebrate their highest moments. In both, their handling of the situation is dictated by faith. Congress needs to adhere to a new battle cry; faith under fire is faith worth fighting for.

I stand today with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to remind Congress of the free exercise clause in the constitution that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion prohibiting the exercise thereof."

COMMEMORATING THE 230TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE TREATY OF PARIS

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize September 3, 2013, as the 230th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Paris. The Treaty of Paris was signed on September 3, 1783, thus ending the American Revolutionary War and declaring the "United States to be free, sovereign and independent states." The Continental Congress ratified the Treaty of Paris on January 14, 1784.

I am proud to represent Virginia's First District, frequently referred to as "America's First District," which is home to Yorktown where the Revolutionary War ended on October 19, 1781. With the help of our French allies, the decisive Battle of Yorktown resulted in the surrender of the British Army commanded by British lord and Lieutenant General Lord Cornwallis.

A resolution of the Continental Congress, dated October 29, 1781, called for a "Yorktown Monument to the Alliance and Victory". The Senate Committee on Military Affairs in its report dated March 16, 1880, stated that "the surrender at Yorktown was the crowning success of the revolution, and its event should be commemorated by national authority." The grounds were secured and the cornerstone laid on October 18, 1881. Today, the Yorktown Battlefield, site of the last major battle of the American Revolutionary War, is administered by the National Park Service and is part of Colonial National Historical Park.

Virginia's First District has a rich history of military service, beginning with the Revolu-

tionary War and continuing today. I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating the 230th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Paris and recognizing the significance of the Battle of Yorktown.

IN HONOR OF AZEM HAJDARI:
LEADER OF ALBANIA'S DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Azem Hajdari, an Albanian democratic leader and parliamentarian who was assassinated in 1998. Today, September 12, marks the 15th anniversary of his tragic death.

Born in 1963 into a working class family, Azem Hajdari grew up in Albania's mountainous northern region of Bajram Curr. While he was a student in Tirana, Albania's capital, the collapse of the Soviet Union led to increased popular unrest in the communist states in Central and Eastern Europe. In Albania, thousands took to foreign embassies in an effort to escape the country. As political and social tensions continued to escalate, in December 1990, students began protests against their worsening living conditions.

Azem Hajdari was committed to democratic change in Albania and quickly emerged as a leader of the student movement. The student demonstrations helped to precipitate the fall of the regime, and Azem then became one of the founders of the Democratic Party, the first non-Communist political party in Albania since the Second World War. He became the Democratic Party's first chairman and was elected in 1991 to the Albanian parliament, where he championed democratic reforms.

In 1997, Azem was shot inside the Albanian parliament and severely injured, yet he refused to be intimidated. He persisted in his mission to build democracy in Albania despite several additional attempts on his life. However, on September 12, 1998, Azem was murdered as he stepped out of his party's offices in Tirana.

Azem Hajdari's death shocked the nation and he was posthumously recognized as a martyr for democracy. Through his words and actions, he taught the people of Albania that freedom is not given—it must be won, through struggle, determination, and faith.

During the conflict in Kosova, Azem also supported the Kosova Freedom and Independence Movement. He was a close friend of Kosova's President Ibrahim Rugova and dedicated significant time and energy to the Kosovar cause.

Today, Albania has made great strides. It has a vibrant political system and is a member of NATO, and Albanians are able to travel freely throughout Europe. Kosova also is a free and independent country, aspiring to join the European Union. Both Albania and Kosova are building strong democracies, just as Azem dreamed.

Azem Hajdari has received many awards after his death, including Albania's "Order of the Flag" on what would have been his 50th

birthday earlier this year, the "Honor of the Nation" award, and the "Gjergj Katriot Skenderbeu" ("Skanderbeg's Order"), which was conferred by Albanian President Bujar Nishani and former presidents Alfred Moisiu and Bamir Topi.

On the 15th anniversary of Azem Hajdari's untimely death, the Albanian people will once more honor a truly historic leader of Albania's democratic movement. On this day, September 12, Albanians from across the country and from around the world, including Albanian Kosovars, will gather to remember Azem and escort him to his final resting place in Tirana's Martyr's Cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, Azem Hajdari was a stalwart champion of democratic values and hero to many Albanians. I respectfully ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing Azem Hajdari for his historic contributions to building democracy in Albania.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 448. I was unable to be present for the vote on H.R. 2052.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

TRIBUTE TO THE HISTORIC PILGRIM BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Pilgrim Baptist Church was founded in September of 1916, as a part of the dreams and work of the Union Grove Prayer Meeting Club who met in the home of Deacon John A. Finnie at 242 East 42nd Street. Because of its steady growth the club was constantly seeking larger space and after three months the founder and first Chairman of the Deacon Board, Mr. John A. Finnie, his wife, Juanita, Georgia Hansberry, L. Whitley and S.S. Harkness joined together to organize a Church. The group asked for and received help from several ministers. Mrs. Finnie suggested the name, Pilgrim Baptist Church and organized the Pilgrim Senior Choir.

The Church immediately took off and in January 1917, Reverend Jessie D. Luck of New York became its first Pastor. Pilgrim experienced great growth and in 1922 Pilgrim Baptist Church purchased Kehilath Anshe Ma'ariv Synagogue located at 3301 S. Indiana Avenue. This edifice had been constructed in 1891, and designed by the famed architect Louis Sullivan and engineer Dankmar Adler. The initial drawings were prepared by draftsman Frank Lloyd Wright. Upon the passing of Reverend Watson, Reverend R.T. Schell and Assistant Pastor, Reverend C.L. Franklin carried on until the Pulpit Committee found what

they considered to be the right man who could handle the continued growth and expansion of the Church. That man was masterful, the Reverend Junius Caesar Austin, a nationally known pulpiteer pastor, financier, organizer and Convention President. He liquidated the debt, renovated the structure and bought a house for the church's founder, built a community center, gymnasium and housing project and established missions in Africa.

In 1931, Thomas A. Dorsey known as the "father of Gospel Music" joined Pilgrim and organized the Pilgrim Baptist Church Gospel Chorus at the request of Pastor Austin. Some of the members of that chorus were legendary singers such as Mahalia Jackson, Sally Martin, Roberta Martin and Clara Ward.

During Pilgrim's ninety-six year history nine Pastors have served:

Jessie D. Luck—January 1917–July 1917
J.E. Jones—July 1917–October 1919
Samuel E.J. Watson—May 1920–July 1925
Junius C. Austin, Sr.—January 1926–August 1968

Junius C. Austin, Jr.—February 1969–December 1991

Floyd W. Davis—February 1992–April 1999
Hycel B. Taylor—November 2001–May 2005

Keith E. Gordon—January 2007–March 2010

Tyrone E. Jordan—October 2010 to Present
The Historic Pilgrim Baptist Church has been home to many renowned and distinguished people, among them are:

Ministers: Reverend Clarence Cobbs, Reverend J.B. Felker, Reverend Elmer L. Fowler, Reverend Stroy Freeman, Reverend Louis Rawls, Reverend Richard Keller (Pastor of Pilgrim Jr. Church).

Entrepreneurs: Oscar Brown, Attorney/Real Estate, Delois Barrett-Campbell, Barrett Sisters, Bessie Coleman, First Black Woman Aviator, S.B. Fuller, Fuller Products Company, Mahalia Jackson, Gospel Singer, Sally Martin, Gospel Singer, Lee Randolph, Professor, Jack Johnson, First Heavyweight Boxing Champion, Claude Holman, President Pro-Tem of the Chicago City Council.

Outstanding Artists who have performed at Pilgrim: James Cleveland, Aretha Franklin, The Edwin Hawkins Singers, The Staple Singers, Albertina Walker, Inez Andrews.

Pilgrim was actively involved in the Civil Rights Movement and on many occasions the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King delivered sermons at the church.

In 1973, Pilgrim Baptist Church was listed on the National Register of Historic Places by Chicago's City Council and was later designated a Chicago Landmark on December 18, 1981. In December 2001, the Church was placed on the National Ten Sacred Places to save list by Partners for Sacred Places, a Philadelphia based religious preservationist group.

In January 2006, the Historic Pilgrim Church was ravaged by fire. The fire virtually destroyed the interior; but the exterior walls are still standing.

In 2010, designs were unveiled to raise Pilgrim Baptist Church, a historic architectural landmark from ashes. Pilgrim has been rolling for 97 years and will keep on rolling. I salute you.

CONGRATULATING SUNNYSIDE LITTLE LEAGUE GIRLS SOFT- BALL TEAM

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to Congratulate Tucson's Sunnyside Little League girls' softball team on winning the 12-and-under Little League World Series.

On August 14, 2013, the Sunnyside Little League became the 2013 Little League Softball World Series champions by defeating the McLean Little League (Virginia) team 9–0. This victory marks the first West Coast team to win the Little League Softball World Series in more than 23 years.

These extraordinary young ladies finished the Little League World Series with a 5–1 record and became the first team in Arizona to win a title in this division and only the third to win it all in any softball division.

In the championship game, the girls from Sunnyside put on a show in front of a crowd of about 2,300 people at Alpenrose Stadium in Portland, Oregon by scoring two runs in the bottom of the first inning and not letting up. Arizona's red-hot offense blew the game wide open in the bottom of the fourth inning, nearly reaching the 10-run rule.

I like to extend my deepest congratulations to the Sunnyside Little League girls and to the coaches that contributed to the overall success and victory of the team.

I give my most sincere thanks to the Sunnyside girls for representing Tucson, AZ with such great pride and passion. These girls are heroes and role models and deserve recognition for their accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on September 9th, I was unavoidably detained and missed Roll Nos. 448 and 449. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both Roll No. 448 and Roll No. 449.

TRIBUTE TO WAYNE THOMPSON

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Wayne Thompson of Denver, Colorado as he will be honored later this week by the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW), Post #5061, for over 40 years of committed service to Colorado's neediest veterans. Wayne Thompson's is one of the exceptional stories of lifelong dedication to public service. Mr. Thompson enlisted in the Navy in 1951 and was stationed in Korea, Japan, and Vietnam over his four-year military career.

Born in Lincoln, Nebraska in 1932, Mr. Thompson began his career in public service in 1960 at the U.S. Department of Labor. While there, he worked on a task force dedicated to helping veterans find jobs. In 1974, Mr. Thompson was assigned to work in Denver and has called the Centennial State home ever since. Mr. Thompson served under multiple Governors of Colorado over the course of thirty years as a top advisor on veterans' health and employment issues. As a member of the VFW for nearly fifty years, Mr. Thompson played key roles in the establishment of numerous veterans' homes in Colorado, the funding of the Western Slope Military Cemetery, and the long-awaited construction of the new veterans' hospital in Denver.

Mr. Thompson's commitment to veterans extended beyond his work in government. In 1972, Mr. Thompson co-founded the United Veterans Committee, a non-profit coalition of veteran service organization which advocates for veterans and their families in Colorado. From 1980–1990, Mr. Thompson served on the Colorado Board of Veterans' Affairs and from 1986–1990, he was its Chairman. He has also served on the board of the Fitzsimmons State Veterans Nursing home since its opening.

Since coming to Colorado, Mr. Thompson has been a devoted champion of the state's veterans at every level and continues to work for the people of Colorado every day. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Mr. Wayne Thompson for his unwavering support of the veteran community in Colorado and a lifetime of public service.

H.R. 3069—THE SHIELD OUR STREET ACT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, introduced on September 9, 2013, would establish two public safety grant programs.

Section 2 establishes Shield Police Hiring Grants, to be implemented by the Attorney General, to provide grants to law enforcement agencies that operate in Elevated Need Localities. An "Elevated Need Locality" is a county (or unit of local government which is not part of a county) which (1) has a crime rate above the national average, and (2) has had budget reductions during the most recent 5-year period. These law enforcement agencies could apply to the Attorney General to receive funds to hire law enforcement officers, or to rehire officers who have been laid off due to budget reductions.

Grants would last for three years and may be extended by two years at the discretion of the Attorney General.

One hundred million dollars for each fiscal year 2014 through 2019 are authorized to be appropriated for this program.

Section 3 establishes Shield Public Safety Enhancement Grants, to be implemented by the Attorney General, to provide grants to units of local government that has jurisdiction over all or part of an Elevated Need Locality.

Local governments could apply to the Attorney General to receive funds to enhance public safety in a number of ways, such as purchasing public safety equipment, funding public safety programs, making infrastructure improvements for the purpose of enhancing public safety, purchasing and installing street lights to deter crime, funding activities related to crime labs, and funding public defender programs. Non-profit organizations operating in Elevated Need Localities may also apply for grants under this program to fund initiatives designed to reduce crime in these jurisdictions.

Grants would be for one year but may be extended at the discretion of the Attorney General.

One hundred million dollars for each fiscal year 2014 through 2019 are authorized to be appropriated for this program.

IN HONOR OF MOLLY SALMI AND HER 25 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

HON. JOHN KLINE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Molly Salmi for her 25 years of dedicated service to the House Committee on Education and the Workforce—and the American people.

Molly Salmi, who joined the Committee as a Staff Assistant, has continued to advance through the ranks to her current position as Deputy Director of Workforce Policy thanks to her unparalleled professionalism and extensive knowledge of the policies that affect literally every working American.

Molly personifies the best qualities of public service—demonstrating tireless enthusiasm and an unyielding commitment to sound public policy. Beyond her contributions to policy, Molly has invested in the lives of countless young staffers and interns, offering advice, guidance, and direction, while setting an example of decorum and grace.

Molly's great work through the years has earned her the respect of seven separate Committee Chairmen—Republicans and Democrats alike—as well as her colleagues on both sides of the aisle, which is no small feat in a world too often mired in partisan posturing.

For all of the above—and so much more—Molly is more than a trusted colleague: she is an invaluable member of our committee family.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, due to attending a classified briefing on the use of chemical

weapons in Syria, I missed one recorded vote on September 9. I would like to indicate how I would have voted had I been present for that vote.

On rollcall No. 448, H.R. 2052, the Global Investment in American Jobs Act of 2013, I would have voted "yea" to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to conduct an interagency review of and report to Congress on ways to increase the global competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF ANN MAGGIO

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life and service of Ann Maggio, who passed away at age 90 on July 6, 2013. Ann left behind her daughter JoAnn, son Anthony, daughter-in-law Tracy, and grandson Andrew and the Suydam Street home she lived in for 75 years.

Ann, a longtime civic leader, moved to Ridgewood in 1938 when her parents bought a house on Suydam Street, where she lived for the remainder of her life. In 1944, after graduating from Hunter College, Ann went on to work for the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company before she married Anthony Maggio in 1948. Together they had two children, Joann and Anthony.

As a resident of Ridgewood, Queens, she witnessed dramatic changes and became an instrumental part of her community. Ann first made her mark in Ridgewood's civic life by transforming the Grover Cleveland High School athletic field. Working with the police to establish a baseball and softball program, Ann kept the area from being vacant and was instrumental in making the athletic fields a reality for the community.

Ann continued to be an active member of the community, dedicating much of her time to a better Ridgewood. Whether it was keeping the neighborhood free from graffiti or promoting the safety of residents, Ann Maggio truly defined what it meant to be a civic leader.

The legacy she leaves behind exhibits the love she had for her community. Besides her family, nothing was more important to Ann than her love for her neighborhood.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me now in honoring Ann Maggio for her service to the people of Ridgewood.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MONARCAS ACADEMY

HON. JERRY MCNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and celebrating the accomplishments of Monarcas

Academy, a non-profit organization dedicated to adolescent soccer teams in Stockton, California. In July of 2013, a Monarcas Academy team won the U.S. National Cup XII in the under age 15 (U15) group. This team also won the 2013 California State Championship, 2013 San Diego Surf Cup, and the 2013 Santa Clara Sporting Invitational.

Year after year, Monarcas Academy athletes compete at high level soccer tournaments throughout California and the nation. The staff and players at the Academy helped create the Central Valley Soccer League, composed of 95 teams that provide youth development to local student athletes. In addition, Monarcas Academy works with Bfut Soccer Academy in Brazil on international soccer principles.

These efforts benefit our region's youth by promoting physical activity, team spirit, and community involvement. I am proud to represent the Monarcas Academy in Congress, and wish the Academy continued success.

I urge my colleagues to join me in commending Monarcas Academy, its U15 championship team, and its dedication to helping the youth in California.

HONORING THE VETERANS OF THE SEPTEMBER 10, 2013 EASTERN IOWA HONOR FLIGHT

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

MR. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, today, over eighty-five Iowa World War II and Korean War veterans will travel to our nation's capital. Accompanied by volunteer guardians, they will visit the monuments that were built in their honor.

For many, today will be the first time they will see the National World War II Memorial and the Korean War Veterans Memorial. On behalf of every Iowan I represent, I thank these heroes for their service to our nation and pay tribute to the incredible sacrifice that they made for our country.

This trip was made possible by the dedicated workforce at Quaker Oats' Cedar Rapids facility who raised all of the funds necessary to send these heroes to the nation's capital. The generosity of the Quaker Oats' workforce and those who donated to this effort demonstrates Iowans' commitment to honoring those who have served our nation in uniform.

Iowans know that we owe our veterans a debt of gratitude. As a reminder of the service and sacrifice of the Greatest Generation, I am proud to have a piece of marble in my office from the quarry that was used to build the World War II Memorial. Our World War II and Korean War veterans rose to defend not just our nation, but the freedoms, democracy, and values that make our country the greatest nation on earth. They did so as one people and one country. Their sacrifices and determination in the face of great threats to our way of life are both humbling and inspiring.

The sheer magnitude of what the Greatest Generation accomplished, not just in war but in the peace that followed, continues to inspire

us today. Their generation and our country did not seek to be tested both abroad by a war that fundamentally challenged our way of life and at home by the Great Depression and the rebuilding of our economy that followed. But, when called upon to do so, the Greatest Generation defended and then rebuilt our nation to make it even stronger. Their patriotism, service, and sacrifice not only defined their generation—they stand as a testament to the fortitude of our nation and the American people. Their legacy endures today.

I am tremendously proud to welcome the Eastern Iowa Honor Flight and Iowa's veterans of the Second World War and the Korean War to our nation's capital today. On behalf of every Iowan I represent, I thank them for their service to our country.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

MR. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,567,425,782.46. We've added \$6,111,690,376,869.38 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

IN RECOGNITION OF DOUG VERBOON

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

MR. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Doug Verboon, an important figure in California's Central Valley who was recently named the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce's 2013 Agriculturalist and Ag Supporter of the Year.

Doug is a lifelong resident of Hanford, California and a fellow graduate of Hanford High School. Born into a farming family, agriculture is more than just his vocation; it is his way of life. He began his agricultural career alongside his father and grandfather as a third generation farmer on the Gold Top Ranch, located in Hanford.

Doug has been an active member of his local community for many years. He has been a trustee of the Pioneer School District for 16 years where he played an important role in establishing the Pioneer School District as the first charter school district in the State of California.

Doug is also a member of the Kings County Board of Supervisors, representing District 3. Additionally, he is a member of the Kings County Farm Bureau, the District Advisory Council for Sequoia Walnut, and the Future Leaders Board for Diamond Walnuts.

The Lemoore Chamber of Commerce's Agriculturalist and Ag Supporter of the Year

Award is given to a local community member who has made immeasurable contributions to the agricultural community in Lemoore. I appreciate the time and effort Doug has enthusiastically devoted to the communities within the Central Valley. I am pleased that his service and commitment to agriculture, and his community as a whole, is being recognized with this prestigious award.

INTRODUCTION OF THE IRS ABUSE PROTECTION ACT OF 2013

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

MR. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my bill, the IRS Abuse Protection Act of 2013, which requires the IRS to notify taxpayers when their records are accessed. Taxpayer information is the private information of the taxpayer and they have a right to know when, who, why, and what that information is used for.

Mr. Speaker, by introducing this bill we hope to ensure people will not be threatened or intimidated by the federal government. This bill presses forth transparency and accountability. Despite what the President has said, the targeting of conservative organizations for extra scrutiny is a real scandal and is simply reprehensible. The thin line of trust between the individual and their government has been broken and we must work to rebuild it. I am strongly urging Congress to continue its investigation into the IRS and to make sure those responsible are held accountable to the fullest extent of the law. I am also joining other Members of Congress calling on Treasury Secretary Jack Lew to investigate the actions of the IRS.

I am committed to making sure the IRS is never again used as a political weapon against any group, conservative or otherwise and my bill will ensure that those responsible for using private information to quiet individuals and organizations that disagree with the President can no longer hide behind the wall of Washington secrecy and are held accountable for their actions.

Simply put, I believe when personal information is accessed; taxpayers have a right to know who accessed the information, why it was accessed, and what the information is used for as well as having access to the information and any reports generated from it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House (and Senate) to support me in passing the IRS Abuse Protection Act of 2013 in order to ensure American families and taxpayers have trust in their government.

A TRIBUTE TO THE 2013 ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2013 recipients of the coveted Ellis Island Medal of Honor. Presented annually by the National Ethnic Coalition or Organizations (NECO), the Ellis Island Medal of Honor pays tribute to our Nation's immigrant heritage, as well as individual achievement. The medals are awarded to U.S. citizens from various ethnic backgrounds who exemplify outstanding qualities in both their personal and professional lives, while continuing to preserve the richness of their particular heritage. We honor these outstanding individuals because they create a better world for all of us in the future by the work they do today. Since the Medal's founding in 1986, more than 2,000 American citizens have received Ellis Island Medals of Honor, including six American Presidents, several United States Senators, Congressmen, Nobel Laureates, outstanding athletes, artists, clergy, and military leaders.

This medal is not about money, but about people who seized the opportunities this great country has to offer and who used those opportunities to not only better their own lives but make a difference in the lives of those around them. As we all know, citizens of the United States can trace their ancestry to many nations. The richness and diversity of American life makes us unique among the Nations of the world and is in many ways the key to why America is the most innovative country in the world. The Ellis Island Medals of Honor not only celebrate select individuals but also the pluralism and democracy that enabled our ancestors to celebrate their cultural identities while still embracing the American way of life. Even in the midst of difficult financial times, this award serves to remind us all that with hard work and perseverance anyone can achieve the American dream. In addition, by honoring these remarkable Americans, we honor all who share their origins and we acknowledge the contributions they and other groups have made to America.

I commend NECO and its Board of Directors headed by my good friend, Nasser J. Kazeminy, for honoring these truly outstanding individuals for their tireless efforts to foster dialogue and build bridges between different ethnic groups, as well as promote unity and a sense of common purpose in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing the good works of NECO, and in congratulating all of the 2012 recipients of the Ellis Island Medals of Honor.

2013 ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Mohamed Mike Ahmar, Varoujan Aldebarmakian, MD, William C. Anton, Bharat H. Barai, MD, Brian Boitano, Noreen Salah Burpee, Hon. Woody Burton, Wendy Y. Chao, Melvin L. Cheatham, MD, Alina Cho, Byung Chang Cho, Im Ja P. Choi, Jerry L. Chong, Esq., Candice Chulee, Seamus Connolly, David C. Dauch, Warren Will David, Vidyasagar Dharmapuri, MD, Alexander W. Dreyfoos, Russell J. Ebeid, John David

Eckstein, MD, Dr. Jamshid Ehsani, Mia Farrow, Joseph Fiorentino, RADM Moira N. Flanders, USN (Ret.), LTG Michael Flynn, USA, Jamshid Ghajar, MD, PhD, Hossein Gharib, MD, MACP, MACE, Dore J. Gilbert, MD, LTC USAR, Hubert Guerrand-Hermes, Xavier Guerrand-Hermes, Yong Hwa Ha, Kenneth S. Hershon, MD, Victoria Shoghag Hovanessian, Yousef Javadi, Hratch Kaprielian, Ara Kevork Karajerjian, AIC, CPC, Patricia J. Kennedy, Rep. Peter T. King, Michelle King Robson, Vahid Kooros, Kenneth Julius Kovach, Jackson H. Kuan, MD, Christopher J. Kuelling, Esq., Arthur Bihua Liu, Captain Gordon A. Loeb, USCG, Dr. J. Phillip London, RADM Brian Losey, USN, James Lu, Col. Robert M. Lucania, USAF (Ret.), Christine Eliska Lynn, Fasha (Farshad) Mahjoor, Dertad Manguikian, MD, Yvonne Marceau, Danny Masterson, Gail J. McGovern, Hon. Gregory J. Melikian, USAF (Ret.), Mark R. Melton, David Merage, Gary Mervis, Robert S. Milligan, H.E. Albert Alexander Montague, MG Patrick A. Murphy, USA, Kikanza Nuri-Robins, EdD, MDiv, 1st Lt Steven Ortiz, MA ANG, Mahendra R. Patel, Ramesh J. Patel, David Anthony Pope, John Psaras, Bruce Ramer, Alma Rangel, Assistant Chief Joseph J. Reznick, Monsignor Robert J. Romano, Ronald J. Ross, M.D., F.A.C.R., Pardis Sabeti, MD, DPhil, Homa Sarshar, Kamala Saxena, MD, Jack G. Shaheen, PhD, H. John Shammass, MD, Thomas Sherak, Deputy Chief Steven J. Silks, Anthony Spavone, Stephen J. Squeri, Valavanur A. Subramanian, MD, Aso O. Tavitian, Silvia Tchakmakjian, George Solon Tsandikos, Russell Thayer Tutt, Jr., Col. Lee A. Van Arsdale, USA, (Ret.), Argyris "RJ" Vassiliou, Richard A. Vermeil, Frank A. Visco, Wyan Hua Wang, Dionne Warwick, Wim Wiewel, PhD, Dar-yih David Wu, Vahe Stephan Yacoubian, MD, Christopher G. Zizza.

HONORING KIMBERLY DOUMA, NAPA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kimberly Douma, who has been chosen as Napa County Teacher of the Year for 2014.

Since 1991, Ms. Douma has taught kindergarten, first, and second grades at West Park Elementary School in Napa, California. Throughout her teaching career, Ms. Douma has worked hard to serve her school community in the Napa Valley. She has been a member of the Napa Valley Unified School District Professional Standards Committee since 2010, served eight years as the West Park Leadership Teacher Representative, six years as the West Park Family Club Teacher Representative, and six years as the West Park School Site Council Teacher Representative. Further, Ms. Douma has offered free tutoring to at-risk children for the past three years and taught Before School Language Arts Intervention. Ms. Douma has co-chaired the West Park Elementary Carnival for the last 22 years, initiating various activities including the Visual and Performing Arts program, and the

Food Booths and the Book Booth. She has been a member of the California Teachers Association and Napa Valley Educators Association for 22 years.

As a member of Covenant Presbyterian Church Ms. Douma has participated on the Long Life Learning Committee for five years, served as a Sunday School Teacher, a Vacation Bible School Chair, and hosted five years of Christmas and Easter Pageants.

Ms. Douma has received accolades for her outstanding contributions as an educator in Napa from various community organizations, including Teacher of the Year from the Napa Rotary Club, and the Young Church Woman Award from the Women United of the Napa Valley.

Mr. Speaker, Kimberly Douma grew up believing that teachers could be tour guides to adventure. Inspired by her late father who was also a teacher, Kimberly is beginning to teach the children of students she had early in her career, and continues to inspire and engage every child that has the privilege to call her "Teacher". It is fitting that today we honor her ongoing commitment to excellence in education.

RECOGNIZING COBRA MOTO

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Cobra Moto, a manufacturer of premium race-ready mini motocross bikes for youth riders that are proudly made in the U.S.A.

Designed and produced in Hillsdale, Michigan, Cobra bikes were recently ridden to victory by three youth national champions at the 2013 Red Bull Amateur National Motocross Championship in Hurricane Mills, Tennessee. While I know the folks at Cobra were very excited at the results, this success doesn't come as a surprise to anyone in the motorcycling community.

Since 1993, Cobra has consistently delivered the most successful line of competition mini bikes in the country. Riders have driven these iconic little yellow bikes to more than 300 titles, a testament to the high standards Cobra demands from each one of their machines.

In this 20th year of producing quality competition dirt bikes, I offer my sincere congratulations and best wishes to the people of Cobra and the riders who enjoy their quality machines.

CONGRATULATIONS DR. CHERYL A. MARSHALL

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Dr. Cheryl A. Marshall who will be inducted as the seventh president of Crafon Hills College on September 27, 2013.

Dr. Marshall has had a distinguished career in the field of education. Having received her doctorate of education from the University of Southern California, Dr. Marshall has spent ten of the last twenty years as an educator in positions of leadership, changing the lives of her students for the better. As a member of the Inland Empire Economic Partnership's Education Council, she has contributed to the region-wide effort to address educational gaps and prepare our students for a strong presence in the workforce. As a former educator, I believe it is her specialization in educational management, strategic planning, and performance management that sets her apart.

A firm believer in the intrinsic value of education, Dr. Marshall fully understands and appreciates the vital role that education plays in our society. Having secured close to \$9 million dollars in grant funding during her career, she has been able to safeguard various programs and services would always be available in order for her students to succeed. During her tenure as Vice President of Instruction, Dr. Marshall ensured Crafton Hills College received full accreditation within just two years. Such dedication, exemplified by Dr. Marshall, makes Crafton Hills College an excellent institution of higher learning.

In closing, I'd like to extend my heartfelt congratulations to Dr. Marshall, her husband Patrick and their two children on her inauguration. I look forward to seeing Crafton Hills College grow and prosper under her experienced direction.

IN RECOGNITION OF COL.
CHARLES JACKSON

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exemplary career of Col. Charles Jackson who recently retired from his position as Assistant Vice President for Facilities at the University of North Texas (UNT) in Denton, Texas. For over a decade, he has competently overseen the rapid growth of new construction and renovation of numerous campus buildings. Prior to his work at UNT, Col. Jackson spent the majority of his career serving his country on active duty with the United States Air Force (USAF). As a registered professional engineer and member of the Association of Physical Plant Administrators, Col. Jackson has distinguished himself as an accomplished military and civilian engineer through his successful direction of numerous projects and developments, domestically and abroad.

Col. Jackson received a B.A. in civil engineering from the U.S. Air Force Academy and a M.A. in engineering/facilities from the Air Force Institute of Technology. He served as the commander of the 7th Engineering Squadron at Carswell Air Force Base at Fort Worth, Texas. His civil engineer leadership positions include duty assignments stateside in Colorado, Texas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma and overseas in Japan, Germany and Belgium. Col. Jackson dedicated 30 years of his life as a civil engineer in the Air Force and achieved

the rank of Colonel upon his retirement in May 1998.

Following his departure from the Air Force, Col. Jackson began employment at UNT as Facilities Maintenance Manager and was selected for his current position in 2005. Since 2000, the UNT campus has rapidly expanded to accommodate the growing number of incoming students. Col. Jackson has overseen the construction of four residence halls, seven major buildings and additional renovation projects. His proudest accomplishments include the Library Mall, the Net Zero Energy Lab, and the recent completion of the SMART project which will have a long-term beneficial impact for the UNT campus. Col. Jackson acted as a vital proponent of this project that will save the University over \$3 million in utility and operation costs annually and ensure reliable systems to support UNT into the future. The SMART project recently received a Green Ribbon Award in the infrastructure category from the U.S. Green Building Council North Texas as the best example of the implementation of sustainable infrastructure design, construction or management practices.

On a personal level, I am grateful to Col. Jackson for his advice and expertise as a member of my Service Academy Board. As a USAF Academy graduate and higher education representative, Col. Jackson's role was to comprehensively screen and interview high school and college applicants wishing to receive a congressional nomination and to advise me upon the selection of qualified service academy candidates.

I join his family, friends and colleagues in congratulating Col. Charles Jackson upon his exemplary service to our community, state and Nation and extend my warmest wishes upon a well-earned retirement. His positive contributions and dedicated efforts will continue to enhance the University of North Texas for years to come, and I am privileged to represent the University of North Texas in the U.S. House of Representatives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 449, I was unable to be present for the vote on H.R. 2844.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

CONGRATULATING THE RIO RICO
LITTLE LEAGUE JUNIORS

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA
OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Rio Rico Little League Juniors, this year's National Champions.

On August 16, 2013, Rio Rico (4-1) beat Goodlettsville, Tennessee 7-3 to capture the

United States Championship at the Junior League World Series.

The Rio Rico Little League Juniors advanced through the state, regionals, and won the National Championship and represented the United States against the undefeated Asia Pacific Baseball Academy team from Taiyuan, Chinese Taipei (Taiwan).

On August 18, 2013, Nogales and Rio Rico both came together in celebration of the Little League's success. The streets were filled with fire trucks, fans, and family members who eagerly and fondly received the team for the champions they are.

I like to extend my deepest congratulations to the Rio Rico Little League boys and to the coaches that contributed to the very success and victory of the team.

I also give my most sincere thanks to the Rio Rico Little League Juniors for their wonderful performance and for representing all of Arizona with such pride, dignity, and courage.

HONORING CITY MANAGER TOM
ROBINSON

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tom Robinson for his public service to the people of La Mirada, California. Tom began with the city in 1985 as the Community Resource Manager and, in 2008, Tom was appointed City Manager. After 27 productive years of service to La Mirada and its residents, Tom has retired.

During his tenure with the City of La Mirada, Tom always provided strong leadership and knowledgeable direction for major projects. Those numerous projects included the City's Community Services Master Plan, the Social Services Model Plan, and the development of the Splash! La Mirada Regional Aquatics Center.

Over the past decade, Tom has worked tirelessly to ensure La Mirada operates on firm financial footing and never outside its fiscal means. While the struggling economy has impacted many cities throughout Southern California, La Mirada has managed to maintain funding for all city services and capital improvement projects and Tom is a big reason why. It's no surprise La Mirada was listed by CNN and Money Magazine as one of the "Best Places to Live" in 2007.

As an active civic member, he has served as a member of the American Society for Public Administration, an accredited member of the Public Relations Society of America, and a member and former president of the Rotary Club of La Mirada. Robinson has been recognized by the California Association of Public Information Officials (CAPIO). The award recognizes exceptional service and career achievement by public communicators.

From one public servant to another, I praise Tom Robinson and commend him on his many years of outstanding public service and dedication to the City of La Mirada and its residents. Let us wish him and his family the very best in retirement.

HONORING CRISTIAN ROLDAN, RECIPIENT OF THE 2012-2013 GATORADE NATIONAL BOYS SOCCER PLAYER OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am here to congratulate Cristian Roldan, who is the recipient of the 2012-2013 Gatorade National Boys Soccer Player of the Year Award. This is an amazing feat that deserves our recognition.

In 1985, The Gatorade Company established an award to recognize high school athletes across the country. Since then, more than 12,500 students have been honored with the award of State Player of the Year and 250 National Players of the Year. This prestigious list includes many top professional athletes such as Payton Manning, Lisa Leslie, and

Derek Jeter. The Gatorade Player of the Year award is presented to high school athletes that have achieved athletic excellence as well as high standards of academic achievement and model character on and off the field. Cristian was selected as the National Player of the Year out of 400,000 boys high school soccer players.

Cristian recently graduated from El Rancho High School in Pico Rivera, CA. Cristian, a 5-foot-7, 165-pound midfielder, was without a doubt the catalyst of the El Rancho Dons boys' soccer team this past season leading them to a 29-2-1 record and the California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) Southern Section Division III title. Scoring 54 goals and 31 assists, he also helped the Dons capture the Division I title at the CIF Southern California Regional Soccer Championships. As the season came to a successful end, Cristian was awarded Most Valuable Player of the CIF Southern Section Division III.

In addition to his success on the soccer field, Cristian was a three-year varsity volleyball player, all while earning a 3.74 GPA

his senior year. Cristian is a member of the California Scholarship Federation for his academic excellence and serves as a peer mentor in his spare time. Cristian has displayed his exemplary character by serving as a volunteer coach for the American Youth Soccer Organization, participating in the El Rancho's Blue Pride service project, and for being a member of the Dons' College Bound Athletes Committee.

Cristian is the fourth boys Gatorade National Player of the Year from California and the first from Los Angeles County. Cristian intends to play soccer on an athletic scholarship at the University of Washington this fall.

What Cristian has achieved is something that deserves our recognition today. Cristian has displayed great academic and athletic achievement. I would like to recognize and congratulate Cristian Roldan for receiving the Gatorade National Player of the Year Award. I wish him a successful college career at the University of Washington.

SENATE—Wednesday, September 11, 2013

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, You are our rock, our fortress, and our deliverer, for we find refuge in Your sovereign leading. On this 12th anniversary of the September 11 attacks, we thank You for the wisdom You provide us in our trying times. Through the terrorist attacks, You helped us to become more aware of our vulnerability as a Nation, to better appreciate the heroes and heroines who emerge during seasons of crisis, and to discover how the worst of times can bring out the best in us.

As our Nation again confronts precarious challenges, use our lawmakers as instruments of Your peace, bringing hope where there is despair and order where there is chaos.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

OBSERVING THE TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ATTACKS ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a moment of silence to pay tribute to the Americans whose lives were taken on September 11, 2001.

(Moment of Silence.)

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business until 2:30 p.m. this afternoon for debate only, with all other aspects of the previous order being in effect.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Republican leader and I have spoken, and we are working on a way forward based on the President's speech and what has happened over the last few days. He and I will confer shortly again, but right now we will be in a period of morning business. Senators may talk about whatever they want. It is my understanding that the time is equally divided between the two sides; is that right?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following leader remarks, the time until 2:30 p.m. will be divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for 10 minutes each. There will be a remembrance ceremony on the east side of the Capitol. Members will gather in the rotunda at 10:45 a.m.

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I can remember events 12 years ago so clearly. I was not far from here at the time. I was in S-219, which is a meeting room. That is where Leader Daschle held his leadership meetings every Tuesday morning at 9 a.m. I was the first one in the room. Senator John Breaux from Louisiana came in and said: Flip on the TV. There is something going on in New York.

We turned on the TV, and it looked as though something happened in New York. We just thought an airplane had malfunctioned or something had gone wrong to cause the plane to hit that tower.

So the meeting started and the TVs were off. We were doing our business of the day when suddenly a group of police officers came in and grabbed Senator Daschle and took him outside. He came back very quickly and said: There is an airplane headed for the Capitol. We have to get out of here.

There was a lot of confusion, to say the least, as staff and Senators were ordered out of the buildings—plural. As we left S-219, we looked out the window toward the Pentagon, and smoke was billowing out of it. We could see it so very plainly. At that time we didn't know what was happening; we just knew we had been ordered to get out of the building.

Of course, we all have memories of what took place that day. I was the assistant leader, as was Senator Nickles from Oklahoma. Senator Lott was the Republican leader, and Senator Daschle was the Democratic leader. We were taken in helicopters from the west front of the Capitol to a secure location. When I was taken to the west front of the Capitol, the scene was eerie to say the least. There were lots of people in black uniforms trying to create order out of confusion. Without going into a lot of detail, we went to a location, and the Vice President was there. He met with us and kept us informed as to what was going on with the President. We spent the day there and then came back to the west front of the Capitol, where all Members of Congress gathered. BARBARA MIKULSKI, for lack of anyone having a better suggestion, said: We should sing "God Bless America." She got the song started, and that was extremely memorable.

We are going to have a ceremony in a few minutes out front, and I will talk a little bit there. The four leaders have been asked to talk out there.

We did have a moment of silence regarding the more than 3,000 people who were killed in New York, Pennsylvania, and the Pentagon. In addition to those 3,000 people who were taken from us permanently, thousands of other people were injured, some of them permanently injured. Some of them have missing legs, some are blind, and some suffer from paralysis. So we raise our voices today in celebration of America's spirit and perseverance. May we never forget 9/11.

It is also worth mentioning that on this day we also honor what took place

a year ago in Libya, where one of our stellar Ambassadors was murdered along with three of his brave colleagues. They were all killed in Libya. Our country remains committed to seeking justice for them and every American victim of terrorism, and that is what the debate of Syria is all about—terrorism.

Before I began the caucus yesterday, when the President came, my introduction to the President was a film that was created by Senator FEINSTEIN and others. It is about 12 or 13 minutes long, and it shows what went on in graphic detail with the brutal chemical weapons attack in Syria where these children were left to die. Remember, these poisons get the little kids first.

Senator DURBIN has a Palestinian on his staff. We all know Reema. She does the whip count for Senator DURBIN and for me. I had her listen to the film. I watched it and she listened so she could give me some idea of what people were saying there. They were yelling. It was so sad. Mostly they were praying. It was very, very sad to see people holding little babies and saying: Breathe, breathe. They couldn't breathe. We could see the perspiration on some of them. They dumped water on them—anything to give them some relief. The video showed rows of dead people. Hundreds of them were little children. Some of them were dressed in their play clothes, little fancy, colorful T-shirts.

Even as we pay tribute to America's tradition of freedom for every citizen across the globe, an evil dictator denies its citizens not only their right to liberty but also their right to live. The Asad family is pretty good at killing people. The New York Times had an article over the last 24 hours about his dad, because of the failed assassination attempt, killing 30,000 people he thought needed to be killed—30,000. That country, Syria, denies its citizens the right to liberty, but even more significant the right to live.

Yesterday I showed the video at the caucus. No one wanted to see it. I didn't want to see it again. It was all I could do to glance up. I had already seen it. Those visions will always be in my mind. I showed my Senators a video of this: little boys and girls and grown men with their eyes crusted, frothing from the mouth. It was such unspeakable scenery. They were convulsing, writhing, spasms from the poison gas he used to murder his victims. It was hard to watch, but it confirmed all of our conviction that the United States must not let the Syrian regime go unpunished for using something that is outlawed. Those weapons are not to be used in a war, let alone used on a bunch of innocent people.

Yesterday the President spoke to two caucuses. He spoke last night and made a compelling case for military action against the Asad regime. As the Presi-

dent said, we have to send an explicit message not only to Syria but the rest of the world. Remember—who has more chemical weapons than Syria? Only one country—North Korea. Think about that. If they get away with this, what is North Korea going to do? Then are we going to have a marketplace for purchasing chemical weapons? The use of chemical weapons by anyone, any time, anywhere, including the battlefield, should not be tolerated.

Preventing these weapons from being used is not only in our own national interests, but it is in the interests of the world. Diplomacy should always be the first choice. That is who we are as a country. So we have been asked to temporarily suspend consideration of the Syria resolution to allow for these conversations to take place around the world.

Tomorrow our Secretary of State is meeting with the Russian Secretary of State, Mr. Lavrov, to explore in fact if this is a legitimate proposal. Talking and action are two separate things. So what the Republican leader and I have spoken about—and we will talk more about it today—is to see what we can do to give the President the time and space our country needs to pursue these international negotiations. We will report back at a later time. America must remain vigilant and ready to use force if necessary, and Congress should not take the threat of military action off the table.

I want to spend a little time talking to Senator MENENDEZ, the chair of the committee. I want to talk to other Senators who are trying to work something out on their own, and I will do that.

Leaders in Damascus and Moscow should understand that Congress will be watching these negotiations very closely. If there is any indication this is not serious—that it is a ploy to delay, to obstruct, to divert—then I think we have to again give the President the authority to hold the Asad regime accountable. So it is our determination not to let Asad's atrocities go unanswered. How we answer is a question we will continue to pursue. But it is very clear that we wouldn't be where we are today—even my friend, the junior Senator from Kentucky, today said the reason we are having the possibility of a deal is because of the President threatening force.

It is interesting. Asad has even denied, until just recent hours, ever even having had chemical weapons. So it is in Syria's power to avoid these strikes, but that will require swift and decisive action on the part of the Asad regime to relinquish these weapons. We need a diplomatic solution to succeed, but saying we want one doesn't mean it will happen. So he must quickly prove the offer to turn over Syria's chemical weapons is real and not an attempt to delay.

All eyes are on the Russian President, President Putin. We all know he was formerly head of the KGB. We all know about the KGB. He is the President of that very big country. We are also grateful that even though relations aren't perfect with Russia, they are OK—so much better than they have been prior to the breakup of that massive country, the Soviet Union.

We hope Russia is a productive partner in these negotiations. Any agreement must also assure it is possible to secure these chemical weapons in spite of the ongoing civil war, to keep those stockpiles out of the hands of terrorists.

In short, I am happy we have some conversations going to see if this can be resolved diplomatically. I certainly hope so.

I apologize to my counterpart, the Republican leader, for taking so much time.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING 9/11

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 12 years ago more than 100 Members of Congress from both parties stood together on the Capitol steps to show our sympathy, solidarity, and resolve. Those of us who were there will never forget it. Later this morning Members will gather on the same steps to remember once again those who died and to recommit ourselves to our national ideals—together. Our Nation always pulls together in difficult moments; 9/11 showed us that. It is important we remember it.

I look forward to joining congressional leaders and others out on the same steps shortly, on this day that has rightly become a very solemn one throughout our country.

We remember today all those who were killed as well as the families they left behind. We remember them with renewed sorrow. We remember all who lost their lives or who have been injured in the line of duty defending our freedoms since 9/11.

Today, we remember the resolve we shared on a clear September morning 12 years ago.

In the days and months that followed the attacks of 9/11, we did not cower. We took the fight to the terrorists, while here at home we opened our doors, our wallets, and our hearts to those around us. We persevered. We maintained what was and is best about our country. And, together, we will continue to do so as long as this struggle continues.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now be in a period of morning business for debate only until 2:30 p.m. with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The assistant majority leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING 9/11

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in a few moments we will recess to gather on the steps of the Capitol. It is an annual event that commemorates 9/11. The leaders have spoken to their memories of that day, and I associate myself with their remarks and the sadness we all feel as we reflect on the lives lost, some 3,000 Americans—to this blatant act of terrorism.

We can all recall that moment. I can recall looking down the Mall toward the Washington Monument and watching the black smoke billowing across the Mall from the Pentagon because of the deadly crash there that took the lives of passengers on that plane and innocent people working in defense of America. That was a moment that will never be forgotten.

Over the weekend there was an indication of a new memorial in New York City that will commemorate 9/11 as well, and soon it will be open as a lasting tribute to not only those who fell and the families we grieve with, but also to the paramedics and first responders who did such a remarkable and courageous job that day.

SYRIA

It is in keeping with that theme that we reflect today on what the majority leader told us. We had a visit yesterday from the President of the United States who spoke directly to the Senate Democratic caucus and Republican caucus luncheons answering questions from Senators. The President came to speak to us about the situation in Syria, about the use of chemical weapons, the deadly impact it has had on innocent people, and the obvious breach of norms of civilized conduct which the world has agreed to for almost 100 years.

The President made it clear that we have a chance now, an opportunity for a diplomatic solution because of the suggestion of the Russians that the Syrians come forward, surrender their chemical weapons, submit to inspections, and have real enforcement. Nations around the world are working with the United States to craft a resolution for the United Nations to consider. I am hopeful and I pray they will be successful. If that occurs, the President will have achieved his goal without the use of military force, which is

something he made clear to us yesterday that he hopes to pursue—achieving his goal without the use of military force. Over and over again yesterday he told us: I am not a President who looks forward to the use of military force. I don't want to do it unless I have to. I believe that, because I know the man. I have known him for many years and I know what is in his heart.

However, we have to acknowledge the obvious. Had the President not raised the prospect of military force, this conversation on an international level would never have occurred. It was the President's leadership, even without majority support among the American people, that precipitated this action by President Putin, and I hope it will lead to a diplomatic solution. It is where it should be—in the United Nations. It was only the threat of veto by Russia and China and the Security Council which kept President Obama from turning to the United Nations first. But we have a chance, and I pray it is successful.

We will now move forward with other items on the Senate agenda very quickly, as we should, and still the possibility that if this diplomatic effort fails, we will have to return to this critically important debate about the future of Syria.

It is important to recall, though, even after the chemical weapons are gone—and I pray that happens with diplomatic efforts soon—there will still be a civil war in that country that has claimed 100,000 lives over the last several years. The sooner that comes to an end, the better. The humanitarian crisis on the ground in Syria is terrible, but the impact on surrounding nations is awful as well.

Last year I visited a refugee camp in Turkey where Syrians, fearing for their lives, moved by the thousands into Turkey. I reflected on the generosity and compassion of the people of Turkey, accepting 10,000 people in one of these refugee camps, providing for them shelter and food and medical care and education for their children. It was an amazing humanitarian gesture on their part.

Then we go to the nation of Jordan. Jordan is overrun with refugees from the Middle East, and it has created serious economic challenges for that country and threats to political stability. The sooner this war ends in Syria, the sooner normalcy comes to the Middle East, the better for Jordan and the better for the entire region. So we pray that occurs soon.

This has been a rough few weeks as we have considered chemical weapons in Syria. As Senator REID said yesterday, the objects and visions we saw on this film and video—the victims of these chemical weapons—remind us of how horrible this is. When those who turn to weapons of mass destruction are not held accountable, there are more innocent victims.

I hope we can solve this issue on a diplomatic basis. We will stand down now in terms of any congressional effort until that effort in the United Nations has a chance to reach fruition, and I pray it will.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

REMEMBERING 9/11

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I rise to speak in morning business to remember 9/11, 2001, a day every American citizen and every citizen in the world remembers. They remember where they were. They remember what they thought. And they remember the tragedy we all watched on television that day.

It is appropriate that on every 9/11 of every year we pause for a moment and pray for the victims of that tragedy and their families, that we remember what happened on that day, and that we commit ourselves to see to it that it never happens again.

It is important that it not just be a memory. It needs to be a seminal moment in our lives that allows us to never forget the tragedy of what I believe is the first battle in the greatest war between good and evil. Terrorism is the ultimate enemy of freedom, liberty, and democracy, and it is something we must stand up to and never cower to.

Sometimes people ask me: What can I do? What can I do on 9/11, 2013, to remember those who died, to remember those who saved lives, and to remember what happened? I say there are three important things for us to always do. No. 1 is to give thanks for the EMTs, the firemen, the law enforcement officers who risked their lives and, in many cases, died to save people who were victims of the Twin Towers tragedy. That is No. 1.

No. 2 is to remember we are a soldier in the army to fight terrorism. Every American should remember to be vigilant, to watch where they go. If they see something unusual, if they see something out of character, report it. We can be the second security force for our country.

Third, and most importantly, pray for our country. Pray that we have the strength to continue to confront terrorism. It is important for us to remember that terrorists win when we fear them. When we change what we do in our lives because we fear terrorism, they have won that great battle. We must stand up to, be vigilant for those signs that indicate a terrorist attack may happen, and let them know that no matter where, no matter when, or no matter what, the people of the United States of America stand ready to confront it and see to it that never does our country cower in fear because of terrorism. So on this tragic day,

when almost 3,000 citizens of the world lost their lives in New York City, Shanksville, PA, and Washington, DC, it is appropriate that we pause and remember those victims, their families, and all of those who worked to save lives on 9/11, 2001. We must also remember those three things: Pray for America and those who were victims, remember to be vigilant and part of the army that keeps our eyes open and reports things that are seen, and always remember that when we cower to terrorism in fear, the terrorists have won. America must always be what America is: the strongest democracy on the face of this Earth.

May God bless our country and may God bless the souls who died on September 11, 2001.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SYRIA

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I rise to speak to the grave issue of the Syria resolution currently pending before the body.

It is September 11. I know many Members have expressed thoughts, and we are all thinking about that day and what it means to our country. In a few minutes I will leave and go to the Pentagon to be with Pentagon staffers and family members as they commemorate the anniversary of this horrible tragedy in American life. The shadow of that tragedy and its rippling effects even today, 12 years later, definitely are a matter on my mind and heart as I think about this issue with respect to Syria.

Also on my mind and heart as I think about this grave issue is its connection to Virginia. I believe Virginia is the most militarily connected State in our country. Our map is a map of American military history: the battle at Yorktown, the surrender at Appomattox Court House, the attack on the Pentagon on 9/11. Our map is a map of American military history. We are more connected to the military in the sense that one in nine of our citizens is a veteran. We have Active Duty at the Pentagon, training to be officers at Quantico, the largest concentration of naval power in the world at Hampton Roads. We have DOD contractors. We have DOD civilians such as Army nurses. We have ROTC cadets, Guard and Reserve members, and military families, all of whom care very deeply about the issue we are grappling with as a nation.

I am sure in the Presiding Officer's State, as in mine and across the country, there is a war weariness on this 12th anniversary of 9/11, and that affects the way we look at this question of whether the United States should potentially engage in military action.

I cast a vote last week in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to authorize limited military action, and I have spent the days since that vote talking to Virginians and hearing from them and hearing from some who aren't happy with the vote I cast.

I spent 1 day talking to ROTC cadets at Virginia State University, folks who are training to be officers who might fight in future conflicts for this country. Then I spent Friday in Hampton Roads with veterans and military families talking about the choices before us.

I heard a teenager last night say something that truly struck me. This is a teenager who doesn't have any direct connection to the military herself, no family members in service. But at an event I was attending, she stood and said: I don't know war, but all my generation and I know is war. Think about that: I don't know war, but all my generation and I know is war. During her entire life that she has been kind of a thinking person, aware of the outside world, we have been at war. That makes us tremendously war-weary, and I understand that. So trying to separate out all those feelings and do what is right is hard.

Similar to many Virginians, I have family in the military who are going to be directly affected by what we do or what we don't do. I think about those family members and all Virginians and all Americans who have loved ones in service as I contemplate this difficult issue.

I wish to say three things. First, I wish to praise the President for bringing this matter to Congress, which I believe is courageous and historic. Secondly, I wish to talk about why I believe authorizing limited military action makes sense. Third, I wish to talk about the need to exhaust all diplomatic opportunities and openings, including the ones that were reported beginning Monday of this week by Russia and Syria.

First, on the President coming to Congress. This was what was intended by the Framers of the Constitution; that prior to the initiation of significant military action—and this would be significant by all accounts—that Congress should have to weigh in. The Framers wanted that to be so. They had read history. They knew executives might be a little too prone to initiating military action, and they wanted to make sure the people's elected representatives had a vote about whether an action should be initiated. Once initiated, there is only one Commander in Chief. But at the initiation,

Congress needs to be involved. That was the intent from the very beginning of this Nation from 1787. There was an understanding that in an emergency, a President might need to act immediately, but even in that case there would need to be a reckoning, a coming back to Congress and seeking approval of Presidential action.

In my view, the President, by bringing this matter to Congress, has acted in accord with law, acted in accord with the intent of the Framers of the Constitution, and actually has done so in a way that has cleared up some sloppiness about the way this institution and the President has actually done this over time.

Only five times in the history of the Nation has Congress declared war. Over 120 times Presidents have initiated military action without congressional approval—at least prior congressional approval. Presidents have overreached their power, and Congress has often made a decision to avoid being accountable for this most grave decision that we make as a nation.

I praise the President for bringing it to Congress, the people's body, because I think it is in accord with law. But I praise him for a second reason. It is not just about the constitutional allocation of responsibility. Responsibilities were allocated in the Constitution, in my view, for a very important moral reason. The moral reason is this: We cannot ask our men and women in service to put their lives on the line if there is not a consensus of the legislative and executive branches that the mission is worthwhile.

That is why it is important for Congress to weigh in on a decision to initiate military hostility because, absent that, we face the situation that would be a very real possibility in this instance that a President would make a decision that an action or a war was worth fighting but a Congress would not support it. That would put the men and women who have to face the risk and potentially risk their lives in a very difficult situation. If we are going to ask people to risk their lives in any kind of a military action, we shouldn't be asking them to do it if the legislative and political branches haven't reached some consensus that it should be done.

That is the first point I wish to make. I wish to thank the President for cleaning up this sloppiness in the historical allocation of responsibilities between a President and Congress, for taking a historic step—as he said he would as a candidate—of bringing a question such as this to Congress.

We may be unable to act in certain cases because we are divided. But if we act and we act united, we are much stronger both militarily and in the moral example that we pose to the world. It is the right thing to do for the troops who bear the burden of battle.

Second, I wish to talk about the actual authorization. We grappled with this. The news came out about the chemical weapons attack on August 21, and 18 of us members of the Foreign Relations Committee returned last week. The Presiding Officer came and attended some of our classified meetings. We grappled with the question about whether in this circumstance a limited military authorization was appropriate, and I voted yes. I voted yes for a very simple reason. I believe there has to be a consequence for using chemical weapons against civilians.

It is pretty simple. There are a lot of nuances, a lot of subtleties, and a lot of questions about whether the plans might accomplish the particular objective we hope. Those are all legitimate questions. But at the end of the day, I feel so very strongly that if chemical weapons have been used—and in this case they were and used on a massive scale and used against civilians—there must be a consequence for that. There must be a sharp consequence for it. If there isn't, the whole world will be worse off.

I believe that if the United States acts in this way to uphold an important international norm—perhaps the most important international norm that weapons of mass destruction can't be used against civilians—if we act to uphold the norm, we will have partners. How many partners? We will see. Maybe not as many as we would wish, but we will have partners. But I am also convinced that if the United States does not act to uphold this principle, I don't think anyone will act. If we act, we will have partners; if we don't, I don't think anyone will act. That is the burden of leadership that is on this country's shoulders.

We know about the history of the chemical weapons ban, and we are so used to it that it seems normal. But just to kind of step back from it, if we think about it, it is not that normal at all.

The chemical weapons ban came out of World War I. World War I was a mechanized slaughter with over 10 million deaths, a slaughter unlike anything that had ever been seen in global history. There were all kinds of weapons used in World War I that had never been used before, including dropping bombs out of airplanes. Dropping bombs out of airplanes, new kinds of artillery, new kinds of munitions, new kinds of machine guns, chemical weapons, all kinds of mechanized and industrialized weapons were used in World War I. The American troops who served in 1917 and 1918 were gassed. They would be sleeping in a trench, trying to get a couple hours of sleep, and they would wake up coughing their lungs out or blinded—or they wouldn't wake up because some of the gases were invisible and silent. With no knowledge, you could suddenly lose your life or be

disabled for life because of chemical weapons.

The number of casualties in World War I because of chemical weapons was small as a percentage of the total casualties. But it is interesting what happened. After World War I, the nations of the world that had been at each other's throats, that had battled each other, gathered a few years later. It is interesting to think what they banned and didn't ban. They didn't ban aerial bombardment. They didn't ban machine guns. They didn't ban rockets. They didn't ban shells. They didn't ban artillery. But they did decide to ban chemical weapons. They were able to all agree, as combatants, that chemical weapons were unacceptable and should neither be manufactured nor used.

It can seem maybe a little bit illogical or even absurd: Why is it worse to be killed by a chemical weapon than a machine gun or by an artillery shell? I don't know what the logic is to it. All I can assume is that the experience of that day and moment had inspired some common spark of humanity in all of these cultures and combating nations, and they all agreed the use of chemical weapons should be banned heretofore on the Earth.

Nations agreed with that ban. The Soviet Union was on board. The United States was on board. So many nations were on board. Syria ultimately signed that accord in 1968. Even in the midst of horrific wars where humans have done horrific things to each other, since 1925 and the passage of the ban, the ban has stuck. The international community has kept that ember of humanity alive that says these weapons should not be used, and only two dictators until now have used these weapons—Adolph Hitler using these weapons against millions of Jews and others and Saddam Hussein using the weapons against Kurds, his own people, and then against Iranians in the Iraq-Iran war.

When we think about it, it is pretty amazing. With all the barbarity that has happened since 1925, this has generally stuck, with the exception of Adolph Hitler and Saddam Hussein, until now. The beneficiaries of this policy have been civilians, but they have also been American service men and women. The service men and women who fought in World War I were gassed from this country, but the Americans who fought in World War II, in Europe and North Africa and the Pacific, who fought in Korea, who fought in Vietnam, who fought in Afghanistan, who fought in Iraq, who fought in other minor military involvements have never had to worry about facing chemical weapons. No matter how bad the opponent was, American troops haven't had to worry about it, and the troops of other nations haven't had to worry about it either. This is a very important principle, and it is a positive thing

for humanity that we reached this accord and we have honored it.

So what happens now if there isn't a consequence for Bashar al-Assad's escalating use of chemical weapons, to include chemical weapons against civilians.

What happens if we let go of the norm and we say: Look, that may have been OK for the 20th century, but we are tougher and more cynical now. There are not any more limits now, so we don't have to abide by any norms now. What I believe the lesson is—and I think the lessons of history will demonstrate that this will apply—is that an atrocity unpunished will engender future atrocities. We will see more atrocities in Syria against civilians and others. We will see more atrocities abroad. We will see atrocities, and we will have to face the likely consequence that our servicemembers, who have not had to face chemical weapons since 1925, will now have to prepare to face them on the battlefield.

If countries can use chemical weapons and there is no serious consequence, guess what else they can do. They can manufacture chemical weapons. Guess what else. They can sell chemical weapons and proliferate chemical weapons. It is not just a matter that the use of chemical weapons would be encouraged, but the manufacture and sale of chemical weapons by individuals or companies or countries that want to make money will proliferate.

This has a devastating potential effect on allies of the United States and the neighbors around Syria such as Lebanon, Israel, Jordan, and Turkey. It would have a devastating impact on other allies, such as South Korea, that border nations that use chemical weapons. It could encourage other nations that have nonchemical weapons of mass destruction, for example, nuclear weapons, to think that the world will not stand up, there is no consequence for their use so they can violate treaties, violate norms, and no one is willing to stand and oppose it.

That was the reason I voted last week in the Foreign Relations Committee for this limited authorization of military force. I was fully aware the debate on the floor might amend or change it, and I was open to that possibility. But I thought it was important to stand as a representative of Virginia and a representative of this country to say: The use of chemical weapons may suddenly be OK in the 21st century for Bashar al-Assad, it may suddenly be OK to Vladimir Putin and others, but it is not OK to the United States of America, and we are willing to stand and oppose them.

The limited military authorization that is on this floor, as the Presiding Officer knows, talks about action to punish, deter, and degrade the ability of the Syrian regime to use chemical

weapons. The goal is to take the chemical weapons stockpile of that nation out of the battlefield equation. The civil war will continue. We don't have the power, as the United States, to dictate the outcome of that war. But chemical weapons should not be part of that war, and they should not be part of any war.

The authorization was limited. There will be no ground troops. It was limited in scope and duration, but make no mistake, the authorization was a clear statement of American resolve that there has to be a consequence for use of these weapons in violation of international norms that have been in place since 1925.

Finally, I want to talk about diplomacy and the urgent need that I know we all feel in this body, and as Americans, to pursue diplomatic alternatives—including some current alternatives on the table—that would be far preferable to military action. It is very important that we be creative. It is very important that we have direct talks with the perpetrators and enablers of these crimes, but also important to look to intermediaries and independent nations for diplomatic alternatives.

We have been trying to do so until recently and have been blocked in the United Nations. But the authorization for military force actually had that as its first caveat. The authorization said: Mr. President, if this passes, we authorize you to use military force, but before you do, you have to come back to Congress and stipulate that all diplomatic angles, options, and possibilities have been exhausted.

So on the committee, and with the wording of this authorization, we were very focused on the need to continue a diplomatic effort, and that is why it was so gratifying on Monday, on my way back to DC after a long week, to hear that Russia had come to the table with a proposal inspired by a discussion with administration figures. It is a proposal that the Syrian chemical weapons stockpile—one of the largest in the world—would be placed under international control.

Then a few hours later—and this was no coincidence—Syria, essentially Russia's client state, spoke up and said: We will very much entertain placing our chemical weapons under international control. Syria has even suggested, beyond that, they would finally sign on to the 1990s-era Chemical Weapons Convention. They are one of six nations in the world that refused to sign it. Syria would not even acknowledge they had chemical weapons until 2012—even though the world knew it.

Over the last 48 hours, we have seen diplomatic options emerge that are very serious and meaningful. In fact—and it is too early to tell—if we can have these discussions and find an accord where Syria will sign on to the

convention and put these weapons under international control, we will not only have avoided a bad thing, such as military action, which none of us want unless it is necessary, but we will have accomplished a good thing for Syrians and humanity by taking this massive chemical weapons stockpile off the battlefield and submitting it to international control and eventually destruction.

The offer that is on the table, and the action that has happened since Monday is very serious, very significant, and very encouraging, and it could be a game changer in this discussion. I said it is serious, but what we still need to determine is if it is sincere. It is serious and significant, but obviously what the administration needs to do in tandem with the U.N. is to determine whether it is sincere.

I will conclude by saying I think it is very important for Americans, for citizens, and for the Members of Congress to understand—we should make no mistake about this—that the diplomatic offer that is on the table was not on the table until America demonstrated it was prepared to stand for the proposition that chemical weapons cannot be used.

I have no doubt that had we not taken the action in Congress last week in the Foreign Relations Committee to show America is resolved to do something, if no one else in the world is resolved to do something, at least we would be resolved to do something, had we not taken that action, Russia would not have suddenly changed its position—they have been blocking action after action in the Security Council—and come forward with this serious recommendation. Had we not taken that action, and had they not been frightened of what America might do, Syria—which was willing to use with impunity these weapons against civilians—would not have come forward either.

So American resolve is important. American resolve is important to show the world that we value this norm and we will enforce it, even to the point of limited military action. But even more important, American resolve is important because it encourages other nations—even the perpetrators and enablers of the use of these weapons—to come forward and shoulder the responsibilities they have, or so we pray, in the days ahead.

What I ask of my colleagues and my countrymen is that because it has been our resolve that has produced a possibility for a huge diplomatic breakthrough and win, I ask we continue to be resolved, continue to show strength, continue to hold out the option that there will be a consequence for this international crime, that America will play a leading role in making sure there is a consequence, and as long as we stand strong with this resolve, we

will maximize the chance that we will be able to obtain the diplomatic result we want.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The minority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, my dad was a pilot in the Army Air Corps in World War II. He served in the Eighth Air Force, the 303rd Bomb Group stationed in Molesworth, England. On his 26th bombing mission over Nazi Germany, he was shot down and captured as a prisoner of war where he served for the remainder of the war. So I learned at a very young age that when we start talking about matters of war and peace, we must take these very seriously.

I appreciate the fact that President Obama came to Capitol Hill yesterday and spoke to both the Democratic conference and the Republican conference. I further appreciate very much the fact that President Obama spoke to the American people last night. I actually wish he had done it a little earlier since the chemical weapons attacks occurred on the 21st of August. It was roughly 3 weeks after that that he finally spoke to the American people. I think it would have been better for him and better for the country if he had done it sooner and demonstrated a greater urgency, but I am glad he did it.

When a President asks the American people to support our U.S. military and the use of military force, he has a solemn obligation to communicate to the American people how it will protect America's vital interests. He has an obligation to tell the American people why going to war is absolutely essential to U.S. national security. He has an obligation to lay out clear and realistic objectives; and finally, he has an obligation to explain how military intervention fits within America's broader foreign policy strategy.

I have used the word war advisedly because sometimes I think we get caught up in political correctness around here—talking about workplace violence at Fort Hood and overseas contingency operations.

As a veteran of the U.S. Marine Corps who served 40 years told me last week when I asked for his advice on what the President was asking us to do, he said: Anytime you kill people in the name of the U.S. Government, it is an act of war.

So like others in this Chamber over the last few weeks, I have attended meetings with the President where I had the honor of being in his presence and listening to him in person on two occasions. I listened to other administration officials. Like all of us, I sat through hours of classified briefings with the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense, and the State Department.

I have listened intently as Senator Kerry described in what I thought at first was an inadvertent statement made as a result of fatigue. I can only imagine what he must have been going through. He has been shuttled back and forth around the world to try to resolve this issue. But he described this strike as unbelievably small. I was further surprised when I heard the White House press secretary say: No, it wasn't a gaffe; he didn't misspeak. I mean, we all misspeak from time to time, so I expected him to say: Well, he should have used other words or might have used other words. Then Senator Kerry himself—now Secretary Kerry—said: No, I didn't misspeak.

I was encouraged to hear the President address the Nation because I believe before we take our case overseas to American allies, we should first make the case here at home to the American people.

In making their case for a brief, limited attack against Syria, administration officials have repeatedly said U.S. military intervention would not seek to topple the Asad regime even though regime change has been the policy of the U.S. Government since at least August 2011. They said their military campaign would not seek to change the momentum in Syria's civil war, even though, as I mentioned a moment ago, our government's official policy is one of regime change, that Asad must go.

My view is a U.S. attack that allowed Asad to remain in power with one of the world's largest stockpiles of chemical weapons would not promote U.S. national security interests. Indeed, it is not hard to imagine how that kind of intervention could actually backfire and end up being a propaganda disaster.

Many of us are concerned about upholding America's credibility, particularly when it comes to matters such as this, and I share their concern. But it would help if before we launch a half-hearted, ineffectual attack which gives our enemies a major propaganda victory that we come up with a more coherent plan and strategy for accomplishing our public policy goals.

Murphy's law says what can go wrong will go wrong. Well, there is a Murphy's law of war too—perhaps many of them but one of them is no plan to go to war survives the first contact intact. In other words, we can plan to shoot the first bullet, but we can't control what happens after that.

In all likelihood, such an attack would hurt our credibility and reduce U.S. public support for future interventions. This is what I mean: If we were to undertake a limited military attack against Asad in order to punish him for using chemical weapons—which is a horrific act on his part, a barbaric act on his part—but it left Asad in power, what is he going to tell the rest of the world? He is going to say: The world's

greatest military force took a shot at me and I am still here. I am still in power. I won and America lost. That is how I can see this backfiring in a very serious way, undermining America's credibility—credibility we must keep intact, particularly as we look at larger, looming threats such as the Iranian aspiration for nuclear weapons.

I wish to be clear, though: I would be willing to support a military operation in Syria but only if our intervention met certain criteria. No. 1: If it directly addressed the nightmare scenario of Asad's use of chemical weapons falling into the hands of terrorists. It is not just his use of chemical weapons on his own people; it is the potential that those chemical weapons could get into the hands of Al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations and harm either Americans or American interests around the world.

No. 2: I could support a resolution if it involved the use of decisive and overwhelming force, without self-imposed limitations, and without leaking to our enemies what our tactics are and what it is we would not do, and ruining one of the greatest tools in war, which is the element of surprise. Why in the world would we tell Asad what we are going to do—and Secretary Kerry said it would be a small attack—and why would we tell Asad what we won't do, thereby eliminating both the ambiguity of our position and the potential threat of even more serious and overwhelming military force?

No. 3: I would be willing to support an authorization if it were an integral part of a larger coherent Syria policy that clearly defined the political end state. I still remember General Petraeus, the head of Central Command covering Iraq and Afghanistan, talking about our policy in those countries. He said, The most important question, perhaps, when we go to war is how does this end. We need a clearly defined political end state that we are trying to achieve by what the President requested and we need an outline of a realistic path to get there.

No. 4: I believe it is important that we have a sizable international coalition of nations, each of which is contributing to the war effort.

This is an amazing reversal for the President since the time he was a Senator and a Presidential candidate. To say we are not going to the United Nations—and I understand why; because of China and Russia, their veto of any resolution out of the Security Council, we are not going to go to NATO. Indeed, the President seemed content, or at least resigned, to going it alone. And if it is true this redline is the international community's redline, then the international community needs to contribute to the effort to hold Asad accountable.

The problem is President Obama's requested authorization for the use of

military force under these circumstances fails to meet each of those criteria. He has failed to make the case that a short, limited military campaign would promote our vital interests and our national security. He has failed to lay out clear and realistic objectives that could be obtained through the use of military force. And he has failed to offer a compelling description of how his proposed intervention would advance America's broader foreign policy strategy; indeed, how it would advance his own policy of regime change. Therefore, if we were asked to vote on an authorization under these circumstances, I would vote no.

I am under no illusion—none of us are—about the utter depravity of Bashar al-Asad. Over the last 2½ years his regime has committed unspeakable acts of rape, torture, and murder. The chemical weapons attacks, by the way, as described by Secretary Kerry's own testimony in the House of Representatives, included 11 earlier uses of chemical weapons, but they were smaller. Can we imagine the difficulty of trying to impose a redline when that redline is crossed 11 times before the President finally decides to try to enforce it? But there is no question that the use of chemical weapons shows an appalling disregard for human life and a cruel desire to terrorize the Syrian population. I, as others, have consistently demanded that Russia stop arming Asad and stop defending him and blocking U.N. Security Council resolutions, and aiding and abetting his barbaric atrocities against his own people. I want to see a free democratic Syria as much as anyone else. But that does not mean I will vote to support a reckless, ill-advised military intervention that could jeopardize our most important national security interests.

There have been a lot of people who have opined on the President's request, some better informed than others. One opinion I found particularly convincing was that of retired Army MG Robert Scales who has written that the path to war chosen by the Obama administration “violates every principle of war, including the element of surprise, achieving mass and having a clearly defined and obtainable objective.”

As I said, we know the latest chemical weapons attack occurred on August 21. Yet President Obama didn't address the Nation until 3 weeks later. The Syrians, of course, have now had weeks to prepare for any pending military intervention and no doubt have moved the chemical weapons to other locations and their military equipment to civilian population centers in order to protect them from any attack. With no element of surprise, it makes the potential for success of any military intervention much less and reveals there is no real coherent policy in this regard.

Consider what happened last Monday. Secretary of State Kerry made what he

calls an off-the-cuff remark about the possibility of canceling a missile strike if Asad turned over all of his chemical weapons. In the same statement he said he wasn't sure that would work or that he would ever be serious about it, but he did say it. Russia, of course, immediately responded by offering to broker a transfer of Syria's WMD to international monitors.

After spending weeks trying to make the case for war, President Obama has asked that the vote in this Chamber be canceled and is apparently treating the Russian-Syrian proposal as a serious diplomatic breakthrough. I would caution all of us—the American people and all of our colleagues—to be skeptical, for good reason, at this lifeline Vladimir Putin has now thrown the administration. I would remind the President and our colleagues that Russia itself is not in full compliance with the Chemical Weapons Convention, nor is it even in compliance with nuclear arms control obligations that are subject to an international treaty. The litany of Russian offenses is long, but I would remind President Obama that since he launched the so-called Russian reset, Moscow has vetoed U.N. resolutions on Syria, sent advanced weaponry to the Asad regime, stolen elections, stoked anti-Americanism, made threats over our possible deployment of missile defense systems; it has expelled USAID from Russia, pulled out of the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program; it has banned U.S. citizens from adopting Russian children, and offered asylum to NSA leaker Edward Snowden. In short, we have very little reason to believe Moscow is a reliable diplomatic partner. The Russians are part of the problem in Syria, not part of the solution. Let me say that clearly. The Russians are part of the problem in Syria; they are not credibly part of the solution.

Moreover, I am curious to learn how international monitors would adequately confirm the disposal of chemical weapons by a terrorist-sponsoring dictatorship among a ferocious civil war. While this strike the President talked about might have been limited in his imagination, if you are Bashar al-Asad, this is total war, because he realizes the only way he will leave power is in a pine box. He knows that. This is total war. I asked the President yesterday: What happens if, in order to punish Asad, we intervene militarily and it doesn't work? In his fight for his survival and the survival of his regime, he uses them again in an act of desperation? The President said, We will hit him again. Well, clearly, what had become a limited strike could quickly spiral out of control into a full-blown engagement in Syria. I think the President's own words suggest that.

But, of course, the Asad regime is the same one that refuses to acknowledge the full extent of its chemical arse-

nal—and this is something we will be hearing more about. It has bioweapons capability. Bioweapons capability is actually a much greater threat to American interests than chemical weapons, which are more difficult to transport and much harder to handle. And this is the same dictatorship that was secretly working on a nuclear weapons program before the Israelis took care of it in 2007.

We have been told that however unfortunate President Obama's "redline" comment might have been, upholding his threat is about maintaining American credibility. And I admit, American credibility in matters of war and peace and national security are very, very important. But America's credibility on the world stage is about more than just Presidential rhetoric. It is about defining clear objectives and establishing a coherent strategy for achieving them. In the case of Syria, President Obama has not offered a clear strategy or clearly laid out his objectives.

Given all that, I am not surprised that the American people do not support the President's call for the use of limited military force in Syria. Those are the calls I got in my office. As I went back to Texas, I kept hearing people—who I would think under almost any other circumstances would say: If America's national security interests are at stake, then we are behind the President, we are behind military intervention, but they simply saw an incoherent policy and objectives that were not clearly laid out to obtain the result the President himself said is our policy.

Well, the most recent experience we have had as a country with limited war has been Libya, and I have heard the President tout that as perhaps an example about how we can get in and get out. The 2011 military operation that deposed Muammar Qadhafi was supposed to be a showcase example of a limited operation in which America led from behind and still obtained its objectives without putting U.S. boots on the ground. Unfortunately, the administration had no real plan for what happened after Qadhafi fell.

We all know it was 1 year ago today in Benghazi when terrorists linked to Al Qaeda massacred four brave Americans, including U.S. Ambassador Chris Stevens. Today Libya is spiraling into chaos and rapidly becoming a failed state. Earlier this month a leading British newspaper reported that "Libya has almost entirely stopped producing oil as the government loses control of much of the country to militia fighters." All sorts of bad actors, including terrorist groups, are flooding into the security vacuum, and "Libyans are increasingly at the mercy of militias which act outside the law."

Before I conclude, I want to say a few words about America's Armed Forces and America's role in the world.

We all know and are extraordinarily proud of our men and women who wear the uniform of the U.S. military. No military in history has been more powerful. No military has ever been more courageous. No military has been more selfless and fought and bled and died to protect innocent people in far-flung places across the planet. No military has ever done more to promote peace and prosperity around the world. I have every confidence that if called upon to act our men and women in uniform will do just that. They will perform their duties with the utmost skill, bravery, and professionalism. But we should never send them to war tying one hand behind their back and ask them to wage limited war against a dictator for whom, as I said earlier, this is total war. This is win or die. Military force is like a hammer, and you cannot thread the needle President Obama wants to thread with a hammer.

I would like to conclude by saying that this debate—which is important and serious and one the American people expect us to have—is not about isolationism versus internationalism. Believe me, I am no isolationist, and I fully support the global security role America has played since World War II, since my dad was a POW. A world without American military dominance would be, as Ronald Reagan noted, a much more dangerous place. I believe peace comes with American strength. However, it will be harder to maintain our global military dominance if we waste precious resources, our credibility, and political capital on hasty, misguided, unbelievably small interventions.

Once again, I would be willing to support an authorization for a military strike against Syria if it met certain basic criteria I have laid out. But I cannot support an operation that is so poorly conceived, so foolishly telegraphed, and virtually guaranteed to fail.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Good afternoon, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much, Madam President.

I rise to speak on the use of chemical weapons by the Syrian regime and the decision that is before the Senate on how to respond to such inhumanity. I also come to the floor with the hope that the use of military force will not prove necessary and that the proposal to place Syria's chemical weapons program under United Nations control will, in fact, be successful.

Last night, in my view, the President delivered a strong, straightforward

speech that directly outlined the current situation in Syria. He asked that a vote by the Congress to authorize military force against the Asad regime be delayed so that a strategy could be developed with Russia and the United Nations Security Council that would eliminate Syria's deadly chemical weapons program. I believe this is the appropriate path forward, and I appreciate very much the majority leader's holding off on bringing this resolution for a vote so that negotiations can continue. Here in the Senate, there are discussions going on about how to amend the resolution passed by the Foreign Relations Committee to provide time for diplomacy.

I would also like to take a minute to give Russia credit for bringing forward this plan for a negotiated solution to the conflict. I disagree with the Senator from Texas. As the Russian Ambassador described to me on Monday of this week, he said Russia is sincere, wants to see a United Nations resolution, and supports the Geneva II process which would accompany a negotiated settlement to Syria's civil war. Based on my conversation with Ambassador Kislyak, I believe Russia's goal is now, in fact, to eliminate these weapons, and I would point out that is also our goal.

So I very much hope that the path to settlement—although complicated, no doubt, but if well-intentioned by all participants, it can be accomplished, and I deeply believe that. If the United Nations Security Council can agree on a resolution to put this proposal into practice, it would put the world's imprimatur on an important plan to safeguard and then to destroy Syria's chemical weapons program.

Russia's responsibility to get this done is enormous, and they must move with all deliberate speed. I think Russia and Syria must understand that the only way to forestall a U.S. strike on Syria is for there to be a good-faith agreement and process underway to put all of Syria's chemical weapons—including munitions, delivery systems, and chemicals themselves—under international control for eventual demolition.

Syria's chemical weapons program is maintained and stored across Syria in more than three dozen sites. There are indications that Syria currently has chemical weapons loaded and ready for immediate use in bombs, artillery, and rockets and already loaded on planes and helicopters. All of it needs to be inventoried, collected, and then destroyed as soon as possible if the effort is to succeed. This will be a large and complicated process, and the agreement may take some time to put in place. But if it can be done, we should take the time to get it done right. At the same time, we cannot allow there to be so much delay and hesitation, as has characterized some arms control efforts in the past.

It is clear to me that the United States is moving quickly already. Tomorrow Secretary Kerry and Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov will meet in Geneva to discuss the specifics of how to move forward.

I cannot stress enough the importance of this process. Not only is it a possible solution to the specter of future use of chemical weapons by the Syrian regime and a way to ensure that extremist elements of the opposition do not gain control of these weapons, but it also sets an important precedent for the United Nations to act to resolve conflict before there is large military confrontation.

But it should be clear by now that the Asad regime has repeatedly used chemical weapons. So I would like to speak as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and lay out some of the unclassified intelligence that shows the regime was indeed behind this largest use of chemical weapons in more than two decades. The unclassified assessment is based on classified intelligence we have seen on the Intelligence Committee and it has been available to all Senators. So here is the case.

The intelligence community assesses today, with "high confidence," that the Syrian regime used chemical weapons—specifically sarin—in the Damascus suburbs in the early morning of August 21. This assessment is supported by all 16 of our intelligence agencies as well as other countries, including the United Kingdom and France.

The Obama administration has publicly laid out its case at an unclassified level, and I have carefully reviewed the classified information that supports those findings.

First, there is intelligence indicating that the Asad regime—specifically its military and the Syrian Scientific Studies and Research Center, which manages its chemical weapons program—has used chemical weapons roughly a dozen times over the past year.

On June 13, 2 months before this latest attack, the administration stated that it had completed a review of all available intelligence and had concluded that the intelligence community had "high confidence" that the Asad regime used chemical weapons, "including the nerve agent sarin, on a small scale against the opposition multiple times." This followed similar assessments by France, the United Kingdom, Israel, and Turkey earlier this year. In some of these cases the regime may have been testing its delivery vehicles or various amounts of chemical agents. Some were small-scale tactical uses against the opposition. Perhaps Asad was just trying to find out how the world would react to his use of chemical weapons.

It has been more than a year since top intelligence officials learned of

Syrian preparations to use sarin in large quantities. Since then, at numerous other briefings and hearings, the Intelligence Committee has followed this issue closely. On September 11, 2012—exactly a year ago—while protests against our Embassy in Cairo were underway and the attack on our diplomatic facility in Benghazi was imminent, I was again briefed on the administration's plans should Asad conduct such an attack.

So the attack on August 21 in Damascus was not a first-time use, rather it was a major escalation in the regime's willingness to employ weapons long held as anathema by almost the entire world population.

Let me lay out the intelligence case that the Asad regime used chemical weapons on August 21. Much of this is described in a four-page August 30 unclassified document entitled "U.S. Government Assessment of the Syrian Government's Use of Chemical Weapons on August 21, 2013."

I ask unanimous consent that the document be printed in the RECORD.

We know that 3 days before the attack of August 21, Syrian officials involved in the preparation and use of chemical weapons and associated with the Syrian Scientific Studies and Research Center were "preparing chemical munitions" in the Damascus suburb of Adra. That is according to the intelligence community.

The intelligence specifically relates to an area in Adra that the regime has used for mixing chemical weapons, including sarin. The Syrian chemical weapons personnel were operating and present there from August 18 to the early morning of August 21, and finished their work shortly before the attack began.

Some of the intelligence collected on the preparations for the attack is highly sensitive. So the details of the Syrian actions cannot be described publicly without jeopardizing our ability to collect this kind of intelligence in the future. But in numerous classified briefings over the past 2 weeks, Members of Congress have been provided with additional detail on the names of the officials involved and the stream of human signals and geospatial intelligence that indicates that regime was preparing to use chemical weapons. So we actually have names.

It is from the specificity of this intelligence reporting that the intelligence community has drawn its high level of confidence that the regime was behind the use of chemical weapons. The strike began in the early morning hours on Wednesday, August 21. It is beyond doubt that large amounts of artillery and rockets were launched from regime-controlled territory in Damascus and rained down on the opposition-controlled areas of the Damascus suburbs. There is satellite imagery actually showing this, as well as thousands

of firsthand accounts that began showing up on social media sites at around 2:30 a.m.

The barrage continued for 5 days, though the use of chemical weapons appears to have been deliberately suspended by the regime after the first few hours. Since the attack, physical samples from the area have been analyzed. The intelligence community assesses with high confidence that “laboratory analysis of physiological samples obtained from a number of individuals revealed exposure to Sarin.”

More than 100 videos were posted online showing the effects of the chemical weapons on hundreds of men, women and, most troubling, sleeping children who were dead or showing the signs of exposure to the nerve agent. At my request, the intelligence community compiled a representative sample of 13 videos which have been corroborated and verified. According to the intelligence community, “At least 12 locations are portrayed in the publicly available videos, and a sampling of those videos confirmed that some were shot at general times and locations described in the footage.”

These videos clearly show the suffering and death caused by these weapons. The intelligence committee has posted these videos on our Web site, www.intelligence.senate.gov. I would urge all Americans to look at this. They are absolutely horrendous and should shock the conscience of all humanity.

The videos show the physical manifestations of a nerve agent attack: foaming mouth, pinpointed and constricted pupils, convulsions, gasping for breath, all happening as the nervous system begins to shut down.

One video shows a lifeless toddler receiving emergency respiratory assistance. Another shows a young boy struggling to breathe, gasping while his eyes are swollen shut and covered in mucous. A third heinous video shows rows and rows of bodies lined up in an improvised morgue. Another shows a man foaming at the mouth and convulsing, both indications of sarin exposure. It goes on and on.

Last night, the President urged all Americans to watch these videos to see how hideous the use of these chemicals actually is. Seeing these images firsthand makes clear why chemical weapons have been banned and why Asad must be prevented from using them again.

What truly affected me was a video I saw of a little Syrian girl with long dark hair who was wearing pajamas. The little girl looked just like my daughter at that age—same hair, same pajamas, same innocence, except the little Syrian girl was lifeless. She had died from exposure to sarin, a chemical the world has essentially outlawed. For me, watching the videos shows the abhorrence of chemical weapons. It shows

why we must do something. Fired into densely populated areas such as cities, they have an indiscriminate effect, killing everyone in their path and causing suffering and eventual death to others nearby.

We have evidence that the chemical attack was premeditated and planned as part of the regime’s heinous tactics against the rebels. Specifically, there is intelligence that Syrian regime personnel were prepared with gas masks for its people in the area, so it could clear these areas in the Damascus suburbs that were attacked in order to wrest control from the opposition. Additional intelligence collected following the attacks includes communications from regime officials that confirms their knowledge that chemical weapons were used.

Let me repeat that. Additional intelligence following the attack includes communications from regime officials that confirms their knowledge that chemical weapons were used. The official unclassified intelligence assessment distributed by the administration states: “We intercepted communications involving a senior official intimately familiar with the offensive who confirmed that chemical weapons were used by the regime on August 21 and was concerned with the U.N. inspectors obtaining evidence.” On the afternoon of August 21, we have intelligence that Syrian chemical weapons personnel were directed to “cease operations.” This is specific evidence.

To sum up the intelligence case, I have no doubt the regime ordered the use of chemical weapons on August 21. I also have no doubt the use of these weapons by the military and under the guidance of Syria’s chemical weapons team, Branch 450, operates under the command and control of the regime, under the ultimate leadership and responsibility of President Asad.

Let me move now from the intelligence case of Syria’s use of sarin on August 21 to the question before the Senate of how to respond. As I said in the beginning, it would be my strong hope that the United States and Russia can come to an agreement with other U.N. Security Council members on a way to resolve this situation peacefully.

Not only is a peaceful solution preferred to the use of force, but if Syria’s chemical weapons program, including all of its precursors, chemicals, equipment, delivery systems, and loaded bombs, can be put in the custody of the United Nations for its eventual destruction, that would provide a much stronger protection against future use.

It also sets an important precedent for the future for the world to settle other disputes of this nature. I have urged the Obama administration to take all possible steps to make this proposal work. I appreciate the President’s decision to ask us to delay any

use-of-force resolution so diplomacy can be given a chance. However, the Senate may still face a resolution to authorize the use of force in the event that all diplomatic options fail. Many of my colleagues have noted that the threat of force has helped push forward the diplomatic option.

The Asad regime has clearly used chemical weapons to gas its own people. I believe it will most likely do so again, unless it is confronted with a major condemnation by the world. That now is beginning to happen.

The regime has escalated its attacks from small scale ones that killed 6 or 8 to 10 people with sarin to an attack that killed more than 1,000. We know the regime has munitions that could kill tens of thousands of Syrians in Aleppo or Homs. If the world does not respond now, we bear the responsibility if a larger tragedy happens later.

Of course, it is not only Syria who is looking at preparing and using weapons long banned by the international community. Iran is watching intently what the world will do in Syria and will apply the lessons it learns to its current development of nuclear weapons.

North Korea, which has refrained from using both the nuclear weapons it has and the chemical weapons stockpile that actually dwarfs that of Syria, may well use the Asad example to fire on South Korea. Remember, we have 28,000-plus troops right over the border of the DMZ, within a half hour.

More generally, countries around the world will see the United States as a paper tiger if it promises to take action but fails to do so. Former Secretary of Defense, Bob Gates, whom I have great respect for, who worked in both the Bush and Obama administrations, said exactly that when he came out in support on the resolution for use of force against Syria.

Gates said this:

I strongly urge the Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, to approve the President’s request for authorization to use force. Whatever one’s views on the current United States policy towards Syria, failure by Congress to approve the request would, in my view, have profoundly negative and dangerous consequences for the United States, not just in the Middle East, but around the world both now and in the future.

I strongly believe the major powers in the world have a responsibility to take action when a country not only slaughters 100,000 of its own citizens, makes millions homeless within Syria, and makes millions into refugees in Turkey and Jordan, but especially when it is willing to use weapons against them that have been banned as an affront to all humanity because they are outlawed by a treaty joined by 189 nations representing 98 percent of the world’s population.

If the United Nations does not act in such cases, I believe it becomes irrelevant. If nothing is done to stop this use

of chemical weapons, they will be used in future conflicts. I am confident of that.

American servicemen in World War I were gassed with their allied partners. In our briefings over the past week, the military has made clear to us that if we allow the prohibition on chemical weapons use to erode, our men and women in uniform may again suffer from these weapons on the battlefield.

Chemical weapons are not like conventional weapons. Consider for a moment how sarin, for example, can kill so indiscriminately. The closer you are to the release, such as from a mortar or an artillery shell, the more certain you are to death. It spreads over a wide geographic area. It can shift from one neighborhood to another if the wind shifts.

During World War I, chemical weapons, primarily chlorine, phosgene, and mustard gas were used by both sides of the war. They caused an estimated 100,000 fatalities and 1.3 million injuries, 1,462 American soldiers were killed, and 72,807 were injured by chemical weapons, which represented one-third of all U.S. casualties during World War I.

Since World War I, not a single U.S. soldier has died in battle from exposure to chemical weapons. However, according to the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, "since World War I, chemical weapons have caused more than 1 million casualties globally."

During World War II, Nazi Germany used carbon monoxide and pesticides such as Zyklon B in gas chambers during the Holocaust, killing an estimated 3 million people.

An additional document will be printed in the RECORD that details the history and uses of chemical weapons around the world since World War I.

These past uses of chemical weapons make clear that they should never be used again and that the entire world must stand up and take action if they are.

In Syria, the intentional use of chemical weapons on civilians, on men, women, and children gassed to death during the middle of the night while they were sleeping, is a travesty that reflects hatred and increasing desperation of the Asad regime. I also believe there are other chemical weapons that have been mixed and loaded into delivery vehicles with the potential to kill thousands more.

Think about that. If Asad can slaughter 100,000 of his own people without a second thought, what is he going to do next if we do nothing to hold him accountable? What is he going to do next if the United Nations does nothing? What is he going to do next if this effort to reach consensus on the Security Council doesn't work? He will use them again. I believe they are ready to go.

Why would the Asad regime load bombs with chemical weapons and not use them?

If the United States does nothing in the face of this atrocity, it sends such a signal of weakness to the rest of the world that we are, yes, a paper tiger. That is going to be the conclusion in Iran and in North Korea.

The answer is we cannot turn our backs. The use of chemical weapons is prohibited by international law and it must now be condemned by the world with action.

Albert Einstein said in a well-known quote: "The world is a dangerous place to live; not because of the people who are evil, but because of the people who don't do anything about it."

For more than 90 years, our country has played the leading role in the world in prohibiting the atrocities of World War I and then World War II. We are the Nation that others look upon to stop repressive dictators and massive violations of human rights. We must act in Syria. We cannot withdraw into our own borders, do nothing, and let the slaughter continue.

I hope military force will not be needed, that we will allow the time for the United Nations and the parties on the Security Council to put an agreement together, and that the threat of force will be sufficient to change President Asad's behavior.

If these diplomatic efforts at the U.N. fail, I know we are going to be back here on the floor to consider the authorization for use of military force, but I sincerely hope it won't be necessary.

When the Ambassador from Russia described Russia's intentions to me on Monday, he told me it was sincere. Now the ball is in Russia's court. Russia and the United States will need to come together, bring the other parties together, and make it possible for the United Nations to act so the United States won't have to.

I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. GOVERNMENT ASSESSMENT OF THE SYRIAN GOVERNMENT'S USE OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS ON AUGUST 21, 2013

The United States Government assesses with high confidence that the Syrian government carried out a chemical weapons attack in the Damascus suburbs on August 21, 2013. We further assess that the regime used a nerve agent in the attack. These all-source assessments are based on human, signals, and geospatial intelligence as well as a significant body of open source reporting. Our classified assessments have been shared with the U.S. Congress and key international partners. To protect sources and methods, we cannot publicly release all available intelligence—but what follows is an unclassified summary of the U.S. Intelligence Community's analysis of what took place.

SYRIAN GOVERNMENT USE OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS ON AUGUST 21

A large body of independent sources indicates that a chemical weapons attack took place in the Damascus suburbs on August 21. In addition to U.S. intelligence information,

there are accounts from international and Syrian medical personnel; videos; witness accounts; thousands of social media reports from at least 12 different locations in the Damascus area; journalist accounts; and reports from highly credible nongovernmental organizations.

A preliminary U.S. government assessment determined that 1,429 people were killed in the chemical weapons attack, including at least 426 children, though this assessment will certainly evolve as we obtain more information.

We assess with high confidence that the Syrian government carried out the chemical weapons attack against opposition elements in the Damascus suburbs on August 21. We assess that the scenario in which the opposition executed the attack on August 21 is highly unlikely. The body of information used to make this assessment includes intelligence pertaining to the regime's preparations for this attack and its means of delivery, multiple streams of intelligence about the attack itself and its effect, our post-attack observations, and the differences between the capabilities of the regime and the opposition. Our high confidence assessment is the strongest position that the U.S. Intelligence Community can take short of confirmation. We will continue to seek additional information to close gaps in our understanding of what took place.

BACKGROUND

The Syrian regime maintains a stockpile of numerous chemical agents, including mustard, sarin, and VX and has thousands of munitions that can be used to deliver chemical warfare agents.

Syrian President Bashar al-Asad is the ultimate decision maker for the chemical weapons program and members of the program are carefully vetted to ensure security and loyalty. The Syrian Scientific Studies and Research Center (SSRC)—which is subordinate to the Syrian Ministry of Defense—manages Syria's chemical weapons program.

We assess with high confidence that the Syrian regime has used chemical weapons on a small scale against the opposition multiple times in the last year, including in the Damascus suburbs. This assessment is based on multiple streams of information including reporting of Syrian officials planning and executing chemical weapons attacks and laboratory analysis of physiological samples obtained from a number of individuals, which revealed exposure to sarin. We assess that the opposition has not used chemical weapons.

The Syrian regime has the types of munitions that we assess were used to carry out the attack on August 21, and has the ability to strike simultaneously in multiple locations. We have seen no indication that the opposition has carried out a large-scale, coordinated rocket and artillery attack like the one that occurred on August 21.

We assess that the Syrian regime has used chemical weapons over the last year primarily to gain the upper hand or break a stalemate in areas where it has struggled to seize and hold strategically valuable territory. In this regard, we continue to judge that the Syrian regime views chemical weapons as one of many tools in its arsenal, including air power and ballistic missiles, which they indiscriminately use against the opposition.

The Syrian regime has initiated an effort to rid the Damascus suburbs of opposition forces using the area as a base to stage attacks against regime targets in the capital. The regime has failed to clear dozens of Damascus neighborhoods of opposition elements, including neighborhoods targeted on

August 21, despite employing nearly all of its conventional weapons systems. We assess that the regime's frustration with its inability to secure large portions of Damascus may have contributed to its decision to use chemical weapons on August 21.

PREPARATION

We have intelligence that leads us to assess that Syrian chemical weapons personnel—including personnel assessed to be associated with the SSRC—were preparing chemical munitions prior to the attack. In the three days prior to the attack, we collected streams of human, signals and geospatial intelligence that reveal regime activities that we assess were associated with preparations for a chemical weapons attack.

Syrian chemical weapons personnel were operating in the Damascus suburb of Adra from Sunday, August 18 until early in the morning on Wednesday, August 21 near an area that the regime uses to mix chemical weapons, including sarin. On August 21, a Syrian regime element prepared for a chemical weapons attack in the Damascus area, including through the utilization of gas masks. Our intelligence sources in the Damascus area did not detect any indications in the days prior to the attack that opposition affiliates were planning to use chemical weapons.

THE ATTACK

Multiple streams of intelligence indicate that the regime executed a rocket and artillery attack against the Damascus suburbs in the early hours of August 21. Satellite detections corroborate that attacks from a regime-controlled area struck neighborhoods where the chemical attacks reportedly occurred—including Kafr Batna, Jawbar, Ayn Tarma, Darayya, and Mu'addamiyah. This includes the detection of rocket launches from regime controlled territory early in the morning, approximately 90 minutes before the first report of a chemical attack appeared in social media. The lack of flight activity or missile launches also leads us to conclude that the regime used rockets in the attack.

Local social media reports of a chemical attack in the Damascus suburbs began at 2:30 a.m. local time on August 21. Within the next four hours there were thousands of social media reports on this attack from at least 12 different locations in the Damascus area. Multiple accounts described chemical-filled rockets impacting opposition-controlled areas.

Three hospitals in the Damascus area received approximately 3,600 patients displaying symptoms consistent with nerve agent exposure in less than three hours on the morning of August 21, according to a highly credible international humanitarian organization. The reported symptoms, and the epidemiological pattern of events—characterized by the massive influx of patients in a short period of time, the origin of the patients, and the contamination of medical and first aid workers—were consistent with mass exposure to a nerve agent. We also received reports from international and Syrian medical personnel on the ground.

We have identified one hundred videos attributed to the attack, many of which show large numbers of bodies exhibiting physical signs consistent with, but not unique to, nerve agent exposure. The reported symptoms of victims included unconsciousness, foaming from the nose and mouth, constricted pupils, rapid heartbeat, and difficulty breathing. Several of the videos show

what appear to be numerous fatalities with no visible injuries, which is consistent with death from chemical weapons, and inconsistent with death from small-arms, high-explosive munitions or blister agents. At least 12 locations are portrayed in the publicly available videos, and a sampling of those videos confirmed that some were shot at the general times and locations described in the footage.

We assess the Syrian opposition does not have the capability to fabricate all of the videos, physical symptoms verified by medical personnel and NGOs, and other information associated with this chemical attack.

We have a body of information, including past Syrian practice, that leads us to conclude that regime officials were witting of and directed the attack on August 21. We intercepted communications involving a senior official intimately familiar with the offensive who confirmed that chemical weapons were used by the regime on August 21 and was concerned with the U.N. inspectors obtaining evidence. On the afternoon of August 21, we have intelligence that Syrian chemical weapons personnel were directed to cease operations. At the same time, the regime intensified the artillery barrage targeting many of the neighborhoods where chemical attacks occurred. In the 24 hour period after the attack, we detected indications of artillery and rocket fire at a rate approximately four times higher than the ten preceding days. We continued to see indications of sustained shelling in the neighborhoods up until the morning of August 26.

To conclude, there is a substantial body of information that implicates the Syrian government's responsibility in the chemical weapons attack that took place on August 21. As indicated, there is additional intelligence that remains classified because of sources and methods concerns that is being provided to Congress and international partners.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS USAGE SINCE WORLD WAR I

1,462 American soldiers were killed and 72,807 injured by chemical weapons in World War I, one-third of all U.S. casualties during the war. No Americans have died in battle from chemical weapons since World War I.

According to the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, "Since World War I, chemical weapons have caused more than one million casualties globally."

1914-1918—During World War I, chemical weapons (primarily chlorine, phosgene, and mustard gas) were used by both sides and caused an estimated 100,000 fatalities and 1.3 million injuries.

During the war, Germany used 68,000 tons of gas, the French used 36,000 tons, and the British used 25,000.

April 1915—Germany used chlorine gas at the Battle of Ypres. This is the first significant use of chemical weapons in World War I.

September 1915—The British used chlorine gas against the Germans at the Battle of Loos.

February 1918—Germans used phosgene and chloropicrin artillery shells against American troops. This is the first major use of chemical weapons against U.S. forces.

June 1918—The United States employed a wide variety of chemical weapons against Axis forces using British and French artillery shells.

1918-1921—The Bolshevik army used chemical weapons to suppress at least three uprisings following the Bolshevik revolution.

1919—The British Air Force used Adamsite gas, a vomiting agent, against the Bolsheviks during the Russian Civil War.

1921-1927—Spanish forces used mustard gas against Berber rebels during the Third Rif War in Morocco.

1936—Italy used mustard gas during its invasion of Ethiopia. No precise estimate of chemical weapon-specific casualties, but contemporary Soviet estimates stated 15,000 Ethiopian casualties from chemical weapons.

1937-1945—Japan used chemical weapons (sulfur mustard, chlorine, chloropicrin, phosgene, and lewisite) during its invasion of China. The Japanese were the only country to use chemical weapons during World War II and did not use them against Western forces. Estimated 10,000 Chinese fatalities and 80,000 casualties as a result of chemical weapons.

1939-1945—Nazi Germany used carbon monoxide and pesticides, such as Zyklon B (hydrocyanic acid), in gas chambers during the Holocaust. Estimated 3 million killed.

1941—Mobile vans were used following the German invasion of the Soviet Union to murder an unknown number of Jews, Roma, and mental patients using exhaust from the vans to gas victims. Vans were also used at the Chelmno concentration camp in Poland.

1942—Nazi Germany began using diesel gas chambers at the Belzec, Sobibor, and Treblinka camps in Poland.

Zyklon B was used to kill up to 6,000 Jews per day at Auschwitz. Zyklon B was also used at Stutthoff, Mauthausen, Sachsenhausen, and Ravensbrueck concentration camps.

1963-1967—Egypt used phosgene and mustard gas against Yemeni royalist forces during the North Yemen Civil War between royalists and republicans. Egypt denied their use, but the Red Cross affirmed their use after forensic investigation.

1975-1982—Las and Vietnamese forces used chemical weapons against Hmong rebels. At least 6,504 killed.

1978-1982—Vietnamese forces used chemical weapons against Kampuchean troops and Khmer villages. At least 1,014 fatalities.

1979-1992—The United States alleged that the Soviet Union used mustard gas and other chemical weapons against mujahidin rebels in Afghanistan. At least 3,000 fatalities.

1980-1988—During the Iran-Iraq War, Iraq employed mustard gas and Tabun nerve agent. Iran retaliated with mustard, phosgene, and hydrogen cyanide gas. Estimated 1 million chemical weapons casualties.

1987—Libya allegedly used Iranian-supplied mustard gas against Chadian forces. However, the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons did not find the allegations sufficiently persuasive to send investigators.

1988—Iraq used hydrogen cyanide and mustard gas against the Kurdish village of Halabja. Estimated 5,000 casualties.

1994—Aum Shinrikyo, a Japanese terrorist group, released sarin gas in Matsumoto, Japan. 8 fatalities and 200 injuries.

1995—Aum Shinrikyo released sarin gas in the Tokyo subway system. 12 fatalities and 5,000 estimated casualties.

Sources: Monterey Institute of International Studies, The Nonproliferation Review, declassified CIA report, Encyclopedia Britannica, The Washington Post, Reuters, New York Times, NPR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

BENGHAZI

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, 12 years ago Al Qaeda terrorists attacked

our homeland, killing nearly 3,000 people. I will never forget the heroes of that day, many of whom laid down their lives for others.

Their courage is epitomized by the words spoken by a fire department captain at the World Trade Center. He radioed in to say, "We're still heading up." Indeed, these firefighters were still heading up while others were fleeing the flames and the acrid smoke. Where that kind of courage and determination comes from is hard to contemplate, but we are so grateful our first responders have that kind of dedication and courage.

Nor will I ever forget the many people who continue to live with the scars, whether they are civilians who lost a loved one that day, firefighters, police officers, or other first responders who rushed to the scene, or our brave military servicemembers who answered the call to defend our country in the years that followed. We must never lose sight of their sacrifice.

This week we have been considering the weighty issue of whether to grant the administration the authority to use military force against Syria. This day, the anniversary of those horrific attacks on our country 12 years ago, should not pass without our calling attention to another important matter of unfinished business critical to our national security and to our Nation's conscience.

A year ago today terrorists with links to Al Qaeda attacked our diplomatic facility in Benghazi, Libya. Despite a steadily escalating stream of threat reporting, and an obvious inability of Libyan security forces to protect our diplomatic personnel and our facilities, the State Department had denied urgent requests for increased security measures. Officials kept the woefully vulnerable Benghazi compound open, setting the stage for attackers to essentially walk right into the compound and set it ablaze.

Tragically we lost four brave, dedicated diplomats and security personnel that terrible day and night: Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, Sean Smith, and Ambassador Chris Stevens. We laud their courage and we honor their memory, but we must also remedy the security failures and punish those responsible for their deaths.

Today I draw attention to the lessons that must be learned from the attacks in Benghazi and to the work that still must be done to bring the attackers to justice. First we must ensure that such wholesale failure to read the signs of escalating danger and to respond to urgent security needs never happens again.

Last year, as chairman and ranking member of the Senate Homeland Security Committee, former Senator Joe Lieberman and I conducted an investigation into the terrorist attacks at Benghazi. In our bipartisan report enti-

tled "Flashing Red," we found the State Department downplayed the terrorist threat in Benghazi despite numerous previous attacks on western targets, that they ignored repeated requests for additional security, and that they insufficiently fortified a shamefully ill-protected American compound. The Benghazi facility should either have been closed until security was strengthened or the threat abated.

We identified changes that must be made, including greater attention to security at high-risk posts around the world and better management to ensure that the recommendations of previous security reviews are fully implemented. It was discouraging to read previous accountability review board reports after the attacks in Africa, for example, back in the late 1990s and see similar patterns of requests for security being denied in Washington.

Second, Secretary of State John Kerry should hold personnel accountable for the problems identified in our committee report and by the Accountability Review Board. After our committee and the ARB identified systemic failures and leadership deficiencies that contributed to the grossly inadequate security in Benghazi, it is totally unacceptable for the State Department to hold no one responsible for the broader mismanagement that occurred prior to the attack.

Finally, a year after the attack, the terrorists who invaded the Benghazi compound still have not been brought to justice despite repeated promises and pledges by President Obama to do so.

After a long-delayed investigation, including a period of weeks when the FBI agents were not allowed to even access the Benghazi facility, Federal authorities have recently filed criminal charges against several suspects. But serious questions remain about the pace, the extent, and the effectiveness of these investigations and charges.

A major problem is the willingness—or lack thereof—of the Libyan Government to fully cooperate. I am told that the whereabouts of one of the prime suspects is known and that he is walking about fully, openly, and freely. Yet he has not been picked up. He has not been arrested. He has not been taken into captivity. Why not?

The administration must follow through on its commitment by taking the steps necessary to bring the attackers to justice, as the President promised. And the State Department, in the meantime, must implement all of the actions needed to prevent a Benghazi-like attack from taking place again. Surely, on the anniversary of the attacks on our Nation 12 years ago and the attacks 1 year ago in Benghazi, we owe it to Chris Stevens and his colleagues and to the American people.

Madam President, seeing no one seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING 9/11

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, today, September 11, 2013, is a day in which we remember lives cut too short in the attacks on our Nation 12 years ago. We also remember acts of bravery, selflessness, and all that took place that morning and in the days and months and the years that followed. I wish to take a moment to thank all the others who have sought to protect us from harm in the intervening years.

FISCAL 2014 SPENDING

Mr. FLAKE. I also rise today to speak about the need for continued attention to our Nation's fiscal health and to encourage my colleagues to seize the opportunity to take the necessary steps to rein in our out-of-control spending. As so often happens this time of year, talk has turned to the need for a continuing resolution for at least part of the next year, and I urge my colleagues to join me in pushing for a CR that respects the commitments we have already made.

As we all know, the President and the Congress approved the Budget Control Act in 2011, putting in place annual spending caps and establishing a deficit reduction commission to find additional savings and solutions to ensure the solvency of our entitlement programs. With the failure of that commission, a sequester that forced \$1.2 trillion in automatic spending reductions was put in place. In the absence of an agreement to replace them, the caps and sequester guarantee at least \$2 trillion in deficit reduction.

Seventy-four Members of the Senate believed these enforcement measures were needed to put us on the right fiscal track. The President signed the Budget Control Act into law, saying that, "It's an important first step to ensuring that, as a Nation, we live within our means." Yet there are continuing conversations about passing a short-term continuing resolution that would fund the government at a level above that established by the Budget Control Act for next year.

I should have to remind no one that under the Budget Control Act, passing

a continuing resolution at anything higher than the \$967 billion limit would trigger another statutory, across-the-board sequester cut in January that would bring spending down to the \$967 billion level for the next fiscal year of 2014.

I can see why there are those who would like to take such action. Passing a CR at a higher-than-BCA-appropriate level would create yet another fiscal cliff, with hopes, I am sure, of causing enough pressure to finally do away with the sequester. That is what some would like. However, such a scenario does little to add pressure to address the sequester, provides the pretense that the BCA levels don't mean anything if even for a short while, and it further complicates agencies implementing what are sure to be the required cuts.

Make no mistake, I understand the sequester process is a blunt instrument and not a preferred method of fiscal restraint. However, it was put in place because Congress failed to do what is needed to rein in reckless spending.

I also understand the difficult position it puts agencies in, particularly the Department of Defense. I am open to allowing reasonable flexibility and to replacing the sequester, albeit with changes to mandatory spending and entitlements, and not hikes in taxes. But that deal, much like the supercommittee's success, has been elusive, and to seek to pass a CR that doesn't reflect the reality of the post-BCA world raises itself a set of problems. However, such a scenario does little to add pressure to address the sequester, as I mentioned. It simply would make it more difficult for agencies to address their needs and to bring down their own spending.

Certainly, passing any budget bill for next year at levels in excess of those that are outlined in the Budget Control Act breaks any promise to "live within our means."

In addition, passing a short-term CR that will allow agencies to spend money as if the sequester isn't imminent early next year only complicates their situation. This would force agencies to squeeze all the necessary spending reductions in just over 9 months instead of an entire year. We can imagine the burdens that puts on agencies, particularly the Department of Defense, with unique procurement requirements.

A less charitable view of why anyone would seek to ignore, even for a short time, the realities of the BCA would be that they might think deficits have fallen and attention to our fiscal state is no longer needed. In fact, the President recently told an audience that, "We don't have an urgent deficit crisis. The only crisis we have is one that is manufactured in Washington."

I beg to differ. Our fiscal problems aren't solved. In fact, we are still on

track to add \$753 billion to our national debt in 2013. There is no doubt this is an improvement from past years. Yet the trillion-dollar deficits of the past 4 years are hardly appropriate benchmarks for today. Even at \$753 billion, this year's deficit is larger than any of those under any previous administration.

Meanwhile, our entitlement programs are still on track to be insolvent, with Social Security Disability set to go broke by 2016, Medicare by 2026, and Social Security by 2033. This is simply not the time to backpedal, by any means, on the agreement we made in 2011.

Congress and the President agree that the Budget Control Act is the first step needed toward budget deficit reduction. We must complete the first stride to set our Nation on the right course and prove to the public we can address the even larger looming challenges we face, such as the solvency of our entitlement programs.

There is no doubt this is going to be a difficult job in the days to come, and we must address it. I urge my colleagues to keep their promise and push for appropriations bills that responsibly respect the spending limits outlined in the Budget Control Act. To that aim, I invite my colleagues to join me in sending a letter to the majority leader asking him to bring to the Senate floor a fiscal year 2014 spending bill that abides by the \$967 billion discretionary limit that is required by law.

Let us continue the progress that has been made so far and keep our promise to fight for a more sound fiscal future.

Madam President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have spoken with the White House, I have spoken with the Republican leader, and we have agreed on a way forward based on the President's speech last night.

As the President told the Nation last night, the President has asked Congress to postpone a vote to authorize the use of force in Syria and pursue instead a diplomatic path to see if that works.

Tomorrow sometime, in Geneva, Secretary Kerry is meeting with Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov. So it is right that the Senate turn from the Syria resolution while the Secretary of State pursues these important diplomatic discussions.

As I said this morning, Congress will be watching these negotiations very

closely. If there is any indication that they are not serious, or that they are being used as a ploy for delay, then the Congress stands ready to return to the Syria resolution to give the President the authority to hold the Asad regime accountable for the pain, suffering, and death it caused with those chemical weapons.

In the meantime, the Republican leader and I have agreed the Senate will return to the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill. Senator SHAHEEN, Senator PORTMAN, and the chairman of the committee, Senator WYDEN, have talked to me many times over a period of more than a year to move this legislation forward. So I think it is appropriate that, rather than us sit here and tread water, doing nothing, we should move forward on this legislation.

As the agreement will indicate, so as not to interfere with the diplomatic discussions going on, we have agreed that the Senate will consider no amendments on the energy efficiency bill relative to Syria or the use of force. I have talked to a number of the Republican Senators and that is certainly fine with them.

We look forward to considering amendments on issues domestic in nature and passing this important piece of legislation.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to proceed to S. 1392 be agreed to, that no amendments or motions be in order relative to Syria or the use of military force during the consideration of the legislation, and that the time until 6 p.m. tonight be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

I think it would certainly be appropriate that we have at this time statements from the chairman and the ranking member, that is, Senators WYDEN and MURKOWSKI, and Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, the sponsors of this legislation. Then I would hope at that time—how long does the chairman need for his statement?

Mr. WYDEN. Twenty minutes.

Mr. REID. Twenty minutes. We will give Senator MURKOWSKI the same amount of time.

Mr. PORTMAN. Ten minutes for me.

Mr. REID. And 15 minutes for Senator SHAHEEN and 15 minutes for Senator PORTMAN. When that time is expired, we will see if we can have some amendments. So that would be the case. Those four Senators will be recognized for the next 70 minutes. As I have indicated, it is for debate only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to S. 1392 is agreed to and the clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1392) to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, let me thank the leader for making sure we could have this opportunity to deal with one of the crucial issues of our time. Leader REID has a long history in energy efficiency, in renewable energy. I thank him for his leadership and particularly the opportunity to be on the floor this afternoon.

Mr. President and colleagues, today the Senate has the chance to put more points on the board for the creation of good-paying jobs, a more productive economy, and greater energy security.

Before the August recess, the Congress put some initial points up by passing hydropower legislation. This legislation was called, by the New York Times: The first significant energy legislation to become law since 2009. Those hydropower bills might have been called small by some, but experts say they can generate a large amount of power.

Hydropower is 60 percent of the renewable, clean power in America. And hydropower has the potential to add 60,000 more megawatts of capacity by 2025, according to the National Hydropower Association. That is enough energy to power more than 46 million homes. Hydro helps to make our economy less dependent on fossil fuels, and it does it in a way Democrats and Republicans can come together on.

Today, as we look at another critical part of modernizing energy policy, I want to start by saying it has almost become obligatory for Members of Congress to say they are for an “all of the above” energy policy. It is almost as though a U.S. Senator has to say that on energy they are for “all of the above” three or four times every 15, 20 minutes or else it is not a real discussion about energy policy.

But here is what is important and I think critical as we start the debate—where I see my friend from New Hampshire and my friend from Ohio—the reality is, you cannot have an “all of the above” energy policy in this country without energy efficiency. It is that simple. If you are serious about an “all

of the above” energy policy—and we have essentially several Democrats and several Republicans on the floor now to demonstrate the seriousness of this issue—you cannot have an “all of the above” energy policy without energy efficiency.

So this legislation is on the floor today thanks to the tireless bipartisan efforts of Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN.

I am also very pleased the ranking minority member of the committee is here, Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska. She consistently meets me halfway in terms of trying to deal with these kinds of issues. As we begin this debate—which I would also mention to colleagues is essentially the first stand-alone energy bill to be debated on the floor of the Senate since 2007—it would not be possible without the cooperation and the good counsel of the ranking minority member, Senator MURKOWSKI. I want her to know how much I appreciate our partnership. We just got through our weekly session this morning as we look at various kinds of businesses. We hope to be able to bring to the Senate helium legislation, which we know a lot of Senators care about, very quickly as well. But there is a reason we are back to energy policy in the Senate, and that is, to a great extent, because of the cooperation Senator MURKOWSKI has shown.

This bill—and one of the reasons it is bipartisan—gives us a chance to cut waste in our energy system and create jobs. This bill would take the biggest step in years toward tapping the potential for energy policy.

The legislation saves about 2.9 billion megawatt hours of electricity by 2030, according to the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy. I say to my colleagues, I thought I would start by translating that into something that becomes a little easier to put your arms around.

To generate those kinds of savings in electricity—2.9 billion megawatt hours—the United States would have to build 10 new nuclear powerplants at a cost of billions of dollars each and run them for more than 20 years.

The heart of this bill is updating voluntary building codes to make homes and businesses more efficient, and it is about installing new wires and pipes and machines and insulation. Here is what I want colleagues to know as we start this discussion: There is money to be made in those pipes and that installation. Businesses know that. That is why more than 250 companies and associations have endorsed this bill, including the Chamber of Commerce.

When you look at those who have endorsed this piece of legislation, it is not a who's who of sort of bleeding-heart environmental folks. I was particularly struck by the headline in a Forbes article last month. They say: “The Shaheen-Portman Energy Sav-

ings Act: It's The Economy, Stupid.” They sure got that right.

If the Congress passes this bill, it is going to immediately become a significant job creator, generating an estimated 136,000 new jobs by 2025.

It will also make a significant difference in our country's energy productivity, and that means savings for families, building fewer powerplants, reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

If we continue business as usual—people say: Oh, gee, we are not really going to pursue this now—the U.S. Energy Information Administration—that is really our statistical arm of the Energy Department—predicts that our country would use 30 percent more electricity by 2040.

But there is an alternative, and that is harnessing the potential of efficiency technologies that actually reduce electricity from today's demand and reduce the use of energy even as our economy and population grows.

The amount of new energy productivity we gain would be like doubling the number of houses in America and then powering all of them without ever adding a new powerplant to the grid.

Choosing the more efficient path we are going to advocate for on the floor of the Senate would mean adding 1.3 million jobs by the middle of the century. Families could shave off one-third of their electricity bills, an average savings of about \$600 per year, according to experts in the field, a big increase in productivity.

So already we have talked about job creation, we have talked about productivity, two areas where I do not see some kind of artificial line between Democrats and Republicans here in the Senate. I see areas we all feel strongly about.

On the other hand, meeting our country's projected electricity demand with today's energy mix and 40 percent coal requires building at least 100 new coal-fired powerplants over 25 years.

We are also going to make the case during this debate that the Federal Government ought to be a leader in this. It is one thing to talk about how everybody in America ought to do something, and then say, oh, the Federal Government might get around to it someday. So we are saying, this is a chance for the Federal Government to save taxpayers money and to play a strong role, a strong leadership role, particularly by improving efficiency at the Federal data centers.

As more and more businesses move to the cloud, reducing energy use there is extremely important. Again, the experts estimate these steps on data center efficiency would save about 35 million megawatt hours of electricity by 2030. We would save the same amount of energy by powering down 60 of the NSA's newest data centers for a year, but I am going to save that one for another day.

There is obviously room for Federal agencies to do more. The government owns nearly 500,000 buildings. The Federal Government is the largest landlord in America. Agencies are directed to buy and use highly efficient equipment under two different executive orders. But according to staff at the Energy Department, less than half of commercial building equipment that agencies buy actually even complies with the government's own rules. So I am going to be offering an amendment to the bill that at least will provide some incentive to ensure that agencies actually follow the rules of the government.

This bill, as I have indicated, is bipartisan. We have been able to pass 62 bills out of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, each one with bipartisan support. This is what Senators have said they care about, this is what the other body has said they care about.

Congressman KEVIN MCCARTHY, the third ranking House Republican, said earlier this year, "All American energy independence means taking a hard look at energy production, distribution, reliability and efficiency." In the House there is a bipartisan companion to this. In other words, we have the good fortune of having Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN working in a bipartisan way.

In the other body—and Senator MURKOWSKI and I have met with the House Members interested in this issue—you have Congressman PETER WELCH and Congressman CORY GARDNER actually creating a bipartisan caucus to promote new financing tools that aid energy efficiency projects. Congressman WELCH and Congressman MCKINLEY have introduced companion legislation to the one we debate today.

If anything, one of our challenges is there is a pent-up demand to debate energy issues in this Congress. If we voted for all of the amendments I hear people say they want to do, we would probably be here until New Year's Eve being fed intravenously trying to figure out how to process all of them. We may not have time to address each and every amendment, but I know of at least a dozen bipartisan amendments that colleagues plan to offer that will produce even more energy savings for businesses and consumers, produce more jobs for the U.S. economy.

Nobody is going to be able to say this is part of a dumb Federal mandate or some kind of "run from Washington, one size fits all" approach. These are approaches that look to productivity, the private sector for leadership and fresh ideas. For example, Senator BENNET and Senator AYOTTE have a better building amendment. It strikes me as a very sensible one.

Senator INHOFE and Senator CARPER have an amendment on thermal efficiency. Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator HOEVEN have an amendment to

help our nonprofits save energy. How can you make a logical case that we should not try to work that out? Our nonprofits are being stretched to the limit. I saw that when I was in Alaska with Senator MURKOWSKI. We talked to some of the nonprofits. We see it in Oregon as well.

We have a bipartisan amendment from Senators HOEVEN and KLOBUCHAR to try to help these nonprofits save energy. These are just a few of the good amendments, in my view, that build on the outstanding work done by Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN in these several years. These amendments and the bill are going to help homes and businesses use less energy, save money, create jobs, without mandates, without spending new Federal money.

It got out of our committee by a 19-to-3 vote. I believe the reason it did is because people said this is a common-sense approach to cutting energy waste and showing folks across the land that there are things you can agree on in the Senate and come together.

I am pleased to be here with Senator MURKOWSKI. We have talked about this a long time, to get the Senate back in the business of a modern energy policy that creates jobs, that promotes energy security and productivity. We started that with the hydropower legislation that was signed into law right after we broke for the August recess. This is the next logical step.

I will say to colleagues, I do not see how a Senator can say they are for an "all of the above" energy policy in America without supporting energy efficiency. This is the time. This is the bill.

I look forward to working with our colleagues. I hope they bring us their various and sundry amendments.

I yield the floor. I know Senator MURKOWSKI has important comments to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the chairman of the Energy Committee, for his comments on not only this very important legislation but his leadership on energy issues as we have worked together on the Energy Committee, a committee that I know the Presiding Officer enjoyed his time on, recognizing that there is so much we can be doing as a Nation on a bipartisan basis to make a difference within our communities, across our regions, not only for the economy and jobs but to make a difference globally in terms of how we handle our energy and our energy resources.

We talk a lot about the "all of the above" strategy, and perhaps that has different interpretations depending upon what part of the country you are from. But one of the slogans that was going around a few years back was: Produce more. Use less. Well, now we

are talking about the "use less" side of that ledger, equally important. I come from a producing State. But let me tell you when you come from a State where our energy costs are some of the highest in the Nation, if not the highest in the Nation, we are also pretty good and wise about how we use less.

I am very pleased that we are at this point today where we are finally taking up the energy efficiency bill. The chairman has mentioned it has been a long time since we have seen energy legislation debated here on the floor. I do find it troubling that we have gone so long without meaningful and sustained debate about energy policy.

Each year our committee sends dozens of bills to the floor with our signature stamp of bipartisan approval which I think is key. Yet for years we have kind of seen the bills come to the floor and that has been the end of the road for those particular efforts. While a small number of our public lands bills are able to pass through by unanimous consent, those that are related to energy, those that often need a little more work to pass this Chamber, are virtually never brought up for further consideration.

I do understand we have all kinds of pressing matters in front of us—obviously the debate over the Syria resolution clearly one of them, the continuing resolution that we will have in front of us as we work to fund the government, critically important. If we do reach agreement on how we should proceed to either of those measures, I will certainly be the first to agree they need to be brought forward for debate. But when we have finished those, I am hopeful we will return, if we have not yet concluded, to energy legislation because it has been too long neglected in this Chamber.

I came to the position as ranking member of the Energy Committee back in 2009. I was very optimistic about what we would accomplish in this area. All of those of us on the committee had worked to deliver three major energy bills during the proceeding years I had been on the committee. We had the Energy Policy Act of 2005, we had the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006, we had the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. All of them were partially or entirely written by our committee. They all received strong support in the Chamber, and they all eventually became law.

Fast forward to where we are today. Our floor debate in 2007 remains the last time, the last time the Senate truly engaged on energy policy. In the interim, about the best we have seen are some amendments here and there along the process or perhaps dueling side-by-sides that seem are inevitably voted down.

But the lack of action on energy legislation is not because we have abandoned a bipartisan approach in committee. It is not because we have perhaps run out of good ideas. It is certainly not because we are somehow unable or unwilling to report legislation to the full Senate. We reported a comprehensive bill back in 2009 that sat on the calendar untouched for 17 months. We unanimously reported a bill to help prevent another offshore spill in 2010. That too was ignored.

The reality is we have one of the most bipartisan and active committees in the Senate. But, unfortunately, we are almost regularly in a situation where we are not provided the floor time needed to complete our work.

I am not complaining here, I am just pointing out some facts. But the chairman noted there has been this pent-up demand, this frustration, about not only where we are in the process but the opportunities that are lost. When you think about the changing dynamic in this country since 2009, I think about what has changed in the energy sector during that course. The fact that we have not addressed real, fulsome energy legislation is quite telling.

But I am hopeful the Senate is now finally on the verge of reversing its unfortunate approach to energy policy. As the chairman has noted, we have already ordered more than 50 bills—50 bills—to be reported to the Senate this year alone. Today, as we begin debate on the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act—I do not even know why we are calling it that; we just call it Shaheen-Portman around here. The work the authors of this legislation have done I certainly applaud.

But we are here at this point because of the very concerted efforts of the authors of this bill, Senators PORTMAN and SHAHEEN, their great bipartisan work, months and months of negotiation, months of waiting. So to be here today, to stand in support of this bill, is wonderful.

I have spent some time on this floor talking about an energy blueprint I had crafted back at the beginning of the year, Energy 20/20. I said this is 115 pages of energy policy, but it can be summed up in one bumper sticker. It says: Energy is good. The fact we are here on the floor talking about energy efficiency is absolutely key.

When I mentioned that 20/20 blueprint, in it I make the point, I make the push that we need to strive to make our energy more abundant, more affordable, clean, diverse, and secure. While we often focus on the more obvious efforts to advance energy policy, in my case more production on Federal lands, passage of approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline, the restoration of some real balance in new regulation, and I think a much greater focus on innovation, it is also critically important

that we look to the efficiency side. It must be a larger part of our energy debate. It deserves to be a larger part of our Nation's energy policy.

The reasons why are no mystery. Efficiency is good for the economy and for our environment. It enables us to waste less and to use our resources more wisely—great conservative principles.

At the same time it can help create jobs and deliver lasting financial benefits. Study after study—and the chairman has pointed out some of those—has shown we could save billions of dollars every year through reasonable efficiency improvements, whether in small appliances, large buildings, or someplace in between. These potential savings cannot be overlooked at a time when we see so many of our families and businesses are struggling to make ends meet, when our debt is escalating and the price of energy remains well above where most of us want it to be.

As policymakers, I can't think of efficiency as an energy issue alone. It is also a bottom-line issue that affects every one of us and every one of our constituents back home.

While we can all agree on the importance of efficiency, we can also agree there is a legitimate debate over the Federal Government's role in this area. In my judgment, that role should be limited and the costs associated with it should be minimal.

The Federal Government must itself be efficient as it pursues efficiency. I think these are areas we can work to enhance. We cannot simply lavish subsidies, pass bill after bill, or impose mandate after mandate, and suggest that is somehow a pursuit of a greater good.

Instead, I think the Federal Government should strive to fulfill three pretty distinct roles. It can act as a facilitator of information that consumers and businesses need to make sound decisions. It can serve as a breaker of barriers that discourage or prevent rational efficiency improvements from being made. As the largest consumer of energy in our country, it can lead by example by taking steps to reduce its own energy usage.

Those are the criteria by which we can evaluate whether the Federal Government is on the right track on energy efficiency and also the criteria by which we can judge whether this particular bill, the Shaheen-Portman bill, would improve our current policies.

Let me move to the bill for a moment and explain why I support it. First, the scope. The scope is both limited and appropriate. It does not contain new mandates for the private sector, not for buildings, not for appliances, not for anything. The provision on building codes is a good example of what the bill does and does not do.

I would not be supporting a provision if it required the mandatory adoption

of those codes, but in this bill it is voluntary, with the Federal Government stepping in to help facilitate new models that others can choose to follow.

The second point here is the cost. We are all focusing on costs nowadays. The costs of this bill are fully offset. It contains no direct spending. The only provision that received a score from the Congressional Budget Office has been dropped. A grants program that passed our committee has now been dropped as well. Some of these things we look at and say we would rather they had been in there, but we are trying to deal with the cost side.

I appreciate both Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN for working with us on that. The authorizations that remain in the bill have been fully offset by cutting a provision from the 2007 Energy bill. Any Federal dollars that are ultimately spent on this legislation will have to be secured through a future appropriations process within the context of our larger debate about the overall Federal budget.

The third point here is I support this bill because of the process that was followed to bring it to this point. Again, I wish to give the chairman credit, and clearly Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN. It was bipartisan from the beginning. The Senator from New Hampshire got together with the Senator from Ohio to lead its development.

I can remember the conversation years ago when he said: I am working on this. It was long before there was any draft. It was working through in the kind of good old-fashioned, roll up your sleeves, let's work on doing good things in energy policy when it comes to efficiency. I give him full credit.

The committee held a hearing on this bill. We had testimony from the Department of Energy and other experts. We moved through to a markup. This could be considered regular order. We improved the bill in the markup. We reported it favorably by a vote of 19 to 3. Possible amendments have been worked on by members and staff alike over these past several months. I think there are many good amendments we all assume will easily win passage.

At the same time the bill's sponsors have continued to work to refine and improve the legislation leading to the product we have before us today. On scope and substance, on cost and on process, this bill has been a good example. This has been an example of regular order, working as usual, showing how the Senate can work, showing the Senate at its best. The only trouble we have encountered is securing the floor time necessary to try to secure its passage.

It is my hope with the efforts of the sponsors of this bill, with the efforts of the chairman of the Energy Committee continuing to push to build good things—rather than trying to blow up things—we will have an opportunity to see this measure enacted into law.

As I mentioned, we don't have an opportunity here on the floor of the Senate to debate energy often or as often as I would wish. By the looks of what we have pending in front of us, we recognize there may be interruptions. It is my hope we can move quickly and take up many of these bipartisan amendments Chairman WYDEN has mentioned.

Let us make the most of the opportunity we have before us now. Let us weigh the Federal Government's proper role in efficiency. Let us make sure this bill reflects all of that. Let us start working through the amendments that have been filed and move forward with a process that will yield good policy for this country.

Again, I thank the sponsors for their yeoman's work in getting us to this point, and I look forward to the discussion and the debate we will have in the days ahead. I know Senator SHAHEEN, with all the work she has put into this, is anxious to finally discuss her bill in the Chamber.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. As my colleague Senator MURKOWSKI said, I am thrilled to be here on the floor of the Senate today after 3 years of work with Senator PORTMAN and so many other people to be talking about the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act.

I wish to begin by thanking Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI for all of the support and great work the Energy Committee has done to help get this bill to the floor.

As they pointed out, and as I know the Presiding Officer knows, the Energy Committee in the Senate has been very bipartisan. I had the opportunity to spend my first 4 years here on the Energy Committee and I can attest to that. I know what great work they have done. The fact they have moved so many bills through the committee already speaks to the consensus they have been able to build on the committee around energy policy. Thank you both very much for all of that great work.

Thank you to my partner in this effort, Senator PORTMAN of Ohio. He is not on floor right now, but I sort of claim him in New Hampshire because he went to Dartmouth, so we figure he has some New Hampshire roots. We have worked in a partnership on this legislation. It has been a very bipartisan effort.

It reflects what I believe is an affordable approach to the use of energy efficiency technologies. It will help create private sector jobs. It will save businesses and consumers money. It will reduce pollution, and it will make our country more energy independent.

I know we are all very aware of the crisis in Syria and how that looms over

this discussion. It couldn't be more timely over how we can make this country more energy independent.

This bill, which Senator PORTMAN and I have been working on for 3 years, has been the result of years of meetings and negotiations, of broad stakeholder outreach. It has been an effort to craft the most effective piece of energy legislation, efficiency legislation, with the greatest chance of passing both Chambers of Congress and of being signed into law.

The legislation will have a swift and measurable benefit to our economy and our environment. In fact, as Senator WYDEN pointed out, we had a recent study by experts at the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, which found this legislation, if it is passed, has the potential to create 136,000 domestic jobs by 2025. They did a study in the last Congress, when we first introduced the bill, which showed in addition to that job creation, it would also save consumers \$4 billion by 2020 and be the equivalent of taking 5 million cars off the road. It is a huge benefit to our environment and to job creation, which is probably at the top of our agenda right now, and also for savings to consumers.

Simply put, as my colleagues have said, we need a comprehensive national energy policy. We have been overly dependent on foreign oil. We have been reliant on an outdated energy infrastructure. This is a situation that hurts business and that also gives our overseas competitors an advantage.

We have to think about an "all of the above" strategy, as everybody has commented, that utilizes a wide range of energy sources: natural gas, oil, nuclear, and renewables such as wind, biomass, and solar. This will give us a stronger and more stable economy. We can't just focus on the supply side, we also need to think about how we consume the energy once we have it, the demand side.

Efficiency is the cheapest, fastest way to address our energy needs. Energy savings techniques and technologies, lower costs—they free up capital that allows business to expand and our economy to grow. I have been to so many businesses throughout New Hampshire in the last 3 years that, because of their ability to save on their energy costs, have been able to stay competitive and have been able to add jobs. This has a real benefit to our economy and to businesses.

Efficiency, as I said, is the fastest way to address our energy needs. I think a lot of times people think about energy saving and energy efficiency as turning down the thermostat, turning off the lights, putting on a sweater, but energy efficiency today is about a whole lot more than that. We can start by improving our efficiency by installing ready and proven technologies. These are off the shelf. They are al-

ready available, such as modern heating and cooling systems, smart meters, computer-controlled thermostats, and low-energy lighting. These are all available today for the benefit of people who wish to save on their energy consumption and their energy bills.

There are substantial opportunities that exist across all sectors of our economy to conserve energy and to create good-paying private sector jobs. As we have already said, I think efficiency has a great shot at passing both the House and Senate and becoming law. Energy efficiency has emerged as an excellent example of bipartisan and affordable opportunity to immediately grow our economy and improve our energy security.

In addition to being affordable, efficiency is widely supported because its benefits aren't confined to a certain fuel source or a particular region of the country. So much of the energy debate over the last few years has been about who benefits, whether it is fossil fuels, alternatives, whether it is the Northeast, the South, the West. Everybody benefits from energy efficiency. It is one of the policy areas where we can come to a real agreement.

It is no wonder that this legislation, Shaheen-Portman, enjoys such large and diverse support. It has received more than 250 endorsements from a wide range of businesses, environmental groups, think tanks, and trade associations, from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers to the National Resources Defense Council. These are the types of nontraditional alliances that have helped us get this bill to the floor.

Senator PORTMAN and I worked with diverse groups to craft this year's bill, and we maintained a transparent and open process in which we tried to make sure all stakeholders had a meaningful opportunity to comment on existing and proposed provisions and to suggest their substantive additions. So using that process of coalition building, we were able to find common ground on a number of important provisions, including commercial and residential building efficiency codes, workforce training, and language that aims to create a more robust public-private partnership between DOE's Advanced Manufacturing Office and industrial energy consumers.

To talk a little about what is actually in the legislation, this bill provides incentives and support but, as we have all said, no mandates for residential and commercial buildings in order to cut energy use. That is very important because buildings consume about 40 percent of the energy used in the United States.

The bill strengthens voluntary national model building codes to make new homes and commercial buildings more energy efficient, and it works

with State and private industry to make the code-writing process more transparent.

The legislation trains the next generation of workers in energy efficient commercial building design and operation through university-based building training and research assessment centers.

Shaheen-Portman assists our industrial manufacturing sector, which consumes more energy than any other sector of the U.S. economy. The bill would direct the Department of Energy to work closely with private sector industrial partners to encourage research, development, and commercialization of innovative energy efficient technology and processes for industrial application. This is something we heard very clearly from businesses throughout the country. They really need and they want a more collaborative effort with the Department of Energy. They want to feel as though the Department of Energy is working with them. So hopefully these provisions will help make that happen.

It also helps businesses reduce energy costs and become more competitive by incentivizing the use of more energy efficient electric motors and transformers.

It also establishes a DOE voluntary program called SupplySTAR, which is modeled on something that has been a great success, the ENERGY STAR Program, to help make companies more aware of their supply chains and how to make them more efficient as well.

The legislation requires the Federal Government, which is the single largest user of energy in the country, to adopt more efficient building standards and smart metering technology. The bill would require the Federal Government to adopt energy-saving technologies and operations for computers. Our data centers are huge users of energy. It would allow Federal agencies to use existing funds to update plans for new Federal buildings using the most current building efficiency standards.

Finally, as has been said, this legislation is fully offset, so there is no new spending in this bill. We reallocate authorization from existing programs.

To conclude—and I know we are going to have a lot of amendments to this bill—we have a number of bipartisan amendments that are going to make this bill better, that will make it more substantive, and I look forward to those amendments and to the debate we are going to have. I think this is a bipartisan, affordable, and I believe widely supported first step as we begin addressing our Nation's very real energy needs, particularly not just on the supply side but on the demand side.

As I have said, a lot of people have worked very hard to get this bill to the floor, and while I am not going to walk through who all of those people are, I

again thank Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI for all of their support, and I thank Majority Leader REID and Republican Leader MCCONNELL for their support in reaching an agreement to get the bill to the floor.

I also thank three staff members whose hard work has really made this possible—first, someone who was in my office earlier but who has now moved on, Trent Bauserman, who worked very hard to get us started on the legislation; Robert Diznoff, who has now taken over in my office to work on the bill; and Steve Kittredge from the office of Senator PORTMAN. Without the three of them and without all of the other staffers both in my office and in the office of Senator PORTMAN and all of the people on the committee who have worked so hard, we would not be here to have this debate today.

So I thank all of them, and I look forward to hearing the amendments and the robust discussion on the floor and to continuing to work with my colleague Senator PORTMAN as we try to move this bill through the process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, we are finally here on the floor, and I would like to thank my colleague Senator SHAHEEN for her comments and for working with me over the last few years to get to this point where we can be talking about something that brings us together, I hope, as a Senate, which is this effort to ensure that we have an energy plan for America that can help bring back jobs, help fix our trade deficit, and help spark an American manufacturing renaissance, and that is the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act.

This is about energy efficiency. It is about using what we have more efficiently, and I think that makes a lot of sense for us to move forward. As Senator SHAHEEN said, it is a first step, but it is an important step.

I thank the chair and ranking member of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee—Senator WYDEN, who spoke earlier, and Senator MURKOWSKI, who is with us on the floor and who spoke earlier—for all the support they have given us over the last few years to get this through the committee process and the markup process and to add some important elements to the legislation, and we will see more as the amendment process proceeds. I also thank Leader REID for helping us bring this bipartisan legislation to the floor today, and I thank Senator MCCONNELL, who has been very supportive of us moving this process forward.

As has been said on the floor this afternoon, this is really the first substantive energy legislation we have seen on the floor in a while—maybe 6 years—and it requires help from both sides of the aisle to get to this point. It is bipartisan.

It is also supported, by the way, on both sides of the Capitol. We have people in the House, including some House Members I spoke to earlier today, who are very interested in what we are doing over here on this legislation because they have companion legislation—not identical but similar legislation—in the House they are working on on a bipartisan basis.

So this is one that I think has a good shot of getting through the Senate. I think it also has a good shot of getting through the House and going to the President for signature and helping to move America forward with a more sensible energy policy.

We are going to see a lot of amendments on the floor, and I think a number of these amendments will be bipartisan and will help improve the bill. In fact, I am looking at a list here of about a dozen bipartisan amendments. These are amendments—some of which we talked about in committee, some of which have come since the process—that involve some very thoughtful work done by our colleagues, and I am looking forward to having a debate on some of those. Actually, I have a list of 41 energy efficiency-related relevant amendments here. So this is an opportunity for us to have a broader debate on energy but also to improve the energy efficiency legislation before us.

Those of us on this side of the aisle talk about the need for an “all of the above” energy policy, and I certainly believe in it. I think we need to do everything we can to make ourselves more energy independent so that we are not dependent on dangerous and volatile parts of the world, including the Mideast. We have certainly seen that here in the last couple of weeks where what is happening in Syria and what is happening in Egypt affects what goes on here in this country in terms of our energy costs and certainly our economy. So this need for energy efficiency should lead us to want to be sure we are including this legislation in the mix.

We need a policy that harnesses more of our domestic resources. I believe in that. I believe we should be producing more energy in the ground here in America. I am for producing more, but I am also for making sure we don't miss the other part of the equation, which is using less. So I believe producing more and using less is a good policy.

This is part of the using-less part that maybe we don't talk about as much on this side of the aisle, but it is also very important. It is important in part because it creates jobs. It is a bill that is supported, by the way, by over 260 businesses, business association advocacy groups, from the National Association of Manufacturers and the chamber of commerce to the Sierra Club and the Alliance to Save Energy. The Christian Coalition is supporting it.

I have here a list of these 260 trade associations and business organizations because there are too many names to go through on the floor, but it is a very impressive list.

I think the legislation got through the Senate Energy Committee with a vote of 19 to 3 partly because of this support because members realize this will help them and their constituents.

Simply put, I think this legislation that the senior Senator from New Hampshire and I have worked on and proposed makes good environmental sense, I think it makes good energy sense, and I think it makes good economic sense too.

I spent time visiting with businesses throughout my State of Ohio on this bill and on this whole issue of energy, and they all say the same thing, which is pretty obvious, and that is that energy is an important component of their business, it is part of the cost of doing business, and energy efficiency makes them more able to compete in the global economy.

We do live in a global economy, and every day businesses in my State go up against businesses not just in other States but in other countries. We are not going to be able to compete on everything. We don't want to compete on wages with developing countries, for instance. We want to have good wages and good benefits in this country. We can compete on the quality of the goods we produce. We want to keep that quality high. But we have to be sure we are giving these businesses the ability to compete by helping to keep their energy costs low—again producing more and using less.

What this legislation does—and it is very significant—is it helps the private sector develop the energy efficiency techniques, technologies of the future. We make it easier for employers to use tools that will reduce their costs, enabling them to put those savings toward expanding jobs, plants, equipment, and hiring new workers. The proposals contained in our bill are commonsense reforms we have needed for a long time.

The bill contains no mandates. Let me repeat that. There are no mandates in this legislation on the private sector, period. In fact, many of our proposals come as a direct result of conversations we have had with folks in the private sector about how the Federal Government can help them to become more energy efficient and to save money, which they can then reinvest in their businesses and communities.

Here is a brief overview of some of the major parts of the legislation, some of which have already been described ably by my colleague from New Hampshire, but I just want to review them quickly.

First, it does specifically help manufacturing. It reforms what is called the Advanced Manufacturing Office at the Department of Energy by providing

clear guidelines on its responsibilities, one of which ought to be to help manufacturers develop energy-saving technologies for their businesses. This is a shift. We think it is important. We think they have gotten away from that a little bit—the Department of Energy—and we need to be sure they get back to it.

It facilitates the already existing efforts of companies around the country that are trying to implement cost-saving energy efficiency policies by streamlining the way government agencies in this arena work with them.

It also increases partnerships with national labs. The national laboratories have a lot of great research, and we want to be sure it is commercialized and shared with the private sector.

Also, it increases partnerships with energy and service technology providers and the national labs together to leverage private sector expertise toward energy efficiency goals.

The legislation strengthens the model building codes so that builders in States that choose to adopt them will have the most up-to-date energy efficient codes developed anywhere—best practices.

The legislation establishes university-based building training and assessment centers. Industrial assessment centers are located around the country. There is one in Dayton, OH. I had the opportunity to visit with one of the researchers there recently, who was out working with mid-sized smaller companies, helping make them more energy efficient. They are strongly in support of this legislation because they want to expand the good work they are doing to help more businesses be more energy efficient, be more competitive, and add more jobs.

Under this legislation, these centers also will be helping to train the next generation of workers in energy efficient building design and operation. Not only will these programs save energy, but they will also help provide our students and unemployed workers who need these skills with the skills they will need to compete in this growing energy field.

To repeat, this bill is not about forcing companies to become more energy efficient or imposing mandates. It is about incentives, and it is about giving these companies the help they are asking for. And we can do it at no additional expense to the taxpayer. Why? Because the cost of this legislation is fully offset. In other words, we change other programs at the Department of Energy to pay for the cost of this legislation.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, it has no impact. It is deficit neutral. But in fact it will save taxpayers money, because all of us as taxpayers will save money because of another provision of the legislation, and that is because we go after the largest

energy user in the world to try to make them more efficient. That is the United States Government. We want to be sure the United States Government starts to practice what it preaches, because as it talks to the rest of us about the need for more energy efficiency, we find that at the Federal Government there are lots of opportunities to make them less wasteful and more efficient.

It directs the Department of Energy to issue recommendations that employ energy efficiency on everything from computer hardware to operation and maintenance processes.

Senator WYDEN had some good examples earlier of some of the waste in the Federal Government that this bill will go after. This is smart because it is the right thing to do in order to save energy, but also it helps taxpayers because it is going to reduce the cost at the Federal Government.

It also takes an interesting commonsense step of allowing the General Services Administration to actually update the building designs they have to meet energy-efficient standards that have been developed since these designs were finalized, some of them many years ago, and they can't update them. We certainly want to be sure the new Federal buildings that are being constructed are using the most up-to-date efficiency standards. This legislation permits that to happen. The government has been looking for places to tighten its belt. This is one. Energy efficiency is a great place to start.

All this adds up to a piece of legislation that Americans across the spectrum can support. It is fully offset, it contains no mandates, it requires the Federal Government to be more efficient.

According to a recent study of our legislation, in 12 years, by 2025, Shaheen-Portman is estimated to aid in the creation of 136,000 new jobs. The report says it is going to save consumers \$13.7 billion a year in reduced energy costs by 2030. A vote on this legislation is a critical step for achieving this goal of a true "all of the above" energy strategy. It produces more energy at home, yes, but also uses less energy—and uses it more efficiently.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come down to the floor, offer their amendments, let's have a good debate and discussion, and let's support this underlying bill. Let's be sure it leaves the Senate with a strong vote and, with it, rigorous debate to ensure it can pass the House of Representatives where, as I said earlier, there is a lot of interest, and that it can go to the President for his signature to take this important step toward making this country more competitive, more energy efficient, less dependent on foreign oil, and creating more jobs in the process while improving the environment. It is a win-win-win.

I thank my colleague from New Hampshire and the chair and ranking member of the Energy Committee. We look forward to entertaining some amendments and look forward to being here on the floor talking about a way to move our country forward in a way that provides a model on moving the Senate forward on other bipartisan measures.

Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1858

(Purpose: To provide for a study and report on standby usage power standards implemented by States and other industrialized nations)

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1858.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] for Mr. MERKLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 1858.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, in my view, this is a very practical amendment offered by my friend and colleague from Oregon Senator MERKLEY. It involves a study on standby power.

The amendment would, in effect, fund the study at the Department of Energy to look at standby power standards in States and other parts of the world to determine what is the most feasible and practical way to approach it. There is no authorization here.

I think it is pretty obvious to Members of the Senate, there are a large number of electronic products, from televisions, cell phone chargers, to microwaves, that cannot be completely turned off without being unplugged, and we ought to find ways to reduce wasted standby power.

It is my intention to support this amendment. I think it is a practical idea. I yield any time to Senator MERKLEY to explain his thoughtful amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I thank my senior colleague from Oregon. I appreciate very much his calling up this amendment and for his

leadership on energy, and specifically energy efficiency.

I would also like to compliment my colleagues from Ohio and New Hampshire, who have worked so hard on this very valuable piece of the energy puzzle: How do we more efficiently utilize energy that we generate?

Specifically, this amendment is related to standby power, the power that is wasted keeping devices ready to use at a moment's notice. I prefer the term "vampire" power or "vampire" electronics. This is the power our electronics suck out of our power system when they are doing absolutely nothing. So this challenge of loss to vampire electronics is certainly something we ought to take on.

Many electronic devices, from televisions to desktop computers, cell phone chargers, microwaves, use energy when they are turned off but are still plugged in. Often, you will see that little light that tells you it is still plugged in. This wasted energy accounts for roughly 5 percent of residential electricity use. So about 1 kilowatt in every 20 or \$1 in every \$20 is utilized to keep those little lights blinking.

The United States has yet to establish standards for efficiency in products related to standby power. Some States have done so, and other industrialized nations have taken action. This amendment would simply tell the Department to look at the standards established elsewhere in the world, or in individual States, compare them and analyze them, so we can consider whether a lot more could be done in the United States to make us more efficient. That efficiency is like producing free, available power by ending the waste. In fact, the EPA estimates 100 billion kilowatt hours of electricity are wasted by vampire electronics each year. That adds up to \$10 billion in extra energy costs.

Depending on the age of components, running a cable box or large-screen TV, a DVD player, a gaming console, surround sound setup, could be like running a significant refrigerator, a significant power draw, and DOE believes it is feasible to reduce this waste from standby power by about 75 percent.

The value of that 75-percent reduction would be equivalent to erecting 25,000 3-megawatt wind turbines for free. That is a lot of wind power being utilized. So let's do it.

Under this amendment, the Department of Energy is instructed to conduct a study of standards of standby power appliances and electronic devices that have been implemented by other States or other industrialized nations, and to evaluate which of the standards studied would be feasible and appropriate in the United States. It is a simple idea and an important study that can contribute substantially to the use of power effectively here in our economy.

I thank my colleagues for bringing this amendment forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, we are not going to vote on this amendment at this time. But when we do, I hope colleagues will support it. I think it is a very fine amendment.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I think there is a little confusion on the floor. I have an amendment. I have talked to virtually everyone. In fact, I can't find one person opposed to it. It is very simple.

What I would ask is that I be able to set aside the pending amendment for the purpose of considering my amendment No. 1851. Let me make that and see if there is objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. VITTER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me go ahead and tell the floor what it is all about. I know I am going to be wanting to come back to the floor and get this in the queue.

It is very rare in this body that we come up with something everyone is for, something that wasn't a part of the original legislation, for a very good reason. We are talking about geothermal.

Right now we all recall in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, there is a provision that requires the Federal Government have a percentage of its energy be from renewable sources. The problem is this: Geothermal doesn't create any new energy. It lets you use the energy that is there, recover it, heat our homes, cool our homes, put it back, and then reuse it again.

As I say, it is something everyone is for. It is 100 percent renewable. The only oversight originally was that it did not actually create energy. The amendment would change this to allow geothermal heat pumps to be among

the renewable energies that could be used by the Federal Government to meet its obligation under the 2005 Energy law.

This amendment doesn't cost anything, it doesn't mandate anything. It simply provides another acceptable way for the Federal Government to meet its obligations in a cost-effective way. It is noncontroversial and something everyone wants.

It would be my hope after that explanation the Senator from Louisiana would be willing to let me bring it up for the purpose of considering it, putting it in the queue, and then going back to where we were, acknowledging objections that he might have to other amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Unfortunately, I am going to have to sustain my objection. But I am very hopeful this can be worked out in short order, as soon as a vote on my amendment is locked down. In fact, I will go this far. It doesn't even have to be on this bill. It does have to be in the near future, because the issue with regard to which I am very concerned happens on October 1. So this is an extremely time-sensitive issue.

I have had good discussions with the majority, and it seems as though we are going to be able to lock down that agreement hopefully very soon. But until then, I am going to have to object.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I intend to support the Inhofe-Carper amendment. In my view, this is really a commonsense clarification of existing law. I want colleagues to have a sense that this is the kind of bipartisan work that Senator MURKOWSKI talked about earlier, that we have been trying to do to try to come to the Senate with ideas that really pass the smell test. I mean they are common sense, they are practical.

In that context, this amendment modifies the existing definition of renewable energy to provide that thermal energy that is generated from—from renewable energy sources ought to be considered renewable energy for Federal energy purchase requirements. For example, if a Federal agency has access to thermal energy from groundwater to heat or cool its facilities, under the Inhofe-Carper amendment that thermal energy would be considered renewable energy produced just as if the buildings had solar or wind power to produce electricity.

I hope colleagues, in this spirit, will bring us these kinds of suggestions and ideas. Senator INHOFE brought this to us early on. I know we are going to have some more discussion because of its connection to other matters, but I hope we will get a vote. It is common sense. It is practical. I intend to support it. I want the RECORD to reflect that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, as author, with Senator SHAHEEN, of the underlying bill, I have a list of a dozen or so bipartisan amendments that I would love to see us have a debate on, including the Inhofe amendment. The Inhofe-Carper amendment is a great example, as the chairman just said, of one that actually improves the bill. As I said, there are some amendments we may not find bipartisan, but this is one, and it is common sense. I appreciate him working with the committee and working with us, and I just wish we could get it up for a vote and get it filed today.

I hope we can work out our differences on other amendments that are not relevant to the legislation so we can go ahead with some of this debate. My sense is that we have a good chance of doing that. Let's figure out how to come together with a practical solution to be able to provide a vote but also to allow us to proceed with this debate.

Senator INHOFE came over here to offer his amendment. He wasn't able to. I hope we can, for the next good bipartisan amendment, have that opportunity.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, let me offer this truly friendly suggestion. I think we can proceed with this debate. Senator PORTMAN said proceed with the debate. We can proceed with this debate right now. We can bring amendments to the floor, we can talk about them, we can have a full debate on any amendment folks want to bring to the floor. I encourage that. I think that will move the process along because we can basically do all of the substantive debate on these amendments. The only thing I am talking about is a technicality, which is making the amendment pending. That is a technicality that does not have to stop or delay or prohibit any debate.

My suggestion is to move full forward with that debate as we work out this agreement. I am fully prepared in the same way to discuss and debate my amendment. I am ready to do that whenever it is appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I don't recall this happening before. Regarding the very amendment that is an obstacle, keeping me from the vote, I ask unanimous consent right now to become a cosponsor of that amendment, the Vitter amendment I am talking about.

I know what he is trying to do. I know he is going to make an effort to get this done maybe in other legislation if it does not happen here. I will be joining him in his cause. I see this as a separate matter here, as I say. We want

to move this along. Everyone agrees to. I will stand by and see if anyone changes their mind.

Thank you, I say to the chairman and ranking member. Thank you for the very kind comments on my amendment.

Mr. WYDEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I was next going to ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 1845. I understand the Senate is in an a bit of an impasse, but, if I might, I would like to talk about my amendment without calling it up with the hope that later my friend and colleague Senator WYDEN will be able to call up my amendment and put it on the list of pending amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I am going to talk a little bit about this important effort which has been authored in partnership with my good friend from the wonderful State of Maine, Senator COLLINS. I wish to take a minute before I do that and say how important it is that we are finally debating, for the first time in years, an energy bill in the Senate. The fact that we are here today beginning this important debate is a huge testament to my colleague from the great State of New Hampshire, Senator SHAHEEN, and my good friend from the days I served in the House and now fellow Senator from the great State of Ohio, Senator PORTMAN, and the leadership of Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI.

I think Senator PORTMAN and Senator SHAHEEN are saying this in every way possible: For our country to truly realize energy independence, energy security, we need to efficiently use the energy we have. That is exactly what Senators PORTMAN and SHAHEEN envision with their legislation. We support energy security, and we save Americans money.

With that background, let me turn to our amendment. Improving the energy efficiency of our schools is a no-brainer, and that is why I am proud to partner with Senator COLLINS to make sure our efforts have the biggest bang for the buck. This is a bipartisan amendment. It will help streamline efforts to improve the energy efficiency of our Nation's schools while, most importantly, strengthening our children's education.

Our schools are often confused by where to go and whom to work with to

pursue energy efficiency efforts and education, and this is in part because of how many agencies, departments, State governments, and the like are involved. By providing a coordinating structure for schools to better navigate existing Federal programs and the financing options available to them, we are going to pare back duplicative efforts and make it easier for schools across my State of Colorado and across the United States to save thousands of taxpayer dollars each year that then can be reinvested in strengthening our education system.

The amendment also has the dual benefit of making Federal programs work better for our schools while still leaving decisions to the States, school boards, and local officials to determine what is best for their schools.

This is a commonsense amendment. I truly hope we get a chance to debate it and to have an up-or-down vote on it.

Before I yield the floor, I would also like to point out—I know my colleague Senator WYDEN is well aware of this, as are Senator SHAHEEN, Senator PORTMAN, and Senator MURKOWSKI—that when we have schools that operate on an energy efficient basis, studies show our young people, our children learn more effectively because if you are in an environment that is comfortable, where the light is appropriate, where you can see, where you can take in what is being taught, you are, of course, going to have a better educational experience.

A better educated America means a stronger America, means a more productive America, a more competitive America. This has benefits across the board in every way imaginable—the broader effort that Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN brought forth but also that Senators WYDEN and MURKOWSKI are handling here on the floor of the Senate.

I wish to draw attention to this important amendment. I thank my colleague Senator COLLINS. I know she will be here later to talk about her perspectives and the other good work she is going to do when it comes to this important legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor of the Senate, I wish to commend my colleague from Colorado, Senator UDALL. This is a practical, commonsense amendment. There is no new expenditure of Federal funds. I am very pleased my colleague brought it to the floor. It is reflective of the approach we see in the Energy Committee in a host of areas where the Senator from Colorado consistently tries to find common ground and act in a bipartisan way.

One of the reasons I wanted to speak for just a minute is now we are seeing these bipartisan amendments are start-

ing to sort of pile up. That is because colleagues are listening to what folks at home are saying. They are saying to Senator UDALL and Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN and myself—Senator MURKOWSKI, they are saying when you all are back there in the fall: Try to find some ways to get things done. Get people to work together.

I think we all understand how important energy is—and energy security. It is about jobs. It is about a cleaner environment. It about productivity. When I look at the specifics of this amendment Senator UDALL and Senator COLLINS are pursuing, sometimes I think it is maybe too logical for the beltway. People say it makes too much sense. When schools do retrofits under the Collins-Udall amendment to become more energy efficient and use cleaner power, the kids come out winners, the environment comes out a winner, and the taxpayers come out winners. That is the whole reason the Federal Government provides assistance to schools for these types of projects in the first place.

It is an opportunity for the Federal Government to save money and ensure that we maximize educational opportunities for the kids. The reality is that Federal school efficiency programs are now strewn, really, all over the Federal Government. They are scattered among more than six different agencies. The States have all these different programs and incentives. What Senator COLLINS and Senator UDALL seek to do is to have a straightforward mechanism for improved Federal coordination. In the real world that means we are going to have more energy projects built, and it means more schools are going to save energy and money.

I would also note—because my friend Senator MURKOWSKI is here—that the Udall-Collins amendment pretty much tracks something we have been interested in. The committee has been looking at S. 1048, which was heard by the Energy Subcommittee on June 25.

Again, no authorization. The minimal costs are covered by existing DOE funds. I wish to commend the Senator from Colorado for his good work and particularly the bipartisan focus he has put on this and everything else that has to do with his Senate business. I hope we will be able to vote on it.

As this debate starts, I want colleagues to see that we are going to start stacking up good, commonsense, bipartisan amendments, and that is why there is so much value in energy efficiency.

Before Senator UDALL came to the floor, I said we all get worked up around here by saying we are for “all of the above” energy policy. It is almost obligatory for a Senator to say they are for “all of the above” three times every 10 or 15 minutes. A Senator can’t be for an “all of the above” energy policy unless they are for energy

efficiency, and Senator UDALL is bringing some of that sensible thinking to the schools.

I am looking forward to getting up this amendment so we can vote on it, and I commend Senator UDALL for his good work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I, too, wish to thank the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Maine for their leadership in this area. When we talk about being efficient, we think: OK. Let’s coordinate, collaborate, and cooperate so we do better with what it is we are utilizing.

I will give an example of how something such as this can make a difference in my State. I have noted before that our energy costs in Alaska are some of the highest in the Nation. Far too often our schools are in remote areas where basically they are not part of anybody’s grid. They are in communities that are diesel powered. It is a tough way to heat a community. Think about how expensive it then becomes for the schools. The school has to absorb these energy costs.

Where do these dollars come from? Effectively, they come out of the education budget, and the State does step in. The State provides substantial assistance, but anywhere, anytime or anyplace we can work together to, again, be more collaborative in our approach as to how we deal with our efficiency opportunities will ultimately help our schools.

This is going to help the schools whether they are in Maine or Alaska or Colorado. Why these places are all colder I am not sure, but maybe it forces us to be a little more efficient. Maybe it forces us to figure out ways to work together better. I want to make sure we are able to get the education dollars into the classroom and not basically fueling the boilers to keep the kids warm.

I applaud my colleagues in this effort. The goal to increase coordination and cooperation at Federal, State, and local agencies to be operating more efficiently and utilizing existing relationships is a positive.

Again, I commend my colleagues for their efforts in bringing us forward on this particular aspect of energy efficiency. I look forward to the opportunity where we will be able to show a good bipartisan vote on this amendment and on others.

I thank the Presiding Officer and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, first, I wish to congratulate the bill’s sponsors, Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, for crafting the underlying bipartisan, commonsense energy efficiency bill.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of their legislation, and I am pleased to see

that the bill is being considered and look forward to the debate on energy efficiency.

I would hope that as we consider amendments to this bill, we could consider amendments that relate to the issue of energy so we can make real progress and that we don't end up—as happened before the recess when I was managing a bill on the transportation and housing appropriations for the minority side—distracted on two issues that had nothing to do with the underlying bill, important though it was.

I am very pleased to join my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Colorado Mr. UDALL in sponsoring an amendment to help streamline the available Federal Energy Efficiency Financing Program to help improve the health and lower energy costs of our Nation's schools.

There are a number of Federal initiatives already available to schools to help them become more efficient. However, in many cases schools are not taking full advantage of these programs. I think this is particularly a problem in rural States such as Alaska or Maine, where the schools don't have the luxury of having grant writers who can spend all day searching for Federal funding that might allow them to upgrade their energy efficiency or reduce emissions from their energy systems.

Large urban schools may have the ability to hire those full-time grant writers, but I know in my State of Maine it is very difficult for schools to even become aware of these programs. One of the purposes of the amendment that Senator UDALL and I are offering is to help schools, regardless of their size, take advantage of existing programs.

I wish to stress that we are not creating a whole lot of new programs. All we are doing is providing a streamlined coordinating structure for schools to help them better navigate available Federal programs and financing options. I also wish to emphasize—particularly to my Republican colleagues—that our amendment still leaves all the decisions to the States, local school boards, and local officials about how best to meet the energy needs of their schools.

So what does our amendment do? Specifically, the amendment would establish the Department of Energy as the lead agency in coordinating a cross-developmental effort to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and retrofitting projects for our schools. It would also require a review of existing Federal programs and financing mechanisms, the formation of a streamlined process of communication and outreach to the States, local education agencies, and schools of these existing programs to make them more aware of their existence, and the development of a mechanism for Governors, State en-

ergy programs, and local educational and energy officials to form a peer-to-peer network to support the initiation of these projects.

Finally, the amendment would require the Department of Energy to provide technical assistance to help schools navigate the financing and development of these projects. Assisting our Nation's schools in navigating and tapping into existing Federal programs that will help them lower their energy usage and save the taxpayers' money at a time of very tight and constrained educational budgets simply makes good common sense.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Udall-Collins amendment numbered 1845. I thank not only the sponsors of the bill but the leaders of the energy committee, Senator WYDEN and Senator MURKOWSKI, for their help and assistance to us.

I hope we can start the debate on this bill on a positive note by adopting a bipartisan amendment that is going to help our schools save money, reduce energy costs, and also lower emissions. That is the way to start the debate on this bill.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senators COLLINS and UDALL for coming to the floor with their positive amendment, laying it out, and debating it. I encourage everyone with an interest in this bill—Democrats and Republicans—to do the same. Come to the floor, lay out amendments, and have that debate so we can move forward in a productive way as the first vote agreement is being worked on and finalized, and that is what I am going to proceed to do with regard to my amendment.

My amendment is not related to this bill, but I have to bring it up now because it is very time sensitive. It is about something that is very wrong, in my opinion, that is happening October 1.

Many of us in this Chamber, and certainly myself, regularly talk against the exemptions under ObamaCare that are created for the rich and powerful and politically connected. Many in this body, including myself, regularly talk about the abuses of this administration going beyond their legitimate authority and what is in the law. They are making up stuff through Executive orders, rulemaking, and Executive fiat. As I said, I am certainly in that group.

I believe an action was taken recently that is a horrible, dangerous, and offensive example of both of those things, and my amendment would correct that situation. I will back up and explain what I am talking about.

Right after all of Congress left for the August recess—a little over 1 month ago—the Office of Personnel

Management, part of the Obama administration, issued a draft rule. This draft rule was basically designed to take any of the sting of ObamaCare away for Washington insiders—specifically Members of Congress and congressional staff.

During the ObamaCare debate, we debated an amendment on the Senate floor, and it, to my pleasant surprise, was actually adopted. The amendment said that every Member of Congress and all congressional staff have to go to the exchange. They have to leave their very generous Federal employee health benefit coverage and go to the exchange. They have to go to the fallback position in terms of health care coverage that millions of Americans are dealing with and have to go to them right now or over the next several months. They have to live under those same rules and under those same circumstances of those tens of millions of Americans.

I supported that. I think it is important that the ruling elite, if you will, need to live under the same laws they created across the board. Specifically, under ObamaCare, I think it is very important that everybody in Congress and in Washington—and I think this should be expanded to the administration—live under the same system in terms of the exchange that many of those folks created.

That was the statute that was supposed to govern. After ObamaCare passed, to quote NANCY PELOSI, folks started looking and reading the bill to figure out what was in it. Lots of folks in Washington got very concerned once they read that revision and figured out what was in it. They understood it would create real dislocation and sting, not for America—although it does do that, but they were not concerned enough about that—but for Washington.

For months, many people lobbied the administration to try to get around this and make up some regulation that would take the sting out of that provision. After intense lobbying, sure enough, the Obama administration issued this rule—again, as I mentioned a minute ago—right after we left town and safely away at the start of the August recess.

The rule did a few things, all of which I think are beyond the law, contrary to law, and outrageous. First of all, it says the statute, which says all official staff of Members of Congress need to go to the exchanges—the first thing the rule says is we don't know what official staff means, so we are going to leave it up to each individual Member of Congress to decide if any member of their staff is official staff. So each Member of Congress can decide whether anybody on their staff has to go to the exchange at all. I think that is ludicrous on its face and completely contrary to the statute.

But then the second big thing the rule did is made, out of thin air, the rule that the present subsidy we get from the taxpayer for our present health care coverage is going to somehow miraculously turn into a subsidy on the exchange, which doesn't exist. It doesn't exist for us under the law; it doesn't exist for any American. So they made up out of thin air this rule that the taxpayer-funded subsidy would follow all of these folks—Members of Congress and the staff who are required to go there—to the exchange. Again, that is not in the law. That is contrary to the letter and spirit of this provision. There is a separate provision of ObamaCare that specifically says with regard to all individuals going to the exchange that when they do this, when they go to a plan on the exchange, they lose their employer-provided subsidy. So that is specific about the situation of folks going to the exchange and directly contrary to this law.

As I suggested at the beginning, I think this is a special exemption for Washington, a special bailout for Washington, to ensure Washington doesn't have to live by the same rules, in this case with regard to ObamaCare and the exchanges, that all of America does, and it is beyond the statute and it is beyond the President's constitutional authority. He can't make things up out of thin air. For that reason, I have joined with many colleagues to draft a bill which would make an amendment to this bill to propose that would fix that, and it is no Washington exemption from ObamaCare.

Specifically, the bill would do three things: First of all, it does away with this OPM rule and it clarifies that Members don't get to pick and choose who is official staff. Congressional staff is congressional staff.

Then it says, all Members of Congress, all congressional staff—and we expand it to the President and Vice President and all political appointees of the Obama administration—all of those folks have to go to the exchanges, the clear language of present law with regard to Members of Congress and their staff.

Finally, we fix the other part of this illegal rule. We say this subsidy Members of Congress and staff currently enjoy under their present health care coverage can't follow them to the exchange. That is not the case for any other American. That is not in the law. In fact, in ObamaCare, there is a broader provision completely contrary to that, so we say that cannot happen.

That is what our bill and our amendment is.

I think it is a fundamental, a threshold, and a very important rule of democracy that the governors have to live by the same laws they pass and impose on the governed. I think that should be the case across the board and

certainly that should be the case under ObamaCare.

Tens of millions of Americans are experiencing having to go to the exchanges. Many of them didn't want to go there. Many of them had good coverage with their employer that they are losing because of the economics of this new situation, and they are being forced to the exchange. The clear language and intent of that provision in ObamaCare was for Members of Congress and staff to have to experience the same thing, and that is the clear language and that is the clear intent. So we should live by that, not get around it. And, in my opinion, we should expand it to the President, who has volunteered to go to the exchange, to the Vice President, and to all of their political appointees. That is what our amendment does. That is what our bill does.

I wish to thank all of the Members, Senate and House, who were working hard on this proposal, including Senators ENZI, HELLER, JOHNSON, and many others. I know I am missing several. There are several House Members, led by Congressman RON DESANTIS of Florida, who are working on identical House language. They are hard at work, particularly in the context of the CR.

The bottom line is this: There should be no special Washington exemption from ObamaCare. All laws we pass should apply to us every bit as much as other Americans, and certainly we, as is the clear language and is the clear intent, should live under that fallback plan of the exchanges just as every other American does. No other American gets this special subsidy the OPM rule gives to us.

Folks in this class under my amendment and bill would be able to qualify for a subsidy, if it is the same subsidy that is available to other Americans, according to income category. So if a person qualifies by income, fine. But this is way beyond that. This is a special deal, a special exemption for Congress, and we need to say there should be no Washington exemption. This bill, this amendment does that clearly and categorically.

I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to support this.

Let me end by talking about a vote. I am bringing up this amendment on this bill. The reason is this issue is very time sensitive. This rule, which was made up out of thin air, in my opinion, goes into effect and all of this is set to happen October 1. So this debate has to happen, a change to this rule has to happen before October 1. That is why I am bringing it up now and demanding a vote. But, actually, that vote doesn't have to be on this bill. I will accept any fair, reasonable, substantive vote before October 1. But we need to lock that down. I think we are well on our way to locking that down, and I look forward to that.

In the meantime, let me again urge my colleagues who have amendments to this bill on the subject of energy or on any other subject to come down and present those on the floor, talk about them and debate them, as I have, as Senators UDALL and COLLINS have. Let's move forward with the process as we nail down this first vote agreement.

As we get to a vote on this amendment, I urge my colleagues to follow the first and, in many ways, most basic rule of democracy: that the rules we impose on the governed we should live by. That is absolutely essential. That should be the case across the board, certainly including ObamaCare, and in the case of ObamaCare, there is specific language which says that. That is what it says. That is what it is supposed to be about. This illegal OPM rule completely invalidates and gets around that rule, so we need to act to fix that now, well before October 1.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1847.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BENNET] proposes an amendment numbered 1847.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, as I made clear previously but I will restate, I objected to and I continue to object to laying aside any amendment and making another amendment pending. We made that clear between the floor staff of the minority and majority side. That was crystal clear, so I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are on the amendment from the Senator from Colorado.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the calling up of the amendment be vitiated out of respect for my colleague from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I wish to very briefly thank the Senator. That is a very generous and gentlemanly thing to do. This was the understanding between the floor staff. I know apparently it wasn't properly communicated to the Chair, but that was the clear understanding, and I appreciate that gesture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, through the Chair, I would say to the Senator

from Louisiana that my understanding was he would object. He was on the floor when I offered it and I thought he was going to object. So knowing of his objection, I withdraw the amendment.

Having said all of that, I think it is a shame that we can't get going with this bipartisan bill. I wish to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their incredibly great bipartisan work on this energy bill. I wish to thank Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN from New Hampshire and Senator PORTMAN from Ohio for the bipartisan work that has been going on for months, if not years, on this bill.

I am pleased to come to the floor—I wish to introduce my amendment but not today because of the objection, but to at least talk about a bipartisan amendment we would like to get on this bill. I wish to thank my colleague Senator AYOTTE for joining me in this important effort.

Our amendment is based on stand-alone legislation we have written called the Better Buildings Act, which encourages energy efficiency in commercial buildings. Over the last several years we worked with building owners across Colorado and the country to craft the legislation. The economic and environmental benefits of improving energy efficiency in buildings are clear.

A well-publicized retrofit of the Empire State Building in New York reduced energy usage by 38 percent—almost 40 percent—and it saved an estimated \$4.4 million annually for the building owner. The retrofit also created over 250 construction jobs right here in the United States that can't be sent overseas.

It is this example, and these ideas, that helped form the basis for the Better Buildings Act and this amendment.

In crafting the measure, we started to think about efficiency in buildings not only from the top down where a building owner makes the improvements, but also from the bottom up where a tenant would see advantages from designing and configuring their rented office space in an energy-efficient manner. With all of that in mind, the amendment we have introduced accomplishes two principal goals. First, it allows for a first-of-its-kind study by the Department of Energy to chronicle private sector best practices as tenants build out their lease spaces in commercial buildings. This study would then inform a voluntary Department of Energy program to recognize tenants, to acknowledge tenants that design and construct high-performance lease spaces in the future.

The second provision, called Tenant Star, would expand on the popular ENERGY STAR Program and make it available to tenants, not just landlords. Under our amendment, tenants will be recognized for the efficient performance of their leased office space. This will provide value to their cus-

tomers, their investors, and ultimately to the building owner.

The ENERGY STAR label has proven a very powerful tool to achieve whole building efficiency. Our language takes the next logical step and confers this recognition on tenants as well.

This bipartisan amendment is broadly supported—from the Alliance to Save Energy to the Real Estate Roundtable, to the Sierra Club. It also received a favorable hearing in the Senate Energy Committee in June, and I thank the chairman for that. The Congressional Budget Office has confirmed it has no score.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan and commonsense amendment. I hope we can get to the business of legislating around this incredibly important bipartisan bill.

With that, I thank the Presiding Officer for his patience, I yield the floor, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Colorado on a fine amendment. I hope we are going to get a chance to vote on it. I think he mentioned that commercial buildings consume almost half of the energy used in the United States.

What I think is important for the Senate to see is the bipartisan amendments are now piling up. We started off with a very good amendment, the Inhofe-Carper amendment in terms of thermal power, Senator UDALL and Senator COLLINS talking about retrofitting schools, getting more for the kids and for a better environment without spending new Federal money, and now we have the Bennet-Ayotte proposal to deal with commercial buildings consuming almost half of the energy consumed in the United States.

You have bipartisan amendments, I say to my colleagues, in effect, stacking up on the floor of the Senate. I think the reason that is the case is because Senators are coming back from the August break. They were home having community meetings and talking to folks, and people said—whether you are from Ohio, like the Presiding Officer, or Oregon or New Hampshire, different parts of the country—you go back there and find a way to deal with some real challenges, and do it in a bipartisan way. So that is what the underlying bill does. That is what the three amendments we seek to be able to vote on do.

In the case of this particular amendment, the voluntary ENERGY STAR Program has created an incentive for

commercial building owners to increase the efficiency of their buildings by recognizing the most efficient. So today there are over 20,000 commercial buildings in the country certified as highly efficient ENERGY STAR buildings.

The challenge, however, is that about half of the energy used in commercial buildings is under the control of the tenants, not the owners. This amendment would promote efficiency in commercial buildings by establishing a Tenant Star program to recognize the energy efficiency achievements of building tenants, as ENERGY STAR does for the owners.

We looked at this in the committee, particularly in the Energy Subcommittee on June 25. To me, again, trying to build on successful approaches is simply what the country wants us to be doing here in the Senate. It is the focus of the underlying bill. It is the focus of the amendments that are pending—each one of them supported in a bipartisan way.

This amendment, as far as I can tell, has a real cross section of businesses interested, for obvious reasons. It constitutes almost half the buildings in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of support we received be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 24, 2013.

Re Better Buildings Act (S. 1191—"Tenant Star").

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Chair, Committee on Energy & Natural Resources, U.S. Senate.

Hon. AL FRANKEN,
Chair, Subcommittee on Energy, U.S. Senate.

Hon. MICHAEL BENNET,
U.S. Senate.

Hon. LISA MURKOWSKI,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy & Natural Resources, U.S. Senate.

Hon. JIM RISCH,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Energy, U.S. Senate.

Hon. KELLY AYOTTE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATORS: We represent real estate owners, developers, building managers, energy service companies, efficiency financing sources, environmental and efficiency advocates, and other stakeholders who support market-based solutions to lower energy consumption in our built environment. As the Senate considers energy legislation, we support proposals that encourage cooperation by landlords and tenants in our nation's commercial buildings to save energy as leased spaces in these structures are designed, constructed, used, and occupied.

We thus commend Senators Bennet and Ayotte for introducing S. 1191, the "Better Buildings Act of 2013." The act takes a market-driven, voluntary, "best practices" approach to align building owners and their tenants to reduce demands on the energy grid. As this proposal fits within existing voluntary programs, it has no regulatory impact and does not require new appropriations.

To date, bills addressing energy efficiency have focused on how real estate owners and developers may lower energy consumption at the “whole-building” level. But in fact, owners and managers of large buildings control only about 50% of their structures’ total energy; tenants consume at least half. The Better Buildings Act takes a holistic approach by considering office tenants’ impact on energy consumption and behaviors. Notably, the act brings the voluntary ENERGY STAR rating for whole-buildings to the next level by authorizing a “Tenant Star” program to certify leased spaces in buildings as energy efficient. Considering the overwhelming success and private sector acceptance of ENERGY STAR for buildings—which are located in all 50 states, represent billions of square feet of commercial floorspace, and saved American businesses over \$2.7 billion in utility bills in 2012 alone—it is sound energy policy to evolve this program to the “Tenant Star” level of leased spaces.

We strongly support the Better Buildings Act and its “Tenant Star” provisions. We urge the Senate to enact S. 1191 whether on its own or as part of any energy package that may be put to a vote.

BETTER BUILDINGS ACT (S. 1191/H.R. 2126)—

“TENANT STAR” ENDORSERS

Alliance to Save Energy, American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, American Hotel & Lodging Association, American Institute of Architects, American Resort Development Association, American Society of Interior Designers (ASID), ASHRAE, Association of Energy Engineers (AEE), Bayer MaterialScience LLC, Boston Properties, Brandywine Realty Trust, Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) International, CBRE, Inc., CCIM Institute, Danfoss, EIFS Industry Members Association (EIMA), Empire State Building Company/Malkin Holdings, Energy Systems Group, First Potomac Realty Trust, Illuminating Engineering Society (IES).

Institute for Market Transformation, Institute of Real Estate Management, International Council of Shopping Centers, Johnson Controls, Inc., Jones Lang LaSalle, LBA Realty, LonMark International, Metrus Energy, Inc., NAIOP, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association, National Apartment Association, National Association of Energy Service Companies (NAESCO), National Association of Home Builders, National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, National Association of REALTORS®, National Association of State Energy Officials, National Electrical Manufacturers Association, National Fenestration Rating Council (NFRC), National Multi Housing Council, Natural Resources Defense Council.

OpenADR Alliance, Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors—National Association, Prologis, Inc., Real Estate Board of New York, Related Companies, Rising Realty Partners, Rudin Management Company, Inc., Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors National Association, Inc., Shorestein Properties LLC, Sierra Club, Spray Polyurethane Foam Alliance (SPFA), SUN DAY Campaign, The Real Estate Roundtable, The Stella Group, Ltd., Tishman Speyer, Transwestern, U.S. Green Building Council, USAA Real Estate Co., Vinyl Siding Institute, Vornado Realty Trust.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am going to stay here to see if other colleagues would like to bring over their amendments. As I indicated in opening comments a couple hours ago, I think

there are at least a dozen good amendments here—amendments that are going to be good for American productivity, they are going to create good-paying, high-skill jobs, and they are going to be winners for the environment. That is a trifecta of valuable concerns being addressed with one piece of legislation, being done in a bipartisan way.

I know the popular wisdom is you cannot thread the needle on legislation and that even on something such as energy efficiency, these folks are going to try to see if they can get their bipartisan amendments passed, but at the end of the day, the forces who want to block legislation, because they care about a particular issue, are too strong. I hope Senators are going to see we are going to make sure people have a chance to have their issues heard. But we also want them to see that to lose the ability to have a key part of an “all of the above” energy policy—I have said you cannot have an “all of the above” energy policy if you are not for energy efficiency. To not advance this particular cause—and we passed the hydropower bill. It is a good bill. People said it was the first major energy bill since 2009. This is the next logical step. We ought to take it.

I see the Senator from Ohio here, who has done so much good work, and I will yield at this time. I know he has a great interest in this topic. I hope, when we get a chance to vote on the Bennet-Ayotte amendment, Senators will support it.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I stand to strongly support this amendment. I think it is exactly as the chairman has suggested. It is bipartisan. It helps to solve a problem we have right now, and I applaud Senator BENNET who spoke earlier, and also Senator AYOTTE from New Hampshire, who has joined with him to take a lead on this. They have worked with us. They have, again, by this amendment, I believe, offered a good opportunity to improve the underlying legislation. I think it is consistent with the underlying legislation.

By the way, it is an amendment that makes sense because there is right now a disconnect between those who own commercial buildings and those who are tenants in those buildings. We have heard this around the country as we have talked about efficiency. It kind of gets the landlords and the tenants in sync with lowering energy costs. It is market driven. It is nonregulatory. It takes a “best practices” approach to address this issue.

Owners and managers of large commercial buildings report that their tenants consume over 50 percent of the total energy in the structure, but again there is this disconnect because owners

lease the space, but they do not pay the bills; therefore, there is often no motivation to cut energy costs by making the space more efficient. The owners do not have that incentive. The tenants do. They pay the bills. But they often have very limited choices in the design or the operation of the energy-consuming aspects of the structure they lease.

This is an attempt to address that issue, and I think it is a smart realistic approach. It encourages tenants to make structural investments when they enter into new leases or renew existing leases. The act asks the Department of Energy to study and learn from private sector “best practices” to achieve high-performance, cost-effective measures with viable payback periods on efficiency.

It also builds on the success of the voluntary ENERGY STAR Program that a lot of folks are familiar with and kind of moves ENERGY STAR into the tenant space, creating a tenant-oriented certification called Tenant Star for leased spaces, again, with the goal of transforming the way building owners and their tenants think about energy.

By the way, this legislation is supported by the Real Estate Roundtable, a group that has looked at this underlying legislation, this amendment, and thinks this helps them to accomplish some of their goals in energy efficiency. It is also supported by the Restaurant Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, and others.

So this better buildings amendment Senator AYOTTE and Senator BENNET have offered I think is strong. I wish they could have actually taken the amendment today off the calendar and actually been able to technically offer it. But we did have a good debate on it, and I am hoping soon we will be able to resolve these other issues and be able to move forward with an actual vote on this because this is a classical example of where we can come together as Republicans and Democrats, finding common ground on how to have a true “all of the above” energy strategy, not just produce more energy, which I strongly support, but also use the energy we have more efficiently.

Since buildings are about 40 percent of energy usage, this is very smart legislation, building on the other amendments we heard about today—on using geothermal, being sure it is part of renewable energy; ensuring that our schools have the best information to be able to become more energy efficient; and other amendments. Again, I count about a dozen of them here that are bipartisan amendments that we hope to have on the floor as part of this underlying bill to help create more jobs, have a cleaner environment, make us less dependent on foreign oil, and move forward on this important leg of our national energy strategy.

With that, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside, and I call up my amendment No. 1856.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I object on behalf of my colleague who has an arrangement with the majority staff on this on the basis of his interest in objecting until he gets a unanimous consent agreement that I think is being worked on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I would still like to talk about this amendment. And I want to thank both Senator WYDEN for working with us on this amendment and also Senator MURKOWSKI for working with us on this amendment. I appreciate their support.

This is an amendment Senator HOEVEN and I have submitted together. I will describe it to you because I think it is such a good amendment. We want to make sure we get moving on this very important bill that I support, as well as these amendments.

The Nonprofit Energy Efficiency Act would provide assistance to nonprofit organizations to help make the buildings they own and operate more energy efficient.

Nonprofit organizations are the heart of our country and serve millions of Americans every day. Nonprofits include hospitals, schools, houses of worship—particularly supportive of this amendment—and youth centers. They face the choice of making facility improvements or serving more people, which is also difficult for them.

That choice is clear for so many organizations. Nonprofits often operate in older, less efficient buildings, and because of their nonprofit status, they cannot participate in energy efficiency programs despite the financial benefits of energy efficiency retrofits and other improvements.

This amendment is about allowing the Department of Energy to make grants of up to \$200,000 for energy efficiency projects over the next 5 years. The amendment requires a 50-percent cost share and includes provisions to ensure that the projects achieve significant amounts of energy savings and are done in a cost-effective manner.

This amendment, the Klobuchar-Hoeven amendment, is fully offset. I appreciate the work of the committee and the committee staff on this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support the Nonprofit Energy Efficiency Act amendment.

Before I yield the floor, I again want to thank Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN for their tireless efforts to

move this important legislation forward. I believe energy efficiency is an area we can all agree is good for the economy, it is good for consumers, and it is an issue where we can find common ground, as you can see by the amendment I have done with Senator HOEVEN.

Senator HOEVEN from North Dakota knows a little bit about producing energy with their oil production, natural gas production, the biofuel production they share with Minnesota. We are some of the top biofuel producers in the country. But in our States we also believe in conserving energy and in energy efficiency. We believe this bill is a good bill and also that this amendment is a very good addition to the bill, as it allows nonprofits, such as places of worship, to also share in the energy efficiency program, and they are very interested in moving ahead with this amendment.

So I thank you. I thank the authors, and I thank the chair and the ranking member of the committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I want to commend Senator KLOBUCHAR on her efforts. This is another one of the great bipartisan amendments that has been worked on to add to this energy efficiency legislation. It shows how great the opportunity is for this legislation to provide for savings for people, to get people engaged in the idea of how much energy they are using and what the costs of that energy are, and also what the environmental benefits and the benefits to consumers and the benefits to our national security are in encouraging energy efficiency. So I want to commend her and thank her for all of her efforts, and we will continue to have this discussion on the floor as we wait for some kind of an agreement from Senator VITTER.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am very hopeful that when we get a chance to vote on this amendment the Senate accepts it. I want to put it in the context of where we are, because we are seeing this pattern of Senators—and I was in North Dakota for Senator HOEVEN a few days ago. We were listening to constituents, I am sure very similar to the kinds of concerns reflected by folks in Minnesota. They all were saying: Go back there in September and focus on real problems and come up with real solutions. We have seen all of this bickering. We have seen all of this quarreling. What we want to see is on the concerns that most affect us: our pocketbook, our environment, in this case national security.

Senator SHAHEEN made an excellent point several hours ago when she point-

ed out that with the backdrop of Syria and national security issues, if there ever was a time while we wait for the next step in this debate to look at another issue, energy and energy efficiency would be a logical one, because we all understand how inextricably linked national security and energy security are.

So, now, after we have had the thoughtful Inhofe-Carper amendment on thermal power, we had the Udall-Collins amendment in terms of school retrofits, we had the Bennet-Ayotte amendment which deals with commercial buildings, which comprise almost half of the energy used in America, we now have a very good bipartisan amendment brought to the floor of the Senate by the senior Senator from Minnesota, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and Senator HOEVEN.

There are literally hundreds of thousands of museums in this country, houses of worship, youth organizations. All of these programs are looking at ways in which they can save energy. The reality is lots of the tools are not available to them because they are tax exempt. So what we have here is a pilot project. Let me kind of underline. Everybody talks about big programs and their "one size fits all," they are "run from Washington" and it is kind of one dastardly plot after another from the Federal Government.

The Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Minnesota come and say they want to have a pilot project, a pilot project to award grants of up to \$200,000, with a match by the Federal Government, to make efficiency improvements to these buildings and these houses of worship, museums, all of these institutions that every Member of the Senate cares a great deal about.

I was especially appreciative, because Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator HOEVEN were supportive of some of the ideas Senator MURKOWSKI and I had to revise this. This is a good amendment. This is already the fourth in the queue of thoughtful, commonsense, low-cost proposals that have come to the floor of the Senate.

I hope my colleagues will shortly give us the opportunity to get to this bill. This is the Senate. Senators like to address a variety of issues. But the reality is, while we had a very good hydropower bill passed right before the August recess, 60,000 megawatts of hydropower, responsible for 60 percent of the clean energy in the country, this bill is the first major piece of energy legislation on the floor of the Senate since 2007. That is light years ago in terms of the dramatic changes we have made in so many reforms in other areas.

For example, I saw in North Dakota over this weekend dramatic changes in terms of natural gas policies. We have a host of issues to talk about there. We

are ready to go on energy efficiency. So I am very appreciative to the Senator from Minnesota who has been working with the Senator from North Dakota.

I would like to see somebody explain to houses of worship and museums and youth organizations why it does not make sense to start a pilot project so they can squeeze more value out of the scarce dollars they have for running their incredibly valuable programs. I do not think any Member of the Senate, Democrat or Republican, can make the case that that makes any sense. I appreciate the Senator from Minnesota coming over. I am prepared to stay here until all hours so Senators who are willing to do what we heard all summer the American people want us to do, which is to address real issues, do it in a bipartisan way. I hope other Senators will come over and approach this the way the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from North Dakota have done.

I thank my colleague.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I think the chairman outlined it well. This is a thoughtful amendment to the underlying bill. Senator SHAHEEN and I are delighted to accept it and support it, but also to say this sort of fits a part of the overall energy efficiency effort we did not cover in the legislation, which is these nongovernmental organizations that own buildings, where they do not have the ability to get the kind of market-based support that is in our legislation.

This is faith-based organizations, but it is also Boys and Girls Clubs, and it is all kinds of different groups that are interested in doing efficiency retrofits. They need a little help. This gives them a match.

Significantly, what maybe we have not focused on earlier is the fact it is paid for. So we are not talking about any impact on the deficit. It is deficit neutral because they went out of their way to try to find good ways to reduce spending at the Department of Energy to have the offsets.

Having a local match is important because that gets the local buy-in. I think that is important, that it be a full match. But it also does give them access to some of this expertise we talked about earlier to be able to have more energy efficiency and also ultimately to save energy in this country but also save money for those non-profit organizations. So I commend my colleagues, Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator HOEVEN. Senator HOEVEN wants to come over and speak on this legislation. He is tied up right now but hopes to come over later. Certainly when it is actually offered and brought up on the floor he will have a chance to talk about it as well.

I commend him and commend his colleague from Minnesota for again of-

fering another bipartisan amendment on top of the geothermal amendment, the schools amendment, the amendment to encourage tenants to be more energy efficient, and now we have this amendment on nonprofits that own buildings that want to do the efficiency retrofits. I appreciate them working with us to find offsets and being sure it does not add to the deficit and that it is a responsible approach on the fiscal side as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I cannot help but join the bouquet tossing that is going on here today, about not only the amendment Senator HOEVEN and Senator KLOBUCHAR have introduced as it relates to our nonprofits, but again the other measures that have been brought up for discussion here this afternoon—geothermal, school efficiency. It really does drive us to the point of this energy efficiency legislation, how it is not just in one section or sector, it is economywide. It is all aspects of our lives.

If we focus on how we live from day to day, the things that are important to us, we can incorporate greater efficiency into all aspects of it and we are better off, whether it is through our schools, our businesses, our government buildings, or through those nonprofits I think we all recognize give so much enrichment to our general lives. But when you think about some of the struggles our nonprofits are currently facing right now, as they are seeing declining budgets, Federal, local, State levels, they are looking to squeeze as much as they can out of every dollar. So when you have proposals such as we have here with pilot programs to award these grants of up to \$200,000 to help make these efficiency improvements to their buildings, this is significant stuff, if you will. This translates into real dollars, allowing them to do what it is they are providing so much better, whether it is Boys and Girls Clubs at a clubhouse, the ability to perhaps have other facilities, whether it is your church facilities, your faith-based organization, the outreach and all they are able to do and those they are able to serve. It is all made better when you do not have to spend as much for your energy costs to meet your energy demands. So it does seem somewhat common sense. It does seem rational and reasonable.

Good heavens, what are we doing here on the floor of the Senate promoting something that is rational and reasonable and common sense? We need to do more of this. This is a good amendment and joins several other good amendments we are seeing as we look to the numerous amendments we talked to colleagues about and that we are anticipating will be up here in the next several hours.

I do hope folks realize that what has been put together by the sponsors of this bill, the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from New Hampshire, is worthy of our consideration, not only on these amendments, but, again, the fuller spectrum of how we are more wise in our energy consumption, how we are better stewards of that which we have when it comes to energy and our energy resources. So I will throw the bouquet to those who have got us to this point.

I see the Senator from Wyoming has joined us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I filed an amendment to S. 1392 that will prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from a massive regulatory overreach. It has been cosponsored by Senators BARRASSO and FLAKE.

My amendment is simple and straightforward. It promotes the right of a State to deal with its own problems. It returns the regulation of regional haze to where it properly belongs, in the hands of State officials who are more familiar with the problem and the best ways to address it.

I hope my colleagues will support my effort.

The Environmental Protection Agency's move to partially disapprove the State of Wyoming regional haze plan will create an economic and bureaucratic nightmare that will have a devastating impact on western economies. The proposal by EPA ignores more than a decade's worth of work on this subject by officials in my home State and seems to be more designed to regulate coal out of existence than to regulate haze. The haze we most need to regulate, in fact, seems to be the one that is clouding the vision of the EPA, as it promotes a plan that imposes onerous regulations on powerplants, that will, in turn, pass those increased costs in the form of higher energy prices on to consumers.

That tells me the EPA's purpose is to ensure no opportunity to impose its chosen agenda on the Nation is wasted. It does not seem to matter to them that their proposed rule flies directly in the face of the States' traditional and legal role in addressing air quality issues.

When Congress passed the 1977 amendments to the Clean Air Act to regulate regional haze, it very clearly gave the States the lead authority. Now the EPA has tossed them in the back seat and grabbed the steering wheel to head this effort in its own previously determined direction.

That is not the kind of teamwork and cooperation Congress intended. The goal of regulating regional haze is to improve visibility in our national parks and wilderness areas. The stated legislative purpose for the authority is

purely for aesthetic value and not to regulate public health. Most importantly, the EPA should not be using regulations to pick winners and losers in our national energy market. This is a State issue. Congress recognized that States should know how to determine what the best regulatory approach would be to find and implement a solution to the problem.

The courts reaffirmed this position by ruling in favor of the State's primacy on regional haze several times. Unfortunately, that is not what happened in this case. The EPA ignored all of the clear precedents and instead handed a top-down approach that ignored the will and expertise of the State of Wyoming.

This inexplicable position flies in the face of the strong and commonsense approach of the State of Wyoming to addressing regional haze in a reasonable and cost-effective manner. The EPA's approach would be much more costly, and it would have a tremendous impact on the economy and quality of life not only in Wyoming but in the neighboring States as well. Clearly, we can't allow this to happen.

Preliminary estimates by the State of Wyoming show that the best available retrofit technologies and long-term strategies under the proposed rule would cost well over \$1 billion—plus millions more every year in additional operational costs that gets passed on to the consumer.

I mentioned that Cheyenne needed some additional powerplants. They went out and found the best natural gas technology available and then found it wouldn't meet the new requirements. This is the best worldwide technology, and it won't meet the new requirements they wish to put on it. Again, those costs would be passed on to the consumers in the form of higher energy prices. Every family knows that when the price of energy goes up, it is their economic security, as well as their hopes and dreams for the future, that is threatened and all too often destroyed.

The EPA's determination to take such an approach would be understandable if it would create better results than the State plan. It doesn't. It admits that. One billion dollars in costs and then millions more each year, and it isn't going to give any better results than what the State plan is? What sense does that make? This is another reason why it makes no sense for the EPA to overstep its authority under the Clean Air Act to force Wyoming to comply with an all-too-costly plan that in the end will provide the people of Wyoming with no real benefits. Again, it is \$1 billion up front, millions a year, and no real benefits.

The plan doesn't even take into account other sources of haze in the State, such as wildfires. We have those every year. They are a problem on Wy-

oming's plains and mountains. They are a major cause of haze in my home State. It makes no sense for the EPA to draft a plan that fails to take into consideration one of the biggest natural causes of the very problem they are supposed to be solving.

This is one that can be solved. The State of Wyoming has spent over a decade producing a plan that is reasonable, productive, cost-effective, and focused on the problem. The EPA has taken an unnecessary and unreasonable approach that violates the legislatively granted job of State regulators to address this issue. We cannot afford to increase the cost of energy to families, schools, and vital public services by implementing an EPA plan that won't adequately address the issue of regional haze. Again, there will be no noticeable effect—\$1 billion up front, millions each year, and no noticeable effect. What sense does that make?

I know my colleagues will see the importance of this matter and support my amendment that will stop the EPA in its tracks and end its interference with Wyoming's efforts to address this very issue. It only makes sense to me that Wyoming's plan, which results from a more than 10-year effort, be given a chance to work. It is not only fair, it is the right thing to do.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here on what we are calling the Shaheen-Portman bill, the energy efficiency bill, and I note that the lead sponsor of the bill, Senator SHAHEEN of New Hampshire, as well as the ranking member of the energy committee, Senator MURKOWSKI, are both here. I have been cleared by them to take a minute on the floor right now and talk about an amendment I would like to have offered and voted on and added to this bill. We call it the pay for success amendment. It is amendment No. 1852.

What this amendment would do is something that is quite simple and bombproof for taxpayers. Ultimately, it would save money and save energy; that is, for the properties managed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, if they do not have the capital to go back into that property and do retrofits and install efficiency measures that will bring down their cost of electricity, this amendment would allow them to contract with the private sector to bring in private capital to achieve those energy savings.

There are significant restrictions in here that will protect taxpayers. Any

money that goes back to these investors comes out of energy savings and only out of energy savings. If something goes wrong and the energy savings don't materialize, the investors lose. The taxpayers and the government are held harmless.

Thanks to an amendment by Senator COBURN of Oklahoma, as we were drafting the amendment, we have even specifically exempted the administrative costs of HUD in administering the legislation. Those have to be paid before the investors take their profits. But once the investors are paid back, there is now a more efficient building and savings for taxpayers over the long haul.

In addition, the result is a reduction of our energy footprint, increases our energy independence, and reduces the contribution of ill effects, such as pollution and climate change, by HUD buildings.

Now is not the time to call it up—we are at too early a stage in the proceedings—but I did want to take a moment to urge my colleagues to support this amendment. We discussed it at length with Senator COLLINS of Maine when we were trying to add it to the Transportation and HUD appropriations bill, and I believe we have worked through issues presented by her office and issues presented by Senator COBURN. If anybody else has any concerns, we look forward to hearing from them, but I think this is a bombproof piece of legislation, from the taxpayers' point of view. It opens up a niche for private capital to come in and earn a return on their investment by capitalizing on the opportunity we have for energy savings in these buildings.

With that, I yield the floor and look forward to a future opportunity to discuss the amendment further and, with any luck, call it up for a positive vote. I thank Senator SHAHEEN and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Before the Senator from Rhode Island leaves, I wanted to commend him for this effort. I think it is a great proposal. I haven't had a chance to look at all the details, so I look forward to that, but using performance contracting to provide for savings on energy costs is a very effective way to address the upfront costs for these kinds of retrofits.

As the Senator points out, the person who is doing the contracting—the private company—is assuming the burden of those costs. Yet the benefits are going to taxpayers. Ultimately, the contractor that does the retrofits is also going to benefit over the long term, and those savings will keep coming back year after year. So once the initial cost is paid off, taxpayers will continue to get those savings year after year.

As Governor, we started retrofitting State buildings exactly this way, and it saved the taxpayers of New Hampshire hundreds of thousands of dollars a year—it is still saving them that—and also thousands of pounds of pollution because, as we know, 40 percent of our energy is used by buildings. So if we save on that energy use in buildings, then that saves not only on those costs, but it also saves on the pollution that comes from heating and cooling those buildings.

So I commend the Senator for his effort and I look forward to having a chance to debate it on the floor and to having a chance to review the proposal in greater detail.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for those comments. I wish to commend her for her leadership on this bill. This is a wonderful bill to have gotten to, and she and Senator PORTMAN have put in an enormous amount of effort in getting us here. So that is immensely commendable.

I would add something I omitted in my remarks earlier because the Senator from New Hampshire brought this up in a private discussion we had on the floor a moment ago; that is, how does CBO—the Congressional Budget Office—feel about this amendment. We have an e-mail from the Congressional Budget Office saying this will not add to the deficit. It is deficit neutral. In point of fact, it actually is viewed as negative—it shrinks the deficit in the long haul, but all we needed from them was the assurance it was deficit neutral and they would treat it as deficit neutral.

As the Senator from New Hampshire very properly pointed out, the benefit of this isn't just on the energy side or on the pollution side. Somebody goes in and installs the new energy efficiency equipment, installs the new windows, insulates the roof, and does whatever it is that will achieve these savings and that is work and those are jobs and that is helpful to our economy.

I will again yield the floor.

VOLUNTARY CERTIFICATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss the Sessions-Pryor Amendment No. 1879 to S. 1392, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act. I would like to recognize the excellent work of my friend, the senior Senator from Arkansas, Mr. PRYOR, who is an original co-sponsor of this amendment, and I would ask him for permission to engage in a brief colloquy concerning our amendment.

Mr. PRYOR. I would welcome an exchange for the RECORD.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank my colleague for his willingness to discuss this amendment. I would ask my colleague, what is the purpose of our amendment?

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his question. In an

effort to encourage energy efficiency compliance, reduce regulatory burdens, and save taxpayer dollars, the Sessions-Pryor amendment would require the Department of Energy to recognize voluntary certification programs for air conditioning, furnace, boiler, heat pump, and water heater products. Federal law requires these heating, cooling, and water heater products to comply with a complex set of Federal energy conservation and efficiency standards. Similar specifications apply to participants in the Energy Star program. The Energy Department currently spends millions of taxpayer dollars annually to conduct verification testing of these covered products. At the same time, U.S. manufacturers of these covered products spend millions of dollars themselves to participate in comprehensive voluntary certification programs that use independent, third-party laboratories to ensure compliance with applicable standards. Our amendment would require the Energy Department, when conducting routine testing to verify product ratings, to rely on data submitted through voluntary, independent certification programs that meet the robust list of criteria set forth in the amendment. To qualify, the voluntary certification program must be (among other things) nationally-recognized, maintain a publicly available list of certified models, and conduct verification testing on at least 20 percent of the product families using an "independent third-party test laboratory." The amendment would require the Energy Department to reduce regulatory burdens for manufacturers participating in a voluntary certification program, as well as require testing of products that are not covered by a voluntary program.

So, I greatly appreciate the leadership of my colleague Senator SESSIONS on this amendment. I would ask him: what are some of the policy reasons for supporting our amendment?

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. Our amendment is sound policy for at least three reasons. First, the amendment saves taxpayer dollars by reducing redundant testing of products when already covered by a comprehensive, voluntary third-party testing program. At a time of record debt and deficits, this government needs to consider every option for making government lean and fiscally responsible. We have been informed by the Congressional Budget Office that our amendment does not impact the deficit.

Second, the amendment reduces regulatory burdens on American manufacturers. We need to do all we can to help make U.S. manufacturing more competitive on the world stage. Our amendment promotes domestic manufacturing and competitiveness.

Third, our amendment increases DOE's enforcement capabilities to en-

sure that a greater number of products are verified every year. This will help achieve the kinds of energy efficiency improvements the law was intended to achieve. So I think this amendment should garner the support of this body.

I recently received a letter from Rheem Manufacturing Company, which has a large manufacturing facility in Montgomery, AL that employs over 1,000 people and manufactures heating and cooling products in Fort Smith, AR. The Rheem letter expresses support for our amendment and explains that it "will enhance our ability to sustain American manufacturing jobs and competitiveness while conserving taxpayer resources and allowing federal agencies to focus enforcement on entities that do not voluntarily participate in rigorous industry-led efficiency certification programs."

I would, in turn, ask Senator PRYOR: who else is supportive of this amendment?

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his remarks. I would answer his question by noting that a broad coalition of industry, energy efficiency, and environmental stakeholders are supportive of our amendment. As you referenced, employers in the State of Arkansas, your State of Alabama, and around the country are supportive. We are also pleased to have the support of the leadership of the Senate Energy Committee, Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI. I am pleased that we have been able to work together on this amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would ask Senator PRYOR one additional question. One of the purposes of this amendment is to reduce the testing burden on manufacturers for a number of Federal government programs. For instance, manufacturers who utilize accredited, independent third parties for testing and certification should not be compelled to undertake duplicative testing to demonstrate compliance with other Federal programs so long as the test methods used for evaluating product performance are the same. Additionally, this amendment does not intend to limit competition between private sector testing and certification programs, provided that accreditation and other legitimate government requirements for recognizing such efforts are clearly defined. Would you agree?

Mr. PRYOR. Yes, I would agree with that characterization.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank Senator PRYOR for his work on this issue.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JESSE OWENS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to honor the memory of Jesse Owens, an

Olympic recordbreaker and pioneer on the track and off the track, who was born 100 years ago tomorrow.

Born in Alabama as the youngest of 10 children, James Cleveland Owens moved with his family to Cleveland, OH, at the age of 9. Leaving the South during the great migration of those several decades between 1910 and 1970, Jesse's family came north seeking economic opportunity and greater personal freedom. His father left his work as a sharecropper in the South—something difficult to do because so often the landowner held those sharecroppers by holding real or imagined debt over their heads—and found a job in the steel industry in Cleveland, OH.

James Cleveland Owens enrolled in Bolton Elementary School on the east side of Cleveland. Because of his strong southern accent, when the teacher asked his name and he said J.C., the teacher misheard it and started calling him Jesse—a name that stuck.

While in junior high, he met Charles Riley, who taught physical education and coached the track team. Charles Riley nurtured Jesse's obvious talent, helping him to grow stronger athletically and to set long-term goals that served him well as he went on to Cleveland East Technical School.

In 1927, my hometown of Mansfield, OH started hosting the storied Mansfield Relays—maybe the biggest in the country—a sporting event that drew athletes from six States and Canada. I remember in the 1960s my family hosting many of the athletes who came to our town to compete.

Obviously prior to my parents doing that, among these many promising athletes none shone brighter than the sprinter from an hour up north. At the Mansfield Relays, Jesse Owens sharpened his focus and won the 1932 and 1933 relays for East Tech, setting records that lasted into my childhood in the 1960s and 1970s.

He later went on to attend the Ohio State University, where he was known as the Buckeye Bullet, winning a record eight individual NCAA championships. The story goes that at the Big 10 track meet 1 year in Ann Arbor, MI, while competing in a 45-minute period, Jesse Owens set 3 world records.

We are used to seeing college athletes who are revered today. But in his day, Owens could not live on campus due to a lack of housing for Black students, and he could not stay at the same hotels when his track team traveled or eat at the same restaurants as the White players on the team who traveled with him. But he achieved global fame and heroism status because of what he did in the 1936 Olympics in Berlin.

While a hateful regime in Germany hoped to use the Olympics to promote the Aryan race and promulgate a wrongheaded, dangerous, and inherently racist belief in the superiority of

that race, Jesse Owens turned this theory on its head. He won four gold medals in Berlin, and he set world records in three events while tying for a world record in a fourth event. He showed that talent and sportsmanship transcend race, and he embarrassed an evil dictator who hoped to manipulate the Olympic Games to further his political agenda.

Interestingly, Adolph Hitler refused to shake hands with Jesse Owens when he won one of those events. The International Olympic Committee told the German Government that Hitler must either shake hands with all the winners or none of the winners. The story goes that Hitler refused to come back and observe the Olympics—again, a testament to the heroism, courage, and discipline of James Cleveland “Jesse” Owens.

Despite these achievements—and the Rose Garden and Oval Office greetings that today's Olympians are accustomed to—Jesse Owens never received congratulations or recognition by President Roosevelt or President Truman. It was only during the presidency of Dwight Eisenhower, beginning to be a different time in race relations in this country, that a President of the United States actually recognized Jesse Owens' achievements.

He was, by most measures, the best athlete in the world, but he returned to the United States of America a Black man in the 1930s to face economic challenges and racial discrimination that are far too familiar to far too many Americans. But he continued to travel and inspire athletes and fans across the globe. I had the honor of meeting Jesse Owens when he was the speaker at my brother Bob's high school graduation in 1965, when I was 12 years old.

Jesse Owens worked alongside the State Department to promote good will in Asia, and worked in 1950 to promote democracy abroad as part of a Cold War effort.

Think about that. A Black man who is the best athlete in the world, was a hero to large numbers of Americans—Black and White—in 1936, standing up in many ways against the Fascist machine of Adolph Hitler, not being recognized by a President of the United States who was winning a war against Hitler ultimately. Yet he went out 5 years later after that war to promote democracy abroad as part of a Cold War effort, still proud of his country, still knowing our country had work to do.

In 1973 he was appointed to the board of directors of the U.S. Olympic Committee, where he worked to ensure the best training and conditions for U.S. athletes. He lent his skill and his talents to various charitable groups, notably the Boys Club of America.

In 1976 Jesse Owens finally received the Presidential recognition he deserved. He was presented with the Presi-

dential Medal of Freedom from President Ford.

Jesse Owens was a pioneer. Despite facing adversity, he had the strength of mind and the discipline, common to almost all great athletes, to become the most elite of athletes. Despite being treated differently and shamefully from other athletes of his stature, he went on to shatter records. Despite the darkest of days globally, he did his part, standing up to fascism, dispelling racism, and promoting unity.

Tomorrow we celebrate the 100th birthday of a hero to all Americans, James Cleveland “Jesse” Owens.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business until 7 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed as in morning business for up to 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SYRIA

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the decision on whether to authorize the President of the United States to use the military might of our great Nation against another country is the most significant vote a Senator can cast. The Constitution vests this responsibility in Congress—a duty that rests heavily on the shoulders of each and every Member.

We are now engaged in a serious debate about what the appropriate response should be to the horrific use of chemical weapons by the regime of Syrian President Asad who killed his own people using chemical weapons on August 21. This was not the first use of chemical weapons by President Asad.

He launched several smaller scale attacks, murdering his citizens, and, notably, many, if not all, of those attacks occurred after the President drew his redline a year ago. But it was not until the large-scale August 21 attack of this year, which resulted in the deaths of approximately 1,400 people, that President Obama decided a military strike against Syria was warranted. The fact is Asad violated the international convention prohibiting the use of chemical weapons and crossed President Obama's redline many times during the past year.

Deciding whether to grant the President this authority is a very difficult decision. I have participated in numerous discussions with the President, the Vice President, and experts in and out of government. I have attended many classified briefings as a member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and I have carefully weighed the assessments of the intelligence community and military and State Department officials. My constituents have also provided me with valuable insights that have helped to guide my decision. After much deliberation and thought, I have decided I cannot support the resolution that was approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week.

One of the criteria for the use of military force is surely whether the adversary poses an imminent threat to the American people. More than once President Obama has stated Syria's chemical weapons and delivery systems do not pose a direct imminent threat to the United States. Neither the United States nor any of our allies have been attacked with chemical weapons. Instead, President Obama justifies the attack he is proposing as a response to the violation of international norms, despite the fact that we currently lack international partners to enforce the Convention on Chemical Weapons through military means.

Although the term "limited air strikes" sounds less threatening, the fact is even limited air strikes constitute an act of war. If bombs were dropped from the air or cruise missiles were launched into an American city, we would certainly consider that to be an act of war, and that is why this decision is fraught with consequences.

American military strikes against the Asad regime, in my judgment, risk entangling the United States in the middle of a protracted, dangerous, and ugly civil war. GEN Martin Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has warned us that the use of U.S. military force "cannot resolve the underlying and historic ethnic, religious, and tribal issues that are fueling this conflict."

The introduction of American Armed Forces into this violent conflict could escalate to the point where we are per-

ceived to be, or actually are, involved in a Syrian civil war or a proxy war with Hezbollah or Iran.

In this complex conflict, it is also becoming increasingly difficult to sort out the good guys from the bad. There is no doubt that Asad is a brutal, ruthless dictator who murders his own citizens and who is supported by thousands of Hezbollah terrorist fighters. The opposition, however, is not pure. It has now been infiltrated by not one but two affiliates of Al Qaeda as well as by criminal gangs. Caught in the middle are millions of Syrians who simply want to lead peaceful lives. The tragic result has been more than 100,000 people killed, 4 million displaced internally, and 2 million refugees.

We do not know how Asad or his allies would respond to a U.S. military attack, but an asymmetric attack by Hezbollah aimed at one of our bases or at other American interests abroad certainly is one potential response. My concern is that reprisals, followed by subsequent retaliations, followed by still more reprisals could lead to an escalation of violence which never was intended by the President but which may well be the result of the first strike.

I have raised this issue directly with administration officials since the "one and done" strike, as retired GEN Michael Hayden puts it, may well not work. I have asked the administration what they would do if Asad waits until the 91st day, when the authorization for the use of military force expires, and then conducts an attack using chemical weapons that kills a much smaller number of people. What will we do then? In each case where I have raised this question, I have been told that we would likely launch another military strike.

In addition to my concern about being dragged into the Syrian civil war, I question whether the proposed military response would be more effective in achieving the goal of eliminating Asad's stockpile of chemical weapons than a diplomatic approach would be.

Let's be clear. The strikes proposed by the President would not eliminate Asad's chemical weapons, nor his means of delivering them. In the President's own words, the purpose of these strikes is "to degrade Asad's capabilities to deliver chemical weapons." Indeed, you will not find any military or intelligence official who believes that the strike contemplated by the administration would eliminate Syria's chemical weapons stockpile or all of the delivery systems. General Dempsey wrote to Armed Services Committee Chairman CARL LEVIN that even if an explicit military mission to secure Syria's chemical weapons were undertaken, it would result in the control of "some, but not all" chemical weapons in Syria, and that is not what is being

discussed because that would undoubtedly involve boots on the ground.

According to the President, the purpose of his more narrow objective is to deliver a calculated message to convince Asad not to use his remaining chemical weapons and delivery systems ever again. But would such a strike be effective in preventing Asad from using these weapons again on a small scale after he has absorbed the strike just to deliver his own message that he retains the capability to do so? Asad would retain a sufficient quantity of chemical weapons, and he knows that we did not respond to smaller chemical weapons attacks that he undertook before the August 21, 2013, event.

So on the one hand, the President is seeking to conduct a precision military strike that is sufficient to deter Asad from using any chemical weapons again. On the other hand, he wants to narrow the scope of a military strike so that Asad does not perceive this act of war as a threat to his regime. Yet the President has previously stated that U.S. policy is the removal of Asad.

While administration officials have gone out of their way to state that the military strikes are only to deter and degrade Asad's chemical weapons use and are not intended to pick sides in the civil war, the text of the resolution before us is at odds with the administration's representations. The text states that it is the policy of the United States to "change the momentum on the battlefield in Syria so as to create favorable conditions for a negotiated settlement that ends the conflict and leads to a democratic government in Syria." Well, no one could ever consider the Asad dictatorship to be a democratic government in Syria.

Furthermore, on September 3 Secretary of State John Kerry testified that "it is not insignificant that to deprive [Asad] of the capacity to use chemical weapons or to degrade the capacity to use those chemical weapons actually deprives him of a lethal weapon in this ongoing civil war, and that has an impact."

That is a very mixed message from this administration about the purpose of these strikes.

All of us want to see a peaceful Syria, no longer led by Asad, nor controlled by the radical Islamic extremists who are part of his opposition. But is military action that could well get us involved in Syria's civil war the right answer?

When I think about the proper response to Asad's abhorrent use of chemical weapons, I am mindful of the suffering and death that has occurred as well as the international conventions banning chemical weapons. Since this is an international norm, however, where are our international partners—the United Nations, NATO, the Arab League?

I have grave reservations about undertaking an act of war to enforce an

international convention without the international support we have previously had when undertaking similar action in the past, such as in Kosovo, Afghanistan, and even Iraq. While NATO's Secretary General has expressed support for consequences, NATO's North Atlantic Council, which is the body that approves military action for NATO, has not approved this military action. The Arab League has condemned with words the use of chemical weapons, but there is yet to be any Arab League statement that explicitly endorses military action or promises to be engaged in that action. Even our ally who has been most supportive, France, has asked for a delay to allow the U.N. inspectors to deliver their report next week.

Let me add that I believe that report early next week will verify that it was the Asad regime that used sarin gas. That is my expectation.

A military strike may well enforce the international norm with respect to chemical weapons, but at the same time it would weaken the international norm of limiting military action to instances of self-defense or those cases where we have the support of the international community or at least our allies in NATO or the Arab League.

In addressing this difficult and tragic crisis in Syria, the administration initially presented us with only two choices: Take military action or make no response at all. I reject and have rejected from the start the notion that the United States has only two choices—undertaking an act of war or doing nothing in response to President Asad's attack on his citizens. There are a variety of nonmilitary responses to consider that may well be more effective. The most promising of these options, proposed by the Russians—one of Asad's strongest allies—would place Syria's chemical weapons stockpile in the custody of the international community before they would ultimately be destroyed.

I am not naive about "trusting" the Russians. My point is that this option may well be in Russia's own interests, would be more effective in securing the stockpile of chemical weapons in Syria, and would involve the international community. This diplomatic alternative would put Syria's chemical weapons under verified international control and would once and for all prevent Asad or anyone else in Syria from using those weapons. A risk of attacking Asad's facilities is that the chemical weapons could fall into the hands of terrorist elements in the country. That risk would be eliminated if the weapons were removed completely from Syria.

One of the arguments advanced by proponents of the authorization for the use of military force resolution is that America's credibility is on the line. This is a legitimate concern. To be

sure, it was unfortunate that the President drew a line in the sand without first having a well-vetted plan, consulting with Congress, and obtaining the necessary support for doing so. I would maintain, however, that the credibility of our great Nation is beyond that of just one statement by the President, even in his important capacity as Commander in Chief. The credibility of the United States is backed by a military that is the most advanced and capable in the world. The strength of our military sends the clear, unmistakable message that the United States is capable of exerting overwhelming force whenever we decide it is the right thing to do and it is necessary to do so. It would be a mistake for our adversaries to interpret a single vote regarding a military response to Syria's chemical weapons program as having ramifications for our willingness to use force when our country or our allies face direct imminent threats, especially with regard to the proliferation of nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missile capabilities.

At the very least we have an obligation to pursue all nonmilitary options that may well be more effective in preventing the future use of Asad's chemical weapons than the military option the President has proposed to undertake.

For these reasons, should the authorization for the use of military force approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee come to the Senate floor, I shall cast my vote in opposition.

My hope, however, is that the negotiations underway with the Russians will pave the way for the removal of chemical stockpiles from Syria and for their verified ultimate destruction. That is the best outcome for this crisis. That would lead to a safer world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I understand that Members can speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

WRDA

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to speak about an issue completely separated from the international concerns we all share because closer to home there was an action taken today by the House of Representatives that has me extremely concerned as the senior Senator from Louisiana and a leader in our delegation and is an issue I have worked on literally since the first day I came to the Senate now almost 17 years ago.

Today, the House of Representatives, unfortunately, in presenting their WRDA bill, which was a bill that was negotiated at great length with great skill by Senator BARBARA BOXER, the

chair of the committee of jurisdiction, and the ranking member, Senator VITTER, who did an outstanding job for the country and for Louisiana, negotiated quite skillfully a bill that was very balanced.

It contained no earmarks, as have been eliminated by the majority of the Congress. It did give a green light for projects that had received a positive Chief's report, which is the signal to go forward with the project for flood protection or navigation or dredging under the jurisdictions of the Corps of Engineers.

Unfortunately, for unexplained public reasons today, which we will find out as soon as we can and report, the House of Representatives, the leadership, decided to drop probably the most important project in the bill for Louisiana, and that project is Morganza to the Gulf. The saddest part about all of this, the House removing this project, this project has already been authorized three times in the last 15 years by the Senate and twice by the House of Representatives.

The people who would be benefited by this project, about 200,000 people who live in south Louisiana, Lafourche Parish and Terrebonne Parish, the same area that was battered by Katrina, Rita, Gustav, Ike, and the oil spill, the same people who have suffered through flood after flood after flood, the same people who have taxed themselves, gotten \$200 million of their own money to build phase 1, have now been told no by the House of Representatives.

For what reasons I cannot understand. They have gone through all of the processes required. They have waited in line, a line that should never have been there because they were given a yes. But as the Presiding Officer knows, under the Corps of Engineers' rules, they can say yes to your project initially and then it takes so long to get to your project because we have a very inefficient system. If the estimates then come in at 20 percent over the original estimate, the law kicks you out and you have to start all over. So they started all over. That is the tragedy of this action. We were furious they had to start all over, but that was the law. So they did. They got a positive Chief's report in June.

The House of Representatives just arbitrarily decides, even with a positive Chief's report, they are taking Morganza to the Gulf out of the bill. I am calling on the Louisiana delegation to stand, particularly members who are in the study committee. I think we have a leader of that committee, Congressman STEVE SCALISE, who was my partner in the RESTORE Act and has been a very able leader in our delegation, to absolutely put their foot down on this WRDA bill moving any further in the House of Representatives until we can get justice for this project.

Our people are doing everything we can to elevate our homes, to fight for

fair flood insurance, to tax ourselves to build levees. We have traveled all over the world to find the best engineers in the Netherlands because we do not seem to have enough engineers in Washington who understand that you can live safely below sea level. Sometimes you have to because that is where the ports are. We do not have the luxury of living on tops of mountains. We are running the Mississippi River. We are not running a ski lodge in Vail. So our people have to live there. They are not living in mansions. They are not living in condos. They are living in fishing villages and fishing camps and in very middle-class neighborhoods, trying to make a living for themselves, their families, their communities and keep this country operating.

We are running the biggest oil and gas operations out of Houma, LA, the town the House of Representatives has just literally made defenseless. They have no levees. New Orleans now, after Katrina, and Jefferson Parish, and Saint Bernard Parish have \$14 billion of taxpayer money invested. That is a lot of money. I know some people in the country get very aggravated about that. Why did they get \$14 billion?

The country should have given us \$1 billion 10 years ago and we could have saved them 14. But the Congress decided not to do that. We asked. We begged. We pleaded. No. No. No. No. So one day the levees broke. Then the bill came due. It was a big bill, \$14 billion. Wait until the next bill comes through. In that whole timeframe, that whole timeframe where our people are begging, drowning, houses going underwater, begging for help, the government keeps telling us no, no, we sent \$161 billion to this Treasury from off our shore, from offshore oil and gas—\$161 billion.

We come up here and try to get \$1 billion for this levee, \$2 billion for that. We are told: We cannot afford it. I tell you, I do not have the power to do this. I do not. But if I did, and if I were the Governor, I—and I do not think he has the power—but if I could, I would shut down every rig in the Gulf of Mexico until this Congress gives the people of Louisiana the money we need to keep ourselves safe from drowning, from flooding.

I would turn the lights off in Washington and in New York and in Maine. We are tired of it. The people in our State cannot survive without levees. The country cannot survive without our people living where we do, to run the maritime, to run the oil and gas industry. Houma, LA, does not deserve this. Terrebonne Parish does not deserve it. Lafourche Parish does not deserve it. Our delegation is not going to stand for it.

So my message to the Speaker of the House and my delegation in the House and the House is that bill will never see

the light of day unless Morganza is put back. I do not know who is going to do it or how they are going to do it.

Please do not tell me there is not enough money. We send alone, Louisiana—forget Texas, forget Alabama, forget Mississippi—Louisiana alone every year sends about \$5 billion to the Federal Treasury just from oil and gas severance taxes, not counting sales tax, income tax, property taxes, other taxes—property taxes would not come here, but income taxes would come here, corporate income taxes would come here. That is not even counting that.

I am tired of begging for nickels and dimes. So the House of Representatives better put Morganza to the Gulf back into that bill. No. 2, I have not read the whole bill. I was just informed about it. So I may have to take this back off the record. But I was told also what they did is say: We are not going to approve projects that had a Chief's report after our committee meeting in June. Then they put some language in that says something like: No project can go forward until they have a committee meeting of the House of Representatives.

So they are basically engaging in earmarks again. In other words, having voted to take earmarks out—I was not for that. I did not go along with that, but they did, the leadership of the House, take earmarks out. They are now trying to put earmarks back in. So the only way you get back in is if you go through their committee and get your project approved, which is earmarking in a different way.

So on two fronts I think the House is wrong. I think they were wrong to take Morganza out, wrong to put this new system in.

The third and final thing I am going to say about this, which is the saddest thing, because Morganza has to go back in, there are some other projects they might have taken out that I am simply not aware of. But I know that the bill that left this Senate was very fair. It was without earmarks. It was based on the science and the process of the Corps of Engineers. But to all of my friends in the Senate, even when I get Morganza back in there, and our delegation does, the problem for all of us is that there is still going to be \$60 billion of authorized projects for all of our States. The total budget of the Corps of Engineers next year that Senator FEINSTEIN chairs—and I serve on the appropriations committee for the Corps of Engineers—will have only \$1.6 billion for new construction.

The total Corps budget is only about \$5 billion. So think about it. Is this not the silliest thing? We have \$40 billion of already authorized WRDA projects. The WRDA bill now has \$20 billion minus Morganza to the Gulf, which they just took out for no good reason, after 20 years of our people suffering.

So they are going to add that 20 plus Morganza which will get back in there. Then we are going to have \$60 billion, and all we have is a few billion to fund it.

It is a system that is so broken and so unfair. Every State feels this. It is not just Louisiana. What people hear is my strong voice, I hope, for the people of Louisiana. We feel it the most. We feel it most frequently just because of our geography. But every community in the country is suffering from this. We do not have enough infrastructure, water infrastructure. Our ports are not where they need to be. Our rivers are not dredged to the depths they need to be. We do not have enough to maintain our maritime industry in this country.

This is undermining our economic strength and our international competitiveness, besides being terribly unfair to people who happen to live along the coast, which is 60 percent of our population. So I am just sending a little warning signal to the House of Representatives: There is no way, no way, that this WRDA bill is going to go anywhere without the Morganza to the Gulf in it. It is not happening. This is one of those sort of do or die kind of issues for the Louisiana delegation.

We have waited 20 years for this project. It is justified from every angle, shape, form. It has been studied to death. The local people have put up \$200 million of their own money. I am not going home to tell them they are not going to get the project. So I would strongly suggest our House delegation, particularly our leader STEVE SCALISE, the Congressman from Jefferson Parish, who is the chairman of the Republican study group, go have a long talk with the chairman of the committee and figure out how to get this project back in the bill.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Ms. LANDRIEU. I wish to move to another subject. I wish to offer at this time two amendments to the underlying bill that we are trying to debate, which is a very important bill on energy efficiency. I know we cannot debate any amendments, but I think I can offer two amendments.

I wish to tell my colleagues, the first I am offering with Senator WICKER and Senator PRYOR. It would ensure that the Green Building Rating System, which is adopted by GSA currently, and new ones under this bill that are put forth by Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN—I support the bill—do not put at a disadvantage the materials that meet the new standard of energy efficiency in the underlying bill.

There was some question about the way the bill was initially worded when it came out of the Energy Committee that it would disqualify some domestic materials that meet the energy efficient standards from being included.

This would have a very devastating effect on our lumber and forestry industry, as well as others. I will send that amendment to the desk when I am able and hope that we will get through this skirmish over health care and get to some very important amendments that will help us create jobs in America, Louisiana, and help our industries.

Secondly, I wish to speak about an amendment Senator WICKER and I will offer that would ensure that small companies are excused from the requirements to submit their products for expensive third-party testing to achieve ENERGY STAR certification.

This is really a small business issue. I think this is acceptable to all parties. I am not sure there is any opposition, actually, to either one of these amendments, which is good. We have worked very hard with the parties who might have a different view to see if we can find some common ground, and I think we have.

I have spoken about these amendments which I will submit for the RECORD when possible, and I hope we can get to the bill of Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN. They have worked very hard, and they have built a great coalition.

Again, this is a bill that could create many jobs and opportunities for our people. While there are a lot of Members talking about how so-and-so should focus on jobs and he or she should do this or that, we have a bill whose essence is to create very good jobs in America and to save us energy costs and to reduce costs to taxpayers and consumers.

I believe this bill was voted unanimously out of the energy committee and, if not, it had overwhelming support from Republicans and Democrats. RON WYDEN, the chairman our committee, who was a very able and centrist leader on these matters, has worked very hard. I am very familiar with the benefits of this bill. I am sorry it has become caught up in the politics of health care, but it is important that we get to this Energy bill.

It is most important that the House of Representatives fix a terrible thing for Louisiana which happened just a few hours ago when they stripped, now for the 20th year in a row, a project that has been certified, stamped, sealed, and approved by the Corps of Engineers. For whatever reason they did this, I do not know. I hope they will fix it.

I yield the floor.

REMARKS OF JUDGE CHRISTINA REISS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on August 16, I had the honor of attending a naturalization ceremony at the Ethan Allen Homestead Museum in Burlington, VT, conducted by the Chief Judge of the United States District

Court for the District of Vermont, Christina Reiss. This naturalization ceremony was especially timely as the Senate had in June voted strongly in favor of passing a comprehensive immigration reform bill. I am proud of the Senate's work on that legislation, and especially proud of the thorough process we had in the Judiciary Committee to give that legislation a fair and public hearing.

I have attended many naturalization ceremonies over the years and never fail to come away inspired by the process and by the participants. Judge Reiss' most recent naturalization ceremony was a reminder of how meaningful American citizenship is, and of what an accomplishment it is for those who earn it. Judge Reiss invited me to address the new Americans, but I was particularly moved by her remarks to the 10 new Americans who were naturalized as citizens of the United States that day.

Judge Reiss delivered a positive, uplifting, and powerful message to these men and women about what it means to be an American. Her message to them was one of hope. It was also a challenge to be the transformative force that so many immigrants have been for America throughout our history. Judge Reiss encouraged their civic participation and commitment to our constitutional values. She called upon them to be full participants in our democracy, to exercise their rights and their responsibilities by voting, and to embrace the rule of law. And Judge Reiss' remarks were a warm Vermont welcome to the 10 new citizens who chose to make Vermont their home.

As I listened to Judge Reiss deliver her remarks, I reflected on my own family's history of immigration and the experience of my wife Marcelle's mother and father who became citizens and made Vermont their home. I hope the message they heard when they swore the oath to become citizens was as inspirational as the one Judge Reiss delivered this summer in Vermont. And I hope the 10 new American citizens we welcomed together on August 16 will take her words to heart as they begin this new chapter in their lives.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Judge Reiss' remarks of August 16, 2013, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE CHRISTINA REISS

Delivered at the Ethan Allen Homestead Museum in Burlington, Vermont, August 16, 2013

Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is my honor as Chief Judge of the United States District Court for the District of Vermont, and as an American citizen, to address you on this special occasion. You are about to undergo an important trans-

formation for which you have carefully and thoughtfully prepared. By the end of this ceremony, you will be a United States citizen.

I am sure that you had many thoughts and feelings as you went through the process of becoming a United States citizen. I want to assure you that you are not alone. Most people here, including me, have had family members who went through this very same process. America is a land of immigrants. With the exception of Native Americans, we all come from other places. Like you, our family members made sacrifices and faced challenges in order to live in this country. We made this country our home. You have made the important decision to make it your home. This is exciting and important for both you and for our country. Your transformation is our country's transformation. Our country gains strength and becomes a better place with the contributions of our new citizens.

You are about to take a solemn oath. In that oath, you will claim the United States as your own country and you will renounce allegiance to all others. You will swear to support and defend the Constitution, and the laws of the United States. And you will promise that you will bear true faith and allegiance to this country. I want to talk with you briefly about what some of those promises mean.

As you know, the United States of America was created through a declaration by its citizens that it would, from now on, be a free and independent nation. The Declaration of Independence also recognizes that we are all created equal, and that we are all entitled to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Those rights are not just something written on a piece of paper. Those rights represent an agreement between us, as fellow citizens, regarding how we will treat each other. Those rights also represent an agreement between us and our Government, regarding what we may expect from our Government, and what it may expect from us in return.

You, too, will be able to enjoy the freedoms guaranteed by the United States Constitution. But as always, with any right comes responsibilities. In accepting the benefits of American citizenship, you likewise accept its responsibilities.

Our society, our freedom, depends on the rule of law. The rule of law requires that every person obey the laws of this country. No person and no organization is above the law. The rule of law is thus an agreement of the citizens of this country to obey the law, to defend it, and to uphold it. The rule of law is what makes our country safe, free, and productive.

If you disagree with a law, you may work to change it. You may vote, you may exercise your freedom of speech, you may seek elected or appointed office, and you may petition the Government. In this country, we encourage citizens to get involved and to work to change the country and its laws for the better.

I know that some of you may come from countries where this opportunity was not available to you. Indeed, you may come from places where by seeking to change a law, you put your life in danger. Here, your right to lawfully seek change will be fully protected.

I urge you to exercise all of your rights and responsibilities as a United States citizen. The right to vote is endangered each time you fail to vote. The freedom of speech is threatened when you do not express your opinions, and stand silent when you should speak up. It is also threatened when you do

not tolerate the views of others, or allow their rights to be violated. The rights of all citizens must be protected, if you expect your own rights to be protected.

Before I end my remarks, I want to say a few things about Vermont because I believe that you have chosen to live in a very special place. As you know, Vermont was not one of the original 13 colonies to sign the Declaration of Independence, but it was the first state to forbid slavery in its own constitution in 1777. Vermont has often been at the forefront of this country in protecting human rights. This is a special place. It is a beautiful place. Enjoy it, cherish it, and make it your home. You are welcome here. President Dwight D. Eisenhower said something about Vermonters which I think is very true. In speaking to the people gathered at the State Dairy Festival in Rutland, he said:

"There are certain things I do know about you. I know that Americans everywhere are the same, in their longing for peace, a peace that is characterized by justice, by consideration for others, by decency above all, by its insistence on respect for the individual human being."

It is my hope that your life in the United States is characterized by justice, by consideration for others, by decency, and by insistence on respect for all human beings.

In conclusion, I wish simply to say, "Welcome my fellow American citizens. Welcome, my American brothers and sisters." I wish you success and happiness in pursuing the American dream.

REMEMBERING 9/11

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in commemorating the anniversary of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. Twelve years ago America was dealt a blow, but in the years since, we have continued to rebuke the message of hate that was brought to our doorstep. What is more is that we affirm our core American values that were magnified in the days following those attacks.

We are still "one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." We are still a diverse nation of many races, religions, and ideas united under the same flag. Maybe most important, we are still at our best when we come together.

Every year we are reminded that though we are a strong and determined nation, we are still healing from the wounds we suffered that day 12 years ago. No amount of time can rationalize the senseless violence or bring back a loved one. It is important to note that we have brought many of the terrorists, including Osama bin Laden, to justice, and we have made great strides in ensuring that those who wish to do us harm like they did on 9/11 will be unable to do so.

Our men and women in uniform, the intelligence community, Foreign Service officers, and the people entrusted with safeguarding our borders, bridges, air and seaports and key infrastructure, have made great sacrifices to ensure our continued safety in a post-9/11 world and we owe so much to

these men and women, and the families who support them.

Today, we join together to show the world that our Nation is united and firmly resolved to defend our freedom and safeguard our liberty against any enemy.

We also take time to remember those Americans who perished on 9/11 and to remember them and their families with a special prayer. We reflect on the heroism of the firefighters, police officers, medical workers, city officials, and ordinary citizens who gave their own lives trying to save others. Who could ever forget the images of firefighters and other first responders going up the stairs of the World Trade Center as everyone else was heading to safety? Each of us has been affected by 9/11. It is a day seared into the national memory.

We cannot forget 9/11 because the virtues that carried us through the days, weeks, and years have been with us since the beginning: 9/11 did not teach firefighters and police to sacrifice, nor did it teach unity among neighbors. It did not teach empathy toward strangers or compassion toward friends.

Rather, these quintessential American virtues were with us all along; 9/11 just put them under a spotlight for all to see. On 9/11 we showed the world a brand of resilience, compassion, and strength that could only be "made in America".

And so, 12 years after the most heinous attacks in our Nation's history, we stand tall. We stand tall, not weighed down by the gravity of 9/11 but made stronger by it. We remain united in our diversity like no other nation on Earth, "one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Mr. CHIESA. Mr. President, I vividly recall, as do most Americans, exactly where I was 12 years ago this morning. My son, Al, who had only recently celebrated his third birthday, was beginning his very first day at preschool. It was a big day for my wife Jenny and me, filled with that mixture of excitement and trepidation that is familiar to all young parents.

Shortly after waving goodbye to Al, we heard the shocking news—an airplane had hit the South Tower of the World Trade Center.

As a native New Jerseyan, raised in the shadow of the Twin Towers, I could picture the scene in my mind's eye.

My first assumption was that a small plane—perhaps one of the sightseeing planes that provided visitors with a bird's-eye view of the wonders of Lower Manhattan and the harbor—had somehow flown off course into the building.

Less than 20 minutes later, however, when the second plane hit, I knew, as we all did, that this was no accident. America was under attack. And as the morning unfolded and the horror increased—the Pentagon was hit, the

towers fell, United flight 93 was brought to the ground near Shanksville, PA—my thoughts turned to faith and family.

I thought of my son—young and innocent, starting his very first day in school—and I realized the world that existed when we dropped him off that morning had changed.

I thought of so many friends and neighbors who might very well have been on the plane that flew out of Newark that morning or in those proud buildings that had been reduced to rubble. I hoped and prayed that they were safe.

I thought of the people who had surely lost their lives in the attacks—in numbers more than any of us could bear, as Mayor Giuliani so eloquently put it—and prayed for them and their families.

And as the day drew to its awful conclusion, I knew that for so many, the terrible anguish of this day was just beginning, and the reminders of that were everywhere: the children whose parents would never arrive to pick their children up from school, the empty place at the dinner table, the gaping hole in the hearts of those who loved those who perished.

Twelve years later, the passage of time has, for many, helped to bring some measure of healing. But the scars remain, and they will never completely fade away.

So today we remember, as we do every year and as we should every day, all those who lost their lives, both in the terrorist attacks themselves and also on foreign fields of battle in the defense of our freedom and our way of life.

We remember today, as we do every year and as we should every day, all those who were injured in the attacks and on the battlefield.

We remember today, as we do every year and as we should every day, all those who responded to the attacks with bravery and determination and many of whom still struggle with the aftermath of their courageous actions.

And we remember today, as we do every year and should every day, all those who lost friends, colleagues, and family members in the attacks and in the years since. Their suffering is our suffering and we must never forget that.

Today is also a day for renewal, for renewing the sense of purpose that united our nation in the aftermath of the attacks, for renewing the spirit of cooperation that made it possible for our country to move forward, both through individual acts of courage, kindness, and compassion and through acts of governance that helped us meet the challenges we faced, and for renewing our determination to keep America safe while also safeguarding our liberties.

Twelve years ago today, when Jenny and I dropped off our son for his very

first day of school—he is, by the way, now a high school freshman—we could never have imagined how much the world would change before he had even settled in to his new preschool routine.

But although so much has changed, one thing remains constant: America, is, as she always had been, a beacon of hope to the world. No act of terror—no matter how brutal—will ever diminish the bright, shining light of the American spirit.

REMEMBERING NICOLAE GHEORGHE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, on August 8, Nicolae Gheorghe, one of the leading figures of the Romani civil rights movement, passed away. He was devoted to improving the situation of Roma, ultimately playing a pivotal role on the international stage and especially within the OSCE. Gheorghe lived an extraordinary life and will be long remembered for his singular contribution to the advancement of human rights.

Nicolae Gheorghe was born in 1946 in Romania during the aftermath of the fascist regime led by Marshall Ion Antonescu. His mother had narrowly escaped the mass deportations of 25,000 Roma planned and implemented by the Antonescu regime.

Members of the Helsinki Commission first met Nicolae Gheorghe when Senator Dennis DeConcini and Representative STENY HOYER, then-Chairman and Cochairman, led a delegation to Romania in April 1990. At that time, Gheorghe was emerging as one of the clearest and most compelling voices sounding the alarm about the deplorable situation of Roma. Although the fall of communism in Central Europe ushered in an era of democratization, it also gave free rein to old bigotry against Roma. In fact, only a few months after that visit, police efforts to remove demonstrators from Bucharest degenerated into brutal attacks on the offices of opposition papers, opposition leaders' homes, and members of the Romani minority.

At almost the same time, the OSCE participating States were meeting in Copenhagen negotiating what would become one of the most ambitious agreements of the Helsinki process: the seminal 1990 Copenhagen Document. I was part of a delegation Representative HOYER led to that historic meeting where we raised our concerns about religious and ethnic minorities directly with the delegation from Romania.

It was also in Copenhagen where Nicolae Gheorghe pressed—successfully—for the adoption of the first reference in any international human rights agreement to the specific problems faced by Roma. The U.S. delegation to that meeting, headed by the late Ambassador Max Kampmen, helped secure the inclusion of that text in the final document.

But in the context of post-Communist economic and political transition, Roma became targets of ethnically motivated attacks. In Romania, dozens of pogroms against Roma were carried out between 1990 and 1997, prompting Gheorghe and others to found Romani CRISS in 1993. The name is a Romanian acronym for Center for Social Intervention and Studies but also a play on the Romani word “kris,” which is a kind of council of elders. In the 1990s, he worked with the New Jersey-based Project on Ethnic Relations and served on the board of the European Roma Rights Center.

He also brought his concerns to the United States. In 1994, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations, and Human Rights, chaired by Representative Tom Lantos, convened the first hearing before Congress on the situation of Roma. Gheorghe, joined by Romani activists Ian Hancock, Andrzej Mirga, and Klara Orgovanova, testified, along with Livia Plaks of the Project on Ethnic Relations.

Gheorghe argued that anti-Roma attitudes and behaviors could serve as a barometer to gauge the success of countries building democratic institutions, the rule of law, and “the consolidation of civil movements and associations and societies and states deeply distorted by the decades of pro-fascist, authoritarian and communist totalitarian regimes.”

He presciently surveyed the scope and implications of anti-Roma manifestations including in Bosnia, Germany, the Czech and Slovak Republics, and Romania. “[T]he most important assistance which can be brought to or sent to our region is the rule of law, the breeding of democratic institutions, and careful implementation of individual human rights.” Gheorghe testified at Helsinki Commission briefings and hearings in 2002 and 2006.

Nicolae Gheorghe also became a fixture at OSCE human rights meetings—first in his capacity as an NGO, then as the first senior adviser on Romani issues for the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. In whatever capacity he worked, he was a relentless advocate for the human rights of Romani people.

His appointment coincided with the deterioration of the situation in Kosovo, the NATO air campaign against Milosevic's Serbia, and the subsequent deployment of a large OSCE mission to Kosovo. As a consequence of developments in the Balkans, he became immediately engaged on issues relating to the displacement of Kosovo Roma to Macedonia and elsewhere. Throughout his tenure with the OSCE, which lasted through 2006, his work was driven by the need for crisis management stemming from acts of violence and other extreme manifesta-

tions of prejudice against Roma—not only in the Balkans but elsewhere in the OSCE region as well.

In his 2006 testimony before the Helsinki Commission, he observed that international organizations had largely focused on the situation of Roma in Central Europe, neglecting Western countries such as Greece, France, Spain, and Italy. “I don't think that Europe for the time being realizes the depth of the racism and racist attitudes in its structures, [in] Europe as a whole.” The mass fingerprinting of Roma in Italy in 2008 and the expulsions of Roma from France in 2010 would illustrate that Gheorghe had spoken with typical insight.

I wish that I could say Nicolae Gheorghe's work to advance the human rights of Roma was complete. Clearly, it is not. Each day, it must be carried on by the many people he encouraged and a new generation of activists. Toward that end, our load is lighter because of the burdens he carried, our goals are nearer because of the distance he traveled, and we are inspired by his legacy.

REMEMBERING RANDY UDALL

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to again thank my colleagues for their kind words on the passing of Randy Udall. Their condolences, and those of so many people who knew and loved Randy, have been a great source of comfort to our family. I would also like to share with them Randy's obituary, published in the Aspen Times, as we remember Randy and celebrate his life.

I ask unanimous consent that the obituary be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

James “Randy” Udall, a native son of the American West, died June 20, 2013, on the eve of the Summer Solstice, doing what he loved most, hiking in the remote Wind River Mountains. He was 61 years old. The cause of his death: natural.

Randy was both a visionary and a pragmatist. Known for the size of his heart and the breadth of his wild mind, Randy Udall was all about energy: physical and mental. His expertise on domestic and international energy sustainability was singular, both as a free-lance writer and as an advocate. In 1984, he co-founded the nonprofit Community Office for Resource Efficiency (CORE) in Carbondale, Colorado, where he served for 13 years as director. CORE's partnerships with electric utilities and local governments led to Colorado's first solar energy incentive program, the world's first Renewable Energy Mitigation Program and some of the most progressive green power purchasing programs in America.

In 2005, Randy co-founded the Association for the Study of Peak Oil-USA to track the shifting balance between world oil supply and depletion. He was a brilliant communicator, owned by no one, plain-spoken, humble, and nuanced. He was a celebrated speaker engaging audiences world-wide on the

complexities of energy development. He was the rare thought leader who put his thoughts into action. Randy's home in Carbondale was retrofitted with solar panels that he often shared would keep 300,000 pounds of carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere over 20 years. The energy bill on his 2,000-square-foot home was a mere \$300 per year.

Randy Udall told hard truths: "We have been living like gods," he often said. "Our task now is to learn how to live like humans. Our descent will not be easy."

Randy Udall was born on October 29, 1951, in Tucson, Ariz., to former Arizona Congressman Morris K. Udall and Patricia Emery Udall. His education was informed by Prescott College and the University of Denver, but he graduated from neither. He subscribed to what John Wesley Powell called "a home-grown education" driven by place and fueled by curiosity. His path of inquiry was grounded in auto mechanics, carpentry, a commitment to writing, environmental studies, and advocacy. He also worked for Outward Bound as a wilderness instructor. Instinct, intuition, and experience became the bedrock of his uncommon wisdom.

Randy belonged to a respected political family. Alongside the distinguished political career of his father, he was the nephew of Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, from whom he drew great inspiration. His eldest brother Mark Udall and his cousin Tom Udall currently represent Colorado and New Mexico in the U.S. Senate. With his usual wit and candor, he often apologized for politicians in the West, but he never abandoned his family's commitment to public service and embrace of the open space of democracy.

In the 1980s, Randy reported on the Sanctuary Movement for the Tucson Citizen, riding the underground railroad and listening to the plight of the refugees it carried from Central America to the United States. He was the first reporter to break the story of the Tucson Sanctuary Movement nationally and garner support and justice for them. Through his writing, Randy continually sought to give voice to others and to the land. "I love forms beyond my own, and regret the borders between us," wrote Loren Eiseley, one of Randy's favorite authors.

In 1987, Randy co-authored "Too Funny To Be President" with his father, Mo Udall, and Bob Neuman. And in 1993, he collaborated with his uncle Stewart Udall and renowned photographer David Muench on the book, "National Parks of America."

He was a man who loved words and big ideas. As much as he loved to climb mountains, he loved the landscape of public discourse. Randy will be remembered as an extraordinary listener and a lively raconteur. He gave dignity to his conversations, be it with a roughneck on an oil patch or testing and charming an environmentalist over beer. He was at home with those who cared. His alliances were creative and brave. He possessed an open mind, and at times, a fierce one, calling for an ethics of a place. Randy did not hesitate to go toe-to-toe with oil executives, calling for accountability, when discussing the realities of peak oil.

But most of all, Randy Udall loved all things wild: skiing across Baffin Island in the 1976; casting a line of light on a meandering river; hiking the Colorado Rockies with his children. In an email to his daughter Tarn, when rafting with her brother down the Tatshenshini River in Alaska, he said simply, lovingly, "Stay warm, stay fed, and feed the morale meter, too." He was a man of

paradoxes: a loner and a communitarian; joyful and brooding; present one minute and gone, the next. And his vast frame of reference was apparent by the diversity on his bookshelves with Mary Oliver's "Collected Poems" next to "A Field Guide to Geology"; Ivan Doig's nonfiction shelved next to "The Prize: The Epic Quest for Oil, Money & Power" by Daniel Yergin. When Wallace Stegner admonished Westerners "to create a society to match the scenery," this was the joyous life work of Randy Udall.

Randy is survived by his beloved wife, Leslie Emerson and their three children, Ren, Tarn, and Torrey Udall; his five siblings: Mark Udall (wife, Maggie Fox), Judith Udall (husband, Ben Harding), Anne Udall (partner, Tillie Clark), Brad Udall (wife, Jane Backer), and Kate Udall; and his nephews, Jed Udall and Clay Harding, and niece, Tess Udall. He also leaves behind his cousin, Tom Udall, alongside Denis Udall, Scott Udall, Lynn Udall, Lori Udall, and Jay Udall. He is preceded in death by his father, Morris K. Udall, his mother, Patricia Emery Udall, his uncle Stewart Udall, and his nephew Luke Harding.

In lieu of flowers, donations can be made to: The Randy Udall Memorial Fund, Alpine Bank, 350 Highway 133, Carbondale, Colorado, 81623. Donations will support youth in action.

RECOGNIZING WARREN EASTON HIGH SCHOOL

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, today I wish to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Warren Easton High School in New Orleans, LA. The students, faculty, staff, school leaders, alumni and community members are celebrating 100 years of excellence in education and service to the New Orleans community.

Warren Easton High School is the oldest public high school in Louisiana. Named after a local superintendent of schools in New Orleans, Warren Easton represents what excellence in education should look like. The school has transitioned from when it opened as an all-boys high school in Uptown New Orleans, then a new location on Canal Street in 1913, to a co-educational setting in 1952 and racial integration in 1967. However, perhaps Warren Easton High School's most profound transformation came in the wake of Hurricane Katrina.

After the storm that devastated so many lives, infrastructures, and a way of life in New Orleans, Warren Easton was forced to close its doors for 1 year. Fortunately, thanks to the strong and spirited history of this school, Warren Easton was opened as a charter school by a group of alumni. Even in the face of challenge, the leaders and alumni created an institution that would not only honor the history of Warren Easton and its previous success, but will continue to create new opportunities for the students of New Orleans.

Since its opening in 2007, Warren Easton High School has seen tremendous growth. During the last school year, 925 students attended school there. For the

past 2 years, the school has celebrated a graduation rate of 100 percent. Student performance has also dramatically increased since the reopening of Warren Easton High School with a school performance score of 64.7 in 2007 and 133.9 in 2012. Further, the 2012 graduating class received over \$6.2 million in scholarships from more than 20 colleges and universities.

Warren Easton is a leading example of excellence in education. Its leaders, alumni, and students continue to be an inspiration to their community. It is with my heartfelt and greatest sincerity that I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Warren Easton High School in New Orleans, LA, and its long-time alumni community as they celebrate 100 years of success.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NEWINGTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to join with the people of Newington, NH, as they celebrate the town's 300th anniversary.

Located in Rockingham County, Newington is surrounded on three sides by water—the Piscataqua River to the northeast, Little Bay to the northwest and Great Bay to the west. Due to its close proximity to water, agriculture became the way of life in the early years of this town.

The town was originally part of Dover and was known as Bloody Point, so named because of the battle between men from Dover and Portsmouth who were vying for more land. In 1640 Thomas Trickery established the Bloody Point Ferry, which crossed the Piscataqua to Hilton's Point and was the only connection between Dover and Portsmouth. Because of the difficulty in getting to the church in Dover, early settlers established a meetinghouse at Bloody Point in 1712. In 1713 local residents held a meeting to hire a minister, and on May 12, 1714, Governor Dudley granted the request and renamed the parish from Bloody Point to Newington. This meetinghouse is still owned by the town and is considered the oldest meetinghouse in New Hampshire. In addition to this historic landmark, residents set land aside to create a town forest in 1710. This forest is the oldest surviving town forest in the United States and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The number of farms grew during the late 1800s thanks in part to the construction of the railroad bridge to Dover point in 1873. The railroad provided the ability to transport perishable commodities, such as apples and dairy, to new markets. Today the population has grown to include over 750 residents, whose patriotism and commitment is reflected in part by their record of service in defense of our Nation.

Over the past several decades, Newington has seen a dramatic change from an agricultural community to an industrial and commercial hub. In the 1950s, the Federal Government acquired land to build Pease Air Force Base, over half of which is located in the town of Newington. Although this base closed, the area has been redeveloped into what is now the Pease International Tradeport. Even with these recent changes, the town of Newington has maintained its quaint and historic character.

Whether it is the popular Newington Mall, the historic town forest or the Great Bay National Wildlife Refuge, the citizens of Newington have contributed much to the life and heritage of New Hampshire during the town's first 300 years. On this day, we honor the 300th anniversary of Newington, salute its citizens, and recognize their accomplishments, their love of country, and their spirit of independence.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:33 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 130. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming.

S. 157. An act to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 256. An act to amend Public Law 93-435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

S. 304. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes.

S. 459. An act to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following

bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1155. An act to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2747. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2747. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1155. An act to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2690. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Propylene Glycol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9394-5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2691. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Topramezone; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9388-9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2692. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Emamectin; Pesticide Tolerance" (FRL No. 9395-6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2693. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tetrachlorvinphos; Pesticide Toler-

ances" (FRL No. 9394-9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2694. A communication from the Management Analyst, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Weighing, Feed, and Swine Contractors" (RIN0580-AA99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2695. A communication from the Management Analyst, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Inspection and Weighing of Grain in Combined and Single Lots" (RIN0580-AB15) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2696. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Registration of Mortgage Loan Originators" (RIN3052-AC78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2697. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sugar Program; Feedstock Flexibility Program for Bioenergy Producers" (RIN0560-AH86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2698. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Enhanced Risk Management Standards for Systemically Important Derivatives Clearing Organizations" (RIN3038-AC98) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2699. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Harmonization of Compliance Obligations for Registered Investment Companies Required to Register as Commodity Pool Operators" (RIN3038-AD75) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2700. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clearing Exemption for Certain Swaps Entered into by Cooperatives" (RIN3038-AD47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2701. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cranberries Grown in States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New

Jersey, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Long Island in the State of New York; Changing Reporting Requirements” (Docket No. AMS-FV-12-002; FV12-929-1 FIR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2702. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Grapes Grown in Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increased Assessment Rate” (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0005; FV13-925-1 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2703. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Increase in Fees for Voluntary Federal Dairy Grading and Inspection Services” (Docket No. AMS-DA-10-0002) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2704. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Kiwifruit Grown in California and Imported Kiwifruit; Relaxation of Minimum Grade Requirement” (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0032; FV13-920-1 IR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2705. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Cotton Board Rules and Regulations: Adjusting Supplemental Assessment on Imports (2013 Amendment)” (Docket No. AMS-CN-12-0065) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2706. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate” (Docket No. AMS-FV-12-0076; FV13-932-1 FIR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2707. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Mango Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Nominations of Foreign Producers and Election of Officers” (Docket No. AMS-FV-12-0041) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2708. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines,

and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Revising Reporting Requirements and New Information Collection” (Docket No. AMS-FV-12-0052; FV12-905-2 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2709. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2013-2014 Marketing Year” (Docket No. AMS-FV-12-0064; FV13-985-1 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2710. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Modification of the General Cull and Handling Regulation for Area No. 2” (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0001; FV13-48-1 IR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2711. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “User Fees for 2013 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers” (Docket No. AMS-CN-12-0074) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2712. A communication from the Associate General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, (4) four reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Agriculture received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2713. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Imazapic; Pesticide Tolerance” (FRL No. 9394-8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2714. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Trafficking Controls and Fraud Investigations” (RIN0584-AE26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2715. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Privacy Protections of Information from Applicant Households” (RIN0584-AD91) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on

September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2716. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Ethyl-2E,4Z-Decadienoate (Pear Ester); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 9396-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2717. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pyraclostrobin; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9395-5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2718. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Halosulfuron-methyl; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9393-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2719. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Service Limits and Loading Combinations for Class 1 Plate-and-Shell-Type Supports” (Regulatory Guide 1.130, Revision 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2720. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Applications” (Regulatory Guide 4.2, Supplement 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2721. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Grotto Sculpin (*Cottus specus*)” (RIN1018-AZ41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2722. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Species Status for the Grotto Sculpin (*Cottus specus*)” (RIN1018-AY16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2723. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Species Status for the Austin Blind Salamander and Threatened Species Status for the Jollyville Plateau Salamander” (RIN1018-AY22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2724. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Diamond Darter (*Crystallaria cincotta*)” (RIN1018-AZ40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2725. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Austin Blind and Jollyville Plateau Salamanders” (RIN1018-AZ24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2726. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Species Status for Jemez Mountains Salamander (*Plethodon neomexicanus*)” (RIN1018-AY24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2727. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Texas Golden Gladecress and Neches River Rose-mallow” (RIN1018-AZ49) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2728. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revisions to the Regulations for Impact Analyses of Critical Habitat” (RIN1018-AY26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2729. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for Texas Golden Gladecress and Threatened Status for Neches River Rose-mallow” (RIN1018-AX74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2730. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Interim Final Determination to Stay and Defer Sanctions; California; San Joaquin Valley” (FRL No. 9900-36-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2731. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled “Revision of Air Quality Implementation Plan; California; Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits” (FRL No. 9813-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2732. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Maintenance Plan Update for Lake County, Indiana for Sulfur Dioxide” (FRL No. 9900-5-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2733. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of New Jersey; Redesignation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes and Approval of the Associated Maintenance Plan” (FRL No. 9900-33-Region 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2734. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arkansas; Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter” (FRL No. 9900-32-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2735. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Michigan; Redesignation of the Detroit-Ann Arbor Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard and the 2006 24-Hour Standard for Fine Particulate Matter” (FRL No. 9900-49-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2736. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District” (FRL No. 9842-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2737. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Florida; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan” (FRL No. 9900-31-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2738. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; St. Louis Area Transportation Conformity Re-

quirements” (FRL No. 9900-41-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2739. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer, Santa Barbara and Ventura County Air Pollution Control Districts” (FRL No. 9835-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2740. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Quality: Revision to Definition of Volatile Organic Compounds—Exclusion of trans 1-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoroprop-1-ene [Solstice 1233zd(E)]” (FRL No. 9844-3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2741. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of Treasury Regulations Pursuant to Section 939A of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act” (RIN1545-BK27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2742. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “2013 Marginal Production Rates” (Notice 2013-53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2743. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Debt That is a Position in Personal Property That is Part of a Straddle” (RIN1545-BK89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2744. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Limitations on Duplication of Net Built-in Losses” (RIN1545-BE58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2745. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Extension of Expiration Dates for Two Body System Listings” (RIN0960-AH60) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2746. A communication from the Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Extension of Port Limits of Indianapolis, IN” (CBP Dec. 13-13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2747. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Disclosures of Return Information Reflected on Returns to Officers and Employees of the Department of Commerce for Certain Statistical Purposes and Related Activities" (RIN1545-BL66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2748. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Use of Differential Income Stream as an Application of the Income Method and as a Consideration in Assessing the Best Method" (RIN1545-BK71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2749. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Shared Responsibility Payment for Not Maintaining Minimum Essential Coverage" (RIN1545-BL36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2750. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Examination of Returns and Claims for Refund, Credit, or Abatement; Determination of Tax Liability" (Rev. Proc. 2013-33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 1494. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to improve child safety and reduce the incidence of preventable infant deaths in child care settings; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1495. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue an order with respect to secondary cockpit barriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 1496. A bill to enhance taxpayer accountability at public transportation agencies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. Res. 222. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Save for Retirement week, including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles and increasing personal financial literacy; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 15

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 15, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 84

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 84, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate discrimination in the immigration laws by permitting permanent partners of United States citizens and lawful permanent residents to obtain lawful permanent resident status in the same manner as spouses of citizens and lawful permanent residents and to penalize immigration fraud in connection with permanent partnerships.

S. 357

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education

Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 460, a bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 535

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 535, a bill to require a study and report by the Small Business Administration regarding the costs to small business concerns of Federal regulations.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 577

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 577, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 631

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 631, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to prohibit the employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

S. 888

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 888, a bill to provide end user exemptions from certain provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

S. 931

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 931, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to raise awareness of, and to educate breast cancer patients anticipating surgery, especially patients who are members of racial and ethnic minority groups, regarding the availability and coverage of breast reconstruction, prostheses, and other options.

S. 1069

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1069, a bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved.

S. 1088

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1123

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1123, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anni-

versary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1188

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1208

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1208, a bill to require meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide certain substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes.

S. 1271

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1271, a bill to direct the President to establish guidelines for the United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1282

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1282, a bill to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting banks' ability to engage in certain risky activities and limiting conflicts of interest, to reinstate certain Glass-Steagall Act protections that were repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1320

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1320, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the armed forces.

S. 1332

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Massachu-

setts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1369, a bill to provide additional flexibility to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish capital standards that are properly tailored to the unique characteristics of the business of insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1405

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1405, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of certain ambulance add-on payments under the Medicare program.

S. 1445

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1445, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1457

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1457, a bill to exempt the aging process of distilled spirits from the production period for purposes of capitalization of interest costs.

S. 1476

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1476, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes.

S. 1490

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1490, a bill to delay the application of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. RES. 203

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 203, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding efforts by the United States to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 1494. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to improve child safety and reduce the incidence of preventable infant deaths in child care settings; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of myself and Senator COLLINS, to introduce the Child Care Infant Mortality Act. This is bipartisan legislation that would allow states participating in the Child Care Development Block Grant, CCDBG, to use part of this funding for child safety training.

Currently, states participating in Child Care Development Block Grant, CCDBG, are required to set aside at least 4 percent of funds to improve the quality of the programs offered in their states. Our bill would simply ensure that strategies to enhance child safety, including disseminating information related to prevention strategies for sudden unexpected infant death, are included in as an allowable use of funds.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, CDC, and the American Academy of Pediatrics, half of the approximately 4,500 SUID cases in the United States are entirely preventable with effective training and implementation of correct sleep practices. It is estimated that child care settings account for 20 percent of all SUID fatalities in the United States. Life-saving sleep strategies, first aid and CPR are successful in preventing infant death and are easily implementable; yet training is not currently an allowable use of funds under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act.

Nationally, over 4,500 infants die suddenly with no immediate obvious cause every year. These deaths are not highly publicized by the media because of the severe pain it causes families. A large percentage of child care providers are unaware of the risks of sleep associated infant deaths until they come face-to-face with a death of a child under their care. The more aware providers are of safe sleep practices, the more likely they are to follow suggested guidelines. In particular, posting safe-sleep practices and offering required training can further cut the number of infants we lose every year to sudden unexpected

infant death. Beyond safe sleep practices, child care provider training in CPR and first aid will allow providers to identify and address potentially harmful situations for infants.

The Child Care Infant Mortality Prevention Act of 2013 expands the list of allowable uses for CCDBG funding to permit states to use this funding on activities to improve child care quality. Our bill would also require the Secretary to update and make widely available training, instructional materials, and other information on safe sleep practices and other sudden unexpected infant death prevention strategies.

I am proud that Senator SUSAN COLLINS has joined me as an original cosponsor of this bill.

It is essential that this issue is addressed by building upon the existing structure and capacity of the networks of Child Care providers participating in the Child Care and Development Block Grant. It is critical that we work to ensure that child safety is a primary goal of the block grant, and that appropriate and adequate training on safe sleep practices, first aid, and CPR are included in the training regimen promoted by this Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1494

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Child Care Infant Mortality Prevention Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) For millions of today's working families, child care is an essential ingredient of their success. Child care helps children, families, and communities prosper, and helps the Nation maintain its competitive edge.

(2) Close to 12,000,000 children under age 5, and 10,000,000 over the age of 5, are in some type of child care setting each day.

(3) More than 60 percent of children are cared for regularly in a child care setting.

(4) Recent polls of working parents found that parents are primarily concerned about safety and quality of care, followed by cost.

(5) Nationally, the most common form of death among post-neonatal infants under age 1 is death occurring during sleep, as a result of incorrect sleeping practices.

(6) According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, each year in the United States, more than 4,500 infants die suddenly of no immediately obvious cause. Half of these sudden unexpected infant deaths are due to Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, the leading cause of sudden unexpected infant deaths and all deaths among infants who are not younger than 1 month but younger than 12 months.

(7) Researchers estimate that child care settings account for at least 20 percent of sudden unexpected infant deaths in the United States.

(8) In its 2011 report on child care center licensing regulations, Child Care Aware of America, formerly known as the National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, noted that—

(A) extensive research and recommendations from organizations like the American Academy of Pediatrics and the National Centers for Disease Control and Prevention favor simple life-saving safe sleep strategies to eliminate serious risk factors for Sudden Infant Death Syndrome and sudden unexpected infant death; and

(B) the strategies noted in subparagraph (A) are not universally required under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 nor in the majority of State child care regulations.

SEC. 3. GOALS.

Section 658A(b)(5) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 note) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) to ensure the health, safety, development and well-being of children in programs supported under this subchapter and to assist States in improving the overall quality of child care services and programs by implementing the health, safety, licensing, and oversight standards established in State law (including regulations)."

SEC. 4. APPLICATION AND PLAN.

Section 658E(c)(2)(F) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 6858c(c)(2)(F)) is amended by striking clause (iii) and all that follows and inserting the following:

"(iii) minimum health and safety training appropriate to the provider setting, including training on cardiopulmonary resuscitation, first aid, safe sleep practices and other sudden unexpected infant death prevention strategies."

SEC. 5. ACTIVITIES TO PROMOTE CHILD SAFETY AND IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF CHILD CARE.

Section 658G of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858e) is amended—

(1) by striking "choice, and" and inserting "choice,"; and

(2) by striking the period and inserting "training (including training in safe sleep practices, first aid, and cardiopulmonary resuscitation), and other activities designed to ensure and improve the health and safety of children receiving child care services under this subchapter."

SEC. 6. DISSEMINATION OF MATERIALS AND INFORMATION ON SAFE SLEEP AND OTHER SUDDEN UNEXPECTED INFANT DEATH PREVENTION STRATEGIES.

Section 658K of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858i) is amended—

(1) by striking the section header and inserting the following:

"SEC. 658K. REPORTS, AUDITS, AND INFORMATION."

; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(c) INFORMATION ON SUDDEN UNEXPECTED INFANT DEATH PREVENTION STRATEGIES.—The Secretary, working with the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Director of the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, shall—

"(1) update training, instructional materials, and other information on safe sleep practices and other sudden unexpected infant death prevention strategies; and

"(2) widely distribute the training, materials, and information to parents, child care

providers, pediatricians, home visitors, community colleges, and other individuals and entities.”.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 1496. A bill to enhance taxpayer accountability at public transportation agencies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I rise to address a crisis of confidence at Chicagoland’s suburban commuter railroad—Metra. Metra plays a vital role for our area—reducing congestion and carrying thousands of suburban residents to and from Chicago each day. But recent developments highlight a troubled transit system and a misuse of public dollars.

Earlier this summer it was reported that Metra CEO Alex Clifford received a severance package worth nearly \$750,000 following allegations of political influence at the agency. Clifford received \$442,237 alone just to buyout the remaining term of his contract, on top of \$307,390 for an additional 12 months if he is unable to find new employment.

This is a gross misuse of public dollars. With this action, Metra’s former CEO makes more than President Obama, who currently makes \$400,000 a year. I asked the Congressional Research Service how this golden parachute ranks compared to the annual salary of the top ten largest transit agencies in the country, and the results were surprising. Each of the top 10 largest transit systems pays their chief executive no more than \$350,000, meaning Metra, the 24th largest transit agency in the country, had the highest earning CEO.

Fortunately federal taxpayer dollars did not contribute to Clifford’s golden parachute. But Metra is expected to receive more than \$135 million in federal capital dollars. If our local government bodies can’t be trusted to be good stewards of the public, then the Congress should step in to put in place reasonable taxpayer protections.

Today I have introduced the Public Transportation Accountability Act which for the first time will put limits on executive compensation at public transit agencies that receive federal funds. No executive or employee of a transit agency would be able to receive annual compensation that is greater than that of the President of the United States. This is a common sense bill that sadly is necessary to safeguard taxpayers’ pocketbooks.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 222—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SAVE FOR RETIREMENT WEEK, INCLUDING RAISING PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE VARIOUS TAX-PREFERRED RETIREMENT VEHICLES AND INCREASING PERSONAL FINANCIAL LITERACY

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 222

Whereas people in the United States are living longer, and the cost of retirement is increasing significantly;

Whereas Social Security remains the bedrock of retirement income for the great majority of the people of the United States but was never intended by Congress to be the sole source of retirement income for families;

Whereas recent data from the Employee Benefit Research Institute indicates that, in the United States, less than 1/3 of workers or their spouses are saving for retirement, and the amount that workers have saved for retirement is much less than the amount they need to adequately fund their retirement years;

Whereas the financial literacy of workers in the United States is important to their understanding of the need to save for retirement;

Whereas saving for retirement is a key component of overall financial health and security during retirement years, and the importance of financial literacy in planning for retirement must be advocated;

Whereas many workers may not be aware of their options in saving for retirement or may not have focused on the importance of, and need for, saving for retirement;

Whereas, although many employees have access through their employers to defined benefit and defined contribution plans to assist them in preparing for retirement, many of those employees may not be taking advantage of those plans at all or to the full extent allowed by Federal law;

Whereas saving for retirement is necessary even during economic downturns or market declines, which makes continued contributions all the more important;

Whereas all workers, including public and private sector employees, employees of tax-exempt organizations, and self-employed individuals, can benefit from developing personal budgets and financial plans that include retirement savings strategies that take advantage of tax-preferred retirement savings vehicles; and

Whereas the week October 20 through October 26, 2013 has been designated as “National Save for Retirement Week”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Save for Retirement Week, including raising public awareness of the importance of saving adequately for retirement;

(2) supports the need to raise public awareness of a variety of ways to save for retirement that are favored under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and that, although utilized by many people in the United States, should be utilized by more; and

(3) calls on States, localities, schools, universities, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe National Save for Retirement Week with appropriate programs and activities, with the goal of increasing the retirement savings and personal financial literacy of all people in the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1852. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1853. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1854. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1855. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1856. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1857. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1858. Mr. WYDEN (for Mr. MERKLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1392, supra.

SA 1859. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1860. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1861. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1862. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1863. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1864. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1865. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1866. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HELLER, Mr. LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1867. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1868. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1869. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1870. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1871. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BURR, Mr. RISCH, Mr. JOHANNIS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1872. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1873. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1874. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1875. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1876. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1877. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1878. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1879. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1880. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1881. Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1882. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1883. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1884. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1885. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1886. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1852. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4. BUDGET-NEUTRAL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ENERGY AND WATER CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENTS AT MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL UNITS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) shall establish a demonstration program under which, during the period beginning on October 1, 2013, and ending on September 30, 2016, the Secretary may enter into budget-neutral, performance-based agreements that result in a reduction in energy or water costs with such entities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate under which the entities shall carry out projects for energy or water conservation improvements at not more than 20,000 residential units in multifamily buildings participating in—

(1) the project-based rental assistance program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), other than assistance provided under section 8(o) of that Act;

(2) the supportive housing for the elderly program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q); or

(3) the supportive housing for persons with disabilities program under section 811(d)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013(d)(2)).

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **PAYMENTS CONTINGENT ON SAVINGS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide to an entity a payment under an agreement under this section only during applicable years for which an energy or water cost savings is achieved with respect to the applicable multifamily portfolio of properties, as determined by the Secretary, in accordance with subparagraph (B).

(B) **PAYMENT METHODOLOGY.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Each agreement under this section shall include a pay-for-success provision—

(I) that will serve as a payment threshold for the term of the agreement; and

(II) pursuant to which the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall share a percentage of the savings at a level determined by the Secretary that is sufficient to cover the administrative costs of carrying out this section.

(ii) **LIMITATIONS.**—A payment made by the Secretary under an agreement under this section shall—

(I) be contingent on documented utility savings; and

(II) not exceed the utility savings achieved by the date of the payment, and not previously paid, as a result of the improvements made under the agreement.

(C) **THIRD PARTY VERIFICATION.**—Savings payments made by the Secretary under this section shall be based on a measurement and verification protocol that includes at least—

(i) establishment of a weather-normalized and occupancy-normalized utility consumption baseline established prerotrofit;

(ii) annual third party confirmation of actual utility consumption and cost for owner-paid utilities;

(iii) annual third party validation of the tenant utility allowances in effect during the applicable year and vacancy rates for each unit type; and

(iv) annual third party determination of savings to the Secretary.

(2) **TERM.**—The term of an agreement under this section shall be not longer than 12 years.

(3) **ENTITY ELIGIBILITY.**—The Secretary shall—

(A) establish a competitive process for entering into agreements under this section; and

(B) enter into such agreements only with entities that demonstrate significant experience relating to—

(i) financing and operating properties receiving assistance under a program described in subsection (a);

(ii) oversight of energy and water conservation programs, including oversight of contractors; and

(iii) raising capital for energy and water conservation improvements from charitable organizations or private investors.

(4) **GEOGRAPHICAL DIVERSITY.**—Each agreement entered into under this section shall provide for the inclusion of properties with the greatest feasible regional and State variance.

(c) **PLAN AND REPORTS.**—

(1) **PLAN.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed plan for the implementation of this section.

(2) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall—

(A) conduct an evaluation of the program under this section; and

(B) submit to Congress a report describing each evaluation conducted under subparagraph (A).

(d) **FUNDING.**—For each fiscal year during which an agreement under this section is in effect, the Secretary may use to carry out this section any funds appropriated to the Secretary for the renewal of contracts under a program described in subsection (a).

SA 1853. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 56, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON ENERGY TAX.

(a) **FINDINGS; PURPOSES.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(A) on June 25, 2013, President Obama issued a Presidential memorandum directing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue regulations relating to power sector carbon pollution standards for existing coal fired power plants;

(B) the issuance of that memorandum circumvents Congress and the will of the people of the United States;

(C) any action to control emissions of greenhouse gases from existing coal fired

power plants in the United States by mandating a national energy tax would devastate major sectors of the economy, cost thousands of jobs, and increase energy costs for low-income households, small businesses, and seniors on fixed income;

(D) joblessness increases the likelihood of hospital visits, illnesses, and premature deaths;

(E) according to testimony on June 15, 2011, before the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate by Dr. Harvey Brenner of Johns Hopkins University, “The unemployment rate is well established as a risk factor for elevated illness and mortality rates in epidemiological studies performed since the early 1980s. In addition to influences on mental disorder, suicide and alcohol abuse and alcoholism, unemployment is also an important risk factor in cardiovascular disease and overall decreases in life expectancy.”;

(F) according to the National Center for Health Statistics, “children in poor families were four times as likely to be in fair or poor health as children that were not poor”;

(G) any major decision that would cost the economy of the United States millions of dollars and lead to serious negative health effects for the people of the United States should be debated and explicitly authorized by Congress, not approved by a Presidential memorandum or regulations; and

(H) any policy adopted by Congress should make United States energy as clean as practicable, as quickly as practicable, without increasing the cost of energy for struggling families, seniors, low-income households, and small businesses.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(A) to ensure that—

(i) a national energy tax is not imposed on the economy of the United States; and

(ii) struggling families, seniors, low-income households, and small businesses do not experience skyrocketing electricity bills and joblessness;

(B) to protect the people of the United States, particularly families, seniors, and children, from the serious negative health effects of joblessness;

(C) to allow sufficient time for Congress to develop and authorize an appropriate mechanism to address the energy needs of the United States and the potential challenges posed by severe weather; and

(D) to restore the legislative process and congressional authority over the energy policy of the United States.

(b) PRESIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of a Federal agency shall not promulgate any regulation relating to power sector carbon pollution standards or any substantially similar regulation on or after June 25, 2013, unless that regulation is explicitly authorized by an Act of Congress.

SA 1854. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4. SOCIAL COST OF CARBON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b) and section 324B of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, until the date the Sec-

retary conducts an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking and promulgates a proposed and final rule on the social cost of carbon, the Secretary and the heads of other Federal agencies shall not consider in any proceeding, regulation, decision, or action to implement this Act or an amendment made by this Act the social cost of carbon, as described in—

(1) the document entitled “Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis under Executive Order 12866”, dated May 2013;

(2) the document entitled “Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis under Executive Order 12866”, dated February 2010; or

(3) any other similar document.

(b) EFFECT ON REGULATIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not affect any final rule that has been published in the Federal Register before the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1855. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

Subtitle C—Energy Information for Commercial Buildings

SEC. 121. ENERGY INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS.

(a) REQUIREMENT OF BENCHMARKING AND DISCLOSURE FOR LEASING BUILDINGS WITHOUT ENERGY STAR LABELS.—Section 435(b)(2) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17091(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”;

(2) by striking “signing the contract,” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:

“signing the contract, the following requirements are met:

“(A) The space is renovated for all energy efficiency and conservation improvements that would be cost effective over the life of the lease, including improvements in lighting, windows, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems.

“(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), the space is benchmarked under a nationally recognized, online, free benchmarking program, with public disclosure, unless the space is a space for which owners cannot access whole building utility consumption data, including spaces—

“(I) that are located in States with privacy laws that provide that utilities shall not provide such aggregated information to multitenant building owners; and

“(II) for which tenants do not provide energy consumption information to the commercial building owner in response to a request from the building owner.

“(ii) A Federal agency that is a tenant of the space shall provide to the building owner, or authorize the owner to obtain from the utility, the energy consumption information of the space for the benchmarking and disclosure required by this subparagraph.”.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a study, with opportunity for public comment—

(A) on the impact of—

(i) State and local performance benchmarking and disclosure policies, and

any associated building efficiency policies, for commercial and multifamily buildings; and

(ii) programs and systems in which utilities provide aggregated information regarding whole building energy consumption and usage information to owners of multitenant commercial, residential, and mixed-use buildings;

(B) that identifies best practice policy approaches studied under subparagraph (A) that have resulted in the greatest improvements in building energy efficiency; and

(C) that considers—

(i) compliance rates and the benefits and costs of the policies and programs on building owners, utilities, tenants, and other parties;

(ii) utility practices, programs, and systems that provide aggregated energy consumption information to multitenant building owners, and the impact of public utility commissions and State privacy laws on those practices, programs, and systems;

(iii) exceptions to compliance in existing laws where building owners are not able to gather or access whole building energy information from tenants or utilities;

(iv) the treatment of buildings with—

(I) multiple uses;

(II) uses for which baseline information is not available; and

(III) uses that require high levels of energy intensities, such as data centers, trading floors, and television studios;

(v) implementation practices, including disclosure methods and phase-in of compliance;

(vi) the safety and security of benchmarking tools offered by government agencies, and the resiliency of those tools against cyber-attacks; and

(vii) international experiences with regard to building benchmarking and disclosure laws and data aggregation for multitenant buildings.

(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—At the conclusion of the study, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study.

(c) CREATION AND MAINTENANCE OF DATABASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act and following opportunity for public notice and comment, the Secretary, in coordination with other relevant agencies shall, to carry out the purpose described in paragraph (2)—

(A) assess existing databases; and

(B) as necessary—

(i) modify and maintain existing databases; or

(ii) create and maintain a new database platform.

(2) PURPOSE.—The maintenance of existing databases or creation of a new database platform under paragraph (1) shall be for the purpose of storing and making available public energy-related information on commercial and multifamily buildings, including—

(A) data provided under Federal, State, local, and other laws or programs regarding building benchmarking and energy information disclosure;

(B) buildings that have received energy ratings and certifications; and

(C) energy-related information on buildings provided voluntarily by the owners of the buildings, in an anonymous form, unless the owner provides otherwise.

(d) COMPETITIVE AWARDS.—Based on the results of the research for the portion of the study described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii), and with criteria developed following public

notice and comment, the Secretary may make competitive awards to utilities, utility regulators, and utility partners to develop and implement effective and promising programs to provide aggregated whole building energy consumption information to multi-tenant building owners.

(e) **INPUT FROM STAKEHOLDERS.**—The Secretary shall seek input from stakeholders to maximize the effectiveness of the actions taken under this section.

(f) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the progress made in complying with this section.

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection (b) \$2,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 122. OFFSET.

Section 422(f) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17082(f)) (as amended by section 401) is amended by striking paragraphs (4) through (6) and inserting the following:

“(4) \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2013;

“(5) \$197,500,000 for fiscal year 2014;

“(6) \$147,500,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(7) \$97,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018.”.

SA 1856. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:

SEC. 4. ENERGY EFFICIENCY RETROFIT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPLICANT.**—The term “applicant” means a nonprofit organization that applies for a grant under this section.

(2) **ENERGY-EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “energy-efficiency improvement” means an installed measure (including a product, equipment, system, service, or practice) that results in a reduction in use by a nonprofit organization for energy or fuel supplied from outside the nonprofit building.

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term “energy-efficiency improvement” includes an installed measure described in subparagraph (A) involving—

(i) repairing, replacing, or installing—

(I) a roof or lighting system, or component of a roof or lighting system;

(II) a window;

(III) a door, including a security door; or

(IV) a heating, ventilation, or air conditioning system or component of the system (including insulation and wiring and plumbing improvements needed to serve a more efficient system);

(ii) a renewable energy generation or heating system, including a solar, photovoltaic, wind, geothermal, or biomass (including wood pellet) system or component of the system; and

(iii) any other measure taken to modernize, renovate, or repair a nonprofit building to make the nonprofit building more energy efficient.

(3) **NONPROFIT BUILDING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “nonprofit building” means a building operated and owned by a nonprofit organization.

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term “nonprofit building” includes a building described in subparagraph (A) that is—

(i) a hospital;

(ii) a youth center;

(iii) a school;

(iv) a social-welfare program facility;

(v) a house of worship; and

(vi) any other nonresidential and non-commercial structure.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a pilot program to award grants for the purpose of retrofitting nonprofit buildings with energy-efficiency improvements.

(c) **GRANTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may award grants under the program established under subsection (b).

(2) **APPLICATION.**—The Secretary may award a grant under this section if an applicant submits to the Secretary an application at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may prescribe.

(3) **CRITERIA FOR GRANT.**—In determining whether to award a grant under this section, the Secretary shall apply performance-based criteria, which shall give priority to applications based on—

(A) the energy savings achieved;

(B) the cost-effectiveness of the energy-efficiency improvement;

(C) an effective plan for evaluation, measurement, and verification of energy savings;

(D) the financial need of the applicant; and

(E) the percentage of the matching contribution by the applicant.

(4) **LIMITATION ON INDIVIDUAL GRANT AMOUNT.**—Each grant awarded under this section shall not exceed—

(A) an amount equal to 50 percent of the energy-efficiency improvement; and

(B) \$200,000.

(5) **COST SHARING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A grant awarded under this section shall be subject to a minimum non-Federal cost-sharing requirement of 50 percent.

(B) **IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.**—The non-Federal share may be provided in the form of in-kind contributions of materials or services.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, to remain available until expended.

(e) **OFFSET.**—Section 942(f) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16251(f)) is amended by striking “\$250,000,000” and inserting “\$200,000,000”.

SA 1857. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. ANNUAL SBA STUDY ON THE COST OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Office of Advocacy shall conduct an annual study of the total cost of Federal regulations to small business concerns.

(b) **METHODOLOGY.**—In conducting each study required under subsection (a), the Office of Advocacy shall use a methodology that is substantially similar to the method-

ology used in conducting the study described in the report released by the Office of Advocacy entitled “The Impact of Regulatory Costs on Small Firms” (September 2010).

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Office of Advocacy shall submit to Congress a report on the findings of the most recent study conducted under subsection (a), which shall include an estimate of the total annual cost of Federal regulations to small business concerns, by agency.

(d) **FUNDING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Office of Advocacy shall carry out this section using unobligated funds otherwise made available to the Office of Advocacy.

(2) **SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FUNDING.**—It is the sense of Congress that no additional funds should be made available to the Administration or to the Office of Advocacy to carry out this section.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “Administration” means the Small Business Administration;

(2) the term “agency” has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) the term “Office of Advocacy” means the Office of Advocacy of the Administration; and

(4) the term “small business concern” has the meaning given the term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

SA 1858. Mr. WYDEN (for Mr. MERKLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. STUDY OF STANDBY POWER USAGE STANDARDS IMPLEMENTED BY THE STATES AND OTHER INDUSTRIALIZED NATIONS.

(a) **STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct a study of standby power usage standards that have been implemented by States and other industrialized nations.

(2) **REQUIREMENT.**—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall evaluate which of the standards studied would be economically and technologically feasible to implement throughout the United States for appliances and electronic devices covered under section 322 or 325 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6292, 6295).

(b) **REPORT.**—On completion of the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that describes the results of the study and the findings of the Secretary under subsection (a)(2).

SA 1859. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:

Subtitle B—Advanced Vehicle Technology

SEC. 411. OBJECTIVES.

The objectives of this subtitle are—

(1) to reform and reorient the vehicle technologies programs of the Department;

(2) to establish a clear and consistent authority for vehicle technologies programs of the Department;

(3) to develop United States technologies and practices that—

(A) improve the fuel efficiency and emissions of all vehicles produced in the United States; and

(B) reduce vehicle reliance on petroleum-based fuels;

(4) to support domestic research, development, engineering, demonstration, and commercial application and manufacturing of advanced vehicles, engines, and components;

(5) to enable vehicles to move larger volumes of goods and more passengers with less energy and emissions;

(6) to develop cost-effective advanced technologies for wide-scale utilization throughout the passenger, commercial, government, and transit vehicle sectors;

(7) to allow for greater consumer choice of vehicle technologies and fuels;

(8) to shorten technology development and integration cycles in the vehicle industry;

(9) to ensure a proper balance and diversity of Federal investment in vehicle technologies and among vehicle classes; and

(10) to strengthen partnerships between Federal and State governmental agencies and the private and academic sectors.

SEC. 412. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term “Department” means the Department of Energy.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 413. COORDINATION AND NONDUPLICATION.

(a) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that activities authorized by this subtitle do not duplicate activities of other programs within the Department or other relevant agencies.

(b) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—The activities carried out under this subtitle shall be subject to the cost-sharing requirements of section 988 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16352).

SEC. 414. VEHICLE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) PROGRAM.—

(1) ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall conduct a program of basic and applied research, development, engineering, demonstration, and commercial application activities on materials, technologies, and processes with the potential to substantially reduce or eliminate petroleum use and the emissions of the Nation's passenger and commercial vehicles, including activities in the areas of—

(A) hybridization or full electrification of vehicle systems;

(B) batteries, ultracapacitors, and other energy storage devices;

(C) power electronics;

(D) vehicle, component, and subsystem manufacturing technologies and processes;

(E) engine efficiency and combustion optimization;

(F) waste heat recovery;

(G) transmission and drivetrains;

(H) hydrogen vehicle technologies, including fuel cells and internal combustion engines, and hydrogen infrastructure;

(I) compressed natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas vehicle technologies;

(J) aerodynamics, rolling resistance, and accessory power loads of vehicles and associated equipment;

(K) vehicle weight reduction, including lightweighting materials;

(L) friction and wear reduction;

(M) engine and component durability;

(N) innovative propulsion systems;

(O) advanced boosting systems;

(P) hydraulic hybrid technologies;

(Q) engine compatibility with and optimization for a variety of transportation fuels including natural gas and other liquid and gaseous fuels;

(R) predictive engineering, modeling, and simulation of vehicle and transportation systems;

(S) refueling and charging infrastructure for alternative fueled and electric or plug-in electric hybrid vehicles, including the unique challenges facing rural areas;

(T) gaseous fuels storage systems and system integration and optimization;

(U) sensing, communications, and actuation technologies for vehicle, electrical grid, and infrastructure;

(V) efficient use, substitution, and recycling of potentially critical materials in vehicles, including rare earth elements and precious metals, at risk of supply disruption;

(W) aftertreatment technologies;

(X) thermal management of battery systems;

(Y) retrofitting advanced vehicle technologies to existing vehicles;

(Z) development of common standards, specifications, and architectures for both transportation and stationary battery applications;

(AA) advanced internal combustion engines; and

(BB) other research areas as determined by the Secretary.

(2) TRANSFORMATIONAL TECHNOLOGY.—The Secretary shall ensure that the Department continues to support research, development, engineering, demonstration, and commercial application activities and maintains competency in mid- to long-term transformational vehicle technologies with potential to achieve deep reductions in petroleum use and emissions, including activities in the areas of—

(A) hydrogen vehicle technologies, including fuel cells, internal combustion engines, hydrogen storage, infrastructure, and activities in hydrogen technology validation and safety codes and standards;

(B) multiple battery chemistries and novel energy storage devices, including nonchemical batteries, ultracapacitors and electromechanical storage technologies such as hydraulics, flywheels, and compressed air storage;

(C) communication, connectivity, and power flow among vehicles, infrastructure, and the electrical grid; and

(D) other innovative technologies research and development, as determined by the Secretary.

(3) INDUSTRY PARTICIPATION.—To the maximum extent practicable, activities under this subtitle shall be carried out in partnership or collaboration with automotive manufacturers, heavy commercial, vocational, and transit vehicle manufacturers, qualified plug-in electric vehicle manufacturers, compressed natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas vehicle manufacturers, vehicle and engine equipment and component manufacturers, manufacturing equipment manufacturers, advanced vehicle service providers, fuel producers and energy suppliers, electric utilities, universities, national laboratories, and independent research laboratories. In carrying out this subtitle the Secretary shall—

(A) determine whether a wide range of companies that manufacture or assemble vehicles or components in the United States are represented in ongoing public private partnership activities, including firms that have not traditionally participated in feder-

ally sponsored research and development activities, and where possible, partner with such firms that conduct significant and relevant research and development activities in the United States;

(B) leverage the capabilities and resources of, and formalize partnerships with, industry-led stakeholder organizations, nonprofit organizations, industry consortia, and trade associations with expertise in the research and development of, and education and outreach activities in, advanced automotive and commercial vehicle technologies;

(C) develop more efficient processes for transferring research findings and technologies to industry;

(D) give consideration to conversion of existing or former vehicle technology development or manufacturing facilities for the purposes of this subtitle;

(E) establish and support public-private partnerships, dedicated to overcoming barriers in commercial application of transformational vehicle technologies, that utilize such industry-led technology development facilities of entities with demonstrated expertise in successfully designing and engineering pre-commercial generations of such transformational technology; and

(F) promote efforts to ensure that technology research, development, engineering, and commercial application activities funded under this subtitle are carried out in the United States.

(4) INTERAGENCY AND INTRAAGENCY COORDINATION.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall coordinate research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities among—

(A) relevant programs within the Department, including—

(i) the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy;

(ii) the Office of Science;

(iii) the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability;

(iv) the Office of Fossil Energy;

(v) the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy; and

(vi) other offices as determined by the Secretary; and

(B) relevant technology research and development programs within the Department of Transportation and other Federal agencies, as determined by the Secretary.

(5) FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION OF TECHNOLOGIES.—The Secretary shall make information available to procurement programs of Federal agencies regarding the potential to demonstrate technologies resulting from activities funded through programs under this subtitle.

(6) INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall seek opportunities to leverage resources and support initiatives of State and local governments in developing and promoting advanced vehicle technologies, manufacturing, and infrastructure.

(7) CRITERIA.—When awarding cost-shared grants under this program, the Secretary shall give priority to those technologies (either individually or as part of a system) that—

(A) provide the greatest aggregate fuel savings based on the reasonable projected sales volumes of the technology; and

(B) provide the greatest increase in United States employment.

(b) SENSING AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Transportation and the relevant research programs of other Federal agencies, shall conduct research, development, engineering, and demonstration

activities on connectivity of vehicle and transportation systems, including on sensing, computation, communication, and actuation technologies that allow for reduced fuel use, optimized traffic flow, and vehicle electrification, including technologies for—

(A) onboard vehicle, engine, and component sensing and actuation;

(B) vehicle-to-vehicle sensing and communication;

(C) vehicle-to-infrastructure sensing and communication; and

(D) vehicle integration with the electrical grid, including communications to provide grid services.

(2) **COORDINATION.**—The activities carried out under this section shall supplement (and not supplant) activities under the intelligent transportation system research program of the Department of Transportation.

(c) **MANUFACTURING.**—The Secretary shall carry out a research, development, engineering, demonstration, and commercial application program of advanced vehicle manufacturing technologies and practices, including innovative processes to—

(1) increase the production rate and decrease the cost of advanced battery manufacturing;

(2) vary the capability of individual manufacturing facilities to accommodate different battery chemistries and configurations;

(3) reduce waste streams, emissions, and energy-intensity of vehicle, engine, advanced battery and component manufacturing processes;

(4) recycle and remanufacture used batteries and other vehicle components for reuse in vehicles or stationary applications;

(5) produce cost-effective lightweight materials such as advanced metal alloys, polymeric composites, and carbon fiber;

(6) produce lightweight high pressure storage systems for gaseous fuels;

(7) design and manufacture purpose-built hydrogen and fuel cell vehicles and components;

(8) improve the calendar life and cycle life of advanced batteries; and

(9) produce permanent magnets for advanced vehicles.

(d) **REPORTING.**—

(1) **TECHNOLOGIES DEVELOPED.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter through 2017, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report regarding the technologies developed as a result of the activities authorized by this section, with a particular emphasis on whether the technologies were successfully adopted for commercial applications, and if so, whether products relying on those technologies are manufactured in the United States.

(2) **ADDITIONAL MATTERS.**—At the end of each fiscal year through 2017 the Secretary shall submit to the relevant Congressional committees of jurisdiction an annual report describing activities undertaken in the previous year under this section, active industry participants, efforts to recruit new participants committed to design, engineering, and manufacturing of advanced vehicle technologies in the United States, progress of the program in meeting goals and timelines, and a strategic plan for funding of activities across agencies.

SEC. 415. MEDIUM AND HEAVY DUTY COMMERCIAL AND TRANSIT VEHICLES.

(a) **PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in partnership with relevant research and development programs in other Federal agencies, and a range of appropriate industry stakeholders,

shall carry out a program of cooperative research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities on advanced technologies for medium- to heavy-duty commercial, vocational, recreational, and transit vehicles, including activities in the areas of—

(A) engine efficiency and combustion research;

(B) onboard storage technologies for compressed natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas;

(C) development and integration of engine technologies designed for compressed natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas operation of a variety of vehicle platforms;

(D) waste heat recovery and conversion;

(E) improved aerodynamics and tire rolling resistance;

(F) energy and space-efficient emissions control systems;

(G) heavy hybrid, hybrid hydraulic, plug-in hybrid, and electric platforms, and energy storage technologies;

(H) drivetrain optimization;

(I) friction and wear reduction;

(J) engine idle and parasitic energy loss reduction;

(K) electrification of accessory loads;

(L) onboard sensing and communications technologies;

(M) advanced lightweighting materials and vehicle designs;

(N) increasing load capacity per vehicle;

(O) thermal management of battery systems;

(P) recharging infrastructure;

(Q) compressed natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas infrastructure;

(R) advanced internal combustion engines;

(S) complete vehicle modeling and simulation;

(T) hydrogen vehicle technologies, including fuel cells and internal combustion engines, and hydrogen infrastructure;

(U) retrofitting advanced technologies onto existing truck fleets; and

(V) integration of these and other advanced systems onto a single truck and trailer platform.

(2) **LEADERSHIP.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall appoint a full-time Director to coordinate research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities in medium- to heavy-duty commercial, recreational, and transit vehicle technologies.

(B) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR.**—The responsibilities of the Director shall be to—

(i) improve coordination and develop consensus between government agency and industry partners, and propose new processes for program management and priority setting to better align activities and budgets among partners;

(ii) regularly convene workshops, site visits, demonstrations, conferences, investor forums, and other events in which information and research findings are shared among program participants and interested stakeholders;

(iii) develop a budget for the Department's activities with regard to the interagency program, and provide consultation and guidance on vehicle technology funding priorities across agencies;

(iv) determine a process for reviewing program technical goals, targets, and timetables and, where applicable, aided by lifecycle impact and cost analysis, propose revisions or elimination based on program progress, available funding, and rate of technology adoption;

(v) evaluate ongoing activities of the program and recommend project modifications, including the termination of projects, where applicable;

(vi) recruit new industry participants to the interagency program, including truck, trailer, and component manufacturers who have not traditionally participated in federally sponsored research and technology development activities; and

(vii) other responsibilities as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with interagency and industry partners.

(3) **REPORTING.**—At the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress an annual report describing activities undertaken in the previous year, active industry participants, efforts to recruit new participants, progress of the program in meeting goals and timelines, and a strategic plan for funding of activities across agencies.

(b) CLASS 8 TRUCK AND TRAILER SYSTEMS DEMONSTRATION.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct a competitive grant program to demonstrate the integration of multiple advanced technologies on Class 8 truck and trailer platforms with a goal of improving overall freight efficiency, as measured in tons and volume of freight hauled or other work performance-based metrics, by 50 percent, including a combination of technologies listed in subsection (a)(1).

(2) **ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.**—Applicant teams may be comprised of truck and trailer manufacturers, engine and component manufacturers, fleet customers, university researchers, and other applicants as appropriate for the development and demonstration of integrated Class 8 truck and trailer systems.

(c) **TECHNOLOGY TESTING AND METRICS.**—The Secretary, in coordination with the partners of the interagency research program described in subsection (a)(1)—

(1) shall develop standard testing procedures and technologies for evaluating the performance of advanced heavy vehicle technologies under a range of representative duty cycles and operating conditions, including for heavy hybrid propulsion systems;

(2) shall evaluate heavy vehicle performance using work performance-based metrics other than those based on miles per gallon, including those based on units of volume and weight transported for freight applications, and appropriate metrics based on the work performed by nonroad systems; and

(3) may construct heavy duty truck and bus testing facilities.

(d) **NONROAD SYSTEMS PILOT PROGRAM.**—The Secretary shall undertake a pilot program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial applications of technologies to improve total machine or system efficiency for nonroad mobile equipment including agricultural and construction equipment, and shall seek opportunities to transfer relevant research findings and technologies between the nonroad and on-highway equipment and vehicle sectors.

(e) **REPEAL OF EXISTING AUTHORITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Sections 706, 711, 712, and 933 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16051, 16061, 16062, 16233) are repealed.

(2) **ENERGY EFFICIENCY.**—Section 911 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16191) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “vehicles, buildings,” and inserting “buildings”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(II) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (E) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively; and

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking paragraph (3);

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3); and

(iii) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by striking “(a)(2)(D)” and inserting “(a)(2)(C)”.

(3) ENERGY STORAGE COMPETITIVENESS.—Section 641 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17231) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (j);

(B) by redesignating subsections (k) through (p) as subsections (j) through (o), respectively; and

(C) in subsection (o) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “and;” after the semicolon at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (4), by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(iii) by striking paragraph (5);

(iv) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (5); and

(v) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated), by striking “subsection (k)” and inserting “subsection (j)”.

SA 1860. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SECTION 5. USE OF FEDERAL DISASTER RELIEF AND EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE FOR ENERGY-EFFICIENT PRODUCTS AND STRUCTURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5141 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 327. USE OF ASSISTANCE FOR ENERGY-EFFICIENT PRODUCTS AND STRUCTURES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘energy-efficient product’ means a product that—

“(A) meets or exceeds the requirements for designation under an Energy Star program established under section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6294a); or

“(B) meets or exceeds the requirements for designation as being among the highest 25 percent of equivalent products for energy efficiency under the Federal Energy Management Program; and

“(2) the term ‘energy-efficient structure’ means a residential structure, a public facility, or a private nonprofit facility that meets or exceeds the requirements of American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers Standard 90.1-2010 or the 2013 International Energy Conservation Code, or any successor thereto.

“(b) USE OF ASSISTANCE.—A recipient of assistance relating to a major disaster or emergency may use the assistance to replace or repair a damaged product or structure with an energy-efficient product or energy-efficient structure.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to assistance made available under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act that is expended on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1861. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 3, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 44, line 23.

Beginning on page 47, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 48, line 16.

SA 1862. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

TITLE I—FEDERAL AGENCY ENERGY EFFICIENCY

SEC. 101. ADOPTION OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY POWER SAVINGS TECHNIQUES BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Administrator of General Services, shall issue guidance for Federal agencies to employ advanced tools promoting energy efficiency and energy savings through the use of information and communications technologies, including computer hardware, operation and maintenance processes, energy efficiency software, and power management tools.

(b) REPORTS ON PLANS AND SAVINGS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the issuance of the guidance under subsection (a), each Federal agency shall submit to the Secretary a report that describes—

(1) the plan of the agency for implementing the guidance within the agency; and

(2) estimated energy and financial savings from employing the tools and processes described in subsection (a).

SEC. 102. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DESIGN UPDATES.

Section 3307 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) through (h) as subsections (e) through (i), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DESIGN UPDATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), for any project for which congressional approval is received under subsection (a) and for which the design has been substantially completed but construction has not begun, the Administrator of General Services may use appropriated funds to update the project design to meet applicable Federal building energy efficiency standards established under section 305 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6834) and other requirements established under section 3312.

“(2) LIMITATION.—The use of funds under paragraph (1) shall not exceed 125 percent of the estimated energy or other cost savings associated with the updates as determined by a life cycle cost analysis under section 544 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8254).”.

SEC. 103. FEDERAL DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator for the Office of E-Government and Information Technology within the Office of Management and Budget shall develop and publish a goal for the total amount of planned energy and cost savings and increased productivity by the Federal Government through the consolidation of Federal data centers during the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, which shall include a breakdown on a year-by-year basis of the projected savings and productivity gains.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—Nothing in this section applies to the High Performance Computing Modernization Program (HPCMP) of the Department of Defense.

SA 1863. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 401. REGIONAL HAZE PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (referred to in this section as the “Administrator”) shall not reject or disapprove in whole or in part a State regional haze implementation plan addressing any regional haze regulation of the Environmental Protection Agency (including the regulations described in section 51.308 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)) if—

(1) the State has submitted to the Administrator a State implementation plan for regional haze that—

(A) considers the factors identified in section 169A of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7491); and

(B) applies the relevant laws (including regulations);

(2) the Administrator fails to demonstrate using the best available science that a Federal implementation plan action governing a specific source, when compared to the State plan, does not result in greater than a 1.0 deciview improvement in any class I area (as classified under section 162 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7472)); and

(3) implementation of the Federal implementation plan, when compared to the State plan, will result in an economic cost to the State or to the private sector of greater than \$100,000,000 in any fiscal year or \$300,000,000 in the aggregate.

SA 1864. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:

SEC. 4. CONVEYANCE TO STATES OF PROPERTY INTEREST IN STATE SHARE OF ROYALTIES AND OTHER PAYMENTS.

Section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (a), by striking “shall be paid into the Treasury”

and inserting “shall, except as provided in subsection (d), be paid into the Treasury”;

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting “and except as provided in subsection (d)” before “, any rentals”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) CONVEYANCE TO STATES OF PROPERTY INTEREST IN STATE SHARE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on request of a State (other than the State of Alaska) and in lieu of any payments to the State under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the State all right, title, and interest in and to 50 percent of all amounts otherwise required to be paid into the Treasury under subsection (a) from sales, bonuses, royalties (including interest charges), and rentals for all public land or deposits located in the State.

“(2) STATE OF ALASKA.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on request of the State of Alaska and in lieu of any payments to the State under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the State all right, title, and interest in and to 90 percent of all amounts otherwise required to be paid into the Treasury under subsection (a) from sales, bonuses, royalties (including interest charges), and rentals for all public land or deposits located in the State.

“(3) AMOUNT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, after a conveyance to a State under paragraph (1) or (2), any person shall pay directly to the State any amount owed by the person for which the right, title, and interest has been conveyed to the State under this subsection.

“(4) NOTICE.—The Secretary of the Interior shall promptly provide to each holder of a lease of public land to which subsection (a) applies that are located in a State to which right, title, and interest is conveyed under this subsection notice that—

“(A) the Secretary of the Interior has conveyed to the State all right, title, and interest in and to the amounts referred to in paragraph (1) or (2); and

“(B) the leaseholder is required to pay the amounts directly to the State.”.

SA 1865. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4. REPEAL OF RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 211 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545) is amended by striking subsection (o).

(b) ADDITIONAL REPEAL.—Section 204 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 7545 note; Public Law 110-140) is repealed.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the regulations under subparts K and M of part 80 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on that date of enactment), shall have no force or effect.

SA 1866. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HELLER, Mr. LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residen-

tial buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL STAFF AND MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.

Section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting the following:

“(D) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL STAFF, AND POLITICAL APPOINTEES IN THE EXCHANGE.”;

(2) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(A) by striking “and congressional staff with” and inserting “, congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, and political appointees with”; and

(B) by striking “or congressional staff shall” and inserting “, congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointee shall”;

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (II), by inserting after “Congress,” the following: “of a committee of Congress, or of a leadership office of Congress,”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) POLITICAL APPOINTEE.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘political appointee’ means any individual who—

“(aa) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

“(bb) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

“(cc) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION.—No Government contribution under section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, shall be provided on behalf of an individual who is a Member of Congress, a congressional staff member, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointees for coverage under this paragraph.

“(iv) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF TAX CREDIT OR COST-SHARING.—An individual enrolling in health insurance coverage pursuant to this paragraph shall not be eligible to receive a tax credit under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or reduced cost sharing under section 1402 of this Act in an amount that exceeds the total amount for which a similarly situated individual (who is not so enrolled) would be entitled to receive under such sections.

“(v) LIMITATION ON DISCRETION FOR DESIGNATION OF STAFF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Member of Congress shall not have discretion in determinations with respect to which employees employed by the office of such Member are eligible to enroll for coverage through an Exchange.”.

SA 1867. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings

and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . CONDITIONING PROVISION OF PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES UNDER THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT UPON CERTIFICATION THAT A PROGRAM TO VERIFY HOUSEHOLD INCOME AND OTHER QUALIFICATIONS FOR THOSE SUBSIDIES IS OPERATIONAL.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no premium tax credits shall be permitted under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and no reductions in cost-sharing shall be permitted under section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18071) prior to the date on which the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services certifies to Congress that there is in place a program that successfully and consistently verifies, consistent with section 1411 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 18081), the household income and coverage requirements of individuals applying for such credits and cost-sharing reduction reductions.

SA 1868. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4. GUIDELINES TO ENCOURAGE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES TO HELP REDUCE ENERGY USE AND COSTS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall issue to the head of each Federal agency guidelines to reduce energy costs at that Federal agency by requiring employees of the Federal agency to—

(1) turn off the lights in the work areas of the employees at the end of the work day; and

(2) turn off or unplugging other devices that consume energy during periods in which the employees are not in the office.

SA 1869. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:

SEC. 4. CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall certify that the amount of energy cost savings over a 10-year period as a result of each project or activity funded under this Act or an amendment made by this Act would equal or exceed the cost of the project or activity.

(b) ACTUAL ENERGY USE.—On completion of a project or activity provided funds under this Act or an amendment made by this Act, the Secretary shall certify that, over a 10-year period, as a result of the project or activity—

(1) there was a reduction in actual energy use; and

(2) the energy cost savings exceeded the costs of the project or activity.

SA 1870. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4. EVALUATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE GREEN BUILDING PROGRAMS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—The term “administrative expenses” has the meaning given the term by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under section 504(b)(2) of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (31 U.S.C. 1105 note; Public Law 111–85), except that the term shall include, for purposes of that section and this section, with respect to an agency—

(A) costs incurred by the agency and costs incurred by grantees, subgrantees, and other recipients of funds from a grant program or other program administered by the agency; and

(B) expenses related to personnel salaries and benefits, property management, travel, program management, promotion, reviews and audits, case management, and communication about, promotion of, and outreach for programs and program activities administered by the agency.

(2) **APPLICABLE PROGRAMS.**—The term “applicable programs” means the programs listed in Table 9 (pages 348–350) of the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled “2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue”.

(3) **APPROPRIATE SECRETARIES.**—The term “appropriate Secretaries” means—

(A) the Secretary;

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(C) the Secretary of Defense;

(D) the Secretary of Education;

(E) the Secretary of Health and Human Services;

(F) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

(G) the Secretary of Transportation;

(H) the Secretary of the Treasury;

(I) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(J) the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology; and

(K) the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(4) **SERVICES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term “services” has the meaning given the term by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The term “services” shall be limited to activities, assistance, and aid that provide a direct benefit to a recipient, such as—

(i) the provision of medical care;

(ii) assistance for housing or tuition; or

(iii) financial support (including grants and loans).

(b) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than October 1, 2014, the appropriate Secretaries shall submit to Congress and post on the public Internet websites of the agencies of the appropriate Secretaries a report on the outcomes of the applicable programs.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In reporting on the outcomes of each applicable program, the appropriate Secretaries shall—

(A) determine the total administrative expenses of the applicable program;

(B) determine the expenditures for services for the applicable program;

(C) estimate the number of clients served by the applicable program and beneficiaries who received assistance under the applicable program (if applicable);

(D) estimate—

(i) the number of full-time employees who administer the applicable program; and

(ii) the number of full-time equivalents (whose salary is paid in part or full by the Federal Government through a grant or contract, a subaward of a grant or contract, a cooperative agreement, or another form of financial award or assistance) who assist in administering the applicable program;

(E) describe the type of assistance the applicable program provides, such as grants, technical assistance, loans, tax credits, or tax deductions;

(F) describe the type of recipient who benefits from the assistance provided, such as individual property owners or renters, local governments, businesses, nonprofit organizations, or State governments; and

(G) identify and report on whether written program goals are available for the applicable program.

(c) **PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Not later than January 1, 2015, the appropriate Secretaries shall jointly submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) an analysis of whether any of the applicable programs should be eliminated or consolidated, including any legislative changes that would be necessary to eliminate or consolidate the applicable programs; and

(2) ways to improve the applicable programs by establishing program goals or increasing collaboration so as to reduce the overlap and duplication identified in—

(A) the 2011 report of the Government Accountability Office entitled “Federal Initiatives for the NonFederal Sector Could Benefit from More Interagency Collaboration”; and

(B) the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled “2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue”.

(d) **PROGRAM ELIMINATIONS.**—Not later than January 1, 2015, the appropriate Secretaries shall—

(1) identify—

(A) which applicable programs are specifically required by law; and

(B) which applicable programs are carried out under the discretionary authority of the appropriate Secretaries;

(2) eliminate those applicable programs that are not required by law; and

(3) transfer any remaining applicable projects and nonduplicative functions into another green building program within the same agency.

SA 1871. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BURR, Mr. RISCH, Mr. JOHANNES, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE —HEALTH PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Fairness for American Families Act

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This Subtitle may be cited as the “Fairness for American Families Act”.

SEC. 02. DELAY IN APPLICATION OF INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE MAN-DATE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5000A(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Section 5000A(c)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” in clause (i) and inserting “2015”; and

(B) by striking “2015” in clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting “2016”.

(2) Section 5000A(c)(3)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”; and

(B) by striking “2015” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “2016”.

(3) Section 5000A(c)(3)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2016” and inserting “2017”; and

(B) by striking “2015” and inserting “2016”.

(4) Section 5000A(e)(1)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”; and

(B) by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Subtitle B—Authority for Mandate Delay Act

SEC. 11. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Authority for Mandate Delay Act”.

SEC. 12. DELAY IN APPLICATION OF EMPLOYER HEALTH INSURANCE MAN-DATE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1513(d) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **REPORTING BY EMPLOYERS.**—Section 1514(d) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(2) **REPORTING BY INSURANCE PROVIDERS.**—Section 1502(e) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to which they relate.

SA 1872. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 4. ELIMINATION OF TAX CREDIT FOR MOTOR VEHICLES PRODUCED THROUGH AN ENERGY AND CARBON-INTENSIVE MANUFACTURING PROCESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other law, the tax credit provided under section 30D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986

shall not be allowed for any motor vehicle if the total amount of carbon dioxide generated through the manufacturing process for such vehicle is greater than 25,000 pounds.

(b) **REVENUE.**—Any increase in revenue as a result of limitation described in subsection (a) shall be made available to offset the cost of any energy efficiency upgrades made to hospitals, schools, nursing homes, and daycare facilities.

SA 1873. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 33, strike line 13 and all that follows through page 36, line 21.

SA 1874. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:
SEC. 4. STUDY AND REPORT ON TAXPAYER-ASSISTED COMPANIES THAT HAVE FILED FOR BANKRUPTCY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct a study to determine the total number of companies that—

(A) received funds from a grant, loan, or loan guarantee of the Department of Energy or any other Federal agency or program under—

(i) section 1703 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16513); or

(ii) section 1705 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16516); and

(B) filed for bankruptcy under chapter 7 or 11 of title 11, United States Code, within 5 years after the date of receipt of the Federal loan, grant, or loan guarantee; and

(2) submit to Congress a report that includes the results of the study described in paragraph (1).

SA 1875. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:
SEC. 4. CONSOLIDATION OF ENERGY STAR PROGRAM.

(a) **CONSOLIDATION OF ENERGY STAR PROGRAM.**—

(1) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to the Energy Star program established under section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a) is terminated.

(2) **TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS.**—There are transferred to the Secretary of Energy all functions that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency was authorized to exercise with respect to the Energy Star program on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) **REDUCTION IN FUNDS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(A) of the amounts made available for the Energy Star program that remain unobli-

gated as of the date of enactment of this Act, 20 percent shall be rescinded; and

(B) of the amounts rescinded under subparagraph (A), 10 percent shall be transferred to the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Energy.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “and the Environmental Protection Agency”;;

(2) by striking subsection (b);

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Administrator and the”; and

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking “Agency or”; and

(4) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

SA 1876. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . LIMITATION ON SUBSIDIES FOR INDIVIDUALS IN TAFT-HARTLEY PLANS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no premium tax credits shall be permitted under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and no reductions in cost-sharing shall be permitted under section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18071) with respect to an individual for health insurance coverage provided pursuant to the terms of a collective bargaining agreement involving one or more employers.

(b) **QUALIFIED PLANS.**—Section 1301(a) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18021(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **TAFT-HARTLEY PLANS.**—The term ‘qualified health plan’ shall not include health insurance coverage provided pursuant to the terms of a collective bargaining agreement involving one or more employers.”.

SA 1877. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 303 and insert the following:
SEC. 303. FEDERAL DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION INITIATIVE.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator for the Office of E-Government and Information Technology within the Office of Management and Budget.

(2) **FDCCI.**—The term “FDCCI” means the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative described in the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative, dated February 26, 2010, or any successor thereto.

(b) **FEDERAL DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION INVENTORIES AND PLANS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **ANNUAL REPORTING.**—Each year, beginning in the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act and for each of the 4 fiscal years thereafter, the head of each

agency that is described in subparagraph (D), assisted by the Chief Information Officer of the agency, shall submit to the Administrator—

(i) a comprehensive asset inventory of the data centers owned, operated, or maintained by or on behalf of the agency, including average server utilization, even if the center is administered by a third party; and

(ii) a multi-year plan to achieve the optimization and consolidation of agency data center assets, that includes—

(I) performance metrics—

(aa) that are consistent with performance metrics established by the Administrator under subparagraphs (C) and (G) of paragraph (2); and

(bb) by which the quantitative and qualitative progress of the agency toward data center consolidation goals can be measured;

(II) a timeline for agency activities completed under the FDCCI, with an emphasis on benchmarks the agency can achieve by specific dates;

(III) an aggregation of year-by-year investment and cost savings calculations for the 5-fiscal-year period past the date of submission to the Administrator, broken down by each year, including a description of any initial costs for data center consolidation and life cycle cost savings, with an emphasis on—

(aa) meeting the Government-wide performance metrics described in subparagraphs (C) and (G) of paragraph (2); and

(bb) demonstrating agency-specific savings each fiscal year achieved through the FDCCI; and

(IV) any additional information required by the Administrator.

(B) **USE OF EXISTING REPORTING STRUCTURES.**—The Administrator may require agencies described in subparagraph (D) to submit any information required to be submitted under this subsection through reporting structures in use as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(C) **CERTIFICATION.**—Each year, beginning in the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act and for each of the 4 fiscal years thereafter, acting through the chief information officer of the agency, shall submit a statement to the Administrator certifying that the agency has complied with the requirements of this Act.

(D) **AGENCIES DESCRIBED.**—The agencies (including all associated components of the agency) described in this paragraph are the—

(i) Department of Agriculture;

(ii) Department of Commerce;

(iii) Department of Defense;

(iv) Department of Education;

(v) Department of Energy;

(vi) Department of Health and Human Services;

(vii) Department of Homeland Security;

(viii) Department of Housing and Urban Development;

(ix) Department of the Interior;

(x) Department of Justice;

(xi) Department of Labor;

(xii) Department of State;

(xiii) Department of Transportation;

(xiv) Department of Treasury;

(xv) Department of Veterans Affairs;

(xvi) Environmental Protection Agency;

(xvii) General Services Administration;

(xviii) National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(xix) National Science Foundation;

(xx) Nuclear Regulatory Commission;

(xxi) Office of Personnel Management;

(xxii) Small Business Administration;

(xxiii) Social Security Administration; and

(xxiv) United States Agency for International Development.

(E) AGENCY IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANS.—Each agency described in subparagraph (D), under the direction of the Chief Information Officer of the agency shall—

(i) implement the consolidation plan required under subparagraph (A)(ii); and

(ii) provide updates to the Administrator, on a quarterly basis, of—

(I) the completion of activities by the agency under the FDCCI;

(II) any progress of the agency towards meeting the Government-wide data center performance metrics described in subparagraphs (C) and (G) of paragraph (2); and

(III) the actual cost savings realized through the implementation of the FDCCI.

(F) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the reporting of information by any agency described in subparagraph (F) to the Administrator, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, or to Congress.

(2) ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Administrator shall—

(A) establish the deadline, on an annual basis, for agencies to submit information under this section;

(B) establish a list of requirements that the agencies must meet to be considered in compliance with paragraph (1);

(C) ensure that each certification submitted under paragraph (1)(C) and information relating to agency progress towards meeting the Government-wide total cost of ownership optimization and consolidation metrics is made available in a timely manner to the general public;

(D) review the plans submitted under paragraph (1) to determine whether each plan is comprehensive and complete;

(E) monitor the implementation of the data center plan of each agency described in paragraph (1)(A)(ii);

(F) update, on an annual basis, the cumulative cost savings realized through the implementation of the agency plans; and

(G) establish Government-wide data center total cost of ownership optimization and consolidation metrics.

(3) COST SAVING GOAL AND UPDATES FOR CONGRESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall develop and publish a goal for the total amount of planned cost savings by the Federal Government through the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative during the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, which shall include a breakdown on a year-by-year basis of the projected savings.

(B) ANNUAL UPDATE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the goal described in subparagraph (A) is determined and each year thereafter until the end of 2018, the Administrator shall aggregate the savings achieved to date, by each relevant agency, through the FDCCI as compared to the projected savings developed under subparagraph (A) (based on data collected from each affected agency under paragraph (1)).

(ii) UPDATE FOR CONGRESS.—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted to Congress and shall include an update on the progress made by each agency described in subsection paragraph (1)(E) on—

(I) whether each agency has in fact submitted a comprehensive asset inventory, including an assessment broken down by agency, which shall include the specific numbers, utilization, and efficiency level of data centers; and

(II) whether each agency has submitted a comprehensive consolidation plan with the

key elements described in paragraph (1)(A)(ii).

(iii) REQUEST FOR REPORTS.—Upon request from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate or the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, the head of an agency described in paragraph (1)(E) or the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the requesting committee any report or information submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for the purpose of preparing a report required under clause (i) or an updated progress report required under clause (ii).

(4) GAO REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—During the 5-fiscal-year period following the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the quality and completeness of each agency's asset inventory and plans required under paragraph (1)(A).

(B) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall, on an annual basis during the 5-fiscal-year period following the date of enactment of this Act, publish a report on each review conducted under subparagraph (A) of an agency during the fiscal year for which the report is published.

(c) ENSURING CYBERSECURITY STANDARDS FOR DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION AND CLOUD COMPUTING.—An agency required to implement a data center consolidation plan under this Act and migrate to cloud computing shall do so in a manner that is consistent with Federal guidelines on cloud computing security, including—

(1) applicable provisions found within the Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program (FedRAMP); and

(2) guidance published by the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(d) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The Director of National Intelligence may waive the requirements of this Act for any element (or component of an element) of the intelligence community.

(e) SUNSET.—This section is repealed effective on October 1, 2018.

SA 1878. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:

SEC. 4. STUDY ON BENEFITS OF COMMERCIAL BUILDING ENERGY CODE COMPLIANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of—

(1) the quantified energy savings and quantified nonenergy benefits of achieving full compliance with national model building energy codes (including any additional energy savings) if all new commercial building construction—

(A) meets national model building energy codes;

(B) exceeds national model codes by 30 percent; and

(C) exceeds national model codes by 50 percent; and

(2) the quantified energy saving and quantified nonenergy benefits realized from conducting comprehensive or deep retrofits in existing commercial buildings, including the effect that expanding the retrofit program would have with respect to—

(A) the United States as a whole; and

(B) 2 States selected for study.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out studies under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(A) include in nonenergy benefits improved health of building occupants and the general population, and greater office productivity that may be achieved from the adoption of national model building energy codes; and

(B) for each of the scenarios described in subsection (a)(1), calculate the societal return on investment from full implementation of national model building energy codes, with and without nonenergy benefits.

(2) DEADLINE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete the studies required under subsection (a).

SA 1879. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4. VOLUNTARY CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS FOR AIR CONDITIONING, FURNACE, BOILER, HEAT PUMP, AND WATER HEATER PRODUCTS.

Section 326(b) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6296(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) VOLUNTARY CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS FOR AIR CONDITIONING, FURNACE, BOILER, HEAT PUMP, AND WATER HEATER PRODUCTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of receiving reports from manufacturers certifying compliance with energy conservation standards and Energy Star specifications established under sections 324A, 325, and 342 for covered products described in paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (9), and (11) of section 322(a) and covered equipment described in subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), (F), (I), (J), and (K) of section 340(1), and for the purpose of routine testing to verify the product ratings of the covered products and equipment, the Secretary and Administrator shall rely on voluntary certification programs that—

“(i) are nationally recognized;

“(ii) maintain a publicly available list of all certified models;

“(iii)(I) unless the Secretary allows the verification testing of fewer product families, annually test at least 20 percent of product families to verify the product ratings of the product families; and

“(II) provide to the Secretary a list of product families whose product ratings are to be verified to allow the Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable, to identify any additional models as priorities for verification testing;

“(iv) require the changing of product ratings or removal of products from the program to reflect verified test ratings for products that are determined to have ratings that do not meet the levels the manufacturer has certified to the Secretary;

“(v) require the qualification of new participants in the program through testing and production of test reports;

“(vi) allow for challenge testing of products covered within the scope of the program;

“(vii) require program participants to certify all products within the scope of the program;

“(viii) are conducted by a certification body that is accredited under International

Organization for Standardization/ International Electrotechnical Commission (ISO/ IEC) Standard 17065;

“(ix) provide to the Secretary—

“(I) an annual report of all test results;

“(II) prompt notification when program testing results in rerating of product performance or delisting of a product; and

“(III) test reports on the request of the Secretary;

“(x) use verification testing that—

“(I) is conducted by an independent third-party test laboratory that is accredited under International Organization for Standardization/International Electrotechnical Commission (ISO/IEC) Standard 17025 with a scope covering the tested products;

“(II) follows the test procedures established under this title; and

“(III) notes in each test report any instructions specified by the manufacturer or the representative of the manufacturer for the purpose of conducting the verification testing; and

“(xi) satisfy such other requirements as the Secretary has determined—

“(I) are essential to ensure standards compliance; or

“(II) have consensus support achieved through a negotiated rulemaking process.

“(B) ADMINISTRATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not require—

“(I) manufacturers to participate in a voluntary certification program described in subparagraph (A); or

“(II) participating manufacturers to provide information that can be obtained through a voluntary certification program described in subparagraph (A).

“(ii) REDUCTION OF REQUIREMENTS.—Any rules promulgated by the Secretary that require testing of products for verification of product ratings shall reduce requirements and burdens for manufacturers participating in a voluntary certification program described in subparagraph (A) for the products relative to other manufacturers.

“(iii) PERIODIC TESTING BY PROGRAM NON-PARTICIPANTS.—In addition to certification requirements, the Secretary shall require a manufacturer that does not participate in a voluntary certification program described in subparagraph (A)—

“(I) to verify the accuracy of the product ratings of the manufacturer through periodic testing using verification testing described in subparagraph (A)(x); and

“(II) to provide to the Secretary test results and, on request, test reports verifying the certified performance for each product family of the manufacturer.

“(iv) RESTRICTIONS ON TEST LABORATORIES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclause (II), with respect to covered products and equipment, a voluntary certification program described in subparagraph (A) shall not be a test laboratory that conducts the testing on products covered within the scope of the program.

“(II) LIMITATION.—Subclause (I) shall not apply to Energy Star specifications established under section 324A.

“(v) EFFECT ON OTHER AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this paragraph limits the authority of the Secretary to test products or to enforce compliance with any law (including regulations).”.

SA 1880. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings

and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE V—ENERGY FREEDOM AND ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

SEC. 501. REFERENCE TO 1986 CODE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

Subtitle A—Repeal of Energy Tax Subsidies

SEC. 511. REPEAL OF CREDIT FOR ALCOHOL FUEL, BIODIESEL, AND ALTERNATIVE FUEL MIXTURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6426 is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 4101(a) is amended by striking “or alcohol (as defined in section 6426(b)(4)(A))”.

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 4104(a) is amended by striking “6426, or 6427(e)”.

(3) Section 6427 is amended by striking subsection (e).

(4) Subparagraph (E) of section 7704(d)(1) is amended—

(A) by inserting “(as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013)” after “of section 6426”, and

(B) by inserting “(as so in effect)” after “section 6426(b)(4)(A)”.

(5) Paragraph (1) of section 9503(b) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 65 is amended by striking the item relating to section 6426.

(d) EFFECTIVE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fuel sold and used after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) LIQUEFIED HYDROGEN.—In the case of any alternative fuel or alternative fuel mixture (as defined in subsection (d)(2) or (e)(3) of section 6426 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as in effect before its repeal by this Act) involving liquefied hydrogen, the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fuel sold and used after September 30, 2014.

SEC. 512. EARLY TERMINATION OF CREDIT FOR QUALIFIED FUEL CELL MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 30B is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subparagraph (A) of section 24(b)(3) is amended by striking “, 30B”.

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 25B(g) is amended by striking “, 30B”.

(3) Subsection (b) of section 38 is amended by striking paragraph (25).

(4) Subsection (a) of section 1016 is amended by striking paragraph (35) and by redesignating paragraphs (36) and (37) as paragraphs (35) and (36), respectively.

(5) Subsection (m) of section 6501 is amended by striking “, 30B(h)(9)”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart B of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 30B.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 513. EARLY TERMINATION OF NEW QUALIFIED PLUG-IN ELECTRIC DRIVE MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 30D is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to vehicles placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 514. REPEAL OF ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLE REFUELING PROPERTY CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 30C is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (b) of section 38 is amended by striking paragraph (26).

(2) Paragraph (3) of section 55(c) is amended by striking “, 30C(d)(2)”.

(3) Subsection (a) of section 1016, as amended by section 102 of this Act, is amended by striking paragraph (35) and by redesignating paragraph (36) as paragraph (35).

(4) Subsection (m) of section 6501 is amended by striking “, 30C(e)(5)”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart B of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 30C.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 515. REPEAL OF CREDIT FOR ALCOHOL USED AS FUEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 40 is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (b) of section 38 is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(2) Subsection (c) of section 196 is amended by striking paragraph (3) and by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (14) as paragraphs (3) through (13), respectively.

(3) Paragraph (1) of section 4101(a) is amended by striking “, and every person producing cellulosic biofuel (as defined in section 40(b)(6)(E))”.

(4) Paragraph (1) of section 4104(a) is amended by striking “, 40”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to fuel sold or used after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 516. REPEAL OF CREDIT FOR BIODIESEL AND RENEWABLE DIESEL USED AS FUEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 40A is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—

(1) Subsection (b) of section 38 is amended by striking paragraph (17).

(2) Section 87 is repealed.

(3) Subsection (c) of section 196, as amended by section 105 of this Act, is amended by striking paragraph (11) and by redesignating paragraphs (11), (12), and (13) as paragraphs (10), (11), and (12), respectively.

(4) Paragraph (1) of section 4101(a) is amended by striking “, every person producing or importing biodiesel (as defined in section 40A(d)(1))”.

(5) Paragraph (1) of section 4104(a) is amended by striking “, and 40A”.

(6) Subparagraph (E) of section 7704(d)(1) is amended by inserting “(as so in effect)” after “section 40A(d)(1)”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 40A.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to fuel produced, and sold or used, after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 517. REPEAL OF ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 43 is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (b) of section 38 is amended by striking paragraph (6).

(2) Paragraph (4) of section 45Q(d) is amended by inserting “(as in effect on the

day before the date of the enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013" after "section 43(c)(2)".

(3) Subsection (c) of section 196, as amended by sections 105 and 106 of this Act, is amended by striking paragraph (5) and by redesignating paragraphs (6) through (12) as paragraphs (5) through (11), respectively.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 43.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to costs paid or incurred after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 518. TERMINATION OF CREDIT FOR ELECTRICITY PRODUCED FROM CERTAIN RENEWABLE RESOURCES.

(a) WIND.—Subsection (d) of section 45 is amended by striking "January 1, 2014" in paragraph (1) and inserting "the date of the enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013".

(b) INDIAN COAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 45(e)(10) is amended by striking "8-year period" each place it appears and inserting "7-year period".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) WIND.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) INDIAN COAL.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to coal produced after December 31, 2012.

(3) OTHER QUALIFIED ENERGY RESOURCES.—For termination of other qualified energy resources for property placed in service after December 31, 2013, see section 45 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 519. REPEAL OF CREDIT FOR PRODUCING OIL AND GAS FROM MARGINAL WELLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 45I is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b) of section 38 is amended by striking paragraph (19).

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 45I.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to production in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 520. TERMINATION OF CREDIT FOR PRODUCTION FROM ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 45J(d)(1) is amended by striking "January 1, 2021" and inserting "January 1, 2015".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 521. REPEAL OF CREDIT FOR CARBON DIOXIDE SEQUESTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 45Q is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to carbon dioxide captured after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 522. TERMINATION OF ENERGY CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 48 is amended—

(1) by striking "January 1, 2017" each place it appears and inserting "January 1, 2015", and

(2) by striking "December 31, 2016" each place it appears and inserting "December 31, 2014".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 523. REPEAL OF QUALIFYING ADVANCED COAL PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 48A is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 46 is amended by striking paragraph (3) and by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 48A.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 524. REPEAL OF QUALIFYING GASIFICATION PROJECT CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 48B is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 46, as amended by this Act, is amended by striking paragraph (3) and by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 48B.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

Subtitle B—Reduction of Corporate Income Tax Rate

SEC. 531. CORPORATE INCOME TAX RATE REDUCED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe a rate of tax in lieu of the rates under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 11(b), section 1201(a), and paragraphs (1), (2), and (6) of section 1445(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to such a flat rate as the Secretary estimates would result in—

(1) a decrease in revenue to the Treasury for taxable years beginning during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, equal to

(2) the increase in revenue for such taxable years by reason of the amendments made by title I of this Act.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The rate prescribed by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning more than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1881. Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4. QUADRENNIAL ENERGY REVIEW.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology recommends that the United States develop a Government wide Federal energy policy and update the policy regularly with strategic Quadrennial Energy Reviews similar to the reviews conducted by the Department of Defense;

(2) as the lead agency in support of energy science and technology innovation, the Department of Energy has conducted a Quadrennial Technology Review of the energy technology policies and programs of the Department;

(3) the Quadrennial Technology Review of the Department of Energy serves as the basis for coordination with other agencies and on

other programs for which the Department has a key role;

(4) a Quadrennial Energy Review would—

(A) establish integrated, Government wide national energy objectives in the context of economic, environmental, and security priorities;

(B) coordinate actions across Federal agencies;

(C) identify the resources needed for the invention, adoption, and diffusion of energy technologies; and

(D) provide a strong analytical base for Federal energy policy decisions;

(5) a Quadrennial Energy Review should be established taking into account estimated Federal budgetary resources;

(6) the development of an energy policy resulting from a Quadrennial Energy Review would—

(A) enhance the energy security of the United States;

(B) create jobs; and

(C) mitigate environmental harm; and

(7) while a Quadrennial Energy Review will be a product of the executive branch, the review will have substantial input from—

(A) Congress;

(B) the energy industry;

(C) academia;

(D) nongovernmental organizations; and

(E) the public.

(b) QUADRENNIAL ENERGY REVIEW.—Section 801 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7321) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 801. QUADRENNIAL ENERGY REVIEW.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) DIRECTOR.—The term 'Director' means the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy within the Executive Office of the President.

"(2) FEDERAL LABORATORY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'Federal Laboratory' has the meaning given the term 'laboratory' in section 12(d) of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a(d)).

"(B) INCLUSION.—The term 'Federal Laboratory' includes a federally funded research and development center sponsored by a Federal agency.

"(3) INTERAGENCY ENERGY COORDINATION COUNCIL.—The term 'interagency energy coordination council' means a council established under subsection (b)(1).

"(4) QUADRENNIAL ENERGY REVIEW.—The term 'Quadrennial Energy Review' means a comprehensive multiyear review, coordinated across Federal agencies, that—

"(A) focuses on energy programs and technologies;

"(B) establishes energy objectives across the Federal Government; and

"(C) covers each of the areas described in subsection (d)(2).

"(b) INTERAGENCY ENERGY COORDINATION COUNCIL.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, and every 4 years thereafter, the President shall establish an interagency energy coordination council to coordinate the Quadrennial Energy Review.

"(2) CO-CHAIRPERSONS.—The appropriate senior Federal Government official designated by the President and the Director shall be co-chairpersons of the interagency energy coordination council.

"(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The interagency energy coordination council shall be comprised of representatives at level I or II of the Executive Schedule of—

“(A) the Department of Energy;
 “(B) the Department of Commerce;
 “(C) the Department of Defense;
 “(D) the Department of State;
 “(E) the Department of the Interior;
 “(F) the Department of Agriculture;
 “(G) the Department of the Treasury;
 “(H) the Department of Transportation;
 “(I) the Office of Management and Budget;
 “(J) the National Science Foundation;
 “(K) the Environmental Protection Agency; and

“(L) such other Federal organizations, departments, and agencies that the President considers to be appropriate.

“(c) CONDUCT OF REVIEW.—Each Quadrennial Energy Review shall be conducted to provide an integrated view of important national energy objectives and Federal energy policy, including the maximum practicable alignment of research programs, incentives, regulations, and partnerships.

“(d) SUBMISSION OF QUADRENNIAL ENERGY REVIEW TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than August 1, 2015, and every 4 years thereafter, the President shall publish and submit to Congress a report on the Quadrennial Energy Review.

“(2) INCLUSIONS.—The report described in paragraph (1) should include, as appropriate—

“(A) an integrated view of short-, intermediate-, and long-term objectives for Federal energy policy in the context of economic, environmental, and security priorities;

“(B) anticipated Federal actions (including programmatic, regulatory, and fiscal actions) and resource requirements—

“(i) to achieve the objectives described in subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) to be coordinated across multiple agencies;

“(C) an analysis of the prospective roles of parties (including academia, industry, consumers, the public, and Federal agencies) in achieving the objectives described in subparagraph (A), including—

“(i) an analysis, by energy use sector, including—

“(I) commercial and residential buildings;

“(II) the industrial sector;

“(III) transportation; and

“(IV) electric power;

“(ii) requirements for invention, adoption, development, and diffusion of energy technologies that are mapped onto each of the energy use sectors; and

“(iii) other research that inform strategies to incentivize desired actions;

“(D) an assessment of policy options to increase domestic energy supplies and energy efficiency;

“(E) an evaluation of energy storage, transmission, and distribution requirements, including requirements for renewable energy;

“(F) an integrated plan for the involvement of the Federal Laboratories in energy programs;

“(G) portfolio assessments that describe the optimal deployment of resources, including prioritizing financial resources for energy programs;

“(H) a mapping of the linkages among basic research and applied programs, demonstration programs, and other innovation mechanisms across the Federal agencies;

“(I) an identification of, and projections for, demonstration projects, including timeframes, milestones, sources of funding, and management;

“(J) an identification of public and private funding needs for various energy tech-

nologies, systems, and infrastructure, including consideration of public-private partnerships, loans, and loan guarantees;

“(K) an assessment of global competitors and an identification of programs that can be enhanced with international cooperation;

“(L) an identification of policy gaps that need to be filled to accelerate the adoption and diffusion of energy technologies, including consideration of—

“(i) Federal tax policies; and

“(ii) the role of Federal agencies as early adopters and purchasers of new energy technologies;

“(M) a priority list for implementation of objectives and actions taking into account estimated Federal budgetary resources;

“(N) an analysis of—

“(i) points of maximum leverage for policy intervention to achieve outcomes; and

“(ii) areas of energy policy that can be most effective in meeting national goals for the energy sector; and

“(O) recommendations for executive branch organization changes to facilitate the development and implementation of Federal energy policies.

“(e) INTERIM REPORTS.—The President may prepare and publish interim reports as part of the Quadrennial Energy Review.

“(f) EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy shall provide the Quadrennial Energy Review with an Executive Secretariat who shall make available the necessary analytical, financial, and administrative support for the conduct of each Quadrennial Energy Review required under this section.

“(2) COOPERATION.—The heads of applicable Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Secretary and provide such assistance, information, and resources as the Secretary may require to assist in carrying out this section.”.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—Nothing in this section or an amendment made by this section supersedes, modifies, amends, or repeals any provision of Federal law not expressly superseded, modified, amended, or repealed by this section.

SA 1882. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4 . . . SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) FARM.—The term “farm” has the meaning given the term in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)).

(3) SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.—The term “Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule” means the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule, including amendments to that rule, promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency under part 112 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

(b) RESTRICTIONS ON ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall not enforce with respect to any farm the Spill, Prevention, Control, and Counter-

measure rule for any violation of that rule that occurs during the period beginning on the date of enactment of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6) and ending on September 30, 2013.

(2) RESTRICTION ON ENFORCEMENT BEGINNING IN FISCAL YEAR 2014.—Beginning on October 1, 2013, the Administrator shall not enforce with respect to any farm the Spill, Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule in any State until the date on which the Administrator has offered to brief each agriculture group and crop growing association in that State on that rule.

SA 1883. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4 . . . LEAD-BASED PAINT ACTIVITIES TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION.

Section 402(c) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2682(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) STUDY OF CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year prior to proposing any renovation and remodeling regulation after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, the Administrator shall conduct, submit to Congress, and make available for public comment (after peer review) the results of, a study of the extent to which persons engaged in various types of renovation and remodeling activities in target housing, Federal and public buildings constructed before 1978, or commercial buildings—

“(i) are exposed to lead in the conduct of such activities; and

“(ii) disturb lead and create a lead-based paint hazard on a regular or occasional basis in the conduct of such activities.

“(B) SCOPE AND COVERAGE.—The study conducted under subparagraph (A) shall consider the risks described in clauses (i) and (ii) of that subparagraph with respect to each separate building type described in that subparagraph, as the regulation to be proposed would apply to each building type.”.

“(C) CONSULTATION.—The Administrator shall consult with Federal, other Governmental, non-profit and private sector owners and managers of residential and commercial buildings as it conducts the study under subparagraph (A).”

SA 1884. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . STATE OPTION OF NON-PARTICIPATION IN RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD.

Section 211(o)(2)(B) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(2)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) ELECTION OF NON-PARTICIPATION BY STATE GOVERNMENT.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the applicable volume of renewable fuel as determined under this subparagraph shall be adjusted in accordance with this clause.

“(II) REQUIREMENTS.—On passage by a State legislature and signature by the Governor of the State of a law that elects to not participate in the applicable volume of renewable fuel in accordance with this clause, the Administrator shall allow a State to not participate in the applicable volume of renewable fuel determined under clause (i).

“(III) REDUCTION.—On the election of a State under subclause (II), the Administrator shall reduce the applicable volume of renewable fuel determined under clause (i) by the percentage that reflects the national gasoline consumption of the non-participating State that is attributable to that State.

“(IV) CREDITS TO HOLD FUEL SALES HARMLESS.—On the election of a State under subclause (II), the Administrator shall provide for the generation of credits for all gasoline (regardless of whether the gasoline is blended) provided through a fuel terminal in the State to be calculated as though the gasoline were blended with the maximum allowable ethanol content of gasoline allowed in that State to apply toward the applicable volume of renewable fuel determined under clause (i).”.

SA 1885. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 36, after line 21, add the following:

SEC. 21 . THIRD-PARTY CERTIFICATION UNDER ENERGY STAR PROGRAM.

Section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) THIRD-PARTY CERTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall revise the certification requirements for the labeling of consumer, home, and office electronic products for program partners that have complied with all requirements of the Energy Star program for a period of at least 18 months.

“(2) ADMINISTRATION.—In the case of a program partner described in paragraph (1), the new requirements under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall not require third-party certification for a product to be listed; but

“(B) may require that test data and other product information be submitted to facilitate product listing and performance verification for a sample of products.

“(3) THIRD PARTIES.—Nothing in this subsection prevents the Administrator from using third parties in the course of the administration of the Energy Star program.

“(4) TERMINATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), an exemption from third-party certification provided to a program partner under paragraph (1) shall terminate if the program partner is found to have violated program requirements with respect to at least 2 separate models during a 2-year period.

“(B) RESUMPTION.—A termination for a program partner under subparagraph (A) shall cease if the program partner complies with all Energy Star program requirements for a period of at least 3 years.”.

SA 1886. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 304. FEDERAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.

Section 305(a)(3)(D) of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6834(a)(3)(D)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking subclause (III) and inserting the following:

“(III) SUSTAINABLE DESIGN PRINCIPLES.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—Sustainable design principles shall be applied to the siting, design, and construction of buildings covered by this clause.

“(bb) SELECTION OF CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS.—The Secretary, after reviewing the findings of the Federal Director under section 436(h) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17092(h)), in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, and in consultation with the Secretary of Defense relating to those facilities under the custody and control of the Department of Defense, shall determine those certification systems for green commercial and residential buildings that the Secretary determines to be the most likely to encourage a comprehensive and environmentally sound approach to certification of green buildings.

“(cc) BASIS FOR SELECTION.—The determination of the certification systems shall be based on ongoing review of the findings of the Federal Director under section 436(h) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17092(h)) and the criteria described in clause (iii).

“(dd) ADMINISTRATION.—In determining certification systems under this subclause, the Secretary shall—

“(AA) make a separate determination for all or part of each system;

“(BB) confirm that the criteria used to support the selection of building products, materials, brands, and technologies are fair and neutral (meaning that such criteria are based on an objective assessment of relevant technical data), do not prohibit, disfavor, or discriminate against selection based on technically inadequate information to inform human or environmental risk, and are expressed to prefer performance measures whenever performance measures may reasonably be used in lieu of prescriptive measures; and

“(CC) use environmental and health criteria that are based on risk assessment methodology that is generally accepted by the applicable scientific disciplines.”;

(2) in clause (iii), by striking “identifying the green building certification system and level” and inserting “determining the green building certification systems”;

(3) by redesignating clauses (vi) and (vii) as clauses (vii) and (viii), respectively;

(4) by striking clauses (iv) and (v) and inserting the following:

“(iv) REVIEW.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services and the Secretary of Defense, shall conduct an ongoing review to evaluate and compare private sector green building certification systems, taking into account—

“(I) the criteria described in clause (iii); and

“(II) the identification made by the Federal Director under section 436(h) of the En-

ergy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17092(h)).

“(v) EXCLUSIONS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclause (II), if a certification system fails to meet the review requirements of clause (i)(III), the Secretary shall—

“(aa) identify the portions of the system, whether prerequisites, credits, points, or otherwise, that meet the review criteria of clause (i)(III);

“(bb) determine the portions of the system that are suitable for use; and

“(cc) exclude all other portions of the system from identification and use.

“(II) ENTIRE SYSTEMS.—The Secretary shall exclude an entire system from use if an exclusion under subclause (I)—

“(aa) impedes the integrated use of the system;

“(bb) creates disparate review criteria or unequal point access for competing materials; or

“(cc) increases agency costs of the use.

“(vi) INTERNAL CERTIFICATION PROCESSES.—

The Secretary may by rule allow Federal agencies to develop internal certification processes, using certified professionals, in lieu of certification by certification entities identified under clause (i)(III).”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(ix) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

“(I) DETERMINATIONS MADE AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2015.—The amendments made by section 405 of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013 shall apply to any determination made by a Federal agency after December 31, 2015.

“(II) DETERMINATIONS MADE ON OR BEFORE DECEMBER 31, 2015.—This subparagraph (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013) shall apply to any use of a certification system for green commercial and residential buildings by a Federal agency on or before December 31, 2015.”.

SEC. 305. HIGH-PERFORMANCE GREEN FEDERAL BUILDINGS.

Section 436(h) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17092(h)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “SYSTEM” and inserting “SYSTEMS”;

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Based on an ongoing review, the Federal Director shall identify and shall provide to the Secretary pursuant to section 305(a)(3)(D) of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6834(a)(3)(D)), a list of those certification systems that the Director identifies as the most likely to encourage a comprehensive and environmentally sound approach to certification of green buildings.”; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “system” and inserting “systems”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) an ongoing review provided to the Secretary pursuant to section 305(a)(3)(D) of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6834(a)(3)(D)), which shall—

“(i) be carried out by the Federal Director to compare and evaluate standards; and

“(ii) allow any developer or administrator of a rating system or certification system to be included in the review.”;

(C) in subparagraph (E)(v), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(D) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) a finding that, for all credits addressing grown, harvested, or mined materials, the system does not discriminate against the use of domestic products that have obtained certifications of responsible sourcing; and

“(H) a finding that the system incorporates life-cycle assessment as a credit pathway.”.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a business meeting has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on Tuesday, September 17, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the business meeting is to consider a committee funding resolution for the period October 1, 2013, through February 28, 2015. In addition, I would like to announce that immediately following the business meeting the Committee will hold a hearing to consider the nominations of Mr. Ronald J. Binz to be a Commissioner of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Ms. Elizabeth M. Robinson to be Under Secretary of Energy, and Mr. Michael L. Connor to be Deputy Secretary of Interior.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC, 20510-6150, or by email to Abigail_Campbell@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224-7571 or Abigail Campbell at (202) 224-4905.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 11, 2013, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “The Department of Homeland Security at 10 Years: Examining Challenges and Achievements and Addressing Emerging Threats.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized

to meet during the session of the Senate on September 11, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Judiciary Nominations.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sergio Aguirre, a legislative fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges during morning business today, September 11, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Donnie Turner, have privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kevin Reed, a legislative fellow in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the consideration of S. 1392.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Amitai Bin-Nun, a fellow in the office of Senator COONS, be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of S. 1392.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL SAVE FOR RETIREMENT WEEK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 222.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 222) supporting the goals and ideals of National Save For Retirement Week, including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles and increasing personal financial literacy.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 222) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I commend the managers of the energy efficiency

bill, Senator WYDEN, chairman of the full committee, Senator MURKOWSKI, the ranking member, and the sponsors of this legislation, Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, for their work in bringing this bill to the floor and managing it today.

We have had a number of Senators who have tried to offer amendments. I was told by Senator SHAHEEN that she had a dozen or so bipartisan amendments that were waiting to be offered. There has been an attempt to offer amendments dealing with the bill but there is a little hurdle here with something that is totally nongermane that has been offered.

One of the amendments Senator UDALL of Colorado would like to offer is a bipartisan amendment to promote energy retrofitting of schools. Senator BENNET of Colorado seeks to offer a bipartisan amendment to facilitate best practices in commercial real estate energy efficiency. Senator KLOBUCHAR would like to offer her amendment to promote energy retrofitting of non-profit buildings. But once again, Mr. President, once again my Republican colleagues can't help themselves. They have objected to the consideration of any of these amendments or any other amendments until the Senate considers an amendment—and not only considers an amendment but is guaranteed a vote on it.

Pretty interesting situation. The Senator's amendment is, of course, and everyone knows it, only for looks. It is a “gotcha” amendment. The Senator's amendment is the sort of amendment that is to help get some headlines in newspapers or some kind of news story. We recognize it is for show. But be that as it may, we will work with managers to craft a way forward on this bill, perhaps, or we may have to take the bill down. But we will make that decision at a subsequent time.

It is unfortunate, but that is the political world we live in now with the tea-party-driven House of Representatives. And by the way—of course everyone knows by now—they couldn't pass their continuing resolution today, so that is off the table. They were going to do that not today but tomorrow, and they pulled that down. Then we have our folks over here trying to just outmatch what they do over there so we wind up getting nothing done. Such a shame.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 12, 2013; and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for

their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans the final half; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 1392, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitive-ness Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:55 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 12, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ROY K. J. WILLIAMS, OF OHIO, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, VICE JOHN R. FERNANDEZ, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PAUL NATHAN JAENICHEN, SR., OF KENTUCKY, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION, VICE DAVID T. MATSUDA, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

CHRISTOPHER SMITH, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (FOSSIL ENERGY), VICE CHARLES DEWITT MCCONNELL, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

ESTHER PUAKELA KIA'AINA, OF HAWAII, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, VICE ANTHONY MARION BABAUTA.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

BRADLEY CROWELL, OF NEVADA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (CONGRESSIONAL AND INTER-GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS), VICE JEFFREY A. LANE.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

VICTORIA MARIE BAECHE WASSMER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE BARBARA J. BENNETT, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

RICHARD G. FRANK, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE SHERRY GLIED, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LARRY EDWARD ANDRE, JR., OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF MAURITANIA.

HELEN MEAGHER LA LIME, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ANGOLA.

LUIS G. MORENO, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO JAMAICA.

GEORGE JAMES TSUNIS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF NORWAY.

PUNEET TALWAR, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (POLITICAL-MILITARY AFFAIRS), VICE ANDREW J. SHAPIRO.

HEATHER ANNE HIGGINBOTTOM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE FOR MANAGEMENT AND RESOURCES, VICE THOMAS R. NIDES, RESIGNED.

MICHAEL ANDERSON LAWSON, OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION.

DANIEL W. YOHANNES, OF COLORADO, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

ANTHONY LUZZATTO GARDNER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE EUROPEAN UNION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

ELIZABETH FRAWLEY BAGLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-EIGHTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

BARBARA LEE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-EIGHTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

MARK MEADOWS, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-EIGHTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

THEODORE STRICKLAND, OF OHIO, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-EIGHTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

STEPHEN N. ZACK, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-EIGHTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED.

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS ONE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

KEVIN TIMOTHY COVERT, OF MARYLAND
JANET WOODBURY MILLER, OF NEW YORK

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS TWO, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

K. ANNA KOSINSKA, OF FLORIDA
YOLANDA A. PARRA, OF FLORIDA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

KATHERINE MARIE DIOP, OF MARYLAND
VANIA Z. GARCIA, OF VIRGINIA
JAHN FRANK JEFFREY, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL STELLARD OBYRON, JR., OF FLORIDA
NIKK SOOKMEEWIRIYA, OF VIRGINIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

KRISTEN ELIZABETH AANSTOOS, OF FLORIDA
BENJAMIN J. ABBOTT, OF NEW YORK
VANESSA GRACE ACKER, OF TEXAS
ZIA AHMED, OF MASSACHUSETTS

JOEL DUNNWAY ALLEY, OF OREGON
SYED MUJTABA ANDRABI, OF WASHINGTON
JEFFREY MICHAEL AUSTIN, OF FLORIDA

NATHAN DOUGLAS AUSTIN, OF WASHINGTON
MICHELLE E. AZEVEDO, OF CALIFORNIA
EMILY HARTER BALL, OF TEXAS

PATRICK BALL, OF TEXAS
JESSICA ROHN BANULS, OF VIRGINIA

GRAHAM GLYN BARKER, OF FLORIDA
JARI D. BARNETT, OF OKLAHOMA

JENNIFER ALAYNE BARR, OF INDIANA
AMANDA K. BECK, OF CALIFORNIA

MICHELLE NICOLE BENNETT, OF CALIFORNIA
ANDREW BERDY, OF NEW JERSEY

JOSEPH STEPHEN BERNATH, OF PENNSYLVANIA
RICHA SONI BHALA, OF ILLINOIS

ALISSA BIBB, OF NEW YORK
DUSTIN REEVE BICKEL, OF GEORGIA

MARQUIS MCLEMORE BOYCE, OF GEORGIA
RYAN G. BRADEEN, OF MAINE

MATTHEW MCMAHON BRIGGS, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
BARRETT G. BRYSON, OF CALIFORNIA

SARAH A. BUDDS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
JOHN P. CALLAN, OF WASHINGTON

JOSEPH CHRISTOPHER CARNES, OF OHIO
MAUREEN CHAO, OF CONNECTICUT

JESSICA CHESBRO, OF OREGON
W. JOSEPH CHILDERS, OF OHIO

MARJORIE E. CHRISTIAN, OF TEXAS
SARAH KATHLEEN CLYMER, OF MINNESOTA

CHRISTOPHER COLLINGTON, OF FLORIDA
BRIAN M. COMMAROTO-ROVERINI, OF NEW JERSEY

WILLIAM ROBERT COOK, OF CALIFORNIA
PHILLIP ANTHONY DE SOUZA, OF MARYLAND

FAUSTO P. DEGUZMAN, OF WASHINGTON
JONATHAN MORRIS DENNEHY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

JILL WISNIEWSKI DIETRICH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NOAH A. DONADIEU, OF PENNSYLVANIA
GIDEON T. DONOHO, OF NEW YORK
EMILY BOND DUNIVANT, OF TENNESSEE
GEORGE ANDREW DUSOE, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
ALLISON D. DYESS, OF TEXAS
WILLIAM ECHOLS, OF WASHINGTON
KARIN MARIE EHLERT, OF MINNESOTA
JESSICA D. EL BECHIR, OF LOUISIANA
JEFFREY GORDON ELSÉN, OF WISCONSIN
JENNIFER SUZANNE EMPIE, OF NEW YORK
MICHAEL A. ERVIN, OF WASHINGTON
CRAIG J. FERGUSON, OF OREGON
TIMOTHY J. FOLEY, OF FLORIDA
SONNET FERNANDEZ FRISBIE, OF TEXAS
SEAN MARIANO GARCIA, OF FLORIDA
LAUREN LEIGH GARZA, OF WASHINGTON
MAXIMILIAN ROBERT PEREZ GEBHARDT, OF NEW JERSEY

IVNA GIAUQUE, OF UTAH
JOHN GOSHERT, OF INDIANA

COLLIER F. GRAHAM, OF MISSISSIPPI
MARK OSTAPOVYCH GUL, OF VIRGINIA

MICHAEL L. GUNZBURGER, OF CALIFORNIA
RENE GUTEL, OF ARIZONA

TAMRA KAY HACKETT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CRISTINA-ASTRID HANSELL, OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID H. HASKETT, OF MARYLAND
NICKOLAUS HAUSER, OF TEXAS

ELAINE MARIE HENSLE, OF VIRGINIA
BENJAMIN D. HESPRICH, OF VIRGINIA

KATE ELIZABETH HIGGINS, OF VIRGINIA
SIRLI HILL, OF VIRGINIA

MARCIA E. HOUSE, OF GEORGIA
MARCUS RYAN JACKSON, OF FLORIDA

TIFFANY L. JACKSON, OF FLORIDA
JOSEPH V. JAMES, OF VIRGINIA

DANA EDWARD JENSEN, OF NEW YORK
RIAN L. JENSEN, OF WASHINGTON

ANNE DUDTE JOHNSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LINDA MARIE JOHNSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ALEX MICHAEL JONES, OF WISCONSIN
AARON JAMES KADKHODAI, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

CHRISTEN DECKER KADKHODAI, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
LISA K. KALAJIAN, OF FLORIDA

MARJON E. KAMRANI, OF TENNESSEE
STEPHANIE J. KANG, OF MISSOURI

JESSICA LEVY KANIA, OF NEW JERSEY
MATHEW KAWECKI, OF CALIFORNIA

MAX EDMUND KENDRICK, OF NEW YORK
SALMAN KHAN KHALIL, OF VIRGINIA

SHANA LEE KIERAN, OF MAINE
CARINA DEA KLEIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ROBERT EDWARD KRIS, OF NEW YORK
KLAUDIA G. KRUEGER, OF FLORIDA

JAMES R. KUYKENDALL, OF OKLAHOMA
ATHENA KWEY, OF CALIFORNIA

KRISTINA D. LAW, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW ROTHSCCHILD LEDERMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MIKAEL DANIEL LURIE, OF OREGON
NATHANAEI MORRISON LYNN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ALEXANDER C. MACFARLANE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ANDREW MALANDRINO, OF VIRGINIA

DAVID R. P. MARTINEZ, OF NEW MEXICO
EMMA OLWEN PAMELA MARWOOD, OF NEW YORK

ALAN DANIEL MCCARTHY, JR., OF VIRGINIA
CHARLES ELLIOTT MCCELLAN, OF ARIZONA

WILLIAM APPLETON MCCUE, OF MAINE
DANIEL E. MEHRING, OF CALIFORNIA

DOERING S. MEYER, OF TEXAS
LEONEL GREENE MIRANDA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MIHAEL WALTER MITCHELL, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL J. MOODY, OF UTAH

YOON S. NAM, OF CALIFORNIA
PAUL W. NEVILLE, OF WASHINGTON

JENNIFER K. NILSON, OF WISCONSIN
RICHARD ANDREW O'NEAL, OF GEORGIA

ZENNIA D. PAGANINI, OF MARYLAND
REENA PATEL, OF TEXAS

DARIN ANN PHAOVISAI, OF ILLINOIS
GRANT G. PHILLIPP, OF ILLINOIS

ARCHANA PODDAR, OF MASSACHUSETTS
CHRISTOPHER THOMAS POLILLO, OF ILLINOIS

ADRIAN J. PRATT, OF FLORIDA
KARA LEE PREISSEL, OF FLORIDA

MICHAEL JOSEPH PRYOR, OF RHODE ISLAND
AARON DAVID RADER, OF MARYLAND

AMY NICOLE REICHERT, OF COLORADO
MICHAEL RICHARDS, OF FLORIDA

RITA ALICIA BUCK RICO, OF CALIFORNIA
JASON CORCORAN ROBERTS, OF VIRGINIA

BENJAMIN O. ROGUS, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHELE ROULBERT, OF ILLINOIS

MACKENZIE LAEL ROWE, OF WASHINGTON
ALAN R. ROYSTON, OF FLORIDA

SUSAN A. RUSSELL, OF MASSACHUSETTS
CRAIG ANTHONY RYCHEL, OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID V. SALVO, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MICHAEL JAMES SCHARDING, OF VIRGINIA

NILESH KANTILAL SHAH, OF CALIFORNIA
GREGORY D. SIMKISS, OF GEORGIA

BARRY SMITH, OF WASHINGTON
LEVI RADMAN SMYLYE, OF FLORIDA

SAUNDRA M. SNIDER-PUGH, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM CATLETT SOLLEY, OF VIRGINIA

ADAM B. STERN, OF FLORIDA

STACEY D. SUTTON, OF GEORGIA

NATELLA V. SVISTUNOVA, OF OREGON

PETER J. SWEENEY, OF NEW JERSEY

HUMZA TARAR, OF FLORIDA

NATHANIEL TEK, OF NEW JERSEY
ROBERT EMIL TIBBETTS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
SERGEY S. TROITSKY, OF FLORIDA
KEVIN A. VAILLANCOURT, OF WEST VIRGINIA
GARETH VAUGHAN, OF FLORIDA
JUSTINE ELIZABETH VEIT, OF MISSOURI
GEOFFREY DAVID LISLE WESSEL, OF NORTH CAROLINA
ERIN MARIE WILLIAMS, OF TEXAS
BRIAN K. WINGATE, OF WASHINGTON
ALEXIS SATHRE WOLFF, OF VIRGINIA
HSUEH-TING WU, OF CALIFORNIA
JOHN ANTHONY GERHARD YODER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

GABRIELA R. ARIAS VILLELA, OF FLORIDA
SAYED FAHIM AZIZI, OF VIRGINIA
SUZANNE BALSAM, OF VIRGINIA
KATRINA MARIA BARNAS, OF NEW YORK
JUAN BARRAGAN, OF VIRGINIA
ASHLEY BARTLETT, OF FLORIDA
KATY BARTLETT, OF FLORIDA
YANIV BARZILAI, OF NORTH CAROLINA
ALEXANDER BENJAMIN BELLAH, OF VIRGINIA
EMMANIA R. BLUM, OF NEW YORK
EMILY ROSE BRANDT, OF TEXAS
JOHN CERABINO-HESS, OF CALIFORNIA
RYAN CLAY, OF VIRGINIA
TYLER E. CRUSE, OF GEORGIA
MICHAEL SEAN CULLINAN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
MARCELINA M. DA SILVA, OF VIRGINIA
MARIA DAVYDENKO, OF ALASKA
DARSHANE M. DAWLEY, OF VIRGINIA
TERRI NATHINE FRANCES DAY, OF NORTH CAROLINA
JOSHUA ROBERT DELARA, OF NEW YORK
MARTHA J. DEMOS, OF FLORIDA
KATRINA NICOLE DRAYTON, OF MICHIGAN
ARTHUR DYMOND, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH A. DZMURA, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT GEORGE EHRLMANN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NASHWA N. ELGADI, OF MASSACHUSETTS
LOGHMAN FATTAHI, OF VIRGINIA
PERLA GABRIELA FERNANDEZ, OF KANSAS
SARAH GARDINER, OF CONNECTICUT
ANTHONY PETER GEORGIANNI, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW J. GOODMAN, OF VIRGINIA
KATY A. GORE, OF VIRGINIA
ERIC T. HAN, OF CALIFORNIA
GARRETT HARKINS, OF NEW YORK
STEPHEN CAREY HARRIS, JR., OF MISSOURI
KARI ELAYNE HATCHER, OF MICHIGAN
JOELY EILEEN HILDEBRAND, OF OHIO
DANIEL JOSEPH HOFFMAN, JR., OF TEXAS
NAHDER BRYANT HOUSHMAN, OF ILLINOIS
HUI JUN TINA HUANG, OF VIRGINIA
ANTHONY A. IPPOLITI, OF VIRGINIA
STANLEY N. JAREK, OF WASHINGTON
BRIAN C. JOHNSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LESHAWNA R. JOHNSON, OF NEW YORK
NATHAN BENJAMIN JOHNSON, OF CALIFORNIA
DANIEL P. JOYCE, OF FLORIDA
RYAN T. JOYCE, OF VIRGINIA
STACEY S. KERNS, OF GEORGIA
GLORYA SING KEY, OF WASHINGTON
DONG WAN KIM, OF VIRGINIA
KENNETH M. LAM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
EDITH HOPE LEE, OF WASHINGTON
HAI F., LI, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL M. LISS, OF FLORIDA
TIMOTHY PETER LOCKWOOD, OF ARIZONA
CHRISTIAN MCCORMICK LOUBEAU, OF NEW YORK
MACIEJ JAN LUCZYWO, OF NEW YORK
SAMIRA MARR, OF VIRGINIA
JILLIAN AMBER MCCOY, OF MARYLAND
JONATHAN DEMETRIUS MCMASTER, OF MARYLAND
RACHEL B. MEHRAVARI, OF NEW YORK
STEPHEN C. MERCADO, OF VIRGINIA
SALLY MEYERS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
TIFFANY MICHELLE MILLER, OF NORTH CAROLINA
SALVADOR CHAIDEZ MOLINA, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL A. MORENO, OF VIRGINIA
TYLER S. MOSELLE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SARAH E. MOYER, OF NEVADA
CHRISTOPHER R. MULLIN, OF CALIFORNIA
EMILY Y. NARKIS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DOMINIC THUAN VINH NGUYEN, OF CALIFORNIA
THAO THI NGUYEN, OF MASSACHUSETTS
NATALIE ANN OLDANI, OF VIRGINIA
KABEER PARWANI, OF MASSACHUSETTS
MARYCLAIRE PEROUTKA, OF VIRGINIA
HOMER C. PICKENS, OF VIRGINIA
TREVIA MARIE POWERS, OF COLORADO
JASON E. RASKIN, OF VIRGINIA
MARK J. REDMOND, OF CONNECTICUT
KRISTINA ROSALES KOSTRUKOVA, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS ROSEN-MOLINA, OF CALIFORNIA
MALIKAT OLAMIDE RUFAL, OF ILLINOIS
LUIS ARMANDO SANCHEZ, OF VIRGINIA
VALERIE J. SANTOS, OF VIRGINIA
MARY SARGENT, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW C. SPADE, OF VIRGINIA
ABIGAIL M. SPENGLER, OF COLORADO
NORA T. STAAL, OF VIRGINIA
NICK STOJANOVICH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CAMERON D. THOMAS-SHAH, OF MICHIGAN
AARON M. THOMPSON, OF VIRGINIA
HARRY R. THOMPSON III, OF ILLINOIS
JULIA B. THOMPSON, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW V. TOMPKINS, OF CALIFORNIA

LARS TRAY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BRYANA K. TUCCI, OF VIRGINIA
JEFFREY L. UNDERCOFFER, OF MARYLAND
MARTIN VAUGHAN, OF IDAHO
IVAN VILELA, OF NEW JERSEY
DANIEL RICHARD WALKER, OF NEW YORK
ADAM MICHAEL WALLINGFORD, OF NEBRASKA
PHILLIP JAMES WALSKY, OF CALIFORNIA
RANDY R. WANIS, OF VIRGINIA
KRISTEN ELIZABETH WEAVER, OF CALIFORNIA
DAMON A. WILLIAMS, OF CALIFORNIA
THOMAS G. WINSTON, OF VIRGINIA
PAUL WULFSBERG, OF MASSACHUSETTS

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

BETH F. COBERT, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR MANAGEMENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, VICE JEFFREY D. ZIENTS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

DAVID WEIL, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, VICE PAUL DECAMP.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

JAMES H. SHELTON III, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF EDUCATION, VICE ANTHONY W. MILLER, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JOHN P. CARLIN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE LISA O. MONACO, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

SLOAN D. GIBSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE W. SCOTT GOULD.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JO ANN ROONEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, VICE ROBERT O. WORK, RESIGNED.

JAMIE MICHAEL MORIN, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE DIRECTOR OF COST ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM EVALUATION, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, VICE CHRISTINE H. FOX, RESIGNED.

MICHAEL D. LUMPKIN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE MICHAEL A. SHEEHAN.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. SAMUEL D. COX

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DARRYL MARKOWSKI

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

RODNEY E. GARFIELD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CLARENCE E. DINGMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

BRIAN W. ADAMS
JOHNNY D. ADAMS
KEVIN D. ADMIRAL
MARK J. AITKEN
STEPHEN B. ALEXANDER
CRAIG J. ALIA
JOHN R. ALLEN
CORNELL E. ANDERTON
JOEL K. AOKI
JAMES J. BAILEY
STEPHEN H. BALES
SEAN W. BARNES
BRENT M. BARTOS
STEVEN G. BASSO
PABLO BATISTAHERNANDEZ
CRAIG S. BAUMGARTNER
DAVID R. BAXTER
THOMAS A. BAYER II
IVAN P. BECKMAN
KOLIN V. BERNARDONI
ROBERT K. BERTRAND
MICHAEL J. BEST
KEVIN A. BIGELMAN

MARK O. BILAFER
KENNETH D. BOGGS
THOMAS R. BOLEN
TY D. BONNER
CHARLES R. BOWERY, JR.
RAYMOND D. BOWYER
JAMES M. BRAMBLETT
CHRISTOPHER J. BREWER
MICHAEL S. BROOKS
PAUL T. BROOKS
WINSTON P. BROOKS
TIMOTHY A. BRUMFIEL, SR.
JEFFREY A. BRYAN
JOHN T. BRYANT
CHRISTOPHER A. BURNS
LARRY Q. BURRIS, JR.
DAVID A. CALDWELL
CHRISTOPHER J. CASSIBRY
GEOFFREY A. CATLETT
EDWARD P. CHAMBERLAYNE
BRETT M. CLARK
MATTHEW J. CODY
CHRISTOPHER L. CONNOLLY
JOHN W. CONNOR
NATHAN E. COOK II
CHRISTOPHER J. COX
DARREN V. COX
PAUL A. CRAVEY
GEOFFREY A. CRAWFORD
PATRICK N. CROSBY
THOMAS A. CROWSON
RONALD T. CUFFEE, SR.
ROBERT A. B. CURRIS
SAMUEL W. CURTIS
JOHN M. CUSHING
SHAWN L. DANIEL
WILLIAM E. DARNE
WILLIAM E. DAVENPORT II
TIMOTHY C. DAVIS
JAMES A. DELAPP
STEVEN L. DELVAUX
JEFFREY C. DENIUS
MICHAEL C. DEROSIER
TORREY A. DICIRO
ROY F. DOUGLAS
JAMES A. DUNCAN
THOMAS A. DUNCAN II
LANDY D. DUNHAM
KEITH A. DUNKLE
MARSHALL V. ECKLUND
RICHARD J. EDWARDS
JAMES W. ELLERSON, JR.
PATRICK J. ELLIS
JAMES G. ERBACH
MICHAEL J. ERNST
MATTHEW H. FATH
KYLE E. FEGER
TIMOTHY J. FLETCHER
WILLIE J. FLUCKER, JR.
DAVID C. FOLEY
TODD M. FOX
TIMOTHY R. FRAMBES
CHARLES D. FREEMAN
JEFFREY W. FRENCH
BRETT T. FUNCK
ANDREW C. GAINIEY
MADALYN S. GAINIEY
JARED J. GALAZIN
LISA A. GARCIA
PAUL N. GARCIA
KIRK E. GIBBS
STEPHEN J. GRABSKI
GARY R. GRAVES
DARRELL L. GREEN
TIMOTHY M. GREENHAW
DENNIS E. GRIFFIN
DANIEL GUADALUPE
EUGENIA K. GUILMARTIN
DOUGLAS B. GUTTORMSEN
YI S. GWON
JUSTIN D. HADLEY
JASON M. I. HALLOREN
THOMAS B. HAM
GREGORY S. HARKINS
FRANK W. HARRAR
JAMES H. HARRELL II
RICHARD A. HARRISON
BRIAN K. HATHAWAY
TIMOTHY C. HAYDEN
JAMES E. HAYES III
DENNIS S. HEANEY
TOWNLEY R. HEDRICK
JOHN W. HENDERSON
MICHAEL D. HENDERSON
VERNON W. R. HERTEL
EARL B. HIGGINS, JR.
ANDREW C. HILMES
DAWN L. HILTON
JOHN D. HIXSON
DANIEL C. HODNE
MARC F. HOFFMEISTER
MARK A. HOLLER
DARYL O. HOOD
ARTURO J. HORTON
JAMES E. HUBER
WILLIAM H. HUFF IV
HERBERT A. JOLIAT
DAVID E. M. JONES
ROBERT P. KADERAVEKI
MICHAEL T. KATONA
RICHARD R. KELLING
CARL D. KELLY, JR.

JASON E. KELLY
 CHRISTOPHER J. KIDD
 SEAN G. KIRSCHNER
 NIAVE F. KNELL
 JOHN H. KNIGHTSTEP
 DAVID R. KRAMER
 KERIEM X. KVALEVOG
 ALLAN H. LANCETA
 ADAM W. LANGE
 GLENN E. LAPOINT
 MICHAEL M. LARSEN
 BRYAN J. LASKE
 MICHAEL T. LAWHORN
 MICHAEL J. LAWRENCE
 DAVID R. LEWIS
 RUSSELL S. LEWIS
 JOSEPH G. LOCK
 RONALD G. LUKOW
 WESLEY F. MACMULLEN
 ROBERT K. MAGEE
 ROBERT MANNING III
 CRAIG J. MANVILLE
 JONATHAN M. MAPLEYBRITTLE
 JOSEPH J. MARTIN
 SILAS G. MARTINEZ
 MICHAEL L. MATHEWS
 JAMES A. MAXWELL
 JOSEPH MCCALLION, JR.
 JAMES L. MCFADYEN
 MATTHEW M. MCHALE
 MICHAEL J. MELITO
 JEFFREY A. MERENKOV
 JEFFREY M. METZGER
 JODY C. MILLER
 SHANNON T. MILLER
 STEPHEN A. MILLER
 ANDREW L. MILTNER
 RONALD J. MINTY, JR.
 BRADLEY F. MOCK
 LANCE D. MOORE
 MATTHEW P. MOORE
 MATTHEW R. MOORE
 MAXIMO A. MOORE
 CHRISTOPHER S. MORETTI, SR.
 ANDREW MORGADO
 DANIEL S. MORGAN
 SHANON J. MOSAKOWSKI
 DEWEY A. MOSLEY
 WILLIAM C. NAGEL
 BRANDON D. NEWTON
 DEMETRIOS J. NICHOLSON
 HEATH J. NIEMI
 T. B. NINNESS
 CHRISTOPHER R. NORRIE
 DAVID A. NORTHBRIDGE
 ROBERT A. OBRIEN IV
 THOMAS W. OCONNOR, JR.
 DAVID S. OESCHGER
 MICHAEL T. OESCHGER
 DANIEL E. OGRADY
 LANCE D. OSKEY
 RAFAEL A. PAREDES
 FLINT M. PATTERSON
 BRIAN A. PAYNE
 ISAAC J. PELTIER
 ROBERT G. PIGHT, JR.
 JOSHUA J. POTTER
 PATRICK V. POWERS
 ANDREW T. POZNICK
 KEITH T. PRITCHARD
 MARK C. QUANDER
 PATRICK D. QUINN III
 JOHN L. RAFFERTY, JR.
 DAVID L. RAUGH
 DAVID G. RAY
 PHILIP J. RAYMOND
 BRAD L. REED
 NEIL A. REILLY, JR.
 STEPHEN C. RENSHAW
 KYLE M. RIEDEL
 BRANDON S. ROBBINS
 ELIZABETH L. ROBBINS
 LORI L. ROBINSON
 ROBERT M. RODRIGUEZ
 PHILIP J. RYAN
 WILLIAM A. RYAN III
 SAMUEL J. SAINÉ
 JUAN M. SALDIVAR, JR.
 JAMES R. SALOME
 DAVID L. SANDERS III
 PHILIP M. SECRIST III
 DAVID J. SEGALLA, JR.
 PETER A. SICOLI
 JEREMY T. SIEGRIST
 MARK A. SISCO
 NOEL C. SMART
 ELIZABETH R. SMITH
 GREGORY M. SMITH
 KELLY H. SMITH
 GROVER R. SOUTHERLAND
 COREY M. SPENCER
 RICHARD W. SPIEGEL
 FRANK J. STANCO, JR.
 KENNETH T. STEPHENS
 GEOFFREY T. STEWART
 JOHN F. TAFT
 CHRISTOPHER P. TALCOTT
 CHRISTOPHER P. TAYLOR
 CURTIS D. TAYLOR
 ERIC R. TIMMERMAN
 BRIAN TRIBUS
 COLIN P. TULEY

JON M. TUSSING
 JACK E. VANTRESS
 JAMES W. VIZZARD
 DOUGLAS J. WADDINGHAM
 ERIC L. WALKER
 TERESA A. WARDELL
 ROLF H. WATTS
 DOUGLAS E. WHITE
 JASON D. WILLIAMS
 BOB E. WILLIS, JR.
 ROBERT A. WRIGHT IV
 CHRISTOPHER V. WYNDER
 ANDREW M. ZACHERL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MARCUS P. ACOSTA
 ARTHUR A. ADDLEMAN
 CHARLES H. ALLEN
 ROBERT F. ALVARO
 MICHAEL R. ANDERSON
 STEVEN ANGERTHAL
 RICHARD T. APPELHANS
 STEPHEN A. ASHPES
 ERIC E. ASLAKSON
 ANTHONY J. AUDREY
 MARION P. BAKALORZ
 JOHN L. BARRETT, JR.
 JAIME T. BAZIL
 JOHN A. BENEDICT
 DOUGLAS W. BENNETT
 TODD A. BERRY
 WOLFGANG T. BIGGERSTAFF
 KIM T. BIVIN
 DAVID M. BRADSHAW
 JOHN D. BRANCH
 STEVEN E. BREWER
 JONALAN BRICKEY
 DANIEL W. BURNETT
 THOMAS M. BUTLER
 ROBERT H. CARR
 CLAUDIA J. CARRIZALES
 TANIA M. CHACHO
 JOO E. CHO
 KURT P. CONNELL
 JOHN A. CONNIFF
 MICHAEL R. CORPENING
 PAUL G. CRAFT
 BRADY A. CROSIER
 ELOY E. CUEVAS
 QUACEY L. DAVIS
 STEPHEN E. DAWSON
 JOHN M. DEMKO
 JOHN A. DINGES
 GREGORY J. DOUBEK
 BRIAN R. DUNMIRE
 CHRISTOPHER R. DURHAM
 DONALD W. EDWARDS, JR.
 DOUGLAS J. EDWARDS
 DEBORAH M. ELLIS
 CHRISTOPHER M. FARRELL
 STEVEN G. FINLEY
 THOMAS F. FOSTER
 JAMES A. FRICK
 DANIEL FRIEND
 DAVID A. GIGLIOTTI
 RICARDO GONZALEZ
 JOHN E. GRANT
 KEVIN L. GRIGGS
 PETER J. HABIC
 DAVID W. HAINES
 JOHN C. HALE
 JERRY A. HALL
 MARIE L. HALL
 BURKE R. HAMILTON
 GARRICK M. HARMON
 ELLIOT E. HARRIS
 BRADLEY C. HILTON
 JOHN G. HINES, JR.
 ERIC A. HOGGARD
 THOMAS P. HOLLIDAY, JR.
 MATTHEW J. INGRAM
 STEVEN M. JOHNSON
 BENJAMIN C. JONES
 WILLIAM H. KACZYNSKI
 KEVIN T. KAWASAKI
 PETER K. KEMP
 JOSEPH E. KOLLER
 DANIEL F. KUNTZ
 THOMAS M. LAFLEUR
 ERIC A. LAND
 ERIC J. LARSEN
 SEUNG J. LEE
 PETER S. LEVOLA
 BRIAN J. LIEB
 KEVIN D. LITWHILER
 WILLIE J. LOCKE III
 MARVIN G. LOERA
 DARON L. LONG
 DARREN D. LYNN

ANDREW W. MACK
 ANDREW D. MARBLE
 EDWARD P. MATTISON
 CYNTHIA A. MATUSKEVICH
 JAMES G. MCADEN
 ANDREW S. MCCLELLAND
 JAMES E. MCDONOUGH
 DAVID P. MCHENRY
 JOHN M. MCNEALY
 GARY P. MISKOVSKY, JR.
 CHARLES P. MOORE
 JOANNE C. MOORE
 KERRY E. MOORES
 ROBERT M. MURRAY
 ANGEL L. NIEVESORTIZ
 JOHN F. NOLDEN, JR.
 WILLIAM K. OCONNOR
 THOMAS J. OLIVER
 WESLEY P. PADILLA
 STEVE D. S. PARK
 MARK B. PARKER
 JOSEPH G. PATTERSON
 GREGORY H. PENFIELD
 CELESTINO PEREZ, JR.
 DAVID C. PERRINE
 KEITH C. PHILLIPS
 WILLIAM R. PITTMAN IV
 CHRISTIANE L. PLOCH
 JAMES S. POWELL
 FIRMAN H. RAY
 JOEL D. RAYBURN
 JETH B. REY
 MARK S. RILEY
 WENDY L. RIVERS
 PAUL D. ROMAGNOLI
 KEVIN P. ROMANO
 CRAIG S. ROSEBERRY
 DANA RUCINSKI
 DANIEL J. RUDEK
 MARK J. RYDZYNSKI
 PAUL M. SALTYSIAK
 RONALD D. SARGENT, JR.
 JAMES P. SCHAPPEL
 WILLIAM M. SCHAUM, JR.
 ROBERT C. SCHULTE
 PAUL D. SCHUMACHER II
 SUZANNE M. SELF
 JEFFREY S. SETTLE
 EULYS B. SHELL II
 DALE K. SLADE
 DARREN R. SMITH
 FRANK H. SMITH, JR.
 STEPHEN M. SMITH
 TIMOTHY A. SOLIE
 WILLIAM A. SPEIER III
 STEVEN D. STANLEY
 KENNETH A. STEVENS
 OLIN K. STRADER
 WALTER S. SUTTON
 FRANK F. TANK
 PATRICK A. TEAGUE
 DAVID W. TROTTER
 GEORGE C. TURNER, JR.
 LANE M. TURNER
 MICHAEL C. VANDEVELDE
 BRET P. VANOPPEL
 WILLIAM T. VIAR
 ROBERT A. VITT
 GLENN J. VOELZ
 JAMES E. WALKER
 FORTE D. WARD
 JOHN W. WEIDNER
 DON L. WILLADSEN
 DAVID T. WILLIAMS
 GREGORY A. WILLIAMS
 DAVID N. WILSON
 LARRY N. WITTWER
 KEVIN P. WOLFLA
 DOUGLAS R. WOODALL
 ROBERT B. WORSHAM
 CARL J. WORTHINGTON
 WILLIAM M. WYATT
 NEWMAN M. YANG
 JAMES M. YOCUM
 MICHAEL A. YORK
 GAIL E. S. YOSHITANI
 RICHARD L. ZELLMANN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JOEL O. ALEXANDER
 EDWARD W. ALLEN II
 SEAN D. ANDERSON
 MICHAEL J. ARNOLD
 WAYNE E. BARKER
 BRIAN W. BASSETT
 MICHAEL A. BAUMEISTER
 DAVID M. BEDARD
 JAMES W. BOGART
 WAYNE J. BONDY, JR.
 STEVEN R. BRADDOM
 JOHN C. BROOKIE
 JOHN M. BROOMHEAD
 CHRISTOPHER L. BROWN

JAMES L. BROWN
 CLYDE M. BUCKLEY
 PATRICK T. BUDJENSKA
 GREGORY N. BUNN
 GARRY B. BUSH
 ADAM W. BUTLER
 DAVID B. BYERS
 MIKE A. CALVIN
 JASON A. CARRICO
 WILLIAM D. CARUSO
 JOSEPH H. CHAN
 GREGORY H. COILE
 CHRISTOPHER H. COLAVITA
 FRANZ J. CONWAY
 AARON J. COOK
 KENNETH J. COON
 PATRICK K. CURRAN
 LANCE G. CURTIS
 PAUL G. DAVIDSON
 FRANK G. DAVIS II
 STEPHEN R. DAVIS
 TOYA J. DAVIS
 GLENN A. DEAN III
 RICHARD B. DEBANY
 ELIZABETH DELBRIDGEKEOUGH
 CHRISTOPHER E. DEXTER
 PAUL D. DISMER
 FARRELL J. DUNCOMBE
 ROYCE A. EDINGTON
 LANCE R. ELDRED
 KEVIN L. ELLISON
 LILLARD D. EVANS
 MARK M. EVANS
 DALE L. FARRAND
 JAY M. FERREIRA
 TODD J. FISH
 MICHAEL E. FOSTER, SR.
 SHANE N. FULLMER
 DANIEL L. FURBER
 GAVIN J. GARDNER
 ANTHONY GAUTIER
 TODD M. GENTRY
 AMERICUS M. GILL III
 MATTHEW G. GOODMAN
 BRETT F. GORDON
 STEPHANIE E. GRADFORD
 MARTY G. HAGENSTON
 RICHARD T. HAGGERTY
 YEE C. HANG
 MATHEW J. HANNAH
 ANTHONY L. HAYCOCK
 JERED P. HELWIG
 JOHN B. HINSON
 RICHARD J. HOERNER
 DEAN M. HOFFMAN IV
 JAMES P. HOOPER
 DONALD W. HURST III
 ANDREW J. HYATT
 SULA L. IRISH
 WILLIAM D. JACKSON
 ELMORE J. JONES, JR.
 JOHN D. KAYLOR, JR.
 JAMES R. KENNEDY
 MARTINE S. KIDD
 PETER J. KIM
 FEDERICA L. KING
 NORMAN B. KIRBY, JR.
 CHARLES H. KOEHLER III
 CHRISTOPHER J. LACKOVIC
 TRACY L. LANIER
 ROBERT N. LAW
 GAVIN A. LAWRENCE
 RICARDO LEBRON
 BRIAN D. LEJEUNE
 DOUGLAS A. LEVIEN
 DOUGLAS S. LOWREY
 LEE J. MACGREGOR
 GARY A. MARTIN
 JEFFREY W. MARTIN
 QUINT L. MATTHEWS
 WILLIAM J. MCCLARY
 DENNIS M. MCGOWAN
 SIDNEY W. MELTON
 GERARDO V. MENESES
 ROBERT J. MICELI
 MATTHEW R. MORRIS
 JOSEPH R. MORROW
 MARC A. MUELLER
 KEVIN J. MULVIHILL
 VERNON L. MYERS
 JOSEPH A. MYRDA, JR.
 MICHAEL T. NAIFEH
 THOMAS D. NETZEL
 KIYOUNG A. PAK
 CHARLES G. PHILLIPS
 JEFFERY E. PHILLIPS
 TERESA A. PLEINIS
 ERIC C. RANOW
 JOHN A. REDINGER II
 STEPHEN J. RILEY
 KRISTIAN A. ROGERS
 MARK W. RUSSELL
 THOMAS J. RYAN
 MARION A. SALTERS
 ANDREW K. SAMPSON
 GREGORY E. SANDERS
 MICHELLE A. SANNER
 MATTHEW M. SCHWIND
 PAUL D. SHULER
 MICHAEL B. SIEGL
 JONATHAN B. SLATER
 ZORN T. SLIMAN

ERIC J. SLOUGHFY
 PHILLIP E. SMALLWOOD
 JAMES M. SMITH
 GARY E. SPEAROW
 BENNY L. STARKS, JR.
 BRYAN J. STEPHENS
 MARK T. STINER
 DONALD W. STONER III
 CLINT C. TAYLOR
 ROBERT J. THOMAS
 LEE M. TONSMEIRE
 VINCENT C. VALLEY
 MENDEL D. WADDELL
 BERNARD WARRINGTON, JR.
 MARTIN J. WEBER
 DONALD B. WILHIDE
 KENNETH K. WILLIAMS
 JEFFREY K. WOODS
 CHARLES WORSIM III
 TIMOTHY W. ZIMMERMAN
 D011416

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
 ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL N. ADAME
 BRAD S. ANDERSON
 FERNANDO ARELLANO III
 CHRYSOTOL L. ATKINSON
 MARK A. AUSTIN
 RODNEY D. BABB
 RONALD A. BAHR
 JEFFREY S. BAIN
 DAVID F. BAKER
 CLARK C. BARRETT
 JOHNNY R. BASS
 SAMUEL K. BEARD
 JACK W. BEASLEY, JR.
 GORDON D. BEHUNIN
 MICHAEL R.M. BENNETT
 LAURENCE R. BISHOP
 MATTHEW D. BJELOBRK
 KEITH D. BLODGETT
 ANTHONY P. BOLANTE
 ALLEN H. BOONE
 WILLIAM L. BOREL, JR.
 RAYMOND D. BOSSERT, JR.
 ROBEBY D. BRANTLEY
 THOMAS J. BRIGHT
 STANLEY E. BUDRAITIS
 CHRISTOPHER A. BURR
 EDWARD M. BUSH III
 GREGORY K. BUSH
 KEITH A. CALHOUN
 WENDELL L. CALHOUN
 BERNARDINO C. CAPRIATO
 BRENT A. CAREY
 BRIAN P. CHAMPAGNE
 EDWARD J. CHRYSTAL, JR.
 CHARLES J. COATES
 JUANITA E. COBBS
 JIMMIE L. COLE, JR.
 DAN E. COLLINS
 PAUL R. CONTE
 MANUEL T. CORONADO
 GARRETT B. COTTRELL
 KEVIN T. COUNTIE
 NATHAN H. CRUM
 NARCISO CRUZ
 JOHN S. CUNNINGHAM
 MARK C. DAVANPORT
 JOHN G. DEAN
 ROSEMARIE DECK
 BYRON P. DEEL
 ANDREAS K. DEKUNFFY
 WILLIAM DELCASTILLO
 KEVIN J. D. DIAL
 KEITH E. DINN
 HENRY S. DIXON
 DAVID L. DODD
 STEVEN E. DONNELLY
 JOHN P. DOOLEY, JR.
 DARLENE A. DOREGO
 JAMES M. DRAGO
 DWAIN E. DRUMMOND
 LAWRENCE DUGAN
 GEORGE L. DUKES III
 MICHAEL W. DYKES
 PAUL F. DYNAN
 TIMOTHY J. EICH
 RICHARD E. ELAM
 SHANE A. ELKINS
 LANCE E. ENGLETT
 MICHAEL J. FALK
 BRUCE K. FERRELL
 JEFFERY J. FILES
 THOMAS J. FOSTER
 ROBERT C. FRICK
 JOANNA E. GALE
 STEVEN C. GARCIA
 KENNETH S. GARRISON
 MICHAEL J. GEORGE
 ANDREW D. GERLACH
 ROLAND C. GONZALEZ
 ALBERT E. GORDON
 ERIC C. GOSLOWSKY
 WILLIAM R. GREER, JR.
 EPHRAIM E. GRUBBS III
 PAUL G. GUSTAFAN
 CHESTER W. GUYER
 MARK D. HAGUE

DUANE B. HAIMBACH
 CARLA F. HALE
 RICHARD D. HALL
 RAYMOND D. HAMMOND
 DANA N. HAMPTON
 JOHN K. HARLAN
 SHAWN A. HARRIS
 JAMES S. HAWKINS, JR.
 RALPH F. HEDENBERG
 JAMES A. HELM
 SCOTT T. HENRY
 DAVID K. HERLIHY
 KELLY F. HILLAND
 STEVEN R. HINES
 DOUGLAS A. HINKLEY
 DANIEL J. HOBEN
 RAYMON J. HOEFLEIN
 HERMAN W. HOLT II
 ELLIS F. HOPKINS III
 DENNIS HUMPHREY
 SHERMAN HUNT
 MANLEY JAMES
 DAVID M. JENKINS
 RODNEY G. JENKINS
 ANTHONY R. JIMNEZ
 SCOTT L. JONDA
 WALTER R. JONES, JR.
 SCOTT E. KAHLDON
 MARTIN J. KANE
 MOSES KAOIWI, JR.
 DAVID L. KAUFFMAN
 RHONDA A. KEISMAN
 SHAWN R. KERRIGAN
 DAVID J. KIEFER
 SCOTT H. KINGSLEY
 STEVEN P. KISTLER
 DONALD E. KNEIFL, JR.
 JOHN G. KRENSON
 DARIN M. KRUEGER
 LANITA R. KUHN
 JACOB D. KULZER
 JOHN D. LANDRETH
 JOHN E. LANGSTON
 GREGORY L. LANKFORD
 DAVID J. LARSON
 KIP O. LASSNER
 TIMOTHY B. LEDMAN
 YOUNG C. LEE
 RUDOLPH LIGSAY
 DEBORAH V. LOBBENMEIER
 MERLE E. LONDON II
 KIMBERLY M. LUND
 CORWIN J. LUSK
 DONALD F. MABRY
 RENEE T. MACDONALD
 DANIEL T. MAHON
 KEVIN G. MALCHOW
 DANIEL E. MARKS
 BRIAN K. MARSHALL
 COLLEEN K. MARTIN
 JUDITH D. MARTIN
 ANITA S. MASSEY
 GERALD C. MAY
 JAMES G. MCCORMACK
 WILLIAM L. MCDANIEL
 PAMELA L. MCGAHA
 SEAN P. MCKIERNAN
 WILLIAM J. MCKINNEY
 KELLY M. MCNEIL
 MELANIE J. MEIER
 ARLENE A. MELLO
 MICHAEL MELLOR
 MIGUEL A. MENDEZ
 MARK A. MERLINO
 WILLIAM W. MERRELL
 GERALD D. MEYER
 WILLIAM P. MIGNON, JR.
 RUSSELL D. MILLER
 ALBERTO L. MIRANDA
 CRAIG M. MIX
 STEPHEN J. MORGAN
 JERRIE R. MUIR
 LANCE J. MYLER
 DENNIS J. NADRASIK
 WALTER R. NALL
 ALAN B. NAUGHER
 VERNON L. NEWMAN
 SEAN C. NIKKILA
 ERIC W. NORRIS
 KEN A. NYGREN
 JOHN M. OBOYLE
 DOUGLAS K. OCONNELL
 EDWARD J. OLOUGHLIN
 EDWARD J. OSHEEHAN
 JODI A. PADAVANA
 CHAD J. PARKER
 JACK W. PARKER, JR.
 WILLIAM L. PEACE
 KIRK P. PEDERSON
 RICHARD W. PELHAM
 JOHN A. PELLERITI
 WILLIAM L. PELLETIER
 CHRISTOPHER L. PERRON
 HENRY M. PERSON
 JEFFREY A. PETERSON
 THURMAN H. PETERSON, JR.
 SCOTT T. PETRIK
 BRIAN A. PHILLIPS
 GEORGE H. POHLMANN
 GREGORY S. POTTER
 JASON D. PRICE
 JAMES L. PRIDGEN

DANIEL L. PULVERMACHER
 JASON O. PYLE
 DANIEL J. QUICK
 IAN H. RANBERG
 ANDREW S. RATZLAFF
 ROBERT W. REDDING, JR.
 JAVIER A. REINA
 EDWIN B. RICE
 RUSSELL E. RICHARDSON
 BOBBY M. ROACH
 JEFFERY A. ROACH
 DONALD M. RODEWALD
 ANDREW E. ROGERS
 ANDREW M. ROMAN
 BRYAN J. ROSS
 GEORGE L. ROSSER, JR.
 TAUBE A. ROY
 BRETT D. RUSS
 ARAM A. SARAFIAN
 ROBBY R. SCARBERRY
 ADRIENNE L. SCHAFFER
 PAUL H. SCHEIDLER
 FARIN D. SCHWARTZ
 CHARLES C. SCOTT
 BRIAN K. SCULLY
 PHILLIP J. SELLEH
 TIMOTHY T. SELLERS
 BRIAN S. SHACKLEFORD
 GERALDINE E. SHUTT
 DAVID K. SILBAUGH
 ADAM R. SILVERS
 MARK F. SLUSAR
 PAUL A. SMITH
 TERRENCE L. SMITH
 LAURA J. SOARES
 PAUL T. SOUTH
 DANIEL C. SPINETI
 MICHAEL A. STACKS
 DANA T. STRANGE
 HEATH J. STRECK
 WALTER B. STUREK, JR.
 SCOTT L. SUCHOMSKI
 MARK M. SULLIVAN
 MICHAEL H. SWANSON
 MICHAEL A. TAFF
 CRAIG TEMMER
 SUSAN P. TEMMER
 JEFFERY J. TEMPLIN
 LAWRENCE M. TERRANOVA
 JEFFREY M. TERRILL
 LEE THAGGARD
 PATRICK C. THIBODEAU
 BARRY W. THOMAS
 MILTON H. THOMPSON
 CYNTHIA K. TINKHAM
 GARY D. TRAVIS, JR.
 DAVID N. VESPER
 CAROLYN C. WALFORD
 KEVIN J. WARREN
 STEPHEN E. WATKINS
 STEVEN F. WEIGEL
 BERNICE S. WHITE
 JOE L. WHITE III
 BARRY C. WHITNEY
 JUDAH M. WHITNEY
 MARK G. WIENS
 JAMES N. WILLIAMS
 JOHN M. WILLIAMS
 MARY C. WILLIAMS LYNCH
 TIMOTHY J. WINSLOW
 WALTER G. WOODRING
 KARL L. WRIGHT
 KEITH L. YOUNG
 THOMAS J. ZELKO II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

CHRISTOPHER J. EGAN
 TERRY L. GRISHAM
 EDWARD C. LEICHTNER
 REX B. PAINTER
 RALPH R. ROBOVSKY
 BRUCE R. WALTON, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

ANDREW D. KASTELLO
 MARK A. SELDES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY CHAPLAIN'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

BRIAN E. MURPHY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

TRENT E. LOISEAU

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S. C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

YORLONDO S. M. WORTHAM

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

JOSH A. CASSADA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

RONALDO S. MEMIJE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

KEVIN L. ALBERT
 JEHAN C. ANDRABADO
 MARK A. BLASK
 JAMEY L. CRUMB
 DEREK L. JONES
 ANTHONY ROBINSON
 MICHAEL D. UHL
 SHAWN C. WILLIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTOPHER B. ALLEN
 AARON T. ALLISON
 CHRISTOPHER W. ARCHER
 GREGERY E. BALSMEIER
 TREVOR A. BINGHAM
 TRAVIS D. BRINKMAN
 STEVEN T. CHAN
 JOSEPH W. CHARLES
 PATRICK C. CHITTY
 ROBERT A. CLARK
 MARCEL T. DUPLANTIER
 NEIL L. EBUE
 RAYMOND D. FLETCHER
 ROBERT A. FREDRIKSEN
 TIMOTHY L. GEHLING
 NATALIE C. O. GILLIVER
 ANDREW E. HAYES
 NATHANIEL L. HERRON
 STUART A. HOLLAND
 MICHAEL T. JANSSEN
 BENJAMIN E. KALISH
 DAVID L. LUNDBERG
 CORY D. MACCUMBEE
 JEROD D. MCCULLY
 JACOB R. MCILVAINE
 MICHAEL J. MCMANUS
 MARC S. NELSON
 JEREMY M. NEVIN
 DUCHUY T. NGUYEN
 CRAIG D. PECK
 JOSHUA M. PERRY
 JEREMY R. POTTS
 ROBERT S. RAMSEY
 MARCUS A. SANCHEZ
 KENNETH D. SOWELL
 HENRY B. SUTHER III
 JEREMY M. THEIS
 PAUL C. WEYANT
 KRISTIN B. WHITEHOUSE
 JOSEPH M. ZUKOWSKY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

PAUL A. ARMSTRONG
 RYAN B. BARENG
 THOMAS A. BINGOL
 AUTUMN E. BUTLERSAEGGER
 DAVID J. CARLSON
 ANDREW B. COLVIN
 JOHN D. CONNOLLY
 DANIEL L. CURTIS
 CRISTIANO S. DESOUSA
 PETER W. DIETZ
 EDWARD H. ERWIN
 DANIEL J. FULLERTON
 RANDY A. GIBSON
 ERIC P. HAMMEN
 DENNIS A. KELLY
 DAVID D. J. KIM
 KYU C. LEE
 JOSEPH F. MAYER
 DOUGLAS C. MCINTOSH
 JOHN C. MONAHAN
 JAMES W. MYERS, JR.
 THOMAS P. OFLANAGAN
 JEFFREY J. ROSS
 RICHARD C. SMOTHERS
 ROBERT S. SPIVEY
 SCOT E. SROKA
 BUSTER L. WILLIAMS

JAMES P. WILLIFORD, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JONATHAN D. ALBANO
 MATTHEW M. BERKAU
 KARLIE M. BLAKE
 DIANA C. BLEVINS
 MICHAEL J. BONO
 JOSEPH R. BOSSI
 BRYAN J. BUSTAMANTE
 JASON D. CALANDRUCCIO
 JEFFREY W. CARIDEO
 BRENDAN T. CASEY
 BRITTA W. CHRISTIANSON
 WILLIAM I. COFFEEN IV
 BRIAN D. COLBERT
 MARCUS M. CRAIG
 VICTOR A. CUNNINGHAM
 ERIK A. DECKER
 PAUL G. DEVORSE
 DANIEL J. EDDY
 ADESINA EKUNDAYO
 JOSHUA S. FISCHER
 ALFONSO V. FRANCISCO II
 MAXINE J. J. GARDNER
 KENNETH E. GILMORE III
 JASON P. HARPER
 MICHAEL C. HOCKETT, JR.
 WILLIAM B. HUNT
 JASON V. ILETO
 IAN G. ILIFF
 JASON F. JACKSON
 TARA R. JACKSON
 CANDICE D. LASTIE
 JONATHAN B. LEUNG
 SOKTHEAS S. LIENG
 ANDREW C. LOVGREN
 ANAS E. MAAZOUZI
 BENJAMIN I. MAY
 DONALD M. MCINTYRE
 JOSHUA R. MELCHERT
 GRANT W. MILLER
 MATTHEW L. MILLER
 BENJAMIN S. NICHOLS
 JOSHUA F. QUENEMOEN
 GEOFFREY F. ROTH
 FRANCISCO SALAZAR, JR.
 JONATHAN D. SCHUMANN
 CHRISTOPHER M. SHUTT
 JARROD H. SMITH
 JOHN G. SPRAGUE
 RYAN R. STICKEL
 JARED J. SWEETSER
 JEREMY B. TAYLOR
 THOMAS P. TEAGUE
 MARCUS E. THOMAS
 MAURA L. THOMPSON
 DEREK E. VOGT
 BROCK L. WALASKA
 TITO A. WARNER
 MICHAEL R. WHEELER
 TRACEY M. WITWER
 DANIEL D. YERGER
 JAMES H. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MICHELE Y. ALLEN
 ARTURO ALVARADO, JR.
 JOHN D. ARCE
 WILLIE R. BARKSDALE
 JAMES M. BIVINS
 KIMBERLY V. BOEHLERT
 LAURA A. BOERSTE
 MARTIN L. BOESE
 JASON A. BRAINARD
 ATHENA J. BRAY
 CHRISTINE M. BURNS
 KATIE A. CAMP
 SHERON Y. CAMPBELL
 HANNAH A. CASTILLO
 AMY R. CLARK
 GABRIELLE A. CRANE
 JAMES E. CRUMPTON
 NEETA V. DARITY
 COREY L. DAVIS
 THOMAS B. DOKE
 STEPHEN J. DUNHAM II
 PHONTHIP M. EADENS
 CARRIE A. EASTON
 MARIE F. EDWARDS
 KIM S. FISHER
 LORELIE D. FLINN
 MICHAEL D. FOUST
 KIMBERLY J. C. GERBER
 TERRI L. GIANOTTI
 JENNIFER L. GOODRIDGE
 CHRISTOPHER J. GREY
 SHAWNA G. GROVER
 BRIAN M. GUZMAN
 DWIGHT L. HAMPTON
 JUDY O. HANHILA
 MELANI L. HARDING
 CANDICE D. HECK
 ANNETTE M. HEMPHILL
 KIRBY L. JAHNKE

ROSE C. JOLLY
FRANK A. JONES
WARREN D. KARR IV
KATHERINE M. KIDDE
KARL KRUGER
TAMERA G. LARSEN
LAUREN S. LAZZARO
CHRISTOPHER A. LINGER
JACQUELINE LOPEZ
RICHARD D. MAIATICO
SONYA L. MCKAY
CHERRY A. MINKAVAGE
MARGARET A. MOFFATT
BRENDA S. MORGAN
JENNIFER E. MORRISON
GWENDOLYN D. MULHOLLAND
HEATHER J. MYER
DAVID R. MYERS
CARLA B. NEWKIRKMCOWELL
COLBY J. OQUIN
JESSICA M. ORZECOWSKI
STEPHANIE M. PAONE
KATHRYN L. PHILLIPS
ROCIO G. PORRAS
EVE S. POTEET
HEATHER Y. PURCELLMULLINS
ANTHONY P. PUTNEY
HARLEY R. RAGLE III
JEREMY M. RAY
APRIL L. REAVES
JONATHAN F. REBUSTILLO
MARGARET M. REYNOLDS
ORLANDO RIVERA, JR.
JEFFEREY M. ROCKETT
JEFFREY L. ROSS
LANDRIA C. RUSSELL
TERI R. RYALS
DAGOBERTO SALINAS, JR.
BETTINA A. SOLWAZI
JOHN T. SPANNUTH
DAMIAN M. STORZ
JENNIFER D. STUDER
STACY M. SYRSTAD
ABREAIL D. TETZLAFF
ANA L. TEXIDOR
DEVIN C. THOMAS
ERIC T. TOBIN
LINDSAY M. TOUCHETTE
FAITH M. UNDERWOOD
JEREMY T. VENSKE
CHRISTOPHER R. WEISS
DAVID W. WELTCH
CAMILLE C. WHITE
ROBYN V. WHITE
BRENDA M. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CANDICE C. ALBRIGHT
MATTHEW S. BAILEY
JOHN J. BATTISTI
DENIZ M. BAYKAN
JONATHAN B. A. BLAZEK
JOHN J. BOYD
TIMOTHY G. BOYLE
JOHN F. BUTLER
SARAH J. COTTRILL
ROBIN D. CRABTREE
JOHN R. GOODIN
BRIAN C. HAAGENSEN II
MICHAEL B. HANZEL
WILLIAM A. HOLT
TARA C. LAWLOR
JOSHUA R. LORENZ
JOHN A. V. LOVASTIK
KEVIN J. MEJEUR
MICHAEL G. MONTAGUE
MISHONDA M. MOSLEY
ANDREW D. MURRAY
STEPHEN A. MURRAY
DANIEL W. NAPIER
ERIC S. NELSON
ELIZABETH A. OCONNOR
REBECCA M. OLDFIELDFREY
PETER R. OSTRUM
TIMOTHY J. PASKEN
JEFFREY M. PEARSON
AYANA B. PITTERSON
JENNIFER L. POLLIO
TRACY L. REYNOLDS
ELIZABETH M. ROCHE
MATTHEW A. SCHULTZ
KATHERINE E. SHOVLIN
GARRETT S. SNOW
DARCY F. URIBE
ALLISON E. WARD
MATTHEW J. WOOTEN
KATHERINE D. WORSTELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ALEXANDER ALDANA
LAURA J. ANDERSON
HAK AUTH
WILLIAM F. BACA
PAUL E. BENOIT
SONIA M. BILLUPS

CARL R. BLAESING, JR.
RICHARD H. BLAIR
WILLIAM A. BLAIR, JR.
AMANDA P. BRADFORD
CLINTON W. BULLMAN
JAMES E. CABALLERO
RAUL E. CARDENAL
KRISTINA K. CARTER
MARTIN M. CASAREZ
DOUGLAS J. CHANG
DOMINADOR D. CONSTANTINO
GABRIEL N. DEFANG
DEIRDRE E. DESMOND
DEEPAK D. DEVASTHALI
JOHN M. DISCHERT
KELLYE A. DONOVAN
CHRISTOFER J. ECKLUND
JOHN M. GARDNER
BOYCE R. GIRE
MARCUS A. GOBRECHT
VENA C. GREEN
ROSA C. GRGURICH
MARIO GUERRERO
THERON HAMILTON
BETH A. HAWKS
MARCUS E. HILL
GRETCHEN S. JACKSON
RYAN F. JARMER
JED J. JUACHON
DEAN KANG
MICHAEL W. KEREKGARTO
TOSHA A. KLOTZBACH
MICHAEL D. KNOELL
LARKIN E. MAGEL
PAUL R. MAYO II
SONNY L. MCGOWAN
RUDY D. MEDINA
GREGORY J. MONK
DARIO P. MORGAN
JOSEPH C. NEWMAN III
KIRT C. NILSSON
JOSEPH E. OSMOND
KITTRA T. OWENS
FERNANDO PATRON, JR.
JODI M. PHILLIPS
GREY H. PICKERILL
RUSSELL J. SANSONE
IVETTE R. SCHMIEGE
MATTHEW R. SCHUMACHER
JOHN R. STAGE
ANN M. TARTER
SUZANNE M. TSCHAUNER
FELIX M. VILLANUEVA, JR.
IAN A. WAUGH
LANCE T. WERSLAND
ANGELA M. WEYRICK
SCOTT H. WILLIAMS
TERESA A. YOUSHOCK
DANIEL L. ZAHUMENSKY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

RICARDO M. ABAKAH
LALEH ABDOLAZADEH
MATTHEW J. ADAMO
MATTHEW W. BANKS
PETER D. CERVENKA
KATHERINE L. CHENG
CHRISTOPHER A. CONNORS
JEFFREY L. CULBREATH
ALEXANDER K. DESTA
WILLIAM C. DONOVAN
DAVID M. DOW II
COLIN A. ELIOT
MALJA A. FISH
REBECCA A. FRAZER
JESUS M. GONZALEZ
MICHAEL J. GRAU, JR.
PETER J. HAMMES
ADAM K. HARKRIDER
ANDREA B. HASLOFF
SCOTT A. HOCKER
VANESSA O. HOFILENA
JACQUELINE A. M. HOGAN
BROCK J. JOHNSON
LAURA E. S. JOHNSON
ANDREW B. KELSO
DARIEN G. LAZARO
JAIME K. LEE
NATHANIEL S. LEEDY
XIANG LI
GUSTAVO E. LORES
JARED W. MACK
MURIEL L. MCKOY
ERIN E. MILLEA
PATRICK B. MOORE
PATRICK T. MORRELL
AMY M. MUNSELLE
RYAN MURPHY
BROC A. MUSHET
MICHAEL M. H. NGUYEN
AJA N. NICHOLS
MARK A. NOCERA
JAMES M. OBRIEN
CHRISTOPHER D. PARKS
MICHAEL L. PAYNE
LEONEL PEREZ, JR.
ARIC M. PETERSEN
JOSEPH N. REARDON
AMY M. RESPONDEK

BENJAMIN L. RICKS
JUSTIN L. ROGERS
ROBERT S. RUEHRWEIN
ROBIN S. SCHROEDER
CHRISTOPHER G. SELLERS
AMY G. SMITH
ROBERT D. STONER
LESLIE H. WALLACE
ANDRE L. WILLIAMS, JR.
GREGORY A. WILLIAMS
DANIEL S. WITCHER
CHRISTOPHER L. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

NEHKONTI ADAMS
JADA M. AIKMAN
ADENIYI S. ALATISE
RICHARD C. ANDERSEN
MARY A. ANDREWS
MICHAEL J. ARMSTRONG
JESSE BANDLE
RYAN C. BARTLE
AARON K. BASSETT
JONATHAN R. BEAR
STEPHANIE M. BEDZIS
JENNIFER M. BERARDUCCI
JONATHAN H. BERGER
CATHERINE M. BERJOHN
SARAH M. BIALOBOK
MATTHEW S. BIDLACK
ERIC D. BIEWENGA
ROBERT O. BOATWRIGHT
RICHARD J. BOWER
DANIEL L. BOWERS
CATHERINE A. BRANKIN
JONATHAN W. BRUGGER
DANIEL G. BRUGGERS
KATHRYN E. BUIKEMA
TSHAWNDA J. BURKE
CARRICK T. BURNS
MELISSA S. BUTTS
MIGUEL A. CABRERA
ORLANDO G. CABRERA
MARC L. CALESTINI
ROBERT C. CALL
VICTORIA A. CAMPBELL
WESLEY R. CAMPBELL
MICHAEL D. CAMPBELL
RICHARD D. CARD II
JEFFREY M. CARNESSE
JOHN J. CHAN
TIMOTHY J. CHINNOCK
ANTHONY J. CHOI
SUNG W. CHOI
STACY M. CHRONISTER
JACALYN H. CLARK
KEITH A. CLAUSSEN
SUZANNE D. CLAYTON
JULIE A. COHN
JEFFREY T. COOK
LARRY M. COWLES
SEAN F. COWLEY
LESLIE F. CRAWFORD
MARK I. CROSBY
ELIZABETH B. CROWELL
BRIDGET K. CUNNINGHAM
JENNIFER L. CUNNINGHAM
PATRICK L. DALY
ANTHONY B. DAMBRO IV
JUSTIN L. DAY
LUKE T. DAY
AMY B. DETTORI
MARIA I. DICKEY
TIMOTHY E. DOCKMAN
SEAN M. DRISCOLL
ELIZABETH A. DUBIL
DAMIAN J. DYCKMAN
STEPHANIE L. ELENBAUM
ANDREW W. ELLIOTT
ANN E. P. ETIM
JOHN T. EWING
KEITH A. FAIRBANKS
KIMBERLY L. FISCHER
SETH M. FISCHMAN
LAUREN C. FISKE
JAMES H. FLINT
AIDITH FLORES
DEREK L. FOERSCHLER
SUSANNE E. FRANCIS
TIMOTHY S. W. FRAZIER
RUTH E. GARDNER
PHILIP A. GAUDREAU III
STEVEN M. GLERUM
RYAN J. GNANDT
BRIANNE C. GOBER
REYNALDO GOMEZ
JENNIFER L. GOODRICH
LAURA A. GRECO
RISHELLE D. GREENLEE
JOSEPH C. GRESSENS
ALAN R. GRIMM
KRISTINA M. GUERRA
LAURA L. HABELOW
JISUN HAHN
MARK E. HALLER
JOHN C. HAMILTON
ANDREW W. HARBUCK
SUNIL B. HARI
BRYAN K. HARRELL

MASON D. HARRELL III
 RACHAEL M. HARTER
 AMIE L. HARVEY
 DANIEL T. HEARD
 RICHARD U. D. HEDELIUS
 JAMES L. HEGARTY
 JESSIN HELMRICKBLOSSOM
 PAUL D. HENDRICKSEN
 NADINE D. HENLEY
 MARCUS G. HEROD
 SHANNON L. HILLIER
 SARAH D. HODGES
 SCOTT P. HOPKINS
 ADAM R. HORN
 BENJAMIN I. HOWIE
 VIRGILIO R. HUERTA
 MEGHAN E. HUGHES
 KATHRYN R. HUNT
 JAMES T. HYNES
 GEORGE A. JAKUBEK
 MIA JIN
 PATRICK E. JONES
 DEV N. KALYAN
 NICOLE M. KING
 ASHLEY B. KLEIN
 CHRISTOPHER M. KNAUS
 PRUDENCE Y. KNIGGE
 KEVIN S. KOEHLER
 LUKE T. KRISPINSKY
 BRENT W. LACEY
 CHRISTINA L. LACROIX
 REMI H. LAI
 DAVID R. LAMBORN
 ARTHUR K. LAMMERS
 TIMOTHY M. LAWLER
 GRACE S. LEE
 JEFFREY J. LEVINE
 ROSELLE E. LIGANOR
 DAVID M. I. LIM
 GEORGE H. LOEFFLER III
 NICHOLAS F. LOGEMANN
 BRYCE D. LOKEY
 JAIME L. LONGOBARDI
 ROZALYN G. F. LOVE
 LESLI M. LUCAS
 MATTHEW L. LUTYNSKI
 KATHARINE I. MANGAN
 JANELLE M. MARRA
 BRUCE L. MATCHIN
 JESSICA A. MATTHESS
 ANDREW J. MCDERMOTT
 APRIL L. MCGILL
 PETER Z. MCINTYRE
 ANDREW D. MCLAUGHLIN
 DANIEL P. MCMAHON
 JOSELYN C. MERCADOABADIE
 MARC A. MOLENAT
 DANIEL J. MONLUX

DANIELLE C. MONTEIL
 JEFFREY L. MOORE, JR.
 SAMIR T. MUKHERJEE
 JENNIFER L. MURIE
 BATI A. MYLES
 ROBERT MYSLIN
 KARL Z. NADOLSKY, JR.
 TARA A. OCONNELL
 DENNIS R. OCONNOR IV
 ROBERT F. O'DONNELL
 LAUREN G. OLIVEIRA
 MICHELLE D. OLSON
 HEATHER K. OSTMANN
 ERIK L. OWEN
 ADAM H. PAGE
 ANDREW M. PAUL
 COLLEEN F. PEREZ
 CHRISTOPHER M. PERRY
 SHANNON H. PHIBBS
 GREGORY L. PIRKL
 RYAN P. PONTON
 ADITYA RAGHUNANDAN
 JEREMY K. RAMSEY
 CATHERINE M. RAPP
 LINDSEY R. RATH
 PAPIYA RAY
 MITCHELL A. REES
 PASQUALE F. REINO
 RYAN D. RESTREPO
 CATHERINE L. RIDINGS
 JAMES P. RIES
 JASON L. ROBY
 MICHAEL J. ROSEDALE
 GRIGORIY A. ROZENFELD
 DANIEL M. RUANE
 BENJAMIN F. RUDDICK
 STACY E. RUSTICO
 ELLE M. SCHOLLNBERGER
 DUSTIN J. SCHUETT
 JOSEPH D. SCHWARTZ
 DONALD J. SETTER
 BENNETT H. SHAPIRO
 STEVEN F. SHELDEN
 JENNIFER C. SHIPPY
 MEGAN M. SICK
 RAJ C. SINGARAJU
 TRICIA V. SKIPPER
 JASON A. SLINGERLAND
 JAMES G. SLOTT
 ASHLEY L. SMITH
 DUSTIN K. SMITH
 TRACIE C. SNIDER
 ROBERT P. SNOW
 KARL A. SODERLUND
 CHARLES A. SOLA
 LEIVI A. SOSA
 MICHAEL K. SRACIC
 CHARLES C. STEHMAN

MATTHEW T. STEPANOVICH
 MARIE I. STRAIT
 STEPHANIE B. STRATTON
 JONI C. STUART
 SEAN M. STUART
 ADAM J. SUSMARSKI
 KATHERINE L. SWARTZ
 AMY N. SWEIGART
 RICHARD B. THOMPSON
 DARSHAN S. THOTA
 DAVID M. TOUCHETTE
 ROBYN M. TREADWELL
 KRISTEN D. TRINCA
 BRIAN P. TULLIUS
 JUSTIN R. TURESON
 SARAH J. TURNER
 ERIC R. VAUGHT
 JOSEPH V. VO, JR.
 KATRINA S. VONGSY
 MICHAEL S. WAGNER
 JAMES P. WALTON
 ALLISON B. WEISBROD
 MATTHEW C. WENDT
 KATHLYN V. WILDE
 DAMIAN T. WILLIAMS
 KEVIN J. WINEGAR
 CHRISTOPHER R. WORLEY
 KATHERINE A. WRENN
 CHAI H. WU
 JOHN M. YOSAY
 CHRISTAL M. YOUNG
 LISA C. YOUNG
 MARVIN W. ZAHLER
 JOSEPH E. ZEMAN, JR.
 WADE A. ZIMMERMAN
 NATHAN S. ZUNDEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

KIMBERLY S. BAILEY
 MARY J. CLINGAN
 BENJAMIN L. DAVIS
 BRITTINNY A. EPPERSON
 PAUL K. HERICKHOFF
 PAUL E. JOHNSON
 JAMES H. LEE
 MEGHAN R. LEWIS
 SUSAN M. MCDOWELL
 KIM A. NGUYEN
 RICHARD J. OKANE II
 NATHANIEL S. RIAL
 ALEXANDER M. TUMMERS
 CAREY A. WELSH
 ERIC E. WONG

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 11, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REED).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 11, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM REED to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MOMENT OF SILENCE COMMEMORATING THE 9/11 ATTACKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will now observe a moment of silence in memory of the victims of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

Will all present please rise for a moment of silence.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

WHERE ARE THE BENGHAZI KILLERS 1 YEAR LATER?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker:

In Libya, al Qaeda cousins, as I call them, the Ansar al-Sharia, claims responsibility for the murder of our U.S. Ambassador and three others. It's no coincidence that these two attacks occurred nearly at the same time, and they both occurred on September 11.

In the past, the United States has always held and went after those that were responsible for this type of conduct. In 1998, when the Kenyan Embassy was attacked and Americans were killed, we responded. Of course, we responded on September 11. We responded after the first World Trade Center bombing. Then, in 1996, when 19 American soldiers were murdered in Saudi Arabia, we responded.

Madam Speaker, the United States must always respond to terrorists, and we must let

them be reminded again and again we will respond in an appropriate manner, as we did on September 11. We must respond today, and we must respond tomorrow. I am encouraged that the President will soon address the Nation on what our response will be.

We must hold those responsible personally accountable because we must let people understand that they need to leave us alone. That is what the message needs to be. We must have justice in these terrorist attacks by these individuals against Americans because, Madam Speaker, justice is what we do.

Mr. Speaker, that was the speech I gave on this House floor 1 year ago. September 12, 2012, was when it was given. But it has been 1 year since the attack in Benghazi, Libya; and we still have no answers.

Today, as we remember those who were murdered 12 years ago on September 11, 2001, in New York, Pennsylvania, and at the Pentagon, young and old, from countries all over the world, we should also remember those four Americans murdered 1 year ago in Benghazi, Libya. We went after those first 9/11 killers—as we should. America had resolve, as it usually has had in our history. But the Benghazi killers run free today.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that the greatest power that has ever existed, with all our vast resources of military, CIA intelligence, the NSA intelligence, the FBI, we can't capture some killers who killed Americans in Benghazi, Libya. When the media can go and talk to them and have them on television, we can't even find them, capture them, and bring them back to justice. It's been a year. What does that tell the families, what does it tell Americans, when we haven't been able to accomplish this capture of terrorists? We know that Ansar al-Sharia was involved. I said that the day after this murder occurred last year on this House floor.

So today, I filed the Ansar al-Sharia Terrorist Designation Act of 2013. It says, "Ansar al-Sharia is a terrorist organization, and we must use all resources available to go after these killers." We must label them as terrorists and deal with them appropriately.

We're not sure about United States policy today in the Middle East. We don't know what the current U.S. policy is about Americans killed overseas. All we get is a lot of words. Even the White House Press Secretary said, "Well, Benghazi was a long time ago." It seems like more is said than done in the Benghazi episode.

Our enemies continue to test us because they no longer fear us, Mr.

Speaker. The world no longer knows where America stands when we are attacked, either at home or abroad, not our allies, not our enemies, and not American citizens.

The President is concerned about Syrians being killed by Syrians. I wish he was just as concerned about Americans being murdered by terrorists in Benghazi, Libya. The administration needs to go after these terrorists by any means necessary and bring them to justice and restore our credibility with the American people, because justice is what we do in this country.

And that's just the way it is.

MO BROOKS OF ALABAMA VOTING "NO" ON ATTACKING SYRIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, President Obama, without consulting Congress or the American people, intervened in Libya's civil war, resulting in the murder of four Americans, including our Ambassador in Benghazi, while creating yet another fertile terrorist recruiting ground. Repeating its Libya mistake, in September 2012, the Obama administration declared that America will intervene in Syria's civil war and work "to support a Syrian opposition to hasten the day when Assad falls."

Shortly thereafter, I stood on this floor, stated my opposition to America's intervening in yet another civil war and argued that "America must stop spending our treasury and risking American lives for those who neither appreciate our sacrifices, nor believe in basic liberties like freedom of religion and freedom of speech."

I have participated in classified hearings with Secretary of State John Kerry, National Security Adviser Susan Rice, and many others. I have listened to President Obama. The arguments for attacking Syria are unpersuasive.

Absent substantially different circumstances, and consistent with my 2012 opposition to intervening in Syria's civil war, I will vote against attacking Syria, if and when Congress has that vote. I reject the President's argument that the best way to keep Syrians from killing Syrians is for Americans to kill Syrians. America has peaceful options. We should pursue them more vigorously.

There is not the required public support to attack Syria. Americans oppose

attacking Syria by a two-to-one ratio. In Alabama's Fifth Congressional District, 1,272 citizens have contacted my office about Syria, and 1,267 citizens oppose attacking Syria. A scant five citizens out of 1,272 support attacking Syria.

The President last night told America that there is no evidence that Syria is a security threat to America that supports preemptive military action. Yet an attack makes Syria and its allies a security threat. President Obama erred when he made Syria's chemical weapons a red line. But a President's verbal gaffes don't justify war. A Syrian war costs money America does not have. Every dollar spent attacking Syria worsens America's deficit and debt, weakens our economy, undermines our ability to pay for national security, and increases the risk of even more defense layoffs and furloughs.

An American attack on Syria aids and abets Syrian rebels. Syrian rebels have beheaded Christians solely because they are Christians. One rebel leader killed a Syrian soldier, cut open his chest, took out his heart, ate it, and then bragged about. Another rebel leader personally executed helpless prisoners of war. I question the wisdom of helping rebels who may be even more evil and barbaric than Syrian President Assad. Yet that is exactly what President Obama proposes.

The White House Syrian strategy is conflicting and amorphous. The President claims he does not seek regime change. Yet in 2012, his administration said the exact opposite. President Obama claims attacks will deter Syria's chemical weapons use, yet his Secretary of State insists that attacks will be "unbelievably small."

I have reservations about this administration's ability to handle a delicate foreign policy matter. This administration bungled its Fast and Furious gun-running program, killing hundreds of innocent Mexicans and an American Border Patrol agent. This administration botched Benghazi and threw in a coverup for good measure. This administration illegally uses the Internal Revenue Service to attack political adversaries. The list goes on and on.

President Obama has cultivated cheerleaders but not players on the field whose militaries will help America attack Syria. America cannot perpetually be the world's only policeman.

In sum, I believe attacking Syria unilaterally makes matters worse, not better. Absent a major international effort to punish Syrian President Assad for his inhumane and criminal use of chemical weapons, I cannot and will not in good conscience vote on the House floor or in the Foreign Affairs or Armed Services Committees to attack Syria.

WAR, PEACE, AND THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, amidst the international humiliation and farce that we've suffered with our abortive war with Syria, there are two good things the President has done, and they need to be noted. Last night, he stepped back from an international crisis that could have had catastrophic consequences by deferring to the Russian diplomatic initiative. Thank God. And last week, he stepped back from a constitutional crisis by deferring to Congress the decision over whether to go to war—as the Constitution requires.

I've been deeply troubled by suggestions from many otherwise responsible officials and commentators—from both parties—that the President has independent authority as Commander in Chief to order an attack on other countries when he deems it necessary. This cuts right to the core of our Constitution's design, and it evinces an alarming deterioration of the popular understanding of the separation of powers that keeps us free. There is nothing more clear in the American Constitution than that Congress has the sole authority to decide the question of war or peace. Only after Congress has made that decision does the President, as Commander in Chief, have the authority to execute that decision.

For centuries, European monarchs had plunged their nations into bloody and debilitating wars on whim, and the Constitution's Framers wanted to protect the American Republic from that fate. They understood that a President, for example, might someday paint himself into a rhetorical corner and feel compelled to save face by exercising force. That is precisely why they entrusted that fateful decision to the Congress.

James Madison, the Father of the American Constitution, said that its single most important feature was the provision that gave the Congress, and not the President, the authority to go to war.

□ 1015

Here's what he wrote in 1793:

In no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confides the question of war or peace to the legislature, and not to the executive department. The trust and the temptation would be too great for any one man.

War is in fact the true nurse of executive aggrandizement. In war, a physical force is to be created and it is the executive will which is to direct it. In war, the public treasures are to be unlocked, and it is the executive hand which is to dispense them. Those who are to conduct a war cannot, in the nature of things, be proper or safe judges of whether a war ought to be commenced, continued, or concluded.

In Federalist 69, Alexander Hamilton wrote that one of the most important differences between the British King and the American President is that the King can plunge his nation into war on his command, but that the American President has no such authority.

The Constitutional Convention gave careful consideration to the clause that provides that "Congress shall declare war." They chose that word carefully to make sure that the only independent war-making power of the President is to repel an attack.

The War Powers Act makes this explicit, that absent congressional authority the President can only order our Armed Forces into hostility in response to "a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States, its Armed Forces, or its territories or possessions." Anything else requires prior congressional action.

The United Nations Participation Act, by which we entered the U.N., requires Congress to act before American forces are ordered into hostilities in U.N. actions. The War Powers Act specifically forbids inferring from any treaty the power to order American forces into hostilities without specific congressional authorization.

Now, some have used the past violation of this constitutional stricture—for example, in Kosovo or most recently in Libya—as justification for its violation now. That is precisely the point. If any violation of this fundamental constitutional provision can be used as justification for its outright nullification, well then any such violation must be vigorously resisted lest we lose for all time the most important check on the most momentous decision that a government can make: to go to war.

War is destruction on a massive scale. To unlawfully initiate such a thing is the highest crime that a public official could possibly commit. Indeed, if the power of impeachment were not intended for such an act as that, I cannot imagine what it would be for. The President was absolutely right not to cross that line.

ACCUWEATHER'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize 50 years of talented work and ingenuity by a company that is headquartered in State College, Pennsylvania, in Centre County, an area of central Pennsylvania that I proudly represent. AccuWeather, a content and media company that provides weather forecasting services worldwide, this year celebrates its 50th anniversary.

In November of 1962, Joel Myers, while serving as a one-man consulting

firm initially forecasting the weather for just one gas utility company in Pennsylvania, laid the groundwork for AccuWeather. In 1971, AccuWeather began to serve television and radio clients, and later expanded to newspapers. Now home to the most professional meteorologists at any one location anywhere in the world, AccuWeather employs hundreds of individuals, many of whom are graduates of nearby Penn State University, at its global headquarters in State College, Pennsylvania.

Today, Mr. Myers and his team provide services to hundreds of outlets across the planet, including top-ranked newspaper publications, television networks, and thousands of other global locations.

Happy 50th anniversary, AccuWeather.

ECONOMY/UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, the latest jobs report released last week was a sad reminder of just how bad things have been in the Obama economy.

When the President's stimulus was passed in 2009, the administration predicted that our unemployment rate would have fallen to just 5 percent by now. But it hasn't. It remains stuck over 7 percent and would be closer to 10 percent if millions of Americans had not given up looking for work altogether.

In fact, this latest jobs report highlighted a deeply disturbing statistic: the percentage of Americans working or looking for work has dropped to its lowest level since the middle of the Carter administration.

What makes this situation even sadder for Americans across the country is that this does not have to be the case. The President could work with Congress to implement policies that would help our economy grow and help our Americans get back to work. The President could work with us to delay ObamaCare, which is devastating the hiring and employment practices of companies across this country and creating a Nation of part-time workers. The President could join a bipartisan consensus here in Congress and approve the Keystone pipeline that would immediately create 20,000 jobs. The President could drop his continued insistence on tax increases and work with this Congress to pass a comprehensive, revenue-neutral tax reform package that promotes economic growth.

The President has a Congress willing to work with him to help struggling Americans across this country. Whether he chooses to work with us is his decision.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MICHIGAN STATE POLICE TROOPER PAUL BUTTERFIELD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to honor the life of Michigan State Police Trooper Paul Butterfield, who was tragically killed in the line of duty on September 9, 2013. Trooper Butterfield was an Army veteran who bravely served his community as a State police officer since 1999. He served at the Michigan State Police post in Manistee and in Hart.

Like all of our law enforcement officers, Paul risked everything to ensure our communities and neighborhoods were safe. He gave his life to protect us. His service and sacrifice will never be forgotten. Sadly, northern Michigan has lost a true hero.

To Trooper Butterfield's family, I am aware no words will ever match your deep sorrow. A loss this great can only be eased by the grace that is beyond all worldly powers. But I am hopeful that you will be embraced by the angels of Heaven and comforted by the knowledge that Paul is safely in the hands of God.

On behalf of the citizens of Michigan's First District, I thank Trooper Butterfield for his service and tremendous sacrifice to Michigan and our Nation.

I yield to my friend and colleague from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENG).

Mr. HUIZENG of Michigan. Thank you, Dr. BENISHEK.

As was said, Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, Michigan lost a true hero. Trooper Paul Butterfield died from a gunshot wound that he sustained while conducting a "routine" traffic stop in Mason County on September 9.

This senseless act of violence will no doubt shake communities throughout northwest Michigan as we wonder why this heartbreaking event ever took place, how it happened in Mason County, and how we make sure it never happens again. Trooper Butterfield's response to the situation has been described by the Michigan State Police as "perfect" and that he "did everything right."

This tragic loss of life serves as an ever-present reminder that there is no such thing as a routine traffic stop for police officers. And on this special day, September 11, we want to thank all of our first responders for the work that they do.

We must never forget or take for granted the work of the men and women who put their lives on the line for us every day as they protect our kids, our communities, and our country.

Paul, you will not be forgotten by me, the people of the Second District, or throughout Michigan. Again, my heart goes out to Trooper Butterfield's

family, his fiancée, his friends, and his colleagues from the State police post in Hart as well as the State police post in Manistee.

Natalie and I and our family will keep you all in our prayers during this time of extraordinary need. And we just want to say to you: Paul, rest well, our friend. Rest well.

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF ATTACK ON AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mark the 12th anniversary of the attack on America of September 11, 2001.

In lieu of formal remarks, I would like to read "The Names," a poem written by then-poet laureate Billy Collins, which was read before a joint session of Congress in lower Manhattan just after the attacks.

"The Names," by Billy Collins:

Yesterday, I lay awake in the palm of the night.

A soft rain stole in, unhelped by any breeze, And when I saw the silver glaze on the windows,

I started with A, with Ackerman, as it happened,

Then Baxter and Calabro, Davis and Eberling, names falling into place As droplets fell through the dark.

Names printed on the ceiling of the night. Names slipping around a watery bend.

Twenty-six willows on the banks of a stream. In the morning, I walked out barefoot

Among thousands of flowers Heavy with dew like the eyes of tears,

And each had a name— Fiori inscribed on a yellow petal

Then Gonzalez and Han, Ishikawa and Jenkins.

Names written in the air And stitched into the cloth of the day.

A name under a photograph taped to a mailbox.

Monogram on a torn shirt, I see you spelled out on storefront windows

And on the bright unfurled awnings of this city.

I say the syllables as I turn a corner— Kelly and Lee,

Medina, Nardella, and O'Connor. When I peer into the woods,

I see a thick tangle where letters are hidden As in a puzzle concocted for children.

Parker and Quigley in the twigs of an ash, Rizzo, Schubert, Torres, and Upton,

Secrets in the boughs of an ancient maple. Names written in the pale sky.

Names rising in the updraft amid buildings. Names silent in stone

Or cried out behind a door. Names blown over the earth and out to sea.

In the evening—weakening light, the last swallows.

A boy on a lake lift his oars. A woman by a window puts a match to a candle,

And the names are outlined on the rose clouds—

Vanacore and Wallace.

(let X stand, if it can, for the ones unfound)

Then Young and Ziminsky, the final jolt of Z.

Names etched on the head of a pin.
 One name spanning a bridge, another under-
 going a tunnel.
 A blue name needled into the skin.
 Names of citizens, workers, mothers and fa-
 thers,
 The bright-eyed daughter, the quick son.
 Alphabet of names in a green field.
 Names in the small tracks of birds.
 Names lifted from a hat
 Or balanced on the tip of the tongue.
 Names wheeled into the dim warehouse of
 memory.
 So many names, there is barely room on the
 walls of the heart.

9/11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, today, on September 11, I want to take a moment to reflect on that fateful event on the day of 2001 at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, the fields of Pennsylvania, and again in Benghazi in 2012, and ask that we always remember the resilience and strength of the greatest Nation on Earth.

Mr. Speaker, there are moments in time when we cease to be Republicans and Democrats; politics and punditry melt away, divisions close and differences fade. We come together as Americans, regardless of race, creed, or religion. September 11, 2001, and again in 2012 were and will always be such occasions.

On those days, our Nation came together. That is what makes our Nation great and unique. Not only do we come together to celebrate in triumph, but we stand together in tragedy.

□ 1030

It is in the face of adversity when our resilience is truly tested, and as Americans, time and time again, throughout history, we have passed that test.

Throughout the course of those days heroes ran into buildings and stormed a cockpit, went into burning embassies. They donated blood when it was needed and the clothes off their back.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the true America. Not partisan gridlock, not tension-building punditry, not games of "gotcha" or smoke-and-mirrors legislation.

The rallying cry of that day was simple in phrase but monumental in meaning: "U-S-A."

Country was first. Everything else was second.

As we tackle the monumental challenges that lie ahead, I ask my colleagues to remember the spirit of that day; to do what is right for America, not for one party over another.

The heroes of that day did what they did not because of any political party but because it was simply the right thing to do. It was the American thing to do.

Americans, regardless of who they voted for, feel the consequences of our

decisions each and every day. Today, of all days, let us all remember to put our country first and act as true representatives for the will of all the people.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day and for a safe return to Washington.

Bless the Members of this assembly as they set upon the important work that faces them. Help them to make wise decisions in a good manner and to carry their responsibilities steadily with high hopes for a better future for our great Nation.

May they be empowered by what they have heard during their home district visits to work together.

On this day, which has become a day of national mourning, help us to remember as well the renewed sense of national courage and resolve that we need to work toward a better future. May we all be inspired by the heroism of so many 12 years ago to be the best that we can be this day.

May all that is done today in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

WAR FROM TERROR IS FAR FROM OVER

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 12 years ago, our Nation was attacked by jihadists who sought to destroy our freedoms. Today, we remember the nearly 3,000 innocent Americans who lost their lives in New York, Washington, and Shanksville. We also pay tribute to those who have successfully fought in Afghanistan and Iraq to keep us safe by defeating terrorists overseas.

Last year, terrorists murdered Ambassador Chris Stevens along with three additional brave Americans at our consulate at Benghazi, Libya. Their efforts to promote democracy will never be forgotten.

We should recognize the war on terrorism is far from over. Conflict continues across the world.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th, 2001, and September the 11th, 2012, at Benghazi in the global war on terrorism.

Todd Beamer was correct: "Let's roll."

9/11

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, on this very somber anniversary, we remember the lives of 2,977 innocent men, women, and children who were killed 12 years ago today.

The horrific and brutal attacks that we witnessed the morning of September 11, 2001, forever changed our country and the world. But even during these difficult hours, we also saw inspiring examples of the very best that America has to offer.

We saw first responders who worked day and night searching for survivors at the World Trade Center. We saw thousands of men and women in uniform bravely answer the call to serve our Nation in a new kind of war—a war against terrorism. And we saw Americans all across this great Nation come together united in the certainty that we would recover from this tragedy, hold the perpetrators accountable, and do everything we could to protect our Nation.

As we face a new set of challenges today, let us recall the inspiring examples that we saw 12 years ago and remember that we are all Americans united by a shared set of values and ideals. But most of all, let us honor the lives that were lost and continue to pray for the comfort and peace of all those who still mourn today.

JUSTICE FOR BENGHAZI

(Mrs. WAGNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 12 years, September 11 has been a day of solemn remembrance in America. And 1 year ago, it was a day of violence in Benghazi that ended with four dead Americans during a planned terrorist track.

Mr. Speaker, as a former United States Ambassador, I rise today in honor of Ambassador Chris Stevens, Information Officer Sean Smith, and Navy SEALs Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods. Their families and the American people deserve answers; they deserve the truth and, more importantly, justice.

One year later, there are still so many unanswered questions: Why did we not answer the cries for greater security at the U.S. consulate? Why in the days and weeks after Benghazi did the administration lie about the terrorist attack? And who gave the stand-down order?

It is shameful that the Obama administration has refused to track and punish those who attacked and murdered these four Americans. The American people deserve answers.

The Congress should convene a select committee to investigate the terrorist attack in Benghazi. The victims' families deserve the truth. The American people deserve a Commander in Chief that stands for strength, liberty, and justice.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SIROUS SADAGHIANI

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Sirous Sadaghiani, a wonderful 9-year-

old boy from Dublin in my congressional district who lost his courageous battle with brain cancer this past weekend.

When he was diagnosed 1 year ago, he was given just 6 months to live. But although Sirous had been fighting for his life during the past year, he never gave up and never let his illness get in the way of his curiosity or his kindness for others. I had the privilege of meeting Sirous and his family. He was a smart, passionate boy who lit up a room.

I was so proud to see the entire Dublin community rally behind Sirous and his family with a meal train and fundraisers during this difficult time in their lives.

This month is Childhood Cancer Awareness Month, and I am committed to continuing the fight for funding for cancer research so no family has to ever experience losing a child to cancer.

Despite his short life, Sirous' story will continue to inspire others. My condolences go out to his entire family—his dad, Reza; mom, Marlene; twin sister, Sima; and brother, Zachary, who were always by Sirous' side as he fought for his life.

We miss you, Sirous.

AMERICA WILL NOT FORGET

(Mr. PERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I remember the morning of September 11, 2001, like it was just yesterday. The horror affected everyone in different ways, and each of us remember where we were and whom we were with on that fateful day.

I remember trying to get home from work. I remember turning on the TV. I remember the second plane hitting the second tower. And I remember my rage.

While America has begun to heal from the wounds of those cowardly and terrifying acts over the last decade, the scars remain. With each passing year, this anniversary serves as a moment for reflection and a time to remember the brave and selfless acts of our first responders and the ordinary citizens who committed extraordinary acts of heroism. Most importantly, we will never forget the thousands of innocent people who died in New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

So today, I join my fellow Americans in prayer in remembrance of those who lost their lives on that fateful day. I also will pause to remember the selfless men and women at home and abroad defending our freedoms and liberties to prevent such a horrific day ever again from occurring.

Today—and always—Americans will not forget.

SEQUESTER

(Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind my colleagues that we are still operating this Nation under the ridiculous sequester budget. It has been months since these across-the-board cuts were enacted, devastating so many important programs that Americans rely on.

The purpose of the sequestration was to create a scheme of cuts so odious that Congress would do anything possible to avoid them. They went into effect, and we need to work together now to find a compromise to fully reverse these automatic, indiscriminate spending cuts. Leaving them in place will continue to hurt our economy. In fact, sequestration will cost about 750,000 jobs by the end of this year, according to the CBO.

Remember, budgets are statements of priorities; and we should not be asked to place a higher value on airline delays in lieu of Head Start, SNAP, Meals on Wheels, FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund, and public safety, to name only a few.

WE REMEMBER SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to remember and reflect upon the heartbreaking attacks our Nation suffered on the morning of September 11, 2001.

We remember the lives lost at the World Trade Center, at the Pentagon, and the passengers on hijacked planes.

We remember the bravery of all the first responders who charged towards the flames and smoke to help their fellow Americans reach safety.

We remember the courageous service of the brave men and women in our Armed Forces and their families as they rose to the moment, responding with force to the cowardly attacks suffered by our great Nation.

We remember a proud and strong United States of America, torn apart by terror attacks, but united by unyielding and unbending resolve.

Today we honor the determination of our Nation, which rose from the rubble to rebuild not just buildings, but our American spirit.

Mr. Speaker, on today's anniversary, we remember to honor the legacies of those we lost that day. We remember the best of the American patriotism and unity in the moments and days immediately after. And we remember to always keep our servicemen and -women in our best thoughts and prayers.

God bless the United States of America.

9/11

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was in this very building on 9/11. I was here when Members of Congress engaged in a meeting, and obviously not paying attention to the crisis around us until the instruction was given to flee. As we came out of offices and meeting rooms, we saw those who were fleeing and those who were trying to protect leadership, and others of us who were told to flee and hit the ground.

But in actuality, what we began to think of is our loved ones in our district. We thought of America. And then after the fact, we thought of the brave souls that actually were saving lives in the Pentagon as we saw the billowing smoke. We heard the rumors of the White House, the State Department. We thought of those whom we had originally seen in New York. And, as well, we thought of those very, very heroic souls in Pennsylvania.

Having gone to Ground Zero in the early stages when they were still in the recovery stage, I saw first responders still going, still pushing to be able to recognize and to find souls for their loved ones.

So today, I hope that we will honor those who lost their lives from terrorist acts. And, Mr. Speaker, if I might say that we adhere to Isaiah 40:31, no matter what our faith:

But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; and they shall walk and not faint.

I hope America's future is in peace for those lost souls that we lost.

REMEMBERING CAL WORTHINGTON

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in memory of a great Californian, a man who was known all up and down the State as "Go See Cal"—Cal Worthington. If you're a Californian, you have probably seen his ads starting back in the fifties of Cal and his dog Spot. He was also a great hero as a World War II airman and pilot.

We know him in northern California for his ranch he has in the Orland area, the "Big W Ranch." In most recent years—he never quit giving—he helped out at the Glen Medical Center with an annual event we called "Splendor in the Valley" that he hosted at his ranch, which was a huge success for the hospital and just goes to show Cal's big heart.

We miss him already in northern California, as does all the State, because he's just a one-of-a-kind man that you will never replace his character, his humor, and what he does to keep giving to the community.

We lost Cal the other day at the age of 92, and we will always remember him. And Splendor in the Valley will go on with its 10th anniversary this year in his honor.

I ask this place to adjourn in his memory today.

□ 1215

SYRIA

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the recent diplomatic proposal to address this terrible crisis in Syria. Peace takes courage, and I am proud we have a President who is willing to embrace this diplomatic option.

The proposals by Russia and Syria have raised the possibility of a real diplomatic solution to the crisis—with Syria possibly agreeing to accept international control of its chemical weapons stockpile.

I hope that this proposal bears fruit, and that the President will do everything he can to make it a reality. But we cannot pretend that military action is a good alternative.

Violence must not be mistaken for strength, and our limited strike risks igniting a dangerously unlimited conflict.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., knew what he was talking about when he said:

Returning violence for violence only multiplies violence, adding deeper darkness to a night already devoid of stars.

Let us give peace a chance to solve the problems that military strikes could not begin to address.

E PLURIBUS UNUM

(Mr. BENTIVOLIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, peace is a fragile thing. It means more than just the absence of war. The standard for American peace is in our foundational documents: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Those values are universal. They serve as a beacon of hope in times of war and an example to a world filled with oppressors, dictators, and terrorists.

With the creation of the Bill of Rights, our Founding Fathers knew that, in this place, the world's people would come together and live in peace.

In this place, anyone with a good idea can succeed and thrive. In this

place, if you can dream it you can do it.

The openness of our society serves as our Nation's greatest strength. The enemies of peace and freedom do not care what we look like, they do not care who we vote for, and they do not care in what part of town you live.

On that fateful September day they attacked us as a whole. We responded by helping our neighbors in their distress and turned lonely strangers into heartfelt friends as our Nation grieved together.

Today, in solemn remembrance of those who lost their lives working to follow their American Dream, we must also remember what we truly represent.

Out of many, one: the last, best hope of mankind.

SEQUESTER

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight some of the negative effects the sequester has had on the residents in my district and across the country.

Just yesterday, I met with a young cancer survivor who would not be here today without the help of critical research conducted by our Federal science and health agencies. Arbitrary, mindless cuts to the operating budgets of these agencies jeopardize lives and unfairly target many vulnerable populations.

The sequester affects more than just research. It also affects domestic jobs and puts our public safety at risk. Right in my district's backyard there is a fire raging in Mount Diablo State Park. This fire has decimated thousands of acres of land and threatens local residents. Our resources are stretched too thin, with fire crews being split between several fires around the State, including the Rim fire in Yosemite National Park. It's critical that budgets do not limit the ability of our first responders to react to these disasters.

On this 12th anniversary of 9/11, I urge my colleagues to work together to develop a rational, meaningful budget that moves America forward.

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS OF SEPTEMBER 11

(Mr. FARENTHOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I come here today about an hour and 20 minutes after we stood on the Capitol steps remembering the victims of the heinous attacks on September 11.

Everybody remembers, if they're of age, where they were at that time. I

was sitting in my office at One Shoreline Plaza in Corpus Christi. When that second plane hit the Twin Towers, I got a feeling in the pit of my stomach that I remember from when I was told my father died when I was a child. It was a devastating moment.

But we cannot let our fear guide us. We've got to be strong, we've got to be vigilant, and we cannot let the terrorists win.

Let's take a moment right now until I'm gaveled out of time to remember and pray for those victims and their families and go forward with our life and reflect how we can do what we need to do so the terrorists don't win.

CR EXTENSION

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this is, indeed, a sober day of reflection on the events of 9/11. Twelve years ago today, I was on the floor of the House when we got word of the first attacks.

It unleashed a series of horrific events, but those events continue to this day. There is another tragedy that is occurring in Iraq and Afghanistan—the thousands of Iraqi and Afghan nationals whose lives are at risk because they helped Americans as guides, drivers, and interpreters.

That is why we developed a special immigrant visa program—to help these people trapped in the country against those with long memories who seek revenge. But this program is seriously broken.

There are thousands of men and women on this waiting list, some who have died while they wait to have the paperwork processed. The State Department won't even tell us how many are on the waiting list. It is seriously broken. Congress can't fix it. But at least we can put in the CR an extension so that the program doesn't expire at the end of the month and their lives lost.

VOW NEVER TO FORGET 9/11

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 12th anniversary of the September 11 attacks on our great Nation. Though on that day cowardly terrorists hijacked the Islamic religion and used it to justify their murderous acts, what we will remember most is America's strength and resolve.

In the aftermath, Americans of all backgrounds and faiths united as one. Servicemembers and first responders ran toward—not away from—the wreckage. Our Nation continues to set an example to the world as a land of opportunity, tolerance, and independence, and in keeping with our founding

document, the promise still of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Speaker, as we witness the construction of One World Trade Center, we see more than a building rise up through the New York City skyline. It is truly representative of the resilience of the American people, which remains unbroken despite these hardships, challenges, and unthinkable acts.

So today, and every day, we stand tall as Americans as we vow never to forget.

THE 12TH ANNIVERSARY OF 9/11

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the 12th anniversary of 9/11, a day that changed America forever.

We remember those who died. We lost close to 3,000 people on 9/11, but many thousands more lost their health and many are suffering from cancer. This body passed the 9/11 health and compensation bill to help them, and I thank my colleagues.

Since that day, much has changed and much has been restored. Ten million people have visited Memorial Plaza that opened in 2011. The 9/11 museum opens next spring. The 104-story Freedom Tower opens next year.

But there are still men and women who suffer—or will suffer—from the effects of that massive toxic stew that enveloped Lower Manhattan for months.

So, on this special day, I would like to remind everyone that the final deadline to register for the benefits under the 9/11 Victims Compensation Fund is October 3. Please let everyone who is eligible know—registering will cost you nothing and may help you and your family tremendously.

THANKING THE FIRST RESPONDERS

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today is 9/11. We've all talked about it.

When I think about 9/11 I mostly think about—I think about the victims, obviously, but the first responders who were also victims—firemen and policemen in New York City and that area who rushed into harm's way and lost their lives trying to protect others.

We appreciate it and thank those heroic fire people and police people. But sometimes I don't think we keep them in our minds like we should. They're public employees, they're middle class Americans. They're having a tough time, and we need to always appreciate the sacrifices they make to people that keep our liberty here in this country

and keep us safe from crime and from horrific circumstances.

I thank the first responders. I appreciate what they did on 9/11 and what they do every day.

REMEMBERING 9/11

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, we all have extremely vivid memories of this day 12 years ago.

Personally, I remember seeing the clouds of smoke from the Pentagon through my office window and the panicked feeling I had as I searched all day for my children who live in New York City but couldn't reach.

I recently saw the emptiness that we all felt captured at Memorial Plaza. We can honor those we lost by remembering that, after the immense tragedy of that day, we rose as a Nation, united in the belief that there was no obstacle we could not overcome together.

Have we lost that spirit?

Many would say that this Congress has been stalled on the best way to lead this Nation, focusing too much on what divides us, losing sight of what brings us together.

It is my hope that we will put aside our differences and come together for the American people. Let us use the sad, traumatic reminder of today and remember that we are all Americans and we all want what is best for our families, our communities, and our country.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise asking my colleagues to join together to end the sequester.

Many constituents and many business owners have expressed this question over the last 6 months: "What is Congress going to do about ending the sequester cuts?"

My district has military and Federal contractors that are impacted by these cuts. Head Start programs are serving fewer children, while nutrition programs that serve seniors such as Meals on Wheels are also being cut. Sequester affects our economy and the most vulnerable of our Nation.

That is why we need a balanced approach to repeal sequestration. We need to reach a compromise on a real plan and work out the differences between the House and Senate budgets to end sequester cuts.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF DERRICK LIONEL MARTIN

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Derrick Lionel Martin. Derrick was a son of Hawaii, born and raised on the island of Oahu. At an early age, Derrick displayed the intelligence, integrity, and vision needed to be an exemplary American.

In 1978, he enlisted in the United States Army before becoming a member of the Hawaii Army National Guard in 1983. He served honorably until 2001, when he chose to continue his commitment to the United States as a member of the Hawaii Air National Guard. He also served as an officer in the Honolulu Police Department for 25 years.

As a veteran of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, Derrick truly understood what it meant to sacrifice for others. A true patriot, he was a man of compassion, understanding, and unwavering resolve. His wife, JoAnn, and two sons, Michael and John, are his greatest legacy and will continue to share Derrick's aloha.

On behalf of the First Congressional District of Hawaii, and the entire State of Hawaii, I would like to bid a fond aloha to Derrick and thank him for his selfless contributions to the defense of our country. As we say in Hawaii, "a hui hou," Derrick—until we meet again.

□ 1230

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE BOULDER WEEKLY

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Boulder Weekly—an alternative newspaper based in my hometown of Boulder, Colorado—on 20 years of publication, a challenging feat for any newspaper, even more so for a newspaper that's freely available to readers both in Boulder County, where print editions are freely distributed, as well as nationally over the Internet.

They've had a number of in-depth, incisive reports that have uncovered human rights abuses within our own prison system in Colorado. They've given detailed coverage on the impact of organic farming practices and GMOs and fracking.

It's very difficult these days to find a trusted investigative news source. The Boulder County community is very fortunate to have one in the Boulder Weekly, and I rise to congratulate them on their 20th anniversary.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2775, NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 339 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 339

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 339 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2775, the No Subsidies Without Verification Act of 2013. This is a critical bill as the Obama administration begins to implement and sign up people for the insurance exchanges in literally less than 3 weeks' time.

I am a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you that the Secretary of Health and Human Services appears ill prepared to verify that the people qualifying for the numerous government handouts and subsidies included in the Affordable Care Act actually meet the income requirements for those subsidies. Because fraud and abuse have been rampant in just about every program that is administered by the Department of Health and Human Services, including Medicare and Medicaid, a certified verification system

being in place prior to the implementation of the Affordable Care Act is critical. This bill addresses this extreme deficiency in the inappropriately named Affordable Care Act.

The rule before us today provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the majority and the minority. Further, the rule makes a correction to the underlying bill, clarifying that the Inspector General for Health and Human Services, rather than the Secretary, which is a partisan position, is better equipped to oversee the verification process for the eligibility of subsidies. Finally, the minority is afforded the customary motion to recommit, allowing for yet another opportunity to amend the legislation.

H.R. 2775, the No Subsidies Without Verification Act, introduced by Mrs. BLACK from Tennessee, is an important piece of legislation to protect taxpayer dollars from inappropriate expenditure. With less than 3 weeks until enrollment in the health insurance exchanges and they go live, the Obama administration continues to tinker and twist the dials on the Affordable Care Act, exposing the executive branch's lack of readiness for such a massive and fundamental change of the way health care is delivered and administered in this country. In an effort to save their misguided health care takeover, the administration has significantly scaled back the original scope of the Affordable Care Act—cutting corners and delaying any piece of the legislation which becomes inconvenient or, perhaps, embarrassing to the President.

The President has chosen to delay the employer mandate included in the Affordable Care Act; yet has not given that same reprieve to everyday Americans. Why? Why should that be? Because enforcing the employer mandate was inconvenient. The President announced that he could not implement the CLASS Act portion of the Affordable Care Act. Why? Because it was inconvenient. Now the President simply will not enforce the verification requirements to prevent the fraudulent acceptance of subsidies. Why? Because, again, it is inconvenient.

Just 3 months before the exchanges are supposed to go live, on January 1, Health and Human Services decided that on July 5 of this year it would simply accept an applicant's attestation of household income without any certifiable verification. The President's strategy on the health care law is now "trust; don't verify."

The Secretary of Health and Human Services has made the opening of the exchanges on October 1 her central priority. However, in facing tight deadlines and daunting workloads, the administration has instead drastically lowered their standards. It's clear from the final rule issued late in the day on July 5, 2013, that the administration

will allow any type of flexibility necessary to ensure that their law appears that it is being implemented as planned. Regardless of what you may believe, the administration has been very clear.

The rule states explicitly:

The exchange may accept the attestation of projected annual household income without further verification for the purposes of the exchange's eligibility determination.

The administration is more than comfortable with letting over \$1 trillion go out the door without verifying that it's going to the correct individuals.

They even state in the final rule:

It is an ideal approach to provide flexibility in the case of many verifications.

Since it's apparently too much work to verify everyone's income, the administration has determined that it is okay with spending over \$1 trillion just based on what individuals think they may make in the next year. Instead of admitting that they won't be ready on time, the administration decided that it will just spend the money anyway.

While the constant delaying and changing of the law is worrisome, what should concern all of us the most is what this new change in regulation will do. By eliminating the verification requirement, the only way the government will determine who gets Federal subsidies now is by whoever claims that they, themselves, need the subsidies. Quite frankly, with premiums rising at the rate they are across the country—and they're set to rise even more for calendar year 2015—it seems like everyone will be telling the Department of Health and Human Services that they need subsidies because, quite frankly, no one will be able to afford the President's health insurance. Maybe then it will be good that no one in the administration is checking to see who might be lying about their household income.

While the constant delaying and changing of the law is worrisome, another concern is what this new change in regulation will do. By eliminating the verification requirement, the only way the government will determine who gets Federal subsidies now is by who says they need them. This will open the exchanges to a staggering amount of potential fraud. It's also blatantly political. By doing this, the Obama administration has made it clear they want as many people to sign up for the exchanges as possible no matter their eligibility status. Taxpayers, unfortunately, will be charged with over \$1 trillion over the next decade to pay for the exchange subsidies. With over \$1 trillion going out the door, shouldn't the American people have the assurance that the government is sending the money to the people who actually need it?

All of this is so the President can reap the public relations benefit of talking about the popularity of ex-

changes, and so he can salvage his failed signature policy initiative.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill. Stand up to this health insurance subsidy fraud.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. This bill is redundant, and it's a waste of time. The Department of Health and Human Services already has a plan in place to review individual information submitted to health care exchanges and to ensure that no one is able to get health insurance tax credits that they aren't eligible for. So, instead of considering these redundant bills, let me talk about what we're not considering here today which would actually solve a problem the American people are demanding that this institution address.

The time to pass comprehensive immigration reform is now. We can do it now. Instead of debating something that's redundant here today, there is a bill that has received more than two-thirds support in the United States Senate. If this body can act on it and can send it to President Obama's desk, finally we will be able to do something to create jobs and increase our competitiveness in the global economy, lower our deficit, ensure our security, and reflect our values as Americans and prevent the undermining of the rule of law that occurs every day, for we have over 10 million people in this country who are undocumented and lack documentation. They're violating our laws. This institution can fix that now. The Senate has acted. Let the House act.

As economists across the political spectrum have found, the economic benefits of immigration reform are tremendous. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation, if we act now to pass the Senate comprehensive immigration reform bill, we would reduce the deficit by over \$135 billion and, in the following decade, by over \$600 billion. Why aren't we spending our time discussing that and passing that here on the floor of the House today? Further, the Senate bill is estimated to boost the output of the U.S. economy by 3.3 percent. It is a 3.3 percent increase to GDP and a reduction in the deficit. That's \$700 billion in additional gross domestic product by 2023.

As a June Wall Street Journal article citing Stephen Goss, Social Security's chief actuary, pointed out:

The future fiscal immigration windfall is likely to exceed \$4 trillion.

We can shore up Social Security and protect our seniors, and we can prevent

any cuts to Social Security by passing immigration reform now. That's what the country wants us to do. Why does it shore up Social Security? Because immigration occurs at a young age. Immigration reform ensures that there are people paying into Social Security—young, healthy workers—particularly as baby boomers retire. As for immigrants, we're talking about people who are already here. Let's make sure they pay their taxes. By not taking this bill up, we are preventing people from paying into Social Security like they should and from paying their taxes like they should. They live in this country. They should pay taxes. According to The Wall Street Journal, immigration reform will result in an extra \$600 billion into the Social Security trust fund and will result in over \$4 trillion over 75 years.

Another urgent reason that this body should be taking up immigration reform instead of redundant measures around health care reform is our national security. We currently have a porous border; and while progress has been made—in fact, in 2011, the number of illegal border crossings was the lowest since 1972—it was still 327,000. There were 327,000 people who illegally crossed our border. What does that say about our security as a country and about our ability to enforce our immigration laws when over 300,000 people have illegally crossed the border?

There is a solution. It's ready to pass. Let's talk about it, not about redundant bills that don't do anything and aren't going anywhere. The Senate comprehensive immigration bill, while, of course, not perfect, includes unprecedented border and interior enforcement measures.

The bill includes increasing the number of full-time Border Patrol agents from 21,000 to 38,405; mandating an electronic exit system at all ports where Customs and Border Protection agents are deployed; constructing at least 350 additional miles of fencing, bringing the miles of high-tech border fencing to 700; constructing additional Border Control stations and operating bases; mandating 24-hour surveillance of the border region; using mobile, video, portable systems as well as unmanned aircraft; and deploying 1,000 distress beacon stations in areas where migrant deaths occur.

□ 1245

Look, it takes getting serious to secure the border, and this costs money. We can do it in the context of reducing the deficit by over \$100 billion, such as the windfall from immigration reform that we effectively get to secure our southern border for free and reduce the deficit by \$100 billion and improve the Social Security trust fund to the tune of \$4 trillion, giving American seniors the security that they need in their retirement. That's what we can do by

bringing the Senate immigration reform bill to the floor of the House right now.

The Senate immigration reform bill also increases American competitiveness. Immigration is the economic engine that's grown our economy for generations. Unfortunately, under our current immigration system, it's not designed to foster job creation. All too often, it undermines American workers, takes jobs away from American workers, leads companies to offshore jobs, to outsource jobs overseas.

I represent a district that has two excellent universities: Colorado State University and the University of Colorado at Boulder. They have great graduate programs in math, engineering, and the sciences. We graduate students with advanced degrees from countries all over the world such as India, Mexico, and China that have the skills that we need to keep America competitive and create jobs. Yet, the day after they graduate, without any access to a green card, many of these talented young Ph.D.s and master's degree students have to return to their home country. Guess what? The jobs follow them back home in the information economy. The employers don't care whether they're here or there, as long as they contribute to bits and bytes. We want those jobs here in America. We want that income here in America. The bipartisan Senate bill addresses that, as well.

Another component that we have for job creation in America is a start-up visa. This is a way that entrepreneurs with ideas can come to America to start their companies here and employ Americans. For goodness' sake, do we want the great companies of tomorrow employing tens of thousands of people to be overseas just because we don't let the founders come here to start their companies? That's common sense. It creates jobs for Americans. Let's do it.

We also have improvements to the EB-5 program to facilitate in foreign investment and raising capital for American companies to grow jobs here in America.

This body should take up the comprehensive immigration reform bill now—not tomorrow and not in 5 minutes. Now. Let's do it so that we can finally move forward on creating jobs, improving border security, reducing our deficit, and shoring up Social Security.

Another reason that we urgently need to bring up immigration reform now is because the current system is simply out of sync with our values as Americans, our faith values as Jews, Christians, Muslims, every other faith in our country, as well as our American values, the values of our Founding Fathers.

Faith leaders from across the spectrum have been among the most vocal supporters of the Senate comprehen-

sive immigration bill. Over the August recess, the Evangelical Immigration Table, a coalition of faith groups, continued the drumbeat for a vote on the Senate bill and called for an end to the "cruelty" perpetuated by the current immigration deportation system. It's completely arbitrary.

Young American children—American citizens, kids, 8, 10, 12 years old in my State and across the country—to our great shame, come home from school to find that their parents are in detention, their parents are not there, their parents are facing deportation proceedings. Why? Perhaps a taillight was out on their car. This is all at a cost to taxpayers of tens of thousands of dollars. They now wait in line for a costly deportation while their American child returns to a home with no parent. How does that reflect our values? As Americans, what is the solution? Pass the Senate comprehensive immigration reform bill now.

The Senate comprehensive immigration reform bill will halt more than 400,000 costly deportations, each one costing taxpayers tens of thousands of dollars, tearing families apart. The bill removes the limitations to the number of visas that legal permanent residents can request for their minor children, for their spouses, ensuring that families aren't separated for years, for generations, while awaiting legal status. It creates a process to clear the estimated 4.4 million person backlog in the family- and employment-based visa system within a decade. It replaces our broken immigration system with one that works, one that reflects our values, and one that respects the rule of law in this country.

The Senate-passed bill would help people like Gabriela, a 20-year-old woman in Colorado, undocumented, recently graduated from high school. Gabriela and her younger sister were brought to the U.S. as young children by their mother. They didn't have a say in the matter. They were brought here. Their mother was deported several years ago, leaving her two children behind. Gabriela is now homeless but has, nevertheless, taken on the responsibility for caring for her younger sister. The Senate bipartisan bill would ensure that families like Gabriela's won't be torn apart. That's not American. That doesn't reflect our values as a country, as a people.

The Senate bill would also assist the young, courageous DREAMers, individuals who were brought to this country as children, completed high school, some college, even military service, grew up in this country, know no other country, and have no pathway to legal status, young people like Javier in my district that I represent who graduated from high school in Summit County. He was the president of the student body. Javier grew up in this country, was brought here when he was young,

doesn't have documentation. Javier is an Eagle Scout. Javier is the first in his family to get into a good college, a 4-year university, but his lack of status has made it difficult not only to pursue his dreams of a higher education, but to figure out how he can live his life in a way that contributes to his country, the United States of America. If only we allow him to fully contribute, he will. Young DREAMers across this country will contribute great things to our Nation and make us proud if only we let them.

It's time to stop talking about these redundant, senseless bills and bring up comprehensive immigration reform now. It's a big part of the solution to our fiscal problems: reducing the deficit, shoring up Social Security, and finally getting serious about enforcing our border and enforcing employment verification to prevent companies from hiring people illegally. It improves American competitiveness, creates jobs, and ensures that the great companies of tomorrow will be here in this country instead of overseas; that the people we need to make our economy grow, create jobs for Americans, are here and doing it legally; and to respect the rule of law in this country, rather than undermine the rule of law every day as our current travesty and broken immigration system does.

Finally, we know, Mr. Speaker, that as a people we are better than this. We need an immigration system that reflects our values, our faith values, our American values, our founding principles as a Nation of immigrants and a Nation of laws.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate is really not about the Affordable Care Act or even health care in general. It's politics. It's redundant. I would ask my friends on the other side of the aisle: Why are we not focused on fixing our broken immigration system when we have a bipartisan bill that two-thirds of the Senate has supported, that 75 percent of the American people support, that the President has expressed a willingness to sign? Let's bring that bill up, debate that bill, pass that bill, and solve a problem that the American people are crying out for a solution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Senate-passed bill, in my understanding from recent discussion with the House Parliamentarian, has not arrived in the House. The reason it has not arrived in the House is because it has an origination problem. The Senate, in its haste to rush a bill through, didn't get it right. As a consequence, that bill cannot come in the House.

We're here today to debate the rule for H.R. 2775. One of the things that I do feel obligated to point out—whether it's comprehensive immigration reform, whether it's any of the other things that people talk about—if you

have an executive branch that only selectively enforces parts of laws that it wants to, why wouldn't the American people fear what might come out of the selective enforcement of a comprehensive immigration law?

Let me quote to you from the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act signed into law by President Obama on March 21, 2010. This is section 1513, section (d). This is a section that deals with the employer mandate. Section (d):

Effective date—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

That doesn't sound ambiguous. That doesn't sound difficult to comprehend, yet we are told that selectively the President has decided he doesn't want to enforce this, that it is inconvenient for him to enforce this, it runs counter to what some of his friends in some of the largest corporations in this country are telling him that they want—not what the American people want, but what they want—and the President simply suspends this part of the law in a blog post on July 2 of this year.

This is a fear that people have in my district: How do we trust that this President is going to enforce the laws that, under the Constitution, he is told that he must enforce? How do we trust the Attorney General, who has sort of selectively decided what laws suit his purpose and what laws don't and selectively enforces those laws?

Why we are here today is because of the administration's selective enforcement of their law. I wasn't in favor of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. I voted against it. I voted against it in committee. I voted against it in the House version. I voted against it after it came back from the Senate. I'll vote against it every chance I get.

The fact of the matter is the President signed it into law and then decided it's inconvenient. So when the effective date reads, "The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013," the President decides that's inconvenient and he doesn't want to do that anymore. He just suspends it, even though the law is the law. We never took a vote on that. We never said, Mr. President, we're with you or against you on this. He simply decided.

That's not the way this country is to run. That's not our constitutional Republic that our Founders envisioned for us. This is unilateral government by a ruler, which, by definition, is not allowed under our Constitution.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Are we serious about border security? Is the border going to secure itself?

There were 300,000 illegal crossings last year. That's almost 1,000 a day. That's 1,000 tomorrow. While Congress is sitting around discussing this stuff, that's 1,000 the next day. It's 1,000 the next day. Every day there will be 1,000 people illegally entering this country. Who knows who they are. Who knows if they represent a security risk.

There's a solution. Let's get serious. Let's increase the number of Border Patrol agents. Let's implement high-tech measures at the border. It's not rocket science.

Guess what? Our friends in the Senate have figured it out. They passed an immigration reform bill that includes provisions that get serious about enforcing our southern border that will substantially reduce—not eliminate—illegal crossings. It won't happen by itself. We have to pass it. We have to bring up that bill and pass it, rather than redundant measures that don't do anything.

Mr. Speaker, the Coalition of Evangelicals have put together an excellent statement of principles on immigration reform. The evangelical Christian leaders have called for a bipartisan solution that respects the God-given dignity of every person, protects the unity of the immediate family, and respects the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this policy statement to the RECORD.

EVANGELICAL STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

Our national immigration laws have created a moral, economic and political crisis in America. Initiatives to remedy this crisis have led to polarization and name calling in which opponents have misrepresented each other's positions as open borders and amnesty versus deportations of millions. This false choice has led to an unacceptable political stalemate at the federal level at a tragic human cost.

As evangelical Christian leaders, we call for a bipartisan solution on immigration that:

Respects the God-given dignity of every person

Protects the unity of the immediate family

Respects the rule of law

Guarantees secure national borders

Ensures fairness to taxpayers

Establishes a path toward legal status and/or citizenship for those who qualify and who wish to become permanent residents

We urge our nation's leaders to work together with the American people to pass immigration reform that embodies these key principles and that will make our nation proud.

For signatories, go to evangelicalimmigrationtable.com.

It's not only people of faith. It's every American who, as we stare in the mirror at night, a vast majority of whom know that our grandparents, our great-grandparents, perhaps great-great-great-grandparents from the Mayflower, somewhere along the line, Mr. Speaker, our predecessors, our parents and our grandparents, came to these shores seeking opportunity, hope, and freedom, just as so many immigrants do today.

□ 1300

We can create a pathway to citizenship for people who are already here and who already contribute to our country to ensure that they do so legally instead of extralegally. Of course, getting behind those who are already in line in our current legal system. There is no citizenship that becomes anybody's right through this Senate immigration reform bill. It simply creates a line, a line behind those who are already in line, but a light at the end of the tunnel to show that some day those who aspire to give back to this country, to make this country wealthier and more prosperous, those who aspire to pay taxes, those who aspire to contribute to Social Security, those who aspire to live within the rule of law, are able to do so someday.

That families are reunited now, not in 10 years, not in 20 years, and we don't have to ever again tell a young girl coming home from school, sorry, your parents have been removed over a taillight or because they were in the wrong place at the wrong time or because their workplace was raided because of an unscrupulous employer.

We can and we must do better. The urgency is now. Not only are families torn apart every day, not only are there close to a thousand people a day crossing that border illegally, which will continue until we act, but we're costing Americans jobs and opportunities every day as well. Entrepreneurs and founders and folks that are looking at where to start their great next company that will employ thousands or tens of thousands of people are turning away from our shores. We're turning them away from our shores.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to take up comprehensive immigration reform and pass the Senate bill now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, let me just remind my colleagues here on the floor of the House that we are considering House Resolution 339 that provides for consideration of H.R. 2775, the No Subsidies Without Verification Act of 2013. And despite all of the tactics to distract from that debate, that is what the debate centers on today.

I would like to point out to my colleagues an opinion piece in The Wall Street Journal from today called "Stopping ObamaCare Fraud." I'm going to read a little bit of the opinion piece:

Every politician claims to hate fraud in government, and the House of Representatives will have a chance to prove it Wednesday when it votes to close a gigantic hole for potential abuse in the Affordable Care Act. The Health and Human Services Department announced in July that it won't verify individual eligibility for the tens of billion in insurance subsidies that the law will dole out. Americans are supposed to receive those subsidies based on income and only if their employer doesn't provide federally approved

health benefits. But until 2015 the rule will be: come on in, the subsidy is fine.

Health and Human Services will let applicants "self attest" that they are legally eligible. No further questions asked. The new ObamaCare exchanges will also be taking the applicant's word on their projected household income. It seems that what it calls "operational barriers" continue to prevent Health and Human Services from checking applications against Internal Revenue Service income data.

The administration argues that the fear of later HHS audits will keep applicants honest, though the threat of such checks has hardly prevented other fraud. The Treasury Inspector General estimates that 21 to 25 percent of earned income tax credits go to people who aren't eligible. An equivalent rate of fraud in the Affordable Care Act could mean \$250 billion in bad payments in a decade. And does Health and Human Services really plan to claw back overpayments from individual exchange participants?

House Republicans by contrast will offer a vote that matters on Tennessee Representative Diane Black's bill to require the administration to have a verification system in place before it hands out subsidies. Democrats have been unusually quiet in their opposition, perhaps because it is hard to justify voting in effect to give Americans subsidies to which they have no legal entitlement. Savings for taxpayers aside, the political merit of the House bill is that it puts a spotlight on a major ObamaCare failure and makes Democrats vote either to fix it or to simply go along with the failure. It also highlights another case in which with the Obama administration is refusing to enforce black-letter law. Republicans are asking that a vast new entitlement be held to the most basic due diligence, or be prudently delayed until it can. If Democrats can't support that vote, voters should know.

Again, that was from today's Wall Street Journal Review & Outlook.

Mr. Speaker, it's pretty apparent that the administration is only enforcing those parts of the law that it finds in its own best interest, and if something is inconvenient or embarrassing, it suspends the enforcement.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague says we are discussing some bill related to the Affordable Care Act or health care. It's simply not true that this House is working on health care. The Affordable Care Act is being implemented. It wasn't repealed. I know there was a candidate that ran for President against Mr. Obama that wanted to repeal it. Had he been elected, it still would have had to pass these Chambers. It didn't happen. Elections happened. The health care reforms are being implemented. I just met with some of the folks in the exchanges from my State of Colorado in my office earlier this morning. I realize the House of Representatives has voted 40 times—41 times—to repeal ObamaCare. It's just talk.

The shopping period in the exchanges begins on October 1. Coloradans, like many across the country, are rolling up their sleeves, going to work and figuring out what the Affordable Care Act means. We even had bipartisan support

in my State for our law that created the exchange as well. When Connect for Colorado goes online next month, more than 817,000 Coloradans will have access to choosing a health care insurance product through the exchange, more than 80,000 people in my district.

Again, these things are just happening. I mean, this is information that I'm sharing here with the public. This has nothing to do with these bills that we're talking about, 40 repeals of ObamaCare, this redundant bill here today, where they like or don't like what the President is doing, they want to do it themselves they like what President Obama is doing so much.

I mean, these things are nothing. These things aren't going to the Senate. These things aren't being signed. They are absolutely symbolic and a complete waste of time, while this body hasn't spent 1 minute on the floor in consideration of an immigration reform bill; not 1 minute, which is why I'm taking this time, instead of talking about nothing—nothing, nothing, nothing—41 repeals of Affordable Care Act when it ain't going to happen because elections matter and have consequences—nothing—not 1 minute on something, something big: securing our border, restoring the rule of law, reducing our deficit, shoring up Social Security, improving our national security, making sure that our system is aligned with our values.

These are big deals. Not 1 minute. Not 1 minute. A lot of time on nothing, nothing, nothing, nothing. That's what we're doing today; it's what we did yesterday. I sure hope it's not what we're doing tomorrow, but, sadly, I'm not optimistic.

We need to act, Mr. Speaker, on so many pressing national issues. Surely we can spare 1 minute or 10 minutes or 15 minutes to discuss and pass the Senate immigration reform bill instead of this nothing. This nothing going nowhere, just like yesterday, just like tomorrow.

We can do better, Mr. Speaker. This Nation deserves an institution in the House of Representatives that serves the people of this country, serves the people in addressing real issues that they face; people that are tired of the undermining of our law by people working illegally, people that are tired of families being torn apart, and people that are tired of a thousand people a day illegally crossing our southern border today, and yes, tomorrow because of the refusal of this body to allow even 1 minute to discuss or debate a bill on immigration reform.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would remind everyone in the House Chamber that seven times the House has voted to restrict, delay, defund a portion of the Affordable Care Act; seven times those have passed into law and been signed by the President.

This is an important effort. This was a massive overtaking of the country's health care system that was passed in not a bipartisan fashion but a single-party vote in March of 2010. The President has decided now even with his own law, he got everything he wanted in the law, he's going to selectively enforce. If we're going to talk about the rule of law, let's talk about the rule of law.

The bill rule before us today is a good rule. It ensures that those taxpayer subsidies are going to individuals who are deserving of those subsidies. And for crying out loud, let's stop the crooks.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I would inquire if the gentleman has any remaining speakers?

Mr. BURGESS. The gentleman from Texas has unlimited speakers in himself; but beyond me, no.

Mr. POLIS. Okay. The hordes of people coming to speak on this bill were not apparent to me here, but I'm prepared to close, Mr. Speaker, seeing no speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, despite spending hours and days of debate here on the Affordable Care Act, repealing it, defunding it, it's being implemented. That's happening. Elections have consequences. As the Speaker of this esteemed body himself has said, to paraphrase, it is unlikely we'll repeal ObamaCare with a fellow named Obama in the White House. That's simply a truism. Yet here we are today discussing something that will go nowhere and does nothing, instead of something that goes somewhere and does something.

This bill before us fails to replace our broken immigration system with one that works. If this bill before us today passes, I guarantee you that a thousand people will continue to cross illegally into the country tomorrow, the next day, and the next day. This bill does not secure our border at all. This bill does not reduce our deficit by over \$100 billion. This bill does not reflect our values in our immigration system. This bill does not allow us to look in the mirror at night knowing that we are a Nation of immigrants and a Nation of laws, and we must reconcile those two.

The Senate passed a bipartisan comprehensive immigration bill last June, a bill that holds true to these principles, these principles of fiscal responsibility, reducing our deficit, shoring up Social Security, the principle of national security, of finally getting serious about securing our southern border, implementing mandatory workplace authentication to ensure that employers are following the law, the principle of job creation and competitiveness, ensuring that the great companies of tomorrow are based here and that we have access to the talent we

need to be great and grow our economy as a country. The Senate comprehensive immigration reform bill would grow our GDP by over 3.3 percent. This bill will not. This bill will not.

And finally, this bill does nothing to address the concerns that have been raised by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, by the Evangelical Immigration Table, by faith-based groups in a broad coalition across this country, and by those who value our traditions and our values as Americans.

This bill does nothing to reconcile our immigration system with our values; and the Senate immigration bill does. We can take it up now. We can pass it now. The President has expressed a willingness to sign it now. I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, to vote "no" on this restrictive rule and unnecessary bill so that finally we can bring forward the Senate immigration reform bill, pass it, and send it to the President of the United States to get serious about addressing problems the American people by an overwhelming majority actually want us to solve.

□ 1315

The Senate bipartisan bill would bring people like Javier out of the shadows, reunite Gabriella and her sister with her parents, and provide them with an accelerated 5-year path to earn permanent residence so that they can contribute to making our country even greater.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate isn't really about the Affordable Care Act, or even health care in general. What's happening is happening. Some people like it; some people don't. It's happening.

This debate is purely politics. I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, Why are we not focused on replacing our broken immigration system with one that works?

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, join me in voting "no," defeating this rule, and defeating the previous question. Perhaps we can finally get to work on the people's business here in the House of Representatives and finally fix our broken immigration system and replace it with one that works for our prosperity, our security, and for job creation for Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, let me remind you why we are here today. We are here today because the President, who signed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act into law in March of 2010, on July 2 of this year decided he was not going to enforce a portion of the law. Unilaterally, the President made the decision, didn't consult with Congress, put it out in a blog post on one of their White House Web sites on July 2.

Then 3 days later, on the Friday before the Fourth of July weekend, they came out with a raft of regulations; and buried within that raft of regulations was the fact that, oh, by the way, we're not checking anybody who comes in. We'll rely on self-attestation.

They were required to do that because, by not enforcing the employer mandate that was in their law that they signed, by not enforcing the employer mandate, the data would not be collected and, in fact, there was no way to enforce that data.

So we simply don't need the data. We'll trust; people are going to be honest. If they come in and say they need a subsidy, of course they need a subsidy. We'll give it to them. And, yeah, at some point, it might even be checked against their IRS records.

How are you going to call that back from someone who doesn't have the money anymore because, after all, the dollars and the subsidy don't go to the individual; they go to the insurance company. It's not like that individual went and deposited that in a bank account. It went to their insurance company to buy their health insurance.

The money's been spent, the policy has been utilized or not, but that water is under the bridge.

I didn't ask for this debate. I didn't ask for the President to sign the health care bill into law, but he did. But then I sure didn't ask him to just delay parts of it.

If anything is inconvenient to you, Mr. President, just kind of put it away, put it to the side.

All kinds of things have fallen off the Affordable Care Act as it's bucked and burped down the road towards implementation. You may remember the debate about preexisting conditions. What about the Federal preexisting condition program?

Anyone who showed up after February 1 of this year to be covered under the Federal preexisting condition program was told, sorry, the window is closed; we're not signing up any more individuals because we're out of money. So they had to wait 11 months until the Elysian Fields of the Affordable Care Act spread out before them.

But what are they to do for that 11 months if they've got a diagnosis which is incompatible with life unless they get treatment?

But the administration didn't care about that. They simply suspended enrollment to the preexisting condition program.

Well, what about the caps on out-of-pocket expenses that an individual could incur during a year?

Under the Affordable Care Act there were caps signed in law by the President. Well, the caps were excluded because it's kind of inconvenient, and we don't want to do that anymore.

The small business health exchanges are delayed for a year. What else is

going to fall off this thing as it lurches towards implementation on January 1?

I don't know. But I do know this: we have an opportunity today to vote on a rule that allows the bill to come to the floor that will require that the Department of Health and Human Services, the Inspector General, ensure that those individuals who come and say, hey, I'm eligible for a subsidy, to ensure that they are, in fact, eligible for that subsidy.

We fight all the time in committee with money going out the door at the Department of Health and Human Services, the pay-and-chase model. It clearly doesn't work.

Medicare and Medicaid, inappropriate payments, inefficient expenditures happen all the time. Let's not make that worse. Let's stop paying the crooks. We have an opportunity today to stop paying the crooks.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of a critical bill to protect taxpayer dollars from the rampant fraud inevitable in an undertaking as massive as the health insurance overhaul that is known as ObamaCare.

I congratulate my colleague from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for her thoughtful piece of legislation. And for that reason, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1410

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings

will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on H. Res. 339; adoption of H. Res. 339, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2775, NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 339) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 196, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 456]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Crawford	Harper
Alexander	Crenshaw	Harris
Amash	Culberson	Hartzler
Amodei	Daines	Hastings (WA)
Bachmann	Davis, Rodney	Heck (NV)
Bachus	Dent	Hensarling
Barletta	DeSantis	Holding
Barr	DesJarlais	Hudson
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Huelskamp
Benishek	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Bentivolio	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Bilirakis	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Bishop (UT)	Ellmers	Hurt
Black	Farenthold	Issa
Blackburn	Fincher	Jenkins
Boustany	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Brady (TX)	Fleischmann	Johnson, Sam
Bridenstine	Fleming	Jones
Brooks (AL)	Flores	Jordan
Brooks (IN)	Forbes	Joyce
Broun (GA)	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Buchanan	Fox	King (IA)
Bucshon	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Calvert	Gardner	Kinzinger (IL)
Camp	Garrett	Kline
Campbell	Gerlach	Labrador
Cantor	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Capito	Gibson	Lamborn
Carter	Gingrey (GA)	Lance
Cassidy	Gohmert	Lankford
Chabot	Goodlatte	Latham
Chaffetz	Gosar	Latta
Coble	Gowdy	LoBiondo
Coffman	Granger	Long
Cole	Graves (GA)	Lucas
Collins (GA)	Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer
Collins (NY)	Griffin (AR)	Lummis
Conaway	Griffith (VA)	Marchant
Cook	Guthrie	Marino
Cotton	Hall	Massie
Cramer	Hanna	McCarthy (CA)

McCaul	Reed	Smith (NJ)
McClintock	Reichert	Smith (TX)
McHenry	Renacci	Southerland
McKeon	Ribble	Stewart
McKinley	Rice (SC)	Stivers
McMorris	Rigell	Stockman
Rodgers	Roby	Stutzman
Meadows	Roe (TN)	Terry
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)
Messer	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry
Mica	Rogers (MI)	Tiberi
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Tipton
Miller (MI)	Rokita	Turner
Miller, Gary	Rooney	Upton
Mullin	Ros-Lehtinen	Valadao
Mulvaney	Roskam	Wagner
Murphy (PA)	Ross	Walberg
Neugebauer	Rothfus	Walden
Noem	Royce	Walorski
Nugent	Runyan	Weber (TX)
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Webster (FL)
Nunnelee	Salmon	Wenstrup
Palazzo	Sanford	Westmoreland
Paulsen	Scalise	Whitfield
Pearce	Schock	Williams
Perry	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)
Petri	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Pittenger	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Pitts	Sessions	Womack
Poe (TX)	Shimkus	Woodall
Pompeo	Shuster	Yoder
Posey	Simpson	Yoho
Price (GA)	Smith (MO)	Young (AK)
Radel	Smith (NE)	Young (IN)

NAYS—196

Andrews	Foster	Matsui
Barber	Frankel (FL)	McCollum
Barrow (GA)	Fudge	McDermott
Bass	Gabbard	McGovern
Beatty	Gallagher	McIntyre
Becerra	Garamendi	McNerney
Bera (CA)	Garcia	Meeks
Bishop (GA)	Grayson	Meng
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	Michaud
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Miller, George
Bonamici	Grijalva	Moore
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Moran
Braley (IA)	Hahn	Murphy (FL)
Brown (FL)	Hanabusa	Napolitano
Brownley (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Bustos	Heck (WA)	Negrete McLeod
Butterfield	Higgins	Nolan
Capps	Himes	O'Rourke
Capuano	Hinojosa	Owens
Cárdenas	Holt	Pallone
Carney	Honda	Pascarell
Carson (IN)	Horsford	Pastor (AZ)
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Pelosi
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Perlmutter
Chu	Israel	Peters (CA)
Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Peters (MI)
Clarke	Jeffries	Peterson
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Clyburn	Kaptur	Polis
Cohen	Keating	Price (NC)
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Conyers	Kennedy	Rahall
Cooper	Kildee	Rangel
Costa	Kilmer	Richmond
Courtney	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Crowley	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz
Cuellar	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Langevin	Rush
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
DeFazio	Lee (CA)	T.
DeGette	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Delaney	Lewis	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Lipinski	Schakowsky
DeBene	Loebach	Schiff
Deutch	Lofgren	Schneider
Dingell	Lowenthal	Schrader
Doggett	Lowe	Schwartz
Doyle	Lujan Grisham	Scott (VA)
Duckworth	(NM)	Scott, David
Edwards	Luján, Ben Ray	Serrano
Ellison	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Engel	Lynch	Shea-Porter
Enyart	Maffei	Sherman
Eshoo	Maloney,	Sinema
Esty	Carolyn	Sires
Farr	Maloney, Sean	Slaughter
Fattah	Matheson	Smith (WA)

Speier	Tsongas	Wasserman
Swalwell (CA)	Van Hollen	Schultz
Takano	Vargas	Waters
Thompson (CA)	Veasey	Watt
Thompson (MS)	Vela	Waxman
Tierney	Velázquez	Welch
Titus	Visclosky	Wilson (FL)
Tonko	Walz	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Cartwright	Herrera Beutler	Olson
Denham	McCarthy (NY)	Payne
Grimm	Nadler	Young (FL)

□ 1437

Messrs. SIREs, McDERMOTT, GEORGE MILLER of California, CARSON of Indiana, and NEAL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 195, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]

YEAS—228

Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Jones
Alexander	Duffy	Jordan
Amash	Duncan (SC)	Joyce
Amodei	Duncan (TN)	Kelly (PA)
Bachmann	Ellmers	King (IA)
Bachus	Farenthold	King (NY)
Barletta	Fincher	Kingston
Barr	Fitzpatrick	Kinzing (IL)
Barton	Fleischmann	Kline
Benishek	Fleming	Labrador
Bentivolio	Flores	LaMalfa
Bilirakis	Forbes	Lamborn
Bishop (UT)	Fortenberry	Lance
Black	Fox	Lankford
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Latham
Boustany	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Brady (TX)	Gardner	LoBiondo
Bridenstine	Garrett	Long
Brooks (AL)	Gerlach	Lucas
Brooks (IN)	Gibbs	Luetkemeyer
Broun (GA)	Gibson	Lummis
Buchanan	Gingrey (GA)	Marchant
Bucshon	Gohmert	Marino
Burgess	Goodlatte	Massie
Calvert	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Camp	Gowdy	McCaul
Campbell	Granger	McClintock
Cantor	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Capito	Graves (AR)	McIntyre
Carter	Griffin (MO)	McKeon
Cassidy	Griffith (VA)	McKinley
Chabot	Guthrie	McMorris
Chaffetz	Hall	Rodgers
Coble	Hanna	Meadows
Coffman	Harper	Meehan
Cole	Harris	Messer
Collins (GA)	Hartzler	Mica
Collins (NY)	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Conaway	Heck (NV)	Miller (MI)
Cook	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Cotton	Holding	Mullin
Cramer	Hudson	Mulvaney
Crawford	Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer
Culberson	Hultgren	Noem
Daines	Hunter	Nugent
Davis, Rodney	Hurt	Nunes
Denham	Issa	Nunnelee
Dent	Jenkins	Palazzo
DeSantis	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen
DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam	Pearce

Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry

Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Grimm
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Nadler
Olson
Payne
Rigell
Ruppersberger
Young (FL)

□ 1446

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2918

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent my name be removed as cosponsor on H.R. 2918.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1077

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1077.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of an extraordinary public servant, beloved colleague, gifted statesman, and fellow Floridian, Congressman E. Clay Shaw, Jr.

Clay passed away peacefully last night, surrounded by his loving and

supportive family, after struggling with lung cancer for many years. Clay was born and reared in south Florida and developed into a hardworking, remarkable man, a strong voice for his district, as well as for the entire Sunshine State.

Mayor of Fort Lauderdale at an early age, Clay quickly earned the respect of our community and cultivated the skills necessary to be elected to the House of Representatives in 1980, serving here honorably for 26 years. Clay set the bar high for a true gentleman, and all who knew him can recall his charming, old-school approach to life. He worked in a bipartisan manner, similar to Congressmen Dante Fascell and Bill Lehman, who also recently passed away.

I am honored to have served with such a remarkable man as E. Clay Shaw. He'll be remembered as a man of sterling character and high ideals, a pillar of our community and a man of this institution.

Clay is survived by his wife of 53 years, Emilie, who was always at his side. I ask for all of us here in this Chamber to take a moment of silence in recognition of the great contributions and sacrifice of a truly dedicated public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment of silence.

IN HONOR AND REMEMBRANCE OF DR. CLARENCE BROOKS

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and remembrance of Dr. Clarence Brooks, a man dedicated to his family, community, and friends. Dr. Clarence Brooks was a generous man who committed his life to serving the community. His legacy spans 61 years and two generations.

Dr. Clarence Brooks graduated from Howard University Medical School in 1975 at the age of 24. And as the youngest member of his class, he was recognized as the number one medical student in family practice. Dr. Clarence Brooks immediately returned to his hometown of Fort Worth and joined his family practice, Brooks Clinic, which was founded by his father and his uncle. Dr. Brooks served an average of 60 patients a day, acted as medical director of two nursing homes, delivered babies, and worked hospital rotations at two local hospitals.

In 1976, Dr. Brooks was named president of the Texas Sickle Cell Anemia Foundation and traveled the State educating communities on the disease and the benefits of being tested. He believed in giving back to the community. Dr. Clarence Brooks supported many young people in realizing their passions in medicine, music, and art. Additionally, he provided low-cost athletic physicals to high school students

NAYS—195

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Galleo
Garamendi
Garcia

Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeke
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod

Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

so they could join athletic teams. I benefited from those low-cost athletic physicals he provided.

He dedicated his medical degree and life as a resource to the benefit of the community. For over 30 years, Dr. Clarence Brooks continued the Brooks' open-door policy to treat everyone regardless of whether or not they had the ability to pay, so they could have medical treatment.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and remembrance of Dr. Clarence Brooks, whose kind spirit and dedicated service touched the lives of so many in Fort Worth at his clinic on Evans Avenue. He will be sorely missed.

I offer my condolences to his wife, Sonya; his two daughters, Leigh Butler and Codie Brooks; two grandsons, Caleb and Gavin Butler; his brother, Roy, and his wife, Jennifer; three sisters, Marion Bryant, Carol Brooks, and Marie Ann Washington; and many nieces, nephews, and friends.

May he rest in peace, Mr. Speaker.

CONGRATULATING JACKSON ELECTRIC MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Jackson Electric Membership Corporation on its 75th anniversary. This year, Jackson EMC will mark 75 years of providing reliable, affordable energy to homes and businesses throughout 10 Georgia counties.

The Jackson EMC has the distinction of being the largest electric cooperative in the State of Georgia and the second-largest in the United States. While Jackson EMC has grown exponentially since its founding in 1938, it continues to offer its original membership fee of only \$5. Today, Jackson EMC serves more than 210,000 members and benefits its members with rates substantially below the State and national average.

While I am sorry to miss the 75th anniversary celebration, I want to extend my congratulations and best wishes to all Jackson employees and members, which include myself. May the next 75 years bring even more innovation and continued success in providing affordable energy needed to fuel Georgia's economy.

□ 1500

THE SYRIAN CRISIS

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member on the House Foreign

Affairs Committee, I want to associate myself with the remarks of President Obama last night in his speech to the Nation.

I, like everyone else, hope that a diplomatic solution can be found and that somehow, between Russia, Syria and the United States, we can find common ground where Assad will not have his weapons of mass destruction and will be put under international control.

But if this is possible, I believe it was only possible because there is a credible threat of U.S. military might, and that causes the equation of both the Russians and the Syrians to think about the United States.

And that's why I believe so strongly that if this falls apart, we need to strike in Syria to let Assad know that it is unacceptable to gas the civilian population. It is indeed a war crime.

Many of us today watched pictures of children foaming at the mouth and dying and shaking, and it's just something that will live with me for the rest of my life.

So I think what the President's proposing is balanced; it's moderate. I will vote "yes," and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DEMAND JUSTICE

(Mr. DESANTIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, the attacks of September 11, 2001, caused many Americans to appreciate the danger posed by Islamic-inspired terrorism. Following September 11, 2001, Americans from all walks of life resolved that we would bring swift and harsh justice to America's enemies.

The routing of al Qaeda and the Taliban following 9/11 showed that terrorists and those who harbor them would pay a steep price for their barbarism. Even when some targets, such as Osama bin Laden, remained illusive, America continued to press forward patiently until we finally exacted justice.

On September 11, 2012, 1 year ago today, four of our fellow citizens, including our Ambassador to Libya, were massacred by Islamic terrorists in Benghazi. The targeting of a diplomat breached recognized standards of civilized behavior that stretch back centuries.

And yet, one year later, justice has not been brought to our enemies in Benghazi. Have we lost our resolve?

Our enemies hide in plain sight, speaking with journalists and boasting of their crimes. The victims of the Benghazi attack deserve justice. The American people demand justice.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA WOMEN'S GYMNASTICS TEAM

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my alma mater, the great University of Florida, and our incredible women's gymnastic team, who earned their first NCAA Super Six National Championship.

I'm very proud of our Lady Gators, as they proved that hard work, tireless dedication and passion lead to great things. I know that, under the direction of Coach Faehn, many of these young ladies will represent not just the Gator Nation, but our Nation, the United States of America, in the next Olympics.

Ladies, I commend you for your exceptional work ethic, your talent and drive in achieving this title. Congratulations, ladies.

And as we like to say back home in Gainesville, it's great to be a Florida Gator and part of the Gator Nation.

TODAY IS A DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this is a day of remembrance. It is a solemn day. It is a day that brings back tragic memories for all of us. And then, in some ways, it brings great hope.

We all remember where we were on 9/11/2001. And I know there are some that say, I just can't take seeing what happened that day; I don't want to see any more video. And I would only submit, it is important not to forget.

To fly planes into buildings, use them as bombs, is an act of war, just as dropping bombs in Pearl Harbor was an act of war. Even though there were no boots on the ground at Pearl Harbor, even though there were no boots on the ground in New York City or Washington, D.C., using bombs, whether planes or missiles are personally set, they're acts of war.

I wasn't aware until this past weekend that there's only been one time when article 5 of our NATO alliance has been triggered. That article of the NATO alliance is a mandatory requirement, and it requires that when any signatory to NATO, any member of NATO is attacked in an act of war, then all other members of NATO must take it as if they've been attacked in an act of war and go to war against whoever attacked one of the NATO members.

The only time that's been triggered was 9/11 of 2001 when the United States

was attacked. Because of the treaty, it's not a voluntary act on behalf of the member states of NATO. It doesn't require the request of the attacked country.

But it had gone without my notice, but the countries that were part of NATO immediately, that day, 9/11/2001, were instantly at war with whatever country attacked us. The problem was we didn't know who attacked us; and, as a result, it did end up eventually causing other countries to go with us into Afghanistan and Iraq.

Actually, within about 4 months of going into Afghanistan, with less than 500 special ops and intelligence individuals, the Taliban was defeated. And then came our mistake, where we added tens of thousands of American troops and allied troops and we became occupiers instead of those that defeated the Taliban, and left the country back in the hands of those who should have had it.

But 9/11 should truly evoke the emotions that we had that day, as people were trapped 1,000 feet or so above the street surface and had to make a decision, do I want to burn up in a horrible burning death, or do I jump to my death?

I think most all of us resolved that day, including those of us who were not in Congress, that it should be our job, as a Nation, to ensure that Americans were never put to a choice like that again, ever.

Actions we knew had to be taken, and authorization of use of military force was passed. In the haste to get it passed to give the President authority to go forward, it had far too much flexibility. So we have been able successfully to rein some of that in in the past months. More work has to be done.

But in the Middle East, the question is coming up in the last few days from leaders over there who did not wish to be identified publicly, but the questions were asked:

Do the people in your government not understand that on 9/11 you had radical Islamists, Muslim Brotherhood people, al Qaeda, trained by the Taliban, but Muslim Brotherhood at the core, that attacked you?

And you went to war, you said, against al Qaeda, the Taliban, and that the Muslim Brotherhood supports them. And you're at war with them.

And then do you not remember that that's who you've been at war with?

And this administration, the Obama administration, has said they're not engaged in a war on terror. They're only at war with al Qaeda. And they mistakenly thought al Qaeda was on the run. Well, if they were on the run, it was a run toward killing more people.

And these leaders in the Middle East have asked: If you could remember that, then why did you come into

Egypt and demand the ouster of your ally, with whom you had agreements, with whom you were working, with whom you were making sure, as best that you could, and the Egyptian leader Mubarak could, that he would try to maintain as much peace with Israel as possible?

So you had all these agreements with him, just like you do with us.

And then Qadhafi was a bad man. But after 2003, when you invaded Iraq, it scared him so badly that he became your ally. You had many agreements with him, he and family members, particularly family members. I remember meeting his son here, who said he was meeting with people in the administration, was going around Capitol Hill meeting. I didn't have a meeting with him, other than just meeting him, someone introducing him. But this was Qadhafi's family here because after 2003, he had become our ally.

And as some in the Middle East have pointed out, he was doing everything he could to provide you information with who the terrorists were. He was your partner. You had agreements with him. You had signed agreements, verbal agreements. He was your partner, and you turned on him.

And even Assad, as bad a guy as most people knew he was and is, you had Secretary Clinton out there saying, oh, Assad's a reformer. He's going to be okay.

But we have watched you, with the Northern Alliance, with Mubarak, with Qadhafi, with all of these people who were your friends, your allies with whom you had agreements, and you tossed them aside and ran them out of office, only to give control to the Muslim Brotherhood.

We do not understand what you're doing; and privately we ask among ourselves here in the Middle East, Which one of us, your allies, will you turn against next?

Which one of us will you decide is a throwaway, you don't need us anymore?

We're concerned, but we don't want to tell people because we don't want them to take that as a sign they need to be coming after us and us be the ones they discard next.

That's no way to have an international policy. It's no way to be the greatest peacemaker in the world, when your allies worry because they've seen you completely disregard signed agreements, verbal agreements, pats on the back.

I mean, you know, when you see the videos of our great Secretary of State Kerry sitting with Assad, having lavish meals and meetings and then all of a sudden he's such a horrendous ogre that you've got to hurt him somehow.

And this stuff about America is the only one that can effectively hit Syria, so we have to be the ones. Why wouldn't it be someone who is in

harm's way who actually could perhaps put boots on the ground, go in and destroy chemical weapons?

□ 1515

For heaven's sake, to see Vladimir Putin end up playing the high card, being the diplomat was incredible. It should have been the U.S. administration that said that we're going to do, actually, what George W. Bush did before the Iraq war. He tried every diplomatic approach he could. He went to the U.N. repeatedly. They got resolutions passed ordering Iraq to open up their weapons systems, ordering Iraq to do the right things, which they refused to do. The first reaction of the much-maligned George W. Bush administration was to go to the U.N., get agreements, get resolutions passed, and then enforce those resolutions.

So we've come to a sad day, now 12 years after 9/11 of 2001, where we're not the ones who proposed diplomacy before we come in and act like a bully in a country in which there was no national security interest, just as our Secretary of Defense Bob Gates said before the administration bombed Qadhafi, destroyed his air force, and made it possible for the rebels, including all the al Qaeda that were immersed within them, to take over Libya; and that ultimately led to a year ago, when our Ambassador, Sean Smith, Ty Woods, and Glen Doherty were killed and others wounded.

Bad decisions have consequences. Most everyone is familiar with the old adage that those who refuse to learn from history are destined to repeat it. The trouble is you cannot learn from history until you learn what the history was. So when some may be tempted to ask what difference it makes with what happened at Benghazi a year ago, it makes a difference in avoiding repeating history because we could not learn from history because the administration was hiding the truth.

I have come to meet and know surviving family members of those we lost in Benghazi. They feel like the blood of their loved ones should be enough to require truth. They would like to think if there was anything accomplished by the loss of their loved one, it could be that we could learn our lessons to be sure it didn't happen again.

Unfortunately, after two U.S. Embassies were attacked and people died in the late 1990s during the Clinton administration, the truth was not effectively and completely learned, and we didn't learn properly from those lessons. So we have to learn another lesson at Benghazi, which was a year ago today. But we can't learn a lesson when we don't know what the truth is.

And it scares our allies. They don't know if they can trust us. Members of Congress can be a big help in letting allies know that, hey, we appreciate the peace you're trying to bring. We appreciate what you're trying to do. Let us

know if there's something we need to take up, hearings we need to have in Congress, an appropriation we need to get rid of because it's doing more harm than good. Let us know. It's a wonderful thing to have working relationships with people on the other side of the world that are in the hotspots.

I continue to communicate with Ty Woods' widow. Ty and Dorothy have a young son. She said he's got so much of Ty in him that he's more than a handful. Because that's an American hero. Ty and Glen were two men who heard that our people were under attack; and rather than go on planning for a campaign trip the next day or sitting down and having meals with others, casually going through conversations, whatever is done, that's not what these two former SEALs did. We knew there were two former Navy SEALs, but it's outrageous that when the names were released, this administration used the words "they were killed while seeking cover." I didn't know Ty Woods and I didn't know Glen Doherty. I had never met them personally. I certainly have come to know them vicariously since. But I know enough SEALs, former and present, to know that those two former Navy SEALs did not die seeking cover. I knew it instantly when I read that. What an outrage.

When I was in the Army at Fort Benning, we were not at war. We should have gone to war with Iran over the attack, the act of war in 1979 against our Embassy. And I think if we had demanded their return within 48 hours or it would be the entire hell that America could bring to bear would come down on Iran if one hostage was harmed, and I always felt during those first few days when they kept saying the students had these hostages, that if we had had a backbone and made a demand and been willing to back it up, they would have released them. And if they had not and we had shown them we were not a paper tiger or a toothless tiger, that we would not have lost the thousands and thousands of Americans we have since. And it would not have been able to be used as a recruiting tool to recruit radical Islamists by telling them, look at what they did in Tehran. They fled Vietnam. The next incident is 1979. They did nothing. They were totally helpless, begging us to let their people go. That's all they would do.

There was a failed rescue attempt, which I would submit failed because of the leadership at the White House and the restraints that were put on them from the beginning. But there is a price when proper decisions are not made. And that weighs heavy on any President. I know it weighs heavy on President Obama. But, for heaven's sake, we have got to learn. It's been 12 years. A year ago, when it was just 11 years, our lessons had not been learned. And so more Americans die in Libya.

I know that people in this administration mean that they have love and respect and admiration for those who were killed in Benghazi; but I would humbly submit that love, respect, and admiration that leads to lies and cover-ups are not actually love, respect, and admiration. It is the lowest form of contempt. These heroes deserve better.

One of the greatest speeches I ever heard was by a man named Barack Obama. I heard the speech. It touched me deeply. We shouldn't be a red State or a blue State. We shouldn't be black or white. We should be Americans. And I want so desperately for this country to come together in that way, and I know it can happen, because I saw it happen on September 12, 2001.

I was a judge at the time, and I watched as hundreds of people came into our town square, as they did all over the country. America came together. There was no red America, blue America. There was not a single hyphenated America in this country on 9/12. We all held hands, embraced, touched in some way, as we sang "God Bless America" and "Amazing Grace" and prayed together. And I looked around and my heart soared as I saw Americans—skin color didn't matter, creed didn't matter, national origin didn't matter, age didn't matter. We were Americans standing together. But you can't have trust, you can't stand together when you know someone next to you is not being truthful. They are being deceptive. They are covering up.

So it's heartbreaking that this article today from CBS Interactive, Inc., says:

One year after the September 11, 2012, terrorist attacks on Americans in Benghazi, Libya, no arrests have been reported but the Justice Department says investigators have made very significant process.

On down, it says:

Last month, government officials confirmed that sealed criminal charges have been filed against suspects. They're said to include Ahmed Khattala, who gave interviews in Benghazi with several news organizations, admitting he was at the scene of the attacks but insisting he was not the ring-leader. Khattala also said nobody from the U.S. Government had attempted to question him.

On further, it says:

The Obama administration continues to keep a great deal of information under wraps, citing an ongoing investigation, national security, and other reasons. The secrecy is an ongoing point of contention with Republicans in Congress.

The article goes on to say:

Tuesday, the House Oversight Committee sent a letter to Secretary of State John Kerry, demanding the Benghazi survivors be made available for interviews with Congress or else they may be subpoenaed. According to the letter, the State Department told Congress on August 23 that it was not prepared to support the request for transcribed interviews. If that doesn't change within 2 weeks, Committee Chairman Darrell Issa, Republican of California, said, I will have no

alternative but to consider the use of compulsory process.

The FBI, CIA, Director of National Intelligence, Defense Department, State Department, National Security Agency, have all rejected or failed to answer multiple Freedom of Information requests made by CBS News, as well as appeals of the denials. The agency cites exemptions related to ongoing investigations of national security.

There's an article today by John Sexton from Breitbart, saying:

It's been nearly a year since the attack which killed four Americans in Benghazi. During that time, various minute-by-minute accounts of the attack have been published. In addition, the administration's decisions to refuse additional security requests and to revise its talking points after the attack have been examined in detail.

Further down, it says:

The general outlines of the CIA effort have been reported. One fact which has not been highlighted is that the U.N. arms embargo of Libya, which the United States helped pass in 2011, makes shipping weapons in or out of the country of Libya a violation of international law. Indeed, the way the U.N. resolution is written, even knowingly allowing such shipments to take place may be a violation of the agreement.

□ 1530

Yet we keep hearing that guns were being shipped from Libya, perhaps to Turkey, perhaps making their way to al Qaeda rebels. Because the rumor that keeps surfacing is that the Turks that we got weapons to are the ones that decided where the weapons would go. And those did not go to people who had any abiding love or even patience with Christians, as we have seen as Christians have been decapitated, killed, maimed in horrendous ways in Syria by those this administration would have been supporting had we bombed Assad. This is all tragic. We need to learn from history, but we've got to know the truth to do that.

I love DARRELL ISSA, but the quote should not be that if the information is not forthcoming, as he says, "I will have no alternative but to consider the use of compulsory process." In the name of Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, Ty Woods, and Glen Doherty, it should not be considered; it should be done. There should be a select committee to get to the truth. We should use all compulsory methods at our fingertips, including cutting off funding to any Federal agency that refuses to comply with proper oversight by Congress, because a Constitution that can be nullified by one of the three branches is a worthless Constitution. And if Congress cannot do meaningful oversight and examine what the money we are appropriating is going for, then that money should not continue to be appropriated to anyone who will not allow knowledge of how it's being spent and if it is being misused.

This has to stop. On 9/12/01, as a district judge in Texas, I was so heartened that on 9/12 we came together. On the

congressional delegation trip last week in the Middle East, two Democrats I don't agree much with politically, but I got to know them a lot better, and I care deeply about them. They are very, very good people. We have the same desire for this country's freedom, liberty, peace, longevity of life—different ideas of how to get there.

I've been encouraged over the last week because of the way we can talk honestly, without impugning anyone's motives, and try to work toward answers. That's what I saw on 9/12, people wanting to work together. But I keep coming back to this fact that people in this administration need to understand, and our own Republican leadership needs to understand: we have got to get to the bottom of these matters; we have got to get the truth.

Jesus said, "You will know the truth, and the truth shall set you free." He was talking about a particular truth. But sometimes the truth comes out and it hurts the person that was seeking the truth or the people who were seeking the truth. And I would humbly submit, here it doesn't matter. We just need the truth.

One of the things that people around the world, as I've talked to people around the world, even going back to my summer in '73 of being an exchange student in the Soviet Union, people have admired the way the United States would expose the truth no matter how ugly it made it appear. People admired that.

Even in the Soviet Union, when they were not getting truth, privately—they couldn't say it publicly, but privately there were college students that pointed this out. We really do admire the way you bring out truth. And your own government's embarrassed, but somehow you manage to keep going on because you deal with truth.

One, in particular, said, I am concerned about my country because we don't get the truth.

Standing and looking at an exhibit in Moscow with a couple of Russian college students, I was amazed. One of them pointed to Gagarin. And I said, wow, Gagarin, the world's first man in space. There was an account that he had been killed during test piloting a jet in the Soviet Union. I was surprised that the two Russian college students would say, Yeah, we know that didn't happen.

I said, You don't believe what your government is telling you?

And he said, No, our government frequently does not tell us the truth.

Well, I didn't know if Gagarin was killed testing a jet plane or not, but I was struck by the fact that these Soviets, college students, knew that their government lied to them routinely. And they said, You seem to get to the truth in your country—it has taken a while with Watergate, but you seem to keep working toward the truth, and we

don't do that here. We just have to accept what we're told.

I believe the expression was "there's nothing to be done."

Well, in America, there is something to be done. We have got to get to the truth. We owe it to the heroes that have given their last full measure of devotion for this country. We owe it to those who have put their lives on the line.

That means getting to the bottom of the rule of engagement for our military as well so that we don't have situations as we just read about this summer, a lieutenant—obviously very young—in charge of a roadblock at a security checkpoint. From the account—and I do want to do further investigation to get to the bottom of it—when waving, trying to get the attention of three people on motorcycles to slow down, to stop for the security—they were going fast, with no indication of slowing down—the lieutenant ordered shots be fired above their head. They didn't slow down. Knowing there had been people killed, Americans killed by so many green-on-blue attacks, knowing that his men were at risk if they had a bomb, he finally ordered his men to fire on the motorcycle riders; two died, one lived. That lieutenant is now reported to be doing 20 years in Leavenworth. That's just wrong. That's just wrong.

I've been in Afghanistan and talked to our soldiers there—soldiers, sailors, marines—and they tell me privately, Look, we have a hard time deciding, do I want to risk just letting someone kill me or going to prison when I get home? I kind of think I'd rather die as a hero and have an NAS burial than to be an embarrassment to my family by going to Leavenworth when I get back to the U.S.

We owe the 9/11 victims, the 9/11 survivors, the Benghazi victims, the Afghanistan soldiers, sailors, and marines that we have lost, we owe those who died in Afghanistan and Iraq, we owe them the truth. We owe them good rules of engagement so their lives are not needlessly put in jeopardy because of political gamesmanship.

We are owed the truth. And when Ambassador Chris Stevens' last words to his State Department colleague and friend, Greg Hicks, were, "Greg, we're under attack," everything should have stopped. The personal, hand-picked representative of the United States President was under attack. Everything should have stopped. I really think if it had and this administration had done everything they could to get help to these people, this President would have won in a huge landslide because he stood up for people, our Americans who were in harm's way.

A year later, we don't even know what he was doing. We don't know what the Secretary of State was doing. We can't talk to the CIA agents, and

they keep getting polygraphed every 30 days to make sure nobody's leaking any information to Congress because apparently that would be embarrassing.

I mentioned to some people earlier today about the doctrine of spoliation. It's a legal doctrine that applies in courts of law. And whether in a court of law or in the court of public opinion, credibility always matters.

We have seen, this week, a briefing by people who may well have gotten their talking points from the same person or persons who altered the talking points a year ago, falsified them, and handed them to what I believe was an innocent Susan Rice and sent her out to unknowingly be a dupe to spread things that weren't true about a video when it wasn't true at all. How do we know what we get in a classified briefing if we don't know who it was that made true intelligence into lying intelligence a year ago? We need to know so we know we can have more faith in what Susan Rice, John Kerry, Secretary Hagel, General Dempsey, in the things they're saying. Where did your information come from? Is it somebody that created some of the lies we got in the past or is this a totally truthful source? It matters. It matters.

It matters when we have Christian Navy SEALs killed in Afghanistan and American flag-draped coffins are mixed with Afghan flag-draped coffins. And an American chaplain is not even allowed to pray in Jesus' name, even though a chaplain may be a Christian and be taught that Jesus said, "If you ask for it in my name, it will be given." Being prevented—as the First Amendment said the Federal Government should never do—from freely exercising his religious beliefs, and then compounding the problem by bringing an imam in Afghanistan to stand and give a Muslim prayer over our SEALs that includes basically the words that, in the name of Allah, the merciful forgiver, the companions of hell, where the sinners and infidels are fodder for hellfire, are not equal with the companions of Heaven. The Muslim companions of Heaven are always the winners. We let an imam speak in his language, say words that, when examined, appear to be gloating over the dead Navy SEALs that should have never been allowed to take off in that chopper, that should never have been allowed to stay on after the Afghans pulled out the Afghan soldiers on the manifest and put other Afghan soldiers on that apparently were disposable to them. It should have stopped there.

There were so many places it should have stopped. But we can't get all the answers about that, how it came about, why our best and brightest were put in harm's way. We can't really get to the truth as to why a good man—I've spoken with him personally, privately; I like him very much—Leon Panetta,

why he would tell people who did not have security clearances that it was SEAL Team Six that took out Osama bin Laden; why JOE BIDEN, as Vice President, I know he meant no harm to our SEAL Team Six, but when he outs a SEAL team as the one that took out Osama bin Laden. And as one SEAL called his mother and said, Mom, you've got to get my name off all of our family stuff online; we've been outed. One parent said his daughter-in-law looked out the window right after Vice President BIDEN outed his SEAL team took out Osama bin Laden, the Marines had provided her a guard because they knew what it meant. It meant this administration had exposed our valiant fighting forces, our SEALs, to danger they should never have been in.

This is a day of remembrance, but if it is not used to get to the bottom of what happened a year ago and what has happened in the 12 intervening years since then, find out where we've made our mistakes so that we can correct them so that we do not have more Boston bombings or attempts like we had in Times Square—thank God for local police and people paying attention there. And thank goodness for a sweaty rear end of a bomber that was prepared to take out a plane and was attempting to do so on Christmas.

The Divine Providence, as our Founders and George Washington so often referred to as God's overseeing, will not protect us forever when we will not protect ourselves. God is good all the time. All the time God is good. But it's time to be better friends to our friends. It's time to stand up and be better enemies to our enemies. It's time that the blood of those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice was honored with the truth.

I hope and pray in the days ahead we will have the resolve, as Members of Congress across the aisle, to stand firm and say, Give us the truth. We don't care who is made to look bad, Republican or Democrat, let the chips fall where they may. The blood of our devoted, life-giving patriots cries out for truth. Let's finally get to it.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1545

LOW-WAGE WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, I am here to present a conversation that we would like to share with the American public, which is the plight of low-wage workers.

The Progressive Caucus here in Congress has worked on this issue for many years. This last month, when Members went home and worked in the district for the month, we joined many of these low-wage workers in a day of strike as a way to present their case to the American people.

Too many people are paid too little for the work they do. That harms families in this country; that depresses the economy in this country; and that makes more people have to go to government assistance because they're simply not paid enough for the work that they're doing.

We all know that economy has had a lot of tough times in the last several years, but things are getting better. The problem is they are only getting better for some.

We know that corporate profits have continued to break records, while Americans are working harder and getting paid less. We know that the stock markets are close to all time highs and corporate profits are booming. The \$200 billion-a-year fast food industry is doing extremely well in this country, and our workers are more than pulling their weight to help in these successes.

Over the past 30 years, the productivity of the American worker has increased 85 percent, however, the salaries that they get paid simply haven't kept up in pace.

Mr. Speaker, why is the economy stuck? Why aren't these people making more money? Why is it that while so many who are in the top 1 percent, the top 10 percent, are doing extremely well, somehow those financial returns haven't trickled down to the rest of the economy?

We know the incomes of the top 1 percent have grown by more than 31 percent since 2009, just in the last several years—a 31 percent increase—yet incomes for the bottom 99 percent have moved less than 1 percent. That inequality is what is causing the real problem that we have.

In order to have the economy truly prosper and truly recover, we have to make sure that all people are benefiting and that all people see an additional wage. Wages have been stagnant for a generation, as the minimum wage right now in real terms is \$1 less than it was in 1980. But yet the fastest-growing jobs in the economy are also those same jobs—they're the lowest paid. Fast food, retail, home health, child care, and security jobs are growing, but they don't pay enough to cover the basic necessities like food, clothing, and rent.

So how much is enough? Many of these people are working across the country at \$7.25 an hour. Now, if you take that times 2,080, which is the number of full-time equivalent hours in a year, that's about \$15,080 a year for a full-time worker on minimum wage. For a couple both earning that, that's

a little over \$30,000. If you have a family, a couple of children, you're not even close to the median income of \$51,144 in this country.

But what makes this number even tougher is when you look at the actual cost of living. The Economic Policy Institute has said that the cost per year of maintaining a modest standard of living for a typical family of four—they figured that out across the country, including in my home city of Madison, Wisconsin, home of Bucky Badger—and these numbers are written in stone—this is what the costs are on average:

If you live in Madison, Wisconsin, your average costs are likely over \$75,000 a year for a family of four. That's a breakdown of housing is about \$10,668; food another \$9,048; child care for that family \$18,312; transportation \$7,284; other necessities a little over \$5,000; and their taxes are about \$6,900.

Now, that's for Madison, Wisconsin, the middle of America. But what about other places? Well, Milwaukee, a bigger city, but still in my State, \$74,000 is that expense. In New York City, it's over \$94,000 for that same low-wage worker, that same minimum-wage worker. And one of the best deals for a major city across the country, Atlanta, it's still almost \$62,000 a year, almost double what an average couple could make on minimum wage.

Now, I know some of the myths that are out there. People say a minimum-wage worker is someone who's living at home, probably going to school, under 18, just for pocket change, right? That's the myth. We've heard that more than enough.

Well, here's the reality. According to the Economic Policy Institute, what is that minimum-wage worker actually? What's their demographic? What's the profile? Well, first of all, 88 percent are over 20 years of age—88 percent. So really it's a small token percent that is that average high school student making minimum wage. A third of them are over 40 years old. So a full third of the lowest-paid workers are over 40 years old. The average age, 35 years old. Twenty-eight percent of those lowest-paid workers have children. So when we talk about that family of four, we are talking about it because the statistics are there. Twenty-eight percent have children. Fifty-five percent of them are full-time workers. So this isn't something on the side for some extra pocket change. This is the full-time job that they have at that minimum wage. On average, over half of them earn half of their family income based on that minimum wage job. Over 43 percent of them have some kind of college education.

So that's the reality. When you look at that worker, that's the real demographic. This isn't that high school kid staying with their parents making some extra money so they can go buy

another CD or some new toy. This in reality is the living sustenance for many of these workers across the country.

Yet, if you look at just one of the fast food companies, their CEO makes 580 times what that low-income worker is making at that very same company. Now, if you just raise that wage to \$10.10, you would literally lift 6 million of these people out of poverty—6 million people, you could literally have a significant change in their lives.

Now, let's look at the economy and what this means. We know that while wages have been stagnant, the price of housing in the United States has doubled since the early '80s. Safe, adequate housing has become less and less affordable to someone who makes minimum wage.

But let's look at some of the consequences of that person making \$7.25 an hour. First of all, it's bad for families. If you can't support your family and your children on that wage, like we just talked about—rent, food, medicine, housing—the most basic costs that you have are more than they could possibly make on that.

Second, it's bad for the deficit. Low-wage workers often qualify for food stamps and other public assistance while big profitable corporations are forcing taxpayers to subsidize their low wages and burden our economy.

In Wisconsin alone, there is one employer that has a majority of folks who are on our low-income assistance health program. A majority of folks who should be getting that support from their job instead are on our public assistance program for health insurance.

Now, thankfully, the Affordable Care Act is going to make sure that more and more people in this country have access to health care. But the reality is we are subsidizing those people right now, each and every one of us, because those big corporations that are having record profits and CEOs making hundreds of times what that low-wage worker makes are doing well and yet we are paying for it.

Also, it's bad for the economy. That means in the local economy if you don't have people spending money in this current economy, that's what's holding us back. I truly believe a rising tide lifts all boats. If we increase that wage, whether it be \$9 that the President proposed, \$10.10, \$15, whatever wage we ultimately have a debate about, you raise that, that money that that low-wage worker has is not going to be invested, it's not going to be held in savings. It's very likely going to be spent in the economy just to get by on the day-to-day expenses. But that builds the entire economy. If they are able to occasionally go to a movie or maybe go to a restaurant, not the fast food one they work at, and have a dinner, that's going to help stimulate the

economy for everyone. So, again, we hold back our economy by those low-wage workers not making more.

Finally, I think what this country really is about is opportunity. This takes away that opportunity to grow the middle class from the middle out and from the bottom up. How do we help those people get that chance, that opportunity for their family that many of us have, but they're not able to because they're stuck at that job at \$7.25 an hour, yet they have the expenses we all have?

Now, at the same time, during this, CEO pay has skyrocketed. We know that the average CEO between 1978 and 2012, their compensation grew, according to an article in *The Huffington Post*, 876 percent. Now, during the same period, worker compensation grew 5.4 percent.

Income inequality is a huge problem in this country. If we don't address it at some point, these stagnant wages that haven't kept up with the cost of living, haven't kept up with the cost of housing, we are going to have real and serious problems for our economy for each and every person.

In fact, the average CEO right now makes 354 times what that low-wage worker makes—354 times. That fast food worker, their CEO made 580 times. But we have to make sure that everyone prospers in this country, and everyone prospers in this economy.

□ 1600

We have to make sure that families can cover their basic needs, that we can lessen the need for public assistance and help reduce our deficit. We can put more money in the pockets of workers instead of corporate CEOs and, thus, more money in the pockets of our small businesses, which are going to benefit when they're spending that additional money. We can lift up our local economies and, by doing that, lift up our local communities—having safer, better, healthier communities by people having more money.

That's why the members of the Progressive Caucus stood with those low-wage workers in this last month, in August, when they took a day of strike. They didn't go to work for part of the day or for the whole day in order to illustrate the problems that they're facing, and we across the country stood with them to support a fair wage for a full day's work. In more than 50 cities across the country, members of the Progressive Caucus and other Democrats joined with these low-paid workers to make sure we talked about their stories. I'd just like to read a couple of quotes from people who participated in this.

One was a gentleman from Milwaukee, Wisconsin, who was 45 years old, a low-paid worker, and this is what he said:

I'm a maintenance man at McDonald's. When my grandbabies come over on the

weekend, I spend on them, making sure that they eat and are comfortable. I eat McDonald's the last 2 weeks of the month because I have no food left.

Is that the America that, I think, we value; the land of opportunity so that every family can prosper?

Let me read another one. This is from a worker in New York City, and she said:

On some days, I've been up for 48 hours straight, and McDonald's makes billions of dollars every year.

Now, think about that. That person, who very likely may have children—28 percent of those people who are making minimum wage do—was up for 48 hours straight. How do you do that? How do you make that work?

So we have tried to stand up on behalf of the low-paid workers and say it's time we address this issue. The President said we need to raise the minimum wage. Democrats have said we need to raise the minimum wage. People across the country—business owners and others—have said that it's time to increase the minimum wage. I served 14 years in the Wisconsin legislature before I was here. Every single time that we increased the minimum wage in Wisconsin we had more people enter the workforce.

As the statistics from the Economic Policy Institute said, this isn't about high school kids earning a little extra pocket change while living at home, which is 12 percent of that population. This is about getting real people into the workforce, earning money, putting it back into the economy, supporting their families, and doing exactly what we need to do with the economy.

When we did this across the country, we were very, very fortunate to have someone who has been a real role model for many of us who are progressives across the country in elected office, someone from the city of Chicago or outside the city of Chicago, but a real leader in the progressive movement in Congress and, again, someone who has been a real leader for many of us for the many years that we've been in government.

I would like to yield, Mr. Speaker, to Representative JAN SCHAKOWSKY from the Chicago area.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Thank you, Representative POCAN, for leading us in this Special Order that really talks about so many Americans who are paid poverty wages, people who simply cannot afford to support themselves or their families on the kinds of wages that they are paid, and the role of the Progressive Caucus in helping them to highlight that.

So, on August 29, I was proud at 7 in the morning to arrive at the Rock-n-Roll McDonald's in downtown Chicago. It's one of the most profitable McDonald's, certainly, in our area. I saw a growing crowd of people wearing T-shirts, saying, Strike for 15, and signs

that said, We are worth more. In Illinois, the minimum wage is \$8.25, so some of them were chanting, We can't survive on \$8.25, and they were engaged in this 1-day strike, the demand being \$15 an hour and the right to join a union, to form a union.

\$15 an hour to work at McDonald's?

If you were to work at McDonald's for 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year—and of course the average employee there works about 24 hours a week—you would at minimum wage make the lavish salary of \$31,000 a year, which starts heading you toward the middle class, but it's certainly not a huge salary. Compare that with the CEO of McDonald's, a man named Donald Thompson, whose pay package last year in 2012 was \$13.7 million for the year. If you divide that out, he makes an hourly wage of \$6,611, and he earns more in the first 2 hours of work on the first day of the year than the workers I was standing with make all year long. Now, these weren't kids. I was out there with some people who have worked at McDonald's for 10 years, 15 years. One gentleman was still making \$8.50 an hour. He had climbed up from the minimum wage to \$8.50 an hour.

Unless you think that McDonald's isn't thinking about its workers, they actually put out a book, a little book, in conjunction with Visa, called "Practical Money Skills," which is going to help their workers figure out how to budget. They have a budget that lists income from a worker's first job and his second job, admitting that you certainly can't plan to work at McDonald's and live on that, so you have to have a second job—so the first job and second job—all totaling \$2,060 for the month.

Then they have recommended monthly expenses to help their workers budget, including \$600 a month for housing. Now, I don't know about Madison, Wisconsin, or anywhere else, but in Chicago, unless you live with somebody—or with maybe a couple of somebodies—\$600 a month for two jobs and budgeting that way is not going to get you a decent place to live. Remarkably, they budget \$20 per month for health insurance, and that exists only in some sort of fantasy world.

These are workers who often turn to government assistance just to make ends meet. These are the people who have often been demonized by our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle for going for SNAP programs, maybe for housing assistance, for Medicaid. Lots of wealthy Americans and even some of our colleagues suggest we ought to test them for drug use or accuse them of being lazy; but I posit today that the real welfare kings are those fast-food giants and all those poverty-wage employers who refuse to pay a livable wage, a living wage. We, the taxpayers—all the rest of the taxpayers—subsidize them because they

don't pay a living wage, so their employees, who are often working their tails off, often have to come to the government for help. I would argue that it's the Walmarts and the McDonald's that really depend on these welfare programs and that, if you want to divide the world into takers and makers, those companies and those CEOs are the real takers.

If I have time, I want to give a couple more facts.

This hasn't always been true in America, these poverty wages. Between 1948 and 1973, the productivity of U.S. workers rose 96.8 percent, and wages rose 93.7 percent. They went up together. Workers benefited from increases in productivity, and that's true of the wages of the managers and bosses and CEOs as well. Wages went up. Between 1973 and 2011, productivity rose 80.1 percent, but wages rose only 4.2 percent. So you saw that, even though productivity went up, wages stayed essentially flat. Median household income today, adjusted for inflation, is at 1989 levels, and it's not coincidental that during that same time union membership dropped from about one-third of the private sector workforce to about 6.5 percent today; nor is it coincidental that almost all the growth in income—and, yes, we are richer today per capita than ever before. We are at the richest point in our country, but that growth in income has gone, really, especially to the top .1 percent, to the very richest Americans. All of that growth in income has gone to the top.

So I think this is not just bad for the workers that we were out with this summer. This is really bad for our economy. If we want to have a robust middle class, where people can go out and buy things and create demand and, thus, create jobs, they would be the real makers. They would be the people who could revive our economy. I think that the essentials here are a living wage and the rights of workers to be able to collectively bargain so that they can defend themselves together, represent themselves together and get a decent middle class life in this richest country in the world, which is at its very richest stage right now.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative SCHAKOWSKY.

In fact, when you talked about that, according to the Economic Policy Institute, the average family expense for a typical family in Chicago is \$73,055. That \$600 allotment for rent is hardly enough. That \$20 for health care will get you a bottle of orange juice and maybe some Band-Aids, but I don't know if I'd call that health care.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. It's like flossing and praying, and that's about it.

Mr. POCAN. You're not going to get much.

I really appreciate what you said about the fact that a business owner

can benefit. I've been a small business owner for 25 years. When I opened my small business, I had hair—it's been a long time—and I can tell you that, when you treat your employees well, everyone benefits. When they make more money, that helps as they're invested in the company, and they're able to support their families. If they have health insurance, they're able to make sure that everyone is healthy in their families. If their families are good, they're good. There are many benefits. Yet when you get to the factor of almost what we'd call greed—when you get to 580 times the salary of that low-paid worker, like the CEO of McDonald's makes—that's a problem across the country.

So I really appreciate what you've brought up and specifically your example from Chicago because, in Madison, we've actually got it slightly higher, about \$75,000 a year. When they broke out those expenses, they were talking housing of about \$10,668, transportation \$7,200, food \$9,000, taxes \$6,900. When you go through that, it's absolutely impossible to live on that minimum wage. Yet, as you said, you were with a bunch of people who were adults who were working at these places. Again, according to the Economic Policy Institute, 88 percent of the people are over 20 years old. The average age of a minimum-wage worker is 35 years old. So the myth that's out there about that low-income worker is simply not true.

Representative SCHAKOWSKY, I wonder if you might be able to just share a little bit more, based on the years you've been here, about exactly what some of the costs are to the local government and to the State government and to the Federal Government that come out of these workers having to come for subsidies, because, as you know, there are various programs that so often get attacked, sometimes by the people on the other side of the aisle. Like you said, there is the SNAP program that they're trying to provide an almost \$40 billion cut to in the next budget if they have their way. There would be even less available for those people who need the subsidy thanks to those companies. I wonder if you could just share a little more about that.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I'll tell you that I have three times now done the SNAP challenge, or the food stamp challenge. The average SNAP benefit is now \$4.50 a day. Almost everyone on the SNAP program is on there for less than a year. It has been described to me by a former SNAP recipient as a trampoline. Nobody wants to do it, and they certainly don't want to line up at a food pantry, and those cupboards are really having a problem being filled.

□ 1615

It is hard to do. You can get the calories, but getting the nutrition and the

health that you need from the food, that is really hard to do.

People are reluctant to apply for these benefits. I wish they weren't, but there's still some stigma attached to that. I want to encourage people, by the way, that if they are eligible, they should get that for the sake of their children and their own health.

States are struggling right now to meet their Medicaid budgets because there are so many people who are not getting health care through their employer or can't afford it on their own, so they are turning to State and local governments. We're finding that those governments are having to decide about fixing the roads, hiring teachers, or being able to provide these kinds of benefits.

The same kinds of decisions that individual poor people are having to make, governments are having to make right now. But if only they were paid a decent wage for all the hours that they're willing to put in to get up early and get on that bus.

Let me just tell you that I went into McDonald's with some of the workers. They had six things that they were asking for. Listen to the modest requests:

Stop requiring employees to pay out of pocket if their cash registers are short;

Two, show respect to your employees—less shouting and insulting language;

Three, air-conditioning in the kitchen;

Four, permit employees to drink water when the kitchen gets too hot. That one threw me for a big loop. They, said, "No, they're saying, 'Get back to work. You can't have a drink of water.'" They put it on paper. It's not made up;

Five, give raises and provide living wages;

Listen to this one: stop requiring employees to pay out of pocket for food that is returned by customers.

The whole event was very peaceful. No one at McDonald's was there to accept it, so they left these demands on the counter.

There is one other little point I want to make. This was during the week that we were commemorating the 50th anniversary of the march for jobs and freedom, the March on Washington. The march sought to "give all Americans a decent standard of living," and called for a minimum wage of \$2 an hour. If you adjust that \$2-an-hour request from 1963, that would equal \$15.26 an hour, which is just about what the workers are asking for right now.

The least that we could do here in this Congress is raise the minimum wage in this country, which hasn't been raised for a long time. You probably have that number. I don't remember how long it's been. A \$7.25-an-hour minimum wage in this country just doesn't make it.

I also believe we need to do more to guarantee workers the right to organize. I believe that organized labor helped to deliver us the middle class, and I think that workers organized will be able to rejuvenate our middle class and make these just and reasonable demands a reality.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative SCHAKOWSKY, for your many years of advocacy on behalf of the low-wage worker.

When you talked about businessowners, one of the things I think about as someone who's been in business my entire adult life is just the fact that you always call us "job creators." I like to think of the consumer as the job creator. When I have someone buying from my business, that allows me to be able to hire someone. If we help people have more money in their pocket, they're the job creators. Each and every one of those people are the job creators we're talking about.

Again, thank you so much.

We've been joined by another strong progressive, Representative RICK NOLAN from Minnesota. I know that he also has been an outspoken advocate when it comes to the plight of the low-wage workers, and I would like to yield to Representative RICK NOLAN from northern Minnesota.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin by commending and complimenting the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman POCAN, for the work that you're doing here in highlighting this important issue. There's so much to be said that one is not sure where to begin. You've provided a lot of the facts and a lot of the information, as have some of the other Members here.

I'd like to just speak to the issue in a more general sense. To be sure, what's happening in this country has to be reversed. The rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer, and the middle class is getting crushed. Corporations and banks are sitting on trillions of dollars.

I'm a business guy. If there's a business opportunity out there, you invest in it; but if the middle class is broke, can't buy the goods and services, you're just going to sit on your cash and you're not going to invest if there aren't customers there for your product. This is not only good for middle America and for poor people, raising the minimum wage is going to be so important for our whole economy.

When I started my entry into the employment market, the ratio of executive compensation to that of the worker was 25 to 1. I just read recently today that the ratio is 273 to 1. To my point, the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. We've just seen some numbers on the percentage of income that's earned by the upper 1 percent and by the upper 10 percent, and they're earning all the revenue.

I would like to suggest that everybody, if they haven't done it yet, take a look at the Bill Moyers film that was done in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, following the lives of two families. It was quite remarkable. Hats off to Bill Moyers for his vision in understanding how valuable a film like this could be because he followed two good, hard-working families playing by all of the rules, doing everything right, going to church on Sunday, not living extravagantly, no speedboats in their driveway, living in modest housing in wonderful modest communities.

He followed them as they were entering into the employment market 22 years ago. They had good-paying manufacturing jobs in the \$25 to \$30 range. They had benefits and retirement. Both families, all the mothers and fathers, ended up losing their jobs, not through the failure to show up to work, but because tax and trade policies had shifted those manufacturing jobs overseas to another country. Through no fault of their own, they found themselves unemployed.

Well, they struggled, and over a period of months they managed to find other jobs. Now they were back down in the \$12 to \$16 range, and in many cases they had lost benefits, but they were content. They just took an extra job here and there and wherever they could. Wouldn't you know, those jobs ended up being moved overseas because of our tax and our trade policies, and this time they had an even harder time finding employment. You could see all the stresses that—because Moyers was going back and visiting these people every year or two and recording what was happening in their lives, you could see the stress that was being created.

In one of the families—oh, gosh, to see these two young kids in love in their youth and to see the young man go into a tailspin of depression at not being able to provide for his family and the conflict that ended up in divorce. He was hanging out with buddies at the end trying to pick up odd jobs here and there, and his wife is living in a spare bedroom in an apartment with a friend. The other couple, the guy is out picking up garbage. Then he showed what happened. They all lost their homes. It also showed what happened to the entire community. All the homes were boarded up. The neighborhood was in shambles because they had all been foreclosed. It was just a classic example of how we have failed these people.

In my judgment, here's what we did:

In our parents' time, at least my age group and maybe your grandparents, the average life expectancy in this country was 47; today, it's pushing 80. That is remarkable progress, especially for the two oldest guys here in the freshman class. Then we did a whole bunch of things. We looked, and the rivers and lakes were catching on fire; acid rain was destroying the forest and

the lakes. I had people in my district whose lives were over. When they were 25 and 30 working in boat factories and for want of ventilation, their lungs were full of fiberglass, and so they couldn't breathe.

Anyway, we did all these things. We set up some good rules for environmental protection. We set up some good rules for health and safety. We insisted on Medicare for our elderly and workers' comp and unemployment comp and Social Security. We put a tremendous amount of burden for all of that on our business community, our manufacturing sector. I know about that. I spent the last 32 years of my life in business, manufacturing.

Then we said to all the manufacturers, Oh, by the way, now you're going to have to go compete with people in countries where they don't have to do any of that. It wasn't fair. It couldn't work. I'm not necessarily faulting corporations for moving overseas, but I am faulting the people responsible for the public policies that allowed that to happen.

The first thing that we have to do here, in my judgment, is to raise the minimum wage. It's not a cure-all, but it's a good beginning to put some money back in the hands of low-income and middle America. There are also so many other things that we need to do.

I just learned in one of our committees they were going to spend \$89 billion in Afghanistan this year on infrastructure projects. I read in the Times one project was \$299 million. Fifty brave young American men and women lost their lives securing the area for this hydroelectric project. And for every one that is killed, there is another six or seven that are maimed and harmed for life. Well, this project has now been abandoned because the locals kept blowing it up as fast as we could secure the area and build it.

We need to start reinvesting in our own infrastructure, our bridges, our roads, our communities, our educational system, investing in our people. We're going bankrupt here on these wars of choice, in this nation-building abroad. We're destroying what made America a great country, a middle class, a place where there was opportunity for everybody. If you showed up and you wanted to work hard, there was a job for you. I submit, in my generation, if you wanted to be a failure, hell, you had to have a plan. There were just so many jobs and so many good-paying jobs and so many opportunities. And that's what we're losing, and that's what we have to get back to in this country. I think we can start by raising the minimum wage.

I am so thrilled to be able to join you and my colleagues in urging the leadership here to bring this measure before the Congress. Let us have the debate. Let us have a vote on it. Let us see if we can't move this country forward.

Let us see if we can't do something for the middle class here, and then let's follow that up with a good, healthy debate on what kind of a trade policy we are going to have. Is it going to be totally free, or is it going to be fair trade that recognizes the accomplishments that we've made here with a determination to keep moving that progress forward?

Also, let's have a good look at the tax policies, too. The fact is anyone who has examined it knows that clearly the richest and most powerful people in this country pay a much lower percentage of their income in taxes than the average person. They just did an analysis in Minnesota here a while back. The average person making between \$30,000 and \$50,000 pays 31 percent of their income in a variety of taxes—Social Security, income, real estate, gas taxes, the whole works.

□ 1630

The average millionaire is only paying 13 percent. Well, that's not fair. Nobody's suggesting here that we should penalize the rich for their success. On the contrary, we want everybody to be successful in this country, but we also want everybody to pay their fair share. So there's no one easy, simple solution to what we're looking at here, but we can start with raising the minimum wage, and then let's go after the tax policy and let's go after the trade policy. Let's institute some fairness in this country. Let's rebuild the middle class, let's restore the American Dream where there's opportunity for everyone—everyone who's willing to go to work, play by the rules, work hard, and go to work every day. That's the America we grew up with. That's the America that we want to leave behind when we pass on to the big country. Thank you.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Congressman NOLAN. Again, thank you for your many years of devotion to helping raise the economy for every single person so they can really have access to that opportunity you talk about. We have a lot to do in Congress. I think we will have a chance to talk about trade and other policies later this year. But you're right, the first and most fair thing that we could possibly do, that we have control in this room to do, is to raise the minimum wage. The President has asked for it. The Democrats have asked for it. It's time we have a vote so we ensure that you don't live in poverty working that job or working two jobs or three jobs trying to get by, because that's exactly what happens.

I would like to yield to another colleague who has spoken out in his district and across his home State of California not only on behalf of low-wage workers but also someone who is a strong environmentalist.

I yield to Representative ALAN LOWENTHAL.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. First, I want to say that I stand with you, and I'm so glad that you've raised this issue about the crisis that is occurring to working families in America, and, as was just pointed out, the tremendous crash and burden on the middle class, who are rapidly becoming low-wage workers because of our policies in this country. I agree completely that the first step that we have to do is to raise the minimum wage and have that discussion and really provide and demonstrate that this Congress really cares about working people in America. That's our first thing.

But I'm also glad that you've given me an opportunity this afternoon to talk about one other issue that is not really directly related to this issue, and that has to do with environmental issues.

I just want to report to my colleagues that later this month the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which is the leading international climate science body with over 195 member countries, is going to be releasing a report which will predict that the planet's average global temperature will increase by more than 2 degrees Celsius over the next century. Not only does this report issue new warnings about continued warming, but it asserts that the scientific community can now claim with 95 percent certainty that the warming is a by-product of human activity.

Yet in this House of Representatives, the majority party continues to ignore the warnings of the scientific community. Over the past 2 years, this Congress has done absolutely nothing to address climate change. Republicans in the House voted to overturn EPA's scientific findings that climate change endangers health and the environment. They voted to block U.S. participation in international climate change negotiations, and they voted to stop the agencies from even preparing for the effects of climate change.

Just yesterday, Republicans on the Energy and Commerce Committee revealed that they are preparing to introduce legislation aimed at preventing EPA from limiting the amount of CO₂ emitted from coal-fired power plants.

This is a mistake.

Mr. Speaker, we need to be moving ahead with policies aimed at encouraging alternative sources of energy, preparing for the worst effects of climate change. We need policies that are not written by the coal lobby. We must take action. And I must remind you, just as you raised these issues about the effect of the economy on our middle class and our lack of preparation of working families, that the people that are the most affected are the people that have the least ability to deal with climate change, and they are working Americans.

It is all related. We must protect working Americans, and the way we do

it is to not only acknowledge some of the effects of climate change but really to give working families the tools that they need so that they can survive. And more than survive, so they can prosper in this society. That's what this is all about.

I thank you for raising this issue, and I am glad to show support.

Mr. POCAN. I thank Representative LOWENTHAL. On behalf of the Progressive Caucus, thank you for showing some of the other issues we're working on. We're fighting for equality for every single person across the country. We want everyone to have access to democracy. We need to have meaningful campaign finance reform, from the Citizens United decision to every single candidate for Congress and how we fund our campaigns.

We need to make sure every single person has the right to vote in this country, something that because of the recent Supreme Court decision isn't guaranteed.

But one thing the Progressive Caucus today really wanted to highlight, and we have made the case, why we joined so many workers across the country in the month of August who are getting paid minimum wage, who are barely getting by, who aren't being treated fairly in their workplace: we literally have too many people who are paid too little for the work they do. As Representative NOLAN said, the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. It's not a talking point, it's a fact. It's the actual statistics that are out there.

If we're going to help people support their families, if we're going to help support the economy, if we're really going to take people off of government assistance, the very ones who are working and yet having to be on government assistance because of the low wage they make, there's a simple answer, and that's increase the minimum

wage. That's what we came here to talk about today, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Progressive Caucus. We appreciate having the time to talk about the plight of the low-wage worker and why we need to raise the minimum wage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2013, 2014 AND THE 10-YEAR PERIOD FY 2014 THROUGH FY 2023

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, Office of the Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal years 2013, 2014 and for the 10-year period of fiscal year 2014 through fiscal year 2023. This status report is current through September 6, 2013.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

Table 1 in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the overall limits set in H. Con. Res. 112 (112th Congress) for fiscal year 2013 and H. Con. Res. 25 (113th Congress) for fiscal year 2014 and the 10-year period of fiscal year 2014 through 2023. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2014 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

Table 2 compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for action completed by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under

H. Con. Res. 112 (112th Congress) for fiscal year 2013 and H. Con. Res. 25 (113th Congress) for fiscal years 2014 and the 10-year period 2014 through 2023. "Action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

Table 3 compares the current status of discretionary appropriations for fiscal years 2013 and 2014 with the "section 302(b)" sub-allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation. The table also provides supplementary information on spending in excess of the base discretionary spending caps allowed under section 251(b) of the Budget Control Act.

Table 4 gives the current level for fiscal year 2015 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 601 of H. Con. Res. 25. This list is needed to enforce section 601 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

In addition, letters from the Congressional Budget Office are attached that summarize and compare the budget impact of enacted legislation during the FY2013 and FY2014 fiscal years against the budget resolution aggregates in force during those years.

If you have any questions, please contact Paul Restuccia.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

TABLE 1—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 AND 2014 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET AS ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 112 AND H. CON. RES. 25

[Reflecting Action Completed as of September 6, 2013 (On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars).]

	Fiscal Year 2013 ¹	Fiscal Year 2014 ²	Fiscal Years 2014–2023
Appropriate Level:			
Budget Authority	2,793,848	2,761,492	n.a.
Outlays	2,891,589	2,811,568	n.a.
Revenues	2,089,540	2,310,972	31,089,081
Current Level:			
Budget Authority	3,021,853	1,903,186	n.a.
Outlays	3,065,784	2,319,366	n.a.
Revenues	2,015,873	2,310,972	31,089,081
Current Level over (+) / under (–)			
Appropriate Level:			
Budget Authority	+228,005	–858,306	n.a.
Outlays	+174,195	–492,202	n.a.
Revenues	–74,667	0	0

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Act for fiscal years 2015 through 2023 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

¹ The appropriate level for FY2013 was established in H. Con. Res. 112, which was subsequently deemed to be in force in the House of Representatives pursuant to H. Res. 5. The current level for FY2013 starts with the baseline estimates contained in Updated Budget Projection: Fiscal Years 2013 to 2022, published by the Congressional Budget Office, and makes adjustments to those levels for enacted legislation.

² The appropriate level for FY2014 was established in H. Con. Res. 25, which was subsequently deemed to be in force in the House of Representatives pursuant to H. Res. 243. The current level for FY 2014 starts with the baseline estimates contained in Updated Budget Projections: Fiscal Years 2013 to 2023, published by the Congressional Budget Office, and makes adjustments to those levels for enacted legislation.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION

TABLE 2—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES

[Reflecting Action Completed as of September 6, 2013 (Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars).]

House Committee	2013		2014		2014–2023	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:						
Allocation	–1,577	–1,503	–2,631	–2,501	–209,044	–208,556
Current Level	–106	–106	0	0	0	0
Difference	+1,471	+1,397	+2,631	+2,501	+209,044	+208,556
Armed Services:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	+77	+94	0	0	0	0
Difference	+77	+94	0	0	0	0
Education and the Workforce:						
Allocation	–18,098	–7,096	–21,712	–7,430	–217,458	–198,921
Current Level	+16,870	+11,355	+14,400	+12,670	+16,770	+8,795
Difference	+34,968	+18,451	+36,112	+20,100	+200,688	+190,126
Energy and Commerce:						
Allocation	–20,137	–4,661	–22,996	–20,659	–1,604,166	–1,596,356
Current Level	+9,762	+11,695	0	0	0	0
Difference	+29,899	+16,356	+22,996	+20,659	+1,604,166	+1,596,356
Financial Services:						
Allocation	–8,562	–8,495	–11,465	–10,428	–94,439	–94,325
Current Level	+5,245	+5,245	0	0	0	0
Difference	+13,807	+13,740	+11,465	+10,428	+94,439	+94,325
Foreign Affairs:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:						
Allocation	0	0	–305	–305	–12,575	–12,575
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	+305	+305	+12,575	+12,575
House Administration:						
Allocation	0	0	–34	0	–295	–130
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	+34	0	+295	+130
Judiciary:						
Allocation	–8,490	–594	–11,506	–637	–47,461	–45,809
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	+8,490	+594	+11,506	+637	+47,461	+45,809
Natural Resources:						
Allocation	–460	–229	–900	–632	–17,995	–17,225
Current Level	+259	+596	0	0	–5	–5
Difference	+719	+825	+900	+632	+17,990	+17,220
Oversight and Government Reform:						
Allocation	–8,146	–8,113	–11,758	–11,758	–165,996	–165,996
Current Level	–9	–9	0	0	0	0
Difference	+8,137	+8,104	+11,758	+11,758	+165,996	+165,996
Science, Space and Technology:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Small Business:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:						
Allocation	–36,626	–9,354	–78	–47	–116,444	–951
Current Level	+6,588	+6,200	0	0	0	0
Difference	+43,214	+15,554	+78	+47	+116,444	+951
Veterans' Affairs:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	–36	–36	0	0	0	0
Difference	–36	–36	0	0	0	0
Ways and Means:						
Allocation	–5,970	–8,211	–22,567	–21,667	–1,298,202	–1,291,946
Current Level	+23,031	+23,031	0	0	0	0
Difference	+29,001	+31,242	+22,567	+21,667	+1,298,202	+1,291,946

TABLE 3—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013—COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2013

[Figures in millions]¹

	302(b) allocations (H. Rept. 112–465)		302(b) for GWOT		Current status as of August 1, 2013		Current status GWOT		Current status less 302(b)		Current status GWOT less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	19,405	22,759	0	0	20,531	22,910	0	0	+1,126	+151	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	51,129	62,853	0	0	50,210	62,708	0	0	–919	–145	0	0
Defense	519,220	573,770	88,480	48,420	517,632	572,413	87,226	48,044	–1,588	–1,357	–1,254	–376
Energy and Water Development	32,098	40,682	0	0	36,744	41,350	0	0	+4,646	+668	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	21,150	23,939	0	0	21,453	24,370	0	0	+303	+431	0	0
Homeland Security	44,598	45,194	0	0	51,385	46,785	254	203	+6,787	+1,591	+254	+203
Interior, Environment	28,000	31,058	0	0	29,827	31,583	0	0	+1,827	+525	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	150,002	162,699	0	0	157,355	167,544	0	0	+7,353	+4,845	0	0
Legislative Branch	4,289	4,381	0	0	4,284	4,315	0	0	–5	–66	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	71,747	79,069	0	2	71,930	79,400	0	2	+183	+331	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	40,132	48,569	8,245	2,454	42,093	49,660	11,203	3,510	+1,961	+1,091	+2,958	+1,056
Transportation, HUD	51,606	115,161	0	0	51,817	115,117	0	0	+211	–44	0	0
Full Committee Allowance	2	0	0	249	0	0	0	0	–2	0	0	–249
Total	1,033,377	1,210,134	96,725	51,125	1,055,261	1,218,155	98,683	51,759	+21,883	+8,021	+1,958	+634
Comparison 302(a) and Total Appropriations¹							BA	OT	BA	OT		
302(a) Allocation							1,033,377	1,210,134	96,725	51,125		
Total Appropriations							1,055,261	1,218,155	98,683	51,759		
302(a) Allocation vs. Total Appropriations							+21,884	+8,021	+1,958	+634		

Memorandum	Amounts Assumed in 302(b)		Emergency Requirements		Disaster Funding		Program Integrity	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories								
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	0	0	224	72	0	0	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	0	0	363	97	0	0	0	0
Defense	0	0	88	42	0	0	0	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0	1,889	327	0	0	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0	811	430	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security	5,481	274	6,693	283	11,779	1,453	0	0
Interior, Environment	0	0	1,443	153	0	0	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	0	0	827	108	0	0	483	430
Legislative Branch	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	0	0	261	24	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation, HUD	0	0	29,070	588	0	0	0	0
Totals	5,481	274	41,669	2,124	11,779	1,453	483	430

¹ Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown above.

TABLE 3—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2013

[Figures in millions]¹

	302(b) allocations (H. Rept. 112–465)		302(b) for GWOT		Current status as of August 1, 2013		Current status GWOT		Current status less 302(b)		Current status GWOT less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	19,450	21,300	0	0	19,450	21,294	0	0	0	–6	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	47,396	58,700	0	0	47,396	58,700	0	0	0	0	0	0
Defense	512,522	543,685	85,769	42,994	512,510	543,674	79,741	41,051	–12	–11	–6,028	–1,943
Energy and Water Development	30,426	38,363	0	0	30,414	38,369	0	0	–12	+6	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	16,966	19,711	0	0	16,966	19,707	0	0	0	–4	0	0
Homeland Security	44,617	45,961	0	0	44,617	45,961	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interior, Environment	24,278	25,207	0	0	0	12,537	0	0	–24,278	–12,670	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	121,797	133,809	0	0	24,642	104,421	0	0	–97,155	–29,388	0	0
Legislative Branch	4,124	4,085	0	0	3,233	3,385	0	0	–891	–700	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	73,320	76,204	0	0	73,320	76,204	0	0	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	34,103	36,308	6,520	5,016	34,103	41,824	6,520	2,182	0	+5,516	0	–2,834
Transportation, HUD	44,100	114,931	0	0	44,100	114,928	0	0	0	–3	0	0
Full Committee, Allowance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	973,099	1,118,264	92,289	48,010	850,751	1,081,004	86,261	43,233	–122,348	–37,260	–6,028	–4,777
Comparison 302(a) and Total Appropriations ¹									BA	OT	BA	OT
302(a) Allocation									973,099	1,118,264	92,289	48,010
Total Appropriations									850,751	1,081,004	862,610	43,233
302(a) Allocation vs. Total Appropriations									122,348	–37,260	–6,028	–4,777

Memorandum	Amounts Assumed in 302(b)		Emergency Requirements ¹		Disaster Funding		Program Integrity	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories								
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Defense	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security	5,626	281	0	0	5,626	281	0	0
Interior, Environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legislative Branch	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation, HUD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	5,626	281	0	0	5,626	281	0	0

¹ Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown above.

TABLE 4—2015 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO H. CON. RES. 25 AS OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2013
[Budget Authority in Millions of Dollars]

Section 601(d)(1) Limits	2,015
Appropriate Level	55,634
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Department of Veterans Affairs:	
Medical Services	0
Medical Support and Compliance	0
Medical Facilities	0
Subtotal, enacted advances ¹	0
Section 601(d)(2) Limits	2,015
Appropriate Level	28,852
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Employment and Training Administration	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement Programs	0

TABLE 4—2015 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO H. CON. RES. 25 AS OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2013—Continued
[Budget Authority in Millions of Dollars]

Special Education	0
Career, Technical and Adult Education	0
Tenant-based Rental Assistance	0
Project-based Rental Assistance	0
Subtotal, enacted advances ¹	0
Previously Enacted Advance Appropriations ²	2,015
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	445
Total, enacted advances ¹	445

¹ Line items may not add to total due to rounding.

² Funds were appropriated in Public Law 113–6.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2013.
Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on

the fiscal year 2014 budget and is current through September 6, 2013. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 25, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, as approved by the House of Representatives and subsequently revised.

Since my last letter dated June 20, 2013, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following act that affects budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2014: the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–28).

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF.

FISCAL YEAR 2014 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 2013

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted: ^a			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,310,972
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,848,718	1,778,493	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	504,662	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-707,692	-707,792	n.a.
Total, Previously enacted	1,141,026	1,575,363	2,310,972
Enacted Legislation:			
Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013	14,400	12,670	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	14,400	12,670	0
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	747,760	731,333	0
Total Current Level ^b	1,903,186	2,319,366	2,310,972
Total House Resolution ^c	2,761,492	2,811,568	2,310,972
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	858,306	492,202	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2014–2023:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	31,089,081
House Resolution ^d	n.a.	n.a.	31,089,081
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Note: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^a Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during this session, but before adoption of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014 (H. Con. Res. 25): an act to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the FEMA for carrying out the National Flood Insurance Program (P.L. 113–1), the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113–2), the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–5), the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113–6), and the Reducing Flight Delays Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–9).

^b For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

^c Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the totals in H. Con. Res. 25, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original House Resolution:	2,769,406	2,815,079	2,270,932
Revisions:			
Pursuant to section 603 of H. Con. Res. 25	-14,089	-4,100	40,040
Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending	5,626	281	0
Adjustment for Technical Correction to the Budget Control Act Spending Caps	549	308	0
Revised House Resolution	2,761,492	2,811,568	2,310,972

^d Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the 2014–2023 revenue totals in H. Con. Res. 25, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2013.
Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2013 budget and is current through September 6, 2013. This report is

submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 112, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2013, as approved by the House of Representatives and subsequently revised.

Since my last letter dated June 20, 2013, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following act that affects budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2013: the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–28).

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,

Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2013 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 2013

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted: ^a			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,293,339
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,869,081	1,818,079	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	553,169	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-729,799	-729,799	n.a.
Total, Previously enacted	1,139,282	1,641,449	2,293,339
Enacted Legislation:			
Authorizing Legislation:			
Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012 (P.L. 112–121)	0	0	1
Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (P.L. 112–114)	8,795	9,439	2,291
Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act (P.L. 112–144)	-16	-16	0
Honoring American's Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act of 2012 (P.L. 112–154)	-36	-36	0
An act to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act . . . and to make technical corrections to the Harmonized Tariff schedule . . . for the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement, to approve the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes (P.L. 112–163)	0	0	-59
FDA User Fees Corrections Act of 2012 (P.L. 112–193)	0	-195	0
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (P.L. 112–239)	-33	-16	0
American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (P.L. 112–240)	57,428	49,804	-279,700
Medicare IVIG Access and Strengthening Medicare and Repaying Taxpayers Act of 2012 (P.L. 112–242)	3	3	0
An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to make clear that accounts in Thrift Savings Fund are subject to certain Federal tax levies (P.O. 112–267)	0	0	1
An act to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for carrying out the National Flood Insurance Program (P.L. 113–1)	5,250	5,250	0
Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–28)	14,290	8,080	0
Total, Authorizing Legislation	85,681	72,313	-277,466
Appropriations Legislation:			
Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 (P.L. 112–175) ^b	423	423	0
Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113–2) ^c	8,840	1,479	0
Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113–6)	1,867,246	1,426,973	0
Reducing Flight Delays Act of 2013 (P.L. 113–9)	0	203	0
Total, Appropriations Legislation	1,876,509	1,429,078	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	1,962,190	1,501,391	-277,466
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	-79,619	-77,056	0
Total Current Level ^d	3,021,853	3,065,784	2,015,873

[In millions of dollars]

^cPeriodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the totals in H. Con. Res. 112, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution.

^f Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the 2013–2022 revenue totals in H. Con. Res. 112 pursuant to various provisions of the resolution.

ingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL. COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

³ Part Military air transportation.

HON. HAROLD ROGERS, Chairman, July 30, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to United Arab Emirates, Afghanistan, April 1-6, 2013:											
Hon. Mike Rogers	4/2	4/4	United Arab Emirates		732.00						732.00
	4/4	4/5	Afghanistan		17.00						17.00
Commercial Transportation							12,843.70				12,843.70
Tim Morrison	4/2	4/4	United Arab Emirates		744.32						743.32
	4/4	4/5	Afghanistan		17.00						17.00
Commercial Transportation							12,843.70				12,843.70

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Leonor Tomero	4/2	4/4	United Arab Emirates		742.88						742.88
Commercial Transportation	4/4	4/5	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Delegation Expenses	4/2	4/4	United Arab Emirates				12,843.70		1,718.94		12,843.70
Visit to Mali, Niger, Nigeria, April 18–23, 2013:											1,718.94
Hon. Mac Thornberry	4/18	4/20	Mali		306.18						306.18
	4/20	4/21	Niger		181.50						181.50
	4/21	4/22	Nigeria		780.64						780.64
Commercial Transportation							10,129.00				10,129.00
Peter Villano	4/18	4/20	Mali		354.18						354.18
	4/20	4/21	Niger		181.50						181.50
	4/21	4/22	Nigeria		848.64						848.64
Commercial Transportation							10,129.00				10,129.00
Paul Arcangeli	4/18	4/20	Mali		354.18						354.18
	4/20	4/21	Niger		181.50						181.50
	4/21	4/22	Nigeria		848.64						848.64
Commercial Transportation							10,129.00				10,129.00
Mark Lewis	4/18	4/20	Mali		354.18						354.18
	4/20	4/21	Niger		181.50						181.50
	4/21	4/22	Nigeria		848.64						848.64
Commercial Transportation							10,129.00				10,129.00
Visit to United Arab Emirates, Afghanistan, Bahrain, April 18–23, 2013:											
Hon. Rob Wittman	4/19	4/19	United Arab Emirates								
	4/19	4/21	Afghanistan		43.00						43.00
	4/21	4/22	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
Commercial Transportation							10,709.60				10,709.60
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	4/19	4/19	United Arab Emirates								
	4/19	4/21	Afghanistan		43.00						43.00
	4/21	4/22	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
Commercial Transportation							10,709.60				10,709.60
Hon. Joe Courtney	4/19	4/19	United Arab Emirates								
	4/19	4/21	Afghanistan		43.00						43.00
	4/21	4/22	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
Commercial Transportation							10,709.60				10,709.60
Hon. Jackie Walorski	4/19	4/19	United Arab Emirates								
	4/19	4/21	Afghanistan		43.00						43.00
	4/21	4/22	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
Commercial Transportation							10,709.60				10,709.60
Hon. Bill Enyart	4/19	4/19	United Arab Emirates								
	4/19	4/21	Afghanistan		10.00						10.00
	4/21	4/22	Bahrain		57.00						57.00
Commercial Transportation							10,709.60				10,709.60
Ryan Crumpler	4/19	4/19	United Arab Emirates								
	4/19	4/21	Afghanistan		43.00						43.00
	4/21	4/22	Bahrain		124.00						124.00
Commercial Transportation							10,709.60				10,709.60
Brian Garrett	4/19	4/19	United Arab Emirates								
	4/19	4/21	Afghanistan		10.00						10.00
	4/21	4/22	Bahrain		100.95						100.95
Commercial Transportation							10,709.60				10,709.60
Delegation Expenses	4/19	4/20							488.75		488.75
Visit to Jordan, Israel, Egypt, April 28–May 5, 2013 with STAFFDEL Karem:											
Roger Zakheim	4/29	4/30	Israel		522.00						522.00
	4/30	5/2	Jordan								
	5/2	5/5	Egypt								
Commercial Transportation							9,717.47				9,717.47
Michael Casey	4/28	4/30	Israel		394.00						394.00
	4/30	5/2	Jordan								
	5/2	5/5	Egypt								
Commercial Transportation							8,947.47				8,947.47
Visit to United Arab Emirates, Afghanistan, May 9–14, 2013:											
Hon. Martha Roby	5/10	5/12	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/12	5/14	United Arab Emirates		485.48						485.48
Commercial Transportation							11,905.10				11,905.10
Hon. Susan Davis	5/10	5/12	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/12	5/14	United Arab Emirates		300.48						300.48
Commercial Transportation							11,905.10				11,905.10
Hon. Kristi Noem	5/10	5/12	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/12	5/14	United Arab Emirates		485.48						485.48
Commercial Transportation							11,905.10				11,905.10
Hon. Niki Tsongas	5/10	5/12	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/12	5/14	United Arab Emirates		485.48						485.48
Commercial Transportation							11,905.10				11,905.10
Hon. Tammy Duckworth	5/10	5/12	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/12	5/14	United Arab Emirates		485.48						485.48
Commercial Transportation							11,905.10				11,905.10
Jaime Cheshire	5/10	5/12	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/12	5/14	United Arab Emirates		422.86						422.86
Commercial Transportation							11,905.10				11,905.10
Debra Wada	5/10	5/12	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/12	5/14	United Arab Emirates		422.86						422.86
Commercial Transportation							11,905.10				11,905.10
Delegation Expenses			United Arab Emirates						1,916.20		1,916.20
Visit to Kosovo, Germany, Qatar, Afghanistan, United Arab Emirates, May 26–June 1, 2013:											
Hon. Joe Wilson	5/26	5/27	Kosovo		147.95						147.95
	5/27	5/28	Germany		205.08						205.08
	5/28	5/29	Qatar		225.77						225.77
	5/29	5/31	Afghanistan		24.00						24.00
	5/31	6/1	United Arab Emirates								
Commercial Transportation							11,826.45				11,826.45
Hon. Peter Gallego	5/26	5/27	Kosovo		194.95						194.95
	5/27	5/28	Germany		267.08						267.08
	5/28	5/29	Qatar		339.77						339.77
	5/29	5/31	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/31	6/1	United Arab Emirates								
Commercial Transportation							11,826.45				11,826.45
Craig Greene	5/26	5/27	Kosovo		194.95						194.95

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial Transportation	5/27	5/28	Germany		267.08						267.08
	5/28	5/29	Qatar		339.77						339.77
	5/29	5/31	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/31	6/1	United Arab Emirates								
Catherine Sendak	5/26	5/27	Kosovo		194.95						194.95
	5/27	5/28	Germany		267.08						267.08
	5/28	5/29	Qatar		339.77						339.77
	5/29	5/31	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
Commercial Transportation			United Arab Emirates								
Delegation Expenses	5/31	6/1	United Arab Emirates								
							11,826.45				11,826.45
Committee total					16,542.75		303,320.74		4,763.35		324,626.84

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, Chairman, July 31, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. George Miller	5/23	5/23	Kuwait				11,509.60				11,509.60
Delegation Expenses	5/23	5/23	Kuwait						292.18		292.18
	5/25	5/29	Bangladesh		1,160.00						1,160.00
Delegation Expenses	5/25	5/29	Bangladesh						838.04		838.04
Richard Miller	5/23	5/23	Kuwait				12,647.80				12,647.80
Delegation Expenses	5/23	5/23	Kuwait						292.18		292.18
	5/25	5/29	Bangladesh		1,160.00						1,160.00
Delegation Expenses	5/25	5/29	Bangladesh						838.04		838.04
Committee total					2,320.00		24,157.40		2,260.44		28,737.84

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN KLINE, Chairman, July 30, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Dan Kildee	4/2	4/4	United Arab Emirates		527.91						527.91
	4/4	4/5	Afghanistan		28.00		(3)				28.00
	4/5	4/6	United Arab Emirates		12,257.70						12,257.70
Hon. Denny Heck	5/26	5/27	Kosovo		194.95						194.95
	5/27	5/28	Germany		231.29						231.29
	5/28	5/29	Qatar		225.77						225.77
	5/29	5/31	Afghanistan		24.00		(3)				24.00
	5/31	6/1	United Arab Emirates				11,826.45				11,826.45
Committee total					1,231.92		24,084.15				25,316.07

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. JEB HENSARLING, Chairman, July 31, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Matt Salmon	4/28	4/29	Argentina		567.00		5,376.98				5,943.98
	4/29	5/2	Brazil		1,181.00		(4)				1,181.00
	5/2	5/5	Colombia		1,172.00		(4)				1,172.00
Hon. Trey Radel	5/2	5/5	Colombia		1,212.00		2,008.60				3,220.60
Hon. Albio Sires	4/28	4/29	Argentina		567.00		5,679.98				6,246.98
	4/29	5/2	Brazil		1,181.00		(4)				1,181.00
	5/2	5/5	Colombia		1,172.00		(4)				1,172.00
Mark Walker	4/28	4/29	Argentina		567.00		5,505.98				6,072.98
	4/29	5/2	Brazil		1,181.00		(4)				1,181.00
	5/2	5/5	Colombia		1,172.00		(4)				1,172.00
Leah Campos	4/28	4/29	Argentina		567.00		2,742.22				3,309.22
Ramon Zertuche	4/28	4/29	Argentina		567.00		5,679.98				6,246.98
	4/29	5/2	Brazil		1,181.00		(4)				1,181.00
	5/2	5/5	Colombia		1,172.00						1,172.00
Hon. Lois Frankel	5/26	5/27	Kosovo		147.95		11,826.45				11,974.40
	5/27	5/28	Germany		230.98		(4)				230.98
	5/28	5/29	Qatar		225.77		(4)				225.77
	5/29	5/31	Afghanistan		24.00		(4)				24.00
	5/31	6/1	United Arab Emirates				(5)				

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	5/24	5/27	United Arab Emirates		583.00		13,065.00		⁶ 2,153.20		15,801.20
	5/24	5/26	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Hon. Joseph Kennedy	5/24	5/27	United Arab Emirates		581.00		16,874.00				17,455.00
	5/24	5/26	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Hon. Ami Bera	5/24	5/27	United Arab Emirates		581.00		2,203.10				2,784.10
	5/24	5/26	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Eddy Acevedo	5/24	5/27	United Arab Emirates		683.00		13,065.10				13,748.10
	5/24	5/26	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Golan Rodgers	5/24	5/27	United Arab Emirates		733.00		13,065.10				13,798.10
	5/24	5/26	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Brent Woolfork	5/24	5/27	United Arab Emirates		756.00		10,087.10				10,843.10
	5/24	5/26	Afghanistan		5.00		(³)				5.00
Hon. Tulsi Gabbard	4/2	4/3	United Arab Emirates		946.00		12,142.00				13,088.00
	4/4	4/5	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Thomas Hill	5/28	5/31	Turkey		986.00		13,764.00				14,750.00
	5/31	6/3	Jordan		1,122.00		(⁴)				1,122.00
Evan McMullin	5/28	5/31	Turkey		986.00		13,273.00				14,259.00
	5/31	6/3	Jordan		1,122.00		(⁴)				1,122.00
Robert Marcus	5/28	5/31	Turkey		986.00		13,764.00				14,750.00
	5/31	6/3	Jordan		1,122.00		(⁴)				1,122.00
Leah Campos	5/26	6/1	Mexico		1,452.00		1,034.30				2,486.30
Ramon Zertuche	5/26	6/1	Mexico		1,381.69		1,431.49				2,813.18
Paul Berkowitz	4/27	5/1	Russia		2,384.00		4,344.74				6,728.74
Naz Durakoglu	4/27	5/1	Russia		2,270.00		4,379.74				6,649.74
Nilmini Rubin	4/28	4/30	Nigeria		792.00		8,814.80				9,606.80
	4/30	5/2	Ghana		602.00		(⁴)				602.00
	5/2	5/4	Liberia		450.00		(⁴)				450.00
Worku Gachou	4/28	4/30	Nigeria		758.00		8,814.80				9,572.80
	4/30	5/2	Ghana		592.00		(⁴)				592.00
	5/2	5/4	Liberia		530.00		(⁴)				530.00
Jaqueline Quinones	4/28	4/30	Nigeria		798.00		8,814.80				9,612.80
	4/30	5/2	Ghana		642.00		(⁴)				642.00
	5/2	5/4	Liberia		560.00		(⁴)				560.00
Eric Williams	4/28	4/30	Nigeria		798.00		8,814.80				9,612.80
	4/30	5/2	Ghana		642.00		(⁴)				642.00
	5/2	5/4	Liberia		560.00		(⁴)				560.00
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	5/28	6/3	Russia		3,531.00		11,573.32		⁶ 16,780.81		31,885.13
Hon. Paul Cook	5/28	6/3	Russia		3,211.00		15,555.32				18,766.32
Hon. Bill Keating	5/28	5/30	Russia		1,196.00		7,586.30				8,782.30
Paul Berkowitz	5/28	6/3	Russia		3,145.00		13,871.92				17,016.92
Naz Durakoglu	5/28	6/3	Russia		3,530.00		11,695.62				15,225.62
Hon. Steve Chabot	4/28	4/30	South Korea		655.00		11,689.60				12,344.60
	4/30	5/2	Japan		728.00		(⁴)		⁶ 3,521.71		4,249.71
	5/2	5/3	Taiwan		306.00		(⁴)		⁶ 1,537.31		1,843.31
Kevin Fitzpatrick	4/28	4/30	South Korea		650.00		11,689.60				12,339.60
	4/30	5/2	Japan		713.00		(⁴)				713.00
	5/2	5/3	Taiwan		311.00		(⁴)				311.00
Priscill Koepke	4/28	4/30	South Korea		595.00		11,689.60				12,284.60
	4/30	5/2	Japan		723.00		(⁴)				723.00
	5/2	5/3	Taiwan		335.00		(⁴)				335.00
Hon. Karen Bass	5/24	5/26	Ethiopia		2,962.50		7,461.52				10,424.02
Committee total					63,250.89		309,384.86		23,993.03		396,628.78

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

⁴ Commercial transportation.

⁵ Not applicable.

⁶ Delegation costs.

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE, Chairman, July 31, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Peter Welch	4/28	4/30	Turkey		517.20						517.20
	4/30	5/1	Pakistan		362.85						362.85
	5/1	5/2	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	5/2	5/3	Germany		194.00						194.00
Hon. Blake Farenthold	5/24	5/25	United Arab Emirates		526.00						526.00
	5/25	5/26	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	5/26	5/27	United Arab Emirates		407.00						407.00
Commercial airfare							5,759.00				5,759.00
Hon. Michael R. Turner	5/24	5/26	Romania		490.65						490.65
	5/26	5/28	Turkey		495.83						495.83
	5/28	5/29	Azerbaijan		373.00						373.00
	5/29	5/30	Turkey		294.00						294.00
	5/30	6/2	Ireland		1,299.00						1,299.00
Delegation Expenditure									2,178.00		2,178.00
Commercial airfare							3,590.40				3,590.40
John Cuaderes	5/24	5/26	Romania		490.65						490.65
	5/26	5/28	Turkey		495.83						495.83
	5/28	5/29	Azerbaijan		373.00						373.00
	5/29	5/30	Turkey		294.00						294.00
Commercial airfare							4,447.60				4,447.60
Committee total					6,669.01		13,797.00		2,178.00		22,644.01

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA, Chairman, Aug. 9, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JEFF MILLER, Chairman, July 30, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Darren Dick	4/1	4/3	Middle East		708.36						
	4/3	4/4	Asia		473.00						
Commercial airfare							14,786.60				15,967.96
Bryan Smith	4/1	4/3	Middle East		708.36						
	4/3	4/4	Asia		473.00						
Commercial airfare							14,786.60				15,967.96
Chelsey Campbell	4/1	4/3	Middle East		708.36						
	4/3	4/4	Asia		473.00						
Commercial airfare							14,786.60				15,967.96
Linda Cohen	4/1	4/3	Middle East		708.36						
	4/3	4/4	Asia		473.00						
Commercial airfare							14,786.60				14,599.96
Michael Baher	4/1	4/3	Middle East		708.36						
	4/3	4/4	Asia		473.00						
Commercial airfare							11,914.60				13,095.96
Hon. Mike Rogers	4/29	4/30	Middle East		317.00						
	4/30	5/1	Middle East		383.00						
	5/1	5/2	Middle East		356.00						
	5/2	5/4	Middle East		476.00						
Commercial airfare							10,807.47				12,339.65
Hon. C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger	4/29	4/30	Middle East		317.00						
	4/30	5/1	Middle East		383.00						
	5/1	5/2	Middle East		356.00						
	5/2	5/4	Middle East		476.00						
Commercial airfare							10,807.47				12,339.65
Darren Dick	4/29	4/30	Middle East		317.00						
	4/30	5/1	Middle East		383.00						
	5/1	5/2	Middle East		356.00						
	5/2	5/5	Middle East		952.00						
Commercial airfare							10,807.47				12,339.65
Heather Molino	4/29	4/30	Middle East		317.00						
	4/30	5/1	Middle East		383.00						
	5/1	5/2	Middle East		356.00						
	5/2	5/4	Middle East		476.00						
Commercial airfare							10,807.47				12,339.65
Hon. Michele Bachmann	4/24	4/24	Caribbean								
Kathryn Wheelbarger	4/24	4/24	Caribbean								
Hon. Frank LoBiondo	5/24	5/25	Europe		295.22						
	5/25	5/27	Africa		497.00						
	5/27	5/29	Africa		461.72						
	5/29	5/31	Africa		663.45						
Commercial airfare							11,125.00				13,042.39
Frank Garcia	5/24	5/25	Europe		295.22						
	5/25	5/27	Africa		497.00						
	5/27	5/29	Africa		461.72						
	5/29	5/31	Africa		663.45						
Commercial airfare							11,125.00				13,042.39
Carly Scott	5/24	5/25	Europe		295.22						
	5/25	5/27	Africa		497.00						
	5/27	5/29	Africa		461.72						
	5/29	5/31	Africa		663.45						
Commercial airfare							11,125.00				13,042.39
Hon. Michele Bachmann	5/27	6/3	Eurasia		2,392.00						
Commercial airfare							716.16				3,108.76
Chelsey Campbell	5/27	5/29	Africa		768.41						
	5/29	5/30	Africa		443.00						
	5/30	5/31	Africa		395.93						
Commercial airfare							16,876.12				18,483.46
Kathryn Wheelbarger	5/27	5/29	Africa		768.41						
	5/29	5/30	Africa		443.00						
	5/30	5/31	Africa		395.93						
Commercial airfare							16,876.12				18,483.46
Michael Bahar	5/27	5/29	Africa		768.41						
	5/29	5/30	Africa		443.00						
	5/30	5/31	Africa		395.93						
Commercial airfare							16,876.12				18,483.46
Committee total											222,644.71

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MIKE ROGERS, Chairman, July 30, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Christopher H. Smith	6/9	6/11	Ukraine	Hryvnia	538.51		3,578.00				4,116.51

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Steve Cohen	5/28	6/3	Russia	Ruble	3,049.00	6,536.42	9,585.42
Hon. Robert Aderhold	4/14	4/15	Denmark	Krone	419.00	4,107.70	4,526.70
Mark Milosch	6/9	6/11	Ukraine	Hryvnia	632.75	3,578.00	4,210.75
Robert Hand	4/14	4/16	Denmark	Krone	718.00	1,634.90	2,352.90
Committee total	5,357.26	19,435.02	24,792.28

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Cochairman, Aug. 21, 2013.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2801. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 3 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2802. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a letter of notification to authorize a 90% guarantee on a supply chain finance facility for JPMorgan Chase & Co. of New York, New York; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2803. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Turkey pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2804. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update of the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Lancaster 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0058; FRL-9841-8] received August 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2805. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Victoria County 1997 8-Hour Ozone Section 110(a)(1) Maintenance Plan [EPA-R06-OAR-2006-0356; FRL-9842-6] received August 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2806. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0582; FRL-9845-2] received August 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2807. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Alaska; Fairbanks Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan and State Implementation Plan Revision [EPA-R10-OAR-2013-0420; FRL-9844-8] received August 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2808. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Disapproval of State Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0350; FRL-9844-9] received August 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2809. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Disapproval of State Implementation Plan; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard; Montana [EPA-R08-OAR-2010-0298; FRL-9843-2] received August 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2810. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Reconsideration of Certain Provisions of New Source Performance Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505; FRL-9844-4] (RIN: 2060-AR75) received August 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2811. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Disapproval of State Implementation Plan; Arizona; Regional Haze Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0913; FRL-9843-7] received August 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2812. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Propylene Glycol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0901; FRL-9394-5] received August 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2813. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2013-0399; FRL-9393-4] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received August 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2814. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Topramezone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0262; FRL-9388-9] received August 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2815. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's report entitled, "Report to Congress on Abnormal Occurrences: Fiscal Year [FY] 2012", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5848; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2816. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a report on the agencies' use of the Physicians' Comparability Allowance Program for fiscal year 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5948(j)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2817. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2818. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2819. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2820. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2821. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Sufficiency Certification for the Washington Convention and Sports Authority's (Trading as Events DC) Projected Revenues and Excess Reserve to Meet Projected Operating and Debt Service Expenditures and Reserve Requirements for Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2822. A letter from the Director, Office of Public Affairs, American Chemical Society, transmitting the Society's Annual Report for 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2823. A letter from the Clerk, Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, C.A. No. 12-2711, U.S.A. v. Zavkibeg Ashurov (August 12, 2013); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2824. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Premerger Notification; Reporting and Waiting Period Requirements (RIN: 3084-AA91) received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2825. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a report entitled, "Geothermal Heat Pump Research, Development and Demonstration"; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2826. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Certain Transfers of Property to Regulated Investment Companies [RICs] and Real Estate Investment Trusts [REITs] [TD 9626] (RIN: 1545-BI84) received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2827. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Mixed Straddles; Straddle-by-Straddle Identification Under Section 1092(b)(2)(A)(i)(1) [TD 9627] (RIN: 1545-BL04) received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2828. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Reimbursed Entertainment Expenses [TD 9625] (RIN: 1545-BI83) received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2829. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report on the Medicare and Medicaid Integrity Programs for Fiscal Year 2011; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

2830. A letter from the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's 2013 annual report on the financial status of the railroad unemployment insurance system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 369; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2481. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to codify and improve the election requirements for the receipt of educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; with amendments (Rept. 113-207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Ethics. In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative John Tierney (Rept. 113-208). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H.R. 3080. A bill to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Ways and Means, and Natural Resources, for

a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 3081. A bill to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act to better enable law enforcement to identify, locate, and recover child victims of sex trafficking; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 3082. A bill to require a report on the designation of the Libyan faction of Ansar al-Sharia as a foreign terrorist organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 3083. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the operation of longer combination vehicles on the Interstate System in Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEFazio (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.J. Res. 60. A joint resolution to amend the War Powers Resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.J. Res. 61. A joint resolution to prevent further use of chemical weapons in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KIND, Mr. WATT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BASS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CHU, and Ms. DELAUNO):

H. Res. 341. A resolution expressing support for designation of September as National Childhood Obesity Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 3080.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (related to general Welfare of the United States), and Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes).

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 3081.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3082.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 10, 11, and 15

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 3083.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 3 (relating to the authority to regulate commerce among the several states).

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.J. Res. 60.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.J. Res. 61.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Section 8, clause 11: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To declare War"

Art. I, Section 8, clause 18: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 30: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 32: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 61: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 138: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 141: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 292: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 310: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 318: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 411: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 437: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 485: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 494: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 509: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 510: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 511: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 543: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ENYART, Mr. HORSFORD, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 562: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 688: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 713: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 720: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 721: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 728: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 842: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 855: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 863: Ms. CLARKE and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 898: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 919: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 921: Mr. SCHRADER.
 H.R. 938: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 949: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 961: Ms. ESTY.
 H.R. 981: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 1015: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 1020: Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 1041: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 1077: Mr. MULVANEY.
 H.R. 1101: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 1186: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 1250: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 1331: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 1339: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. COOK, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 1343: Mr. PAYNE and Ms. CLARKE.
 H.R. 1387: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
 H.R. 1395: Mr. HORSFORD.
 H.R. 1505: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 1518: Ms. JENKINS.
 H.R. 1521: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 1528: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 1573: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1630: Mr. CLAY and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1661: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
 H.R. 1666: Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COOK, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 1698: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 1731: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 1732: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 1733: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1748: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. CARNEY.
 H.R. 1780: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 1787: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 1814: Mr. CARNEY.
 H.R. 1816: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1827: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1830: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 1998: Mrs. CAPPs.
 H.R. 2000: Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. CHU, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. LABRADOR.
 H.R. 2019: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
 H.R. 2030: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 2055: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 2059: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 2090: Mr. YOHO.
 H.R. 2134: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 2174: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 2189: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 2250: Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 2283: Ms. BASS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 2302: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. REICHERT.
 H.R. 2305: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 2375: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MAFFEI, and Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 2399: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 2415: Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 2417: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 2424: Mr. POCAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 2452: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 2483: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 2512: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 2536: Mrs. WAGNER.
 H.R. 2607: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 2632: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 2638: Mr. OLSON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 2682: Mr. RIGELL.
 H.R. 2689: Ms. ESTY.
 H.R. 2703: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 2715: Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 2753: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 2771: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. ROHR-ABACHER.
 H.R. 2797: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 2800: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 2805: Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 2870: Mr. NEAL.
 H.R. 2887: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 2907: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. JONES, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. WEST-MORELAND, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 2947: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 2994: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 3043: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 3065: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. YOHO.
 H.R. 3067: Mr. OLSON.
 H.J. Res. 41: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.J. Res. 56: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.J. Res. 58: Mr. AMASH, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. POSEY, Mr. YOHO, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. PITTS.
 H. Res. 36: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. RUNYAN.
 H. Res. 89: Mr. BACHUS.
 H. Res. 101: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H. Res. 281: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SIREs, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MARINO, and Ms. DELAURO.
 H. Res. 301: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. GERLACH.
 H. Res. 308: Mr. KENNEDY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1077: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 2918: Mr. BUCSHON.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE MEMBERS OF THE 529TH MILITARY POLICE COM- PANY USAEUR HONOR GUARD

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the prodigious service of the members of the 529th Military Police Company Honor Guard, first activated in July of 1945, which served at and protected the United States Army in Europe (USAEUR) Headquarters and handled internal security for the USAEUR Commander-in-Chief's command building and residence.

The 529th had the responsibility and privilege of honoring notable figures such as President John F. Kennedy, President Charles de Gaulle of France, General William C. Westmoreland, and Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor.

Beyond its important work to protect U.S. interests and dignitaries in Europe, this talented and dedicated MP company spent many long hours practicing the drill team manual, including perfecting the "click-tap-click" of the "Deuce Nine." In addition, the unit was assigned three 105mm Howitzers which formed their salute battery, and successfully fired 742 rounds without a misfire.

Across the nation and the world, U.S. military police provide an important duty to protect and serve not only our nation but also their colleagues. The tireless and selfless dedication of the 529th Military Police Company Honor Guard and all military police companies must not be overlooked.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in wishing all the members of the 529th Military Police Company Honor Guard our sincerest thanks and appreciation for their valiant service.

HONORING CHAD HIGDON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize a special member of my staff. After more than 11 years of service, Chad Higdon has left his position in my Saint Joseph District Office to become the Executive Director of Second Harvest Community Food Bank.

Chad had been with my congressional office nearly from the start. He began as an intern in 2001, helping to set up our first office in the St. Joseph Post Office Building. A year later, he was hired as the office Staff Assistant. Chad has filled many roles in the office, even-

tually working his way to become the congressional "go-to-guy" for the Saint Joseph community.

As a field representative, Chad spent many hours behind the wheel representing me in the small towns across Northwest Missouri. He built strong relationships with local leaders and always had his finger on the pulse of a community. Whether it was listening to a veteran's retelling of war stories, helping a local community find funding for sewer upgrades, or providing a legislative update to farmers, Chad's work was always done whole-heartedly and with a smile.

In 2010, Chad temporarily left his post to serve as my campaign manager. He helped secure a solid vote-margin that November and represented our organization well across all 26 counties. Chad's willingness to serve and his dedication to constituent service was a great example of how government should work. While I am losing a valuable member of my team, I am proud of Chad and excited to watch the next chapter of his career.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in thanking Chad Higdon for his many years of service to the people of the Sixth Congressional District. I know Chad's colleagues, family and friends join with me in thanking him for his commitment to others and wishing him many years of success to come.

HONORING RANDOLPH F. SNOWDEN OF NAPA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Randy Snowden, who is retiring as the Director of the Napa County Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA).

Mr. Snowden is a true public servant in the Napa Valley, and a leader in community public health programs and health care reform. As the director of the largest agency in Napa County, Mr. Snowden has consistently held himself to the highest levels of integrity, principle, and ethical business practice. In the recent recession, Mr. Snowden led efforts to stabilize Napa County HHSA's budget while maintaining critical services that other counties dramatically cut.

Mr. Snowden guided the agency and the county in integrating services and increasing accessibility. During his tenure, Napa County HHSA opened a satellite office in American Canyon, and an embedded Clinic Ole was established on HHSA's campus.

As the agency's leader, Mr. Snowden displayed a dedication to the pursuit of diversity, collaborative management, and program-based budgeting. He has overseen the trans-

formation of HHSA's culture from one of compliance to one focused on quality management.

Above all, Mr. Snowden held fast to HHSA's mission to help those in need. For him, it is always all about the clients. He has remained true to his and the agency's guiding principles and has served as a professional and personal role model for all who know him.

Mr. Speaker, Randy Snowden has a long and distinguished career of service to Napa County, most notably to the Napa Valley Health and Human Services Agency. It is therefore appropriate that we honor Mr. Snowden today and wish him well in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING REVEREND DR. JOHN F. WILLIAMS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, this year, Reverend Dr. John F. Williams is celebrating twenty-five (25) years preaching, twenty-three (23) years in pastoral leadership and seven (7) years as Pastor of Antioch East Baptist Church this year, he has provided stellar leadership to his church and community; and

Whereas, Reverend Dr. John F. Williams under the guidance of God has pioneered and sustained Antioch East Baptist Church as an instrument in our community that uplifts the spiritual, physical and mental welfare of our citizens; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man of God has given hope to the hopeless and is a beacon of light to those in need; and

Whereas, Reverend Dr. Williams is a spiritual warrior, a man of compassion, a fearless leader and a servant to all, but most of all a visionary who has shared not only with his Church, but with our state and the nation his passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Reverend Dr. John F. Williams, as he celebrates this milestone in pastoral leadership; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim August 25, 2013 as Reverend Dr. John F. Williams Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 25th day of August, 2013.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HONORING ST. JOHN MISSIONARY
BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable historical church, St. John Missionary Baptist of Darling, Mississippi and the great leadership it is under.

St. John Missionary Baptist Church has been a part of the Darling Squirrel Lake, MS community for some 130 years. Many families have come and gone, but many can boast of a great start at this little wooden church in the country. Although, this is a small church, its pastor and members have always had big hearts. St. John has reached out into the community to host and sponsor reading classes in an effort to improve reading skills among the young and old; summer feeding program—preparing and serving hot balanced meals for the youths and disabled in the church community; and doing a garden project to provide fresh vegetables for the church community.

Years has brought about change, but the hearts of St. John members are still big and fill with love. The name was changed to New St. John some ten years ago, but Jesus and saving souls is still the focus of the church.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing St. John Missionary Baptist Church for its dedication to serving our great country.

“THE LIVING MEMORIAL” PREPARED REMARKS BY LT. COL. SEAN N. DAY FOR CITY OF SAN JOSE MEMORIAL DAY OBSERVANCE

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor at Oak Hill Cemetery's Memorial Day event on May 27th to listen to Lt. Col. Sean Day's speech celebrating and honoring the memories of Americans who have died defending freedom. I would like to honor his words which are so meaningful.

“THE LIVING MEMORIAL” PREPARED REMARKS: CITY OF SAN JOSE MEMORIAL DAY OBSERVANCE, OAK HILL CEMETERY, SAN JOSE, CA, 1100 27 MAY 2013

Lt. Col Sean N. Day, USMCR Commanding Officer, 2nd Battalion, 23rd Marine Regiment

Mayor Reed, Supervisor Cortese, Congressman Honda, Congresswoman Lofgren, Vice Admiral Zukunft, Major General Regua, other distinguished guests, friends and fellow Americans.

Thank you for the opportunity to be a small part of your celebration of the lives and sacrifices of our most honored citizens. It is with profound humility that I am speaking with you on this sacred day, on this hour and in this place.

Now, if you would indulge me for a moment—

Do we have any veterans from the War in Vietnam in the audience?

It's with deep appreciation that if you have never heard it, or even if you have been told a thousand times, to the veterans of the War in Vietnam, we are so very proud of you and welcome home.

Now, I am keenly aware that as the final speaker of the day, I am all that stands between you and cookouts and the first game of the Bay Area brawl between the Giants and the A's. So, in the few minutes that we'll spend together this afternoon I won't talk about the great sales at Valley Fair Mall or the day off so many are enjoying. I won't speak of bands or bugles, or even the stone and marble monuments raised in memory of the sacrifices given by our most honored citizens.

But instead, my brief comments will center on “The Living Memorial.”

In every age, just as during the Vietnam War era, those who are willing to face down shot and shell are few. During the Revolution, only a few answered the call for help that rang out at the Rude Bridge in Concord. Many heard the call, had more pressing priorities and moved on with their lives. A few answered, and some who did gave the last full measure of devotion to enable the beginning of the Republic that we love so dearly.

And right down through the years, it has been the same. Many hear, few answer and a portion of those who do, consecrate our nation's highest ideals with their lives. On battlefields long forgotten, or for the mass of our fellow citizens not known or even cared about, this story of self-sacrifice, complete devotion and fidelity to the best and highest of ourselves, plays out again, and again and again. The many war veterans in the audience, from World War II right up to the ones of today, can tell you what it is like to hear an unrelenting drumbeat demanding sacrifice.

They can remember in jungle monsoons or savage desert sandstorms, seeing the very best our country can produce step forward. And then watching those same brave brothers in arms, friends and comrades fall to the violence of the cruel enemy. All the while, hearing that same drumbeat, demand more and more sacrifice.

How many friends have we held as their final breaths slipped away?

How many times have we seen flag-draped transfer cases placed on aircraft;

How many times have we stood at memorials in hot, dirty, dusty places;

And how many times have we been asked by parents and family members what the last days of their loved ones were like.

Everyone here knows the answer—far too many times.

So many of our friends are no longer here to teach their sons to throw a baseball, escort their daughters to quinceaneras, or to guide their parents into old age. We, who have born the battle, must give voice to our fallen comrades. They stood for all Americans when it counted most. So, we must stand tall today and everyday—because they cannot.

As witnesses to the most profound human tragedies, our charge now is to ensure their memories are not forgotten. But even more importantly—that the ideals of the great republic they gave their very lives to protect—live on and are strengthened. It is our sacred obligation to represent those whose lives were so cruelly ended; to be their “Living Memorial.”

One of our most distinguished countrymen, Oliver Wendell Holmes, not only served as a

Supreme Court Judge for the great state of Maine, and on the Supreme Court of the United States, but he was also a wartime and combat veteran. Serving as an infantryman during the Civil War, Justice Holmes offered a poignant reminder to all of us. . .

“We have shared the incommunicable experience of war, we have felt, we still feel, the passion of life to its top. In our youth our hearts were touched with fire.”

And we stand in constant memory of our fallen brothers.

It is worth remembering that those brave Americans who fell threw the torch of freedom to those in the next generation, who would take it up and shield it. Each successive generation of patriots serves as a “Living Memorial” to those who gave all in the preceding age. And a few in this generation have caught that same torch of freedom.

When tyranny and terror have attacked the torch and caused its flame to flicker, a few have protected it from the violence of the enemy. They have given their blood and lives to shield it, and in so doing had their own lives extinguished so that the light of liberty would continue to shine.

They have done so in the ancient Mesopotamian cities of Baghdad, Al Kut and Hillah in Iraq. From Afghanistan's desert plains of the Helmand province to its wispy heights of the Hindu Kush, where air to breathe is hard to come by, but enemy bombs, bullets and attacks are easy to find.

The honor roll of names who have given the last full measure is not nearly as popular or as well-known as the latest winner of American Idol, the results of the NFL draft or the latest cover story in People magazine. And because of this, it is up to us to carry their lives, loves and memories forward to serve as their “Living Memorial.”

For those esteemed fallen patriots are the precious few who were willing to step forward for all of America. The story of their lives and commitment answers the ancient question, “Who will go for us and who will we send.”

They answered the question through their actions; stepping forward for all of us.

The scriptures say, “A man has no greater love than to lay down his life for his brother.” What they showed may have been patriotism, may have been devotion, and it certainly was sacrifice—but what we know is that they gave their all, and in so doing, showed all of us today that those who will follow, love in its most basic form. A love for our country, our families—yours and mine, and our way of life; one that exceeded the love they had even for themselves. And as we look out across the years, and think of far-away places, our deep and humble appreciation is with those whose love exceeded all bounds.

So what to make of this devotion, belief and sacrifice?

One of our very distinguished Americans, Eleanor Roosevelt, witnessed some of the most significant events in our country's proud history. She carried in her wallet this poem to remind her daily of the sacrifices of our most esteemed citizens and it reads:

“Dear Lord,
Lest I continue
My complacent way,
Help me to remember that somewhere,
Somehow out there
A man died for me today.
As long as there be war,
I then must
Ask and answer
Am I worth dying for?”

Eleanor Roosevelt understood deeply that she was a “Living Memorial,” for those who

enabled her to do all the wonderful things she did for our great country. She understood the deep debt of gratitude owed to those who "gave their today to ensure our tomorrow." She understood that her life personally, and our nation's way of life, was a "Living Memorial" to those who gave all.

So, I leave you with this. Today is not a day for mourning.

It is, of course, a remembrance for what has been lost—the finest our country has produced from across the ages. However, this day is more than that, it is a celebration. A celebration of our national heritage, a celebration of the very best our country represents. We ought not lament the loss of our true champions. Instead, cherish the thought that such very fine Americans lived, such fine Americans sacrificed for your family and mine—such American gave all. Our challenge is to ensure that their sacrifices were not in vain.

Your presence in this place, at this hour indicates that you probably don't need to hear this message. However, many of our countrymen do need to hear it. So as you leave here today, each of you has a mission.

Carry forth the memory of those who gave all they had to give for the finest ideals of our country and of all humanity.

Carry forth the memory of our honored dead.

Remind others that our champions were not victims, but Americans who made our way as a people possible. They carved the path that brought freedom from the yoke of distant tyranny, they served as the guarantors of independence, they made the proclamation of emancipation real. And they ensured that liberty remained a reality rather than a mere idea, a word on a page, or a hope for dream.

I ask each of you to resolve to live in such a way as to carry on the work of the fallen. To make our great country better each day, and in doing so to serve as "Living Memorials," to our most honored citizens.

Thank you for taking the time out today to be part of this celebration.

God Bless America and Semper Fidelis.

RECOGNIZING AMERICORPS ON THEIR TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the national service organization AmeriCorps on its twentieth anniversary. AmeriCorps has provided young Americans with the opportunity to meet critical needs in the communities in which they work.

AmeriCorps partners with nonprofit organizations, government agencies, schools, and faith-based organizations to support intensive community service work. AmeriCorps was first formed under President Clinton in 1993 as a part of the Corporation for National and Community Service. Since its inception, 800,000 people have taken the AmeriCorps oath, with about 80,000 now serving annually.

Mr. Speaker, AmeriCorps members are hard at work in my district and all across the country. They tutor students in junior and high schools. They work directly with families to help them overcome barriers to employment.

They advocate for victims of domestic violence. They teach CPR classes. In short, AmeriCorps members are making a difference and are strengthening communities.

Not only do communities benefit from AmeriCorps—so do the participants. These young people are able to work side-by-side with local community partners on issues that are important to them. AmeriCorps functions as a framework for how individual citizens motivated to public service can come together and make a difference in a tangible way.

AmeriCorps has demonstrated remarkable successes over the last 20 years; I look forward to more accomplishments and more impact over the next 20 years. I am hopeful that a new task force created by President Obama earlier this year can help identify new ways that AmeriCorps can employ members' talent and ingenuity to further national priorities. As Martin Luther King, Jr., once said, "Everyone can be great because everyone can serve."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by extending my gratitude for the hard work AmeriCorps members are doing by serving and making America even greater.

HONORING NEW BEGINNING FULL GOSPEL BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, for the past twenty years, New Beginning Full Gospel Baptist Church has been and continues to be a beacon of light to our county and district; and

Whereas, today, Bishop James H. Morton and the members of the New Beginning Full Gospel Baptist Church family continue to uplift and inspire our county and district; and

Whereas, the New Beginning Full Gospel Baptist Church family has been and continues to be a place where citizens are touched spiritually, mentally and physically through outreach ministries and community partnership to aid in building up our county and district; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious Church of God has given hope to the hopeless, fed the needy and empowered our community for the past twenty (20) years; and

Whereas, this Church has produced many spiritual warriors, people of compassion, people of great courage, fearless leaders and servants to all, but most of all visionaries who have shared not only with their Church, but with our community their passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the New Beginning Full Gospel Baptist Church family for their leadership and service to our District on this the 20th Anniversary of their founding; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim August 18, 2013 as New Beginning Full Gospel Baptist Church Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 18th day of August, 2013.

SEPTEMBER 11

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, twelve years ago, the course of our country's history changed.

In an unprovoked attack that sought to bring America to its knees, the world was reminded instead that ours is a nation of heroes—where people run toward danger for the sake of their fellow man; where a new generation of protectors, knowing full well the risk, chose to answer its country's call to defend liberty and pursue peace.

Last year on this day we were again reminded that freedom has its foes. We mourn the lives of the four dear Americans we lost to terror in Benghazi and pledge justice on their behalf.

To the families bound together by this tragic date eleven years apart, we promise our continued prayers for peace, and we take comfort that the nearness of Almighty God is always with the brokenhearted.

September 11, another infamous date for our Republic, revealed the strength and resolve of American character, and proved once again to the adversaries of liberty that the champions of freedom will not be stopped. We will never waiver, we will not cede strength, and we will stand firm as the last best hope of earth.

IN HONOR OF R. BURNETT MILLER'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Sacramento's former mayor, city councilman and a prominent member of our community, R. Burnett Miller, as he celebrates his 90th birthday. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this great civic-minded individual who has served his country with honor and has contributed so much to the Sacramento region.

Burnett was born in Sacramento, California, in 1923 and graduated from C.K. McClatchy High School. He began his life of service by joining the ROTC at Santa Clara College in 1941. He was a sophomore when World War II began, and went on to serve our nation in the Battle of the Bulge, and was a part of the U.S. 11th Armored Division when it liberated the Mauthausen concentration camp in Austria on May 6, 1945. His service earned him a Purple Heart and the Silver Star for gallantry in action against an enemy of our nation. His experiences were featured in Ken Burns' documentary The War on PBS.

Burnett completed his college education at Georgetown University and lived in Europe for several years; however, he never forgot his hometown. Burnett moved back to Sacramento and joined his family's lumber business, which later became known as Burnett and Sons Planing Mill and Lumber Company.

For over 144 years, this company has prided itself in special and unique craftsmanship and has provided high-quality jobs to local Sacramentans.

Burnett continued his lifetime of public service by serving first as a member of the Sacramento City Council and then as mayor. As a leader in our community, Burnett has championed local causes and organizations, raising funds for the Crocker Art Museum, the Sacramento Symphony, and the Sacramento History Center.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in recognizing the great life of my friend, R. Burnett Miller, as he celebrates his 90th birthday with his lovely wife Mimi, his children and his friends and family in Sacramento. His life and legacy are an inspiration to us all.

HONORING FRIENDSHIP
MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Friendship Missionary Baptist Church for their unwavering resiliency and unity in continuing to spread the Gospel among members of their congregation and community for over 143 years.

Since its beginnings in early spring of 1870, the church has had a number of spiritually led pastors who, through the years, have helped the congregation grow in number and in spiritual knowledge. Among the ministers who have led the congregation were Reverend James Williams, Reverend A.H. Davis, Reverend H.W. Scott, Reverend S.S. Butler, Reverend W.P. Whitfield, Reverend Curtis L. West, and Reverend McKinley K. Nelson.

In March 1965, the congregation elected Reverend Bobby Burks as their leader. Under Reverend Nelson, the church underwent significant changes, ultimately leading to impressive growth in many different areas. During Pastor Burks' leadership, the church saw a considerable growth in membership, implementation of prayer meetings and bible class, youth ministry, sick and shut-in ministry, fellowship breakfast, Praise Team group, and an annual church trip and picnic. In addition to implanting a number of new activities for the membership, Pastor Burks was also instrumental in establishing numerous ministries.

With such growth in activities and membership, the church deemed it necessary to expand to accommodate the increase members. Many physical improvements to the church were made from 2003 through 2007. Completion of a handicap accessible sidewalk and rails, new bathrooms added near the front entrance of the church, addition of a public address and security system, construction of the Family Life Center, and the furnishing of the church's finance room with a copier, computer, fax, and binding machine all took place as a result of a 249+ increase in membership.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Friendship Missionary Baptist Church in its commitment to remain grounded

in the true traditions of the Baptist doctrine within the Edwards community.

RECOGNIZING MS. ANTOINETTE
TUFF

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, today we pause to recognize a virtuous woman of God whose actions, thinking, and spirit blessed the lives of the children, parents, teachers, and support staff of not only the Ronald E. McNair Discovery Learning Academy, but the hearts of citizens across America; and

Whereas, Ms. Antoinette Tuff on August 20, 2013 gave of herself to calm and defuse an incredibly dangerous situation that could have devastated our community and our Nation; and

Whereas, Ms. Antoinette Tuff talked down an armed and troubled intruder who was focused on harming elementary school children, their teachers, support staff, and police officers on the scene; and

Whereas, Ms. Tuff stood as a citizen diplomat, cool and calm, communicating with the would be assailant, as she advocated for life, not only for the intruder and herself, but for every life in the school building on that day; and

Whereas, this wise woman of God shared her stories, her struggles, her trials and her triumphs, to breathe in words of encouragement and comfort, transforming a spirit of destruction into a spirit of redemption, allowing herself to be an instrument of God ensuring that all would live to see another day; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Antoinette Tuff for her bravery, her selflessness, leadership, and service not only to those students, teachers, support staff, police officers, and administrators at Ronald E. McNair Discovery Learning Academy in DeKalb County, Georgia, but also for her heart and spirit that have touched our Nation and the World; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim August 25, 2013 as Ms. Antoinette Tuff Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 25th day of August, 2013.

RECOGNIZING THE 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF DELANEY STREET BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a special occasion for Delaney Street Baptist Church in Orlando, Florida. Delaney Street Baptist Church will celebrate their 85th anniversary this upcoming Sunday, September 15, 2013.

The First Baptist Church of Orlando began a Mission in 1923, which later would develop into Delaney Street Baptist Church. Under the leadership of Reverend T.E. Waldrup, thirty-six Charter members laid the foundations for what would become Delaney Street Baptist Church. On September 14, 1928, Delaney Street Baptist church was officially founded.

This is a special moment in the history of Delaney Street Baptist Church, and they deserve to be commended for their 85 years of service to their community. I would like to thank them for their many years of faithful ministry to our community and their dedication to Christian leadership.

On behalf of the people of Central Florida, it is my pleasure to recognize and congratulate Delaney Street Baptist Church on this momentous occasion. May God continue to bless their church and ministry throughout future generations.

ON RECOGNITION OF THE TRAGEDY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR SURVIVORS

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors.

The Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors or TAPS assists families of our Armed Forces who have lost their military loved one. TAPS is a resource that provides 24/7 tragedy assistance based on a framework of peer-to-peer emotional support. Their programs fill the crucial need of connecting survivors with survivors to provide comfort, compassion, healing and hope in time of need.

For nearly 20 years, TAPS has provided essential support to more than 40,000 military family members and those assisting them. TAPS successfully builds on the experience of survivors by connecting them as peer-mentors to other grieving family members in similar circumstances.

However, connecting survivors is just the beginning. TAPS continues its outreach and support through grief seminars, camps for kids and physical events. The TAPS network in not a one-time liaison but a continuing support framework that provides continuous compassion and assistance to families as they grieve.

Ms. Bonnie Carroll founded TAPS in 1994 after she tragically lost her husband in 1992, Brig. Gen. Tom Carroll, in a military plane crash. Sensing an unfilled need, Ms. Carroll established TAPS to ensure surviving military family members have the necessary resources to cope with their loss. Since then, Ms. Carroll has dedicated her life to supporting our surviving military families. Ms. Carroll and all of the TAPS volunteers are deserving of our highest thanks and honor.

HONORING BROWNSVILLE
MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Brownsville Missionary Baptist Church for exemplifying the importance of resolute faith, persistence, and ultimately perseverance in the face of many historical adversities, consequently serving as a model for others within the Baptist community.

The beginning of the initial foundation was formed under the guidance of Reverend Nelson in 1862, thus sparking the beginning of Brownsville Beaureau Colored Church. Brownsville Beaureau Colored Church began its initial foundation at the intersection of Highway 22 and Bolton-Brownsville Road, north of the site it now stands. Preaching services were held at Beulah Memorial Baptist Church (now named Brownsville Beulah Baptist Church). Reverend Nelson conducted services for both congregations (black and white), when Brownsville's shared the church. Service was conducted in the morning for Beulah's congregation and the evening for Brownsville's.

A "brush harbor" was erected on the land purchased during the period of growth and separation. The land the present church is on, is recorded to have been bought on March 18, 1862. The members worshipped and held service faithfully under the brush harbor structure, thus, history continued to be made and the initial foundation set forth. Because limitations of space and format necessitated the need for even more land, additional land was purchased in April 1890.

Since the earlier days of the church beginnings, many events have occurred in the life of the church and its members. The church has been rebuilt, expanded several times, and the latest remodeling consisted of renovation of the sanctuary after the ceiling collapsed in August 2005. The church underwent its first major renovation in 1968 under the leadership of Reverend L.M. Robinson. With the renovation of the church came a number of other construction projects that ultimately enhanced the church and solidify it as a concrete fixture of spiritual guidance within the community. Among those additions were construction of a kitchen, a baptismal pool, a handicap accessible ramp, additional bathrooms, paving of the parking area, refinishing of the church pews, replacement of sanctuary windows, and completion of the Fellowship Hall.

Members of the Brownsville Missionary Baptist Church congregation are tirelessly committed to maintaining a solid foundation for spiritual growth within their church home and community. A number of church auxiliaries and committees have been established through the 146-year existence of the church, which includes the Benevolent committee, Brotherhood, Beautification, Bible Class, BTU (training of Christian values to the members that strengthen earthly lives), Cemetery, Mission Society, Praise Teams, and Brownsville Review.

During Brownsville's 146 years of existence, the church has been under the leadership of

21 pastors. Little is known of the lives of the earlier pastors, but the effectiveness of their work is evidenced by the fact that the church has survived and developed through the years. The most notable pastor was Reverend Eddie Gibson. Pastor Gibson' ministry is characterized by his gift of compassion and his concern for individual growth and for each member of the congregation. He faithfully served the church for 20 years. Currently Minister Stanley Garner serves as leader of this magnificent congregation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Brownsville Missionary Baptist Church in its commitment to remain grounded in the true traditions of the Baptist doctrine within the Bolton community.

HONORING MRS. BARBARA ANN
FLANIGAN

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, a virtuous woman of God accepted her calling to serve in the Educational System; and

Whereas, Mrs. Barbara Ann Flanigan began her educational career in teaching thirty-seven (37) years ago, and this year she retires from teaching at Cedar Grove Elementary School in Ellenwood, Georgia, she has served the DeKalb County School District well and our community has been blessed through her service; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents as a Teacher, Educator, and Motivator, giving the citizens of Georgia a person of great worth, a fearless leader, a devoted scholar, and a servant to all who want to advance the lives of our youth; and

Whereas, Mrs. Flanigan is formally retiring from her educational career today, she will continue to promote education because she is a cornerstone in our community that has enhanced the lives of thousands for the betterment of our District and Nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Barbara Ann Flanigan on her retirement from the DeKalb County School District and to wish her well in her new endeavors; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim June 2, 2013 as Mrs. Barbara Ann Flanigan Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 2nd day of June, 2013.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF SEPTEMBER
11, 2001

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House to observe a moment of som-

ber remembrance for the 12th anniversary of the September 11th attacks on the United States.

Twelve years ago, nearly 3,000 innocent men and women in New York, Washington, D.C., and Pennsylvania perished when our nation suffered its worst terrorist attack in our history.

While together we have moved a decade beyond that tragedy, the memories of September 11th will forever be with us. All across the country, Americans are coming together for what has become a day of service and remembrance. As we take the time to reflect today, we are reminded that what unites us is far stronger than what divides us, and that the courage and perseverance of the American people should never be underestimated.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to not only join me in remembering those who lost their lives, but to also remember the many first responders, members of the military and ordinary citizens who answered the call of duty.

IN HONOR OF GLEN DOHERTY AND
TYRONE WOODS

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, on the one year anniversary of the terrorist attack on our consulate in Benghazi, Libya, I rise to honor Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods, two former Navy SEALs that were killed during the attack.

Glen was born in Massachusetts and always had a sense of adventure. He became a pilot, and enjoyed skiing and whitewater rafting. His desire to serve his country led him to join the Navy and become a Navy SEAL, where he was part of the team that responded to the attack on the USS *Cole*. Several years later, Glen fought in Iraq, earning the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal with Combat Distinguishing Device.

Tyrone grew up in Oregon and was the father of three children. After high school he joined the Navy with the goal of becoming a SEAL. During his first attempt at SEAL training, Tyrone suffered an injury, but his perseverance led him to try again, and he earned his trident in 1991. During his 20 years of service in the Navy, Tyrone participated in Operations in Somalia, Iraq and Afghanistan, where his bravery earned him the Bronze Star with combat "V" device.

After both men left the military, they continued to serve their country by protecting Americans serving overseas. On the night of September 11th, 2012, our consulate in Benghazi, Libya, was under siege by terrorists. As the coordinated attack unfolded, Glen and Tyrone exposed themselves to enemy fire as they engaged attackers that were armed with guns, mortars and rocket-propelled grenades. Their ultimate sacrifice saved the lives of numerous American personnel that were rescued and safely returned to their families. Despite their brave actions, Glen and Tyrone's heroism and sacrifice has not been recognized through a formal awards process.

In recognition of their sacrifice, I have introduced H.R. 1186, which would award Glen

and Tyrone the Congressional Gold Medal. As we remember those that we lost on that tragic day in Benghazi, we must not forget the heroic acts and selfless courage displayed by Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods.

HONORING NICHOLETTE P.
STEFFES

HON. E. SCOTT RIGELL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a first for Accomack County, Virginia, in the 2nd Congressional District which I am honored to represent. On August 4, 2013, the Accomack County Department of Public Safety promoted Fire Medic II Nicholette P. Steffes, to the rank of Fire/EMS Captain, the first female Captain ever in the service of Accomack County. Nicholette joined the Department of Public Safety in 2007 as a recruit fire medic, another first for Accomack County, and after completing her fire training at the Eastern Shore Regional Fire Training Center, and earning her EMT basic certificate, Nicholette began her service as a Fire Medic. After several years of intensive training and course study, much of this on her own time, Nicholette completed her National and Virginia certification as a Paramedic in 2012.

Mr. Speaker, the Accomack Director of Public Safety, Mr. Jeff Terwilliger, should be commended for his leadership and dedication for providing Accomack County with a first class and effective Department of Public Safety. Nicholette is to be congratulated for her hard work, dedication, and achievements in the service to the residents of Accomack County. I am proud to represent the dedicated men and women of the Department of Public Safety, Accomack County Virginia, whose motto is "Together We Make a Difference."

HONORING MOUNT OLIVE
MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an irreplaceably important architecture of worship in the town of Bolton, Mississippi. For 143 years, the Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church has served as a beacon of spiritual light for so many in the community.

The beginnings of Mount Olive were formed through a coordinated effort among a group of God-fearing, Christian individuals who regularly gathered to conduct Sunday worship service beneath a small bush harbor in the late 1800s. The group subsequently established the Forkey Hill Missionary Baptist Church, located at the intersection of Mount Olive Road and Joe Hall Road. In 1883, the congregation decided to move and build a new sanctuary; in doing so, the church was renamed to Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church.

In order to finance the construction of the new sanctuary, Brother John H. Jones and his wife, Earnestine Jones, allowed the church to use their home as collateral to have the new church built. Once financing was achieved, the church was built and continued to grow in number. One notable pastoral leader was Reverend Augustus Harper. Under his leadership, the church became debt-free by completing the terms and payments on the mortgage for the sanctuary in November 1971. The church also purchased 8 acres of prime farmland from Sister Alma Reuben and family, of which 2 of the acres were designated for the church cemetery and 3 acres were designated for the church parking lot. Through additional contributions made from Sister Reuben, the church was also able to construct the first lighted outdoor recreational facility for children of the community.

The construction and establishment of the Mount Olive community park encouraged other members of the congregation to spearhead the church's first athletic program, softball, and baseball teams. With so many positive advancements occurring within the congregation and the community, the Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church saw it necessary to construct a larger sanctuary to accommodate the growing membership. By September 2010, the membership performed a ribbon cutting ceremony, officially opening the new sanctuary.

In addition to acquiring a new sanctuary, the church was blessed with many other new amenities from members of the congregation, including a new refrigerator, a new stove, cabinets, dishes, a hot water tank, and a kitchen vent. Amongst all of the additions and changes came a revelation that Reverend Harper would honorably resign as pastor of Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church in 2002. The following year, Reverend Wayne C. Moore became pastor and established numerous new ministries and goals for the church.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church for being an inspiration for change, growth, and unwavering spiritual unity for its congregational members and local community.

RECOGNIZING MS. PATRICIA
PARKER

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, A virtuous woman of God accepted her calling to serve in the Educational System; and

Whereas, Ms. Patricia Parker began her educational career in teaching thirty-eight (38) years ago, and this year she retires from teaching at Dunaire Elementary School in Stone Mountain, Georgia, she has served the DeKalb County School District well and our community has been blessed through her service; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents as a Teacher, Ed-

ucator and Motivator, giving the citizens of Georgia a person of great worth, a fearless leader, a devoted scholar and a servant to all who want to advance the lives of our youth; and

Whereas, Ms. Parker is formally retiring from her educational career today, she will continue to promote education because she is a cornerstone in our community that has enhanced the lives of thousands for the betterment of our District and Nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Patricia Parker on her retirement from the DeKalb County School District and to wish her well in her new endeavors; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim May 21, 2013 as Ms. Patricia Parker Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 21st day of May, 2013.

HONORING WOODY HUNT

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor distinguished El Pasoan Woody Hunt as the recipient of the Ysleta High School "2012-13 Outstanding-Ex Award," which recognizes exceptional school alumni. Mr. Hunt has earned this distinction through a lifetime of serving the El Paso community in his roles as a successful business leader, tireless education advocate, and generous community servant.

Mr. Hunt, a fourth generation El Pasoan, graduated from Ysleta High School in 1962 and earned his Bachelor's Degree in Finance from the University of Texas at Austin (1967). He received his MBA in Finance from UT Austin (1970) and later earned his MA in Management from the Drucker School of Management in Claremont, California (1986).

Mr. Hunt began his career by returning to El Paso to work for the family business, which he eventually grew into one of the nation's leading construction and development companies. As Chairman and CEO of Hunt Companies, Inc., Mr. Hunt manages more than \$13 billion in assets focused on the key areas of public-private partnerships, community development, real asset investment management and multi-family housing. Mr. Hunt uses his business expertise as a board member of numerous business and leadership nonprofits in El Paso.

Beyond his notable business achievements, Mr. Hunt has been a particularly effective higher education advocate. He understands that access to college is essential to growing our middle class and ensuring that all Americans have an opportunity to succeed. Mr. Hunt is a board member of several national, statewide and local education organizations focused on college access, including Complete College America; the College for All Texans Foundation; and the Development Boards of the University of Texas at El Paso and the Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center at El Paso. He previously served as the Vice-Chairman of the University of Texas System

Board of Regents. This work allows him to focus on closing achievement gaps and increasing opportunity for traditionally underrepresented students. He is one of the first people I call when issues of higher education are before Congress.

Mr. Hunt is also passionate about promoting quality and accessible healthcare. He is the founding Chairman and current board member of the Medical Centers of Americas Foundation in El Paso; a member of the Board of Visitors of the University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center in Houston; and was the Chairman of the Paso del Norte Health Foundation.

Mr. Hunt serves as Chairman of the Hunt Family Foundation, which he and his wife Gayle established in 1987. The El Paso community continues to be enriched by Woody Hunt's legacy of leadership, integrity and generosity. I thank Mr. Hunt for his commitment to improving the quality of life for everyone in El Paso, and in particular for his tireless efforts to ensure young people in our community have access to excellent educational opportunities.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 10, 2013, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on rollcall No. 452, "yea."

HONORING DR. LARRY RIDLEY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, legendary jazz artist Dr. Larry Ridley will be honored this year by the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation (CBCF) at the Jazz Issue Forum and Concert that will take place during the 43rd Annual Legislative Conference (ALC). Dr. Ridley, an internationally renowned bassist/composer/bandleader/educator, will also perform at the concert, which will take place on Thursday, September 19, 2013, at the Walter E. Washington Convention Center, in Washington, D.C. Dr. Ridley will receive the 2013 CBCF ALC Jazz Legacy Award for his contributions to jazz and world culture.

Hugh Wyatt of the New York Daily News described Dr. Ridley as a "master bassist" and a "musician's musician." He has been one of the most in-demand bassists of the past six decades, performing with over 150 artists including Wes Montgomery, Carmen McRae, Freddie Hubbard, Thelonious Monk, David Baker, Dizzy Gillespie, Marvin Gaye, Tammi Terrell, and Alicia Keys. Ridley has also recorded over 50 sessions as a sideman. His recordings as a leader include *Other Voices* and *Live at Rutgers University* (with the Jazz Legacy Ensemble), and *Sum of the Parts*.

Dr. Ridley served as Chairman, Music Department, Livingston College of Rutgers University, 1972–1980; Professor of Music, Rutgers University, 1972–1999, and has served as Professor Emeritus at Rutgers, beginning in 1999. He has served as Artist-in-Residence at a number of colleges, universities and institutions including Southern University, College of the Virgin Islands, University of Natal-Durban and the Schomburg Center/New York Public Library, where he has been in residence since 1993.

Dr. Ridley's numerous honors and awards include the Mid-Atlantic Arts Foundation's Living Legacy Jazz Award (1997), Howard University's Benny Golson Award (2001) and the Don Redman Society's Don Redman Heritage Award (2011). He has also been inducted into The International Association of Jazz Educators Hall of Fame (1998); Down Beat Magazine's Jazz Education Hall of Fame (1999) and received the Rutgers University/Livingston College Legacy Award (2011).

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Larry Ridley is a living jazz treasure and I urge all members to join me in commending him for his magnificent contributions as an artist and educator.

HONORING ANDERSON UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Anderson United Methodist Church Jackson, Mississippi.

Anderson United Methodist Church began as a mission in 1914 under the leadership of local ministers from the Central and Pratt Methodist Episcopal Churches. One of the ministers, the late Rev. R. L. Pickens, then pastor of Central, helped organize the Cloverleaf Methodist Episcopal Mission. During the 1920s, the first group of members met at the home of William Harper on Woodrow Wilson Avenue where they worshiped until a specific location was secured.

By 1928, a temporary house of worship for the Mission had been obtained, an old abandoned store on Whitfield Mill Road, (now Martin Luther King Dr.). In 1936, a lot on Spring Street was purchased, and the first church building was constructed. It was named for the Rev. R. L. Anderson the first conference appointed minister. Rev. Anderson died in 1930. The Rev. I. R. Kersh, Sr., was the pastor at the time Anderson Chapel, as it was known then, was constructed. During the next fifty-five years, the following ministers Pastored Anderson Chapel: Reverends J.C. Bell, Golden Price, S.L. Webb, W.J. Eubanks, N.W. Ross, R.D. Gerald, Whalon Blackmon, T.S. Davis, A.L. Holland, F.P. Leonard, C.P. Payne, H.C. Clay, Sr., and John L. Baker.

In September 1952, under the leadership of Rev. Blackmon, a new structure was built on Page Street and given the name Anderson Memorial. In 1968, under C.P. Payne, Anderson Memorial became Anderson United Methodist Church. In 1972, during the tenure of Rev. Clay, the white and black United Meth-

odist conference merged into one conference. In 1985, Rev. Jeffrey A. Stallworth was appointed pastor at Anderson. It was under his leadership that the church moved to 485 West Northside Drive.

Because of the tremendous growth, Anderson relocated to 1–220 at Hanging Moss Road in November, 1994. At this time, membership was over 1,600. After being at this location for only two years, in December 1996 the membership at Anderson surpassed the 3,000 mark.

In June 2002, the Reverend Joe W. May became Pastor of Anderson United Methodist Church. As membership continue to rise, Anderson United Methodist Church works diligently to provide a friendly worship atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Anderson United Methodist Church.

HONORING DR. BENNIE PENNINGTON

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, a tenacious man of God accepted his calling to serve in the Educational System; and

Whereas, Dr. Bennie Pennington began his educational career in teaching thirty (30) years ago and this year he retires from teaching at Dunaire Elementary School in Stone Mountain, Georgia, he has served the DeKalb County School District well and our community has been blessed through his service; and

Whereas, this remarkable man has shared his time and talents as a Teacher, Educator and Motivator, giving the citizens of Georgia a person of great worth, a fearless leader, a devoted scholar and a servant to all who want to advance the lives of our youth; and

Whereas, Dr. Pennington is formally retiring from his educational career today, he will continue to promote education because he is a cornerstone in our community that has enhanced the lives of thousands for the betterment of our District and Nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Dr. Bennie Pennington on his retirement from the DeKalb County School District and to wish him well in his new endeavors; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim May 21, 2013 as Dr. Bennie Pennington Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 21st day of May, 2013.

CONGRATULATING THE BENSON
UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR
THEIR STRAIGHT A REPORT
CARD

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Benson Unified School District on the high honor of being named Arizona's top performing school district.

The Benson School District serves 1200 students in the community of Benson as well as other areas across San Pedro Valley. Their mission is to provide a safe and welcoming learning community that prepares students to be competitive and productive citizens.

The success of Benson Schools comes after years of commitment to proven instructional practices and a strong academic curriculum for their students. This dedication has led to the accolades we celebrate today.

This distinguished recognition is testament to the hard work and dedication Superintendent David Woodall, the school board, and the dedicated staff and teachers of the district. I am proud to represent these outstanding schools in Congress.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHIEF
KENNETH BROOKER

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the illustrious career of Chief Kenneth Brooker of the Flower Mound Police Department as he retires after 40 years of committed service in law enforcement. Over his past 30 years with the Flower Mound Police Department, Chief Brooker has advanced from Patrol Officer to Chief of Police, a leadership position he has held since 1999.

During his tenure, as the Town of Flower Mound's population has grown from 4,400 to over 62,000, Chief Brooker has capably overseen the expansion of the police force in accordance with the town's needs. In addition to the growing from 13 employees on staff to its current 86 sworn officers and 82 civilians, the Flower Mound Police Department has achieved accreditation through the Commission on the Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, developed a SWAT team, Citizen's Patrol, Chaplain Corps, School Crossing Guard Program and Junior Police Academy.

Under Chief Brooker's direction, the Flower Mound Police Department has been honored nationally for well-designed police vehicles and was recognized as a Webber Seavey Award for Quality in Law Enforcement finalist by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. The Town of Flower Mound has been repeatedly recognized as one of the safest cities in Texas, a phenomenal and challenging feat.

Chief Brooker's legacy of honorable service, diligence to duty and inspired leadership will

continue to positively influence the Town of Flower Mound and the police department he has supervised over the past 14 years. It is my privilege to commend Flower Mound Police Chief Kenneth Brooker and wish him well in his retirement and to represent the Town of Flower Mound in the U.S. House of Representatives.

HONORING PEARL STREET AFRICAN
METHODIST EPISCOPAL
CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pearl Street African Methodist Episcopal Church in Jackson, Mississippi. In 1865, Reverend Thomas W. Stringer organized Pearl Street African Methodist Episcopal Church. The first church was known as Foley Chapel, and Reverend Stringer served as pastor until Reverend James Ellsworth was appointed as pastor. The church was located on the corner of Clifton and Pearl Streets. About seventeen pastors served the church in its initial edifice, including Reverend Hugh Miller Foley, the pastor for whom Foley Chapel was named.

In 1898, Reverend James E. Carter, who had served as president of Shorter College in Arkansas, came to Mississippi and was assigned in 1899 as pastor. Under Reverend Carter's leadership, the name of the church was changed to Pearl Street African Methodist Episcopal Church, and a new edifice was built in 1902. The newly built church was on the corner of Clifton and Pearl Streets. Foley Chapel remained on the property as Foley Hall.

In 1956, Bishop W. W. Wright appointed Reverend G. R. Haughton to Pearl Street A.M.E. Church as pastor. During his pastorate, the city requested the property at Clifton and Pearl Streets for opening a new street. Reverend Haughton immediately focused members' attention on building Greater Pearl Street African Methodist Episcopal Church in another location at 925 West Pearl Street. A home at 1051 Deer Park Street was purchased for the new parsonage. Members began use of the new church in April 1961, and it was dedicated on April 30, 1961. Successors to Reverend G. R. Haughton include the following: Reverend Dr. George A. Sewell (1965–1967) and Reverend William Portis (1967–1974).

In October 1974, Reverend Thomas Benjamin Brown, Jr. was appointed as pastor of Pearl Street. He served as pastor for eight years. In 1976, during Reverend Brown's leadership of the church, the trustees purchased additional property around the church at 925 West Pearl Street. Also, the church sold the parsonage on Deer Park Street and purchased a home at 219 Claiborne Street as the new parsonage. Four years later, Reverend Brown kicked off his campaign for Bishopric on May 24, 1980 in his native Greenwood, Mississippi. Two years following the kick-off campaign, Bishop Cummings determined that perhaps Reverend Brown stood a better

chance of winning the Bishopric if he were to run for the Bishop serving as pastor of Union Bethel, New Pearl Street. So in November 1982, Bishop Frank Curtis sent Reverend Brown to New Orleans as pastor of Union Bethel, and he sent Union Bethel's pastor, Reverend Lorenzo G. Clarke to Pearl Street. Reverend Clarke was pastor of Pearl Street from November 1982–October 1985.

At the General Conference 1984, Bishop Donald George Kenneth Ming was assigned to the Eighth Episcopal District Bishop Ming appointed Reverend Johnny Barbour, Jr. as pastor of Pearl Street A.M.E. Church in October 1985. Reverend Barbour, Pearl Street's longest serving pastor, remained as pastor for 15 years. In 1987, under Reverend Barbour's spiritual leadership, the church moved from 925 West Pearl Street into a church edifice at 2519 Robinson Street (valued at 3.5 million dollars). During this same year, 1987, Mrs. Ruth Roseman Dease, dedicated church historiographer from 1958–1987. Shirley Hopkins Davis was privileged and honored to have worked with Mrs. Dease in typing the history, which she so competently recorded on a weekly basis. Following Mrs. Dease's death, Reverend Barbour appointed Ms. L'Dina Robinson as church historiographer.

Ten years following the purchase of the edifice at 2519 Robinson Street (1997), Reverend Johnny Barbour, Jr. and the officers and members burned the mortgage. The presiding bishop then was the Rt. Reverend Richard Allen Chappelle, Sr. Since the church has been purchased under Rt. Reverend Donald G. K. Ming's bishopric, Reverend Barbour invited Bishop Ming back to preach at the Mortgage Burning. Bishop Chappelle conducted the Mortgage Burning ceremony. Reverend Barbour had announced his candidacy for Secretary-Treasurer of the A.M.E. Sunday School Union at the General Conference 1996. So, he was campaigning for the office during this time. He remained pastor of progressive Pearl Street for several months after he was elected to the office at the General Conference 2000, in Cincinnati, Ohio.

During the General Conference 2000, the 8th Episcopal District was assigned Bishop Cornal Garnett Henning, Sr. whose father, Reverend H. W. Henning, had served as pastor of Pearl Street from 1940–41. Bishop Henning asked Reverend Barbour to remain pastor of Pearl Street until Planning Meeting in December 2000, and Reverend Barbour remained as pastor while carrying on his new General Officer position of Secretary-Treasurer of the Sunday School Union.

On December 2, 2000 the Rt. Reverend C. Garnett Henning, Sr. appointed the Reverend Dr. Samuel Boyd, Sr. as pastor of Pearl Street African Methodist Episcopal Church. Reverend Boyd had served as pastor of Historic St. James A.M.E. Church, New Orleans, LA for ten years. He preached as pastor of Pearl Street on December 3, 2000.

Pearl Street has a rich history of growth and development as a church family and community supporter. After 136 years, the church remains a stronghold and a source of spiritual empowerment for its members and the community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Pearl Street African Methodist Episcopal Church.

RECOGNIZING MR. VAL ARCHER

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, a cool, calm, collected and very tenacious man, Mr. Val Archer was born April 13, 1929, raised in Chicago, Illinois and now resides in Conyers, Georgia; and

Whereas, during WWII at the tender age of 15, and even in the face of segregation and discrimination, out of a strong sense of patriotism and love of country, he answered the call to service in the U.S. military; and

Whereas, Mr. Archer served honorably in the U.S. Army Air Corps, the United States Air Force and as a member of the renowned Tuskegee Airmen, a unit with a strong sense of honor and duty who performed with great precision in combating the enemy in the European theater; and

Whereas, he saw active duty in Korea, Japan, Guam, the Marshall Islands and Europe where he was always proud of the performance of his fellow Tuskegee Airmen who proved beyond a doubt that they were there to excel; and

Whereas, he served with great distinction as the President of the Atlanta Chapter of the Tuskegee Airmen, Inc. and he is the recipient of The Congressional Gold Medal, the nation's highest civilian honor; and

Whereas, this model citizen continues sharing his time, talents and great wisdom with young people urging them to not drift or follow the crowd, to get an education, practice self-respect, integrity and responsibility to themselves, their family and their country; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mr. Val Archer for his outstanding leadership and service to the citizens in the 4th District, the state of Georgia and the nation; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim May 18, 2013 as Mr. Val Archer Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 18th day of May, 2013.

HONORING THE ROTARY CLUB OF JOLIET

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Rotary Club of Joliet for selflessly working for 100 years to improve communities in Illinois. The organization's motto of "Service Above Self" inspires its members to provide humanitarian service, encourage high ethical standards, and promote good will in the world. The Joliet Rotary Club has over 130 members and is part of Rotary International. It was established in 1910 as the Study Club, and it became the first Rotary club in a city with less than 75,000 residents.

Joliet Rotarians learned the best practices of service, and went on to help establish new

Rotary clubs in surrounding communities over the next decades. They participated in the foundation of the Joliet Chamber of Commerce, the conservation of Higginbotham Woods, and collecting shoes and supplies for World War I soldiers. They have always been instrumental in providing financial assistance for groups and foundations in their call to community service.

The Guiding Principles of Rotary capture important and admirable values for our community. The principles state: "The object of Rotary is to encourage and foster the ideal of service as a basis of worthy enterprise and, in particular, to encourage and foster: first, the development of acquaintance as an opportunity for service; second, high ethical standards in business and professions, the recognition of the worthiness of all useful occupations, and the dignifying of each Rotarian's occupation as an opportunity to serve society; third, the application of the ideal of service in each Rotarian's personal, business and community life; fourth, the advancement of international understanding, goodwill, and peace through a world of fellowship of business and professional persons united in the ideal of service."

Rotary International founder Paul P. Harris said it best, "Rotary brings men differing in social status, religious beliefs and nationality together in order that they may be more intelligible to each other and therefore more sympathetic and friendly." If we all follow this model, we will leave our community and our world a much better place.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Rotary Club of Joliet, not only for its longevity, but also for its dedication to service of our fellow man. I commend the club's continued dedication to making the world around us a better place for all.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, on August 2, 2013 I was not present to vote on the Motion to Recommit and Final Passage of H.R. 2009—the "Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act of 2013." I want to inform you that if present I would have voted: "aye" on the Motion to Recommit to H.R. 2009; and "nay" on Final Passage of H.R. 2009.

The legislation prohibits the Secretary of the Treasury, or any delegate of the Secretary, from implementing or enforcing any provisions of or amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

This bill marks the 40th time House Republicans have brought forth legislation seeking to repeal, obstruct and undermine the Affordable Care Act. It is time for Congress to focus on legislation that strengthens the middle-class, creates jobs and grows the economy.

IN HONOR OF RESCUE 5 AND THE 78 FALLEN FIREFIGHTERS OF 9/11

HON. MICHAEL G. GRIMM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following.

Staten Island Strong "Go Together, Stay Together" in honor of Rescue 5 and the 78 fallen firefighters of 9/11 and their families.

F/F Faustino Apostle, Jr., Battalion 2, F/F Louis Arena, Ladder 5, A/C Gerald Barbera, C.W.C., F/F Arthur Barry, Ladder 15, F/F John P. Bergan, Rescue 5, F/F Paul Beyer, Engine 6, F/F Brian Bilcher, Squad 1, F/F Carl Bini, Rescue 5, F/F Greg Buck, Engine 201, F/F Salvatore Calabro, Ladder 101, F/F Michael Cammarata, Ladder 11, F/F Brian Cannizzaro, Ladder 101, F/F Peter Carroll, Squad 1, F/F John Chipura, Engine 219, F/F Michael Clarke, Ladder 2.

F/F Reuben Correa, Engine 74, F/F Robert Curatolo, Ladder 16, Lt. Edward Darti, Squad 1, F/F Michael D'Auria, Engine 40, F/F Scott Davidson, Ladder 118, F/F Edward Day, Ladder 11, F/F George Dipasquale, Ladder 2, Capt. Martin Egan, Jr., Division 1, F/F Francis Esposito, Engine 235, Lt. Michael Esposito, Squad 1, Capt. Joseph Farley, Division 1, F/F Michael Fiori, Rescue 5, F/F Andre Fletcher, Rescue 5, Lt. Michael Fodor, Ladder 21, F/F Gary Geidel, Rescue 5.

F/F James Giberson, Ladder 35, F/F Jeffrey Giordano, Ladder 3, F/F James Gray, Ladder 20, B/C Joseph Grzelak, Battalion 48, Lt. Joseph Gullickson, Ladder 101, F/F Sean Hanley, Ladder 20, F/F Thomas Hannifin, Ladder 5, Lt. Harvey Harrell, Rescue 5, F/F Jonathan Hohmann, HazMat, BC Charles Kasper, Special OPS CD., F/F David LaForge, Ladder 20, F/F Robert Lane, Engine 55, F/F Neal Leavy, Engine 217, F/F Daniel Libretti, Rescue 2, F/F Joseph Maffeo, Ladder 101.

Lt. Charles Margiotta, Rescue 5, Lt. Peter Martin, Rescue 2, F/F Joseph Mascalli, Rescue 5, F/F John McAvoy, Ladder 3, F/F Timothy McSweeney, Ladder 3, F/F Douglas Miller, Rescue 5, F/F Henry Miller, Jr., Ladder 105, Capt. Louis Modiferri, Rescue 5, F/F Christopher Mozzillo, Engine 55, F/F Joseph Ogren, Ladder 3, F/F Patrick O'Keefe, Rescue 1, F/F Jeffrey Olsen, Engine 10, F/F Eric Olsen, Ladder 15, F/F Jeffrey Palazzo, Rescue 5, F/F Paul Pisani, Engine 10.

Lt. Glenn Perry, Battalion 12, Lt. Philip Petti, Battalion 7, Lt. Michael Quilty, Ladder 11, F/F Louis Ragaglia, Engine 54, F/F Nicholas Rossomando, Rescue 5, F/F Thomas Sabella, Ladder 13, F/F John Santore, Ladder 5, F/F John Schardt, Engine 201, F/F Stephen Siller, Squad 1, F/F Jeffrey Stark, Engine 230,

STATEN ISLAND STRONG

(By Albert Carey Caswell)

All in these,
Our darkest of all hours!
Will we so find the strength,
to somehow overcome,
the power?
To go so courageously forth,
to shine and not to cower!
While, all there but in the face death!
While, putting our own lives all at risk to
others bless!
To so show the world of faith's true power!
And become Angels,
all because of these our last and most finest
of all hours!
And how will our loved ones so find the
strength?

To so accept God's Will,
 knowing what their loss has meant?
 As all around them such heartache towers!
 As their tears roll down their chins,
 all throughout the coming years and hours!
 And how will they so find the grace,
 to wipe all those tears from their face?
 And start again with hearts of courage full
 so breaking then!
 With the kind of pain that only heaven
 heals, so ends!
 As upon bended knee,
 as all across this Nation we now so pray for
 them!
 As we so ask our Lord to help them find the
 strength!
 Because strength cannot so be measured in
 girth and power!
 Or muscle mass acquired,
 while working out in a gym for hours!
 But from rather what so comes from heart
 within!
 For the greatest of all strength so comes. . .
 With the kind strength,
 that lets one run up those steps into the face
 of hell!
 And let's their love ones hearts so mend,
 as each new day in such heartache they so
 dwell!
 All in the shadow of America's Liberty. . .
 All in this Empire State for all to see. . .
 But lies such a magnificent community. . .
 An island to its self which greaves,
 as to all hearts now so speaks!
 So speaks of faith and courage and dignity!
 Of an Island made of Staten Steel which
 breathes!
 Of blue collar workers,
 just trying to live That Great American
 Dream!
 Of such strength and courage,
 a monument to all the world to be!
 Of such heroic hearts which beat!
 Who against all odds would succeed!
 And would not wave,
 as why up to heaven they so rose Godspeed!
 All because of the greatest of all gifts they
 gave!
 Who with such Strength In Honor so be-
 haved!
 Who on 9/11 so taught you and me!
 Just how truly great a heart can be!
 Because, all in the moments of our lives. . .
 When, who lives and who so dies. . .
 When, it all so depends upon you, relies!
 Will we so with our hearts of courage full,
 rush in to shine bright like a jewel?
 To over evil to so rule!
 To make a difference with it all!
 To save life,
 while Standing Strong!
 While, Standing Tall!
 Leaving the Angels in such awe!
 Would we be so willing to pay such a price?
 With these,
 our own most precious of all lives?
 All with such selfless sacrifice!
 Bringing tears to our Lord's eyes!
 People, who in one another so believed!
 You go! I go!
 As all into that face of death together, WE!
 "GO TOGETHER, STAY TOGETHER",
 was but their most heroic creed!
 And all of those most heroic families!
 Who so lived with all of that worry. . .
 As each new morning off to work they'd
 leave!
 Who so faced death, To So Rescue Me!
 Such fine Men and Women of humanity!
 Who Stood Staten Island Strong,
 to be all that they could be!
 Who all in that moment of truth,
 so showed us how Angels are so conceived!
 When, their fine hearts. . .

just like a song would speak!
 Living by such a most selfless creed!
 All but To Rescue Me!
 Armed with such brave hearts which no
 longer beat!
 Who all out upon war wagons came rushing
 these,
 jumping up upon them to death to cheat!
 As it was one for all,
 and all for one!
 You go. . . I go!
 A band of brothers so willing to die and
 bleed!
 Who upon each other so relied,
 the need!
 For they were some of America's greatest
 ones!
 Whose families are our Nation's quiet heroes
 and heroines!
 As no new day is so promised to anyone!
 And on 9/11 as their day begun,
 just like all those others, had each one. . .
 For on this day of days they all stood Staten
 Island Strong!
 As each and everyone could so be counted on!
 Armed but with such Gotham Hearts,
 to which belonged!
 As why now up in Heaven they are Angels all
 among!
 To watch over us from dust to dawn!
 Rescue 5 and these Fire Fighters,
 up on a pedestal so belong!
 "GO TOGETHER, STAY TOGETHER"
 Just like a Psalm!
 As you rushed up while others rushed down!
 As you rushed in while others rushed out!
 While, the face of death you stared down!
 With each new most heroic step,
 closer to Heaven your soul was swept!
 As you gave all,
 That Last Full Measure,
 would accept!
 So many heroes from that Island died that
 day!
 Standing Staten Island Strong in every way,
 as all of their fine lives they gave!
 Heroes come all in such shapes and sizes!
 But it's what's within their hearts which so
 comprises!
 Who they are!
 That which so lives on bright like a star!
 And for all of those families,
 Husbands and Wives who now so weep!
 And for all of those children without Mom's
 and Dad's,
 whose pain now mounts so ever deep!
 And all of those Brothers and Sisters,
 who in your arms your best friends can't
 keep!
 Could we just as your loved ones such cour-
 age speak?
 To a place where only hearts of courage beat!
 And be Stand Staten Island Strong,
 as once had all of these!
 And as you lay your heads down to rest, to
 sleep!
 In Staten Island there comes a gentle rain,
 so very deep. . .
 As it's your loved ones tears,
 from up in Heaven to so ease. . .
 To so ease your pain as you weep. . .
 Until one fine day up Heaven you'll all so
 meet. . .
 And you won't have to cry no more!
 So hush little baby don't you cry,
 one day up in Heaven you will look into your
 parent's eyes!
 And you will hear them on the wind,
 and when you wake feel them again and
 again. . .
 And remember my child,
 on the day you were born,
 their greatest wish so formed. . .
 Was for you to have a happy life,

to live on. . .
 So make your parents dreams come true,
 and somehow carry on. . .
 Goodness!
 Evil!
 Darkness!
 Light!
 Those brave hearts who evil must fight!
 Who bring their light!
 Were but all of those who fought that fight!
 Who Stood Staten Island Strong with all
 their might!
 And in the shadow of America's Liberty. . .
 All in this 'The Empire State for all to
 see. . .
 But lies such a magnificent community. . .
 An island who out to all hearts now so
 speaks!
 That which stands even stronger this day in-
 deed!
 All because of them, these!
 Who so showed us all how to so live and die,
 and how to grieve!
 As they Stood Staten Island Strong,
 for their families and what they believed!
 For We Will Never Forget,
 Never. . . all of these!
 And The Greatest Strength,
 all within a heart so beats!
 All in this most heroic community,
 which sits in the shadow of Liberty!
 Amen!

HONORING AALIYAH COLE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speak-
 er, I rise today to honor Ms. Aaliyah Cole, a
 dedicated student, who is making a difference
 in her community.

On a crisp winter day in December of 1994,
 Aaliyah Cole was born to Biven and Beatrice
 Cole. She grew quickly both physically and in-
 tellectually. At the age of two, she was able to
 read children's books on her own. In Sep-
 tember of 1999, her little brother, Biven Cole
 Jr., was born. They grew together as siblings
 and companions. As a young girl she began to
 set her sights high on accomplishing things
 bigger than herself. She was motivated, deter-
 mined, and driven to make a difference and
 dream big.

Throughout her years in school, Aaliyah has
 maintained exceptional academic records
 backed by outstanding leadership roles and
 giving dynamic service to her community. In
 the second grade, she wanted to be the Val-
 edictorian of her graduating class and she ac-
 complished that. She has held three state offi-
 cer positions—State President, State Sec-
 retary, and State Treasurer-in the Technology
 Student Association and she is also the cur-
 rent chairman of her high school yearbook
 committee. She received several leadership
 awards for her leadership abilities.

Aaliyah has served her community, since
 she was a little girl, whether it was recycling
 plastics and aluminums, hosting voter registra-
 tion drives, or visiting the community nursing
 home, she has always found urgency in mak-
 ing a difference in the world and in people's
 lives.

In March of 2011, Aaliyah launched her very
 own organization by the name of Team

M.A.W.M.A.C. (Make a Wave, Make a Change), an organization designed to raise awareness about the many things that plague communities around the world. With this organization, she held a Teens for Jeans drive which helped her school to collect 152 pairs of blue jeans to donate to homeless teens around the world. They also plan to cultivate her school flower beds on Earth Day this April, 2013.

Upon completing high school, Aaliyah plans to further pursue her dream of making a difference by attending either the University of Southern Mississippi or Xavier University of Louisiana. There she will pursue a degree in Biochemistry/Pre-Medicine, to later attend medical school and become a licensed Pediatric Neurologist. She also plans to open her own private practice. During her career, she plans to help rebuild the Jefferson County community by renovating their schools and seek businesses to invest the area. She also dreams about creating a scholarship program that will give African American students in underprivileged communities like her hometown greater funds to assist students with paying for college.

Aaliyah likes to live by this motto: "When you have big dreams don't listen to what nobody says that is trying to turn you away. When you have big dreams, keep your eyes on the prize and don't fall by the wayside; reach for the sky."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a talented student, Ms. Aaliyah Cole, for her zeal in actively making a difference in her community.

HONORING THE WAY, THE TRUTH AND THE LIFE CHRISTIAN CENTER, INC.

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, today we celebrate leadership, service and a ministry that for the past thirty one years has enhanced our district, our state, our country and the world; and

Whereas, Apostle Ulysses Tuff and Pastor Deborah Tuff are today celebrating thirty one years as spiritual leaders and servants of God at the church of their founding, The Way, The Truth and The Life Christian Center; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man of God, Apostle Ulysses Tuff and this phenomenal virtuous woman of God, Pastor Deborah Tuff are instruments of God who give hope to the hopeless, feed the needy and empower our community by preaching the gospel, teaching the gospel and living the gospel; and

Whereas, the members of The Way, The Truth and The Life Christian Center continue to uplift and inspire others, through outreach ministries, The Giver of Life Mission School, The Giver of Life Christian Academy, The Giver of Life Institute of Ministerial Training, and The Giver of Life Ministerial Association; and

Whereas, The Way, The Truth and The Life Christian Center has produced many spiritual warriors, people of compassion, people of great courage, fearless leaders and servants to all, but most of all visionaries who have shared not only with their Church, but with our district, our nation and the world; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize The Way, The Truth and The Life Christian Center, Inc., on their 31st Anniversary and for their distinguished leadership and service to humanity; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim August 25, 2013 as The Way, The Truth and The Life Christian Center, Inc., Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 25th day of August, 2013.

TRIBUTE TO SHERRY BARBARA SHAPIRO

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sherry Barbara Shapiro on her retirement following 40 years of extraordinary federal service.

Ms. Shapiro began her federal service in July, 1973 working for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, which later became the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration (ARBA).

In 1975, she left ARBA to join the Congressional Research Service (CRS) of the Library of Congress as a government and law bibliographer. In this position, prior to the wide availability of commercial and academic electronic databases, Sherry indexed and abstracted thousands of articles to serve as authoritative resources for public policy makers conducting congressional business.

Working collaboratively with the Government Printing Office each year for many years, Sherry coordinated CRS's compilation of materials to support the annual high school and college debate manuals.

Sherry's primary work assignment was to respond directly to Member and committee research requests related to foreign affairs, regional studies, and national defense. Sherry at the same time served the information needs of the analysts and senior specialists in CRS's Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division. Her research supported the production of hundreds of CRS reports and CRS analyst testimony during her 40-year career.

During her tenure at CRS, she supported a number of congressional programs, among them democracy-building programs conducted by Members of Congress working on the Frost-Solomon Task Force, the House Democracy Assistance Commission, and later the House Democracy Partnership. Her knowledge of foreign affairs and regional studies made her the go-to person for information compiled for Congressional delegations to East Timor, Hungary, Mongolia, China, South Korea, and Indonesia. Sherry accompanied Commission members and staff on several

congressional delegation trips to work with members of foreign legislatures. Her specialized knowledge and her genuine concern for the people of the countries she visited resulted in many lasting friendships, and the high regard in which Sherry was held by those she met provided enhanced opportunities for congressional delegations to learn a great deal from their experience of travel to these countries.

As Sherry supported and participated in congressional delegations, she also trained foreign parliamentary and government agency librarians and encouraged literacy in developing countries such as Mongolia and Kyrgyzstan. Whenever she traveled abroad, she expanded her efforts to reach students in fledgling democracies to share her knowledge of what it means to be a librarian in a functioning democracy.

While at CRS, Sherry also spent considerable time reviewing electronic resources and developing innovative ways to increase access to these resources by staff serving the information needs of the Congress.

Another important aspect of Sherry's work at CRS was her work as a mentor to new librarians. Her knowledge of federal librarianship and the work of the legislative branch allowed her to develop a new generation of librarians.

Sherry's dedication to her work at CRS was based on responding to each person she encountered with kindness and respect, fairness, and a willingness to go the extra mile to make sure each one had the tools and skills to locate the information needed to help develop legislation, answer constituent requests, or examine the critical issues of the day.

Outside of her many duties and responsibilities at CRS, Sherry not only raised five children with her husband John, but was actively involved in community activities. Sherry works tirelessly in our community of Alexandria. The Girl Scouts, the elderly and memory-impaired, a soup kitchen, an animal rescue organization, and others, all have benefitted from her determination to make our community better.

During my own time at CRS, I knew and worked with Sherry, and I look forward to continuing to work with her on projects that will benefit our community.

I congratulate Sherry, her husband John, and their children, Matt, Daniel, Emily, Lauren and Nora on this momentous occasion.

I personally thank her for 40 years of service to the United States Congress.

TRIBUTE TO SGT. DEREK JOHNSON

HON. JASON CHAFFETZ

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dedicated public servant and American hero who died tragically in the line of duty while protecting the city of Draper, Utah. In the early morning hours of September 1, 2013, 32-year-old police Sgt. Derek Johnson was ambushed while responding to a suspicious vehicle during the last few minutes of his graveyard shift. Never able to draw his own

weapon or return fire, Sgt. Johnson died from multiple gunshot wounds shortly after the incident. We honor his lifelong commitment to the safety and security of his community.

Remembered as one of the hardest working officers in the Draper Police Department, Sgt. Johnson is a decorated officer who earned many awards for his efforts. Not only was he the 2012 Community Policing Officer of the Year, he also earned the Life Saving Award and Distinguished Service Award for his outstanding service. According to his family, he grew up wanting to be a police officer.

We honor the immeasurable personal sacrifice of Sgt. Johnson's family. He leaves behind his wife, Shante Sidwell Johnson and his six-year-old son Bensen Ray, who he called Little Buddy. His love for his family was obvious to all. We also recognize his mother, Laura, father, Randy, and four siblings: brothers Devin, Darin, and Dayson and his sister Desirae. The Johnson family has endured a terrible tragedy and made an extraordinary sacrifice to keep the community safe. We are forever thankful.

The streets of the United States of America stay safe because of the honorable and dedicated service of officers like Sgt. Derek Johnson. His loss will be keenly felt by all who knew him.

Today, I ask all Members of Congress to join me as we honor the life and legacy of Sgt. Derek Johnson, as well as each man and woman who risks life and limb to secure our communities. I also ask that we recognize the sacrifice and burdens their families endure in support of this great country. We owe them all our eternal gratitude.

HONORING MOUNT ZION MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable historical church, Mount Zion Missionary Baptist of Lambert, Mississippi and the great leadership it is under.

The New Mount Zion M. B. Church in Lambert, Mississippi was first organized in 1917 or 1918. It took on new life in 1923, when a small piece of land was purchased and a new church was built through donations made by members of the church. W. L. Morgan was the first pastor of the church.

Rev. Jossell was elected as pastor on Sunday, September 4, 1994. He preached his first

sermon as pastor on September 18, 1994 and is still here. We are a full time Church on the move for Jesus.

After construction was completed, the first sermon in the new sanctuary was held on Sunday, December 3, 2006. The name of New Mt. Zion M. B. Church was officially changed back to Mount Zion M. B. Church on December 29, 2006. On April 30, 2008, the church parking lot was paved. In 2009, BTU (Baptist Training Union) and Evening Worship Service were instituted. In the spring of 2011, the recently constructed Family Life Center was used for a Red Cross Shelter to housed flood victims, and continues to be identified as a voluntary Red Cross shelter in the event of a natural disaster.

Mt. Zion M.B. Church outreach ministries is known for addressing the needs of the whole man through Parenting Classes, Healthy Marriage Seminars, Music Classes, Male Mentoring and Abstinence Education Programs. Mt. Zion also sponsors an annual Senior Citizen Christmas food bag giveaway that was expanded through efforts of the establishment of the Quitman County Community Revival. Currently plans are underway to collaborate with other churches in the Quitman County Community to host a "feed the hungry" drive where participants will receive free food for physical nourishment and spiritual food (the spoken word) to strengthen and empower the soul.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mount Zion Missionary Baptist Church for its dedication to serving our great country.

RECOGNIZING HILLCREST CHURCH OF CHRIST

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, since 1951, Hillcrest Church of Christ has been and continues to be a beacon of light in our district; and

Whereas, Bro. Richard L. Barclay, Senior Minister and the members of the Hillcrest Church of Christ family, today continue to uplift and inspire those in our district and beyond; and

Whereas, Hillcrest Church of Christ has been and continues to be a place where citizens are touched spiritually, mentally and physically through outreach ministries and community partnership to aid in building up the community; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious Church of Christ has given hope to the hopeless, fed the needy and empowered our community by preaching the gospel, witnessing for the gospel and teaching the gospel; and

Whereas, Hillcrest Church of Christ has produced many spiritual elders, people of compassion, people of great courage, fearless leaders and servants to all, but most of all visionaries who have shared not only with their Church, but with our district and the world as they spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Hillcrest Church of Christ family as they dedicate their new Church Sanctuary and for continued leadership and service to our District and the world; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim August 25, 2013 as Hillcrest Church of Christ Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 25th day of August, 2013.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am making my financial net worth as of March 31, 2013, a matter of public record. I have filed similar statements for each of the thirty-four preceding years I have served in the Congress.

Assets:

Real Property:

Single family residence in City of Alexandria, Virginia, at assessed valuation. (Assessed at \$1,378,823). Ratio of assessed to market value: 100% (Unencumbered)	\$1,378,823.00
Condominium in Village of Menomonee Falls, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, at assessor's estimated market value. (Unencumbered)	\$134,700.00
Undivided 25/44ths interest in residence in Village of Chenequa, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, at 25/44ths of assessor's estimated market value of \$1,370,700.	\$778,806.82
Total Real Property	\$2,292,329.82

3/31/13 Disclosure

Common & preferred stock	# of shares	\$ per share	Value
Abbott Laboratories, Inc.	12200	35.32	430,904.00
AbbVie Inc.	12200	40.78	497,516.00
Alcatel-Lucent	135	1.33	179.55
Allstate Corporation	370	49.01	18,133.70
AT & T	7099.76991	36.69	260,490.56
JP Morgan Chase	4539	47.46	215,420.94
Benton County Mining Company	333	0.00	0.00
BP PLC	3604	42.35	152,629.40
Centerpoint Energy	300	23.96	7,188.00
Chenega Country Club Realty Co.	1	0.00	0.00
Comcast	634	41.98	26,615.32
Darden Restaurants, Inc.	2160	51.68	111,628.80
Discover Financial Services	156	44.84	6,995.04
Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.	1250	83.65	104,562.50

3/31/13 Disclosure—Continued

Common & preferred stock	# of shares	\$ per share	Value
E.I. DuPont de Nemours Corp.	1200	49.16	58,992.00
Eastman Chemical Co.	540	69.87	37,729.80
Eastman Kodak	1080	0.30	324.00
Exxon Mobil Corp.	9728	90.11	876,590.08
Frontier Comm.	504.616019	3.99	2,013.42
Gartner Inc.	651	54.41	35,420.91
General Electric Co.	15600	23.12	360,672.00
General Mills, Inc.	5760	49.31	284,025.60
NRG Energy (Formerly GenOn Energy)	28	26.49	741.72
Hospira	1220	32.83	40,052.60
Imation Corp.	99	3.82	378.18
Kellogg Corp.	3200	64.43	206,176.00
Merck & Co., Inc.	7303	44.20	322,792.60
3M Company	2000	106.31	212,620.00
Express Scripts (Formerly Medco Hlth)	6656	57.62	383,518.72
Monsanto Corporation	2852.315	105.63	301,290.03
Moody's	5000	53.32	266,600.00
Morgan Stanley	312	21.98	6,857.76
NCR Corp.	68	27.56	1,874.08
Newell Rubbermaid	1676	26.10	43,743.60
JP Morgan Cash	345.12	1.00	345.12
PG & E Corp.	175	44.53	7,792.75
Pfizer	30415	28.86	877,776.90
Century Link	95	35.13	3,337.35
Tenneco Inc.	182	39.31	7,154.42
Unisys, Inc.	16	22.75	364.00
US Bancorp	3081	33.93	104,538.33
Verizon	1880.97125	49.15	92,449.74
Vodafone Group PLC	323	28.40	9,173.20
Wisconsin Energy	2044	42.89	87,667.16
Total Common & Preferred Stocks & Bonds			\$6,465,275.88

3/31/13 DISCLOSURE

Life insurance policies	Face \$	Surrender \$
Northwestern Mutual	12,000.00	108,180.02
Northwestern Mutual	30,000.00	260,254.77
Massachusetts Mutual	10,000.00	15,571.32
Massachusetts Mutual	100,000.00	409,111.38
American General Life Ins.	175,000.00	42,652.72
Total Life Insurance Policies		\$835,770.21

3/31/13 DISCLOSURE

Bank & IRA accounts	Balance
JP Morgan Chase Bank, checking account	38,834.51
JP Morgan Chase Bank, savings account	64,532.38
BMO Harris Bank, checking account	7,686.64
Burke & Herbert Bank, Alexandria, VA, checking ac- count	1,245.05
JP Morgan Chase, IRA accounts	158,071.11
Total Bank & IRA Accounts	\$270,369.69

3/31/13 DISCLOSURE

Miscellaneous	Value
2009 Ford Taurus	10,508.00
1994 Cadillac DeVille	1,675.00
1996 Buick Regal	1,641.00
Office furniture & equipment (estimated)	1,000.00
Furniture, clothing & personal property (estimated)	180,000.00
Stamp collection (estimated)	160,000.00
Deposits in Congressional Retirement Fund	222,803.80
Deposits in Federal Thrift Savings Plan	460,525.44
Traveler's checks	7,800.00
17 ft. Boston Whaler boat & 70 hp Johnson outboard motor (estimated)	5,000.00
20 ft. Pontoon boat & 40 hp Mercury outboard motor (estimated)	8,000.00
Total Miscellaneous	\$1,058,953.24
Total Assets	\$10,922,698.84

3/31/13 DISCLOSURE

Liabilities	
None	
Total Liabilities	\$0.00
Net Worth	\$10,922,698.84

3/31/13 DISCLOSURE

Statement of 2012 taxes paid	
Federal Income Tax	\$135,247.00
Wisconsin Income Tax	\$47,256.00
Menomonee Falls, WI Property Tax	\$2,463.00
Chenequa, WI Property Tax	\$19,975.00
Alexandria, VA Property Tax	\$13,618.00

I further declare that I am trustee of a trust established under the will of my late father, Frank James Sensenbrenner, Sr., for the benefit of my sister, Margaret A. Sensenbrenner,

and of my two sons, F. James Sensenbrenner, III, and Robert Alan Sensenbrenner. I am further the direct beneficiary of five trusts, but have no control over the assets of either trust. My wife, Cheryl Warren Sensenbrenner, and I are trustees of separate trusts established for the benefit of each son.

Also, I am neither an officer nor a director of any corporation organized under the laws of the State of Wisconsin or of any other state or foreign country.

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in solemn remembrance of the events of twelve years ago today, of the people who lost their lives, the families that have carried on, and the brave men and women who risked everything to save others. The human loss was tremendous and we pause with to honor those personally affected.

This is also a time for our nation to remember the resilience and unity that we showed in the days following September 11, 2001. It is an opportunity to renew our commitment to serving this country that we love. In times of difficulty or disagreement, may this day always provide a reminder of the blessings that we share as Americans and the responsibilities that come with that.

Today we again resolve to honor the sacrifice of citizens who risk their lives to help those in harm's way. The courage of first responders who gave all for the protection of others demonstrated that September 11th would not be the downfall of our great nation but would be a defining moment. May we all, like them and so many others who labored on that day, always stand ready to assist our neighbors in need.

I wish to give thanks to the brave men and women who defend our freedom as members of the armed services, many of whom may

have enlisted as a direct result of the events of September 11th. We are all forever indebted to you for your tireless and selfless efforts that ensure our security. Thank you.

My prayers continue to be with the families and friends of the loved ones lost on this day twelve years ago, with our great nation, and with those who serve it.

HONORING BOBBY WATSON

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, legendary jazz artist Bobby Watson will be honored this year by the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation (CBCF) at the Jazz Issue Forum and Concert that will take place during the 43rd Annual Legislative Conference (ALC). Mr. Watson, an internationally renowned saxophonist/composer/arranger/bandleader/educator, will also perform at the concert, which will take place on Thursday, September 19, 2013, at the Walter E. Washington Convention Center, in Washington, D.C. Mr. Watson will receive the 2013 CBCF ALC Jazz Legacy Award for his contributions to jazz and world culture.

Blessed with sizzling and sinewy sound that Jazz: The Rough Guide described as "a highly individual, extraordinarily fluid style imbued with powerful feeling," Watson was born in Lawrence, Kansas, and grew up in Kansas City, Kansas. He started playing piano at ten, the clarinet one year later, took up the saxophone in the eighth grade, played in various concert and R&B bands in high school. He graduated from the University of Miami in 1975, moved to New York City. Watson joined Art Blakey's Jazz Messengers, serving as his Musical Director from 1977 to 1981. He has recorded over one hundred recordings as a sideman and has worked with an impressive array of artists including Max Roach, Joe Williams, Dianne Reeves, Betty Carter and Lou Rawls. He was also a co-founder of the 29th Street Saxophone Quartet.

Watson formed the group, Horizon in 1980. Horizon's six recordings include No Question About It, Midwest Shuffle and Post-Motown Bop. Watson's nearly thirty CD's as a leader include Appointment in Milano, Round Trip, The Year of the Rabbit and his Kansas City opus, The Gates BBQ Suite. Watson's compositions, "In Case You Missed It," "Love Remains," and "E.T.A.," are considered modern jazz standards. Prof. Watson taught at William Patterson University in the mid-eighties, and at the Manhattan School of Music from 1986 to 1999. He returned to Kansas City in 2000, where he was selected as the recipient of the first William D. and Mary Grant Missouri Distinguished Professorship in Jazz Studies, the first endowed chair at the University of Missouri-Kansas City Conservatory of Music, where he continues to serve as the Conservatory's Director of Jazz Studies. Watson received Howard University's Benny Golson Award earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Watson is a living jazz treasure and I urge all members to join me in commending him for his magnificent contributions as an artist and educator.

HONORING THE NON-DENOMINATION HOUSE OF PRAYER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable Christian organization, The Non-Denomination House of Prayer.

The Non-Denomination House of Prayer was founded in 1948 by Pastor Charity Waffer in the historical city of Mound Bayou, Mississippi. Pastor Waffer was the first female pastor in the Mississippi Delta. As a pastoral pioneer she was instrumental in opening doors for women and youths through various church auxiliaries and functions. Her leadership guided many to various freedoms and liberties.

The current overseer is Dr. Earnestine Flowers which over sees other churches in Mississippi with the communities of Duncan, Batesville, Sardis, Oxford and in Chicago, Illinois. The Non-Denomination House of Prayer in the City of Mound Bayou current ministerial leaders are Pastor Willie Joe Flowers, Assistant Pastor Carl Henry, and Minister Martha Sanders. They have increased the church membership and have embarked on renovating and expanding their facilities in order to continue to be a blessing to its members, community, and surrounding communities by being able to be a place of refuge to those who are hungry physically and spiritually and by offering comprehensive programs to meet the needs of others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Non-Denomination House of Prayer for their dedication in being a corner stone in the Mound Bayou Community.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM ROY "TANK" SIMS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following U.S. Citizen of Distinction.

Whereas, we are gathered to celebrate the life of Mr. William Roy "Tank" Sims, one of DeKalb County's favorite sons; and

Whereas, William Roy Sims, Jr., was born to William Roy Sims, Sr., and Pearl McCray Sims, on March 10, 1951, he was educated in Birmingham, Alabama, graduated from Ullman High school and later graduated from Tuskegee Institute, in 1973 he was the first African American to work at the Macon County Commission in Alabama; and

Whereas, he was a man who believed and lived a life for God, country, community and family; and

Whereas, William Roy "Tank" Sims gave of himself, his time, his talent and his life with unwavering commitment to his family; and

Whereas, he was a son, a brother and a friend; he was a man who enjoyed life, savoring the moments with his family, his beloved fraternity Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc., and his church, Hillcrest Church of Christ in Decatur, Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia recognizes Mr. William Roy "Tank" Sims as a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby attest to the 113th Congress that Mr. William Roy "Tank" Sims is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honor" by declaring Mr. William Roy "Tank" Sims U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 27th day of May, 2013.

IN COMMEMORATION OF 9/11

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a dozen years after the tragic events of September 11, 2001, the scars from the heinous attack on our country remain. We continue to mourn the loss of the lives of nearly 3,000 innocent men, women and children, including more than 50 men and women from my own district, the 4th District of New Jersey.

The scars remain, obviously, in the painful void in the lives of the families who have sought in vain to make sense of their tragic loss. And the scars remain embedded in the fabric of our society, which has had to learn to cope with the reality of a world where indiscriminate, vicious attacks on human life are a constant threat.

While recognizing the extraordinary efforts and courage of America's first responders—the firefighters, police officers, and other emergency response personnel, the heroes—it was also apparent from the terrorist attacks that

our Nation had much to learn. We had to craft policies to better protect our people.

While progress has been made—we are safer, but still not safe—some lessons have still not been effectively learned by some in our government. One year ago today, unfortunately—on the very anniversary of the original 9/11 tragedy—we lost four Americans in a sustained attack on the U.S. consulate in Benghazi, Libya, including the U.S. ambassador to that country.

I was one of those, among so many others, who advocated early and consistently for a commission to chronicle the facts, missteps, and opportunities lost leading up to the original 9/11 tragedy and to develop a well-informed, thoughtful strategy to reduce the risk of an attack. The 9/11 Commission—that was chaired so ably by Governor Tom Kean, the former Governor of New Jersey, and former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Lee Hamilton—issued an historic, incisive report, a comprehensive report which, together with subsequent legislation, was thoroughly examined by House and Senate committees.

Virtually all of the recommendations were enacted into law. The whole thrust, post 9/11, has been to mitigate and, God willing, prevent such a tragedy from ever occurring again on our homeland. We have largely succeeded as several terrorist bomb plots have been prevented, except for the dreadful bombing at this year's Boston Marathon on April 15. Still, the perpetrators of that attack have been captured—one is now deceased fatally wounded in a shoot out with police and the other arrested and facing trial for his part in the bombing.

I wish I could say the Benghazi murderers of the four Americans have met swift justice, but one year later, no one has been arrested, there are no credible leads on the perpetrators, and those deemed by the subsequent Accountability Review Board (ARB) report to be at fault received months of paid leave and are now back at work at the State Department. Then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton claimed to be responsible, but even though she was directly involved in decisions made during the hours of attacks on the Americans in Benghazi, the ARB didn't even question her and never explained why. A year later, we still don't know who gave the order to our military to stand down from rescue operations while there presumably was still time to save the four Americans who died. Despite House and Senate hearings on the matter, a shroud of silence has descended to withhold the answers to the mysteries still surrounding the events of one year ago today.

Our enemies are constantly searching for our vulnerabilities, and our ability to remain ahead of them is critical to our very survival. However, when Americans lose their lives and no one is culpable for their deaths, our safety in the homeland or abroad cannot be assured. Our enemies must know that justice will surely find them, and our officials must be certain that unjustifiable errors in judgment are not without cost.

This is a very solemn day for America. There are now two tragedies associated with this day, and the most recent one remains painfully unresolved.

HONORING NEW HOPE BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor New Hope Baptist Church Jackson, Mississippi.

On April 13, 1913 Reverend Cassie organized New Hope Baptist Church along with seven members in the home of Mrs. Ida Taylor of Whitfield Mills Road, Jackson, Mississippi. Reverend Spencer Taylor succeeded Pastor Cassie in 1914 and served the growing congregation as pastor for ten years. The church relocated to the corner of Holmes and Spring Streets when Reverend Nick Bradley was called to pastor. During Reverend Bradley's administration, the church moved to Whitfield Mills Road.

Following Reverend Bradley's death in 1924, his son, Reverend E. M. H. Bradley, was called to pastor and served until his death in 1944.

Reverend G.C. Hunte became the fifth pastor of New Hope Church in 1944. Under his leadership, the church began its first financial drive with a goal of securing funds to build a new facility. Construction began in 1950 on Whitfield Mills Road. On May 1, 1955, construction was completed and the congregation moved to its new facility at 2355 Whitfield Mills Road. Reverend Hunte faithfully served the congregation until his death in 1973. In addition to spiritual leadership, Reverend Hunte was a good steward who, upon his death, left the church debt free.

Reverend E.C. Burns became pastor in November 1973, and served until June 1979. During his administration, the membership nearly doubled to 750; additional property was purchased; a church constitution was written; and a new order of service was implemented.

On February 1, 1980, Reverend Jerry Young began his administration as the seventh pastor of New Hope Baptist Church. Reverend Young, a dynamic and expository preacher, lead the church in tremendous growth and opportunity for ministry and outreach. Realizing such tremendous growth, with vision and foresight, Reverend Young led the church in purchasing a new facility at 5202 Watkins Drive. The first worship service in the new facility was held in March 1981. The Deacon's Family plan, "The Shepherd's Plan," became operational.

In July 1982, the New Hope Kindergarten and Day Care Center was established with an ultimate vision of developing a Christian School. New Hope Kindergarten and Day Care Center began serving children ages 3 through 5. "A Going Church to Meet the Coming Christ," a phrase coined by Reverend Young, became the motto of the church and was indicative of the thrust of the total ministry. Membership at New Hope reached 1000 in 1983.

The first Pictorial Directory was published in 1984, and by 1985, the church celebrated the liquidation of the indebtedness of the facility during three days of praise, worship, and thanksgiving. The church held its first annual

Yuletide Fellowship and began its annual Reformation Celebration. Twenty-one acres of land were purchased north of the facility in 1986. During that year, the church records were computerized. New ministries were developed in 1989 that included: Equipping, Prison, Hospital, Outreach, Youth Christian Education, and Membership. In 1989, the Kindergarten and Day Care Center became New Hope Christian School which served children ages 6 months through first grade.

Pastor Young lead the congregation in the development of a vision and mission statement for the church, "Our vision is to touch our community with the transforming power of the gospel of Jesus Christ in order that a Christian world and life view may permeate our communities." This vision guided the work of the ministry. In 1990, two ordination services were held; eleven deacons and one minister were ordained. The Laymen's Ministry was reorganized and an Administrative Staff was added. In 1991, the Discipleship Ministry was enhanced and a Money Management class was implemented. Plans for the Family Life Center were completed in 1992. Small Group Study for adults and a Children's Ministry were established in 1993.

A groundbreaking ceremony for the new Family Life Center was held in 1994. The church hired its first Youth Director and the first graduation from the elementary school that had grown to serve students through 6th grade was held in May 1994. In 1997, the Family Life Center was completed and dedicated; the elementary division of New Hope Christian School moved into the Family Life Center; the Christian Education Director became a full time staff person; and the Comforting Ministry was established. Three young men were called to the ministry and one was ordained.

In 1990, Reverend Young directed the Future Development Design Committee of the ministry to add to the present ground and facilities a plan for the inclusion of a West campus which would have a worship facility, softball/soccer fields, tennis courts, picnic area, a half mile jogging track and additional parking.

The year 2000 brought inspiration and opportunity. Ten new deacons were trained and ordained into the ministry. The first scholarship fund for high school and college graduates was established and \$5000 in scholarship money was issued to deserving students within the ministry. Reverend Young and his family celebrated their 20th year pastoral service to the New Hope Congregation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing New Hope Baptist Church.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and

any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 12, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 16

Time to be announced

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 113th Congress.

S-216

SEPTEMBER 17

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 113th Congress; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nominations of Ronald J. Binz, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Elizabeth M. Robinson, of Washington, to be Under Secretary of Energy, and Michael L. Connor, of New Mexico, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

SD-366

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights

To hold hearings to examine stand your ground laws, focusing on civil rights and public safety implications of the expanded use of deadly force.

SD-226

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) efforts to combat human trafficking, focusing on the role and mandate of the Special Representative and Coordinator for Trafficking in Human Beings and efforts to combat modern day slavery in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe region.

SD-106

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 113th Congress, S. 120, to expand the number of scholarships available to Pakistani women under the Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program, and the nominations of Kenneth R. Weinstein, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and Evan Ryan, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.

S-116

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

SEPTEMBER 18

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Stevan Eaton Bunnell, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel, and Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for National Protection and Programs, both of the Department of Homeland Security.

SD-342

10 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine implementing Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century's (MAP-21) provisions to accelerate project delivery.

SD-406

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 113th Congress, the nominations of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, Chai Rachel Feldblum, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and Scott S. Dahl, of Virginia,

to be Inspector General, Department of Labor, and any pending nominations.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine reevaluating the effectiveness of Federal mandatory minimum sentences.

SD-226

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine closing the wealth gap, focusing on empowering minority owned businesses to reach their full potential for growth and job creation.

SR-428A

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development

To hold hearings to examine recovering from Superstorm Sandy, focusing on assessing the progress, continuing needs, and rebuilding strategy.

SD-538

2 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine older Americans, focusing on the changing face of HIV/AIDS in America.

SD-562

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Economic Policy

To hold hearings to examine implementation of the "Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Act of 2012", focusing on one year after enactment.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by

the committee during the 113th Congress.

SR-253

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the economic costs of debt-ceiling brinkmanship.

SH-216

SEPTEMBER 19

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Deborah Lee James, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Air Force, Jessica Garfola Wright, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, and Marcel J. Lettre II, of Maryland, to be Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Intelligence, all of the Department of Defense, Frank G. Klotz, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Energy for Nuclear Security, and Kevin A. Ohlson, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.

SD-G50

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine wildlife management authority within the State of Alaska under the Alaska National Interest Lands Act and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

SD-366

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

SENATE—Thursday, September 12, 2013

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, You are our God alone. Early to You we lift our hearts in praise. We look to You today to sustain us, for because of You we live and move and breathe. By Your power, we find life and joy and peace. Today, help us to focus on Your love that can make us messengers of understanding and purveyors of justice to our Nation and world.

Lord, give to our lawmakers the peace that the world can't give, protecting them from seen and unseen dangers. Encompass them with Your strength and meet their every need.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks there will be an hour of

morning business. The majority will control the first half and the Republicans will control the final half.

Following morning business the Senate will consider S. 1392, the energy savings and industrial competitiveness legislation. We may have some votes today. We will work and see if we can come up with some energy-related amendments on which we can vote.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, America has and had for so many years the most brilliant, innovative, and imaginative scientists in the world. Many of them have worked hard to develop new environmentally friendly energy sources. That is one area in which we have been so good.

Every year over the last many years during the month of August I host an energy summit in Las Vegas. We have had Governors and Presidents and all kinds of Cabinet officers there. It is a bipartisan event. One of the activities we do there is recognize some of the smartest and most creative inventors and investors in the world to show their latest discoveries, and there are lots of them. This past August I learned about an American company that is developing high-tech batteries. It has great potential. They want to store solar power for use long after the Sun goes down. I met the inventor of a flying wind turbine that looks like a cross between a giant kite and a small plane.

On the Nevada and California border just a few miles from Las Vegas there is an amazing project going on out there. They have hundreds and hundreds of thousands of solar panels—mirrors. They have three very tall towers that look like skyscrapers, and they harness the Sun. The reason this invention is so terrific is that one of the problems we found with solar energy is that when the Sun goes down, it is not producing energy anymore. This will no longer be the case because these large skyscrapers have molten salt stored in them. During the day it heats up, and when the Sun goes down it still produces energy. It is amazing. That is now 98 percent completed.

I am constantly amazed by the ingenuity of the clean energy that brings a bright spot during the darkest of economic times. But Americans cannot just rely on scientists and inventors to solve our energy dilemma and break our reliance on polluting fossil fuels. We need to be part of the solution instead of part of the problem, and that will mean reducing our energy con-

sumption at home and at work. That is what the Shaheen-Portman legislation is all about.

Being more efficient at home—we can start with small choices, such as replacing a burned out lightbulb with an energy-efficient one, buying more efficient appliances, which are out there, so we can do that. We can install thermostats that turn the heat or the air down when no one is home. It can be regulated remotely. The effect of these choices and many more is real.

We also need to make the buildings we live in and work in, as well as the technology inside those buildings, more efficient. What has happened for generations here in America is that you design a building and give the specifications, but then people come in and build it as cheaply as they can. At the time it is constructed, the construction company wants to get it done as quickly and cheaply as possible. As a result, the insulation is not good and the air-conditioning equipment and appliances are not as good as they could be. So we need to make the buildings we work in, as well as the technology inside those buildings, more efficient.

Much of the electricity created in America is wasted. When I was a boy growing up in rural Nevada, less than a mile from our home were these massive power lines coming from the Hoover Dam, extending to California—lots of them. We used to be amazed. We would stand under them and hear the electricity popping and snapping. It went from Boulder City to L.A. Think of all of the electricity lost while transmitting that electricity down there. So much of the electricity we use in America today is wasted. Just heating and cooling our homes and offices with outdated technology is one way we waste so much electricity. The legislation before the Senate will spur the use of energy-efficient technologies. Here is what Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN named the legislation: the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act. It will spur the use of energy-efficient technologies in private homes, commercial buildings, as well as in the industrial sector—all at no cost to taxpayers. I commend Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN for their persistence and dedication in bringing this bill to the floor. I thank Senator WYDEN, chairman of the full committee, and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI for their able management of this measure.

Investing in energy efficiency is one of the fastest and most effective ways to grow our economy. This legislation will make our country more energy

independent, protect our environment, and will also save consumers and taxpayers money by lowering their energy bills.

It is estimated that this measure would save American families today \$14 billion per year and will create more than 150,000 new jobs, according to some of the studies surrounding this legislation. This bipartisan bill makes it easier for the private sector to adopt efficient technology.

By 2030—even as a young man presiding, the Senator understands how quickly 2030 will get here—this legislation will reduce Americans' CO₂ emission as much as taking nearly 17 million cars off the road. The bill creates incentives for companies to use technology that is already available right off the shelf. It is technology that can be used in every State in the Nation, and it will pay for itself right away through savings and energy.

The Federal Government also has an important role to play in saving energy, and we have not done very well in the past. The Federal Government is the Nation's single largest energy consumer of electricity. No one is a bigger customer for electricity in America today than the Federal Government. Reducing the government's energy use will not only be good for the environment, it will save taxpayers lots of money.

I am aware that Senators wish to offer amendments. I have been told by Senator SHAHEEN that there are 18 bipartisan amendments to be offered. I look forward to working with them and the bill's managers to help American businesses and consumers play an active role in reducing our Nation's energy consumption. While some of the answers to America's energy dilemma will come from inventors and researchers, others must begin in the places we live and work.

There has been a lot of happy talk about what a great piece of legislation this is—and it is. I have worked with Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN. They said there will be amendments and that all the amendments are bipartisan. Of course, we have been totally diverted from what this bill is all about. Why? Because the anarchists have taken over. They have taken over the House, and now they have done the same in the Senate.

The Speaker could not pass a simple CR today. When asked at a press event yesterday—as I heard reported on the news today—they said: What is next?

He said: If you have a couple of ideas, give them to me, and they will be shot down also.

We are in a position here where people who don't believe in government—and that is what the tea party is all about—are winning. That is a shame. There has not been a single amendment allowed to be offered in this legislation that has anything to do with energy.

There are all kinds of different issues, such as defunding ObamaCare.

As the fiscal year comes to an end, I guess that is what it is all about: You do what we want and get rid of ObamaCare or we won't fund the government. The President of the United States has said he is not going to negotiate dealing with the debt ceiling.

If the Republicans in the House can't pass a simple funding resolution for a short time, then it will shut down because of that. The government can't fund unless we have activity here.

Even though I gave all the reasons why we need to do this Energy bill—and Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN have been talking to me for months and months: Let's do this bill. They said there won't be amendments on it unless they relate to energy. So here we are. Where are we? Where we have been this whole year. What have we accomplished? Not much.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

OBAMACARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I did a lot of listening over the past several weeks in meetings and events all across Kentucky. Last week I participated in my 51st hospital townhall since 2011, and one thing kept emerging over and over: Kentuckians are really, really worried about ObamaCare. They read the same stories we have about businesses being forced to cut hours and eliminate health care and about people being laid off. They read about how the rollout of this massive law is becoming a massive mess and how their personal information could be compromised by scam artists. I know there are some who supported the law who are thinking: Well, they will learn to like it. But it is precisely the kind of "we know what is good for you" attitude that is so upsetting to my constituents. That is what got us into this mess in the first place.

So let's at least get this much straight: The doctors, the nurses, the health care professionals, the patients, and everyday Kentuckians I have been speaking with on this issue are not ignorant of the facts. They know what they are talking about. A lot of them know more about health care than those who voted for this law ever will.

The fact is that the more my constituents seem to know about ObamaCare, the more worried they tend to be. That is true for the business owners too. One small business owner in Murray wrote to me about how she is looking at premium increases of nearly 90 percent. I think she summed up the situation pretty well. She wrote:

Government is crippling the businesses that are keeping this country going.

Another constituent wrote to me to say that as a matter of conscience, he doesn't want to let his employees go uninsured but that realistically he may no longer have a choice. One of Kentucky's biggest employers recently announced plans to stop providing health care to spouses of 15,000 of its employees—also due in part to ObamaCare.

This is part of a growing trend across America. These are just some of the human costs of this law, and it hasn't even fully come online yet. So it is small consolation for business owners in my State that they will have a little more time to work through this mess after the President's decision to delay the so-called employer mandate for a year. They get a reprieve for a year, and then the mess comes along a year later.

Interestingly enough, just yesterday the country's largest union federation, the AFL-CIO, outlined serious flaws in ObamaCare that could hurt its members too. Apparently, they came very close—very close—to calling for outright repeal. This is the AFL-CIO that came very close to calling for outright repeal. News reports suggested a lot of harsh words were said. I don't think I can even quote all of it on the floor. But one union leader implied that ObamaCare could lead to the federation losing three-quarters of its membership in just the next few years. This is the AFL-CIO—the biggest supporter the President had—coming this close to calling for outright repeal.

So we know Big Labor is leaning on the President. We know they want him to let them rewrite the same law they helped ram through, and apparently he is listening to them.

But what about everybody else who is not in Big Labor? What about the single mom in Bowling Green who will not be able to cover rent if her hours are, in fact, cut as she anticipates they will be? What about the recent college graduate in Louisville who is barely scraping by as it is and who will not be able to afford a premium increase? What about the families from Covington to Paducah who are worried sick about this law? Doesn't the administration think those folks deserve some relief too? The same kind of delay at least businesses will get? Republicans do. That is why the Republican-led House of Representatives passed a bill on a bipartisan basis—that means Democrats voted for it too—before the August recess to do just that. Last month I tried to pass that same bill in the Senate, but the Washington Democratic leadership blocked it. I am not sure why.

This legislation is just common sense. It is the fair thing, the right thing to do. So today I am going to try again. Yesterday, along with a number of my colleagues, I filed an amendment

to the Portman-Shaheen bill that would provide the same reprieve for individuals the administration has already offered to businesses. This time I hope my colleagues on the other side will join me in supporting it, as a number of Democrats did over in the House.

I know they all got an earful when they were home last month. So maybe they have reconsidered the wisdom and fairness of their earlier position. Maybe now they think individuals and families should be treated no differently than businesses when it comes to protecting them from ObamaCare. This same legislation, as I indicated, attracted votes from both Republicans and Democrats in the House, and there is no reason for blocking it in the Senate.

We need to pass a 1-year delay—a 1-year delay—of ObamaCare for everyone. That is what the amendment I filed would do. Then we need to enact what Kentuckians and Americans truly need, a full repeal of this job-killing mess of a law—job-killing mess of a law; that is what it is—and what I intend to keep fighting for. As I said earlier, union members who pushed for this bill now are turning against it in droves, so are businesses and so are our constituents. I don't care what party people are in, we will hear from them. So let's take this first step together. Let's delay ObamaCare mandates for families right now, just as the White House did for businesses, while there is still time to do it. Then let's work together, Democrats and Republicans, to repeal the law for good and replace it with the kind of commonsense, step-by-step reforms that will actually lower costs.

That is what Kentuckians want, that is what Americans want, and anybody who actually listened to their constituents last month already knows what I just said.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders and their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first half.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about a new CNN poll that came out yesterday. It says support for the President's health care law appears to be "waning." CNN polling director Keating Holland talks about this. He says that support has dropped in virtually all demographic categories, but it has fallen the farthest among two core Democratic groups: women and Americans who make less than \$50,000 a year.

He goes on to say:

Those are also the two groups that are most likely to pay attention to health insurance issues and possibly the ones most likely to be affected by any changes. That may be particularly true for lower-income Americans who are most likely to have part-time jobs, be on Medicaid, or not currently have health insurance and thus be the first to have to navigate the new system.

So there is the story from CNN polling yesterday: Support for the President's health care law appears to be waning.

I have spent a lot of time, as the Presiding Officer has, over the last month traveling around my State, listening to constituents, hearing what is on people's minds. That is what I did back in Wyoming over the last month. I do it every weekend, meet with lots of people. We have had lots of county fairs and rodeos, townhall gatherings.

One thing that came up just about everywhere I went was the concern that so many folks still have about the President's health care law. Some are confused, many are upset, and many more are angry, angry that the law is doing serious damage to middle-class jobs and to people's paychecks. Even the insurance coverage many people already had and liked, there are things they are going to lose.

Republicans have warned from the beginning that the President's law created too much redtape, too many new taxes, new fees, and expensive mandates. As a result, people are going to end up paying a lot for health insurance.

Well, for months now, Americans have been seeing exactly that. One of the latest numbers that really stuck out was from Delta Air Lines. They say they are going to be paying about \$100 million more to cover their employees next year. All of the mandates in the health care law, the President has said so many of these are free. They are not free. Somebody has got to pay for them. Just covering workers' children up until age 26—it is about 8,000 young people covered by Delta Air Lines, added to their policy—is going to cost them an extra \$14 million next year.

Remember, the President said health care costs were supposed to go down,

not up. He also said that for 85 to 90 percent of Americans who already have health insurance, the only impact, he said, of the law was that their insurance was better than it has ever been before.

Well, that does not seem to be the case. All you need to do is pull out today's New York Times business section, first page, B-1, above the fold, "Unions' Misgivings on Health Law Burst Into View." Labor delegates level criticism at Congress and the President. It seems the President's promises to people who believed him that they could keep what they had if they like it—they are now saying: Mr. President, something has to change here. You know, you have not leveled with us. What we are seeing now coming out of this administration is not what you promised us.

It is not just the New York Times. Today's Investors Business Daily, above the fold, first page, "ObamaCare Hitting Union Members—And They're Upset." Unionized part-timers losing health insurance; full-timers losing hours. That is not what the President promised.

What this means is people are not just losing their health care, their insurance, it is affecting their jobs and it is affecting their paychecks.

Another step some employers have had to take is to drop coverage for spouses who can get their insurance elsewhere. The President said that was not going to happen. He said, if you like the insurance you have, you will be able to keep it. But once again the President has failed to see how much harm his health care law will do to middle-class Americans. Those hard-working people are now paying the price. In a recent memo to employees, the shipping company UPS said it plans to exclude 15,000 spouses from its insurance plan. They cited the health care law as the top reason for the switch.

It is not just businesses. The University of Virginia recently announced plans to drop spousal coverage for some of its employees too. The President is berating colleges about the cost of tuition, but yet his own mandates are making it more expensive for colleges to provide insurance for members of their faculty. So, of course, they pass those costs on to the students. The school said the President's health care law would add \$7.3 million to the cost of its health plan in 2014. So just like UPS, if a worker's husband or wife can get insurance from their own employer, the University of Virginia will not be covering them anymore, even if it is insurance that they have and they like, the President said they could keep. The school directly laid some of the blame on the health care law. It is not something the President admitted might happen, and it is not something he is eager to talk about now.

He is also not eager to talk about his promise to cut the price people pay for insurance. President Obama promised that by the end of his first term he would lower people's premiums by \$2,500 per family per year. He did not say this once; he said it over and over, at least 19 times. He did not misspeak. It was a practiced line, an intentional line, an intentional part of his stump speech.

He did not say premiums would go down if Congress passes a perfect law that takes effect the first day in office. He did not tell the audience it would be \$2,500 less than the projected rate of growth someone estimated we would have otherwise. He chose to ignore all of that, to leave out every caveat he could have included. He said, \$2,500 less by the end of his first term, period.

Every person, every audience, knew what the President was promising. Well, now we know President Obama broke that promise, like so many others. He and his supporters should stop trying to explain it away and admit they failed.

According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, the average family premium has soared by almost \$3,000 since the President took office. That is not a prediction about what will happen over the next 4 years; it is a simple, indisputable fact about how much more people are already paying. So you have people who are losing their insurance plans that the President's health care law taxes too heavily. You have other people losing the insurance they have now because employers are dropping coverage for spouses. You have some people who will keep their insurance but they are going to have a lot less money in their paycheck because costs are going up, thanks to the health care law. You have a lot of people the President's health care law is really hitting in the wallet. It is because we are continuing to see towns and counties and school districts having to cut back the hours of their workers. They need to keep more employees at a part-time status in order to reduce the burdens and expenses of the health care law. Over the past month, even more places have had to take these steps.

Middletown Township in New Jersey said they would cut the hours of 25 people. A county in Texas said it would do the same. Another county in Florida figured it would cost them more than \$1 million to cover all of their part-time workers under the health care law. So they are already reducing the hours for some of these people and they are planning to make additional cuts.

The Obama administration is brushing off these reports. They are saying it is only anecdotal evidence. Anecdotal? These are not anecdotes, these are people's jobs. One of the analysts out there found 258 different employers have cut work hours, cut jobs, or taken other steps to avoid ObamaCare's

costs—258 employers across the country, many of them school districts, counties, communities, some private businesses, and more are coming forward every day. They are limiting the hours they can pay busdrivers, librarians, coaches, substitute teachers, and middle-class workers. The Obama administration says, everything is fine because some of these workers will get a subsidy to help buy their expensive insurance.

Well, the people I talk to are not looking for a subsidy, they are looking for a job. They are looking for more hours. They are looking for the ability to take home a paycheck comparable to the paycheck they may have had last year but it is going down because their hours have been cut. They want the Obama administration to stop making it so tough for them to find full-time work. They want to go back to the insurance they had before the President's health care law went into effect. Instead, they are getting more bad news, more signs that the health care law is a trainwreck that is going to hurt the middle class even more.

We all knew the health care system in this country had problems and needed to be fixed. Costs were rising year after year. Too many people were having trouble getting the care they needed. Democrats could have sat down with Republicans to write a law to help those people. Instead, President Obama and Democrats in Congress, who were in charge of the House and the Senate, passed their plan, a one-sided plan, a plan that today is failing the American people. They did it without Republican support, and they did it without seriously considering our ideas.

Washington Democrats promised reform, but the reform they promised is not what is delivered in this 2,800-page health care law. With over 100,000 pages of regulations, it is hard for anyone to understand or comply with.

Republicans have voted to repeal this failed law and start over with reforms that solve the biggest problems families face today. We are going to keep trying to get that done. If Democrats are serious about helping middle-class Americans, they will join us.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. COATS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, since its inception, ObamaCare has remained consistent in one regard: an alarming pattern of delays, glitches, and overturned provisions, not to mention failure to meet certain promises that were made when this bill was passed.

First, Congress repealed the law's 1099 mandate after realizing this provi-

sion would drastically increase expenses on every business, charity, and local government entity. Then Congress repealed the law's long-term care program in 2012 after the administration admitted this wouldn't work.

Next came a slough of waivers. Rather than admit ObamaCare would drive up costs, the administration created a program that has granted more than 1,700 waivers covering more than 4.1 million people. A lot of other Americans are saying: Hey, how about our waiver? Why did these 1,700 waivers covering 4.1 million people go to them and not to us?

Even meeting its own deadlines for implementation seems to be too difficult for the White House. According to the Congressional Research Service, as of May 31, 2013, the administration had yet to meet half, only 41 of 82, of the deadlines legally required by the Congress under this legislation.

But in June 2013, President Obama claimed: "I think it is important for us to recognize and acknowledge this is working the way it's supposed to."

Really? There are 1,700 waivers for people who couldn't comply with this, repeals enacted by Congress, and it is working the way it is supposed to? Is that what they intended when they passed the bill? It is not what they promised. A month later the President's team announced the delay of another key ObamaCare component, the employer mandate—a 1-year delay—while maintaining implementation of the individual mandate. Individuals, yes; employers, no.

We know they are not able to comply, that the downside of complying with this under this timetable doesn't work, so we force individuals to comply with the law and the mandate to buy health insurance or pay a tax, but we take that burden away from employers. Is that fair? Is that fair, to give it to part of the country, give it to employers? How about the other half, the employees? How about the other individuals who don't fall under those plans? Yesterday the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office released a report of 19 instances in which portions of ObamaCare had been changed, rescinded, repealed, or delayed—19 separate times when it has either been changed, repealed, rescinded, or delayed.

The report specifically found the President has signed 14 laws, several of these with multiple provisions, that each amend, rescind, or repeal part of ObamaCare. The administration also has delayed at least five significant provisions of the law.

What does all of this tell us? It tells us that even the President and his administration recognized the health care law they wrote and they passed—not one single vote of support from the opposing party. They recognize this is not going as promised or planned.

Recognizing the impact his health care law is having on job creators, the President decided to give relief to businesses. As I said before, don't all Americans deserve the same break? Don't we all deserve some relief?

While it is a necessary step, even the delay of the employer mandate came too late for many Hoosiers, whose companies have been forced to drop employees or cut back their hours to less than 30 hours per week, the threshold at which ObamaCare kicked in for companies.

In recent weeks newspapers across Indiana had been filled with stories of companies and school systems that have reduced hours to avoid the ObamaCare requirements. All this is coming at a time of continued, chronic, high unemployment. People are working two and three part-time jobs to keep their heads above water, only to barely keep the bills paid at a time when our economy is growing at half the rate it should.

We are not putting people back to work and people are actually dropping out of the job search category. We add this burden on them.

Let's take a moment and consider the contrast between these reports, the promises made by those who authored and those who have supported and voted for it. This administration continues to say it is working as planned.

When President Obama signed his health care reform package into law back in March 2010, he said the reforms would "lower costs for families and for businesses" and "help lift a decades-long drag on our economy."

A law that was supposed to help workers, employers, and families in our economy is, instead, doing the exact opposite. I have heard the same sentiments over and over—and I continue to hear from Hoosiers as I travel across the State—this law is not helping, it is hurting.

We need to repeal this law and replace it step by step with reforms that lower costs, increase access to care, and empower patients, not bureaucrats in Washington.

I have voted more than two dozen times to repeal, defund, and strip provisions from ObamaCare. It is a principle I share with all of my colleagues on the Republican side, and I will continue to support these efforts.

However, I believe the best way to stave off this coming train wreck—as described by a Democratic Senator who was instrumental in writing the bill—is to delay implementation of the ObamaCare mandates for 1 year.

The President has already determined he is going to delay the employer mandate, so let's add to that the delay of the individual mandate which essentially delays the implementation of this law for a year so we have the opportunity to do what we need to do legislatively. We need to repeal this

law and replace it with sensible legislation—rational and cost-effective legislation—that actually addresses the problem we are dealing with. It also gives the American people a chance to basically tell the White House: This ain't working.

We need to make a difference here. This can be an issue American people can debate throughout 2014 while it is delayed and then express their concerns at the ballot box in November of 2014.

As a consequence of this, I have introduced legislation, supported now by over 30 Senators, which would delay the individual mandate until January 2015. I am pleased the minority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, has agreed to take up this bill to lead the effort, to join me in not only having this body examine this bill, debate it, and vote on it, but to join the House, which has already passed.

My Indiana colleague in the House, Congressman TODD YOUNG, introduced this legislation in the House of Representatives, and it passed with bipartisan support. Even the members of the President's own party have recognized this train wreck that is coming and have chosen, in significant numbers, to support the Republican effort of my colleague from Indiana, Congressman YOUNG.

I am carrying this ball here in the Senate. I am pleased the minority leader, as I stated, Senator MCCONNELL, is willing to take this up. We already have the support of more than 30 Senators, and I expect that will grow and hopefully it will be bipartisan support.

The bill is identical to legislation the Republicans passed in the House. I am proud that fellow Hoosier Congressman TODD YOUNG has authored that bill.

If Democrats, Republicans, and a majority of the Americans agree this law is not working, then let's do something now before ObamaCare's full impact on our economy takes effect.

I urge the majority leader to allow a vote on this amendment that will be offered and give all Americans the same protection this administration has provided to businesses—to give that to individual Americans. After all, it is simply a matter of fairness. The administration, having decided to waive for a year the implementation of the employer mandate, needs to waive for a year the implementation of the individual mandate in fairness to the American people.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLAKE. I come to the floor today to urge my colleagues to do everything we can to ensure ObamaCare

is delayed. Like the Senator from Indiana who just spoke, we know this law is not ready for prime time. The President has delayed certain parts of it, a number of parts of it.

The individual mandate has been delayed. If we are going to delay the employer mandate, it would make sense to delay the individual mandate as well.

I have introduced S. 1490. This would delay by 1 year all provisions of the Affordable Care Act that are supposed to take effect on January 1, 2014, or later.

In addition, it would suspend all taxes, including the tax on medical devices associated with the law for 1 year.

I am also a cosponsor of the legislation introduced by Senator COATS. The minority leader has offered this legislation as an amendment to the energy efficiency legislation which is on the floor now. It would also delay the individual employer mandates for 1 year.

Like many of my colleagues, I have opposed ObamaCare from the beginning. I have voted against this legislation time and time again. I think the count is 37 times in the House to repeal it. Obviously I did not support it in the first place. Even the law's strong advocates agree there are issues with implementation under the current timeline and that a positive immediate next step for all Americans would be to delay this harmful law.

January 1, 2014, marks a rollout of some of the most fundamental parts of the law. The CBO estimates some 37 million will join the individual exchanges that are scheduled to open their enrollment period in less than 3 weeks from now, and all of our constituents will start feeling the pain if the law isn't ready from the outset. As I mentioned, even the President has conceded the health care law is not ready by issuing a combination of waivers and delays for certain parts of the law.

He did it for the employer mandate a while ago. If we do it for the employer mandate, it makes sense to do it for the individual mandate as well. Because of the delay of this employer mandate starting in 2014, many individuals will be using the honor system to verify their income and whether they have access to employer-provided health coverage. Without an appropriate verification system in place, individuals will have an incentive to report a lower income to receive more subsidies than they qualify for. This will ultimately raise the cost for everyone else.

On the individual exchanges, just 2 weeks ago HHS delayed the signing of final agreements for insurance plans that are going to be sold on the exchanges starting October 1. This comes on top of a report issued by GAO this past June cautioning that the health care law could miss the October 1 open

enrollment date because of missed deadlines and delays in several areas. The administration has also delayed the cap on out-of-pocket expenses that was intended to go into effect in 2014.

If this wasn't enough, there are also privacy and fraud concerns. There is great apprehension over the new Federal navigators who are hired by the Federal Government to help individuals weed their way through the new paperwork and enrollment guidelines of the Affordable Care Act. These navigators receive no antifraud training, and the administration recently announced the training for these individuals would be reduced from 30 to 20 hours. Further, these individuals will have access to consumers' private and personal data without having any minimum eligibility criteria or background checks.

I could continue to list the pitfalls this law has already faced, but the point is clear: The law is simply not ready for prime time. Implementing this law before it is ready will only force taxpayers into a system riddled with potential fraud, certain gridlock, and increase costs for all. As lawmakers, we have a responsibility to our constituents. If a law is not ready, we need to delay it for everyone. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the minority leader's amendment coming up on this legislation on the floor today and any other legislative vehicle to grant taxpayers a 1-year delay for the Affordable Care Act to ensure the least harmful path forward.

Simply put, I believe a total delay of ObamaCare is the fairest way and most realistic plan to prevent the law from wreaking havoc on all Americans.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I strongly support the previous two speakers in their attempts to delay a law that is clearly not ready for prime time. In that spirit, I again put forward my proposal to make sure there is no Washington exemption from ObamaCare. This, I believe more than anything else, will ensure that Washington doesn't impose something unduly burdensome—not ready for prime time—on America if it is living under the same rules.

Unfortunately, that is not the case right now. This special OPM rule, which was made up out of thin air, in my opinion, and unveiled in draft form a little over 1 month ago, creates a huge Washington exemption—a special deal—particularly for Members of Congress and our staff.

We need to say no Washington exemption, and my amendment on the bill that is on the floor now, and my separate bill of the same substance, the No Exemption for Washington from ObamaCare Act, will do just that. It will say all Members of Congress, all

congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, and all of their political appointees have to go to the exchanges for their health care—the fallback option for every American—and they have to do that under the same rules, under the same parameters as every other American does—no special deal, no special exemption, no special subsidy.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure as an amendment on the bill that is on the floor now or as a free-standing bill.

With regard to the posture of the bill on the floor now, I have no desire to hold up any other amendments. I am eager to move forward with those amendments and with mine. I simply need assurance that my amendment will get a fair vote, particularly before October 1. This is very time sensitive because October 1 is when the OPM rule will otherwise take effect. I am eager to come to an agreement so all of us can move forward with this proposal and this vote and others in a constructive way, and I look forward to that happening.

I would add this doesn't have to happen on this bill. This can happen regarding my stand-alone bill or in other ways, as long as that is assured before October 1.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2013

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1392, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1392) to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Wyden (for Merkley) amendment No. 1858, to provide for a study and report on standby usage power standards implemented by States and other industrialized nations.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, when the Senate began debate on the bipartisan energy efficiency bill yesterday, I thought it was important to start by putting the discussion in the context of

what I know Senators heard all summer long. All summer long Senators heard from folks at home who said: Look, when the Senate goes back into session in September, what you folks have to do is knock off some of this bickering, this pettiness, which seems like a kind of glorified food fight, and get serious about real issues, get serious about those kinds of concerns that are most important to us here at home—energy, creating good-paying jobs, the infrastructure, and all of those bread-and-butter questions that go right to the heart of how middle-class people in America improve their standard of living.

I was struck yesterday—and I especially appreciate the tone brought to this discussion by the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Ohio—by how the Senate reflected and got, in those first few hours of the debate, the message from the summer. It seemed this body heard the American people saying: Knock off this pettiness and this bickering and get serious about real issues, and that means doing it in a bipartisan way. In the first couple hours of this discussion, we had five amendments that were bipartisan, and all of them stemmed, in effect, from Senators on both sides of the aisle who were responding to this kind of welling up of the benefits of energy savings and how those energy savings help to create good-paying jobs and a cleaner environment.

For the first couple hours, we had Senator after Senator coming in these bipartisan kind of pairs to discuss real issues. So I am just going to spend a few minutes talking about how that unfolded.

The first one that came up was the Inhofe-Carper amendment. Those two might not agree on every possible cause but certainly they said: Look, we ought to include thermal energy in the definition of renewable energy as part of the Federal energy purchases that take place. That probably is too logical for some—and certainly if you want to spend your time on polarizing fights you might not be that interested in the Inhofe-Carper amendment—but I said I was going to back that because two Senators did a lot of good, constructive work and they came to us early on with a good idea.

Then we heard from Senator COLLINS and Senator UDALL about another practical idea to reduce redtape—to reduce bureaucracy and redtape—so we could maximize energy efficiency programs in our schools.

We also heard about a useful amendment from Senators BENNET and AYOTTE in terms of recognizing the efficiency achievements of commercial building tenants. This space constitutes about 41 percent of all the energy that is used in our country, and so two Senators said here is an opportunity to again promote the efficiency

and the visibility of the programs that work.

Then we had a useful amendment offered by Senators KLOBUCHAR and HOEVEN to assist nongovernmental organizations. These are the churches and the senior citizens groups and the programs for kids. These are the non-profits. And what that bipartisan coalition wanted to do was to assist nongovernmental organizations in making these energy-efficient improvements.

Then as the fifth part of this discussion we had the Landrieu-Wicker-Pryor amendment to improve the way in which various governmental agencies select the Green Building Program certification systems for Federal agency use—again, something designed to reduce some of the bureaucratic redtape that is associated with how these programs are implemented.

So there you are. The first five amendments are bipartisan. They are in response to this kind of welling up, as I would characterize it, to the opportunity that this bill presents.

We received letters from a number of organizations just today—the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, the Business Roundtable, the Alliance to Save Energy, and the Natural Resources Defense Council—all of which wrote to Majority Leader REID and Minority Leader MCCONNELL to express their support for this legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 11, 2013.

MAJORITY LEADER REID AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: We write representing a broad spectrum of interests to express our support of S. 1392, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act, introduced by Senators Shaheen (D-NH) and Portman (R-OH). This bill reflects a bi-partisan, consensus agreement on a set of energy policies that will benefit the economy, advance energy security, and improve the quality of the environment. All agree that expanding energy efficiency is in the national interest and this legislation would increase energy efficiency opportunities for businesses, consumers, and the federal government.

S. 1392 is built on a consensus principle and the broad support it has received is the product of that principle. It is our hope that the Senate will proceed with full consideration of this bill in a manner that gives it the best opportunity to move forward in the legislative process.

Thank you for your consideration and we look forward to continuing to work with you and the Senate to support federal energy efficiency policies that benefit all Americans.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
MANUFACTURERS.

NATURAL RESOURCES
DEFENSE COUNCIL.

AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR AN
ENERGY-EFFICIENT
ECONOMY.

ALLIANCE TO SAVE ENERGY. BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE.

Mr. WYDEN. The reason they wrote this kind of letter is that the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy has estimated that just 10 of the efficiency amendments—most of which were introduced and heard by our energy subcommittee on June 25—would increase, by 2030, the number of jobs created by 10,000. So 10,000 jobs, and we have just 10 of those amendments that would make that kind of difference, and the amendments would increase energy savings by over 10 percent and increase the annual savings by 2030 by \$1.5 billion.

The Business Roundtable, the National Association of Manufacturers, the leading environmental groups—that is not exactly a coalition that comes together for every important energy issue, every important environmental question all the time. But they are there on this one, and they are there to a great extent because they understand that modernizing energy policy and having an “all of the above” energy policy means you have to pass legislation like the Shaheen-Portman bill and the useful amendments that are associated with it.

Senators come to the floor here in the Senate constantly to talk about how they are for an “all of the above” energy policy. It is almost obligatory that you mention it three or four times just to show you are serious about energy policy. You can’t be serious unless you support a robust bipartisan effort, such as the Shaheen-Portman bill. This is too important to the overall agenda for energy, productivity, job creation, and a cleaner environment.

I look forward to hearing more from colleagues on their efficiency amendments. I very much hope we can keep the amendments that go forward relevant to the question of energy policy.

It just seems to me that when you have a bipartisan foundation, as we have with this bill—and it started bipartisan with the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Ohio, and it got significantly more bipartisan yesterday.

It would be one thing if Senators came to the floor yesterday and said: We are here to talk about energy legislation. I really don’t care about this topic. What I want to do is talk about these other issues that are important to me politically.

That would be one thing. But Senators didn’t do that. They came to the floor and they said they want to talk about energy, they want to talk about getting something done in a bipartisan way, they like the bipartisan bill, and they want to make it even stronger. It seems to me that if we now spend an appreciable amount of our time undermining that bipartisan foundation and preventing us from working together on a subject Senators say they care

about, that they recognize is part of an “all of the above” energy policy, that would be particularly unfortunate.

This bill is an opportunity for the Senate to put some points on the board for the people who sent us here to pass legislation that is going to benefit the country and have a positive impact on folks at home.

Senator MURKOWSKI and I and Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN talked yesterday about the extraordinary breadth of the coalition that supports this bill—business and energy efficiency advocates and environmental organizations. More than 200 businesses and groups from across the political spectrum support this bill.

I have already asked that their letter be printed in the RECORD, but I would like to read one passage from the letter that I think reflects the case for enacting this bill. Those organizations—again, the Business Roundtable, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Natural Resources Defense Council—agreed that “this bill reflects a bipartisan, consensus agreement on a set of energy policies that will benefit the economy, advance energy security, and improve the quality of the environment. All agree that expanding energy efficiency is in the national interest and this legislation would increase energy efficiency opportunities for businesses, consumers, and the federal government.”

So why the Senate would want to say no to something like that because Senators want to advance other unrelated issues important to them really doesn’t add up. I know in the Senate there is a desire to debate a whole host of issues, but the reality is that Senators who have talked about energy policy for years and years—and there are a host of them for whom energy is particularly important—now say they want to have their issues that are unrelated to energy advanced today, even though that has the potential to undermine this bill. I don’t know how that adds up if you give a lot of speeches at home about sensible energy policy and then you take steps to undermine a bipartisan effort, which got more bipartisan yesterday.

So I am very hopeful that this legislation, which got out of the energy committee on a 19-to-3 vote and got better yesterday, starting with Senators INHOFE and CARPER and going through all the Senators who had bipartisan proposals, I hope it will not be undermined by unrelated matters. If we stay focused on efficiency, I believe we will have an even stronger vote than we had in the committee, which was a 19-to-3 vote, because Senators will have made clear that they understand this debate is about energy productivity, it is about job creation, it is about a cleaner environment, and that they especially understand this bill reflects what Senators heard all this summer.

All this summer the message was, go back to Washington, deal with important issues, particularly those related to the economy. Do it in a bipartisan way. That is what I believe an overwhelming majority of Senators wants to do, and if we keep this bill related to energy efficiency, that will be the result, and that will be good for the country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I respect and appreciate my distinguished colleague, the majority floor manager on this bill, and I appreciate his remarks. But since they were all directed at my activity, I would like to briefly respond.

I have nothing against his efforts. I have nothing against this bill and the provisions of it. I applaud that work, and I want to support that work. And I too listened really hard this summer, all through August. I do townhall meetings in every parish in Louisiana every Congress. This August alone I did 18, and I did hear a lot. Quite frankly, I didn't hear about this bill or any provision of this bill, but I am not denigrating it. I support the vast majority of the provisions of this bill.

What I did hear over and over is this: Washington shouldn't be treated differently and better than we are. What is good for America needs to be good for Washington. And if that rule is applied across the board, you all will start getting a lot of things right in Congress and in Washington.

I heard that articulated hundreds of times at 18 townhall meetings in a lot of different ways. That is what my amendment is all about. And the reason I am demanding a vote now is simply because this illegal OPM rule is set to happen and go into effect on October 1, so it is time-sensitive. I didn't ask for that. I didn't invite that. I would like that rule to go away. But that is a fact, and that is why this is a pressing time-sensitive matter.

The distinguished Senator also talked about bipartisanship. Well, this proposal—the “no Washington exemption from ObamaCare” proposal—is thoroughly bipartisan in America. It has enormous bipartisan support in America. The only place it is not popular, quite frankly, on a bipartisan basis is in Washington, DC.

Again, what I heard over and over in 18 townhall meetings was this: The quicker you all apply all laws to yourselves as much as they apply to America, the quicker you will start figuring this stuff out and doing the right thing in Washington.

I agree with that. So I am simply asking for a timely vote on my proposal—which has to be before October 1 for reasons I have explained that are beyond my control—and I have no desire to hold up these other amendments or this bill.

In that spirit, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and the following amendments be made pending: Bennet No. 1847, Enzi No. 1863, Udall No. 1845, Sessions No. 1879, Inhofe No. 1851, Klobuchar No. 1856, and Vitter No. 1866; that on Tuesday, September 17, at a time to be determined jointly by the majority and minority leaders, my amendment No. 1866 and a side-by-side amendment on the same subject by the majority leader be made pending and receive 60 minutes of debate evenly divided and controlled by the majority bill manager and me; that no points of order be in order in relation to these two amendments; and that upon expiration of the time for debate, without any intervening motions or debate, the Senate then proceed to votes on these two amendments subject to a 60-vote threshold for passage, and subsequent to each amendment vote and motion to reconsider, each vote be made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is heard.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, reclaiming my time, I am sorry for that. I think that establishes a perfectly reasonable path forward in which we could present and vote on these energy votes the distinguished floor manager is talking about. It would mean a 60-minute debate on this important and timely topic I am bringing up next week. So I think that is a reasonable path forward.

But I have an alternative that would take it out of the context of this bill, if that would be preferable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the Vitter amendment No. 1866; that on Wednesday, September 25, 2013, at 3 p.m., the Senate discharge the relevant committees from consideration of my bill, the No Exemption for Washington From ObamaCare Act, and proceed to immediate consideration of that bill; that without any intervening motions or debate, the Senate proceed to 60 minutes of debate on that bill, evenly divided and controlled by the majority leader and me; that the bill not be subject to any amendments or motions to commit; that after debate has expired, the bill be engrossed for a third reading, read a third time, and the Senate immediately vote on final passage; and that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, again reclaiming the floor, I think that is unfortunate because that would be a path forward that takes this issue and this

vote completely out of the context of this bill—which I have no problem with. I have no problem with that. I have no desire to obstruct or delay this bill, and I have laid out a path that makes that crystal clear. I am open to any reasonable variation of these ideas, either an amendment vote next week on this bill or a timely vote on the amendment—or a timely vote on my identical bill before October 1. I am completely open to any of that. I hope the majority side and the majority leader will take that under consideration and agree to a version of that. That would immediately solve this impasse, which is created by the majority leader, not by me.

This is an important issue. This is timely. This illegal OPM rule, which creates a special exemption, a special deal for Washington, is happening October 1. I heard a lot from my constituents this August and I heard a lot about that. I heard a lot about how Washington should live under the same rules as America. I heard that on a thoroughly bipartisan basis. I look forward to furthering that important goal.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, by way of responding to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I think I am about as bipartisan as anybody here. The one thing I have tried to make essentially the focus of my time in public service is trying to find a way to get folks together, whether it is on tax reform or health care or education with MARCO RUBIO. That is what I want to be all about.

Particularly on the Energy Committee, Senator MURKOWSKI has consistently met our side halfway, trying to find common ground, trying to get folks to work together. The two of us laugh often about it. We do not agree on every single issue under the sun, but there is an awful lot we can agree on. That is why no other committee in the Senate has passed as many bills to the floor in a bipartisan way as the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

When it comes to working on important issues in a bipartisan way, the Senator says that is what he wants to do. He got me at “hello” on that. But I ask him to not hold this bipartisan legislation, which was a first-rate bill when Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN brought it here. It got better yesterday during the first couple hours. Senator MURKOWSKI and I heard five amendments from Senators. This is already a block of 10 Senators. Each of them was bipartisan, starting with Senator INHOFE and Senator CARPER. It got better yesterday.

I ask the Senator from Louisiana, who I know cares a lot about energy policy—in his State I imagine they talk about energy quite a bit—to not

hold this bipartisan Energy bill hostage for something else. Let's get this passed. It is the first significant Energy bill on the floor of the Senate since 2007.

Hydropower was a very good bill, largely accomplished through the leadership of Senator MURKOWSKI and a handful of other Republican and Democratic Senators. This is a chance to put points on the board for an issue that dominates so much of our country and I know certainly the part of the country that the Senator from Louisiana represents.

I want him to understand—and I think he knows—since my days when I was codirector of the Gray Panthers, health care is truly my first love. I am willing to work with the Senator from Louisiana on these health care issues. But I implore, in the strongest possible way, that we not hold up this bipartisan Energy bill, a bill that was bipartisan before it arrived and it got better after it did—that we not hold this bipartisan Energy bill hostage for something else.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, again, I respect the distinguished majority floor leader. I appreciate his comments. He has been very bipartisan in his work in the Senate. But I am a little confused because it is as if he did not hear my unanimous consent request. I think those are clearly two possible paths forward that do not have to hold up anything. All I am asking for is a vote on a very important issue before this illegal rule goes into effect October 1.

Again, I re-urge both unanimous consent requests and ask the distinguished floor leader, why is that not a path forward and why do the American people—forget about me—why do the American people not deserve this vote? Because they sure as heck support this on a thoroughly bipartisan basis.

Again, I am open to either path forward, either a vote on my amendment on this bill or let's withdraw that and have a separate vote before October 1. That is a path forward. There is no hostage-taking here. There is no holding up anything. What I am reacting to is this illegal OPM rule and this October 1 deadline, which I certainly did not ask for. I think that is completely contrary to the law. But now that it has been issued I think we need to respond and have a public vote. I urge that, either path forward. Let's take that in a bipartisan way. Let's listen to our constituents, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. If we listen to them, we will not only have this vote, we will pass this amendment, we will pass this bill.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I also wish to respond to my colleague from Louisiana because I appreciate his interest in addressing some of the concerns on health care that have come up. I would certainly like the opportunity to correct a lot of the misinformation that is out there. But, again, I think there are other opportunities to do that. We should not be doing that on an energy bill that has such bipartisan support.

The Senator is talking about wanting to get a vote on his legislation. Senator PORTMAN and I have been waiting for 3 years to get a vote on this legislation. For something that has such overwhelming support, I hope my friend from Louisiana is going to be flexible and think about how he can address the concerns he has and yet let the debate on this bill go forward.

We have, as Senator WYDEN said, 16 bipartisan amendments that have already been vetted by both sides on the committee, that are ready to go, that I think we could probably get a voice vote on, on all of those, because we have so much support on both sides.

This is legislation on which we have had a number of other amendments filed that we should debate, around energy, because we have not debated energy on the floor of the Senate since 2007. We have more than 260 groups and businesses that have endorsed this legislation. Everybody from Eastern Mountain Sports, which is a great New Hampshire business, to large companies such as General Electric and Raytheon, to small businesses such as—in New Hampshire we have a company called Warner Power, which makes the first innovation in transformers in over 100 years; they are supporting it.

One of the other businesses I thought was particularly interesting is Eileen Fisher, which makes women's clothes. They support the legislation. As everybody knows, anybody who is doing manufacturing in this country is using a lot of energy and they are looking for any way possible to reduce their energy use because they want to be competitive.

We have a number of manufacturing companies on this list that are interested in how they can reduce their energy use. Then we have a whole number of organizations, everything from the Christian Coalition to the Union for Reform Judaism. We have environmental groups such as the League of Conservation Voters and the Sierra Club. We have trade associations such as the American Chemistry Council. When is the last bill we have seen that has both the Sierra Club and the American Chemistry Council supporting the same legislation?

We have a whole list of industry groups that understand that energy efficiency is something they can support because it is something that is going to

allow them to add jobs in their businesses. We have the League of Women Voters, the National Restaurant Association, the Oil Heat Council of New Hampshire—a small group that is concerned about making sure people in New Hampshire can heat their homes at a reasonable cost.

The North Carolina Chamber of Commerce, the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy—this is legislation that has support all over the country. The U.S. Council of Mayors as well as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, they are supporting it because they understand first how important energy is for the future of this country. If we are going to stay competitive, we have to be able to meet the energy demands that businesses have, that people who are trying to heat their homes and pay their electric bills have, that we have as a country, as the U.S. government, where we are the biggest user of energy in the country and part of our legislation deals with government's use of energy and tries to reduce that.

They understand it is in their interest to try to reduce their energy use. We are having a debate about how focused we are going to be on fossil fuels, whether we are going to put more support in for alternative sources of energy. But energy efficiency benefits everybody, regardless of whether one supports fossil fuels or new sources of energy. That is why this legislation makes so much sense.

We have heard just in the last couple weeks from the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy that if we can pass this legislation, by 2025 it will support the creation of 136,000 jobs. How many pieces of legislation have we seen on the floor of the Senate that for the costs we are talking about in this bill—no new authorization—that we can support the creation of 136,000 jobs?

Last year when they looked at the bill, they said it would also be the equivalent of taking 5 million cars off the road, saving consumers \$4 billion. This is a win-win-win. At a time when we know our future energy opportunities are limited, to some extent, by what is happening in the Middle East, what is happening with foreign oil, this is something that makes sense. For us to be held up because there are people in the Chamber who want to debate health care or who want to debate what the EPA is doing or who want to debate any other myriad of issues—I understand. I am willing to have those debates. I am willing to take those votes. But right now we should be limiting our debate to energy because that is the legislation on the floor before us.

I urge that we try to address the concerns that people have but we do it in a way that will allow us to move forward on this Energy bill. I think it is in the best interests of the country. As Senator WYDEN said so eloquently: People in this country want us to work

together. They want us to work together to address the issues we are facing in America. Senator PORTMAN and I have tried to do that. We have spent 3 years trying to do that. We want to move forward. We want to work together to address this issue. I certainly want to have the debate with my colleague from Louisiana about health care. But I don't want to have it right now because we cannot move forward on this legislation as long as that, his amendment, is holding this up.

I hope we can work out some way to do that in a way that we can both find agreeable and that allows us a path forward to address energy because, clearly, we have to come up with a comprehensive energy strategy for this country. I think energy efficiency is the first step, and that is what this legislation would do.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I appreciate not only the words but the work of my colleague from New Hampshire, and I specifically suggest, re-urge, and again call attention to my second suggestion, in the form of a UC which was to withdraw my amendment from this bill as long as a fair vote were assured before October 1.

The reason this is so time sensitive, and the only reason I am camped out here on the floor in this way, is because this illegal OPM rule happens October 1. This is happening right now. It was announced a little over a month ago. We were not here during the intervening time. We were in the August recess. This is happening, so I don't particularly want to debate this next year. We need a vote next week because of that timetable, which is not of my making.

I appreciate the sentiment of the Senator from New Hampshire. I look forward to working with the Senator in that way.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, would my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I will yield for a question.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the consent agreements are usually worked out by the leadership of both the majority and the minority. I know Senator VITTER understands that too. Would the Senator from Louisiana be willing to withdraw his objection to moving forward to amendments on the bill if he and I went—in good faith—to the majority and minority leaders to see if we can get some agreement on when we can address Senator VITTER's issue?

Mr. VITTER. I would not agree to that because that discussion—in good faith—has been going on for a long time, and it is not yielding anything. I hope it does. But simply put, I cannot take the pressure off that discussion to

yield something because that discussion has been going on for a long time. I am happy to continue that discussion, but moving forward with the bill, quite frankly, lets all the pressure out and assures defeat and lack of progress.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Would the Senator from Louisiana not agree there are other bills that will be coming to the Senate in the next couple of weeks, and so if we cannot come to an agreement, there will be another opportunity before the deadline when the Senator could also have this debate he is looking for?

Mr. VITTER. Well, again, answering the question through the Chair, I would observe the time between now and October 1 is pretty darn short, and what may be coming to the floor is pretty limited. It may be a CR, and the amendment opportunities on that are very uncertain. I know there are nominations that are moving forward with obviously no amendment opportunities.

No. 1, I don't know what other bills there may be to even try to get an amendment on; but, No. 2, even if I knew of those targets, I would not be assured of a vote. I would just be put off some more.

Again, I am open to any solution that guarantees a vote, not for me but for the American people, on this important issue before October 1. Again, that timeline was not of my making. It was due to the issuance of what I think is a clearly illegal rule to benefit Washington, contrary to the statutory language of ObamaCare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I have been watching with admiration the work done by my colleagues from New Hampshire and Ohio, Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, and I would suggest in all respect to colleagues who may have extraneous amendments that this measure is so important and vital to the future of our country. It is important not only in the policies it achieves but also the trust it will inspire. If we are able to come together and work on a bipartisan basis and get this job done, it can set a template for changing the mindset within this building and across the country as to how Congress can function.

We have an opportunity here. Let's seize it. Let's avoid the kind of quagmire, gridlock, and paralysis that has been so damaging to the trust and confidence in our public institutions.

Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN deserve a tremendous amount of credit for getting this bill to where it is right now. They never gave up, and I am proud they have come this far. Let us enable this Congress to go the rest of the way.

This legislation is more than the sum of its parts. It is about saving money—clearly saving \$13.7 billion per year—

and it is about saving energy and creating jobs. It will create 164,000 jobs by 2030, so it is also a great return on investment. It is also about creating trust and confidence in our ability to protect our national security from excess use of energy that makes us more dependent on nations that have no particular affection for us, and indeed, wish us more harm than good.

This legislation authorizes \$10 billion in grants for institutions of higher learning, trade schools, and community colleges to provide workforce training and skill creation to engineers and builders who need to develop and install the latest, most cutting-edge technologies. It provides limited but very helpful rebates of up to \$20 million over the next 2 years for manufacturers who upgrade their electric motors and transformers.

It directs the Department of Energy to focus its ongoing research and development offices on alternative energy sources for our heating and power. These measures, along with energy efficiency required in our Federal buildings and facilities, are meaningful and real. They may not be the biggest steps but they are important steps that take us in the right direction toward saving energy, money, and ultimately saving our planet. We know climate change—more properly known as climate and planet disruption—are facing us if we fail to act as this measure would have us do.

I have an amendment to the bill that will provide for very straightforward, noncontroversial steps in this same direction. It is amendment No. 1878, and it would require the U.S. Department of Energy to study the nonmonetary benefits to our communities of energy-saving products and complying with energy codes for buildings.

For example, buildings account for almost 40 percent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions, according to the World Business Council for Sustainable Development. We all see the difference energy efficiency makes in our pocketbooks and wallets. This amendment will help quantify these same improvements so far as a cleaner environment, and energy saving contributes in nonmonetary ways to our quality of life. It makes us more efficient in the workplace because the quality of life in the workplace is improved and better conditions make people more productive.

There are other amendments, such as the fine work done by my colleague Senator BENNET of Colorado to get a better understanding of the financial—that is the monetary savings that commercial energy-efficient buildings generate for both owners and tenants. My amendment looks to the nonmonetary benefits and seeks to quantify them and build a case for energy efficiency there and throughout our society insofar as we work better and enjoy life more from savings this bill may achieve in money and energy.

As chair of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Oversight of Federal and Agency Actions, I have seen how Federal agencies are able, through the rulemaking process, to take into account the nonmonetary factors during their cost-benefit analysis. Consumers and manufacturers should also have a better understanding of the nonmonetary factors that are addressed through energy efficiency, such as improved building codes that benefit occupants and the general population as well as greater office productivity.

There are three areas of manufacturing in Connecticut that are thriving because of energy efficiency. United Technologies makes building systems, elevators, and heating and air conditioning units and systems that are focused on the most innovative and sustainable technology. We all use their energy-efficient Otis elevators every day to come to the Senate floor, to bring constituents to the Capitol Visitor Center.

At Legrand in West Hartford, CT, visitors can see firsthand the jobs this legislation supports. Legrand employs about 500 people. They make the electrical and digital insides of buildings across commercial, industrial, and residential markets. They have a demonstration visitors can walk through and see how energy-efficient products work and how they save energy, money, and also improve quality of life.

This past May, Legrand was recognized by the U.S. Department of Energy for its continuing efforts in making energy efficiency a top priority through that company's involvement in the Better Buildings, Better Plants Challenge.

Connecticut is also leading the world in making energy-efficient fuel cells and hydrogen energy systems, which is a third area of great importance in energy savings. Fuel cells are of great importance to everything from our neighborhood schools to military bases to many other areas where inexpensive energy storage and power, as well as increased reliability, result from grid independence. These lessons are tangible, real, and dramatic. They are lessons in energy efficiency.

In fact, after Superstorm Sandy, we know something about the need for reliable backup power in Connecticut. Fuel cells are our future, and we should be recognizing that energy efficiency is our future as well. It is an investment that helps everyone in all communities.

I have long supported making energy efficiency more supportable, affordable, and reliable by improving the existing and new technologies. Since arriving in the Senate, I have fought for continued adequate funding for weatherization assistance programs.

A comprehensive energy strategy is what the Nation needs. This measure is

a step in that direction. We cannot live successfully and we cannot thrive as a Nation in the 21st century without an energy policy and without moving forward on measures such as this one that enable us to be more energy efficient.

This legislation is an important approach and part of a comprehensive policy our Nation needs to address climate disruption, national security threats, fiscal austerity, and all of the challenges of quality of life that are so imminent and direct to our Nation.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the work of my colleague from Connecticut. I will add his amendment numbered 1878 to my proposed UC. I absolutely support it being fully debated and having a vote. I have absolutely no problem with that.

Alternatively, I have no problem withdrawing my amendment from this bill and getting a vote subsequent to this bill before October 1, and certainly the Blumenthal amendment numbered 1878 should get a vote. I fully support that.

Finally, I absolutely agree with the need to build the confidence of the American people. Let me suggest that I don't think the way to build the confidence of the American people is by passing some energy efficiency act, which I expect to support but they have never heard of, and sweeping under the rug and thereby protecting this special deal and special Washington exemption from ObamaCare.

I think step one of rebuilding the confidence of the American people is to say and to live by the motto that everything we pass and apply to America has to apply in the same way to us. That is exactly what this illegal OPM rule goes against and disrupts.

There is a statutory provision in ObamaCare that specifically says all Members of Congress and all congressional staff have to go to the exchange. This OPM rule completely and effectively reverses that. It takes all the sting out of that. It is contrary to the law and, therefore, illegal. I think letting that stand, ignoring it, or sweeping it under the rug is no way to build the confidence of the American people.

I want to do both things. I want to address that and I want to debate and vote on this bill and all of these amendments, certainly including the Blumenthal amendment No. 1878 which I will certainly add to my proposed UC.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague and friend from Louisiana for his support of my amendment and say that I respect and appreciate the passion and zeal he has brought to this debate on behalf of his

beliefs. We can disagree on the policies and the merits of those beliefs, and I would respectfully add my voice to the voices of other colleagues who have suggested there may be other ways to raise this issue and to indeed have a vote. As my colleague from New Hampshire articulated so well, I would in no way shirk from votes on the issues the Senator from Louisiana has raised. I am ready to debate and confront those issues and deal with the merits. I would simply suggest there may be better ways to raise this issue than, in effect, to block consideration of a bill that is so important to the American people, so widely supported among so many different groups, and has amassed and mobilized such a strong bipartisan coalition.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I will respond through the Chair that I appreciate those remarks and the genuine sentiment behind those remarks. I welcome and will accept any reasonable path forward that assures a vote before October 1, which is the deadline established by OPM's illegal rule. I will agree to any path forward that assures a vote before October 1, absolutely. I look forward to that.

Finally, I am not blocking anything. I am proposing votes. I am proposing making amendments and, alternatively, I am proposing withdrawing my amendment from this bill as long as we can vote before October 1.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Louisiana for his comments.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I rise today to talk about energy efficiency and my amendment to Senators JEANNE SHAHEEN's and ROB PORTMAN's Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act. I am very pleased we are acting on this legislation today, and I am very appreciative of the work the Energy and Natural Resources Committee Chairman RON WYDEN and Ranking Member LISA MURKOWSKI have done to get us to this point.

This is a very important piece of legislation. In the United States, our energy consumption is about one-fifth of the world's total energy consumption. Yet when you consider we have less than one-twentieth of the world's population, that says we have a role to play

here and especially when a tremendous amount of that energy is simply lost through inefficient buildings, appliances, industrial processes, and automobiles. Those losses have been estimated to cost U.S. businesses and households \$130 billion a year.

By making investments in energy efficiency, we can help consumers lower energy costs, and we can reduce pollution, boost the manufacturing sector, and create jobs. That is a win-win-win-win.

That is what this legislation is all about. I am proud that the first hearing I held as chairman of the Energy Subcommittee on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee was on amendments to Senator SHAHEEN's and Senator PORTMAN's bill. We considered a number of amendments that would bolster the bill's efforts to make our economy more energy efficient. Now we have the opportunity to consider some of those amendments we addressed in my subcommittee on the floor of the Senate. I would like to call up and briefly talk about an amendment I filed to this bill.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 1855.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I would like to propose an alternative unanimous consent request that would certainly allow that amendment to be made pending.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and the following amendments be made pending: Franken No. 1855, Blumenthal No. 1878, Bennet No. 1847, Enzi No. 1863, Udall No. 1845, Sessions No. 1879, Inhofe No. 1851, Klobuchar No. 1856, and Vitter No. 1866; and that on Tuesday, September 17, at a time to be determined jointly by the majority and minority leaders, my amendment Vitter No. 1866 and a side-by-side amendment on the same subject by the majority leader be made pending and receive 60 minutes of debate, evenly divided and controlled by the majority bill manager and myself; that no points of order be in order in relation to these two amendments; that upon expiration of the time for debate, without any intervening motions or debate, the Senate then proceed to votes on these two amendments subject to a 60-vote threshold for adoption, and that subsequent to each amendment vote, a motion to reconsider each vote be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request from the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. WYDEN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the request from the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. VITTER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I am disappointed my colleague is objecting to us moving forward with this energy bill for reasons I believe are entirely unrelated to this bipartisan piece of legislation, for an amendment that is not germane, and I hope we can work this out. But in the meantime, I would like to explain what my amendment does on energy efficiency, which is what this bipartisan bill is about.

My amendment is simply designed to help get information on the energy use in buildings. That way building owners and private sector companies can identify energy savings. Unless we know how well buildings are performing, we cannot be sure what types of energy efficiency technologies will be the most effective. And that is exactly what my amendment addresses.

The main thing my amendment does is to require that building spaces that are leased by the Federal Government measure and report their energy use. The Federal Government is the Nation's largest consumer of energy. Taxpayers are paying for all of that energy. We owe it to them, to our taxpayers, to make sure our buildings save as much energy as possible.

The Energy Savings and Independence Act of 2007 created energy efficiency requirements for Federal buildings and for federally leased spaces. However, over half of those leased spaces are exempt from these energy efficiency requirements. My amendment makes the Federal Government's energy usage accountable to taxpayers by requiring disclosure of energy use in all federally leased spaces, where such disclosures would be practical and appropriate.

This amendment will also have a small grant program so that utilities and their partners that want to measure and disclose energy use in their buildings are able to do so. The grant program is voluntary and is fully offset.

My amendment would be a significant step in making our commercial buildings more energy efficient. I had a call with a member of the Real Estate Roundtable. Benchmarking is what this is called. On that call, he was saying: Well, not only will this save the Federal Government money, save taxpayers money, but it will, through the whole commercial building sector, create more energy efficiency and save dollars. Again, it will make the Federal Government more accountable to taxpayers.

By accessing information on the energy use of buildings, private sector investors and energy service contract companies can identify and deploy more effective energy efficiency retrofits.

Retrofits are a win-win-win, and it is low-hanging fruit. When you do a retrofit, you are putting people to work doing the retrofit, you are improving the value of the property, you are using products that are made by manufacturers in the United States, so you are creating jobs there, you are also reducing the amount of energy use, so saving money. Retrofits pay for themselves. It lowers our carbon footprint and, again, it saves money. So it is a win-win-win. Let's do that.

I again commend Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN on their legislation. I look forward to the adoption of this commonsense amendment, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I strongly support the Franken amendment. This concept known as benchmarking—and that is what the Senator's amendment is all about—is something of a term of art in the energy field. But I think it is important for people to know that benchmarking is essentially about information. It is about making markets work better. Benchmarking is a process that allows building owners to assess and disclose the energy use of their buildings so they can compare it to similar buildings.

The information provides an incentive for owners to improve building efficiency. And, obviously, better information on energy use is itself an incentive to improve efficiency.

All this amendment does is expand benchmarking. In effect, it approaches the issue of building efficiency and says: One of the most practical commonsense steps we can take is to expand access to good information.

So I am very appreciative that the Senator from Minnesota has offered this amendment. It is very much consistent with what is known as the ENERGY STAR Program, which also encourages building owners to share this kind of information.

So I hope Senators will support it. I am sure that not every Senator has heard the word "benchmarking" before because that is something of a term of art in the energy policy field, but to put it in something resembling English, this is about sharing information, it is about making markets work better. There are no mandates or requirements here in terms of the private sector.

I am very hopeful that, again, as part of the effort to keep this bill focused on energy efficiency, we can get the Franken amendment before the entire Senate. I support it and I support it strongly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Minnesota

for coming down to the floor and talking about his amendment, even though he cannot officially offer it, because I think it is an important amendment. I think it improves the legislation. I appreciate the fact that he took time to figure out how to offset it because some of the original drafts of the amendment had some authorization without offsets. So this is a deficit-neutral amendment, as I understand it. I have looked at the offsets, and they look as if they are offsets that are consistent with the underlying bill to make sure we are not adding any burden to the deficit here.

But it does make sense. This benchmarking is important. It enables people to see what others are doing, comparing performance to similar buildings. It is invaluable when evaluating the need for upgrades, and particularly in the Federal sector, where we do not have necessarily that same profit motive to be able to be incentivized to look at those comparable energy efficiency performances.

So I like this amendment because it has a sensible approach on benchmarking. It has no mandates on the private sector. It does expand benchmarking from federally owned facilities to federally leased facilities, which is important because we have a number of those around the country. And it also does something I think positive in terms of requiring DOE to study the whole methodology behind benchmarking, which will help not only the Federal sector but the private sector. It requires that these methodologies be studied so that cities and States can implement better practices and best practices.

So I think this amendment is an example of the four other amendments I see here we have already had good discussion on in the last day which deal with aspects of energy efficiency that improve the legislation. Again, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for bringing it forward, as have others—Senator INHOFE, Senator CARPER, Senator HOEVEN, Senator BENNET, Senator AYOTTE, Senator COLLINS, and others, over the last 24 hours.

I look forward to getting the amendment actually called up so we can move forward. I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find a unanimous consent agreement so we can move forward. It seems to me we are pretty close to that. Having followed the proceedings this morning, it seems as though every time we get close, there is another concern that gets raised. I think we need to figure out how to resolve the health care issue in a way that does permit this Chamber to have its voice heard but then get back to this underlying legislation and to these amendments.

This is something we have worked on now for 2½ years. It is something that

I think is the result of the kind of bipartisan effort we ought to be doing around here, helping to find common ground to actually move the country forward on things that actually help create jobs, help our economy, and make us more competitive as a country but also have an environmental and energy benefit.

I yield the floor and again thank the Members who are willing to come down to the floor and talk about some of these amendments, even though we cannot officially offer them at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I also wish to thank my colleague from Minnesota for his work and for this amendment. I wish to underscore I am not blocking his amendment. In fact, I presented a unanimous consent that makes his amendment pending, assures a debate, and would assure a vote. I am completely open to that with regard to that Senator's amendment and all the other amendments we are talking about.

Alternatively, if it is preferable, earlier—I know the Senator from Minnesota was not on the floor, so I do not expect him to know this, but I wanted to underscore, earlier I presented an alternative unanimous consent request to withdraw my amendment from this bill and be assured of a vote outside of this bill on the Senate floor before October 1.

Of course, that October 1 deadline is real and is important, not created by me, created by this illegal proposed OPM rule. So that is an alternative path forward that would take my amendment and my proposal completely outside of this bill. I also offered that unanimous consent agreement. I would re-urge it. I too hope we are making progress toward that sort of fair resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I would like to speak to an amendment that has been filed by my colleague from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN. I expect he will be here momentarily to speak specifically to his amendment, but it has to do with the Keystone Pipeline. This is an appropriate opportunity to talk about the energy needs our country has and the way in which those are being addressed.

We believe there is a great opportunity for our country to benefit in so many ways from the building of the Keystone Pipeline. Obviously, Senator HOEVEN's state is benefiting enormously from the oil and gas find they have in North Dakota. There are lots of abundant energy resources. As typically is the case, you have to have a way to get those to the ultimate marketplace.

The most efficient way to do that is through a pipeline. The Keystone Pipe-

line, which has been proposed now for several years, is a way in which we can move about 830,000 barrels of oil every single day according to the Department of Energy. Not only would this pipeline transport Canadian crude to U.S. markets, but it would also benefit oil production from the Bakken formation in the Upper Great Plains.

Just to put that figure into perspective, 830,000 barrels represent about half the amount that the United States imports from the Middle East each and every day. According to the Department of Energy, much of the needed oil of the United States shipped through this pipeline will be refined at the Gulf Coast refineries and would likely offset heavy crude imports from Venezuela.

Keystone XL Pipeline is a \$5.3 billion investment. According to the Obama State Department, the pipeline would support 42,000 jobs across the country; that is, over a 1- to 2-year construction period, approximately 3,900 would be directly employed in construction activities. These jobs would translate into approximately \$2 billion in wages and earnings.

Keystone XL would also generate much needed tax revenue in several States, including an estimated \$5 billion in additional property taxes throughout the operational life of the pipeline. The Keystone XL Pipeline has been under review now for 1,819 days. September 19 will mark the 5-year anniversary of the initial application for the pipeline's Presidential permit. Four environmental reviews have already concluded that the pipeline would not have a significant impact on the environment.

As President Obama continues to delay, Canada's oil supply is growing by the day and is expected to double by the year 2025. Canadian oil producers are quickly building pipelines to Canada's east and west coast to ship their oil to foreign markets. Meanwhile, reports indicate we may not get a decision out of the administration until the year 2014. By delaying approval of the pipeline, President Obama is providing China and other nations with an opportunity to outcompete the United States and gain access to Canada's growing oil supply.

Senator HOEVEN's resolution declares that the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline is in our national interest. That is what the State Department will have to conclude at the end of this current environmental impact statement process, which is supposed to be wrapped up in the coming weeks. At that point, Secretary Kerry, the Secretary of State, has 90 days to determine if the pipeline is in our national interest.

I would state again: this pipeline is going to create jobs, it is going to boost investment, it is going to reduce our dependence on Venezuelan oil, and it will strengthen our relationship with

our largest trading partner. Keystone XL Pipeline is clearly in our national interest. I would hope the Senate would go on record to that effect. If we think about the impact it can have on our economy, on jobs, the impact it can have on reducing that dangerous dependence we have on foreign sources of energy, this makes all the sense in the world.

I would reiterate what I said earlier; that is, this has been studied, this has been scrutinized, this has been reviewed now for 5 years. 1,819 days have elapsed since this permit was first applied for; five years have lapsed and four environmental reviews have been done. There is now currently yet another environmental impact study under way, which is supposed to be concluded soon, at the conclusion of which there will be a 90-day period in which the Secretary of State has to make a determination about whether the Keystone Pipeline is in our national interest.

What this amendment, offered by my colleague from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN, would do is simply put the Senate on the record as saying the Keystone Pipeline is, in fact, in our national interest. I believe that is a statement the Senate ought to make. We ought to weigh in on this subject. It is clear from all of the economic impact, clear from the environmental impact, clear from the need that we have to get away from the dependence we have on foreign sources of energy that this is a win-win for Americans, win-win for American consumers, win-win for American workers who need those jobs, and a win-win for the American economy in not having to get so much of our oil and our energy supply from outside the United States.

I would hope my colleagues and I get the chance, as we continue the debate on this bill, to discuss this amendment but also to ultimately vote on it and to declare once and for all, through the Senate, that this is, in fact, in the national interest. I see my colleague from North Dakota who is the author of this amendment is here. I credit him for bringing this amendment to the floor and giving us an opportunity to discuss what I think is a very important issue, not only to his State and my State and to many others that would be impacted directly by this, but to the entire economy and our country.

I would yield to the Senator from North Dakota who is the author of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I wish to thank the esteemed Senator from South Dakota for being here and for his comments on this very important issue and also for being a cosponsor of this amendment, both now and in previous amendments that I have submitted in support of the Keystone XL Pipeline project.

I believe some of the other sponsors of this amendment will be joining us. I will ask that they are able to say a few words as well as they appear. I wish to thank the Senator from South Dakota for his leadership on this issue. The pipeline will actually go through part of South Dakota, I should mention.

It was not too long ago I was back home in North Dakota, and down in the southwest corner of our State there are hundreds of miles of pipeline stacked, just waiting to be used, to be put in the ground.

A lot of that pipeline will go through the State of South Dakota, through the western part of your State. Of course, this is all about building vital infrastructure for our Nation. What it is truly about is getting our Nation to energy independence, working with Canada to have North American energy independence, so we no longer depend on oil from the Middle East. That is something all Americans very much want.

As the Senator from South Dakota said, this is a joint resolution, a concurrent resolution of the Senate, and then of course it would go to the House. So it would be putting both the Senate and the House on record together stating specifically and clearly that the Keystone XL Pipeline is in the national interest. It is in the national interest.

Why is that important? Because, quite simply, that is the decision our President needs to make. He has been reviewing this project for 5 years. TransCanada submitted an application to build this pipeline in September of 2008. Now it is September of 2013. For 5 years this has been under review and under study.

So what is the decision for the President of the United States? The decision for the President of the United States is he needs to determine is this pipeline in the national interest? Why is that important? Because it crosses an international boundary. The pipeline starts in Hardisty, which is in Alberta, Canada, and it travels down to the Canadian border and then across our country to our refineries, to a variety of refineries across the country.

It will provide 830,000 barrels of oil a day. But that is not just Canadian oil, that is also oil from the great State of North Dakota and Montana, more than 100,000 barrels a day of the lightest, sweetest crude oil produced anywhere in the country, really in the world. It takes it to our refineries so our consumers can use that refined fuel from Canada and from the United States rather than what? Rather than oil from the Middle East.

How fitting is it that we are here today where we are talking about the Middle East and Syria and today now talking about an energy efficiency bill. I will submit to you, it is a lot more efficient to move oil in a pipeline than it

is by trains and trucks. So it is certainly appropriate that this amendment be part of the energy efficiency bill.

Americans do not want to get their oil from the Middle East anymore. That is a no-brainer. They do not want to get oil from the Middle East. They want it produced here. They want to work with our closest friend and neighbor, Canada. That is what this project is all about. So we figure if Congress can go on the record together, the Senate and the House together, just go on the record stating clearly, simply, and straightforwardly, after more than 5 years of study, exhaustive environmental impact statements, we are stating this pipeline is in the national interest.

It is in the national interest because we want the jobs. It is in the national interest because we want the energy. It is in the national interest because it will create tremendous economic activity, tax revenue without raising taxes for our country, for the States. It is in the national interest because of our national security.

We do not want to have to go to Venezuela or to the Middle East for our oil. We can produce it here and we can work with Canada to produce that oil. So by clearly stating in a joint resolution, in a concurrent resolution from the Senate and the House, this is in the national interest, we believe we can get the President to say, after 5 years of study, after environmental impact statement after environmental impact statement that shows no significant environmental impact, that he will make a decision.

The decision is to approve the project.

Mr. THUNE. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to my distinguished colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. I would ask the Senator from North Dakota, who has been a great leader on all of these energy issues as we debate energy policy in the Senate, to confirm this but my understanding is that, according to President Obama's State Department, the pipeline will support 42,000 jobs across the country.

There have been some discussions and debate but the President, not too long ago, made a comment in front of an editorial board in one of the country's major newspapers that this is only going to create a couple of thousand jobs and that this was a very minimalist thing.

We have an unemployment rate that continues to hover in the 7.5-percent range and we have the lowest labor participation rate in our country today that we have had literally in 35 years, going back to the Carter administration. The real unemployment rate in other words those who are not only unemployed but those who would like to

be working full time or those being forced to work part time or those who have quit looking, is actually much higher. About 14 percent—22 million Americans—fall into that category. We should be interested in anything that would create shovel-ready jobs.

We have heard from this administration, particularly when we were debating the stimulus, that we need shovel-ready jobs. We need jobs that can get people back to work immediately. This perfectly fits that description.

I would ask the Senator from North Dakota if it is his understanding, as well, that it is actually thousands of jobs that would be created as a result of building a pipeline. Wouldn't that be something we would add to the argument? There are many arguments, but this certainly is one, when we are talking about a sluggish economy where growth continues to hover in that 1- to 2-percent range, to get the economy growing and expanding again.

This is not only to get the immediate construction jobs but, when we are producing energy in this country and lowering the cost of energy because we are actually having more of it produced here as opposed to importing it from somewhere else around the world, it gives us a competitive advantage. It is good for economic growth and good for job creation.

Would the Senator from North Dakota speak to the issue of jobs and what his understanding is in terms of jobs that would be created if, in fact, we did move forward with the pipeline?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Absolutely. This is a project, a \$7.9 billion construction project. The administration's State Department has been working with a variety of agencies and has developed a number of environmental impact statements. In their own analysis, they indicate more than 40,000 jobs. We are talking of a project that costs billions to build and will create more than 40,000 jobs by their own admission. In the construction process alone, it will generate hundreds of millions in tax revenue at the local, State, and Federal level. It has a huge economic impact at a time when we need to get people working and when we need to get our economy growing.

At this time, I wish to acknowledge this is very much a bipartisan approach. Look, to get anything done, we have to be bipartisan. When we show a concurrent resolution from the Senate and the House, both Houses of Congress together, with Republicans and Democrats coming together and saying this is in the national interest, that is a powerful statement. It is one I certainly hope the President will acknowledge and make the same decision that this project truly is in the national interest.

On that note, I see Senator MARY LANDRIEU, my esteemed colleague from

Louisiana, who is also a prime sponsor of this resolution. Also, I see Senator BEGICH from the great State of Alaska and Senator HEITKAMP from my State of North Dakota. They are here as well. I wish to acknowledge them and acknowledge their cosponsorship of this legislation.

I will read the sponsors we have on-board already. There will be more. Then I will turn to the esteemed Senator from Louisiana, who was so instrumental in crafting this resolution.

I wish to mention all of our sponsors in addition to the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU, Senator THUNE of South Dakota, Senator MCCONNELL of Kentucky, Senator JOHN BARRASSO of Wyoming, Senator BEGICH of Alaska, Senator CORNYN of Texas, Senator BLUNT of Missouri, Senator RISCH of Idaho, Senator MARK PRYOR of Arkansas, and there will be others.

I mention these Senators both to thank them and to make the point this is very much a bipartisan effort because we are serious about getting something done. This is not about making a statement. This is about getting something done in a bipartisan way from the people's representatives across this great Nation.

I yield to Senator LANDRIEU, the co-author of this resolution, and thank her for all of her great work on this project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I am proud to join a fairly large group of colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to talk about the importance of energy for our country, domestic energy and all facets of it, particularly the Keystone Pipeline. It will transport oil primarily—potentially gas as well but oil right now—from an important part of the country to the refineries that can refine it so our people can use it here and, as appropriate, export it as appropriate around the world.

Canada is a very strong ally of ours. We have reduced our imports of oil because of the fallout of demand and the increased production domestically, but we can do more.

Before I get into my brief remarks, I see Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN on the floor. I wish to commend them for bringing an energy bill to the floor, a conservation energy bill to the floor, that will not only make America more secure, but it has the potential to create literally millions of jobs in our country, the kinds of jobs we want that rely on cutting-edge science, technology, and manufacturing here at home. It is hard to get a bill out of any committee with bipartisan support.

The chairman, Senator WYDEN, has done a fabulous job, in my view, navigating between many very tough currents to get this bill to the floor. It is disheartening that some people would

come to the floor this morning to talk about health care or to talk about non-related issues to energy, when this government needs to be focused on creating jobs, supporting the middle class, and growing the middle class.

I am proud to be here talking about what most Americans want us to talk about, which is creating jobs at home, ending this recession, expanding our economy, and investing in good old American know-how about how to get things done.

I am pleased to spend my time talking about things that are positive; that is, the Keystone Pipeline. I am proud to be the lead cosponsor on the Democratic side with Senator HOEVEN, and we are about to be joined by the Senator from Alaska and Senator HEITKAMP.

I again urge support of our resolution, which we believe will have more than 60 votes. It will urge the President and push us to a place where we can approve the Keystone Pipeline as an important infrastructure component to our efforts to greatly expand production.

There is horizontal drilling that is going on, and there is fracking that can be done very safely with a minimum environmental blueprint. There are some opportunities, as the chairman knows, to export gas. We are a big gas producer and consumer. I understand the balance that is necessary.

We most certainly don't want to export 100 percent of our production, but we do need to export enough to send a signal to the marketplace that if you risk your money to find it, you will have a market for it. These are the fundamentals of any kind of market. Whether it is the cotton market, the gas market or the oil market, they all operate the same.

We are excited about what is happening in America. From our view in Louisiana, this is one of the most exciting times we have had in decades because there is so much interest in more domestic production. So many more jobs are being created.

In Senator HEITKAMP's State, I think they have run out of workers. I am not even sure we can build their roads fast enough to help us get this production underway.

It is revitalizing the manufacturing base of America. All of my industries are excited. I am going to finally say this because there are others who wish to talk.

Just between Lafayette, LA, and Lake Charles, two medium-sized cities in south Louisiana, just the southern part of our State, there is currently \$60 billion of investments being made today because of this extraordinary new domestic production.

The Keystone is part of this. I know there are some environmental concerns. I think they are unfounded. I think they have been disputed by any

number of groups. What I am here to say is this is about American jobs. This is about building our infrastructure in America for more domestic production.

Let's get over this hump and let's get together, focus on that which matters to the American people and not undermine this bill. I am going to end with this—not undermine this bill. This is an important component to do what we can to get this Keystone Pipeline moving in a cooperative spirit, which is not often found on the floor.

I wish to ask the Senator from Alaska what he heard in Alaska, because I have heard nothing but green light for the Keystone when I was home in Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. I thank the Chair.

We find ourselves always on the floor on oil and gas issues, but our group has grown. We have Senator HEITKAMP of North Dakota. We appreciate that she is here on these issues. It is always interesting on Keystone and hearing my colleagues on the other side.

It is one of the issues where Democrats and Republicans are focused on what is right for America, creating jobs and opportunities, not just having partisan fights. We are focused on what is important.

When you think about energy at all, this is what I hear a lot back home.

First, get us off of energy from countries that don't like us. That is the first priority. We do a lot of business with countries that do not like us because we don't have our own production or have the capacity to tap into production.

Second, of course, Alaska is a huge producer of oil. I know my friends from North Dakota will tell me they outrank us today.

I will remind them when the OCS opens, the Outer Continental Shelf, we will have a few 26-plus billion barrels of oil which we have already started moving into production in the sense of exploration. We hope next year they get back into the OCS. We feel very confident about that.

Alaska, similar to Louisiana, North Dakota, Montana, and others, is abundant with this resource which will get us off foreign oil. This is what I hear over and over. What a better deal than to work with our Canadian partners from whom we import enormous amounts of oil.

Why not work on a pipeline with a country that is unbelievably always there for us. We know a little bit about pipelines in Alaska. We built a pretty large one going through some tough terrain and very environmentally sensitive areas. It has been operating successfully for decades, and that was under the old rules of construction.

Today, with the new engineering technology, there is an unbelievable potential to bring that resource to our

refineries. The choice isn't they are not going to do it. I think this is a false argument you hear out there. People say: If we just stop this pipeline, they will not produce it.

No. Canada is a sovereign country. They have a resource they intend to utilize. They will ship this resource to us to refine or China. I don't know about you, but there is a clear difference in environmental standards between China and the United States. By the way, those jobs aren't our jobs in China. These jobs were produced by a project, the pipeline alone. I know there are people who discount it—well, it is only a temporary project, it only has so many jobs.

First off, they have a labor agreement. It is unbelievable when you think about it, laborers, Teamsters, IBEW, plumbers, pipefitters who will be trained and employed. For North Dakota and Montana, a resource of oil being developed there, this creates access. This is access for their product, U.S. oil, to be able to be moved through the pipeline, refined down south and in incredibly strict environmental standards. And yes, some might be exported, some might stay in the United States. But at the end of the day, it is about creating American jobs.

From Alaska's perspective, people say: Well, why are you for this, if you want to do your own projects in Alaska? Because it is good for all of us. I want to see Chukchi Sea and Beaufort Sea in Alaska built, and they are on their way. The National Petroleum Reserve will see the first production. I was up there 2 weeks ago with the Secretary of the Interior and saw CD-5, which is a platform being developed, and over the next 2 years that well alone will produce 14,000 to 15,000 barrels a day—just one well. They have plans for two or three more. This is an incredible component, but Keystone is the safest way to move this.

And oh, by the way, we already have oil coming from that tar sand through the Chicago region—about half a million barrels already. Now unless I have missed something, I didn't hear a lot of complaints on that. So this will up the capacity to 1.1, the southern section that is being built. It is about American jobs, an American resource, and it is the right decision.

I am somewhat perplexed by the administration's delay after delay after delay and arguments why somehow something else can't happen. In reality, this project is a good project, a good jobs project, and it has a lot of opportunity not only for us here in the United States, in the sense of the lower 48—where I am standing today in this Chamber—but for Alaskans too. Because the oil industry moves around. We have people working in the North Dakota region from Alaska; we have people down in Louisiana and vice

versa. It is a unified system of employment. It is good jobs, good jobs, good jobs. Did I mention that?

This is the United States and Canada, which have been partners for years. Why would we not purchase this oil or work through this and build this pipeline to make sure this oil from this great partner is refined in the United States, rather than focusing on oil from countries that do not like us? It makes no sense to me.

So I thank my friend from Louisiana for asking. I hear it all the time. I know we have been joined by the Senator from North Dakota, and probably the Senator from Louisiana is very excited to have another person here on the floor with us talking about oil and gas issues because sometimes we feel a little lonely, but on this bill, this amendment, there are a lot of us.

I know my friend from North Dakota has a lot to say because I heard it during her campaign. So I will turn to my colleague from North Dakota, if it is okay with the Senator from Louisiana, and ask my friend from North Dakota if she has some additional comments or what she is also hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I would ask at this time to be able to propound a unanimous consent request with respect to Keystone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, there has been a bit of confusion with respect to the handling of Keystone because I was under the impression we would be completed at this time with the discussion of Keystone. So I ask unanimous consent that at this time we allow Senator HEITKAMP to speak with respect to her position on Keystone, then Senator PORTMAN would go next. Both of them have indicated they will be brief. I would then ask, for purposes of this part of the discussion, that Senator BOXER and Senator WHITEHOUSE be recognized for their views with respect to Keystone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I thank the Senator from Oregon for clarification and for this opportunity to very briefly speak on the significance of the Keystone Pipeline.

We have been waiting 5 years. We fought a world war and defeated the Nazis in less time than we have been waiting to have a determination on the Keystone Pipeline. I know there is a lot of discussion here and a lot of concern and, obviously, this has gotten to be a national issue of some magnitude. But when we look at it, overwhelmingly the building of the Keystone

Pipeline is supported by the American people.

Why is that? Because it is good for our national security, and I think we heard how good it is for employment and job opportunities, but I want to spend a moment in recognizing that in this time we are in right now, given the events of last week and early this week, the American public is looking for a way to allow us to express our national security interests without worrying about where our oil comes from.

I was fortunate enough during the August recess to go up to the oil sands in Alberta and spend some time with the Premier, spending some time with their environmental community, spending some time with their labor community, and talked about the developments there and talked about the enormous opportunities. When we take a look at Alberta and North Dakota, these are two of the fastest growing economies in the world because of this development. We should not walk away from this delivery system, which is very remote and very much needs this pipeline in order to participate in this great North American energy independence opportunity we have.

As a final note, I want to talk about the relationship we have with Canada and the responsibility we have to our largest trading partner, the responsibility we have to one of our best and longest allies. In North Dakota, we celebrate that border with a peace garden that is on both sides of the border, recognizing this is unheard of in the history of the world. This is not some rogue country that doesn't have environmental standards. They are adopting standards and doing everything they can to deal with what they believe is their responsibility for global climate change, and they shake their head and wonder why it is we are waiting 5 years down here to provide them with an opportunity to work with us to create a North America that is energy independent. So I can't say enough about how frustrating this issue has been, but I think how important it is that we have again a sense of the Senate because we represent the people. We represent the majority opinion in this country which says build the pipeline.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from North Dakota and my other colleague from North Dakota, who has been leading this effort over the past couple of years to get to a point where we can have, as Senator HEITKAMP said, the views of the American people here on the floor.

Although this discussion is on the energy efficiency bill, and this is more of a production issue, I do think it is consistent with the legislation. As we have

talked about from the start, we need an "all of the above" energy strategy, and it has to include, in my view, efficiency as one of those key elements, but also producing more. We have talked about the importance of producing more oil and gas in this country to make us less energy dependent on other countries, where we are currently, and unfortunately, dependent on volatile and dangerous parts of the world for our energy, which affects the price at the pump by virtue of the spike in gasoline prices we have seen. It also affects our economy. So I think this goes hand in hand.

As the Senator from North Dakota knows—because I am a cosponsor of the legislation he has proposed before, and I also supported his amendment on the budget resolution—I would also make an argument here on efficiency. One of the things that has been frustrating to me on this Keystone debate is the discussion seems to be that somehow there would be more emissions and less efficiency if we were to allow the pipeline. I think the opposite is true. This is oil which would come, as we know, from the oil sands in Canada, but it also comes from the Bakken in North Dakota and other places. Right now most of that is being trucked or trained, and that is certainly not an efficient way to move oil and gas. In fact, it is a more dangerous way to do it.

It is difficult for me to see how there are efficiency gains by continuing the current policy rather than allowing this pipeline to be built, which will create tens of thousands of jobs, which is why the AFL-CIO Building Trades Council supports it, but also it has efficiency improvements.

Second, if we don't build the pipeline and cannot access the oil from Canada, which helps us to become North American energy independent from an area of the world which is not volatile and dangerous, then that oil will be sold. As the Senator from Alaska said, it is a sovereign country, they will figure out where the market is, and that market, apparently, is China. Our environmental standards in this country are, of course, at a higher level than in China. So in terms of an emissions issue and an environmental issue it would be an advantage to send it to our high-tech refineries on the gulf coast.

Second, how would that oil get there? Not by pipeline, but by rail and by truck and, ultimately, by tanker. Certainly that is not a more efficient way to deliver that product, regardless of whether there were environmental standards at the end of that process. Of course they would not be at the level as they would be in the United States.

So I do think this is an important amendment, and I do think it ties into this overall strategy of having an "all of the above" energy strategy. I do think the way the Senator from North

Dakota has phrased this amendment it gives us the opportunity to have our views be expressed, but also the House to have its views be expressed, and hopefully would result in the President making an important decision that is in the interest of economic growth, in the interest of good energy policy, as I said earlier, and in the interest, ultimately, of efficiency and fewer emissions, not more emissions.

With that, with the understanding we have a time agreement here, I appreciate the opportunity to talk a little about it. I appreciate the fact the Senator from North Dakota is also on the energy committee with me and also supports our energy efficiency bill, which is the underlying bill, and also offered an amendment yesterday that we talked about and that is a very important improvement in terms of the energy efficiency issue he offered with the Senator from Minnesota, Senator KLOBUCHAR. He has another amendment, I understand, that deals directly with efficiency. So we appreciate working with him on that.

Again, hopefully we can resolve these unrelated issues and move forward with this energy efficiency legislation and have votes on some of these energy issues.

With that, I yield to my colleague from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I want to express some thanks as we close out our colloquy, and I want to begin with the Senator from Oregon, who is the chairman of the energy committee, as well as our ranking member, the Senator from Alaska—Senator WYDEN from Oregon and Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska. I thank them for working to get energy legislation to the floor and for the way they are working to be inclusive and bipartisan in this effort.

I also thank Senator SHAHEEN from the great State of New Hampshire and Senator PORTMAN from the great State of Ohio for their bipartisanship in this energy efficiency bill, which truly creates efficiencies and is a natural piece of legislation for us to add this amendment to, as Senator PORTMAN described.

Again, recognizing the time constraints, I want to finish by thanking the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU, for her coauthorship of this legislation, and for all of the Senators who have joined with us in this bipartisan interest on the Keystone XL Pipeline, which we truly believe is in the national interest.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I rise to talk about why approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline is not in the national interest and why it places our Nation's families at risk.

There is a reason why it is taking a long time to get this approved. It is because it is very controversial and there are some irrefutable facts that I think need to be laid on the table about this pipeline.

I also want to say how discouraging it is to me to see a Senator come here and offer an unrelated amendment that has to be seen, in my mind, as an attack on working people who happen to work for their country and try and derail this bill. It is wrong. And let's be clear: If a Senator doesn't want to have health care here, they should take themselves out of it. If they don't think their staff deserves to have a health care benefit as an employer, tell them they do not have to take it. Tell them to opt out. Tell them it would please you if they didn't have that benefit.

To see a good bill such as this, shepherded by a great chairman, RON WYDEN, and two terrific Senators here on this particular piece of legislation, Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, get derailed because someone wants to attack working people is unfortunate—absolutely unfortunate.

Let me say that one of my colleagues said: Oh, this is all the people in America want the XL pipeline. I don't know. Maybe in her State that is true. It is not true in my State. And it is not true in many States. As a matter of fact, that is why there have been 1.2 million comments to the State Department from various public agencies and private parties, from Native American tribes and others.

I think when the President said on June 25 that our national interests will be served only if this project does not significantly exacerbate the problem of carbon pollution, he was speaking the truth. You would have to be asleep for 10 or 15 years to not believe that carbon pollution is dangerous to the planet. I know Senator WHITEHOUSE will follow with his comments on this. But when I listened to the debate, I didn't hear one person say carbon pollution is a problem.

The Keystone XL would ship one of the dirtiest fuels on the planet through America's heartland and through critical water supplies. It will significantly increase carbon pollution, and the oil will be exported to other countries. So to stand here and not even address the issue of pollution and not even admit that most of this oil will be exported, I do not think is a fair argument.

To put it into context, if the full range of products produced from tar sands crude oil, such as petroleum coke, is taken into account, EPA estimates that tar sands would create 30 percent more carbon pollution than domestic oil. We would see carbon pollution of over 18 million more metric tons per year, according to the State Department.

You would have to be asleep not to notice Superstorm Sandy and what it

cost us not only in lives and in damage but in dollars. You would have to be asleep if you haven't noticed that Yosemite National Park is close to burning. Thank the Lord God we had firefighters who were protecting it. The fire is still burning. You would have to be asleep if you didn't notice what is happening to our oceans and to our economy.

We had just the other day a meeting of folks out there, from farmers to recreational industry people, who were saying their world is changing because of climate change. But you don't hear our colleagues talking about that. They say: Oh, there is no problem. How about the fact that a Nebraska study found that Keystone XL is likely to have 91 major spills over its 50-year lifetime? And tar sands oil will be very difficult to capture if the pipelines rupture.

For all the talk about jobs, when we look at the permanent jobs, we are looking at 50 jobs. What are the chances that there are going to be spills?

Just look at what happened in 2010, when over a million gallons of tar sands oil spilled into the Kalamazoo River in Michigan. Over three years later, the clean-up of the river—which has cost almost \$1 billion—still continues, and the local communities are still struggling.

Another reminder of the terrible price that Americans pay when tar sands pipelines rupture occurred in March 2013 in Mayflower, Arkansas. In that case, 22 residents were evacuated when tar sands oil ran through the neighborhood streets, and contaminated a local lake.

The risks are real, and we cannot forget the damage that tar sands oil spills have already caused in our communities.

What are the chances that we are going to hurt this planet? And what are the chances that if we were smart and we did what this underlying bill is doing—which is make sure we have incentives for alternatives that are clean, that are made in America, that work for us—there will be many more jobs? That is the kind of alternative I want to see.

They may pass their amendment if we ever get to it, if they can stop this attack on our working people that is evident in an amendment that has been offered, but I know there is a better way, and I would like to see us make sure that when we say XL is great, we consider all of the reasons there is so much controversy surrounding it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am very pleased to come to the floor today after my chairman on the Environment and Public Works Committee,

Senator BOXER, and offer an alternative view to that expressed by my distinguished colleagues who are supporting the Keystone XL Pipeline. In my view, that pipeline takes us in the wrong direction, from an energy point of view, and it supports the wrong kind of energy.

If we look at the growth of green and renewable energy, there are actually more jobs in clean, green, and renewable energy than there are in the oil industry. I had that question reviewed by Politifact, and I got a "true" on it. The energy jobs of the future are going to be in clean, green, renewable, sustainable energy, and this takes us in exactly the wrong direction.

Moreover, they are temporary jobs. I think the State Department put the number of final jobs produced by the Keystone Pipeline at between 35 and 50—not thousands, not tens of thousands, but between 35 and 50. What we might as well do is actually go out there and build a pyramid and put tens of thousands of people to work stacking up a pyramid, and we would actually do better because that pyramid wouldn't pollute. Those are the kinds of jobs we are talking about.

We would be far better off investing in clean, green, renewable, sustainable energy technologies and developing those markets which are going to be the competitive markets in the future rather than chasing the tail of fossil fuel technology.

I didn't hear everybody speak the whole time. I had to come over from my office, and I missed that point, and I had to take a call, and I missed that point. I believe I heard seven Senators speak for 45 minutes, and I believe the words "climate change" and the words "carbon pollution" were never mentioned.

We are going to pipe out the tar sands from Canada, and we are going to add 18.7 million metric tons of additional carbon pollution. That is just from refining the tar sands. We are going to add another 3.5 million metric tons from the electricity required to heat and pump the stuff through the pipeline. The refining cost is the equivalent of 5 million cars out on the road that otherwise wouldn't be there. The electricity cost is another 600,000 cars on the road that wouldn't be there.

We just hit 400 parts per million carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. For as long as the human species has existed on this planet, we have been in a window of 175 to 300 parts per million. It has been a long and successful run for homo sapiens in that comfortable window of environmental protection. We are out of it. We are out of it for the first time in probably millions of years—at a minimum, 800,000 years, more likely 3 million or more. We are not out of it a little bit—not 301, not 315—but 400 and climbing. This adds to that problem.

It is irresponsible to discuss energy and refuse to discuss climate change, refuse to discuss carbon pollution. But for our friends on the other side and for our friends from the coal- and oil-producing States, carbon pollution and climate change are the Lord Voldemort of the discussion: It is he who must not be named. They are just going to ignore it, pretend it isn't there at all. That is wildly irresponsible in the environment we are in right now, as we see the effects of climate change occurring on our coasts, in our oceans, in acidification, to our fisheries, to our farms, and to our forests. You really don't have to go very far in this country to find something that is being affected by the changes in our climate from our carbon pollution, and all of that for 50 long-term jobs. I don't think this is the good deal our colleagues suggest.

I will close by saying two things. First, on energy independence, this pipeline connects to Port Arthur, TX, a foreign-trade tax-free zone. That is where it is going to go, and then it is going to be shipped overseas to other countries. This isn't going to protect American energy independence; this is going to protect energy corporation profits. That is what is behind all of this.

We have a supplemental environmental impact statement coming from the State Department. You can believe the people who for some reason can't seem to get the phrase "climate change" or "carbon pollution" to come out of their mouths or you can believe me. You can believe whomever you want. But from a point of view of being fair to the process, we should probably wait until the State Department has concluded the supplemental environmental impact statement they are now working on before we make too many rash decisions about polluting tar sands oil, investing in that dirty addition to our energy mix, and continuing to suck funding and support away from the energy sources of the future, which are the clean ones and the sustainable ones and the ones that aren't going to keep shoving the carbon dioxide concentration in our atmosphere over and beyond where it is right now, which is 400, where it hasn't been in millions of years, where it hasn't been in the history of the human species.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that we be in a period of debate only until 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am going to be very brief. I think Senator BOXER and Senator WHITEHOUSE have made a number of very important points with respect to this climate debate and particularly the scientific finding that we are now at 400 parts per million. That ought to be a wake-up call to everyone with respect to the challenge of climate and carbon.

I was in North Dakota last week at the request of our colleague and friend Senator HOEVEN. Certainly, there is a lot of common ground that can be found on this natural gas issue. Of course, natural gas is 50 percent cleaner than the other fossil fuels. It has been a real catalyst for the American manufacturing sector, with a lot of companies that for economic reasons felt they had to do business overseas coming back to do business here in the United States. Of course, it has a direct connection to the expansion of green power—solar and wind and others—because it can be a key factor in making those energy sources part of an embedded power system.

So there are a lot of opportunities for common ground. For example, when I was with Senator HOEVEN last week, we talked about—the way I would characterize it—a wide berth for the States with respect to regulating natural gas because the geology differs for various States.

So when we look at these kinds of approaches, there is an opportunity for common ground. Clearly, this is a good set of challenges to have. We have the natural gas, the world wants it, and the pricing advantage is ours. This is a good set of challenges to have.

I do think it is important to recognize that the debate about the pipeline has changed very significantly since it was originally proposed. I am particularly struck by the fact that we now have the CEO of the largest producer in the Bakken essentially saying that the pipeline isn't needed, and we have the CEO of the largest oil company in Canada saying that Keystone isn't needed. I will be very specific and use their words.

Last month Harold Hamm, the CEO of the largest oil producer in the Bakken shale, Continental, said the Keystone Pipeline was not "critical." For anybody who is interested in the politics, Mr. Hamm isn't some flaming liberal. He was Mitt Romney's chief energy adviser.

Just a few days ago we had the CEO of Suncor—by some estimates, Canada's largest oil company—saying that the lack of a pipeline, in his words, has "certainly not constrained [his company's] growth" and that his best estimate would be that it has not "significantly constrained the rest of the market, either."

So we recently had the CEO of the largest producer in the Bakken saying the pipeline is not needed. We have the

CEO of the largest oil company in Canada saying essentially the same thing. That basically leaves only the refiners. It turns out they have been pretty much saying the same thing.

A few days ago the Wall Street Journal had a story with the headline "U.S. Refiners Don't Care if Keystone Gets Built."

Valero, one of the largest refiners in the country, said Keystone was, in their words, not "critical" to their business. This is a refiner that signed up early to get oil from Keystone, spent billions upgrading their refiners in the gulf to process it, and they now say it is not critical.

We are going to have further discussion about this. I want it understood that I think Senator BOXER and Senator WHITEHOUSE have made some important points. I am particularly struck by how, as you get into this issue, there are significant questions about how this fundamentally benefits the American people. My hope—and I have talked about this with Senators on both sides of the aisle—is that we can work out the various procedural questions with respect to how Keystone comes up here on the floor of the Senate. In fact, I am going to go spend about 45 minutes trying to be part of an effort to see if we can find some common ground so we can get the issues that Senators want addressed done, done promptly, done once, and then we can go to the energy efficiency legislation and have a vote, up or down, on the merits of that bill.

Senator PORTMAN is here. He and Senator SHAHEEN have done an excellent job. Frankly, they had done a good job of keeping this issue bipartisan in the interests of energy security, in the interests of creating more jobs and a cleaner environment. They had done that before the bill arrived on floor, and the bill has been improved since it came to the floor with bipartisan amendments that colleagues have offered.

I appreciate that we are now in a period of debate only until 2 o'clock.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Mississippi for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, Senator WICKER and I come to the floor to talk about a very important matter. We appreciate the opportunity to talk

about our amendment that will update the current EISA statute to reflect the evolution of green building rating systems and create a more strategic approach for the Federal Government so that we have the highest performing, most efficient, and most cost-effective buildings. I would like to ask Senator WICKER to go into a little bit more detail, and then I will come back to some more information about our amendment that has been filed.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Louisiana and agree that this is a very important amendment because it addresses a number of issues that are important to American industries. In particular, the amendment specifies that the Department of Energy and the General Services Administration must allow the use of multiple green building rating systems for both commercial and residential buildings. We should avoid the situation where the Federal Government endorses one green building standard over others.

DOE and GSA ought to support competition and allow the free market to produce the best energy-efficient buildings at the lowest cost. They also ought to support the use of domestically produced materials, such as sustainable wood and green technologies.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Mississippi. He and I have worked very closely together on the amendment we are talking about today, and hopefully we will get a vote on it sometime in the near future. But I am also concerned that many rating systems arbitrarily discriminate against domestically produced products based on arbitrary hazards, without consideration for risk of exposure and supporting scientific data.

Our amendment—and we have worked very carefully on this—will address this issue by requiring an ongoing review of private sector green building certification systems and allowing for the exclusion of portions of green building certification systems that are found to be discriminatory. This will not preclude efforts to exclude or reduce exposure to known environmental risks, such as radon, formaldehyde, or volatile organic compounds; however, it will ensure that the risk of exposure is not ignored.

This process will support competition among green building certification systems and encourage existing systems to revise portions of their systems that are determined to be discriminatory to domestic products.

Let me add that since many of these products that are in question come from Mississippi and Louisiana as well as other States, that is what has engaged and piqued our interest.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana is exactly correct. Basically, what we are saying is there

is more than one way to get where we need to go when it comes to green buildings. This amendment is a step forward to ensure GSA's and DOE's green building policies are fair and effective.

I also wish to point out that this amendment requires the consideration of environmental impacts across the entire life cycle of a building material or product by incorporating a life-cycle assessment. This will ensure that the Federal Government is utilizing green building certification systems that are the most efficient.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana, and I wholeheartedly endorse our amendment and call on our colleagues to vote on it.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, let me finally say that we believe our amendment strengthens—not weakens but strengthens—the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act as introduced by Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN by encouraging improvements to green building rating systems and policies. I look forward to seeing this bipartisan legislation move forward. It is in that spirit that our colloquy and our amendment is being offered.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I wish to discuss amendments I am offering to the Shaheen-Portman bill. However, I have been watching what has been happening on the floor, and I don't understand this because I have some amendments I am working on which are bipartisan. I know there have been major endorsements of this bill from the Business Roundtable, from the Chamber, and many others. What we are seeing here is a very targeted attack from the other side to prevent all of these bipartisan amendments from coming forward. All the debate this week has been good on this bill, but we aren't able to offer amendments. We are not having the ability to debate amendments. That is very important. So I am one of the Members who is going to be talking about amendments. I have been reaching out. I think they are very bipartisan amendments. But we are being blocked, and that is very unfortunate.

I rise today to discuss several amendments to the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act. First, I wish to thank Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN for working on this important legislation, for working on it so

long, and for being so diligent about it. Energy efficiency is critical for our future, and this bill takes us in the right direction.

There are a few areas where I think we need to take additional steps. My first amendment connects energy and water efficiency. Many people do not realize that water efficiency is energy efficiency. Three to four percent of our national electricity consumption is for water and wastewater services each year. That is about 5 to 6 billion kilowatts and \$4 billion a year in costs. That is a lot of energy and it is a lot of money.

When we talk to the water management professionals in our States, they tell us these costs add up quickly. The energy-water nexus is one that cannot be ignored.

The energy committee has been engaged in the water-energy nexus for some time, both under Senator Bingaman and continuing under the leadership of Senator WYDEN. I know the Presiding Officer is on the committee with Senator WYDEN, and I know he is very interested. The Senator from Oregon has done a very good job in terms of trying to pull all of this together.

Water and wastewater utilities are typically the largest consumers of energy in towns and cities, often accounting for 30 to 40 percent of total energy consumed. As ratepayers, we all pay those bills. And inefficient systems don't just cost money; they waste huge amounts of water. As much as 6 billion gallons per year is lost. Let me repeat that: Six billion gallons of water a year is wasted. That is enough water to serve 10 of the largest cities in this country or the entire State of California.

To continue this practice while the Southwest and other regions are facing extreme drought is ridiculous, and in some of our communities it is downright dangerous. We can do better, and we have to do better. Efficiency of U.S. water and wastewater pumping facilities is about 55 percent. But for a new, well-designed pumping facility, it is 80 percent. Consider this: If water and wastewater utilities could reduce energy use by just 10 percent, it would save about \$400 million annually.

My amendment calls for \$15 million to support smart water system pilot projects, supporting innovation and the kinds of investments today that will pay off tomorrow. Our amendment is fully offset. This is not about adding cost; it is about reducing the cost to ratepayers.

I believe this amendment is worthy of bipartisan support. We have support from almost every major water utility association and from the technology industry. It should be included on any amendment list, especially on a bipartisan amendment list. I am talking about the blocking that is going on

from the other side of the aisle to prevent good, bipartisan amendments from coming forward.

Putting innovation to work in three to five cities is a first step. The program will be jointly managed by the Department of Energy and the EPA to create incentives for public-private partnerships, lowering the cost of innovation, applying best practices to the public and private sectors, and to eventually benefit communities across the entire country.

I also plan to introduce a second more ambitious amendment to improve the water efficiency of our homes, to save water, and to lower costs for American families. The average family of 4 in our country uses 400 gallons of water every day. My amendment will provide funds to States, local government, and utilities to implement incentives and rebates for customers to purchase water-efficient products and landscaping.

In addition, the amendment will authorize the EPA WaterSense Program, similar to the ENERGY STAR Program, to enable WaterSense to improve and expand its labeling system for water-efficient appliances, plumbing fixtures, landscaping, and new homes.

My amendment also establishes a grant program called Blue Bank, providing water and sewer utilities with grants for important investments in climate change adaptation, including advanced water supply management, modification of infrastructure, improved planning, and water efficiency and reuse.

Finally, I will offer an amendment for a renewable electricity standard, to get to 25 percent renewable electricity by 2025. The first legislation I introduced as a Senator was to create a national RES. The time is right to put this idea back on the table. Renewables are a crucial part of our energy mix. A national RES will create thousands of jobs that cannot be outsourced and will help revitalize rural America. It has worked in over half of the States in the country by guaranteeing a market for wind and sun and other clean energy sources.

Renewable energy is a key partner of energy efficiency in a modern energy system. They are often installed side by side, increasing the payback in energy savings and reducing emissions and fighting climate change.

Our Nation needs a "do it all, do it right" energy policy to address global climate change and to reduce our dependence on foreign oil—those are the big threats—but also a big opportunity. We can create a clean energy economy that leads the world in producing the jobs of the future.

Again, I wish to thank my colleagues Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN for their work and I look forward to continued bipartisan efforts as we address the energy needs of our country.

I would say to Senator SHAHEEN and to Senator WYDEN, I find it very unfortunate that we are in a position now where so many Members have come to the floor to offer bipartisan amendments and my colleagues have been stopped in their tracks from moving this bill forward, dealing with and voting on those amendments. We should let the Senate work its will. I know my colleagues are trying to cut through that, but I wish the other side of the aisle would let us proceed to the bipartisan amendments and move forward.

I see Senator WYDEN is here on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank Senator UDALL for steering the Senate toward a very sensible, important area.

Last year, it is my understanding we had the worst drought in our country's history since the Dust Bowl. So we are looking at some serious drought issues in the days ahead. The Senator from New Mexico is suggesting we start very modestly. The Senator has some voluntary efforts. These are not mandatory, not run from Washington, one size fits all—leviathans that would inflict pain and trauma on local communities. They are voluntary. They are about saving water, which is about saving energy.

In our part of the world, the West, this is especially important. But I think what we saw last year, with these extraordinary drought conditions, is this is something that is not going to go away.

So Senator MURKOWSKI and I have already begun to look at these issues. I will just say for myself, I am looking forward to very closely working with the Senator on these issues, and I am very hopeful we can get the Senator's amendment up and we can work out some way to advance this idea because water is, frankly, an issue that has gotten short shrift. It has gotten short shrift in the West. It has gotten short shrift in terms of our policy debate. I think the Senator is clearly starting us in the right direction. I look forward to working closely with the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Mexico leaves, I just want to also commend him for his work. I have not seen the amendment he would like to offer. Like him, I am so disappointed he is not able to offer it right now, that it is being held up on an unrelated issue. But as the Senator pointed out, there is a clear nexus between water and energy use.

I remember visiting the wastewater treatment plant in North Conway, NH, and being told that 4 percent of our energy use in the country is with wastewater treatment. I have seen that at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, where

they do such great work on Los Angeles class and Virginia class submarines. As they have cut back their energy use, they have also been able to cut back their use of water in a way that has provided for tens of thousands of gallons in savings in water, as well as tremendous savings in energy use. So this is a connection we all ought to be making as we look at our energy use in the future.

I truly appreciate the Senator working on this amendment, his interest in offering it, and I certainly hope we are going to get to the point where we can actually debate the amendments people are bringing to the floor because we have so much bipartisan support for not only the bill but for so many amendments.

I appreciate my colleague from Ohio, Senator PORTMAN, his partnership in working on this legislation. This is a win-win-win, and we need to move this forward.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, let me thank Senator SHAHEEN and Senator WYDEN, and I see Senator PORTMAN is on the floor too. I just want to say to Senator PORTMAN that the partnership he and Senator SHAHEEN have developed has been incredibly impressive. I know how hard they have worked on this bill, and our intent is that many of us want to try to improve it. We want to try to bring forward bipartisan amendments.

So I hope we can all work together to make sure whatever roadblocks and objections are out there, that we can deal with this bill in a way where bipartisan amendments can be voted on, we can move the bill along, and let the Senate work its will because this is the kind of bill I believe can pass in the House of Representatives because these two Senators have worked so hard over the last couple years.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I understand where we are. I would make the following comments to my colleagues who have not been here quite as long as I have. Regular order, before they got here, was you could offer any amendment on any bill anytime you wanted. Since we have had the leadership that we have, we have changed that, and now we consider it abnormal that somebody wants to address a critical issue in our country on a bill, and we find that distasteful.

I will remind you that 92 percent of the people in this country think everybody involved in the FEHBP who is working for the Federal Government ought to be in the exchanges. To not allow a vote on an amendment is cowardly because it says: I do not want to vote on that issue.

So there is a very big difference from what we have heard said and what the reality has been—until 2006, the end of 2006 and the starting of the Congress in 2007. I think it is important.

I have several amendments to this bill, several that I think will make it much more compliant with what the Constitution says, and I will not offer them today until this logjam of lack of minority rights is relieved. But I do have some comments.

The intention of this bill is good. I appreciate what Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN have done. But I have some real differences of opinion about the effectiveness and the command and controls centered in Washington that come about through this bill.

If you actually read this little book called the U.S. Constitution, we are going down the same path again that says Washington knows best, because in this bill the Secretary is going to determine final plans, final efficiency standards—not the standards groups that are out there because the Secretary will have to do it.

So my hope is that we can get back to offering amendments on this bill—all the amendments that need to be offered, whether it is germane to the bill or not, as the Senate functioned for over 200 years. There should not be an issue that we cannot debate an amendment in the Senate at any time. That is the history of the Senate. That is what makes it a great body. That is what allows our Republic, our constitutional Republic, to function.

I would say I am disappointed that the majority leader does not want to have a vote on something that 92 percent of the people in this country agree with and that he is not allowing Senator VITTER to have his amendment to address an issue people are burned up over—creating something better for us than what the average American can get. It is a tin ear. We do not pay attention to the American public at our own risk.

I will not spend any more time. I have several amendments. I will try to offer them in the first part of next week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank my colleague from Oklahoma. He does have some amendments, and we are looking forward to them. We have talked about this bill and some of his amendments. I think you are going to find it is a good debate and some of the amendments will be helpful to the legislation.

We have tried, as you know, on this legislation to focus on exactly what my friend from Oklahoma talked about, which is to make sure we are not putting new mandates on the private sector. There are none in this legislation—none.

We do have some mandates on the Federal Government. It basically asks the Federal Government to practice what it preaches. Being the biggest user of energy, not just in the country but in the world, we believe the Federal Government can do a lot better. So things such as requiring the Federal Government to use some efficiency standards and some of the best practices saves all of us, as taxpayers, money. It is the right thing to do for taxpayers. It is also the right thing to do for energy efficiency and for our environment.

We are not focused on mandates. In fact, we are explicitly focused on only incentives, only best practices. There are lots of amendments that will be offered on the floor that will try to add some mandates, and as a group we do not think that is the way to go, just to be clear on that.

Also, in terms of the development of building efficiency standards, it is not the Secretary who will establish them. The Secretary provides the technical assistance, but the authority is preserved actually in the private standard-making bodies. I think that is appropriate.

So we have gone out of our way to make this a voluntary bill, not a mandate bill. We have gone out of our way to ensure that this is responsive to what we are hearing out there among the business community: They are looking for better research, technology, looking for some deployable technologies to be able to improve their efficiency, to make them more competitive with their global competitors, because around the world other companies are competing with our companies in Ohio or in the other States represented in this great body. What we find is we are not going to want to compete on labor rates with developing countries. We do not want to lower our standards. Where we can compete is on the energy input into our manufacturing process. We are spending more than we have to because we are not as efficient as other countries, even some emerging economies, much less developed economies.

So that is part of the reason the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, the Ohio manufacturers are supporting this legislation strongly. Over 200 businesses are supporting it because they believe this will help them to compete and win in the global marketplace.

By the way, the Chamber of Commerce agreed today that they are going to key vote this legislation. They are strongly in support of it. I appreciate that. I think that will help to make the point this is not about Washington knows best; this is about ensuring that people have the information, the transparency, the technology, the research to be able to have a true “all of the above” energy strategy—yes, including

producing more energy, which I am strongly for. We talked about that earlier. We need to produce more in this country. But also we could use the energy we have more efficiently. That combination is a recipe for success because it will help create jobs, it will help ensure we have a cleaner environment, and it will certainly help to make us less dependent on foreign oil and other forms of energy, which is in our national security interests, as we have seen so poignantly over the last couple weeks in the Middle East and other dangerous, volatile parts of the world we are relying on for our energy.

I thank my colleague from Oklahoma. I look forward to working with him on his amendments when he is able to offer them. Again, I would strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to look carefully at the actual legislation because there is some information out there that may or may not be accurate in terms of the subsidies or mandates in this legislation. There are no mandates in the private sector, period, and we have deliberately crafted it in that manner.

With that, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, very briefly, Leader REID has indicated to me that we continue to look for a way to move forward on the energy efficiency issue and there may be votes still today. The leader will have more to say, certainly, as he has a chance to explore these issues in the afternoon.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VITTER. I know there are still discussions ongoing, including with the majority leader, about moving forward with this bill and with the important “no Washington exemption” issue. I want to encourage that discussion toward a positive resolution and state again that I am open to multiple ways in which all of that can be accomplished. Let me specifically address one issue.

There is some concern that somehow I am going to demand multiple votes on this between now and October. What I am looking for is one vote straight up on this issue between now and October 1. It can be on this bill, it can be on the CR. But I am looking for that one vote. If we do have, for instance, an amendment vote on this bill, and the issue is added perhaps to the CR from the House and comes over, then I am sure we would have to deal with it again. But that would not be of my making or of my demanding.

What I am looking for here in the Senate is simply to lock down and be assured of one fair up-or-down vote on this crucial issue between now and October. Of course, if this issue persists, I am sure I will talk about it and bring it up again, including after October 1. There are plenty of different ways to get there, all of which would be consistent with moving forward on the energy amendments and moving forward on this bill.

I think there are a lot of reasonable ways to solve this. I am open to any and all of them.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so that I may call up my own amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. VITTER. Reserving the right to object, I propose an alternative unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and the following amendments be made pending: the Sanders amendment, Bennet amendment No. 1847, Udall amendment No. 1845, Klobuchar amendment No. 1856, Franken amendment No. 1855, Blumenthal amendment No. 1878, and Vitter amendment No. 1866; that on Tuesday, September 17, at a time to be determined jointly by the majority and the minority leaders, my amendment No. 1866 and the side-by-side amendment on the same subject by the majority leader be made pending and receive 60 minutes of debate evenly divided and controlled by the majority bill manager and me; that no points of order be in order in relation to these two amendments; that upon expiration of the time for debate, without any intervening motions or debate, the Senate then proceed to votes on these two amendments subject to a 60-vote threshold for passage; and that subsequent to each vote, a motion to reconsider each vote be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. WYDEN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the modified request.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, again reserving my right to object, I wish to outline another alternative which I think is a very reasonable path forward on this amendment and on the bill.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the Vitter amendment No. 1866 and then on Wednesday, September 25, 2013, at 3 p.m., the Senate discharge the relevant committees from consideration of my bill, the No Exemption for Washington from ObamaCare Act, and then proceed immediately to consideration of that bill; that without any intervening motions or debate, the Senate proceed with 60 minutes of debate on that bill evenly divided and controlled by the majority leader and me; that the bill not be subject to any amendments or motions to commit; that after debate has expired, the bill be engrossed for a third reading, read a third time, and the Senate immediately vote on final passage subject to a 60-vote threshold; and that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. WYDEN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I do object, sadly, that we can't choose such a path forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. It is clear there are differences of opinion in this body and in this country on how we proceed on energy matters. But I think—at least I hope—that there is pretty unanimous agreement that energy efficiency makes a whole lot of sense.

At a time when the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory tells us that over half of the total energy produced in the United States is wasted due to inefficiency, I would hope that regardless of one's political perspective, we could all move forward together to create a more energy-efficient society which will, A, lower the cost of fuel for millions of Americans; B, cut back on greenhouse gas emissions and help us deal with the planetary crisis of global warming; and C, as we make our Nation more energy efficient, we can create tens and tens of thousands of jobs. If there is a win-win-win situation out there, I think this is it, and I would hope we could move forward. This is why, because of the win-win-win aspect of this bill, I think we should be supporting the Shaheen-Portman bill, which has earned support from a wide array of Senators and organizations from across the political spectrum.

I think Senator SHAHEEN would agree this is a fairly modest bill. It is not transforming the world, but this is a small step forward in doing what certainly needs to be done and that there should be very little disagreement about.

As part of this effort, Chairman WYDEN and I are proposing what I

think is a significant amendment that complements the overall thrust of the bill. Our amendment is called the Residential Energy Savings Act, which, in fact, is a strong complement to the Shaheen-Portman bill. Our legislation focuses on residential energy efficiency—residential. We do that because we understand that in Vermont, in Louisiana, in Oregon, all over this country, there are tens of millions of people who understand they are wasting energy. When it gets cold, the heat is going through their roofs, through their windows, and through their walls. They are wasting money every single day, but they don't have the modest investment they need to make their homes more energy efficient. This is the problem Senator WYDEN and I are trying to address. We are focusing attention on homeowners all over this country.

The Residential Energy Savings Act will save money for homeowners and tenants and cut energy use by lowering the cost of energy efficiency upgrades. It will also create jobs for installers and for the companies that manufacture windows, insulation, and other energy efficiency materials.

How does this amendment work? It is pretty simple. This bill makes loans available to States through the State Energy Program of the U.S. Department of Energy to create or expand existing financing programs. This provides homeowners and tenants with access to low-cost, consumer-friendly capital for energy efficiency projects. Homeowners and tenants use the funding to invest in energy efficiency. Here is the exciting part of this concept: They pay back the loans through their energy savings and the U.S. Treasury gets the money back. In other words, we lend somebody \$15,000 to make their home more energy efficient. They save \$1,000 a year. They pay back the loan by those savings in their fuel bill. At the end of the day—for 15 years in that example—they are not paying any more for fuel, but in the 16th year they are going to see significant savings in their bill, and throughout the process we see significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, we have created jobs in a number of areas—the installers and those people who manufacture energy-efficient products.

These are the key features of the amendment introduced by Senator WYDEN and me:

It is technology neutral. People will make their own choices about how they want to go forward.

This amendment provides States with a high level of flexibility to support existing State and local programs or to design new financing programs that best fit their own circumstances and need.

This amendment supports effective existing State and local programs and

supports innovations designed to improve energy efficiency financing. There are no mandates. Participation is entirely voluntary. The Department of Energy must consider regional diversity in issuing loans. This amendment encourages public-private partnerships and other strategies for leveraging public dollars.

The bill incorporates annual reporting requirements to ensure accountability and provides valuable data to consumers, State and local governments, lenders, utilities, and the real estate industry about financing industry upgrades. The residential energy savings amendment is complementary to energy efficiency proposals by other Senators. Supporters of this amendment include the Alliance to Save Energy, the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, the American Institute of Architects, Efficiency First, and the National Association of State Energy Officials.

Residential energy efficiency—helping homeowners save energy and money while creating jobs at the same time—is an approach that is enjoyed by people all over the country.

Let me reiterate the bottom line. This is a very simple concept. The Federal Government lends money to the States to be repaid back in full. This is not an expense for the Federal Government. There will be an administrative cost.

We think at the end of the day there will be \$1 billion of effort in making residential homes more energy efficient. In Vermont, you don't have to be a genius or an economist to know that it is pretty stupid to be heating your home in the wintertime and seeing that heat go out the window or the roof or the walls. In Vermont, and I am sure all over this country, we have a lot of older homes. They are wasting a lot of energy. People are spending much more money than they should.

I will never forget doing an event with two sisters from Barre, VT, who were in their eighties. The State put forth a weatherization program. They reduced the cost of their fuel bill by something like 50 percent. Their home was much more comfortable. This is what we should be doing all over this country, but working families and middle-class families in many ways can't come up with that \$10-, \$15-, \$20,000 they need in order to make this happen. This bill gives money to the States, and they give it to the homeowners. The homeowners repay it based on reductions in fuel bills. The Federal Government gets its money back. We create jobs, we cut greenhouse gas emissions, and we save consumers huge sums of money. If this is not a win-win situation, I am not sure what is.

I thank Senator WYDEN for his hard work on this amendment. We look forward to working with my colleagues to see that it gets passed.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I am going to be very brief.

I thank Senator CORNYN for his courtesy. To respond, I am very pleased to be supportive of this amendment. I just want my colleagues to get one number with respect to this proposal. Our assessment is that for every dollar made available under this particular amendment, it would leverage \$10 worth of loans for homeowners to weatherize across the country. So when people talk about getting bang for the buck, that is the relevant number. Make \$1 available through the States—this is not run by the Federal Government—under this program, and that results in \$10 worth of loans being made for weatherization across the country. I think that is getting bang for the buck.

I thank Senator CORNYN for his courtesy. I hope colleagues, when we get a chance to vote, will vote positively on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, our friends on the other side of the aisle keep promising that once the President's health care law is fully implemented it will deliver fabulous results. Unfortunately, they have a massive credibility problem. Indeed, despite all the promises made to the American people during the debate and passage of the Affordable Care Act in 2009 and 2010, every week brings more evidence the President's health care law is, No. 1, already discouraging full-time job creation; No. 2, destroying many existing full-time jobs; No. 3, hampering medical innovation; and No. 4, encouraging further executive branch overreach.

And of course the worst is yet to come because, amazingly enough, once this law was passed in 2010, it wasn't implemented before the 2010 mid-term elections, nor was it implemented fully between then and the 2012 Presidential election. So the American people have yet to feel the full force of the implementation of ObamaCare, even though what we see already is discouraging, to say the least.

Once ObamaCare is fully implemented, it will drive up individual insurance premiums. We have already seen some indication of that around the country in the rates that have been announced for the individual exchanges that have been created. That is because of phenomena such as the guaranteed issue and age banding, which basically have engineered the insurance industry so that it no longer is insurance but prepaid health care.

Secondly, it will cause millions of Americans to lose their current coverage. Remember when the President said: If you like what you have, you can keep it? That is proving not to be true.

Thirdly, it will weaken Medicare and Medicaid.

My colleagues may recall that during the 4th of July recess the administration announced it would not be confirming taxpayer eligibility for the ObamaCare premium subsidies until 2015, even though the subsidies will begin flowing—taxpayer dollars will be flowing—1 year earlier in 2014. In other words, for 1 year, under the administration's current plan, people will be able to get taxpayer dollars without any independent verification of what they are representing in terms of their eligibility for those tax dollars. That is correct, without any independent verification—no safeguards for overpayments or fraud.

Earlier today the House of Representatives passed legislation that would delay the ObamaCare premium subsidies until the administration establishes a system for verifying eligibility, to make sure those tax dollars are not stolen or obtained under false pretenses.

It is one of those measures that should be a no-brainer. After all, whatever one thinks about health care reform, everyone should want to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse. Yet our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol, House Democrats, were almost unanimously opposed to the No Subsidies Without Verification Act, and the majority leader in this body refuses to allow a vote in the Senate on similar legislation.

Again, this is what one outside of Washington and the beltway would think is a no-brainer, but here we have an alternate universe, apparently. Apparently, our Democratic friends are okay with that, but I certainly am not, and neither are the 26 million people in Texas I have the privilege of representing.

At a time when the Federal Government is almost \$17 trillion in debt, shouldn't we be doing everything humanly possible to try and crack down on wasteful spending and fraud? Well, I would think so. But here is yet another question: Wasn't ObamaCare itself sold on the basis it would reduce health care fraud? Wasn't it supposed to improve oversight? That is what we were told during 2009 and 2010. Apparently those promises have now been forgotten.

If the President and his allies are wondering why they have such an enormous credibility gap on ObamaCare, the answer is actually quite simple: So many of the promises that were made in selling ObamaCare have simply not been kept. It is simply not performing as advertised.

Think about what we have learned in the last few months alone. In July, the National Bureau of Economic Research published a study showing ObamaCare may cause substantial declines in aggregate employment. In other words,

unemployment will go up and the number of people getting work will go down. That same month, the Wall Street Journal reported that between 2009 and 2012 the number of doctors opting out of Medicare nearly tripled.

In my State, if you are covered by Medicare you might find a doctor who will take a new Medicare patient and you might not. Only about two-thirds of Texas physicians will take a new Medicare patient because the reimbursements have been slashed to the point where many doctors simply can't economically take a new Medicare patient. This is like the old shell game where people are told they have coverage but they can't find a doctor willing to see them based on that coverage.

The problem for Medicaid is even worse. In mid-August the University of Virginia announced that ObamaCare is projected to add \$7.3 million to the cost of the university's health plan in 2014 alone. That is just at the University of Virginia. About a week later, National Journal reported that for the vast majority of Americans, premium prices will be higher in the individual exchanges than they are paying currently for employer-sponsored benefits.

I have two daughters in their early thirties. They are the ones, under ObamaCare, who are going to have to bear the financial burden for subsidizing the health care costs for older Americans, and it is unfair. This is the very same cohort of the population that is finding it harder to find jobs and finding the burdens of our broken entitlement programs are going to be visited upon them, not to mention their share of the Federal debt, which boils down to about \$53,000 each. If I were a 30-year-old or 30-something, I would be pretty irritated at my elders for not being responsible and pushing that debt and those responsibilities on me—if I were them.

Last week Investor's Business Daily reported that "more than 250 employers had cut work hours, jobs, or taken other steps to avoid ObamaCare costs." We heard a lot about this, including from some of the largest labor unions in the country, saying many employers, in order to avoid the employer mandate and other mandates associated with ObamaCare, were simply taking full-time jobs and turning them into part-time work, obviously resulting in people taking a cut in their income.

A few days ago, a local media outlet in Michigan reported ObamaCare will cost the medical device company Stryker "fully 20 percent of its total research and development investments." This has to do with the medical device tax which is part of the way ObamaCare was paid for and which punishes medical device companies. These companies create jobs here in the United States. They create new and innovative medical equipment that

helps improve outcomes and makes our lives better. Yet they are being targeted under ObamaCare with this medical device tax and it is chasing jobs overseas and stifling innovative medical research.

In addition, the Huffington Post has reported the Trader Joe's grocery chain will be dropping health insurance coverage for all employees who work fewer than 30 hours a week.

As I said, we have seen some of our organized labor unions, particularly the one representing IRS employees that announced it does not want its members to receive health insurance through ObamaCare exchanges, even though, under ObamaCare, the IRS will be implementing the exchanges for everyone else, as well as the individual mandate. In other words, the very people responsible for administering ObamaCare want no part of joining the exchanges, and that should speak volumes to all of us.

The truth is it wasn't supposed to be this way. Whether you were one of the most ardent advocates for the Affordable Care Act or whether you were a skeptic, such as I, who didn't believe it could work, I think the facts are undeniable. The Affordable Care Act was supposed to help the middle class, not cut their work hours and threaten their benefits. It was supposed to help young people, not drive up their insurance premiums. It was supposed to help medical innovation, not lead to factory closures and cancellations. And it was supposed to help make Medicaid stronger, not overload a broken system. It was sold on the basis it would strengthen Medicare, not trigger an exodus of doctors from seeing Medicare patients.

My point is: Whether you were one of the most ardent advocates or whether you were a skeptic, ObamaCare is not living up to the hopes and the promises made by its biggest fans, and we should work together to try and find a way to deal with that in a responsible way.

One final point. The President has apparently decided ObamaCare says whatever he wants it to say. For example, he has unilaterally delayed both the employer mandate and the eligibility verification I spoke about a moment ago simply because it has proven to be politically inconvenient. Many of my constituents are outraged at this and wonder how a law that applies to everyone in America can be enforced on a piecemeal or cherry-picked basis. My only explanation to them is the President controls the executive branch of government, including the Department of Justice. Congress has no authority to enforce these laws, only to pass the laws, expecting the executive branch will administer the laws and enforce the laws as written. But that hasn't happened. Meanwhile, the IRS has announced it will violate the text of the law and issue health sub-

sidies through Federal exchanges, even though the law clearly states those subsidies can only be issued through the State exchanges.

Here again is another example in this case of the IRS rewriting the law where it proves to be convenient to achieve a particular outcome. This should be and is an outrage. Indeed, on issues ranging from the tax subsidies to the employer mandate, ObamaCare has effectively become government by waiver.

There is no way to sugarcoat it. The law is damaging our economy, damaging our health care system, and weakening our constitutional checks and balances and our legacy of being a Nation of laws, not of men. That is why the best course of action, I believe, is to delay ObamaCare, dismantle ObamaCare, and replace ObamaCare.

I have cosponsored legislation numerous times that would delay both the employer and individual mandates, for example. It was introduced last night, the latest version, as an amendment to the current energy efficiency bill. My ultimate goal is to replace ObamaCare with patient-centered reforms that do several important things we could all, hopefully, agree are important principles for whatever our health care system is.

First of all, a replacement would make sure a health care system is in place where price and quality information is fully transparent and readily available. That is so people can compare and shop and use the market system to make sure people who provide those goods and services do so at as low a price and at as high a quality as they can get.

A replacement system would include a Tax Code that treats individually purchased health insurance the same way as employer-provided health insurance.

A replacement system would make sure every American is protected against catastrophic expenses.

This is one of the phony ways I have heard people talk against this idea. They say: Well, if you replace ObamaCare, you will eliminate the system against dealing with people with preexisting conditions. That is false. That is not true. You don't need this behemoth legislation that costs \$2.7 trillion—or whatever the final figure is—in order to deal with people with preexisting conditions. What we can do is simply help fund the State-based insurance exchanges that provide coverage to people with preexisting conditions at a far cheaper price and still accomplish the same goal.

So anyone who tells you we have to have ObamaCare to deal with preexisting conditions is trying to sell you a bill of goods.

We should have a system replacing ObamaCare that gives all Americans an opportunity to save money in tax-free health savings accounts so they can

use that money to pay for their health bills. If they don't need the money for that purpose, they can save it like an IRA or some other savings account tax free.

We should have a replacement system where the States will have much greater flexibility in improving Medicaid. We would be happy in Texas for the Federal Government to write us a check for its share of Medicaid and let us administer it in a much more cost-effective and a much higher quality sort of way.

We need a system to replace ObamaCare that protects Medicare for future generations and a system that preserves the right for the most important decisions about medical care to be left to patients and their physicians.

I remain confident that someday we can make this kind of health care system a reality. First, we need to delay if we can't replace it now. Certainly, as ObamaCare starts crumbling in on itself, we need to protect the American people from this catastrophic and epic failure and provide an alternative that has the sort of qualities I have described a moment ago—which will make sure that people have access to quality health care at an affordable price in a way that doesn't let Washington interfere with doctor-patient relationships or decisions we ought to reserve to ourselves and our families when it comes to our health care.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, often it is a little hard to divine what is actually going on here on the floor of the Senate.

I want to make sure folks understand that the pending business before the Senate is a bipartisan bill offered by the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Ohio on energy efficiency. That is the pending business before the Senate. One of the measures of this bill is the extraordinary support. We have business groups such as the Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, and the Roundtable joining with the Natural Resources Defense Council. That is not exactly a coalition that comes up every single day, but you have it because of the good work Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN have done. They had all that in place as we came to the Senate.

Since that time—and it has been 1½ days now that we have been on this bill—Senator after Senator has come to the floor of the Senate in a bipartisan fashion, starting with Senator INHOFE and Senator CARPER—and the list goes on and on—have come to the floor to say this is a good energy efficiency bill and we have some ideas on how we can make it even better. So they have offered their bipartisan amendments, and they have not been

able to get a vote on those bipartisan amendments to a bipartisan bill. I think it would be fair to say that if they could get votes on those bipartisan amendments, they would pass overwhelmingly. We have others certainly in the wings as well.

Who are the losers because we haven't been able to get those amendments up and we haven't been able to move ahead on this bill? I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the people who are the losers are the consumers. They are the job creators. If you look at the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, a business-oriented group, this is legislation that will create thousands of jobs. And taxpayers are the losers, because a bipartisan bill which would be improved by the bipartisan amendments colleagues want to offer cannot go forward because it is stuck in this procedural morass.

So you have consumers losing out on billions of dollars of savings, thousands of jobs, and our country missing out on dramatic energy savings.

That seems foolish even by the sometimes stilted standards of the beltway, to pass up that kind of opportunity. The reason the breadth and support of this bill is so extensive is because this bill isn't run from a Washington Federal leviathan. This doesn't involve any mandates. The focus is on States and the private sector.

Senator SANDERS talked about an idea in terms of weatherization that I find very appealing. It is voluntary, like virtually this entire bill is.

I was very pleased when Leader REID indicated he was continuing to look for a way to move forward. I and others have been talking to various Senators in the leadership about how to do that. I hope that will be possible and we will see tangible progress made here shortly.

I think it is so important to respond to what people said all summer to Senators, in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Oregon, and across the country; that is, people at home are tired of this food fight in Washington, tired of the bickering and the pettiness. They would like to see us show up, work together in a bipartisan way on issues that are fundamental to their well-being, and, in particular, grow an economy with more opportunities for high-skilled, high-wage jobs in the middle class. That is certainly what happens when we promote some of the top technologies associated with energy efficiency.

The public said Senators ought to go back to Washington and do exactly what Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN have been talking about, an effort which has been supplemented by similar kinds of bipartisan proposals from various Senators.

That is where we are 1½ days after the bill, Senator after Senator coming

to the floor wanting to offer relevant bipartisan amendments to a bill that will be good for the productivity of the country, good for our environment, and good for our job creation.

I am going to stay at my post here and hope we can find a path to go forward. I know there are discussions taking place. I am very grateful because Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN have been here at their posts trying to advance the bipartisan focus of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I thank Chairman WYDEN for making the clarification that we are here on the floor not to talk about health care or other unrelated issues, but we are here to talk about energy.

As the Senator pointed out yesterday, as Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator PORTMAN, and I have pointed out, this is the first energy bill to come to the floor since 2007. On an issue that is so critical to the future of our country, it is nice to finally be having a debate. It is nice to finally be able to listen to people on both sides of the aisle talking about why energy is so important, and talking about their amendments and the difference those amendments will make for people across this country.

We were interrupted by health care after Senator WYDEN and Senator SANDERS talked about the amendment on residential energy efficiency, but I wanted to applaud both for that effort. Senator SANDERS talked about the challenges faced by people in his home State of Vermont. My neighboring State of New Hampshire, the Presiding Officer's State of Massachusetts, the State of Oregon are all States that are cold weather States. In New Hampshire we have an inordinate number of people who heat with home heating oil which is very expensive, and we have a lot of old buildings. Because New Hampshire is one of the first States in the original Thirteen Colonies, we have a lot of buildings in the State that are old that need to be upgraded to be more energy efficient so people can afford their heating bills. This amendment that Senators would like to introduce—if we can ever get on the bill and get to some of these bipartisan amendments—would help address the challenges that people in the Northeast, the upper West, and the upper Midwest all face with the high costs of heating their homes in the wintertime.

I would also point out that it is not just important to us in the North to have more energy-efficient homes, even though in the northeast we have more older homes. In the South it is equally important because air conditioning is very expensive as well. So people who can have their homes be more efficient

when they are trying to cool them in the summer also benefit.

This is an amendment that is a win-win. As Senator WYDEN pointed out for the last 1½ days, this legislation is a win-win for everybody. It is a win on job creation, it is a win on helping to prevent pollution in our environment, it is a win on reducing the threat from dependence on foreign oil. So the connection to national security is there. And it is a win in terms of saving consumers the cost of energy.

In New Hampshire we have the sixth highest energy costs in the country, so we need to be able to save on energy costs because it is good for our businesses, it is good for our residents to not have to pay those high costs. I hope we can find some way to move forward on this bill and move forward on these bipartisan amendments, because this is a place where we can come to some agreement, we can work together, and we can get this done. The people of this country are expecting us to do that.

I thank Senator WYDEN for his leadership, and Senator MURKOWSKI. Hopefully we are going to stay here, we will hopefully keep having people come to the floor to talk about their amendments and what we can do, once we can get on this bill, to make a difference.

The bottom line here is that in addition to all the other good things it would do with the amendments that are being offered with the underlying bill, this will help create jobs, and it will do it in a way that doesn't cost a lot of money in terms of subsidizing those jobs. It is the private sector working in conjunction with public policy in a way that will encourage that job creation.

I continue to be hopeful we can come to some agreement and move this legislation in a way that I know the people of this country are expecting.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, we are going to stay and continue to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to try to find a path forward on the bill.

I want to announce from Senator REID, as a courtesy to all Senators—because we know their schedules are busy—there will be no recorded votes today, so that Senators can have that information.

For all of us who are working on a path to move forward on this bipartisan energy efficiency bill, we will continue those efforts through the afternoon.

Madam President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACCESS TO JUSTICE

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I am confident the Presiding Officer is familiar with the phrase, "Justice too long delayed is justice denied." Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., wrote that from his jail cell in Birmingham. "Justice too long delayed is justice denied."

I rise to talk about justice and the budgetary choices Congress is making that impact the ability of the American people to access the justice promised them by our Constitution.

Our Federal courts translate laws into justice and effective courts require fair judges, well-trained lawyers, and efficient clerks. As the Presiding Officer well knows, the fewer judges and clerks we have and the reduced resources in time-saving technology, the fewer cases can be handled at a time, and the longer cases will take to process. "Justice too long delayed is justice denied."

Of course, staffing the courts costs money, but when we compare it to the rest of the Federal Government, this whole branch is a relative bargain. For every \$100 spent by our Federal Government, just 19 cents goes to the entire Federal court system. We actually spend more every month on the ongoing conduct of operations in Afghanistan than we do an entire year on the whole Federal court system. It is, relatively speaking, a bargain.

With caseloads growing and budgets shrinking, though, the Federal courts have been cutting back where they could for years now, methodically looking for ways to cut costs, reduce overhead, lower personnel, and generally be more efficient. They are both metaphorically and literally looking under every cushion for coins, looking for ways to cut costs, reduce overhead, lower their personnel costs, whatever they can do to keep up.

Then came the sequester. Of course, when it was first conceived, the sequester was designed to be so reckless, so dangerous that it would drive Congress back to the negotiating table—House and Senate, Republicans and Democrats—to confront our Nation's annual deficits and craft a bipartisan agreement. But, sadly, it failed. Congress as a whole failed, and the across-the-board spending cuts engineered in the sequester went into effect.

It has been almost 7 months since they came into effect and, in that time, I have heard from hundreds of Delawareans, as I am sure all the Members have heard from their constituents, directly impacted by the sequester. I have spoken with dumbfounded employees at Dover Air Force Base—more than 1,000 hard-working Delawareans, many of them veterans who can't be-

lieve that they individually are paying the price because Congress, House and Senate, Republicans and Democrats, can't craft a responsible deal.

Kevin from Magnolia asked me: Why are my family and I being punished with a 20-percent pay cut this quarter? Bryan from Houston—both towns in Delaware—said he was tired of being the one to suffer the consequences because, in his view, Congress can't get the budgetary job done.

My heart goes out to Kevin and Bryan and every Delawarean who has called my office, written to me, and talked to me about the sequester. I agree with them. It needs to be replaced responsibly and urgently. As a member of the Budget Committee, I have worked with my colleagues to craft a budget that would replace sequester in a way that is in keeping with our core values and the priority of investing in America's future.

Not many people, though, are talking about how the sequester is impacting our courts. We hear about how sequester is affecting defense. We hear about how it is affecting research, and infrastructure, but our courts have often gone without consideration. There is no natural constituency, bluntly, that feels slighted; the number of furloughed employees is relatively small and there is no real lobby in Washington for the health of our courts.

But the sequester's impact on the Federal courts affects all of us—every single American. The sequester is slowing the pace, increasing the cost, and eroding the quality of the delivery of justice in this country.

At the end of our last session, I chaired a hearing of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts that looked at how the sequester is impacting the public defender service in our Nation's courts. These courts have been forced to cut past the fat and well into muscle and soon into bone.

The Judiciary has looked at a variety of measures to address this new budgetary reality and very few of them come without significant pain to the businesses, individuals, and communities that rely on our courts. One proposal—to simply not schedule civil jury trials in September—would effectively impose a 30-day uncertainty tax on everyone. A judge in Nebraska has threatened to dismiss low-priority immigration status crimes because of a lack of adequate capacity. In New York, deep furlough cuts to the public defender's office caused the delay of the criminal trial for Osama bin Laden's son-in-law and former Al Qaeda spokesman Sulaiman Abu Ghaith.

In my home State of Delaware, sequester has meant lengthy employee furloughs at the clerk's office of the bankruptcy court, reduced investments in IT, and postponed essential upgrades. Simply put, the financial state

of our Federal courts erodes our fundamental constitutional rights. Individuals depend on the courts to be there when they need them, to seek relief from discrimination, to resolve commercial disputes, to allow parties to stop fighting and get to work growing the economy or to guarantee fairness and efficiency in criminal proceedings.

The reality is our Federal courts were already stretched thin before this sequester.

Chief Justice Roberts leads the Judiciary Conference of the United States. The Judicial Conference was created by Congress to administer the Federal court system and work with Congress to ensure appropriations keep up with the needs of our courts. The Judicial Conference is and always has been non-partisan.

Earlier this year, the Judiciary Conference sent Chairman LEAHY and me a letter recommending that in order for the courts to fulfill their missions, we must add Federal judges to the bench. In the last two decades, since the last comprehensive judgeship bill—23 years, to be precise—article III district courts have seen their caseloads grow nearly 40 percent. Yet the number of judges has grown by four. Today, judges in the Eastern District of California, long recognized as one of the most overburdened in the Nation, face over 1,000 waiting case filings per judge. In the District of Columbia, case filings were over 1,500 per judge. The Judicial Conference generally believes that additional judgeships are needed when there are more than 500 per judge. So even before the sequester, our courts weren't keeping up with their caseloads.

Heeding the recommendations we received last month, Chairman LEAHY and I introduced the Federal Judgeship Act of 2013, which will create 91 new Federal judgeships, 2 Federal circuits, and 32 judicial districts across 21 States. This bill would provide much needed relief to our overburdened courts, ensuring they are better prepared to administer justice quickly and efficiently.

Again, this proposal, this bill, is in direct response to the analytical work of the nonpartisan Judicial Conference. This change is long overdue. Congress has not comprehensively addressed judicial staffing levels since 1990—23 years ago—and the trial court weighted filings per judgeship have risen from 386 back then to 520 today. Those national figures actually mask even more dramatic circumstances faced by the most burdened districts in Texas, Delaware, and California.

Yesterday, I chaired a hearing of the Senate Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts to consider this act and, during this hearing, District Court Judge Sue Robinson of Delaware testified on the need for more judgeships. She ex-

plained that “despite all the additional technologies we have, and an excellent staff, there is nothing more I can do at this point with respect to getting my cases resolved timely.” At that hearing, I appreciated and was encouraged by the statement of my colleague from Alabama that, in fact, the District of Delaware deserves another judge due to its incredible caseload. I would argue, though, and the evidence suggests, that the need is not confined to my State but to districts all across the country. We need to take on the whole problem, not just a small piece of it. Nobody wants to be in a courtroom, but when you need to be in court it is because something significant has happened in your life and you don't want a judge rushing to move on to the next thing because of a crushing caseload. You don't want clerks so awash in paperwork that yours gets lost.

In conclusion, we need to help our judges deliver justice by replacing the sequester with a responsible, balanced approach that restores the funding taken from our courts and allows us to add the judgeships we need to keep pace with demand.

Dr. King was right: Justice too long delayed is indeed justice denied. By delaying the delivery of justice, the sequester is denying justice to too many Americans. We don't need more delays; we need more judges, and we need to act together to get it done now.

Thank you, and with that I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 1860 to the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitive Act of 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I certainly support a vote on this amendment and many other amendments—all amendments, my amendment—and, therefore, I propose an alternative unanimous consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and the following amendments be made pending: Gillibrand No. 1860, Franken No. 1855, Inhofe No. 1851, Bennet No. 1847, Udall No. 1845, Klobuchar No. 1856, Sessions No. 1879, Enzi No. 1863, and Vitter No. 1866; and that on Tuesday, September 17, at a time to be determined jointly by the majority and minority leaders, my amendment No. 1866 and a side-by-side amendment on the same subject by the majority leader be made pending and receive 60 minutes of debate evenly divided and controlled by the majority bill manager and myself; that no points of order be in order in relation to these two amendments;

that upon expiration of the time for debate, without any intervening motions or debate, the Senate then proceed to vote on these two amendments, subject to a 60-vote threshold for passage; and that subsequent to each amendment vote, a motion to reconsider each vote be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. WYDEN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, let me offer another alternative because, again, I want this amendment to be voted on, I want all the amendments I mentioned to be voted on. I want my amendment or issue to be voted on.

So in that spirit, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to withdraw my Vitter amendment No. 1866; that on Wednesday, September 25, 2013, at 3 p.m., the Senate discharge the relevant committees from consideration of my related bill, the No Exemption for Washington from ObamaCare Act, proceed immediately to consideration of my bill; that without any intervening motions or debate, the Senate proceed with 60 minutes of debate on the bill, evenly divided and controlled by the majority leader and myself; that the bill not be subject to any amendments or motions to commit; then, after debate has expired, the bill be engrossed for a third reading, read a third time, and the Senate immediately vote on final passage, subject to a 60-vote threshold; and that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. WYDEN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, in that case, I must object, and I regret that we cannot choose these paths forward which would ensure a vote on these amendments that we are discussing.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I have an amendment that will help anyone in America who has had to rebuild after a natural disaster and I truly hope we can break this impasse and it can soon be considered.

My amendment would remove burdens and streamline the process that recipients of disaster aid face when upgrading to more energy-efficient technology.

In the wake of Superstorm Sandy, we saw all too well that old technology

can fail all too easily. Yet because of administrative burdens, recipients of much needed emergency funds will replace appliances and infrastructure with the same antiquated counterparts that were damaged. In many cases this means replacing a 10-year-old hot water heater with another 10-year-old unit or replacing a 20-year-old electric transformer with similarly antiquated systems without any regard for modern safety and efficiency standards.

At a minimum we should provide the option of allowing these homeowners, businesses, and utilities the ability to use emergency disaster funding to upgrade to more energy-efficient appliances, machinery or electrical infrastructure.

Not only will the use of energy-efficient technology save money, it will reduce pollution, it will create jobs, and it will help ensure that our infrastructure is more resilient to the increase in extreme weather events we have seen facing this country.

My amendment allows emergency funding recipients to voluntarily upgrade damaged equipment and structures with energy-efficient technology.

It is a budget-neutral alternative to current law. It does not direct FEMA to spend at higher levels. Remember, every \$1 spent in upgrading to more energy-efficient technology provides upward of \$5 in savings.

We should be streamlining the process and removing the roadblocks individuals and businesses face when choosing to replace items destroyed in natural disasters with more energy-efficient technology.

Thank you. I do hope we can consider this amendment soon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, just to respond to the distinguished Senator from New York, I want her to know I am very hopeful we will get her amendment formally in front of the Senate. I want the Senator from New York to know and colleagues to know that I think Senator GILLIBRAND has brought a first-rate idea to this already bipartisan bill.

Here is what Senator GILLIBRAND is talking about, because I know energy is sometimes a little bit of a complicated area. What Senator GILLIBRAND is essentially saying is that she wants to give folks who have been clobbered by a disaster more choice in how they rebuild after a disaster.

In effect, what the Senator from New York is saying is let's give those folks who have been hard hit by disasters a chance to trade up for those energy-efficient products that are going to save them energy and save them money.

This is the kind of idea, colleagues, that sometimes seems too logical for Washington, DC. But it sure makes a lot of sense to me.

I commend the Senator from New York for offering this particular idea.

As she has indicated, no mandates. This is not the Federal leviathan sweeping in and forcing people to do X, Y, and Z after a disaster. This is about choice. It is being done without any extra money provided by the government. I think it is just a first-rate idea. Frankly, this is what Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN and I thought would be part of this debate. It has been so long since anybody got serious about this issue on the floor we were convinced people would start bringing good ideas to the floor—the fact that they have been welling up all this time, when we have not had energy efficiency on the floor.

So we have been here for a day and a half. I sure wish we were voting on my colleague's amendment and other amendments relating to energy efficiency. I think it is an excellent idea. I hope colleagues will support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, let me just echo, I hope Senator GILLIBRAND gets a vote. I hope all these amendments mentioned get a vote. Of course, I hope my proposal gets a vote. The distinguished majority leader several days ago announced that the floor was open for amendments—no limitations, except one, which we all agreed to put the Syria debate on hold, as the President asked, and everyone agreed to that. The majority leader said this would be an open amendment process; the floor was open for any and all amendments.

Great. Let's have it. Let's have votes on all of these amendments, certainly including those by Senators GILLIBRAND, FRANKEN, BLUMENTHAL, INHOFE, BENNET, UDALL, KLOBUCHAR, SESSIONS, ENZI, and my amendment. Again, the vote I am asking for—quite frankly, demanding—does not have to be in the context of this bill. As I have made clear with my second UC request, I will put it aside and withdraw it from this bill, but it is time sensitive. It does have to occur in a fair up-or-down way before October 1 because the illegal OPM rule—that is a bailout, an exemption for Washington—takes effect then. It is very time sensitive. I did not create that rule certainly and I did not create that timeline and, therefore, I did not create that urgency. But it is there because of that, in my opinion, illegal OPM action.

I will also happily accept that vote outside the context of this bill, and I have suggested multiple paths forward where we can vote. Let's vote. But everybody needs to get reasonable votes, not just those who are approved by the majority leader. I look forward to that resolution. I have put multiple paths forward and look forward to that being resolved in the near future.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would like to speak to a couple amendments I have filed to the bill that is under consideration by the Senate today. I wish to talk about amendment No. 1876. Just to kind of give you the background context, most of us know that when we were debating the health care bill a few years ago, the labor unions were enthusiastic supporters of ObamaCare. It perhaps should come as no surprise that they are having some buyer's remorse. I think they are realizing they were sold a bill of goods, and similar to a lot of people around this country whom I talk to, they would like to have a do-over.

In fact, if we look at what has happened since the legislation has become law and what has happened to premiums—they continue going up. In fact, there was a Kaiser study just this last month that had family premiums going up \$3,000, on average, since President Obama took office. Of course, that was after the promise that health care premiums were going to go down by \$2,500.

We have seen employers either cut jobs or slash hours. In fact, 250 employers have cut jobs, and there is hardly a day that goes by where there is not a headline in a major newspaper about some employer who is having to reduce their workforce or not hire people they otherwise would hire simply because of the additional cost, the requirements, the mandates, all the uncertainty created by ObamaCare.

Of course, what that means is the people who are getting hired are getting hired for part-time jobs. If we look at the number of jobs created this year, about 77 percent of those are part-time jobs. What is happening? A lot of employers—those that are under 50 employees—if they go over 50, obviously, they are covered by the mandate that says they have to provide government-approved health care. So they are keeping the number under 50 employees. Then the other requirement is to qualify as a full-time employee, you have to work 30 hours a week. So employers are also reducing the hours of their employees. So we have, I think, more now 29-hour-a-week jobs in this country than we have ever had before. The numbers since the beginning of the year with regard to jobs created—part-time time jobs—do bear that out. More and more employers are finding their way to reduce the hours of employees and hire people for jobs that are part-time jobs as opposed to full-time jobs.

What does that mean? That means the take-home pay of middle-class Americans is going down, and in order to make ends meet, they are now having to get that second job. It is creating all kinds of distortions in the labor force. So it is no surprise, I would think, that the labor unions would like to have this issue revisited.

I wish to share with you a couple statements that have been made. The

International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the UFCW, and UNITE-HERE sent a letter to House minority leader NANCY PELOSI and Senate majority leader HARRY REID in July stating:

On behalf of the millions of working men and women we represent and the families they support, we can no longer stand silent in the face of elements of the [health care law] that will destroy the very health and wellbeing of our members along with millions of other hardworking Americans.

The United Union of Roofers, Waterproofers, and Allied Workers—this from a letter several months ago in April—

I am therefore calling for repeal or complete reform of the Affordable Care Act to protect our employers, our industry, and our most important asset: our members and their families.

If we look at the letter that was sent on July 11 by the three unions I mentioned earlier, it goes on to say it will create nightmare scenarios, it will shatter benefits, and, actually, that it will destroy the backbone of the middle class, which is the 40-hour workweek—so very strong language by some of those who were the most enthusiastic and strongest advocates and supporters of ObamaCare when it was being discussed and debated in the Senate.

Last night, at their annual convention, the AFL-CIO passed a resolution calling for major changes to ObamaCare.

The unions are trying to get a special deal, and they want to work with the administration in a way that completely ignores the text of ObamaCare.

The law says anyone who has an offer from their employer of government-approved health care coverage is not eligible—not eligible—to go into the exchanges and receive refundable health care premium tax credits.

The law also states that union-provided insurance, known as Taft-Hartley multiemployer health plans, is—~~is~~—government-approved health care coverage.

Consequently, union employees enrolled in these Taft-Hartley plans are not eligible for the exchanges and the refundable premium tax credits that are available in the exchange.

Obviously, the unions are not happy about that. In fact, on August 27, 2013, the trade publication *Inside Health Policy* reported:

The Office of Management and Budget previously showed on its regulatory review website that on Aug. 24 it received a Department of Labor Proposed rule on “Health Insurance Premium Assistance Trust Supporting the Purchase of Certain Individual Health Insurance Policies.” The rule, which OMB said is Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act-related (PPACA), also appears to deal with the exclusion from a definition of an employee welfare benefit plan, but this week the description disappeared.

The unions are clearly seeking a way around the law and want a special fix

that would apply to them and to them only.

If they have their way, what essentially happens is that union members will receive government subsidies for their insurance plans from three different sources, in three different ways—a benefit position that no other organization or individual is in.

First, they get the tax deduction that an employer receives for contributing to a union health plan.

Second, they will get the nontaxable income that the employee receives when his or her employer purchases a union health plan. Third, finally, a new premium assistance tax credit for union members who purchase the union health plan.

A recent analysis from the American Action Forum shows that if the administration gives labor unions what they want, it would cost taxpayers \$187 billion over the next 10 years. The new health care law is clear that taxpayer-funded premium assistance credits are intended for low- to middle-income Americans without access to affordable insurance through an employer or who purchase health insurance on the exchanges.

The fact is that Taft-Hartley union health plans are not exchange-based plans, they are employer-sponsored health plans. Providing union members with a premium assistance tax credit on top of the favorable tax treatment already afforded to them for their employer-sponsored coverage amounts to double-dipping for union workers and is grossly unfair for every nonunion worker in America who would receive no such special benefit.

The law states that union employees should not receive both Taft-Hartley coverage and premium tax credits, but the administration has made it abundantly clear that they are willing to ignore this law in other areas. That is why I have introduced as a bill and an amendment to the pending legislation the Union Bailout Prevention Act that would seek to close off any possible loophole the administration might create or could use to give unions a special fix.

I do not blame at all the unions or other Americans around this country for not liking what they got. I think a lot of people had higher hopes, and those, obviously, who supported this and enthusiastically supported the health care law are now realizing this is not what they were promised. As a consequence, a lot of them would like to see a do-over. They want to see changes. They want to see reforms. Some want to see repeal. That obviously would be my preference in all of this. But it is not fair to carve out groups of people at the exclusion or detriment of other Americans who would be unfairly impacted by that carve-out.

That is essentially what they are requesting here. They are trying to get

special treatment that would allow them to claim not one, not two, but three special tax provisions or tax treatments as a result of the new Affordable Care Act when, in fact, under Taft-Hartley plans they already receive favorable tax treatment and they are in government-approved plans. That is a government-approved plan and therefore not eligible for the exchanges, as are many other Americans who do not have access to some sort of employer-provided health care plan.

So if this carve-out were something the administration would approve, it would create a special treatment, a special provision that would cost taxpayers billions of dollars and be completely unfair to countless Americans who would love to see the provisions of this law either repealed or delayed for them as well.

The better solution, I would argue, is let's delay this for everybody. I would like to see it repealed. I think we could have done a much better job. We did not need a 2,700-page bill and 20,000 pages of regulations to deal with some of the challenges and problems we have in our health care system today, but that is what we have. We have a government takeover of our health care system. We have 20,000 pages of regulations—which, by the way, is significantly taller than I am. It is about 7 feet tall when you stack those regulations. Somebody has to interpret all of that. Somebody has to make sense out of it. Obviously, as people start to interpret and make sense out of it, they are not liking what they are finding. That should not come as any surprise because when you get a massive expansion of the government, which is essentially what this was, a takeover of literally one-sixth of the American economy, you are going to have a lot of associated unintended consequences.

I think it would make a lot of sense—there are so many better ways of going about this—if we were to repeal this and start over, but at a minimum, if one group is going to get special treatment, then all Americans ought to get that same treatment. I would argue that the best way to do that is to delay this for everybody across this country, not to create special carve-outs, special treatment that would apply to just a small number of Americans when there are literally millions of Americans who are impacted by this new law.

I would also like to address briefly, if I might—this is another amendment I filed to this bill. It is amendment No. 1887. It has to do with the Department of Energy loan program that has already cost taxpayers millions in bad investments. It is the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Loan Program. It was intended to provide loans for manufacturing facilities that produce fuel-efficient vehicles. However, after making only five loans over the past several years, this program was mothballed in 2011.

Remarkably, Secretary Moniz is considering reviving this program and is reportedly seeking new applications for the ATVM Program. I have introduced this amendment because the Obama administration has not proven itself to be a very good venture capitalist. If you look at the record of the five recipients of ATVM loans, one is bankrupt and another has suspended their payments on a \$192 million loan. The Government Accountability Office has also questioned whether the Department of Energy has the expertise to properly assess loan applications. The GAO has also concluded that the Department of Energy lacks the engineering expertise needed for effective technical oversight.

Not only is this program poorly managed, it is no longer needed. Credit markets in the auto industry have largely recovered from the recession, and industry participants have shown little interest in the ATVM Program in recent years. Additionally, stricter fuel economy standards, which automakers supported, promote vehicle technologies that are subsidized by the loan program.

The ATVM Program has \$16.6 billion in outstanding lending authority. According to GAO, that is a credit subsidy risk of over \$4 billion. I have offered this amendment to prohibit any new loans from being made under the ATVM Program and to protect taxpayers from this outstanding exposure. Given the Energy Department's poor track record and the fact that these subsidies are no longer necessary, I would urge my colleagues to support my amendment to stop the administration from making additional risky loans and losing even more taxpayer dollars.

I hope we will get a chance to vote on these amendments. I know the manager of the bill, the Senator from Oregon, is working with others to try to come up with a path forward in terms of processing amendments. But this is certainly one that would save the government and the taxpayers some money. If you look at the record, I think most Americans would agree this is not the way they want to see their money used.

I yield the floor.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act, S. 1392. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation, which would build on previous energy efficiency legislation and proposes cost-effective mechanisms to support the adoption of off-the-shelf efficiency technologies for buildings, manufacturers, and the federal government.

As honorary Vice-Chair of the Alliance to Save Energy, I have been a long-time proponent of efforts to improve energy efficiency. Encouraging the adoption of energy efficiency meas-

ures is one of the easiest yet most effective mechanisms for reducing energy consumption, lessening pollution, and ultimately saving families, businesses, and the federal government money.

Legislation to improve our Nation's energy policy is long-overdue. I would like to congratulate the bill sponsors, Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, for crafting this bipartisan, commonsense bill and for their efforts in working with the leadership of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI, to bring this bill to the Senate floor. The provisions in S. 1392 will kick-start the use of energy efficiency technologies that are commercially available now and can be deployed by residential, commercial, and industrial energy users. It will also improve the energy efficiency of the federal government, which is the largest user of energy in the country. Given the challenging fiscal environment, it is notable that all authorizations included in S. 1392 are fully offset.

Specifically, S. 1392 would strengthen voluntary building codes for new homes and commercial buildings, train workers in energy-efficient commercial building design and operation, help streamline manufacturing energy efficiency, create a pilot program for highly efficient supply chains, and require the federal government to adopt energy saving practices for computers.

I am also pleased to be the lead cosponsor of two amendments that complement the goals of S. 1392. First, I have joined my colleague, the Senator from Colorado, Mr. UDALL, in sponsoring an amendment which would provide a streamlined, coordinating structure for schools to help them better navigate available federal energy efficiency programs and financing options. This would be particularly helpful for rural schools in states such as Maine and would help these institutions save money on their rising energy costs. Decisions about how best to meet the energy needs of their schools, however, would still appropriately be made by the states, school boards, and local officials.

The second amendment I am pleased to be cosponsoring along with my colleagues from Delaware, Senator COONS, and Rhode Island, Senator REED, would reauthorize and extend the core Weatherization Assistance Program and State Energy Program activities at the Department of Energy through 2018, develop a competitive grant program for non-profits to carry out weatherization projects, and require minimum professional standards for weatherization contractors and workers. I am a long-time supporter of weatherization, which plays an important role in permanently reducing home energy costs for low-income families and seniors in all states, lessening our dependence on

foreign oil, and training a skilled workforce. Weatherizing homes and reducing energy costs is particularly important for a State such as Maine, which has the oldest housing stock in the Nation and a high dependence on home heating oil.

Earlier this week, the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, ACEEE, released new analysis demonstrating that S. 1392 would save consumers and businesses over \$65 billion on their energy bills by 2030 and would help support thousands of new jobs by cutting government and industrial energy waste and assisting homeowners in financing energy efficiency improvements.

S. 1392 has the support of a broad coalition of stakeholders, including energy efficiency, business, and environmental organizations, small and large businesses, utilities, and public interest groups. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of S. 1392 and urge its swift passage.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I know the Presiding Officer has some thoughts on this efficiency bill, and we are going to hear from him later. I appreciate that. I thank Senator THUNE and others who have come to the floor to not offer their amendments officially because we have this issue we need to resolve on the health care front but to talk about good amendments to the legislation and ways to improve it. I know Senator GILLIBRAND was earlier talking about her amendment, which is a commonsense approach to ensure that as you do retrofits after natural disasters, you can use more energy-efficient appliances and so on.

There are some commonsense ways for us to move the efficiency agenda forward with an "all of the above" energy strategy. We have had a good debate today on that topic. I think we have actually gotten a number of amendments that have been proposed—I can count seven of them that are bipartisan that have been discussed here on the Senate floor that are going to help us as we proceed on this bill.

I am hopeful that we will have votes on Monday and Tuesday and that we can move forward with resolving the outstanding issues on the health care front to be able to move to the bill. I do hope my colleague from Louisiana

does get a vote on his health care bill. I think it is important. I think it is important that the Senate be heard. But let's also be sure that we actually move forward with this underlying legislation. This is an unfortunately rare example of where Republicans and Democrats have come together here in the Senate to put forward legislation that has been worked out carefully, thoughtfully over time, that addresses one of the concerns we have as a country, which is that the energy used in our manufacturing facilities and by us as individuals and families and certainly by our Federal Government makes our economy less competitive and increases our costs.

There are ways to make our economy stronger, certainly improve the environment, and also make us less dependent on foreign energy by moving forward with energy efficiency as one leg of really a combination of things we need to do in an "all of the above" energy strategy.

Some of that, of course, should be producing more energy. I think this is a great opportunity for America, particularly in States such as Ohio, which I represent, where we have a tremendous opportunity to produce more natural gas—so called wet gas that is very valuable right now—and also oil. That will help to have not only lower energy costs but more stable energy costs going forward to bring back manufacturing. That can actually lead to a rebirth of some of the great industries in States like mine, Ohio, but also around our country to help get this economy back on track as we face high unemployment and low economic growth. But along with producing more, we need to use less and use what we have more efficiently. This is a conservative approach because we want to be sure that what we have is used most effectively and efficiently.

We have seen a lot of gridlock on Capitol Hill recently on other issues. Again, this is one where we do have Republicans and Democrats who have worked together with the Senator from New Hampshire, who spent 2½ years working on this. That is one reason we have over 200 businesses supporting us. We have over 260 organizations, ranging from the Chamber of Commerce, which agreed today to "key vote" this legislation, to the National Association of Manufacturers on the one hand and the Sierra Club, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and other groups on the other hand. So it is an interesting combination of folks who believe energy efficiency is low-hanging fruit. It is a way for us to use less energy and therefore have a more productive economy, have a better environment, and make us less dependent on foreign oil.

This is an opportunity for us to do something else, in my view, which is to not just pass good energy legislation for the first time really in several

years here on the floor but also to provide a model of how we can maybe work on some issues that are even bigger than energy efficiency, such as dealing with the debt and deficit and broader economic growth issues such as tax reform. So I am hopeful we can move forward with this debate.

I appreciate people being patient today as they came to the floor and waited for their turn to be able to speak about their amendments. I also appreciate those who are trying to work out some sort of unanimous consent agreement with my colleague from Louisiana so we can move forward on the actual votes.

I know we are going to hear from our colleague who is currently presiding tonight and others this evening about energy efficiency, but I would like to end by saying that there is a way for us to make progress on these issues. We have shown it with this legislation.

Let's get through these procedural hurdles, and let's be sure we can in this instance break the gridlock and get something done that helps my State of Ohio, helps the American people, and helps us move forward in terms of better economic growth, a cleaner environment, and also a better national security situation, where we are not dependent on these foreign sources of oil, sometimes from very dangerous and volatile parts of the world. As we have seen in the last several weeks, that is problematic. There is a better way. There is a better way forward. This energy efficiency bill is one of the steps we can take moving forward.

With that, I appreciate the Presiding Officer's work on this issue and look forward to hearing his comments later.

I yield the floor.

I see my colleague from Ohio is on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Ohio.

TPP TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. BROWN. I appreciate my colleague's words and his work with Senator SHAHEEN on a very important energy bill.

I rise today to speak about how our Nation's efforts to combat tobacco products—the No. 1 preventable cause of death—are being threatened by a pending trade bill.

Next week the Obama administration will continue negotiations on the Trans-Pacific Partnership called TPP. The TPP is a proposed trade agreement that currently includes the United States and about a dozen other countries. It would create a free-trade zone among the member countries. Sounds good. Maybe it will create jobs, although trade agreements in the past have always been overpromised.

There are real opportunities for workers and businesses in this trade deal if done right, but, like any agree-

ment of this size, there are many challenges, many issues that will require a close examination by Congress and the American people.

This sort of one-size-fits-all type deal with a broad set of countries—from rich countries, such as the United States and Australia, to poorer developing countries, such as Malaysia, to communist countries, such as Vietnam—it is a challenging undertaking to integrate these economies in a way that works for us.

Congress will have time to examine the details of the TPP as it moves along, but today I would like to talk about one specific part of this agreement that hasn't gotten the attention it deserves. In fact, the text of the TPP has not been widely available—except more to interest groups than it has to the American public. I wish to talk about the U.S. proposal on tobacco products and how tobacco companies could challenge anti-tobacco efforts in the United States and abroad under this Trans-Pacific Partnership.

We know Big Tobacco will stop at nothing to replace the thousands of customers they lose each year to lung disease.

I remember many years ago—and I will talk a little more about this in committee later—we did a number of tobacco hearings when I was in the House of Representatives. One thing that was clear that we talked about in those days was that I believe the number—350,000, 400,000 Americans died from tobacco use every year.

When tobacco executives came and talked to us, one thing was very clear: They understood that 350,000 of their customers were dying every year, so they had to find 350,000 new customers every year. Where did they go? They didn't go to people of the age of the Presiding Officer, me, or the Members of the Senate; they went to the people of the age of the pages sitting on the steps next to the chair of the Presiding Officer. They went after the 14-year-olds, 15-year-olds, and 16-year-olds because that is how they were going to replenish their customer base. Any business has a business plan to attract new customers, but when your business actually kills people, as tobacco does—350,000 to 400,000 a year, and the estimates right now are slightly in excess of that—that business has to figure out creative and in this case immoral ways of getting young people to start smoking cigarettes.

More than 440,000 Americans die yearly from tobacco-related illnesses, making it the leading cause of death in this country. This now includes 50,000 deaths—something we weren't so sure of 20 years ago—attributable to second-hand smoke.

In Ohio each year 20,000 people die from smoking and 2,100 adults die from exposure to secondhand smoke. Smoking kills more people in Ohio than alcohol, AIDS, car crashes, illegal drugs,

murders, and suicides combined. This means that 20 percent of deaths in Ohio are attributable to smoking.

Each year 17,000 Ohioans start smoking. By the time they leave high school, many are addicted. Ninety percent of adult smokers started before their 18th birthday. Of course they did. Not many people start smoking when they are 25, 35, or 40.

Tragically, around 293,000 Ohio children under the age of 18 who are alive today will ultimately die prematurely because of their smoking addiction. And with the rise in electronic cigarette use among American teens, it is not a stretch that deaths of young people who use tobacco products may, in fact, increase. Last week the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported that the percentage of middle school and high school Americans who use e-cigarettes doubled from 2011 to 2012, from 4.7 percent to 10 percent. I have no doubt that we will find these devices to have their own negative health effects and that they will be serving as gateway devices to conventional tobacco products. You have to figure that is the hope of the tobacco companies.

We know that tobacco-related deaths represent the No. 1 preventable cause of death in the world. Thankfully, we are making progress. We passed and President Obama signed into law the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act 4 years ago, which empowers the FDA to regulate the manufacturing and the sale of tobacco products. The Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act will finally take action to curb tobacco use and increase regulation of these deadly products.

This law though, don't forget, was decades in the making. Two decades ago—I mentioned this hearing—in my first or second year in Congress, I sat on the House Energy and Commerce Committee. Chairman HENRY WAXMAN of California, a Democrat, first brought the leaders from the seven big tobacco companies to testify about whether tobacco is addictive and whether its marketing targeted children. These seven tobacco executives raised their right hands—a famous picture, front page amongst newspapers in the country—and they pledged to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth to this committee. Then they lied. Under oath, they said nicotine is not addictive. They knew nicotine was addictive. Their own tests showed nicotine was addictive. But they lied to the American people. Their testimony strained the imagination.

By enacting stronger regulations of the tobacco industry, we helped decrease the rates of respiratory and cardiovascular disease and cancer. We reduced the risks associated with tobacco use. For example, smoking rates in the United States are down from 25 percent

of the population in 1990 to 19 percent today—from 25 percent to 19 percent. That is a huge public health victory. It is not good enough, but it is a huge public health victory. Other countries with strong anti-tobacco laws, such as England, Canada, and Australia, are seeing similar successes. Currently, of the world's 1.3 billion smokers, 83 percent live in low- or middle-income countries.

It is proven that anti-tobacco laws actually help curb this epidemic. America has a moral imperative to stand for global public health. Besides the 1 billion people in the world predicted by the World Health Organization to die this century from smoking, there are secondary costs, including agriculture for food being diverted for tobacco fields and money spent by often malnourished people on tobacco rather than the staples they need.

It is no accident that tobacco's predatory marketing strategies involve appealing to citizens who can least afford to waste tight family funds on a preventable addiction to tobacco. In Ohio health care costs directly caused by smoking are more than \$4 billion—\$1.3 billion of that paid by Medicaid, by taxpayers. Our overburdened Medicaid Program simply can't continue to bear the brunt of these costs.

We are all affected by tobacco use. Consider this: In Ohio the costs to taxpayers of government-related tobacco expenses add up to a virtual "tobacco tax" of each Ohioan of about \$600 per household. How does that work? People who smoke end up spending more time in the hospital. They end up with more diseases and illnesses that are expensive to treat. That comes out to about \$600 per household, whether you smoke or not, paying for that cost. We can't afford those costs in human life and society if tobacco companies have the ability to challenge public health efforts under trade laws.

As we have made headway against this plague in America, Big Tobacco has turned to trade deals. Amazingly enough, we wouldn't have predicted this 30 years ago. Big Tobacco typically has lost fights in the Congress. Big Tobacco used to be like the NRA. They used to be like Wall Street. Then, they rarely lost any big fight in the Congress. But they have in the last 20 years because increasing numbers of Americans have understood how Big Tobacco plays, how hard, the way they lobby, the underhanded way they market, how they have marketed to children. We have stopped a lot of that. What does Big Tobacco do? Now they have turned to trade deals as the most fertile avenues for defeating international public health efforts. Understand this: The tobacco industry has deliberately made big trade laws its new potent and legal weapon.

Last year the U.S. Trade Representative—the key part of this—proposed a

safe harbor provision that would have significantly limited efforts by Big Tobacco to challenge anti-tobacco efforts under trade rules created by the Trans-Pacific Partnership. They created a safe harbor provision.

The right thing to do was the administration was standing up to Big Tobacco against the wishes and lobbying efforts of Big Tobacco. However, last month the administration changed course, arguing that the United States can best balance the priorities of public health advocates and business by not excluding any one product, including tobacco, from rules of the trade agreement. Rather than giving tobacco safe harbor, they said: We are not going to do it for anybody—the safe harbor to protect public health.

In my view, this desire to strike a balance on a public health issue like tobacco is questionable, particularly when there is clear evidence that tobacco causes cancer, heart disease, and lung disease. As we have said, tobacco use is the world's leading preventable cause of death.

My concerns are shared by leading public health advocates, such as the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, as well as longtime anti-tobacco voices such as New York mayor Michael Bloomberg.

Some will say the current U.S. tobacco proposal recognizes the unique nature of tobacco products, but neither the current nor the original U.S. proposal would prevent the most serious threat posed to global public health—the tobacco industry's ever-growing use of something called investor-state disputes or country-to-country dispute cases arising over tobacco product measures.

In other words, since NAFTA—and I was talking to the Presiding Officer from Delaware about this a minute ago—the North American Free Trade Agreement, companies have been empowered to be able to go to a trade court and challenge public health law. If there is a strong environmental law, as there was in Canada about additives in gasoline—a company that made those additives in Richmond, VA, sued the Canadian Government, saying that their public health law banning this substance in gasoline—their public health law—hurt their business and was, therefore, an unfair trade practice. That is an example of what investor-state lawsuits allow in provisions of these trade agreements. We are afraid tobacco companies would do the same.

For example, Australia's Tobacco Plain Packaging Act of 2011 is already under challenge under both the Australia-Hong Kong bilateral investment treaty and in a separate World Trade Organization dispute settlement proceeding. These cases are pending despite the fact that Australian courts—

locally controlled laws, determined laws, locally controlled courts all in Australia—that Australian courts already held in favor of the plain packaging law.

What we are allowing is when a country has a strong public health law, if we in the United States write a strong public health law in tobacco, on clean air, on safe drinking water, the courts of the United States said this is constitutional and should stay in effect—what this trade agreement would do is allow companies in other countries to sue the U.S. Government to undermine and weaken our public health laws.

There are similar cases launched against Uruguay over its proposed graphic warnings proposal on cigarette packages and advertisements. Uruguay has passed strong warning signs, warning labels on packages of cigarettes, but they have been challenged by tobacco companies in other countries. Why should a tobacco company be able to tell the people of Uruguay that their law shouldn't stand in a trade court? I mean, what is sovereignty all about?

The bottom line is that the tobacco industry will use every weapon in its arsenal. They did it in the House of Representatives, the Senate, HHS, and the FDA. They have done it wherever they can. It will use every weapon in its arsenal, fortunately unsuccessfully recently—much more successfully two decades ago—they will use every weapon in their arsenal to protect their packaging and advertising, which is seen by millions around the world each day. It is used to attract new customers, replacing those who inevitably lose.

Unfortunately, these investor-state challenges are being used by companies around the world more frequently.

The U.N. Conference on Trade and Development notes that the 62 cases initiated in 2012 are the highest number of cases ever filed in 1 year. Allowing private enforcement of investment rights outside of domestic legal systems can undermine and pose serious threats to public health, the environment, and consumer efforts taken by our trading partners, as well as our own agencies.

Americans are willing to support international trade agreements when there is a clear public good, but public confidence in the international institutions and agreements is quickly diminished when we so clearly elevate corporate interests ahead of public health, ahead of the environment, ahead of protection for workers, and ahead of public safety. In the case of tobacco, of all things, such an upside-down approach will lead to greater global public health risk, disease, and premature death. Americans don't expect our trade negotiations to result in a situation that makes tobacco regulation in the United States and around the world more vulnerable to challenges.

I hope the Obama administration will put forward a new proposal and will give favorable consideration to proposals of other trade partners that reflect not only the American but the global consensus on tobacco priorities as they relate to protecting public health and the common good.

Let me close with repeating something I think is particularly important. I remember my first understanding of this in the mid-1990s when we were told that 350,000 to 400,000 people died from tobacco use every year. We then examined and listened to the tobacco companies talk and originally deny their knowledge and their efforts to sell to children 12 and 14 and 16 years old with very sophisticated, high-powered marketing techniques—with mailings—television and radio initially, but mailings and other ways—handing out cigarettes and billboards near playgrounds and high schools. You can fully understand the way tobacco marketing works when you realize they lose 400,000 customers a year and they have to find 400,000 new customers a year. And they will do anything to find those new customers. They will aim at children—they will aim at 16- and 17-year-olds, they will aim at the poorest people in the world.

If you are an Indian public health official or a Chinese public health official or a public health official in Bangladesh, you have lots of problems stemming from cholera and typhoid, malaria, AIDS, and tuberculosis, and so you probably don't have the ability to fight back against Big Tobacco. We in this country have put a premium on public health efforts against Big Tobacco. In those countries their efforts have to be against these terrible infectious diseases of tuberculosis and malaria and AIDS and cholera and typhoid and all those things, so they simply can't fight back on tobacco.

That is why it is up to us, in our efforts in these trade agreements, to stand for something—to stand for public health and fairness and to stand up against Big Tobacco and to do the right thing.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENERGY SAVINGS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak to the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, S. 1392 or more commonly referred to here by the names of its lead cosponsors, Shaheen-Portman.

This is a bill that allows us to turn back to the issue so many Americans have been asking us to focus on: jobs, competitiveness, manufacturing, the steps we can take to put our country back on the right path for our future.

This bill is essentially about energy efficiency and all the different ways energy efficiency, used wisely, can strengthen America. An America that uses less energy is an America that is taking less from the Earth, an America less reliant on other nations for the fuel that powers our lives and livelihoods, an America whose people won't need to mortgage their future in order to cool their homes.

An America that uses less energy is an America that will never again wait in long gas lines; that in the summers won't have to sweat through brownouts and in the winters won't have to make the tragic choice between feeding their families and keeping them warm.

There have been some tough economic times for our Nation in recent years. And while I haven't been in Washington all that long, I get the sense the climate here around the budget and our fiscal issues has almost never been as toxic and difficult to navigate as it is right now. Of course, the reality is broadly, across the whole Federal budget, we do need to tighten our belts and we are going to have to prioritize investments that are the most important to America's future. But energy efficiency is entirely about America's future. It is exactly the sort of area where we can reach a bipartisan agreement on an important path forward together.

Energy efficiency is entirely about America's future. There is no winning in the fight for energy efficiency. There is only progress. There is doing better, conserving energy, and saving money. The pennies we invest today in energy efficiency will save our governments, our businesses, and our families dollars down the road.

So how do we do it? How do we build our more energy-efficient future when cost efficiency is ruling the day here in this Chamber and in this Congress? It starts with this wise, balanced, and bipartisan bill we are considering today, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this valuable bill, and I applaud the tireless work of my friends, Senators SHAHEEN of New Hampshire and PORTMAN of Ohio, in crafting the bill, focusing this bill, and then ultimately getting it to the floor. I am also grateful to the leadership of Senator WYDEN, the chairman of the energy committee, and Senator MURKOWSKI, his ranking Republican, in ably advancing it through the committee where it passed by a vote of 19 to 3 and in getting it to the floor today.

I am grateful to Senators WYDEN and MURKOWSKI for the bipartisan energy

they have crafted on the committee and for the positive tone they have set. I have greatly enjoyed my years of service on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and appreciate their work that has allowed Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN and many of the other cosponsors of this bill to see it on the floor here today.

We are at a critical moment. If America is going to lead, we have to work together to set a long-term strategy that moves us toward an efficient, clean energy-competitive economy. This bill helps us do that.

It looks as though we are going to have a few more days to talk about the full scope of this bill because, unfortunately, there have been other amendments offered—amendments that aren't directly germane to this bill. And as has sadly, so often been the case in the months gone by, we have had a grinding halt to the opportunity to move forward on this broad bipartisan bill that enjoys support from Republicans and Democrats, that has an opportunity to be passed through the other Chamber as well as this, and that could do great work for America.

It is my hope that next week when we return, this Chamber will take up, consider, and pass this bill; that we will consider dozens of amendments germane to this bill, relevant to this bill that will bring other good ideas about energy efficiency to the floor, and that we will strengthen it and pass it.

This bill has been scored as having a very real prospect of creating 136,000 jobs in the next dozen years, by 2025. Imagine getting back to considering bills that actually help create jobs. There is a list of more than 250 corporations, nonprofits, and associations from all different sectors of the American society and economy that have endorsed this bill. It has a broad range of provisions that deal with energy efficiency codes and voluntarily improving them, skills and training, improving manufacturing, improving the energy efficiency of the U.S. Government, the single biggest purchaser and user of energy in our country—indeed, probably in the world. It achieves huge targets, great objectives, saving nearly 3 billion megawatt hours in energy by 2030, and saving consumers more than \$13 billion a year by 2030. These are great and robust goals, and I am truly hopeful we will turn to this bill in earnest next week and take up and consider some of the range of amendments that have been offered.

I wish to now briefly review three of the amendments I have introduced for consideration as part of Shaheen-Portman.

I know one of the best things about how the Senators and the committee leaders have crafted this bill is that it is open to consideration of a broad range of ideas. All three of these

amendments are directly related to energy efficiency. Not all three of them may end up being part of this bill, and I understand, but I am grateful for a few moments of my colleagues' attention to bring them up and discuss their benefit, value, and relevance.

The first is 1842. It allows for the reauthorization of valuable energy programs that have been at the heart of the Federal Government's energy efficiency strategy for a long time; the Weatherization Assistance Program and the State Energy Program. Both are programs in place for decades and that work daily in each and every one of our States, helping to reduce energy usage and reduce energy costs.

In States such as your own, Mr. President, the State of Massachusetts, where the winters can be cold and long and energy expensive, programs at the State level and weatherization assistance programs can make a real difference in the lives of consumers. These programs link national, State, and local interests in a critical way. They create highly effective public and private partnerships that have delivered real results. In fact, studies have shown that the Weatherization Assistance Program returns more than \$2.50 in household savings for every \$1 invested. The program serves over 7 million families in its existence, including more than 1 million in the last 4 years. The results are equally strong for the State Energy Program, where every Federal dollar invested has an energy cost savings of more than \$7 a year and nearly \$11 in non-Federal dollars is leveraged for every Federal dollar spent.

These are highly effective programs, but both of their authorizations have expired, so we need to reauthorize these programs so we can help Americans save energy and save other energy costs.

Earlier this year I partnered with Senators COLLINS of Maine and REED of Rhode Island to introduce the Weatherization Enhancement and Local Energy Efficiency and Investment in Accountability Act. That is a mouthful, but it has a wide base of support, including from the Alliance to Save Energy, the Community Action Foundation, the National Association of State Energy Officials, Habitat For Humanity, building suppliers such as Masco Corporation, business groups such as the Business Council For Sustainable Energy, environmental groups such as the NRDC, and many more.

I have introduced that legislation as an amendment. To summarize what it does, it reauthorizes these two critical energy programs for 5 more years, the State Energy Program and the Weatherization Assistance Program. But it doesn't just reauthorize them, it modernizes them. It enhances them with new ideas and ultimately works to ensure their long-term viability.

We call for a complementary, competitive innovation program as well as

call for setting baseline standards. This amendment actually reduces the funding levels to where they were 6 years ago, in order to attract the bipartisan support and to be more fiscally responsible. This amendment says that the new minimum efficiency standards the Department of Energy is working on must be in place by October of 2015, and it creates a complementary competitive grant program to allow NGOs to compete for their piece of the funding. Overall, we want to bring in new partners, new approaches, new technologies, and new ideas to ensure that more homes can be weatherized, more families have their heating bills reduced, and more energy saved with limited Federal funding. I urge the support of my colleagues for this a first amendment, No. 1842, about the Weatherization Assistance Program.

Let me now turn to something that I think is just common sense, where I hope the Federal Government, one of the largest users of energy in the world, will take advantage of a contracting tool to achieve energy savings and cost savings in ways that both the private sector and local government have as well. I am talking about Energy Savings Performance Contracts, and I had personal experience with them when I was in the private sector with a manufacturing company in Delaware and when I was a county executive. We used this tool, this technique, in both of those contexts to finance very expensive capital investments in chillers and boilers and motors in elevators and lights and in energy efficiency retrofits throughout our buildings. But they were not paid for upfront by either the manufacturing company I worked for or the county which I ran as county executive; they were financed off of dedicated future energy savings. So these capital improvements were installed at the cost of a private company, not the government, not the manufacturer upfront, and then paid for over a long time by the energy cost savings that the increased efficiency achieved.

That may seem complicated, but it is well known, well demonstrated and used widely across this country and is something the Federal Government should make better use of. As I mentioned, by contract, the company is paid for its upfront capital investments in these higher efficiency systems through future savings that result from decreased utility costs. If State, local, and Federal facilities are currently taking advantage of these, if they are well known and well demonstrated, why isn't the Federal Government making broader use of them? Partly because of contracting and budgeting challenges, and it is partly because there is not enough push, enough energy behind the use of these ESPCs.

They also have a secondary benefit of creating lots of private sector jobs,

jobs that cannot be outsourced, jobs that require local workers. Because what we are truly talking about are sheet metal workers and electricians, folks who are installing things and taking things out, laborers and mechanics. These are great jobs and at no cost to the taxpayer.

Estimates are that there are more than \$20 billion available to the Federal Government through the use of performance contracts, savings that we know we can achieve and at no cost to the taxpayer.

In December of 2011, President Obama announced a Federal commitment to enter into Energy Savings Performance Contracts equal to \$2 billion over 2 years. But what happens when that window ends? Now that we are in 2013 and about to hit the end of that window, there will be no authority to continue to encourage the use of ESPCs in Federal facilities. In the current fiscal climate, performance contracts offer the Federal Government the best method for upgrading aging facilities and reducing energy costs.

Earlier this summer I introduced the Energy Savings Through Public-Private Partnership Act to push the Federal Government in the right direction by encouraging increased utilization of these contracts. I introduced that as an amendment to the Shaheen-Portman act. As I mentioned, it creates a new goal for the Federal Government, to be specific, a goal to enter into \$1 billion a year in energy savings contracts over the next 5 years—\$5 billion in savings at no cost to the taxpayer.

It encourages more performance contracting by requiring that Federal facilities managers “shall consider” implementing identified energy and water conservation measures. It increases energy savings transparency by requiring the online publication of energy and water conservation measures, and it requires government energy managers to publicly explain why they chose not to use NSPC if they do not. It ensures greater accountability by requiring the administration to report to Congress on the status of the annual performance contracting goal each year.

In previous hearings, I have asked the Secretary of Energy and others involved in the Federal performance system why this is not more actively used. The explanations have more to do with the complications of bureaucracy adrift in inaction than why it cannot be done. Positive responses from the President and from departments and from facility managers strongly suggest that this amendment, this bipartisan amendment, could be considered as a part of S. 1492.

Let me last turn to one I have worked hardest on and am most excited about, amendment No. 1841, the Master Limited Partnership Parity Act. This one has the potential to change the long-term playing field for

energy financing in the United States. Access to low-cost financing will determine our Nation's energy future. It will determine how and when and which energy sources emerge as central players in the American energy marketplace in the long term, and I think it is up to us to ensure our vast national supply of clean renewable power as well as energy efficiency are vital parts of that overall equation.

What am I talking about? What is a master limited partnership? It is a business structure that is taxed as a partnership but whose ownership interests are traded like corporate stocks on a market. It is a tax-advantaged capital formation vehicle. They have been around more than 30 years. There are more than 100 of them with a market cap over \$40 billion, and they have been overwhelmingly used by oil and gas and pipeline interests. Oddly, by statute, MLPs are only available to investors in energy portfolios for oil, natural gas, coal extraction, and pipeline projects—nonrenewable energy. As I mentioned, these projects get access to capital at a lower cost and are more liquid than traditional financing approaches to energy projects, making them highly attractive to private sector investment.

Investors in renewable energy and energy efficiency projects, however, have been explicitly prevented from forming MLPs, starving a growing portion of America's domestic energy sector of the capital it needs to grow. I introduced the bipartisan Master Limited Partnership Parity Act to include renewable energy and energy efficiency projects among all those other areas of energy for which MLPs could be formed, and I am grateful for the tireless partnership of my lead cosponsor, Senator JERRY MORAN of Kansas and for the courage and energy Senator LISA MURKOWSKI of Alaska has brought to advocating for this bill as a cosponsor and for the early support of Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan. The four of us have now over two Congresses worked tirelessly on this bill.

It has a corollary in the House that also has a strong bipartisan group of cosponsors. I recently testified about this bill, as has Senator MORAN, both at the Senate Energy Committee and Finance Committee, and I have been grateful for the interest of Chairman RON WYDEN and an array of other Senators from both parties.

As I mentioned, this MLP Parity Act has the opportunity, the possibility of being the “all of the above” energy strategy that is so often talked about and to be the capital-financing piece of this, a strategy that does not pick winners and losers but allows the markets to decide where to invest in the long term. It has generated a great deal of interest and support. It has hundreds of supporters coming from the private sector, from think tanks, from non-profits, and from advocacy groups.

It could not be simpler. It is a very short bill, just a few hundred words. Instead of barring renewable projects and energy efficiency projects from being able to organize as Master Limited Partnerships, it embraces them. It would bring new low-cost capital into the energy market and help get more renewable energy and energy efficiency projects to get off the ground, increase domestic energy production, and increase our Nation's energy security.

I urge support for this amendment, which is a separate piece of legislation being offered as an amendment to this bill. All three of these amendments are good ideas. As we proceed next week, I may or may not call them up as amendments to this bill to be considered on the floor, but the last, the Master Limited Partnership Parity Act in particular, is a public policy idea worthy of consideration by this body at some point in the months and years ahead.

Let me in closing simply say I am grateful we have had the opportunity to return to a vigorous debate about a bipartisan bill that has the very real prospect of saving energy, of creating jobs, of investing in manufacturing and in skills and of growing the economy of the United States in a way that reduces our energy use, makes us less reliant on foreign energy sources, makes less of an impact on our environment, and gives us more hope for the future—a brighter and more optimistic future.

I can think of no better signal this Senate and this Congress can send to the people of the United States but that we take up, consider, and pass many of the bipartisan amendments that have been discussed here today and then finally pass the Shaheen-Portman bill and send it to the House for consideration, passage, and ultimately signature into law.

The people of my home State ask me all the time when will we get back to listening to each other, working together, and passing real bipartisan bills that can help create jobs. This bill will accomplish those goals.

It is my prayer, my hope we will do that vital work next week when we return.

I yield the floor.

MCC COMPACT FOR EL SALVADOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier today the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation voted to approve a second MCC compact for El Salvador. This was expected, and it begins the last phase of discussions between the United States and El Salvador on the compact which, if finally agreed to and funded, could result in investments totaling \$277 million from the United States and \$85 million from El Salvador.

The compact has three main components, described by the MCC as

partnering with the private sector to enhance the country's investment climate; strengthening the country's future workforce by teaching the skills demanded by the labor market; and reducing transportation and logistics costs by expanding a highway in the coastal region and improving the border crossing into Honduras. I agree that these investments would have a positive impact on the lives of the Salvadoran people.

However, I am also aware that some Salvadoran civil society organizations have concerns about the potential impact of MCC-financed development on the environment and the livelihoods of coastal communities. If the compact is funded these organizations should be consulted on the design of the details of the compact in a transparent and inclusive process particularly relating to environmental and regulatory issues, and on the ongoing monitoring of compliance.

When the law to establish the MCC was written a decade ago it was not intended to be just another foreign aid program. I remember, because I was involved in writing the law. Rather, it was designed to reward countries whose governments are taking effective steps to address key issues of governance, particularly combating corruption, strengthening the rule of law, and supporting equitable economic growth.

I supported the first compact for El Salvador, although during the design phase I raised concerns about the high level of violent crime and corruption in that country and encouraged the MCC and the government of El Salvador to consider using a portion of the funds to strengthen the judiciary and the rule of law. Regrettably, that was not done.

While El Salvador can point to some success compared to its neighbors Honduras and Guatemala, it remains a country of weak democratic institutions where the independence of the judiciary has been attacked, corruption is widespread, and transnational criminal organizations have flourished. Money laundering is a multi-billion dollar scourge in El Salvador and other Central American countries, and impunity is the norm. The national police is discredited, infiltrated by organized crime and distrusted by the public.

I have urged the MCC, the Department of State, and the government of El Salvador during the preliminary discussions and prior to a decision to release the funds for a second compact in which the Congress will have a say, to address a number of issues which I and others here and in El Salvador believe is necessary for the rule of law and economic growth in that country.

First is to significantly strengthen the capacity of the Attorney General's office and the police to combat money laundering, which is a growing problem and is driving legitimate businesses

out of business. President Funes recently announced the creation of a special police unit for this purpose and I commend him for doing so, but it remains to be seen whether such a unit receives the necessary resources to be effective, and is not corrupted by the very criminals it is responsible for investigating and bringing to justice.

Second is to respect the independence of the Constitutional Oversight Court of the Supreme Court, or the Sala de lo constitucional as it is known in Spanish, which is the chamber of the Supreme Court that rules on constitutional issues. For the first time since the Peace Accords El Salvador has an independent judicial body of magistrates who are widely recognized for being honest, who do not show fear or favor, and who have consistently ruled in an independent manner. Because their rulings have at times gone against the interests of the FMLN governing party and at other times against the interests of the opposition ARENA party, there have been efforts to replace them with individuals who can be manipulated.

Third is the concern I have raised about some public officials in positions of authority who have promoted individuals within the police and security forces who have no business being in public office because of their involvement in illegal activities.

An MCC compact is widely regarded as providing a kind of stamp of approval by the United States, indicating that the government of the compact country has demonstrated a commitment to integrity, to good governance and respect for the rule of law, and to addressing the needs of its people. This should be doubly so for a second compact. If organized crime is operating with impunity, if corruption is pervasive including within the police, and if there are people in public office who abuse their authority to the detriment of democratic institutions, that is not consistent with the intent or purpose of the MCC.

The first round of El Salvador's next presidential election is scheduled for February 2014, and I have no doubt that the Funes Government wants that stamp of approval as the election approaches. I appreciate that MCC CEO Yohannes, U.S. Ambassador Aponte, and other State Department officials have echoed some of the concerns I have raised. Today's decision by the MCC Board is an important step, but it is not the final step. I urge the government of El Salvador to act decisively to address those concerns.

CAPRONI NOMINATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, on Monday the Senate confirmed two of the President's Federal judicial nominees. One of these nominees, Ms. Valerie Caproni, served for 8 years as the gen-

eral counsel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and I interacted with her in that capacity on a number of occasions as a member of the Select Committee on Intelligence. I will say frankly that I was troubled by some of the aggressive positions that Ms. Caproni took regarding domestic surveillance while she was the FBI's general counsel, and I understand why a number of my colleagues had serious concerns about her nomination.

After giving the matter serious thought I decided to vote yes on Ms. Caproni's nomination based on the letter that she sent to Senator DURBIN in July of this year, in which she stated that she would recuse herself from any cases that would require her to determine the legality of any surveillance programs about which she provided legal advice, in addition to any cases for which she had personal or supervisory involvement. This broad recusal commitment is somewhat unusual, but I believe it is appropriate given Ms. Caproni's long record of advocating for particular surveillance authorities as FBI general counsel. As the Senate has seen in recent years, Federal judges play a critical role in interpreting the government's surveillance authorities, so when considering nominees for judicial positions that are likely to consider surveillance cases it is important to ensure that these nominees will not be overly deferential to the government's interpretation of what its own surveillance authorities should be. I thank Senator DURBIN for his work on this nomination, and I look forward to continuing to work with him and our other colleagues on this critically important issue.

AMERICAN LEGION POST 145

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to America's veterans of World War II. Seven decades ago, our country was faced with a war that we did not seek but that we had to win. Those who answered the call to serve left the safety and security of home to free the oppressed in distant lands, and they made great sacrifices with pride and honor. These veterans exemplify the courage and devotion to duty that have been the hallmarks of the U.S. Armed Forces throughout our Nation's history.

Members of the American Legion Cyr-Plourde Post 145 in Frenchville, ME, were among the World War II veterans fighting for the freedom of others. They included Army TSGT Maurice Sirois, Army SSG Alfred Turgeon, Army SGT Clovis Daigle, Navy PO3 Thomas Clavette, Army CPL Gerard Michaud, Marine Cpl Robert Michaud, Army CPL Maurice Raymond, Army PFC Oniel Dumais and Army PFC Donat Michaud. They confronted many challenges with courage, strength and selfless determination, and they preserved the values upon which the

United States was forged. After the war ended, their dedication to our great Nation did not. Their involvement in their communities throughout their lives after the war and support for other veterans is admirable. For their service and sacrifice, they have the heartfelt thanks of a grateful nation.

AMERICAN LEGION POST 147

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in the decades since World War II, our Nation has changed in numerous ways. One constant in American history is our unquestionable willingness to stand in defense of our own freedom and the freedom of those around the world. The veterans of our Nation's Armed Forces have made many grave sacrifices to preserve the values of the United States for which our forefathers fought so earnestly and paid so dearly.

I rise today to recognize and thank the World War II veterans and members of the American Legion Thomas O. Cyr Post 147 in Madawaska, ME: SSG Joseph Cyr, Army SSG Armand Martin, Navy PO1 Nivard Hebert, Marine LCpl Elmer Hunting, Army and Air Force PFC Adrian Cyr, Army PFC Louis Dufour, Army CPL Roland Michaud, Army Private Clarence Cyr and Army Private Alphe Pelletier. During World War II, these men fought courageously against tyranny and oppression in distant lands. These veterans fought with selflessness, honor, and dedication through harrowing conditions and then returned home, often without their comrades. For this, our Nation owes them an unfathomable debt. But through involvement in their communities and the American Legion, these men have continued to give even more of themselves to our Nation. Their work has led to memorials, remembrance services, and the sponsorship of countless community events that remind us of the fabric of this great Nation and the great State of Maine. May God bless them and our great Nation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CATHERINE HILL

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I would like to pay tribute to Catherine "Kay" S. Hill of Dayton, MD. Kay Hill is retiring after a 38-year career with the National Security Agency, NSA, where she led the Agency's efforts to forge partnerships with the State and local governments and the surrounding community. Ms. Hill has put a human face on an agency long known for its secrecy and is legendary in Maryland for her leadership and vision.

In 1975 Ms. Hill was recruited by the NSA to establish a commuter transportation office. She oversaw the NSA

motor fleet services operation and quickly recognized the need to expand ridesharing beyond the gates. In 1976 she began working with State and local governments to develop a statewide vanpool program that grew to be the largest program in the State. In 1980 NSA was the only Federal agency to receive a Presidential Award in recognition of its successful and groundbreaking Ridesharing Program, which has since been duplicated by other Federal agencies.

As a result of her success in forging collaborative partnerships in those early days, Ms. Hill became one of the few public faces of NSA, and Agency leadership began to place more emphasis on working with the broader community. In 1999 NSA management established the office of State and Local Government Relations and Community Partnership and appointed Ms. Hill as its first Director. She has continued her work to partner with the community in a number of areas to address problems of mutual interest like education and workforce development, road improvements, transportation, and other infrastructure issues.

Kay Hill is an outstanding Federal employee, dedicated to public service. I am grateful and pleased that because of her advocacy, the NSA enjoys a reputation in the surrounding community as a good neighbor, business partner, and model employer. I wish her all the best as she begins the next phase in her life—one that I hope is both relaxing and productive.●

TRIBUTE TO AIRMAN DUNCAN KIRKLAND

• Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I wish to honor in the RECORD Amn Duncan Kirkland of Waycross, GA. Airman Kirkland is a true American hero and was recently awarded as "USS *George H.W. Bush* Avenger of the Day" for his outstanding performance on August 16, 2013.

Airman Kirkland's quick action to prevent the rotor wash from Trident Helicopter 612 from blowing a shipmate down a slippery section of catapult track and into the rotor arc of Spartan Helicopter 711, embodied the spirit of President George H.W. Bush. Airman Kirkland grabbed his shipmate by the float coat, anchoring him to the deck until the helicopters could be shut down. His keen situational awareness and response was critical in preventing the possible injury or death of a shipmate. Airman Kirkland's motivation and continued drive for success have set the standard high for others to emulate.

I send my great thanks to Airman Kirkland for his work daily on behalf of our proud Nation, and I thank and congratulate his family and friends for supporting his service to the United States of America.●

BIDDEFORD FREE CLINIC

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Biddeford Free Clinic for its 20 years of service to the people of York County, ME. Biddeford Free Clinic relies on a team of dedicated volunteers and community partners to provide free medical care and nonnarcotic prescription medication to the uninsured population.

When Dr. Francis Kleeman, along with his wife Alphine and several other volunteers, started the Biddeford Free Clinic, it was the first free medical clinic in the northeast. Over the past 20 years they have treated over 12,000 patients, had over 75,000 referrals, and over 15,000 medical visits. Every year they provide free medical care to 700 people in the York County community and they are still the only free clinic in Maine with a licensed pharmacy.

Given the exorbitant rise in the cost of health care in recent years having a great organization in Southern Maine providing medical care is a tremendous service to the community. While the Affordable Care Act will significantly increase the number of Mainers with health insurance, there will always be a great need for the services the Biddeford Free Clinic provides to the uninsured.

Maine has always been a leader in providing the best health care and the Biddeford Free Clinic has been an integral part of that for the past 20 years. It is my great honor to recognize this significant milestone they have reached, and I look forward to seeing the great accomplishments they will achieve in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO LEO FLOYD ARGYLE

• Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to honor one of Utah's finest, Leo Floyd Argyle, a veteran of World War II and exemplary citizen. Leo turned 91 this year, and will soon be travelling to Washington, D.C. to visit the memorials and honor his brothers in arms.

Leo Floyd Argyle, of Bountiful, UT was born at the beginning of the roaring twenties in Woods Cross, UT. His father passed 13 short years later, leaving his mother and three siblings at the height of America's Great Depression. Leo dutifully continued his schoolwork and graduated from Davis High School in 1939. The value of hard work was instilled in this generation of Americans, and Leo is a perfect example of that. He worked topping beets and weeding onions after high school and eventually worked his way into the telecommunications business—at first digging trenches for phone lines.

Leo was digging a phone cable trench in 1942 when he received notice to report to Fort Douglas. He had 1 week to get his affairs in order prior to reporting for duty. He served in the 573rd Signal Air Warning Battalion, and was

part of some of our most extraordinary military efforts in Great Britain, Normandy, the Ardennes, the Rhineland, and throughout Central Europe. He related part of his noble service as follows:

An experience I remember from World War II was that after having 12 months of radio radar training, we boarded the Queen Mary in New York. The Queen carried more than 800,000 troops over the course of the War. We landed in Scotland five days later. Hitler had put out a \$250,000 reward for the submarine that could sink her, but she was too fast. At this time I realized how important the training I had received was and the part I was to play during the war. Our first radar location was in Dover, England. This was to track incoming aircraft and later the V1 rockets aimed at England. After a considerable amount of time we proceeded through Normandy and Northern France, which had been liberated by American Troops. There we found the US 3rd Army. From there we were sent all over Europe. I was in France on VE Day and then we were getting ready to be shipped to Japan when the United States dropped the atom bombs on Japan, which led to their subsequent surrender. I was sent home December 28, 1945.

Simply put, Leo is a part of that generation who, when called to fight against the forces of despotism and evil, answered courageously.

Leo Argyle is not only a proper example of duty to country, but also an example of a good father and husband. He has been married to his sweetheart, Marline Brey Argyle since March 9, 1951, and they have lovingly reared their three children, Mike, Lisa, and Jennie. They have eight grandchildren, and 10 great-grandchildren. His son Mike recently recounted the lessons that his father teaches through example:

One of the things I remember most about my dad was that he has always been a hard worker. He worked for the phone company for 41 years, even though they changed the name of the phone company over the years. His love for vacations at Bear Lake has helped keep the family close. We spent most weekends and dad's vacation there each summer. He taught me to drive a tractor and an old Jeep. He taught me the value of work and to be employed. He taught me to plow the orchard. It seems that he is always busy, as he enjoys work even now. He has been retired for many years but continues to work every day, at his home, orchard, and cabin. He loves to sing, and he enjoys going to see his friends at the senior center every day. He also makes many visits to people in the hospital. He has been an example of stability and goodness to me all my life.

As we face harrowing challenges in our complex world today, might I suggest that we look to the example of citizens like Leo Argyle. As we look to the example set by our forebears, especially in the steady hand of hard work and the honorable performance of one's duty, we will find that principles are constant, that goodness and virtue are real, and that our prosperity as a Nation depends on our adherence to those principles. May we ever strive to emulate the firm resolve with which our

grandfathers held the flame of liberty and the standard of justice and honor.●

NEW HAVEN MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

● Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the New Haven Manufacturers Association.

Established in 1913 as the Employer's Association of New Haven County, the New Haven Manufacturers Association has served the manufacturing community of Southern Connecticut and beyond for the past century. Since its inception, the New Haven Manufacturers Association has endeavored tirelessly to encourage the growth and success of the manufacturing sector in Connecticut's economy. It has advocated policies critical to the manufacturing community, provided opportunities for manufacturers to network and share ideas, and educated members on business best practices. It has also actively worked to stimulate students' interest in manufacturing careers to secure the next generation of workers and ensure manufacturing's continued strong presence in the State.

Connecticut has had a long, storied manufacturing history, dating to the days of Eli Whitney. The New Haven Manufacturers Association has played an important role in that history. In recognition of that role, I am proud to honor the 100-year anniversary of the New Haven Manufacturers Association, its commitment to serving its member companies, and its promotion of Connecticut's manufacturing sector.●

ALL-OHIO STATE FAIR YOUTH CHOIR

● Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the 50th anniversary of the All-Ohio State Fair Youth Choir and the leadership of its founder, Glenville D. Thomas. In 1963, Mr. Thomas founded the choir to provide high school singers in Ohio with the opportunity to enjoy a musical experience similar to that of the All-Ohio State Fair Band.

In 1975, the All-Ohio State Fair Youth Choir became the first marching choir during its debut at the Tournament of Roses Parade. In 1975, the group was also the first-ever choir to sing in the Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade, which included a pre-show performance atop the World Trade Center. Mr. Thomas and the choir also performed at the New York World's Fair, appeared on several national and local TV and radio programs, and sang for President Nixon at the White House.

This year, the 2013 Ohio State Fair featured a butter choir sculpture—in addition to an iconic butter cow—that honored the thousands of youth who have been members of the choir throughout the last five decades. I was

pleased to be able to visit with some of the members of the All-Ohio State Fair Youth Choir, hear some of their great singing, and congratulate them at the fair.

The All-Ohio State Fair Youth Choir is an asset to the Ohio State Fair and I congratulate all who were involved in making its first 50 years a success.●

NORTHWEST NAZARENE UNIVERSITY

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator CRAPO, I wish to recognize the 100-year anniversary of Northwest Nazarene University in the city of Nampa in the great State of Idaho.

On September 13, 1913, this education institution began as an elementary school—the Idaho Holiness School. With a strong and unstoppable vision for the future, the founders quickly developed it into a secondary school and then a university. Highly respected in the community and, indeed, all across the great State of Idaho and in several other States in the region, Northwest Nazarene University has conferred degrees upon thousands of college graduates since 1917.

Dr. David Alexander, who began his association with NNU as a member of the faculty and in 2008 became its 12th president, continues to carry out the early vision of growth, excellence and the Great Commission. The university offers a world-class, multi-discipline education, which now serves more than 2,000 undergraduate and graduate students; more than 6,000 continuing education students; and 2,300 high school students through its concurrent credit program. On its 90-acre campus in Nampa, 60 education disciplines are offered as well as 11 graduate-level programs. The university also offers programs of study in other Idaho cities including nearby Boise, Twin Falls and Idaho Falls, and works in cooperation with education programs in 10 countries.

NNU, a nonprofit Christian school, is affiliated with the Church of the Nazarene and is one of the premiere universities in our State. Through education and spiritual development, students become leaders in business, public service, education and in faith-based careers. At NNU, they have become students of scholarship, strong in character and robust contributors to their communities.

As Governor, Lieutenant Governor and State Senator, I have had a long and good working relationship with NNU, which I tremendously value. I mark their achievements and continued growth as terrific highlights for the Treasure Valley and the State of Idaho. Their commitment to their original vision and the foundations of their beliefs as they recognize changing times has made NNU an institution of

stability and a vital resource for Idahoans.

I remember well participating in the dedication of the Thomas Family Health and Science Center, which further moves NNU into the ranks of a competitive university with state-of-the-art laboratories and researchers. In addition, I am proud to have had their participation on the Nursing Task Force, which I initiated as governor, and which continues to make a significant impact on reducing the shortage of nurses in Idaho and beyond.

For 100 years, Northwest Nazarene University has proved itself a strong asset to our community and state. It is a proverbial shining light, making a positive difference on its campus, in nearby neighborhoods and across oceans. We are very proud to have this institution serving our young people and those continually updating their skills and education. Our country stands stronger because NNU goes the extra mile, perseveres and stays the course.

May God bless Northwest Nazarene University with another 100 years of being a top-rated institution of higher learning.●

COPPER CANNON CAMP

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the fiftieth anniversary of Copper Cannon Camp in Bethlehem, NH.

Each year, millions of American children pack their bags and prepare to spend their summers in the great outdoors, hiking, playing sports, and enjoying time with friends. While many people are fortunate enough to have the resources to send their children to camp, some family budgets do not permit this opportunity for their children.

As a young boy, Copper Cannon Camp's founder, Hamilton Ford, received assistance to attend summer camp. That experience changed Mr. Ford's life and inspired him to share his experiences with children who could not otherwise attend camp. The Camp's mission is to provide underprivileged New Hampshire youth with an opportunity to experience the joys of attending summer camp at no cost to their families. Since 1963, Mr. Ford's dream has been a reality, and the camp now welcomes approximately 600 campers each year.

Now in its 50th year, Copper Cannon Camp has provided a traditional summer camp experience to more than 21,000 youths from New Hampshire. For many of these children, their week at Copper Cannon Camp has changed their lives.

The camp has earned a place in the hearts of countless individuals and families from New Hampshire, and its mission remains as relevant and important today as it was 50 years ago. That generous mission reflects the compas-

sion and dedication demonstrated by the Camp's board, staff, and community members.

There is much to celebrate in the first 50 years of Copper Cannon Camp, and with exciting expansion plans underway, we can look forward with great anticipation to the Camp's next 50 years. I congratulate everyone involved in Copper Cannon Camp's success and wish them many wonderful summers ahead.●

REMEMBERING WILLIAM HENRY JOHNSON

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor William Henry Johnson, a veteran of the United States Navy.

William was born in Butte, MT, in 1944. He graduated from Butte High School and enrolled in college for a few years before joining the Navy.

William was stationed on the USS *Canberra*, stationed out of San Diego. The *Canberra*, with William serving aboard, deployed to the South China Sea to provide support for the Vietnam War. During his deployment, William was injured in an accident on the ship. He was airlifted to the Naval Hospital at Subic Bay in the Philippines and then to the Naval Hospital in Bremerton, WA.

William was honorably discharged and returned home to MT, where he married and had three children.

It was my honor to track down the National Defense Service Medal and the Vietnam Service Medal William did not receive when he returned home from Vietnam. These decorations are small tokens, but they are powerful symbols of true heroism, sacrifice, and dedication to service. They are presented on behalf of a Nation that will never forget William Henry Johnson's service.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM MARK FOSTER

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor William Mark Foster, a veteran of the United States Air Force. Mark was born in Gross Pointe Woods, MI, in 1952.

At the age of 5, his family moved to Arizona where he graduated from high school and attended Scottsdale Community College. After a few years of working and going to school, Mark enlisted in the U.S. Air Force.

He underwent basic training at Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, TX, and achieved the rank of Airman First Class. Mark then trained to become a weapons mechanic at Lowry Air Force Base in Denver. At every step, he aimed to excel and his superiors rewarded him with greater responsibility. He even earned several awards for his marksmanship with small arms.

Mark was then stationed at Plattsburgh Air Force Base in upstate New

York as part of the 380th Munitions Maintenance Squadron. He and his load crew were responsible for loading planes with nuclear missiles. They were so efficient that they received an Air Force Outstanding Unit Award.

He began the process to undergo officers' training, but after a number of hurdles got in the way, Mark mustered out in May of 1977 with the rank of Senior Airman.

He returned to Scottsdale to work with his father, but began spending much of his time with his mother and stepfather in Red Lodge, MT, until he decided to move here.

Mark has been an active member of his community for nearly three decades. He is also a founding sponsor of the Air Force Memorial in Arlington, VA.

It was my honor to present Mark with his Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, National Defense Service Medal, and Small Arms Expert Marksmanship Ribbon. These decorations are small tokens, but they are powerful symbols of true heroism, sacrifice, and dedication to service. They are presented on behalf of a Nation that will never forget William Mark Foster's service.●

TRIBUTE TO KENT DAVID RUDOLPH

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Kent David Rudolph, a veteran of the United States Navy.

Kent was born in Chester, MT, in 1956. He graduated from Joplin High School in 1974 and enlisted in the Navy. He went through basic training in San Diego and studied to be a cryptological technician in Pensacola, FL.

Kent's first tour began in Guam, where he encoded and decoded communications. While in Guam, he also spent time in Japan and South Korea. He did an additional tour on the USS *Constellation*.

During the Iran Hostage Crisis, Kent was stationed in the Indian Ocean, where he and his unit followed a dispute within Yemen.

He separated from active duty in May of 1979 and returned home to Chester. He joined the reserves in 1991 and worked with the Navy's Construction Battalion. Kent retired from the Naval Reserve in 2009 with the rank of Petty Officer Second Class.

It was my honor to present Kent with his Navy Good Conduct Medal, Navy Expeditionary Medal, and Meritorious Unit Commendation Ribbon. These decorations are small tokens, but they are powerful symbols of true heroism, sacrifice, and dedication to service. They are presented on behalf of a Nation that will never forget Kent David Rudolph's service.●

**TRANSMITTING PRINCIPLES FOR
MODERNIZING THE MILITARY
COMPENSATION AND RETIRE-
MENT SYSTEMS—PM 18**

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 674(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, Public Law 112-239, January 2, 2013, I hereby transmit principles for modernizing the military compensation and retirement systems requested by the Act.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 12, 2013.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 11:22 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 130. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming.

S. 157. An act to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 256. An act to amend Public Law 93-435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

S. 304. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes.

S. 459. An act to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 12, 2013, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 130. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming.

S. 157. An act to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 256. An act to amend Public Law 93-435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

S. 304. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes.

S. 459. An act to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes.

**EXECUTIVE AND OTHER
COMMUNICATIONS**

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2751. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) for the quarter ending June 30, 2013 (DCN OSS 2013-1283); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2752. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to information requested in section 308(a) of the Intelligence Authorization Act of 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2753. A communication from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to force structure of the Army for Fiscal Years 2014 through 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2754. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Least Developed Countries that are Designated Countries" ((RIN0750-AI00) (DFARS Case 2013-D019)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2755. A communication from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of Cost Assessment and Program Assessment, Department of the Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2756. A communication from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Intelligence), Department of the Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2757. A communication from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Secretary of the Air Force, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2758. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Release of Fundamental Research Information" ((RIN0750-AH91) (DFARS Case 2012-D054)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2759. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an alter-

native plan for monthly basic pay increases for members of the uniformed services for 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2760. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Susan S. Lawrence, United States Army, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2761. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral James P. Wisecup, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2762. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2763. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of twenty-one (21) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2764. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general, as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2765. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General James D. Thurman, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2766. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Dana K. Chapman, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2767. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral William E. Landay III, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2768. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a, for a period not to exceed 14 days before assuming the duties of the position for which the higher grade is authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2769. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Rhett A. Hernandez, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2770. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Global Strategic Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the obligation and expenditure of funds for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2771. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations/Low-Intensity Conflict), transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2012 annual report on the Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2772. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to depot-level maintenance and repair workloads by the public and private sectors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2773. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Dispute Resolution Pilot Program for Public Assistance Appeals" ((RIN1660-AA79) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0015)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2774. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 65) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2775. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2776. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2777. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2778. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2779. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received during adjourn-

ment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2780. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2013-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2781. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition and Revision to the List of Validated End-Users in the People's Republic of China" (RIN0694-AF95) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2782. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of a national emergency declared in Executive Order 13222 with respect to the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2783. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997, with respect to Burma; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2784. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the continuation of the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13396 on February 7, 2006, with respect to Cote d'Ivoire; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2785. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2786. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was originally declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2787. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Australia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2788. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Luxembourg; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2789. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S.

exports to various countries; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2790. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Turkey; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2791. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, (3) reports relative to vacancies within the Department, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2792. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "HOME Investment Partnerships Program: Improving Performance and Accountability; Updating Property Standards" (RIN2501-AC94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2793. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hearing Officer and Administrative Judge" (RIN1992-AA36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2794. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Residential Clothes Dryers" (RIN1904-AC63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2795. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pennsylvania Regulatory Program" (Docket No. PA-162-FOR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 5, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2796. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Modeling, Data, and Analysis Reliability Standard" (Docket No. RM12-19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2797. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Third-Party Provision of Ancillary Services; Accounting and Financial Reporting for New Electric Storage Technologies" (Docket No. RM11-24-000 and AD10-13-000) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2798. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Procedural Regulations Governing Transportation by Interstate Pipelines" (Docket No. RM12-17-000) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2799. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Page 700 of FERC Form No. 6" (RIN1902-AE55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2800. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Department of Energy Activities Relating to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Fiscal Year 2012"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2801. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2012 Methane Hydrate Program"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2802. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Geothermal Heat Pump Research, Development and Demonstration"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2803. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2804. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the progress made in licensing and constructing the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2805. A communication from the Deputy Chief of the National Forest System, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the detailed boundary for the Roaring Wild and Scenic River and Sandy Wild and Scenic River, Upper Portion, Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2806. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "United States Department of Transportation 2013 Report to Congress from the Intelligent Transportation Systems Program Advisory Committee"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2807. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Centerville, Midway, Lovelady, and Oakwood, Texas)" (MB Docket No. 12-92, RM-11650, RM-11679) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2808. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Ap-

proach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (13); Amdt. No. 3541" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2809. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (85); Amdt. No. 3540" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2810. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-55 and V-169 in Eastern North Dakota" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0484) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2811. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Washington, DC" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0081) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2812. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D Airspace; El Monte, CA" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0505) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2813. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Port Townsend, WA" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-0926) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2814. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Live Oak, FL" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0001) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2815. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Selmer, TN" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0074) received during adjourn-

ment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2816. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Captiva, FL" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1335) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2817. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-537, GA" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-0971) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2818. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tuskegee, AL" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0158) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2819. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-0420) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2820. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Helicopters" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0019) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2821. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; B-N Group Ltd. Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0314) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2822. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1052) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2823. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0205)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2824. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-1155)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2825. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1214)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2826. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0447)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2827. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Various Helicopter Models" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0521)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2828. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Engine Alliance Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1329)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2829. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-0983)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2830. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd and Co KG Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0458)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the Presi-

dent of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2831. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1221)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2832. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Hawker Beechcraft Corporation (Type Certificate Previously Held by Raytheon Aircraft Company) Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0462)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2833. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Kamchatka Flounder in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XC750) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2834. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Western Pacific; Fishing in the Marianas Trench, Pacific Remote Islands, and Rose Atoll Marine National Monuments" (RIN0648-BA98) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2835. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Recreational Management Measures for the Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Fishing Year 2013" (RIN0648-BD13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2836. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Dusky Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XC741) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2837. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish and Dusky Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XC756) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2838. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fish-

eries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Gulf of Mexico Aggregated Large Coastal Shark and Gulf of Mexico Hammerhead Shark Management Groups" (RIN0648-XC748) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2839. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XC740) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2840. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trip Limit Adjustment for the Common Pool Fishery" (RIN0648-XC737) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2841. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0383)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2842. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XC739) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2843. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2013 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Gray Triggerfish" (RIN0648-XC728) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2844. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Shark Management Measures; Amendment 5a" (RIN0648-BB29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2845. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rate Regulation Reforms" (RIN2140-AB12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2846. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; 'Other Rockfish'" in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XC753) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2847. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery and Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 24 and Framework Adjustment 49; Correction" (RIN0648-BC81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2848. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XC752) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2849. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Rougheye Rockfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XC761) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2850. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; National Standard 2-Scientific Information" (RIN0648-AW62) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2851. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Time Limit for Completion of Voluntary Self-Disclosures and Revised Notice of the Institution of Administrative Enforcement Proceedings" (RIN0694-AF59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2852. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2853. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, De-

partment of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs and Chief Financial Officer, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2854. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Joint Operations Exercise, Lake Michigan, IL" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0611) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2855. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Sherman Private Party Fireworks, Lake Michigan, Winnetka, IL" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0615) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2856. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Sister Bay Marina Fest Fireworks and Ski Show, Sister Bay, WI" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0614) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2857. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Alpena Area HOG Rally Fireworks, Alpena, Michigan" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0661) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2858. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile 662.8 to 663.9" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0410) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2859. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Motion Picture Filming; Chicago River; Chicago, IL" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0612) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2860. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Evening on the Bay Fireworks; Sturgeon Bay, WI" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0613) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15,

2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 559. A bill to establish a fund to make payments to the Americans held hostage in Iran, and to members of their families, who are identified as members of the proposed class in case number 1:08-CV-00487 (EGS) of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-104).

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 815. A bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity (Rept. No. 113-105).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. Res. 223. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 224. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Kenneth Allen Polite, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HELLER, Mr. LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1497. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to apply the provisions of the Act to certain Congressional staff and members of the executive branch; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 1498. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions relating to small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHANNES (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 1499. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 278 Main Street in Chadron, Nebraska, as the "Sergeant Cory Mracek Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1500. A bill to declare the November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas, a terrorist attack, and to ensure that the victims of the attack and their families receive the same honors and benefits as those Americans who have been killed or wounded in a combat zone overseas and their families; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1501. A bill to establish a Financing Energy Efficient Manufacturing Program in the Department of Energy to provide financial assistance to promote energy efficiency and onsite renewable technologies in manufacturing and industrial facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1502. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to protect against foodborne illnesses, provide enhanced notification of recalled meat, poultry, eggs, and related food products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BAUCUS, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. HAGAN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1503. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1504. A bill to increase funds set aside for off-system bridges; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. Res. 223. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary; from the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

S. Res. 224. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LEE, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. HELLER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BURR, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. Res. 225. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate that Congress should establish a joint select committee to investigate and report on the attack on the

United States diplomatic facility and American personnel in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. Res. 226. A resolution celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of James Cleveland "Jesse" Owens and honoring him for his accomplishments and steadfast commitment to promoting the civil rights of all people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 119

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 119, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 344

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from approving the introduction into commerce of gasoline that contains greater than 10-volume-percent ethanol, and for other purposes.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 429

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 463

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 463, a bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to modify the definition of the term "biobased product".

S. 468

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Pennsyl-

vania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 468, a bill to protect the health care and pension benefits of our nation's miners.

S. 534

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 534, a bill to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 641, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 647

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 647, a bill to modify the prohibition on recognition by United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names, or commercial names.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 669

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 669, a bill to make permanent the Internal Revenue Service Free File program.

S. 820

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 820, a bill to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, and for other purposes.

S. 908

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, the name of the Senator

from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 908, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the diagnosis and treatment of hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia, and for other purposes.

S. 948

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 948, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 987, a bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media.

S. 1141

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1141, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the rehabilitation credit, and for other purposes.

S. 1143

At the request of Mr. JOHANNES, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1143, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1204, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related

discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1307

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1307, a bill to provide for evidence-based and promising practices related to juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention to help build individual, family, and community strength and resiliency to ensure that youth lead productive, safe, healthy, gang-free, and law-abiding lives.

S. 1322

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1322, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues.

S. 1332

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1417

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1417, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act.

S. 1438

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1438, a bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to provide that military technicians (dual status) shall be included in military personnel accounts for purposes of any order issued under that Act.

S. 1442

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1442, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the minimum low-income housing tax credit rate for unsubsidized buildings and to provide a minimum 4 percent credit rate for existing buildings.

S. 1487

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin

(Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1487, a bill to limit the availability of tax credits and reductions in cost-sharing under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to individuals who receive health insurance coverage pursuant to the provisions of a Taft-Hartley plan.

S. 1488

At the request of Mr. COATS, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1488, a bill to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 1489

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1489, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to notify the taxpayer each time the taxpayer's information is accessed by the Internal Revenue Service.

S. 1490

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1490, a bill to delay the application of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. CON. RES. 13

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 13, a concurrent resolution commending the Boys & Girls Clubs of America for its role in improving outcomes for millions of young people and thousands of communities.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.

Res. 75, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

AMENDMENT NO. 1852

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1852 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1856

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1856 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1857

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1857 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1867

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1867 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1871

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1871 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1876

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin

(Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1876 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1500. A bill to declare the November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas, a terrorist attack, and to ensure that the victims of the attack and their families receive the same honors and benefits as those Americans who have been killed or wounded in a combat zone overseas and their families; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1500

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Honoring the Fort Hood Heroes Act".

SEC. 2. DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

Congress makes the following declarations of policy:

(1) The November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas constituted an act of terrorism, not merely workplace violence.

(2) The United States Government has a fundamental duty to our military service members to safeguard them against avoidable harm in the course of their service, and the attack on Fort Hood could and should have been prevented.

(3) Nidal Hasan, the perpetrator of the attack, had become radicalized while serving in the United States Army and was principally motivated to carry out the attack by an ideology of violent Islamist extremism.

(4) Through his actions that day, Nidal Hasan proved himself to be not just a terrorist, but also a traitor and an enemy of the United States.

SEC. 3. AWARDS REQUIRED.

(a) PURPLE HEART.—The Secretary of the military department concerned shall award the Purple Heart to the members of the Armed Forces who were killed or wounded in the attack that occurred at Fort Hood, Texas, on November 5, 2009.

(b) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE MEDAL FOR THE DEFENSE OF FREEDOM.—The Secretary of Defense shall award the Secretary of Defense Medal for the Defense of Freedom to civilian employees of the Department of Defense and civilian contractors who were killed or wounded in the attack that occurred at Fort Hood, Texas, on November 5, 2009.

SEC. 4. BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE WHO WERE KILLED OR WOUNDED IN THE NOVEMBER 5, 2009, ATTACK AT FORT HOOD, TEXAS.

(a) TREATMENT.—For purposes of all applicable Federal laws, regulations, and policies, a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the Department of Defense who

was killed or wounded in the attack that occurred at Fort Hood, Texas, on November 5, 2009, shall be deemed, effective as of such date, as follows:

(1) In the case of a member, to have been killed or wounded in a combat zone as the result of an act of an enemy of the United States.

(2) In the case of a civilian employee of the Department of Defense—

(A) to have been killed or wounded by hostile action while serving with the Armed Forces in a contingency operation; and

(B) to have been killed or wounded in a terrorist attack.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a member of the Armed Forces whose death or wound as described in that subsection is the result of the willful misconduct of the member.

(c) COVERAGE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL INJURIES.—Subsection (a) applies to members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) or other psychological injuries as a result of the attack that occurred at Fort Hood, Texas, on November 5, 2009.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BAUCUS, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. HAGAN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1503. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, every day almost 50 million children pass through the doors of public schools across the country.

For these young people, school is a place to learn, make friends, and be exposed to new things.

For a small number of children, however, lunch time, a classmate's birthday party, or a piece of candy from a friend can risk exposure to foods that can cause a severe and life-threatening allergic reaction.

Although food allergies are common—with one out of every 25 children having a food allergy—you may not personally know a child that suffers from severe food allergies.

But I am sure you have heard the sad stories about students trying a new food at lunch or accidentally eating something containing peanuts or soy.

Most of us wouldn't even notice the peanuts or soy, but for these kids the consequences can be fatal.

Their throats constrict, making them fight for every breath. And if they don't get a life-saving shot of epinephrine within minutes they can die.

Last year, I met with the mother of 7-year-old Amarria Johnson from Virginia.

One day at recess a friend gave Amarria a peanut, which triggered a severe allergic reaction.

By the time emergency crews arrived they could not resuscitate her.

This was the first time Amarria had a severe allergic reaction, so she did not have an epinephrine shot prescribed for her at the school to use in an emergency.

Almost 4 years ago in my home state, a 13-year-old named Katelyn Carlson passed away from a severe allergic reaction after she ate Chinese food during a party in her 7th grade class.

Our hearts ache when we hear tragic stories like this, but in most cases they could have been prevented.

A year after Katelyn passed away, Illinois Governor Quinn signed a law that I hope will prevent another child from dying from an anaphylactic reaction because the school does not have epinephrine on hand.

Today I introduced, along with Senator KIRK, a bill that encourages every state to follow Illinois' example.

The School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act encourages states to require all schools to maintain a supply of epinephrine on the premises and to allow trained school personnel to administer epinephrine if a child is having a serious anaphylactic reaction.

Schools can help by being prepared and allowed to treat a child in the few minutes they have to save their life.

Considering that children spend about 28 percent of their time at school, schools can and should play a role in responding to students that have a severe and potentially fatal allergic reaction.

Currently students with severe allergies are allowed to self-administer epinephrine if they are having a serious allergic reaction.

But what if the child forgets their epinephrine at home?

What about the many children who don't even know they have an allergy?

About 25 percent of epinephrine administrations in schools involve young people with no previous allergy.

Dying from a severe allergic reaction is preventable.

Unfortunately most of our schools are not prepared for the likely event that a student has a severe allergic reaction.

A 2001 study on a small group of young people found that 28 percent of school-aged children who died due to allergic reaction, died at school, and epinephrine was either not administered or was administered too late.

We can do better.

States should require schools to keep epinephrine on hand, and school personnel need to be trained to identify a severe allergic reaction and know how to respond.

I will work with Senator KIRK and my colleagues in Congress to pass this bill, which I hope will help protect kids when they try a new food during lunch time or are given a cookie from a classmate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1503

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL PREFERENCE TO CERTAIN STATES THAT ALLOW TRAINED SCHOOL PERSONNEL TO ADMINISTER EPINEPHRINE.

Section 399L(d) of part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

"(F) SCHOOL PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION OF EPINEPHRINE.—In determining the preference (if any) to be given to a State under this subsection, the Secretary shall give additional preference to a State that provides to the Secretary the certification described in subparagraph (G) and that requires that each public elementary school and secondary school in the State—

"(i) permits trained personnel of the school to administer epinephrine to any student of the school reasonably believed to be having an anaphylactic reaction;

"(ii) maintains a supply of epinephrine in a secure location that is easily accessible to trained personnel of the school for the purpose of administration to any student of the school reasonably believed to be having an anaphylactic reaction; and

"(iii) has in place a plan for having on the premises of the school during all operating hours of the school one or more individuals who are trained personnel of the school.

"(G) CIVIL LIABILITY PROTECTION LAW.—The certification required in subparagraph (F) shall be a certification made by the State attorney general that the State has reviewed any applicable civil liability protection law to determine the application of such law with regard to elementary and secondary school trained personnel who may administer epinephrine to a student reasonably believed to be having an anaphylactic reaction and has concluded that such law provides adequate civil liability protection applicable to such trained personnel. For purposes of the previous sentence, the term 'civil liability protection law' means a State law offering legal protection to individuals who give aid on a voluntary basis in an emergency to an individual who is ill, in peril, or otherwise incapacitated."; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

"(E) The term 'trained personnel' means, with respect to an elementary or secondary school an individual—

"(i) who has been designated by the principal (or other appropriate administrative staff) of the school to administer epinephrine on a voluntary basis outside their scope of employment;

"(ii) who has received training in the administration of epinephrine; and

"(iii) whose training in the administration of epinephrine meets appropriate medical standards and has been documented by appropriate administrative staff of the school.".

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 223—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LEAHY submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on the Judiciary; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 223

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014 and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall not exceed \$9,267,893, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,861,622, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the

payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations".

SENATE RESOLUTION 224—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 224

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014 and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall not exceed \$5,293,156, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$14,348 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$861 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,205,482, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$5,978 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$359 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations

for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations".

SENATE RESOLUTION 225—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD ESTABLISH A JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND REPORT ON THE ATTACK ON THE UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC FACILITY AND AMERICAN PERSONNEL IN BENGHAZI, LIBYA, ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2012

Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LEE, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. HELLER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BURR, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 225

Whereas the September 11, 2012, terrorist attack on the United States diplomatic facility in Benghazi, Libya, resulted in the brutal deaths of four Americans: Ambassador Christopher Stevens, Foreign Service Officer Sean Smith, and former Navy SEALs Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods;

Whereas the Nation commemorates and mourns the loss of these American heroes;

Whereas Ambassador Christopher Stevens is the first United States ambassador to be murdered since Ambassador Adolph Dubs was kidnapped and killed in Afghanistan in 1979;

Whereas President Barack Obama declared in his first address to the Nation about the attack on September 12, 2012, "make no mistake, we will work with the Libyan government to bring to justice the killers who attacked our people," yet there has been no action of reprisal and no justice rendered;

Whereas failure to hold accountable the perpetrators of this vicious attack will leave

terrorists around the world with the impression that they can kill Americans and escape the consequences—increasing the likelihood of future attacks;

Whereas progress in the investigation into the attacks on the United States diplomatic facility has been disappointing, and no suspects are in United States custody;

Whereas whistleblowers, including former Deputy Chief of Mission Gregory Hicks, have reported unwarranted repercussions and fear of retaliation;

Whereas the Department of State's lack of adequate cooperation has prevented congressional committees from properly investigating and receiving direct testimony on behalf of Benghazi survivors;

Whereas the American people deserve to have a complete account from their government of the events in Benghazi before, during, and after the September 11, 2012, attack because, as Gregory Hicks said, "the American people need to have the story. And Ambassador Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, Ty Woods and Glen Doherty's names are names that should be remembered by every American for the sacrifice that they made."; and

Whereas the White House declared on September 10, 2013, "We remain committed to bringing the perpetrators of the Benghazi attacks to justice and to ensuring the safety of our brave personnel serving overseas": Now therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that Congress should establish a joint select committee to investigate and report on the attack on the United States diplomatic facility and American personnel in Benghazi, Libya on September 11, 2012.

SENATE RESOLUTION 226—CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF JAMES CLEVELAND "JESSE" OWENS AND HONORING HIM FOR HIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND STEADFAST COMMITMENT TO PROMOTING THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF ALL PEOPLE

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 226

Whereas James Cleveland "Jesse" Owens was born on September 12, 1913 in Oakville, Alabama;

Whereas Jesse Owens, the youngest of 10 children of sharecroppers and the grandson of a slave, moved with his family at the age of 9 to Cleveland, Ohio as part of the Great Migration;

Whereas, as a student at Fairmount Junior High School, Jesse Owens broke junior high school world records for the high jump and the broad jump;

Whereas Jesse Owens attended East Technical High School in Cleveland, Ohio where, as a member of the track team, he placed first in 75 of the 79 races he entered during his senior year, set the world record in the 220-yard dash, and tied the world record in the 100-yard dash;

Whereas Jesse Owens, the "Buckeye Bullet", matriculated at the Ohio State University in 1933 after attracting national attention as a high school athlete;

Whereas, while attending classes, training, and breaking a number of track and field

records, Jesse Owens worked various jobs, including as an elevator operator at the Ohio State Capitol, a waiter, a gas station attendant, and a library employee;

Whereas, due to his race, Jesse Owens was barred from living on campus at the Ohio State University, denied service at restaurants near the University, and forced to stay in segregated hotels;

Whereas, on May 25, 1935, in a 45-minute period during the Big Ten Track and Field Championships in Ann Arbor, Michigan, Jesse Owens, competing with an injured back, tied the world record in the 100-yard dash and set new world records in the long jump, the 220-yard dash, and the 220-yard low hurdles;

Whereas, as of the 2012 Summer Olympics, only two men had surpassed the long jump record Jesse Owens set in 1935;

Whereas, at the 1936 Summer Olympics, Jesse Owens won 4 gold medals, tied the world record in the 100-meter dash, and set new Olympic records in the 200-meter race, the long jump, and the 400-meter relay;

Whereas Jesse Owens' resilience and heroic performance at the 1936 Summer Olympics exposed the struggle against racial bigotry and publicly defied Adolf Hitler's intention of proving that ethnicity was a predetermining factor for achievement;

Whereas the record-breaking performance by Jesse Owens at the 1936 Summer Olympics was never recognized by President Franklin D. Roosevelt or President Harry S. Truman, but was later recognized in 1955 by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who referred to Jesse Owens as an "Ambassador of Sport";

Whereas, following his Olympic career, Jesse Owens resumed his commitment to public service by spending much of his time working with community groups such as the Boys Clubs of America, chronicling his personal story to magnify the importance of equality and civil rights;

Whereas, during the 1950s, Jesse Owens worked with the Department of State to promote democracy abroad as an Ambassador of Goodwill during the Cold War and advocated for socioeconomic equality, individuality, freedom, and love of country;

Whereas Jesse Owens was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Gerald R. Ford in 1976 and the Living Legend Award by President Jimmy Carter in 1979, and was posthumously awarded the Congressional Gold Medal by President George H.W. Bush in 1990; and

Whereas the integrity, courage, and strength of character that Jesse Owens demonstrated remain an example for all people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors and celebrates the 100th anniversary of the birth of James Cleveland "Jesse" Owens; and

(2) supports and encourages the people of the United States to recognize the contributions of Jesse Owens to the Olympic Games, collegiate athletics, international race relations, and democracy.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1887. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1888. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1889. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1890. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1891. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1892. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1893. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1894. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1895. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1896. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1897. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1898. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1899. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1900. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1901. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1902. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1903. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1904. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1905. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1906. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1907. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1908. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. HEITKAMP,

Mr. THUNE, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1909. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1910. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1911. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1912. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1913. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1914. Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1915. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1916. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1917. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1918. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1919. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1920. Mr. HARKIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1921. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1922. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1923. Mr. JOHANNIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1924. Mr. JOHANNIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1925. Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1926. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1927. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

bill S. 1392, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1887. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013) is repealed.

(b) EFFECT OF REPEAL.—The repeal under subsection (a) shall not affect any incentive, loan, or other assistance provided under section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013) on or before January 1, 2013.

SA 1888. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4 PROHIBITION ON COLLECTION AND DISBURSEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCER PERSONAL INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not establish any searchable online database of the personal information of any owner, operator, or employee of a livestock or farming operation.

(b) INCLUSIONS.—For purposes of subsection (a), personal information includes—

- (1) names of the owners, operators, or employees or of family members of the owners, operators, or employees;
- (2) telephone numbers;
- (3) email addresses;
- (4) physical or mailing addresses;
- (5) number of livestock;
- (6) Global Positioning System coordinates;

or

(7) other personal information regarding the owners, operators, or employees.

(c) FOIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Personal information described in subsection (b) shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—For purposes of paragraph (1), this section shall be considered a statute described in section 552(b)(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code.

SA 1889. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4 STUDY OF REGULATIONS THAT LIMIT GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM EXISTING POWER PLANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the effect that regulations limiting greenhouse gas emissions from existing power plants would have on jobs and energy prices.

(b) DETERMINATION.—If, based on the study conducted under subsection (a), the Secretary of Energy determines that the regulations described in that subsection would directly or indirectly destroy jobs or raise energy prices, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not finalize the regulations.

SA 1890. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4 STUDY OF EFFECT OF TIER 3 MOTOR VEHICLE EMISSION AND FUEL STANDARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the effect that the Tier 3 motor vehicle emission and fuel standard would have on the price of gasoline.

(b) DETERMINATION.—If, based on the study conducted under subsection (a), the Secretary of Energy determines that the Tier 3 motor vehicle emission and fuel standard would result in an increase in the price of gasoline, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not finalize the standard.

SA 1891. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4 CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF EPA REGULATIONS WITH HIGH COMPLIANCE COSTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the cost of compliance with a regulation of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency exceeds \$1,000,000,000, the regulation shall not take effect unless Congress enacts a law that approves the regulation.

SA 1892. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4 DOMESTIC OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION GOAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In developing an onshore and offshore oil and gas leasing program for the Department of the Interior, subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Interior

(referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) shall determine a domestic strategic production goal for the development of oil and natural gas from Federal onshore and offshore areas, which goal shall be—

(1) the best estimate of the practicable increase in domestic production of oil and natural gas from the outer Continental Shelf and Federal onshore areas; and

(2) focused on—

(A) meeting domestic demand for oil and natural gas;

(B) reducing the dependence of the United States on foreign energy; and

(C) the production increases achieved by the leasing program at the end of each of the 15- and 30-year periods beginning on the effective date of the program.

(b) PROGRAM GOAL.—For purposes of the onshore and offshore oil and gas leasing program of the Department of the Interior, the production goal determined under subsection (a) shall be an increase by January 1, 2032, of the greater of—

(1)(A) not less than 3,000,000 barrels in the quantity of oil produced per day; and

(B) not less than 10,000,000,000 cubic feet in the quantity of natural gas produced per day; or

(2) not less than the projected 30-year percentage increase in the production of oil and natural gas from non-Federal areas, as determined by the Energy Information Administration.

(c) REPORT.—Beginning on the date that is 1 year after the effective date of the onshore and offshore oil and gas leasing program and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the progress of the program in meeting the production goal under subsection (a) that includes an identification of projections for production and any problems with leasing, permitting, or production that will prevent meeting the goal.

SA 1893. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4 ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) COVERED ENERGY-RELATED RULE.—The term “covered energy-related rule” means a rule of the Environmental Protection Agency that—

(A) regulates any aspect of the production, supply, distribution, or use of energy or provides for that regulation by States or other governmental entities; and

(B) is estimated by the Administrator or the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to impose direct costs and indirect costs, in the aggregate, of more than \$1,000,000,000.

(3) DIRECT COSTS.—The term “direct costs” has the meaning given the term in chapter 8 of the document of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses” and dated December 17, 2010.

(4) **INDIRECT COSTS.**—The term “indirect costs” has the meaning given the term in chapter 8 of the document of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses” and dated December 17, 2010.

(5) **RULE.**—The term “rule” has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) **PROHIBITION AGAINST FINALIZING CERTAIN ENERGY-RELATED RULES THAT WILL CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECTS TO THE ECONOMY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator shall not promulgate as final any covered energy-related rule if the Secretary determines under subsection (c)(4) that the rule will result in significant adverse effects to the economy.

(c) **REPORTS AND DETERMINATIONS PRIOR TO PROMULGATING AS FINAL CERTAIN ENERGY-RELATED RULES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before promulgating as final any covered energy-related rule, the Administrator shall carry out the activities described in paragraphs (3) and (4).

(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—For each covered energy-related rule, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report (and transmit a copy to the Secretary) containing—

(A) a copy of the rule;

(B) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

(C) an estimate of the total costs of the rule, including the direct costs and indirect costs of the rule;

(D) an estimate of—

(i) the total benefits of the rule; and

(ii) when those benefits are expected to be realized;

(E) a description of the modeling, the assumptions, and the limitations due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information associated with the estimates under subparagraph (D);

(F) an estimate of the increases in energy prices, including potential increases in gasoline or electricity prices for consumers, that may result from implementation or enforcement of the rule; and

(G) a detailed description of the employment effects, including potential job losses and shifts in employment, that may result from implementation or enforcement of the rule.

(3) **INITIAL DETERMINATION ON INCREASES AND IMPACTS.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall prepare an independent analysis to determine whether the covered energy-related rule will cause—

(A) any increase in energy prices for consumers, including low-income households, small businesses, and manufacturers;

(B) any impact on fuel diversity of the electricity generation portfolio of the United States or on national, regional, or local electric reliability;

(C) any adverse effect on energy supply, distribution, or use due to the economic or technical infeasibility of implementing the rule; or

(D) any other adverse effect on energy supply, distribution, or use (including a shortfall in supply and increased use of foreign supplies).

(4) **SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATION ON ADVERSE EFFECTS TO THE ECONOMY.**—If the Secretary determines, under paragraph (3), that the rule will result in an increase, impact, or effect described in that subsection, then the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, the Secretary of Commerce, the Sec-

retary of Labor, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall—

(A) determine whether the rule will result in significant adverse effects to the economy, taking into consideration—

(i) the costs and benefits of the rule and limitations in calculating those costs and benefits due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information; and

(ii) the positive and negative impacts of the rule on economic indicators, including those related to gross domestic product, unemployment, wages, consumer prices, and business and manufacturing activity; and

(B) publish the results of that determination in the Federal Register.

SA 1894. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4. SENSE OF SENATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ENERGY SAVINGS PROJECTS.

(a) **FINDING.**—The Senate finds that performance-based contracts for energy savings help Federal agencies meet energy efficiency, renewable energy, water conservation, and emission reductions goals.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the 2011 Presidential Memorandum regarding the Implementation of Energy Savings Projects is an important energy initiative of the Federal Government; and

(2) Federal agencies are encouraged to meet the goals described in the Memorandum through the continued implementation of energy savings projects.

SA 1895. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

Subtitle B—State Energy Race to the Top Initiative

SEC. 511. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “State Energy Race to the Top Initiative Act of 2013”.

SEC. 512. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to assist energy policy innovation in the States to promote the goal of doubling electric and thermal energy productivity by January 1, 2030.

SEC. 513. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **ENERGY PRODUCTIVITY.**—The term “energy productivity” means, in the case of a State or Indian tribe, the gross State or tribal product per British thermal unit of energy consumed in the State or tribal land of the Indian tribe, respectively.

(2) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(3) **STATE.**—The term “State” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6202).

SEC. 514. PHASE 1: INITIAL ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO STATES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue an invitation to States to submit plans to participate in an electric and thermal energy productivity challenge in accordance with this section.

(b) **GRANTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to section 517, the Secretary shall use funds made available under section 518(b)(1) to provide an initial allocation of grants to not more than 25 States.

(2) **AMOUNT.**—The amount of a grant provided to a State under this section shall be not less than \$1,000,000 nor more than \$3,500,000.

(c) **SUBMISSION OF PLANS.**—To receive a grant under this section, not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of the invitation under subsection (a), a State (in consultation with energy utilities, regulatory bodies, and others) shall submit to the Secretary an application to receive the grant by submitting a revised State energy conservation plan under section 362 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322).

(d) **DECISION BY SECRETARY.**—

(1) **BASIS.**—The Secretary shall base the decision of the Secretary on an application submitted under this section on—

(A) plans for improvement in electric and thermal energy productivity consistent with this subtitle; and

(B) other factors determined appropriate by the Secretary, including geographic diversity.

(2) **RANKING.**—The Secretary shall—

(A) rank revised plans submitted under this section in order of the greatest to least likely contribution to improving energy productivity in the State; and

(B) provide grants under this section in accordance with the ranking and the scale and scope of a plan.

(e) **PLAN REQUIREMENTS.**—A plan submitted under subsection (c) shall provide—

(1) a description of the manner in which—

(A) energy savings will be monitored and verified and energy productivity improvements will be calculated using inflation-adjusted dollars;

(B) a statewide baseline of energy use and potential resources for calendar year 2010 will be established to measure improvements;

(C) the plan will promote achievement of energy savings and demand reduction goals;

(D) public and private sector investments in energy efficiency will be leveraged with available Federal funding; and

(E) the plan will not cause cost-shifting among utility customer classes or negatively impact low-income populations; and

(2) an assurance that—

(A) the State energy office required to submit the plan, the energy utilities in the State participating in the plan, and the State public service commission are cooperating and coordinating programs and activities under this subtitle;

(B) the State is cooperating with local units of government, Indian tribes, and energy utilities to expand programs as appropriate; and

(C) grants provided under this subtitle will be used to supplement and not supplant Federal, State, or ratepayer-funded programs or activities in existence on the date of enactment of this subtitle.

(f) **USES.**—A State may use grants provided under this section to promote—

(1) the expansion of policies and programs that will advance industrial energy efficiency, waste heat recovery, combined heat and power, and waste heat-to-power utilization;

(2) the expansion of policies and programs that will advance energy efficiency construction and retrofits for public and private commercial buildings (including schools, hospitals, and residential buildings, including multifamily buildings) such as through expanded energy service performance contracts, equivalent utility energy service contracts, zero net-energy buildings, and improved building energy efficiency codes;

(3) the establishment or expansion of incentives in the electric utility sector to enhance demand response and energy efficiency, including consideration of additional incentives to promote the purposes of section 111(d) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2621(d)), such as appropriate, cost-effective policies regarding rate structures, grid improvements, behavior change, combined heat and power and waste heat-to-power incentives, financing of energy efficiency programs, data use incentives, district heating, and regular energy audits; and

(4) leadership by example, in which State activities involving both facilities and vehicle fleets can be a model for other action to promote energy efficiency and can be expanded with Federal grants provided under this subtitle.

SEC. 515. PHASE 2: SUBSEQUENT ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO STATES.

(a) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 18 months after the receipt of grants under section 514, each State (in consultation with other parties described in subsection (b)(3)(F) that received grants under section 514 may submit to the Secretary a report that describes—

(1) the performance of the programs and activities carried out with the grants; and

(2) in consultation with other parties described in subsection (b)(3)(F), the manner in which additional funds would be used to carry out programs and activities to promote the purposes of this subtitle.

(b) GRANTS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the receipt of the reports required under subsection (a), subject to section 517, the Secretary shall use amounts made available under section 518(b)(2) to provide grants to not more than 6 States to carry out the programs and activities described in subsection (a)(2).

(2) **AMOUNT.**—The amount of a grant provided to a State under this section shall be not more than \$30,000,000.

(3) **BASIS.**—The Secretary shall base the decision of the Secretary to provide grants under this section on—

(A) the performance of the State in the programs and activities carried out with grants provided under section 514;

(B) the potential of the programs and activities described in subsection (a)(2) to achieve the purposes of this subtitle;

(C) the desirability of maintaining a total project portfolio that is geographically and functionally diverse;

(D) the amount of non-Federal funds that are leveraged as a result of the grants to ensure that Federal dollars are leveraged effectively;

(E) plans for continuation of the improvements after the receipt of grants under this subtitle; and

(F) demonstrated effort by the State to involve diverse groups, including—

(i) investor-owned, cooperative, and public power utilities;

(ii) local governments; and

(iii) nonprofit organizations.

SEC. 516. ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall invite Indian tribes to submit plans to participate in an electric and thermal energy productivity challenge in accordance with this section.

(b) **SUBMISSION OF PLANS.**—To receive a grant under this section, not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of the invitation under subsection (a), an Indian tribe shall submit to the Secretary a plan to increase electric and thermal energy productivity by the Indian tribe.

(c) DECISION BY SECRETARY.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the submission of plans under subsection (b), the Secretary shall make a final decision on the allocation of grants under this section.

(2) **BASIS.**—The Secretary shall base the decision of the Secretary under paragraph (1) on—

(A) plans for improvement in electric and thermal energy productivity consistent with this subtitle;

(B) plans for continuation of the improvements after the receipt of grants under this subtitle; and

(C) other factors determined appropriate by the Secretary, including—

(i) geographic diversity; and

(ii) size differences among Indian tribes.

(3) **LIMITATION.**—An individual Indian tribe shall not receive more than 20 percent of the total amount available to carry out this section.

SEC. 517. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.**—To evaluate program performance and effectiveness under this subtitle, the Secretary shall consult with the National Research Council regarding requirements for data and evaluation for recipients of grants under this subtitle.

(b) **COORDINATION WITH STATE ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Grants to States under this subtitle shall be provided through additional funding to carry out State energy conservation programs under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.).

(2) **RELATIONSHIP TO STATE ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A grant provided to a State under this subtitle shall be used to supplement (and not supplant) funds provided to the State under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.).

(B) **MINIMUM FUNDING.**—A grant shall not be provided to a State for a fiscal year under this subtitle if the amount of funding provided to all State grantees under the base formula for the fiscal year under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) is less than \$50,000,000.

(c) **VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.**—The participation of a State in a challenge established under this subtitle shall be voluntary.

SEC. 518. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle \$200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2017.

(b) **ALLOCATION.**—Of the total amount of funds made available under subsection (a)—

(1) 30 percent shall be used to provide an initial allocation of grants to States under section 514;

(2) 61 percent shall be used to provide a subsequent allocation of grants to States under section 515;

(3) 4 percent shall be used to make grants to Indian tribes under section 516; and

(4) 5 percent shall be available to the Secretary for the cost of administration and technical support to carry out this subtitle.

SEC. 519. OFFSET.

Section 422(f) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17082(f)) (as amended by section 501) is amended by striking paragraphs (5) and (6) and inserting the following:

“(5) \$80,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

“(6) \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017; and

“(7) \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.”.

SA 1896. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . DELAY IN APPLICATION OF PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

(a) **ONE-YEAR DELAY IN PPACA PROVISIONS SCHEDULED TO TAKE EFFECT ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2014.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of (including any amendment made by) the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) or of title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2011 (Public Law 111-152) that is otherwise scheduled to take effect on or after January 1, 2014, shall not take effect until the date that is one year after the date on which such provision would otherwise have been scheduled to take effect.

(b) **ONE-YEAR SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN TAX INCREASES ALREADY IN EFFECT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of any tax which is imposed or increased by any provision of (including any amendment made by) the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) or of title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2011 (Public Law 111-152), if such tax or increase takes effect before January 1, 2014, such tax or increase shall not apply during the 1-year period beginning on such date.

SA 1897. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, strike lines 15 and 16 insert the following:

(1) to the extent and in the amount provided in advance in appropriations Acts; and

(2) if the Secretary of Energy complies with the requirements for covered agencies under section 609(d) of title 5, United States Code.

SA 1898. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings

and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, strike lines 15 and 16 insert the following:

(1) to the extent and in the amount provided in advance in appropriations Acts; and

(2) if the Secretary of Energy ensures that no employee shall be compensated by the Department while performing duties related to a labor organization or collective bargaining that are otherwise authorized under section 7131 of title 5, United States Code.

SA 1899. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4. FEEDSTOCK FLEXIBILITY PROGRAM FOR BIOENERGY PRODUCERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9010(b) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8110(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary shall not sell or transfer any eligible commodity to a bioenergy producer under this section unless the resale price of the eligible commodity at the time of the sale and transfer is within 1 cent per pound of the loan rate for the eligible commodity under section 156 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272).”; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) OFFSET OF COSTS.—The Secretary shall offset all costs associated with the storage, transfer, and resale of eligible commodities under this section through a penalty on forfeited eligible commodities described in section 156(f)(3) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(f)(3)).”

(b) FORFEITURE PENALTY.—Section 156(f) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) FORFEITURE PENALTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—To carry out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall assess a penalty on the forfeiture of sugar pledged as collateral under this section.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall set, and subsequently periodically adjust, the penalty at levels necessary to offset all costs to the Federal Government for storing, transferring, and reselling forfeited sugar, including potential resale losses to bioenergy producers under section 9010 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8110).”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall be effective beginning with the 2014 crop year.

SA 1900. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4. REPEAL OF FEEDSTOCK FLEXIBILITY PROGRAM FOR BIOENERGY PRODUCERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9010 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8110) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 359a(3)(B) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359aa(3)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking clause (iii).

(2) Section 359b(c)(2)(C) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb(c)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “, except for” and all that follows through “of 2002”.

SA 1901. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 56, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

SEC. 5. GAS ACCESSIBILITY AND STABILIZATION.

(a) EXPANSION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Section 211(c)(4)(C) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(c)(4)(C)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii)(II), by inserting “a problem with distribution or delivery equipment that is necessary for the transportation or delivery of fuel or fuel additives,” after “equipment failure.”;

(2) in clause (iii)(II), by inserting “(except that the Administrator may extend the effectiveness of a waiver for more than 20 days if the Administrator determines that the conditions under clause (ii) supporting a waiver determination will exist for more than 20 days)” before the semicolon at the end;

(3) by redesignating the second clause (v) (relating to the authority of the Administrator to approve certain State implementation plans) as clause (vi); and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(vii) PRESUMPTIVE APPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subparagraph, if the Administrator does not approve or deny a request for a waiver under this subparagraph within 3 days after receipt of the request, the request shall be considered to be approved as received by the Administrator and the applicable fuel standards shall be waived for the period of time requested.”

(b) FUEL SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS HARMONIZATION STUDY.—Section 1509 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-58; 119 Stat. 1083) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting “biofuels,” after “oxygenated fuel.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(G), by striking “Tier II” and inserting “Tier III”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “2008” and inserting “2014”.

SA 1902. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4. SOCIAL COST OF CARBON.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) on May 31, 2013, the White House released monetized estimates of the effects associated with carbon emissions to be used in Federal agency evaluations of the costs and benefits of carrying out regulations;

(2) the estimate described in paragraph (1) is often referred to as “the social cost of carbon” and is crucial to the environmental agenda of the Obama Administration, because the higher the social cost of carbon is determined to be, the more costly regulations can be justified;

(3) the estimate described in paragraph (1) was developed behind closed doors, without opportunity for public comment or participation, by an interagency working group;

(4) although Office of Management and Budget guidance requires the use of a 3 and 7 percent discount rate when predicting future costs and benefits, the interagency working group referred to in paragraph (3) ignored that guidance and used substantially lower discount rates, thereby leading to higher estimates;

(5) depending on the discount rate used by the interagency working group, the increase in the estimate ranges from 34 to 120 percent;

(6) Office of Management and Budget guidance requires that economically significant proposed and final regulations be analyzed from the domestic perspective while analysis from the international perspective is optional;

(7) the interagency working group referred to in paragraph (3) determined that the social cost of carbon should incorporate the full global damages of carbon, thereby greatly increasing the estimates without providing a United States-specific analysis;

(8) the estimate developed by the interagency working group is a de facto carbon tax that is buried in the cost-benefit analyses of energy related rulemakings;

(9) the cost-benefit analysis referred to in paragraph (8) will play a role in the decision of the Obama Administration relating to the Keystone pipeline and the development of emissions regulations for coal fired power plants; and

(10) the actions of the interagency working group unnecessarily and unwisely results in increased energy costs to consumers and households, thereby reducing economic growth and opportunity.

(b) SOCIAL COST OF CARBON IN COST-BENEFIT ANALYSES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any rulemaking or other action, an agency head shall not monetize any direct or indirect effects associated with carbon emissions to be used in a cost-benefit analysis of the agency, including the social cost of carbon estimate (as described in the document entitled “Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis under Executive Order 12866”, dated May 2013, or any preceding, succeeding, or substantially related document).

SA 1903. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 401. REGIONAL HAZE PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental

Protection Agency (referred to in this section as the "Administrator") shall not reject or disapprove in whole or in part a State regional haze implementation plan addressing any regional haze regulation of the Environmental Protection Agency (including the regulations described in section 51.308 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)) if—

(1) the State has submitted to the Administrator a State implementation plan for regional haze that—

(A) considers the factors identified in section 169A of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7491); and

(B) applies the relevant laws (including regulations);

(2) the Administrator fails to demonstrate using the best available science that a Federal implementation plan action governing a specific source, when compared to the State plan, results in at least a 1.0 deciview improvement in any class I area (as classified under section 162 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7472)); and

(3) implementation of the Federal implementation plan, when compared to the State plan, will result in an economic cost to the State or to the private sector of greater than \$100,000,000 in any fiscal year or \$300,000,000 in the aggregate.

SA 1904. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 5. SMART WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term "eligible entity" means—

- (A) a utility;
- (B) a municipality;
- (C) a water district; and
- (D) any other authority that provides water, wastewater, or water reuse services.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

(4) SMART WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.—The term "smart water resource management pilot program" or "pilot program" means the pilot program established under subsection (b).

(b) SMART WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator and the Secretary shall establish and carry out a smart water resource management pilot program in accordance with this section.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the smart water resource management pilot program is to award grants to eligible entities to demonstrate novel and innovative technology-based solutions that will—

(A) increase the energy and water efficiency of water, wastewater, and water reuse systems;

(B) improve water, wastewater, and water reuse systems to help communities across the United States make significant progress in conserving water, saving energy, and reducing costs; and

(C) support the implementation of innovative processes and the installation of ad-

vanced automated systems that provide real-time data on energy and water.

(3) PROJECT SELECTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator and the Secretary shall jointly make competitive, merit-reviewed grants under the pilot program to not less than 3, but not more than 5, eligible entities.

(B) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting an eligible entity to receive a grant under the pilot program, the Administrator and the Secretary shall consider—

(i) energy and cost savings;

(ii) the novelty of the technology to be used;

(iii) the degree to which the project integrates next-generation sensors, software, analytics, and management tools;

(iv) the anticipated cost-effectiveness of the pilot project in terms of energy efficiency savings, water savings or reuse, and infrastructure costs averted;

(v) whether the technology can be deployed in a variety of geographic regions and the degree to which the technology can be implemented on a smaller or larger scale; and

(vi) whether the project will be completed in 5 years or less.

(C) APPLICATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), an eligible entity seeking a grant under the pilot program shall submit to the Administrator and the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Administrator and the Secretary determine to be necessary.

(ii) CONTENTS.—An application under clause (i) shall, at a minimum, include—

(I) a description of the project;

(II) a description of the technology to be used in the project;

(III) the anticipated results, including energy and water savings, of the project;

(IV) a comprehensive budget for the project;

(V) the names of the project lead organization and any partners;

(VI) the number of users to be served by the project; and

(VII) any other information that the Administrator and the Secretary determine to be necessary to complete the review and selection of a grant recipient.

(4) ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Administrator and the Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of understanding that—

(A) outlines the respective duties of the Administrator and the Secretary in carrying out this section; and

(B) establishes an interagency working group that shall—

(i) discuss the implementation of this section and related energy and water policy issues;

(ii) develop the application, evaluation, and other administrative processes necessary to carry out this section; and

(iii) determine whether the Environmental Protection Agency or the Department of Energy shall serve as the lead agency for purposes of evaluation and other administrative activities under this section, including the provision of technical and policy assistance.

(5) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 300 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator and the Secretary shall select grant recipients under this section.

(B) EVALUATIONS.—The Administrator and the Secretary shall annually carry out an evaluation of each project for which a grant is provided under this section that—

(i) evaluates the progress and impact of the project; and

(ii) assesses the degree to which the project is meeting the goals of the pilot program.

(C) TECHNICAL AND POLICY ASSISTANCE.—On the request of a grant recipient, the Administrator and the Secretary shall provide technical and policy assistance.

(D) BEST PRACTICES.—The Administrator and the Secretary shall make available to the public—

(i) a copy of each evaluation carried out under subparagraph (B); and

(ii) a description of any best practices identified by the Administrator and the Secretary as a result of those evaluations.

(E) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Administrator and the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of each evaluation carried out under subparagraph (B).

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator and the Secretary shall use not less than \$7,500,000 of amounts made available to the Administrator and the Secretary to carry out this section.

(2) PRIORITIZATION.—In funding activities under this section, the Administrator and the Secretary shall prioritize funding in the following manner:

(A) Any unobligated amounts made available for the surface water protection program on sustainable infrastructure management and for water infrastructure grants management activities of the Environmental Protection Agency and the State Energy Program of the Department of Energy, respectively.

(B) Any unobligated amounts (other than those described in subparagraph (A)) made available to the Administrator and the Secretary, respectively.

SA 1905. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SECTION 4. WATER EFFICIENCY, CONSERVATION, AND ADAPTATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1)(A) human-induced climate change is affecting the natural water cycle, decreasing precipitation levels in the West, especially the Southwest, and making droughts and floods more frequent and more intense;

(B) declining precipitation levels will severely impact water supplies in Southwestern States; and

(C) a sharp increase in the number of days with very heavy precipitation throughout the Northeast and the Midwest will stress aging water infrastructure;

(2) changes in the water cycle caused by climate disruptions will adversely affect water infrastructure, energy production and use, human health, transportation, agriculture, and ecosystems, while also aggravating water disputes across the United States;

(3)(A) the Colorado River, which supplies water for more than 30,000,000 people, is experiencing the worst drought in more than 100 years of recordkeeping; and

(B) the primary reservoirs of the Colorado River Basin and Lakes Mead and Powell have lost nearly half of the storage waters of the reservoirs and Lakes, and clean hydropower generated from Hoover Dam risks reduction if the extended drought persists;

(4) States and local governments and water utilities can begin to address the challenges described in this subsection by providing incentives for water efficiency and conservation, while also planning and investing in infrastructure to adapt to the impacts of climate change, particularly those impacts already affecting the United States;

(5) residential water demand can be reduced by 25 to 40 percent using existing, cost-effective technologies that also can reduce the water bills of consumers by hundreds of dollars per year; and

(6) water and energy use are inseparable activities, and supplying and treating water consumes around 4 percent of the electricity of the United States, and electricity makes up 75 percent of the cost of processing and delivering municipal water.

(b) **DEFINITION OF ADMINISTRATOR.**—In this section, the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(c) **WATERSENSE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established within the Environmental Protection Agency a WaterSense program to identify and promote water efficient products, buildings, landscapes, facilities, processes, and services so as—

(A) to reduce water use;

(B) to reduce the strain on water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure;

(C) to conserve energy used to pump, heat, transport, and treat water; and

(D) to preserve water resources for future generations, through voluntary labeling of, or other forms of communications about, products, buildings, landscapes, facilities, processes, and services that meet the highest water efficiency and performance criteria.

(2) **DUTIES.**—The Administrator shall—

(A) establish—

(i) a WaterSense label to be used for certain items; and

(ii) the procedure by which an item may be certified to display the WaterSense label;

(B) promote WaterSense-labeled products, buildings, landscapes, facilities, processes, and services in the market place as the preferred technologies and services for—

(i) reducing water use; and

(ii) ensuring product and service performance;

(C) work to enhance public awareness of the WaterSense label through public outreach, education, and other means;

(D) preserve the integrity of the WaterSense label by—

(i) establishing and maintaining performance criteria so that products, buildings, landscapes, facilities, processes, and services labeled with the WaterSense label perform as well or better than less water-efficient counterparts;

(ii) overseeing WaterSense certifications made by third parties;

(iii) conducting reviews of the use of the WaterSense label in the marketplace and taking corrective action in any case in which misuse of the label is identified; and

(iv) carrying out such other measures as the Administrator determines to be appropriate;

(E) regularly review and, if appropriate, update WaterSense criteria for categories of products, buildings, landscapes, facilities, processes, and services, at least once every 4 years;

(F) to the maximum extent practicable, regularly estimate and make available to the public the production and relative market shares of, and the savings of water, energy, and capital costs of water, wastewater,

and stormwater infrastructure attributable to the use of WaterSense-labeled products, buildings, landscapes, facilities, processes, and services, at least annually;

(G) solicit comments from interested parties and the public prior to establishing or revising a WaterSense category, specification, installation criterion, or other criterion (or prior to effective dates for any such category, specification, installation criterion, or other criterion);

(H) provide reasonable notice to interested parties and the public of any changes (including effective dates), on the adoption of a new or revised category, specification, installation criterion, or other criterion, along with—

(i) an explanation of the changes; and

(ii) as appropriate, responses to comments submitted by interested parties and the public;

(I) provide appropriate lead time (as determined by the Administrator) prior to the applicable effective date for a new or significant revision to a category, specification, installation criterion, or other criterion, taking into account the timing requirements of the manufacturing, marketing, training, and distribution process for the specific product, building and landscape, or service category addressed;

(J) identify and, if appropriate, implement other voluntary approaches in commercial, institutional, residential, industrial, and municipal sectors to encourage recycling and reuse technologies to improve water efficiency or lower water use; and

(K) if appropriate, apply the WaterSense label to water-using products that are labeled by the Energy Star program implemented by the Administrator and the Secretary of Energy.

(3) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection—

(A) \$7,500,000 for fiscal year 2013;

(B) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

(C) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2015;

(D) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

(E) for each subsequent fiscal year, the applicable amount for the preceding fiscal year, as adjusted to reflect changes for the 12-month period ending the preceding November 30 in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

(d) **STATE RESIDENTIAL WATER EFFICIENCY AND CONSERVATION INCENTIVES PROGRAM.**—

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term “eligible entity” means a State government, local or county government, tribal government, wastewater or sewerage utility, municipal water authority, energy utility, water utility, or nonprofit organization that meets the requirements of paragraph (2).

(B) **INCENTIVE PROGRAM.**—The term “incentive program” means a program for administering financial incentives for consumer purchase and installation of water-efficient products, buildings (including new water-efficient homes), landscapes, processes, or services described in paragraph (2)(A).

(C) **RESIDENTIAL WATER-EFFICIENT PRODUCT, BUILDING, LANDSCAPE, PROCESS, OR SERVICE.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “residential water-efficient product, building, landscape, process, or service” means a product, building, landscape, process, or service for a residence or its landscape that is rated for water efficiency and performance—

(I) by the WaterSense program; or

(II) if a WaterSense specification does not exist, by the Energy Star program or an in-

centive program approved by the Administrator.

(ii) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term “residential water-efficient product, building, landscape, process, or service” includes—

(I) faucets;

(II) irrigation technologies and services;

(III) point-of-use water treatment devices;

(IV) reuse and recycling technologies;

(V) toilets;

(VI) clothes washers;

(VII) dishwashers;

(VIII) showerheads;

(IX) xeriscaping and other landscape conversions that replace irrigated turf; and

(X) new water efficient homes certified under the WaterSense program.

(D) **WATERSENSE PROGRAM.**—The term “WaterSense program” means the program established by subsection (c).

(2) **ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.**—An entity shall be eligible to receive an allocation under paragraph (3) if the entity—

(A) establishes (or has established) an incentive program to provide financial incentives to residential consumers for the purchase of residential water-efficient products, buildings, landscapes, processes, or services;

(B) submits an application for the allocation at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Administrator may require; and

(C) provides assurances satisfactory to the Administrator that the entity will use the allocation to supplement, but not supplant, funds made available to carry out the incentive program.

(3) **AMOUNT OF ALLOCATIONS.**—For each fiscal year, the Administrator shall determine the amount to allocate to each eligible entity to carry out paragraph (4), taking into consideration—

(A) the population served by the eligible entity during the most recent calendar year for which data are available;

(B) the targeted population of the incentive program of the eligible entity, such as general households, low-income households, or first-time homeowners, and the probable effectiveness of the incentive program for that population;

(C) for existing programs, the effectiveness of the program in encouraging the adoption of water-efficient products, buildings, landscapes, facilities, processes, and services;

(D) any allocation to the eligible entity for a preceding fiscal year that remains unused and

(E) the per capita water demand of the population served by the eligible entity during the most recent calendar year for which data are available and the accessibility of water supplies to the eligible entity.

(4) **USE OF ALLOCATED FUNDS.**—Funds allocated to an eligible entity under paragraph (3) may be used to pay up to 50 percent of the cost of establishing and carrying out an incentive program.

(5) **FIXTURE RECYCLING.**—Eligible entities are encouraged to promote or implement fixture recycling programs to manage the disposal of older fixtures replaced due to the incentive program under this subsection.

(6) **ISSUANCE OF INCENTIVES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Financial incentives may be provided to residential consumers that meet the requirements of the applicable incentive program.

(B) **MANNER OF ISSUANCE.**—An eligible entity may—

(i) issue all financial incentives directly to residential consumers; or

(ii) with approval of the Administrator, delegate all or part of financial incentive administration to other organizations, including local governments, municipal water authorities, water utilities, and nonprofit organizations.

(C) AMOUNT.—The amount of a financial incentive shall be determined by the eligible entity, taking into consideration—

(i) the amount of any Federal or State tax incentive available for the purchase of the residential water-efficient product or service;

(ii) the amount necessary to change consumer behavior to purchase water-efficient products and services; and

(iii) the consumer expenditures for onsite preparation, assembly, and original installation of the product.

(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this section—

(A) \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2013;

(B) \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

(C) \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2015;

(D) \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 2016;

(E) \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2017; and

(F) for each subsequent fiscal year, the applicable amount for the preceding fiscal year, as adjusted to reflect changes for the 12-month period ending the preceding November 30 in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

(e) BLUE BANK FOR WATER SYSTEM MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ABRUPT CLIMATE CHANGE.—The term “abrupt climate change” means a large-scale change in the climate system that—

(i) takes place over a few decades or less;

(ii) persists (or is anticipated to persist) for at least a few decades; and

(iii) causes substantial disruptions in human and natural systems.

(B) OWNER OR OPERATOR.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term “owner or operator” means a person (including a regional, State, local, municipal, or private entity) that owns or operates a water system.

(ii) INCLUSION.—The term “owner or operator” includes a non-Federal entity that has operational responsibilities for a federally owned water system.

(C) WATER SYSTEM.—The term “water system” means—

(i) a community water system (as defined in section 1401 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f));

(ii) a publicly owned treatment works (as defined in section 212 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1292)), including a municipal separate storm sewer system;

(iii) a decentralized wastewater treatment system for domestic sewage;

(iv) a groundwater storage and replenishment system; or

(v) a system for transport and delivery of water for irrigation or conservation.

(2) GRANTS.—Beginning in fiscal year 2010, the Administrator shall make grants to owners or operators of water systems to address any ongoing or forecasted (based on the best available research and data) climate-related impact on the water quality or quantity of a region of the United States, for the purposes of mitigating or adapting to the impacts of climate change.

(3) ELIGIBLE USES.—In carrying out this subsection, the Administrator shall make grants to assist in the planning, design, construction, implementation, or maintenance

of any program or project to increase the resiliency of a water system to climate change by—

(A) conserving water or enhancing water use efficiency, including through the use of water metering to measure the effectiveness of a water efficiency program;

(B) modifying or relocating existing water system infrastructure made or projected to be made inoperable by climate change impacts;

(C) preserving or improving water quality, including through measures to manage, reduce, treat, or reuse municipal stormwater, wastewater, or drinking water;

(D) investigating, designing, or constructing groundwater remediation, recycled water, or desalination facilities or systems;

(E) enhancing water management by increasing watershed preservation and protection, such as through the use of natural or engineered green infrastructure in the management, conveyance, or treatment of water, wastewater, or stormwater;

(F) enhancing energy efficiency or the use and generation of renewable energy in the management, conveyance, or treatment of water, wastewater, or stormwater;

(G) supporting the adoption and use of advanced water treatment, water supply management (such as reservoir reoperation), or water demand management technologies, projects, or processes (such as water reuse and recycling or adaptive conservation pricing) that maintain or increase water supply or improve water quality;

(H) modifying or replacing existing systems or constructing new systems for existing communities or land currently in agricultural production to improve water availability, storage, or conveyance in a manner that—

(i) promotes more efficient use of available water supplies; and

(ii) does not further exacerbate stresses on ecosystems;

(I) supporting practices and projects, such as improved irrigation systems, water banking and other forms of water transactions, groundwater recharge, stormwater capture, and reuse or recycling of drainage water, to improve water quality or promote more efficient water use, including on land currently in agricultural production;

(J) conducting and completing studies or assessments to project how climate change may impact the future operations and sustainability of water systems; or

(K) developing and implementing mitigation measures to rapidly address impacts on water systems most susceptible to abrupt climate change, including those in the Colorado River Basin and coastal regions at risk from rising sea levels.

(4) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant from the Administrator under paragraph (2), the owner or operator of a water system shall submit to the Administrator an application that—

(A) includes a proposal of the program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement to be planned, designed, constructed, implemented, or maintained by the water system;

(B) cites the best available research or data that demonstrates—

(i) the risk to the water resources or infrastructure of the water system as a result of ongoing or forecasted changes to the hydrological system brought about by factors arising from climate change, including rising sea levels and changes in precipitation levels; and

(ii) how the proposed program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement would perform under the anticipated climate conditions;

(C) explains how the proposed program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement is expected to enhance the resiliency of the water system, including source water protection for community water systems, to these risks or reduce the direct or indirect greenhouse gas emissions of the water system; and

(D) demonstrates that the program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement is—

(i) consistent with any approved State and tribal climate adaptation plan; and

(ii) not inconsistent with any approved natural resources plan.

(5) COMPETITIVE PROCESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each calendar year, the Administrator shall conduct a competitive process to select and fund applications under this subsection.

(B) PRIORITY REQUIREMENTS AND WEIGHTING.—In carrying out the process, the Administrator shall—

(i) prioritize funding of applications that are submitted by the owners or operators of water systems that are, based on the best available research and data, at the greatest and most immediate risk of facing significant climate-related negative impacts on water quality or quantity;

(ii) in selecting among the priority applications determined under clause (i), ensure that the final list of applications funded for each year includes a substantial number that, to the maximum extent practicable, includes each eligible use described in paragraph (3);

(iii) solicit applications from water systems that are—

(I) located in all regions of the United States; and

(II) facing varying risks as a result of climate change; and

(iv) provide for solicitation and consideration of public input in the development of criteria used in evaluating applications.

(6) COST SHARING.—

(A) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of any program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement that is the subject of a grant awarded by the Administrator to a water system under paragraph (2) shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the program, strategy, and infrastructure improvement.

(B) CALCULATION OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—In calculating the non-Federal share of the cost of a program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement proposed by a water system through an application submitted by the water system under paragraph (4), the Administrator shall—

(i) include the value of any in-kind services that are integral to the completion of the program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement, as determined by the Administrator; and

(ii) not include any other amount that the water system receives from a Federal agency.

(7) LABOR STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—All laborers and mechanics employed on infrastructure improvements funded directly by or assisted in whole or in part by this subsection shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing for the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with subchapter IV of chapter 31 of part A of subtitle II of title 40, United States Code.

(B) AUTHORITY AND FUNCTIONS.—With respect to the labor standards in this paragraph, the Secretary of Labor shall have the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (64 Stat.

1267; 5 U.S.C. App.) and section 3145 of title 40, United States Code.

(8) REGULATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall promulgate final regulations to carry out this subsection.

(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF TREATMENT WORKS.—In carrying out this paragraph, the Administrator shall incorporate all relevant and appropriate requirements of title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.) applicable to the construction of treatment works that are carried out under this subsection.

(9) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 3 years thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress a report on progress in implementing this subsection, including information on project applications received and funded annually.

(10) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection such sums as are necessary.

SA 1906. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . HOLDING SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN ESCROW UPON FAILURE TO MEET DEBT OBLIGATIONS.

(a) HOLDING SALARIES IN ESCROW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Federal Government is unable to make payments or meet obligations because the public debt limit under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, has been reached, during the period described in paragraph (2) the payroll administrator of each House of Congress shall deposit in an escrow account all payments otherwise required to be made during such period for the compensation of Members of Congress who serve in that House of Congress, and shall release such payments to such Members only upon the expiration of such period.

(2) PERIOD DESCRIBED.—The period described in this paragraph is the period beginning on the date on which the Federal Government is unable to make payments or meet obligations because the public debt limit under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, has been reached, and ending on the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the Senate and the House of Representatives present a bill to the President under article I, section 7 of the Constitution of the United States, to increase the public debt limit under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code; or

(B) the last day of the One Hundred Thirtieth Congress.

(3) WITHHOLDING AND REMITTANCE OF AMOUNTS FROM PAYMENTS HELD IN ESCROW.—The payroll administrator of each House of Congress shall provide for the same withholding and remittance with respect to a payment deposited in an escrow account under paragraph (1) that would apply to the payment if the payment were not subject to paragraph (1).

(4) RELEASE OF AMOUNTS AT END OF CONGRESS.—In order to ensure that this section is carried out in a manner that shall not vary the compensation of Senators or Rep-

resentatives in violation of the 27th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the payroll administrator of a House of Congress shall release for payments to Members of that House of Congress any amounts remaining in any escrow account under this section on the last day of the One Hundred Thirtieth Congress.

(5) ROLE OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall provide the payroll administrators of the Houses of Congress with such assistance as may be necessary to enable the payroll administrators to carry out this section.

(b) TREATMENT OF DELEGATES AS MEMBERS.—In this section, the term “Member” includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress.

(c) PAYROLL ADMINISTRATOR DEFINED.—In this section, the term “payroll administrator” of a House of Congress means—

(1) in the case of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate, or an employee of the Office of the Secretary of the Senate who is designated by the Secretary to carry out this section; and

(2) in the case of the House of Representatives, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, or an employee of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer who is designated by the Chief Administrative Officer to carry out this section.

SA 1907. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 44, after line 23, add the following
Subtitle E—Financing Energy Efficient Manufacturing Program

SEC. 241. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to encourage widespread deployment of energy efficiency and onsite renewable energy technologies in manufacturing and industrial facilities throughout the United States through the establishment of a Financing Energy Efficient Manufacturing Program that would—

(1) encourage the widespread availability of financial products and programs with attractive rates and terms that significantly reduce or eliminate upfront expenses to allow manufacturing and industrial businesses to invest in energy efficiency measures, onsite clean and renewable energy systems, smart grid systems, and alternative vehicle fleets by providing credit support, credit enhancement, secondary markets, and other support to originators of the financial products and sponsors of the financing programs; and

(2) help building owners to invest in measures and systems that reduce energy costs, in many cases creating a net cost savings that can be realized in the short-term, and may also allow manufacturing and industrial businesses owners to defer capital expenditures, save money to hire new workers, and increase the value, comfort, and sustainability of the property of the owners.

SEC. 242. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) COVERED PROGRAM.—The term “covered program” means a program to finance energy efficiency retrofit, onsite clean and renewable energy, smart grid, and alternative vehicle fleet projects for industrial businesses.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

(3) STATE.—The term “State” means—

(A) a State;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(D) any other territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 243. FINANCING ENERGY EFFICIENT MANUFACTURING PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a program, to be known as the “Financing Energy Efficient Manufacturing Program”, under which the Secretary shall provide grants to States to establish or expand covered programs.

(b) APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State may apply to the Secretary for a grant under subsection (a) to establish or expand covered programs.

(2) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate applications submitted by States under paragraph (1) on the basis of—

(A) the likelihood that the covered program would—

(i) be established or expanded; and

(ii) increase the total investment and energy savings of retrofit projects to be supported;

(B) in the case of industrial business efficiency financing initiatives conducted under subsection (c), evidence of multistate cooperation and coordination with lenders, financiers, and owners; and

(C) other factors that would advance the purposes of this subtitle, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) MULTISTATE FACILITATION.—The Secretary shall consult with States and relevant stakeholders with applicable expertise to establish a process to identify financing opportunities for manufacturing and industrial business with asset portfolios across multiple States.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—A State receiving a grant under subsection (a) shall give a higher priority to covered programs that—

(1) leverage private and non-Federal sources of funding; and

(2) aim explicitly to expand the use of energy efficiency project financing using private sources of funding.

(e) DAVIS-BACON COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All laborers and mechanics employed on projects funded directly by or assisted in whole or in part by this subtitle shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on projects of a character similar in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with subchapter IV of chapter 31 of part A of subtitle II of title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the “Davis-Bacon Act”).

(2) AUTHORITY.—With respect to the labor standards specified in this subsection, the Secretary of Labor shall have the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. App.) and section 3145 of title 40, United States Code.

(f) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of receipt of a grant under this subtitle, a State shall submit to the Secretary, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that describes the performance of covered programs carried out using the grant funds.

(2) DATA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A State receiving a grant under this subtitle, in cooperation with the Secretary, shall—

(i) collect and share data resulting from covered programs carried out under this subtitle; and

(ii) include in the report submitted under paragraph (1) any data collected under clause (i).

(B) DEPARTMENT DATABASES.—The Secretary shall incorporate data described in subparagraph (A) into appropriate databases of the Department of Energy, with provisions for the protection of confidential business data.

SEC. 244. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle \$250,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(b) STATE ENERGY OFFICES.—Funds provided to a State under this subtitle shall be provided to the office within the State that is responsible for developing the State energy plan for the State under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.).

SA 1908. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4 _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) safe and responsible production, transportation, and use of oil and petroleum products provide the foundation of the energy economy of the United States, helping to secure and advance the economic prosperity, national security, and overall quality of life in the United States;

(2) the Keystone XL pipeline would provide short- and long-term employment opportunities and related labor income benefits, such as government revenues associated with taxes;

(3) the State of Nebraska has thoroughly reviewed and approved the proposed Keystone XL pipeline reroute, concluding that the concerns of Nebraskans have had a major influence on the pipeline reroute and that the reroute will have minimal environmental impacts;

(4) the Department of State and other Federal agencies have conducted extensive studies and analysis over a long period of time on the technical, environmental, social, and economic impact of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline;

(5) assessments by the Department of State found that the Keystone XL pipeline is “not likely to impact the amount of crude oil produced from the oil sands” and that “approval or denial of the proposed Project is unlikely to have a substantial impact on the rate of development in the oil sands”;

(6) the Department of State found that the incremental life cycle greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Keystone XL project are estimated in the range of 0.07 to 0.83 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents, with the upper end of this range representing 1,000 of 1 percent of the 6,702,000,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide emitted in the United States in 2011;

(7) after extensive evaluation of potential impact to land and water resources along the

875-mile proposed route of the Keystone XL pipeline, the Department of State found, “The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that there would be no significant impacts to most resources along the proposed Project route (assuming Keystone complies with all laws and required conditions and measures).”;

(8) the Department of State found that “[s]pills associated with the proposed Project that enter the environment are expected to be rare and relatively small” and that “there is no evidence of increased corrosion or other pipeline threat due to viscosity” of diluted bitumen oil that will be transported by the Keystone XL pipeline;

(9) the National Research Council convened a special expert panel to review the risk of transporting diluted bitumen by pipeline and issued a report in June 2013 to the Department of Transportation in which the National Research Council found that existing literature indicates that transportation of diluted bitumen poses no increased risk of pipeline failure;

(10) plans to incorporate 57 project-specific special conditions relating to the design, construction, and operations of the Keystone XL pipeline led the Department of State to find that the pipeline will have “a degree of safety over any other typically constructed domestic oil pipeline”;

(11) the Department of State found that oil destined to be shipped through the pipeline from the oil sands region of Canada and oil shale deposits in the United States would otherwise move by other modes of transportation if the Keystone XL pipeline is not built.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) construction of the Keystone XL pipeline will promote sound investment in the infrastructure of the United States;

(2) construction of the Keystone XL pipeline will promote energy security in North America and will generate an increase in private sector jobs that will benefit both the region surrounding the Keystone XL pipeline and the United States as a whole; and

(3) completion of the Keystone XL pipeline is in the national interest of the United States.

SA 1909. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 404. REGULATION OF OIL OR NATURAL GAS DEVELOPMENT ON FEDERAL LAND IN STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Mineral Leasing Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 44 (30 U.S.C. 181 note) as section 45; and

(2) by inserting after section 43 (30 U.S.C. 226-3) the following:

“SEC. 44. REGULATION OF OIL OR NATURAL GAS DEVELOPMENT ON FEDERAL LAND IN STATES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior shall not issue or promulgate any guideline or regulation relating to oil or gas exploration or production on Federal land in a State if the State has otherwise met the requirements under this Act or any other applicable Federal law.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may issue or promulgate guidelines and regulations relating to oil or gas exploration or production on Federal land in a State if the Secretary of the Interior determines that as a result of the oil or gas exploration or production there is an imminent and substantial danger to the public health or environment.”.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Part E of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following: “SEC. 1459. REGULATIONS.

“(a) COMMENTS RELATING TO OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION AND PRODUCTION.—Before issuing or promulgating any guideline or regulation relating to oil and gas exploration and production on Federal, State, tribal, or fee land pursuant to this Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), the Act entitled ‘An Act to regulate the leasing of certain Indian lands for mining purposes’, approved May 11, 1938 (commonly known as the ‘Indian Mineral Leasing Act of 1938’) (25 U.S.C. 396a et seq.), the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), or any other provision of law or Executive order, the head of a Federal department or agency shall seek comments from and consult with the head of each affected State, State agency, and Indian tribe at a location within the jurisdiction of the State or Indian tribe, as applicable.

“(b) STATEMENT OF ENERGY AND ECONOMIC IMPACT.—Each Federal department or agency described in subsection (a) shall develop a Statement of Energy and Economic Impact, which shall consist of a detailed statement and analysis supported by credible objective evidence relating to—

“(1) any adverse effects on energy supply, distribution, or use, including a shortfall in supply, price increases, and increased use of foreign supplies; and

“(2) any impact on the domestic economy if the action is taken, including the loss of jobs and decrease of revenue to each of the general and educational funds of the State or affected Indian tribe.

“(c) REGULATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A Federal department or agency shall not impose any new or modified regulation unless the head of the applicable Federal department or agency determines—

“(A) that the rule is necessary to prevent imminent substantial danger to the public health or the environment; and

“(B) by clear and convincing evidence, that the State or Indian tribe does not have an existing reasonable alternative to the proposed regulation.

“(2) DISCLOSURE.—Any Federal regulation promulgated on or after the date of enactment of this paragraph that requires disclosure of hydraulic fracturing chemicals shall refer to the database managed by the Ground Water Protection Council and the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

“(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any regulation described in this section, a State or Indian tribe adversely affected by an action carried out under the regulation shall be entitled to review by a United States district court located in the State or the District of Columbia of compliance by the applicable Federal department or agency with the requirements of this section.

“(2) ACTION BY COURT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A district court providing review under this subsection may enjoin or mandate any action by a relevant Federal department or agency until the district court determines that the department

or agency has complied with the requirements of this section.

“(B) DAMAGES.—The court shall not order money damages.

“(3) SCOPE AND STANDARD OF REVIEW.—In reviewing a regulation under this subsection—

“(A) the court shall not consider any evidence outside of the record that was before the agency; and

“(B) the standard of review shall be *de novo*.”.

SA 1910. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4. ELECTRIC GENERATING UNIT COMPLIANCE DELAY FOR CERTAIN EPA RULES.

(a) DEFINITION OF COAL REFUSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term “coal refuse” means any waste coal, rock, shale, slurry, culm, gob, boney, slate, clay and related materials, associated with or near a coal seam, that are—

(A) brought aboveground or otherwise removed from a coal mine in the process of mining coal; or

(B) separated from coal during cleaning or preparation operations.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The term “coal refuse” includes underground development waste, coal processing waste, and excess spoil.

(b) COMPLIANCE DELAY.—An electric generating unit that uses coal refuse as the primary feedstock of the electric generating unit shall be exempt from the rule of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units and Standards of Performance for Fossil-Fuel-Fired Electric Utility, Industrial-Commercial-Institutional, and Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units” (77 Fed. Reg. 9304 (February 16, 2012)) until December 31, 2017.

SA 1911. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 47, strike line 17 and all that follows through page 48, line 2, and insert the following:

SEC. 4. CONSUMER ACCESS TO ELECTRIC ENERGY INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall encourage and support the adoption of policies that allow electricity consumers access to their own electricity data.

(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR STATE ENERGY PLANS.—Section 362(d) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (16), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (18); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:

“(17) programs—

“(A) to enhance consumer access to and understanding of energy usage and price information, including consumers’ own residential and commercial electricity information; and

“(B) to allow for the development and adoption of innovative products and services to assist consumers in managing energy consumption and expenditures; and”.

(c) VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES FOR ELECTRIC CONSUMER ACCESS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) RETAIL ELECTRIC ENERGY INFORMATION.—The term “retail electric energy information” means—

(i) the electric energy consumption of an electric consumer over a defined time period;

(ii) the retail electric energy prices or rates applied to the electricity usage for the defined time period described in clause (i) for the electric consumer;

(iii) the estimated cost of service by the consumer, including (if smart meter usage information is available) the estimated cost of service since the last billing cycle of the consumer; and

(iv) in the case of nonresidential electric meters, any other electrical information that the meter is programmed to record (such as demand measured in kilowatts, voltage, frequency, current, and power factor).

(B) SMART METER.—The term “smart meter” means the device used by an electric utility that—

(i) measures electric energy consumption by an electric consumer at the home or facility of the electric consumer in intervals of 1 hour or less; and

(II) is capable of sending electric energy usage information through a communications network to the electric utility; or

(ii) meets the guidelines issued under paragraph (2).

(2) VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES FOR ELECTRIC CONSUMER ACCESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall issue voluntary guidelines that establish model standards for implementation of retail electric energy information access in States.

(B) CONSULTATION.—Before issuing the voluntary guidelines, the Secretary shall—

(i) consult with—

(I) State and local regulatory authorities, including the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners;

(II) other appropriate Federal agencies, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

(III) consumer and privacy advocacy groups;

(IV) utilities;

(V) the National Association of State Energy Officials; and

(VI) other appropriate entities; and

(ii) provide notice and opportunity for comment.

(C) STATE AND LOCAL REGULATORY ACTION.—In issuing the voluntary guidelines, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be guided by actions taken by State and local regulatory authorities to ensure electric consumer access to retail electric energy information, including actions taken after consideration of the standard established under section 111(d)(17) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2621(d)(17)).

(D) CONTENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The voluntary guidelines shall provide guidance on issues necessary to carry out this subsection, including—

(I) the timeliness and specificity of retail electric energy information;

(II) appropriate nationally recognized open standards for data; and

(III) protection of data security and electric consumer privacy, including consumer consent requirements.

(ii) INCLUSIONS.—The voluntary guidelines shall include guidance that—

(I) retail electric energy information should be made available to electric consumers (and third party designees of the electric consumers) in the United States—

(aa) in an electronic machine readable form, without additional charge, in conformity with nationally recognized open standards developed by a nationally recognized standards organization;

(bb) as timely as is reasonably practicable;

(cc) at the level of specificity that the data is transmitted by the meter or as is reasonably practicable; and

(dd) in a manner that provides adequate protections for the security of the information and the privacy of the electric consumer;

(II) in the case of an electric consumer that is served by a smart meter that can also communicate energy usage information to a device or network of an electric consumer or a device or network of a third party authorized by the consumer, the feasibility should be considered of providing to the consumer or third party designee, at a minimum, access to usage information (not including price information) of the consumer directly from the smart meter;

(III) retail electric energy information should be provided by the electric utility of the consumer or such other entity as may be designated by the applicable electric retail regulatory authority;

(IV) retail electric energy information of the consumer should be made available to the consumer through the website of the electric utility or other electronic access authorized by the electric consumer, for a period of at least 13 months after the date on which the usage occurred;

(V) consumer access to data should not interfere with or compromise the integrity, security, or privacy of the operations of a utility and the electric consumer;

(VI) electric energy information relating to usage information generated by devices in or on the property of the consumer that is transmitted to the electric utility should be made available to the electric consumer or the third party designee of the electric consumer; and

(VII) the same privacy and security requirements applicable to the contracting utility should apply to third parties contracting with a utility to process the customer data of that utility.

(E) REVISIONS.—The Secretary shall periodically review and, as necessary, revise the voluntary guidelines to reflect changes in technology, privacy needs, and the market for electric energy and services.

(d) VERIFICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State may submit to the Secretary a description of the data sharing policies of the State relating to consumer access to electric energy information for certification by the Secretary that the policies meet the voluntary guidelines issued under subsection (c)(2).

(2) ASSISTANCE.—Subject to the availability of funds under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall make Federal amounts available to any State that has data sharing policies described in paragraph (1) that the Secretary certifies meets the voluntary guidelines issued under subsection (c)(2) to assist the State in implementing section 362(d)(17) of

the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322(d)(17)).

(3) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 4 . . . OFFSET.

Section 422(f) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17082(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) \$200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014;

“(5) \$145,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(6) \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018.”.

SA 1912. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

Subtitle C—School Buildings

SEC. 121. COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.

(a) **DEFINITION OF SCHOOL.**—In this section, the term “school” means—

(1) an elementary school or secondary school (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801));

(2) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a));

(3) a school of the defense dependents' education system under the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.) or established under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code;

(4) a school operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(5) a tribally controlled school (as defined in section 5212 of the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2511)); and

(6) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b))).

(b) **DESIGNATION OF LEAD AGENCY.**—The Secretary, acting through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall act as the lead Federal agency for coordinating and disseminating information on existing Federal programs and assistance that may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools.

(c) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In carrying out coordination and outreach under subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) in consultation and coordination with the appropriate Federal agencies, carry out a review of existing programs and financing mechanisms (including revolving loan funds and loan guarantees) available in or from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, the Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate Federal agencies with jurisdiction over energy financing and facilitation that are currently used or may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools;

(2) establish a Federal cross-departmental collaborative coordination, education, and outreach effort to streamline communication and promote available Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1), for energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects that enables States, local educational agencies, and schools—

(A) to use existing Federal opportunities more effectively; and

(B) to form partnerships with Governors, State energy programs, local educational, financial, and energy officials, State and local government officials, nonprofit organizations, and other appropriate entities, to support the initiation of the projects;

(3) provide technical assistance for States, local educational agencies, and schools to help develop and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects—

(A) to increase the energy efficiency of buildings or facilities;

(B) to install systems that individually generate energy from renewable energy resources;

(C) to establish partnerships to leverage economies of scale and additional financing mechanisms available to larger clean energy initiatives; or

(D) to promote—

(i) the maintenance of health, environmental quality, and safety in schools, including the ambient air quality, through energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofit projects; and

(ii) the achievement of expected energy savings and renewable energy production through proper operations and maintenance practices;

(4) develop and maintain a single online resource Web site with contact information for relevant technical assistance and support staff in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for States, local educational agencies, and schools to effectively access and use Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1) to develop energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

(5) establish a process for recognition of schools that—

(A) have successfully implemented energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

(B) are willing to serve as resources for other local educational agencies and schools to assist initiation of similar efforts.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the implementation of this section.

SA 1913. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 9, strike lines 18 through 23.

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 4 . . . ELIMINATION OF REGULATION OF PLUMBING SUPPLIES.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—Section 2 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a period;

(3) by striking paragraph (8); and

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (7) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 321 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6291) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or, with respect to showerheads, faucets, water closets, and urinals, water”; and

(B) in the matter following paragraph (1), by striking “incandescent reflector lamps, showerheads, faucets, water closets, and urinals” and inserting “and incandescent reflector lamps”;;

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “, or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, and urinals, water use,”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(15), (16), (17),”; and

(C) in the matter following subparagraph (B), by striking “325(r)” and inserting “325(p)”;

(3) in paragraph (7), by striking “, and in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, and urinals, the aggregate retail cost of water and wastewater treatment services likely to be incurred annually,”; and

(4) by striking paragraph (31) and inserting the following:

“(31) **ANSI.**—The term ‘ANSI’ means the American National Standards Institute.”.

(c) **COVERAGE.**—Section 322(a) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6292(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (15) through (18); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (19) and (20) as paragraphs (15) and (16), respectively.

(d) **TEST PROCEDURES.**—Section 323 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6293) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “water use (in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, and urinals),”;;

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the first sentence—

(I) by striking “or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, or urinals, water use”; and

(II) by striking “, or in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, or urinals, representative average unit costs of water and wastewater treatment service resulting from the operation of such products during such cycle”; and

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking “, water, and wastewater treatment”; and

(C) by striking paragraphs (7) and (8);

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, and urinals, water use” each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2); and

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “, measured energy use, or measured water use” and inserting “or measured energy use”; and

(B) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by striking “, energy use, or water use” each place it appears and inserting “or energy use”.

(e) **LABELING.**—Section 324 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F); and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (G) through (I) as subparagraphs (E) through (G), respectively;

(B) in subsections (a)(3), by striking “(19)” and inserting “(15)”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “paragraphs (15) through” and inserting “paragraph”; and

(B) in paragraphs (3) and (5), by striking “(19)” and inserting “(15)”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (7), by striking “(13), (14), (15), (16), (17), and (18)” and inserting “(13) and (14)”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (8).

(f) **ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS.**—Section 325 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (j) and (k);

(2) in subsection (l), by striking “(19)” each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting “(15)”; and

(3) in subsection (o)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, or urinals, water use,”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “, or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, or urinals, water efficiency,”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (i)—

(aa) in subclause (III), by striking “, or as applicable, water,”; and

(bb) in subclause (VI), by striking “and water”; and

(II) in clause (iii), by striking “, and as applicable, water,”; and

(C) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, or urinals, water, or”.

(g) **REQUIREMENTS OF MANUFACTURERS.**—Section 326 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6296) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(4), by striking “or water use”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “, energy use, or, in the case of showerheads, faucets, water closets, and urinals, water use” and inserting “or energy use”.

(h) **EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.**—Section 327 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6297) is amended—

(1) by striking “, energy efficiency, or water use” each place it appears in subsections (a)(1)(B) and (d)(1)(A), and inserting “or energy efficiency”;

(2) by striking “, energy use, or water use” each place it appears in subsection (b) and subsection (c), and inserting “or energy use”;

(3) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “or water use”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “, water use,”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **DEFINITION OF STATE REGULATION.**—In this section, the term ‘State regulation’ means a law, regulation, or other requirement of a State or the political subdivisions of a State.”;

(4) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “flow rate requirements for showerheads or faucets, or water use requirements for water closets or urinals,”;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “, or is a regulation (or portion thereof) regulating showerheads” and all that follows through “325(k) is applicable”;

(C) in paragraph (5), by inserting “or” after the semicolon at the end;

(D) in paragraph (6), by striking “; or” at the end and inserting a period; and

(E) by striking paragraph (7);

(5) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 325(j)(3), and subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 325(k)(3)”;

(B) by striking paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7); and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(6) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “or river basin commission” each place it appears;

(ii) in subparagraphs (B) and (C), by striking “or water” each place it appears; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C), in the undesignated matter following clause (ii), by striking “, and, with respect to a State” and all that follows through “water supply development”; and

(B) in paragraph (5)(B)(i)—

(i) by striking “or, if the State” and all that follows through “emergency condition,”;

(ii) in subclause (I), by striking “or, in the case of a water emergency condition, water or wastewater treatment,”; and

(iii) in subclause (II), by striking “or, in the case of a water emergency condition, by the importation of water,”.

(i) **CONSUMER EDUCATION.**—Section 337 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6307) is amended by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 4. PROHIBITED ACTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 332 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6302) is repealed.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Section 325(i)(2) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(i)(2)) is amended by striking “Notwithstanding section 332(a)(5) and section 332(b), it” and inserting “It”.

(2) Sections 331, 333, 334, and 335 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6301, 6303, 6304, 6305) are repealed.

(3) Section 345(a)(4) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6316(a)(4)) is amended by striking “(other than in section 333(c))”.

(4) Section 346 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6317) is amended by striking subsection (f).

SEC. 4. VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any model building code or standard, appliance efficiency standard, or corporate average fuel economy standard established under Federal law shall not be binding on a State, local government, Indian tribe, or individual, as a matter of Federal law.

SA 1914. Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4. REGULATIONS PROMULGATED UNDER THE CLEAN AIR ACT REGULATING CARBON DIOXIDE EMISSIONS FROM INDUSTRIAL SOURCE CATEGORIES.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) **COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “commercially available” means any technology with prov-

en test results for commercial use in an industrial source category application.

(B) **EXCLUSION.**—The term “commercially available” does not include a combination of technology from different industrial source applications if the technology has not been proven in combination at a single industrial source category application.

(3) **INDUSTRIAL SOURCE CATEGORY.**—The term “industrial source category” includes—

(A) an electric generating unit;

(B) a petroleum refinery;

(C) a petrochemical production facility;

(D) an industrial boiler;

(E) a cement kiln;

(F) a metal smelter;

(G) a chemical plant;

(H) a lime manufacturing facility;

(I) a pulp or paper mill;

(J) an ammonia manufacturing facility;

(K) a waste combustor;

(L) an aluminum production facility;

(M) a ferroalloy production facility; and

(N) an electronics manufacturing facility.

(b) **REGULATIONS.**—If the Administrator promulgates a regulation under section 111(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(b)) regulating carbon dioxide emissions from an industrial source category, the Administrator shall promulgate the regulation using emissions rates based on efficiencies achievable by the best demonstrated technology—

(1) subcategorized by fuel type; and

(2) that is commercially available.

SA 1915. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 47, strike line 17 and all that follows through page 48, line 2, and insert the following:

SEC. 4. STATE RESIDENTIAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY UPGRADES LOAN PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **LOANS FOR RESIDENTIAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY UPGRADES.**—Part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 367. LOANS FOR RESIDENTIAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY UPGRADES.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **CONSUMER-FRIENDLY.**—The term ‘consumer-friendly’, with respect to a loan repayment approach, means a loan repayment approach that—

“(A) emphasizes convenience for customers;

“(B) is of low cost to consumers; and

“(C) emphasizes simplicity and ease of use for consumers in the billing process.

“(2) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) a State or territory of the United States; and

“(B) an Indian tribal government.

“(3) **ENERGY ADVISOR PROGRAM.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘energy advisor program’ means any program to provide to owners or residents of residential buildings advice, information, and support in the identification, prioritization, and implementation of energy efficiency and energy savings measures.

“(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘energy advisor program’ includes a program that provides—

“(i) interpretation of energy audit reports;

“(ii) assistance in the prioritization of improvements;

“(iii) assistance in finding qualified contractors;

“(iv) assistance in contractor bid reviews;

“(v) education on energy conservation and energy efficiency;

“(vi) explanations of available incentives and tax credits;

“(vii) assistance in completion of rebate and incentive paperwork; and

“(viii) any other similar type of support.

“(4) **ENERGY EFFICIENCY.**—The term ‘energy efficiency’ means a decrease in homeowner or residential tenant consumption of energy (including electricity and thermal energy) that is achieved without reducing the quality of energy services through—

“(A) a measure or program that targets customer behavior;

“(B) equipment;

“(C) a device; or

“(D) other material.

“(5) **ENERGY EFFICIENCY UPGRADE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘energy efficiency upgrade’ means any project or activity—

“(i) the primary purpose of which is increasing energy efficiency; and

“(ii) that is carried out on a residential building.

“(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘energy efficiency upgrade’ includes the installation or improvement of a renewable energy facility for heating or electricity generation serving a residential building carried out in conjunction with an energy efficiency project or activity.

“(6) **RESIDENTIAL BUILDING.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘residential building’ means a building used for residential purposes.

“(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘residential building’ includes—

“(i) a single-family residence;

“(ii) a multifamily residence composed not more than 4 units; and

“(iii) a mixed-use building that includes not more than 4 residential units.

“(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a program under this part under which the Secretary shall make available to eligible entities loans for the purpose of establishing or expanding programs that provide to residential property owners or tenants financing for energy efficiency upgrades of residential buildings.

“(2) **CONSULTATION.**—In establishing the program under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, with stakeholders and the public.

“(3) **NO REQUIREMENT TO PARTICIPATE.**—No eligible entity shall be required to participate in any manner in the program established under paragraph (1).

“(4) **DEADLINES.**—The Secretary shall—

“(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, implement the program established under paragraph (1) (including soliciting applications from eligible entities in accordance with subsection (c)); and

“(B) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, disburse the initial loans provided under this section.

“(c) **APPLICATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To be eligible to receive a loan under this section, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and con-

taining such information as the Secretary may require.

“(2) **SELECTION DATE.**—Not later than 21 months after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, the Secretary shall select eligible entities to receive the initial loans provided under this section, in accordance with the requirements described in paragraph (3).

“(3) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In selecting eligible entities to receive loans under this section, the Secretary shall—

“(A) to the maximum extent practicable, ensure—

“(i) that both innovative and established approaches to the challenges of financing energy efficiency upgrades are supported;

“(ii) that energy efficiency upgrades are conducted and validated to comply with best practices for work quality, as determined by the Secretary;

“(iii) regional diversity among recipients, including participation by rural States and small States;

“(iv) significant participation by families with income levels at or below the median income level for the applicable geographical region, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(v) the incorporation by recipients of an energy advisor program;

“(B) evaluate applications based primarily on—

“(i) the projected reduction in energy use, as determined in accordance with such specific and commonly available methodology as the Secretary shall establish, by regulation;

“(ii) the creditworthiness of the eligible entity; and

“(iii) the incorporation of measures for making the loan repayment system for recipients of financing as consumer-friendly as practicable;

“(C) evaluate applications based secondarily on—

“(i) the extent to which the proposed financing program of the eligible entity incorporates best practices for such a program, as determined by the Secretary;

“(ii) whether the eligible entity has created a plan for evaluating the effectiveness of the proposed financing program and whether the plan includes—

“(I) a robust strategy for collecting, managing, and analyzing data, as well as making the data available to the public; and

“(II) experimental studies, which may include investigations of how human behavior impacts the effectiveness of efficiency improvements;

“(iii) the extent to which Federal funds are matched by funding from State, local, philanthropic, private sector, and other sources;

“(iv) the extent to which the proposed financing program will be coordinated and marketed with other existing or planned energy efficiency or energy conservation programs administered by—

“(I) utilities;

“(II) State, tribal, territorial, or local governments; or

“(III) community development financial institutions; and

“(v) such other factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate; and

“(D) not provide an advantage or disadvantage to applications that include renewable energy in the program.

“(d) **ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.**—

“(1) **TERM.**—The Secretary shall establish terms for loans provided to eligible entities under this section—

“(A) in a manner that—

“(i) provides for a high degree of cost recovery; and

“(ii) ensures that, with respect to all loans provided to or by eligible entities under this section, the loans are competitive with, or superior to, other forms of financing for similar purposes; and

“(B) subject to the condition that the term of a loan provided to an eligible entity under this section shall not exceed 35 years.

“(2) **INTEREST RATES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary, at the discretion of the Secretary, shall charge interest on a loan provided to an eligible entity under this section at a fixed rate equal, or approximately equal, to the interest rate charged on Treasury securities of comparable maturity.

“(B) **LEVERAGED LOANS.**—The interest rate and other terms of the loans provided to eligible entities under this section shall be established in a manner that ensures that the total amount of the loans is equal to not less than 20 times, and not more than 50 times, the amount appropriated for credit subsidy costs pursuant to subsection (h)(i).

“(3) **NO PENALTY ON EARLY REPAYMENT.**—The Secretary shall not assess any penalty for early repayment by an eligible entity of a loan provided under this section.

“(4) **RETURN OF UNUSED PORTION.**—As a condition of receipt of a loan under this section, an eligible entity shall agree to return to the general fund of the Treasury any portion of the loan amount that is unused by the eligible entity within a reasonable period after the date of receipt of the loan, as determined by the Secretary.

“(e) **USE OF FUNDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An eligible entity shall use a loan provided under this section to establish or expand 1 or more financing programs—

“(A) the purpose of which is to enable residential building owners or tenants to conduct energy efficiency upgrades of residential buildings;

“(B) that may, at the sole discretion of the eligible entity, require an outlay of capital by owners or residents of residential buildings in accordance with the goals of the program under this section; and

“(C) that incorporate a consumer-friendly loan repayment approach.

“(2) **STRUCTURE OF FINANCING PROGRAM.**—A financing program of an eligible entity may—

“(A) consist—

“(i) primarily or entirely of a financing program administered by—

“(I) the applicable State; or

“(II) a local government, utility, or other entity; or

“(ii) of a combination of programs described in clause (i);

“(B) rely on financing provided by—

“(i) the eligible entity; or

“(ii) a third party, acting through the eligible entity; and

“(C) include a provision pursuant to which a recipient of assistance under the financing program shall agree to return to the eligible entity any portion of the assistance that is unused by the recipient within a reasonable period after the date of receipt of the assistance, as determined by the eligible entity.

“(3) **FORM OF ASSISTANCE.**—Assistance from an eligible entity under this subsection may be provided in any form, or in accordance with any program, authorized by Federal law (including regulations), including in the form of—

“(A) a revolving loan fund;

“(B) a credit enhancement structure designed to mitigate the effects of default; or

“(C) a program that—

“(i) adopts any other approach for providing financing for energy efficiency upgrades producing significant energy efficiency gains; and

“(ii) incorporates measures for making the loan repayment system for recipients of financing as consumer-friendly as practicable.

“(4) SCOPE OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided by an eligible entity under this subsection may be used to pay for costs associated with carrying out an energy efficiency upgrade, including materials and labor.

“(5) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—In addition to the amount of the loan provided to an eligible entity by the Secretary under subsection (b), the eligible entity may provide to recipients such assistance under this subsection as the eligible entity considers to be appropriate from any other funds of the eligible entity, including funds provided to the eligible entity by the Secretary for administrative costs pursuant to this section.

“(6) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) INTEREST RATES.—

“(i) INTEREST CHARGED BY ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The interest rate charged by an eligible entity on assistance provided under this subsection—

“(I) shall be fixed; and

“(II) shall not exceed the interest rate paid by the eligible entity to the Secretary under subsection (d)(2).

“(ii) INTEREST CHARGED BY ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS.—A recipient of assistance provided by an eligible entity under this subsection for the purpose of capitalizing a residential energy efficiency financing program of the recipient may charge interest on any loan provided by the recipient at a fixed rate that is as low as practicable, but not more than 5 percent more than the applicable interest rate paid by the eligible entity to the Secretary under subsection (d)(2).

“(B) NO PENALTY ON EARLY REPAYMENT.—An eligible entity, or a recipient of assistance provided by an eligible entity, shall not assess any penalty for early repayment by any recipient of assistance provided under this subsection by the eligible entity or recipient, as applicable.

“(f) REPORTS.—

“(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of receipt of the loan, and annually thereafter for the term of the loan, an eligible entity that receives a loan under this section shall submit to the Secretary a report describing the performance of each program and activity carried out using the loan, including anonymized loan performance data.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary, in consultation with eligible entities and other stakeholders (such as lending institutions and the real estate industry), shall establish such requirements for the reports under this paragraph as the Secretary determines to be appropriate—

“(i) to ensure that the reports are clear, consistent, and straightforward; and

“(ii) taking into account the reporting requirements for similar programs in which the eligible entities are participating, if any.

“(2) SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress and make available to the public—

“(A) not less frequently than once each year, a report describing the performance of the program under this section, including a synthesis and analysis of the information provided in the reports submitted to the Secretary under paragraph (1)(A); and

“(B) on termination of the program under this section, an assessment of the success of,

and education provided by, the measures carried out by eligible entities during the term of the program.

“(g) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The Secretary may provide to eligible entities a total of not more than \$1,000,000,000 in loans under this section for the costs of activities described in subsection (e).

“(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section—

“(1) \$20,000,000 for the cost of credit subsidies;

“(2) \$37,500,000 for energy advisor programs;

“(3) \$5,000,000 for administrative costs to the Secretary of carrying out this section; and

“(4) \$37,500,000 for administrative costs to States in carrying out this section.”.

(b) REORGANIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by redesignating sections 362, 363, 364, 365, and 366 as sections 364, 365, 366, 363, and 362, respectively, and moving the sections so as to appear in numerical order;

(B) in section 362 (as so redesignated)—

(i) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by striking “section 367, and” and inserting “section 367 (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the State Energy Efficiency Programs Improvement Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 6201 note; Public Law 101-440)); and”; and

(ii) in each of paragraphs (4) and (6), by striking “section 365(e)(1)” each place it appears and inserting “section 363(e)(1)”;

(C) in section 363 (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subsection (b), by striking “the provisions of sections 362 and 364 and subsection (a) of section 363” and inserting “sections 364, 365(a), and 366”; and

(ii) in subsection (g)(1)(A), in the second sentence, by striking “section 362” and inserting “section 364”; and

(D) in section 365 (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in paragraph (1), by striking “section 362,” and inserting “section 364”; and

(II) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 362(b) or (e)” and inserting “subsection (b) or (e) of section 364”; and

(ii) in subsection (b)(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “section 362(b) or (e)” and inserting “subsection (b) or (e) of section 364”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 391 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6371) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(M), by striking “section 365(e)(2)” and inserting “section 363(e)(2)”; and

(B) in paragraph (10), by striking “section 362 of this Act” and inserting “section 364”.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 note; Public Law 94-163) is amended by striking the items relating to part D of title III and inserting the following:

“PART D—STATE ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

“Sec. 361. Findings and purpose.

“Sec. 362. Definitions.

“Sec. 363. General provisions.

“Sec. 364. State energy conservation plans.

“Sec. 365. Federal assistance to States.

“Sec. 366. State energy efficiency goals.

“Sec. 367. Loans for residential building energy efficiency upgrades.”.

SEC. 4. OFFSET.

Section 422(f) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17082(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2013;

“(5) \$125,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

“(6) \$85,000,000 for fiscal year 2015;

“(7) \$80,000,000 for fiscal year 2016;

“(8) \$70,000,000 for fiscal year 2017; and

“(9) \$70,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.”.

SA 1916. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:

SEC. 4. GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS.

Part B of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6291 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 325(e), by adding at the end the following:

“(6) ADDITIONAL STANDARDS FOR GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) ACTIVATION KEY.—The term ‘activation key’ means a physical device or control directly on the water heater, a software code, or a digital communication means—

“(I) that must be activated to enable the product to operate continuously and at its designed specifications and capabilities; and

“(II) without which activation the product will provide not greater than 50 percent of the rated first hour delivery of hot water certified by the manufacturer.

“(ii) GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATER.—The term ‘grid-enabled water heater’ means an electric resistance water heater—

“(I) with a rated storage tank volume of more than 75 gallons;

“(II) manufactured on or after April 16, 2015;

“(III) that has—

“(aa) an energy factor of not less than 1.061 minus the product obtained by multiplying—

“(AA) the rated storage volume of the tank, expressed in gallons; and

“(BB) 0.00168; or

“(bb) an efficiency level equivalent to the energy factor under item (aa) and expressed as a uniform energy descriptor based on the revised test procedure for water heaters described in paragraph (5);

“(IV) equipped by the manufacturer with an activation key; and

“(V) that bears a permanent label applied by the manufacturer that—

“(aa) is made of material not adversely affected by water;

“(bb) is attached by means of non-water-soluble adhesive; and

“(cc) advises purchasers and end-users of the intended and appropriate use of the product with the following notice printed in 16.5 point Arial Narrow Bold font:

“‘IMPORTANT INFORMATION: This water heater is intended only for use as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program. It will not provide adequate hot water unless enrolled in such a program and activated by your utility company or another program operator. Confirm the availability of a program in your local area before purchasing or installing this product.’”

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—The manufacturer or private labeler shall provide the activation key only to utilities or other companies operating electric thermal storage or demand

response programs that use grid-enabled water heaters.

“(C) REPORTS.—

“(i) MANUFACTURERS.—The Secretary shall require each manufacturer of grid-enabled water heaters to report to the Secretary annually the number of grid-enabled water heaters that the manufacturer ships each year.

“(ii) OPERATORS.—The Secretary shall require utilities and other demand response and thermal storage program operators to report annually the number of grid-enabled water heaters activated for their programs using forms of the Energy Information Agency or using such other mechanism that the Secretary determines appropriate after an opportunity for notice and comment.

“(iii) CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall treat shipment data reported by manufacturers as confidential business information.

“(D) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In 2017 and 2019, the Secretary shall publish an analysis of the data collected under subparagraph (C) to assess the extent to which shipped products are put into use in demand response and thermal storage programs.

“(ii) PREVENTION OF PRODUCT DIVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that sales of grid-enabled water heaters exceed by 15 percent or greater the number of such products activated for use in demand response and thermal storage programs annually, the Secretary shall, after opportunity for notice and comment, establish procedures to prevent product diversion for non-program purposes.

“(E) COMPLIANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraphs (A) through (D) shall remain in effect until the Secretary determines under this section that grid-enabled water heaters do not require a separate efficiency requirement.

“(ii) EFFECTIVE DATE.—If the Secretary exercises the authority described in clause (i) or amends the efficiency requirement for grid-enabled water heaters, that action will take effect on the date described in subsection (m)(4)(A)(ii).

“(iii) CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out this section with respect to electric water heaters, the Secretary shall consider the impact on thermal storage and demand response programs, including the consequent impact on energy savings, electric bills, electric reliability, integration of renewable resources, and the environment.

“(iv) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this subparagraph, the Secretary shall require that grid-enabled water heaters be equipped with communication capability to enable the grid-enabled water heaters to participate in ancillary services programs if the Secretary determines that the technology is available, practical, and cost-effective.”; and

(2) in section 332—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in the first paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by redesignating the second paragraph (6) as paragraph (7);

(D) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (7) (as so redesignated), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) with respect to grid-enabled water heaters that are not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program, for any person knowingly and repeatedly—

“(A) to distribute activation keys for those grid-enabled water heaters;

“(B) otherwise to enable the full operation of those grid-enabled water heaters; or

“(C) to remove or render illegible the labels of those grid-enabled water heaters.”.

SA 1917. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4 . . . ENERGY PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENT FOR FEDERAL BUILDINGS.

Section 543 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) ENERGY PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENT FOR FEDERAL BUILDINGS.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—Subject to paragraph (2), each agency shall apply energy conservation measures to, and shall improve the design for the construction of, the Federal buildings of the agency (including each industrial or laboratory facility) so that the energy consumption per gross square foot of the Federal buildings of the agency in fiscal years 2006 through 2017 is reduced, as compared with the energy consumption per gross square foot of the Federal buildings of the agency in fiscal year 2003, by the percentage specified in the following table:

Fiscal Year	Percentage Reduction
2006	2
2007	4
2008	9
2009	12
2010	15
2011	18
2012	21
2013	24
2014	27
2015	30
2016	33
2017	36

“(2) EXCLUSION FOR BUILDINGS WITH ENERGY INTENSIVE ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An agency may exclude from the requirements of paragraph (1) any building (including the associated energy consumption and gross square footage) in which energy intensive activities are carried out.

“(B) REPORTS.—Each agency shall identify and list in each report made under section 548(a) the buildings designated by the agency for exclusion under subparagraph (A).

“(3) REVIEW.—Not later than December 31, 2017, the Secretary shall—

“(A) review the results of the implementation of the energy performance requirements established under paragraph (1); and

“(B) based on the review conducted under subparagraph (A), submit to Congress a report that addresses the feasibility of requiring each agency to apply energy conservation measures to, and improve the design for the construction of, the Federal buildings of the agency (including each industrial or laboratory facility) so that the energy consumption per gross square foot of the Federal buildings of the agency in each of fiscal years 2018 through 2030 is reduced, as compared with the energy consumption per gross square foot of the Federal buildings of the agency in the prior fiscal year, by 3 percent.”; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) as subparagraphs (F), (G), and (H), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) ONGOING COMMISSIONING.—The term ‘ongoing commissioning’ means an ongoing process of commissioning using monitored data, the primary goal of which is to ensure continuous optimum performance of a facility, in accordance with design or operating needs, over the useful life of the facility, while meeting facility occupancy requirements.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) ENERGY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.—An energy manager designated under subparagraph (A) shall consider use of a system to manage energy use at the facility and certification of the facility in accordance with the International Organization for Standardization standard numbered 50001 and entitled ‘Energy Management Systems’.”;

(C) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:

“(3) ENERGY AND WATER EVALUATIONS AND COMMISSIONING.—

“(A) EVALUATIONS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), effective beginning on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, and annually thereafter, each energy manager shall complete, for each calendar year, a comprehensive energy and water evaluation and recommissioning or retrocommissioning for approximately 25 percent of the facilities of each agency that meet the criteria under paragraph (2)(B) in a manner that ensures that an evaluation of each facility is completed at least once every 4 years.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—An evaluation and recommissioning shall not be required under subparagraph (A) with respect to a facility that—

“(i) has had a comprehensive energy and water evaluation during the 8-year period preceding the date of the evaluation;

“(ii)(I) has been commissioned, recommissioned, or retrocommissioned during the 10-year period preceding the date of the evaluation; or

“(II) is under ongoing commissioning;

“(iii) has not had a major change in function or use since the previous evaluation and commissioning;

“(iv) has been benchmarked with public disclosure under paragraph (8) within the year preceding the evaluation; and

“(v)(I) based on the benchmarking, has achieved at a facility level the most recent cumulative energy savings target under subsection (a) compared to the earlier of—

“(aa) the date of the most recent evaluation; or

“(bb) the date—

“(AA) of the most recent commissioning, recommissioning, or retrocommissioning; or

“(BB) on which ongoing commissioning began; or

“(II) has a long-term contract in place guaranteeing energy savings at least as great as the energy savings target under subclause (I).

“(4) IMPLEMENTATION OF IDENTIFIED ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of completion of each evaluation under paragraph (3), each energy manager may—

“(i) implement any energy- or water-saving measure that the Federal agency identified in the evaluation conducted under paragraph (3) that is life-cycle cost effective; and
 “(ii) bundle individual measures of varying paybacks together into combined projects.

“(B) MEASURES NOT IMPLEMENTED.—The energy manager shall, as part of the certification system under paragraph (7), explain the reasons why any life-cycle cost effective measures were not implemented under subparagraph (A) using guidelines developed by the Secretary.”; and

(D) in paragraph (7)(C), by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) SUMMARY REPORT.—The Secretary shall make available a report that summarizes the information tracked under subparagraph (B)(i) by each agency and, as applicable, by each type of measure.”.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS; CERTIFICATION SYSTEM AND LEVEL FOR GREEN BUILDINGS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 303 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6832) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “to be constructed” and inserting “constructed or altered”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(17) MAJOR RENOVATION.—The term ‘major renovation’ means a modification of building energy systems sufficiently extensive that the whole building can meet energy standards for new buildings, based on criteria to be established by the Secretary through notice and comment rulemaking.”.

(b) FEDERAL BUILDING EFFICIENCY STANDARDS.—Section 305 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6834) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)—

(A) strike “(3)(A) Not later than” and all that follows through subparagraph (B);

“(3) REVISED FEDERAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS; CERTIFICATION FOR GREEN BUILDINGS.—

“(A) REVISED FEDERAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013 and after the date of approval of each subsequent revision of ASHRAE Standard 90.1 or the International Energy Conservation Code, as appropriate, the Secretary shall establish, by rule, revised Federal building energy efficiency performance standards that require that—

“(I) new Federal buildings and alterations and additions to existing Federal buildings—

“(aa) meet or exceed the most recent revision of the International Energy Conservation Code (in the case of residential buildings) or ASHRAE Standard 90.1 (in the case of commercial buildings) that the Secretary determines saves energy compared to previous versions of the Code or Standard; and
 “(bb) meet or exceed the energy provisions of state and local building codes applicable to the building, if the codes are more stringent than the International Energy Conservation Code or ASHRAE Standard 90.1, as applicable;

“(II) unless demonstrated not to be life-cycle cost effective for new Federal buildings and Federal buildings with major renovations—

“(aa) the buildings be designed to achieve energy consumption levels that are at least 30 percent below the levels established in the version of the ASHRAE Standard or the International Energy Conservation Code, as

appropriate, that is applied under clause (i); and

“(bb) sustainable design principles are applied to the siting, design, and construction of all new Federal buildings and replacement Federal buildings;

“(III) if water is used to achieve energy efficiency, water conservation technologies shall be applied to the extent that the technologies are life-cycle cost effective; and

“(IV) if life-cycle cost effective, as compared to other reasonably available technologies, not less than 30 percent of the hot water demand for each new Federal building or Federal building undergoing a major renovation be met through the installation and use of solar hot water heaters.

“(ii) LIMITATION.—Clause (i)(I) shall not apply to unaltered portions of existing Federal buildings and systems that have been added to or altered.”;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “(C) In the budget request” and inserting the following:

“(B) BUDGET REQUEST.—In the budget request”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by striking clause “(D) Not later than” and all that follows through the first sentence of subclause (III) and insert the following:

“(C) CERTIFICATION FOR GREEN BUILDINGS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—”;

(ii) by striking clause (ii);

(iii) in clause (iii), by striking “(iii) In identifying” and insert the following:

“(ii) CONSIDERATIONS.—In identifying”;

(iv) in clause (iv)—

(I) by striking “(iv) At least once” and inserting the following:

“(iii) STUDY.—At least once”; and

(II) by striking “clause (iii)” and inserting “clause (ii)”;

(v) in clause (v)—

(I) by striking “(v) The Secretary may” and inserting the following:

“(iv) INTERNAL CERTIFICATION PROCESSES.—The Secretary may”; and

(II) by striking “clause (i)(III)” each place it appears and inserting “clause (i)”;

(vi) in clause (vi)—

(I) by striking “(vi) With respect” and inserting the following:

“(v) PRIVATIZED MILITARY HOUSING.—With respect”; and

(II) by striking “develop alternative criteria to those established by subclauses (I) and (III) of clause (i) that achieve an equivalent result in terms of energy savings, sustainable design, and” and inserting “develop alternative certification systems and levels than the systems and levels identified under clause (i) that achieve an equivalent result in terms of”; and

(vii) in clause (vii), by striking “(vii) In addition to” and inserting the following:

“(vi) WATER CONSERVATION TECHNOLOGIES.—In addition to”; and

(2) by striking subsections (c) and (d) and inserting the following:

“(c) PERIODIC REVIEW.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) every 5 years, review the Federal building energy standards established under this section; and

“(2) on completion of a review under paragraph (1), if the Secretary determines that significant energy savings would result, upgrade the standards to include all new energy efficiency and renewable energy measures that are technologically feasible and economically justified.”.

SA 1918. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment

intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 23, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 102. LIMITATION.

The General Services Administration and the Department of Homeland Security may not construct a building that meets a third party certification standard for sustainability or energy efficiency purposes if—

(1) the primary purpose of the construction project is for the rental, lease, or sale of 1 or more single family homes or residential housing units to Federal Government personnel, Federal Government contractors, or the immediate family members of such individuals; and

(2) the construction cost per square foot for such project is anticipated to exceed the average construction cost per square foot of single family homes or residential housing units built during the same fiscal year within the same or an adjacent metropolitan statistical area by at least 5 percent.

SA 1919. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4. ENERGY PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENT FOR FEDERAL BUILDINGS.

Section 543 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) ENERGY PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENT FOR FEDERAL BUILDINGS.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—Subject to paragraph (2), each agency shall apply energy conservation measures to, and shall improve the design for the construction of, the Federal buildings of the agency (including each industrial or laboratory facility) so that the energy consumption per gross square foot of the Federal buildings of the agency in fiscal years 2006 through 2017 is reduced, as compared with the energy consumption per gross square foot of the Federal buildings of the agency in fiscal year 2003, by the percentage specified in the following table:

“Fiscal Year	Percentage Reduction
2006	2
2007	4
2008	9
2009	12
2010	15
2011	18
2012	21
2013	24
2014	27
2015	30
2016	33
2017	36

“(2) EXCLUSION FOR BUILDINGS WITH ENERGY INTENSIVE ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An agency may exclude from the requirements of paragraph (1) any building (including the associated energy consumption and gross square footage) in which energy intensive activities are carried out.

“(B) REPORTS.—Each agency shall identify and list in each report made under section

548(a) the buildings designated by the agency for exclusion under subparagraph (A).

“(3) REVIEW.—Not later than December 31, 2017, the Secretary shall—

“(A) review the results of the implementation of the energy performance requirements established under paragraph (1); and

“(B) based on the review conducted under subparagraph (A), submit to Congress a report that addresses the feasibility of requiring each agency to apply energy conservation measures to, and improve the design for the construction of, the Federal buildings of the agency (including each industrial or laboratory facility) so that the energy consumption per gross square foot of the Federal buildings of the agency in each of fiscal years 2018 through 2030 is reduced, as compared with the energy consumption per gross square foot of the Federal buildings of the agency in the prior fiscal year, by 3 percent.”; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) as subparagraphs (F), (G), and (H), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) ONGOING COMMISSIONING.—The term ‘ongoing commissioning’ means an ongoing process of commissioning using monitored data, the primary goal of which is to ensure continuous optimum performance of a facility, in accordance with design or operating needs, over the useful life of the facility, while meeting facility occupancy requirements.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) ENERGY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.—An energy manager designated under subparagraph (A) shall consider use of a system to manage energy use at the facility and certification of the facility in accordance with the International Organization for Standardization standard numbered 50001 and entitled ‘Energy Management Systems’.”;

(C) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:

“(3) ENERGY AND WATER EVALUATIONS AND COMMISSIONING.—

“(A) EVALUATIONS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), effective beginning on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, and annually thereafter, each energy manager shall complete, for each calendar year, a comprehensive energy and water evaluation and recommissioning or retrocommissioning for approximately 25 percent of the facilities of each agency that meet the criteria under paragraph (2)(B) in a manner that ensures that an evaluation of each facility is completed at least once every 4 years.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—An evaluation and recommissioning shall not be required under subparagraph (A) with respect to a facility that—

“(i) has had a comprehensive energy and water evaluation during the 8-year period preceding the date of the evaluation;

“(ii)(I) has been commissioned, recommissioned, or retrocommissioned during the 10-year period preceding the date of the evaluation; or

“(II) is under ongoing commissioning;

“(iii) has not had a major change in function or use since the previous evaluation and commissioning;

“(iv) has been benchmarked with public disclosure under paragraph (8) within the year preceding the evaluation; and

“(v)(I) based on the benchmarking, has achieved at a facility level the most recent cumulative energy savings target under subsection (a) compared to the earlier of—

“(aa) the date of the most recent evaluation; or

“(bb) the date—

“(AA) of the most recent commissioning, recommissioning, or retrocommissioning; or

“(BB) on which ongoing commissioning began; or

“(II) has a long-term contract in place guaranteeing energy savings at least as great as the energy savings target under subclause (I).

“(4) IMPLEMENTATION OF IDENTIFIED ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of completion of each evaluation under paragraph (3), each energy manager may—

“(i) implement any energy- or water-saving measure that the Federal agency identified in the evaluation conducted under paragraph (3) that is life-cycle cost effective; and

“(ii) bundle individual measures of varying paybacks together into combined projects.

“(B) MEASURES NOT IMPLEMENTED.—The energy manager shall, as part of the certification system under paragraph (7), explain the reasons why any life-cycle cost effective measures were not implemented under subparagraph (A) using guidelines developed by the Secretary.”; and

(D) in paragraph (7)(C), by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) SUMMARY REPORT.—The Secretary shall make available a report that summarizes the information tracked under subparagraph (B)(i) by each agency and, as applicable, by each type of measure.”.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS; CERTIFICATION SYSTEM AND LEVEL FOR GREEN BUILDINGS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 303 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6832) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “to be constructed” and inserting “constructed or altered”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(17) MAJOR RENOVATION.—The term ‘major renovation’ means a modification of building energy systems sufficiently extensive that the whole building can meet energy standards for new buildings, based on criteria to be established by the Secretary through notice and comment rulemaking.”.

(b) FEDERAL BUILDING EFFICIENCY STANDARDS.—Section 305 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6834) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)—

(A) by striking “(3)(A) Not later than” and all that follows through subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(3) REVISED FEDERAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS; CERTIFICATION FOR GREEN BUILDINGS.—

“(A) REVISED FEDERAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013 and after the date of approval of each subsequent revision of ASHRAE Standard 90.1 or the International Energy Conservation Code, as appropriate, the Secretary shall establish, by rule, revised Federal building energy efficiency performance standards that require that—

“(I) new Federal buildings and alterations and additions to existing Federal buildings—

“(aa) meet or exceed the most recent revision of the International Energy Conservation Code (in the case of residential buildings) or ASHRAE Standard 90.1 (in the case of commercial buildings) that the Secretary determines saves energy compared to previous versions of the Code or Standard; and

“(bb) meet or exceed the energy provisions of State and local building codes applicable to the building, if the codes are more stringent than the International Energy Conservation Code or ASHRAE Standard 90.1, as applicable;

“(II) unless demonstrated not to be life-cycle cost effective for new Federal buildings and Federal buildings with major renovations—

“(aa) the buildings be designed to achieve energy consumption levels that are at least 30 percent below the levels established in the version of the ASHRAE Standard or the International Energy Conservation Code, as appropriate, that is applied under clause (i); and

“(bb) sustainable design principles are applied to the location, siting, design, and construction of all new Federal buildings and replacement Federal buildings;

“(III) if water is used to achieve energy efficiency, water conservation technologies shall be applied to the extent that the technologies are life-cycle cost effective; and

“(IV) if life-cycle cost effective, as compared to other reasonably available technologies, not less than 30 percent of the hot water demand for each new Federal building or Federal building undergoing a major renovation be met through the installation and use of solar hot water heaters.

“(ii) LIMITATION.—Clause (i)(I) shall not apply to unaltered portions of existing Federal buildings and systems that have been added to or altered.”;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “(C) In the budget request” and inserting the following:

“(B) BUDGET REQUEST.—In the budget request”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by striking “(D) Not later than” and inserting the following:

“(C) ENERGY CONSUMPTION REDUCTION.—Not later than”; and

(ii) by striking “(i) For new Federal buildings” and all that follows through the first sentence of subclause (III) and inserting the following:

“(i) NEW OR RENOVATED FEDERAL BUILDINGS.—For new Federal buildings and Federal buildings undergoing major renovations, the following requirements shall apply:

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The buildings shall be designed such that:

“(aa) The energy consumption of the buildings is reduced, as compared with energy consumption by similar buildings in fiscal year 2003 (as measured by Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey or Residential Energy Consumption Survey data from the Energy Information Agency) by the percentage specified in the following table:

“Fiscal Year	Percentage Reduction
2020	80
2025	90

“(bb) Beginning in 2030, the buildings shall be designed to be zero-net-energy buildings (as defined in Executive Order 13514 (74 Fed. Reg. 52126)).

“(II) CALCULATION.—For purposes of calculating a reduction in energy consumption

under this clause, electricity or thermal energy produced without the direct emission of greenhouse gases (including energy consumption offset by the use of renewable energy credits) shall not be counted as energy consumed by a building.

“(III) EXCLUSION.—The Secretary may allow energy consumption from combined heat and power systems that achieve at least 80 percent efficiency (or a higher percentage as specified by the Secretary) to be excluded from the calculation of whether a building achieves the requirements under subclause (I)(aa) if the Secretary finds that the exclusion would produce a substantial efficiency or environmental benefit that would not otherwise be achieved.

“(IV) DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENT.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—On petition by an agency subject to this subparagraph, the Secretary may adjust the applicable requirement under subclause (I)(aa) downward with respect to a specific building, if—

“(AA) the head of the agency designing the building certifies in writing that meeting the requirement would be technically impracticable in light of the specified functional needs of the agency for that building; and

“(BB) the Secretary concurs with the conclusion of the agency.

“(bb) EXCLUSION.—This subclause shall not apply to the General Services Administration.

“(D) CERTIFICATION FOR GREEN BUILDINGS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—”;

(iii) by striking clause (ii);

(iv) in clause (iii), by striking “(iii) In identifying” and inserting the following:

“(ii) CONSIDERATIONS.—In identifying”;

(v) in clause (iv)—

(I) by striking “(iv) At least once” and inserting the following:

“(iii) STUDY.—At least once”; and

(II) by striking “clause (iii)” and inserting “clause (ii)”;

(vi) in clause (v)—

(I) by striking “(v) The Secretary may” and inserting the following:

“(iv) INTERNAL CERTIFICATION PROCESSES.—The Secretary may”; and

(II) by striking “clause (i)(III)” each place it appears and inserting “clause (i)”;

(vii) in clause (vi)—

(I) by striking “(vi) With respect” and inserting the following:

“(v) PRIVATIZED MILITARY HOUSING.—With respect”; and

(II) by striking “develop alternative criteria to those established by subclauses (I) and (III) of clause (i) that achieve an equivalent result in terms of energy savings, sustainable design, and” and inserting “develop alternative certification systems and levels than the systems and levels identified under clause (i) that achieve an equivalent result in terms of”; and

(viii) in clause (vii), by striking “(vii) In addition to” and inserting the following:

“(vi) WATER CONSERVATION TECHNOLOGIES.—In addition to”; and

(2) by striking subsections (c) and (d) and inserting the following:

“(c) PERIODIC REVIEW.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) once every 5 years, review the Federal building energy standards established under this section; and

“(2) on completion of a review under paragraph (1), upgrade the standards to include all new energy efficiency and renewable energy measures that are technologically feasible and economically justified, if the Secretary determines that significant energy savings would result.”.

SA 1920. Mr. HARKIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4. COMMUNITY ENERGY PROGRAM.

Part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended by inserting after section 364 (42 U.S.C. 6324) the following:

“SEC. 364A. COMMUNITY ENERGY PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting in conjunction with State energy offices, shall establish and carry out a community energy program under which the Secretary shall make grants to eligible entities to support community energy systems improvement projects, including projects involving energy assessments, development of energy system improvement strategies, and implementation of those strategies so as to reduce energy usage and increase energy supplied from renewable resources.

“(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall be—

“(1) a municipality (including a town or city or other local unit of government); or

“(2) a nonprofit institutional entity (including an institution of higher education, hospital, or school system).

“(c) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall—

“(1) provide to the Secretary evidence that the entity has a commitment to improving the energy systems of the entity;

“(2) encourage broad citizen participation in the project carried out with the grant;

“(3) submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require; and

“(4) meet such other eligibility criteria as are established by the Secretary.

“(d) TYPES OF GRANTS.—The Secretary shall provide to eligible entities under this section—

“(1) planning and assessment grants to support—

“(A) the assessment of current energy types and uses of the eligible entity;

“(B) the identification of potential alternative energy resources to serve the energy needs of the eligible entity, including energy efficiency measures and renewable energy systems; and

“(C) the development of energy improvement project plans that specify energy efficiency measures to be adopted and renewable energy systems to be installed; and

“(2) implementation project grants to support the implementation of energy system improvements, regardless of whether the eligible entities received planning and assessment grants for the improvements under paragraph (1).

“(e) USE OF GRANTS.—

“(1) PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT GRANTS.—An eligible entity may use a planning and assessment grant provided under subsection (d)(1)—

“(A) to assess energy usage across the eligible entity, including energy used in—

“(i) public and private buildings and facilities;

“(ii) commercial and industrial applications; and

“(iii) transportation; and

“(B) to formulate energy improvement plans that describe specific energy efficiency measures to be adopted and specific renewable energy system to be installed, including identification of funding sources and implementation processes.

“(2) IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT GRANTS.—An eligible entity may use an implementation grant provided under subsection (d)(2) to implement energy efficiency measures, or install renewable energy systems, in support of energy improvement plans.

“(f) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal cost of carrying out a project under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of total project costs.

“(g) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall establish criteria for program participation and evaluation of proposals for projects to be carried out under this section, including criteria based on—

“(1) energy savings; and

“(2) reductions in oil consumption.

“(h) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To assist eligible entities in carrying out projects under this section, the Secretary may—

“(A) provide training and technical assistance and support to entities that receive grants under this section; and

“(B) support regional conferences to enable entities to share information on energy assessment, planning, and implementation activities.

“(2) EVALUATION PROGRAM.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall develop and support use of an evaluation program that measures and evaluates the energy and economic impacts of projects carried out under this section.

“(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

“(1) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2014; and

“(2) \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018.”.

SA 1921. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON ENFORCEMENT OF THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On May 10, 2013, the Internal Revenue Service admitted that it singled out advocacy groups, based on ideology, seeking tax-exempt status.

(2) This action raises pertinent questions about the agency's ability to implement and oversee the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152).

(3) This action could be an indication of future Internal Revenue Service abuses in relation to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, given that it is their responsibility to enforce a key provision, the individual mandate.

(4) Americans accept the principle that patients, families, and doctors should be making medical decisions, not the Federal Government.

(b) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary of the Treasury, or any delegate of the Secretary,

shall not implement or enforce any provisions of or amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152).

SA 1922. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4. ENDANGERED SPECIES SETTLEMENTS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 3 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1532) is amended—

(1) by redesignating—

(A) paragraphs (1) through (4) as paragraphs (2) through (5), respectively;

(B) paragraphs (5) through (10) as paragraphs (7) through (12), respectively; and

(C) paragraphs (12) through (21) as paragraphs (13) through (22), respectively;

(2) by adding before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) **AFFECTED PARTIES.**—The term ‘affected party’ means any person, including a business entity, or any State, tribal government, or local subdivision the rights of which may be affected by a determination made under section 4(a) in a suit brought under section 11(g)(1)(C).”; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(6) **COVERED SETTLEMENT.**—The term ‘covered settlement’ means a consent decree or a settlement agreement in an action brought under section 11(g)(1)(C).”.

(b) **INTERVENTION; APPROVAL OF COVERED SETTLEMENT.**—Section 11(g) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1540) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **PUBLISHING COMPLAINT; INTERVENTION.**—

“(i) **PUBLISHING COMPLAINT.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the plaintiff serves the defendant with the complaint in an action brought under paragraph (1)(C) in accordance with Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish the complaint in a readily accessible manner, including electronically.

“(II) **FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.**—The failure of the Secretary to meet the 30-day deadline described in subclause (I) shall not be the basis for an action under paragraph (1)(C).

“(ii) **INTERVENTION.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—After the end of the 30-day period described in clause (i), each affected party shall be given a reasonable opportunity to move to intervene in the action described in clause (i), until the end of which a party may not file a motion for a consent decree or to dismiss the case pursuant to a settlement agreement.

“(II) **REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION.**—In considering a motion to intervene by any affected party, the court shall presume, subject to rebuttal, that the interests of that party would not be represented adequately by the parties to the action described in clause (i).

“(III) **REFERRAL TO ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION.**—

“(aa) **IN GENERAL.**—If the court grants a motion to intervene in the action, the court

shall refer the action to facilitate settlement discussions to—

“(AA) the mediation program of the court; or

“(BB) a magistrate judge.

“(bb) **PARTIES INCLUDED IN SETTLEMENT DISCUSSIONS.**—The settlement discussions described in item (aa) shall include each—

“(AA) plaintiff;

“(BB) defendant agency; and

“(CC) intervenor.”;

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) **LITIGATION COSTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the court, in issuing any final order in any suit brought under paragraph (1), may award costs of litigation (including reasonable attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, whenever the court determines such award is appropriate.

“(B) **COVERED SETTLEMENT.**—

“(i) **CONSENT DECREES.**—The court shall not award costs of litigation in any proposed covered settlement that is a consent decree.

“(ii) **OTHER COVERED SETTLEMENTS.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—For a proposed covered settlement other than a consent decree, the court shall ensure that the covered settlement does not include payment to any plaintiff for the costs of litigation.

“(II) **MOTIONS.**—The court shall not grant any motion, including a motion to dismiss, based on the proposed covered settlement described in subclause (I) if the covered settlement includes payment to any plaintiff for the costs of litigation.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) **APPROVAL OF COVERED SETTLEMENT.**—

“(A) **DEFINITION OF SPECIES.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘species’ means a species that is the subject of an action brought under paragraph (1)(C).

“(B) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(i) **CONSENT DECREES.**—The court shall not approve a proposed covered settlement that is a consent decree unless each State and county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs approves the covered settlement.

“(ii) **OTHER COVERED SETTLEMENTS.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—For a proposed covered settlement other than a consent decree, the court shall ensure that the covered settlement is approved by each State and county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs.

“(II) **MOTIONS.**—The court shall not grant any motion, including a motion to dismiss, based on the proposed covered settlement described in subclause (I) unless the covered settlement is approved by each State and county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs.

“(C) **NOTICE.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall provide each State and county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs notice of a proposed covered settlement.

“(ii) **DETERMINATION OF RELEVANT STATES AND COUNTIES.**—The defendant in a covered settlement shall consult with each State described in clause (i) to determine each county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs.

“(D) **FAILURE TO RESPOND.**—The court may approve a covered settlement or grant a motion described in subparagraph (B)(ii)(II) if, not later than 45 days after the date on which a State or county is notified under subparagraph (C)—

“(i) (I) a State or county fails to respond; and

“(II) of the States or counties that respond, each State or county approves the covered settlement; or

“(ii) all of the States and counties fail to respond.

“(E) **PROOF OF APPROVAL.**—The defendant in a covered settlement shall prove any State or county approval described in this paragraph in a form—

“(i) acceptable to the State or county, as applicable; and

“(ii) signed by the State or county official authorized to approve the covered settlement.”.

SA 1923. Mr. JOHANNIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. 3. REPORT ON FEDERAL AGENCY FACILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on energy use and energy efficiency projects at the facilities occupied by each Federal agency.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an analysis of energy use at each facility occupied by a Federal agency;

(2) a list of energy audits that have been conducted at the facilities described in paragraph (1);

(3) a list of energy efficiency projects that have been conducted at the facilities described in paragraph (1); and

(4) a list of energy efficiency projects that could be achieved through the use of a consistent and timely mechanical insulation maintenance program and through the upgrading of mechanical insulation at the facilities described in paragraph (1).

SA 1924. Mr. JOHANNIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4. ENERGY EFFICIENCY REGULATION REGARDING CERTAIN BATTERY CHARGERS.

Golf cars shall be exempt from the proposed rule entitled “Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Battery Chargers and External Power Supplies” (77 Fed. Reg. 18478 (March 27, 2012)) in the same manner that low-speed vehicles that are substantially similar to golf cars in design, construction, and use, or other electric vehicles used for personal transportation are exempt from the proposed rule.

SA 1925. Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4. COMPRESSED NATURAL GAS FUELING STATIONS REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall submit to Congress a report that describes options to incentivize the development of public compressed natural gas fueling stations.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall analyze a variety of possible financing tools to incentivize the development of public compressed natural gas fueling stations, which may include Federal grants and credit assistance, public-private partnerships, and membership-based co-operatives.

SA 1926. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:

SEC. 4. NATURAL GAS VEHICLES.

(a) MAXIMUM FUEL ECONOMY INCREASE FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL AUTOMOBILES.—Section 32906(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “(except an electric automobile)” and inserting “(except an electric or natural gas automobile)”.

(b) AUTOMOBILE FUEL ECONOMY DEFINITIONS.—Section 32901(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by inserting “, but the inclusion of a reserve gasoline tank for incidental or emergency use in the event of alternative fuel depletion shall not detract from the dedicated nature of the automobile” before the period at the end; and

(2) in paragraph (9)(B), by striking “provides equal or superior energy efficiency” and inserting “provides reasonably comparable energy efficiency”.

(c) MINIMUM DRIVING RANGES FOR DUAL FUELED PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES.—Section 32901(c)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(except electric automobiles)” and inserting “(except electric or natural gas automobiles)”;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking “(except electric automobiles)” each place it appears and inserting “(except electric or natural gas automobiles)”.

(d) MANUFACTURING PROVISION FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL AUTOMOBILES.—Section 32905(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) the percentage utilization of the model on gasoline or diesel fuel, as determined by a formula based on the model’s alternative fuel range, divided by the fuel economy measured under section 32904(c); and

“(2) the percentage utilization of the model on gaseous fuel, as determined by a formula based on the model’s alternative fuel range, divided by the fuel economy measured under subsection (c).”

(e) HOV FACILITIES.—Section 166 of title 23, United States Code is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(5), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) INHERENTLY LOW EMISSION VEHICLE.—If a State agency establishes procedures for enforcing the restrictions on the use of the HOV facility by the vehicles, the State agen-

cy may allow use of the HOV facility by both—

“(i) alternative fuel vehicles; and
“(ii) new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicles (as defined in section 30D(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).”; and
(2) in subsection (f)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “solely” before “operating”.

SA 1927. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. FEDERAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARDS.

Section 305(a)(3)(A)(i)(II) of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6834(a)(3)(A)(i)(II)) is amended by inserting “location,” after “applied to the”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 12, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 12, 2013, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Essential Elements of Housing Finance Reform.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 12, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled “Dental Crisis in America: The Need to Address Cost” on September 12, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the For-

eign Relations Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 12, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 12, 2013, at 10 a.m. in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Anna Henderson, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 113th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, September 16, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 175 and 176; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate’s action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 219; that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Victoria Nuland, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (European and Eurasian Affairs).

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have just spoken to my staff and the floor staff. Monday evening, we will come in and try to move forward on the energy efficiency legislation. I have suggested to my staff that they talk to the Republican staff and see if there is a way we can move forward on this, so we will see. I hope so, because it has been a totally wasted week.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY,
SEPTEMBER 16, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, September 16, 2013; and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 4 p.m. with Senators during that period of time being permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; and following morning business the Senate resume consideration of S. 1392; further, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. A vote will be at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
SEPTEMBER 16, 2013, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:57 p.m., adjourned until Monday, September 16, 2013, at 2 p.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 12, 2013:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

VICTORIA NULAND, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (EUROPEAN AND EURASIAN AFFAIRS).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 12, 2013

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 12, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

Though having returned so recently, the House prepares to leave for a long weekend. Many of its Members prepare to observe Yom Kippur—the Day of Atonement.

At a time of great international tensions, many others will take pause to acknowledge past failures and renew efforts at peaceful and productive resolutions to ongoing difficulties.

On this day, give the Members of this assembly listening hearts and a willingness to give to each other time and attention. May they be ready to respond to Your Spirit living in each of their colleagues.

And may all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present

and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TONKO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

LACK OF LEADERSHIP

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, we're living in a dangerous world abroad, with challenging economic times at home, but America has been here before.

On Tuesday, Americans witnessed the embarrassing and dangerous results of this administration's lack of a coherent foreign policy: Vladimir Putin filled the global leadership void. What happens next with Syria and that region is anyone's guess, but it's clear that America is not in the driver's seat.

The President failed to convince me—and most of the American people—that military action in Syria is in our best interests. This debate was not conducted from a position of foreign policy strength because Syria was allowed to fester. Flawed attempts at coalition building failed.

Iran is ever closer to a nuclear bomb. Iran funds terrorist organizations. Iran's influence in the region is significant. And a Middle Eastern arms race would likely follow, the results of which could be catastrophic.

The world is looking to America for leadership. The American people are

looking to this President for leadership. Mr. President, it's time for you to step up to the plate.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, recent superstorms like Hurricane Sandy, Hurricane Irene, and Tropical Storm Lee have tested the resiliency of our infrastructure. During these severe weather events, bridges failed, blackouts occurred, and communities were devastated by flooding at the same time that our water supply systems failed. It took weeks to restore these vital services. Our electricity, potable water, and transportation networks must be reliable even in the face of severe storms.

The American people need and deserve a Congress that will work together to address the present and growing threat of climate change and do what is necessary to ensure the resiliency of our roads, bridges, electrical grid, dams, and water systems. Accomplishing this would create jobs and support our communities and our economy.

This week, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration reported that Sandy-like flooding is now twice as likely due to the sea level rise associated with climate change. One need look no further to understand that the time is now to act on climate.

UNAFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, all over this country many thousands are not being hired because of the so-called Affordable Care Act, which is really unaffordable. Many thousands more are seeing their hours cut so they do not go over the 30-hour-per-week threshold. Someone said the new normal is now two 20-hour-a-week jobs.

Now the State of Tennessee has had to notify 16,000 Tennesseans they can no longer have coverage under CoverTN, a low-cost health care plan for small businesses and the self-employed. The plan is being abolished because it does not meet all the bureaucratic requirements of ObamaCare.

Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER said:

The new health care law has destroyed an innovative State health insurance plan that is helping 16,000 Tennesseans afford health care coverage.

When the President was selling ObamaCare to Americans, he said again and again that people who had insurance they liked could keep it. Despite the President's promises, Tennesseans enrolled with CoverTN are among the thousands of Americans who are being forced to buy new, more expensive plans with much higher premiums because of the "Unaffordable Care Act."

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, it's now been 2 years since President Obama stood before a Joint Session of Congress to present a comprehensive and cost-effective plan to address our national jobs crisis.

With all eyes now on Syria, the CR, and the debt limit, we cannot forget that the emergency for tens of millions of Americans is still painful and pervasive joblessness. It's now been 2 years, and the President's bill, the American Jobs Act, has still not even received a vote in this House.

Madam Speaker, it's time to commit to a serious jobs agenda that stops sequester layoffs and provides real options for the long-term unemployed people in our Nation. It's time to bring the American Jobs Act of 2013 to the floor. Madam Speaker, the mantra of this Congress should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

"NEW NORMAL" II

(Mr. MEEHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, my colleagues and I have returned to Washington after spending time back in our districts with our constituents, and it's clear we've got our work cut out for us.

Already we've been hearing personal stories—and I know I did—of folks in our districts who are having trouble making ends meet in this new normal under the Obama economy.

And last week, we found things were only getting worse with unemployment. This rate has been too high for too long. Millions of our fellow Americans are unemployed, with an average of 8.5 months out of work.

The simple truth is they deserve better.

House Republicans have a solid plan to put Americans back to work and secure our future. To do that, we believe the solution lies in expanding our free-

dom and opportunity, not restricting it.

KSBW CELEBRATES 60-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in the United States Congress to celebrate and honor our local television station—it started 60 years ago—KSBW, an NBC affiliate for the central coast of California. SBW stands for "Salad Bowl Capital of the World," which is what the Salinas area is known for.

In September 1953, the station opened, and it proudly represented the whole feeling of the central coast to have its first television station. I was 12 years old, and I remember sitting there with my father as he was being interviewed on that television station. It went through decades of being the area's first station to provide local news. It was the first station to broadcast in color. It was the first to broadcast news reports from the field. It was the first to broadcast in high definition.

For the past 15 years, the station has been owned by the 126-year-old Hearst Corporation and led locally by Joseph W. Heston as president and general manager. Hearst continues to operate a full-time Washington, D.C., news bureau, making KSBW the only local station on the central coast to provide direct reports from Washington to local constituents.

Congratulations, KSBW, for 60 years of firsts. I wish them another 60 years of great success on the central coast.

NATIONAL SUICIDE PREVENTION WEEK

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Suicide Prevention Week.

Suicide is a serious public health problem that takes an alarming toll on so many individuals, including our military personnel and veterans. A growing number of returning servicemembers and veterans suffer from posttraumatic stress, acute brain injuries, severe anxiety, depression, and a variety of other mental illnesses from battle. The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs released a study in February 2013 which estimates that approximately 24 veterans commit suicide every day.

Our highest priority must be the mental health and well-being of our friends, our colleagues, and loved ones,

and also the brave men and women who serve our Nation. Should one fear that someone they know is in crisis or depressed, giving that person an opportunity to open up and share their troubles with you can go a long way.

National Suicide Prevention Week is a time for all of us to learn more about suicide, its warning signs, and what can be done to help those in need.

PANCREATIC CANCER

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to a disease that plagues our Nation and my home State of Florida—that is pancreatic cancer.

Unfortunately, pancreatic cancer today remains the fourth leading cause of cancer death, with a 5-year survival rate of just 6 percent. In 2013, the Pancreatic Cancer Network anticipates that there will be 3,380 new cases of pancreatic cancer in Florida alone.

Last year, Congress passed the Recalcitrant Cancer Research Act, which calls on the National Cancer Institute to help develop a scientific framework for combating pancreatic cancer. This was an important step forward, but there is clearly more that we can do and should be done.

We must continue to fund investments in the National Cancer Institute's research so that they can better understand how to prevent and treat this disease. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this critical funding and to renew and strengthen our commitment to combating pancreatic cancer.

□ 0915

SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, in less than 3 weeks, the Special Immigrant Visa program expires. This is something we created to help bring people who served Americans in Iraq and Afghanistan as interpreters, guides, drivers, people who helped our soldiers, who put their lives at risk, to be able to escape to safety. Unfortunately there are people with long memories who are there seeking revenge against those who have helped us.

But sadly, this project has been hampered by what can only be charitably described as "bureaucratic ineptitude." The State Department can't even tell us how many thousands of people are in the backlog. Chairman ROGERS just this week told me that an interpreter

for one of his heroes is trying to seek refuge in the United States.

The program will expire September 30. If we can't help the State Department fix it, we can at least extend it in the continuing resolution so that we've got a chance for these people who gave so much for Americans to be able to get the refuge that they deserve.

NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 339, I call up the bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 339, the amendment printed in House Report 113-206 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2775

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "No Subsidies Without Verification Act".

SEC. 2. CONDITIONING PROVISION OF ACA PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES UPON CERTIFICATION THAT A PROGRAM TO VERIFY HOUSEHOLD INCOME AND OTHER QUALIFICATIONS FOR THOSE SUBSIDIES IS OPERATIONAL.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no premium tax credits shall be allowed under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and no reductions in cost-sharing shall be allowed under section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18071) before the date that the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services certifies to the Congress that there is in place a program that successfully and consistently verifies, consistent with section 1411 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 18081), the household income and coverage requirements of individuals applying for such credits and cost-sharing reductions prior to making the benefits available.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 10 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 2275.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to speak about the economic disaster facing all Americans on October 1.

Nearly 3 years ago, I decided to run for office for one primary reason: to defeat and repeal Obamacare. Three years later, this terrible law is set to be implemented and the dire warnings and predictions are already coming true.

This past summer alone, we saw three major delays in the law's implementation—from the employee mandate to consumer price caps to the issue we are debating here today.

Congresswoman BLACK's bill, H.R. 2775, the No Subsidies Without Verification Act, is a first step at attacking the latter.

The premise of this bill is quite simple. Serving as the stewards of taxpayer dollars is one of our most important jobs as Members of Congress. After all, dollars wasted by Congress or improperly spent by the executive branch has a direct impact on the budgets of families across this country who are struggling to pay their bills.

This is why I was appalled by this summer's announcement by the Department of Health and Human Services. In the 600-page rule issued during the July 4 holiday, HHS stated that they would no longer verify income for ObamaCare subsidies. Instead, the Obama administration would now rely on self-attestation and sample audits when launching the ObamaCare exchange subsidy program—an initiative that is estimated to cost over \$1 trillion over the next decade.

After receiving criticism, HHS announced that they would reverse course and extend audits to all applicants. Yet, to this date, the administration has issued no formal change in the rule to codify this policy. In other words, they are saying one thing and doing another.

As it stands today, the rule issued by HHS reads:

The exchange may accept the applicant's attestation without further verification.

And yet, while verification has been removed, the fines remain in place. Any applicant who enters information improperly could possibly face a \$25,000 fine. If the mistake is knowing and willful, the fine could grow as high as \$250,000.

As Ronald Reagan famously said, "trust, but verify." If history is any

guide, these claims of accountability will be disregarded unless oversight is enforced.

This only reinforces the need for the No Subsidies Without Verification Act. The bill would simply require certification systems to be in place so that the administrators can successfully and consistently verify eligibility before any premiums and cost-sharing credits are paid out.

Similar language was adopted by the Senate, but the bill before us would implement a bipartisan consensus and protect taxpayer dollars. It would do so by requiring the inspector general of HHS to certify that income verification is in place before precious taxpayer dollars are wasted and abused.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2775, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The bill before us today is nothing more than another page out of the Republican playbook to delay, derail, and otherwise repeal the Affordable Care Act. Rather than a productive, bipartisan effort to ensure successful implementation, Republicans will instead waste more precious floor time to take their 41st vote that undermines and repeals the Affordable Care Act.

H.R. 2775 is based on a flawed premise that HHS does not have the verifications in place to ensure that families who are getting financial help are eligible for that help.

But my Republican friends, that's simply not true, and your bill will do nothing but prevent millions of hardworking American families from gaining Affordable Care Act coverage.

First and foremost, this bill is totally unnecessary. HHS already has stated in regulations that they will check and verify income on 100 percent of the applications. If someone receives payments that they determine aren't substantiated, those payments will have to be paid back—100 percent verified and reconciled.

Here is how it works. To get subsidies to make their health insurance affordable, hardworking Americans and families will submit their projected annual household income through the marketplaces. The data will then be checked against IRS data, Social Security data, and current wage information. If there is an inconsistency, the marketplaces will require additional documentation from applicants.

In addition, marketplaces will check employer coverage information from the applicant and their employer against data from a number of employer data sources approved by HHS to verify eligibility for the subsidies. If applicant information and other data do not match, the marketplaces will ask for further supporting documentation.

And lastly, all payments of premium tax credits are reconciled by IRS the following year. The income data submitted to the marketplaces are reconciled against the actual wages and health-covered information on the individual's income tax return. If there is an inconsistency, the applicant pays back the excess.

Let me repeat that part, that last part, Madam Speaker, because it is the most critical. Even after HHS has verified wage information on each individual situation that arises before tax credits are sent out, the income information will still be doublechecked again against actual wages on the individual's income tax return the following year. So if there is an inconsistency, the applicant pays back the excess. There is, again, 100 percent income verification and reconciliation on the back end.

Madam Speaker, both CBO and JCT, the Joint Committee on Taxation, confirmed this, stating that the program HHS has in place satisfies the certification requirements under section 1411 of the law—proving, again, that this bill is simply irrelevant.

But, of course, in light of this report, our Republicans at the twelfth hour have hastily amended the bill. The new language will basically ask the IG of HHS to formally certify these verification systems, which does nothing but delay the start of the law and deny millions of hardworking Americans from getting the tax credits they're clearly eligible for.

I maintained in Rules last night, and I'll maintain again, this is not the responsibility of the inspector general. The inspector general doesn't do this. They probably can't do this.

The IG's office has confirmed these implications by stating that this new language places unworkable requirements on their office and that it has no resources to perform this and that it is outside of its traditional role. The Republicans know very well all of this, and that's the exact reason they made this change. It's simply a delay tactic.

□ 0930

Again, the IG won't be able to do this. This is not its traditional role. So the only thing that happens here, Madam Speaker, is that this is a legislation which, of course, will never pass; but if it did pass and got signed by the President, which would never happen, it would simply delay the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, and that's what the Republicans want. Repeal, delay, defund—this is what they're all about. It's the 41st vote, again, to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Madam Speaker, we are 20 days away from October 1, when millions of uninsured Americans will finally get access to quality, affordable health care. No longer will hardworking families worry

about getting sick or injured or losing coverage because of the loss of a job, because the Affordable Care Act gives health security and peace of mind. For those hardworking families who need additional tools to help them afford their health coverage, the ACA will help make coverage a reality.

So despite the delay tactics in this bill and the millions of hours and dollars spent to derail the ACA, the law is moving forward. Organizations across this country, including labor, small businesses, employers, health care providers, advocates, religious leaders, and others, will continue to focus on helping uninsured Americans gain access to health care.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. It is, again, an unnecessary delay; but I at least am optimistic in knowing that the ACA will move forward and that the Republicans will not have success.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee.

Mr. PITTS. I rise in support of H.R. 2775, and I commend the gentlelady, Congresswoman BLACK, and also Congresswoman ELLMERS for their leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, earlier this year, we found out that the IRS flagged for further review 90 percent of Americans who claimed the adoption tax credit, and 70 percent of the adoptive families faced at least a partial audit. Only a minuscule percentage of the tax credits given to those families were disallowed. Many needy families saw their returns delayed for months. We also found out this year that hundreds of conservative nonprofits had their applications for tax-exempt status delayed for months and years by IRS agents.

Ask millions of small business owners who have spent hours laboring over tax returns—the government doesn't typically operate by the honor system, but when it comes to doling out billions of dollars in new ObamaCare subsidies, the government is just going to accept applications without question, on the honor system.

This is all in the interest of getting ObamaCare up and running as soon as possible without any regard to potential fraud, and it's after the old "pay and chase" model. We are entrusted with protecting taxpayer dollars, not watching them go out to people who don't need them. If the Treasury Department can't figure out how to prevent fraud, then subsidies shouldn't be going out the door. And if the tax subsidy is overpaid to the insurance companies for the tax credits for individuals, guess who pays back the overpayment? It's not the insurance companies. It comes out of the individual's pocket.

I'm sure I won't be the only person on the floor today to recall President Reagan's words of "trust, but verify." The byword for ObamaCare is just simply "trust." The Obama administration doesn't trust adoptive parents or conservative nonprofits or small businesses; but for the purpose of getting the President's signature legislation up and running, they are perfectly willing to see taxpayers get fleeced. This is simply wrong. We need to demand that the administration follow the law. ObamaCare was such a landmark piece of legislation. Why does it have to be ignored at every turn?

I urge Members to support the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), a member of our committee.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Thank you very much, Mr. PALLONE, for yielding time this morning, and thank you for your extraordinary leadership on our committee and for giving affordable health care to every American.

Madam Speaker, I rise this morning to oppose H.R. 2775. This bill, if passed by the House and passed by the Senate and signed by the President, which I would say is highly unlikely, would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to certify to Congress that an income verification system is in place before any subsidies can be distributed for individuals to purchase health insurance through the marketplace.

Here you go again—repeal effort No. 41.

The Republican majority is obsessed with discrediting the President of the United States by using every procedural maneuver imaginable to weaken this law, which was passed by the Congress and upheld by the United States Supreme Court.

I invite my Republican colleagues to read a report published by the Congressional Budget Office, which states that HHS already has in place sufficient safeguards for distributing subsidies to assist uninsured Americans with the purchase of insurance.

This is not an honor system, Mr. PITTS. It is written into the law, and the Congressional Budget Office recognizes that we do have in place a system to verify the incomes.

Madam Speaker, I am still fuming about the 15 Republicans on the Energy and Commerce Committee who on August 29 sent a multi-page investigatory letter to 51 community nonprofits that have been approved to receive navigator grants to assist the uninsured with the process. I simply do not understand how the chairman of a committee and a few like-minded committee members can author a letter to grant recipients, demanding that they answer questions and produce documents. I suggest that this letter exceeds the authority of these individuals

to harass and to intimidate grant recipients.

I urge the Republican majority to stop trying to discredit President Obama. Stop trying to defund and repeal the Affordable Care Act. It is the law of the land. Millions of Americans are benefiting from it today and will be in the future. You should be using this creativity and energy expended this morning to pass a budget and lift the sequester, which is hurting families and communities all across America.

My friends, get serious; and let's stop playing games with the American people.

Mrs. ELLMERS. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the vice chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentlelady.

Madam Speaker, I want to commend Mrs. BLACK, my colleague from Tennessee. She has done a tremendous job in bringing this legislation forward, and she brings it forward because of the experience we have had in Tennessee with a program that was called TennCare, which had no verification. It became "just in time" insurance, and guess what? It became too expensive to afford. When you do not exercise appropriate oversight and verification, that is what happens—you incentivize the use. Those who really do not qualify come into the program. Indeed, we had a Governor—a Democrat Governor by the way—who removed about 300,000 individuals from this program.

I am pleased that as we discuss and stand in support of H.R. 2775 that my colleagues across the aisle are getting our message. When it comes to ObamaCare, yes, delay, defund, repeal, replace. That is exactly what we want to do because this law has become so amazingly unpopular with the American people and, indeed, with women. Over 65 percent of all American women oppose this law and the implementation of this law.

The reason we are bringing this legislation forward is that there is a gaping hole. We know that having self-attestation for getting these taxpayer subsidies in these exchanges is going to lead to an incredible amount of fraud. We are even having estimates of as much as \$250 billion worth of fraud, which could be going into this program. We're not acting on theory. We're looking at what has previously happened with programs such as TennCare. Indeed, my colleague from New Jersey has heard me talk about this for years, and he knows that when we look at something that is public option health care that that is the public option from which we draw our experience.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), who is a long-time supporter and person in the

mix on health care, certainly as a nurse and as a health care professional.

Mrs. CAPPS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, my friend from New Jersey.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. Our Nation is facing a host of challenges; we need to end the sequester; we need to fund our government properly to avoid a shutdown; we need to increase the deficit limit so that we can pay our bills and maintain a strong credit rating; and we must have a full and open debate about what to do in response to chemical weapons being used in Syria.

But instead of any of these pressing issues, here we are again, at the insistence of the House majority, voting for the 41st time to repeal, defund, obstruct, or derail the Affordable Care Act; and they want to do so as more and more Americans, including my constituents on the central coast of California, are now beginning to benefit from the law.

Already 11,000 young adults in my district have gained health care insurance coverage under their parents' plans, allowing them to pursue their education or to start new ventures without the fear of going bankrupt if they should get sick. Almost 300,000 of my constituents are now able to get the preventative health services they need without worrying about the cost, and 10,000 seniors have already found relief when falling into the dreaded prescription drug doughnut hole in Medicare; and in less than 1 month, California families who for so long have been priced out or denied coverage in the private health insurance market will finally get the coverage they want and deserve.

Throughout the program—we call it Covered California Exchange—along with health care at marketplaces all across this country, individuals, families and small businesses will gain a transparent, one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies. They will also be able to receive financial assistance and to sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage; and they won't have to worry about being denied coverage for their preexisting conditions. Yet this bill before us would erode all of these benefits, essentially blocking hardworking families from getting the affordable health insurance coverage they need.

The American people have moved on. They want us to come together to improve our Nation, not to divide it. So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill. Let's get to work on the many critical issues facing our Nation.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Washington, Congresswoman McMORRIS RODGERS, the chair of our Republican Conference.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. I thank the gentlelady.

Madam Speaker, in less than a month, enrollment for ObamaCare's

largest entitlement program will begin. Subsidies will go out the door on January 1, and they will go to anyone who claims he is eligible—no verification, no accountability. The GAO and the Inspectors General for both Health and Human Services and the IRS have told us that the administration's verification system is extremely vulnerable to fraud, but the picture gets worse.

In 2012 alone, Health and Human Services gave out more than \$64 billion in improper payments. In fact, the Department of Health and Human Services, the agency charged with implementing these exchanges, has the highest annual improper payment rate among Federal agencies. The Department of the Treasury, which is responsible for enforcing 47 different tax provisions, is second only to Health and Human Services. The Wall Street Journal recently reported that not verifying eligibility could cost taxpayers more than \$250 billion in improper payments. Yet the administration doesn't seem to care.

Over the last several months, we've seen the wheels falling off—the delay in the employer mandate, the delay in the consumer cost containment rule, the delay in the finalizing of agreements with insurance plans, and now this delay in ensuring that the verification mechanisms are in place to protect taxpayers. This administration has made one thing clear, that it will stop at nothing to ensure that 7 million people are enrolled in exchanges in 2014—2.7 million of whom must be young in order to make it work—and that subsidies are handed out to as many Americans as possible.

□ 0945

The administration's decision to allow enrollees to self-attest to the information provided to the exchanges is not only irresponsible, but ripe for fraud. The only real solution is the passage of H.R. 2775, and I urge our colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, this is sort of a charade that's going on today. Our Republican friends allow, for example, businesses to self-certify in a whole range of other areas. This is not about that. What this is, is another attempt to sabotage health care reform.

America is involved in a grand reform. Some of us are in States like Oregon, California, Washington, New York, and Maryland where we're actually working to implement the reform, and our citizens are going to have lower rates, more choices, and subsidies for individuals and small businesses for better coverage.

In other parts of the country some of our Republican friends have decided to

sabotage implementation. Customers won't get extra help in Alabama, Oklahoma, Texas, or Wyoming, where insurance commissioners won't even review health plans to make sure that they're offered in the new marketplaces to provide consumers with required benefits and protections. In Missouri, believe it or not, the Republican legislature has made it illegal for new health insurance marketplaces for State employees to tell people what they're eligible for. Today, this is one more effort to throw sand in the gears.

The response from Republicans, who have no vision for health care, refuses to acknowledge that what we are working on now and what they derisively call ObamaCare, actually had its roots in a bipartisan consensus of what's necessary to get more value out of American health care.

The health care reform train has left the station. We should simply reject today this misguided attempt to sabotage it. Americans from coast to coast will be able to see the difference in communities that are embracing it and implementing it versus those that are trying to sabotage it.

In the course of the next 2 years, the facts will be clear. Mercifully, what the House is going to pass today is not going to be enacted into law, and the rest of us can get to work implementing reform.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds just to outline some of the things that have already been repealed in ObamaCare.

As a consequence of Congress passing ObamaCare to find out what is in it, we have found some terrible ideas in the law. To date, the President has actually signed into law seven bipartisan bills repealing or defunding parts of the health care law. H.R. 4 repealed the small business paperwork mandate, or the 1099. H.R. 1473 cut \$2.2 billion from a stealth public plan and froze the IRS budget. H.R. 674 saved taxpayers \$13 billion by adjusting eligibility for ObamaCare programs. H.R. 2055 made more cuts to CO-OPs, IPAB, and the IRS. H.R. 3630 slashed billions from ObamaCare slush funds. I could go on, Madam Chairwoman.

Now I would like to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman PAT MEEHAN.

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the No Subsidies Without Verification Act, legislation of which I'm a proud cosponsor. October 1 is only days away, and almost every day we see a brand new headline about ObamaCare, demonstrating the "train wreck," as one Senator put it. Those are their words, not mine.

The thousands of rules, regulations, and mandates are only increasing the cost of health insurance and dramatically expanding the bureaucracy in our health care. And the implementation of ObamaCare has been one disaster after another.

Buried in the hundreds of pages of regulations that have been released this summer was a rule change announcing that the government will no longer verify whether applicants for ObamaCare's insurance exchange are actually qualified for the aid. Instead, they will simply rely on the honor system.

Madam Speaker, we're talking about billions of dollars here. How can we possibly be relying on an honor system? According to *The Wall Street Journal*, it's estimated that not verifying the eligibility could result in approximately \$250 billion in fraudulent payments.

The No Subsidies Without Verification Act will stop any taxpayer funding subsidies until an accurate real-time verification system is in place to ensure the applicants are indeed eligible. It seems like common sense to me. We need a trusted system in place to stop any waste, fraud, and abuse resulting from not verifying eligibility for ObamaCare insurance subsidies.

This is being operated through a data hub, which will have millions of persons' personally identifying information. Of most concern, this is going to be a honeypot for identity theft and the very purpose for which it was put in place in the first place. This income verification is not capable of being accurately done because this administration has refused to allow the businesses who will give the information to apply.

I am a proud cosponsor, and I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

I rise today to ask an incredulous question of how many times do we have to say, "No," and how many times do the American people have to say, "Take your hands off my good Affordable Care Act" that has allowed millions of Americans to have preventable care that is being poised to attack the scandalous high percentage of uninsured in the State of Texas, being the number one State with uninsured persons? How many times?

First of all, this bill is frivolous. The reason is because there is a construct in the Affordable Care Act to deal with all of the questions that they've asked. First of all, it will require that individuals will have to submit their projected annual household income. All income data submitted through the marketplace will then be checked against IRS data, Social Security data, current wage information. If there is inconsistency, the marketplace will require additional documentation. In addition, marketplaces will check employer coverage information from the applicant and their employer against data, OPM, and the SHOP Marketplaces, as well as other data sources.

It is absolutely absurd for this bill to place more responsibilities on an already sequestered government. If my colleagues want to do anything to provide any substance to what they're talking about, let's put a bill on the floor to end sequestration. There's no resources that would add to the inspector general's ability to do all that they said.

Let me add further insult to injury, and I want my constituents to listen closely. \$67 million was given to navigators to provide the kind of oversight and construction that these individuals on this bill have suggested they need. What I find appalling and what I've not seen in my tenure in Congress is the number of Members on the Energy and Commerce Committee that have sent a letter to the 51 navigators governed by Health and Human Services to require them to send information.

I want my navigator that received a grant from HHS to refuse to do anything with that letter, and I'm going to ask the Secretary of HHS to reject this letter that has no authority in law. Again, it is trying to abuse and reject the idea of the Affordable Care Act.

This bill should go down, and don't answer the letter. This is a bad way to deal with health care in America.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2775, the so-called "No Subsidies Without Verification Act." I oppose this unnecessary and dilatory legislation which imposes unnecessary and burdensome conditions on the ability of Americans to utilize the tax credits provided by the Affordable Care Act which will enable them to purchase affordable health insurance for themselves and their families.

This is the 41st attempt by House Republicans to repeal, delay, or undermine effective implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

Even though the Affordable Care Act, which has been upheld by the Supreme Court and is here to stay, House Republicans refuse to abandon their quixotic quest to derail a law that will bring peace of mind to millions of Americans and reduce the deficit by \$1 trillion.

Their latest attempt is the bill before us which prohibits any health insurance premium tax credits from being provided until the HHS Inspector General Office certifies there is a program in place that "successfully and consistently verifies" household income and coverage requirements for those applying for these credits.

This bill, H.R. 2775, is unnecessary because HHS already has a strong income verification system in place, as confirmed by CBO. The only purpose of this legislation is to hinder the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

The impact of the enactment of this GOP bill would be an unconscionable delay in obtaining health insurance for more than 25.7 million Americans, 22.7 million of whom are members of working class families.

The new requirement imposed by the irresponsible bill before us would delay millions of our hard-working constituents from getting the premium tax credits they are clearly eligible for beginning on January 1, 2014.

Madam Speaker, Americans do not have to be told that justice delayed is justice denied!

Under current law, to receive the premium tax credits to make their health insurance affordable, individuals will have to submit their projected annual household income. All income data submitted through the Marketplaces will then be checked against IRS data, Social Security data, and current wage information. If there is an inconsistency, the Marketplaces will require additional documentation from applicants.

In addition, Marketplaces will check employer coverage information from the applicant and their employer against data from OPM and the SHOP Marketplaces as well as other data sources approved by HHS to verify eligibility for the tax credits. If applicant information and other data do not match, the Marketplaces will ask for further supporting documentation.

Further, all payments of premium tax credits are reconciled by IRS the following year. The income data submitted is reconciled against the actual wages and health coverage information on the individual's income tax return. If there is an inconsistency, the applicant pays back the excess, subject to statutory limit and there is 100 percent income verification and reconciliation on this back-end.

In sum, there are ample existing safeguards to ensure that premium tax credits are available only to those eligible to receive them.

Madam Speaker, after the sobering events of the last week, regarding war and peace, I would hope all my colleagues would take into consideration the importance of using our limited legislative time more wisely.

We should be addressing the need to eliminate sequestration, raising the debt ceiling and passing the jobs bill in order to repair infrastructure. But instead House Republicans continue to repeal, delay, or undermine the Affordable Care Act. Instead of wasting time on these time-consuming but futile efforts, our friends across the aisle should join with their Democratic colleagues to work together to create jobs and educational opportunities for our people.

Moreover, the Affordable Care Act is working and my constituents—and those of my colleagues—are benefiting from this landmark legislation.

Many of those most in need of the healthcare coverage provided by the Affordable Care Act live in the districts of many members on both sides of this argument. My home state of Texas leads the list of states with the highest percentages of uninsured residents. The states with the highest percentage of uninsured are:

1. Texas: 28.8%.
2. Louisiana: 24%.
3. Nevada: 23.3%.
4. California: 23.2%.
5. Florida: 22.8%.
6. Georgia: 22.5%.
7. Arkansas: 21.9%.
8. Mississippi: 21.7%.
9. Oklahoma: 21.4%.

The highest concentration of the uninsured is the poor. The Affordable Care Act provides at no or nearly no cost to states an option to enroll those living in or near poverty into their Medicaid program, which would benefit my

state of Texas tremendously if the Governor can be persuaded to follow the example of his Republican counterparts and accept a deal of a lifetime.

I cannot understand the continued refusal by House Republicans to accept the Affordable Care Act, which is now the law of the land and is modeled after the plan put in place in Massachusetts by the nominee of their party in the last presidential election.

Instead of focusing on the issues that the American people want addressed, we are having the same discussion to repeal the Affordable Care Act in efforts of my colleagues to repeal, obstruct and undermine this law.

What is even more frustrating is that while there is so much energy in trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act, there has been no plan or suggestions posed on how to replace it.

Additionally, I oppose this misguided legislation because the Affordable Care Act is working for America and for my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas. Let me count the ways:

13 million Americans benefited from \$1.1 billion in rebates sent to them from their health insurance companies last year.

105 million Americans have access to free preventive services, including 71 million Americans in private plans and 34 million seniors on Medicare.

Millions of women began receiving free coverage for comprehensive women's preventive services in August 2012.

100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on healthcare coverage.

Nearly 17 million children with pre-existing conditions can no longer be denied coverage by insurers.

6.6 million young-adults up to age 26 have health insurance through their parents' plan, half of whom would be uninsured without this coverage.

6.3 million Seniors in the 'donut hole' have already saved \$6.1 billion on their prescription drugs.

3.2 million Seniors have access to free annual wellness visits under Medicare, and

360,000 small employers have already taken advantage of the Small Business Health Care Tax Credit to provide health insurance to 2 million workers.

Because of the Affordable Care Act 3.8 million people in Texas—including 2.2 million seniors on Medicare now receive preventative care services. Over 7 million Texans no longer have to fear lifetime limits on their healthcare insurance. Texas parents of 300,731 young adults can sleep easier at night knowing that their children can remain on their health insurance until age 26.

The protection provided by this law is a guarantee to 5 million Texas residents that their insurance companies will spend 80 percent of their premium dollars on healthcare, or customers will get a rebate from their insurance company.

In my state, there are 4,029 people who had no insurance because of pre-existing conditions, but today the Affordable Care Act has provided them with access to coverage. The Affordable Care Act means that many Texans are free of worry about having access to healthcare insurance.

The Affordable Care Act has helped my constituents in the 18th Congressional District

of Texas tremendously. Because of the Affordable Care Act:

11,400 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan;

Over 4,100 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth \$5.4 million, an average discount of \$600 per person in 2011, \$650 in 2012, and \$1,040 thus far in 2013;

71,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible;

121,000 individuals in the district—including 23,000 children and 50,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible;

113,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20 percent of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections;

Over 31,100 consumers in the district received approximately \$4.4 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of \$95 per family in 2012 and \$187 per family in 2011;

Up to 46,000 children in the district with pre-existing health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers;

153,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014;

Up to 193,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a pre-existing health condition; and

The 17,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

However, the list of benefits from the Affordable Care Act is not complete. In 2014, when the Affordable Care Act's final provisions will become effective, insurance companies will be banned from: discriminating against anyone with a pre-existing condition; charging higher rates based on gender or health status; enforcing lifetime dollar limits; and enforcing annual dollar limits on health benefits.

In 2014, access to affordable healthcare for the self employed or those who decide to purchase their own coverage will be easier because of Affordable Insurance Exchanges. There will be a one-stop marketplace where consumers can do what Federal employees have done for decades—purchase insurance at reasonable rates from an insurer of their choice. This will ensure that health care consumers get the care that they need from the medical professionals they trust most at a price they can afford.

This Congress has work that needs to be done, and it is work that should be taken up to restore workers, their families, and communities to sound economic health. We do not have time for partisan political games that do not advance the interests of the American people.

With less than 20 days before enrollment in the Marketplaces begins, the last thing we

should be doing is considering legislation that serves no purpose other than to delay affordable health care coverage to millions of Americans who need and deserve the security and peace of mind such coverage brings.

I urge my Colleagues to put partisan politics aside and join me in voting no on the passage of this bill.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, August 29, 2013.

DEAR —: Pursuant to Rules X and XI of the United States House of Representatives, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is examining the role Navigators will play in efforts to enroll individuals in health insurance exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA).

On August 15, 2013, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) awarded \$67 million in Navigator Cooperative Agreements to entities that will assist consumers in preparing electronic and paper applications to establish eligibility and enroll in coverage through the PPACA marketplaces. Your organization was identified as a recipient of a Navigator grant by the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight (CCHIO).

In order to better understand the work you will perform as a Navigator and the consumer protections that will be in place before open enrollment begins on October 1, 2013, we ask that you contact Committee staff to schedule a briefing to occur no later than September 13, 2013, to discuss your participation as a Navigator in the health insurance exchanges. We also ask that you provide written answers to the following questions and produce the materials requested no later than September 13, 2013:

1. Provide a written description of the work that will be performed with the funds obtained via your Navigator grant. This would include a description of the number of employees, volunteers, or representatives that will be utilized and the pay and duties for each, as well as a written description of how any other portion of the grant may be spent. If a budget or detailed description of how this funding will be utilized exists or will be created, provide these documents in addition to the written response requested.

2. Provide a written description of the training or education employees, volunteers, or representatives must complete, including training or education required by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), CMS, CCHIO, or any other federal or state entity. Provide a written description of any training or educational efforts employees, volunteers, or representatives must complete that are required by your organization beyond that required by any federal or state entity. Provide copies of these materials.

3. Provide a written description of the processes and procedures in place to monitor, review, or otherwise supervise your employees, volunteers, or representatives. If documentation of these standards exists or will be created, provide these documents in addition to the written response requested.

4. Provide a written description of how your organization will utilize the information obtained during performance of your Navigator grant. This would include, but is not limited to, descriptions of the measures your organization will take to safeguard an individual's personal and medical information. Furthermore, provide a written description of whether your organization may use

any of the information obtained during performance of your Navigator grant, including any prohibitions on the use of that information. For example, please provide a written description of whether your organization may contact individuals who have utilized your services as a Navigator for the purposes of fundraising, voter registration efforts, campaign activities, or any other reason.

5. Provide a written description of whether your organization has been contacted by any health insurance company or health care provider to discuss your Navigator grant. This would include, but is not limited to, discussions of supporting your organization in any way or promoting the health insurance company or health care provider to individuals your organization may contact.

6. Provide all documentation and communications related to your Navigator grant. This would include, but is not limited to, materials your organization submitted in order to obtain the grant, materials provided to your organization upon obtaining the grant, and communications between your organization and representatives from HHS, CMS, CCHIO or any other federal or state entity. This request also includes, but is not limited to, any documents provided by (or communications with), representatives from HHS, CMS, CCHIO, Enroll America, or any other entity including federal or state governments discussing individuals to target or solicit for enrollment under the PPACA, including discussions or documents related to geographic area.

Instructions for responding to the Committee's document request are included as an attachment to this letter. Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. If you have questions or wish to discuss your responses or production, please contact Karen Christian or Sean Hayes.

Sincerely,

Fred Upton, Chairman; Tim Murphy, Chairman; Marsha Blackburn, Vice Chairman; Phil Gingrey; Gregg Harper; Cory Gardner; Joe Barton, Chairman Emeritus; Joseph R. Pitts, Chairman, Subcommittee on Health; Michael C. Burgess, Vice Chairman, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations; Steve Scalise; Pete Olson; Morgan Griffith; Bill Johnson; Renee Ellmers; Billy Long.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to point out to my colleagues across the aisle that in the latest Wall Street Journal article of September 10, one of the things that they point out again is that in the Senate, which is the Democrat majority, they put in an HHS spending bill a sense of the Senate that the provision for income verification be in place.

This is something that is very important. It is common sense. Madam Speaker, wouldn't it be just a major commonsense issue to just simply put in place a proactive prevention of fraud, waste, and abuse?

I would also like to point out to my colleagues that have discussed the issue of whether or not the inspector general has the ability to do so, first and foremost, we wouldn't be approaching this in this manner if the rule had not been removed. Yet, we have to have a system in place that will address these issues.

There is no reason that we can't approach it from this, again, very commonsense approach where we ask that we actually have a rule put in place. We can't simply move forward on this incredible disaster of a law when we are not asking for some verification. I think it's a very simple move. I think it's a very commonsense move.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. I now yield 3 minutes to the chairman emeritus of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, here we go again. Time in the House is being wasted. The business of the Nation is being obfuscated. The Republicans have got more nonsense to put on the floor.

We're told that this is important. That's baloney. This is the 41st time that the Republicans have tried to gut the Affordable Care Act. They don't understand that you're supposed to respect the will of the people and to carry forward the business of the Nation. What a shame that we have such behavior on that side of the aisle.

All Members agree that we have to verify the incomes of those getting subsidies through the marketplaces, and that is exactly what will take place starting on October 1. This is obfuscation and deceit. All income data will be submitted through the marketplaces and will be checked against data from both the IRS and the Social Security Administration under existing practices. This is a lot of witchcraft and baloney. If there is an inconsistency, then additional documentation is going to be required. Furthermore, all the subsidies are reconciled by the IRS when an individual files their tax returns.

This is just spinning by people who don't want the legislation to come to be, and again, this is the 41st time we've engaged in this silly exercise.

The practical impact of this bill is to deny millions of Americans from getting subsidies for purchasing health insurance. Its purpose is to delay and obfuscate the implementation of the legislation that it is supposed to be helping. To pass this bill is simply going to prove to be a malicious assault on the most vulnerable people in our country and those most in need of the Affordable Care Act.

We've seen this song and dance before. As I mentioned, this is the 41st time we've engaged in this nonsense, wasting about \$1.5 million each hour we're doing this. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R.

2775. This is political gimmickry. It is going to have harmful effects, and it is intended to do so.

I urge that the legislation be rejected and that we stop this nonsense and we get going forward to try to see to it that we do implement, in a proper way, the Affordable Care Act.

I thank my good friend New Jersey for yielding this time to me, and I urge my colleagues to reject this nonsense.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to respond to some of the comments from my esteemed colleague.

This is theory. That's basically what we have now, because, as the rule was removed the week of the Fourth of July, there has been no rule put in place to replace it. Basically what we're hearing is the description of how it would be run if the rule were in place.

Mr. Speaker, an August 5 frequently asked question document was given out by HHS and the administration, which basically explains the verify process of the Federal exchange but outlines no details on how it will occur. Additionally, this fact sheet has no force of law. Even worse, the fact sheet doesn't even pretend to address the verification applications submitted to ObamaCare exchanges administered by the States. It simply says that the State can choose whatever sample size it wants to audit, meaning no actual verification may occur before millions of dollars of taxpayer-financed benefits are paid out.

□ 1000

While I believe America is a Nation of honorable people, we have to remember there are always those who will abuse the system. The fact sheet from CMS doesn't change the status of the rule. States can continue to audit whatever sample size they see fit or simply not audit at all.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this unnecessary piece of legislation.

Thank you for the time to speak. The bill before us is unnecessary. It is burdensome and serves as a barrier for those who are qualified to receive the care they need. Health and Human Services (HHS), the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and the marketplaces are equipped to handle income verification. If people lie on their tax forms, that is a federal crime.

This is nothing more than one more attempt to block implementation of this law. The Republicans know that as implementation moves ahead their exaggerations and their fear mongering will be exposed. This is a desperate, last ditch effort to stop millions of qualified individuals and families from being able to access care by holding back any sub-

sidies until unreasonable requirements are met by HHS. We have controls in place. The marketplaces and the IRS are tasked with reconciling the data they receive. Americans who are eligible for subsidies should receive them and this bill prevents it from happening.

The Affordable Care Act is a critical law but it's not a perfect law. However, we are spending time with 11th hour attempts at thwarting the law of the land, upheld by the Supreme Court, rather than spending time helping our constituents navigate the new health landscape.

I oppose this bill and urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New Jersey for yielding, and I'm glad he's back with us.

The purpose of this bill is to make it as hard as possible for a hardworking person to get health insurance for their family. So somewhere in America today there's a person working in a nursing home or a retail store or driving a schoolbus, and if their children got sick tonight, they could not take them to a hospital with an insurance card in their pocket; they'd have to pay for it whatever way they could, which is not at all.

The new law says that that person, under most circumstances, starting October 1, can sign up for a health insurance policy as good as the ones that Members of Congress have, for a reasonable and affordable price, maybe \$30 or \$40 a week for that family. This is not someone on public assistance. This is not someone sitting around watching someone else pay their bills. This is a hardworking, taxpaying American. That person has to report their income. They have to follow the rules and do all the things that are needed to be done. This bill makes it as hard as possible for that person to do that, and that's why it should be defeated.

So here we are again. This is attempt number—what number are we using today—44, 45, 46, whatever the number is. The government is going to shut down on September 30 if we don't pass a budget. The majority said it was going to bring that budget to the floor this morning, but they're not doing that. Instead, we're having attempt number 44 to repeal the Affordable Care Act. This is not only a waste of the country's time, it's an imposition on hardworking people who finally deserve a break after all these years.

Vote "no" on this unwise piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to close. I would like to ask my colleague if he has any further speakers remaining?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the re-

maining 30 seconds to our Ways and Means Committee time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Here in Washington we have a way of doing things, and one of those ways is to deal with problems after they've been created.

Prior to coming to Washington, I was a nurse for many, many years. One of the rules that we had drummed into our heads was, if it's not documented, it did not happen. This is a rule that is not documented, so it will not happen. It is not enough that we simply ask to be on the honor system. This is a very important piece of legislation. We must ensure the hard-earned taxpayer dollars are protected and abuses are avoided. I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2775 for this purpose. I believe it is incumbent on the American people and the job that we do here in Washington to ensure that this happens.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) has 10 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 10½ minutes.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of the No Subsidies Without Verification Act because too many of our precious tax dollars are being lost to fraud. That's the simple goal of this bill by Representative DIANE BLACK, stopping fraud and abuse in ObamaCare.

We wouldn't allow an individual to apply for a mortgage, a car loan or a credit card without verifying their income. You can't go into a restaurant, grocery store, or gasoline station and just pay on the honor system. Yet today—because the White House, frankly, has botched the last 3½ years, and ObamaCare is still not ready—somehow they believe that it's okay for billions of dollars in new taxpayer subsidies to go out the door without a bat of the eye on the honor system.

As hard as you work to earn every paycheck, how much more fraud in health care can we accept? Today we have the opportunity, and I think the responsibility, to hold the Federal Government's feet to the fire and insist it put in place strong protections that will end this pay first and chase later model that's been so ineffective at stopping fraud.

This bill simply insists that the independent inspector general of the Health and Human Services agency certifies there is a real, genuine program in place to stop fraud and abuse in ObamaCare by stopping taxpayer subsidies from going out the door to those

who aren't eligible. Wow, that's radical in Washington—not paying those who aren't eligible.

This will give American taxpayers some assurance that we're protecting their hard-earned tax dollars. President Obama has admitted in ObamaCare it's not ready for businesses, and so he waived that. Everyone knows it's not ready for families and workers either. Is it asking too much to at least insist that it be ready to protect taxpayers against a mountain of more fraud?

Now, the White House and our Democratic friends tell us, trust us, we'll verify everything before giving out taxpayer subsidies. Really? This is from the same White House that said exchanges may accept the applicant's attestation without further verification. This is from the same Health and Human Services agency that had to backtrack and explain maybe they would audit all of the applications, but not for State exchanges; they're on their own.

Sorry, but I'm not buying it, and nor are taxpayers in my State of Texas. Time and time again, Health and Human Services and the White House have ducked the real details about ObamaCare. They have no real plan in place. Meanwhile, taxpayer subsidies will fly out the door as individuals pinky swear that their income is accurate.

Only Members of Congress who refuse to stop fraud, who enjoy wasting taxpayer dollars, and who want to turn a blind eye to wasted money could oppose this bill. I strongly urge a "yes" vote on this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

So why are we going through the motions once again—I guess 41 times now? Because the health care reform train is rolling. It's picking up momentum, and the Republicans are once again trying to throw a monkey wrench in its way. In Michigan, 14 different insurance entities are competing. Tens and tens and tens of organizations are working to make this work. Medicaid is now available. Republicans see this happening, and they just can't stand the thought.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) who has really led the effort to stop fraud and abuse in ObamaCare and who understands health care herself.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As Members of the people's House, protecting the American taxpayer from fraud and abuse is absolutely a critical part of our job. And if, like me, you spent the last few weeks visiting your constituents, you will know that the American people are fed up and they're tired of footing the bill for Washing-

ton's failures. That's why passing the No Subsidies Without Verification Act is so important.

This bill would protect American taxpayers from the staggering amount of fraud and abuse in ObamaCare exchanges by simply requiring that ObamaCare live up to its original guarantee in their original law that only those who certify to be eligible for taxpayer subsidies receive them. Unfortunately, because of this administration's clandestine rule change on the July 4 holiday, this is not currently the case. It is estimated that as much as \$50 billion of hard-earned American taxpayer dollars could be given out in fraudulent ObamaCare subsidy claims.

Protecting the taxpayers' money is not a partisan issue. The health care law was originally written—yes, was originally written—so that only those who qualify would receive Federal subsidies in the exchanges. And the Democratic controlled Senate Appropriations Committee has passed legislation expressing their sense that verification needs to occur before subsidies are doled out.

I urge my colleagues here in the House today to join me in helping to protect the American taxpayer, and I call on the Senate to bring this for a vote so that we can send a common-sense measure to the President and protect the American taxpayer from fraud and abuse.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be managed by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time to speak against this bill.

The American public should know what this bill is all about. It is the 41st attempt in the House to repeal and confuse the American people about the Affordable Care Act. It's a deliberate distortion of the actions that have already been in place to protect the taxpayers.

We have letters from the Department of Health and Human Services as well as the Congressional Budget Office that the verification system is in place so that taxpayers' money is being protected.

But the message that the Republicans have been sending over and over again is that we should delay, defund, repeal, but never replace the Affordable Care Act. If they needed further evidence to ignore, just yesterday the nonpartisan CBO reported that HHS has already put the verification system in place that their bill suggests we do.

Mr. Speaker, what they want to do is to create a duplicative, unworkable process to certify a verification system, and they want to give it to the inspector general of HHS, but the Inspector General's Office has told us that they have no idea what this bill is proposing or what that office would have to do. They have no experience in doing it.

So this is not a credible bill. It's a political bill. They can't repeal the Affordable Care Act, so they're determined to keep it from working. It's a clear effort to delay the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

When I was home, my constituents, particularly those who are looking forward to the legislation going into effect, people who have had preexisting conditions or inability to get insurance in the past, keep on asking me: Is this really going to happen, or are the Republicans going to stop it?

I urge a "no" vote on this bill because it's another effort by the Republicans to stop health care for all Americans.

□ 1015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the head of the Republican Policy Committee, and a leader in health care.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, this administration's been very proud of the work that they have done to reduce fraud in Medicare, that they have done to reduce fraud in durable medical equipment. Just a couple of weeks ago there was a huge bust in Puerto Rico trying to deal with Social Security disability fraud that has happened there for years.

But for whatever reason, they have chosen, on this piece of legislation, to look the other way, to actually turn away and say we're going to allow people to self-verify whether they're eligible for the subsidies, when right now people don't even know if they're eligible for the subsidies.

If I walked up to 100 people on the street today and asked them the two questions on that—does your employer provide you a qualified health plan—most of them would say: I have no idea. What's a qualified health plan?

And then if I said, Do you qualify for the subsidies?, just about every American would say: I don't know. I have no idea.

Yet, they're being asked, when no one knows right now, to self-verify that you know one way or the other. They don't have the information. They don't know the information. We don't even know what's going to happen on the exchanges yet. That's not been released yet, and it starts in 3 weeks.

So to say to people something that doesn't even exist yet, you've got to be able to say whether you certify for it or not, whether you can say that, yes, I do qualify for, this is absurd.

We're just asking the simple question: Shouldn't we stick with the original plan on this if we're going to do this?

The law itself said that it had to be certified. Then they created a waiver out of thin air and said, no, this is going to be too complicated; we're going to delay that for a while.

Then people say, what's your plan?

I can tell you, my State is begging to keep our own plan for Insure Oklahoma. We're having to go back to the Federal Government and request that we can keep the plan we've had for a while taking care of those in poverty. This is absurd.

There is a straightforward, simple way to do this that can be done; but, instead, we've created this convoluted mess.

Just this morning I've heard people on the other side say that the train has left the station on this. I've heard health care reform, that train is rolling.

Well, I can tell you, in the Senate the Democrats are saying, at least some of them are saying, this is a train wreck. And I agree.

The train has left the station, and if we don't step out and say this has to stop, then we'll continue to have more and more fraud. We have got to take this on and take it on right now.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD four documents. One is a letter from the President, in his opposition to the bill. The second is technical assistance from the Inspector General, saying they have no ability to do this. The third is a cost estimate from CBO, and the fourth is a letter from HHS detailing their verification plans.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, September 10, 2013.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2775—NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

(Rep. Black, R-TN, and 103 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 2775 because the goal of the bill is already being accomplished while the text of the bill would create delays that could cost millions of hard-working middle-class families the security of affordable health coverage and care they deserve. It is time for the Congress to stop fighting old political battles and join the President in an agenda focused on providing greater economic opportunity and security for middle class families and all those working to get into the middle-class.

The Affordable Care Act gives people greater control over their own health care and has already improved many aspects of the Nation's health care system. Beginning in October 2013, millions of low- and middle-income Americans will be eligible to receive tax credits to help them purchase insurance and cost-sharing reductions to help with out-of-pocket expenses for coverage effective January 1, 2014. Tens of millions of Americans who have previously been denied coverage due to a pre-existing medical condition

will now be covered. The nearly one in two Americans under the age of 65 with pre-existing medical conditions will have the peace of mind that comes from knowing that they cannot be dropped from their health plan or denied coverage because of those conditions. House passage of H.R. 2775 would undermine this security by delaying tax credits and cost-sharing reductions that will otherwise be provided to millions of Americans.

H.R. 2775 is unnecessary because the Secretary of Health and Human Services has already put in place an effective and efficient system for verification of eligibility for premium tax credits and cost sharing reductions. Moreover, it would create vague standards for the Inspector General, whose office has never performed this type of prospective review, to "successfully and consistently" verify eligibility. As a result, this legislation's unnecessary pre-certification requirement would impede opening the Marketplaces on October 1, 2013, driving up out-of-pocket health care costs for millions of Americans and reducing timely access to much-needed and long-denied affordable coverage.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2775, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FROM THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

We offer the following technical assistance on draft HR 2775, as amended, as requested. We note that this technical assistance represents the views of the Office of Inspector General (OIG) and does not necessarily represent the views of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)/the Administration.

Page 2, line 13, as amended by the amendment: The draft legislation would require the IG to make a certification to Congress. We are uncertain what Congress means by a certification. The certification function described in the legislation is substantially outside a traditional OIG oversight role. There is no generally accepted auditing definition or standard for a "certification", nor are certifications of the type described in the legislation among the types of work articulated under the IG Act.

The legislation can be read as contemplating a prospective certification occurring before the program starts operations (or, if operations have begun, before the program has been operational long enough for a statistically sound review of actual operations; typically, we require more than three months of data). As an OIG using accepted auditing and oversight standards, it is difficult to predict whether programs will, in fact, work as intended. More traditionally, an OIG might review internal controls and make recommendations to strengthen them if needed; conduct statistically-valid, retrospective reviews of actual operational history; or issue an opinion on design controls. These options may be more effective for oversight of the verification program.

Page 2, line 14, as amended by the amendment: We note that the "successfully and consistently" standard articulated in the amendment is a standard without clear meaning from an audit perspective. It is not clear to us how this standard would intersect with Yellow Book standards.

General comment on the legislation, as amended: While we are not entirely clear about the scope and nature of the work contemplated by the drafters, under any interpretation of this draft legislation, the OIG would need to develop additional programmatic and tech-

nical expertise in a new program area and would need resources. Given the potential scope of the work described in the draft legislation, the apparent timeframe contemplated, and the serious implications of not completing the work on an expedited basis, we would need substantial additional resources, including auditors, contractors, or other staff. If the certification were to cover multiple systems (including the Federal and State-based exchanges) or require auditing of complex operations, we might need dozens of staff to do the work in the time allotted. To do the certification proposed in the legislation, or the alternative internal controls review and retrospective reviews of operations in accordance with OIG's historic oversight role,—as well as other essential oversight of ACA—we need OIG's 2014 budget appropriated.

H.R. 2775—A bill to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes

Summary: H.R. 2775 would make the availability of premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies to eligible individuals and families under the Affordable Care Act (ACA) contingent on a certification to the Congress by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) that a program is in place that verifies, consistent with section 1411 of the ACA, the household income and coverage qualifications of people applying for such credits and cost-sharing subsidies. Section 1411 of the ACA establishes requirements for a program to determine whether someone meets the income and coverage qualifications for such premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies (among other things).

CBO and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) estimate that enacting H.R. 2775 would not affect direct spending or revenues. A program is currently being put in place to verify income and coverage qualifications for the tax credits and subsidies, and that program appears to CBO and JCT to be in accordance with section 1411. Accordingly, we expect that the Secretary would certify before the beginning of 2014, when premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies would first be paid, that the requirements in H.R. 2775 are satisfied.

Pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply to H.R. 2775 because enacting the bill will not affect direct spending or revenues in CBO and JCT's estimation.

H.R. 2775 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA).

Estimated Cost to the Federal Government: H.R. 2775 would prohibit premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies from being paid before the Secretary of HHS has certified to Congress that a program is in place that verifies, in accordance with section 1411 of the ACA, the household income and coverage qualifications of people applying for such tax credits and subsidies.

Section 1411 of the ACA describes a program to determine whether someone meets income, coverage, and other qualifications for premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies. The section specifies methods for verifying the information provided by applicants and establishes penalties for the provision of false or fraudulent information. In addition, section 1411 establishes reporting requirements for individuals related to determining if the individual has an affordable

offer of insurance coverage from an employer. Further, the section specifically grants flexibility to the Secretary of HHS to modify the methods used for verification of information provided by applicants.

In July, the Administration delayed for one year two reporting requirements for certain large employers and health insurance coverage providers. Further, regulations issued by HHS in July provided state-based insurance exchanges with limited flexibility when verifying applicants' household incomes and offers of employment-based health insurance coverage for the 2014 benefit year.

CBO and JCT do not expect that those administrative actions and regulations, by themselves, would prohibit the Secretary from being able to provide certification under H.R. 2775. In particular, the reporting requirements for employers are not covered by section 1411, and the flexibility regarding verification that is provided in the regulations issued by HHS appears to us to be consistent with section 1411. (The regulations that were issued regarding verification are slightly looser than CBO and JCT had previously expected, so we revised our baseline projections following the announcement of those regulations.¹ However, in our judgment, the regulations are consistent with the flexibility granted the Secretary by section 1411.)

1. Congressional Budget Office, Letter to the Honorable Paul Ryan Re: Analysis of the Administration's Announced Delay of Certain Requirements Under the Affordable Care Act (July 30, 2013), www.cbo.gov/publication/44465

Thus, CBO and JCT conclude that a program is currently being put in place in accordance with section 1411 regarding the verification of household income and coverage qualifications. CBO and JCT expect that this program will be in place by January 1, 2014, when the premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies would begin to be paid. We therefore expect that the Secretary would certify by that time that the requirements in H.R. 2775 are satisfied, allowing premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies to be made available on schedule. As a result, we estimate that H.R. 2775 would have no budgetary effects relative to our current baseline projections.

This conclusion, however, is uncertain. The language of H.R. 2775 is unclear regarding the meaning of the term "program." That term might be construed to go beyond regulations and guidance to encompass operational competence, such as software and enrollment procedures that have been proven to work as provided for in regulations. Determining whether or not those systems work as provided for in regulations, however, may not be possible until there is some experience or data that can be used to evaluate the systems.

Estimate Prepared by: Federal Costs: Jean Hearne, Sarah Masi, and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation; Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Lisa Ramirez-Branum; Impact on the Private Sector: Alexia Diorio.

Estimate Approved by: Holly Harvey, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR LEGISLATION,

Washington, DC, August 22, 2013.

Hon. FRED UPTON,

Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: The Secretary has asked that I respond to your letter con-

cerning eligibility determinations under the Affordable Care Act. The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has been working tirelessly to implement the Affordable Care Act to ensure that on October 1, 2013, millions of Americans will have access to quality, affordable health coverage, including private insurance plans through the Marketplaces. This work includes close collaboration with other federal agencies and the states to ensure a consumer-friendly experience for individuals, families, and small businesses applying for coverage while implementing appropriate verification procedures and safeguards to protect federal taxpayer dollars.

It is important to note that verification of income and employer-sponsored coverage applies only to individuals and families seeking financial assistance in the Marketplaces through the insurance affordability programs, which include Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), premium tax credits, and cost-sharing reductions. Federal regulations at 45 CFR 155.320 provide detailed verification procedures for household income and eligibility for and enrollment in employer-sponsored coverage for individuals and families applying for insurance affordability programs.

The Marketplace will check the income information submitted by every individual applying for insurance affordability programs by comparing it with data from tax filings and Social Security data, and in many cases, with the additional use of current wage information that is available electronically. The multi-step process begins when an individual applies for an insurance affordability program through the Marketplace and affirms or inputs his or her projected annual household income. The Marketplace then compares the applicant's projected annual household income with information available from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and Social Security Administration (SSA). If the data submitted by the applicant cannot be verified by the Marketplace using IRS and SSA data, then the information is compared with wage information from employers provided by Equifax Workforce Solutions (Equifax), which is under contract with HHS to provide this information. If Equifax data does not substantiate the applicant's inputted income, the Marketplace will request an explanation or additional documentation from the applicant.

When documentation is requested, the regulations, at 45 CFR 155.315 (f)(4)(ii), specify that if the consumer meets all other eligibility requirements, he or she will be provided with time-limited advanced payments of the premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions based on his or her attestation to projected household income, while documentation is gathered and submitted to the Marketplace. If documentation is requested and is not provided within the specified timeframe (90 days, which may be extended based on the applicant's good faith efforts to obtain required documentation), the statute specifies that the Marketplace will base its eligibility determination on data from IRS and SSA. If no data from IRS is available, the Marketplace will discontinue advanced payments of premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions.

For eligibility for 2014 only, we recently indicated that HHS will exercise enforcement discretion such that a Marketplace may choose to request additional documentation from a statistically-significant sample of the group of individuals in only one specific situation: when the Marketplace has IRS data,

the applicant attests to projected annual household income that is more than ten percent below IRS and SSA data, Equifax data is unavailable, and the individual does not provide a reasonable explanation for the inconsistency between the attestation and IRS and SSA data. In all other cases in which the data submitted by the individual cannot be verified using IRS and SSA data or Equifax data, and the individual does not provide a reasonable explanation for any discrepancy identified between their attestation and electronic data, the Marketplace must request additional documentation. This includes, for example, all cases in which IRS data is not available for an individual, and the attestation to projected annual household income cannot be verified using Equifax data; and all cases in which there is both IRS data and Equifax data for an individual but the attestation to projected annual household income cannot be verified using that data.

We have clarified that, for the Federally-facilitated Marketplace, CMS intends to set the initial size of the sample at 100 percent, such that everyone who is in the circumstance described above in which sampling may be used is asked to submit satisfactory documentation. Since publication of the final rule, we have ascertained that there are sufficient resources to ask every individual in this circumstance for such documentation with no exceptions. State-based Marketplaces may choose to use other sample sizes, provided that they are statistically significant for 2014. As described in 45 CFR 155.320(c)(3)(vi)(F), if satisfactory documentation is not submitted by the end of the resolution period, the Marketplace will determine eligibility based on the IRS and SSA data.

With respect to verification of employer-sponsored coverage, section 1411(a) of the Affordable Care Act requires the Secretary to establish a program for determining eligibility for enrollment in a qualified health plan (QHP) through the Marketplace, advance payments of premium tax credits, and cost-sharing reductions. Section 1411(b) of the Affordable Care Act requires applicants for insurance affordability programs to provide specific information regarding employer-sponsored coverage, and section 1411(d) of the Affordable Care Act requires the Secretary to verify the accuracy of this information, "in such manner as the Secretary determines appropriate."

The Marketplace requests and verifies employer-sponsored coverage information as part of the eligibility determination process for advance payments of the premium tax credit and cost-sharing reductions. Regulations at 45 CFR 155.320(d) specify that the Marketplace must verify an applicant's access to employer-sponsored coverage through data available to the Marketplace. The Marketplace will have access to electronic data sources for verifying access to employer-sponsored coverage through the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) federal employment data and data from the Small Business Health Options Program (SHOP) Marketplace operating in its state, where available. If discrepancies are identified using either OPM or SHOP data, the Marketplace will notify the applicant and request additional information. If the applicant does not adequately resolve the discrepancy with additional information, the Marketplace will make a final decision based on information obtained from the electronic data sources. A Marketplace may also use additional available electronic data sources that have been

approved by HHS for this purpose, based on evidence that the sources are sufficiently current, accurate, and minimize administrative burden.

An individual who applies for insurance affordability programs and has income in the premium tax credit range will input information related to whether or not he or she has access to employer-sponsored coverage that meets the minimum value standard. This process is assisted by the Employer Coverage Tool, a page that is included in the Marketplace's single, streamlined application that will help applicants gather information about any employer health coverage for which they are eligible. Applicants may ask their employer to help fill out the Employer Coverage Tool, or employers may make this information available in other ways, such as by making it part of the notice specified in section 18B of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The Marketplace then compares the applicant-supplied employer coverage information with information from OPM and the SHOP, where the Marketplace has access to SHOP data. When information provided by an applicant is inconsistent with OPM or SHOP data, the Marketplace will provide a period of 90 days for the applicant to provide satisfactory documentation or otherwise resolve the inconsistency. Consistent with general Marketplace verification procedures, eligibility for advance payments of the premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions is provided during the period, to the extent that the applicant is otherwise eligible and attests that he or she understands that any advance premium tax credit paid is subject to reconciliation by the IRS. If documentation is not provided within the specified timeframe (90 days, which may be extended based on the applicant's good faith efforts to obtain required documentation), or documentation provided is not sufficient to resolve the inconsistency, the Marketplace will make the determination based on available electronic data.

For eligibility for 2014 only, the Marketplace has the flexibility to identify a statistically-significant sample of the applicant population for which OPM, SHOP, or an approved state-based data source do not have available data, and request information regarding employer-sponsored coverage from their employers. The Federally-facilitated Marketplace will conduct the sample-based review and will collect a robust set of data from the income and employer verification process. This data, and information gathered by State-based Marketplaces that are conducting similar reviews, will be used as the basis for analysis to support the development of targeted verification strategies and future enhancements to the verification process.

It is important to note that advance payments of premium tax credits are provided directly to the health insurance plan, not to the consumer. In addition, individuals seeking to purchase insurance in the Marketplace must attest, under penalty of perjury, that they are not filing false information. The Affordable Care Act also provides for penalties when an individual provides false or fraudulent information. Individuals on whose behalf tax credits are provided must acknowledge, before they receive advance payments of the tax credit, that they understand that the payments are reconciled at the close of the year. They must also file income taxes for the year in which the credit is received. All advance payments of premium tax credits are reconciled with the IRS at the close of the year.

With respect to your questions about the employer responsibility requirements, as noted in previous correspondence, decisions regarding administrative action with respect to sections 6055, 6056 and 4980H of the Internal Revenue Code remain under the purview of the Department of the Treasury.

Although HHS regularly works with and communicates with other federal departments that share responsibility for implementation of the Affordable Care Act, particularly with respect to programs or provisions that are cross-cutting, it is important to note that the Department of the Treasury's decision to provide transition relief with respect to insurer and employer reporting requirements under the Internal Revenue Code has no impact on the process for verifying employer-sponsored coverage. HHS' policy regarding verification of employer sponsored coverage was articulated in a series of regulatory documents beginning in August 2011, culminating in the final rule, published on July 15, 2013. Throughout the development of this policy HHS has been clear that we would verify the availability of employer-sponsored coverage against available electronic data sources.

HHS is committed to the successful enrollment of millions of Americans into qualified health plans through the Marketplace, and to ensuring that individuals receive the financial assistance for which they are eligible. Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

JIM R. ESQUEA,

Assistant Secretary for Legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We're here today because we're supposed to be dealing with the CR, continuing the funding of the Federal Government. But the Republicans are scrapping among themselves and can't figure out what to do.

Now, right now, medical research in my district and across this country is grinding to a halt. Grant money is disappearing, laboratories are closing, and potentially world-transforming projects are being set aside. Researchers are being laid off, and students are discouraged from entering the field. There is no end in sight.

Now, the question you have to ask yourself is, why is the sequester not being dealt with?

It's the mechanism that's breaking our economy for the future because innovation, research, and our ability to compete in the global marketplace depends on research, which starts now continuously, not to mention the life-saving cures and treatments we're losing because of these empty labs.

So what are we doing here today?

Thank God for ObamaCare. We've got something to do. We can try and repeal it for the 41st time.

ObamaCare, folks, is not going away. It's about to take off. In Washington, Oregon and California, we can't wait. The rest of the States may be sitting on their hands, but we aren't.

And the fact is, even Senator CRUZ from Texas says "you aren't going to win this one."

Now, maybe these endless, pathetic kind of tantrums that we have out here

every 2 weeks wouldn't matter if there weren't so many much more important things that need to be done.

We get it. I mean, we really do understand it. The American people even get it, that the Republicans really, really, really, really, really don't like this law. But can't we move on?

Stop screaming about wanting a budget and pass one. You've had the budget; you put the people forward to go and have a conference committee.

Quit dancing around with the CR. America needs jobs, and you can do something about it. It's not just some force of nature we can't control. Our economy is weak because we're starving it. Let's do something about that, instead of this biweekly announcement that you dislike access to affordable care.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN), a key member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, when I look across this country and look at who opposes the President's health care law, ObamaCare, it's not just Republicans. The New York Times today says the AFL-CIO is fed up with the law and ready to get it repealed if they can't fix it. Employers across this country are fed up with it. That's why the President delayed it for a year till after the elections.

Come on, let's get a grip and face reality.

But my dislike of the law aside, that's not what this is about. This is about the Federal Government handing out money without verifying who's getting it. That's ludicrous. It's unbelievable.

We have to verify, when I, as an Army Reservist, sign up for TRICARE Select, because now I'm thrown into the ObamaCare exchanges. If you buy alcohol, you have to show an ID. I mean, this is pretty basic.

We just want to verify who's getting government cash. That's it. And that's why I support the bill. It's common sense. Let's pass it.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, 19 days, in just 19 days, millions of working Americans can apply to receive premium assistance tax credits to help them get health insurance. These are neighbors who were previously denied coverage, or who were excluded because of a preexisting condition, or because a small employer could not afford to provide health insurance.

And today's bill is about one thing, and that is to deny those Americans their lawful opportunity, on October 1, to obtain health care security. This bill is certainly not about fraud because there is already a comprehensive system to prevent overpayment and verify income.

This very afternoon, a family that suffers severe injuries in a traffic accident on I-35, or a San Antonio family that is notified of a dread disease, those families that lack affordable health insurance are suddenly overwhelmed with medical bills, and they deserve an alternative; and that alternative is coming on October 1, if these folks can't stop it.

This bill would pull the affordability rug right out from under our working families, just as they're beginning to learn about its availability.

Yes, this is the 41st time that they've tried to delay and dismantle and deny the rights of American working families. We know it won't be their last vote. In fact, next week they're so intent on blocking American families from getting health insurance coverage, they're willing to shut down the entire Federal Government.

And as if that weren't enough, next month they propose to default on the full faith and credit of the United States of America for the first time in our history for the sole purpose of denying American families that don't have insurance now some health security.

I think it's wrong. They talk about trust. Well, I don't think we should trust these zealots with our health care future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yielding myself 15 seconds, yesterday we learned the Federal Government is paying millions of dollars to prisoners for unemployment benefits, millions of dollars of your money to cons in prison. But don't worry, we'll stop the fraud in ObamaCare.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, like my Republican colleagues, I too am concerned about fraud in any public program, whether it's ObamaCare, food stamps, Medicare. Who could be against verification?

But this is not about verification. Again, the 41st failed attempt to submarine reform in health care.

The question before us today is whether or not the risk of fraud in ObamaCare is so pervasive that we should shut down an essential part of the law.

My friends on the other side would have you believe that the administration's decision to delay income and coverage verifications leaves the health care marketplace vulnerable to rampant fraud. This is not the case.

First, federally operated and partnership exchanges still will verify such information beginning in 2014. Only 16 States and the District of Columbia

will wait until 2015 to begin more comprehensive verification.

In those instances, the incentive to provide false information is greatly overshadowed by the benefit of doing so. Lying on the exchange form carries with it a penalty of \$25,000. On top of that, anyone who provides false income information will have to pay back the extra subsidies when filing a tax form for 2014.

Additionally, States will audit a statistically significant number of individuals, meaning that everyone has an equal opportunity to be audited.

Finally, fighting fraud requires an investment of funding and resources.

How dare you get up here and talk about a plan when you, in the regular budget, want to cut every penny from resources, from research, from helping us get to the point where American people will be served.

Look, you can't stand success. Help us improve the system, not continue a system where patients are playing second fiddle.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time in case the gentleman from Washington has additional speakers or would like to close on his side. We are prepared to close.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) to close our arguments.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear: this is not about the integrity of the tax system. There are any number of areas where we rely far more on discretion to individual taxpayers, and there's no appetite, actually, to move in those areas.

My Republican friends are not interested in providing adequate resources to the IRS to be able to appropriately enforce the tax law right now, and we have hundreds of billions of dollars of taxes that aren't collected.

But this is part of a mean-spirited and shortsighted effort to sabotage the health care reform effort. Bear in mind what's going on in States around the country.

In Missouri, the Republican legislature has been on a rampage that will even make it illegal for State employees to tell Missourians what they're entitled to under State law. This is a new low in, I think, political malpractice.

The Republicans are willing to flirt with shutting down the American Government in their attempt to prevent Americans from getting health care they're entitled to under the law. This is wrong.

I strongly urge that we reject this mean-spirited approach.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as I yield the balance of our time to the gentlelady from Tennessee, I make the case, this is simply choice. Those who want to stop fraud in ObamaCare support this bill. Those who want to turn a blind eye to that fraud oppose it.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, even the White House veto threat actually proves the need for the No Subsidies Without Verification Act.

The White House says that H.R. 2775, which simply requires the administration to verify whether people are eligible for taxpayer-funded ObamaCare subsidies before they're doled out, would create delays is what they say. It would create delays.

But the veto threat then goes on to say that the bill is "unnecessary" because the administration officials claim they already have, "an effective and efficient system for verification and eligibility."

So which is it?

Does the Obama administration have a way, other than the honor system, to verify whether someone is eligible for taxpayer subsidies or will requiring the administration to have one create delays?

□ 1030

If they had a transparent verification system in place, one that actually worked, this bill would create no delays. The administration should actually welcome it, and so should all Members of this body, who should vote for this. That's why we need this bill. We need independent verification that programs are in place before taxpayers' subsidies go out the door.

For all taxpayers, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2775.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2775, the No Subsidies without Verification Act sponsored by my good friend from Tennessee, Representative BLACK. I oppose because the goal of this bill is already being accomplished under provisions of the Affordable Care Act. Passage of this bill would simply bog down what is already being done and could cost hard-working middle class Americans millions. The security of knowing that they have the affordable health insurance coverage they deserve and need. For all practical purpose, one could say that this is the forty-first time that the House has sought to repeal (to no avail) the Affordable Care Act. It is not going to happen! Let's move on so that millions of low and middle income Americans will be eligible to receive tax credits to help them purchase insurance to the tens of millions of Americans who have previously been denied coverage due to preexisting medical conditions will knowing that they can have coverage, peace of mind and the healthcare they need.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, the government has enough trouble ending waste, fraud, and abuse that is already currently occurring. We should not knowingly allow even more to occur.

This is why I am a cosponsor of H.R. 2775, legislation that we will soon vote on that will

prohibit taxpayer funded subsidies to individuals without income verification. The Administration has had three and a half years to implement a system to verify that only those individuals who qualify for a taxpayer funded subsidy will receive them. Despite having significant time, the Administration has failed to safeguard taxpayers from even more waste, fraud, and abuse.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation that will protect taxpayers until the Administration can establish a better form of income verification than the honor system.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 339, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 191, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

YEAS—235

Aderholt	Cook	Griffin (AR)
Alexander	Cotton	Griffith (VA)
Amash	Cramer	Grimm
Amodei	Crawford	Guthrie
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Hall
Bachus	Culberson	Hanna
Barletta	Daines	Harper
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Barrow (GA)	Denham	Hartzler
Barton	Dent	Hastings (WA)
Benishek	DeSantis	Heck (NV)
Bentivolio	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Bilirakis	Duffy	Holding
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Black	Duncan (TN)	Huelskamp
Blackburn	Ellmers	Huizenga (MI)
Boustany	Farenthold	Hultgren
Brady (TX)	Fincher	Hunter
Bridenstine	Fitzpatrick	Hurt
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Issa
Brooks (IN)	Fleming	Jenkins
Brown (GA)	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Bucshon	Fortenberry	Jones
Burgess	Foxx	Jordan
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Joyce
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (PA)
Campbell	Gardner	King (IA)
Cantor	Garrett	King (NY)
Capito	Gerlach	Kingston
Carter	Gibbs	Kinzinger (IL)
Cassidy	Gibson	Kline
Chabot	Gingrey (GA)	Labrador
Chaffetz	Gohmert	LaMalfa
Coble	Goodlatte	Lamborn
Coffman	Gosar	Lance
Cole	Gowdy	Lankford
Collins (GA)	Granger	Latham
Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)	Latta
Conaway	Graves (MO)	Lipinski

LoBiondo	Petri
Long	Pittenger
Lucas	Pitts
Luetkemeyer	Poe (TX)
Lummis	Pompeo
Marchant	Posey
Marino	Price (GA)
Massie	Radel
Matheson	Reed
McCarthy (CA)	Reichert
McCaul	Renacci
McClintock	Ribble
McHenry	Rice (SC)
McIntyre	Rigell
McKeon	Roby
McKinley	Roe (TN)
McMorris	Rogers (AL)
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)
Meadows	Rogers (MI)
Meehan	Rohrabacher
Messer	Rokita
Mica	Rooney
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Miller (MI)	Roskam
Miller, Gary	Ross
Mullin	Rothfus
Mulvaney	Royce
Murphy (PA)	Runyan
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)
Noem	Salmon
Nugent	Sanford
Nunes	Scalise
Nunnelee	Schock
Olson	Schweikert
Palazzo	Scott, Austin
Paulsen	Sensenbrenner
Pearce	Perry
Perry	Shimkus
Peterson	Shuster

NAYS—191

Andrews	Enyart	Lujan Grisham
Barber	Eshoo	(NM)
Bass	Esty	Lujan, Ben Ray
Beatty	Farr	(NM)
Becerra	Fattah	Lynch
Bera (CA)	Foster	Maffei
Bishop (GA)	Frankel (FL)	Maloney,
Bishop (NY)	Fudge	Carolyn
Blumenauer	Gabbard	Maloney, Sean
Bonamici	Gallo	Matsui
Brady (PA)	Garamendi	McCollum
Braley (IA)	Garcia	McDermott
Brown (FL)	Grayson	McGovern
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al	McNerney
Bustos	Green, Gene	Meeks
Butterfield	Grijalva	Meng
Capps	Gutiérrez	Michaud
Capuano	Hahn	Miller, George
Cárdenas	Hanabusa	Moore
Carney	Hastings (FL)	Moran
Carson (IN)	Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)
Cartwright	Higgins	Napolitano
Castor (FL)	Himes	Neal
Castro (TX)	Hinojosa	Negrete McLeod
Chu	Holt	Nolan
Ciilline	Honda	O'Rourke
Clarke	Horsford	Owens
Clay	Hoyer	Pallone
Cleaver	Huffman	Pascarell
Clyburn	Israel	Pastor (AZ)
Cohen	Jackson Lee	Payne
Connolly	Jeffries	Pelosi
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Peters (CA)
Costa	Kaptur	Peters (MI)
Courtney	Keating	Pingree (ME)
Crowley	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Cuellar	Kennedy	Polis
Cummings	Kildee	Price (NC)
Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Quigley
Davis, Danny	Kind	Rahall
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
DeGette	Kuster	Richmond
Delaney	Kyburz	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Langevin	Ruiz
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Deutsch	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Dingell	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Linda
Doggett	Levin	T.
Doyle	Lewis	Sanchez, Loretta
Duckworth	Loebach	Sarbanes
Edwards	Loftgren	Schakowsky
Ellison	Lowenthal	Schiff
Engel	Lowey	Schneider

Schrader	Speier	Vela
Schwartz	Swalwell (CA)	Velázquez
Scott (VA)	Takano	Walz
Scott, David	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Sewell (AL)	Tierney	Waters
Shea-Porter	Titus	Watt
Sherman	Tonko	Waxman
Sinema	Tsongas	Welch
Sires	Van Hollen	Wilson (FL)
Slaughter	Vargas	Yarmuth
Smith (WA)	Veasey	

NOT VOTING—6

Diaz-Balart	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Herrera Beutler	Nadler	Visclosky

□ 1101

Messrs. BERA of California and VELA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. WALBERG changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 253, noes 147, answered “present” 1, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

AYES—253

Aderholt	Capps	Duckworth
Alexander	Cárdenas	Duncan (SC)
Amodei	Carney	Duncan (TN)
Bachmann	Carter	Edwards
Bachus	Cartwright	Ellison
Barletta	Cassidy	Ellmers
Barrow (GA)	Castro (TX)	Engel
Barton	Chabot	Enyart
Beatty	Chaffetz	Esty
Becerra	Ciilline	Farenthold
Bera (CA)	Clay	Fattah
Bilirakis	Cleaver	Fincher
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Forbes
Black	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Blackburn	Cook	Foster
Blumenauer	Cooper	Frankel (FL)
Bonamici	Cramer	Franks (AZ)
Boustany	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Bridenstine	Culberson	Gabbard
Brooks (AL)	Daines	Gallo
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Danny	Garamendi
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Gingrey (GA)
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Goodlatte
Buchanan	DeLauro	Gosar
Bustos	DelBene	Gowdy
Butterfield	Dent	Granger
Camp	DesJarlais	Grayson
Campbell	Grimm	Deutch
Cantor	Doggett	Guthrie
Capito	Doyle	Gutiérrez

Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Huffman
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Klingston
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Maloney,
Carolyn
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)

NOES—147

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Barr
Bass
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chu
Clarke
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Cotton
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
DeSantis
Dingell
Eshoo
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores

McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon

Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stutzman
Takano
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Vargas
Wagner
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sewell (AL)
Slaughter

Smith (MO)
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Veasey

Vela
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Waters
Weber (TX)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—31

Brady (TX)
Calvert
Castor (FL)
Coble
Courtney
Crawford
Davis (CA)
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Garcia
Gohmert

Grijalva
Hanna
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Labrador
Lynch
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
Moran
Nader
Nolan

Quigley
Rohrabacher
Rush
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Webster (FL)

□ 1111

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, 2013, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 458 and 459.

Had I been present for rollcall vote 458, on passage of H.R. 2775, to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes, I would have voted "No."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 459, on approving the Journal, I would have voted "no."

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE
CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR
OF H.R. 1001

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1001, a bill originally introduced by Representative Bonner of Alabama, for the purposes of adding co-sponsors and requesting reprinting pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

□ 1115

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, for the purposes of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet in pro forma session at 2 p.m., and no votes are expected. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Madam Speaker, Members are advised that, pending ongoing discussions on the continuing resolution, the House may need to be in session during the week of September 23 and possibly into the weekend. Members should expect an announcement next week regarding when the House would meet during the week of September 23. This is a change from the previously announced schedule.

Madam Speaker, next week, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

The House will likely consider H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, sponsored by the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Representative DOC HASTINGS. In addition to improving forest health and helping to prevent catastrophic wildfires, this legislation contains a short-term extension of the Secure Rural Schools program.

In addition, I expect the House to consider H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013, authored by Representative MARK AMODEI; and H.R. 687, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013, drafted by Representative PAUL GOSAR. These bills, both from the Natural Resources Committee, will foster economic growth and create jobs for the middle class.

The House will also consider the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act, authored by Agriculture chairman, Representative FRANK LUCAS. This legislation restores the intent of the bipartisan welfare reforms adopted in 1996 to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. It also refocuses the program on those who need it most. No law-abiding beneficiary who meets the income and asset tests of the current program and is willing to comply with the applicable work requirements will lose his benefits under the bill.

Finally, Madam Speaker, Members should be prepared to vote on the continuing resolution as the new fiscal year approaches.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I would reiterate to Members, in case they weren't listening, that the majority leader has

said that we ought to be clearing our calendars for the week of the 23rd of September. That's the last week of the month. Originally, we were scheduled to be off that week, but in light of the fact that we have been unable yet to pass a continuing resolution or appropriations bills to fund the government's activities after the end of the fiscal year on September 30, I am pleased to see the majority leader is putting the House on notice. I have been telling my Members for the last 2 months to reserve that time in the contingency of which the majority leader speaks.

Mr. Majority Leader, before we left in July, we had a bill on the floor to fund Transportation and the Housing and Urban Development Department as well as other items. That bill was pulled. Subsequent to that bill's being pulled, HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, sent a notice out to a lot of people. I presume the gentleman had an opportunity to read it.

It read:

I am extremely disappointed with the decision to pull the T-HUD bill—as it's referred to—from the House calendar today. The prospects for passing this bill in September are bleak at best given the vote count on passage that was apparent this afternoon.

He then made this statement, Mr. Leader:

With this action, the House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted 3 months ago. Thus, I—HAL ROGERS speaking—believe that the House has made its choice. Sequestration and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts must be brought to an end.

Mr. Leader, as you know, he went on to say this:

The House, Senate and White House must come together as soon as possible on a comprehensive compromise that repeals sequestration, takes the Nation off this lurching path from fiscal crisis to fiscal crisis, reduces our deficits and debt, and provides a realistic, top-line, discretionary spending level to fund the government in a responsible and attainable way.

That was his statement—the chairman from Kentucky, a conservative Republican—on July 31, 2013.

I want to tell my friend, the majority leader, that I agree with Mr. ROGERS. The sequester level is unattainable and unrealistic. That's the chairman of your Appropriations Committee, who is responsible—and has been for many years—for judging what are the appropriate expenditures for our government to maintain programs important to our country, to our economy, and to our national security.

Mr. Leader, we have another issue beyond the continuing resolution which will also, as the gentleman knows, have a very substantial effect on the fiscal credibility of America, on the fiscal stability of America and on the growth of our economy, and of the confidence of our people and of people

around the world, and that is the extension of our debt limit. This is going to be a shorter colloquy than we usually have because the issues that confront us are so very, very important.

I want to tell the majority leader that we have not had any discussions about a possible compromise; nor have we had any discussions with Mr. MCCARTHY about a possible compromise; nor have I or the leader had any substantive conversations with the Speaker about a substantive compromise, in our view, consistent with what your chairman of the Appropriations Committee rightfully, in my view, observed of the fiscal realities confronting our country. You have said and Mr. BOEHNER has said—I believe and Ms. PELOSI believes—that not extending the debt limit is unthinkable; and if we fail to do so, it would have very, very serious, adverse consequences on our country.

So rather than discuss other further scheduling issues, except to the extent that the gentleman wants to respond, let me say to the gentleman that, with these two items in particular, I stand ready to work with your side, and my side stands ready to work with your side on a compromise; but I will tell the gentleman, with all sincerity, that we will not pursue what Mr. ROGERS correctly observed is an unsustainable and damaging process. To that extent, we will not compromise on that issue because your chairman is correct—it's harmful to our country.

So, in that context, Mr. Leader, I am hopeful that, as we move forward, as you've just been required to have another week added to the calendar because we've been unable so far to do our work—and this week, of course, is 1 of 2 weeks that we were supposed to meet in September, and we haven't done much. That's unfortunate. So we have used 50 percent of the time that we had for not much. I would ask the gentleman if he thinks that there is a possibility to compromise. I have observed and the world has observed the difficulty the gentleman and Mr. BOEHNER, the Speaker, have had in getting agreement in your own party, but we need to get agreement between the two parties and the Senate and the President of the United States so that this country can be funded and can meet its obligations and stabilize our economy.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, Madam Speaker.

First, I would say I'm glad he received the news that we may very well be in session in the last week of September the way he has because I do think it reflects the seriousness with which both sides take the pending fiscal issues and deadlines that we are about to confront both in the continuing resolution as well as in the debt ceiling, itself.

Now, Madam Speaker, I've set aside the statement that my friend, the

Democratic whip, has indicated about not doing anything this week, because we just voted on a bipartisan bill enforcing accountability on ObamaCare.

As the Democratic whip knows, ObamaCare is growingly unpopular in this country. In fact, in the latest public poll out today, nearly 60 percent of Americans reject ObamaCare and the direction in health care, and we are serious and committed on this side of the aisle for a better future for health care. The President, himself, has said that it's not ready for prime time and has issued waivers for businesses, for insurance companies. We need to have a waiver and a delay for all people of ObamaCare.

The bill that we passed today says that the administration is hoping that all of the income subsidies that are still in effect will go forward in a transparent and accountable way. That's really impossible to guard against fraud given that the administration has already exempted corporate America and the businesses from having to comply with the verification of someone's eligibility for subsidies. So there is no way that this law can work; and our side is committed to discussing how we go forward, which is, first and foremost, a delay of ObamaCare.

I'd say to the gentleman that I'm glad that he is willing to sit down and talk, and I would hope that he could impose that upon the administration, because as late as August 27, 2013, Treasury Secretary Jack Lew said:

The President has made it clear: we are not going to negotiate over the debt limit.

I would say, Madam Speaker, history has shown us that in periods of divided government there have always been discussions around the fiscal issues of this country; and in fact, the issue of the debt ceiling has provided a forum for resolution on some of those fiscal issues. Going back to Gramm-Rudman-Hollings that was negotiated and settled around a debt ceiling discussion, as was the Congressional Review Act, as was, Madam Speaker, as we know 2 years ago, the Budget Control Act. So I hope that the gentleman could take his dedication to trying to work things out to the White House and say it's time for all of us to sit down and resolve these issues.

Now, as far as the sequester is concerned, I would say to the gentleman he knows I don't think that the sequester is the right way and the best way to go about reducing spending. I mean, just by its very nature, a blunt, across-the-board cut treats programs that you might want to get rid of in the same way that it treats programs that, perhaps, are really doing a great job. That indiscriminate type of cut is something on which we could really do better. We could do a lot better than doing those kinds of cuts, which is exactly our point. We need to sit down and discuss with this administration how we are

going to effect the reforms that we need on the entitlement side and effect the delay of ObamaCare. That's what we've got to do, Madam Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. The problem has again been expressed. We have a single focus of the majority party, Madam Speaker, on defunding the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1130

So many Republicans have said it is an unreasonable and irrational expectation to expect, after an election has occurred in which that was one of the principal issues in the election, for the President or, frankly, the Senate, to agree to the objectives of the Republican Party that lost in America on this issue. There was a poll taken November 2012. The President of the United States won that poll. Your myopic focus on that one issue threatens to shut down government and put at risk the creditworthiness of the United States of America. That is not what the American people expect.

Unless the gentleman wants to respond, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI). The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next and that the order of the House of January 3, 2013, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

IN RECOGNITION OF LANGHAM LOGISTICS

(Mr. ROKITA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROKITA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a truly exceptional Hoosier company and a great friend in Langham Logistics and its president, Cathy Langham.

Today, Langham Logistics will be celebrating their 25th anniversary. Langham Logistics was founded by two sisters, Cathy and Margaret Langham, who took the risk of starting a transportation business. Cathy and Margaret literally built Langham from the ground up, starting in a small office space and now operating a 300,000-square-foot state-of-the-art warehouse that operates and advises supply chains from the smallest of companies to multibillion-dollar corporations throughout the world. Their story is

not unlike so many people in this country who dared to dream and then succeeded beyond even their own wildest dreams.

Their customers aren't the only ones who have noticed their hard work. In 2003, then-President George W. Bush visited Langham Logistics to highlight them as a model start-up business that succeeded and was continuing to expand at an amazing rate. It was at that event that I first met Cathy Langham.

Not only has Cathy and her family built this amazing operation, but they did it the right way—through hard work. They gave back and continue to give back every chance they can. I could list all the numerous charities and causes that Cathy, her team, and her family contribute to, but that will go well beyond the 1 minute, Madam Speaker, that I asked for.

On behalf of Hoosiers, I say congratulations to Cathy and Langham Logistics. May you have another 25 years like the last 25.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a truly exceptional Hoosier company and a great friend in Langham Logistics and its President, Cathy Langham.

Today, Langham Logistics will be celebrating their 25th anniversary. Langham Logistics was founded by two sisters, Cathy and Margaret Langham who took the risk of starting a transportation company. Cathy and Margaret literally built Langham from the ground up—starting in a small office space and now operating a 300,000 square foot state-of-the-art warehouse that operates and advises supply chains from the smallest of companies to multibillion dollar corporations throughout the world. Their story is not unlike so many people in this country who dared to dream and then succeeded beyond, even their own, wildest dreams.

Their customers are not the only ones who have noticed their hard work and success. In 2003, then President George W. Bush visited Langham Logistics to highlight them as a model startup business that succeeded and was continuing to expand at an amazing rate. It was at that event that I first met Cathy Langham.

Not only has Cathy and her family built this amazing operation, but they did it the right way. They gave back and continue to give back every chance they can along the way. I could list all of the numerous charities and causes that Cathy, her team, and her family support, but it is not in Cathy's nature to promote her good work.

But one story, that I find remarkable and worth noting here today is that of Cathy's role in the Indianapolis 2012 Super Bowl Host Committee.

While most of us would jump at the chance to highlight Indiana and plan the Super Bowl, Cathy did something quite different with the opportunity. She, along with her friends, launched Indy's Super Cure to benefit the Komen for the Cure Tissue Bank at the Indiana University Simon Cancer Center and to help women who are facing breast cancer.

While many of us would have been distracted, focusing on the Super Bowl, Cathy

and her friends made sure to use the event to give back to the community. And Mr. Speaker, honestly, I cannot think of any better example to describe why Cathy is to a stranger, to my colleagues, or to the friends that will gather later today to celebrate this occasion.

On behalf of 4th District Hoosiers, I say congratulations to Cathy and Langham Logistics. May you have another 25 years like the last 25.

NATIONAL SUICIDE PREVENTION WEEK

(Ms. ESTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ESTY. Madam Speaker, this week is National Suicide Prevention Week.

More than 38,000 Americans die by suicide every year, 90 percent of whom have at least one treatable mental illness.

Veterans account for 20 percent of suicides in this country, and military suicide is at an all-time high. The July 2012 cover of Time Magazine described the tragedy of military suicide with a simple headline: One a Day. One year later, these rates have remained largely unchanged, and we owe far better to those who have worn or do wear the uniform.

Earlier this summer, I added an amendment to Defense appropriations to add \$10 million for military suicide awareness and prevention. It is our responsibility to care for our troops and for our veterans, and more work needs to be done.

During National Suicide Prevention Week, let us commit to ensuring that every American has access to treatment.

LNG EXPORT CAUCUS

(Mr. FARENTHOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, America has a lot of clean-burning natural gas.

The Eagle Ford Shale, in the district I represent, has created 400,000 jobs and roughly \$2.6 billion in salaries and benefits in the 13-county area. Similar booms are happening in other parts of the country like North Dakota and Pennsylvania.

Our domestic energy creates widespread economic prosperity and will continue if we don't ruin it with overregulation and red tape.

Exporting some of America's huge supply of natural gas will create tens of thousands more jobs, narrow our trade deficit by billions, and help both our allies in need like Japan and the environment. When you factor in transportation costs, gas here at home will always be cheaper.

The DOE recently conditionally approved additional LNG export licenses,

but there's still a lot of red tape to wade through before these properties open. I worry these contingent licenses artificially overstate the potential for future LNG exports, and the lengths of time these approvals take risks our competitive and economic advantage over Middle Eastern countries.

I, along with three of my colleagues, JIM COSTA, JOE BARTON, and FILEMON VELA, created the LNG Export Caucus to help the development and timely export of LNG and encourage a rational regulatory environment that ensures the production and export of LNG, creating jobs, helping the economy, and cleaning the environment.

PARTNERING FOR ILLINOIS' ECONOMIC FUTURE

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the most pressing issues facing my region of Illinois, and that's creating good-paying jobs and growing the economy. That's why, last month, I launched Partnering for Illinois' Economic Future. The goal of this initiative is to bring together regional leaders from across economic sectors—from business, educational institutions, and community organizations.

We gathered to discuss ways to increase collaboration, to create jobs and bolster the region's economy and manufacturing sectors. We held regional meetings in Rockford, Peoria, and the Quad Cities in conjunction with the University of Illinois. We will also be holding a District-wide economic summit later this fall.

Before we do this, I want to hear directly from the hardworking people of my region to get their thoughts on how best to create economic opportunity for all. The insight and input from my constituents, combined with the information we collected from the regional meetings, will help us develop solutions that will benefit all of our communities.

THE SYRIAN CIVIL WAR AND U.S. INVOLVEMENT

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the United States is considering sending missiles into Syria. Also, CIA-funded weapons have begun flowing to Syrian rebels.

The rebels are made up of the Free Syrian Army, al Qaeda, and others. It seems the Free Syrian Army is liberating areas, and al Qaeda comes in behind and imposes strict Islamic shari'a law in those territories. Al Qaeda is a terrorist group that is at war with the United States.

Richard Engel, with NBC, interviewed Abu Abdul Rahman, one of the thousands of al Qaeda fighters in Syria. In the interview, Engel asked Rahman this question:

The United States is considering launching military strikes against Syria. Would that help you?

Rahman replied:

We have a prayer: "Allah, please annihilate our enemies by other enemies." Assad is an enemy and America is an enemy. Let them fight.

Madam Speaker, in this civil war, why would we ever consider getting involved by launching missiles into Syria or arming the rebels, which include our enemy, al Qaeda?

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF MS. ALENE WASHINGTON

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Alene Washington from my hometown of Fort Worth, Texas. She is a recent recipient of the President's Award for Service for her dedication and service to Tarrant County senior adults.

Ms. Washington has devoted her life to caring for her community, especially the elderly. She began her tenure at Senior Citizens Services in 1973, and shortly thereafter became the director of Fellowship Corner Senior Center on the south side of Fort Worth on New York Avenue. Here, she has provided care for families through multiple generations, ensuring that they are able to age in place with health and dignity through the activities and friendships offered at Fellowship Corner Senior Center. Here, she empowers older adults to find new friends, improve their health with nutrition and exercise, and contribute back through volunteer service.

Most notably, Ms. Washington founded a dance group known as the Steppin' Grannies, which performs around the DFW Metroplex, giving seniors the opportunity to have fun while staying active.

For over 40 years, Ms. Washington has encouraged older adults throughout Tarrant County to live with purpose and independence. Next week, she will be given the award at the Annual Senior Spirits Awards, given by Senior Citizen Services of Tarrant County.

Madam Speaker, again, I would like to congratulate Ms. Alene Washington and commend her for her dedication to Tarrant County seniors.

NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Madam Speaker, according to The Wall Street Journal, without the legislation just passed by this Chamber, fraudulent subsidy payments under the Affordable Care Act could account for \$250 billion over the next decade. For this reason, I'm proud to have voted in support of H.R. 2775, the No Subsidies Without Verification Act.

The White House has come out in strong opposition to this proposal, citing the fact that a program to verify eligibility already exists. I wonder, though, if a plan already exists, why the strong opposition to this proposal? And in the broader context, why the strong opposition to any proposal that seeks to create accountability with respect to Federal spending?

Across the Nation, millions of families sit at their kitchen tables in order to figure out their limited finances and to make difficult decisions, ensuring that their hard-earned dollars are being stretched to maximum effect. The Federal Government, however, shies away from any opportunity to ensure the same accountability.

Madam Speaker, Americans are tired of seeing their hard-earned tax dollars wasted through fraud. I hope to see this commonsense legislation signed into law.

IN PRAISE OF DR. THOMAS F. FREEMAN: EDUCATOR, SCHOLAR, AND LEGENDARY COACH AND TEACHER OF THE ART OF DEBATE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this is a great opportunity to rise today to salute and praise Dr. Thomas F. Freeman: educator, scholar, and legendary coach and teacher of the art of debate at the historic Texas Southern University, supporting the historic Texas Southern University debate team.

For those of you who have not heard of that team, I ask you to look closely at the number of awards it has received because of this great educator. He comes from a great family with a great wife, who is also an educator.

Today I rise to salute him as a first-rank scholar, but also as a person of great eloquence, talent, and oration, someone who was inspirational to the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the honorable late Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, my predecessor.

A prodigy himself, Dr. Freeman graduated from Virginia Union University at 18 and went on to become a professor at Virginia Union before his 30th birthday. He would later receive degrees from Andover Newton Theological School, Harvard University, Chicago Divinity School, the University of Vienna in Austria, and the University of

Liberia in Africa. Dr. Freeman was among a group of accomplished academics of color hired by Texas Southern University.

What I want to say most about Dr. Freeman is that he is a renaissance man. He's a man of courage. He's a man who broke color lines, teaching at Rice University for 23 years. He is a man that has a number of sayings that are so vital. One is:

There is an ethical dimension to leadership. If you do not consider ethics, then your leadership is hollow.

I thank Dr. Freeman for being the kind of icon that America can honor. His leadership will be rewarded by the many students who have gone on to greatness because of his tutoring. In fact, even Denzel Washington was tutored by Dr. Thomas Freeman.

He is 95 years old and will be honored in his retirement at Texas Southern University tomorrow, Friday, September 13, 2013. However, his light will continue to shine, for he will continue to work with students and to provide light to those who are willing to learn.

Thank you, Dr. Freeman, for being a great American and a great leader and a man of ethics, passion, Christianity, and courage.

□ 1145

INVESTIGATING BENGHAZI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, and to do so the day after the anniversary of the tragic attack on America that took place September 11, 2001, and the tragic attack that took place against Americans in Benghazi September 11, 2012.

Who would have believed, Madam Speaker, that a full year would go by and we would still not have the truth, we would still not be to the bottom of the Benghazi events. We still wouldn't have a timeline, we wouldn't have a chronology, we wouldn't have an autopsy report from Ambassador Stevens and others, we wouldn't have the testimony of those who were wounded and those who survived, and we wouldn't have the full story from the administration. And we wouldn't have yet the confession from the administration that they willfully, I believe, misinformed the American people and the United States Congress.

And so the individual who has taken the lead on this Benghazi series of events and called for a special select committee to investigate is the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and I am very pleased to yield to the leader

on the Benghazi incident here in the United States Congress, Mr. WOLF of Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. KING for the time. I am very grateful.

Madam Speaker, yesterday marked the one-year anniversary of the deadly attacks on the U.S. consulate and CIA annex in Benghazi, Libya, which took the lives of four Americans, and seriously wounded several others. One is still out at Walter Reed Hospital after one year.

Despite a year of investigations in five different House committees, most of the key questions about what happened in Benghazi and why no response was authorized by Washington remain unanswered. So far the Congress has failed.

That is why since last November I have been pushing for a House select committee to focus on this investigation, hold public hearings, issue subpoenas to key witnesses and survivors, and produce a final report that answers these important questions. One hundred seventy-four Republicans in the House have now cosponsored H. Res. 36 to establish a select committee—three-quarters of the majority—and six new cosponsors joined this week alone.

The select committee approach has been endorsed by family members of the Benghazi victims, the special operations community, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, and the editorial page of *The Wall Street Journal*, among many other prominent individuals and organizations.

I was pleased to receive a copy of a letter sent to the Speaker earlier this week calling for the creation of a select committee and signed by some of the most respected and distinguished national security and military leaders that have served our country.

These leaders include:

Former Attorney General Michael Mukasey, who also served as judge in the trial of the Blind Sheikh, the first trial dealing with an attack against the World Trade Center;

Admiral James "Ace" Lyons, U.S. Navy, Retired, former commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific fleet;

General Frederick J. Kroesen, U.S. Army, Retired, former Vice Chief of Staff of the Army;

Lieutenant General William "Jerry" Boykin, U.S. Army, Retired, former Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and commander in Mogadishu during the "Black Hawk down" incident;

Lieutenant General Harry Edward Soyster, U.S. Army, Retired, former Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency;

Ambassador Henry Cooper, former chief negotiator of the defense and space talks and the former Director, Strategic Defense Initiative;

Major General Paul E. Vallely, U.S. Army, Retired, former deputy com-

mander of the U.S. Army Forces, Pacific;

Honorable Tidal McCoy, former Secretary of the Air Force;

Lieutenant Colonel Allen West, U.S. Army, Retired, and former Member of Congress;

Honorable Joseph E. Schmitz, former inspector general of the Department of Defense;

Honorable Michelle Van Cleave, former National Counterintelligence Executive;

Vice Admiral Robert Monroe, U.S. Navy, Retired, former Director of the Defense Nuclear Agency; and

Frank J. Gaffney, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy.

It is good to have their support for this important effort, and I would like now to read the text of their letter.

They said:

Dear Mr. Speaker:

As former military, intelligence and national security officials with extensive experience in security policy and practice, we are concerned about the American people's apparently serious loss of confidence in the institutions of their government. One factor contributing to this alienation has been the failure of those institutions to respond appropriately to the murderous jihadist attacks in Benghazi on September 11, 2012. They rightly expect, at an absolute minimum, that Congress will ensure accountability of those responsible.

As you are well aware, our country is nearing the first anniversary of the assaults on the Special Mission Compound and CIA Annex in Benghazi. To date, however, the five House committees that share jurisdiction have held only a small number of mostly less-than-illuminating hearings into the policies that led to, and the events that occurred during and after, the murder of four of our countrymen and the wounding of many more.

We appreciate that the chairmen of these committees produced four months ago a joint "interim report." Yet, its authors acknowledged that they did not have answers to many crucial national security questions. In addition, no timeframe has been publicly announced for going beyond the interim report or holding additional hearings toward that end. This is particularly troubling in light of press accounts that the survivors of the Benghazi attack are being intimidated and risk job action should they come forward with their eyewitness account.

If Congress does not afford them an opportunity to do so without fear of retaliation by issuing subpoenas for their testimony, it will be complicit in precluding their help in seeing justice served—and in denying the American people the full accounting to which they are entitled.

They go on to say:

We believe an ample chance has been afforded for the regular order to operate in investigating Benghazi-gate. It has failed to do so. Now is the time for a select committee to be established with a mandate to draw upon the five committees' existing investigative resources and results to date and to complete—if possible by year's end—the necessary, thorough and comprehensive inquiry. This approach can alleviate concern about undue costs and further delay in convening a select committee.

Mr. Speaker, they go on to say:

The survivors want to tell their stories and correct the record. Two different books based on their stories are reportedly in the works. If the American people learn what happened from a published account rather than from those charged with congressional oversight, the perception of a coverup—or at least a serious dereliction of duty—is inevitable.

Our Republic is predicated on the trust of the governed in those they choose to represent them. We must not allow the jihadists who have thus far paid no price for murdering Ambassador Stevens, murdering three of his comrades and afflicting the lives of so many others, to do violence as well to our people's confidence in their constitutional form of government.

For all these reasons, we call upon you to establish without further delay a select committee to investigate the Benghazi attacks.

I think they make a very, very powerful case. For the Congress to fail to do this, as they said, the Congress will be complicit in this. So I call on the Speaker of the House to do what these gentlemen, who have as much experience as any Member who serves in this Congress on either side, have asked us to do, and establish a select committee.

With that, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Virginia and ask if the gentleman could stick around for a moment. I have a couple of questions that occurred to me as I was listening to his presentation. I would like to ask for the record, and your knowledge of the Benghazi incident goes more deep than mine does, and I think probably as deep as anyone in the Congress does, Mr. WOLF, and so I wanted to ask: Do we know how many survivors there were from the Benghazi incident?

Mr. WOLF. There were roughly 30 or 31 or so that waited on the tarmac after the fighting had ended to be picked up, and they were not picked up in an American plane; they were picked up in a Libyan plane. There were a number of wounded. One, Mr. David Ubben, who is currently out at Walter Reed, and another gentleman who was severely wounded, they were flown out separate from that other group, and they were flown out not in an American plane but in a Libyan plane, maybe even commandeered by those that rescued.

We also know that we lost four. Several were Navy SEALs. And we were also told by those who have been in touch with those on the ground that there was a call from the consulate to the annex saying, help us. They were told to stand down by the CIA station chief, not knowing if that came out of Washington or not. They did stand down. They got another call, and they were told to stand again, and they did stand down. They had another call and they finally said we're not standing down, and they went. Some believe that had they gone at the initial time,

they could have saved the life of Ambassador Stevens and Sean Smith.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The information you provided here, especially information as to the numbers of survivors and the numbers of wounded, where they were picked up, and by a Libyan plane, not a U.S. plane, was that information that was forthcomingly delivered to you or the American people by our administration, or how did you learn those facts?

Mr. WOLF. No, it was not delivered by the administration, nor was it delivered by any committee up here. It was delivered by people who are connected to, related to people who were on the ground.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Do we know, has any of that information been entered into the record under oath, so far as witnesses are concerned, before the five committees that have jurisdiction?

Mr. WOLF. I think not, but I have not been in some of the closed doors. As you know, that is one of the problems. The Intelligence Committee has everything in closed doors. Quite frankly, if you're a Member of the House, you have very little opportunity to find out sometimes what even goes on in the Intelligence Committee. So they could have been sworn in. The people I have spoken to have not even been called. And I spoke last week, last Tuesday to a person who was on the scene at the time of the attack, and he has not been called.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And so, Mr. WOLF, is it possible that the Select Committee on Intelligence could have had testimony before the committee, and because they are bound by the confidentiality of classified information, that even if they learned something from an open source that also confirms something that they learned in a classified setting, they now are prohibited from speaking about that outside of that room?

Mr. WOLF. I do not know. I do not serve on the Intelligence Committee. There are all good people on it, and Mr. ROGERS does a good job. I can't answer. They can better answer that. I don't know what the rules are with regard to that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Let me pick up on that. I have a measure of classified rating as a member of the Judiciary Committee. Those are the rules that we are bound by when we go into a classified setting. What we speak about there, what we learn there, even if we know it from an open source before we go in, or even if we learn about it from an open source after we go out, we cannot speak to that topic outside of the room.

That's one of the reasons why we need the select committee. Even if all of the information we need to know happens to be gathered by the special Select Committee on Intelligence, that doesn't get that information that can

be declassified declassified, that doesn't get it correlated with the balance of the information that is public knowledge, or the information that has come before the other committees.

Another question: Do we have any autopsy reports from Ambassador Stevens or any of the other three fatalities that were killed in that action a year and a day ago?

Mr. WOLF. My committee that I chair, the House Appropriations subcommittee that funds the Justice Department and the FBI, we have never received an autopsy report. We have been told how the death of the Ambassador took place verbally, but we have never seen the autopsy report.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Do we have a timeline that sets down events that took place from its inception to its relative conclusion in the operations and the cleanup that also correlates with a timeline of the situation room in the White House, and who was in the White House and what they knew and when they knew it? Are you aware of any timeline that correlates that?

□ 1200

Mr. WOLF. There may be. Perhaps the Intel Committee has it. I understand there are some timelines out there that do not quite, quite match; but I do not know the answer to that. That's why we need public hearings.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Virginia. That's my understanding as well. And this colloquy that we've had here, I think, illuminates the questions, some of the questions that can be answered with a special select committee that would be addressing the Benghazi incident.

And a full year and a day has gone by. The trail gets more cold every day. And just yesterday, I saw the announcement that the administration is going to make some of the survivors available to Congress, finally, after a full year, so that we can have some dialogue with them.

I just envision the 9/11 Commission that sat around the table. They swore in witnesses. They built a public record. The American people watched in on all of those deliberations so they could draw their judgment on whose version was the most accurate and the closest to the truth.

When the 9/11 Commission report came out, it was a bound book about that thick. I read it. A lot of us read it. But that was the definitive response to the United States Congress that said these are the facts as we can determine them, the reasoned judgment of the United States Congress.

That also happened on the Warren Commission report on the assassination of President Kennedy. I think that the Benghazi incident deserves a full investigation in that fashion.

I applaud the gentleman from Virginia for taking the lead on this, and

I'll certainly support it all the way to its conclusion.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman. Thank you for the time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Virginia. And reclaiming my time, I appreciate having the dialog to this extent.

And I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has a real focus on Benghazi. We've had some of this dialogue before, and so I would be very pleased to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Thank you for yielding, and I want to begin by thanking our colleague from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his leadership with House Resolution 36.

It should not have to come to a select and special committee to investigate this, but it's very apparent that the administration operating on point on this is doing everything they can and expending all resources to obfuscate, stonewall, and keep the truth and the facts from the American people.

And so, while we appreciate the fact that there are numerous committees in the House investigating this simultaneously, but individually, one concerted effort is probably what it's going to take, at the end of the day, to answer the call of this administration who would rather this information not be let out to the American people.

I just want to start out by saying that, you know, a year ago, a year ago on this day, Americans were waking up to or hearing about on their lunch hour that the first Ambassador in over 30 years, a United States Ambassador, had been killed on foreign shores.

And as a person who's operated in the military and as just a citizen who thinks that, look, some of this would make common sense, on the anniversary date of such a historic event and shameful event in America, that we would increase our security posture, especially overseas.

And as a person who has served overseas during 9/11, the anniversary of 9/11, I know very well that we did increase our security posture. So the fact that this happened really leads to questions as to what the heck was going on at the State Department regarding the security in Benghazi and who was making decisions.

It's disgraceful that an entire year later, despite the fact that a number of terrorists have been identified who have participated in this attack, not one of them has been brought to justice, not one.

And it's also interesting that this administration has the information, the intelligence information that it has regarding Syria. Yet while we were in Benghazi, while we had boots on the ground in Libya, a year later we don't seem to have the facts about the intelligence that occurred there.

Some questions that I have—it's my understanding that Under Secretary

Kennedy will be testifying in front of the Foreign Affairs Committee on which I serve next week, and we have some questions for him.

I think the American people want to know why this administration politicized national security during an election cycle regarding the talking points, and who made that order. Who decided that? Who was at the top of that?

The reduction in security forces, again, on 9/11, it's my understanding, with an outpost like Benghazi, that it could only have come from one person. There's only one person in the State Department that is authorized to issue that reduction in security posture, and that is the Secretary.

We want to know whose signature is on the authorization. We want to know who authorized not sending help.

In the military, we don't have a stand down order. But somebody said, no, and somebody didn't contingency plan. Somebody wasn't prepared.

Now, the boots on the ground, the fine soldiers, the airmen, the men and women who would have gone into help, they were ready to go. The United States military was ready to respond. It's the chain of command that wasn't, somewhere along the line. And we want to know who made that decision.

We don't know yet what the Ambassador was doing there. Do we really know?

We've asked the question, but we don't know what his purpose was. Sure, we hear that he was there to solidify that location as an operations point for diplomatic actions and show that everything was normal in Libya again. But on 9/11 you're really going to send him there with a reduced security posture?

Folks, ladies and gentlemen, these Ambassadors don't roll in a car by themselves out to these outposts. They don't even go to their consulates by themselves. They have a security detachment of highly trained people. The vehicles they ride in are not something that you buy on the lot. These guys are loaded up, and they're ready to handle contingencies.

This is abnormal. What was he doing there?

Why does this administration continue to stonewall?

You're hearing that they're giving us everything that we ask for, the emails and so on and so forth.

Why is it that the emails come in a box, to a SCIF, a secure location, our people in the Congress, we're allowed to look at them, our investigators are allowed to look at them, transcribe information, and then the emails go back into the box under armed guard and they're taken away.

We're not allowed to copy them. We're not allowed to get them all at one time. They're meted out to us. Why is that?

If there's nothing to hide, why not have the information so we can all

know what it is within the confines of security postures and operational security and security clearances?

Finally, or maybe not finally, who's accountable?

Has anybody been held accountable?

Sure, there were some four employees at the State Department that were excused from their duty for a year, or nearly a year, with pay, and then brought back in. And this is not to disparage those employees.

It's my understanding, since we haven't talked to any of them yet because we've been disallowed to talk to them, that they didn't even know they were held responsible until the day it happened, and they still haven't seen the report that says they were responsible for the reduced security posture. Nobody's been held accountable.

Why wasn't the Secretary involved in the questioning of the ARB, the Accountability Review Board?

The person at the top, not even questioned. That's like having a murder investigation in a family where the husband was having an affair and having strained relations with his wife, the wife was murdered, and he was the only one in town at the time, and not questioning that. That's what that's like.

Nobody questioned the Secretary. Really?

Was there real-time video information via drone, unarmed aerial vehicle?

We heard originally—I was in the questioning, in the hearing with the Secretary, Secretary Clinton, when she originally came earlier this spring, and she said that there was no real-time information.

Yet, on national radio, I heard a guy call into national radio who was the payload operator. And to be clear, the payload operator is not the individual flying the unarmed aerial vehicle. The payload operator is the individual that handles the camera or the weapons system.

So the individual handling the camera called into a national talk show and described what he was seeing as it was occurring. So if we had the real-time information, why weren't we acting on it?

Where is that real-time information? Why haven't we seen it?

Finally, where was the President during this?

I mean, this is a crisis of national proportion and national security. And I know the President hasn't come before Congress to ask a question, and every time we ask anybody else the question, the answer's going to be, well, I don't know. I don't keep the President's schedule.

Why can't the American people know the facts?

We just want the truth. We just want the facts. The facts will lead us to the truth. We're not on a witch hunt. The American people deserve to know. The families of the fallen, they deserve to know what happened here.

And I know the administration is hoping that time will go by, debt ceiling, continuing resolution, ObamaCare, Syria, anything will get in the way of finding out what happened here. But we are duty-bound, ladies and gentlemen, Madam Speaker, we are duty-bound to find out this information on behalf of the American people.

I applaud you, Mr. KING. Thank you for yielding the time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and appreciate his presentation here on the floor. I'd ask if he could stick around for a moment because I'm trying to do a little research of my own here, and that is that there's a patchwork of information that's been gathered together.

Among the American people, they'd have collectively, within their memory and their records, all that's publicly available. If we could go out and pull it together and consolidate it, then we could organize it.

This Congress is similar to that. We're representatives of the American people. And from each of our districts, each of our sets of responsibilities and access to information, we can put together some of the puzzle here.

But it's hard to put together a puzzle if you don't have the picture that's on the box. This administration has the box, with the pieces, and the picture on the box of the puzzle of what actually happened in Benghazi, and they knew it almost in real-time. And they have been meting out the information, accepting or admitting to information as it was forced upon them thanks to the media, thanks to people that have done real research.

I recall a statement made to our gathering in our meeting that there weren't any wounded from the Benghazi incident out at Walter Reed Army Hospital. One of our Members went out there and hung around the cafeteria until he found out otherwise and made personal contact and had deep conversations with at least one individual that was a survivor of Benghazi that was in a long-term rehab, Walter Reed. And so that's the level that we have to go to to get an admission.

I wanted to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania just a series of questions that clutter my mind. Have you seen a list of the survivors of Benghazi, those survivors that Mr. WOLF talked about that were picked up on the Tarmac at the airport in Benghazi and flown out by a Libyan plane?

Mr. PERRY. I have not seen the list.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Do you know the name of any of those 30-some survivors?

Mr. PERRY. I do not.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And have you seen a timeline that shows what happened in Benghazi from beginning to end, one that is credible, that you have confidence in?

Mr. PERRY. Well, I certainly haven't seen anything that I have confidence in. There's been numerous ones put together, mostly by the side that wants to investigate, that's trying to piece it together based on open-source information.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Open-source timeline. Have you seen any timeline of the Situation Room in the White House?

Mr. PERRY. We have no knowledge of anything in the Situation Room in the White House.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Just wondering. When the assault went on in the compound that took out Osama bin Laden, and I would ask the gentleman, did you see any pictures from inside the Situation Room, and did you see a timeline of the events that took place on that assault?

Mr. PERRY. Sure. The whole world saw that, and rightly so.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Exactly. And as I draw a comparison to Benghazi and the takedown of Osama bin Laden, those circumstances would have been similar, except that we initiated the operation against Osama bin Laden, so I presume there were some people that got invitations to go into the Situation Room and be there. We saw the looks of worry and concern on their faces. I remember the President there in front of it, Secretary Clinton was there, and others in that setting.

But we have no visuals of who was in the Situation Room during Benghazi. We have no timeline of who came into the room, who was in the room, who left the room or when. And in that list would be when the President came, how long he was there, and when he left.

We don't know the answers to that, even though everybody that was in the Situation Room would have known when the President arrived. They would have known when he left. They would have remembered precisely all dialogue that came from the President and almost all that went to the President.

That's how I envision it. Would you envision that the same way, Mr. PERRY?

Mr. PERRY. That's exactly right.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And so the American people need to know this. Do you have any knowledge of who had custody of the body of Ambassador Stevens from the moment he was killed until such time as he turned up at the hospital in Benghazi?

Mr. PERRY. Well, there's been some conflicting reports between, again, open source, between the rebels, and then he went to the hospital and was picked up by some of the folks from Tripoli; but then he wasn't there, and they—there's nothing congruent in that.

I'm not sure the custody, the chain of custody regarding the Ambassador's

body. We're pretty sure we know what happened to it, and it's very unpleasant. But again, without an autopsy we can't even be sure of that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would agree. And the individuals that delivered Ambassador Stevens' body to the hospital should be available to us. We should have been able to put them under oath and gather the record of what took place there. We don't know who had custody of Ambassador Stevens' body. We just know his body showed up at the hospital.

And the balance of that is conjecture, although we've seen at least one picture of him being carried through the streets in a vertical way, with no knowledge of whether he was alive or dead at that time. Most believe that he was dead at that time, but we just simply don't know.

And can you imagine if it's your family member who had gone through this, and to be locked out from the truth, if you'd lost one of the four lives that we lost in that, or if you're one of those that is wounded and has been muzzled.

□ 1215

The argument came out yesterday that the administration asserts that they have not commanded people to be muzzled or to be quiet about what happened in Benghazi, yet there's the intimidation factor. If your top officers lean on you and say, You've already taken a confidentiality oath, you better stick with that confidentiality oath.

As a former member of the armed services, if you're bound by confidentiality and you've already taken the oath and then your commander, your superior comes to you and says, You've been involved in an incident, and you're bound to that confidentiality, would you honor that, Mr. PERRY?

Mr. PERRY. Well, in the interest of national security, you're in a dilemma. You've taken an oath and you do have a confidentiality requirement. However, I would also say there is a compelling reason for you to provide information to the American people and certainly to the Congress.

I know that the Foreign Affairs Committee has set up hearings with some of these folks and they have said they were coming, and then, miraculously and mysteriously, they declined between the time they said they were coming and the time they were supposed to appear. And so we're not sure why they would agree to it at the onset and then decide to change their mind hence. I think it's a very compelling question. But I think in the interest of finding out the truth, they would be compelled to testify under oath.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Do you believe that the attack by our enemies on our Ambassador and the other victims was a planned attack or a spontaneous eruption?

Mr. PERRY. There's no doubt in America's mind, the world's mind. Libyan intelligence knew it within 24 hours.

And we have the fact that our Ambassador, which—by the way, I must say that it besmirches her credibility, the President's credibility, the administration's credibility, including the recent activities regarding Syrian foreign policy and decisionmaking, to go out for weeks on end, including the President, and issue talking points that they clearly knew were false. They knew they were false, and the world knows they're false now. Most of the world knew they were false then.

This was not a spontaneous eruption of violence, including RPGs and a coordinated attack. Coordinating the attack requires planning. It requires resourcing. That didn't happen in a few moment's time over a video, which maybe that gentleman is still in prison to this day. The only person held accountable for this, I think, is arguably somebody who had absolutely nothing to do with this.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Do you believe that the administration knew in real-time that it was a planned attack on our Ambassador and an assassination attempt?

Mr. PERRY. Since the Ambassador himself and his deputy both reported it was a real-time, coordinated attack, not a spontaneous demonstration, I'm very certain in my heart and my mind that the administration knew what was happening.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Do you think Susan Rice knew when she went before the five television networks the following Sunday?

Mr. PERRY. Again, we want to know who changed the talking points. I don't want to indict her if she was given the talking points. But at the level she was operating, she either should have known or corroborated the talking points. And so, to a certain extent, I think she's culpable, and it's reasonable to expect that she did know the talking points were changed and she was misleading the public.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he attended the classified briefing Monday at 5 o'clock.

Mr. PERRY. I did.

Mr. KING of Iowa. What level of confidence did that give you when you see Ambassador Susan Rice there to lead the briefing?

Mr. PERRY. Again, I suggest that the administration has a trust and confidence issue not only with this Congress but with the American people, and that is one of the reasons. You can't send somebody out at the top levels of government to provide information on such a sensitive issue as potentially going to war or an act of war whose credibility has been diminished by her own actions and the actions of

this administration. So I think that that trust and confidence has been eroded because of prior actions, particularly with Benghazi and Libya.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And I would agree wholeheartedly, Mr. PERRY, and end this one remaining component of this topic that I think that you alluded to somewhat in your statement. The question is: What was Ambassador Stevens doing in Benghazi?

We've seen the announcement that came out last night or today that our administration is funneling weapons now into some elements of the Free Syrian Army. I'm concerned that those elements are the Muslim Brotherhood elements of the Free Syrian Army. But they have now announced that they're finally getting some resources in there. If that was the plan and the strategy, to funnel weapons into the Free Syrian Army a year ago, that would have been a better strategy because the Muslim Brotherhood hadn't completely taken over that operation then.

But some have speculated in the media—and we don't know because we haven't had a select committee that brought all this information out—that that was part of the business that may have been taking place in Benghazi. I don't have confirmation that that is the case. And I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if you have seen any evidence that that might be the operation that was taking place and the reason that Ambassador Stevens was in Benghazi that day.

Mr. PERRY. We've seen no evidence. We've been given no evidence. We have asked the questions directly and been denied.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Denied a straight answer to that.

Mr. PERRY. Denied any answers.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Denied any answers.

So what we know is that the administration immediately announced that it was a spontaneous eruption of a protest over a video. How they ever found that information to even be able to tie it to it because it's completely disconnected and illogical, but they sent Susan Rice out before the American public and on five networks she gave the same story. And now she's been awarded with the confidence of the President to advance her even more within this administration and sent before the House of Representatives in a classified setting to lead us in the briefing on potential Syrian engagement.

So we know it wasn't a video. Do we know if the individual who actually produced that video is yet out of jail? Do you have any information?

Mr. PERRY. He may be. I'm not sure. He may be out of jail. But I know he was held accountable at some point, and he literally did go to jail. And I would say it's arguable that he had absolutely anything to do with this or anything else.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And the last information I had was that he was still in jail. That's been some weeks ago. But I think he's a person you might be able to identify as a political prisoner at this point. It's unlikely that he would be in jail for his not meeting the parole requirements for this period of time except for the politics that he got wrapped up into, Madam Speaker.

All of these things that are inaccuracies and some of them outright dishonesties. There's been no question that this administration went out and willfully misinformed the American people. They did so in open source setting, the President's dialogue directly to the United Nations and multiple oblique references to a video. They knew in real-time that it was a planned attack. There's a reason why we know that, and I know Mr. PERRY knows that reason.

I ask you if you can tell us here why we know that it was a planned attack against our U.S. Ambassador.

Mr. PERRY. Like I said, you don't just bring heavy weapons like RPGs and things of this sort to a spontaneous eruption and demonstration. Like I said, it requires resourcing, ammunition.

This thing went on for hours and hours with heavy weapons. You just don't show up with a belt-fed weapon and the ammunition to support it on a whim. This is something that's heavy to carry. The ammunition is heavy to carry. It requires vehicles and people and coordination and what we call fields of fire, so you don't shoot the friendly; you only shoot the enemy. This coordination takes effort and time. It doesn't happen in a minute or two.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I recall a message that came out from the administration that Libya is a highly armed country and people walk around with AK-47s or else they've got them very handy so, if there's a violent demonstration, that they can grab their AK-47 and run to the sound of not the guns but the demonstration.

I don't disagree that that's a possibility in Libya. I know it was a possibility in Iraq with the armament that they have or the weapons they have in their homes. But we also know that there were RPGs there. We know that there were mortars there.

We know that there were two locations. The first location was where the attack took place, and then there was a fallback location. One was the compound and one was the annex. We know that there were mortar rounds dropped in on the secondary location. It looked like, the sequence, that they had already dialed in that secondary location as a target. If that's the case, not only was it a planned attack, but it was a planned attack with intel that had the secondary location, the alternative location where they would retreat to

once attacked, and the primary location already set up, the mortars zeroed in on that.

Does that fit with what you know from a military background, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Absolutely. A mortar is what we call an indirect fire method weapon. You don't necessarily have to see the target. You lob the round into the target. So it requires coordination and known points of where the mortar is located versus where the target is located. You have to shoot the right angle and the right azimuth.

It's not just something that's done capriciously or quickly. There's a thing called a baseplate, which holds this mortar tube. It has to be carried. It usually takes several men or a vehicle, depending on the size of the mortar. And then there's the ammunition that comes in cases. It's not something that you just carry around in your pocket. It's heavy. And you're not just shooting one, so multiple cases.

Again, logistics and support for this, planning for this. Of course, like you said, the planning on multiple locations of attack. They would have to know that. They would have to know the location of where it is, of course, and where their firing point was for the best field of fire and security from opposing fire.

Of course, I think the Ambassador described all this in his phone calls. Our troops on the ground, some of them who perished, lasered the target, expecting support from the United States, from what they knew. You never go without knowing who your support is going to be, what your backup plan is. These folks fully expected some guided munitions to come take out the assault, but it never came.

And so there's no doubt in my mind that this was a coordinated, well-prepared attack, and there's also no doubt in my mind that the administration knew this very early on. Maybe if they didn't know it within 24 hours, they certainly knew it within the span of a week. But the misleading of the American public went on for weeks.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If the gentleman were going to set up a mortar and zero in on a target, what would be the minimum number of rounds that it would take to have confidence that you can zero in on the top of a building?

Mr. PERRY. Well, a mortar is what we call an area weapon, so you're not going to shoot a mortar into a window. But what they fire on, they sometimes shoot long, they shoot over, or they shoot short. So they bracket it. They adjust the tube back and forth until they get it to range. But if you have a known point that you're firing from and a known point that you're firing to, you can do that with much greater accuracy in much less time.

I would suggest that they had that all figured out when they showed up,

which is how they were able to deliver rounds on the target immediately.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would ask the gentleman, if the third mortar round was the fatal round for two of our brave Americans, would that indicate that that mortar had been set up and planned in advance?

Mr. PERRY. Absolutely. You must know that it takes multiple, what we call, registration rounds and so on and so forth to bracket a target, multiple iterations of firing the tube or the mortar to hit the target. I'm talking half a dozen, a dozen times, and it's very precise.

So they knew exactly what they were doing. They had this planned well in advance, in my opinion.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And we would have known that in almost real-time in the Situation Room in the White House, would be what I would say, and yet still people went out and made the story that it was a movie. And then after the story of the movie began to break down, it became, well, it was actually a spontaneous response and people came running with the weapons that they had.

We've gotten more truth out in this dialogue that we've had here in this past 45 minutes on the floor of the House of Representatives than has willingly been brought forward by this administration.

I have said that Benghazi is worse than Watergate. I think that's a very easy position to hold in that Watergate was a burglary that the President found out about afterwards. It was wrong for President Nixon to seek to cover that burglary up. It cost him the Presidency and it cost America dearly in the events of history that unfolded from that, but this is something that goes deeper and worse.

I believe it was a planned assassination attack on our Ambassador, and I believe that we had a whole group of heroic Americans who conducted themselves very well and they deserve to be identified, if they want to be, and they deserve the respect and appreciation and the honor that the American people would like to give them.

The best thing we can do for the memories of those that are lost is to provide the full truth that goes outside that that must be classified. As history moves on, classification changes because of relevance of need for it to remain secret also changes.

So perhaps today we can pick up the momentum to get those final signatures on the Wolf resolution, get to the point where we can convince our Speaker that we need to have this special select committee to investigate Benghazi, that it incorporates the top people from the five committees that have jurisdiction to do those kind of hearings with a significant budget where we can make sure that it's well staffed and also subpoena the people

that we need to put that record out into the public eye and the public ear, record that record and build that and put it into a bound copy, a version which says, This is the reasoned judgment of Congress. These are the facts as they can be gathered, and that has been scrutinized by the public in real-time.

□ 1230

If we do that—we can draw our conclusions; historians will be able to draw their conclusions—we can do honor to those who lost their lives, gave their lives for us. We can do honor to those who have suffered serious wounds, and we can do honor to those who were in that conflict. And we can clean this up to the point where all of those that serve us in the Foreign Service and put their lives on the line—and there have been, by my recollection, eight Ambassadors who have lost their lives in the line of duty or died while in service of our country over the course of the history of the United States—Ambassador Stevens the most recent, the most violent, but also the one that they have the most questions about.

This was going to be an open administration, one of the most transparent in history. And now we have the Secretary of State who presided over this, who was the lead voice, the one who should have given us the most direct response, has not given us a full testimony. She did appear before a Senate committee and it was a limited amount of testimony, but she has not come clean with this.

As we see this, the situation of the coverup of the facts of Benghazi, we are also seeing the people that are engaged in this that do know the facts asking for an even higher level of responsibility in leadership, in fact, all the way to the White House seems to be the direction that the former Secretary of State would like to take. I'm going to suggest, Madam Speaker, that this can't happen in America. You cannot have someone who covered up something worse than Watergate find a path to go back to the White House and then put this country back under another shield to hide information, a coverup. The American people deserve the truth.

One of the strengths that we have as a Nation is because we have been willing to face the real truth, face the real realities, and brace up and take on the enemies within the world. The people that serve this country, and do so with dignity and honor and nobility, are those in uniform. But it isn't only those in uniform. It's those that are in the CIA. It's some of the civilian contractors that have served in our military that are also part now of civilian security detail. There are those in the State Department that know they're out there on the edge and on the end. We need to honor all of them by bringing the truth out.

There are many people, especially within the State Department and the CIA, who are sick at heart because they know the real truth. We need to give them an opportunity to bring that real truth out.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Well, you are absolutely right, Mr. KING. As you already stated, the American people deserve to know.

Scarcely 6 weeks ago, I talked to some of the families of the fallen who have not, since that fateful day nearly—well, it's a year ago now; then it was just nearly a year—have still not gotten any answers from the administration. As a matter of fact, the administration doesn't talk to them at all. They're coming into Congress asking us to find answers.

I would ask the American people: Is that how you want the people that serve this country overseas in very dangerous situations to be treated? Some of these are former military members serving in this capacity as security detail for the Ambassador, or that just picked up and went to the fight, even though they were told not to, and gave their lives. Their lives were taken from them. And this is how their families are being treated. They're dead, and their families are getting no resolution. They're getting no closure on this thing. And it's at the hands of this Federal Government and this administration. It's reprehensible. And it can be stopped immediately if they would just answer the questions that we have, that all Americans have.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I will just say a few more words, Madam Speaker.

I sat through a series of briefings over the last week or a little better in different places around the world. In one of those briefings, one of our Special Operations Forces personnel made a point that they were ready to go to Benghazi. Now, there's nobody there that trains that isn't ready. Nobody is reluctant to step in and serve. No matter how dangerous a mission, no matter what the prospects are of success, if there are Americans in trouble and they are given the green light—and that's the order to go into battle—they don't hesitate. They don't shrink back. They don't think, "I wish I wasn't here." They train for that. And as they train for that, there is no hesitation.

So we should always know that our military men and women, our security personnel, there is no hesitation on their part. They wanted to be there. That's why, when they got the order to stand down at the third time, they went anyway because these were brethren that needed to be protected.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERRY. I would ask, Mr. KING, we were told that there wasn't adequate time, that reinforcements and help were too far away. How did the ad-

ministration know how long this was going to take, how long this attack was going to go on for? Because when the calls came from the Ambassador, it was hours and hours later until he perished, until others perished. During that period of time, we could have sent people on the way. Maybe they would have never gotten there in time, and maybe that's still a failure in planning, but I think the American people could forgive the mistake with the effort. But the effort wasn't made at all.

And I wonder who made the determination that this is going to end in 2 hours or 3 hours or 10 hours or 10 minutes and said, No, we're not going to send anybody because it's going to be over. How did they know that? I would suggest they never knew that because they never had any intention of sending anybody because they never had any plan. They never expected this, they never wanted this, and they hoped it would go away quietly into the night. That's what I would suggest.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, reclaiming my time, it appears to me that there was a political decision that was made in the Situation Room in the White House, and that political decision was: We're in a tough, tight, reelection battle. This is September 11. We are less than 2 months before the election date. This could become a whole pivotal issue that the election is decided upon. Let's see if we can slide this thing down and tamp it under the rug and maybe it will go away. Maybe it won't be as big or as bad as we fear that it is. That is the question that comes back.

There is a time in this job to do your duty. There is a time in this political arena that we're in that you set aside politics. There is a time when you look at your reelection and you decide, My job here in this moment doing the right thing is more important than any prospects of how people will vote 2 months from now or a year or more from now. That's that sense of duty.

That's why we take an oath to uphold this Constitution. We all stand here on the floor of this House and take this oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. The President does so. The executive personnel do so.

When I look back through history, I can think of no time that our leadership in the White House has decided that the political calculation was more important than the lives of an Ambassador that had an opportunity to be saved. And maybe we would not have been able to save the Ambassador. Maybe we could have saved two of the others that were killed later in that operation. But we could have at least been there to send that message and to intimidate. And we're now a year and a day later. The press has identified some of the perpetrators. They have gone to Benghazi and sat down and had lunch and interviewed them. There are

at least three media networks that have interviewed one or more of these perpetrators. If we know who they are and justice was going to be brought to them, why hasn't that been the case? Why hasn't this administration acted?

Meanwhile, they will tell us they know exactly how to put a precision strike in on Assad in Syria to send just the right message that won't tip the balance of power and change the result of the civil war in Syria, but it will give him the message that he won't use weapons of mass destruction again. They have enough intel to apparently do that, but not enough intel to just follow the reporters around in Benghazi and collar the people that they talk to. That would be just that simple.

Furthermore, the intel that seems to have identified the elements of the Free Syrian Army, I'll just say a few words about that that I've gathered as I have circumnavigated this globe and sat down in a whole series of meetings that took place that put the pieces of the puzzle together on the intel with Syria and Egypt and others.

Just on the Syria side, we had a Free Syrian Army that emerged. It emerged as a popular uprising against Assad for his cruel and evil dictatorship of his people and for killing some of his own people even then, his political enemies. And the Free Syrian Army emerged. So they should have easily been the people that we supported.

Well, as that battle went on, they were taking over different areas within Syria, tactical objectives and communities and cities and large geographical areas of Syria. And at a certain point, the Muslim Brotherhood stepped in. They took over some parts of the Free Syrian Army. They set up an operation to essentially sacrifice the leader of the Free Syrian Army. He was captured in an operation where he was sacrificed. They took him out of command. His successor commander now has been marginalized and pushed off to the side.

And the Free Syrian Army—the knowledge that I have—is now controlled by the Muslim Brotherhood and other radical Islamist entities, including al Qaeda. That is the entity that we now have good enough intel that we are starting to send supplies and military supplies into.

Those two entities, Assad and radical Islamist components, which is a large component of the Free Syrian Army, they're the bad guys. They're both our enemies. Yet the administration is in the business now, a year after that should have been happening in an aggressive way, of arming some of the wrong people.

It's not that we didn't have good choices. There still are good choices. There still are good people in Syria and outside Syria that will step forward that want to have a secular Syria, a

Syria that has freedom of religion, a Syria that is run by the people of Syria. Those elements are still there in Syria and around Syria—at least 2 million Syrian refugees. That force can be put together. It takes longer than firing a cruise missile into Damascus and picking a target to send a pinprick message. It can be done, but I'm not confident that this administration has identified our friends.

What I have seen is that, when we've aligned with anybody in the Middle East, it's been the Muslim Brotherhood. We've had 2½ years of the Arab Spring; and in every break that has changed the power within the countries of North Africa and the Middle East, every break has gone in favor of the Muslim Brotherhood, except one. That is now, when the Muslim Brotherhood took over Egypt under Morsi. Thirty to 33 million people came to the streets in a popular demonstration—the largest demonstration in the history of the world—to unseat Morsi because they don't have a constitutional way to impeach him. They didn't have a way to arrest him. The only thing they could do was go to the streets and demand that he be removed from power.

Our administration sent a message before Morsi came to power that Mubarak had to be gone yesterday—remember that word? “He needs to be gone yesterday.” Well, that upset the balance of power in Egypt. That helped Morsi come to power. Morsi squeaked by by winning an election with 5.8 million people voting for him out of 83 million or so Egyptians altogether. Not exactly what you would call a majority of the people supporting Morsi—Morsi's complete incompetence, but also his very bold moves to consolidate power within Egypt to where it became clear that there was not going to be another election in Egypt and that the Muslim Brotherhood was going to impose shari'a law. And you start seeing that happen.

Well, 30 to 33 million people in the streets of Egypt, and the Egyptian military stepped forward to support the popular uprising that took place. Now they have laid out a time line, a roadmap to write a constitution, put a constitution out on a public vote to ratify and then to elect a president and a civilian government. And General Assisi has pledged to turn over this military control of the Egyptian Government to a newly elected, legitimate civilian government. That time line is a good time line. It's a good commitment that has been set up and it's a good result.

The problem we have is that our administration was against Mubarak and helped push him out of power. That helped open the door for Morsi, who came in—one of the Muslim Brotherhood. And it's clear, this new leadership, the interim President of Egypt, General Assisi, commanding the mili-

tary—and also, by the way, they have the support of the Pope of the Coptic Christian Church in Egypt—all of that, the new forces are clear. They oppose the Muslim Brotherhood.

The struggle within the Middle East, Muslim Brotherhood, radical Islam, radical and violent Islamist groups working against the free people in that part of the world, we need to be on the right side of everyone, not on the wrong side of everyone. And the administration is going to have to turn their course around in Egypt and get behind the new administration and support new elections and a new constitution.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. I would like to pose a question to you based on what you've seen regarding Syria and Benghazi and Libya, the classified briefings and your travels.

This administration reported to us that Syria had used chemical weapons 11 times previously. On the 12th time, we want to send a message that that's not okay—and it's not okay, let's be clear about that. But why didn't we send a message and why haven't we sent a message that it's not okay to kill a United States Ambassador? When is that message going to be sent?

I would just like to get your thoughts on that and the dichotomy and the lack of parallel in some kind of strategy and foreign policy that is congruent and makes sense to our allies and our adversaries.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, I would just say to the gentleman that he has pointed out a stark contradiction in our policy. Eleven or 12 times of alleged, at least, weapons of mass destruction used against the Syrian people. I'm going to suggest that this push now is because some of the people that want those elements of the Free Syrian Army that I described to succeed are saying, Help us out by landing a strike or two in on Assad. That's my guess.

But with regard to justice for the people that perpetrated the Benghazi incident against our Americans and our American Ambassador, that justice needs to be delivered. We know who some of those people are. And it's irresponsible of this administration to shut information down to the United States Congress, to the American people, and to fail to act when they have a clear act of war committed against the United States on U.S. territory.

□ 1245

I'm aware that the clock has ticked down here to the end.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for coming to the floor. I'm sure that he wasn't aware that this wasn't choreographed. It was a spontaneous eruption of protest calling for the truth to come out and a light to shine on Benghazi.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his leadership on this, Mr. Speaker,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALMON). The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

PRINCIPLES FOR MODERNIZING THE MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT SYSTEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-60)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 674(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, Public Law 112-239, January 2, 2013, I hereby transmit principles for modernizing the military compensation and retirement systems requested by the Act.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, September 12, 2013.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, as the House adjourns, I want to note that when we come back the House will be in session for 5 days before the end of the fiscal year. That could bring a shutdown of the Federal Government. What most Americans don't know is that that could bring a shutdown also of the government of the Nation's Capital, the District of Columbia.

I want to make clear that there is not a single Member of this House or the Senate who desires that outcome. There is nothing in that for anybody. Many Members of Congress and their staff actually live in the District of Columbia, so to have the Nation's Capital shut down is not anything that would be even in their interest.

Beyond their own interest, most Members of Congress believe in local control and are mystified when they come here, whatever their party, to find that the Congress has anything to do with the local budget of the District of Columbia—\$8 billion raised by the city—which has to come here before the city can spend a dime of its own money.

The city has before the Congress, as I speak, a balanced budget. In fact, a budget that has won plaudits all around the country, and even in this Congress, because of the fund balance that the city has managed to build—over \$1 billion—over time. D.C.'s very middle name should be "prudence." If anything, the District of Columbia has been an example of what we are trying to get cities and States all across the country to do.

I understand why the leadership decided not to move forward with a continuing resolution, which would have guaranteed that the government would remain open until December 15. They need the time to get the votes and to satisfy their Members. That's perfectly understandable. What would not be understandable is if we went through another shutdown crisis.

The government actually did shut down about 18 years ago. I do want to say here on the floor how grateful I am to the Speaker of the House at the time, Newt Gingrich, who indeed kept the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital, open during multiple shutdowns of the Federal Government. He did so simply because it makes no sense to shut down the government of the Nation's Capital, which has not one ounce of interest in or blame for the disputes that have increasingly grown and have caused us to go on continuing resolutions because we do not get our bills done in time. There needs to be time to reconcile those matters.

It is important to note that the District of Columbia budget, which was submitted here on time, is in such good shape that it did, in fact, pass both of the appropriation committees that receive it. So there's no issue here involving the District of Columbia, no reason why anybody would want it entangled in a Federal dispute. In fact, I thought that my good friends in the majority, above all, stood for disentanglement of the Federal Government from what should rightly be the work of the localities.

I hasten to say this is an unintended consequence that comes from the fact that most Members don't even know it. Members come here to do the business of their district and the Federal Government. They don't come here to be educated on the District of Columbia. They have no idea that the District would close down if there was a close-down of the Federal Government. They would understand that I must do my job, and that is to take whatever steps I can to make sure that this unintended result does not occur.

I'm asking to testify at the Rules Committee when the continuing resolution is considered. That is the resolution, as I indicated, that would keep the government open until December 15. It is interesting to know that with only a slight change the District of Columbia would not be an issue here.

I want to thank the Republican appropriators who—it must be at least 10 years ago—corrected another consequence that the Congress never intended. The District budget used to be held up whenever the budget, of course, of the Federal Government was held up, and for the very same reason that it hadn't come to the floor.

So you had a city whose budget was due out by September 30 which sometimes got out in November or December. This wreaked havoc on the opening of schools and on the ability of the city to contract because the budget was over here and hadn't been passed.

It is important also to put on the record that the budget doesn't come here because any Member of the Congress is interested in the budget or thinks that their oversight is necessary to make sure that the budget is done correctly. In fact, the budget is virtually never looked at.

What does happen when a budget comes here is that extraneous amendments that reflect the views, not of the District of Columbia, but of a Member who is offering them, often are attached to our budget.

The Appropriations Committee has never interfered with the budget itself. How could they? The budget has been put together by D.C. Council subcommittees and committees and the city has a chief financial officer—the only jurisdiction in the United States that has a financial officer appointed for 5 years, cannot be fired except for cause, who has to pass on the budget and make sure that there is no overspending. The D.C. budget comes here out of tradition. It comes here because for more than 200 years it has come here while the Congress has been trying to figure out how to deal with the anomalous position that it has put its Nation's Capital in.

So here it is. In order to avoid the budget getting out so late that you cripple or certainly make extremely difficult the ability of the city officials to run a big, complicated city, the appropriators agreed upon a small change. I'm asking us to act on that already existing change.

That change says that in every CR there will be, no matter what the CR says, and most CRs say very little, that the District will be allowed to spend its own funds at the levels that have been approved by its council, and by the Mayor, at next year's level. That has had enormously important good effects on the city. I believe we will be in the upcoming CR in the same way.

As the District's Member of Congress, I have to contemplate the possibility, however, that even on December 15 the government could close down. And I would have to, indeed, look at what would be even, perhaps, better, that it didn't close down but there was yet another CR. Imagine trying to run a big city in the United States on mul-

tiples CRs. That's what I'm trying to avoid. That's what no Member of Congress intends.

I also have had to take precautions for the possibility that even the CR that comes before us—I'm hoping next week—could fail. If that CR fails, I also have a bill that would allow the District to run whenever the Federal Government shuts down, this year and in perpetuity. Again, if I am right that there is no Member who would like to shut down any local jurisdiction, and especially the Nation's Capital, then I think this bill would take care of it.

I have to go now to the Rules Committee for the CR, the next step. That's the next opportunity to draw this matter to the attention of the House and to, therefore, by amendment allow the District to spend for the entire fiscal year, not from CR to CR, but for the entire fiscal year.

I don't think that is asking too much, and I've never had an objection when I've tried to keep the District open. It has been difficult to do. Three times the District almost shut down in recent history because we got that close to it.

The problem for the city when the city almost closes down runs close to being like if it does close down. The city can't assume the best; it has to assume the worst, so it has to call out its staff and its lead officials to prepare for a shutdown even if a shutdown does not occur.

The only responsible thing for the city to do right now with only 5 session days left, at least as it now stands, because there is to be a recess beginning at the end of the month, is we've got to assume the status quo and we've got to assume the worst because it would be irresponsible not to. So, in addition, I have to put in a bill—that's in addition to the amendment—that would allow the District to remain open.

To illustrate just how unintended would be a shutdown, the House needs to know that the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, on which I sit, has passed a bill that would give the District more autonomy over its local budget and, importantly, would keep the District from shutting down. That bill now is pending and could come to the floor at any point.

□ 1300

The President of the United States has in his budget a shutdown avoidance bill for the District, and the Senate Appropriations Committee has the same language in its bill. The House appropriators have taken the position that they do not believe the District should be shut down. Of course, they defer to the authorizers, as I indicated, and the Oversight Committee has legislation that has been voted out of committee that is now pending.

I think any Member who has held local office—and by the way, I did not

hold local office before I came to Congress—have, I think, a better idea of what such a threat means to a local jurisdiction and how much it is at odds with what both sides understand to be the American approach to federalism, when local jurisdictions get to run their own localities and States and, by the way, get to raise their own funds. That is what the District has done, and it has done it well.

These frequent shutdown threats have had a very disruptive effect on the city and on its employees and on its residents. It does something that we, I'm sure, appreciate that no elected official wants to have happen: it casts a pall of uncertainty right when you're looking forward to a budget for the coming year. That kind of uncertainty already has had its effect. Wall Street, for example, understands that the District budget is not final until it somehow is passed out of the Congress. The District pays a premium—it pays a price—for that because there are two bodies, not one, that get a say over its local budget.

No city should ever have to wonder whether it will be shut down. Shutdowns really don't occur at the local level because residents won't let it occur. They are close enough to the people so that that is not a threat you could much get away with at the local level. Here we are some levels above that, and most Members and most Americans don't know that there is local legislation that is put in that peril as I speak.

The District has about 630,000 residents. It's growing well. People are moving into the city, not out. There are cranes all over town; and much of this comes out of the excellent management of the city, out of the way the city has conducted its economic affairs, out of the fact that it has an independent chief financial officer, who cannot be fired because he disagrees with the council or with the Mayor and, therefore, has to tell the truth. It's all worked together to make the District the kind of jurisdiction that the Congress, at least, should have no concerns about and, I believe, has no concerns about.

The price the District would pay is hard for me to make clear to Members because it would have to occur before they felt it. We have come close to feeling it; and almost 20 years ago, we did, in fact, feel it. There are some parts of your services to the people that continue, but huge parts cannot because the Congress has not passed the budget, not because the Congress objects to the budget and not because any Member of this House desires that outcome.

This House does not mean to hold the District budget as hostage. If it did, there would have been something the District could do to get out of the hostage fight. So what makes this so frustrating is that there is nothing we can

give, nothing we can do to extricate ourselves from a fight that is wholly inside baseball within this Chamber and the Chamber across the way. To be sure, I have contacted my Senate allies; but, frankly, this has to be done here. We've got to get agreement on both sides of the aisle to the simple proposition that those of us who believe in the great and important freedoms of the Framers would least want to be held responsible for closing down a local jurisdiction, one with which we have no beef.

This country was established on a pedestal of federalism. One thing we understand is the difference between a local jurisdiction and its rights and responsibilities and ourselves. If anything, there are Members of this Chamber who would want some of what the Federal government does no longer done by the Federal Government at all but, in fact, to be the work of local jurisdictions. Many in this Chamber not only support but, indeed, believe that local jurisdictions do a better job at governing than does any institution at the Federal level. I can, therefore, find no set of principles here from any Member of Congress that would be in play when the decision is made on my amendment to the continuing resolution or on the bill that I will introduce as a fallback in case it does not occur.

As we go home, perhaps earlier than expected, to ponder what to do with keeping the Federal Government open, I ask that Members bear in mind that they would be closing not only Federal agencies but the District of Columbia Government. In the name of the people of the District of Columbia, I ask you, wherever we stand on the Federal Government, to allow the District of Columbia to move forward, to govern itself, and to take care of its day-to-day business.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 281

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 281.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

THE INVESTIGATIONS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There are a couple of issues that are certainly worth elaborating on today. One is codified in The Wall Street

Journal article from September 11, yesterday, and 7:35 p.m. is when it's timed out. It's regarding IRS Supervisor Lois Lerner. The article is entitled "Lois Lerner's Own Words."

The article reads:

Congress' investigation into the IRS targeting of conservatives has been continuing out of the Syria headlines, and it's turning up news. Emails unearthed by the House Ways and Means Committee between former director of Exempt Organizations Lois Lerner and her staff raise doubts about IRS claims that the targeting wasn't politically motivated and that low-level employees in Cincinnati masterminded the operation.

In a February 2011 email, Ms. Lerner advised her staff, including then Exempt Organizations technical manager Michael Seto and then Rulings and Agreements director Holly Paz, that a Tea Party matter is "very dangerous" and is something "counsel and Lerner adviser Judy Kindell need to be in on." Ms. Lerner adds, "Cincy should probably NOT have these cases."

That's a different tune than the IRS sang in May when former IRS Commissioner Steven Miller said the Agency's overzealous enforcement was the work of two "rogue" employees in Cincinnati. When the story broke, Ms. Lerner suggested that her office had been unaware of the pattern of targeting until she read about it in the newspaper. "So it was pretty much we started seeing information in the press that raised questions for us, and we went back and took a look," she said in May.

Mr. Speaker, so no one misunderstands, it is a crime to give false information to Congress.

The article goes on:

Earlier this summer, IRS lawyer Carter Hull, who oversaw the review of many Tea Party cases and questionnaires, testified that his oversight began in April 2010. Tea Party cases under review are "being supervised by Chip Hull at each step." Ms. Paz wrote to Ms. Lerner in a February 2011 email. "He reviews info from TPs—or Tea Partys—correspondence to TPs, et cetera. No decisions are going out of Cincy until we go all the way through the process with the (c)(3) and (c)(4) cases here."

The emails also put the targeting in the context of the media and congressional drumbeat over the impact of conservative campaign spending on the 2012 elections. On July 10, 2012, then Lerner adviser Sharon Light emailed Ms. Lerner a National Public Radio story on how outside money was making it hard for Democrats to hold their Senate majority.

It certainly appears that the IRS was weaponized for the political purpose of one party, which would, of course, be one of the worst nightmares for the Founders of this country. Of course, George Washington didn't even want us to have political parties—he warned of the danger there—and here we are, all this time later, with a group of Democratic operatives who are doing things with the IRS that Richard Nixon could have only dreamed of doing.

This article from The Wall Street Journal goes on:

The Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee had complained to the Federal Election Commission that conservative groups like Crossroads GPS and Americans

for Prosperity should be treated as political committees rather than 501(c)(4)s, which are tax-exempt social welfare groups that do not have to disclose their donors. "Perhaps the FEC will save the day," Ms. Lerner wrote back later that morning.

□ 1315

Having been a district judge presiding over criminal cases, that is what you would call, Mr. Speaker, a statement against interests by Ms. Lerner in a prior communication that directly contradicts what she said the motivation was. I think there are criminal implications here that need to be followed up.

In any event, the article goes on:

That response suggests Ms. Lerner's political leanings, and it also raises questions about Ms. Lerner's intentions in a separate email exchange she had when an FEC investigator inquired about the status of the conservative group, the American Future Fund. The FEC and IRS don't have the authority to share that information under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code. But the bigger question is: Why did they want to? After the FEC inquiry, the American Future Fund also got a questionnaire from the IRS.

Again, that's from *The Wall Street Journal* dated last night.

When one party in power in the executive branch can weaponize its Federal agencies against its political opponents, unless it is stopped, this little experiment in democracy will come to an end. It will bring about the very things that the Founders had hoped would not happen but were realistic enough to talk about them at some length about when and if we might move to one person being able to grasp control of the Federal Government.

Of course, one of the things they used to try to keep that from happening was to give Congress the power of the purse, to give Congress oversight over the executive and judicial branches. When we've had Congress try to do oversight, whether it's over Fast and Furious, Benghazi, the IRS scandal, we've met with nothing but blinded opaqueness—not transparency—from this administration. They have obfuscated constantly, done everything they can to prevent Congress from getting the truth about what they have called even phony scandals.

If they're so phony, why don't you get the transparency out here, Mr. Speaker? Let's get people out here with the truth and then we can see fully whether or not they're phony scandals. The more this drip, drip, drip of information comes out, the more it becomes clear as to why this administration has been hiding evidence and attempting to keep Congress from discovering things.

I have personally been pushing for many months now to have a special prosecutor investigate the Internal Revenue Service situation with regard to targeting for political purposes. The reason is that there are statutes that pertain to the IRS that could make some of this conduct potential crimes for which people could go to prison.

I am so proud that I became a friend of Chuck Colson before he passed. I think he is one of the great Christian luminaries of the 20th and 21st centuries. His becoming a Christian all came about after his arrogance and his willful disobedience of the law during the Nixon administration brought him to prison. He had possession of information from the FBI about someone. As I recall, that got him about 1½ years in prison. Yet, we have seen during the close of the Clinton years as President, one man having, at the White House, about 1,000 FBI files. If he had been held to the same standard as Chuck Colson, he would never have gotten out of prison, but nobody went to prison.

We've seen, as time has gone on and abuses within the executive branch have not been dealt with properly, the abuses have continued and gotten worse. From reports I hear from conservative groups, whether Tea Party, pro-Israel, pro-marriage, as it's been known throughout the history of mankind as being between a man and a woman, groups that just wanted the Constitution followed are all coming under attack—not all of the groups have, but most of the groups that have have been these type of groups—from the IRS.

Then I hear from others who are being hit by inquiries from the FEC, not about Democratic matters, but about contributions to the Republican candidates and party. Then we hear that the EPA and other Federal agencies are going after conservatives.

It is unbelievable how powerful this government has gotten and how dramatically it can affect the outcome of an election. We must make sure that these kinds of abuses stop. We have the power of the purse to stop it, and we should. If the administration is not going to be forthcoming with information about the IRS, then it may be necessary to defund part of the executive branch until such time as they become truthful.

The Department of Justice still has not been forthcoming on information that in our Judicial Committee we've been trying to get. We still haven't gotten answers to all of the matters that ended up resulting in the Attorney General of the United States being held in contempt for failing and refusing to answer.

It would seem that in the Fast and Furious scandal, where this administration saw to it that 2,000 or so guns made their way into the hands of drug cartels in Mexico, resulting in the loss of hundreds of lives in Mexico and at least one or more here in the United States, that someone should be held to account. When no one is held to account, when there is no accountability, the abuses get worse. That's what we're hearing.

You would have thought once the IRS scandal had been exposed that peo-

ple would be more cautious about going after conservative groups for political purposes. Since no one has been held accountable yet, no budgets cut, the arrogance and the political maneuvering within Federal agencies seems to be growing much worse.

I'm hoping that my friends on the other side of the aisle will understand that the pendulum swings back and forth. I cannot imagine a single of my Democratic friends across the aisle being nearly as composed as we've been on the Republican side of the aisle about the abuses if the shoe were on the other foot and those abuses were over Democratic groups that were trying to elect the next Democratic President. If they were, I should be helping the Democrats and I would help the Democrats, because there's no place for an administration that weaponizes for political purposes the agencies under its control. We've gone for over 200 years fighting and doing what we could to avoid that happening, yet here it's happening.

It is a Federal agency that I want to go to next that's been involved in carrying out the will of this administration.

Here's an article from yesterday from Breitbart, written by John Sexton. He says:

It has been nearly a year since the attack which killed four Americans in Benghazi. During that time, various minute-by-minute accounts of the attack have been published. In addition, the administration's decisions to refuse additional security requests and to revise its talking points after the attack have been examined in detail.

Mr. Speaker, before I go on, I would like to grab a couple of posters.

I would have felt good in life having Ty Woods and Glen Doherty covering my back, just as they were trying to do for the survivors for our American Government workers at our consulate in our annex in Benghazi.

These are the four people we've lost: Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, and our two former Navy seals, Ty Woods and Glen Doherty. They deserve the truth to come out.

This article continues:

But Benghazi may have been a case where most observers have missed the forest for the trees. This is not an attempt to add new information so much as it is to collate the information that already exists from the most reputable journalistic sources.

To begin with, Benghazi was a CIA operation involving weapons, one which had no cover beyond a small mission that provided a diplomatic fig leaf for the effort. Officially, the CIA was there to track and collect dangerous weapons left over from the war that ousted Qadhafi. But the evidence suggests that the CIA was also either tacitly or actively involved in a multinational effort to ship those weapons to Syrian rebels. Our covert effort in Benghazi, Libya, was connected to our escalating involvement in Syria.

The general outlines of this CIA effort have been reported. One fact which has not been highlighted is that the U.N. arms embargo of Libya, which the United States

helped pass in 2011, makes shipping weapons in or out of the country a violation of international law. Indeed, the way the U.N. resolution is written, even knowingly allowing such shipments to take place may be a violation of the agreement.

I want to add parenthetically here that some of our concerns with having a world court and international tribunals that have jurisdiction over American citizens is that they may have laws that they decide to enforce that are against or outside what our United States Constitution allows. I would submit that American individuals, whether they're CIA agents or military, should be accountable to the United States and under the United States Constitution and not some world court. And it should be worth noting that as this administration pushed U.N. resolutions—I'm not sure what the statute of limitations is, but if individuals within this administration then violated the international law that they pushed to create, then they probably need to be careful when they're traveling in years after they leave the White House or the administration efforts because, who knows, you might get an indictment somewhere in one of these international tribunals that you violated the U.N. law you passed. You got guns into or out of Libya, you violated the law.

People in this country need to understand that participating in the making of laws and that participating in the violation of laws have consequences.

This article continues:

In 2012, the Obama administration publicly claimed it was working on diplomatic and humanitarian responses to the situation in Syria. But behind the scenes, the United States was aware that a network of arms shipments was being created to support the rebels. This network involved shipping weapons from Qatar and, later, Libya to Turkey where they could be taken across the border and distributed to militia in Syria.

In June of 2012, The New York Times reported that a contingent of CIA agents were "operating secretly" in Turkey to help vet which groups would receive these weapons. But later reporting by the Times would indicate the CIA was doing more than vetting.

□ 1330

The article goes on down and mentions that The Wall Street Journal reported at the time, this was back in June, that:

The Central Intelligence Agency has begun moving weapons to Jordan from a network of secret warehouses and plans to start arming small groups of vetted Syrian rebels within a month, expanding U.S. support of moderate forces battling President Bashar al-Assad, according to diplomats and U.S. officials briefed on the plans. To sum up, the CIA encouraged the creation of a multinational arms pipeline, helped shop for weapons to fill it, vetted the groups who would receive those weapons in Syria and, since June of 2013, contributed U.S. weapons to the mix. With that backdrop in place, we can now return our attention to Libya.

During the U.S. involvement in overthrowing Libyan dictator Muammar Qadhafi

during 2011, the Obama administration became aware that shipments of weapons were making their way to Qadhafi's troops, allowing them to resupply themselves and pose a greater threat to civilians.

I might add parenthetically that with Qadhafi, that Qadhafi was an ally of this administration and this country at the time, that this administration chose to destroy and help remove.

The article says:

So in February the U.S. and other allied nations including the U.K. and France pushed for a package of international sanctions which became U.N. Security Council Resolution 1970. Resolution 1970 condemned the bombing of civilians, imposed travel restrictions on Qadhafi and his inner circle, froze assets and, importantly, banned any transfer of arms to or from Libya. In addition, Resolution 1917 requires member states, upon discovery of such arms, to destroy them.

A second resolution, number 1973, was passed a month later in March 2011. It created a no-fly zone and reaffirmed that member states were expected to help enforce the embargo by inspecting any sea or air vessels believed to be shipping weapons to or from Libya. If discovered, such weapons were to be destroyed. But despite Resolution 1970, The New York Times reported in April 2011 that shipments of arms were reaching Libyan rebels from Qatar. Another in-depth story published in December 2012 describes how the U.S. winked at these shipments despite concerns that some weapons were falling into the hands of extremists.

Parenthetically, I might insert, duh.

The article goes on:

In fact, the nature of our military strategy in Libya made partnering with Qatar necessary. The Obama administration wanted to avoid getting immersed in a ground war, which officials feared could lead the United States into another quagmire in the Middle East. As a result, the White House largely relied on Qatar and the United Arab Emirates, two small Persian Gulf states and frequent allies of the United States. After discussions among members of the National Security Council, the Obama administration backed the arms shipments from both countries, according to two former administration officials briefed on the talks. "The UAE was asking for clearance to send U.S. weapons," said one former official. "We told them it's okay to ship other weapons."

But the American support for the arms shipments from Qatar and the Emirates could not be completely hidden. NATO air and sea forces around Libya had to be alerted not to interdict the cargo planes and freighters transporting the arms into Libya from Qatar and the Emirates, American officials said.

Again, that would be a direct violation of the U.N. resolution that we helped pushed into international law.

The article says:

This pattern of winking at violation of the U.N. arms embargo of Libya was repeated after Qadhafi's ouster. With the war in Libya at an end and the one in Syria ramping up, the direction of the arms pipeline simply reversed itself. Whereas weapons had been coming into Libya from Qatar, they now headed out of Libya back to Qatar and from there on to either Mali or Syria by way of Turkey. A June 21, 2013 New York Times story points out that local militias were or-

ganizing these shipments—including flights this year from Tripoli and Benghazi. But these shipments out of Libya are said to have been taking place for a year, beginning several months before the 9/11 attack in Benghazi—

that killed these four American patriots.

To sum up, the U.S. approved and cleared a path for a pipeline of weapons into Libya during the revolution in 2011. That pipeline would eventually reverse course to provide the same spare weapons to rebel in Syria. Both efforts seem to violate the U.N. resolutions which the United States helped pass in early 2011. But late in 2011 the United States realized its revolution on the cheap in Libya had a worrisome downside. Thousands of dangerous anti-aircraft weapons were loose in Libya, attracting militants who might wish to use them to commit terrorist acts against civilian air traffic. Something had to be done.

So the article goes on to talk about how we sent people into Libya to try to reclaim the weapons that we had helped provide, including surface-to-air missiles. The article says:

A month later, just three days after the 9/11 attack in Benghazi, the Times of London reported that a Libyan ship carrying 400 tons of weapons, including SAM-7 surface-to-air anti-aircraft missiles, docked in Turkey. This was the largest known shipment of weapons to Syria at the time. The ship's captain, Omar Mousaeb, was from Benghazi.

The article goes on to make light of the allegation that this is a phony scandal. If it's so phony, why is there so much in the way of effort to keep Congress from knowing what really happened? Reports have been that we have CIA agents with direct knowledge of what happened during the death of our four patriots. They are being polygraphed every 30 days to keep them quiet, and demanding to know if anyone has leaked any information to Congress or the media because this administration is doing absolutely everything they can to keep us from getting to the truth of what happened there.

And I have been greatly encouraged this week, and in a trip to the Middle East, where, over the safety and the future of the United States, people in a bipartisan way were very concerned about our involvement in Syria, that we should not get involved in Syria, that it would be a huge mistake. Some say Members of Congress should never travel outside their district or Washington, D.C., but what I have seen, and especially from a trip to the Middle East last week, we're not getting the straight information from this administration. If we want to know what's really going on, where we are appropriating money, where we are making policy through our control of the purse strings—or lack of control—we've got to go to those areas and talk to the leaders involved. It's amazing what you find out. When leaders of allied countries tell us we don't understand you,

what you are doing. Do you not know you went to war in Afghanistan for the Muslim Brotherhood—against the Muslim Brotherhood? There you were fighting the Taliban, and then you go to Libya, and—well, first to Egypt. We have helped the Muslim Brotherhood in the wrong places, and it needs to stop in Syria as well.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for September 11 and 12.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 130. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming.

S. 157. An act to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 256. An act to amend Public Law 93-435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

S. 304. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes.

S. 459. An act to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 16, 2013, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2831. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grapes Grown in Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0005; FV13-925-1 FR] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2832. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Increase in Fees for Voluntary Federal Dairy Grading and Inspection Services [Doc. No.: AMS-DA-10-0002] (RIN: 0581-AD25) received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2833. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Kiwifruit Grown in California and Imported Kiwifruit; Relaxation of Minimum Grade Requirement [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0032; FV13-920-1 IR] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2834. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0076; FV13-932-1 FR] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2835. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mango Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Nominations of Foreign Producers and Election of Officers [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0041] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2836. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Revising Reporting Requirements and New Information Collection [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0052; FV12-905-2 FR] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2837. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2013-2014 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0064; FV13-985-1 FR] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2838. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Modification of the General Cull and Handling Regulation for Area No. 2 [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0001; FV13-948-1 FR] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2839. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — User Fees for 2013 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers [AMS-CN-12-0074] (RIN: 0581-AD30) received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2840. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cranberries Grown in States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Long Island in the State of New York; Changing Reporting Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0002; FV12-929-1 FR] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2841. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cotton Board Rules and Regulations: Adjusting Supplemental Assessment on Imports (2013 Amendment) [Doc.: AMS-CN-12-0065] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2842. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Office of Justice Programs annual report for Fiscal Year 2012, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3712(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2843. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "Health, United States, 2012 report"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2844. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2845. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the National Emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2846. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2847. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting pursuant to Title II, Section 203, of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act (No FEAR Act), the Department's annual report for FY 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2848. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, transmitting the 2012 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2849. A letter from the Inspector General, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting notification that the Commission recently began the audit of financial statements for the fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2850. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's final inventory list for 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2851. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2852. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for *Sphaeralcea gieriichii* (Gierisch Mallow) [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0018] (RIN: 1018-AZ46) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2853. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and

Plants; Endangered Species Status for Diamond Darter [Docket No.: FWS-R5-ES-2012-0045] (RIN: 1018-AY12) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2854. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Recovery and State Grants, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Non-essential Experimental Population of Topeka Shiner (*Notropis topeka*) in Northern Missouri [Docket No.: FWS-R3-ES-2012-0087] (RIN: 1018-AY45) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2855. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Annual Report to Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program for the period October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010 as required by section 413(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2856. A letter from the Clerk, Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, *KM Enterprises, Inc., v. Global Traffic Technologies, Inc. and Global Traffic Technologies, LLC*, No. 12-3406, (Aug 2, 2013); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2857. A letter from the Clerk, Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, *Milija Zivkovic v. Eric Holder, Jr.*, No. 12-2143, (July 31, 2013); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2858. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting copy of the Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States for the March 2013 session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2859. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Deadline to Submit Opinion and Advisory Letter Applications for Defined Benefit Mass Submitter Plans is Extended to January 31, 2014 [Announcement 2013-37] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2860. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's 2012 report entitled, "Department of Energy Activities Relating to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board"; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Armed Services.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PASCARELL (for himself, Mr. STOCKMAN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 3084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for the production of renewable chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ENYART, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SHIMKUS,

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. SCHOCK):

H.R. 3085. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3349 West 111th Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Captain Herbert Johnson Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 3086. A bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3087. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the receipt of bonuses by Department of Veterans Affairs employees who violate Federal civil laws or regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 3088. A bill to concentrate Federal resources aimed at the prosecution of drug offenses on those offenses that are major; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3089. A bill to amend section 503A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to pharmacy compounding; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. BARBER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. NEGRETTE MCLEOD, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. TONKO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 3090. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize Federal assistance to State adult protective services programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUNYAN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JONES, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 3091. A bill to promote the development of meaningful treatments for patients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 3092. A bill to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 3093. A bill to exclude individuals who receive health insurance coverage pursuant to the terms of a collective bargaining agreement from tax credits and reductions in cost-sharing under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3094. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RADEL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND):

H.R. 3095. A bill to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rule-making proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 3096. A bill to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Pollin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the "Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WATT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 3097. A bill to posthumously award a congressional gold medal to Constance Baker Motley; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 3098. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the treatment of certain small business concerns for purposes of Department of Veterans Affairs contracting goals and preferences; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LATTI, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 3099. A bill to provide for the development of a fishery management plan for the Gulf of Mexico red snapper, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3100. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to make local

funds of the District of Columbia available for use by the District during any portion of a fiscal year in which no Federal law appropriating local funds for the fiscal year is in effect, at the rates of operation provided under the local budget act for the fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 3101. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the credit for employers establishing workplace child care facilities, to increase the child care credit to encourage greater use of quality child care services, to provide incentives for students to earn child care-related degrees and to work in child care facilities, and to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. PERRY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. STUTZMAN):

H.J. Res. 62. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Federal excise tax on heavy-duty trucks should not be increased; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution urging all parties to the conflict in Syria to work through the United Nations and with the international community to hold the Assad regime accountable and resolve the crisis in Syria through a negotiated political settlement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. Res. 342. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2013 as "National Sepsis and Septic Shock Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MICA, Ms.

FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RADEL, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. ROSS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H. Res. 343. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable E. Clay Shaw, Jr., formerly a Representative of the State of Florida; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H. Res. 344. A resolution directing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to direct, for the purpose of interpreting Office of Personnel Management (OPM) guidance with respect to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, that the definition of "congressional staff" employed by an "official office" shall include all committee staff, all joint committee staff, and all staff employed by leadership offices of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 345. A resolution recognizing the importance of nonprofit organizations and expressing support for designation of May 16, 2014, as "National Nonprofit Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself and Mr. RIBBLE):

H. Res. 346. A resolution recognizing the 110th anniversary of the founding of the Harley-Davidson Motor Company, which has been a significant part of the social, economic, and cultural heritage of the United States and many other nations and a leading force for product and manufacturing innovation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 3084.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3085.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 3086.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, including, but not limited to, Clauses 1, 3 and 18.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 3088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9

The Congress shall have Power *** To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court.

Article III, Section 1

The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behaviour, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

Article III, Section 2

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be a Party, the Supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all other Cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

Article IV, Section 1

Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records, and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

Article I, Section 9, Clause 2

The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power *** To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 3089.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3090.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—to provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 3091.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 2, Clause 3

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 3092.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 3093.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which states, "the Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3094.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 3095.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 3096.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The "necessary and proper" clause of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DeLAURO:

H.R. 3097.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 3098.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 3099.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 3101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 62.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law;"

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 25: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 200: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 207: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 274: Mr. MAFFEI and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 362: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 363: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 471: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 495: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 498: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 533: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 543: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 638: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 681: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 685: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 689: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 713: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 724: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 792: Mr. HALL and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 797: Mr. PAULSEN and Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 809: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 833: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 855: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. ENYART, Mr. FARR, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 911: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 920: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. DeFAZIO, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 942: Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1020: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1078: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 1091: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 1180: Ms. DeGETTE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 1201: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 1248: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1250: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 1303: Mr. TIPTON and Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD.

H.R. 1309: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1310: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1318: Mr. HONDA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1339: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1431: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1462: Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 1466: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1485: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 1523: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 1666: Mr. FARR, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1717: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 1775: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1779: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1795: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1812: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1830: Mr. LUTKEMEYER.

H.R. 1838: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1869: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1905: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1908: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1926: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1962: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1998: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2011: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2085: Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico.

H.R. 2134: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2199: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2203: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 2226: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2247: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATTA, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2300: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 2318: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2328: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 2330: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2480: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 2482: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 2502: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 2561: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2590: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 2643: Mr. MAFFEI and Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 2682: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 2686: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 2692: Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. KEATING, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2715: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2720: Mr. KIND and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2725: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2745: Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 2772: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2773: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2797: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2807: Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 2809: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LANCE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HARPER, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 2835: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2878: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2901: Mr. CULBERSON and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2917: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2939: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2955: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2989: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 2998: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 3023: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 3037: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 3043: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3055: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 3067: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 3076: Mr. FLORES and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. MICA.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mrs. ROBY.

H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 30: Mr. ENYART.
H. Res. 231: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. VEASEY, Mr.
PIERLUISI, and Mr. NOLAN.
H. Res. 319: Mr. HORSFORD.
H. Res. 341: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors
were deleted from public bills and reso-
lutions as follows:

H. Res. 281: Ms. GABBARD.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—
ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Member added his
name to the following discharge peti-
tion:

Petition 4 by Mr. STOCKMAN on House
Resolution 306: Dana Rohrabacher.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EXTENDING CONGRATULATIONS TO THE OHIO JUDICIAL CON- FERENCE

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize the Ohio Judicial Conference on the celebration of their 50th anniversary.

For 50 years, the Ohio Judicial Conference has worked to maintain the coequal status of the judicial branch of government in relation to the legislative and executive branches while furthering its goal of informing the public about the judicial system. Furthermore, they have worked to provide leadership to those involved in the Ohio judicial system and uniformity in the application of law. The Ohio Judicial Conference holds values such as stewardship, service, and communication in high regard, and these values have enabled the success which the organization enjoys today.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I proudly recognize the Ohio Judicial Conference. They have put forth a great deal of effort into their cause and have been rewarded with much success. I look forward to seeing what the next 50 years will hold for this organization.

CONGRATULATING TONY SKINNER

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I pay tribute to Tony Skinner, a highly dedicated Ventura County resident, whose commitment to the development and growth of today's skilled labor force is remarkable and commendable.

For the past 10 years, Tony has served as the President of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) Local #952. The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers represents 750,000 active members and retirees who work in a wide variety of fields, including utilities, construction, telecommunications, broadcasting, and manufacturing. Under his leadership, IBEW Local #952 has been instrumental in ensuring the strengthening and prosperity of Ventura County's technical and high-skilled occupations.

Tony has worked to organize, mobilize, reach out to community partners, and build coalitions to change people's lives. He has been a staunch and unwavering leader in the labor community that has dedicated his career to working for our county's working families.

As an advocate for technical and vocational training in the region, he has worked to bring

to fruition a vision for a strong and relevant 21st century workforce. Tony founded the Architecture, Construction and Engineering High School in Camarillo, a unique and distinctive school that seeks to prepare students for construction affiliated careers through demanding circumstantial, hands-on curriculum that prepares them for higher education, apprenticeship programs, or a career. Tony currently presides as the President of the Board of Directors for the school.

In addition, Tony's service to the community is extensive. He currently serves on multiple local industry associations and boards including the Tri-Counties Central Labor Council, the Ventura County Workforce Investment Board, and the Economic Development Collaborative of Ventura County.

Tony personifies dedication and commitment to the growing workforce in Ventura County. I am pleased to join Ventura County's Tri-Counties Building and Construction Trades Council in honoring Tony Skinner as a true champion of America's workers.

HONORING GEORGIA SHAPE HONOR ROLL RECIPIENTS

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate 19 schools in Georgia's 11th District for being awarded medals in the SHAPE Honor Roll program.

As a former member of the Marietta school board, it is a great source of pride to see students back home working hard to create healthy habits that will last them a lifetime.

Under the leadership of Governor Deal last year, the SHAPE program began as a statewide initiative in Georgia to help combat childhood obesity and create lifelong healthy habits through physical activity, nutrition, and wellness. Since then, a dedicated network of partners, agencies, and athletic teams have joined forces in their commitment to helping Georgia's youth achieve a greater level of fitness and commend public schools that help them do so.

This year's esteemed award-winners include public institutions from the elementary to high school level across the state of Georgia. Students, parents, administration officials, and instructors have gone above and beyond their duties in ensuring that their youth understand the mental and physical benefits of a healthy lifestyle, and should look upon this accomplishment with great enthusiasm.

Mr. Speaker, this distinguished group of awarded educational communities has established a benchmark of excellence which schools across the nation should aspire to. On behalf of Georgia's 11th Congressional Dis-

trict, I congratulate these educational communities on this achievement, and extend my deepest thanks for their dedication to the youth of our community.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE LIFE OF MICHAEL VOSBURG-CASEY

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an extraordinary young man, Michael Vosburg-Casey, who passed away on July 31, 2013, in Atlanta, Georgia.

Michael will forever be remembered as a devoted husband to his wife Amy, adoring father of his daughter Elena, and the loving son of Betty and Tom Casey. He will be deeply missed by his brother Dr. Daniel Casey and his wife Sarah and children Megan and Brendan; and by his sister Elizabeth Casey Pereira and her husband Vincent. I count myself blessed to have known the Casey family for many decades, and I'm proud to be among the countless people who know and respect their family.

Michael Casey was born in Redwood City, California on March 13, 1974 and attended local schools. A graduate of Bellarmine College Preparatory in San Jose and Colby College in Maine, he worked briefly for the San Mateo County Park System. He then joined the Jesuit Volunteer Corp, moved to Texas, then Atlanta, and eventually joined the Open Door Community and worked with the Georgia Justice Project where he met his wife Amy Vosburg. Michael's unswerving faith moved him to take on every cause with a passion—helping the homeless, visiting prisoners, and serving the poor. He devoted his life to pursuing peace and justice, and annually protested against the School of the Americas. Michael's commitment was so great that he willingly served time in federal prison for his beliefs.

His three-year-old daughter was the joy of his life. He brought her with him to visit the sick, to soup kitchens and to demonstrate for peace. He was a piano tuner, a chicken farmer, and he taught his daughter to sing and dance in the rain. Michael was a force for good and a courageous, generous fighter for justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the extraordinary life and accomplishments of Michael Vosburg-Casey and extend our sympathy to his entire family. His time on earth was brief, but his love of humanity, his decency and his integrity touched countless others, strengthening his community and his country immeasurably.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

RECOGNIZING SISTERS HOSPITAL,
ST. JOSEPH'S CAMPUS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the St. Joseph's Campus of Sisters Hospital as the recipient of the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce's 2013 Large Business of the Year Award.

One of Western New York's premiere medical institutions, Sisters Hospital, St. Joseph's Campus has been recognized by the American Heart Association and the American Stroke Association for achieving 85 percent or higher adherence to all Get with the Guidelines Stroke Performance Achievement Indicators. Cleverley and Associates, a prestigious consulting firm in Columbus, Ohio has recognized Sisters as a five-star hospital.

In addition, Sisters Hospital has received numerous awards for the care they provide to members of our community, demonstrating their great work towards improving patient outcomes and their quality of patient care.

A testament to Sisters Hospital's commitment to the community is their ongoing educational classes including Prepared Childbirth Classes, Better Breathers Club, Lifeskills Diabetes 4-part Series, the Savvy Shopper and Taking Performance to the Next Level. These invaluable classes provide information necessary to empower patients to make informed decisions about their health.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to recognize Sisters Hospital, St. Joseph's Campus, a fundamental piece of Western New York's thriving medical community, as it receives this well-deserved award.

CONGRATULATING CHARLES A.
REIMER ON HIS RETIREMENT
AND TO COMMEND HIM FOR HIS
33 YEARS OF MILITARY SERVICE
AND 27 YEARS OF FEDERAL
CIVIL SERVICE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Charles A. Reimer, a resident of the 11th District, for his years of service to our country and to congratulate him on the occasion of his retirement following 33 years of military service and 27 years of federal civil service.

Mr. Reimer enlisted in our United States Army in August 1966 and served honorably for 3 years. In 1969, Mr. Reimer began his federal civil service, and, in 1970, he joined the Massachusetts National Guard. For the following 13 years, he served concurrently as a civilian employee in the Department of the Army as well as fulfilling his duties in the Guard.

During this period of concurrent service, Mr. Reimer became an expert in personnel management and focused on development of train-

ing programs and enhancement of training though facilities management. His innovative techniques were used to support the development of training programs for the National Park Service, U.S. Marshals Service, U.S. Marine Corps, and other federal and state agencies. In 1980, his expertise was invaluable in helping to implement a new initial entry training for the Army as well as more specialized training for inter-service personnel. Mr. Reimer's civil service evolved to more technical positions in developing strategic education programs aimed at preparing individuals for senior leadership positions in the military as well as foreign area officers and strategists.

In June, 1983, Mr. Reimer was ordered into Federal Active Duty with the National Guard, where he served with distinction in personnel management and later in the areas of environmental management, diplomacy, and international affairs. His military career culminated with his service as Chief, Africa/Asia/Pacific Division, International Affairs Directorate for the National Guard Bureau. He was released from active duty in August 1999 and returned to federal civil service. His last assignment as the Strategic Planning Officer for the Chief of the National Guard Bureau was a culmination of all the years of service and experience supporting federal, state and local officials and organizations.

In recognition of his exemplary service in uniform and as a civilian federal employee, Mr. Reimer has received numerous decorations, awards, and medals including: Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Award (4), Joint Service Commendation Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Reserve Component Achievement Medal (7), Good Conduct Medal, Humanitarian Service Medal, National Defense Service Medal (2), Armed Forces Reserve Medal with Gold Hour Glass Device, Medal for the Defense of Freedom, Superior Civilian Service Medal (2), Commander's Award for Civilian Service, Army Superior Unit Award (2), Texas Medal of Merit, and Massachusetts Emergency Service Award.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in commending Charles A. Reimer for his dedication and service to our country while serving in the National Guard and also as a dedicated public servant. I also thank his family for their support and sacrifices which have enabled Charles to contribute so greatly to our country. He has made immeasurable contributions to our nation, and I wish him a healthy, happy, and well-deserved retirement.

HONORING CHELSEA MONAYÉ
MARTIN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Chelsea Monayé Martin, a dedicated student, who is making a difference in her community.

Ms. Chelsea Monayé Martin was born on July 31, 1995 to the parents of Barbara Mur-ray and David Martin. She is 17 years old and

currently in the 12th grade attending Crystal Springs High School. Her hobbies are playing soccer, reading, singing, and helping others.

Chelsea has been in Girl Scouts for 13 years and has completed over 500 hours of Community Service. Some of her community services consist of volunteering at a number of places such as: Sims House, Stew Pot, Mississippi Department of Human Services and Soup for Elderly and as a Library Assistant.

Chelsea's extracurricular activities include: Students Against Destructive Decisions, Mu Alpha Theta, Lady Tigers Soccer Team, My Sister's Keeper, JROTC and Girl Scouts.

Chelsea's many achievements include: United States National Student Council Award, Girl Scout Silver Award, Girl Scout Gold Award, Highest Average Health Education, Principal's Honor Roll and Mississippi American Legion Auxiliary 2012 Magnolia Girls State.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a talented student, Ms. Chelsea Monayé Martin, for her zeal in actively making a difference in her community.

RECOGNIZING SAHBA ZAARE

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Mesa Community College student Sahba Zaare, recipient of a 2013 Phi Theta Kappa Hites Transfer Scholarship, recognizing academic rigor, engagement, and leadership.

Sahba was chosen from over 2,300 applicants to receive this award, which will assist in his attainment of a baccalaureate degree from a senior degree-granting institution. He plans to transfer to Arizona State University, my alma mater, this coming year. Sahba, a Mathematics and Physics major at MCC, is a member of Phi Theta Kappa, the MCC Honors Program, and has been recognized as a Chancellor's Scholar, Coca-Cola Leaders of Promise Scholar, and American Mathematical Association of Two Year Colleges National Math Contest Winner.

Sahba is a recent immigrant to the United States and through his achievements confirms the promise of our educational system. Our community colleges provide invaluable vocational and technical training while also inspiring students such as Sahba to pursue big dreams and continue their education. It is thanks to institutions such as Mesa Community College and organizations such as the Hites Family Community College Scholarship Foundation and Phi Theta Kappa that such opportunities are available.

Given his accomplishment as well as the support provided by Mesa Community College and the collaborating scholarship foundations, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Sahba Zaare for being awarded a Phi Theta Kappa Hites Transfer Scholarship.

HONORING DR. ROY D. MOORE

HON. MELVIN L. WATT

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor a constituent and distinguished veteran, Dr. Roy D. Moore.

For decades, Dr. Moore has dedicated his service to the citizens of Guilford County, the State of North Carolina and our country helping to enhance and protect their quality of life. Dr. Moore was instrumental in organizing and directing programs and initiatives that have added value to communities in Greensboro and across the state of North Carolina, including the first After-School Program for Children at the Hayes Taylor YMCA and the Summer Food Program for children administered by North Carolina A&T State University.

In the late 1980s Dr. Moore was instrumental in initiating dialogue that eventually created district based representation on Greensboro's City Council. This opened the door for minority representation on that governing body. He also served as the first Chairman of the 12th Congressional District of North Carolina which I am proud to represent.

Dr. Moore's accomplishments also include the 1988 Man of the Year Award at St. James Presbyterian Church (Greensboro, NC), the 1997 Community Service Award from the Greensboro Chapter of the NAACP, the 2001 Guilford County Democrat of the Year Award and being the 1st Chair of the African American Democratic Caucus in Guilford County.

Dr. Moore will be honored on September 14, 2013 in Greensboro, North Carolina at the Grand Opening of the new Disabled American Veterans headquarters. I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing and congratulating Dr. Roy Moore for his September 14 honor and for his tireless work for many years to improve the lives of all people by strengthening the voices of those who are often ignored.

RECOGNIZING RUSSELL SALVATORE AS 2013 CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Mr. Russell Salvatore as the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce recognizes him as their 2013 Citizen of the Year. Russ's professional and civic activities demonstrate his commitment to making a difference in the lives of individuals and a positive impact in his community.

Beginning as a young boy working for his father, Russ exemplifies the American ideals of hard work and determination. In 1967, Russ found a small hot dog stand for sale on Transit Road. He purchased the stand and served as the cook, dishwasher, and waiter himself. Eventually, he expanded the modest establishment into the landmark that is now Salvatore's Italian Gardens.

In 1995, a fire destroyed Salvatore's Italian Gardens. Although Russ's next project, a hotel, was already underway, Russ refocused the efforts of the construction crews from the hotel project to rebuilding the restaurant. Once the restaurant was back in business, he hosted a dinner for all the volunteer firemen who helped save his Salvatore's Italian Gardens. Work soon resumed at the Garden Place Hotel. The finished product is a beautiful one hundred and sixty-six room facility complete with a courtyard, fitness room, meeting rooms and twenty-five luxurious suites.

In 2006, Trocaire College met with Russ to discuss their plan to build a satellite campus in the suburbs to bolster a struggling hospitality program. Enthusiastic about the project, Russ partnered with Trocaire to open the Russell J. Salvatore School of Hospitality at Trocaire to the Sisters of Mercy in 2008.

Russ's great vision and drive led him to open another restaurant adjacent to Salvatore's Grand Hotel, Russell's Steaks, Chops, and More. The restaurant and hotel have received numerous honors and awards since their opening. Russ is known for greeting his customers himself, providing a personal touch and top notch service. Russ's latest endeavor is his new cooking show "Come Dine With Me," which showcases local chefs and restaurants.

A dedicated philanthropist, one of Russ's proudest accomplishments was the creation of the "Patriots to Heroes Park." Located on Transit Road, the park is home to memorials of 9/11 and Flight 3407, tragedies that deeply affected Western New Yorkers. Russ is a generous supporter of the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, the Variety Club of Buffalo, Juvenile Diabetes of Buffalo, Heritage House, Women's and Children's Hospital, the Italian American Federation and the local school districts of Lancaster, Williamsville, Amherst and Clarence. Through the Russell J. Salvatore Foundation, he supports Kids Escaping Drugs, the Make A Wish Program, the Food Bank of Western New York and Meals on Wheels Organization. His annual "Ham-a-Lot" event fed almost 1,000 families this past Easter.

In 2012, Russ worked with Olmstead Conservatory to honor fallen heroes of the War of 1812 by funding the replacement of two marker willow trees in Delaware Park. During Erie County Medical Center's drive to improve patient relations, he donated new television sets for the entire hospital, which included an agreement that no patient should have to pay for television service again. This past year, he bought out the remaining tickets to a Buffalo Bills game to avoid a local blackout.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize the great works of Russ Salvatore. His philanthropic spirit and dedication to Western New York is inimitable, and I congratulate him upon his receipt of the 2013 Citizen of the Year Award from the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce.

HONORING BRUSHY CREEK CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a pillar of the community, Brushy Creek Church.

Brother Edward Spencer was the founder of Brushy Creek Church. He was born in Virginia in 1819 and was brought to Mississippi by the slave traders at the age of 9. He professed religion in 1849 but remained in the white Baptist Church until 1869 as a free man.

Brother Spencer was appointed deacon by the white Baptist Church and decided that he needed to seek shelter for his own race. So with the assistance of others Brother Spencer succeeded in building a church approximately 30' x 40'. Not being satisfied with this he then organized a Sunday school and afterwards a public school and later he added another 10' making the church 30 ft. x 50 ft.

Brother Edward Spencer was the father of 14 children, often having to be away from his family traveling back and forth to church. In his old age, trying to return home about 7:00 p.m., he fell a victim to death on the roadside and was found on a Tuesday morning.

His funeral was attended by his wife, who was approximately 90 yrs. of age, 2 surviving children, Pastor R. B. Jordan and the mothers of Brushy Creek Church. He was buried on land he had purchased more than 31 years before.

The church was repaired under the administration of Rev. R. B. Jordan of Jackson, MS. He made the walls higher and made room for the pulpit and he added a deacon board to the church: Bro. L. A. Catching, Bro. V. L. Harper and Bro. Joe Murry.

The Brushy Creek Missionary Baptist Church has its roots in the Hopewell Baptist Church from which development of a separate church began in 1853, with the establishment of a separate room for the black members of the congregation.

In 1866 the black members of Hopewell Baptist Church voted to hold separate services every third Sunday and called Bro. Theophilus Green, "a white man" to serve as pastor. The final break with the Hopewell Baptist Church came in October 1869 when Brushy Creek Church was organized with 50 charter members.

In March of 1877, the Sunday School Roll had record that there were 26 members: Fifteen males and eleven women including the superintendent, Bro. Edward Spencer Sr., the Secretary, Bro. Calvin Spencer and the Treasurer, Bro. George Green.

The original church was actually at Brush Harbor where members met on land owned by Mr. Retnor who eventually deeded the land to the church. The first church structure was a log building. Then a lumber building finished in 1902 and a stone building rebuilt in 1951.

Rev. Hugh C. White of Raymond, MS, who became pastor in February 1930 in the year 1931 was paid as low as \$2.50 per month and as high as \$31.67 per month but received plenty of chickens, potatoes, greens, and eggs as a partial payment.

Rev. Hugh White along with the board elected a grievance committee and a grave section. In reading the records Rev. White took in many candidates for baptism and baptized them in the creek in back of Reno's Store. Rev. White gave his resignation in March 1934 and said his last sermon would be the 3rd Sunday in December 1934.

Rev. E. G. Roberson was motioned in April 1935 to serve as tentative pastor of Brushy Creek until the year of 1935 was out and on February 15, 1936 became the permanent pastor and the members voted to move the church to the top of the hill during the year of 1936.

The church records reflect Rev. S. M. Dukes of Jackson, MS was elected pastor of Brushy Creek Baptist Church in 1952. Under his leadership, Bro. Joe Haley was added to the deacon board.

He served as pastor for a number of years, after which the Rev. Nick C. Bradley of Jackson, MS. Under his leadership the church was repaired by building a bell tower approximately 30' high.

Following his administration, Rev. A. Banks of Jackson, MS was elected pastor of Brushy Creek and served one year. No records were found in regards to his accomplishments.

Records reflect that Rev. Willie H. Hines was the next pastor who was elected and served for 26 years, under his leadership many souls were brought to Christ and many accomplishments were made. The building addition added was 16' x 40'. Rev. Hines later moved to Hattiesburg where he also had a church.

Brushy Creek Baptist Church elected Rev. Hugh Lewis to serve as associate pastor for the remainder of the year. Rev. Lewis then became Brushy Creek's pastor and served for over 20 years. Under his leadership he added more deacons and made many accomplishments such as adding a fellowship hall, hot water heater, reroofing the church, installing an inside baptism pool, the concrete was poured in front of the fellowship hall, water fountains, carpet, P.A. System, new organ, new ladies room at the front entrance, new pulpit, floors partially replaced, new light fixtures, a bus was purchased and later sold for \$500.00.

Rev. Hugh Lewis gave his resignation in December 2003 and recommended that Rev. Gregory D. Brown be over the pulpit until it was decided who the next pastor would be.

Rev. Gregory D. Brown was nominated Pastor of Brushy Creek Church and preached his first sermon as pastor in December 21, 2003. Rev. Brown was installed as pastor February 8, 2004.

Rev. Brown previously served as Moderator of Brushy Creek New Hope Association. The membership has grown and he restored services back to full time with services starting at 9:00 a.m. for Sunday school, and morning worship starting at 10:30 every Sunday. Congressman Bennie Thompson Foundation donated two laptops to the church. The congregation both, children & adults, have benefited from the donation. Congressman THOMPSON's Foundation was also very instrumental in the donation of 5 acres of land that was acquired August 27, 2010 for church use only from Sis. Mary Jane Catchings, who was once a member of Brushy Creek Church.

Rev. Brown has served as our pastor for 9 years and still serves faithfully. On June 16, 2013 we will be celebrating 144 years of the church's anniversary and the funds raised will go toward our dream of building a new church.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Brushy Creek Church as they strive to be the foundation for others to find the joy of serving God through His Son, Jesus Christ.

CONGRATULATING BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA TROOP 150 ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 85TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Boy Scouts of America Troop 150 on the occasion of its 85th anniversary. Boy Scouts of America is one of the largest youth organizations in the United States, with more than 4.5 million current members. Since its founding, nearly 84 million boys have participated in scouting.

Founded in 1928, Troop 150 was the first Boys Scout Troop in Fairfax County and remains one of the longest-standing active troops in the country. Since its founding, every meeting, including the very first which consisted of only 10 boys, has been held at the Annandale United Methodist Church. The relationship between the church and Troop 150 not only has endured; it has grown. The Annandale United Methodist Men have been the predominate partner over the years. The first Scoutmaster, John Walter Mercer, is buried at the church cemetery, and a memorial fund bearing his name was created 20 years ago by John Webb, an original member of Troop 150. This fund sponsors annual trips designed to develop the leadership potential of deserving scouts.

Troop 150 plays a prominent role in the wider community as well. The Troop 150 Color Guard leads the annual Annandale Parade and also has performed this honor for Tee Ball on the South Lawn at the White House. Troop 150 has built community gardens, collected food for the needy, repaired trails, and participated in many other projects for the betterment of the community. More than 80 young men from this troop have earned the rank of Eagle Scout. Many of our country's greatest leaders have been scouts, and having been a scout, especially reaching the rank of Eagle Scout, is an achievement that is highly prized by our Military Service Academies.

Scouting develops leadership skills and ethics that foster future success in life. Troop 150 exemplifies the values and tenets of the Boy Scouts of America and supports the character development that encourages responsible citizenship and self-reliance. Members of this troop adhere to the Scout Law: "A Scout is trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent" and by the Scout Slogan: "Do a good turn daily."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Boy Scout Troop 150 on

the occasion of its 85th anniversary and in thanking its Scoutmaster, volunteers, family members, and community sponsors for their commitment to our children.

HONORING MR. KIRK W. JOHNSON FOR HIS COURAGEOUS WORK THROUGH THE LIST PROJECT TO RESETTLE IRAQI ALLIES

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pride to rise today to recognize Mr. Kirk W. Johnson, the founder and executive director of the List Project to Resettle Iraqi Allies, for his continued efforts to safely resettle those Iraqis who have risked their lives working for the United States. I had the distinct honor of first meeting Kirk in 2008, when I began working with him and his organization on legislative remedies to this crisis. He has since been featured in numerous interviews and documentaries on the subject, testified on two occasions before members of the House and Senate on the consequences of our withdrawal from Iraq, and just published his first book. Kirk is truly an amazing individual who has selflessly dedicated himself to helping Iraqis who have worked for the United States in Iraq—and whose lives have been placed in grave danger for that service.

Kirk was born and raised in West Chicago, Illinois. In 2002, he earned a bachelor's degree with general and departmental honors in Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations from the University of Chicago. During that time, he received a Foreign Language Acquisition Grant to study the Syrian colloquial dialect of Arabic in Damascus, followed by fellowships from the American Academy in Berlin, Yaddo, MacDowell, and the Wurlitzer Foundation. Finally, prior to his work in Iraq, he conducted research on political Islamism as a Fulbright Scholar in Egypt.

In 2005, Kirk served in Iraq with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), first in Baghdad and then in Fallujah, where he was the Agency's first coordinator for reconstruction in the war-torn city. A letter from an Iraqi colleague in 2006, which said, "People are trying to kill me and I need your help," got him involved in helping America's endangered Iraqi allies. After Kirk successfully assisted his colleague, many other pleas for help followed, which led Kirk to found the List Project. The organization has grown to become the largest single pro bono initiative ever undertaken on behalf of refugees.

His recently published book, "To Be a Friend is Fatal: A Story from the Aftermath of America at War," tells the story of the List Project's seven-year struggle to protect thousands of Iraqi allies. It centers on the lives of four Iraqis who stepped forward to help the United States, following them as they flee from Iraq and come up against the challenging bureaucracy of the U.S. refugee resettlement program.

To date, Kirk's writing on U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East and towards Iraqi allies who

approached him in dire need of help has appeared in The New York Times, The Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, the Washington Post Magazine, The Wall Street Journal, and Foreign Policy. In addition, he has appeared on 60 Minutes, The Today Show, and World News Tonight. A leading public advocate for Iraqis who assisted the U.S. Government, Kirk's efforts have been recognized by Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, where he will be continuing his studies next year.

Mr. Speaker, Kirk has so far helped nearly 1,500 Iraqis, which makes him a true American hero in my eyes. He has given a voice to those individuals who were there for us when we needed their help, but were left to struggle through the system when they needed ours. Kirk has faced significant challenges and proven himself to be a leader whose service to this nation has only just begun.

**HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF THE HONORABLE E. CLAY
SHAW, JR.**

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share in the great sadness of my colleagues as we mourn the passing of former Florida Congressman E. Clay Shaw, Jr., who passed away on September 10, 2013.

I would like to first express my condolences to Clay's beloved wife of 53 years, Emilie; his children Emilie "Mimi" Shaw Carter (Jim), Jennifer Shaw Wilder (Greg), E. Clay Shaw III (Heather) and John Charles "J.C." Shaw (Angela) and his 15 grandchildren. We extend our deepest sympathies to the family during this difficult time and hope that some solace may be found in the appreciation of a grateful nation for their husband, father and grandfather's service and sacrifice.

I have had the privilege and honor of knowing Clay for over four decades. Devout in his commitment to public service and with faith in God and country, Clay heeded the call to public office in the 1960s when he first served as the assistant city attorney for Fort Lauderdale. He would later serve as chief city prosecutor, associate municipal judge, city commissioner, vice mayor and mayor for his city which he held so dear.

In 1980, Clay was elected to the U.S. Congress to represent the 15th District of Florida. His service spanned more than a quarter of a century, and I firmly believe that future generations and history will remember our colleague as a dedicated public servant who conducted himself with a tremendous sense of higher purpose and compassion for those he represented.

During his tenure in the House of Representatives, Clay championed vital reforms to welfare, Social Security and other government programs to ensure every American had the opportunity to succeed. He worked tirelessly to preserve the Florida Everglades, a great national treasure, for future generations.

A devoted husband, father, and grandfather, he truly made an indelible mark on his family,

community and our country. E. Clay Shaw, Jr., stood for integrity, compassion and public service and through that principled dedication, he leaves a proud and distinguished legacy. I join my Florida colleagues and all Members of Congress in expressing our sympathy to the Shaw Family and our appreciation for sharing their loved one with us over these past years in Congress.

**HONORING SOLENBERGER'S TRUE
VALUE HARDWARE STORE**

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Winchester, Virginia's oldest hardware store, Jno. S. Solenberger True Value Hardware. Solenberger's Hardware is celebrating its 125th anniversary this week.

Solenberger's was founded by John Solenberger and Daniel Stouffer in 1888 and can be found today at 832 Berryville Ave., where it sells a large variety of products at competitive prices.

The store employs over 30 people from the Winchester community and has been proudly run by the Solenberger family since its inception, now spanning five generations. Currently, nine of John Solenberger's descendants work for the store and one, Cyndi Thwaite, still serves as president.

Solenberger's has been a constant for the community through the ups and downs of the last century and has proven itself a positive force for Winchester and its residents. I wish the Solenberger family the best of luck in continuing the family tradition.

I submit the following article from the Winchester Star on Solenberger's Hardware's unique place within the community.

[From the Winchester Star, Sept. 7, 2013]

HARDWARE STORE IS A FAMILY AFFAIR

(By Sally Voth)

WINCHESTER.—The city's oldest hardware store is throwing itself a party today.

Solenberger's Hardware (Jno. S. Solenberger & Co.) is marking its 125th anniversary this week, capping it with a car show today from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m.

The event will also feature a bounce house, bungee run, food vendors and door prizes, said Patti Solenberger, director of marketing and merchandising.

Her husband John Solenberger is the great-grandson of the hardware store's founder, John S. Solenberger.

The store got its start in 1888 as Solenberger & Stouffer, at Baker and Cameron streets. Solenberger's cousin Daniel Stouffer was the co-founder.

After the original store was destroyed by a fire in 1908, a new one was opened at 142 N. Loudoun St., dropping Stouffer from the name, Patti Solenberger said.

The business would stay in that three-story building for the next 85 years.

In 1993, Solenberger's Hardware bought its current store at 832 Berryville Ave. The 50,000-square-foot building had formerly been a Heck's and an L.A. Joe's, company Vice President John Solenberger said. His father John T. Solenberger died just before the store moved.

About 40,000 square feet of the space is used for the sale of items ranging from tools to plumbing and electrical supplies, lawn and gardening equipment, kitchenware, fans, soaps, hats, candles, grills and even toys.

"We have to satisfy everybody," Patti Solenberger said.

Today, nine of John S. Solenberger's descendants work in the store. Great-granddaughter Cyndi Thwaite is the store's president.

"We've got a fifth generation now," John Solenberger said.

But he didn't grow up assuming that he would one day help to run the family business.

"I wanted to be a veterinarian when I was a kid," John Solenberger said. "The more I worked [here], the more I enjoyed working with the people. Just the fact it's a family business and being able to keep something going that's been there generations."

While Solenberger's has had industrial locations selling transportation products and bearings, it now handles those products from the back of the store, John Solenberger said.

Along with family members, about 30 other people are employed at the store.

While working with relatives is mostly good, it has its drawbacks, John Solenberger said. "You never stop talking about it," he said of hardware-store related conversations.

"I love working with him because he's a great guy," said Patti Solenberger, who has worked at the store since 1993. "I respect him so much. It's been a great 20 years. We all for the most part get along."

Thwaite has been company president for 20 years, although she said she and her younger brother are more like co-presidents.

"We're very, very proud," she said. "It's something that I guess when we were kids we never thought about. We never thought about being here for 125 years."

Like her brother, going into the family business wasn't part of Thwaite's original plan either. She changed her mind after doing some student-teaching.

"My dad and I worked very well together," Thwaite said.

The siblings have seen some changes in the hardware store business over the decades.

"Back 30 years ago, we were one of the only ones in town, and people had more of an allegiance," Thwaite said. "And you don't quite see that as much now as you did back then. Same with employees. We've been very fortunate that we have such long-term employees."

In fact, two employees—Jack Shiley and Sam Riley—have more than 55 years each under their tool belts at Solenberger's.

While the arrival of Lowe's and The Home Depot in Winchester concerned them at first, the Solenbergers said their business hasn't really been hurt by either.

"I think people automatically assume we would have an adversarial relationship ..., but they're so good to us, and we're good to them," Patti Solenberger said.

Each carries items unavailable at the other, she said.

"I don't think there's a day go by we don't have somebody coming from Lowe's, or we send somebody," John Solenberger said.

The family is working on an "antiquities corner" at the store to display some of its oldest items. These include a gold-leaf store sign, an oak desk, a carriage lantern, a nail bucket, a key machine, a radio and sled runners.

"These are just things we found when we cleaned the store out downtown," Patti Solenberger said.

When Sam Riley, 74, started working at Solenberger's 55 years ago, customers had accounts, and would be billed. Sales of more than \$100 had to be approved by Solenberger.

Riley has been a part-time employee for a few years, but plans to continue work if he remains healthy.

"I never got out of bed hating to to work for 50-some years," he said. "There was a lot of nice people. The Solenbergers are very nice people to work for. I'm on the fourth generation [of] Solenbergers. I worked under the second generation of Solenbergers, and that was Hugh and Herbert."

"You've got to enjoy your work. I've enjoyed it for 55 years. It's been a good ride."

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF ROSEMARIE DIETSCHLER

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mrs. Rosemarie Dietschler as she prepares to celebrate her 100th birthday on September 18th, 2013.

Born in Buffalo, New York, Rosemarie has spent most of her life in Buffalo and Tonawanda.

On January 25th, 1941, she married the love of her life, her husband Edwin. Rosemarie and Edwin shared many adventures. During their courtship, the two enjoyed traveling to West Valley in Edwin's car, yet the only way up the Springville breakers was to physically push the car from behind.

A hard worker, Rosemarie held a variety of jobs during her career. In addition to her work as a secretary, she worked at Kobackers, the iconic Mom and Pop grocery store on North Main Street in Brewster, New York, as well as at Hens and Kelly, the chain of department stores based right in Buffalo.

Rosemarie's generosity is unparalleled. A devoted parent, grandmother, and great-grandmother, her hobbies include crocheting baby sweaters and blankets. She made many special outfits for the children in her life, and was involved in the Kenmore Mercy Sewing Guild for many years.

Rosemarie is admirably dedicated to her family. She and her husband have three children, Dianne Burns, Donna Veiga, and Denise Locsei. She is close with her grandchildren and their spouses, Daniel and Lisa Burns, Anthony and Shannon Haeick, Justin and Bethany Locsei, Megan Burns Moran, and Morgan Locsei. Rosemarie has the honor of being a great-grandmother, and loves her great-grandchildren, Maggie Burns, Brian Burns, and Evan Haeick, dearly. Homemaking has consistently been at the center of Rosemarie's life, as evidenced by the love and support she displays for all of her family as well as her close friends.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to celebrate Rosemarie Dietschler's 100th birthday, her generous spirit, and her boundless love for her family and friends. Thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize the legacy of this outstanding woman. I wish Rosemarie and her family all the best for their many years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE GREATER RESTON ARTS CENTER ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Greater Reston Arts Center (GRACE) on the occasion of its 40th anniversary and to recognize the contributions this local institution has made to the cultural life of throughout Northern Virginia.

Founded in 1974 by artists and friends of the arts as a source of cultural enrichment for what was then the "new town" of Reston, GRACE has enriched community life by promoting involvement and excellence in contemporary visual arts. GRACE initially operated out of the landmark Heron House on Lake Anne and offered classes in sculpture, painting, and weaving for children and adults. In 1976, GRACE began training volunteer "docents" to lead interactive discussions of art history in elementary schools. This signature program now reaches more than 20,000 students in 42 schools across the region.

From its current location in Reston Town Center, GRACE provides a year-round program of contemporary visual art exhibitions, education programs for all ages, and special events. In recent years, GRACE has introduced new traditions such as the seasonal "Focus" exhibition series, and has engaged the community with events such as free gallery receptions, holiday wine tastings, and string quartet performances. The annual Northern Virginia Arts Festival, operated by GRACE, is widely recognized as a signature event that features more than 200 juried, national artists and draws tens of thousands of attendees/buyers annually. Such activities greatly enhance both the cultural life and local economy of Reston and Fairfax County.

Looking forward, GRACE intends to fill the need for a more dynamic artistic and cultural presence brought about by Reston Town Center's emergence as an international business destination and regional attraction. Under the leadership of Executive Director Damian Sinclair, GRACE recently announced its "40 Forward" campaign to develop a more robust Fine Arts Festival, enhance its gallery exhibitions, extend its education program online, and partner with other institutions to promote a stronger commitment to public and performance art.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating GRACE on its 40th anniversary and thanking its staff, volunteers, and supporters for their ongoing contributions to the quality of life in Northern Virginia.

HONORING PRATT MEMORIAL UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a pillar of the community, Pratt Memorial United Methodist Church. Pratt Memorial United Methodist Church was founded as a Mission Charge and was organized under the ministry of Reverend Henry Henderson on July 9, 1897. It was housed in a small school building and was called the West Jackson Methodist Episcopal Church. The Reverend J. D. Brooks, who succeeded Reverend Henderson in 1898, built the first parsonage during his two years as a pastor.

An effort to build the first church was made by Reverend E. P. Chatman. Although his plan was not completed, he did succeed in the construction to the extent that services could be held. Reverend Chatman served two years and was succeeded by Reverend I. L. Pratt. Unfortunately both the church and the parsonage burned. But by faith and sacrifice, the pastor and the faithful members built the first sanctuary, naming it in honor of Reverend Pratt. He served one year and was followed by Reverend Hiram Mae who was pastor for only six months.

Following Reverend Mae, the Conference sent Reverend W. L. Marshall to shepherd the congregation. He succeeded in building the second parsonage but resigned after spending a year and a half at Pratt. Pratt's seventh pastor, Reverend W. A. Oates, came from Yazoo City, Mississippi and spent two and a half fruitful years paying off many of the church's debts while also ministering to the needs of his people. The Reverends Garrett Tate, Simpson Joshua, Henry Woods, M. T. J. Howard and N. Ross, all followed in succession as pastors of Pratt. Each served one year and each contributed much to the spiritual growth of the loyal and faithful membership.

Reverend Prentiss Taylor, the fourteenth pastor, stimulated growth and hope. Reverend Taylor's successor, Reverend E. A. J. Isabel, helped make his dream a reality when he ushered in a new day for membership and under Reverend Isabel, Pratt was taken off the circuit and became a stationed charge. Later a beautiful brick veneer edifice was built and the name was changed from Pratt's Chapel to Pratt Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church.

Reverend Isabel broke all previous records of service to the church with a tenure that spanned ten years. He was affectionately called the "great builder" and was succeeded by Reverend A. B. Keeling. His business acumen as well as his abilities as a pastor helped him meet the demands of the church. Reverend Keeling took a great interest in the youth of the church, providing opportunities for their talents, to develop leadership qualities and to gain experience through attendance at youth meetings and conferences. Through his work developing young church members, Pratt took its place among the top churches in the conference, attracting area-wide attention in both ministerial and lay circles. Reverend J. C. Hibbler continued the work among the youth

and both Reverend Hibbler and his successor, Reverend S. G. Roberts, served three years respectively. Each kept the faith and did much to improve the church grounds and physical structure.

Reverend L. E. Johnson was sent to fill the vacancy created by the departure of Reverend Roberts. A powerful minister and good fundraiser, Reverend Johnson reduced the church debt during his four-year tenure. The youth activities were expanded, the membership grew rapidly and other areas of the church were improved. Reverend Johnson was elevated to District Superintendent of the Jackson District at the end of his tenure. Through the inspiration of Reverend W. H. Blackman, Reverend Johnson's successor, there was an increase in membership. The three-year stay of Reverend Blackman was due to the call of the Conference for him to become the Executive Secretary of Christian Education of the Mississippi Conference. He was succeeded by Reverend C. P. Payne.

Under Reverend Payne's guidance, the balance of the church's indebtedness was paid off and the mortgage was burned on October 1, 1944. Dr. Clovis Chappell, pastor of Galloway Memorial Methodist Church of Jackson, delivered the dedication sermon. Pratt became the third-ranked among the top churches in the Mississippi Conference attracting area-wide attention.

Next was Reverend Frank P. Leonard. In spite of a bright outlook for the congregation and good leadership of its pastor, the physical structure collapsed in March, 1953, but the pastor and congregation rebuilt and the new church opening was held March 14, 1954. The beautiful edifice, which now stands, is a tribute to Reverend Leonard and his congregation. The \$43,000 debt was reduced to \$23,000 by the time the building was completed and Reverend Leonard became District Superintendent the following year.

In 1956, Reverend M. T. J. Howard, Jr. was assigned to Pratt. The parsonage was rebuilt and completely furnished.

Reverend G. W. Williams succeeded Reverend Howard in 1958.

Reverend A. L. Holland succeeded Reverend Williams but died at the helm after only six months of service. Reverend C. P. Payne, the District Superintendent, assisted in completing the year's work. In 1963 Reverend Allen Johnson was sent to Pratt. Like his father, Reverend L. E. Johnson, Reverend Johnson was a good fundraiser as well as an organizer. An inspirational choir, a youth choir and a children's choir were all organized. Funds were raised to pay off the church and parsonage indebtedness. Reverend Johnson also became distinguished as a fearless and courageous leader in the Civil Rights Movement of the sixties, which broke down racial barriers.

When Reverend Sydney L. Webb appeared on the scene in 1967, the congregation concluded that Pratt must rise to the new challenge in the age of space. As a first step, they envisioned a much needed renovation and building program. With conference and local financial obligations completed for the conference year, the congregation decided to launch a 66th Anniversary program to celebrate as well as to raise funds for the building program. The 66th Anniversary was held June

2, 1968. In June 1969, Reverend Webb was appointed by the Conference to head the Jackson District.

Reverend C. E. Appleberry advanced plans initiated by Reverend Webb, the first pastor to serve the church after it became known as Pratt Memorial United Methodist Church. This was due to the union of the Methodist Church and the Evangelical United Brethren Church. Reverend Appleberry served two faithful years.

Reverend C. P. Payne, who became the only pastor to serve Pratt Memorial on more than one occasion, succeeded Reverend Appleberry. After a two-year period, Reverend Coleman Turner succeeded Reverend Payne. Under Reverend Turner's supervision, the church took on a new life, the choir took on a new look, and the young people became more active in all phases of church life. The financial affairs of the church were ordered and funds were raised to begin the second phase of the building program. The repair of the church steeple was also made. The United Methodist Women were reorganized under Reverend Turner's administration and the women of the church began serving as officers, a choice not open to them before.

Following Reverend Turner's retirement after 11 years of service, the 1984 June Annual Conference appointed Reverend Noah Lee Moore to Pratt. As he took over the reins, Reverend Moore faced an uncertain church renovation and remodeling program, which had come to a halt. Being a dynamic young minister with deep spiritual convictions, he provided the leadership for the hour. In less than a year and a half, the church parsonage was renovated, upgraded and painted, followed by the remodeling and renovation of the entire church. During the same time span, the United Methodist Men's organization was revived and revitalized. The youth and children of the church became organized and their activities added much to the life of the church. But perhaps the most historical accomplishment during this period was the resolving of the divisible issue of two units of United Methodist Women in the church. One all-inclusive unit was formed and developed in keeping with the laws of the United Methodist Church. With the anticipated strengthening of all areas of the church so as to implement the ministry it espouses, the securing of a loan from the general church to take over the mortgage incurred for the building program was implemented under the leadership banner of Reverend Moore.

Reverend Deborah Mingo Palmer, Pratt Memorial's first female pastor, succeeded Reverend Noah Moore in June 1993. Her ability to inspire and teach the word of God through illustrative sermons sparked increases in Sunday School and worship services' attendance. Her talent for planning and presenting special programs and services made the worship experience unique, colorful and as always—spiritually uplifting. The high energy and innovative ideas of the pastor motivated the membership to revitalize ministries that already had great potential, such as communication, children, youth and young adult ministries. Wonderful Wednesday, Sensational Saturday, The Singles, Orientation Sunday School Class were new ones for Pratt.

Another first for Pratt Memorial United Methodist Church was the addition of three Associate Pastors to the personnel roster; Reverend Glenda Funchess, Reverend Carl Palmer, Jr. (the pastor's spouse) and Reverend Eliza Forbes. The Associate Ministers were involved in worship services and other junctions to give ministerial support for the pastor.

In Reverend Palmer's fourth year span of leadership, the church parsonage was renovated to accommodate a three-room office and small group meeting space. The church steeple was repaired, two additional lots were purchased and the parking lot was paved and lined.

Reverend John L. Cornelius was appointed the thirty-third pastor at the June 1997 and the church purchased the home next to the church parsonage. This was the beginning of the Pratt Memorial UMC Resource Center for computer training and after school tutorial. During Reverend Cornelius' term, the Administrative Council also approved the purchase of a computer and software to keep finances electronically.

Rev. Selber M. McShepard was appointed the thirty-fourth pastor of Pratt on June 2005. With a strong spirit of ministry Pratt connected with eight other West Jackson Churches in The Cluster. The Cluster churches worked on outreach ministry in the district, as well as exchanging pastors one Sunday out of the year. Rev. McShepard encouraged the youth of the church to become active through attendance, in summer camps and connectional ministry meetings. She also worked with the Building and Redevelopment Committee of the church toward the planning of Pratt's first Family Life Center.

Rev. Brenda McCaskill was appointed the thirty-fifth pastor of Pratt at the June 2010 Mississippi Conference. She immediately began to work toward improving leadership in the church by conducting monthly Leadership Training Classes. She focused on ministering to young adults in the church and community by helping to establish a Sunday School class and other social activities. Rev. McCaskill was instrumental in establishing a toll free Prayer Line Monday through Friday to pray for their concerns. Her Outreach Ministry included visiting local prisons and programs like the "Gospel and Youth Explosion" held in the community.

In June of 2013, Rev. DeMario F. Benson, Sr. was appointed the thirty-six pastor of Pratt. He has also focused on improving leadership at Pratt and youth and young adult involvement within the church. He has also been instrumental in initiating a Youth Ministry, Singles Ministry, and Marriage Ministry while at Pratt. We trust that under his leadership, we can keep the faith and adhere to those same principles, which started Pratt on this journey one hundred sixteen years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Pratt Memorial United Methodist Church as they strive to be the guide for others to find the joy of serving God through His Son, Jesus Christ.

EASTLAKE LITTLE LEAGUE ALL-STAR SOFTBALL TEAM

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the extraordinary merit of the Eastlake Little League All-Star Softball Team from Sammamish, WA, today, September 12, 2013.

The Eastlake Little League All-Star Softball Team won the state championship before advancing to the West Regional Tournament in San Bernardino, California. At the West Regional Tournament they had an electrifying run defeating Alaska 11–0, Montana 9–8, and Idaho 11–1, before falling to Oregon 4–2 and then to California 4–1 in the regional semifinals.

Throughout the state and regional tournaments, they demonstrated great cohesion and teamwork. Congratulations to the Eastlake Little League All-Star Softball Team for an outstanding tournament; they are deserving of very special recognition. The players and coaches who made this excellent season possible are listed below.

Players: Georgia Robinson, Mackenzie Kurtz, Sophia Robinson, Belle deOliveira, Kailey Mohamed, Natalie Guinasso, Josie Charles, Morgan Olynyk, Courtney Zaidi, Regan Hines, Ryan Kurtz, Peyton Wright, Hannah Butterklee, and Kaitlyn Recob

Coaches: Don Hines, Steve Pollis, Steve Olynyk

ON THE OCCASION OF SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF OPERATIONS OF CREDIT UNION ONE

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Credit Union ONE as its employees, executives, members and the communities it serves celebrate seventy-five years of operations. Over its seven-and-a-half decades of business, Credit Union ONE has remained true to its roots in the Southeast Michigan community.

Credit Unions are important local financial institutions that know their neighbors and use their unique understanding to serve their communities with the tools that are necessary to grow and prosper. Credit Union ONE was founded in 1938 when fifteen neighbors in Ferndale, Michigan came together to create the Ferndale Co-Op Credit Union, and is a shining example of the strong connection credit unions have to the communities they serve. These concerned neighbors worked together with the shared goal of helping the neighborhoods of Ferndale thrive. With its strong roots in the Greater Detroit region, Credit Union ONE has grown to be one of the top ten credit unions in Michigan with over 106,000 members—a long way from its humble start in the basement of a church in Ferndale. Over the years, Credit Union ONE has

substantially expanded the services it offers to its members from its nineteen branches across Michigan, rising to meet their needs with a full range of financial tools to assist members with personal financial planning, home ownership, retirement and small business support services.

The key to the success of Credit Union ONE has been its ongoing commitment as an active stakeholder in the well-being of its members and communities across Michigan. As part of its mission Credit Union ONE has partnered with local health care service organizations, including the nationally renowned Barbara Ann Karmanos Cancer Institute of Michigan, to support cancer care and research. Additionally, Credit Union ONE has hosted numerous free fraud/identity theft seminars and financially literacy sessions, as well as workshops for first-time homeowners and financial planning, for both its members and the broader community. As a further benefit to its members, Credit Union ONE offers a scholarship to college-bound high school graduates of their families which can substantially assist a student with the cost of higher education. Furthermore, as part of its dedication to the vitality of Michigan, Credit Union ONE was an official 2010 Census Partner, educating the public on the importance of responding to the Census to maximize the resources available to its community partners across the state.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize Credit Union ONE for seventy-five years of successful operations across Michigan. Throughout its history, Credit Union ONE has been more than just a local member-based financial institution; it has been an important strategic partner for residents, small businesses, and local governments across Michigan that has worked with them to improve their quality-of-life. The success of Credit Union ONE is a success for Michigan, especially the Greater Detroit region where it is based, and I wish its members, employees, and its executive leadership many years of future success.

RECOGNIZING THE COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER OF BUFFALO DURING NATIONAL HEALTH CENTER WEEK

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize National Health Center Week and the Community Health Center of Buffalo.

National Health Center Week was started by the National Association of Community Health Centers nearly 30 years ago to raise awareness about the noble mission and incredible accomplishments of America's Community Health Centers. Health Centers strive to provide local solutions for affordable and accessible health care. In recognition of their mission, the theme of this year's National Health Center Week is "Celebrating America's Health Centers: Transforming Health Care in Our Local Communities."

Community Health Centers provide their services to all who need it, regardless of their

ability to pay or insurance status. For over 45 years, these Health Centers have been ranked among the highest quality and cost effective care providers in the nation. Today, America's Health Centers serve over 22 million people at more than 8,200 delivery sites spread far and wide across all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and U.S. territories.

Established in 1999, the Community Health Center of Buffalo has been one of the leading health care providers in our region, providing a safety net to the uninsured and underinsured. As a provider of comprehensive primary care services in medicine and dentistry, their services are essential to ensure Western New Yorkers receive quality health care.

Their mission is to provide quality, culturally sensitive, preventive and primary healthcare to the underserved of our community through state of the art clinical and business practices, while promoting a teaching environment and empowering patients in order to reduce health disparities.

In addition to their main location, the Community Health Center has a satellite location in Niagara Falls, which is the first Federally Qualified Community Health Center in Niagara Falls. The center offers a number of medical care services for the entire family.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize the honorable mission of our nation's Community Health Centers, and the inspiring work they do to promote public health here in Western New York.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF GERALDINE "GERRY" ESTEP SHERWOOD

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate and celebrate the life of one of Fairfax City's most prominent citizens, Mrs. Geraldine 'Gerry' Estep Sherwood. Mrs. Sherwood passed away on August 5, 2013 leaving a legacy that will benefit Fairfax City and the Northern Virginia community for generations to come.

Mrs. Sherwood's passion for the musical arts emerged at an early age. When she was just a small child, she was asked if she would like a large, toy piano for a present; she responded by saying that she would "wait for the real thing." The wait was not to be very long, she began piano lessons at age 6 and continued her education through college where she majored in music.

Mrs. Sherwood's involvement in Fairfax City began in 1947 when she accepted a position as a teacher at Fairfax High School. At Fairfax High School, she initiated a choral music program and shepherded its growth for seven years. At that time, Fairfax was a 'village' of about 1,000 residents. The area was surrounded by farmland described by Mrs. Sherwood as "a wasteland as far as music was concerned."

Also in 1947, Mrs. Sherwood met a young veteran, Mr. Stacy Sherwood, who had served in the U.S. Air Force during World War II.

They married in 1950 and together became a force in Fairfax City. Mr. Sherwood served on the town and city councils, and was instrumental in having Fairfax City identified as the location of what is now George Mason University. While Mr. Sherwood continued his civic activities, Mrs. Sherwood dedicated herself to promotion of the arts in Fairfax City.

Following public school teaching, Mrs. Sherwood provided private lessons in piano and voice and directed junior and senior choirs at a local church which she continued through 2010. She served with the Fairfax Symphony Orchestra, the Fairfax Music Guild and the Fairfax Choral Society, and was a founding member of the Arts Council of Fairfax County. Mrs. Sherwood was named the Honorary Chair for the 2010 Spotlight on the Arts Festival.

In 2007, Mrs. Sherwood offered to donate \$5 million for the construction and operation of a community center in the heart of Fairfax City. Although a centrally located community center had been contemplated since the 1960's, it was not until her generous offer that the dream could become a reality. Named in honor of her husband who passed away in 2002, The Stacy C. Sherwood Center opened its doors in February 2011.

The Stacy C. Sherwood Center was immediately recognized as a superior, state-of-the-art facility, earning the prestigious "Best New Facility Award" from the Virginia Recreation and Parks Society in 2012. Containing over 14,000 square feet, the Center caters to a wide range of arts, activities and programs. This center is also used as a venue for weddings, private business and social activities, in fact the Center contains the largest performance and banquet space in the City of Fairfax. This Center not only provides a facility to expand and promote the arts, it enhances the identity of the region and is a gift to the community that will live on.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life and contributions of Mrs. Geraldine "Gerry" Estep Sherwood. Mrs. Sherwood will be missed, but will always be remembered as the driving force that changed Fairfax City from a "wasteland as far as the arts were concerned" into a regional treasure. I, and the constituents of the 11th Congressional District of Virginia, owe Mrs. Sherwood a debt of gratitude that cannot be repaid.

HONORING CENTRAL UNITED
METHODIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Central United Methodist Church Jackson, Mississippi. Central United Methodist Church is a church full of history and heritage spanning almost 150 years.

When the Mississippi Mission Conference convened at Wesley Chapel in New Orleans from December 19–25, 1865, it was composed, for the most part, of Negroes, who sought affiliation with the "Old Church." Mis-

issippi, Louisiana, and Texas combined the Mission Conference. The Jackson Mission grew out of the Conference in 1866. Miles Proctor shepherded the fledgling mission until later in the year when Moses Adams and Thomas Anderson were appointed the pastors. At the time of its beginning, the Jackson Mission is said to have been located in the area of Millsaps College.

Over the next ten years, the mission grew. In 1876, it established a church at the corner of Grayson, now Lamar and Fortification Streets.

Several years later, in January 1890, the Annual Conference adopted a resolution that granted the Board of Church Extensions permission to use eighteen hundred dollars realized from the sale of land to buy another lot and to build a new church. Augustus M. Trotter, pastor of the church, presented the resolution.

On June 25, 1890, December Sharp sold the land on which the church now stands to the Board of Trustees, headed by William Young. On May 16, 1891, a second deed was acquired for land brought from M.F. Chiles for seventy-five dollars. In 1892, the first building to house Central Methodist Episcopal was completed. The structure was razed in March 1965, and a new edifice was consecrated in June 1966.

Throughout the years, Central has undergone a number of changes. In 1921, the Mississippi Annual Conference appointed the first Bishop of African descent, Robert E. Jones. That year, Central hosted the first Annual Conference over which Bishop Jones presided in the state.

At the result of two mergers, the church has changed names twice. In 1939, church became Central Methodist, in the Central Jurisdiction. In 1968, after the union of the Methodist Church and the Evangelical United Brethren, church became Century of Methodism in Jackson. In 1997, Central acquired the Marion-Jones Branch of the YWCA to use as its Family Life Center. Today it houses Central's Scouting Ministry, Food and Clothing Distribution and Summer Enrichment Programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Central United Methodist Church.

PROCLAMATION FOR NATIONAL
PREPAREDNESS MONTH

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, September is National Preparedness Month, a time when Americans are reminded of the importance of being prepared for disasters and emergencies.

After Hurricanes Irene and Sandy, the damaging flooding of the Delaware, and devastating fires that damaged residential and commercial properties, my constituents are no strangers to disasters. Events like these have shown us that being ready for an emergency is essential; there is no substitute for preparedness.

This year's National Preparedness Month campaign focuses on the theme: You Can Be the Hero.

In coordination with FEMA and the American Red Cross, I urge all citizens to take concrete action toward preparing for emergencies and disasters. It takes a team effort to ensure that we are ready for any disaster.

I encourage individuals, families, organizations, and businesses across America to make an emergency plan, put together an emergency supply kit, and join in local efforts to become a community preparedness partner. Your efforts today may save a life tomorrow.

HONORING ISMAEL "TONY"
TORRES

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a model public servant who dedicated his life to the betterment of the Williamsburg community in Brooklyn, New York. Ismael "Tony" Torres was born in Carolinas, Puerto Rico on November 29, 1933, and arrived in New York City in 1946.

Mr. Torres is an extraordinary man who is proud of his heritage and has dedicated his life's work to advancing the cause of equal rights, community empowerment and civil rights for Puerto Ricans in Williamsburg. In 1952, he was arrested for organizing a rally against wage theft for six Puerto Rican factory workers in Brooklyn. This was the beginning of a long and storied activist career.

Mr. Torres served in the U.S. Armed Forces from 1954 to 1956 in the ARMY 7th Steps To Hell, Company A unit. Upon returning home, he continued the fight for justice and fairness and against discrimination.

In 1958 he coordinated the first Puerto Rican parade along Graham Avenue. Thanks to his advocacy and work with the former Councilmember, Graham Avenue today is known as Avenida Puerto Rico.

In the 1970s he founded the Williamsburg Federation of Tenants for Better Housing. Comprised of local residents and leaders. This organization led to the development of two massive affordable housing projects in the 1970's and 80's—Caribe Village and Borinquen Plaza Housing Development. In 1977, he led and won the fight to create one of the oldest senior centers in Williamsburg—the Borinquen Senior Center. In addition, he served as the president of the Tenants Association where he led the fight to improve the quality of life for public housing residents.

Mr. Torres was also very active in the fight for affordable and quality healthcare in Williamsburg and Greenpoint. Along with health advocates, he organized to improve services for the underserved at Greenpoint Hospital. The coalition initiated by Mr. Torres and other Latino leaders led to the closure of that facility and its replacement with an updated, state-of-the-art health center known today as Woodhull Medical Center.

Today, Mr. Torres continues to be a powerful advocate because people trust him. He is

a community legend and champion for those who too often lack a voice. Once again, I pay tribute to Mr. Ismael "Tony" Torres, a Puerto Rican trailblazer for his people and a renaissance man who made a positive impact in housing, civil and workers' rights and local politics. Those of us who have the opportunity to observe and experience his example consider ourselves fortunate.

TRIBUTE TO THE CORONA ROAD RACE ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th anniversary of the Corona Road Race. On September 14, 2013, the race will celebrate its centennial. The Corona Road Race has a rich and colorful past, which has contributed to the diversity and history of our county and to auto racing at-large.

Designed by civil engineer H. Clay Kellogg, Grand Boulevard, the road set as the centerpiece in the city of Corona, provided the perfect circular shape and venue for the first Corona Road Race. Spanning three miles, the track was set up for a variety of races including the 102 mile "Light Car Race," the 251 mile "Heavy Car Race," and the 301 mile "Free-For-All Race." With the right setting and prizes totaling over \$10,000, racing legends including Earl Cooper, Teddy Tetzlaff, Barney Oldfield, Eddie Rickenbacker, and Bob Burman flocked to Corona for a chance to make history. On September 9, 1913, the first ever Corona Road Race was held, hosting thousands of fans and drivers from throughout the world.

With stiff competition and an impressive lineup, the "Free for All" proved the most exciting race, with \$5,000 up for grabs, and a chance at an additional \$1,000 should the winner break the world record. Amidst cheering fans, Earl Cooper sped to victory and claimed the title as first winner of the Corona Road Race.

Due to the success of the 1913 Road Race, organizers quickly began planning for a second race to take place the following year. Bigger than ever, the Race returned on Thanksgiving Day, November 26, 1914. With new safety measures, an even bigger pot of \$12,000, and a five foot fence, which gave the track its distinguishable look, the Corona Road Race took new form. News and wire services covered the day from start to finish, broadcasting to cities all over the United States, making the race an event for the whole family and nation. Once again hosting the best in international auto racing and loyal fans, the Corona Road Race was met with more success than ever. Crowds roared as Eddie Pullen took his last lap and finished first.

Due to a shift in race season, from fall to spring, the third annual Corona Road Race was delayed until 1916. On the day of the race, April 8, the city of Corona experienced record-breaking heat waves. While twelve cars entered the race, only five completed it. With numerous overheating vehicles and several

tire blowouts, disaster was imminent. As racer Bob Burman rounded the 97th lap, his car plunged into onlooking spectators, killing him and two members of his crew. Though a beloved event rich with history, the tragic incident of the 1916 Corona Road Race, lack of financial success, and complaints from neighbors led to the end of the race and a tradition the city of Corona and the nation had grown to love.

Today, a monument indicating the start and finish line of the Road Race remains at the cross of Grand Boulevard and Washburn in Corona, a constant reminder of the glory days of the Corona Road Race. Though tragic events led to its demise, the Corona Road Race was an important element in launching Corona to national recognition, and furthering the sport of auto racing. I am honored to represent Corona and its rich history in the U.S. House of Representatives.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MICHAEL MCCABE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life and legacy of our dear friend Michael McCabe. An active member of our community and a proud South Buffalonian, Mike passed away in November of 2012 after a hard-fought battle with brain cancer. To honor Mike's memory, Today's Rowin', Growin' and Throwin' 5k will benefit Carly's Club and cancer research.

Born and raised in South Buffalo, Michael graduated from Bishop Timon High School and the University at Buffalo.

Mike lived in South Buffalo for his entire life, demonstrating his deep pride through his honorable community service. He was the long-time commissioner of the St. Martin's Athletic Club, and a member of the Erie County Democratic Committee.

Professionally, Mike served as a teacher in the Buffalo Public Schools for thirty-seven years. Day in and day out, he dedicated his boundless energy and talents to his students.

After school hours, Mike was an avid sailor. His boat, The Irish Wake, was a fixture in the RCR Marina in downtown Buffalo.

In September 2011, Michael was diagnosed with brain cancer. While he and his family faced this unfathomable tragedy, Mike remained upbeat and positive. Just one year later, Mike lost his battle with cancer.

Mike's spirit of goodwill and passion for public service lives on through his family. He loved and cherished his wife, Maureen, their four sons, Michael, Sean, Chris, and Bret, daughter Mollie, and eight grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor the life and legacy of Mike McCabe and his energy and passion for our community. I am proud to continue the fight for funding for cancer research, to improve the quality of care for those affected by cancer, and ultimately, to find a cure.

HONORING GREATER DAMASCUS CHURCH OF CHRIST (HOLINESS) U.S.A.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a pillar of the community, Greater Damascus Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A.

One of the most prominent churches in the Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A. Movement is Greater Damascus Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A., on 1013 Damascus Circle, Hazlehurst, Mississippi. Since its beginning, the Church has been instrumental in the community's development.

As far as records indicate, Damascus Church began during slavery, and grew out of the white Damascus Baptist Church. In 1865, when the slaves were set free, a division arose in the church due to a disposition of Negro membership freed of bondage after the Civil War. Because of this, the Negro congregation was given ten acres of land to continue their worship service. In 1867, the already established colored Damascus Baptist Church began having services in a brush arbor under the leadership of Rev. Tom Askermeese as pastor. He served from 1867 until his death in 1872, a total of five years.

In 1872, Elder W. S. Pleasant was elected pastor. He pastored the Damascus Baptist Church from 1872 to 1896, which was twenty-four years. In 1896, Elder Pleasant and the Church joined with Bishop Charles Price Jones, founder of the Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A., and Damascus Church became one of the first churches to join the "Holiness Movement." The Church became known as Damascus Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A. The Church was able to move out of the brush arbor into their erected church building under Elder Pleasant's leadership. He served as pastor of the new denominational church from 1896 to 1918, twenty-two years. Elder Pleasant's total service to Damascus Church was forty-six years. He resigned as pastor to do evangelistic work. He died February 7, 1935.

In 1919, the Church accepted Elder L. J. Brunson as the second pastor of the new denominational church. He pastored from 1919 to 1932, a total of twelve years, before resigning to go to Norfolk, Virginia. He died in 1941.

On January 27, 1931, the Rev. George A. Thomas, a man of many talents, came as pastor of Damascus Church. In 1966, Rev. Thomas built the second church since the brush arbor. The dedication of the church was held on September 15, 1966. In June 1971, the adjoining building to the church was built to serve as classrooms and as a dining hall. Rev. Thomas served as pastor of Damascus Church longer than either of the previous pastors. His tenure lasted January 27, 1931 until his death on January 13, 1980, a term of forty-nine years.

After the death of Rev. Thomas, the Church sought out a new pastor. In a call meeting, May 1980, the congregation voted to accept Elder Arnold Stanton, Sr., who came as pastor in September, 1980. The third church was

built and dedicated to God in August 1986. The contractor was Damascus' own, Deacon George A. Harris, Sr. The new sanctuary led to the name changing from Damascus Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A. to Greater Damascus Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A. On December 25, 1994, Elder Stanton resigned as pastor of Greater Damascus Church. His tenure lasted fourteen years.

January 1, 1995, Greater Damascus Church was without a pastor. Elder Clifton Goodloe, Jr., accompanied by his lovely wife, Sister Delores Goodloe, came and conducted the morning service. Elder Goodloe's text was taken from Acts 24:10-16, and the thought was, "Let Your Conscience Be Your Guide." On Monday, January 2, 1995, the Church's first business meeting of the new year was conducted by Bishop Maurice D. Bingham, Presiding Prelate of the South Central Diocese of the Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A. Bishop Bingham was accompanied by Elder Eddie Jones, Jr., pastor of the Crystal Springs Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A. In this business meeting, the congregation of Greater Damascus Church voted to accept Elder Clifton Goodloe, Jr. as pastor.

On January 8, 1995, Elder Clifton Goodloe, Jr. became pastor of Greater Damascus Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A. Elder Goodloe's main goal and objective is to "Preach God's Word in His Fullness" so when men, women, boys and girls hear the "Word" they may be convicted and become saved. Elder Goodloe is in his nineteenth year as pastor of Greater Damascus Church.

"Damascus Church" has produced five "Sons of the House." They are the late Elder C. D. Tate, Sr., Rev. Ellis Blackwell, Jr., Elder Henry Smiley, Elder Andre' Tyler and Elder Nicholas Tanner.

Greater Damascus Church has had a grand processional of Christian soldiers who labored for many, many years and laid a solid foundation for generations to follow. Those who are gone have left a rich heritage that should not be merely praised and testified to, it must be built upon.

Greater Damascus Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A. has been in existence one hundred and forty-nine years, in the "Holiness Movement" one hundred and seventeen years, and six pastors during this time. What a legacy!

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Greater Damascus Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A. as they strive to be the guide for others to find the joy of serving God through His Son, Jesus Christ.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF KLEBERG COUNTY, TEXAS

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 100th anniversary of Kleberg County, Texas.

The recorded history of the land which includes Kleberg County precedes the establish-

ment of the United States, and Kleberg County was already well on its way to prominent status when local leaders successfully petitioned the Texas Legislature in 1913 to break away from Nueces County and establish a new county.

Over the last century several key developments helped spur growth and development in Kleberg County.

An anchor of Kleberg County, the King Ranch was established in 1853 when Richard King purchased the Santa Gertrudis grant from the heirs of the original Spanish grantees. The King Ranch continues to thrive today as an industry leader in the fields of farming, ranching, and conserving natural resources.

The establishment of the City of Kingsville and the construction of railroad lines helped bring new industry to the region. Over the past 100 years, the county has been a top producer of energy and agricultural commodities, and the county's proximity to the Gulf of Mexico has made it a destination for visitors from around the world who come for the clear blue water and rich diversity of wildlife.

Kleberg County saw the establishment of Naval Auxiliary Air Station Kingsville in 1942. The base originally trained military aviators for combat. Now known as Naval Air Station Kingsville, the base remains one of the U.S. Navy's premier locations for jet aviation training.

Texas A&M University Kingsville, originally established as South Texas Teachers College in 1921, is the oldest continuously operating public institution of higher learning in south Texas, and the first in the Nation to develop a doctoral program for bilingual education.

It truly is a privilege and honor to represent Kleberg County in the United States House of Representatives, and I ask my colleagues in Congress to join me in celebrating this momentous occasion.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED COLLEGE ACTION NETWORK

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the United College Action Network, (U-CAN), and to congratulate this fine organization on 25 years of service. As U-CAN's founders, staff and supporters gather to celebrate 25 years of unparalleled service to the Sacramento community, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring this organization.

Founded on September 12, 1988, by Alan and Donna Rowe, U-CAN has helped countless local high school students attend college. U-CAN specializes in providing college opportunities at historically black colleges and universities for students who may not normally pursue a college degree.

U-CAN's successful model includes outreach, educational support, and mentoring services to students and their parents. U-CAN has built strong partnerships with local school districts, admissions officers, financial aid de-

partments, coaches and department deans. Due in large part to their track record, they enjoy supportive relationships with a wide variety of faith, businesses and community organizations. U-CAN seeks to recruit and support socially and economically disadvantaged students regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, or national origin to attend historically black colleges and universities. Since its inception, U-CAN has assisted over 54,000 students in achieving their dream of a college education, generated \$55 million in scholarship awards for students, and made it possible for 15,000 students to be accepted to historically black colleges and universities.

Mr. Speaker, on their 25th anniversary, I am pleased to the United College Action Network for their service to students from the Greater Sacramento Area. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this organization and wishing them continued success as they serve local students as they pursue a college degree.

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OLD ELYTON CHAPTER OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. SPENCER BACHUS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of its 100th anniversary, I want to extend commendations to the Old Elyton Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The members of the Old Elyton Chapter are guardians of our nation's cherished history of freedom and, through their educational initiatives with young people especially, are ensuring that there will be continuing respect and reverence for the democratic principles that are the foundation of America. Through their service, they fulfill the motto of the National Society of the DAR: God, Home, and Country.

The Old Elyton Chapter has deep roots in Alabama. In fact, its very name is historical and is associated with the formation of the City of Birmingham. The chapter was organized by Mrs. J. Morgan (Kate Duncan) Smith and her daughter, Mrs. Samuel L. Earle, on January 4, 1913, just 23 years after the formal organization of the National Society of the DAR.

The chapter's 100th anniversary celebration falls on the 226th anniversary of the signing of the U.S. Constitution by the Continental Congress. The selection of the date of September 17, which is highly significant to the origins of our great nation, was fitting for an organization whose own members trace their family heritage to the Patriots of the American Revolution.

The Old Elyton Chapter has demonstrated an unwavering commitment to the principles of the National Society of the DAR, a volunteer women's service organization dedicated to promoting patriotism and preserving American history through the education of young people. Its purpose is drawn directly from its charter, which was incorporated by an Act of Congress in 1896: "To perpetuate the memory and spirit of women and men who achieved American

independence; to promote, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge; to cherish, maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom; to foster true patriotism and love of country." The volunteer initiatives of DAR members include support for student financial aid and scholarships and donations to schools for the underprivileged.

A major service project of the Old Elyton Chapter is its continuing support of the Kate Duncan Smith DAR School in Grant, Alabama. Established in 1924, it is the only K-12 school in the United States owned and operated by chapters of the DAR. Known as the "Gem of Gunter Mountain," the school annually provides more than 1,000 children in the remote Appalachian area of Northeast Alabama with schooling, extra-curricular activities, clothing, health care, daily nutrition through a free breakfast and lunch program, training in life skills, and a love of American ideals. It exemplifies the best principles of the DAR in action.

The members of the Old Elyton Chapter of the DAR are proud supporters of our troops and veterans. They participate in many events honoring our veterans in the Birmingham area and remind us that we are able to enjoy the freedoms we have today only because of the sacrifices made by our men and women in uniform in the past and now in the present.

Patriotism in the Birmingham community and the State of Alabama runs deep and the Old Elyton Chapter of the DAR has been an essential part of maintaining that tradition through many generations. Having completed one hundred years of vital service, it now prepares to embark on its second century of promoting American ideals and values. On behalf of the people of the Sixth District, let me congratulate the Old Elyton Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution and send best wishes and blessings to all of its members.

HONORING THE CAREER OF JIM SAMPSON UPON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to honor the remarkable career of Mr. James Sampson as he retires from his position of President and Chief Executive Officer of Gateway-Longview, Inc. One of Western New York's largest child welfare agencies, Gateway-Longview has expanded exponentially during Jim's nine years as President and CEO.

During Jim's tenure, Gateway-Longview has expanded to include eighteen different programs, serving 3,400 children and families per year. His work includes the establishment of Gateway-Longview's Family Resource Center, Behavioral Mental Health Clinic, and Supervised Independent Living Program. Located on East Ferry Street, the Family Resource Center promotes familial strength and provides bonding activities such as tutoring, swim classes and music lessons. Jim assisted in creating Gateway-Longview's Behavioral Mental Health

Clinic, which tends to the emotional needs of Gateway children and families. The program currently has two satellite offices in Buffalo Public Schools, with five more set to open in the fall, to ensure our city's children receive the care they desperately need. For teens that have not been adopted but have aged out of foster care, Gateway created a Supervised Independent Living Program to help teens develop the skills necessary to live independently and become self-sufficient.

Jim is a truly dedicated public servant. Beyond his work with Gateway-Longview, Jim was elected to serve on the City of Buffalo School Board this past May, and is a founding member and trustee of the West Buffalo Charter School. Under appointment from Governor Cuomo, he serves as Chair of the Erie County Fiscal Stability Authority, and has previously been a member of the Board of Directors for the Buffalo Niagara Partnership. Jim is also involved with the Rotary Club of Buffalo.

Jim's undergraduate years were spent at the University at Buffalo, where he earned his Bachelor's degree in Social Work. For his graduate studies, Jim attended the University of Wisconsin-Madison for his Master's in Social Work. Current, he holds the position of adjunct professor for the University at Buffalo's School of Social Work, teaching leadership, management, and administration.

Jim's love for children and families stems from his own. He is happily married to his wife, Florence, with whom he has two children. His son Gregory is a lawyer and Assistant Parliamentarian for the United States Senate, living in College Park, Maryland with his wife, Jamie and their two children, Isaac and Kira. His daughter, Robin, is the lead scientist for the Department of Energy Solar Energy Loan Guarantee Program, living in Washington, D.C. with her husband Dr. Frank Wong.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize the inspiring career of Mr. Jim Sampson. His work for Western New York's children and families is truly admirable, and I wish him the best in his retirement.

HONORING FARISH STREET BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Farish Street Baptist Church. Organized in 1893, Farish Street Baptist Church has been blessed by the vitality, imagination, and inspiration of its leadership.

The Reverend Elbert B. Topp served as pastor of Mt. Helm Baptist Church from 1888-1893, when, according to Patrick Thompson in his book *History of Negro Baptists in Mississippi*, "he (Topp) with 210 members came out and organized what is now known as the Farish Street Baptist Church." The newly formed church held worship services in the Congregational Church, which was then located at the corner of Capitol and Lamar Streets. White Jacksonians would line the

bridge to hear the choir sing, giving generously to the collections. Soon the infant congregation had enough money to purchase the lot at the corner of Farish and Church Streets. It was here that the newly organized congregation built the first place of worship—a frame structure. Lightning destroyed this building and it was replaced by a two-story frame structure. The second story was reserved for worship, with all other activities, including funerals, taking place on the first level. A fire, which began on Oakley Street and spread, destroyed the second building. Determined to minimize this threat in the future, in 1909, Reverend Topp led the membership in constructing a brick building. He pastured Farish Street Baptist Church until 1916.

Reverend Topp died on October 3, 1925. The October 9 edition of the *Advance Dispatch* carried a front page announcement of his death. Of Topp, Patrick Thompson wrote, "no member of the convention and state is more conspicuous and popular. Reverend Topp is good natured and full of life. True to his fellow preachers and has but few equals as a gospel minister."

Reverend E. L. Twine, an Alcorn College graduate and teacher of mathematics, was called to serve the Church in 1916, and for three years, he labored faithfully. During that brief tenure, he encouraged the congregation to purchase new pews and to make a substantial payment on the church mortgage, which had been left from previous years. His pastorate was to be the shortest during the Church's first 100 years of existence. Because of his stately nature, Reverend Twine would be known by his contemporaries as the "Black Prince of Mississippi."

In November 1919, the Church extended the call to Reverend Chester Arthur Greer. Reverend Greer had pastored and taught school in Arkansas and Mississippi, and at the time he was called to Farish Street Baptist Church, he was serving as pastor of Second Baptist Church in Oxford, Mississippi. He served as pastor of Farish Street Baptist Church until November 1927. During those eight years, the mortgage was paid in full; the bell tower was completed; an annex was built onto the 1909 structure; a parsonage was bought; an old note of \$500.00 on Dr. Topp's salary, held by Brother C. C. Sims against the Church was redeemed; 40,000 bricks were bought and placed on the church grounds to be used in the construction of a new church facility; plans and specifications with an architect's rendering had been presented in the church conference on March 4, 1926, and had been approved without one dissenting vote; several hundred dollars were raised and negotiations for a loan of \$20,000 were initiated. However, in November 1927, just a little more than a year after Dr. Greer had presented those plans to the church, he resigned and moved to Fort Worth, Texas, to accept the pastorate of Mt. Gilead Baptist Church.

Reverend W. L. Varnado assumed the pastorate of Farish Street Baptist Church in April 1928. Perhaps Reverend Varnado will be remembered best as the only person to pastor Jackson's three historic black congregations—Mt. Helm, College Hill and Farish Street Baptist Churches. During his term of service, the membership increased and two rooms were

added to the parsonage. Reverend Varnado was a great churchman. It was during his pastorate that a young Jackson State College student from the Class of 1927 was ordained to the gospel ministry. His name was Joseph Harrison Jackson. Who would have envisioned in 1927 that Reverend Varnado was ordaining to the work of the gospel ministry the future leader of six million black Baptists? Dr. Varnado resigned in October 1934 to accept a pastorate in Jackson, Tennessee.

Without fanfare, the man who had served diligently as the third pastor returned in January 1935, to begin his second pastorate. Reverend Chester A. Greer began a building program, which resulted in the replacement of the forty year old structure with a modern building, which still serves the congregation today. The ground-breaking ceremony was a joyous occasion. Mrs. Lillie Bentley and Mr. Turner M. Patterson, two of the original 210 members to leave Mt. Helm Baptist Church in 1893, participated in breaking ground for the new facility. Dr. Jacob L. Reddix, President of Jackson State College, Chairman of the Trustee Board of Farish Street Baptist Church, gave invaluable advice during the construction phase. At the laying of the corner stone, Jackson State College Band performed to the delight of the congregation. Dedication services for the newly constructed church building were held during the week of March 5–12, 1950. A renewed people joined hands with their sisters and brothers to praise Him Who is the great Builder and without Whom they that build, build in vain.

After serving for twenty-three years during his second pastorate, Reverend Greer was successful in retiring the debt and burning the mortgage before his victorious and faithful members. With his health on the decline, Reverend Greer decided to retire from the pulpit in March 1958. Reverend Greer was named "Pastor Emeritus" of the Church. Three decades of service to a great people had come to an end. The assistant pastor, Reverend G. W. Williams, supplied the pulpit until a successor was elected. Reverend Greer died on August 13, 1962.

During the summer of 1958, a young seminary teacher, Reverend S. Leon Whitney, came to Jackson to teach at the Mississippi Baptist Seminary. He was invited to preach to the congregation at Farish Street Baptist Church. Impressed with his preaching, on September 4, 1958, the congregation instructed the Pulpit Committee, chaired by Brother M. M. Hubert, to interview Reverend Whitney. On September 22, 1958, the Pulpit Committee made its recommendation to the Church. A meeting to vote on extending a call was set for the third Sunday in October. However, Brother D. T. Mason offered a motion that the rules be suspended and that Reverend Whitney be elected pastor that night. The motion carried and the church extended the call to pastor to Reverend Whitney. Thus began a term of service that lasted ten years.

Unlike his predecessors, Reverend Whitney did not inherit the financial debts of former years. He found a congregation ready for new leadership. Reverend Whitney served wisely and made many improvements in the order of service. Moreover, he rejuvenated the spirit of the Church and increased the membership.

He encouraged the establishment of a centralized treasury. The baptistry was elevated, and the building was renovated and redecorated. This youthful, energetic preacher accepted the challenge and embarked upon an aggressive ministry of evangelism, stewardship and social concerns. It was these social concerns—the freedom rides, the sit-ins, the protest marches and the mass meetings—that helped shape the ministry of this congregation during the turbulent sixties. Yet, despite ten years of fruitful, positive and constructive leadership in the church and community, Reverend Whitney resigned the pastorate of Farish Street Baptist Church in May 1968, to accept the pastorate of New Prospect Baptist Church in Detroit, Michigan.

In June 1968, Reverend Hickman M. Johnson, Chaplain of Tougaloo College, was invited to serve as interim minister. On July 22, 1968, the church voted to call Reverend Johnson and on August 4, 1968, he preached his first sermon as pastor. On December 1, 1968, Reverend Johnson was installed as the sixth pastor of Farish Street Baptist Church. Reverend Johnson brought to the Church a strong capacity for effective organization. He recommended that the Church become incorporated and on November 13, 1969, a Charter of Incorporation was issued to Farish Street Baptist Church by the State of Mississippi. He labored for a continuous and consistent building program and established the necessary framework for the most diversified religious education and service-oriented programs in the Church's history. A 1969 church brochure described the proposed building addition as being "of contemporary design, functional, attractive and air-conditioned, with ample parking . . . the first floor includes: administrative complex—church office, pastor's study; fellowship-assembly hall, game room, dining room, kitchen; the second floor includes: education-nursery, ten large multi-purpose classrooms." While improvements were to be made on the 1969 model, nevertheless, the functions on which this model were based remain unchanged: a) education, b) fellowship, and c) administration.

At the 1976 Annual Meeting, the Building Committee recommended that the Church authorize its officers to secure a commitment for permanent financing in the amount of \$225,000. On February 10, 1976, a contract was signed with Charles Craig, project architect, to design and provide a set of working drawings. Invitations to Bid were tendered and proposals received from various contractors were tabulated and groundbreaking ceremonies for the new building were timed to coincide with the celebration of the Church's 83rd Anniversary. One year later, in May 1977, the Educational Building was dedicated. This would be the first of several major improvements to the physical property completed during the Johnson's years. Dr. Johnson is an administrator with great spirit; an historian who is cognizant of the importance of a people's heritage; a businessman with a vision. He is a theologian and a teacher, who strives daily to build an even stronger congregation at Farish Street Baptist Church—a congregation committed to serve this community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Farish Street Baptist Church.

HONORING RUBEN ARGUELLES

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Ruben Arguelles to express my deep appreciation for all that he has done for south Texas students.

For the last 23 years, Mr. Arguelles has dedicated himself to educating young people. He spent six years in the classroom as a teacher and 17 years as an administrator leading students, teachers, and staff. His commitment to the Rio Grande Valley is reflected in his service across several independent school districts (ISD)—Weslaco ISD, Progreso ISD, Mercedes ISD, and Santa Rosa ISD.

In every position he has held, Mr. Arguelles demonstrated a tireless focus on ensuring that children have access to the best possible education to prepare them for the future. His dedication also extended to providing a supportive school environment, improving the community, and bettering the lives of South Texas families.

In his last two years at Santa Rosa ISD, Mr. Arguelles faced a great personal challenge. Although he was diagnosed with cancer, Mr. Arguelles continued to serve as principal even as he underwent grueling treatment. Even in the most difficult of times, Mr. Arguelles remained focused on his mission as an educator.

On behalf of all those whose lives he touched, I rise to recognize the exemplary service of Ruben Arguelles. His dedication, even when faced with illness, is an inspiration to us all.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY AND NATIONAL SERVICE OF AUSTIN J. BURKE, PRESIDENT OF THE GREATER SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career-long community and national service of Austin Burke, who is retiring this year as President of the Greater Scranton Chamber of Commerce.

Scranton, Pennsylvania in my district has been through a lot of changes since Austin Burke took the reins at the Chamber back in 1981. Mr. Burke helped lead the effort to transform Scranton's former industrial economy into a new economy that is better positioned to sustain jobs and growth throughout the 21st Century.

Reclaiming and re-using thousands of acres of leftover mining land has been a major accomplishment of the Chamber under Austin's leadership. Putting that land into new business use has created thousands of jobs and fueled economic growth in greater Scranton. Mr.

Burke also worked closely with federal and local officials to bring the Steamtown National Historic Site to downtown Scranton. This was a key step toward improving the city's image and bringing in tourists. If we can bring back passenger rail service for both tourists and commuters, the connection between Scranton's past and future will be even more complete.

Austin Burke's counsel and ideas have been valued in both the Pennsylvania governor's office and the White House in Washington. He was a leader at the national level through his groundbreaking successes here in Scranton and his involvement with the U.S. Chamber on its nationwide initiatives.

Austin served in the Air Force in his earlier years, and he has always brought a strong sense of commitment, loyalty and professionalism to his work at the Chamber. He is an easy guy to look up to. Everyone in Scranton is indebted to Austin Burke for his many years of community development work, and I wish him and his family the very best for his retirement.

RECOGNIZING THERESA JEPSEN

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Mesa Community College student Theresa Jepsen, recipient of a 2013 Cherokee A Nurse I Am Scholarship. Each recipient receives \$2,000 toward defraying the cost of their nursing education.

Theresa was chosen for the scholarship on the basis of an essay she wrote in response to the documentary, *A Nurse I Am*. She was asked to consider aspects of cultural sensitivity demonstrated by nurses in the film, as well as to respond to how she would demonstrate such sensitivity herself. Theresa wrote that "the nursing field requires a unique trifection of emotional intelligence, adaptation, and cultural awareness . . . and it falls to the nurse to discover the client's cultural basis and the values therein in order to serve fully."

I share Theresa's sentiments and applaud her thoughtfulness. Nurses interact intimately with patients, serving them face-to-face, every day. It is of utmost importance that we train nurses who treat patients holistically, caring for them with competence, kindness, and respect. Nurses have the opportunity to positively impact patients' health and thereby overall lives. I congratulate Cherokee Uniforms and Mesa Community College for their support of Theresa and this admirable scholarship program.

Given her accomplishment as well as the support provided by Mesa Community College and the collaborating scholarship foundation, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ms. Theresa Jepsen for her reception of a Cherokee A Nurse I Am Scholarship.

HONORING DIAMOND HAWK GOLF COURSE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Diamond Hawk Golf Course as it is awarded the 2013 Small Business of the Year award by the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce.

Originally a hunting area, construction on the Diamond Hawk Golf Course began in 2004. The name Diamond Hawk reflects the land's history, combining "Diamond," an enduring and precious figure and the "Hawk," after the red-tailed hawks that frequented the hunting area.

Completed in 2006, the Diamond Hawk Golf Course is a par 72, 18-hole golf course. Its state-of-the-art facilities include a driving range, pro shop and an 8,000 square foot clubhouse. Diamond Hawk is widely regarded as one of Western New York's premiere golf courses. In 2007, Buffalo Spree rated the course the Top Public Golf Course in the area.

Throughout its development, one of the course's biggest supporters has been Sam Tadio. Sam's community service efforts are well-known in Cheektowaga. He has held volunteer positions with the Traffic Commission, Narcotics Commission and Police Commission. Reflecting Sam's altruism, the course hosts a variety of high school and junior golf tournaments, as well as charitable events.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize the Diamond Hawk Golf Course and the great work of its advocates and employees as it is awarded Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce's 2013 Small Business of the Year Award. Their commitment to their community and guests exemplifies the highest quality of small business in our country.

HONORING ANDERSON UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Anderson United Methodist Church Jackson, Mississippi.

Anderson United Methodist Church began as a mission in 1914 under the leadership of local ministers from the Central and Pratt Methodist Episcopal Churches. One of the ministers, the late Rev. R. L. Pickens, then pastor of Central, helped organize the Cloverleaf Methodist Episcopal Mission. During the 1920s, the first group of members met at the home of William Harper on Woodrow Wilson Avenue where they worshiped until a specific location was secured.

By 1928, a temporary house of worship for the Mission had been obtained, an old abandoned store on Whitfield Mill Road, (now Martin Luther King Dr.). In 1936, a lot on Spring Street was purchased, and the first church

building was constructed. It was named for the Rev. R. L. Anderson the first conference appointed minister. Rev. Anderson died in 1930. The Rev. I. R. Kersh, Sr., was the pastor at the time Anderson Chapel, as it was known then, was constructed. During the next fifty-five years, the following ministers Pastored Anderson Chapel: Reverends J.C. Bell, Golden Price, S.L. Webb, W.J. Eubanks, N.W. Ross, R.D. Gerald, Whalon Blackmon, T.S. Davis, A.L. Holland, F.P. Leonard, C.P. Payne, H.C. Clay, Sr., and John L. Baker.

In September 1952, under the leadership of Rev. Blackmon, a new structure was built on Page Street and given the name Anderson Memorial. In 1968, under C.P. Payne, Anderson Memorial became Anderson United Methodist Church. In 1972, during the tenure of Rev. Clay, the white and black United Methodist conference merged into one conference. In 1985, Rev. Jeffrey A. Stallworth was appointed pastor at Anderson. It was under his leadership that the church moved to 485 West Northside Drive.

Because of the tremendous growth, Anderson relocated to I-220 at Hanging Moss Road in November, 1994. At this time, membership was over 1,600. After being at this location for only two years, in December 1996 the membership at Anderson surpassed the 3,000 mark.

In June 2002, the Reverend Joe W. May became Pastor of Anderson United Methodist Church. As membership continue to rise, Anderson United Methodist Church works diligently to provide a friendly worship atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Anderson United Methodist Church.

IN PRAISE OF DR. THOMAS F. FREEMAN: EDUCATOR, SCHOLAR, AND LEGENDARY COACH AND TEACHER OF THE ART OF DEBATE

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Dr. Thomas F. Freeman, who for more than 60 years has been a professor of philosophy at Texas Southern University, which is located in my congressional district.

In addition to being an educator and scholar of the first rank, Dr. Freeman is world renowned as the legendary coach and teacher of the art of forensic debate. It is therefore most fitting that he is being honored today in Houston at Texas Southern University Founders Day Convocation.

Dr. Freeman has shaped the lives of countless young people who were his students, including the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the late Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, who once held the seat I now hold. Dr. Freeman's tools were the spoken word. His canvas was the minds of the brilliant and talented young African Americans seeking a higher education.

A prodigy himself, Dr. Freeman graduated from Virginia Union University at the age of 18

and went on to become a professor at Virginia Union University before his 30th birthday. He would later receive degrees from Andover Newton Theological School; Harvard University; Chicago Divinity School; the University of Vienna in Austria, and the University of Liberia in Africa.

In 1949, Dr. Freeman was among a group of accomplished academics of color hired by Texas Southern University (TSU). The same year he held a debate in his TSU logic class using his own undergraduate experience as a guide.

Debate is defined as a contention by words or arguments; or as a formal discussion of a motion before a deliberative body according to the rules of parliamentary procedure; or a regulated discussion of a proposition between two matched sides. But to Dr. Freeman, it was much more than a contest; it was a way of life.

Dr. Freeman understood, as did Socrates when he said to Glaucon in Book X of the Republic that "the contest is great my dear Glaucon, greater than it seems—this contest that concerns becoming good or bad." Dr. Freeman's success was informed by his passionate belief that strong debate skills translated into a range of life skills that would serve students well in their personal lives and professional careers.

Dr. Freeman's academic roots in moral philosophy and theology came through in his instruction of his debate team students. Through the art of debate, Dr. Freeman taught what the ancients Greeks called arete, which is defined as an "activity of the soul in accord with virtue in a complete life." As Aristotle explains in the Nicomachean Ethics, happiness comes from exercising the full range of one's vital powers directed toward excellence.

Virtue and excellence and happiness is what Dr. Freeman taught his students and that is why he and they were special. In 1949, the TSU students who participated in Dr. Freeman's debate class were so impressed with their experience that they requested that Dr. Freeman to form and coach a team. Dr. Freeman agreed and founded the Texas Southern University debate program which today is world renowned for its skill and for the number of championships won.

Dr. Freeman is internationally known for his debate coaching prowess and for the prominent Americans who studied under his tutelage. Among them are the late Congresswoman Barbara Jordan and the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The debating skills that young Barbara Jordan developed under Dr. Freeman's tutelage were so formidable that she became the first female to travel with the TSU debate team. She and her debate partner Otis King participated in and won many awards, including the championship at Baylor University, the first integrated debate match held in the South.

Barbara Jordan went on to become a Texas State Senator and the first Texas African American woman elected to the House of Representatives from my state. She characterized her experience of learning under his tutelage as having shaped her view of the importance of mastering the skills of debate. Congresswoman Jordan and Dr. Freeman remained close and upon her death he gave the eulogy at her funeral.

Dr. Freeman's skill as a debate coach came to the attention of Denzel Washington when he sought a model for the role of a debate coach for his role in the critically acclaimed film "The Great Debaters," based on life of Melvin B. Tolson, who formed the Wiley College debate team. The Wiley College debate team defeated the University of Southern California (USC) debate team for the 1935 national championship.

One of the students who was a student in Dr. Freeman's class during his tenure as a visiting lecturer at Morehouse University was a young Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. Freeman had such an influential effect on him that years later while Dr. Freeman and a group of students happened to be in the same restaurant as Dr. King he was surprised when Dr. King approached his table to say hello. Dr. King reminded Dr. Freeman that he had been a student in his Morehouse class and explained to the students how much that experience shaped his life.

Dr. Freeman's contributions to the Texas Southern University Community included serving as Founding Dean of both the Weekend College and the Honors College. Dr. Freeman worked with then TSU President Granville M. Sawyer to develop the program and serve as its dean. The Honors College, renamed in his honor as the Thomas F. Freeman Honors College, was developed for academically gifted and motivated students to provide them with the most rigorous and challenging academic regimen.

In 1972, Dr. Freeman was asked by Rice University to join its faculty after it had desegregated. Dr. Freeman began a 23-year career association with Rice University. As near as anyone recalls, he was the first African American professor to teach at this prestigious university before returning to TSU where he resumed teaching and leading the TSU debate team to countless victories.

This weekend TSU will honor Dr. Freeman's 60 years of service, and I join them in recognizing the impact a great teacher can have in changing the world for the better through his or her students. Too often a teaching career is viewed by too many as an option taken by those who cannot excel elsewhere. But those of us who know better know that it is the great teacher that makes it possible for us to succeed anywhere and in any pursuit.

Dr. Freeman was and is such a teacher. But as he lived a full and complete life rooted in excellence, virtue, and service, he also was a minister of the gospel, community leader, husband, father, mentor, and a friend to thousands. It can truly be said of Dr. Freeman that his has been a consequential life.

That is why Dr. Freeman is legendary and deserving of the fitting tribute of being honored at the 2013 Founder's Day Convocation at Texas Southern University.

Congratulations Dr. Freeman and thank you for your service to TSU, to America, and to humanity.

RECOGNIZING COSTANZO'S BAKERY, INC.

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to recognize Costanzo's Bakery, Inc. and the Costanzo family, as they receive the Special Presentation Award from the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce. The company is an outstanding employer and well-run company that showcases the endless possibilities of growth for businesses today in Western New York.

In 1933, Angelo Costanzo started a small business along the Niagara River known as Costanzo's Bread. His Italian breads became a household name in supermarkets and grocery stores around Buffalo. In the 1970's Angelo Sr. realized the growth in sub and pizza shops around the area, and expanded his business to sell to local food service establishments.

In 1977, Angelo Jr. and his brother took over the bakery and moved into a new location on Union Road in Cheektowaga. It was here that Costanzo's grew to serve a national marketplace by developing a line of frozen, fully baked sub rolls and round rolls. This was the beginning of Costanzo's Bakery, Inc.

Costanzo's now represents the last remaining member of a once vibrant baking industry locally. The industry has faced many issues over the last several years. Customer demands, compliance costs and increased commodity prices have negatively impacted many bakeries. But Costanzo's has continued to grow, due to its "recipe for success" that it has maintained for eight decades.

The company's products are delivered fresh up to five days a week to dozens of local delis, convenience stores, specialty markets, and supermarkets throughout the region. It has also launched many new products including brioche rolls, artisan style sandwich rolls, rustic-style sub rolls, whole wheat rolls and spicy Buffalo rolls.

While the recipes have stayed the same, Costanzo's has been innovative in developing strategies to meet modern challenges. With the goal of selling its bread to all people regardless of location, it has recently established a national sales team comprised of a director of national accounts and a corporate chef to work directly with multi-unit retail and food service accounts nationwide. The company has also partnered with a Canadian food distributor to represent the brand in Ontario and Quebec. Costanzo's is also pursuing a British Retail Consortium certification, which is the highest level of quality and food safety certification in the industry.

The bakery employs over 120 full and part-time employees, many of whom reside in Cheektowaga and the surrounding areas of the Buffalo-Niagara Region. In addition, Costanzo's gives back to the community providing donations to over 40 non-profit organizations and community groups throughout Erie County.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize Costanzo's Bakery

and the Costanzo family as they receive their Special Presentation Award from the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce. For the past 80 years, they have demonstrated impressive commitment to our community, their customers, and employees. Their quality service and history is known throughout Western New York, and we are proud to have such reputable small businesses filled with hard-working employees in our region.

HONORING GREENWOOD CHAPEL
UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Greenwood Chapel United Methodist Church Carthage, Mississippi. The Word: "The State of Mississippi, Leake County, and The Indenture made this 31 day of January 1872 between Bennett E. Charthan and Catherine Charthan, his wife, of the first part deeded to the Colored People of the south end of said property in Beat 3", was taken from the deed which deeded to at that time, land for the church and school.

The church building most remembered would be the one that faced the road with the tall steps. On May 5, 1944 one acre of land was sold to the Trustees of Greenwood Chapel Colored Church, the land located behind the present day church by Susie Truesdale. In 1960, the church was rebuilt under the leadership for Reverend Russell. The trustees at that time were: Presley (Jack) Smith, Grant Matlock, Edward W. (Ed) Merchant, Willie (Bill) Smith, and Jefferson (Jeff) Smith, Sr.

In 1975, Dorothy Peterson, Douglas Peterson, and Gwen Peterson sold additional land to Greenwood Chapel Methodist Church. The trustees at that time were: Clarence Smith, Bennett Smith, Cogan Matlock, Melvin Carson, Presley (Jack) Smith, and Clytie Coleman.

The church was rebuilt in 1960 under the contractor, Presley (Jack) Smith, Sr. In 1978 the church was remodeled again with Presley (Jack) Smith being the primary contractor. This occurred under the leadership of Reverend John Cornelius.

In 1995, construction was started on a Fellowship Hall under the leadership of Reverend James Morris. In June of 1996, Reverend Marlon King was assigned as pastor and under his leadership the Fellowship Hall was completed. Clytie Coleman, Herman Hall, Robert Lee Harris, and James Matlock served as builders. Reverend Marlon King was reassigned as pastor for four years. In June of 2000, Reverend Willie Handy was appointed to serve as pastor.

Services are conducted on the first and third Sunday of each month, with the first Sunday in August serving as the churches Homecoming.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Greenwood Chapel United Methodist Church.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN AVOIDANCE ACT OF 2013

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer the District of Columbia Government Shutdown Avoidance Act of 2013 to eliminate the prospect of a District of Columbia government shutdown on September 30, 2013, or ever again. This bill is essential because a new fiscal year is upon us and D.C.'s local, balanced budget, which has been approved by the House and Senate Appropriations committees, has not reached the floor in either house. Frequent shutdown threats to the local D.C. government have been costly and disruptive to the city government, its employees and its residents, including many federal officials and employees who reside in the District. This bill would add to existing authorities the city has long had to spend its local funds by permanently authorizing the District government to spend its local funds in the event of a Federal Government shutdown and therefore remain open.

Because of the uncertainty and adverse effects on the city caused by increasingly frequent shutdown threats, I am taking several actions to try to prevent a D.C. government shutdown at the end of the month. I begin by introducing this bill. I must take action now because some Republicans are threatening to block a new spending bill when the current bill expires on September 30 unless the new bill defunds the Affordable Care Act, which could lead to a shutdown of both the Federal and District governments, and because the House is scheduled to be in session for only five days before September 30. In case my bill is not enacted in time, I will also offer an amendment to the fiscal year 2014 short-term continuing resolution (CR) (H.J. Res. 59) to authorize the District government to spend its local funds for all of fiscal year 2014, and not only until the expiration of the CR on December 15, 2013, so that the city does not face a shutdown threat again when the CR expires in December.

The D.C. government should never have to wonder whether it will be shut down. I do not believe any Member wants to shut down the D.C. government and bring a large, complicated city to its knees because of a purely federal matter. Indeed, there is bicameral, bipartisan support for preventing D.C. government shutdowns. In July, both the Republican-led Oversight and Government Reform Committee and the Democratic-led Senate Appropriations Committee approved larger bills that contained the provision in this bill that would permanently authorize the D.C. government to spend its local funds during a Federal Government shutdown. The President's fiscal year 2013 budget also contained the shutdown-avoidance provision. The report accompanying the Republican-led House Appropriations Committee-passed fiscal year 2013 Financial Services and General Government Appropriations bill also acknowledged the harm of District government shutdowns.

The bill would permanently protect the more than 600,000 residents of the District of Columbia and the Federal Government from an unintended catastrophe in any future Federal Government shutdown. The District of Columbia raises and manages an \$8 billion local budget, but Congress technically appropriates these funds back to the District, an anachronistic holdover and throwback from the pre-home-rule era. Several years ago, Republican appropriators and I reached a bipartisan agreement to approve the District government's local budget in CRs, until the expiration of those CRs, allowing the District government to spend at next year's level, if the District government's regular appropriations bill has not been signed into law by the start of a fiscal year. We are grateful that this agreement has been honored through Democratic and Republican Congresses and administrations. This agreement has enabled District officials to operate complex, big-city functions more effectively than during the many years when the city's local budget was approved by Congress months after the start of a fiscal year. However, last Congress, we saw the limits of even this helpful agreement when the Federal Government almost shut down on multiple occasions, and we are facing a shutdown again this year.

If the District government shuts down, in addition to the vital municipal services that would cease, the District could default under certain financing agreements and leases. Tourists to this city, your constituents, not to mention federal officials, federal buildings, foreign embassies and dignitaries and businesses, rely daily on the city's services. Furthermore, forcing D.C. to operate under successive CRs greatly hinders the operations of the District government. Not only do successive CRs make it difficult for the city to plan its activities for the year, successive CRs greatly increase the city's costs of doing business. The city's partners, from Wall Street to small vendors, may charge it a risk premium due to the uncertainty created by successive CRs. These are not results the Congress envisions or desires as we approach the end of the fiscal year. Our bill would once and for all remove the Nation's Capital from the entanglement in federal matters and disputes for which the city has no blame or involvement.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

TRIBUTE TO ROSE KLEYWEG MITCHELL

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Hy-Vee, Inc.'s Senior Vice President of Education and Governmental Affairs, Rose Kleyweg Mitchell. I have personally known Rose through her tireless advocacy for Hy-Vee and the grocery industry. Rose has led important initiatives to make our state and our fellow Iowans healthier by making more informed decisions about nutrition and the foods we eat.

Originally from Sioux City, Rose earned a bachelor's degree and education certificate in

1977 from Simpson College in Indianola, Iowa. Upon graduation, Mrs. Mitchell began teaching at West Des Moines' Valley High School while simultaneously pursuing part-time work at the local Hy-Vee food store. Two years later, Rose had joined Hy-Vee's corporate staff as the first in-house corporate trainer. Mrs. Mitchell would continue to rise through the ranks at Hy-Vee and ultimately assume the roles of Training Supervisor, Director of Training, and Assistant Vice President of Training. By 1996, Rose had been elected to the Board of Directors as the first female vice president where she oversaw Education, Training and Government affairs. Mrs. Mitchell was promoted to her current role as Senior Vice President in 2005.

Throughout her storied career, Rose's great work has been recognized through numerous honors and awards. Mrs. Mitchell was named the Hy-Vee Director of the Year in 1991, awarded the Simpson College Distinguished Alumni Achievement award in 1995, and received simultaneous awards in 2002 as the Greek Alumni and Advisor of the Year. Mrs. Mitchell is also a charter member of the Hy-Vee Toastmasters Club which she has helped shape through her leadership and award-winning performance.

In addition to her work with Iowa's largest private employer, Mrs. Mitchell has displayed an enduring and selfless commitment to her community. Rose has used her talents to serve as President of the Simpson College Alumni Association, hold national office for Delta Delta Delta Sorority, and lead in various roles with the Children's Convalescent Home and Habilitation Center, United Way, and the Unity Point Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, Rose's contribution to Hy-Vee and to the great state of Iowa cannot be overstated. While Mrs. Mitchell's expertise and experience are sure to be missed, she leaves behind a truly grateful community and an excellent example of service for which to strive. I wish Rose and her husband Jerry nothing but the best as they begin a new chapter in their lives.

IN HONOR OF MR. JESSE OWENS'
100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to honor Mr. Jesse Owens on the 100th anniversary of his birthday. James Cleveland Owens was born the son of a sharecropper on a farm in Oakville, Alabama on September 12, 1913. It's been said the family sold its only valuable possession, their mule, in order to travel to Cleveland, Ohio in search of a better life. A teacher at his new school, misunderstanding when James Cleveland told her his name was J.C., called him Jesse, and the name stuck.

When Jesse entered junior high school, the track team coach noticed his ability to run and jump and recruited him for the team. By the time Jesse entered high school, he was a track star. He set many school records and

continued to do so after entering college at Ohio State University.

In 1935, Jesse entered the Big Ten Championship held at Ann Arbor, Michigan where he tied one world record and set three new ones. His long jump record of 26 feet 8.25 inches went unbroken for 25 years.

In 1936, he competed in the Summer Olympics in Berlin, Germany, where he won four gold medals, the most ever won by an individual up until that time. In doing so, Jesse Owens proved that Adolph Hitler's Nazi views of Aryan superiority were inaccurate and that anyone, regardless of race, religion or national origin can achieve greatness.

Owens was a motivational speaker for much of his post-Olympics life and devoted much of his time to youth sports programs for underprivileged children. He earned many awards, among them the Medal of Freedom and the Presidential Living Legends Award.

Owens died of lung cancer in 1980, with his wife, Ruth, and his three daughters by his side. He hasn't been forgotten, though. Thousands of admirers visit Jesse Owens Park and Museum in Oakville, AL each year, many of them from Germany and other foreign countries.

On a monument dedicated to his memory in 1983 and now on display at Jesse Owens Memorial Park are the words, "He inspired a world enslaved in tyranny and brought hope to his fellow man . . . from the cotton fields of Oakville to the acclaim of the entire world, he made us all proud to be called Lawrence Countians."

I am thankful for the life and legacy of Jesse Owens, because of his tremendous athletic achievements as well as the inspiration he provided to millions here and around the world.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$16,738,557,190,345.35. We've added \$6,111,680,141,432.27 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING THE TUSKEGEE AIR- MEN FROM WESTERN PENNSYL- VANIA

HON. KEITH J. ROTHFUS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, we rise to pay special tribute to the Tuskegee Airmen, a group of African American servicemembers who served our nation honorably and with dis-

tingtion in World War II. In recognition of their service and sacrifice, the Tuskegee Airmen were awarded the Congressional Gold Medal on March 29, 2007. Although the Airmen are now well known for their wartime accomplishments, their feats of heroism went unheralded for decades.

Western Pennsylvania produced more Tuskegee Airmen than any other region in the United States. Hailing from cities and towns across Western Pennsylvania, including places like Erie, Aliquippa, Washington, Pittsburgh and Johnstown, ninety-five men and one woman served as flight instructors, pilots, bombardiers, navigators, and flight-line personnel.

They and their fellow Airmen served in the 332nd Fighter Group, which was based at the Tuskegee Army Air Field in Tuskegee, Alabama.

By the end of the war, the Airmen flew more than 1,500 missions and 15,500 sorties in North Africa, continental Europe, and Sicily. The Fighter Group shot down 112 enemy aircraft, destroyed 150 planes on the ground, and boasted one of the most successful escort records in the military.

Western Pennsylvanians contributed honorably to this legacy.

Lieutenant Robert Johnson, an honors graduate of Schenley High School in Pittsburgh, was the youngest Tuskegee pilot commissioned in the Army Air Corps.

Lieutenants Elmer Taylor and James Wright of Pittsburgh and Carl Woods of Mars were killed in action.

Lieutenant Cornelius Gould, a graduate of Westinghouse High School in Pittsburgh, was shot down, captured, and held as a prisoner of war.

Lieutenant Calvin Smith of Aliquippa stood against discrimination when a group of African American officers were denied entry into an officers' club at Freeman Field.

Rosa Alford, the lone female from Western Pennsylvania, returned after serving honorably during the war to give back to her community, as a counselor at New Brighton High School in Beaver County.

On September 15, 2013, the country's largest outdoor memorial for the Tuskegee Airmen will be dedicated in Sewickley, Pennsylvania. This memorial will serve as fitting tribute to these individuals and all Tuskegee Airmen who served the United States with bravery, honor and distinction. They exemplify the very best our Commonwealth and nation have to offer. Amidst hardship and discrimination, the Airmen rose to the challenge and answered the call to service.

We are proud of these Western Pennsylvanians and honored to recognize them today.

HONORING THE 90TH ANNIVER- SARY OF CHEF'S RESTAURANT

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 90th anniversary of one of Buffalo's most beloved dining establishments, Chef's Restaurant.

In 1923, Chef's Restaurant opened its doors on the corner of Seneca and Chicago, and soon established itself as a fixture in the neighborhood.

During the restaurant's early years, a hard-working employee named Lou Billittier began to move his way up the ranks. Beginning as a dishwasher and busboy, Lou was promoted to a waiter. Eventually, he earned the title of restaurant manager.

By 1950, Lou had become co-owner of Chef's. Four years later, he stood proudly as the sole owner of the neighborhood staple.

For over 60 years, Chef's has stayed true to their motto, "Where family and friends meet to eat." The late Lou Billittier, along with his daughter Mary Beth and son Louis John, have worked tirelessly to run their establishment according to the values of community involvement and customer service. The Billittiers believe in being involved in the restaurant's day-to-day process, and know that a personal touch goes a long way.

Over the years, Chef's has mastered blending tradition and innovation. The restaurant began with just seven tables and a small banquet room. Three years ago, they implemented a drive-through window which enabled the restaurant's sales to increase. Now, the famous dining establishment is innovating again with their plans to create a food truck that will take Chef's notable Italian cuisine to the streets of Buffalo.

In addition to their renowned restaurant, the Billittiers are known for their charity. Lou Billittier memorably had former Buffalo Sabre Rob Ray shave his head in front of a crowd of supporters for "Bald for Bucks," a fundraiser for cancer research and patient support programs at Roswell Park Cancer Institute.

On September 11th, 2013, in honor of its 90th anniversary, the restaurant will play host to the "World's Largest Pasta Dinner." Proceeds from the event will benefit the Wounded Warriors Project which honors and empowers wounded U.S. troops and assists in making their post-service transition a smooth one.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to recognize Chef's Italian Restaurant for providing 90 years of dining and community service to Western New York, as well as the Billittier family for their continued hard work and generosity. As one of my personal favorites, I am proud to honor their legacy today, and I wish them the absolute best in all of their future endeavors.

HONORING COLLEGE HILL MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor College Hill Missionary Baptist Church, which was organized in 1907 under an oak tree on the south side of Florence Avenue in west Jackson, Mississippi approximately 100 yards from its present site. College Hill emerged from humble beginnings and has made continual advancement in all phases of development.

After an initial period of services in Robinson Hall, located on Rose and Pascagoula streets, the present site was set aside by Dr. L. G. Barrett, the second president of Jackson College (now Jackson State University), as a gift to the people of west Jackson for religious services theory. Thus the bond between this church and the college was formed. The designated tract was to be used for none other than religious purposes.

The church was a frame building with no classrooms, kitchen, nor plumbing. After growth in membership, some renovations were made. In 1957, under the leadership of Reverend R. E. Willis, the Education Building was completed in 1967. The sanctuary was modernized and the church grew to full-time worship and an organization composed of various auxiliaries.

Under the leadership of Reverend Hoses J. Hine, pastor since August 1990, College Hill has experienced tremendous growth through restructuring, revitalization and initiation of new ministries. With Evangelism as the focus, membership has increased dramatically and the budget has grown consistently. College Hill has moved to two Sunday morning services, 8:00 and 11:00, and study service and activity throughout the week.

Building on a solid foundation, Pastor Hines ushered in the concept of Team Ministry. In addition to Evangelism, Christian Education, Community Outreach, Extended Ministries (Food, clothing and Health Care), Children and Youth Ministry have become major focuses.

In October 2000, College Hill completed and dedicated a new modern Family Life Center. Plans are underway for a new 700 seat new sanctuary. Founded on principles of ministry, mission and Christian education, College Hill's major focus for the future is evangelism (Matthew 28: 19-20).

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing College Hill Missionary Baptist Church.

EASTLAKE ALL-STARS

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the extraordinary merit of the Eastlake All-Stars from Sammamish, WA today, September 12, 2013.

The Eastlake All-Stars (Northwest) won the WA state championship, and then the regional championship, defeating Billings, Montana (Big Sky Little League) 13-1 in four innings. They advanced as far as the United States semi-final of the Little League World Series in Williamsport, Pennsylvania.

Their route was inspirational. After losing to New England, they rallied to defeat the Southwest, Midwest, and Southeast teams before advancing to the semi-final. Facing off against New England once again in a rollercoaster game, they were defeated 13-14.

Throughout the Little League World Series they demonstrated great cohesion and teamwork. Congratulations to the Eastlake All-Stars

for an outstanding tournament at the Little League World Series; they are deserving of every special recognition. The players and coaches who made this excellent season possible are listed below.

Players: Will Armbruester, Cameron Bowlers, Adam Carper, Jack Carper, Dalton Chandler, Jacob Dahlstrom, Bryce Delay, Nathan Fitzgibbons, Jack Matheson, Dylan Matsuoka, Austin Oh, Zack Olson, Jack Rud, and Jack Titus.

Coaches: Rob Chandler, Matt Fitzgibbons, and Jamie Matsuoka.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AND DESIGNATING MAY 16, 2014 AS "NATIONAL NONPROFIT DAY"

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution recognizing the importance of nonprofit organizations and designating May 16, 2014 as "National Nonprofit Day." I would also like to take this opportunity to thank my friend and colleague, Congressman TOM ROONEY for introducing this resolution with me.

Nonprofit organizations have made many important contributions to our nation. Over the past decade, the number of nonprofits has risen steadily, and there are approximately 2.3 million of them now operating in the United States. Whether these groups are working to improve education or to protect environmental resources, they all have the same goals: to enact meaningful change in our world and to improve human lives.

Many nonprofits support science and research that will have a significant impact on future generations. For instance, there are nonprofit organizations that support research to fight diseases such as Cancer and HIV/AIDS. Many other organizations advocate for vulnerable populations across the globe—for refugees, for the homeless, and for our nation's veterans. They educate and teach, as well as engage with local communities to improve the quality of life for all.

In addition to being a force for change and progress, the nonprofit sector is vital to the economic security of the United States. In fact, the growth rate of the nonprofit sector has surpassed the rate of both the business and government sector. In 2010, nonprofits added nearly \$780 billion to our national GDP and employed 1 in 10 working Americans. Nonprofit organizations also facilitate charitable giving and community activism, and the combined donations and volunteer hours of individuals to nonprofits are worth billions of dollars annually.

But perhaps most importantly, nonprofit organizations are founded and managed by people trying to make the world a better place. Whether they are abroad or at home, the work that these men and women do is incredibly meaningful. Without the people behind these organizations—working tirelessly to change the world, sometimes just one life at a time—

the nonprofit sector would not be the force for good that it has become today.

Mr. Speaker, nonprofit organizations advocate for solutions to some of the great challenges facing our nation and the world, and they deserve to be recognized for their valuable contributions to society. No matter their focus, nonprofits play a pivotal role in shaping the future of America. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and to join me in designating May 16, 2014 as "National Nonprofit Day."

RECOGNIZING THE CHEEKTOWAGA PATRIOTIC COMMISSION

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the Cheektowaga Patriotic Commission as they are awarded the 2013 Community Service Award by the Cheektowaga Chamber of Commerce.

The Cheektowaga Patriotic Commission was established almost 40 years ago in response to the Town of Cheektowaga's designation as a National Bicentennial Community by the state and federal governments. The founding officers devoted their time to planning a number of activities to celebrate our nation's 200th birthday, including a flag pole dedication, Appreciation Days for the Town's veterans and firemen, and the unveiling of the Town's Bicentennial Calendar. Their dedication demonstrates the pride the officers have in their country, which is both honorable and commendable.

The Cheektowaga Patriotic Commission continues their great work today, giving residents and businesses in Cheektowaga the opportunity to show their patriotism. The group sponsors and coordinates the July 4th Parade as well as the activities and fireworks display in Town Park. These activities bring together the community to celebrate their pride in the United States of America.

The Commission donates their time and talent to projects that benefit and entertain the residents of Cheektowaga and Western New York. They worked with the Town Park Homeowners Association, the Polish-American Festival Committee, the Federation of German-American Societies, and the Cheektowaga Cultural Society to establish a pavilion in Town Park.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to recognize my good friends in the Cheektowaga Patriotic Commission for the important role they have played in our community for the past 40 years. I sincerely appreciate their efforts, and wish them much continued success in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING BIG SURF WATERPARK

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Big Surf Waterpark, a beloved institution of Tempe, Arizona for the past 44 years, for their designation as a Historical Mechanical Engineering Landmark by the Arizona delegation of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

No other amusement or water park has received this honor, and Big Surf is just the third landmark designated in Arizona by the ASME. It is easy to forget how innovative the design of Big Surf's Waikiki Beach Wave Pool was at the park's opening in 1969. Phil Dexter invented the wave generation process after a 1965 trip to the California coast. He sought to recreate ocean waves, first building a tabletop prototype for which he applied for patent rights in 1966, and then a 1,000-gallon, 40-foot by 30-foot prototype in an abandoned billiard hall. The Big Surf pool is an exact replica of the model and was built, designed, and engineered by John Hauskins, then a 19-year-old student at the University of Arizona, at the scale of 2.5 million gallons of re-circulating water within a span of 2.5 acres. To this day, children enjoy the same original components for generating waves as they did in 1969, and Mr. Hauskins continues to serve our county in innovative ways as director of transportation.

The innovations at Big Surf have come to define the waterpark industry and signify, then and now, the spirit of industry prevalent in Arizona's Ninth District. I am proud to congratulate Big Surf Waterpark, Phil Dexter, and John Hauskins on their honor conferred by ASME, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing their accomplishment.

TRIBUTE TO EAGLE SCOUT TRENT BROWN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Trent Brown of Boy Scout Troop 120 in Solon, Iowa for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

The Eagle Scout rank is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about five percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained for more than a century.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Project to benefit the community. For his project, Trent landscaped and installed a bench and grill at Lake Macbride State Park. The work ethic Trent has shown in his Eagle Project and every other project leading up to his Eagle

Scout rank speaks volumes of his commitment to serving a cause greater than himself and assisting his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I know that all of my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating Trent on obtaining the Eagle Scout ranking, and I wish him continued success in his future education and career.

HONORING MORNING STAR BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Morning Star Baptist Church, Jackson, Mississippi.

In the summer of 1925, Morning Star Baptist Church came into existence as a result of a split from Pearlie Grove Baptist Church of Jackson, Mississippi. Reverend Albert Thornton organized Morning Star Baptist Church with fifteen members in 1925. Services were held in Cuney Hall, located on the corner of Farish and Amite Streets. There was only one Deacon, Ike Brown. Two months later, five additional deacons were appointed: I.S. Brown, John Pearson, Lee James, Bill McCuring and Dempsey Lewis. Brothers Leonard Wilson, H.C. Carter and Landy McWright served as trustees. The first mothers were Lula Lofton, Carter and McQuine. The first church clerk was Clarence Winter.

The Missionary Society was organized by Sister Lula Lofton who served as its president; the Sunday School was organized by Brother Sell Mason who served as superintendent; the Baptist Training Union was organized by Brother Leonard Wilson who served as director and the Senior Choir was organized by Deacon I.S. Brown who served as president. Deacon Brown later organized other choirs and directed them for more than 29 years.

The first revival service was held under a tent on Hamilton Street with Reverend Billy Sunday, from Alabama, serving as evangelist. During this service, 25 candidates for baptism were received. Baptism took place in the Pearl River.

Under the pastorate of Reverend Thornton, land was purchased to build a church; however, Reverend Thornton resigned in 1928. Reverend James Beard and Reverend Richard Hardis then led the church for short periods. Reverend N.C. Johnson was later elected as pastor, and a frame church was built. Upon completion of the church, Reverend Johnson resigned. In 1930, the church chose Reverend John H. Sims as pastor and he served for four years. Reverend P.E. Lott was invited to conduct revival services in June 1934, and was chosen as pastor in September of 1934. His administration lasted for 31 years, September 1934 through January 1966.

During those 31 years, Sister Lula Newman served as president of the Missionary Society. Several organizations were formed, which included the J.M.A., Matron's League, Y.W.A.,

Sunshine Band, Red Circle, Crusaders and the Pastor's Aide Club which was organized by Sister M.A. Roebuck. Membership grew rapidly and after a short period, it became apparent that a larger building was needed to accommodate the worship service. Thus, a massive building program was started. A large edifice was erected at 960 Kane Street in 1947. Upon Reverend Lott's resignation, he recommended that Reverend Sterling Jones be accepted. Reverend Jones was immediately elected and preached his first sermon on February 13, 1965. Morning Star continued to grow, and a small plot of land was purchased directly behind the church with the intention of expanding. It was later decided that a new site was needed. Two and one-half acres of land located at 3420 Albermarle Road was purchased. This land serves as home of the present church. Reverend Jones resigned as pastor on January 25, 1970, and on March 30, 1970, Dr. M.K. Nelson was elected as the 8th pastor. Under Dr. Nelson's leadership, he designed a half-million dollar structure which was liquidated during the first week of May 1988. On April 16, 2001, after several years of illness, God called Dr. Nelson to eternal rest. The valiant men and women of this church who kept the faith through trials and tribulations give light in a dark world, peace to the troubled, compassion to the weary and love to all God's children.

On March 9, 2002, Reverend John Russell Johnson, Jr., was elected to be the 9th pastor of Morning Star Baptist Church. Under his leadership, Morning Star has grown into a large, more diversified congregation with essential ministries for internal study, growth and external outreach. The following ministries were adopted under Pastor Johnson: Daughters of Destiny, Prison, Crown, Greeters,

Brotherhood, Assimilation, Children's Church, Transportation, Young Adult Choir, and Adopt-A-School.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Morning Star Baptist Church.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER OF
CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER
LARRY CANNAN UPON THE OC-
CASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 2013

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable career of Chief Warrant Officer Larry Cannan upon the occasion of his retirement. After nearly thirty years of dutiful service to our country in the United States Coast Guard, Larry will be retiring on August 24, 2013. Larry bravely chose to enlist in the United States Coast Guard in August 1982. Initially joining the Reserve Unit in San Diego as a Petty Officer 3rd Class, he remained in California for two years until his transfer to Buffalo, New York.

Throughout his years of service, Larry steadily advanced in rank. While serving in Buffalo, he obtained his coxswain qualification and certification.

After participating in port security unit training operations in Ahuas Tara, Honduras, Larry was called into active duty. During the first Gulf War, he selflessly served in both Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm in Saudi Arabia from September 1990 to April 1991. Just three years later, Larry was once again called into active duty for Operation Re-

store Democracy in Haiti. Using his expertise in port security, Larry instructed training units in Valdez, Alaska in April 1995, and was a participant in training operation Marcot 96 in Nova Scotia, Canada.

In January 2001, Larry advanced to Petty Officer 1st Class, transferring to the Group Buffalo Field Intelligence Team. Two years later, he was promoted to Port Security Chief Petty Officer and completed the Chief Petty Officer Academy.

November 2006 saw Larry return to active duty as a First Coast Guard Fulltime Liaison Officer to the International Border Intelligence Team in Ottawa, Canada, where he served until February 2007. In August 2008, he commissioned as Chief Warrant Officer at Sector Buffalo Intelligence and completed Indoctrination School at the Coast Guard Academy.

Larry's last service in active duty ran from May 2010 to August 2010 for Operation Deepwater Horizon. Called into service by the Atlantic Area Logistics Unit, Larry was commended as responsible for 1/3 of the production of the 6 member unit.

From March until June in 2012, Larry authored and obtained approval as a Project Officer of Operation Spring Break, a sector Buffalo intelligence joint operation in cooperation with U.S. Border Patrol conducted along the St. Lawrence River in Ogdensburg, New York. For his exemplary service, Larry was commended for the success of the operation and distinct honor of it being the first operation of its kind in the 9th district.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize the truly outstanding career and service of Larry. I am sincerely grateful for his service, and wish him the best in all of his future endeavors.

SENATE—Monday, September 16, 2013

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CHRISTOPHER MURPHY, a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of all mercies, You continue to provide us with refuge and strength. We don't boast about tomorrow, for no one knows what a day may bring. Lord, we ask You to comfort the victims and families of the deadly Navy Yard shooting, providing them with a peace that the world can't give or take away. Use our Senators today to hasten the time when harmony will dominate discord and hope will triumph over despair.

We also ask Your richest blessings upon our U.S. Capitol Police who daily risk their lives for freedom. Bless also all the members of our armed services. Thank You for giving us these guardians of freedom and servants of liberty.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 16, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRISTOPHER MURPHY, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MURPHY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

NAVY YARD SHOOTINGS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Sergeant at Arms is here on the Senate floor. The Republican leader is here.

When I was doing my exercise this morning, I heard there was an incident at the Navy Yard and traffic was tied up. I didn't know what it was. Of course, coming to the Capitol I knew something was up because I saw our police officers with their automatic weapons that they usually don't carry, at least in view of everybody on Constitution Avenue and other places.

I was saddened to hear about the events here in Washington, alluded to in the prayer by the Chaplain, that occurred at the Navy Yard this morning, hearing that a number of people have been injured. I don't know all the details. We know at least there is one dead. I don't know all the details—I don't know a lot of the details of this tragedy or who the perpetrator or perpetrators may be. But according to the reports we have received, several people were killed and several were injured, including a Washington Metropolitan police officer and a military police officer. My sympathies are, of course, with those families who have loved ones who died, with those who have been injured, and my wishes go out to all of those who work in the Navy Yard complex which is a short distance from here and the surrounding neighborhood.

As usual with these events, we have to recognize the first responders who rushed to the scene and their professionalism. I don't know all about it, but I am certain it was there. My thanks go to the brave law enforcement officials who are on the scene and who put their lives on the line. Today we realize that they do put their lives on the line to keep this Capitol complex safe and the city safe.

I urge everyone in the area to follow law enforcement direction for their own safety, whether that be sheltering in place or simply avoiding the Navy Yard area today. The shooters, to my knowledge, have not been apprehended. I have been told they have their fixation on who one of them might be, but we will all continue to follow this situation as it develops.

Based upon this, as I indicated, I have spoken with the Sergeant at Arms, and the Republican leader has been advised of everything I have said and what I am going to suggest. In light of the events at the Navy Yard, we have decided to recess the Senate until tomorrow morning. The vote scheduled for this evening will be rescheduled. We will have an announcement later on the time of those votes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if the majority leader would suspend.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am sorry I didn't do that.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

NAVY YARD SHOOTINGS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a few observations about the events of the day.

We are all thinking about today's tragic shootings at the Navy Yard, about the victims and their families. The men and women of the military courageously put their lives on the line in many dangerous places around the world. It is painful for all of us to think about and having to worry about their safety when they come home too.

Many people in the area, and across the country, will be directly affected by this terrible tragedy and we pray for them all. These kinds of incidents always remind us how fragile life is. They also remind those of us who work in and around the Capitol how much we all owe to the men and women who work so hard to keep us safe every day.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank Terry Gainer and his team, Chief Dine, and the entire Capitol Police force for all they do day in and day out, and for everyone else who is working through this tragedy, including the first responders, the medical personnel, and DC police. I want them all to know one thing: We are all thankful for your hard work and your sacrifice. Everyone is deeply grateful, especially on days such as this.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate very much my friend's statement. Earlier this morning I had in my office a Capitol Police officer. I said, what is the number on your badge? I don't remember exactly—3600 and something. I said, look at my cabinet there, look at my badge. Mine was 363.

So Senator McCONNELL is absolutely right, we take for granted the work these men and women do for us here. It is significant. They do everything they can to protect us and all of the thousands of people who work in this Capitol complex.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as if in executive session, that the order for consideration

of the Campbell-Smith and Kaplan nominations be modified to be after consultation with Senator McCONNELL, with all of the provisions remaining in effect.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONOR FLIGHT OF NORTHERN COLORADO

• Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the outstanding military service of a group of incredible Coloradans. At critical times in our Nation's history, these veterans each played a role in defending the world from tyranny, truly earning their reputation as guardians of peace and democracy through their service and sacrifice. Now, thanks to Honor Flight, these combat veterans came to Washington, DC, to visit the national memorials built to honor those who served and those who fell. They have also come to share their experiences with later generations and to pay tribute to those who gave their lives. I am proud to welcome them here, and I join with all Coloradans in thanking them for all they have done for us.

I also want to thank the volunteers from Honor Flight of Northern Colorado who made this trip possible. These volunteers are great Coloradans in their own right, and their mission to bring our veterans to Washington, DC, is truly commendable.

I wish to publicly recognize the veterans who visited our Nation's capital, many seeing for the first time the memorials built as a tribute to their selfless service. Today, I honor these Colorado veterans on their visit to Washington, DC, and I join them in paying tribute to those who made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of liberty.

Veterans from World War II include: Homer Anderson, Ernest Baugh, Norman Bever, William Compton, Alton Cooper, Arthur Cushing, Robert Davis, Harold Dawe, Jr., Richard Doyle, Robert Eldridge, Stewart Fonda, Jr., Donald Forry, Albert Gablehouse, Charles Gebauer, William Hammond, Sidney Hanks, William Hargis, Walter Hayward, Herman Huwa, Reinard Janssen, Donald Larson, Evelyn Lee, John MacQueen, Robert Martin, Isaac Martinez, George Norton, Eugene Olson, Herbert Pugh, Eugene Replogle, William Ripple, Max Rodgers, Loyal Smoke, Glen Springer, Harold Sutton, Donald Steinshouer, Eugene Turnbull, Roger Van Thorre, Charles Webb, James Whitley and Lawrence Zuppan.

Veterans from the Korean War include: Harry Ahlbrandt, Wallace Akers, Ronald Anderson, Joseph Annello, Filbert Baca, Gilbert Ball, Delbert Black,

Keith Bordewyk, Delmar Bonser, Emilio Brito, Robert Burkholder, Charles Carihfield, Marvin Carihfield, Charles Dunfee, Sr., Thomas Eckrich, Verne Einspahr, Virtus Einspahr, Frank Faiella, Theodore Farwell, Edwin Foss, Loren Garretson, Henry Geisert, Scott Goshorn, Earl Graham, Howard Hanson, Fred Hara, Jerry Herring, Bernard Hill, John Holloway, Harold Hoyland, Vealeless Hudspeth, William Hughes, Jimmie Hylton, John Jacobson, Ray Jacoby, Richard Jagers, Kenneth Jan, Frances Killinger, Jr., Raymond Kosley, Edward Kirvonak, William Krupke, Pat Lanphear, Owen Lecheler, William Leppert, Clarence Lueb, Robert MacLauchlin, Philip Mahoney, Roquez Martinez, Horacio Masearenas, Edward Minch, Howard Morgan, Robert Muller, Leonard Peatrowsky, William Phillips, Dean Pope, Charles Pugh, George Pugh, Teddy Putnum, Thomas Ramm, Tommy Richie, Theodore Roos, Leonard Schmidt, Paul Schroeder, Lloyd Seekamp, Robert Sharrett, Richard Sherman, James Sparks, Boyd Stark, Harvey Steward, Joseph Stockert, Leon Stone, Richard Stoner, Jr., Betty Taylor, Leo Thielen, John Toth, John Wachsmann, Benjamin Wagner, Roger Warden, Jr., Robert Weber, Lester Weers and James Weitz.

Veterans from other conflicts include: Frank Griggs, James Smith and Robert Wideman.

Our Nation asked a great deal of these individuals—to leave their families to fight in unknown lands and put their lives on the line. Each one of these brave Coloradans bravely answered the call. They served our country with courage, and in return, let us ensure they are shown the honor and appreciation they deserve. Please join me in thanking these Colorado veterans and the volunteers of Honor Flight of Northern Colorado for their tremendous service. •

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2775. An act to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend

and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 1442

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1442, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the minimum low-income housing tax credit rate for unsubsidized buildings and to provide a minimum 4 percent credit rate for existing buildings.

AMENDMENT NO. 1895

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1895 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1928. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1928. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4. LEAD EXPOSURE REDUCTION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Lead Exposure Reduction Amendments Act of 2013".

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 401 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2681) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting the clauses appropriately;

(B) in the first sentence, by striking "The term" and inserting the following:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term";

(C) by striking "Such term includes—" and inserting the following:

"(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'abatement' includes—"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'abatement' does not include any renovation, remodeling, or other activity—"

“(i) the primary purpose of which is to repair, restore, or remodel target housing, public buildings constructed before 1978, or commercial buildings; and

“(ii) that incidentally results in a reduction or elimination of lead-based paint hazards.”;

(2) by redesignating—

(A) paragraphs (4) through (12) as paragraphs (5) through (13);

(B) paragraph (13) as paragraph (15); and

(C) paragraphs (14) through (17) and paragraphs (18) through (21), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) **EMERGENCY RENOVATION.**—The term ‘emergency renovation’ means a renovation or remodeling activity that is carried out in response to an event—

“(A) that is an act of God, as that term is defined in section 101(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980; or

“(B) that if not attended to as soon as is practicable—

“(i) presents a risk to the public health or safety; or

“(ii) threatens to cause significant damage to equipment or property.”;

(4) by striking paragraph (10) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) and inserting the following:

“(10) **LEAD-BASED PAINT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘lead-based paint’ means paint or other surface coatings that contain lead in excess of—

“(i) 1.0 milligrams per centimeter squared; or

“(ii) 0.5 percent by weight.

“(B) **TARGET HOUSING.**—With respect to paint or other surface coatings on target housing, the term ‘lead-based paint’ means paint or other surface coatings that contain lead in excess of the lower of—

“(i) the level described in subparagraph (A); or

“(ii) a level established by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 302(c) of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act.”;

(5) by inserting after paragraph (13) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(14) **POSTABATEMENT CLEARANCE TESTING.**—The term ‘postabatement clearance testing’ means testing that—

“(A) is carried out upon the completion of any lead-based paint activity to ensure that—

“(i) the reduction is complete; and

“(ii) no lead-based paint hazards remain in the area in which the lead-based paint activity occurs; and

“(B) includes a visual assessment and the collection and analysis of environmental samples from an area in which lead-based paint activities occur.”; and

(6) by inserting after paragraph (15) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(16) **RENOVATION.**—The term ‘renovation’ has the meaning given such term in section 745.83 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this paragraph.

“(17) **RENOVATION AND REMODELING REGULATION.**—The term ‘renovation and remodeling regulation’ means a regulation promulgated under section 402(a) and revised pursuant to section 402(c)(3)(A), as such regulation is applied to renovation or remodeling activities in target housing, public buildings constructed before 1978, and commercial buildings.”.

(C) **LEAD-BASED PAINT ACTIVITIES TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION.**—Section 402(c) of the

Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2682(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **STUDY OF CERTIFICATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year prior to proposing any renovation and remodeling regulation after the date of enactment of the Lead Exposure Reduction Amendments Act of 2013, the Administrator shall conduct, submit to the Congress, and make available for public comment (after peer review) the results of, a study of the extent to which persons engaged in various types of renovation and remodeling activities in target housing, public buildings constructed before 1978, or commercial buildings—

“(i) are exposed to lead in the conduct of such activities; and

“(ii) disturb lead and create a lead-based paint hazard on a regular or occasional basis in the conduct of such activities.

“(B) **SCOPE AND COVERAGE.**—Each study conducted under subparagraph (A) shall consider the risks described in clauses (i) and (ii) of such subparagraph with respect to each separate building type described in such subparagraph, as the regulation to be proposed would apply to each such building type.”;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the first sentence by striking “Within 4 years” and inserting the following:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 4 years”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **EXEMPTION.**—An emergency renovation shall be exempt from any renovation and remodeling regulation, and a person carrying out an emergency renovation shall be exempt from any regulation promulgated under section 406(b) with respect to the emergency renovation.

“(C) **PROHIBITION ON POSTABATEMENT CLEARANCE REQUIREMENT.**—No renovation and remodeling regulation may require postabatement clearance testing.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **TARGET HOUSING OWNERS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and subject to subparagraph (B), the Administrator shall promulgate regulations to permit an owner of a residential dwelling that is target housing, who resides in such residential dwelling, to authorize a contractor to forgo compliance with the requirements of a renovation and remodeling regulation with respect to such residential dwelling.

“(B) **WRITTEN CERTIFICATION.**—The regulations promulgated under subparagraph (A) shall require that an owner of a residential dwelling that is target housing, who resides in such residential dwelling, may only authorize a contractor to forgo compliance with the requirements of a renovation and remodeling regulation if the owner submits to such contractor a written certification stating that—

“(i) the renovation or remodeling project is to be carried out at the residential dwelling in which the owner resides;

“(ii) no pregnant woman or child under the age of 6 resides in the residential dwelling as of the date on which the renovation or remodeling project commences, or will reside in the residential dwelling for the duration of such project; and

“(iii) the owner acknowledges that, in carrying out the project, such contractor will be exempt from the requirements of a renovation and remodeling regulation.

“(C) **RESTRICTION.**—A contractor may not forgo compliance with the requirements of a renovation and remodeling regulation pursuant to a written certification submitted under subparagraph (B) if such contractor has actual knowledge of a pregnant woman or child under the age of 6 residing in the residential dwelling as of the date on which the renovation or remodeling commences (and for the duration of such project).

“(D) **LIMITATION OF CONTRACTOR LIABILITY.**—The Administrator may not hold a contractor responsible for a misrepresentation made by the owner of a residential dwelling in a written certification submitted under subparagraph (B), unless the contractor has actual knowledge of such a misrepresentation.

“(5) **TEST KITS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(i) **RECOGNITION.**—The Administrator shall recognize for use under this title a qualifying test kit, and publish in the Federal Register notice of such recognition.

“(ii) **SUSPENSION OF ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN REGULATIONS.**—If, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator does not recognize a qualifying test kit under clause (i), the Administrator—

“(I) shall publish in the Federal Register notice of such failure to recognize a qualifying test kit; and

“(II) except as provided in clause (iii), may not enforce any post-1960 building renovation and remodeling regulation, with respect to a period beginning on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph and ending on the date that is 6 months after the date on which the Administrator—

“(aa) recognizes for use under this title a qualifying test kit; and

“(bb) publishes in the Federal Register notice of such recognition and of the date on which enforcement of the post-1960 building renovation and remodeling regulations will resume.

“(iii) **APPLICABILITY OF SUSPENSION.**—The Administrator shall not suspend enforcement of any post-1960 building renovation and remodeling regulation for the period described in clause (ii)(II) with respect to a residential dwelling in which a pregnant woman or child under the age of 6 resides.

“(B) **QUALIFYING TEST KIT.**—In this subsection, the term ‘qualifying test kit’ means a chemical test that—

“(i) can determine the presence of lead-based paint, as defined in section 401(10)(A);

“(ii) has a false positive response rate of 10 percent or less;

“(iii) has a false negative response rate of 5 percent or less;

“(iv) does not require the use of off-site laboratory analysis to obtain results;

“(v) is inexpensively and commercially available; and

“(vi) does not require special training to use.

“(C) **POST-1960 BUILDING RENOVATION AND REMODELING REGULATION.**—In this subsection, the term ‘post-1960 building renovation and remodeling regulation’ means a renovation and remodeling regulation, as it applies to—

“(i) target housing constructed after January 1, 1960;

“(ii) public buildings constructed between January 1, 1960 and January 1, 1978; and

“(iii) commercial buildings constructed after January 1, 1960.

“(6) **APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PENALTIES.**—Any renovation and remodeling regulation requiring the submission of documentation to the Administrator shall provide—

“(A) an exemption from an applicable penalty for failure to comply with such requirement for a person who—

“(i) is submitting the required documentation for the first time; and

“(ii) submits documentation that contains only de minimus or typographical errors, as determined by the Administrator; and

“(B) a process by which a person described in subparagraph (A) may resubmit the required documentation.

“(7) ACCREDITATION OF RECERTIFICATION COURSES.—The hands-on training requirements required by subsection (a)(2)(D) shall not apply to any recertification course accredited by the Environmental Protection Agency that is otherwise required to be completed under this title by a person that is certified to engage in renovation and remodeling activities.”.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, September 17; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be

deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until noon, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans the next 30 minutes; and following morning business the Senate return to consideration of S. 1392.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:09 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 17, 2013, at 10 a.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATIONS

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of 01/07/2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*JON T. RYMER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of 01/07/2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*STEVE A. LINICK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, September 16, 2013

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 16, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS J. ROONEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We thank You that You give us a share in Your creative work, having endowed each with unique and important talents.

On this day, we ask Your blessing on the men and women of the people's House, who have been entrusted with the care of this great Nation's people. Because of the great blessings You have bestowed on our Nation, may we embrace the opportunity to build a better world beyond our borders, as well.

Bless also all those who work in the Nation's Capital. May their work be appreciated by the American people, for their faithfulness in service to our Nation is truly edifying.

May all that they do this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until noon tomorrow for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 17, 2013, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2861. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Enhanced Risk Management Standards for Systemically Important Derivatives Clearing Organizations (RIN: 3038-AC98) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2862. A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inspection and Weighing of Grain in Combined and Single Lots (RIN: 580-AB15) received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2863. A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Weighing, Feed, and Swine Contractors (RIN: 0580-AA99) received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2864. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sugar Program; Feedstock Flexibility Program for Bioenergy Producers (RIN: 0560-AH86) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2865. A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Definition of a Ski Area (RIN: 0596-AD12) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2866. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Release of Fundamental Research Information (DFARS Case 2012-D054) (RIN: 0750-AH92) received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2867. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Least Developed Countries that are Designated Countries. (DFARS Case 2013-D019) (RIN: 0750-

AI00) August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2868. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-69; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket: FAR 2013-0078; Sequence 5] received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2869. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-69; Introduction [Docket: FAR 2013-0076; Sequence 5] received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2870. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8287] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2871. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2872. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2873. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No.: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8291] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2874. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Webster County, Kentucky, and Incorporated Areas) [Docket: ID FEMA-2013-0002] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2875. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — HOME Investment Partnerships Program: Improving Performance and Accountability; Updating Property Standards [Docket No.: FR-5563-F-02] (RIN: 2501-AC94) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2876. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Student Assistance General Provisions (RIN: 1880-AA87) received August 29,

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2877. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research — Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers [CDFA Number: 84.133B-11.] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2878. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2879. A letter from the Acting Chief Policy Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2880. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hearing Officer and Administrative Judge (RIN 1992-AA36) received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2881. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Residential Clothes Dryers [Docket No.: EEE-2011-BT-TP-0054] (RIN: 1904-AC63) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2882. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Practitioner Data Bank and Privacy Act; Exempt Records System; Technical Correction (RIN: 0906-AA97) received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2883. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Program Integrity: Exchange, SHOP, and Eligibility Appeals [CMS-9957-F] (RIN: 0938-AR82) received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2884. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Spirulina Extract [Docket No.: FDA-2001-C-0878] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2885. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Labeling; Gluten-Free Labeling of Foods [Docket No.: FDA-2005-N-0404] (RIN: 0910-AG84) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2886. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio Redesignation of the Ohio Portions of the Parkersburg-Marietta and Wheeling Areas to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0212; EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0338; FRL-9900-28-Region 5] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2887. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Nevada; Regional Haze Federal Implementation Plan; Extension of BART Compliance Date for Reid Gardner Generating Station [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0148; FRL-9843-8] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2888. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Disapproval of PM2.5 Permitting Requirements; Correction [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0502; FRL-9900-30-Region 5] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2889. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa [EPA-R07-OAR-2013-0466; FRL-9900-39-Region 7] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2890. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Electronic Reporting of Toxics Release Inventory Data [EPA-HQ-TRI-2011-0174; FRL-9835-5] (RIN: 2025-AA30) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2891. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program; Final Amendments and Confidentiality Determinations for Subpart I [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0028; FRL-9845-6] (RIN: 2060-AR61) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2892. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment for the West Central Final Nonattainment Area for the 2006 Fine Particle Standard; Arizona; Determination Regarding Applicability of Clean Air Act Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0449; FRL-9900-58-Region 9] received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2893. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; NOx Emission Trading Orders as Single Source SIP Revisions [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0198; A-1-FRL-9900-63-Region 1] received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2894. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Virginia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R03-RCRA-2012-0294; FRL-9900-47-Region 3] received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2895. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tetrachlorvinphos; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0360; FRL-9394-9] received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2896. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle and Nonroad Technical Amendments [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0102; NHTSA-2012-0152; FRL 9900-11-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR48; 2127-AL31) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2897. A letter from the Chief, TCD, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 1.80(b) of the Commission's Rules; Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties to Reflect Inflation received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2898. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Lifeline and Link Up Modernization and Reform [WC Docket No.: 11-42] received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2899. A letter from the Chief, Broadband Division, Wireless Communications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Service Rules for Advanced Wireless Services H Block—Implementing Section 6401 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 Related to the 1915-1920 MHz and 1995-2000 MHz Bands [WT Docket No.: 12-357] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2900. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90] received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2901. A letter from the Legal Advisor, CGB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Speech-to-Speech and Internet Protocol (IP); Speech-to-Speech Telecommunications Relay Services; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities [CG Docket No.: 08-15] [CG Docket No.: 03-123] received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2902. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to Page 700 of FERC Form No. 6 [Docket No.: RM12-18-00; Order No. 783] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2903. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Third-Party Provision of Ancillary Services; Accounting and Financial Reporting for New Electric Storage Technologies [Docket Nos.: RM11-24-000 and AD10-13-000; Order No. 748] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2904. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to Modeling, Data, and Analysis Reliability Standard [Docket No.: RM12-19-000; Order No. 782] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2905. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Energy and Water Use Labeling for Consumer Products Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (Energy Labeling Rule) [3084-AB15] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2906. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Japan Lessons-Learned Project Directorate Guidance for Assessment of Flooding Hazards Due to Dam Failure (JLD-ISG-2013-01) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2907. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Facility Security Clearance and Safeguarding of National Security Information and Restricted Data [NRC-2011-0268] (RIN: 3150-AJ07) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2908. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — The Rulemaking Process; Management Directive 6.3 received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2909. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the April 21, 2013 — June 19, 2013 reporting period including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq, pursuant to Public Law 107-243, section 4(a) (116 Stat. 1501); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2910. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Time Limit for Completion of Voluntary Self-Disclosures and Revised Notice of the Institution of Administrative Enforcement Proceedings [Docket No.: 120207107-3621-02] (RIN: 0694-AF59) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2911. A letter from the Director, Office of Executive Secretariat and Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Freedom of Information Act Regulations (RIN: 1093-AA15) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2912. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 2005-69; Item VII; Docket 2013-0080; Sequence 4] received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2913. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Update to Biobased Reporting Requirements [FAC 2005-69; FAR Case 2013-0006; Item VI; Docket 2013-0006, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM63) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2914. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Least Developed Countries that are Designated Countries [FAC 2005-69; FAR Case 2013-009; Item V; Docket 2013-0009, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM62) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2915. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Repeal of Sunset for Certain Protests of Task or Delivery Order Contracts [FAC 2005-69; FAR Case 2013-011; Item IV; Docket 2013-0011, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM16) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2916. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Iran Threat Reduction [FAC 2005-69; FAR Case 2012-030; Item II; Docket 2012-0030, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM44) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2917. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Definition of Contingency Operation [FAC 2005-69; FAR Case 2013-003; Item I; Docket 2013-0003, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM48) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2918. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Pay Under the General Schedule and Recruitment, Relocation, and Retention Incentives (RIN: 3206-AM13) received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2919. A letter from the Branch of Recovery and State Grant, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reclassification of *Acmispon dendroideus* var. *traskiae* (= *Lotus* d. subsp. *traskiae*) and *Castilleja grisea* as Threatened Throughout Their Ranges [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2012-0007] (RIN: 1018-AY04) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2920. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Interior,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Commercial Filming and Similar Projects and Still Photography Activities [NPS-WASO-VRP-09328; PXXVPADO515] (RIN: 1024-AD30) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2921. A letter from the Chief, branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for *Sphaeralcea gieriischi* (*Gierisch Mallow*) Throughout Its Range [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2012-0049] (RIN: 1018-AY58) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2922. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; National Standard 2 — Scientific Information [Docket No.: 0808041047-3587-03] (RIN: 0648-AW62) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2923. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery and Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 24 and Framework Adjustment 49; Correction [Docket No.: 121129661-3591-03] (RIN: 0648-BC81) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2924. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Rougheye Rockfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC761) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2925. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC752) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2926. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; "Other Rockfish" in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC753) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2927. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 37; Correction [Docket No.: 121004518-3559-02] (RIN: 0648-BC66) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2928. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Enhanced Document Requirements To Support Use of the Dolphin Safe Label on Tuna Products [Docket No.: 130221153-3572-02] (RIN: 0648-BC78) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2929. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2013 Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Quota Specifications [Docket No.: 130214139-3542-02] (RIN: 0648-XC513) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2930. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Diego International Airport Terminal Two West Grand Opening Fireworks; San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0637] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2931. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Kentucky Air National Guard Vessel for Parachute Rescue Jumpmaster Training, Lake Erie, Dunkirk, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0584] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2932. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8293] received August 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2933. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Pacific Northwest Grain Handlers Association Facilities; Columbia and Willamette Rivers [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0011] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2934. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; North Hero Air Show; North Hero, VT [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0497] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2935. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Sister Bay Marina Fest Fireworks and Ski Show, Sister Bay, WI [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0614] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2936. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Alpena Area HOG Rally Fireworks, Alpena, Michigan [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0661] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2937. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile 662.8 to 663.9 [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0410] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2938. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Motion Picture Filming; Chicago River; Chicago, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0612] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2939. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Evening on the Bay Fireworks; Sturgeon Bay, WI [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0613] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2940. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Recurring Events in Northern New England [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1057] (RIN: 1625-AA08; AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2941. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Kuoni Destination Management Fireworks; San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0666] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2942. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Butler County, Kentucky, and Incorporated Areas) [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received August 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2943. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Regattas and Marine Parades in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan Area [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0327] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2944. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Maritime Heritage Festival Fireworks, St. Helens, OR [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0485] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2945. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Chicago Harbor; Navy Pier Southeast; Chicago, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0320] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2946. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bullhead City Regatta; Bullhead City,

AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0260] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2947. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Metedeconk River; Brick Township, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0636] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2948. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Sherman Private Party Fireworks, Lake Michigan, Winnetka, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0615] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2949. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Joint Operations Exercise, Lake Michigan, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0611] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2950. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Tall Ship Safety Zones; War of 1812 Bicentennial Commemoration, Great Lakes [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0192] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2951. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; James River; Newport News, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0670] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2952. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Discovery World Fireworks, Milwaukee Harbor, Milwaukee, WI [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0326] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2953. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone and Regulated Navigation Area; Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Romeoville, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1108] (RIN: 1625-AA11, 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2954. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rate Regulation Reforms [Docket No.: EP 715] received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2955. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — VA Health Professional Scholarship and Visual Impairment and Orientation and Mobility Professional Scholarship Programs (RIN: 2900-AO34/WP2010-041) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2956. A letter from the Director of Regulatory Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — VA Veteran-Owned Small Business Verification Guidelines (RIN: 2900-AO49) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2957. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Service's final rule — Shared Responsibility Payment for Not Maintaining Minimum Essential Coverage [TD 9632] (RIN: 1545-BL36) received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2958. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Service's final rule — Appeals Settlement Guidelines — New Qualified Plug-In Electric Drive Motor Vehicle Credit received August 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2959. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Use of Differential Income Stream as an Application of the Income Method and as a Consideration in Assessing the Best Method [TD 9630] (RIN: 1546-BK71) received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2960. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2013-33) received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2961. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Disclosures of Return Information Reflected on Returns to Officers and Employees of the Department of Commerce for Certain Statistical Purposes and Related Activities [TD 9631] (RIN: 1545-BL66) received August 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2962. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Regulations pertaining to the disclosure of return information to carry out eligibility requirements for health insurance [TD 9628] (RIN: 1545-BK87) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2963. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — September 2013 (Rev. Rul. 2013-18) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2964. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Requirement of a Section 4959 Excise Tax Reform and Time for Filing the Return [TD 9629] (RIN: 1545-BL85) received August 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 3102. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 3103. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to modify the reporting requirements for decisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3104. A bill to clarify the application of all laws, including the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, to the Federal Government and Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.J. Res. 63. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of Personnel Management relating to the treatment of Members of Congress and congressional staff under section 1312 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make corrections in the enrollment of H.J. Res. 62; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

127. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 17 urging the Congress to direct the Pentagon to reopen the review of Leonard DeWitt's Medal of Honor nomination; to the Committee on Armed Services.

128. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 9 supporting the continued use and responsible development of coal-based power; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

129. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Ohio, relative to Senate Concurrent

Resolution No. 15 urging the Congress to hold regular hearings regarding the First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

130. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 12 reaffirming the strong commitment between Taiwan and Delaware; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

131. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 24 informing the President and the Congress on the results of the plebiscite held on November 6, 2012; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

132. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 18 requesting the Congress to amend the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

133. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 6 urging the Congress to send to the States an amendment to the Constitution consistent with the findings of this memorial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

134. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 63 requesting that Congress pass and send to the states for ratification an amendment to the Constitution regarding the federal budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

135. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 3 urging the Congress to transmit an amendment to the Constitution regarding Article 1, section 8, clause 3; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

136. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to Resolution No. 127-32 urging the Congress to expand the "Radiation Exposure Compensation Act of 1990"; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 3102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 which includes the power to provide nutrition assistance.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 3103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution: The Congress shall have Power *** To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, 3, and 18:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

Article I Section 6 Clause 1: The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.J. Res. 63.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 55: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 148: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 176: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 301: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 477: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 544: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 647: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 920: Mr. WALBERG, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SIREs, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 924: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 984: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1015: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1024: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 1037: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1094: Mr. TONKO, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1098: Mr. BARBER and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 1199: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1240: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1276: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 1518: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. COFFMAN, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1563: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 1588: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1891: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1950: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 2041: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 2122: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 2137: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2237: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2328: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2426: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2465: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2502: Mr. COSTA and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2538: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2654: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2682: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2697: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2921: Mr. OWENS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 3045: Mr. RUSH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 3089: Mr. FORBES and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 3092: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.J. Res. 34: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DOGGETT, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.J. Res. 62: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. STEWART, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. RADEL, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. REED, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POMPEO, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. TERRY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

46. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Jamestown, New York, relative to Resolution 201307 B09 urging the Congress to oppose the proposed reduction in funding for the Community Development Block Grant; to the Committee on Financial Services.

47. Also, a petition of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 2013-28288 supporting the efforts of responsible firearms retailers and manufactures to reduce gun violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

48. Also, a petition of the California State Lands Commission, California, relative to a resolution supporting H.R. 335 and S. 218; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING ANDY CLARKE ON TEN YEARS WITH THE LEAGUE OF AMERICAN BICYCLISTS

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 2013

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the League of American Bicyclists has a long and storied history. Over 120 years ago, the League was in the forefront of introducing cycling to America. It was the leader of the good roads movement as the cycling craze swept the country, producing a demand for more and better quality roads. Over a century later, America is in the midst of a new cycling renaissance.

For the last 10 years Andy Clarke has been at the helm of the League of American Bicyclists helping promote cycling coast-to-coast and in every state. There is no one who has done more than Andy to lift our vision and our spirits. I will be forever grateful that the United States has given him a green card, not just for his accent, but for his global vision of the power of cycling to help rebuild and revitalize our communities.

Andy understands the need to deal with all of the cycling community: young and old, recreational bicyclists, cycling tourists, the hardcore mountain biker, the weekend road cyclists, the commuter, and everybody in between.

Andy has been part of an effort to bring together the wide range of cycling interests which includes local government, people in the cycling community, and the businesses who benefit from cycling customers.

Cycling is not just the most efficient form of urban transportation ever designed, it is the key to fitness for our families, freedom for our children, and the easiest, quickest, and most inexpensive way to increase road capacity.

Andy, thank you for understanding these principles, for organizing the cycling community, and for providing vision, good humor, and leadership as we all navigate the tremendous opportunities that cycling presents for all Americans.

AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 2013

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is important that America's vital infrastructure be approved and constructed on a reasonable and predictable schedule. In that regard, I am concerned with some tactics that have emerged in some states to utilize federally delegated authority,

most notably under the Clean Water Act, to stall and even deny the necessary permits or certifications for federally approved projects, frustrating federal licensing and permitting processes. It is my understanding that other states may try to use their authority under the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) to object to consistency approvals regarding federal projects, even though the facility has existed for years in the coastal zone and was previously found to be consistent with the state's Coastal Management Plan. Such an effort would appear to be an attempt to manufacture challenges to the federal proceedings.

In the case of States using federal delegated authority under the Clean Water Act to frustrate federally approved projects, the Congress has previously legislated and may well need to do so again. I intend to work with my colleagues to assess that need presently. As to consistency determinations under the CZMA, it is my understanding that the law is clear that a State has very limited authority to review an existing project a second time, if it underwent a previous federal consistency review. The Act and its legislative history show that these requirements were meant to apply primarily to new facilities, not to existing facilities. Our federally permitted and licensed domestic infrastructure is the backbone for a vibrant economy, and Congress should work diligently to ensure that it is not jeopardized.

CELEBRATING THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DOORWAYS FOR WOMEN AND FAMILIES

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 35th anniversary of the founding of Doorways for Women and Families. Northern Virginia is home to four of the top ten wealthiest counties in the United States. Yet amidst this wealth are numerous homeless families.

Every year, hundreds of thousands of Americans become homeless, including thousands of families. A typical family who is homeless is comprised of a mother in her late twenties with two children. Over 1.6 million children in the United States are homeless, putting them at increased risk for moderate to severe health conditions. Nearly 50 percent of the homeless in Arlington County are families.

In 1978, a group of concerned community-minded residents set out to build Arlington's first shelter for homeless families and those fleeing domestic violence. Four years later, the group purchased a 1957 Cape Cod-style home that would become Arlington's first domestic violence shelter, and eventually Doorways for Women and Families. Since then,

Doorways has gone on to assist thousands of families in need.

From its humble beginnings, Doorways has grown considerably. Last year, 120 families benefited from the group's host of services—including 162 children, who received physical, emotional and social support in order to help them heal from the traumatic effects of homelessness and domestic violence.

Doorways piloted the Virginia Address Confidentiality Program in Arlington, paving the way for 26 more counties to adopt the program. In 2009, the Washington Post awarded Doorways their Excellence in Nonprofit Management award for financial health and organization efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to honor Doorways for Women and Families as it marks 35 years of dedicated service to the residents of Northern Virginia.

IN HONOR OF JULIA LONGMORE

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, warmest wishes to Julia B. Longmore on your 100th birthday. May this day bring you as much happiness and love as you have brought to your family: your husband, Alfred, and sons, Alfred and Joseph, your nine grandchildren, seventeen great-grandchildren and three great-great grandchildren.

We know your life's journey began on September 17, 1913 in Tamaqua, Pennsylvania, later leading to long and happy family life in Philadelphia. You and your husband provided a loving home for your children, who will long remember your gift of love and your gentle spirit. May this special birthday celebration reflect the joy you have given them.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, September 17, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 18

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Stevan Eaton Bunnell, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel, and Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for National Protection and Programs, both of the Department of Homeland Security.

SD-342

10 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine implementing Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century's (MAP-21) provisions to accelerate project delivery.

SD-406

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 113th Congress, the nominations of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, Chai Rachel Feldblum, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and Scott S. Dahl, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of Labor, and any pending nominations.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine reevaluating the effectiveness of Federal mandatory minimum sentences.

SD-226

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine closing the wealth gap, focusing on empowering minority owned businesses to reach their full potential for growth and job creation.

SR-428A

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development

To hold hearings to examine recovering from Superstorm Sandy, focusing on

assessing the progress, continuing needs, and rebuilding strategy.

SD-538

2 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine older Americans, focusing on the changing face of HIV/AIDS in America.

SD-562

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Economic Policy

To hold hearings to examine implementation of the "Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Act of 2012", focusing on one year after enactment.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 113th Congress.

SR-253

Committee on Indian Affairs

Business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee from October 1, 2013, through February 28, 2015.

SD-628

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the economic costs of debt-ceiling brinkmanship.

SH-216

SEPTEMBER 19

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Deborah Lee James, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Air Force, Jessica Garfola Wright, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, and Marcel J. Lettre II, of Maryland, to be Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Intelligence, all of the Department of Defense, Frank G. Klotz, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Energy for Nuclear Security, and Kevin A. Ohlson, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.

SD-G50

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine wildlife management authority within the State of Alaska under the Alaska National Interest Lands Act and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

SD-366

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jo Emily Handelsman, of Connecticut, and Robert Michael Simon, of

Maryland, both to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and Kathryn D. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

SR-253

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine promoting a system of shared responsibility, focusing on issues for reauthorization of the "Higher Education Act".

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine reforming and renewing the postal service, part I, focusing on maintaining services, reducing costs and increasing revenue through innovation and modernization.

SD-342

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

SEPTEMBER 24

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Eunice S. Reddick, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Niger, John Hoover, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Sierra Leone, Michael Stephen Hoza, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cameroon, Mark Bradley Childress, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the United Republic of Tanzania, Thomas Frederick Daughton, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Namibia, Matthew T. Harrington, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Lesotho, and Dwight L. Bush, Sr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

OCTOBER 1

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 812, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take actions to implement the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, and H.R. 1613, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs.

SD-366

SENATE—Tuesday, September 17, 2013

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Savior, who promised to never forsake us, be a shield for this land we love. As flags fly at half staff in remembrance of the victims of yesterday's Washington Navy Yard shooting, teach us to use wisely all the time You give us. Show Your mighty power during seasons of distress, transforming negatives into positives and dark yesterdays into bright tomorrows.

Today, guide our lawmakers, inspiring them in their going out and coming in, as You give them the wisdom to labor not simply for time but for eternity. Lord, bless us all with strength of will, steadiness of purpose, and power to persevere.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 17, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER FOR MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish we could do more, but I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now observe a moment of silence in honor of the victims of the tragedy at the Navy Yard and those killed and those suffering from the wounds inflicted on that terrible day, yesterday, that occurred not far from the Capitol.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Moment of silence.)

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that at 11:30 a.m., the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order to consider the Campbell-Smith and Kaplan nominations, both nominees to the Federal Claims Court; further, that following the disposition of those nominees, the Senate recess until 2:15 this afternoon to allow for the weekly caucus meetings; and, finally, that at 2:15, the Senate resume consideration of S. 1392, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. We are trying to come up with a finite list of amendments to move forward on that legislation. We hope that, in fact, can happen.

It is my understanding Senator VITTER has an amendment he wants to offer. He has been on the floor a few times during the time we have been in session. We would have an amendment, or second-degree side-by-side, to his amendment. In order to do that, we have to have a finite list of amendments. We can't go on with unrelated amendments forever on this bill. So there will be one rollcall vote and we hope to vote on energy efficiency amendments whenever there is an agreement that can be made.

NAVY YARD TRAGEDY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there are no words that can ease the pain of the rampage and certainly the deaths involving a dozen human beings who

were killed yesterday at the Navy Yard. I hope it is some small comfort that this city, this institution, the U.S. Senate, and a whole Nation, mourn alongside them. To my knowledge, there is no explanation for the violence that occurred yesterday. My thoughts are with those who are suffering as a result of the loss of their loved ones as well as those people who are recovering from their wounds, and some of them are very serious. We wish them a speedy recovery. My heart goes out to all of the 16,000 military and civilian employees who work at the Navy Yard complex, as well as their friends and family members who were affected by this tragedy.

It was only a few days ago—and the Presiding Officer was here on that occasion also—when we as Members of Congress marked the anniversary of September 11, 2001, during a ceremony on the steps of the Capitol. We had a moment of silence here in the Senate. Yesterday's shootings were the worst loss of life in the Capitol region since those September 11, 2011, attacks which were centered around the Pentagon.

Last week's significant anniversary and yesterday's terrible violence are a reminder that life is fragile and precious. They are a reminder of the debt we owe to those who protect our freedom and our safety, whether they serve in the military or as first responders. The Sergeant at Arms, who is responsible for our safety, was certainly on the job yesterday. He is a dedicated police officer. That is his goal. I still refer to him as Chief Gainer. He was chief of the Capitol Police force before he took responsibility as the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. He has been a street officer for a long time. He could have done other things—he has a law degree; he is a well-educated man—but his responsibility is to take care of the Senate, and he does that very well.

I appreciate very much—I speak for the entire Senate—those dedicated police, fire, and rescue personnel who put their lives on the line to prevent a lot more loss of life on Monday. In particular, the city owes a debt of gratitude to a K-9 officer, a 24-year veteran of the Metropolitan Police force, a man by the name of Scott Williams who was hurt very badly in the shootings. I wish him a full recovery and thank him for his selflessness.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have to return to the business at hand. Since the moment President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act, making it the

law of the land and ensuring every American has access to quality health insurance at a price they can afford, Republicans have been on an absurd quest to undo this progress.

Republican Members of Congress were horrified when the U.S. Supreme Court said the law we call "ObamaCare"—the Affordable Care Act—is constitutional. That is what the Supreme Court said. In spite of this being the law of the land—and it is the law of the land—House Republicans alone have voted more than 40 times to repeal ObamaCare and are now threatening to shut down the entire government unless this Congress denies funding to implement this very constitutional law.

Under ObamaCare, Members of Congress and their staffs will be covered by exactly the same plans that will extend health insurance to millions of Americans next year. Five hundred thirty-five Members of Congress and 16,000 staff members are treated the same as other employees across America under the law. They are treated that way under ObamaCare, and rightfully so. Just as 150 million other Americans who get their health insurance through their jobs; that is, their employer, the Federal Government will share a part of the cost of that health care for us, for the 16,000 who work in the Capitol complex—as it has for all Federal employees for many decades. These are the people in Carson City, NV, Reno, NV, and Las Vegas, NV, who answer the phones and help people with problems involving Social Security, veterans' benefits, whether they can be buried at the beautiful cemetery we have in Fernley for veterans or the one in Boulder City where every day we bury lots and lots of people who are veterans.

These are the sorts of inquiries we get around the State of Nevada, and people work long hard hours to respond to those requests. They are dedicated public servants. That is to whom the junior Senator from Louisiana said, No thanks; they are not entitled to anything as far as being treated as everybody else is treated.

Even more directly to the point, Members of Congress and our staffs will live by the same rules and get their health care from the same exchanges as other Americans. But the junior Senator from Louisiana, I repeat, and a number of other misguided Republicans want to force Members of Congress and their staffs to live by a different set of rules. Although Senator VITTER has happily allowed the Federal Government to pay for a portion of his health insurance for many years as a Member of the House of Representatives and as a Member of the Senate, now he wants these 16,000 congressional workers to cover the full cost of health insurance.

With this background, one must ask: If Senator VITTER opposes the em-

ployer contribution for congressional staffers, does he oppose it also for the 150 million other Americans whose employers help pay their health insurance premiums? Does he want to discourage private employers from doing the right thing and providing their employees with affordable health insurance coverage? Is it what he wants, to do away with the insurance 150 million Americans have in America? Millions, I repeat, millions and millions of employers rely on this important benefit to attract the best and brightest and hardest working people they can find. Ending the employer contribution would effectively slap 150 million Americans with a big pay cut. Is that Senator VITTER's intention?

If Republican Senators believe they should bear the full cost of their own health insurance, they can, without any change in the law, decline Federal Government support in contributions and pay their own way. They can even encourage their own staffs to do so. Why they would want to do that, I don't understand, but they could do it. But for Senator VITTER and his Republican allies to end the contribution for 16,000 hard-working Federal employees—even after years of accepting the subsidy themselves—is hypocritical and mean-spirited.

In truth, this is only the latest Republican aim to derail the successful implementation of ObamaCare. Last November there was a big poll taken—it is called an election—where Americans overwhelmingly voted to reelect President Obama and to keep ObamaCare as the law of the land. That was the issue of the campaign. Who won that? The American people won, and President Obama won. As for ObamaCare—the constitutional law of the land—the American people said, Let's go ahead and do it. Americans have spoken very loudly and very clearly. It is time to move on to something else. It is the law and has been.

On October 1, about 25 million Americans who have no health insurance will—for the first time, most of them in their entire lifetime—be able to get insurance. What we have found in New York alone is that the insurance is going to save 50 percent of what it did before—it is 50 percent cheaper. In Nevada it is cheaper. It is the way it is all over the country.

According to the voters and according to the Supreme Court of the United States of America, ObamaCare is the law of the land. It is time for Republicans to mature—I guess you could say it a different way: to grow up—and recognize this is the law in America and has been for years. It is time for Republicans to stop denying reality.

The Senate should be passing other legislation. We should be passing an energy efficiency bill that will save taxpayers money, creating good-paying jobs—we need that—rebuilding roads

and bridges. I have said here before 70,000 bridges are in a state of disrepair. Yesterday a report came out that 8,000 of them are near collapse—8,000. We are not spending money to take care of that problem. Our highways, our roads, our dams need money. This is not money that goes to the Federal Government so you can have a truck that says: Federal Government building a road or fixing a dam. The money goes to the private sector. That is what we should be doing. For every \$1 billion we spend doing something about the highways, bridges, roads, dams, water systems, sewer systems, we create 47,500 high-paying jobs, and thousands of other jobs spin off from that. That is what we should be doing.

We should be facing the reality of climate change. Look what happened in Colorado. I talked to Senator BENNET yesterday. He said the floods were Biblical. In one part of Colorado, it rained 12 inches in 2 hours. I cannot imagine that. Fires all over the West. Climate change is here. I met with the Foreign Minister of Bangladesh. They do not know what they are going to do with the rise of the sea which is taking place. In that country there is no high ground. It is that way all over the world. The Marshall Islands—a thousand islands make up the Marshall Islands—55,000 people live there. These islands are being washed away with the new waves they have never seen before.

Climate change is here. We are doing nothing about it. They are spending all of our time, the American taxpayers' time, trying to repeal a law that has been in effect for 4 years.

We should be doing something about immigration reform. They talk about wanting to do something for the economy. Try passing immigration reform. It creates the positive \$1 trillion. It would reduce our debt by \$1 trillion. Let's do that. Let's fix our broken tax system.

We should be doing those things, not relitigating 4-year-old policy battles. But instead of working with Democrats to effectively implement ObamaCare or to pass new laws that benefit middle-class families, Republicans are obsessed with fighting a real old battle, and they are doing it at taxpayer expense.

Instead of standing with millions of Americans who are already benefiting from ObamaCare, Republicans are standing with insurance companies that would return us to a time when profits came before people. That is the way it works.

Since President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law, insurance companies can no longer discriminate against children with preexisting conditions. That is a good deal. If you have a child with diabetes, that boy or girl cannot be denied insurance. If they have epilepsy, they cannot be denied insurance. And in a short few months

all Americans will no longer be able to be denied insurance coverage because of a preexisting illness. They can no longer raise your rates for no reason. They can no longer drop your coverage if you get sick. That is the law today.

Today children can no longer be denied insurance, as I have indicated, because they are born with a disease or a disability. And that, I repeat, will soon be extended to all Americans no matter their age. And listen to this one: Very soon being a woman will no longer be considered a preexisting condition, as it was before ObamaCare passed.

In my relatively sparsely populated State of Nevada, tens of thousands of seniors have saved tens of millions of dollars on medicines because the Affordable Care Act has helped close the gap on prescription drug coverage.

More than 3 million young people, including 33,000 young Nevadans, have been able to stay on their parents' health policies until they are 26 years old—3 million. Hundreds of thousands of businesses that already offer their employees health insurance are getting tax credits for doing the right thing.

In a few months almost 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions—and what are some of these preexisting conditions; I talked about it generally a minute ago: high blood pressure, all kinds of things that happen as you get older—will have access to reasonably priced coverage, no matter their high blood pressure or their heart condition or whatever the situation might be. And 25 million Americans who cannot afford health insurance today will be offered health insurance through the exchanges.

Republicans have been trying for years to erase these gains and force millions of American families once again to rely on the most expensive care in America today, which is where? It is emergency rooms. Hospitals hate it because their bad debt goes up, and all it does is drive up the cost of insurance. The care is not as good as it would be if they could go when they first get sick. They go there out of desperation, and that is what I assume the Republicans want everyone to do. Everyone can go to an emergency room, but it is so expensive and does not do the trick.

So punishing hard-working congressional staff, who put in long hours because they believe in public service—that is, the work we do here in Congress—will not roll back the benefits of ObamaCare. Punishing congressional staffers will not prevent millions of Americans from gaining the health insurance they need and deserve next year. But it will hurt thousands of men and women, including Senator VITTER's colleagues and his own staff.

Instead of willfully denying that ObamaCare is the law or purposely trying to derail its implementation, it is time for Senator VITTER to help us im-

prove the law of the land and ensure every American has access to the kind of care Members of Congress enjoy already, as do 150 million other Americans who get health care through their employers.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

NAVY YARD TRAGEDY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning all of us are thinking about yesterday's tragic events at the Navy Yard, and we are also thinking, in particular, of the brave men and women of our military and the sacrifices they make day in and day out on our behalf.

Once again I would like to extend condolences to the families and friends of those who lost their lives or were injured in this terrible, terrible shooting. Know that your country is with you in these most difficult moments.

I would also like, again, to express sincere gratitude to all the first responders and the medical personnel and law enforcement officers from so many different agencies who worked together to keep all of us informed—and most of all safe—throughout the day.

CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, 226 years ago today about three dozen patriots helped form a more perfect union when they signed their names to a document that guides us still. The U.S. Constitution and the timeless principles that inform it have endured, ensuring liberty and freedom for the people of this country through war and peace, turmoil and prosperity.

So on this September 17, like every Constitution Day, we take a moment to reflect on just how fortunate we are to live in a nation that, unlike any other before or since, was founded on an idea. A big part of that idea is the fact that our rights come not from men but from the Creator, and that for this reason they cannot be taken away.

That is the context in which our Constitution was written, and it is the context of the Bill of Rights that was added to it, and it is just one of the things that makes America exceptional.

The first thing that every Senator, Congressman, or President does upon assuming office is take an oath to uphold the U.S. Constitution. On this Constitution Day I join my fellow lawmakers in recommitting myself to that solemn oath, to doing everything I can to ensure that the principles of constitutional self-government are adhered to and defended in Washington.

This glorious document that binds us is the guarantor of our freedom and the light that continues to guide our people.

Today we remember that with pride—and with optimism about the future of this great country.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period of morning business until 11:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling the next 30 minutes.

The Senator from Illinois.

IMPORTANT VALUES IN AMERICA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, flags across America are being flown at half-mast this morning because of the terrible tragedy which occurred out that door 1½ miles away yesterday.

Men and women who worked for our Department of Defense to keep America safe reported to work as usual on a Monday morning, and then tragedy struck. A gunman appeared with an assault rifle, several other weapons. At the end of it, 12 innocent people died, another dozen or so seriously injured.

This Capitol was in shock. It was locked down at some point to ward off the possibility there were other shooters and more danger outside. We watched as the people who worked at the Navy Yard and those who worked in adjoining buildings waited patiently for the police to do their important and courageous work. At the end of the day, they showed television footage of these employees being bused away from the Navy Yard to a safe metro location to return home—all but 12 of them who, sadly, lost their lives through this senseless gun tragedy.

We read the papers this morning trying to understand what could possibly motivate a person to do this. As we read the background of the shooter, it was clear there were moments in his life when he had used a firearm to shoot the tires of a car that he thought should not be parked in his driveway, shooting a gun in his own apartment that went through the ceiling to an adjoining apartment. Those sorts of things might have been warning signals. Questions are raised—How could a man with that kind of a background end up getting the necessary security clearance for a military contractor to

go into this Navy Yard, to be permitted to go into this Navy Yard? How did he get these weapons into this Navy Yard; an assault rifle and other firearms—questions that still remain to be answered.

God forbid we go on with business as usual today and not understand what happened yesterday.

What happened yesterday brings into question some important values in America. If we value our right for ourselves and our families and our children to be safe, if we value this Constitution, if we value the right of every American to enjoy their liberties with reasonable limitations, then we need to return to issues that are of importance.

There was an issue before the Senate several months ago—a bipartisan amendment offered by Senators MANCHIN and TOOMEY that would have taken an extra step to keep guns out of the hands of those who have a history of felonies or people who are mentally unstable. The vast majority of Americans think this is common sense. We can protect the right of law-abiding citizens to use guns in a responsible, legal way for sporting, hunting, self-defense, but we have to do everything we can to keep guns out of the hands of those who would misuse them: felons who have a history of misusing firearms; the mentally unstable who cannot be trusted to have a firearm.

But today we pause and reflect on the lives lost. I hope the lessons learned. I had a hearing scheduled this morning before the Senate Judiciary Committee on a controversial issue involving firearms. In light of what happened yesterday, in light of the uncertainty of our schedule today, I am rescheduling that hearing. It is an important one, and I want to say to those who are following it that it will be rescheduled. But at this point in time we have decided to postpone it for today, to another day in the near future.

HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let's talk for a minute about the Vitter amendment that is on the floor. One-half of all Americans have a common experience. The experience is this: They get health insurance where they work—one-half of all Americans. For virtually all of them, their employer pays for part of their health insurance premium and the employer gets a tax break. If you own a company and offer health insurance to your employees, we have what we call the employer's exclusion for health care benefits. In other words, what you pay for your employees' health insurance is excluded from your income for tax purposes. It is one of the most expensive exclusions in the Tax Code, but it is a valuable one because it encourages businesses to offer health insurance to their employees, which is important for those families, important for our Nation.

Of course, when it comes to the Federal Government, the same rule applies. The employer—the Federal Government—offers health insurance to its employees under what is known as the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Program. Eight million Americans, representing Federal employees and their families, get their health insurance through the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Program. It includes Members of Congress. We do not have a special health insurance plan. We have the same plan that millions of Federal employees have. And our staff enjoy those same privileges.

Well, now we are in a period of transition because of the new Affordable Care Act.

This Affordable Care Act says that from this point forward Members of Congress as well as their staff members will no longer be insured by the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program but instead will become part of the insurance exchanges that were created. These exchanges, which are going to be in virtually every State because of State sponsorship, Federal sponsorship, or shared responsibility, will offer health insurance plans across America so that those who currently do not have health insurance today will be able to apply for a plan under the insurance exchange. If they are extremely low-income individuals, they will get help—subsidies and tax treatment that will help them pay for their premiums. The notion is that no matter where you live you will have access to health insurance.

The health insurance offered by these exchanges and by every other company in America will change because this law—change for the better. Senator REID spoke about it earlier.

Preexisting conditions. How many of us do not have a preexisting condition or somebody in our family with a preexisting condition? Perhaps someone in our family was treated for cancer or diabetes or even a mental illness. In the past health insurance companies could discriminate against you and say: Sorry, we do not offer health care plans to cancer survivors. Well, that is no longer the case. This new law, the Affordable Care Act—so-called ObamaCare—says that health insurance policies from this point forward have to cover preexisting conditions not just in children but adults as well. The Republicans are saying: We want to repeal that. We do not want to put that new provision in the law. We do not want to require insurance companies to cover those with preexisting conditions.

There is another change in the law. Some insurance policies today have limits on how much they will pay. Well, I can tell you, be careful. If your health insurance plan says: We will cover your bills, say, up to \$100,000, be careful. You could go in tomorrow—or

someone in your family—and be diagnosed with a cancer condition requiring extensive medical care that far exceeds the \$100,000. Under ObamaCare there are no limits on health insurance protection. If you have a terrible illness or if someone in your family does, the insurance policy will cover you. The Republicans want to repeal this provision so that they can set limits on health insurance policy limits, which could literally bankrupt a family with a terrible medical condition with which they are trying to deal. That is one of the provisions in ObamaCare that the Republicans want to repeal.

The issue on the floor today is the Vitter amendment. Senator VITTER is from Louisiana. He came to the floor last week and he said: Since Members of Congress and their staffs are now going into these insurance exchanges, it is time for us to eliminate the employer contribution for Members of Congress and their staffs. They have to pay it all, 100 percent of the premium, unlike 150 million Americans who get insurance through their employer and the employee pays a portion of it.

When it comes to congressional staff and Members of Congress, no employer contribution, pay it all. Well, it turns out that is exactly the opposite of the way Senator VITTER voted on the floor of the Senate on an amendment offered by Senator GRASSLEY, No. 3564 on the Affordable Care Act. Senator VITTER voted, during the debate on this issue, to protect the right of congressional employees and others on the employer contributions. Now he has reversed himself. Now he says: No employer contribution. This is unfair. It is unfair to do this to the employees of the Senate as well as the Members. All we are asking is that this group of individuals be treated the same as every other American with health insurance through their employment.

My fear is that this is not the end of Senator VITTER's crusade against health insurance by employers. I think this is a first step. The next step could be to eliminate the employers' contribution for health insurance across the board. That would be devastating, absolutely devastating and fundamentally unfair to see workers across America—not just congressional employees, Federal workers, workers in the private sector—paying the entire premium with no employer contribution. That is a good way to eliminate coverage, not to expand it. We should be expanding health insurance coverage.

I listened to the Senator from Louisiana describe the employer contribution to health insurance as a Federal subsidy—a Federal subsidy. Well, I guess technically he is right because the Tax Code says to employers: We will give you special positive tax treatment if you offer health insurance. So the Tax Code does, in fact, give a subsidy to all employers who offer to pay

a part of their employees' health insurance premiums.

OK. I will accept that definition. But that is a worthy subsidy. Even though it is the most expensive provision in the Tax Code, it is a worthy subsidy because it encourages more health insurance. It makes it more affordable for working families in Louisiana, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, and across the United States.

If Senator VITTER is going to attack an employer's contribution to health insurance as a Federal subsidy we can no longer afford, then say it on the floor of the Senate. Let's have an up-or-down vote. I challenge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for working families across America—in the private sector, in the public sector, our congressional employees, even Members of Congress—to be treated the same. No special preference for Members of Congress but have employer contributions protected under the law regardless of whether you buy the plan in the private sector or in the public sector.

This is an important vote. I think some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so determined to end ObamaCare, so determined to put an end to this effort to reduce the cost of health insurance premiums and to make health insurance more available to people across America and basically a sound investment for your health insurance future—I think those Republicans who are determined to eliminate that have some questions to answer.

They want to eliminate the provision in ObamaCare that says parents can keep their kid under their health insurance policy until that young man or woman reaches the age of 26. Is it important? Well, do you have a son or daughter graduating college soon who cannot find a full-time job? Are you worried about whether they are going to have health insurance? They can stay on your policy, mom and dad, until they reach the age of 26. The Republicans want to repeal it.

Also, we have a prescription drug program for seniors. It is very popular. Part D says: We are going to help seniors pay for medicine so they can stay well and healthy and independent and strong and not end up in a hospital or convalescent senior center or a nursing home. In the ObamaCare bill, we extend the protection of this prescription program for Medicare recipients. The Republicans want to repeal that. How in the world can that be in our best interest for seniors—many of them on fixed incomes with limited savings—to have to pay more for their prescription drugs? Is that the Republican answer? It is not a good one if that is what they are proposing.

When it comes to quality health insurance that will not discriminate against people with preexisting conditions, when it comes to quality health

insurance that has to offer maternity benefits—hard to believe, isn't it, that health insurance plans before ObamaCare could exclude maternity benefits? One of our Senators this morning said that up to 60 percent of the policies do not cover the birth of a child. They have to now under ObamaCare. But the Republicans would repeal that requirement, leaving more women in a situation where they have to pay out of pocket for prenatal care and the delivery of a child. How can that be in the interest of a healthy America? We want moms, as soon as they know they are pregnant, to go see a doctor, go through ordinary prenatal care, have those healthy, happy babies who make such a difference in their lives. Is it important? I think it is. It is in ObamaCare. The Republicans want to repeal it. Why?

If they want to change some provisions, if they want to debate them and amend them, let's do it. You know, when it gets down to it, there is not a perfect law that has ever been passed. We can always change it for the better if we do it in good faith and in the democratic way. That is the way it should happen. But, instead, the House of Representatives—which the Presiding Officer served in before joining us here in the Senate—has voted 41 times to repeal ObamaCare—41 times. One time the Republican leader over there tried to change one provision, perhaps even improve it. His own Republican caucus turned on him and said: No, we do not want to improve it.

The last thing I want to say is this: Those who ignore history are condemned to repeat it. That is etched on the side of one of our buildings downtown here. The year was 1935. Franklin Delano Roosevelt looked around America and saw that the poorest group of Americans turned out to be elderly people, people who could no longer work and had nowhere to turn. Sadly, many of them had no choice—they went to live among poor people in a poorhouse or if they were lucky enough, their kids took them in. If you hear the story of your own family, they can remember back when grandma and grandpa moved in that spare bedroom because they could not work anymore and they had nowhere to turn.

So in 1935 Franklin Roosevelt said: Let's do something about it. Let's create an insurance plan. Here is what it says: You pay into this insurance plan while you are working. When you reach the age of 65, we will pay you at least some money each month to get by. They called this insurance plan Social Security. It was part of the New Deal under Franklin Roosevelt. It was pretty sensible but controversial too.

Do you know what the Republican reaction was to Social Security in 1935? Here on the floor of the Senate, there was a Republican filibuster to stop Roosevelt from implementing Social

Security. They would not let him open the Social Security offices he needed across America nor give him the staff. A Republican filibuster stopped it.

In 1936 the Republican candidate for President was Alf Landon, a progressive Republican Governor from Kansas. Alf Landon said: If I am elected President of the United States in 1936, my first act of office will be to repeal Social Security.

Then, when they started implementing it, the chamber of commerce here in Washington sent out notices to employers across America to put a notice in the pay envelope. It said: The 1 percent you are paying into Social Security, Mr. Worker, is never going to help you. You are never going to see a penny of it. The only way to stop it is to vote against this fellow named Roosevelt.

Does any of this sound familiar? Does this playbook sound like something you have seen recently? That is exactly what the Republicans are doing to the Affordable Care Act, to the effort by this Congress and this President to make health insurance more affordable, to make the policies more valuable, to help working families, and to try to make sure those who are uninsured have a chance to buy insurance because uninsured people get sick too. They go to the hospital. They get treated. When they cannot pay, we pay for it. We pay for it. Everybody in the health insurance plan pays more because those people in the hospital cannot afford to. If we bring more and more people into insurance coverage under ObamaCare, it is going to mean they accept the personal responsibility to buy insurance and their bills do not become our bills. Republicans want to repeal that. They are replaying the same script and same scenario we saw when they tried to abolish Social Security. Let's not let it happen. Let's move forward in a positive way on health insurance as more than just some privilege. From my point of view, it is one of the most basic rights of this country.

If you have ever been in a situation with a serious illness in your family and you had no health insurance, you will never forget it. It happened to me and my wife. We will never forget it as long as we live. I do not want to see another family in that situation. Repealing ObamaCare could create it. I hope we have the good sense to vote down the Vitter amendment and stand for good, affordable health insurance for working families whether they work in the private sector, the public sector, or Congress, and to make sure they have an employer contribution so that health insurance is affordable.

The Vitter amendment is a step back in time. It is a step back in time that will eliminate the protection of health insurance for literally thousands if not millions of Americans. That is not the

way to go. I would say to the Senator from Louisiana it makes no sense to the working families of America.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

NAVY YARD TRAGEDY

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wish to say a brief word about yesterday's tragic and senseless violence at the Washington Navy Yard.

The men and women who protect our Nation and the men and women in uniform and the thousands who serve the Department of Defense make enormous sacrifices for us. Facing a workplace gunman should not have been one of them. Those who have died, their wounded, their families, and loved ones are in our thoughts and in our hearts today.

SYRIA

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning to discuss another senseless act of violence and our Nation's response.

In the early morning hours of August 21, the Syrian military began firing artillery rockets into the suburbs east of Damascus, hitting neighborhoods held by opposition forces that had been fighting to end the brutal dictatorship of Bashar al Assad.

We know from the accounts of independent observers such as Human Rights Watch, the work of our intelligence services, and those of our allies, that many of these rockets were armed with warheads carrying sarin, a deadly nerve gas. We know these rockets were launched from areas under the control of Assad's regime, using munitions known to be part of Assad's arsenal, and into areas held by opposition forces. We know from the report of the U.N. weapons inspectors released yesterday that the weapons used, both the rockets and the chemicals themselves, were of professional manufacture, including weapons known to be in the Syrian Government's arsenal. There is no other source of this deadly gas except the Syrian Government. Nothing else makes any sense whatsoever.

President Obama declared that the United States would act in response to this threat to global security. He determined it was necessary to use American military force to degrade Assad's chemical capability and deter future use of such weapons by Assad or others. He did so because a failure to act would weaken the international prohibition on chemical weapons use. He did so because the failure to act could lead to greater proliferation of these weapons of mass destruction, including the potential that they could fall into the hands of terrorists and used against our people. He did so because if the use of chemical weapons becomes routine,

our troops could pay a huge price in future conflicts.

On September 4, a bipartisan majority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved the President's request for an authorization of the limited use of military force.

Faced with this credible threat of the use of force and in response to a diplomatic probe by Secretary Kerry, Russia—which had for more than 2 years blocked every diplomatic initiative to hold Assad accountable for the violent repression of his people—announced that Assad's chemical arsenal should be eliminated.

The agreement that followed requires Syria to give up its chemical arsenal on a historically rapid timetable.

Within a week Syria must fully account for its chemical weapons stockpiles and infrastructure. By the end of November, U.N. inspectors must be allowed to complete their assessments and key equipment used to produce chemical agents must be destroyed. All of Syria's chemical stocks, materials and equipment must be destroyed by the end of next year.

Any failure to abide by the terms of the agreement would lead to consideration of penalties under Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter, under which the U.N. Security Council may authorize among other steps "action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security." Regardless of U.N. action or inaction, the President retains the option of using force if Assad fails to fully comply.

This agreement is a significant step toward a goal we could not have achieved with the use of force. The authorization approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had the stated purpose of degrading Assad's chemical capability and deterring the use of chemical weapons by Assad or by others. What can now be achieved is more than degrading and deterring. We may be able to eliminate one of the world's largest stockpiles of chemical weapons.

We should have no illusions that achieving this outcome will be easy. First are the technical and logistical challenges. Many have expressed concern about the likelihood that Assad's stockpiles can be secured and disposed of as quickly as this agreement provides—by the end of 2014—especially given the dangerous security environment in Syria. I share these concerns. But accepting and addressing these challenges is a better course than not acting against the certain danger of leaving these weapons in the hands of a brutal dictator allied with Hezbollah, a dictator who has demonstrated a willingness to use them against civilians.

Some have expressed doubts that Assad and Russia will follow through on the agreement which was reached in Geneva. To address these doubts, we

must inspect, verify, and continue to hold open the option of a strike against Assad's chemical capability if he fails to fully abide by the Geneva agreement.

What I do not understand is why some of the same voices who called for the United States to get Russia to end its obstructionism now criticize the President for getting the Russians involved. I was disappointed to hear my Michigan colleague, Congressman MIKE ROGERS, make the irresponsible claim that this agreement amounts to "being led by the nose" by Russia. This contradicts his previous statements that we need to put pressure on Russia to get involved in a solution to the Syrian threat.

Chairman ROGERS has also said: "What keeps me up at night: We know of at least a dozen or so sites that have serious chemical weapons caches" in Syria, and stressed the urgency that "all the right steps are taken so that we don't lose these weapons caches and something more horrific happens."

Thanks to U.S. pressure and a threat to take military action in response to Assad's use of chemicals, the Russians are finally getting involved in getting Syria to respond. We have taken a major step toward securing these chemical weapons as Chairman ROGERS himself so strongly urged.

We need not rely on good intentions from those who have not shown good intentions in the past. It was the credible threat of the use of military force that brought Russia and Syria to the bargaining table. It is a continued credible threat of military force that will keep them on track to uphold the provisions of that agreement.

The President has made it clear, and rightfully so, that "if diplomacy fails, the United States remains prepared to act."

Secretary Kerry, standing right beside his Russian counterpart in Geneva, emphasized this agreement in no way limits President Obama's option to use force if it becomes necessary.

Many of our colleagues have stressed repeatedly in recent weeks that the credible force, the credible threat of military force, is essential to reining in Assad. I strongly agree. For the life of me, I cannot understand why those who have taken that position would now argue, as some of those same colleagues are arguing, that the Geneva agreement is somehow of little or no use because they say it somehow removes the option to use force. The Geneva agreement says nothing of that sort.

Their argument isn't just inaccurate, it is damaging to our efforts. Why would those who believe the threat of force is essential to keeping pressure on Syria and Russia want to argue it is no longer available? Why would those who have accurately said the United States does not need international approval to use its military forces now

argue the Geneva agreement leaves us in the position of needing to get international approval to use force in this case when the Geneva agreement does nothing of the sort?

Some have criticized the Geneva agreement for not doing more to aid the Syrian opposition. Russia and Syria tried to get an agreement from us to not support the opposition, but they failed to get that agreement from us in the Geneva agreement or anywhere else. Indeed, the administration is seeking ways to facilitate the additional support for the opposition that so many of us believe is essential.

I believe we should facilitate the provision of additional military aid to the opposition, particularly the vetted elements of Syria's opposition forces, including antitank weapons. Such aid will help the Syrian people defend themselves from the brutal Assad regime, furthering our goal of bringing a negotiated end to his rule.

I find it troubling that so much of the commentary on this topic has not dealt with substance and policy. Washington has been and always will be a political town, but we now reach the point where politics seems to be the only lens through which so many people around here view the most important and serious matters of the day, including national security.

Speculation as to motives, or about potential winners or losers, or who is up and who is down, misses the point. This is not an ice-skating contest with points awarded for style. What is important is our national security and whether this agreement advances it. Removing weapons of mass destruction from the hands of a brutal dictator—a preliminary outcome, yes, but real and tangible—is the direct result of American leadership.

A month, a year, or 5 years ago, an agreement to eliminate Assad's chemical weapons would have been seen as a significant gain for our security and for the world's security, not just for the President who achieved it but far more importantly, again, for the safety of our people, of our troops, and the entire world.

I hope as we continue with the hard work of implementing this agreement and as we seek an end to Bashar al Assad's rule, we can keep our eyes on those goals and skip the superficial political scorekeeping and inaccurate potshots that distract us from achieving those goals.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NAVY YARD TRAGEDY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, as I rise today, I wish to talk about the economy and the need to create an economic climate that strengthens the middle class.

Before I do, I wish to acknowledge, as have many of my colleagues, and to comment on the tragedy that occurred here at the Washington Navy Yard yesterday.

We are going to debate a lot of issues. The business of the country goes on and the business of the Senate goes on, but for the families of the victims of that tragedy yesterday, things stand still. It is important for all of us to take a moment to mourn with them the loss they have experienced and to extend our thoughts and prayers to their families and their loved ones. It is a horrible tragedy. As we continue the back-and-forth we have on the issues of the day, we will remember and keep those families in our thoughts and prayers.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the economy. The President has yet again this week—in fact, he gave a speech yesterday where he was pivoting back to the economy, a topic that millions of unemployed Americans haven't had the luxury of pivoting away from.

For most Americans, they are living this economy every single day in their personal lives. When the President talks about pivoting back to the economy, this has been a repivot, and a repivot many times. He talks about something else for a while and then talks about coming back to the economy. For the American people, the American economy is, was, has been, and will continue to be the issue for them and their families.

As the President steps up his rhetoric to try and convince a skeptical public that his policies have somehow helped our economy, I think it is important to point out that the President's policies, according to facts, simply aren't working.

The reality is participation in the labor force continues to decline. The August job numbers report a labor participation rate of 63.2 percent. This is the lowest participation rate since August of 1978, 35 years ago when President Carter was President.

What this means is if thousands of Americans haven't given up looking for work, the unemployment rate would be over 10 percent. We talk about the reported unemployment rate, which is 7.3 or 7.4—it has hovered around that range for a long time—but the real unemployment rate should include those who have quit looking for work. When you add that number in, the unemployment goes up to 10.6 percent.

In August the number of long-term unemployed—those people who have been jobless for 27 weeks or more—re-

mained roughly at 4.3 million people. Those individuals accounted for 37.9 percent of the unemployed. We are not seeing any improvement in the area of people who have been without jobs for a long period of time.

Worse yet, 60 percent of the jobs created this year were part-time jobs. We continue to see evidence that the President's policies, President Obama's policies, are leading to not the creation of full-time jobs but the creation of part-time jobs. In other words, Americans are having to work more than one job to make ends meet, therefore reducing the take-home pay for them and their families. This is another thing we have seen. Take-home pay has gone down in this President's time in office.

The American people understand the President's economic policies have fallen short. That is why, as you look at these various polls, most Americans—the majority of Americans—disapprove of the President's handling of the economy. The reality remains that this administration's policies are hurting jobs in our economy. The President's signature health care law is probably as much to blame for that as anything else.

As I talk to employers in my State of South Dakota and across the country, the recurring theme is the mandates, the requirements, all the new redtape associated—and the higher taxes with the President's health care law—are meaning higher taxes and fewer hours for American workers. According to Americans for Tax Reform, there are 20 new or higher taxes in ObamaCare that will hit American families and small businesses. As a result of these taxes and other policies in ObamaCare, the President's signature health care law significantly impacts what matters most to people, and that is their jobs and their ability to provide for their families. It is no secret that a good job is a critical part of the American dream, but this President's policies are putting that dream farther and farther out of reach for many Americans.

In fact, in selling the law, former House Speaker NANCY PELOSI declared at the time:

This bill is not only about the health security of America, it's about jobs. In its life, it will create 4 million jobs—400,000 jobs almost immediately.

The former Speaker's claims run completely contrary and counter to what we are seeing. People are working fewer hours. As the numbers I have presented before demonstrate, fewer people are actually even participating in the labor force. Americans are discouraged by the lack of economic growth and by ObamaCare's impact on employers. Their ability to offer quality jobs is taking its toll on our investment.

Only last week Investor's Business Daily reported that due to ObamaCare at least 258 employers cut work hours

or jobs so far. Meanwhile, according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 71 percent of small businesses say the law makes it harder to hire workers.

According to the July Fed Beige Book, the health care law has been cited as a job market concern. They quote from that report: "Several retailers reported that the Affordable Care Act would lead to more part-time and temporary versus full-time hiring."

The President's health care law is smothering employers in bureaucratic redtape, uncertainty, and taxes. Already more than 20,000 pages of regulations have come from the 2,700-page law. The time and cost of complying with these regulations places a serious burden on the ability to spend time and energy creating new jobs. Time and money that would be spent opening a new store, increasing hours, upgrading equipment, which would create more jobs, is instead being spent on lawyers and consultants who have to help small businesses interpret all of the regulations, all the requirements, and all the mandates created by this administration's health care law.

Poll after poll has shown that ObamaCare is extremely unpopular among a majority of Americans. According to a recent CNN poll conducted by ORC International, nearly 60 percent of Americans said they oppose the Democratic signature law. I would hope the President would begin to be honest with the American people about what this law truly means for jobs and our economy, and I would hope he would begin to listen to Americans. If he does, he will find what most of us have discovered a long time ago; that is, the American people don't want this and American employers and small businesses believe it will lead to fewer jobs and lower take-home pay for the people they employ.

I hope in the days ahead, as we focus on the economy—and if the President is sincere about his pivot back to the economy, he will take into consideration what really ails the economy; that is, excessive taxes, regulations, redtape, bureaucracy, mandates and requirements, many of which are associated with his signature achievement, which is the ObamaCare health care legislation.

What the country does not need right now is another tax increase. What the country needs right now is policies that will expand and grow the economy, that will reform our Tax Code in a way that lowers rates and makes us more competitive in the global marketplace and unleashes American energy in a way that gives us a competitive advantage over our foreign competitors. We can do all of that. All the President has to do is sign off, for example, on the Keystone Pipeline, which would create thousands of jobs immediately and many more once it is fully built and working.

It would also mean we do away with the onerous, burdensome requirements of the ObamaCare legislation and replace it with policies that make sense, that actually focus on what will give Americans more access to affordable health care in this country.

We need to reduce spending here in Washington, DC, and quit looking at every problem as an opportunity to raise taxes. That seems to be the Democratic solution for everything. Their budget proposed a \$1 trillion tax increase. The leader of the Democrats here in the Senate has said tax reform has to include \$1 trillion in new taxes. It is not revenue that is the problem here in Washington, it is spending. If we look at revenues, they are up \$284 billion in the first 11 months of this year. We don't have a revenue problem, we have a spending problem. We don't need another tax increase, we need policies that will lower the rates, that will get rid of the redtape and the regulations that are strangling our economy and allow our small businesses to create jobs that will make lives better for middle-class Americans and improve the take-home pay for every family in the country.

The job-killing mandates in ObamaCare are harmful to our economy, they are harmful to jobs, and it is time we delay or repeal it and replace it with commonsense alternatives. We believe that discussion needs to occur, and I hope the President will allow it to occur. It is time to focus on comprehensive, revenue neutral tax reform of our broken tax system, repeal the mandates in Obamacare, and get rid of a lot of the government redtape and regulations that are making it more difficult and more expensive for employers in this country—for small businesses—to grow jobs.

Those are the types of things that will get the economy unleashed, that will expand and grow the economy and create more jobs for ordinary working-class Americans who are out of work and will raise the take-home pay for families in this country, which would allow the quality of life and the standard of living to improve for every American family.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

NAVY YARD TRAGEDY

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, before I make my remarks, I would like to join Senator THUNE and others on the Senate floor who have expressed their compassion and their sympathy for the survivors and the victims of yesterday's terrible tragedy at the Washington Navy Yard. Yesterday was but another grim reminder of the dangerous society we live in, the danger that can confront all of us, and the need for all of us to be aware and do everything we

can to make sure our environment is secure and safe.

To those who were injured, those who sacrificed their lives, those whose loved ones were hit, may God bless their souls and may God bless them in their recovery during this period while dealing with this terrible tragedy.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN D. KNOX, JR.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, tonight in Marietta, GA, my hometown, there will be a celebration I cannot attend. There will be a celebration to honor 50 years of medical service to our community by Dr. John D. Knox, Jr. I hate it that I can't be there because he has been an important part of my life, but I would like to take a minute on the floor of the Senate to pay tribute to Dr. Knox and all those physicians who deliver health care to our people, our citizens in our States, our districts, and our country.

As I pondered what I would say about John Knox on the floor this morning, I was sitting in my office looking at the plaques and certificates all of us receive for various works we have done in public life, and it occurred to me, when you go into a doctor's office you will see a diploma and you might see a Norman Rockwell painting, but really the trophies and tributes to doctors are people walking around with two feet in our communities who have survived a terrible injury or a terrible disease and who are living a normal life because a physician, with his or her training, brought them back to life or cured a terrible problem.

Dr. John Knox has done that for 50 years in my community—50 years as an orthopedic specialist and orthopedic surgeon with Resurgens Orthopaedics, which is one of the largest orthopedic practices in the Southeast. In fact, one of those great trophies to John D. Knox, Jr., is my son Kevin, who in 1989 went through the windshield of a pickup truck on a rural road in south Georgia. He had a double compound fracture of his lower right leg. He landed in a ditch full of dirty water and lay there for 2 hours before help came. Fortunately, he didn't sever an artery, but he was in bad shape.

I got the call at 4 a.m. that no parent ever wants to get—the call that paramedics had my son, that they were on the interstate and did I want them to take him to Augusta Medical College or to Atlanta, GA, for treatment because nobody in rural Georgia had the facility to treat his injuries. I immediately asked them to bring him to Marietta, GA, to Kennestone Hospital, and to immediately call John D. Knox and ask him if he would meet my son at the emergency room. The next 6 weeks my son had four surgeries, all performed by John D. Knox. He had antibiotic therapy to make sure his bone

marrow did not get infected from lying in the ditch. For 8 months he got psychiatric and psychological help and home recovery with his mom, myself, doctors, and those physicians recommended by John Knox.

The great story is that the night before my son was injured, he started as defensive end for Walton High School. One year later, after this terrible wreck and recovery, he again started as defensive end for Walton High School. The miracle of medicine put my son back together, but if it wasn't for John D. Knox, my son might not be here today.

I wanted John D. Knox, a great doctor in Marietta, GA, to know that what he did in 1989 for my son and what he has done for countless thousands of citizens in my community for years and years never will go unappreciated and will always be recognized. I am glad my family was a part of his 50 years of service as a physician. God bless John D. Knox, and congratulations on his service to our great community of Cobb County, GA.

I yield the floor.

FISCAL ISSUES

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, yesterday the President indicated that we need to pivot back to the fiscal issues facing this country and facing Congress. This comes after a year with little sense of urgency on perhaps the most pressing and challenging domestic issue before us. Of course, issues such as Syria and foreign policy have to be addressed, but we have had a year in this Congress to address our fiscal issues knowing we were moving toward a drop-dead date fiscally of September 30, and here we are now, more than halfway through September, just beginning to take up these issues that will direct the fiscal future of this country. The clock is ticking away, and we have spent little time preparing for what is coming. But here we are once again careening toward another fiscal cliff.

The American people are sick and tired of this. I think the Senate and the Congress are sick and tired of doing this. Yet we find ourselves once again careening up against a deadline to provide funding to keep our economy moving forward and to keep our government providing essential services.

Clearly, we could all argue there are a number of things that don't need to be funded or can be postponed, but there are essential functions of the Federal Government that can't be handled any other way and must be funded. National security is one of those top priorities, along with homeland security. We continue to have issues in terms of providing safety for American workers in the workplace, such as the tragedy that occurred yesterday at the Naval Yard, and these all come under the rubric of providing law enforce-

ment and homeland security enforcement for our people.

These are essential functions of government, and unless we come to some agreement by the end of this month, we are going to shut all that down. Our troops won't get paid, our homeland security personnel won't get paid, and a whole number of other essential functions will not be able to take place. So we have a lot of work before us and very little time to do it.

We also know that very quickly—shortly after the end of this month—if we don't pass an ongoing resolution to provide funding while we work out some of our differences, we will also reach the national debt limit. We are going to have to address whether or not to raise it and, if so, how much to raise the current borrowing limit. Today we are looking at an unimaginable national debt of \$16.7 trillion, and it is growing every day. All of us who have seen the debt clock ticking away are astounded at the rate we spend and how much we have to borrow in order to cover our spending because the revenues do not match the spending. Washington has had this spending addiction for decades, as if money just falls from trees or can just be printed down at the Fed and we won't have to pay any financial consequences.

We have had 5 years of stagnant growth in our economy, timid progress that is not putting people back to work. Our economy is not working well. Yet we are still spending way beyond our means. That also has to be addressed. In the last 20 years Federal spending has grown 63 percent faster than inflation. So it is clear that without changes, mandatory spending, including net interest, is going to consume three-fourths of the Federal budget in just one decade. Almost half of that Federal spending will go toward Social Security and health care entitlements. In 2002 that percentage was 25 percent, and now it is 45 percent.

Far too little has been done to address this runaway spending train. Instead of waiting for a crisis to hit, instead of governing from one fiscal cliff to another, isn't it time we worked together on a plan to reduce our debt and curb the rate of mandatory spending? This is a matter of extreme importance. It can't be solved with a deal at the eleventh hour.

There has been a lot of talk around here about putting us on a path to fiscal solvency but no real action, and the clock continues to tick. I would like to ask the President and the Senate majority leader at what point they think we should start acting on a plan to reduce our debt—\$17 trillion, \$20 trillion, \$25 trillion? At what point, Mr. President, do we say this is unsustainable? This is driving us toward insolvency. We need to take action. How much red ink is too much?

When will the President draw a red line on debt and borrowing? When

pressed, the President says he actually has a fiscal plan: just continue to raise taxes, pass another one of his stimulus spending plans—the last one didn't work too well—and adopt his budget proposal that doesn't even have the support of his own party.

Clearly, the President is unwilling to lead on addressing our fiscal crisis. Absent his leadership, I am urging my colleagues in the Senate, Republican and Democratic, to focus on this important issue. Let's put something on the President's desk and ask him to either sign it or reject it. But let's stop waiting for the White House to come forward with a plan because their plan is going nowhere. It doesn't have the support of either side of this body, Republicans or Democrats. I am urging the majority leader to focus the Senate's attention on reducing our debt, growing our economy, and getting Americans back to work.

The best way to grow the economy and secure our country's fiscal future is by creating a long-term budget plan that focuses on restructuring mandatory spending programs, reforming our Tax Code, and cutting unnecessary Federal spending. This has been a mantra of mine ever since I came back to the Senate. I came back for this very reason, and here we are 3 years after the 2010 election, when the public was urging us to address this issue, and we still have not accomplished this task. It is because we have not had leadership from this President to address the underlying issues that are so plain, that are so evident, that are so consequential to our fiscal future. When we boil it down to what it means to American families, whether it be saving money to send their kids to college, getting a decent job after they graduate with a huge debt and being able to pay that back or getting middle-class people back to work who have been laid off for years, getting our economy moving again at more than a timid 1.8 percent or 1.5 percent, stumbling along after 5 years of recession—the policies, whether we think they are right, frankly, haven't worked. Isn't it time to deal with something everyone knows we need to deal with; that is, excessive spending, this addiction to spending, the plunging into debt that is holding us back from doing what we need to do.

I am committed to working toward a solution to address our debt, to strengthen our economy, and help provide full-time jobs for the millions of Americans who are without those jobs. It is time to stop procrastinating. It is time to start acting. It is time that the President and this Congress stop delaying the hard choices and start representing the American people who sent us.

It is so unfortunate that we cannot rely on the President—the leader of our country—to act. He has announced he

would not even discuss this incredibly important issue that determines the financial viability of our country. The President says: I will not negotiate with Congress on the debt limit. I will not negotiate with Congress on the resolution coming before us to fund the government going forward.

How does this provide results to the American people? How can we work on a plan to reduce the debt if the President refuses to even negotiate it? He is willing to negotiate with President Putin of Russia, but he refuses to negotiate with Congress on how we can address our rising debt. This isn't leadership. We can't rely on Putin to pull us out of this one.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF PATRICIA E. CAMPBELL-SMITH TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

NOMINATION OF ELAINE D. KAPLAN TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nominations of Patricia E. Campbell-Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, and Elaine D. Kaplan, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, we are voting on 2 nominees to serve 15-year terms in the United States Court of Federal Claims. The Court of Federal Claims is an Article I court that is authorized to hear monetary claims that arise from the Constitution, Federal statutes, executive regulations, or

contracts with the United States. We are finally voting on two well-qualified nominees for these positions, but we should also be voting on any of the 9 other Article III judicial nominees that are pending on the Executive Calendar.

As I have consistently noted, Senate Republicans have unnecessarily and persistently delayed nominees on the floor throughout this President's tenure and today's vote is another example. Rather than moving these two uncontroversial Article I nominees by unanimous consent, we are forced to take up scarce time on the Senate Floor, when we know that both of these nominees will be confirmed by overwhelming margins. There is no good reason why we could not also vote to confirm the consensus and non-controversial Article III nominees on the Calendar. One effect of these unnecessary delays is that for the first time in nearly 2 years, our Federal district courts are again facing what the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service calls "historically high" vacancies. This means that there are now more seats empty on the districts courts than there were during 90 percent of the time during the 34 years after the Ford Administration. Despite this, judicial nominees languish on the Executive Calendar.

The two women we are considering today for the Court of Federal Claims are highly qualified, and their nominations have been stalled unnecessarily. Patricia Campbell-Smith has served as a Special Master for the United States Court of Federal Claims since 2005 and as Chief Special Master since 2011. Ms. Campbell-Smith previously served as a law clerk to Emily Hewitt, chief judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, from 1998 to 2005, as an associate in private practice at the firm of Liskow & Lewis from 1993 to 1996, and again from 1997 to 1998. She served as a law clerk for Judge Sarah Vance of the Eastern District of Louisiana from 1996 to 1997, and for Judge Martin Feldman of the same court from 1992 to 1993.

Elaine Kaplan is currently the General Counsel for the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, and has served as the Acting Director of the Office of Personnel Management since April 2013. She previously served as Senior Deputy General Counsel and in other legal capacities for the National Treasury Employees Union from 2004 to 2009, and as the Senate-confirmed head of the U.S. Office of Special Counsel from 1998 to 2003. From 2003 to 2004, Ms. Kaplan served in private practice as a counsel at Bernabei and Katz PLLC. She has also served as a staff attorney for the State and Local Legal Center in Washington, D.C., and as an attorney with the Office of the Solicitor of the U.S. Department of Labor. The Senate Judiciary Committee reported these nominations to the Senate by voice vote on June 6, 2013.

As we vote on these nominees today, it is also important that we begin taking steps to address the urgent needs of our Federal judiciary. Last week, Senator COONS chaired a hearing before the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts to consider these urgent needs. At that hearing, we heard testimony from a Federal judge from the District of Delaware, who stated that while she loved her job, she felt sorry for the judges who were just coming on because of the daunting caseload that many of these judges would be facing. A law firm partner testifying on behalf of the American Bar Association explained that the shortage of judges and resources were leading to harmful delays in resolving cases brought by individual civil litigants and businesses.

These delays have a real life impact on the American people and the economy. It does not benefit anyone if litigants have their cases delayed for months and months because our Federal courts are understaffed. When an injured plaintiff sues to help cover the cost of his or her medical expenses, or when two small business owners disagree over a contract, they should not have to wait years for a court to resolve their dispute. Americans are rightly proud of our legal system and its promise of access to justice and speedy trials. This promise is embedded in our Constitution.

Sequestration has also had an especially damaging impact on the Federal judiciary. I continue to hear from judges and other legal professionals about the serious problems that sequestration presents. Chief Justice John Roberts said in July that these cuts "hit [the judiciary] particularly hard . . . When we have sustained cuts that means people have to be furloughed or worse and that has a more direct impact on the services that we can provide." We must look to streamline our Federal budget wherever we can, but we should do so with care and not simply cut indiscriminately across the board. The Federal judiciary's budget takes up substantially less than 1 percent of the entire Federal budget. That is correct. We have the benefit of the greatest justice system in the world for less than 1 percent of our budget. Yet, we refuse to provide this co-equal branch with the adequate resources it needs. Let us work to reverse the senseless cuts to our legal system from sequestration so that we can help our coequal branch meet the Constitution's promise of justice for all Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

VOTE ON CAMPBELL-SMITH NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of

Patricia E. Campbell-Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON KAPLAN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on the Kaplan nomination.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Elaine D. Kaplan, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims?

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) would vote "aye."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 202 Ex.]

YEAS—64

Alexander	Hagan	Murphy
Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Begich	Hatch	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Portman
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blunt	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Isakson	Reid
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kaine	Sanders
Cardin	King	Schatz
Carper	Klobuchar	Schumer
Casey	Landrieu	Shaheen
Chambliss	Leahy	Stabenow
Chiesa	Levin	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Corker	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCasikill	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Franken	Mikulski	
Gillibrand	Murkowski	

NAYS—35

Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Coburn	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Crapo	Kirk	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	

NOT VOTING—1

Baucus

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid on the table, and the President will immediately be notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session. The Senator from Arkansas.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. PRYOR. I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 p.m. the Senate be in a period of morning business until 2:30 p.m., with the time controlled by Senator UDALL of Colorado and Senator BENNET; further, that at 2:30 p.m. the Senate resume consideration of S. 1392.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:37 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be a period of morning business until 2:30 p.m., with the time controlled by the Senator from Colorado.

The Senator from Colorado.

COLORADO FLOODS

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I thank the Chair for the recognition, and I rise today to talk about the unimaginable losses all of us in Colorado have experienced over this last week.

While much of the Nation's attention was focused on Syria or on the activities here in Washington, those of us in Colorado watched rain fall for 1, 2, 3, and 4 days straight with no end in sight. Creeks, such as the one that runs behind my home in Eldorado Springs, swelled. Culverts, such as those in Commerce City, quickly filled with rushing water. Rivers, such as the Big Thompson near the beautiful town of Estes Park, turned into walls of water that threatened entire communities. From the foothills of the Rocky Mountains to the Eastern Plains, rivers overtopped their banks—crumbling highways, drowning family homes, and transforming entire farms into lakes.

Many Americans have seen photos like this one that show the widespread and indiscriminate path of the floodwaters. In some places even today entire communities are still underwater, with families and homes uprooted by the ferocious strength of nature.

We say that water makes the West possible, but this past week Mother Nature gave us rain for 5 straight days, and now at least eight people are dead and hundreds are still missing or in

need of rescue. We pray that we find every single one of those missing persons alive and in good health.

As of today the President has issued major disaster declarations for 4 counties and 15 counties are in a state of emergency, where lifesaving rescue efforts are still underway. In these areas active search and rescue operations are being conducted 24 hours a day by the Colorado National Guard, local police and fire departments, and rescue teams flown in from across the State and around our country. At least 19,000 homes have been damaged or destroyed. Several towns, such as Jamestown and Lyons, have been washed out and lack even the most basic public services. The town of Estes Park, which I mentioned earlier, the gateway community to the Rocky Mountain National Park, has literally been cut off from the rest of the State because the two major highways to it have literally been destroyed and the only access road will soon be closed for the winter.

There are some wonderful, inspiring stories that have come out of these events that we couldn't possibly comprehend or predict, and I want to start with the National Guard.

The National Guard has been amazing, doing outstanding work and rescuing thousands of Coloradans who have been affected by this disaster. They tell me that more people have been rescued by air in the past few days than at any time since the devastation we saw with Hurricane Katrina.

We saw—Senator BENNET, who is here with me, and I, along with the Governor and many members of our congressional delegation—the devastation from these floods with our own eyes. Just a few days ago—Saturday, to be exact—Senator BENNET and I joined others to fly over flooded areas in Boulder and Larimer Counties with a Colorado National Guard unit. At one point, as we circled over an area, we spotted a couple of families waving for help. We were able to land and be a part of the effort that brought them out of one of those isolated situations. That experience impressed upon me the very human side of this disaster.

As we all know, behind these graphic images being shown on TV are the lives of thousands of Colorado families, some forever changed. While so much of this disaster has taken on the grand proportions of a historic disaster, those whose lives have been affected by this flood have endured it on a very personal scale. I think this photograph says it all. It is the family who has to dig through mud and debris just to get into their kitchen or the older couple who returns from the evacuation to see their lifelong home completely destroyed or even, as I mentioned earlier, the extended family members who sit by the phone waiting for a call from a missing aunt, a niece, a child, or a friend. These are the very human faces of this tragedy.

This is a tragedy from which we can't recover alone. The outpouring of support from our friends and neighbors has been crucial to early response efforts, and this generosity will only strengthen us as we begin to recover. After all, there is no "i" in Colorado, and it is this strong sense of community which will allow us to recover from this disaster and to rebuild stronger and more resolute than before.

We are also going to rely on the full support of our Federal partners. I have long supported disaster aid, such as during Hurricanes Sandy and Katrina, as well as when we have experienced other countless acts of God, and now it is time for us to come together as one Nation and rebuild.

This will not be fast. It will not be easy. Many of our narrow mountain highways that had been carefully built through steep canyons have been destroyed and washed downstream. These highways, such as those in the Presiding Officer's State, are the economic basis for our Mountain State. Without them, trade and movement of any kind comes to a complete standstill.

I took this photo as we flew over what looks to be a river, but it actually used to be a stretch of U.S. Highway 34 outside of Estes Park. That major east-west highway is gone. In looking at this photograph and seeing what Senator BENNET and I and many others saw on Saturday, it is one of those "oh my God" moments over and over again. Mother Nature has literally rewritten the map. This isn't an isolated incident in this canyon. There are dozens of these washouts, as we see here.

That is why I am going to fight in this Congress for full Federal support for recovery and rebuilding efforts. I am confident the support will be there, just as it was for so many others in their time of need.

In the meantime, individuals and businesses that are still dislocated or figuring out the extent of their damage must take action. So I want to share some advice I have received from FEMA and the other agencies involved.

If your home was damaged because of the storms of the past week, please go to DisasterAssistance.gov to view Federal assistance that may be available to you and to submit your claim. So that is right here—DisasterAssistance.gov. I urge everybody to go there and enroll, if you will, on that Web site.

If you operate a small business that has been affected by the flooding, you should register your claim with the Small Business Administration by going to DisasterLoan.SBA.gov. Again, if you have a small business and you have been affected by the flooding, go to this Web site: DisasterLoan.SBA.gov.

If you are just looking, as so many people are, for a way to help the people

suffering from this disaster, go to HelpColoradoNow.org, where the State of Colorado has pooled resources to assist those in need.

Madam President, as I conclude, again I want to reference that in so many ways the history of our part of the Nation—the West—has been a story of water, but now that very resource that is our lifeblood is writing a new chapter in our history as it runs uncontrolled over every road, field, and structure in its path. But we are Colorado tough and we are rugged cooperators, and our spirit of strengthened independence has seen us through the most trying of times. It will see us through these days of loss and hardship.

I thank the Chair for her attention and her support, and I yield the floor to my colleague and friend MICHAEL BENNET.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I would like to thank my colleague MARK UDALL for summarizing so well what we are facing out in Colorado. I thought I would share a few of my thoughts too.

As Senator UDALL said, our State is in the midst of unprecedented flooding that has wiped out entire communities in over a dozen counties across Colorado. Last week rain began to fall across our State, across the Colorado Front Range, and it didn't let up. A lot of reports have termed this historic, but to get your head around the scale and scope of the damage it is important to express what that means in hard numbers.

In the course of 1 week, 21 inches of rain fell in parts of Boulder, including over 9 inches on September 12 alone. The previous alltime high for a single day in Boulder was 4.8 inches in 1919, and they have kept records since 1893. The average annual precipitation in Denver is 14.9 inches—for an entire year. On September 12, 11.5 inches poured down in Aurora. Just to give a sense of the order of magnitude, that is almost as much rain as it typically gets in 1 year—in 1 day. It was the same story all across the Colorado Front Range. The result was flooding, destruction, and tragedy on an unprecedented and unmanageable scale.

Based on the latest estimates, over 17,000 homes were seriously damaged, over 1,500 homes were completely destroyed, and over 2,300 agricultural properties were flooded. In just Larimer County alone, they estimate that 200 businesses were destroyed and 500 more were damaged. At least 30 highway bridges were destroyed, and at least 20 more were seriously damaged. Hundreds of miles—hundreds of miles—of major roads have been washed away, as Senator UDALL said. The floodwaters consumed more than 2,000 square miles across 15 counties along the Front

Range—an area about twice the size of Rhode Island. Because the rain is just finally letting up and emergency officials are only beginning to measure the magnitude of this rain, these numbers could easily go up, and they could go up a lot.

As recently as yesterday morning, 4 days after the flooding reached a crisis, over 1,000 Coloradans are still stranded and awaiting evacuation, with hundreds still not accounted for. Tens of thousands were forced to evacuate, and many had to abandon their homes within minutes, grabbing whatever they could carry and wading through rising waters to seek shelter and safety. Most tragic of all, eight Coloradans are either confirmed or presumed dead as a result of this storm. Those are just some of the numbers and a taste of the pain this disaster has brought to cities and counties across our State.

As Senator UDALL mentioned, over the weekend I joined him and Governor Hickenlooper and others on a helicopter tour of the damage, and from the air the scope and scale of the destruction boggles the mind. Here is some of what we saw. These photos were taken from the Denver Post and other media.

Here is an image showing dozens of vehicles flooded in Greeley, CO.

Here is a home and a car stranded after a flash flood destroyed a bridge near Golden. Dozens of other bridges also collapsed.

This is a picture of the Big Thompson River washing out the Loveland Water Storage Reservoir.

In this picture, young Casey Roy, 9 years old, is looking through a window into her family's basement under 3 feet of water. And there are thousands of families in Colorado just like Casey's.

Finally, this image shows the Big Thompson River overflowing and tearing apart Colorado U.S. 34 in the Big Thompson Canyon—another example of the damage to the infrastructure across our State.

Madam President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No time is remaining.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. I won't go on too much longer, but in addition to showing these images, I do want to pass along a few of the stories we are hearing from Colorado families from the past week.

In Jamestown, a small mountain community of just a few hundred people in the mountains northwest of Boulder, a mudslide destroyed the home of 72-year-old Joey Howlett, a pillar of that community. It killed him. In the hours that followed, Jamestown residents pooled their resources so that no one was without food or shelter. The town, isolated from outside assistance, was literally split in

two by the flood, so they rigged a pulley system to carry food, medicine, and supplies across the rising waters to fellow townspeople.

Just outside of Lyons, CO, four adults, three children, and two dogs had to scramble up hills and across ledges with no trails to escape the floodwater. At one point they literally had to make a human chain across waist-deep water so nobody would be carried away. These are a few of the thousands of stories from across our State.

We know these floods are devastating. We know the loss some Colorado families feel today is beyond words. We know some have lost loved ones, and many others have lost homes and businesses that took them decades to build. But stories such as this remind me Coloradans are resilient, that the worst disasters often bring out the best in our neighbors. All across the State we have seen Coloradans of different ages, backgrounds, and beliefs pull together and help each other get through this massive storm. We saw real heroism a thousand times a day as first responders and National Guardsmen risked life and limb to carry the young, the old, the vulnerable, and the injured to safety.

I close by saying thank you to the FEMA Administrator for his prompt response to our request to declare a disaster. He would not let me leave the floor without saying that if you are in Boulder, Weld, Adams, or Larimer Counties, and impacted, you can go to disasterassistance.gov or call 1-800-621-FEMA to register for disaster assistance.

As we move from rescue to recovery, frustration and enormous challenges lie ahead. We know in the coming weeks, months, and even years Colorado is going to face a lot of rebuilding, and we will rise to this occasion. We will build it back better than it was before it was destroyed. We are going to fight every day for Colorado families, many of whom have lost everything, to make sure they are getting the support they need.

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1392, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1392) to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Wyden (for Merkley) amendment No. 1858, to provide for a study and report on standby usage power standards implemented by States and other industrialized nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT CORRECTION

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, it is one thing for a politician to say he misspoke and another for most ordinary people to say they got it wrong.

I made a statement on the floor of the Senate earlier this morning which turns out was not entirely accurate, and I would like to clarify it and correct it for the RECORD.

I was recounting the history of the Social Security Program created by Franklin Roosevelt in 1935, and recounted that it faced a filibuster in the Senate. I mistakenly believed it was a Republican filibuster when in fact it was a filibuster by Senator Huey Long, a nominal Democrat, who was filibustering because of his support of certain agricultural subsidies. I want the RECORD to be clear the filibuster to delay or in any way impact the implementation of Social Security was in fact by Senator Long, not a Republican filibuster.

I also note the information I used on the floor was derived from a book which I am reading entitled "Citizens of London" by Lynne Olson, and it is no reflection on her that I got that fact wrong. I remembered it wrong when I spoke to it on the floor.

The Washington Post is going to go to great lengths tomorrow to explain my other errors in my statement, and I acknowledge I could have done more research before coming to the floor, but I stand by the premise that the notion we are somehow going to filibuster the Affordable Care Act to delay its implementation is not in the best interests of the United States. If this bill or law needs amendment or repair, let's do it on a bipartisan basis, rather than voting 41 times, as they have in the House, to abolish it.

I also believe it is valuable for this country to face the cost of health care. If we are going to deal with America's debt and deficit, we have to acknowledge that 60 percent of it relates to health care costs. The Republican side has not come up with any alternative to deal with this health care crisis. We believe the President's legislation—which I proudly supported—is a step in the right direction. It can be improved. I will work to improve it. But simply saying we are not going to allow it to be implemented is not a positive effort to improve the situation in America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, as bipartisan discussions go on over the next hour or two on the important Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency legislation, I wish to take a few minutes to outline where we are, why this bill is

so important, and how it is going to affect energy policy deliberations generally.

I appreciate the work of colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I see Senators from both sides who I believe would very much like to see Democrats and Republicans work on an agreement to move forward on the Shaheen-Portman legislation.

When you look at this bill, it is almost the platonic ideal of how consensus legislation ought to work in the Senate. You have in effect a bipartisan Energy and Natural Resources Committee. We are very pleased the Presiding Officer has joined the committee very recently.

This bipartisan committee, taking a piece of bipartisan legislation authored by Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, two of our most thoughtful Senators—took their bill to the floor of the Senate and hour after hour the bill got more bipartisan, starting with the distinguished Senators INHOFE and CARPER, who came with a thoughtful amendment with respect to thermal energy. The list went on and on. Senatorial pair after senatorial pair came to the floor and said they wanted to show law-making 101 is Democrats and Republicans working together in a bipartisan way and to respond to what we have heard Americans say all during the summer break. No matter what part of the country you are from, the message was the same: Go back and deal with the important issues for the economy. Let us expand the winner's circle in a middle-class-driven economy. That is what this legislation does. It is going to help create jobs, it is going to allow consumers to save money through practical energy savings, and it is going to increase American productivity.

It is an extraordinary coalition that has assembled for Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN's legislation: Business Roundtable, National Association of Manufacturers, and environmental groups, public interest organizations—an incredible breadth of support for this bill.

What I have been struck by in discussions, particularly over the last 24 hours, is this question: OK, the Senate is now finally on energy legislation. We actually did a major bill right before the August recess, the hydropower bill. Hydropower is the biggest source of clean power in the country right now, 60,000 megawatts, essentially, of potential production delivery out of that legislation. But this is the first bill to actually be on the floor of the Senate since 2007.

A number of Senators have said we have got this huge pent-up demand to work on energy, and now we have scores of amendments coming in on this bill—perhaps as many as 60 amendments that Senators want to offer. Obviously, we could probably be here

until New Year's Eve working on this legislation if we have scores of amendments coming in. What I have tried to tell Senators is, We can't do everything under the Sun—literally and figuratively—with respect to this bill and still be able to move on to other subjects. We would not be able to deal with the continuing resolution and a whole host of other issues the Senate has to tackle. So there has to be some limits.

My hope is that agreement can be worked out on several of the issues Senators have felt most strongly about. Then if Senators REID and MCCONNELL can work out an agreement to have a finite number of amendments that will address energy issues, hopefully bipartisan, we can then move to a vote on energy efficiency. It seems to me there is no reason why, theoretically, that could not be done this week. If we have votes on a couple of these issues through a procedural agreement that would address what Senators have been debating over the last few days and then the leaders come up with a finite list of amendments on the other issues, we could finish this bill this week. I think it is important for the institution to do so.

I say to Senators who want to debate a variety of energy issues that deal with, for example, the EPA, we can't do all of those issues on this bill. The energy committee doesn't have jurisdiction over those issues. Those are going to come up. On some of what Senators are most concerned about, the government hasn't even acted yet. In other words, it is one thing to have a response from the Senate after an agency has acted. On some of these matters, the agency hasn't even acted yet. So it ought to be possible to find a path forward that would allow for votes on several issues that have been debated since the middle of last week. I think there is a way to do that if we can get an agreement on a finite list of additional amendments so both sides could have some other questions aired and we could vote on energy efficiency.

The reality is on the question of energy efficiency, those who are most knowledgeable on the subject say our country has plenty of room for improvement. As of 2011, our country ranked ninth out of the top 12 global economies in the amount of energy it uses to generate every dollar of goods and services it produces. This is what is commonly known as energy productivity. This is not a hypothetical exercise. As of 2008, industries consumed about one-third of the total U.S. energy use. The biggest users were chemicals and petroleum refining, pulp paper, iron and steel, and obviously other important industries are energy intensive as well. A lot of those employers know using less energy means lower costs and higher margins. Especially larger companies are in a posi-

tion to take the steps that will allow them to tap those financial gains. But the small and medium-sized companies often don't have the technical expertise to know about which upgrades are going to make the biggest difference.

Here we have this bipartisan bill, and without putting any mandates on the private sector—not a single mandate on the private sector—this bill takes three steps that can help our small companies—the kind of company that dominates Oregon and Wisconsin and others as well. With this legislation, these small companies are going to be able to be more competitive.

First, the bill tells the Energy Department to reach out to the small and medium-sized businesses and make their experts available so the small businesses can learn directly what the commercially available energy-efficient technology is in their area that will allow them to become more competitive.

Second, it creates rebate programs to encourage manufacturers to replace some of their inefficient equipment, particularly motors and transformers. These are two pieces of equipment in particular that have long service lives and often get rebuilt instead of replaced because of the high cost of replacement.

Finally, the legislation establishes a program called Supply Star to recognize companies that have successfully made their supply chains more efficient—once again, voluntary, modeled after the ENERGY STAR Program. I offer that in this debate about what the role of the government is in an “all of the above” energy policy, these kinds of approaches that have a market-driven orientation, that are voluntary in nature, are ones that I think are going to allow our country in the days ahead to keep ahead of the competition.

In wrapping up, we do have, apparently, over 60 amendments filed. A significant chunk of them are not on the topic of energy efficiency. I see that the distinguished Senator from Ohio is on the floor, Senator SHAHEEN is on the floor, as are others who have strong concerns and are going to look to see if we can put together a bipartisan approach over the next few hours. I ask Senators to focus on what is doable, which is to have votes on the several issues that have been debated over the last few days, and then come to a finite agreement on the rest of the issues that would be offered—hopefully by colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Then we can vote, quaint as the idea might be, on an energy efficiency bill, which is the topic that has been before the Senate since the middle of last week.

I note that the Senator from Ohio is on the floor. He brought a good bill, with Senator SHAHEEN, to the floor in the middle of last week. It got better

with the Inhofe-Carper amendment on thermal energy; the Landrieu-Wicker amendment, which helps us make better use of the green building certification system; the Hoeven-Pryor amendment that allows the continued use of grid-enabled water heaters to make utility management programs more efficient; the Sessions-Pryor and the Landrieu-Wicker amendments that reduce regulatory burdens on testing consumer products; the Bennet-Ayotte amendment on commercial buildings; the Pryor-Alexander amendment to look at how the review process works in terms of planning our energy future; the Isakson-Bennet amendment to look at home efficiency during mortgage underwriting.

When you think about this, the reality is you seem to know more about the energy efficiency of the products you have around your house, such as a toaster, than you do about a major—really an extraordinary purchase, such as a home. So we have a bipartisan duo in the Senate, Senator ISAKSON and Senator BENNET, wanting to address it. It is a terrific amendment, in my view.

Then there is the Bennet-Coburn amendment and the Udall-Risch amendment—saving taxpayers money by saving energy in the Federal computer data centers—and Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator HOEVEN trying to make our nonprofits make better use of their energy because with that tax status it is hard to qualify for some of the opportunities to save energy.

I could go on, but it just highlights how a bipartisan committee took a bipartisan bill from Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN and then a big group of bipartisan Senators made it better. And that is what we could pass, and we could do it this week.

For all the Senators who have said there is this pent-up demand since the Senate has not been dealing with energy since 2007, I say the only way we can really get to all those topics is to pass a bill such as this that does have a finite list of amendments, and then let's vote on Shaheen-Portman.

Several of my colleagues are on their feet.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee regarding this Energy bill and his suggestion of a way forward. We did have a good debate last week—not just on the underlying legislation but also, as he indicated, on seven different bipartisan amendments. I know we have a couple of colleagues interested in coming to the floor today to talk about additional amendments. We have an opportunity to actually come together as Republicans and Democrats with a good bill but to improve it through some of these amendments that have been discussed on the floor.

We do need a way forward. We need to know we are going to have the opportunity to have good debate on these issues, to have votes on these issues. Specifically, I know Senator VITTER is going to speak in a minute on his amendment. I hope he will be given a vote on his amendment. I understand there is an interest in doing that and perhaps allowing the other side to have their point of view expressed as well, along with his vote. If we can have that move forward, my understanding is that then we would be able to agree to a series of amendments, perhaps an equal number on each side.

I am looking at a list here of about a dozen amendments that are truly bipartisan. I am looking at another list of maybe 20 amendments that people on our side of the aisle are interested in offering, some of which are directly related to energy, some of which are not. I am hopeful we can come up with some time agreements that are reasonable and come up with a list that makes sense. The alternative is for us to turn our backs on an opportunity here to help grow our economy, to reduce our imports of foreign energy—specifically oil. We will miss an opportunity to save taxpayers a bunch of money by forcing the Federal Government to be more energy efficient, to practice what it preaches.

Finally, we have an opportunity before us to have a cleaner environment and to have one of the important legs of an “all of the above” energy strategy not just debated on the floor but actually passed by the Senate and would then go to the House, where there is a lot of interest on both sides of the aisle in together doing something comparable, and go to the President's desk for signature and actually be able to move the country forward in the way I think is needed, which is a national energy plan that takes into account producing more energy, as we talked about last week. I am interested in ensuring that we use the resources we have here in the ground in America but also using that energy more efficiently. It makes too much sense for us to allow this opportunity to go by.

I am hopeful that even in the next few hours here we can come together with a list of amendments that make sense, that we can move forward by allowing the Senate to express its view on the Vitter amendment and other amendments on both sides of the aisle that come forward but also move this underlying legislation forward at a time when, frankly, we need a little bipartisanism around here, at a time when we seem to be gridlocked on so many big issues. Maybe by finding a way forward on the relatively narrow issue of energy efficiency—one where there is a lot of consensus, one where there is a lot of common ground, frankly—we can find a model for dealing with some of the bigger issues.

We do have some time this week to do this; however, the continuing resolution is likely to come over from the House soon. I hope it will because we have to deal with that issue before the end of the month.

My urging of my colleagues is, if you have not already come over to talk about your amendment, please do so today, understanding that you will not be able to offer it in an official manner. You will be able to talk about it, which will help expedite the process later as we begin moving on these amendments, which I hope we will do again even after coming up with this agreement today. And then if you have an amendment you do not think is on this list, please be sure to tell us right away.

I do think getting this across the finish line should be something Republicans and Democrats alike can agree to. I am not suggesting that everybody is going to vote for it, but I think everybody should be willing to let us have a chance to move to this legislation.

By the way, it is endorsed by over 260 groups, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which decided to key vote the legislation late last week. As they looked at some of these amendments and the underlying bill, they thought it was important enough to key vote it. But it is not just the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, it is the Alliance to Save Energy, which is a group that has worked on this legislation with us for almost 3 years now, and it is also the National Association of Manufacturers and the environmental groups, including NRDC. It is an unusual combination when you have business groups and environmental groups saying: This makes sense. It helps make our economy more competitive, helps create jobs, and gets us away from our dependency on foreign oil. It actually makes the environment cleaner. That is a combination we do not see often.

My hope is that we will move forward, and I again urge my colleagues to come forward to help us move forward by talking about your amendments today so that when we have a chance to move forward officially on these amendments, we can do so expeditiously.

I see my colleague from New Hampshire Senator SHAHEEN is on the floor. I know she is speaking with her side of the aisle as I am talking to my side of the aisle to try to come up with a list of amendments to which we can agree within a reasonable timeframe, and I am hopeful we can move forward with that in the next few hours.

I yield back my time and look forward to talking about some of these amendments as people bring them to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, I wish to commend my colleagues Sen-

ators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN for their work to bring this legislation to the floor. I commend as well Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI for their leadership in the energy committee.

Fully half of the energy we use in this great country is wasted. That is a fact we can no longer afford to ignore. Each one of us is able to make changes in our daily lives to increase our energy efficiency. There is no kilowatt hour, no Btu more valuable than the ones we do not actually use in the first place. But it is clear that we are going to have to do a lot more than turn the lights out when we leave home to be a leader in the world in this field.

As the largest energy consumer in the United States, I think the Federal Government has not only an obligation but also an opportunity to lead by example when it comes to energy performance. We know that buildings are the largest energy consumers in the United States today. Accounting for over 40 percent of our use, they offer the greatest opportunities for energy savings.

Over the summer I had the opportunity and the privilege of joining the Department of Energy in presenting the Brackish Groundwater National Desalination Research Facility—that is a mouthful, I know. It is an important research facility in New Mexico, in my home State. We presented them with a Better Buildings Award on behalf of the DOE. The Federal Energy Management Program designed those awards, the Better Buildings Awards, to encourage significant reductions in energy usage in Federal buildings all across the country—reductions that go above and beyond the current codes and mandates that exist.

What the team at the desalinization research facility accomplished was nothing short of truly impressive and an example of what is possible with legislation such as this and in the field of energy efficiency. They were able to save approximately 300,000 kilowatt-hours per year—an annual savings of \$42,000. That is a remarkable 53.6 percent of their former energy footprint at a time when that research facility was actually increasing the amount of research going on. They did this through thoughtful analysis, by implementing both active and passive energy conservation techniques, and with a capital investment of literally less than \$800. For \$800 and some engineering expertise, this research facility was able to save the taxpayers over \$40,000 last year—\$40,000 next year, \$40,000 the year after that and into the future. That is a window into why this kind of legislation is so important and why we ought to be able to find common ground when it comes to energy efficiency.

I would also like to touch on another area of rapid energy innovation that is

relevant to this legislation—the lighting sector. Lighting consumes 22 percent of the electricity that is generated in this country. That is \$50 billion per year for consumers across the United States. In Albuquerque, Sandia National Laboratories is accelerating advances in what is called solid state light, or SSL, which is a rapidly evolving technology with the potential to reduce energy consumption in lighting by a factor of three to six times. My colleagues may have seen some of the new solid-state lights if they have been to Home Depot or Lowe's or their locally owned hardware store. These light bulbs are so efficient that when I was installing a couple in my son's bedroom a few weeks ago, I could literally put my hand on the light bulb because they make such good use of the energy they use.

Sandia has worked in solid-state lighting for a long time and their SSL Science Center is exploring new energy conversion techniques in tailored photonic structures. Drawing on their long history of research and development in this area—and, frankly, working closely with both university and private sector partners—they are working to understand the mechanisms and the defects in SSL semiconductor materials so they can make these already incredibly efficient light bulbs even more efficient.

Sandia is also investigating the basic conversion of electricity to light using radically new designs that can take these things even further—things such as luminescent nanowires, quantum dots, and even hybrid architectures that may be the bright light bulb of the future. This is progress driven by basic research and science—the kinds of investments that, frankly, have made our country great and made our economy so strong.

The Shaheen-Portman bill will spur the use of energy efficiency technologies such as these, where all of us live and work and, in turn, will lower utility bills for consumers and save money for taxpayers. Furthermore, this bipartisan bill will strengthen U.S. competitiveness by stimulating significant private sector research and development investments in manufacturing innovation and productivity.

Investing in energy efficiency is one of the fastest as well as the most cost-effective ways we can grow our economy. It is estimated that this measure alone—just this piece of legislation—would help create 136,000 new jobs by 2025 and, by 2030, the bill would net an annual savings of over \$13 billion—billion with a “B”—for consumers, and lower CO₂ emissions and other air pollutants by the equivalent of taking over 20 million cars off the road.

My home State of New Mexico is already capitalizing on a highly diversified but rapidly transforming energy sector. It stands to benefit from

leveraging investments and efficiency projects and native technologies.

Through American ingenuity we can slow the effects of climate change and unleash the full potential of cleaner homegrown energy, creating a stable and healthier nation for future generations of Americans.

So instead of transforming this debate about what is fundamentally supposed to be a debate about energy efficiency into another tired battle over ObamaCare, I urge my colleagues to embrace the fact that this bill truly represents the culmination of years of bipartisan work to craft a smart, effective energy bill with a good chance of actually becoming law.

I know when I go home—and I have spoken to many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who say the same—one of the complaints we hear the most right now is: Why can't you guys just get something done? Why can't you work together on something? This is an opportunity to show we can still legislate, we can come together on the things we agree on, even while agreeing to disagree on many other issues.

Again, I thank Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN for working so tirelessly on this bill, I thank the chair and ranking member of the energy committee for making it a priority, and I thank all of the Senators who serve on that committee for working together on both sides of the aisle to see this move forward. I hope as a Senate we will seize this opportunity.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Republican Whip.

NAVY YARD SHOOTINGS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor the day after a terrible tragedy that befell Washington, DC, particularly those who live and work around the Washington Navy Yard.

Hardly a mile from this building, and in the shadow of its dome, there occurred an act of senseless violence that took the lives of 12 men and women and injured several more, as well as the life of the shooter himself. These men and women worked, by and large, in service to our country, whether as uniformed military or as civilian contractors. Of course, they are more than just the numbers usually ascribed. They are mothers and fathers, brothers, sisters, husbands and wives.

When I heard about this shooting yesterday as I was traveling from Texas back to Washington, DC, I couldn't help but think about a not-too-dissimilar tragedy that occurred about 4 years ago at Fort Hood, TX, when MAJ Nidal Hasan killed about 13 people there as well as injuring more than 30 others.

At this difficult time, we, of course, pray for these souls who were unexpectedly taken from us. We pray for

comfort for their grieving families and friends, and we pray that healing may come quickly for those who were wounded.

We witnessed evil yesterday, but as so often is the case when the unthinkable occurs, accounts of tremendous bravery and self-sacrifice emerge. I found some small measure of solace in one such story I read. It described how one gentleman at the scene—a man by the name of Omar Grant—guided his partially blind colleague to safety. As shots rang out and people ran for the exits, Mr. Grant took his colleague by the arm and, risking his own safety, made his mission to guide him out of the building. This, of course, says nothing about the remarkable feats of bravery of the first responders who rushed to the scene and who placed their lives at risk in order to preserve the safety of others ahead of their own.

Yesterday's events remind us life is fragile and it is a precious gift. Let us express our deep gratitude for those who work around the clock, both in places such as the Navy Yard and here at the Capitol, to help keep us safe. I wish to thank the DC Metropolitan Police for their important role, the U.S. Capitol Police, and all the first responders for their extraordinary response. Their courage, their vigilance, and their sacrifice is what helps keep all of us safe, all of us who work here and visit our Nation's Capital. We thank them and we promise, on behalf of a grateful nation, we will never forget.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I was very happy to hear the description of a possible path forward from the floor manager for this bill a few minutes ago, and I welcome that path forward. It is completely consistent with the UC I offered many times last week that was, unfortunately, then rejected. Hopefully, it will now be accepted so we can have a path forward and have votes on so many amendments brought to this bill about energy, on my amendment, and on other significant topics. It certainly sounds as though the discussion at the majority lunch today was, let's say, more appropriate and more productive than the discussion last Thursday. I look forward to that path forward.

As we hopefully build on that path forward, let me again explain why I think a clear up-or-down vote before October 1 on my amendment is very important and why I am demanding it. It is not my choosing that this happen in terms of this illegal OPM rule, it is not my choosing this October 1 deadline has been created, but that is exactly what has happened, which demanded that I act with my amendment which, in general, I am joined with the

support of several colleagues and I appreciate their partnership and their help.

This all began in the ObamaCare debate—in our debate and in our legislating—on the ObamaCare bill. In that process a Grassley amendment was accepted that said in clear and no uncertain terms that every Member of Congress and that all congressional staff would go to the so-called exchanges, no ifs, ands or buts. The purpose of that language was crystal clear. The message was whatever the fallback plan is for all Americans—first it was the public option and then it became an exchange—whatever that fallback plan is for all Americans, that is what every Member of Congress and that is what congressional staff should go to. There should be no special deal, no special exemption, no special subsidy; that is what we should live by. I certainly supported that language. It goes to what is a fundamental rule of democracy: The governors should live by the same rules as the governed, across the board.

Our Founders actually talked about that specifically. James Madison, a co-author of the Federalist Papers, wrote Federalist No. 57 specifically about this point, and a central theme in that Federalist No. 57 was exactly this: What is good for America is good for Washington. The rule for America should certainly be the rule for those who have the particular honor and responsibility to help govern, and that should be the case across the board, certainly including ObamaCare. That is why that provision got into law, passed into law, and was signed into law by President Obama.

After that, I guess we sort of experienced what NANCY PELOSI described about ObamaCare, which was we had to pass the law to find out what is in it. After the law was passed, several folks around here on Capitol Hill and in Washington read the law, read that particular provision, and they said: Oh “you know what.” They said: Wait a minute, look at this, and they correctly noted the clear language demands that all Members of Congress, all congressional staff, go to the exchange, and, clearly, our current subsidy for health care does not follow us there. In fact, there is a specific other section of ObamaCare that says quite clearly that when an employee of a business goes to the exchange, that employee’s employer contribution for employer-based health care does not follow him or her to the exchange.

Again, when a lot of folks around here, after the fact, read what was then the ObamaCare law on that point, they said: Oh “you know what.” That is when a lot of scurrying started, a lot of gnashing of teeth, a lot of scheming, a lot of discussion, and ultimately a lot of lobbying of the President and the Obama administration. Sadly, it was bipartisan, I believe, a lot of folks

pushing to have the Obama administration simply issue a rule, a regulation that fixed all of this.

The problem is pretty simple, pretty straightforward, and pretty important. We are not supposed to issue a rule or regulation that is contrary to the statute, and that is what these folks were lobbying for and, sadly, that is what they got.

Right as Congress was going into the August recess, safely leaving town, the Obama administration issued this OPM rule that my language is all about. That rule is flatout clearly illegal on two grounds.

First of all, under this proposed OPM rule, every Member of Congress gets to decide for himself or herself what staff members are even covered by the mandate to go to the exchange at all. That is ridiculous, and it is directly contrary to the clear, unmistakable language in ObamaCare. That language says all official staff go to the exchange. Now this illegal OPM rule is going to say: Well, it did not really mean all official staff; it just meant whoever any individual Member of Congress decides. That is ridiculous and that is illegal.

The second part of the OPM rule is just as illegal, just as ridiculous, just as objectionable, and it says: Whoever does go to the exchange—Members of Congress and whatever staff do go to the exchange—they get to bring along with them their big taxpayer-funded subsidy from their previous Federal Employee Health Benefits Plan.

Well, wait a minute. ObamaCare does not say that. In fact, there is a separate provision of ObamaCare that says the opposite, that says when an employee goes to the exchange from a business, that employee loses his or her employer contribution—a specific part of ObamaCare directly contrary to what this illegal OPM rule is trying to do.

So, again, the attempt is simply to rewrite the law by administrative fiat, yet again to create another exemption from ObamaCare, if you will, that is nowhere in the statute. That is wrong, that is illegal, and that demands action. That is why I, with several other Members—House and Senate—came up with this language.

This language I am proposing on the floor now as an amendment would stop this illegal OPM rule. It would say exactly what ObamaCare says now: Every Member of Congress, all of our staff, must go to the exchange and operate under the same rules as all other Americans—no special deal, no special exemption, no special subsidy. No other American gets this fat employer subsidy in going to the exchange, nor should we. That is not in ObamaCare, and there is a specific section of ObamaCare that, in fact, says the opposite. So my language on the floor now would say that and would broaden the

rule, appropriately, to the President, the Vice President, and all of their political appointees.

The clear intent of this provision in ObamaCare from the beginning was that what is good for America has to be good for Washington, whatever cards America is dealt, including that fallback plan—originally it was proposed as the public option; now the exchanges—that should be what is imposed on Washington. No special plan, no special deal or exemption or subsidy; what is imposed on America needs to be imposed on Washington.

That is true under ObamaCare. That should be true across the board today, just as it was true in the eyes and minds and hearts of the Founders. Again, James Madison, in Federalist No. 57, wrote specifically on this point. This basic first rule of democracy goes back that far.

That is why I come to the floor and demand a vote. It is an explicit reaction to an illegal rule—a rule issued by the administration beyond the President’s authority, with no basis in the ObamaCare law, in fact, with provisions of the ObamaCare law that are directly contrary to it, and a rule that is set to take effect October 1. So we must vote now.

That is why, again—to come back full circle to the comments of the distinguished majority floor leader on this bill—I welcome the path forward he was describing. That is exactly the path forward I set out last week in my UC request. So let’s vote. Let’s do what this institution is supposedly set up to do. Let’s vote on this very important, very timely issue. Let’s vote on other amendments on the bill. Let’s vote on the bill. Let’s move forward in that appropriate and productive way.

Thank you.

With that, I yield back the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am here to speak to the Shaheen-Portman legislation that is on the floor, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act. But I have to start by responding to my colleague from Louisiana because, first of all, I appreciate that he wants a vote on this issue of the OPM ruling. There are a lot of things I would like to see a vote on, and I understand he is saying he is not opposed to the bill, which I very much appreciate. But the fact is, he chooses to be here to hold up this bipartisan piece of legislation at a time when we can get some real agreement on energy legislation coming out of the Senate—the first time since 2007 we have had an energy bill on the floor.

This is a bipartisan energy bill. It is a bill that has over 16 bipartisan amendments that have been vetted by the energy committee, that have support not just from the chairman of the energy committee and the ranking

member but from the committee staff, from Senator PORTMAN and myself. We think we have a real opportunity to pass this bill and to make it even better because of all of these bipartisan amendments. But my colleague from Louisiana, Senator VITTER, is refusing to allow us to get these votes because he wants a vote on his amendment.

I am happy to take a vote on his amendment. I would like to be able to clarify for the record the OPM ruling. I think there is a lot of misinformation—people who are calling to say that Members of Congress are not going to be in the exchange. Well, the fact is, Members of Congress who choose to continue to have their health care through the Federal program are in the exchange, as are our staffs. But we are not asking other large employers such as the Federal Government to eliminate the employer share of health care, as Senator VITTER would ask—that the Federal Government eliminate its employer share of health care for all of our staffs who are working for the Federal Government.

I do not think the American people believe the employer's share of health care should be eliminated. I think we have a system of health care that is employer based, and the system we have in the Federal Government is going to continue to be employer based as well. That means the Federal Government will pay a share of health care.

I think this is a debate we ought to have because I think there are a lot of people who are on the extreme right who want to be disingenuous about what is going on here. They are interested in spreading misinformation about what is happening with the health care law because they cannot believe Congress passed the Affordable Care Act, that the Supreme Court upheld the Affordable Care Act, and that, in fact, we are already seeing the benefits for people across this country from the Affordable Care Act.

We are seeing people who have had previous illnesses—so preexisting conditions—who are no longer going to be denied health insurance because of the Affordable Care Act. We are seeing people who can stay on their health care—young people—until they are age 26 because of the Affordable Care Act. We are seeing people who no longer have lifetime limits on what their share is for health insurance when they become ill. We are seeing people who are in the doughnut hole with their prescription drugs who are getting help for those prescription drugs. So I am happy to have that debate on the Affordable Care Act. But now is not the time to do it. This is a time when we can get some real agreement on energy efficiency, on an energy bill that, as the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy has said, would create 136,000 jobs by 2025, that would save consumers bil-

lions of dollars by 2030, that would be the equivalent of taking millions of cars off the road. It is a win-win-win, and it is a bill that has not just considerable bipartisan support in this Chamber but it is a bill that has support from groups that are as far apart as the American Chemistry Council and the Sierra Club, groups that do not normally come together on a bill—over 260 groups. That list is growing every day, private businesses that say: The way we need to begin to address our energy challenges is by saving energy. The cheapest, fastest way to address our energy needs is through energy efficiency.

This is a bill that does not depend on whether you support fossil fuels or new alternatives. The Presiding Officer knows we can support coal, investments in coal, and still support energy efficiency. We can support wind and still support energy efficiency. We can support solar and still support energy efficiency. We can support more drilling and still support energy efficiency.

This bill is a win-win-win, and we need to get on the bill. We need to get those people who would rather debate issues that are extraneous to this legislation to hold those debates for a later time.

As I said, I am happy to continue to debate health care. Even though we have been debating it now for the 4 years since the bill has been passed, I am happy to do that. But now is not the time to do that.

So, Mr. President, I will yield the floor and hope we can reach some agreement that will address Senator VITTER's concerns, that will address some of the other concerns that have been waiting that will allow us to move forward on an energy bill that is in the best interests of the country.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

NAVY YARD TRAGEDY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, to begin, my thoughts and prayers certainly go out to everyone who was impacted by the horrific events of yesterday at the Navy Yard, particularly to those whose loved ones lost their lives or were injured in what is a senseless tragedy.

Having said that, I also want to express my gratitude to the brave men and women who serve in our Nation's military for the sacrifices they make for each and every one of us and to the first responders and law enforcement personnel who work tirelessly to assist those in need and to keep us all safe throughout the day.

It was a dreadful day. I know there is little I can say or do to bring comfort to those who are suffering today, but I hope and pray they will find some measure of peace in the coming days.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to speak about some of the

problems we face as the administration continues to struggle with the implementation of the so-called Affordable Care Act.

It seems as though nearly every week we learn about another problem facing the Obama administration as they seek to implement this misguided law. More often than not, those problems are revealed through statements announcing delays in certain elements of the law.

The employer mandate? Delayed. The small businesses health insurance market? Delayed. Employee automatic enrollment in the exchanges? Delayed.

Of course, this should not come as a surprise to anyone. This is, after all, the largest expansion of government in a generation. And it is not as though it was carefully crafted. No. The President's health care law was rushed through Congress in a partisan fashion, virtually ensuring it would face problems when the rubber meets the proverbial road.

For months now, experts have been warning us about ObamaCare's failings and the challenges those failings pose as the administration tries desperately to have something ready to implement by October 1.

One of the major parts of ObamaCare is the health care exchanges. These are designed to be online marketplaces where those without health insurance will be required by law to shop for coverage.

Millions of people are expected to sign up to purchase insurance through the exchanges. As a result, the exchanges are expected to have a massive impact on the overall insurance market, even affecting those who get their insurance elsewhere.

Make no mistake, ObamaCare's health insurance exchanges will have an impact on every American, regardless of where they get their health insurance.

That being the case, one would reasonably assume the administration would not move forward on the exchanges until they were ready. Unfortunately, when it comes to implementing the President's health care law, reason does not appear to enter into the equation. Despite countless red flags, the administration is charging ahead. They are, to say the least, desperate to avoid another delay when it comes to ObamaCare. So come hell or high water, the exchanges will go live on October 1 of this year.

This is problematic for numerous reasons, not the least of which are the privacy and security considerations that up to now appear to have been ignored by the administration officials. When people sign up for insurance through an exchange, they will be required to submit their Social Security number, tax returns, household income information, and the like. This is, to say the least, highly sensitive information.

In recent months, we have seen government-certified security systems have been shown to be less than reliable when it comes to protecting personal information. This past July, for example, the IRS accidentally posted thousands of Social Security numbers on its Web site. That was a small mistake with potentially devastating consequences for those who had their information exposed.

The information collected when people sign up for the exchanges will be entered into a Federal services data hub, a new information-sharing network that will allow State and Federal agencies, including the IRS, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Homeland Security, to verify a person's information. It is at this point unclear whether the data hub has adequate security in place to prevent enrollees' information from falling into the hands of data thieves. There are plenty of them out there.

Last month the HHS Office of Inspector General issued a report indicating the government had failed to meet several deadlines for testing operations and reporting data security vulnerabilities involved with the data hub. This, as you might expect, led to an outcry from Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle. As a result, on September 10, the White House conveniently announced that all testing has been completed and that the data hub was ready to launch.

This announcement came a mere 3 weeks before the exchanges were set to go live. Of course, no independent entity will get a chance to verify the testing and to certify that there are, as the administration claims, no security problems. No third party will be able to make recommendations to improve safeguards in order to better protect the privacy of consumers. Instead, we are supposed to simply rely on the administration's internal testing of the data hub security and stop asking questions. This, sadly, is par for the course with the Obama administration.

So here we are. We are mere days away from the launch of the exchanges, and we have yet to definitively prove whether the massive IT or information technology system that will be compiling enrollees' information is secure. What a state of events. To the millions of consumers about to enroll in the exchanges, this could end up being their worst nightmare.

As if the potential disaster surrounding the data hub were not enough, we also have lax regulations regarding the hiring of the so-called navigators who are to help people get through these problems. As you will recall, under ObamaCare, organizations will receive grants to assist the uninsured in determining what type of coverage they qualify for in States where the Federal Government will be run-

ning the exchange. The individuals working with those organizations are called navigators. Under the law, they will often have access to enrollees' personal information.

In April HHS published its proposed rule regarding the certification of navigators. Almost immediately Members of Congress recognized the regulations were far too lenient, cutting corners on things such as training and background checks and threatening to leave patients and consumers with inadequate protection.

A group of my colleagues and I sent a letter to Secretary Sebelius outlining our concerns regarding this rule. Our hope was the requirements for navigators would be enhanced to ensure consumers were not harmed by unqualified navigators or imposters serving as government counselors. Sadly, our request fell on deaf ears. We never received a response.

In late July HHS issued its final navigator rule keeping in place the very weak privacy protections, opening the door for private information to fall into the wrong hands. Consumer watchdog groups are already warning of scams leading to fraud and identify theft with regard to the exchanges. Indeed, it seems criminals and fraudsters are already lining up to game the system and prey on the innocent.

Over the last few years I have come to the floor several times to talk about the shortcomings of ObamaCare. I continue to believe the law is beyond saving, that it should be repealed in its entirety. That remains my No. 1 goal when it comes to ObamaCare. However, I also believe those of us who opposed this law, which, according to recent polls, is a growing percentage of the population, cannot stand on the sidelines and let this law inflict harm on the American people. While we continue to push for a full repeal of the law, we need to do all we can to mitigate the damage that could come from this law.

With regard to privacy and data security, we need to ensure the administration does not expose the personal data of millions of Americans to more fraud. That is why I am introducing the Trust But Verify Act. If enacted, this important legislation would delay the implementation of the Federal and State health insurance exchanges until the Government Accountability Office, in consultation with the HHS inspector general, can attest that the necessary privacy and data security parameters are in place.

It would simply be irresponsible to open the exchanges without adequate safeguards to protect and secure consumers' personal information. While the administration claims these safeguards exist, there is simply no way to verify these claims absent an independent review, which they are not taking. Until we can demonstrate to

the public their personal information is secure, we should not move forward with enrollment in the exchanges. It is that simple. My legislation would ensure the exchanges remain on ice until this threshold issue is addressed. These are not frivolous concerns; these are real problems. I hope all of my colleagues, even those who continue to support the President's health law, will work with me to help address these issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, first, let me commend the chief cosponsors of this bill, Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, for their perseverance and their great leadership on this issue. I am a wholehearted and passionate supporter of this cause and urge my colleagues to address what is truly a triple play.

This bill is a way to win for employment and economic growth. It is a way to win for energy savings and financial savings for our manufacturing companies, to make America more competitive. It is a way to win for our planet, indeed, to help save our planet along with saving money and saving energy.

I will not only support the bill and the amendments, but I have asked for support for an amendment of my own that would help to measure the non-monetary benefits of some of the changes that would be brought about by this legislation. I ask Senators PORTMAN and SHAHEEN to accept this amendment and for my colleagues to support it as well.

NEWTOWN ANNIVERSARY

I am here to help commemorate the 9-month anniversary of the tragedy at Newtown that took the lives of 26 wonderful people—20 beautiful children and 6 courageous, skilled educators. It was a commemoration I was going to observe yesterday on the floor of the Senate, but, of course, there was no Senate session yesterday because of yet another unspeakable, horrific tragedy, this one close, literally within blocks of this great building.

It was physically close, but every one of those incidents should be close to us emotionally as Newtown has been for me and others of my colleagues, most especially my friend and colleague Senator MURPHY. It brought back a rush of memories for me because Newtown is still close to us in emotional proximity, just as the Navy shooting was close in physical proximity. The Navy lost 12 of its members. My heart and prayers go out to those great sailors, civilians, and contractors, and their loved ones.

Today we have an inspector general report that is profoundly and deeply

troubling. If reports of this audit are true, the Navy put the safety of personnel at risk to save dollars and cents. This apparent security lapse, permitting people with criminal records to freely access military bases and facilities, is deeply concerning, indeed shocking. I call on the inspector general to release the full report. I have the report. I have reviewed it briefly. I cannot talk about its contents because it has not been released. Make this report public so we know what the inspector general of the Navy has said about lapses of security and about the failures of the RAPIDGate technology that was supposed to protect people at the Navy Yard here in Washington, DC.

Lax safety and security measures at our military facilities is inexcusable. I commend the Secretary of the Navy and the leadership of the Navy for raising this issue and hope they will decide to make public the full report to the extent it can be done so consistent with our Nation's security.

But one of the lessons here is that the Navy, with RAPIDGate technology and all of its facilities with armed guards and the complex technology it uses, could not protect members of its own ranks at the Navy Yard. We should know why. If it could not do so there, can our schools be safe? Can our workplaces be safe? Can America be safe with the present plethora of firearms in our Nation today?

This day was horrific and tragic for America. Yet in many ways it was another day. The threat is these incidents will become the new normal. We need to ask, will these incidents, these horrific, unspeakable tragedies, make a difference? Will they change the political mindset and culture in this body and in the House of Representatives?

In the days to come, we will learn more. There is much more to learn before we draw conclusions. I emphasize the facts are disclosed one by one even as we watch the news. We will try to wrap our minds around whatever evil motive caused this senseless crime, but we know the means all too well. The moment shots rang out and the blurb came over the news wire, we knew with an instinctive understanding this unfolding incident was another act of gun violence in America, another act of gun violence in an America plagued by a plethora of guns.

The answer to the question, will it become a new normal, should find the articulate, in fact, deeply powerful words of Janis Orlowski, the chief medical officer of MedStar Washington Hospital Center, the hospital that received some of yesterday's victims, the hospital that deals routinely with gunshot wounds and sometimes deaths. I hope the Nation will hear her plea when she said, in effect, these senseless killings have to stop, stating:

There's something evil in our society that we, as Americans, have to work to try and

eradicate. I would like you to put my trauma center out of business. I really would. I would like to not be an expert on gunshots. Let's get rid of this. This is not America.

When I went to Sandy Hook 9 months ago on December 14, I felt an obligation to go as a public official, but what I saw was through the eyes of a parent, the cries of grief and pain that I will never forget. They will live with me always, loved ones and parents emerging from that firehouse having learned moments before that their beautiful children and loved ones would not be coming home that evening.

Like the loved ones who said goodbye to the 12 victims at the Washington Navy Yard, it was another day, a day like every other day when they expected them to come home to the routine, mundane joys of life. Twenty innocent, beautiful children and 6 great educators did not come home that day. In the days that followed, we all hoped the Senate of the United States would keep faith with those families. In the 9 months since, we have hoped the Nation would keep faith with the 8,158 Americans around the country, the 8,158 victims of gun violence.

Last April, the Senate turned its back on Newtown families. One of the most difficult days of my career in this job or any other job was to try to explain to those families how more than 90 percent of the American people—a majority of gun owners, in fact many members of the NRA—could back a commonsense measure like background checks, the bill the Presiding Officer and Senator TOOMEY sponsored so courageously and ably—could have that kind of support and yet fail to pass this body. It had 55 Senators supporting it on that day—54 voting for it, but 60 votes were needed. One of the answers, of course, is to change the Senate rules, which I have long supported, to eliminate the filibuster.

The families of Newtown, and those 8,158 Americans, their loved ones, and all Americans deserve a better answer. It is not to accept these mass killings as the new normal, as the commonplace of America. We are better than that normal as a Nation. We cannot accept it. I hope, ask, and pray that the unspeakable, unimaginable tragedy of Newtown and now Washington Navy Yard will renew and reinvigorate this movement and give us impetus, emotional, intellectual, and political, which we need and deserve.

The shooting at the Washington Navy Yard makes clear that, as we said in the wake of Newtown, these kinds of mass killings can happen anywhere, any school, any community—in Newtown, the quintessential New England town, or at the Washington Navy Yard, a supposedly secure military facility. We need to make sure it happens nowhere.

Let us make a mental health initiative a centerpiece of this renewal and

reinvigoration of our effort to stop gun violence. Let us combine it with background checks and other commonsense measures. Bring back this issue and these measures.

We are not going away. We are not giving up. Many of the Newtown families will be here again this week. The Newtown Action Alliance has been joined by other groups such as Sandy Hook Promise, Newtown Speaks, and Mayors Against Illegal Guns. They have formed a powerful gun coalition, and I promise I will never give up. I know together we can prevail.

Not long ago—in fact, this past weekend—I attended a playground dedication on the beach in Fairfield overlooking Long Island Sound, a beautiful, cloudless day lit by an early morning Sun, to dedicate a playground in honor of one of the children, Jessica Rekos, whose family was there as well. That playground will be a living reminder of our obligation to do better.

There are regulations right now that have not been approved in final form for mental health parity to enable more people to have private health insurance coverage. There are commonsense mental health funding initiatives. As we speak on this day, groups are going around to our offices from the National Council for Behavioral Health, asking for support for the Excellence in Mental Health Act, S. 264, ably cosponsored by Senator STABENOW and Senator BLUNT, focusing on mental health and combining those measures with other commonsense, sensible gun violence prevention measures. It is the way to forge the consensus we need and move from those 55 votes to the 61 we need for passage of a gun violence prevention measure that can make us proud, make America better, safer, and that can make us, as Americans, a better Nation to leave for generations to come.

As we celebrate the lives lost but commemorate the horrific, unspeakable tragedy of Newtown, we should take heart from the courage and resilience of those families and their loved ones. From the Newtown community which will be visiting the Capitol again, their resoluteness and steadfastness should inspire us to do better and to ask more of ourselves and make America a better Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to extend my sympathy to all those who have suffered a loss yesterday, both here in DC and any other place in the country. A loss, a quick and unexpected loss, is always difficult.

CONSTITUTION DAY

I also wish to take a second today to recognize that this is Constitution Day. It is 226 years of our country having this Constitution, which is a world record for a constitution. Hopefully we

will continue to live under the Constitution, work and make progress.

OBAMACARE

My main purpose today is to take a few minutes to talk about something that occurred during the recess that is another sad example of business as usual in Washington. The health care law we are all under requires Members of Congress and their congressional staff to obtain health insurance under the new exchanges provided by ObamaCare next year. I voted to include Congress under the health care law in 2009 because I believe very strongly that Congress should have to live under the laws it passes.

Let me say that again. I think Congress ought to live under the laws it passes. We passed a law that is going to affect most people in the United States. I can tell you that the administration doesn't appear to share this belief.

On August 2, immediately after Congress adjourned, the Office of Personnel Management, under heavy pressure from congressional leaders, announced it would issue regulations saying the government can continue to make the employer contribution to the health plans of congressional Members and staff. No one else in America who will get their health insurance through an exchange may receive a contribution from their employer, but the administration decided it would be OK for Congress.

I am not sure where the authority came from to be able to do that or say that. It was difficult at the beginning of the process for us to get that amendment in the HELP Committee, Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, when the bill was coming through there. It was repeated again in the Finance Committee, and it wound up in the final bill.

That is a law we passed. It is a law we passed that said we are going to be subject to the same thing the American people are going to be subject to.

Now the administration has said, no, it doesn't apply to Congress. Where does it say it doesn't apply to Congress?

I was in Wyoming for the last month or so, holding listening sessions and meeting with the people as I drove 6,000 miles across the State. I can tell you people are angry that Congress gets some exemptions from ObamaCare that they don't. They are tired of the deal making that happens here instead of legislating that could be occurring. They see these kinds of exemptions and they don't think it is fair. I agree. I don't think it is fair either.

This is why Senator VITTER and I have introduced a bill that would prohibit Members of Congress from receiving a contribution from the Federal Government toward their health insurance. Of course, it is not only—in our amendment, it is not only Congress but

the President, the Vice President, and the people responsible for implementing the health care law who will not be allowed to receive any government subsidy.

The President talks about how great the health care bill will be for everyone, but the administration doesn't think it is so great that they should have to live under it. That should change.

In addition, the legislation ensures Congress and the administration will have to live under the laws it passes and enforces by clarifying that all of us can only obtain our health insurance next year through an exchange. That is what it says.

The bill also states Members do not have the authority to define official staff. That would be a sneaky way of making an exclusion for some of the people we consider to be critical, and can thereby not exempt any of their staff from going into the exchange. Yes, that is difficult. Yes, that is the same thing that is going to happen with the rest of America. The rest of America is going to have these same pangs of wishing their contribution could go with them to the exchange. But they are going to have to go to the exchange and it is not going to follow, and there is no reason we should get an extension.

The reason we have this amendment is to show Congress shouldn't be special, that the American people are going to have this great pain and we ought to suffer from it too or change it for everybody. That would be unique.

I wish to clarify that our bill does not end the government contribution for all congressional staff. Those who make the least amount of money will still receive a contribution, but many staff who would not qualify for any assistance otherwise will not. There is a provision in the law that anybody who goes on the exchange, and they make less than \$43,000 a year as an individual or \$92,000 as a family, can get a subsidy under the exchange. It would work the same way for Congress.

Legislation is needed to prevent lawmakers and their staff from getting special treatment under the law. Absent this legislative change, Congress and the administration are essentially shielded from the higher cost, the limited access, and the confusion everybody else is going to feel.

I continue to oppose the health care law, as I have done since it was passed. When you pass something from one side of the aisle, without taking into consideration the amendments from the other side of the aisle, and when you make special deals in order to keep the one side, you will end up with a law you will own and it will have flaws in it. It is time we quit dealmaking and start legislating on all the issues and considering all of the amendments. This is one example of an amendment

that is up—it is the next amendment up—and it should get a vote. It could have had a vote last week and it can have a vote this week, but we need to vote on these things and see how they wind up.

I do continue to oppose the health care law, as I have done, and I support full repeal of the law. There are replacements out there. I have worked with replacements. In fact, I had my own 10-step plan before the President even became a Member of the Senate. That 10-step plan would have done more than this bill does and it would have been paid for.

I also worked with Senators BURR and COBURN on a substitute when this legislation was going through the process, and that one would have done many of the things the President promised in his joint speech to Congress. He promised there would be certain things in the bill. I took very careful notes at that meeting and found out there were 14 things that didn't appear to be in the bill. So I asked those things be in the bill, and that is when it became a partisan issue.

The President said the bill would have tort reform. There is no tort reform in the bill. The President said there would be a doc fix. There is no doc fix in the bill. I guess the thing that amazed me was that people from the American Medical Association stood behind the President when he signed the bill, realizing they didn't get the two things they insisted on and said they would continue to push for and continue to oppose the bill until they were in there, and that was tort reform and the doc fix.

Doctors, under the law for Medicare are not going to be paid adequately. If they are not paid adequately, they have a tendency to not see Medicare patients. I am pretty sure all of us know somebody who has tried to get an appointment with the doctor and the doctor asked: Do you get Medicare? If they said yes, he said: I am sorry. I am not taking Medicare patients.

So if you can't see a doctor, do you have insurance at all? I don't think so. Medicare has been the lifesaver for seniors in our country for some time, and we haven't begun to see the tip of the iceberg yet on what is going to happen to our seniors.

This amendment, which we should get to vote on, is just one piece of an overall effort to make sure the bill will work for everybody in America. I have 17 other amendments that would, hopefully, close loopholes and dismantle pieces we know would not work and make changes. So there are ideas out there that could make this bill work, but this one amendment is just part of an overall effort. It will close the loophole for Congress and it will ensure that everyone is treated equally under the health care law.

For better or for worse, we should all be in this together. Again, this isn't

just to subject our colleagues to pain; it is to get them to recognize the pain America is about to feel. It is not fair for us to make ourselves pain free. We can't inoculate ourselves or give ourselves some special medication. That is what we are doing in the bill. This amendment clarifies Members don't have the authority to define "official staff" and, therefore, they can't exempt any of their staff from going into the exchange. It clarifies that Members of Congress, all of their staff, the President, the Vice President, and all political appointees are no longer eligible for the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan and have to go into the exchange.

That seems fair to me. The bill is named after the President. Why wouldn't the President want to be under the bill? How could he possibly avoid being under the bill and doing what the rest of Americans will have to do? If it is such a great deal, and since the bill is named for him, one would think he would want to do that.

I voted to include Members and staff on ObamaCare before the bill passed, in the HELP Committee, in the Finance Committee, and on this floor. It got tweaked a little after it passed on the floor—and I am a little disturbed about that—but even that doesn't warrant the clarification of this magnitude. People deserve and expect those who are responsible for passing and implementing laws will have to live under the same laws they do.

I have cosponsored this legislation with Senator VITTER, and I appreciate all of the initiative he has taken, the difficult and specific task of drafting, and all of the work that has gone into this. This will make a difference. Congress will realize the difference. The American people will blame us if they see the difference and we haven't.

I would ask we get to vote on this amendment. I hope we get to vote on it soon and we can then move on to other amendments on an important bill and get things done. That is what the American people expect us to do. They expect us to get some things done. If somebody thinks this is something that would be wrong for us, they should consider it to be wrong for America as well and join us in fixing it one way or the other.

Again, I thank Senator VITTER for all his efforts on it, and I do expect we should get a vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I thank and recognize the longstanding work of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. He has fought long and hard from the very beginning for this position during the ObamaCare debate, and he has done so in a very focused and determined and consistent way. I appreciate his doing that all through the

ObamaCare debate and bringing it to the floor with me and others in this amendment.

I repeat, I appreciate all of his leadership in fighting for what I consider the first principle of democracy, which is that all rules that are passed on to America should be visited on Washington, and we should be treated exactly the same as the rest of America is treated. That should be true across the board, but it certainly should be true under ObamaCare. That is the very intent of this provision, which is the law now. It is the law now under ObamaCare.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I see my colleague from North Dakota Senator HOEVEN is here so I will be brief.

I wish to pick up on something Senator ENZI talked about, which is that the American people are expecting us to get something done. I couldn't agree with him more. That is why I have been on the floor for the last 3 days, along with my colleague from Ohio Senator PORTMAN, who has worked so hard with me to put together an energy efficiency bill to address the very real challenges facing this country around energy security, and energy efficiency is the cheapest, fastest way to deal with our energy needs.

We have multiple bipartisan amendments to this legislation. We have a lot of bipartisan support for this legislation, with more than 260 groups, as varied as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Resources Defense Council, supporting this legislation. I hope all those people who would like to have a different conversation around health care, or whatever else, will be willing to postpone that conversation so we can deal with the bill before us, which is the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act.

I appreciate all the work of my colleague from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN. He has been willing to engage with us on this legislation and I urge all of us to get to the bill at hand and deal with energy issues and let us have those other debates at the appropriate time. Now is not the appropriate time.

Mr. WYDEN. Would the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I would.

Mr. WYDEN. How many years has the Senator from New Hampshire been involved in this legislation? Because I can recall the various iterations that she and Senator PORTMAN offered, and then she worked with various groups, business organizations and public interest groups, and I think it would be helpful to hear how long she has been working on this legislation and how long she has been waiting to actually get this bill in front of the Senate.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Senator PORTMAN can correct me on this, but I think we

introduced this legislation early in 2011, not too long after he came to the Senate, and we have been working for 3 years. We reintroduced it in this Congress and have made a number of changes over the years in response to what we heard from stakeholders and in response to some of the concerns expressed by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to make the bill better and to try and put together legislation that could actually pass the Congress.

We have another bill in the House that is very similar, which is also a bipartisan piece of energy efficiency legislation. There has been a lot of interest expressed in the House in trying to act on this issue, so we have a real opportunity to get a bill through Congress, to get it to the President's desk, to get it signed, and to begin making progress on those 136,000 jobs we have heard about from the ACEEE—the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy—that could be created as a result of passing this bill.

Mr. WYDEN. Is it the view of the Senator from New Hampshire that the amendments that have been offered—the bipartisan amendments—take her bill, the product of all those negotiations, more than 3 years' worth of work, and actually make the bill even better?

I look at some of the amendments, particularly the one offered by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Colorado—the Isakson-Bennet amendment—and I realize we know more in America about the kind of common energy-efficient products that one might use, whether it is a toaster or something else around the house, than we do about the actual house itself. So we have two thoughtful Senators coming together and they have worked with a whole host of commercial building interests and they are going to make it possible, in my view, to save a lot of energy that will result in savings for homeowners and other Americans.

I would be interested in the Senator's take on the various amendments that have been filed because I think those amendments take the very fine bill she and Senator PORTMAN have and make it even better.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. There is no doubt about that. I have been impressed with the amount of thought that has gone into these bipartisan amendments and with the variety of ways in which they improve on energy efficiency.

The Senator talked about the Isakson-Bennet amendment. Senator BENNET has an amendment with Senator AYOTTE, my colleague from New Hampshire, talking about tenants who are renting and the incentives we can provide to tenants to address their energy use.

Senator GILLIBRAND, who came to the floor last week, talked about how we could look at emergency disaster relief

and try and make sure when we rebuild from disasters we rebuild in a way that is much more energy efficient.

So we have a whole range of ideas. Senator HOEVEN, who is on the floor, is talking about addressing water heaters and the need to make sure water heaters are more efficient. He is working with Senator PRYOR. We have a whole list of amendments that are thoughtful and that have been the result of a lot of work on the part of a lot of Senators in this Chamber.

It is unfortunate we can't get to those amendments and get them passed. I think most of them would pass on a voice vote.

Mr. WYDEN. Let me wrap up with one last question to get a sense of the Senator's intent. My sense is the Senator is very open, as is Senator PORTMAN, that there will be votes. I see our colleagues on the floor who have also been here since Wednesday, but the Senator from New Hampshire, I believe, is open to giving them votes on the several issues that have come up in connection with this debate, that have been debated over the last few days, and then she would be open to the leadership on both sides agreeing to a finite list of amendments and then actually voting on the energy efficiency bill this week.

My hope is that is what the Senator would like to do because that is what I have tried to tell colleagues, as chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. WYDEN. I just came back from an excellent visit to North Dakota with Senator HOEVEN. There are a lot of other issues the Senate wants to tackle in the energy area to make sure we fully tap the potential of natural gas. There are win-win opportunities that are also good for the environment. We would like to resolve the nuclear waste question. We have a bipartisan bill here in the Senate.

Is that the intent of the Democratic sponsor of this legislation, that in the next couple of hours we get a finite list of the additional amendments. In other words, we have the Senator's bill, and we have several amendments that have been debated at length already. Those would be part of the vote, and then in the next couple of hours we would have a finite list, and then we could address those and finish the bill this week?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Absolutely. And I think that is Senator PORTMAN's interest. We would like to get some agreement on how to move forward. As I said last week, I don't have any objection to voting on Senator VITTER's legislation if we can get some agreement on limiting those extraneous amendments that really don't have anything to do with energy efficiency so we can get onto this bill, get it done, and make progress because, as the chairman knows, it is going to be very challenging to tackle some of those other

energy issues that are much more controversial than this energy efficiency bill. So it would be nice to be able to have agreement so we can move on to some of those other issues.

I especially appreciate the Senator's leadership and Senator MURKOWSKI's leadership in reaching some agreement and trying to move an energy agenda on the floor.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I wish to briefly respond to the comments by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

First, I welcome her statement that she supports getting a vote on the Vitter amendment. I am not sure I have heard it before, but I heard it just then and I welcome it and I appreciate it and want to echo that.

Secondly, I wish to briefly respond to the notion that somehow now is not the appropriate time for that vote. I and my colleagues who support this language are reacting to an illegal rule that goes into effect October 1, so I am demanding a vote before October 1, when this goes into effect. I am not sure what more appropriate time there can be than before October 1 if we are trying to block this illegal rule that will happen October 1. So this is the appropriate time—not according to a timetable I made but according to a timetable that the Obama administration made and that is supported by the opponents of our language.

If OPM wants to announce that they are delaying this illegal rule indefinitely or for 1 year, then we will delay this vote because that would be appropriate. But the appropriate time to stop this illegal rule that goes into effect October 1 is, by definition, before October 1, which is all I have demanded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to introduce two energy efficiency amendments that I am offering for attachment to the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill.

I thank both of the bill's sponsors, the Senators from New Hampshire and Ohio, for their willingness to work with me and with our cosponsors on this bipartisan legislation. I also thank both the Senator from Oregon, who is the chairman of the energy committee, as well as the ranking member of the energy committee, the Senator from Alaska, for working with us as well.

Obviously, I hope we will be able to work through the list of amendments to this legislation so that we can get votes on these bills. We have broad bipartisan support on both of these measures, so I wish to take a few minutes to introduce them and to briefly describe them.

The first is an amendment regarding water heaters. It is actually the water heater efficiency amendment. Currently, a 2010 Department of Energy rule on water heaters effectively bans the manufacture of large electric water heaters beginning in 2015, which will greatly affect consumers in our rural areas and hurt the effectiveness of some of the demand-response rural electric programs. These demand-response rural electric programs are designed to use off-peak loads, which is both energy efficient and also generates big-time savings for consumers. So it is one of those win-win deals. But many of our rural areas are not serviced by natural gas. As a result, they would be forced to buy multiple water heaters in order to meet their need because the load doesn't enable them to store enough heat. That doesn't make any sense.

What I am offering is a practical amendment that improves the efficiency of electric water heaters but lets our rural areas have access to affordable, efficient water heaters that can supplement renewable energy. Much of this off-peak energy is renewable energy, so there is another benefit as well. This is one that saves money, is energy efficient, and also provides good environmental stewardship.

Many of our electric cooperatives and other utilities have voluntary demand-response programs that use electric water heaters to more effectively manage power supply and demand. In those areas where renewables are part of the electric generation system, these water heaters facilitate the integration of renewable energy that can be stored—like at nighttime, obviously—for use during peak hours. That includes such things as wind and solar energy.

This amendment would allow the continued manufacture of large, grid-enabled, electric-resistance water heaters only for their use in electric thermal storage or demand-response programs, meaning that they use off-peak load or lower cost energy that would otherwise be lost or not used. The amendment would require that grid-enabled water heaters have a volume of more than 75 gallons, be energy efficient, and work on grids that have a demand-response system. So, again, you are using off-peak loads, using renewable energy, and it saves the consumer a lot of money and makes sure they have the hot water they need for their use but is a big-time cost saver and good environmental stewardship measure.

We have broad support from the energy efficiency groups, from the environmental groups, from manufacturers, and from the rural electric cooperatives. I will name some of them. These include the Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute, the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, the American Public Power

Association, Edison Electric Institute, General Electric Company, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the National Resource Defense Council, the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance, and there are many more. This has broad support. I am not aware at this point if there are opponents.

The Shaheen-Portman bill is an energy efficiency bill. It is about using energy more wisely, benefiting both providers and consumers alike. And that is exactly what this amendment does. It saves money, it saves energy, it benefits the environment, and it benefits consumers.

Mr. PORTMAN. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I certainly yield to the good Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. I know my colleague is going to talk about another one of his amendments in a moment. I wish to briefly stay on this amendment.

It makes a lot of sense, and he said it well. In Ohio as well as other States, during these off-peak periods—and often it is renewable energy—think about a time when you can generate power during the day from solar or wind or other sources, and if you can store that during the peak times and if these water heaters are well enough insulated, they can store that heat that is otherwise wasted or not used.

It seems it makes a lot of sense to ensure that the 2010 DOE rule the Senator talked about doesn't preclude the possibility of manufacturing these large water heaters for electric thermal storage and for these demand-response programs the Senator talked about that some of them have. One is the Buckeye Power Utility, an electric co-op, and they are very interested in this amendment.

I support the amendment. I think it is an example of an amendment brought to the floor that is going to help make the bill better. It is consistent with the energy efficiency goals of the legislation.

I thank the Senator for his work.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the good Senator from Ohio. It really does comport both with the spirit and intent of the legislation that he has co-authored with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, but really it actually accomplishes what the Department of Energy set out to do.

In rural areas across this country, whether in North Dakota, Ohio, West Virginia, New Hampshire, or anywhere else, we have rural consumers who are looking at having to buy multiple water heaters just to have enough hot water because they are on these off-peak load programs, which makes sense and which is what we want. We want them on these off-peak programs because it is more efficient and saves money and utilizes renewable energy, but we have to enable them to do it. So

this accomplishes what DOE set out to do.

Again, I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, I wish to offer another amendment to the underlying legislation. This is the "all of the above" Federal building energy conservation.

We talk about doing "all of the above" energy development in this country, and we have to get from talking about it to doing it. This is a great example of what I am talking about. It actually goes back and addresses a problem that was created in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. In that act they set efficiency standards for Federal buildings that have to be achieved by 2030 and then they limit it as to which types of energy can be used, creating a real problem for the Department of Energy, which is actually having to implement that legislation.

This is a piece of legislation that actually will enable some of these energy efficiency goals to be achieved with better environmental stewardship but with a commonsense "all of the above" approach in terms of energy sources. Frankly, the goals of that cannot be achieved without them. The Shaheen-Portman legislation is an on-subject piece of legislation that really allows us to correct the problems in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 and really accomplishes what that act set out to do, so if I could just take a couple minutes to describe it.

This "all of the above" Federal Building Energy Conservation Act, amendment No. 1917, is a commonsense piece of legislation that saves taxpayers money by enhancing the energy efficiency of Federal buildings by allowing all forms or all sources of energy to power our buildings while still meeting the objectives of the underlying legislation.

Currently, section 433 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 mandates the elimination of all fossil fuel-generated energy use in any new Federal building by the year 2030, but the mandate also covers any major renovation of \$2.5 million or more to any Federal building. Unfortunately, the Department of Energy has been unable to finalize a rule because the law itself is unworkable.

Think about it—any Federal building where there is a renovation of more than \$2.5 million, you can no longer use fossil fuels—think natural gas—in that building. So what are you going to heat and cool the building with? Are you sure you are going to have enough intermittent power—whether it is solar or wind or something else—to make sure that for any Federal building where you make a change of more than \$2.5 million you are going to be able to meet the energy needs of that building? The Department of Energy can't do it. They can't write a rule that meets that

statutory requirement. So we fix it in this amendment.

My amendment would replace an unworkable mandate that is impossible to implement with a practical, time-proven approach, using technology and all of our energy resources to achieve the goal of energy efficiency. Again, this will enable us to achieve the energy efficiency goals of the underlying legislation, which is the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.

Instead of prohibiting the use of fossil fuels, including next-generation technologies as section 433 would currently provide as written, this amendment creates sensible energy efficiency guidelines to make Federal buildings more energy efficient, thereby lowering emissions. The measure also helps to make sure when we do major renovations we use the most up-to-date building codes. We do all of this in a transparent manner by having the Secretary of Energy make information available as to how the Federal Government is improving its efficiency in Federal buildings.

Current law is unable to do any of this. The reality is section 433 does not work, as I said, and cannot be implemented without a fix. We are providing that fix. According to the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy:

The current section 433 is not very workable because in its present form it discourages investments in long-term energy savings contracts and in combined heat and power systems.

So if you care about efficiency—that is what this underlying bill is all about, energy efficiency—if you care about efficiency, we need to change section 433. If you care about making sure our taxpayer dollars are well spent, we need to pass the amendment I am offering. It is better to have aggressive yet achievable goals with a means to obtain them through private sector financing mechanisms than to have an unfunded mandate that will not produce the intended results.

Major conservation stakeholders agree. This amendment is supported by a remarkably broad coalition. That coalition includes: the Alliance to Save Energy, the Combined Heat and Power Association, the American Gas Association, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the Edison Electric Institute, the Federal Performance Contractors Coalition, Owens Corning, Siemens, the National Association of Energy Service Companies, the American Public Power Association, Lockheed Martin, Fuel Cell & Hydrogen Energy Association, Honeywell—the list goes on, and there are many more.

That is because, again, it is about common sense, it is about energy efficiency, and it is about doing it in a way that actually accomplishes those goals.

Energy conservation is an objective where we should be able to find consensus. Everyone agrees it makes good sense to save energy. This amendment makes the current law both practical and achievable. The Congressional Budget Office says it saves money. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

Finally, if I may before I close, I would like to make some brief comments in regard to the farm bill. We have been working on a farm bill for over 2 years. I am a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Last year we passed a solid farm bill from the Senate Agriculture Committee that strengthens and enhances crop insurance and saves money. At a time when we are running a Federal deficit and debt, we are saving money. We passed the bill out of the Agriculture Committee last year. The House passed a bill different than the bill we passed out of the Senate Agriculture Committee, but the House Agriculture Committee passed a farm bill as well, and a good farm bill.

On the Senate floor last year we passed the farm bill and passed it with a large bipartisan vote. On the House side they were not able to pass it. They were not able to pass their bill, so at the end of the year when the current farm bill expired we were forced to do an extension.

We come back this year. The Senate Agriculture Committee again passes a good solid farm bill that strengthens crop insurance, is good for farmers and ranchers, and saves money. We pass it on the Senate floor as well. On the House side, they pass the bill through the House Agriculture Committee and they pass a bill on the floor. It did not include the nutrition piece, but they did pass a bill on the floor.

This week they are set to vote on a nutrition bill. That is good. They need to do that and they need to make their decision on how they want to handle the food stamp reform, or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program reforms. But the key is they need to name their conferees. They need to take action this week and name their conferees. We have named our conferees. I am pleased to be a member of the conference committee. But we need to work. We need to get this finished.

The reality is, for our farmers and ranchers, we should not be providing another 1-year extension. These are business people. They need to plan. They need to know what the 5-year farm program is going to be so they can plan and operate their business accordingly. There are on the order of 16 million jobs in this country that are dependent, directly or indirectly, on agriculture. We want to get this economy growing. Those are a tremendous number of jobs, 16 million jobs, that, directly or indirectly, rely on agriculture. Agriculture creates a positive balance of trade.

We are talking about an energy efficiency bill right now and our farmers are out there right now, not only producing food but fuel as well—food, fuel, and fiber. They create not only jobs in this country but they have a positive trade balance, which is tremendous for our country.

The bill, as I mentioned earlier, saves money. At a minimum we are going to save \$24 billion, and it will likely be more than that. It helps with the deficit and the debt.

I want to close today by again calling on my colleagues on the House side to deal with the nutrition issue, name their conferees, let's get into conference, and let's get a farm bill done. Thanks to our farmers and ranchers, we have the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the world, in the history of the world. That benefits every single American—whether you live in rural America or in the biggest city. Let's get it done.

I again thank the sponsors of this bill. They are working hard. You know what. They are setting an example for this body on the kind of bipartisanship and working together we need to have to get things done for the American people. I commend them both and thank them for this opportunity to present these amendments to their bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, the second amendment my colleague from North Dakota spoke about is another example of a bipartisan piece of legislation. In fact, I think the Presiding Officer of the Senate this afternoon is a co-sponsor of it, which I think makes sense because I think the current program which would, by 2030, lead to no fossil fuel-generated energy for use in newer renovated buildings is not practical. I think the impracticality of it is shown by the inability of the Department of Energy to move forward with their regulations.

I will say while this amendment repeals the fossil fuel ban in section 433, it also strengthens other existing provisions for Federal energy management, including extending the Federal efficiency targets for Federal buildings to 2013. I think it is a responsible approach and a practical approach. It will give the Federal Government added flexibility to achieve these reductions in energy production without adding burdensome new requirements to the Federal building energy managers.

It is also, in combination with many aspects of the underlying bill which deal with energy efficiency on Federal Government buildings and practices, basically encouraging the Federal Government to practice what it preaches and be more efficient, as the largest energy user in the country and probably in the world.

I think it is consistent with the legislation, although there may be some al-

ternatives people want to talk about, but I do think this is an amendment which actually makes sense because it is practical and I think it also is consistent, again, with our underlying purpose which is to, in a way that provides flexibility, achieve efficiency standards at the Federal Government level. It encourages more efficiency.

Finally, on the farm bill comments, I agree with my colleague from North Dakota. Our farmers need the predictability and certainty that comes with the farm bill. He talked about 1 year not being enough. I do agree with that. I hope we will be able to get the conferees named and get in conference and come out with a bill that helps farmers know what the rules of the game are. That is what they are looking for. They want to know the crop insurance program is going to be there and be sure and strong, the safety net will be there—which this bill will provide, regardless whether it is the House version or Senate version, and then they need to know what the rules of the game are for the other commodities and other programs.

I hope that can move forward because it would be great for our country, great for Ohio. The No. 1 industry in Ohio is agriculture. We are proud of that. We want to make sure those farmers have the ability to succeed.

I will yield back my time and thank Members who have come to the floor to talk about amendments. I hope other Members who might be listening will do that.

This is an opportunity, even before we can officially file or introduce amendments and debate and vote them. At least we can have the discussion so we are ready to go when I suspect we will have an agreement between leadership of both of our parties even later today. We are working on that. We think we have limited the number of amendments to a reasonable level and we are trying to encourage Members to work with us to ensure we can get to this underlying legislation and move forward with a bipartisan energy efficiency bill that is going to help on our trade deficits, going to help our economy grow jobs, make our environment cleaner, and is going to be one that actually shows this body we can in a bipartisan way do what is good for our constituents.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

NAVY YARD TRAGEDY

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in favor of the Vitter amendment to the energy efficiency bill. Before I begin my remarks, I wish to recognize the horrific events that occurred yesterday, a little over a mile from here. Yesterday's tragic and senseless shooting devastated families and changed lives forever. We continue to hold the victims and their loved

ones in our thoughts and we are deeply appreciative of law enforcement and first responders who helped save lives and prevent further violence.

Senator VITTER's amendment to the energy efficiency bill addresses a serious concern that I, along with many of my constituents, have expressed about ObamaCare. Specifically, this amendment seeks to eliminate special Washington, DC, exemptions in the current law. It requires congressional staff, including the committee and leadership staff as well as the President and the Vice President and all political appointees in the administration, to participate in the same exchanges ObamaCare forces on everyday Americans.

I have cosponsored this amendment with some of my colleagues, including Senators VITTER and ENZI, because I think it is clear the American people are fed up with the beltway mentality that the rules apply to everyone else but not Washington, DC. If you ask me, a law that applies to all Americans except those who wrote it simply does not pass the smell test.

By the way, I wish to note this elitist attitude is not anything new. In fact, America's second President, John Adams, warned against a legislative assembly that would "in time not hesitate to exempt itself from the burdens which it will lay without shame on its constituents." It turns out this was a tragically accurate prediction.

Before ObamaCare was even passed into law, I argued that those who wrote the law should be beholden to it. As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, I introduced an amendment that would require all Members of Congress and their dependents to obtain their health insurance through the Affordable Care Act's health care insurance exchanges. But last month, immediately after Congress left for the August recess, the Office of Personnel Management announced in its proposed rules on ObamaCare that the government can continue to make employer contributions to the health plans of congressional Members and staff. This basically means Members of Congress and congressional staff will receive a taxpayer-funded subsidy for their health care insurance. Ultimately, these tax dollars will be used to protect Washington insiders from the negative consequences of ObamaCare's health exchanges.

Following OPM's announcement, I immediately wrote to them, asking that they clarify in their final rule exactly who is subject to the exchanges. Specifically I asked them to ensure that in addition to Members of Congress, all congressional staff, including committee and leadership staff as well as political employees, go to the exchanges. I have written a followup letter to OPM, and as of yet I have not received a single response for this concern.

If ObamaCare is such a good idea, why would those who helped write the law not stand proudly by it? The fact that ObamaCare protects a select few from participating in the exchanges is further evidence that the law never should have been passed to begin with. But now that it has been passed, upheld by the courts as a massive tax increase, those who put it in place should be subject to the same burdensome regulations, taxes, and mandates that everyday Americans are stuck with. If the President and Congress say it is good enough for the American people, then it should be good enough for the President, Vice President, political appointees, and all congressional staff too. So this amendment I have cosponsored ensures that there is no special fix or exemption for Members of Congress and their staffs. It ensures that they participate in the exchanges just as does every other American starting January 1 of next year. It also ensures that any type of taxpayer-funded subsidies offered to them are also available to the American taxpayers through tax credits.

As many of my colleagues did, I spent the August recess meeting with my constituents and listening to their concerns. It probably won't surprise anyone that the general public doesn't think very highly of Congress, and this exemption is a perfect example of why that is the case.

Unfortunately, in recent days the conversation about this particular amendment has taken an ugly turn toward personal attacks. Regardless of whether my colleagues support this amendment, we should be talking about this measure in the context of what is fair and what is best for the American public. I urge my colleagues to abandon threats and personal attacks and examine this legislation based on its merits.

Since the Supreme Court upheld ObamaCare, its provisions have been repeatedly delayed by the administration, demonstrating that the Federal Government understands how bad the law will be for businesses and middle-class families. In fact, the Washington Times just reported that the Obama administration has delayed major aspects of the health care law no less than five times to date. And this latest move to insulate DC insiders from this unpopular law is more than enough evidence that ObamaCare is the wrong answer to the health care challenges in this country.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It is a reflection of a basic principle of our democracy: that equality under the law means the law applies to everyone. Serving the people of the United States is a privilege. It is about service. It is not about status. And if Congress is going to pass laws that are unpopular, we better be ready to live by the same rules as everyone

else. This is what this amendment is about, and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I wish to personally thank our distinguished colleague from Nevada for all of his work and partnership on this important measure. He has been an outspoken leader from the very beginning of this debate and has stood hard and fast for the truly fundamental principle that any rule we pass here for America should first and foremost and equally be applied to Washington. So I really appreciate his leadership and his work, which continues, and we look forward to the vote that we absolutely demand and deserve before October 1.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, every 68 seconds—a little more than 1 minute—someone in America develops Alzheimer's. It is a devastating and irreversible brain disease that slowly destroys an individual's cognitive functioning, including memory and thought.

Back home in Kansas, a Kansas City physician, Dr. Richard Padula, and his wife Marta had been married for 51 years when he was diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease in 2006. It is difficult to imagine the anguish Dick and Marta and their family and their friends experienced as he deteriorated from a leading heart surgeon into someone unable to comprehend a newspaper article. Unfortunately, these stories have become very common.

Alzheimer's currently affects more than 5.2 million people in the United States and more than 35.6 million people worldwide.

As our population ages, the number of people diagnosed with Alzheimer's after the age of 65 will double every 5

years, while the number of individuals 85 years and older with this disease will triple by 2050. Already, Alzheimer's is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States, and there is currently no cure, no diagnostic test, and no treatment for this terrible, terrible disease.

As a nation, we should, we must, we ought to commit to defeating one of the greatest threats to the health of Americans and to the financial well-being of our Nation.

In 1962, President Kennedy called our Nation to action to reach the Moon by the end of the decade, and Americans rallied around that cry. Similarly, we need to commit ourselves to a goal just as ambitious but perhaps even more imperative. We must strive to achieve not only an effective treatment but a cure for Alzheimer's over the next decade.

President Kennedy said: "... because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and skills, because that challenge is one that we are willing to accept, one we are unwilling to postpone, and one which we intend to win. . . ."—I would like those words to be spoken about the fight against Alzheimer's.

As the baby boomer generation ages and Alzheimer's disease becomes more prevalent, the need to confront the pending health care crisis has become even more urgent. The financial costs alone cannot be ignored. What it costs America's health care system, what it costs Americans, what it costs the taxpayers, we need to address these issues.

Caring for those with Alzheimer's and other dementias is expected to reach an expense of \$203 billion this year—\$203 billion this year—with \$142 billion covered by the Federal Government through Medicare and Medicaid.

A recent study by the RAND Corporation stated that the cost of dementia care is projected to double over the next 30 years, surpassing health care expenses for both heart disease and cancer. Without a way to prevent, cure or effectively treat Alzheimer's, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to rein in our Nation's health care costs.

Alzheimer's has become a disease that defines a generation, but if we focus and prioritize our research capacity, it does not need to continue to be an inevitable part of aging.

It is time to truly commit to defeating this disease in the next decade, a goal no more ambitious than President Kennedy set forth for the Apollo space program. For every \$27 that Medicare and Medicaid spend caring for an individual with Alzheimer's, the Federal Government only spends \$1 on Alzheimer's research—\$27 to care for the disease; \$1 to try to cure or prevent the disease.

Yet we know that research suggests that more progress could be made if given more support. One study found

that a breakthrough against Alzheimer's that delays the onset of the disease by just 5 years would mean an annual savings of \$362 billion by 2050. A sustained Federal commitment to research for Alzheimer's will lower the cost and improve the health outcomes for people living with the disease today and in the future.

I am the ranking Republican on the Senate Appropriations subcommittee that funds the National Institutes of Health. NIH is the focal point of our Nation's medical research infrastructure, and I am committed to working with my colleagues to prioritize funding for Alzheimer's research. This year our subcommittee increased funding for the National Institute on Aging—the lead institute for Alzheimer's research at NIH—by \$84 million and supported the initial year of funding for the new Presidential initiative to map the human brain. Both projects will increase our understanding of the underlying causes of Alzheimer's, unlock the mysteries of the brain, and bring us closer—closer—to an effective treatment and, one day, closer to a cure.

Alzheimer's is a defining challenge of my generation, and we should commit to a national goal to defeat this devastating disease. We can do that by supporting critical research carried out by scientists and researchers across our Nation and supported by the National Institutes of Health.

In my view this is an area in which we all can come together. You can be the most compassionate, caring person—and we ought to spend money to care for people—you can be the most cautious about spending dollars and the investment and what the return is for every dollar we spend, and because we could save on health care costs, you ought to be supportive of this funding.

The health and financial future of our Nation, in my view, is at stake, and the United States cannot, should not, must not ignore this threat. Together, we can make a sustained commitment to Alzheimer's research that will benefit our Nation and bring hope to families such as the Padulas, as well as to every American. It is a challenge. It is a challenge we ought to accept. The moment for us to act is now, and the end result is hope for the future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I rise in support of the legislation coauthored by Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act. I wish

to take a minute to thank them for their leadership and for their tenacity in getting this bill to the floor, struggling through all of the amendments that are being offered to it, trying to make sure we figure out how we can actually save some energy, save some money, and do some good for our environment.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire very much. It is always a pleasure to work with a recovering Governor. We will see where this ends. I hope it ends in a good place. As our economy picks up and our Nation's energy needs grow, investing in energy efficiency is a no-brainer.

Energy efficiency investments save money, save money in energy costs, save energy resources, protect our environment, and create jobs.

Homeowners and businesses are already investing in energy-efficient technologies. As an extra bonus, many of these technologies are developed right here—not here in Washington but right here in America. Earlier this month I visited a company called WhiteOptics, and they are producing advanced light bulb technology. When it is used, it can deliver more light than traditional fluorescent bulbs for half the energy. Think about that, more light for half the energy. The payback for that technology is not just less than a decade, not less than 5 years, it is less than 1 year.

Since the cost of lighting can comprise up to 50 percent of a manufacturer's energy bill, it is a relatively easy and inexpensive way to save money and, as it turns out, a lot of money. Through investments in advanced light bulbs, light technology, and other energy efficiency measures, our country has the potential to save as much as 40 gigawatts of power by 2018.

How much is 40 gigawatts? Think of 80 coal-powered plants, all of them going full blast, is about 40 gigawatts.

Unfortunately, barriers such as upfront costs and inadequate efficiency standards are preventing our country from realizing our energy efficiency potential. The Shaheen-Portman bill breaks down many of these barriers. Again, I think voting for it is a no-brainer.

As an added bonus, the legislation before us will help us rein in Federal spending too, because it includes provisions that will reduce Uncle Sam's energy consumption from across the country and around the world.

To illustrate that point, let me use an example from the world of sports. Similar to a lot of Americans, I spent some time the past two weekends watching some terrific football games. But on Labor Day I took the 12-year-old boy I mentor and his twin sister to see the final game of the season of the Wilmington Blue Rocks, a Single-A team, Minor League team that played in the Carolina League.

It turned out to be a very good game. One of the highlights again—the Presiding Officer is from Massachusetts and the prime sponsor of the bill is from New Hampshire. My guess is they are Red Sox fans, and we used to be a farm club for the Red Sox. Now we have a farm club of the Royals, but the minor league game we went to was terrific.

One of the highlights occurred when the Blue Rocks came close to pulling off a triple play. You don't see that very much. It is very rarely seen and done in the majors, much less in the minors.

While our Blue Rocks came close to pulling off a triple play that day, our Federal Government can actually pull one off, at least figuratively speaking, by reducing the amount of energy we consume every year in the Federal Government.

Here is how we do it. First, you cut down on the carbon and the air pollution that is going into the air and we thus improve American's health.

Second, we cut down on Federal spending. The deficit is down—what did we hear at lunch today—about \$1.4 trillion 4 years ago. We are down to something under \$700 billion now.

It is still too much, but we have seen the deficit come down by over half, and this can help bring it down a bit further.

The third point is we can cut down unemployment by creating good American jobs to produce, install, and to maintain the energy that is needed for energy efficiency technology, a lot of which I said earlier is made right here in the USA. We are not talking minor leagues here either, at least in terms of savings. This is big league stuff.

The annual energy bill for the Federal Government is around \$25 billion. I think the Federal Government is the largest consumer of electricity in the country. Of that, some \$7 billion alone is spent on energy to operate Federal buildings, \$7 billion just for the buildings alone.

Last Congress, my colleague from Delaware, Senator CHRIS COONS, and our colleague SHELDON WHITEHOUSE—from another small State—and I tried to pull off a triple play of our own. We produced a bill that was called the Reducing Federal Energy Dollars Act. It focused like a laser on greening down Federal energy costs.

Today we are happy to see that many of its provisions have been incorporated in the Shaheen-Portman bill. If we pass it, we could pull off that triple play after all.

One of those provisions takes what works and seeks to ensure we do more. Here is just one example. Not too long ago the Veterans Affairs Department, which runs the VA for us, mandated that employees turn off their computers at the end of the workday. This is not the whole Federal Government.

This is one department of the Federal Government, the VA.

The agency also began acquiring more energy-efficient computers and software. Combined, the Department plans to save about \$32 million over the next 5 years—\$32 million. This is not too shabby. Again, that is just one Federal department. The bill before us calls on all agencies to adopt these kinds of energy and cost-saving techniques.

Another provision included in the Shaheen-Portman legislation adopted from our earlier legislation ensures that we build Federal buildings with some of the most energy-efficient technology that is available. These are buildings that will be with us for not just a couple of years, maybe not just for a couple of decades, they could be here a whole lot longer.

They could be around when all of these pages down here are dead and gone. We still have these Federal buildings. They can still be energy efficient, but if we build them wrong, they will never be energy efficient. Maybe so. This is a chance to get it right from the start.

Overall, the Shaheen-Portman bill makes major strides in promoting Federal energy efficiency. I wish to applaud its authors, both of whom I have huge respect, love and affection for, especially my former colleague in the National Governors Association.

However, there is a small provision in the bill that was overlooked and one that, if added, could make possible even greater gains. I will talk about that for a minute.

Under the Energy Policy Act of 2005, Congress overlooked geothermal as a renewable for the purposes of Federal energy requirements. Renewable thermal energy is clean, it is efficient, and it is often more cost-effective than electric energy.

This is why I have joined a colleague, Senator INHOFE of Oklahoma, in offering amendment No. 1851—if you are keeping score—which allows geothermal to be considered a renewable energy for Federal requirements. Our amendment gives Federal agencies another valuable option as they consider the most cost-effective way to meet their energy needs and obligations. It is another option.

I again wish to thank our chair and ranking member of the energy committee, as well as the sponsors of this bill, the authors of this bill, in support of our amendment.

Before I close, there is something I have to get off my chest. This is a bipartisan bill. This is a bill that seeks to do a number of things I said earlier. This is a bill that tries to reduce our energy consumption in this country, especially the energy consumption of the energy consumed in the Federal Government.

This is legislation that tries to do some good things for the environment.

This is legislation that helps to further reduce our budget deficits. It helps keep them coming down.

This is a bill that has bipartisan support and does so much good. People offer amendments to this bill, hopefully, that are germane amendments. Let's debate them and have a chance to vote on them, up or down, but let's do it and let's move on. Let's not be dilatory. Let's not just offer amendments that have nothing to do with this legislation. Let's address some real problems—not just address them, but let's solve them. Let's solve them. And we can do that.

We have plenty of work to do on this front. I wish to see us do it. We will be a lot more successful in this regard if we work together to foster what I call a culture of thrift.

We need to look at everything we do in this government that has discretion and will probably get a better result for less money. One of the ways is how do we provide energy for Federal buildings and for Federal employees to use in the work we do for our taxpayers—how do we get a better result for less money or the same amount of money.

Almost everything needs to be on the table if we are to continue to whittle down the size of our Federal budget and restore our Nation's fiscal challenge for my children, for our children, and for our grandchildren. I think if we accomplish this while at the same time creating some well-paying jobs at home and save energy, we will come close to completing that triple play that the Wilmington Blue Rocks came very close to pulling off a couple of weekends ago.

In doing so, we will give something for our fans—there are not a lot of them these days—to talk about for seasons to come.

The last thing I wish to say is this. One of the amendments that is offered, maybe a couple of the amendments offered to this bill have to do with health care.

I serve on the Finance Committee and worked a fair amount on the Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare. The heart and soul of the Affordable Care Act, as far as I am concerned, is the creation of the health exchanges, Federal exchanges, or they call them marketplaces. The idea is to let everybody in this country—not everybody but a lot of people in this country who don't have health care coverage or who have paid an arm and a leg for it—have the opportunity to participate in a large purchasing pool in their own State.

We have something such as the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan that all Federal employees, Federal retirees, including legislators, Members of the legislative branch, judges, folks throughout the country, Federal retirees, their dependents, postal employees, postal retirees, their dependents,

everybody who wants to purchase their health insurance through the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan can do that. It is up to about 7 million or so people. We don't have that many Federal employees, but there are a lot of people who use that plan to buy their health insurance. It is not free. It is not cheap.

One of the things that helped drive down the cost is every health insurance company worth their salt in this country wants to sell through this large purchasing pool, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan purchasing pool. Because of the large size, the economies of scale, the administrative costs to those who get their insurance through the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan, the administrative costs are not 30 percent of premiums, they are not 20 percent of premiums, they are not 10 percent of premiums—they are 3 percent of premiums.

What we do with the Affordable Care Act is we allow every State to set up a health care exchange, a large purchasing pool, also called health insurance marketplaces. If you are an individual, if you have a family, a small- or medium-sized business up to 50 employees, you can buy your health insurance through the exchange in the health insurance marketplace in your State.

One of the stipulations—I am not sure who authored it, but I am pretty sure it is a Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee. It may have been Senator GRASSLEY. Somebody authored an amendment that required and said if these exchanges are such a great idea, why don't we require us, Members of Congress, and our staffs to buy our health insurance through the exchanges? If that is such a great idea, why don't we too? That is what the legislation says.

We don't get our health insurance free. Members, our staff, folks who work for the Federal Government, we don't get it free. We have to pay a percentage of our premiums.

Most large employers pay something. The employer contribution, the average is about 70 percent. The Federal Government pays about 70 percent of our health insurance premiums. We have to pay the rest.

I think for us to set an example, I think the kind of example we should set would be if we set up these health insurance exchanges, why don't we participate in them. We are going to.

Some people think we get free health care. Some people think we get a pension after 2, 4 or 6 years. People see this stuff on the Internet and they believe it. It is not true.

We say in the Navy if you want to find out the truth, ask for the straight skinny. That is what you call it in the Navy, the straight skinny. Tell me the straight skinny. Give it to me straight.

The great skinny is these health exchanges are a very important compo-

nent of the Affordable Care Act. Every State will have an opportunity to set them up. Individuals, families, small- and middle-sized businesses will have an opportunity to participate. They will get better options to choose from. In the end, I think we will get better prices and they will be better off. Small businesses that participate, small- and middle-sized businesses will be better off as well.

The last word, speaking of the truth, the words of Thomas Jefferson come to mind. Thomas Jefferson said a lot of great things, but one of my favorite things he said was if the people know the truth, they will not make a mistake. If the American people know the truth, they will not make a mistake.

Our job is to make sure they know the truth about the Affordable Care Act, the kinds of options and opportunity they can find through these exchanges and through these health marketplaces across the country. Let's stick to the truth.

In closing, the truth is this bill that is before us shouldn't be a vehicle for health care reform, getting rid of it or expanding health care reform; this should be a roadmap to help us save money, clean our environment, preserve energy, reduce energy, and foster American technology. That is great. That is not a triple play. If they had four outs in an inning, there would be four of them.

Senator SHAHEEN—Senator PORTMAN is not with us—my hat is off to both of them. Thank you for leading the way. We are happy to be, as we say in NASCAR, drafting on you, and hopefully we will draft right across that finish line with you.

Thank you very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Before my colleague from Delaware leaves the floor, I wish to thank him for coming down, speaking on the bill, and for his kind words. As the Senator pointed out, we were Governors together. Actually, we have another former Governor on the floor, Senator KING of Maine, who also appreciates dealing with the challenges of high energy costs.

The Senator pointed out, and something that I know, that as Governors energy was a big issue for us. In New Hampshire we have the sixth highest energy costs in the country, so it is still a big issue for us in New Hampshire. As the Senator points out, energy efficiency is the cheapest, fastest way to deal with our energy needs because the energy we don't use doesn't cost us any money.

I would argue that, as the Senator mentioned when he closed, this is not just an opportunity for a triple play but an opportunity for us to win on four fronts: on job creation, on reducing pollution, on savings for businesses and for consumers who have to use en-

ergy, but also on national security. Because to the extent we can reduce our dependence on foreign oil, it helps improve our national security. So this bill is a win-win-win-win.

The amendments, such as the one the Senator is talking about today with Senator INHOFE, improve the bill significantly. If we can call up that amendment today—the amendment of the Senator from Delaware on thermal energy—we can probably get a voice vote on it because it has that kind of bipartisan support in this body. It is something the committee has looked at—both the majority and the minority on the energy committee—and said this is an amendment we think can be supported and has great bipartisan support.

As the Senator from Delaware says, we need to have these votes on energy, we need to get a comprehensive energy-efficient strategy in this country, and that is what Shaheen-Portman does. I very much appreciate the Senator's good work on this legislation.

Mr. CARPER. Reclaiming my time for a moment—and I note Senator ANGUS KING is patiently sitting over there waiting to speak—I said earlier the cleanest, most affordable form of energy is the energy we never use. The cleanest, most affordable form of energy is the energy we never use. Whoever said that first was a wise man or woman. That is the case here, and so I thank Senator SHAHEEN for leading us toward that goal.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I thank the Senator. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am here, as the Presiding Officer knows, for the 43rd time now, to say it is time to wake up to the threat of climate change. Today I am joined by my colleague from Maine, Senator ANGUS KING, a fellow New Englander, whose State, like Rhode Island, has rich cultural and economic ties to the sea. As carbon pollution changes our oceans, the consequences for our States, for our fishermen, for our economies, for our way of life are very real—far more real than the lives of the deniers.

Here is what we know: The oceans are warming. That is a measurement, it is not a theory. Sea level is rising. That is another measurement, not a theory. And oceans are becoming more acidic. Again, that is a measurement.

In fact, according to research published in the journal *Oceanography*, the acidity of the oceans is now increasing

faster than it has in the last 50 million years. We know what is causing it—carbon pollution. My colleagues can deny and delay and dance all day to the polluters' tune, but these are facts.

The changes are already reaching our marine life. A research paper published in August looked at the changes over time of where species have lived, when they laid their eggs, and how they have grown their shells. The authors concluded that more than 80 percent of the changes documented in the study were consistent with what one would expect as consequences of a warming and acidifying ocean.

Some species are moving toward the colder water of the North and South Poles, moving at about 10 to 45 miles per decade, extending their range. Events that are timed for spring and summer, such as egg laying or migration, are happening on average about 4 days earlier per decade. This means if a parent teaches their child how to fish, where the best spots are, how to dig for quahogs or what time of year to get the traps out, all of that changes by the time that child becomes a parent.

Here is how these changes are affecting Rhode Island, according to Christopher Deacutis, the previous chief scientist of the Narragansett Bay Estuary Program. I will read what he said:

Although regional climate factors, such as the North Atlantic Oscillation, can influence temperature trends, there appears to be an overall increase in annual Narragansett Bay water temperature of about 3 degrees Fahrenheit since 1960. Fish species in Narragansett Bay are shifting, seemingly in step with increased temperatures. Jeremy Collie—

And he is a URI professor.

—and others have shown that cold-water marine species, such as the winter flounder, which used to be the dominant fish species in the bay, are radically decreasing in numbers. Meanwhile, warmer-water species, such as summer flounder, scup, and butterfish seem to be increasing. More southern warm-water species that weren't seen in the past are likely to extend their range north as Narragansett Bay continues to warm. In addition, there seems to be an overall shift from large bottom-dwelling species, such as flounder, to small water column plankton-feeding species, such as anchovies.

That is the end of his quote.

NOAA researchers studied 36 fish in the northwest Atlantic Ocean—fish such as the Atlantic cod and haddock, yellowtail and winter flounders, spiny dogfish, Atlantic herring—and found that about half are shifting northward. Janet Nye, the lead NOAA researcher, said:

During the last 40 years, many familiar species have been shifting to the north, where ocean waters are cooler, or staying in the same general area but moving into deeper waters than where they traditionally have been found. They all seem to be adapting to changing temperatures and finding places where their chances of survival as a population are greater.

Those are long descriptions of the situation. Here are some briefer de-

scriptions. One Rhode Island fisherman told me: "It's getting weird out there." Another said he is seeing "real anomalies . . . things just aren't making sense."

Some might say: Who cares about the winter flounder or these other fish, for that matter? Some people don't care about God's world or God's species unless they can monetize them. Let's answer them in the terms they care about.

The winter flounder has been a lucrative catch for Rhode Island fishermen, and according to a variety of estimates commercial fishing generates about \$150 million to \$200 million of spending per year in Rhode Island and directly supports about 5,000 workers. Recreational fishermen spend over \$100 million annually and directly support about 2,000 workers.

Last year the Commerce Department declared the northeast groundfish fishery a disaster. To quote Acting Commerce Secretary Blank:

The diminished fish stocks . . . resulted despite fishermen's adherence to catch limits intended to rebuild the stocks.

The Commerce Department says it is not overfishing that is preventing our stocks from rebounding. Scientists think warmer waters could be the culprit.

The effects of climate change on marine life don't stop with warmer waters. Carbon dioxide emissions are also causing our oceans to become more acidic. Last week two Rhode Islanders came down and visited us here in the Senate: Bob Rheault, the executive director of the East Coast Shellfish Growers Association, and Dave Spencer, president of the Atlantic Offshore Lobstermen's Association. Dr. Rheault told my colleagues about shellfish larvae literally dissolving because of more acidic waters. More acidic waters caused a 70- to 80-percent loss of oyster larvae at an oyster hatchery in Oregon and crashed wild oyster stocks in Washington State. This is an industry worth millions to those local economies.

The problem, as Dr. Rheault pointed out, is that while we know carbon pollution is causing ocean acidification, we don't know enough yet how to protect the shellfish industry. We could help by continuing support for the Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act and by supporting funding for the U.S. Integrated Ocean Observing System. We could support funding for the National Endowment for the Oceans. We need to better understand the changes around us to protect the economic, ecological, cultural, and recreational value our oceans and coasts provide.

Rhode Islanders are already working hard to rebuild our fishing industry. We are managing overfishing and limiting water pollution. We have planned for the future by developing a special

area management plan for our coasts and waters. We are working on a shellfish management plan to better support an industry that is growing at 20 percent a year. We have supported world-class oceanographic research with scientists at URI's Graduate School of Oceanography, conducting some of the highest quality long-term research on marine ecology.

My wife Sandra was part of that research tradition at URI, and I can remember as a young husband helping her in her lab and out on the bay.

There was a story recently in the Providence Journal about a lobsterman named Al Eagles, out on his boat near the Newport Bridge recording on a tablet computer the size, gender, and location of lobsters he catches. Mr. Eagles is working with the Commercial Fisheries Research Foundation trying to improve the southern New England lobster stock assessment. American lobsters have been, in the past, Rhode Island's most valuable commercial catch. Mr. Eagles said:

The last 2 years it has been very slow. It's been the worst 2 years we've ever had.

In Rhode Island, lobster catches and stocks rose rapidly in the 1990s and then plummeted around 2000.

Again, it is a similar story. Scientists think the lobsters are moving offshore and northward to shelter in cooler waters. As the lobsters move offshore and change their traditional behavior, we need to know more about what is going on. But it gets more difficult. We are doing our level best, from our scientists to our fishermen, from our labs to our lobster boats, to understand. There is now so much more we need to understand. Fisheries and fisheries management, like so many other industries, is going to have to operate in a new reality—a reality of warmer and more acidic seas.

In the colder waters of Maine, as Senator KING will explain, a lobster boom continues, but it is not all good news, and Maine lobstermen are already sounding the alarm bells at what climate change will mean for them in the future. The fates of our two coastal economies—Maine's and Rhode Island's—are connected.

The Presiding Officer represents the State of Massachusetts, which is right in the middle of this problem as well. None of our three States can solve what carbon pollution is doing to our oceans alone. Even with our three States working together, we can't solve what carbon pollution is doing to our oceans. Federal action is necessary to reduce the carbon emissions that are warming and acidifying our seas and to help us adapt to the changes we can no longer avoid. Fishermen and scientists know these challenges are real, as does my friend from Maine, Senator ANGUS KING. But we can't act alone. It is time for all of Congress to wake up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

A LOOMING THREAT

Mr. KING. Madam President, in the 1930s there was a looming threat from Germany to the peace of Europe and to the existence of England. That threat was real, and there were multiple signs. There was data. But there were very few people who wanted to do anything about it because it would have caused disruption—economic and personal disruption.

There was one politician in England who understood this threat, understood its dangers, and understood that if gone unmet it would engulf his country into a destructive and potentially catastrophic war. Of course, that politician was Winston Churchill. He saw the danger based upon data—the size of the German air force, the building of munitions, the invasion of other smaller countries, the expansion of Germany and their armed forces. He was ignored and ridiculed by his own party and by the leadership of his own party, but he kept talking. He kept raising this issue. He kept trying to raise and awaken the people of England. It was a very difficult task. In fact, our own great President John F. Kennedy wrote his thesis as a student about this period in English history, and the title was very provocative and forward-thinking: “Why England Slept.” Churchill tried to wake them up. Had he been heeded, World War II could have been avoided.

There were multiple times when Hitler could have been stopped by the slightest bit of resistance on the part of the European powers. Instead, the war came, and 5 years later 55 million people had died. Not heeding warnings has consequences, and we can always find reasons for nonaction. Churchill acknowledged this. The British had been through the trauma of World War I less than 20 years before. They couldn't face the possibility of another devastating war. That is totally understandable, and that is human nature.

To capture the flavor of Churchill's warning, which I think is very relevant to us here today, here is what he said in a speech to the Parliament on November 12, 1936:

The era of procrastination, of half measures, of soothing and baffling expedience, of delays, is coming to its close. In its place we are entering a period of consequences. We cannot avoid this period, we are in it now.

He understood the resistance of the people in England. He said:

We recognize no emergency which should induce us to impinge on the normal course of trade. If we go on like this, and I do not see what power can prevent us from going on like this, some day there may be a terrible reckoning—

That reckoning was World War II—and those who take the responsibility so entirely upon themselves are either of a hearty disposition or they are incapable of foreseeing the possibilities which may arise.

He then went on to talk about the responsibility of a parliamentary body. And I will conclude my comments on Churchill with this quote:

Two things, I confess, have staggered me, after a long Parliamentary experience, in these Debates. The first has been the dangers that have so swiftly come upon us in a few years. . . . Secondly, I have been staggered by the failure of the House of Commons to react effectively against those dangers. That, I am bound to say, I never expected. I never would have believed that we should have been allowed to go on getting into this plight, month by month and year by year, and that even the Government's own confessions of error would have produced no concentration of Parliamentary opinion. . . . I say that unless the House resolves to find out the truth for itself, it will have committed an act of abdication of duty without parallel in its long history.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Madam President, I rise today because we are entering a period of consequences. It is 1936. It is August 2001, when we had warnings that Al Qaeda determined to strike in the United States.

I actually carry this chart around in my iPhone, but I blew it up for today's purposes. It is a chart of the last million years of CO₂ in the atmosphere. I believe this chart answers two of the three basic questions about global climate change.

The first is, Is something happening? And occasionally we hear people say: Well, climate change happens in cycles, and CO₂ goes up and down, and we are just in a cycle and it is no big deal.

This is 1 million years, and for the past 999,000-plus we did have cycles. The cycles were between about 180 parts per million in the atmosphere up to about 250—I think 280 was the highest—back 400,000 years ago. But this has been the cycle since before human beings started to actively impinge upon the environment.

Then comes the year 1000. We go along here at a fairly high level, and then around 1860 it starts to go up. What happened in 1860? That was the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. That was when we started to burn fossil fuels in large quantities, whether it was coal, later oil, gas. But that was when it happened.

So this answers the second question, which is, Do people have anything to do with it? Of course they do. It would be the greatest coincidence in the history of the world if this change just happened to begin at the same time as the Industrial Revolution.

Then you see where it has gone since 1960. This chart is actually a couple of years out of date. This point is just below 400 parts per million. We passed 400 parts per million this summer. We are now here.

I don't see how anyone can look at this chart and conclude anything else. A, something is happening to CO₂ in the atmosphere, and B, people are involved in causing it. I just don't see how you can escape that.

I believe this is the other piece about this 400. The last time we had 400 parts per million of CO₂ in the atmosphere we know from ice cores was 3 million years ago, during the Pliocene period. I knew someday my sixth grade geology would come to the fore. And when we had 400 parts per million of CO₂ in the atmosphere 3 million years ago, sea levels were 60 to 80 feet higher than they are today. As the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island said, this isn't argument. This isn't theory. This is data. This is fact.

Remember I said there are three questions about global climate change. One is, Is CO₂ really going up? The answer is yes. Two is, Do people have anything to do with it? The answer is yes. The third question is, So what? So what if CO₂ is going up?

Here is an interesting chart of the past 400,000 or 500,000 years. You have a red line and a black line. The black line is temperature and the red line is CO₂. As you can see, it is an almost exact correlation. I don't think anybody could argue, looking at this, that the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere has nothing to do with the temperature on the Earth. Is it causal? Is there a correlation? There are a lot of things going on here about feedback loops, and it is very complicated. Climate science is one of the most complicated sciences there is. But I don't think you can look at this chart and say there isn't some relationship between carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and temperature. This is what has been happening as CO₂ and temperature move essentially in lockstep.

I should mention that often when we are talking about these things—and the Senator from Rhode Island knows what I am saying—people tend to think that we are talking in long periods of time, we are talking about geologic time, thousands of years. No. Climate change often happens abruptly. That is a word that ought to strike fear into our hearts. Abruptly. Almost overnight.

This is temperature and size of the ice field in Greenland. You can see it going back 5,000 to 10,000 years. Here it is going along, temperature goes along, starts to drop, and then it drops in a decade. It is as if someone throws a switch. So this isn't something where we can just say: Oh well. We will do a few little things now and maybe it will be OK, and then 100 years or 500 years from now somebody else will worry about it. There could be a catastrophic event within years, certainly within decades.

The University of Maine has a center that talks about climate change. When I went up to see them last spring, they said: Senator, you have to understand, we are talking about the possibility of abrupt climate change, not just climate change. I think that is a very important point to realize.

So what difference does temperature make? If it gets a little warmer, Maine will have a longer tourist season. That will be OK if it is warmer. I don't think anybody will complain if it is warmer in Maine in February—maybe the ski industry. But what difference does it make?

It makes a lot of difference. It makes a lot of difference to species, but it also makes a lot of difference to people.

Here is a chart that shows what would happen to many of our coastal communities with a sea level rise that is reasonably modest. The dark red out here is a 1-meter rise. It goes up to 6 meters. That is about 20 feet. But remember the last time we were at 400 parts per million, it was 60 to 80 feet. So this is conservative. This is a smaller example of what can happen if we let this happen to us.

Boston essentially is gone. A good deal of downtown Boston, Virginia Beach, Norfolk, the Outer Banks—gone. Southern Florida, Miami, the eastern coast of Florida all the way up into Tampa—gone. By the way, there is no more fresh water in Florida during this period either because of the intrusion of seawater into the water table. New Orleans is all gone. This is at 20 meters. In fact, it is not even that. This is about a 3-meter rise. Going up, Savannah and Charleston, New York City, Long Island, the New Jersey shore—all gone.

This isn't academic. This impacts billions of dollars of expenditures to try to fight this off and to hold it at bay.

What about species? In Maine we talk about lobster. The lobster is an iconic product of Maine. It is a huge part of our society, it is part of our culture, it is also a big part of our economy. Well over \$1 billion a year in Maine is attributable, in one way or another, to the lobster. The lobster population in Maine was pretty steady for an awful long time. When I was Governor—and that was 10 or 12 years ago—we harvested roughly 50 million pounds of lobster per year. That was the way it had been, between 40 and 50 million. In 2008 it went to 69 million pounds; in 2009 it went to 81 million; 2010, 96 million—last year, 123 million pounds, more than twice as much as what was harvested 10 or 12 years ago.

I am sure you are saying to yourself: What is the problem, Senator? The lobsters are doing great.

They were doing great in Rhode Island and Connecticut until the temperature started to kill them off. It makes a boom and then there is a danger—we certainly hope it will not happen—but there is a danger of a collapse. That is what happened. The lobster fishery in southern New England has essentially collapsed.

The lobster makes up about 70 to 80 percent of our fisheries' value. What is happening in Maine is as the water gets

warmer the lobsters go north. Is the water getting warmer? Here is Maine—Boothbay Harbor, ME, a great town. If anybody wants to visit, it is a wonderful place to visit. I have to get in that little bit of promotion.

Here is the water temperature in Boothbay Harbor over the last 10 years. It is going up. It is getting warmer. There is no indication—in fact, if you follow the curve here, it appears it is headed into an accelerating mode, the famous hockey stick.

Anything above 68 degrees of water temperature is very stressful to lobsters. The University of Maine says:

While warmer waters off the coast in recent years have probably aided the boom in lobster numbers, putting us right in the temperature sweet spot . . . we're getting closer and closer to that point where the temperature is too stressful for them, their immune system is compromised and it's all over.

"And it's all over," that is a frightening phrase, it is all over. In the 1980s lobster fishing was concentrated in southern Maine, along our coast, in what is called Casco Bay, which is down around Portland. Then it moved up into what is called the midcoast, Lincoln County near where I live. The bulk of the lobster fishing moved up into Penobscot Bay and now the bulk of the lobster fishing is in what we call Hancock County, the village of Stonington, ME. At least that is where it was last year. In other words, the lobsters are moving north because the temperatures are getting warmer. That is what is happening.

I have a young man on my staff whose father is a lobster buyer in the midcoast of Maine. His father has been buying lobster since 1975. This past summer he bought 200 crates a night of lobsters; 10 years ago he was buying 100. So it has doubled. But what we are worried about is that when the lobster line passes, this industry is gone. We saw it collapse in southern New England, Rhode Island. In 1999 lobstering in Long Island Sound collapsed totally without warning, in part because of an infection that was brought about by the warmer water temperatures.

I use lobster as just an indication. You can substitute your own issue, local issue. Whether it is lobsters in Maine or flooding in Colorado, the impacts are real.

So what do we do? I hate raising problems and not talking about what to do. By the way, I have to say I am puzzled about why this has become a partisan issue. I do not understand it. Maybe it is because Al Gore invented it? I don't know. But I don't understand why this became a partisan issue because it is a scientific issue, it is a data issue. The data is overwhelming.

So what do we do? By the way, I should mention when I was a young man working in and around the legislature in Maine, the leaders of the environmental movement in Maine who

passed the major legislation to protect our environment were all Republicans—not all, but most of them were Republicans and they were great names in Maine history.

OK, what do we do? The first thing we have to do is admit there is a problem. If you do not admit there is a problem, by definition you cannot address it. That is No. 1. I think the data is becoming overwhelming.

The second thing you have to do is gather all the facts and information you can. Gather all the information. It has been my experience in working on public policy most of my adult life, if you have shared information, if the people working on the problem have the same facts, generally the conclusion, the policy, is fairly clear. It may be controversial, it may be difficult, but usually it becomes pretty self-evident if everybody shares the same sets of information. Once we can agree on the facts, the solutions become clear.

What are some things we can do in the near term? We have to talk about mitigating the impacts. We have to talk about the fact that fisheries are made up of both fishermen and fish. As climate change alters these coastal economies, we have to work to preserve both. We have to work with groups such as a nonprofit in Maine called the Island Institute that is working to preserve Maine's working waterfronts, and we also have to make sure our Federal fisheries management laws take cognizance of what is going on here and manage ecosystems, not just single species. We have to take cognizance of the fact that the fish are in fact moving.

In the long term, it seems to me, it is pretty simple. The big picture answer is we have to stop burning so much stuff. That is what is putting carbon in the atmosphere. Whether it is in our automobiles, our homes, our factories, our powerplants—it is burning fossil fuel that is putting CO₂ into the atmosphere. That is why the efficiency bill we are on this week is an important bill, because it cuts back on the use of energy altogether and saves us in terms of putting CO₂ into the atmosphere.

The President has proposed a carbon agenda that I think is an important first step. But this is hard. Dealing with this is a hard issue, just as dealing with the prospect of World War II was a hard issue in England in 1936. It is hard because it is going to require changes that are going to be, perhaps, expensive, and significant modifications—because our whole society is based on burning stuff. That is what makes our cars and trucks go, that is what makes our transportation system work, that is what keeps us warm in the winter, cool in the summer, and creates the electricity for all the products we use. It is hard because of the internal impacts.

It is also hard because it is an international problem. The Senator from Rhode Island talked about this being national. You know, Maine and Rhode Island can't fix it. He says the Federal Government has to step in. I would take it one step further. This has to be an international solution. We cannot take steps which would compromise our economy at the same time China and India are becoming major polluters. Air doesn't respect international boundaries. CO₂ is the same whether it is coming up from China, India, Europe, or the United States. I believe this is a case where we absolutely have to have international cooperation.

We have to do something. We have to do something. The generation that nobly woke up to World War II and fought it and preserved this country and Western civilization for us has often been referred to as the "greatest generation." The reason they were the "greatest generation" is they were willing to face a problem and make enormous sacrifices in order to deal with it, to protect us and our children and grandchildren and our ability to function in this new world. They were the "greatest generation."

I have to say, if somebody were going to characterize us, we would be characterized as the oblivious generation, the generation that saw the data, saw the facts, saw the freight train headed for us and said: That is OK, it is business as usual, don't bother me, I don't want to be inconvenienced.

To go back to Churchill:

The era of procrastination, half-measures, of soothing and baffling expedients, of delays, is coming to its close. In its place we are entering a period of consequences. . . . We cannot avoid this period; we are in it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, may I take this opportunity to thank my friend Senator KING for his remarkable comments on the Senate floor. I think it truly is our choice in this time and in this generation to be Nevilles or to be Winstons. Which way will we go? On that choice will hinge history's judgment of us.

There was another good Winston Churchillism that talked about " . . . the sharp agate points, upon which the ponderous balance of destiny turns."

For better or for worse, we live at a time that is a sharp agate point upon which the ponderous balance of destiny will turn. Senator KING has done a wonderful job of calling us to that duty and to that responsibility. I fear that in this particular body the facts are less relevant than the interests that are involved.

There are special interests, there are polluters who are calling a tune to which too many of our Members are happy to dance. I worry that many of

them will be willing to go down with the ship; that as the waters gurgle down their throats that last time, the last words up out of their mouths will be the flagrant falsehood: But the science still isn't real.

As much as I would like to see us solve this problem in this Chamber, as committed as I am to making that happen, I think we do have to call on the American people to stand and be counted and to make sure their voices are heard, because the choice that is before us is one where the American people have a view. They understand this problem and they know it is real. They are not fooled. They are not part of the polluters' dance. But they have to be heard. Whatever we can do to make sure their voices are reflected here I think we need to do.

There are some very important voices that recognize climate change is real: the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the entire property casualty insurance industry, the nameplate corporate leaders of America—whether it is Ford and GM or Nike and Apple or Coca-Cola and Pepsi, our national security establishment or national intelligence establishment and our foreign policy establishment. Wherever you look, people get it, except right here where the polluters call the tune and too many of us dance to it.

But with more people standing up the way Senator KING did, the sooner we will be able to bring that day. I am confident the American people will get this done and get it right.

The last Churchillism—I am kind of a fan of Winston Churchill: The American people will always do the right thing, after they have tried everything else.

We work together to bring that day forward.

Let me change the subject briefly to remark on a different occasion. It is also oceans related.

BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE

We have just been through the 200th anniversary of one of the pivotal naval victories in our Nation's history which was led by a great Rhode Island hero, Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry. Commodore Perry was born just after the dawn of our Republic in 1785, in South Kingstown, RI. His father Christopher Perry had fought in the American Revolution and after the war became a captain in the U.S. Navy. By the time young Oliver reached his teenage years, he was already serving as a midshipman on his father's vessel. Interestingly enough, his father's vessel was called the *General Greene*, named after Rhode Island's Revolutionary War hero Nathanael Greene, whose statue stands in this building—in the center of the Capitol—and who is renowned. General Cornwallis is reputed to have said that "Greene is more dangerous than Washington."

Young Oliver Perry was also destined for great things. The late 1700s and the early 1800s were a very precarious time for this fledgling American democracy, and it was still an open question whether our experiment in self-government would endure. In 1812, when America once again declared war on Britain, following a series of disputes over trade and territory, the future of this young democracy hung in the balance.

Oliver Hazard Perry went to war. He began his war service in Newport, RI, but in February of 1818, as the War of 1812 raged on, Perry was given command of the American forces on Lake Erie.

When Perry arrived in the region, the British had taken Detroit and were looking to expand their control of the American Northwest. As Richard Snow wrote in his chronicle of the Battle of Lake Erie for American Heritage magazine: "Perry took command vigorously and at once." He oversaw an aggressive shipbuilding operation on the lake's shore and worked diligently to raise enough men and guns to carry out his mission. GEN William Henry Harrison, later to be President, had positioned his fleet into a stalemate with British GEN Henry Procter on Lake Erie, leaving Perry and his fleet with the responsibility of retaking the lake for the United States.

Perry sailed west and holed up in Put-in-Bay on Lake Erie's South Bass Island. There he waited until, on September 10, 1813, Robert Heriot Barclay sailed his British command within sight of Commodore Perry's lookout. As Snow wrote about that:

The American ships cleared for action; stands of cutlasses were set up on deck, shot was placed near the guns, and the hatches were closed . . . Sand was sprinkled on the deck so that the sailors could keep their footing when the blood began to flow. Perry brought the ship's papers, wrapped in lead, to the ship's surgeon and told him to throw them overboard should the Lawrence be forced to strike. Sometime during the morning he hoisted his battle flag, a blue banner bearing the dying words attributed to Captain Lawrence: "Don't give up the ship."

The battle commenced, but the British were better armed and gained an early advantage. Soon enough, Perry's flagship, the *Lawrence*, was crippled, but he refused to give up. He took down his flag, climbed aboard a small row boat, and made his way toward the *Niagara*, the *Lawrence's* sister ship which had yet to engage in the battle. Perry's crossing between the ships is the inspiration for William Henry Powell's painting, which hangs in the staircase directly outside of this room right now. It is the biggest painting in the Senate, and it features a hero of the littlest State in the country.

From the *Niagara*, Perry reengaged the battle with the British and ultimately gained the day. He forced their surrender and sent the now famous

message to General Harrison: "We have met the enemy and they are ours." Lake Erie had been secured for America.

The War of 1812 continued on through 1814, but Perry's victory on Lake Erie was pivotal. Had the British taken Lake Erie, it would have provided a base for attacks into New York or into the new State of Ohio and for control of the American Northwest. Instead, the Treaty of Ghent ended the conflict with no loss of territory or trade to the United States.

Perry continued his naval service after the war, but he contracted yellow fever during a mission to Venezuela in 1819 and he died at the age of 34. Today, his name and his actions are remembered in ways large and small throughout our country. In Ohio, on Lake Erie, a bicentennial celebration was held this year commemorating the great battle, and Put-in-Bay boasts a memorial maintained by the National Park Service—Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial. I am told that up there one can toast to Perry's victory with a Commodore Perry IPA, courtesy of Cleveland's Great Lakes Brewing Company.

In Rhode Island, one can travel along Commodore Perry Highway in his native South Kingstown or visit the newly commissioned Rhode Island tall ship SSV *Oliver Hazard Perry*, which will provide education-at-sea programs to Rhode Island kids.

It is fitting that we continue to honor this great Rhode Islander. His victory on Lake Erie was, to borrow from Churchill, one of those "sharp agate points" on which history turned. So today I hope we will all take a moment and remember Oliver Hazard Perry and reflect on how differently our world would have turned out were it not for his actions.

I thank the Chair, I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. KING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today, the Nation celebrates the 226th anniversary of the Constitution's sign-

ing. That moment was a decision to create a Federal Government with the power to address national problems. During the Constitutional Convention, the delegates debated hundreds of issues and proposals before crafting the original version of the Constitution. Even then, though, the true genius of their charter was article V, which provided for later amendments—because the Founding generation knew that they did not have all the answers and they had faith in future generations to perfect their charter and "form a more perfect Union." And so, step by step, we have. "We the People" have shown a continuing concern for the sacred right to vote. And we have amended the Constitution six times to expand that right.

For over 2 centuries, the Constitution has allowed America to flourish and adapt to new challenges. Since the inclusion of the Bill of Rights in 1791, the Constitution has been amended 17 times. Our current version of the Constitution reflects not just the Founders original crafting, but also the need for subsequent amendments. Today is a good day to remind the American people that when we pledge to support the Constitution, we must pledge our support for the whole Constitution, and not just those specific provisions and amendments that we favor or find convenient to uphold.

Too often, I have heard people who profess to support the original meaning of the Constitution, ignore the subsequent amendments that inform and alter that original meaning. Some even express strong support for specific amendments, but then ignore others. That is not how our charter functions. It is not a menu that you can pick and choose from. The whole Constitution is what we celebrate today.

This past June, when the Supreme Court issued its decision on the Voting Rights Act, I noticed that there was surprisingly little discussion of the fundamental importance of the Reconstruction Amendments. After the Civil War, we transformed our founding charter into one that embraced equal rights and human dignity by abolishing slavery, guaranteeing equal protection of the law for all Americans, and prohibiting racial barriers to the right to vote. I find it alarming that many who claim to support and honor the Constitution conveniently ignore these critical amendments that made our Nation a more perfect one after the Civil War.

There are perhaps no two amendments that have played a larger role in securing liberty and equality for all Americans than the 14th and 15th Amendments. Without the 14th Amendment we would still have "separate but equal" treatment of Americans and State-sanctioned gender discrimination. Without the 15th Amendment, minorities would continue to be excluded

from fully participating in our democracy.

The importance of these amendments was clear upon passage. President Ulysses S. Grant in 1870 signed a bill into law that created the United States Department of Justice to help facilitate the enforcement of the 14th and 15th Amendments. But the Justice Department does not have sole responsibility for supporting and upholding the 14th and 15th Amendments. Congress, as provided by the text of the Amendments, has an even greater role in enforcing the mandates of those Amendments.

Section 5 of the 14th Amendment states that: "The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." Section 2 of the 15th Amendment states that: "The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." It is clear that the Constitution has placed the burden on Congress to ensure that all Americans are entitled to the freedoms and rights guaranteed by these two amendments.

It is for this reason that Congress must respond to the recent Supreme Court decision severely undercutting the Voting Rights Act by passing legislation that protects against racial discrimination in voting. It is our duty and constitutional obligation to not waver from the path of greater political inclusion that we have set for the Nation through our bipartisan support of the Voting Rights Act. I hope that Congress will work with me so that we can provide the protections guaranteed by these two amendments for all Americans.

On this day, as we commemorate the signing of the Constitution of the United States of America 226 years ago, I hope that Congress will be reminded of its obligation not only to periodically read the words of our founding charter, but to act and to give meaning to those words. I look forward to working with fellow Senators to reinvigorate the Voting Rights Act this fall to uphold our constitutional values and ensure that every American enjoys the right to vote.

CITIZENSHIP DAY

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, in 1940, Congress officially recognized the values inherent in United States citizenship by enacting legislation to designate a day of commemoration. At that time, the third Sunday in May was designated "I Am an American Day." In 1952, Congress passed new legislation to move the commemoration date to September 17, the date in 1787 the Constitution was signed. September 17 became known as Citizenship Day, a day that we recognize today.

Today's celebration of the values represented by United States citizenship represents also a celebration of our democracy. In Vermont, United States

Federal District Court Judge William Sessions will conduct a naturalization ceremony today. Once again the President will issue a proclamation to honor the principles of what it means to be an American. I am proud to join the President in the official recognition of the citizenship process and all it represents.

Last week, as Americans remembered and reflected upon the tragedy of September 11, 2001, I was reminded of how I recognized that terrible day on its 1-year anniversary. With Judge William Sessions, on September 11, 2002, we convened a naturalization ceremony in Vermont's historic State House. I was honored to speak at that ceremony and at others in the years following. These celebrations, in which we welcome new Americans, reflect America's resiliency and ongoing renewal. They also serve as an emotional reminder to me what it means to be part of this country. When we say to those who aspire to be Americans that we welcome you regardless of religion, ethnicity, native language, or culture, we honor the principles upon which America was founded, and which Americans spanning generations have given so much to defend.

This August, I was privileged to be invited to participate in a naturalization ceremony by the Chief Judge of the Federal District Court for the District of Vermont, Christina Reiss. I was moved then, as I am at every naturalization ceremony I attend, by how uplifting and hopeful this process is for those who have earned it and for those including myself who witness it.

In June, 68 Senators voted to pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill. The Senate and so many Americans—and aspiring Americans—wait with optimism and hopefulness for the House of Representatives to act. The core of the Senate's legislation was the opportunity for many millions of undocumented people living in the United States to enter the lawful immigration system, and to one day become citizens. The Senate recognized that the time for action is now and in acting, upheld the sacred values we celebrate today.

CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, especially in times of crisis but also in times of ease, Americans have reason to reflect on the foundation of the life we enjoy as a Nation. More than the citizens of any other country, when Americans think of their collective lives or their individual liberties, we think of a document. On this day, 226 years ago, a group of America's Founders signed the Constitution of the United States.

In May of 1787, 55 of the 70 delegates chosen by 12 of the 13 States gathered in the Pennsylvania Statehouse, where

both the Articles of Confederation and the Declaration of Independence had been signed. Just 115 days later, 39 of those delegates signed the Constitution and within 18 months it had been ratified and was the supreme law of the land.

The Constitution is special both for whose it is and for what it does. The Constitution's first three words identify its ownership when it says "we the people." The Constitution belongs to the people. The Constitution is also special for what it does. It both empowers and limits government. The Constitution gives powers to government by delegating enumerated powers to the Federal Government and reserving the others to the States and the people. And the Constitution limits those powers in multiple ways, including the very fact of being written down. As the Supreme Court put it in *Marbury v. Madison*, the Constitution was written so that the limits on government would be neither mistaken nor forgotten.

Put these two principles together and we see that the Constitution is the primary tool for the people to control their government. That is both the genius of its design and the source of its vitality. The Constitution lives because of whose it is and what it does. Departing from that design kills the Constitution.

President George Washington said in his farewell address that the very basis of our political system is the people's right to control their Constitution. Take away that right, undermine that control, strikes at the heart of the system of government that has given us liberty unparalleled in human history. That is why, for example, we contend over the appointment of Federal judges, many of whom appear willing or even determined to control the Constitution rather than to be controlled by it.

In times of crisis, we often look to the powers of government and in times of ease, we may emphasize more the limits on those powers. But let us never mistake or forget whose the Constitution is and what it does so that it may continue to fulfill the purposes stated in its preamble: to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

REMEMBERING DEREK JOHNSON

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity today to honor a true Utah hero—Sergeant Derek Johnson. Sadly, Sergeant Johnson lost his life in Draper, UT on the morning of September 1, 2013 in the line of duty.

From a very young age, Johnson always knew he wanted to be a police of-

ficer. His childhood aspirations became reality as he worked in various aspects of law enforcement. While he was still in high school he was an Explorer Scout for the Sandy City Police Department; followed by time as a police dispatcher, and then completion of police academy training. He has worked for the Draper City Police Department for the past 8 years, first as a reserve officer and then a full-time officer, and recently as Sergeant.

In 2012, Johnson was presented with the Distinguished Service Medal for his role in the investigation and prosecution of a child abuse homicide in 2012. He also received the Life Saving Award, and the 2012 Community Policing Officer of the Year.

Those who knew Johnson said he loved his family, and he loved his work as a police officer. Johnson has been described as someone with a good nature and a sense of humor that could light up any room; and the ability to make anyone his friend.

Draper City Mayor Darrell Smith stated: "I have known Derek for many years. He is one of the best and most qualified sergeants on our force."

Johnson leaves behind his childhood sweetheart and wife Shante' Sidwell Johnson, their 7-year-old son, Bensen who he called his "little buddy," his parents Randy and Laura Johnson, and many other family and friends.

I have the highest personal regard for those who not only enter law enforcement but put their lives on the line each day to protect and serve our fellow men, women and children in communities across America. Sergeant Johnson did just that—he sacrificed to keep his community safe and we owe a debt of gratitude to him for his courage and selfless service.

It is my sincere hope that Shante' and Bensen and the many family members and friends who love Sergeant Johnson will find peace and hope in the life he lived and the example he set for so many to follow.

REMEMBERING MARREEN CASPER

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I am grateful for this opportunity today to pay tribute to a truly extraordinary woman—Marreen Casper. Sadly, Marreen passed away on September 14, 2013, while she was serving a mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints with her husband Ron Casper in Tennessee.

I had the wonderful opportunity of working with Marreen while she served on my staff for 13 years. She retired at the end of last year to pursue new opportunities in life, and to spend time with her family whom she greatly loved. Throughout her years of service in my Senate Office, she distinguished herself as someone who truly cared about our great State and its citizens. For many years she worked as my

Southern Utah Field Director and became immersed in the many communities she served. She had a dogged determination and a great compassion for the citizens of southern Utah and had a ready smile and helping hand for all. She literally had friends in every corner of Utah through associations she has made and help she has rendered.

There has been no assignment ever given to Marreen that she did not fulfill willingly and with enthusiasm. She was a world-class volunteer for schools, campaigns, and other causes she believed in; dedicated Senate employee who fulfilled her duties in a professional, caring manner; faithful servant in her church; and loving wife and mother. Marreen was absolutely loyal and always approached challenges and obstacles with grit and determination.

To know Marreen was to know one irrefutable truth—she truly loved her family. She was very proud of her children and grandchildren. Family photos adorned her office walls, and conversations with Marreen were always peppered with anecdotes and stories of events and accomplishments taking place within her family. She was very careful to always balance her work responsibilities with family time. In fact, most of her vacation days were spent traveling to visit and participate in important events in the lives of family members. I know she attended sports events, graduations, baptisms, mission farewells, and so many other milestones in her children and grandchildren's lives and loved to regale her peers and friends with memories from these experiences. Marreen loved her family with her whole heart and soul and believed wholly in the power and strength of family.

Marreen also deeply loved the Gospel of Jesus Christ and had a strong and firm testimony of eternal life and in the teachings of our Savior. She served in many positions in the church and had a profound influence in the lives of those she worked with and through her beautiful example. Marreen and Ron had planned on serving a mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints for many years and carefully prepared for this opportunity to serve. She was thrilled to be called to Tennessee to spread the message of the Gospel and to help those in need. She was a true disciple of Jesus Christ and a loving example of missionary work going forward throughout the world. It is my firm hope that Ron and her family will find some peace and comfort knowing that Marreen died while in the service of her Heavenly Father whom she deeply loved.

I am grateful I had the opportunity to work and share a friendship with Marreen Casper. Her life although not as long as many would have hoped for; was a life well-lived. She was a woman deeply admired and loved. Elaine and I extend our deepest sympathies to Ron

and her five children and many grandchildren. May they find peace and comfort in the cherished memories they have shared with this noble woman.

REMEMBERING ELMORE LEONARD

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, when Michigan novelist Elmore Leonard passed away on August 20, the world lost an irreplaceable voice, a witty creator of unlikely and unforgettable characters who, like their creator, knew the value of brevity.

Leonard's novels took place in the American West, in the Everglades, in the Horn of Africa or the streets of Havana, but they always carried a little of his hometown, Detroit. His protagonists, like his hometown, were tough and gruff, but loveable and good-hearted, people of few words but bold actions. Like his hometown, Leonard's writing was without pretense or formality. "If it sounds like writing," he said, "I rewrote it."

The New York Times accurately described Leonard as "A Man of Few, Yet Perfect, Words." In 2001, he wrote for The Times a short essay on his tips for writers, titled, "Easy on the Adverbs, Exclamation Points and Especially Hoopedoodle." Their aim, he said, was to "remain invisible when I'm writing a book, to help me show rather than tell what's taking place in the story." His rules for writing are useful for all of us who write and want to be read, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD. The world has lost a great writer. I have lost a friend.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Published: July 16, 2001]

WRITERS ON WRITING: EASY ON THE ADVERBS, EXCLAMATION POINTS AND ESPECIALLY HOOPEDOODLE

(By Elmore Leonard)

These are rules I've picked up along the way to help me remain invisible when I'm writing a book, to help me show rather than tell what's taking place in the story. If you have a facility for language and imagery and the sound of your voice pleases you, invisibility is not what you are after, and you can skip the rules. Still, you might look them over.

1. Never open a book with weather.

If it's only to create atmosphere, and not a character's reaction to the weather, you don't want to go on too long. The reader is apt to leaf ahead looking for people. There are exceptions. If you happen to be Barry Lopez, who has more ways to describe ice and snow than an Eskimo, you can do all the weather reporting you want.

2. Avoid prologues.

They can be annoying, especially a prologue following an introduction that comes after a foreword. But these are ordinarily found in nonfiction. A prologue in a novel is backstory, and you can drop it in anywhere you want.

There is a prologue in John Steinbeck's "Sweet Thursday," but it's O.K. because a character in the book makes the point of

what my rules are all about. He says: "I like a lot of talk in a book and I don't like to have nobody tell me what the guy that's talking looks like. I want to figure out what he looks like from the way he talks . . . figure out what the guy's thinking from what he says. I like some description but not too much of that . . . Sometimes I want a book to break loose with a bunch of hoopedoodle . . . Spin up some pretty words maybe or sing a little song with language. That's nice. But I wish it was set aside so I don't have to read it. I don't want hoopedoodle to get mixed up with the story."

3. Never use a verb other than "said" to carry dialogue.

The line of dialogue belongs to the character; the verb is the writer sticking his nose in. But said is far less intrusive than grumbled, gasped, cautioned, lied. I once noticed Mary McCarthy ending a line of dialogue with "she asseverated," and had to stop reading to get the dictionary.

4. Never use an adverb to modify the verb "said" . . .

. . . he admonished gravely. To use an adverb this way (or almost any way) is a mortal sin. The writer is now exposing himself in earnest, using a word that distracts and can interrupt the rhythm of the exchange. I have a character in one of my books tell how she used to write historical romances "full of rape and adverbs."

5. Keep your exclamation points under control.

You are allowed no more than two or three per 100,000 words of prose. If you have the knack of playing with exclamers the way Tom Wolfe does, you can throw them in by the handful.

6. Never use the words "suddenly" or "all hell broke loose."

This rule doesn't require an explanation. I have noticed that writers who use "suddenly" tend to exercise less control in the application of exclamation points.

7. Use regional dialect, patois, sparingly.

Once you start spelling words in dialogue phonetically and loading the page with apostrophes, you won't be able to stop. Notice the way Annie Proulx captures the flavor of Wyoming voices in her book of short stories "Close Range."

8. Avoid detailed descriptions of characters.

Which Steinbeck covered. In Ernest Hemingway's "Hills Like White Elephants" what do the "American and the girl with him" look like? "She had taken off her hat and put it on the table." That's the only reference to a physical description in the story, and yet we see the couple and know them by their tones of voice, with not one adverb in sight.

9. Don't go into great detail describing places and things.

Unless you're Margaret Atwood and can paint scenes with language or write landscapes in the style of Jim Harrison. But even if you're good at it, you don't want descriptions that bring the action, the flow of the story, to a standstill.

And finally:

10. Try to leave out the part that readers tend to skip.

A rule that came to mind in 1983. Think of what you skip reading a novel: thick paragraphs of prose you can see have too many words in them. What the writer is doing, he's writing, perpetrating hoopedoodle, perhaps taking another shot at the weather, or has gone into the character's head, and the reader either knows what the guy's thinking or doesn't care. I'll bet you don't skip dialogue.

My most important rule is one that sums up the 10.

If it sounds like writing, I rewrite it.

Or, if proper usage gets in the way, it may have to go. I can't allow what we learned in English composition to disrupt the sound and rhythm of the narrative. It's my attempt to remain invisible, not distract the reader from the story with obvious writing. (Joseph Conrad said something about words getting in the way of what you want to say.)

If I write in scenes and always from the point of view of a particular character—the one whose view best brings the scene to life—I'm able to concentrate on the voices of the characters telling you who they are and how they feel about what they see and what's going on, and I'm nowhere in sight.

What Steinbeck did in "Sweet Thursday" was title his chapters as an indication, though obscure, of what they cover. "Whom the Gods Love They Drive Nuts" is one, "Lousy Wednesday" another. The third chapter is titled "Hooptedoodle 1" and the 38th chapter "Hooptedoodle 2" as warnings to the reader, as if Steinbeck is saying: "Here's where you'll see me taking flights of fancy with my writing, and it won't get in the way of the story. Skip them if you want."

"Sweet Thursday" came out in 1954, when I was just beginning to be published, and I've never forgotten that prologue.

Did I read the hooptedoodle chapters? Every word.

MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the Attorney General has recently announced that the Department of Justice will not charge certain drug offenders in a way that would trigger the imposition of mandatory minimum sentences.

Before outlining some of the concerns that I have with the policy and the statement that the Attorney General issued on the subject, I do want to note that I agree with a number of the points that he made.

These are the specific points with which I am in agreement with the Attorney General:

The Department will coordinate with State, local, and tribal law enforcement to maximize the operation of Federal resources in criminal prosecutions.

The development of comprehensive anti-violence strategies by the U.S. attorneys with input from State and local authorities.

The designation by the U.S. attorneys' offices of coordinators for prevention and reentry.

Direct Federal assistance to hot spots of violence and the new use of COPS grants for school resource officers.

Creation of a new task force for violence experienced by Indian children.

Providing support for survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence.

Compassionate release of nonviolent inmates who are elderly and have served a long part of their sentences is wise.

And I favor addressing unwarranted racial disparities in sentencing.

That is quite a bit of agreement. I am pleased that we share some common ground.

But there are other statements of the Attorney General that I cannot agree with, and I think it is important to set the record straight.

Almost 30 years ago the crime situation in this country was far different from the 1960's on, crime rates had risen rapidly. One reason for that state of affairs was the way sentencing worked. There was often little relation between the length of sentence that was imposed and the actual time the offender served. Parole often led to release of criminals too soon, enabling them to repeat their crimes on other unsuspecting victims. Judges had almost limitless discretion in sentencing within a broad range. Sentences imposed depended much more on which judge was giving the sentence than the nature of the offense or the criminal history of the offender. Parole and excessive judicial discretion led to unwarranted disparities in sentencing.

And so in 1984 Congress changed how Federal sentencing operated. We adopted truth in sentencing. We added certainty by abolishing parole. Now Federal sentences given are the time that is served. Disparities due to parole boards were eliminated. Sentencing guidelines were established. They reflected the nature of the criminal offense and the criminal history of the offender. Those guidelines were normally binding on any Federal judge in the country. So no longer would sentences turn on which judge a criminal appeared before.

The guidelines eliminated other disparities as well. Judges could not consider factors that often led to wealthier defendants receiving shorter sentences for similar crimes than less wealthy defendants. Racial bias in sentencing, conscious or unconscious, also was addressed through mandatory guidelines. The legislation was passed by wide bipartisan majorities. Nearly everyone agreed that some judges were too lenient in sentencing and that the excessive discretion they exercised produced various unfair disparities.

Congress, separate from the sentencing guidelines, also increased the number of mandatory minimum sentences. Since then, due in part to tougher Federal criminal penalties, elimination of parole, increased numbers of inmates, better police practices, and other factors, crime rates have dropped significantly.

However, the Supreme Court undermined the excellent sentencing legislation that Congress passed. First, the Court created from whole cloth a novel interpretation of the Sixth Amendment.

Second, the Court in a 2005 case called *Booker* unnecessarily extended

that line of cases to mandatory sentencing guidelines and held them unconstitutional.

Third, rather than then strike down the guidelines, the Court rewrote them. In a particularly egregious example of judicial activism, they overrode congressional intent and made the guidelines advisory. It was only because the guidelines were clearly intended to be mandatory that Congress ever passed them in the first place.

Following *Booker*, Congress now has only one available tool to make sure that sentences are not too lenient and do not reflect unwarranted disparity. That is mandatory minimum sentences.

Given this background, I do take issue with a number of the Attorney General's statements.

I do not agree with him that prisons today "warehouse and forget."

All kinds of programs and incentives exist for prisoners today to improve their behavior when they are released. Sentences can be shortened by completion of these programs. And I don't think that the solution to a cycle that ends in incarceration is simply to incarcerate criminals for less time or to jail fewer criminals.

For the most part, it is not the case that too many Americans go to prisons for too long and for no good law enforcement reason. And the Attorney General just is not right when he says that "[w]idespread incarceration at the federal, state, and local levels is both ineffective and unsustainable."

Increased incarceration has led to less crime.

I do see that for the first time in 5 years the Obama administration has finally found one area of Federal spending that it wants to cut: prisons.

But in the same speech, the Attorney General called on more spending on Federal defenders.

I do not agree with that. Federal defenders play an important role and often represent defendants well. But we should be encouraging more private attorneys, at lower cost, to represent defendants against the Government. And we should consider requiring better training of these lawyers before they are allowed to represent defendants.

The Attorney General correctly notes that "unwarranted disparities are far too common." He cited one report that shows that "black male offenders have received sentences nearly 20 percent longer than those imposed on white males convicted of similar crimes," and that this is "shameful." But he overlooks the reason for those disparities. They exist not so much due to mandatory minimum sentences, which existed both before *Booker* and after. In fact, Congress has reduced mandatory minimum sentences since *Booker*. Rather, the disparities are due primarily to the Supreme Court's *Booker* decision that made the sentencing guidelines advisory, rather than to mandatory minimums.

Since that 2005 ruling, the guidelines have been applied in fewer and fewer cases every year. Sentences imposed now turn on which judge the offender appears before. And more than before, the quality of the lawyer and the other factors that produced disparity before the Sentencing Reform Act are now creeping back into sentencing.

The sentencing commission, in that report that the Attorney General referred to, tracked racial disparities in sentencing. It compared sentences of African-American and White males at the time the guidelines were still mandatory compared to today, when they are advisory only. For cases overall, when the guidelines were mandatory, African-American males served 11.5 percent longer sentences than White males. Now that the guidelines are advisory, African-American men serve 19.5 percent longer sentences than white males.

That is a significant difference.

There are various categories of crimes in which the rendering of the sentencing guidelines as advisory has increased disparity. For instance, in firearms case, African-American men received sentences that were 6 percent longer than White men when the guidelines were mandatory. Today, African-American men receive sentences 10 percent longer than Whites for these crimes. For drug trafficking, African-American men received sentences that were 9 percent longer than White men in 2005, but since the guidelines were made advisory, they now receive sentences that are 13 percent longer.

It is true that sentences overall are falling since the guidelines were made advisory. But as the sentencing commission concluded, "Although sentence length for both Black male and female offenders and White male and female offenders have decreased over time, White offenders' sentence length has decreased more than Black offenders' sentence length."

And in considering racial disparities in the criminal justice area, the race of the victims must also be considered. Despite reductions in homicides nationwide in recent years to levels not seen since the 1960s, this is not true for the number of homicides of African-Americans. "The number of black male murder victims rose more than 10 percent from 2000 to 2010, to 5,942 from 5,307," according to the Wall Street Journal.

Two areas that the Attorney General has said are criminal enforcement priorities also exhibit disparities. These are financial crimes and child pornography possession. As I have said many times before, I wish the Department would prosecute even one of the executives of the major financial firms whose criminal conduct contributed to the financial crisis.

These two criminal fields both tend to involve White male defendants. Too

often, the sentences imposed are too lenient. In addition, these crimes do not carry mandatory minimum sentences. We should consider imposing mandatory minimum sentences for these offenses, both to reduce racial disparities and to give prosecutors additional tools to combat these serious crimes. Since Booker, there have been press reports of people who have been convicted of financial fraud who have received very lenient sentences, far below the guidelines. That is leading to disparity.

One report showed that there have been so many financial fraudsters in New York who have been sentenced merely to probation that lawyers for newly convicted fraudsters have argued that to avoid disparities, their clients must also receive probation. Other press accounts have shown financial criminals who have persuaded judges that the financial benefits these criminals have provided to needy people should be considered to lighten their sentences. No poor defendant would be able to reduce his sentence based on using a portion of his ill-gotten gains to help others.

Another set of defendants who in the post-Booker world have received very lenient sentences is those who are convicted of child pornography possession. Too many judges are lenient in their sentencing. Too often we are seeing that unless the defendant actually molested a child, a judge doesn't impose a serious punishment. More than other Federal crimes, defendants in financial and child pornography cases tend to be White males. Too many judges have given these criminals only a slap on the wrist. After Booker, the only way Congress can control the abuse of discretion that judges are showing in these cases is through imposition of a mandatory minimum sentence.

The Attorney General announced a new policy of not charging certain defendants with crimes that carry mandatory minimum sentences. That raises concerns. Withholding quantities of drugs from indictments may not have the effect he desires, since the judge will know the quantity in any event when the presentencing report is received. The judge can still take that into account when sentencing. Moreover, a dangerous precedent may be established by not charging the greatest offense that can be proved.

All Federal crimes now are typically prosecuted at the highest level that can result in a conviction, unless a plea agreement is reached. This reduces prosecutorial discretion and disparity in charging and sentencing. I hope that the new policy will not be applied or extended in a way that would increase disparity.

Mandatory minimum sentences are not new. The first Congress enacted mandatory minimum sentences in 1790.

Nor are they as inflexible as they are often characterized. According to the

sentencing commission, almost half of all offenders convicted of an offense carrying a mandatory minimum sentence are not given such a sentence.

We hear over and over that mandatory minimum sentences are one size fits all. We hear that low level and first time offenders always receive harsh sentences. Not so. The safety valve provision requires judges not to impose mandatory minimum sentences for first time, low-level, nonviolent drug offenders, who have provided all information to the authorities. Mandatory minimum sentences are not imposed on many other offenders because they provide substantial assistance to the government in prosecuting more serious criminals.

Congress in 2010 also passed legislation reducing mandatory minimum sentences for certain crack cocaine offenses. Contrary to standard rules of statutory construction, that law has been interpreted to apply retroactively to people who committed their crimes before enactment of the law. We need to keep that in mind for any sentencing legislation we might enact.

The combination of mandatory minimum sentences and a reduction for substantial assistance provides investigative leads against bigger fish. It is a benefit of mandatory minimum sentences that is not always appreciated. Were we to meaningfully cut back on mandatory minimums, we would lose the ability to bring prosecutions against a large number of major criminals. We should always consider what crimes should carry mandatory minimum sentences and what the length of those sentences should be. But for the reasons I have outlined, it would be a serious mistake to eliminate mandatory minimum sentences, either wholesale or for a class of drug offenses.

I am also troubled by a document the Attorney General released along with his speech entitled, "Smart on Crime."

In that document the Department favors diversion and supervision rather than incarceration for what it terms low-level, non-violent offenders. The Department says it encourage U.S. Attorneys to use "best practices" of diversion for non-violent offenders and supervision for more serious offenders. The document says, "Examples of eligible defendants are those charged with non-violent bank robberies." What bank robberies does the Attorney General think are non-violent? If a person hands the teller a note that says, "I have a gun, hand over the money," but he does not actually have a gun, is that a non-violent offense? No, it is not. Robbery always involves violence or the threat of violence. There is no such thing as a non-violent bank robbery. Those who commit that crime should go to jail, not be released back into the community under supervision, as the Department is advocating.

There is a danger that some of what the Attorney General is proposing is

unjustified leniency and would harm public safety.

Madam President, I appreciate that the Attorney General has offered ideas on sentencing. I agree with some. Others are misguided, even dangerous. I will work with him where I can. But we cannot have a proper debate on sentencing reform without understanding how we have reached our current situation, why unwarranted disparities exist, and what changes in sentencing would improve rather than harm the situation.

The Judiciary Committee will hold a hearing on mandatory minimum sentences and proposed legislation on Wednesday. As I have stated, there are some common misunderstandings on this subject. I hope that more clarity will emerge as a result of the hearing.

CROSSROADS CHURCH

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, today I wish to congratulate Crossroads Church on 50 years of ministry in Pickaway County, OH. The Crossroads Church held its first service in 1963 under the leadership of Rev. Roy Ferguson.

Crossroads Church was created as an extension of Circleville First Church to provide ministry in the growing community. In 1998, as it continued to grow, the church purchased 71 acres just east of the city of Circleville. In October 2001, Crossroads Church opened its doors for the first service at the new spacious location.

Crossroads Church remains grounded in the traditions of the Christian faith. Today, I congratulate all who have been involved in the first 50 years of ministry to Circleville.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THORNTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, today I wish to honor Thornton, NH—a town in Grafton County that is celebrating the 250th anniversary of its founding. I am proud to join citizens across the Granite State in recognizing this special occasion.

Thornton is a gateway community to New Hampshire's beautiful White Mountains—welcoming visitors from near and far throughout the year. This picturesque community represents the very best of New Hampshire's proud heritage.

The land that would become Thornton was granted in a charter by Governor Benning Wentworth on July 6, 1763, one of New Hampshire's great statesmen, to a small group of settlers including Doctor Matthew Thornton. Thornton later represented New Hampshire as a representative to the Continental Congress, and signed the Declaration of Independence. The town was

named to honor Thornton for his service to New Hampshire.

The town's population has grown to include over 2,400 residents. The patriotism and commitment of the people of Thornton are reflected in part by their record of service in defense of our Nation.

Notable Thornton residents include 19th century abolitionist Moses Cheney, a conductor with the Underground Railroad, and MIT professor and nutritionist Nevin S. Scrimshaw.

Thornton is home to one of the oldest remaining meetinghouses in the State. Erected in 1789, the Old Town House is listed on the New Hampshire State Register of Historic Places and serves as an enduring symbol of New Hampshire's tradition of self-governance.

Thornton is a place that has contributed much to the life and spirit of the Granite State. I am pleased to extend my warm regards to the people of Thornton as they celebrate the town's 250th anniversary.●

TRIBUTE TO RITA NEEDHAM

• Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, as we continue our debate about health care reform, I would like to recognize an organization in Missouri that has been a leader in innovation in driving down the healthcare costs for manufacturers and their employees. The Missouri Association of Manufacturers and their CEO, Rita Needham, have been at the forefront of the debate in my State. She is committed to new strategies to provide affordable health care through consortiums of manufacturers that employ more than 2,100 people.

As an educator, human resource manager and administrator, Rita Needham joined the Southwest Area Missouri Association, SAMA, in 1999 as community affairs director. SAMA reached out to support manufacturers in the Springfield, MO area. Needham was elevated to executive director 2 years later and created a health care consortium which provided affordable health care coverage for manufacturers.

Rita was the driving force in obtaining a two-year waiver from the Missouri Department of Insurance to enable companies of all sizes to join together in a pilot program to purchase group health insurance. Before the consortium was created, the initial 32 companies who joined the SAMA I Consortium had to buy their health insurance individually, but, under the consortium, they were rated as one policy holder therefore achieving significant savings. Six smaller companies who were part of the consortium were able to access affordable health care for the first time. The consortium members were able to achieve long term rate stability, create large group buying power and reduce claim risk in response to their biggest concern—the rising costs of health care.

In 2006, Rita led SAMA's efforts to persuade the Missouri General Assembly to pass House bill 1827, landmark legislation known as the SAMA bill, which allowed manufacturers of all sizes the option of purchasing a group health plan under the consortium.

In 2010, the Southwest Area Manufacturers Association became the Missouri Association of Manufacturers, MAM, with 170 member companies across the State representing 14,500 employees. Today, MAM is a strong voice for manufacturing with free market positions on trade, regulation, tax and energy policy, education, health care and the environment.

Rita is planning to retire this year, but throughout her career she has been a thoughtful, dedicated leader for Missouri manufacturers. I have always relied on her expertise and common sense to better understand how Federal policy impacts health costs for manufacturers.

I wish Rita and her husband Jim a wonderful retirement. There is no doubt that Rita's advocacy and smart leadership have improved the business environment in Missouri.●

LAS VEGAS NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM

• Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I wish to recognize the Las Vegas Natural History Museum and congratulate it on being awarded national accreditation by the American Alliance of Museums. This accreditation is the highest national recognition of a museum's commitment to public service, professional standards, and excellence in education. This important milestone exemplifies the remarkable progress that the Las Vegas Natural History Museum has made, and attests to the central role the museum plays in educating the local community.

For more than 2 decades, the Las Vegas Natural History Museum has provided Nevadans of all ages and from all walks of life the opportunity to explore the natural treasures of our past. The museum has expanded the small, loaned exhibit with which it began into a premiere, multi-million dollar collection of wildlife and prehistoric exhibits. Today it offers a truly unique educational experience from which countless Nevadans have benefited. Under the leadership of Executive Director Marilyn Gillespie, as well as a dedicated board of directors, the Las Vegas Natural History Museum has completed a demanding process in order to become nationally accredited. The museum and its leadership team should be proud of this important achievement.

Centers of learning such as the Las Vegas Natural History Museum enrich our communities by making the learning process an engaging and exciting endeavor. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this exceptional

museum and extend my best wishes for many more successful years to come.●

FAITH LUTHERAN MOCK TRIAL TEAM

● Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I wish to recognize an outstanding achievement by a group of hard-working students at Faith Lutheran Junior/Senior High School in Las Vegas. The Faith Lutheran Mock Trial team has been invited to compete in the Seventh Annual Empire Invitational in New York City, and is the first ever Nevada team to be invited to compete in this mock trial event.

Faith Lutheran's mock trial program is part of the school's justice and advocacy program, which is designed to prepare and equip students for academic and professional paths in public policy, law and advocacy. It is notable achievement to be invited to the Empire Invitational event, which is the only mock trial tournament in the country that hosts schools from Canada, Ireland and the United Kingdom. By competing in this year's tournament, Faith Lutheran's mock trial participants will not only receive invaluable experience applying legal principles, but they will also enhance skills that are critical to their future scholastic and vocational success.

Educational activities such as this mock trial tournament open the door to increased possibilities for young students to make a difference in their communities. Faith Lutheran's mock trial team serves as an admirable example to aspiring students across the Silver State.

This special achievement is the result of many hours of teamwork, effort and preparation. The dedicated students and faculty who are part of Faith Lutheran's mock trial team should be immensely proud of the opportunity to represent their school, and the State of Nevada, at this year's Empire Invitational. I ask my colleagues to join me in commending these exceptional students, and wish them a successful and memorable experience at the tournament.●

TRIBUTE TO BECKY NELSON

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, today I wish to recognize and congratulate Becky Nelson of Sioux Falls, SD for over 38 years of service with Sanford Health.

In 1971, Ms. Nelson graduated from Presentation College in Aberdeen, SD, and began her career at Dakota Midland Hospital. In 1975, Ms. Nelson joined Sioux Valley Hospital & Health System, which would later become Sanford Health. Starting as a critical care staff nurse, Ms. Nelson's skill and intellect launched her into clinical leadership positions.

Today, Ms. Nelson is Sanford Health's senior vice president & chief

operating officer, overseeing all patient care services provided by Sanford Health's northern and southern regions, encompassing parts of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Minnesota.

In addition to her outstanding work at Sanford Health, Ms. Nelson remains an active leader in the community. She has served on the First National Bank board of directors as well as the Boards of the University of Sioux Falls, Sanford Research/USD, Washington Pavilion of Arts and Science, and the Sioux Falls Development Foundation.

Ms. Nelson's devotion to exceptional care will continue to benefit Dakotans and Midwesterners long after her retirement. She is an exceptional role model who has a positive impact on those who cross her path. For example, her soon-to-be successor, Nate White, whom she is currently mentoring, commented, "There isn't a day that goes by when there isn't something I grasp onto and say, I have to remember that." "Clearly, her excellent example resonates with her peers.

I thank Ms. Nelson for her incalculable contributions to our community and wish her and her husband, Dave, all the best in retirement.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

TRANSMITTING THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC ON SOCIAL SECURITY, CONSISTING OF A PRINCIPAL AGREEMENT AND AN ADMINISTRATIVE AGREEMENT—PM 19

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)) (the "Social Security Act"), I transmit herewith an Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Slovak Republic (the

"United States-Slovak Republic Totalization Agreement"). The Agreement consists of two separate instruments: a principal agreement and an administrative arrangement. The Agreement was signed in Bratislava on December 10, 2012.

The United States-Slovak Republic Totalization Agreement is similar in objective to the social security totalization agreements already in force with most European Union countries, Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, and the Republic of Korea. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation and to help prevent the lost benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries. The United States-Slovak Republic Totalization Agreement contains all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and other provisions that I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233, pursuant to section 233(c)(4) of the Social Security Act.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report prepared by the Social Security Administration explaining the key points of the United States-Slovak Republic Totalization Agreement, along with a paragraph-by-paragraph explanation of the provisions of the principal agreement and administrative arrangement. Annexed to this report is another report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the effect of the United States-Slovak Republic Totalization Agreement on income and expenditures of the U.S. Social Security program and the number of individuals affected by the United States-Slovak Republic Totalization Agreement.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 17, 2013.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 2009. An act to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

H.R. 2775. An act to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes.

S. 1513. A bill to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

S. 1514. A bill to save coal jobs, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER
COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2861. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the activities of the Office of the Medicare Ombudsman; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2862. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 2013-1056, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2863. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 2013-1288, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2864. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1002 (P.L. 107-243) and the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution (P.L. 102-1) for the April 21, 2013-June 19, 2013 reporting period; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2865. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to amendment to part 126 of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2866. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State, Legislative Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2867. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2013-0142-2013-0149); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2868. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2013-0136-2013-0141); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2869. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2013-0150-2013-0155); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2870. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period April 1, 2013 through May 31, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2871. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-118); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2872. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 12-113); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2873. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of proposed transfer of major defense equipment pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. RSAT-13-3520); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2874. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of proposed transfer of major defense equipment pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. RSAT-12-3037); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2875. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-067); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2876. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-096); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2877. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-117); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2878. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-092); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2879. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-111); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2880. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-107); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2881. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-120); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2882. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, De-

partment of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13-115); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2883. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, the report of a rule entitled "Visas: Documentation of Nonimmigrants—Visa Classification; T Visa Class" (RIN1400-AD42) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2884. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to international financial institutions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2885. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Program Integrity: Exchange, SHOP, and Eligibility Appeals" (RIN0938-AR82) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2886. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Labeling; Gluten-Free Labeling of Foods" (Docket No. FDA-2005-N-0404) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2887. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Spirulina Extract" (Docket No. FDA-2011-C-0878) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2888. A communication from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received during adjournment in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2889. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Student Assistance General Provisions" (RIN1880-AA87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2890. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Pell Grant Program" (RIN1840-AD11) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the

Senate on August 23, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2891. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Priority—National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers" (CFDA No. 84.133B-11) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2892. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; Race to the Top—Early Learning Challenge" (RIN1810-AB18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2893. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for the Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Wage Methodology for the Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment H-2B Program; Delay of Effective Date" (RIN1205-AB61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2894. A communication from the Director of the Implementation and Support Unit, Office of the Deputy Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; Race to the Top—District" (RIN1810-AB17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2895. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report entitled "Report to Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2896. A communication from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's 2013 Annual Report for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2897. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the premarket approval of devices that may be used in pediatric patients; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2898. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Implementation of Section 3507 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2899. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Performance Report of the Food and Drug Administration's Office of Combination Products for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2900. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final

Regulations: Education Department General Administrative Regulations" (RIN1890-AA14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 29, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2901. A communication from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Office of Inspector General's budget request for the fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2902. A joint communication from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report on Thefts, Losses, or Releases of Select Agents or Toxins"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2903. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on the Application of Electronic Health Records (EHR) Payment Incentives for Providers Not Receiving Other Incentive Payments"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2904. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Delays in Approvals of Applications Related to Citizen Petitions and Petitions for Stay of Agency Action for Fiscal Year 2012"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2905. A joint communication from the Executive Director and the Chair of the Board of Governors, Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Institute's 2012 Annual Report; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2906. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Regulations—Student Assistance General Provisions Amendment of the Electronic Filing Procedures for Administrative Adjudication Proceedings Involving Title IV of the Higher Education Act" (RIN1880-AA87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2907. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an alternative plan for pay increases for civilian Federal employees covered by the General Schedule and certain other pay systems for 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2908. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Premerger Notification; Reporting and Waiting Period Requirements" (RIN3084-AA91) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 8, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2909. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to intercepted wire, oral, or electronic communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2910. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Office of Justice Programs Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2012"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2911. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs Annual Report to Congress for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2912. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to applications for delayed-notice search warrants and extensions during fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2913. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second quarter of fiscal year 2013 quarterly report of the Department of Justice's Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2914. A communication from the Staff Director, U.S. Sentencing Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the compliance of federal district courts with documentation submission requirements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2915. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States" for the March 2013 session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2916. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first quarter of fiscal year 2013 quarterly report of the Department of Justice's Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2917. A communication from the Secretary of State, State of Florida, transmitting, a Senate Memorial, adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to the creation of the Haitian Family Reunification Parole Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SANDERS, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 131. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured veterans and their spouses, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-106).

By Mr. SANDERS, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 851. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to all veterans with a serious service-connected injury eligibility to participate in the family caregiver services program (Rept. No. 113-107).

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1072. A bill to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-108).

By Mr. SCHUMER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 228. An original resolution authorizing the reporting of committee funding resolutions for the period October 1, 2013, through February 28, 2015.

S. Res. 229. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. STABENOW, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, without amendment:

S. Res. 230. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. Res. 231. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEVIN, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. Res. 232. A resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANDERS, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 233. A resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 234. A resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment:

S. Res. 235. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship for October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015.

By Mrs. BOXER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. Res. 236. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN from the Committee on Armed Services.

*Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. James M. Kowalski, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Bennie Earl Abbott and ending with Laura L. Zurek, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 11, 2013.

Air Force nominations beginning with David W. Abba and ending with Matthew E. Zuber, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 23, 2013.

Air Force nominations beginning with David M. Abel and ending with Michael M. Zwale, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Air Force nominations beginning with Veronique N. Anderson and ending with Aaron Eugene Woodward, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Air Force nominations beginning with Robert F. Booth and ending with Charles E. Wiedie, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Air Force nomination of Darryl Markowski, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Eddie V. Latham, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Brian W. Adams and ending with XXXXXXXX, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Marcus P. Acosta and ending with XXXXXXXX, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Joel O. Alexander and ending with XXXXXXXX, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Michael N. Adame and ending with Thomas J. Zelko II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher J. Egan and ending with Bruce R. Walton, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with Andrew D. Kastello and ending with Mark A. Seldes, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Army nomination of Brian E. Murphy, to be Major.

Army nomination of Trent E. Loiseau, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Yorlondo S. M. Wortham, to be Major.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher M. Allen and ending with Stacey E. Zimmerman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Wajahat Ali and ending with Jacob E. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Hannah L. Bealon and ending with Alicia R. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Brian C. Baker and ending with Kan Yang, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Kristie M. Colpo and ending with Matthew N. Watts, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Onege Bateagborsangaya and ending with Michael G. Tomsik, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Anthony J. Falvo IV and ending with William B. Tisdale, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Trenton J. Arnold and ending with Robert A. Wainscott, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Brian C. Fredrick and ending with Ernesto R. Villalba, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Matthew R. Argenziano and ending with Aaron A. Zimmer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Shane L. Beavers and ending with John J. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Charles B. Abbott and ending with George S. Zintak, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2013.

Navy nomination of Josh A. Cassada, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Ronaldo S. Memije, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Kevin L. Albert and ending with Shawn C. Willis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher B. Allen and ending with Joseph M. Zukowsky, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Paul A. Armstrong and ending with James P. Williford, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Jonathan D. Albano and ending with James H. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Michele Y. Allen and ending with Brenda M. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Candice C. Albright and ending with Katherine D. Worstell, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Alexander Aldana and ending with Daniel L. Zahumensky, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Ricardo M. Abakah and ending with Christopher L. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Nehkonti Adams and ending with Nathan S. Zundel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

Navy nominations beginning with Kimberly S. Bailey and ending with Eric E. Wong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 2013.

By Mr. SCHUMER for the Committee on Rules and Administration.

*Ann Miller Ravel, of California, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2017.

*Lee E. Goodman, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2015.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1505. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to certain sporting good articles, and to exempt those articles from definition under that Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1506. A bill to provide tax relief for persons affected by the discharge of oil in connection with the explosion on, and sinking of, the mobile offshore drilling unit Deepwater Horizon; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1507. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. REID):

S. 1508. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program of awarding grants to owners or operators of water systems to increase the resiliency or adaptability of the systems to any ongoing or forecasted changes to the hydrologic conditions of a region of the United States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1509. A bill to establish a Maritime Goods Movement User Fee and provide grants for international maritime cargo improvements and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. PAUL, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1510. A bill to provide for auditable financial statements for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1511. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to remove barriers to the adoption of children in foster care

through reauthorization and improvement of the adoption incentives program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1512. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the "Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1513. A bill to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 1514. A bill to save coal jobs, and for other purposes; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. Res. 227. A resolution to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the heroic rescue of Danish Jews during the Second World War by the Danish people; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Res. 228. An original resolution authorizing the reporting of committee funding resolutions for the period October 1, 2013, through February 28, 2015; from the Committee on Rules and Administration; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Res. 229. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Rules and Administration; from the Committee on Rules and Administration; placed on the calendar.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. Res. 230. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. Res. 231. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. Res. 232. A resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Armed Services; from the Committee on Armed Services; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. Res. 233. A resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. Res. 234. A resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. Res. 235. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on

Small Business and Entrepreneurship for October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015; from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. Res. 236. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Environment and Public Works; from the Committee on Environment and Public Works; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 51

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 51, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act.

S. 84

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 84, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 120

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 120, a bill to expand the number of scholarships available to Pakistani women under the Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program.

S. 195

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 195, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and violence to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs.

S. 254

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 254, a bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize and support the creation of cardiomyopathy education, awareness, and risk assessment materials and resources by the Secretary of Health and Human Services through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the dissemination of such materials and resources by State educational agencies to identify more at-risk families.

S. 274

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 274, a bill to strengthen nutrition education for elementary school and secondary school students to promote healthy eating choices through developmentally appropriate lessons and activities integrated into the school day.

S. 326

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 326, a bill to reauthorize 21st century community learning centers, and for other purposes.

S. 357

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty.

S. 358

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 358, a bill to establish a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) Master Teacher Corps program.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 392

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 392, a bill to support and encourage the health and well-being of elementary school and secondary school students by enhancing school physical education and health education.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to add Vietnam Veterans Day as a patriotic and national observance.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 423, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend funding for family-to-family health information centers to help families of children with disabilities or special health care needs make informed choices about health care for their children.

S. 429

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of

S. 429, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 452

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 452, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the incidence of diabetes among Medicare beneficiaries.

S. 456

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 456, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish an award program recognizing excellence exhibited by public school system employees providing services to students in pre-kindergarten through higher education.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 524, a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Pike National Historic Trail.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 596

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a bill to establish pilot projects under the Medicare program to provide incentives for home health agencies to furnish remote patient monitoring services that reduce expenditures under such program.

S. 603

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 603, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 619

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 619, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent unjust and irrational criminal punishments.

S. 648

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 648, a bill to amend the Elementary

and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to support teacher and school professional training on awareness of student mental health conditions.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to prohibit attendance of an animal fighting venture, and for other purposes.

S. 669

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 669, a bill to make permanent the Internal Revenue Service Free File program.

S. 731

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 731, a bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency to conduct an empirical impact study on proposed rules relating to the International Basel III agreement on general risk-based capital requirements, as they apply to community banks.

S. 749

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 749, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the 15-year recovery period for qualified leasehold improvement property, qualified restaurant property, and qualified retail improvement property.

S. 769

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 769, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 907

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 907, a bill to provide grants to better understand and reduce gestational diabetes, and for other purposes.

S. 915

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 915, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to update reporting requirements for institutions of higher education and provide for more accurate and complete data on student retention, graduation, and earnings outcomes at all levels of postsecondary enrollment.

S. 1023

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1023, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to conduct an interagency review of and report on ways to increase the competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign investment.

S. 1089

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1089, a bill to provide for a prescription drug take-back program for members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1089, *supra*.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1242

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1242, a bill to amend the Fair Housing Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1296

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1296, a bill to amend the Wounded Warrior Act to establish a specific timeline for the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to achieve interoperable electronic health records, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1310

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1310, a bill to require Senate confirmation of Inspector General of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes.

S. 1323

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.

PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1323, a bill to address the continued threat posed by dangerous synthetic drugs by amending the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues.

S. 1324

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1324, a bill to prohibit any regulations promulgated pursuant to a presidential memorandum relating to power sector carbon pollution standards from taking effect.

S. 1332

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 1442

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1442, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the minimum low-income housing tax credit rate for unsubsidized buildings and to provide a minimum 4 percent credit rate for existing buildings.

S. 1455

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1455, a bill to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income is operational.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1462

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1462, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 1487

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1487, a bill to limit the availability of tax credits and reductions in cost-sharing under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to individuals who receive health insurance coverage pursuant to the provisions of a Taft-Hartley plan.

S. 1488

At the request of Mr. COATS, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1488, a bill to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 1497

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1497, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to apply the provisions of the Act to certain Congressional staff and members of the executive branch.

S. 1500

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to declare the November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas, a terrorist attack, and to ensure that the victims of the attack and their families receive the same honors and benefits as those Americans who have been killed or wounded in a combat zone overseas and their families.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1503, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 60

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 60, a resolution supporting women's reproductive health.

S. RES. 165

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 165, a resolution calling for the release from prison of former Prime Minister of Ukraine Yulia

Tymoshenko in light of the recent European Court of Human Rights ruling.

AMENDMENT NO. 1853

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1853 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1856

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1856 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1859

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1859 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1860

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1860 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1861

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1861 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1865

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1865 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1866

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1866 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1871

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1871 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1881

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1881 intended to be pro-

posed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1882

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1882 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1883

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1883 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1886

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1886 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1901

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1901 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1904

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1904 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1908

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1908 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1908 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 1912

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1912 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1916

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Georgia

(Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1916 intended to be proposed to S. 1392, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. REID):

S. 1508. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program of awarding grants to owners or operators of water systems to increase the resiliency or adaptability of the systems to any ongoing or forecasted changes to the hydrologic conditions of a region of the United States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, our existing water infrastructure is crumbling. The longer we ignore the problem, the more it costs us. The truth is that we are in a crisis that can be averted. There is no need to lose revenue from disrupted business and flooded streets. Our water infrastructure may be buried and out of sight and out of mind; but today we must elevate these systems to the priority level they deserve.

Each year within my home State of Maryland I witness stark reminders of what cities across the Nation are facing. In July of this year, Prince George's County, MD, experienced a breakdown of its most essential public infrastructure when a water main serving 100,000 people began to fail. Mandatory water restrictions were instituted, limiting access to water for homes and businesses during an intense heat wave that saw the heat index repeatedly reach the triple digits. At the National Harbor, one hotel evacuated 3,000 guests and was forced to cancel upcoming reservations. Included in the affected area is Joint Base Andrews, which publicized plans to shut down a long list of services, including appointments at its medical center.

There are incidents like this happening all across America. The reports are startling. They confirm what every water utility professional knows: we need massive reinvestment in our water infrastructure now and over the coming decades. The Nation's drinking water infrastructure—especially the underground pipes that deliver safe drinking water to America's homes and businesses—is aging. Like many of the roads, bridges, and other public assets on which the country relies, most of our buried drinking water infrastructure was built 50 or more years ago, in the post-World War II era of rapid demographic change and economic growth. Some of our systems are even

older; in Baltimore, where I live, many of the pipes were installed in the 1800s. We need investment to deal with changing population needs and changing hydrological conditions. We have no other choice but to elevate it to a public safety priority and to take action now.

The Water Infrastructure Resiliency and Sustainability Act aims to help local communities meet the challenges of upgrading water infrastructure systems to meet the hydrological changes we are seeing today. The bill directs the EPA to establish a Water Infrastructure Resiliency and Sustainability program. Grants will be awarded to eligible water systems to make the necessary upgrades. Communities across the country will be able to compete for Federal matching funds, which in turn will help finance projects to help communities overcome these threats.

Improving water conservation, adjustments to current infrastructure systems, and funding programs to stabilize communities' existing water supply are all projects WIRS grants will fund. WIRS will never grant more than 50 percent of any project's cost, ensuring cooperation between local communities and the Federal government. The EPA will try to award funds that use new and innovative ideas as often as possible.

It's estimated that by 2020, the forecasted deficit for sustaining water delivery and wastewater treatment infrastructure, will trigger a \$206 billion increase in costs for businesses. In a worst case scenario, a lack of water infrastructure investment will cause the United States to lose nearly 700,000 jobs by 2020.

A healthy water infrastructure system is as important to America's economy as paved roads and sturdy bridges. Water and wastewater investment has been shown to spur economic growth. The U.S. Conference of Mayors has found that for every dollar invested in water infrastructure, the Gross Domestic Product is increased to more than \$6. The Department of Commerce has found that that same dollar yields close to \$3 worth of economic output in other industries. Every job created in local water and sewer industries creates close to four jobs elsewhere in the national economy.

We know that a reactive mode causes us to lose billions in revenue in the short-term. Let us instead take a proactive approach, making strategic investments in innovative projects designed to meet the current and future needs of our water systems. That is the purpose of the Water Infrastructure Resiliency and Sustainability Act.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1509. A bill to establish a Maritime Goods Movement User Fee and provide

grants for international maritime cargo improvements and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss legislation that Senator CANTWELL and I are introducing today to strengthen our maritime economy and protect American jobs.

Over the past decade, we have seen increasing competition for the market share of U.S.-bound maritime goods from ports beyond our border to the north and to the south. In fact, among the 25 largest North American ports, the fastest growing in 2012 were the Port of Prince Rupert in Canada and the Port of Lazaro Cardenas in Mexico. Instead of U.S.-bound cargo creating economic growth here at home by entering at U.S. ports, we are witnessing it being diverted through Canadian and Mexican ports. This loss of cargo shipments leads to decreased activity and capacity at American ports. In our home State alone, more than 200,000 jobs are tied to the activities at the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma. With nearly 27 percent of international container cargo potentially at risk of moving to Canada from four West Coast ports, this trend could result in significant job losses.

One of the main reasons for cargo diversion is the Harbor Maintenance Tax, HMT. The HMT is a levy on imports designed to fund the operation and maintenance of America's large and small ports, which drives job creation and strengthens America's trade economy. Unfortunately, shippers have been able to avoid the Harbor Maintenance Tax by shipping goods through ports in Canada and Mexico and then transporting those goods into the United States via truck and rail. This growing cargo diversion reduces the funds available to keep our ports in operating condition.

The loss of revenue from cargo diversion is only part of the problem. Equally concerning is the fact that only half of the tax revenue collected is being spent, even though ports across the country are in desperate need of additional maintenance funding. As of 2011, the balance of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, HMTF, which is funded by the HMT, had a surplus of more than \$6.4 billion, and it continues to grow. Furthermore, of the funds allocated through the HMTF, the balance is rarely spent on operations and maintenance at West Coast ports, where a significant amount of the tax revenue is generated. Our two largest ports in Washington—Seattle and Tacoma—generate, on average, close to seven percent of the funding for the HMTF, but each received just over a penny for every dollar collected from shippers who pay the HMT in Seattle and Tacoma. We believe that we must work to address the issue of cargo diversion as well as ensure that the funds collected are allocated fully and more equitably

to meet our nationwide harbor and waterway needs.

To remain competitive in an international marketplace, we need a long-term plan to grow and support infrastructure development, and reforming the Harbor Maintenance Tax is a commonsense place to start. That is why we are proud to introduce the Maritime Goods Movement Act for the 21st Century. The legislation addresses threats to America's maritime economy by repealing the Harbor Maintenance Tax and replacing it with the Maritime Goods Movement User Fee. The proceeds of which would be fully available to Congress to provide for port operation and maintenance. This would nearly double the amount of funds available for American ports, which will help our economy thrive.

The bill ensures that shippers cannot avoid the Maritime Goods Movement User Fee by using ports in Canada and Mexico.

The legislation sets aside a portion of the user fee for critical low-use ports that are at a competitive disadvantage for Federal funding compared to large ports.

Lastly, the bill creates a competitive grant program using a percentage of the proceeds of the user fee to help make improvements to the intermodal transportation system of the United States so that goods can more efficiently reach their intended destinations.

The HMT simply is not being collected or spent in a way that ensures American ports can continue to compete on a level playing field. Our legislation works to address these inequalities and enhance our economic competitiveness abroad while supporting good jobs here in the United States.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. PAUL, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1510. A bill to provide for auditable financial statements for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, this bill, the Audit the Pentagon Act of 2013, sharpens the teeth of the appropriations and accountability clause in the Constitution, article I, section 9, clause 7, which says:

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

The intent of this clause is simple: Congress cannot possibly know that the executive branch is obeying the first part of the appropriations clause—spending—of the Constitution without

confidence in the second—accountability. The decades-long failure by the Pentagon to comply with existing Federal financial management laws is against the very spirit of the Constitution—our Founding Fathers demanded that those spending taxpayer dollars are accountable to taxpayers.

The Pentagon's financial management problems are intimately related to the problems of waste at the Pentagon and the budget crisis that has created sequestration. Currently, neither Pentagon leaders, nor Congressional members can consistently and reliably identify what our defense programs cost, will cost in the future, or even what they really cost in the past. When the Pentagon doesn't know itself and can't tell Congress how it is spending money, good programs face cuts along with wasteful programs, which is the situation in which we find ourselves today under sequestration. Unreliable financial management information makes it impossible to link the consequences of past decisions to the defense budget or to measure whether the activities of the Defense Department are meeting the military requirements set for it. Passing a financial audit is a critical step that will protect vital priorities and help the Pentagon comply with current law and our Constitution.

The problem is clear: if the Pentagon doesn't know how it spends its money, Congress doesn't really know how DOD is spending its money. This incomprehensible condition has been documented in hundreds of reports over three decades from both the Government Accountability Office, GAO, and the Department's own inspector general (DOD IG).

Our current Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel knows that this is a problem. In testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee he said that the Pentagon needs "auditable statements, both to improve the quality of our financial information and to reassure the public, and the Congress, that we are good stewards of public funds." Secretary Hagel agrees that the Pentagon must audit the Pentagon and says, "Our next goal is audit-ready budget statements by the end of 2014 . . . I strongly support this initiative and will do everything I can to fulfill this commitment."

For far too long, Congress has abdicated its constitutional role and its duty to the taxpayers by choosing not to hold DOD accountable for the deadlines it sets for itself, and the result has been continued missed deadlines and wasteful, non-value added spending. Past efforts to make the Pentagon comply with the law by passing additional laws with no teeth has not worked—the Pentagon simply ignores the laws because it suffers no consequences. The result is that unlike every other major Federal department,

the Pentagon continues to fail at their requirement and responsibility to report to Congress and the American people that it can show where the hundreds of billions of dollars of taxpayer money goes. I hope my fellow Senators will join me in supporting this bill for auditable financial statements.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1511. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to remove barriers to the adoption of children in foster care through reauthorization and improvement of the adoption incentives program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, throughout my career in the Senate, I have been proud to fight tirelessly for policies that will help vulnerable children in our foster care system find the permanent homes they need and deserve. I have been very proud of the Finance Committee's bipartisan work over the years to encourage adoption and enhance child welfare services for our most vulnerable children. That work would not have been possible without the commitment of Chairman BAUCUS, as well as my other colleagues that I have been so proud to work with over the years. Our goal has always been to improve our Federal laws related to adoption and foster care, so that every child has an opportunity to have a loving, safe home and a successful future.

To build on our history of encouraging safe and stable families, Senator CASEY and I are introducing the Removing Barriers to Adoption and Supporting Families Act of 2013. This legislation outlines our vision for a path to increase the number of successful adoptions from foster care in our country. Doing so, we believe, can improve the lives of the hundreds of thousands of children in our foster care system.

This legislation encourages safe and stable families, and takes a number of important steps forward to ensure that permanency is paramount for children in our foster care system.

First, the legislation puts incentives in place to help encourage interstate adoptions, creating a shared incentive for states that work together to connect children in foster care with families who are ready and willing to provide loving homes, but who happen to live across state lines. It also helps facilitate interstate adoptions further through better data tracking and development of national standards for home studies, a requirement before a child can be adopted.

Second, the bill aims to establish permanency for youth by eliminating long-term foster care as a goal for children under 17. We also request a study to learn more about why long-term foster care has been set as a goal for some

youth. We believe the study will further inform our overall goal of connecting these children to permanent families and caring adults. But, simply put, we believe permanent foster care should not be a goal for children who are younger than 17.

Third, this legislation dedicates funding to post-adoption and post-permanency support services for children who are adopted, or are permanently in the care of a relative or guardian. This is an important step to make sure that families receive support after a child becomes a family member and, more broadly, can help make sure more adoptions and permanent placements are successful. Additionally, the legislation requires states to engage in public-private partnerships and enhanced strategies to find more permanent placements for older youth who are most at risk of aging out of foster care. Among our foster care population, these are some of our most vulnerable and valuable young people who are most in need of guidance and a loving, nurturing home.

Finally, this legislation would do more to keep siblings together after they are removed from an unsafe home. The bond between siblings is unique and often an important source of stability for children. Unfortunately, once a child joins a permanent home through adoption, there are sometimes barriers to maintaining sibling relationships under current Federal law. Our legislation helps to remove these barriers by strengthening the opportunities for sibling relationships and joint placement, and making sure that the parents of siblings are given notice if their brother or sister enters foster care.

Our legislation lays out an important vision for how we can improve adoption and foster care in our country. Adoptions from foster care have increased in recent years, which means that more families are stepping up to adopt children who are in vulnerable situations through no fault of their own. But, we have far more to do to ensure that every child in foster care has this opportunity. I am extremely grateful to many of the adoption advocates, including the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute, Voice for Adoption, and Listening to Parents, among others, who have been so instrumental in developing recommendations and moving this and other related proposals forward.

Together, we can make great strides toward improving opportunities for the nearly 400,000 children in foster care, of which 102,000 are waiting to find forever families through adoption. New data from the Department of Health and Human Services on adoption and foster care suggests that while the number of children in foster care remains steady, the adoption rate continues to climb. Last year alone, 52,000

children were adopted from foster care and for each of those children, being adopted is a positive, affirming, and life-changing event. Through our work, we can provide more of these opportunities for children in foster care, and set them up to have successful lives with forever families.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. 1514. A bill to save coal jobs, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1514

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Saving Coal Jobs Act of 2013”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PROHIBITION ON ENERGY TAX

Sec. 101. Prohibition on energy tax.

TITLE II—PERMITS

Sec. 201. National pollutant discharge elimination system.

Sec. 202. Permits for dredged or fill material.

Sec. 203. Impacts of Environmental Protection Agency regulatory activity on employment and economic activity.

Sec. 204. Identification of waters protected by the Clean Water Act.

Sec. 205. Limitations on authority to modify State water quality standards.

Sec. 206. State authority to identify waters within boundaries of the State.

TITLE I—PROHIBITION ON ENERGY TAX

SEC. 101. PROHIBITION ON ENERGY TAX.

(a) FINDINGS; PURPOSES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) on June 25, 2013, President Obama issued a Presidential memorandum directing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue regulations relating to power sector carbon pollution standards for existing coal fired power plants;

(B) the issuance of that memorandum circumvents Congress and the will of the people of the United States;

(C) any action to control emissions of greenhouse gases from existing coal fired power plants in the United States by mandating a national energy tax would devastate major sectors of the economy, cost thousands of jobs, and increase energy costs for low-income households, small businesses, and seniors on fixed income;

(D) joblessness increases the likelihood of hospital visits, illnesses, and premature deaths;

(E) according to testimony on June 15, 2011, before the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate by Dr. Harvey Brenner of Johns Hopkins University, “The unemployment rate is well established as a risk factor for elevated illness and mortality rates in epidemiological studies performed since the early 1980s. In addition to influences on mental disorder, suicide and alcohol abuse and alcoholism, unemployment is also an important risk factor in car-

diovascular disease and overall decreases in life expectancy.”;

(F) according to the National Center for Health Statistics, “children in poor families were four times as likely to be in fair or poor health as children that were not poor”;

(G) any major decision that would cost the economy of the United States millions of dollars and lead to serious negative health effects for the people of the United States should be debated and explicitly authorized by Congress, not approved by a Presidential memorandum or regulations; and

(H) any policy adopted by Congress should make United States energy as clean as practicable, as quickly as practicable, without increasing the cost of energy for struggling families, seniors, low-income households, and small businesses.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(A) to ensure that—

(i) a national energy tax is not imposed on the economy of the United States; and

(ii) struggling families, seniors, low-income households, and small businesses do not experience skyrocketing electricity bills and joblessness;

(B) to protect the people of the United States, particularly families, seniors, and children, from the serious negative health effects of joblessness;

(C) to allow sufficient time for Congress to develop and authorize an appropriate mechanism to address the energy needs of the United States and the potential challenges posed by severe weather; and

(D) to restore the legislative process and congressional authority over the energy policy of the United States.

(b) PRESIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of a Federal agency shall not promulgate any regulation relating to power sector carbon pollution standards or any substantially similar regulation on or after June 25, 2013, unless that regulation is explicitly authorized by an Act of Congress.

TITLE II—PERMITS

SEC. 201. NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF GUIDANCE.—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) APPLICABILITY OF GUIDANCE.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) GUIDANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘guidance’ means draft, interim, or final guidance issued by the Administrator.

“(ii) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘guidance’ includes—

“(I) the comprehensive guidance issued by the Administrator and dated April 1, 2010;

“(II) the proposed guidance entitled ‘Draft Guidance on Identifying Waters Protected by the Clean Water Act’ and dated April 28, 2011;

“(III) the final guidance proposed by the Administrator and dated July 21, 2011; and

“(IV) any other document or paper issued by the Administrator through any process other than the notice and comment rule-making process.

“(B) NEW PERMIT.—The term ‘new permit’ means a permit covering discharges from a structure—

“(i) that is issued under this section by a permitting authority; and

“(ii) for which an application is—

“(I) pending as of the date of enactment of this subsection; or

“(II) filed on or after the date of enactment of this subsection.

“(C) PERMITTING AUTHORITY.—The term ‘permitting authority’ means—

“(i) the Administrator; or

“(ii) a State, acting pursuant to a State program that is equivalent to the program under this section and approved by the Administrator.

“(2) PERMITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in making a determination whether to approve a new permit or a renewed permit, the permitting authority—

“(i) shall base the determination only on compliance with regulations issued by the Administrator or the permitting authority; and

“(ii) shall not base the determination on the extent of adherence of the applicant for the new permit or renewed permit to guidance.

“(B) NEW PERMITS.—If the permitting authority does not approve or deny an application for a new permit by the date that is 270 days after the date of receipt of the application for the new permit, the applicant may operate as if the application were approved in accordance with Federal law for the period of time for which a permit from the same industry would be approved.

“(C) SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETENESS.—In determining whether an application for a new permit or a renewed permit received under this paragraph is substantially complete, the permitting authority shall use standards for determining substantial completeness of similar permits for similar facilities submitted in fiscal year 2007.”.

(b) STATE PERMIT PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) STATE PERMIT PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—At any time after the promulgation of the guidelines required by section 304(a)(2), the Governor of each State desiring to administer a permit program for discharges into navigable waters within the jurisdiction of the State may submit to the Administrator—

“(A) a full and complete description of the program the State proposes to establish and administer under State law or under an interstate compact; and

“(B) a statement from the attorney general (or the attorney for those State water pollution control agencies that have independent legal counsel), or from the chief legal officer in the case of an interstate agency, that the laws of the State, or the interstate compact, as applicable, provide adequate authority to carry out the described program.

“(2) APPROVAL.—The Administrator shall approve each program for which a description is submitted under paragraph (1) unless the Administrator determines that adequate authority does not exist—

“(A) to issue permits that—

“(i) apply, and ensure compliance with, any applicable requirements of sections 301, 302, 306, 307, and 403;

“(ii) are for fixed terms not exceeding 5 years;

“(iii) can be terminated or modified for cause, including—

“(I) a violation of any condition of the permit;

“(II) obtaining a permit by misrepresentation or failure to disclose fully all relevant facts; and

“(III) a change in any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the permitted discharge; and

“(iv) control the disposal of pollutants into wells;

“(B)(i) to issue permits that apply, and ensure compliance with, all applicable requirements of section 308; or

“(i) to inspect, monitor, enter, and require reports to at least the same extent as required in section 308;

“(C) to ensure that the public, and any other State the waters of which may be affected, receives notice of each application for a permit and an opportunity for a public hearing before a ruling on each application;

“(D) to ensure that the Administrator receives notice and a copy of each application for a permit;

“(E) to ensure that any State (other than the permitting State), whose waters may be affected by the issuance of a permit may submit written recommendations to the permitting State and the Administrator with respect to any permit application and, if any part of the written recommendations are not accepted by the permitting State, that the permitting State will notify the affected State and the Administrator in writing of the failure of the State to accept the recommendations, including the reasons for not accepting the recommendations;

“(F) to ensure that no permit will be issued if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Army (acting through the Chief of Engineers), after consultation with the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, anchorage and navigation of any of the navigable waters would be substantially impaired by the issuance of the permit;

“(G) to abate violations of the permit or the permit program, including civil and criminal penalties and other means of enforcement;

“(H) to ensure that any permit for a discharge from a publicly owned treatment works includes conditions to require the identification in terms of character and volume of pollutants of any significant source introducing pollutants subject to pretreatment standards under section 307(b) into the treatment works and a program to ensure compliance with those pretreatment standards by each source, in addition to adequate notice, which shall include information on the quality and quantity of effluent to be introduced into the treatment works and any anticipated impact of the change in the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the publicly owned treatment works, to the permitting agency of—

“(i) new introductions into the treatment works of pollutants from any source that would be a new source (as defined in section 306(a)) if the source were discharging pollutants;

“(ii) new introductions of pollutants into the treatment works from a source that would be subject to section 301 if the source were discharging those pollutants; or

“(iii) a substantial change in volume or character of pollutants being introduced into the treatment works by a source introducing pollutants into the treatment works at the time of issuance of the permit; and

“(I) to ensure that any industrial user of any publicly owned treatment works will comply with sections 204(b), 307, and 308.

“(3) ADMINISTRATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Administrator may not disapprove or withdraw approval of a program under this subsection on the basis of the following:

“(A) The failure of the program to incorporate or comply with guidance (as defined in subsection (s)(1)).

“(B) The implementation of a water quality standard that has been adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c).”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 309 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1319) is amended—

(i) in subsection (c)—

(I) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “402(b)(8)” and inserting “402(b)(2)(H)”; and

(II) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “402(b)(8)” and inserting “402(b)(2)(H)”; and

(ii) in subsection (d), in the first sentence, by striking “402(b)(8)” and inserting “402(b)(2)(H)”.

(B) Section 402(m) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(m)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “subsection (b)(8) of this section” and inserting “subsection (b)(2)(H)”.

(c) SUSPENSION OF FEDERAL PROGRAM.—Section 402(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) LIMITATION ON DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) through (3), the Administrator may not disapprove or withdraw approval of a State program under subsection (b) on the basis of the failure of the following:

“(A) The failure of the program to incorporate or comply with guidance (as defined in subsection (s)(1)).

“(B) The implementation of a water quality standard that has been adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c).”.

(d) NOTIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATOR.—Section 402(d)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(d)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(2)” and all that follows through the end of the first sentence and inserting the following:

“(2) OBJECTION BY ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), no permit shall issue if—

“(i) not later than 90 days after the date on which the Administrator receives notification under subsection (b)(2)(E), the Administrator objects in writing to the issuance of the permit; or

“(ii) not later than 90 days after the date on which the proposed permit of the State is transmitted to the Administrator, the Administrator objects in writing to the issuance of the permit as being outside the guidelines and requirements of this Act.”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “Whenever the Administrator” and inserting the following:

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—If the Administrator”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) EXCEPTION.—The Administrator shall not object to or deny the issuance of a permit by a State under subsection (b) or (s) based on the following:

“(i) Guidance, as that term is defined in subsection (s)(1).

“(ii) The interpretation of the Administrator of a water quality standard that has been adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c).”.

SEC. 202. PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and all that follows through “SEC. 404. (a) The Secretary may issue” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 404. PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.

“(a) PERMITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may issue”; and

(2) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(2) DEADLINE FOR APPROVAL.—

“(A) PERMIT APPLICATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), if an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement, as appropriate, is required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Secretary shall—

“(I) begin the process not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a permit application; and

“(II) approve or deny an application for a permit under this subsection not later than the latter of—

“(aa) if an agency carries out an environmental assessment that leads to a finding of no significant impact, the date on which the finding of no significant impact is issued; or

“(bb) if an agency carries out an environmental assessment that leads to a record of decision, 15 days after the date on which the record of decision on an environmental impact statement is issued.

“(ii) PROCESSES.—Notwithstanding clause (i), regardless of whether the Secretary has commenced an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement by the date described in clause (i)(I), the following deadlines shall apply:

“(I) An environmental assessment carried out under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall be completed not later than 1 year after the deadline for commencing the permit process under clause (i)(I).

“(II) An environmental impact statement carried out under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall be completed not later than 2 years after the deadline for commencing the permit process under clause (i)(I).

“(B) FAILURE TO ACT.—If the Secretary fails to act by the deadline specified in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A)—

“(i) the application, and the permit requested in the application, shall be considered to be approved;

“(ii) the Secretary shall issue a permit to the applicant; and

“(iii) the permit shall not be subject to judicial review.”.

(b) STATE PERMITTING PROGRAMS.—Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) through (4), until the Secretary has issued a permit under this section, the Administrator is authorized to prohibit the specification (including the withdrawal of specification) of any defined area as a disposal site, and deny or restrict the use of any defined area for specification (including the withdrawal of specification) as a disposal site, if the Administrator determines, after notice and opportunity for public hearings, that the discharge of the materials into the area will

have an unacceptable adverse effect on municipal water supplies, shellfish beds or fishery areas (including spawning and breeding areas), wildlife, or recreational areas.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—Before making a determination under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall consult with the Secretary.

“(3) FINDINGS.—The Administrator shall set forth in writing and make public the findings of the Administrator and the reasons of the Administrator for making any determination under this subsection.

“(4) AUTHORITY OF STATE PERMITTING PROGRAMS.—This subsection shall not apply to any permit if the State in which the discharge originates or will originate does not concur with the determination of the Administrator that the discharge will result in an unacceptable adverse effect as described in paragraph (1).”.

(c) STATE PROGRAMS.—Section 404(g)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(g)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “for the discharge” and inserting “for all or part of the discharges”.

SEC. 203. IMPACTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGULATORY ACTIVITY ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) COVERED ACTION.—The term “covered action” means any of the following actions taken by the Administrator under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.):

(A) Issuing a regulation, policy statement, guidance, response to a petition, or other requirement.

(B) Implementing a new or substantially altered program.

(3) MORE THAN A DE MINIMIS NEGATIVE IMPACT.—The term “more than a de minimis negative impact” means the following:

(A) With respect to employment levels, a loss of more than 100 jobs, except that any offsetting job gains that result from the hypothetical creation of new jobs through new technologies or government employment may not be used in the job loss calculation.

(B) With respect to economic activity, a decrease in economic activity of more than \$1,000,000 over any calendar year, except that any offsetting economic activity that results from the hypothetical creation of new economic activity through new technologies or government employment may not be used in the economic activity calculation.

(b) ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS OF ACTIONS ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.—

(1) ANALYSIS.—Before taking a covered action, the Administrator shall analyze the impact, disaggregated by State, of the covered action on employment levels and economic activity, including estimated job losses and decreased economic activity.

(2) ECONOMIC MODELS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Administrator shall use the best available economic models.

(B) ANNUAL GAO REPORT.—Not later than December 31st of each year, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the economic models used by the Administrator to carry out this subsection.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—With respect to any covered action, the Administrator shall—

(A) post the analysis under paragraph (1) as a link on the main page of the public Internet Web site of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(B) request that the Governor of any State experiencing more than a de minimis negative impact post the analysis in the Capitol of the State.

(c) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator concludes under subsection (b)(1) that a covered action will have more than a de minimis negative impact on employment levels or economic activity in a State, the Administrator shall hold a public hearing in each such State at least 30 days prior to the effective date of the covered action.

(2) TIME, LOCATION, AND SELECTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A public hearing required under paragraph (1) shall be held at a convenient time and location for impacted residents.

(B) PRIORITY.—In selecting a location for such a public hearing, the Administrator shall give priority to locations in the State that will experience the greatest number of job losses.

(d) NOTIFICATION.—If the Administrator concludes under subsection (b)(1) that a covered action will have more than a de minimis negative impact on employment levels or economic activity in any State, the Administrator shall give notice of such impact to the congressional delegation, Governor, and legislature of the State at least 45 days before the effective date of the covered action.

SEC. 204. IDENTIFICATION OF WATERS PROTECTED BY THE CLEAN WATER ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not—

(1) finalize, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed guidance described in the notice of availability and request for comments entitled “EPA and Army Corps of Engineers Guidance Regarding Identification of Waters Protected by the Clean Water Act” (EPA-HQ-OW-2011-0409) (76 Fed. Reg. 24479 (May 2, 2011)); and

(2) use the guidance described in paragraph (1), any successor document, or any substantially similar guidance made publicly available on or after December 3, 2008, as the basis for any decision regarding the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or any rulemaking.

(b) RULES.—The use of the guidance described in subsection (a)(1), or any successor document or substantially similar guidance made publicly available on or after December 3, 2008, as the basis for any rule shall be grounds for vacating the rule.

SEC. 205. LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY TO MODIFY STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.

(a) STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.—Section 303(c)(4) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(2) by striking “(4) The” and inserting the following:

“(4) PROMULGATION OF REVISED OR NEW STANDARDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The”;

(3) by striking “The Administrator shall promulgate” and inserting the following:

“(B) DEADLINE.—The Administrator shall promulgate;” and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the Administrator may not promulgate a revised or new standard for a pollutant in any case in which the State has

submitted to the Administrator and the Administrator has approved a water quality standard for that pollutant, unless the State concurs with the determination of the Administrator that the revised or new standard is necessary to meet the requirements of this Act.”.

(b) FEDERAL LICENSES AND PERMITS.—Section 401(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) STATE OR INTERSTATE AGENCY DETERMINATION.—With respect to any discharge, if a State or interstate agency having jurisdiction over the navigable waters at the point at which the discharge originates or will originate determines under paragraph (1) that the discharge will comply with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307, the Administrator may not take any action to supersede the determination.”.

SEC. 206. STATE AUTHORITY TO IDENTIFY WATERS WITHIN BOUNDARIES OF THE STATE.

Section 303(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(d)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) STATE AUTHORITY TO IDENTIFY WATERS WITHIN BOUNDARIES OF THE STATE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall submit to the Administrator from time to time, with the first such submission not later than 180 days after the date of publication of the first identification of pollutants under section 304(a)(2)(D), the waters identified and the loads established under subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of paragraph (1).

“(B) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL BY ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of submission, the Administrator shall approve the State identification and load or announce the disagreement of the Administrator with the State identification and load.

“(ii) APPROVAL.—If the Administrator approves the identification and load submitted by the State under this subsection, the State shall incorporate the identification and load into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

“(iii) DISAPPROVAL.—If the Administrator announces the disagreement of the Administrator with the identification and load submitted by the State under this subsection, the Administrator shall submit, not later than 30 days after the date that the Administrator announces the disagreement of the Administrator with the submission of the State, to the State the written recommendation of the Administrator of those additional waters that the Administrator identifies and such loads for such waters as the Administrator believes are necessary to implement the water quality standards applicable to the waters.

“(C) ACTION BY STATE.—Not later than 30 days after receipt of the recommendation of the Administrator, the State shall—

“(i) disregard the recommendation of the Administrator in full and incorporate its own identification and load into the current plan of the State under subsection (e);

“(ii) accept the recommendation of the Administrator in full and incorporate its identification and load as amended by the recommendation of the Administrator into the current plan of the State under subsection (e); or

“(iii) accept the recommendation of the Administrator in part, identifying certain additional waters and certain additional loads proposed by the Administrator to be

added to the State's identification and load and incorporate the State's identification and load as amended into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

“(D) NONCOMPLIANCE BY ADMINISTRATOR.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator fails to approve the State identification and load or announce the disagreement of the Administrator with the State identification and load within the time specified in this subsection—

“(I) the identification and load of the State shall be considered approved; and

“(II) the State shall incorporate the identification and load that the State submitted into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

“(ii) RECOMMENDATIONS NOT SUBMITTED.—If the Administrator announces the disagreement of the Administrator with the identification and load of the State but fails to submit the written recommendation of the Administrator to the State within 30 days as required by subparagraph (B)(iii)—

“(I) the identification and load of the State shall be considered approved; and

“(II) the State shall incorporate the identification and load that the State submitted into the current plan of the State under subsection (e).

“(E) APPLICATION.—This section shall apply to any decision made by the Administrator under this subsection issued on or after March 1, 2013.”

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 227—TO COMMEMORATE THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HEROIC RESCUE OF DANISH JEWS DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR BY THE DANISH PEOPLE

Mr. MENENDEZ submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 227

Whereas, in the fall of 1943, the Nazis occupied Denmark and issued orders that the Danes deport all Danish Jews to concentration camps where the Jews would eventually be exterminated;

Whereas the Danish people, as a result of the Nazi mandate, refused to accept the prosecution of the Jews and began a mission of mercy on October 1, 1943, smuggling Jews across the Oresund Strait to neutral Sweden via small boats and fishing cutters;

Whereas the Danish rescuers unselfishly risked their own lives, avoiding German patrols for weeks during the rescue operations;

Whereas approximately 90 percent of the Danish Jews were saved from certain death at the hands of the Nazis by the sheer courage and compassion demonstrated by the Danes; and

Whereas it is imperative that future generations continue to remember and understand what happened so that the horrors of the Holocaust will never be repeated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and commemorates the bravery and valor of those Danes who participated in the 1943 rescue operations that saved the lives of 7,300 Jews who would otherwise have perished in Nazi concentration camps; and

(2) declares that the world owes a great debt to these Danes who did not turn a blind

eye on the dangers that faced Jews under Nazi occupation and continue to serve as inspiration to others in times of difficulties and challenges.

SENATE RESOLUTION 228—AUTHORIZING THE REPORTING OF COMMITTEE FUNDING RESOLUTIONS FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 2013, THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 2015

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Rules and Administration; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 228

Resolved, That notwithstanding paragraph 9 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate—

(1) not later than September 20, 2013, each committee shall report 1 resolution authorizing the committee to make expenditures out of the contingent fund of the Senate to defray its expenses, including the compensation of members of its staff, for the period October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015; and

(2) the Committee on Rules and Administration may report 1 authorization resolution containing more than 1 committee authorization resolution for the period October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015.

SENATE RESOLUTION 229—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Rules and Administration; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 229

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014 and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,334,743, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$12,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed

\$972,810, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$31,250 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 230—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Ms. STABENOW submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 230

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. (a) The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall

not exceed \$4,181,090 of which amount (1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$40,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$1,742,121 of which amount (1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$40,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations".

SENATE RESOLUTION 231—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 231

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of the Rules, including holding hearings, reporting the hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on En-

ergy and Natural Resources (referred to in this resolution as the "Committee") is authorized for the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending September 30, 2014, and for the period beginning October 1, 2014, and ending February 28, 2015, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) INITIAL PERIOD.—The expenses of the Committee for the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall not exceed \$5,463,481.

(b) SUBSEQUENT PERIOD.—The expenses of the Committee for the period beginning October 1, 2014, and ending February 28, 2015, under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,276,450.

SEC. 3. REPORTING OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

The Committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it considers advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. PAYMENT FROM CONTINGENT FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Expenses of the Committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(1) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(2) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate;

(3) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery of the Senate;

(4) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(5) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate;

(6) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(7) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

SEC. 5. AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

There are authorized such sums as are necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the Committee for the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending September 30, 2014, and for the period beginning October 1, 2014, and ending February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations".

SENATE RESOLUTION 232—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. LEVIN submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Armed Services; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 232

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing

Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall not exceed \$6,421,128, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$80,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$30,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,675,470, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$30,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations".

SENATE RESOLUTION 233—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. SANDERS submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 233

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014 and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,178,117, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$9,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$907,549, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$21,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$3,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or

(7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations".

SENATE RESOLUTION 234—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CARPER submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 234

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate and S. Res. 445 (108th Congress), including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs (in this resolution referred to as the "committee") is authorized from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, in its discretion to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2015.

(a) EXPENSES FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 2013 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2014.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 under this resolution shall not exceed \$9,488,952, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 2014 THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,953,730, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. EXPENSES; AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS; AND INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013 through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations" of the Senate.

(c) INVESTIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee, is authorized to study or investigate—

(A) the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corruption, or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public;

(B) the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities;

(C) organized criminal activity which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions and the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activity have infiltrated lawful business enterprise, and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international

commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against such practices or activities;

(D) all other aspects of crime and lawlessness within the United States which have an impact upon or affect the national health, welfare, and safety; including but not limited to investment fraud schemes, commodity and security fraud, computer fraud, and the use of offshore banking and corporate facilities to carry out criminal objectives;

(E) the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to—

(i) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(ii) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge and talents;

(iii) the adequacy of present intergovernmental relations between the United States and international organizations principally concerned with national security of which the United States is a member; and

(iv) legislative and other proposals to improve these methods, processes, and relationships;

(F) the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of all agencies and departments of the Government involved in the control and management of energy shortages including, but not limited to, their performance with respect to—

(i) the collection and dissemination of accurate statistics on fuel demand and supply;

(ii) the implementation of effective energy conservation measures;

(iii) the pricing of energy in all forms;

(iv) coordination of energy programs with State and local government;

(v) control of exports of scarce fuels;

(vi) the management of tax, import, pricing, and other policies affecting energy supplies;

(vii) maintenance of the independent sector of the petroleum industry as a strong competitive force;

(viii) the allocation of fuels in short supply by public and private entities;

(ix) the management of energy supplies owned or controlled by the Government;

(x) relations with other oil producing and consuming countries;

(xi) the monitoring of compliance by governments, corporations, or individuals with the laws and regulations governing the allocation, conservation, or pricing of energy supplies; and

(xii) research into the discovery and development of alternative energy supplies; and

(G) the efficiency and economy of all branches and functions of Government with particular references to the operations and management of Federal regulatory policies and programs.

(2) **EXTENT OF INQUIRIES.**—In carrying out the duties provided in paragraph (1), the inquiries of this committee or any subcommittee of the committee shall not be construed to be limited to the records, functions, and operations of any particular branch of the Government and may extend to the records and activities of any persons, corporation, or other entity.

(3) **SPECIAL COMMITTEE AUTHORITY.**—For the purposes of this subsection, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee, or its chair-

man, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the chairman is authorized, in its, his, her, or their discretion—

(A) to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents;

(B) to hold hearings;

(C) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recess, and adjournment periods of the Senate;

(D) to administer oaths; and

(E) to take testimony, either orally or by sworn statement, or, in the case of staff members of the Committee and the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, by deposition in accordance with the Committee Rules of Procedure.

(4) **AUTHORITY OF OTHER COMMITTEES.**—Nothing contained in this subsection shall affect or impair the exercise of any other standing committee of the Senate of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

(5) **SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.**—All subpoenas and related legal processes of the committee and its subcommittee authorized under S. Res. 64, agreed to March 5, 2013 (113th Congress), are authorized to continue.

SENATE RESOLUTION 235—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP FOR OCTOBER 1, 2013, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2014, AND OCTOBER 1, 2014, THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 2015

Ms. LANDRIEU submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 235

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014 and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,581,019, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$1,075,424, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations".

SENATE RESOLUTION 236—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mrs. BOXER submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Environment and Public Works; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 236

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014 and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, under this resolution shall

not exceed \$5,194,253, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$8,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$2,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

(b) For the period October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,164,272, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$3,333.33 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i))), and (2) not to exceed \$833.33 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(j))).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2015.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014, and October 1, 2014, through February 28, 2015, to be paid from the Appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations".

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1929. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1930. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1931. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1932. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1933. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment

intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1934. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1935. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1936. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1937. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1938. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1939. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1940. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1941. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1942. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1943. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1944. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1945. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1946. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1947. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1948. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1949. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1950. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1951. Mr. HARKIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1952. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1929. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:

SEC. 4. STUDY ON BENEFITS OF ENERGY SAVING DEVICES AND ENERGY CODE COMPLIANCE IN COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct a study of—

(1) the potential future energy and energy cost savings from full implementation of cost-effective investments in energy saving devices, equipment, and systems in the commercial building sector; including—

(A) devices such as timers, dimmers, and sensors with applications for reducing the power consumption of lighting and plug load in a building;

(B) equipment such as air control and hot aisle containment products with applications for reducing power consumption in data centers through signification reduction of cooling requirements; and

(C) systems such as controllers and sensors that work together to reduce power consumption of lighting and plug load at the room, floor, and building levels;

(2) the quantified energy savings and quantified nonenergy benefits of achieving full compliance with national model building energy codes (including any additional energy savings) if all new commercial building construction—

(A) meets national model building energy codes;

(B) exceeds national model codes by 25 percent; and

(C) exceeds national model codes by 50 percent; and

(3) the quantified energy saving and quantified nonenergy benefits realized from conducting comprehensive or deep retrofits in existing commercial buildings, including the effect that expanding the retrofit program would have with respect to—

(A) the United States as a whole; and

(B) 2 States selected for study.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out studies under paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(A) include in nonenergy benefits improved health of building occupants and the general population, and greater office productivity that may be achieved from the adoption of national model building energy codes; and

(B) for each of the scenarios described in subsection (a)(2), calculate the societal return on investment from full implementation of national model building energy codes, with and without nonenergy benefits.

(2) **DEADLINE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete the studies required under subsection (a).

SA 1930. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 303 and insert the following:

SEC. 303. FEDERAL DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION INITIATIVE.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator for the Office of E-Government and Information Technology within the Office of Management and Budget.

(2) **FDCCI.**—The term “FDCCI” means the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative described in the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative, dated February 26, 2010, or any successor thereto.

(b) **FEDERAL DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION INVENTORIES AND STRATEGIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **ANNUAL REPORTING.**—Each year, beginning in the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act and for each of the 4 fiscal years thereafter, the head of each agency that is described in subparagraph (D), assisted by the Chief Information Officer of the agency, shall submit to the Administrator—

(i) a comprehensive asset inventory of the data centers owned, operated, or maintained by or on behalf of the agency, even if the center is administered by a third party; and

(ii) a multi-year strategy to achieve the optimization and consolidation of agency data center assets, that includes—

(I) performance metrics—

(aa) that are consistent with performance metrics established by the Administrator under subparagraphs (C) and (G) of paragraph (2); and

(bb) by which the quantitative and qualitative progress of the agency toward data center consolidation goals can be measured;

(II) a timeline for agency activities completed under the FDCCI, with an emphasis on benchmarks the agency can achieve by specific dates;

(III) an aggregation of year-by-year investment and cost savings calculations for the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date described in subsection (e), broken down by each year, including a description of any initial costs for data center consolidation and life cycle cost savings, with an emphasis on—

(aa) meeting the Government-wide performance metrics described in subparagraphs (C) and (G) of paragraph (2); and

(bb) demonstrating agency-specific savings each fiscal year achieved through the FDCCI; and

(IV) any additional information required by the Administrator.

(B) **USE OF EXISTING REPORTING STRUCTURES.**—The Administrator may require agencies described in subparagraph (D) to submit any information required to be submitted under this subsection through reporting structures in use as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(C) **CERTIFICATION.**—Each year, beginning in the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act and for each of the 4 fiscal years thereafter, acting through the chief information officer of the agency, shall submit a statement to the Administrator certifying that the agency has complied with the requirements of this Act.

(D) **AGENCIES DESCRIBED.**—The agencies (including all associated components of the agency) described in this paragraph are the—

- (i) Department of Agriculture;
- (ii) Department of Commerce;
- (iii) Department of Defense;
- (iv) Department of Education;
- (v) Department of Energy;
- (vi) Department of Health and Human Services;

(vii) Department of Homeland Security;

(viii) Department of Housing and Urban Development;

(ix) Department of the Interior;

(x) Department of Justice;

(xi) Department of Labor;

(xii) Department of State;

(xiii) Department of Transportation;

(xiv) Department of Treasury;

(xv) Department of Veterans Affairs;

(xvi) Environmental Protection Agency;

(xvii) General Services Administration;

(xviii) National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(xix) National Science Foundation;

(xx) Nuclear Regulatory Commission;

(xxi) Office of Personnel Management;

(xxii) Small Business Administration;

(xxiii) Social Security Administration; and

(xxiv) United States Agency for International Development.

(E) **AGENCY IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIES.**—Each agency described in subparagraph (D), under the direction of the Chief Information Officer of the agency shall—

(i) implement the consolidation strategy required under subparagraph (A)(ii); and

(ii) provide updates to the Administrator, on a quarterly basis, of—

(I) the completion of activities by the agency under the FDCCI;

(II) any progress of the agency towards meeting the Government-wide data center performance metrics described in subparagraphs (C) and (G) of paragraph (2); and

(III) the actual cost savings realized through the implementation of the FDCCI.

(F) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the reporting of information by any agency described in subparagraph (F) to the Administrator, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, or to Congress.

(2) **ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The Administrator shall—

(A) establish the deadline, on an annual basis, for agencies to submit information under this section;

(B) establish a list of requirements that the agencies must meet to be considered in compliance with paragraph (1);

(C) ensure that each certification submitted under paragraph (1)(C) and information relating to agency progress towards meeting the Government-wide total cost of ownership optimization and consolidation metrics is made available in a timely manner to the general public;

(D) review the plans submitted under paragraph (1) to determine whether each plan is comprehensive and complete;

(E) monitor the implementation of the data center plan of each agency described in paragraph (1)(A)(ii);

(F) update, on an annual basis, the cumulative cost savings realized through the implementation of the agency plans; and

(G) establish Government-wide data center total cost of ownership optimization and consolidation metrics, which shall include server efficiency and other comprehensive metrics established at the discretion of the Administrator.

(3) **COST SAVING GOAL AND UPDATES FOR CONGRESS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall develop and publish a goal for the total amount of planned cost savings by the Federal Government through the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative during the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, which shall include a breakdown on a year-by-year basis of the projected savings.

(B) **ANNUAL UPDATE.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the goal described in subparagraph (A) is determined and each year thereafter until the end of 2018, the Administrator shall aggregate the savings achieved to date, by each relevant agency, through the FDCCI as compared to the projected savings developed under subparagraph (A) (based on data collected from each affected agency under paragraph (1)).

(ii) **UPDATE FOR CONGRESS.**—The goal required to be developed and published under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted to Congress and shall include an update on the progress made by each agency described in subsection paragraph (1)(E) on—

(I) whether each agency has in fact submitted a comprehensive asset inventory, including an assessment broken down by agency, which shall include the specific numbers, utilization, and efficiency level of data centers; and

(II) whether each agency has submitted a comprehensive consolidation plan with the key elements described in paragraph (1)(A)(ii).

(iii) **REQUEST FOR INFORMATION.**—Upon request from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate or the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, the head of an agency described in paragraph (1)(E) or the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the requesting committee any report or information submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for the purpose of preparing a report required under clause (i) or an updated progress report required under clause (ii).

(4) **GAO REVIEW.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—During the 5-fiscal-year period following the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the quality and completeness, and verify, each agency's asset inventory and plans required under paragraph (1)(A).

(B) **REPORT.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall, on an annual basis during the 5-fiscal-year period following the date of enactment of this Act, publish a report on each review conducted under subparagraph (A) of an agency during the fiscal year for which the report is published.

(C) **ENSURING CYBERSECURITY STANDARDS FOR DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION AND CLOUD COMPUTING.**—An agency required to implement a data center consolidation plan under this Act and migrate to cloud computing shall do so in a manner that is consistent with Federal guidelines on cloud computing security, including—

(1) applicable provisions found within the Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program (FedRAMP); and

(2) guidance published by the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(d) **CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.**—The Director of National Intelligence may waive the requirements of this Act for any element (or component of an element) of the intelligence community.

(e) **SUNSET.**—This section is repealed effective on October 1, 2018.

SA 1931. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 23, strike line 6 and all that follows through page 25, line 21.

SA 1932. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 47, strike line 17 and all that follows through page 48, line 2, and insert the following:

SEC. 4. STATE RESIDENTIAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY UPGRADES LOAN PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **LOANS FOR RESIDENTIAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY UPGRADES.**—Part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 367. LOANS FOR RESIDENTIAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY UPGRADES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CONSUMER-FRIENDLY.—The term ‘consumer-friendly’, with respect to a loan repayment approach, means a loan repayment approach that—

“(A) emphasizes convenience for customers;

“(B) is of low cost to consumers; and

“(C) emphasizes simplicity and ease of use for consumers in the billing process.

“(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) a State or territory of the United States; and

“(B) a tribal organization (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)).

“(3) ENERGY ADVISOR PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘energy advisor program’ means any program to provide to owners or residents of residential buildings advice, information, and support in the identification, prioritization, and implementation of energy efficiency and energy savings measures.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘energy advisor program’ includes a program that provides—

“(i) interpretation of energy audit reports;

“(ii) assistance in the prioritization of improvements;

“(iii) assistance in finding qualified contractors;

“(iv) assistance in contractor bid reviews;

“(v) education on energy conservation and energy efficiency;

“(vi) explanations of available incentives and tax credits;

“(vii) assistance in completion of rebate and incentive paperwork; and

“(viii) any other similar type of support.

“(4) ENERGY EFFICIENCY.—The term ‘energy efficiency’ means a decrease in homeowner or residential tenant consumption of energy (including electricity and thermal energy) that is achieved without reducing the quality of energy services through—

“(A) a measure or program that targets customer behavior;

“(B) equipment;

“(C) a device; or

“(D) other material.

“(5) ENERGY EFFICIENCY UPGRADE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘energy efficiency upgrade’ means any project or activity—

“(i) the primary purpose of which is increasing energy efficiency; and

“(ii) that is carried out on a residential building.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘energy efficiency upgrade’ includes the installation or improvement of a renewable energy facility for heating or electricity generation serving a residential building carried out in conjunction with an energy efficiency project or activity.

“(6) RESIDENTIAL BUILDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘residential building’ means a building used for residential purposes.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘residential building’ includes—

“(i) a single-family residence;

“(ii) a multifamily residence composed not more than 4 units; and

“(iii) a mixed-use building that includes not more than 4 residential units.

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program under this part under which the Secretary shall make available to eligible entities loans for the purpose of establishing or expanding programs that provide to residential property owners or tenants financing for energy efficiency upgrades of residential buildings.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—In establishing the program under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, with stakeholders and the public.

“(3) NO REQUIREMENT TO PARTICIPATE.—No eligible entity shall be required to participate in any manner in the program established under paragraph (1).

“(4) DEADLINES.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, implement the program established under paragraph (1) (including soliciting applications from eligible entities in accordance with subsection (c)); and

“(B) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, disburse the initial loans provided under this section.

“(c) APPLICATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a loan under this section, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(2) SELECTION DATE.—Not later than 21 months after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, the Secretary shall select eligible entities to receive the initial loans provided under this section, in accordance with the requirements described in paragraph (3).

“(3) REQUIREMENTS.—In selecting eligible entities to receive loans under this section, the Secretary shall—

“(A) to the maximum extent practicable, ensure—

“(i) that both innovative and established approaches to the challenges of financing energy efficiency upgrades are supported;

“(ii) that energy efficiency upgrades are conducted and validated to comply with best practices for work quality, as determined by the Secretary;

“(iii) regional diversity among recipients, including participation by rural States and small States;

“(iv) significant participation by families with income levels at or below the median income level for the applicable geographical region, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(v) the incorporation by recipients of an energy advisor program;

“(B) evaluate applications based primarily on—

“(i) the projected reduction in energy use, as determined in accordance with such specific and commonly available methodology as the Secretary shall establish, by regulation;

“(ii) the creditworthiness of the eligible entity; and

“(iii) the incorporation of measures for making the loan repayment system for recipients of financing as consumer-friendly as practicable;

“(C) evaluate applications based secondarily on—

“(i) the extent to which the proposed financing program of the eligible entity incorporates best practices for such a program, as determined by the Secretary;

“(ii) whether the eligible entity has created a plan for evaluating the effectiveness of the proposed financing program and whether the plan includes—

“(I) a robust strategy for collecting, managing, and analyzing data, as well as making the data available to the public; and

“(II) experimental studies, which may include investigations of how human behavior impacts the effectiveness of efficiency improvements;

“(iii) the extent to which Federal funds are matched by funding from State, local, philanthropic, private sector, and other sources;

“(iv) the extent to which the proposed financing program will be coordinated and marketed with other existing or planned energy efficiency or energy conservation programs administered by—

“(I) utilities;

“(II) State, tribal, territorial, or local governments; or

“(III) community development financial institutions; and

“(v) such other factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate; and

“(D) not provide an advantage or disadvantage to applications that include renewable energy in the program.

“(d) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—

“(1) TERM.—The Secretary shall establish terms for loans provided to eligible entities under this section—

“(A) in a manner that—

“(i) provides for a high degree of cost recovery; and

“(ii) ensures that, with respect to all loans provided to or by eligible entities under this section, the loans are competitive with, or superior to, other forms of financing for similar purposes; and

“(B) subject to the condition that the term of a loan provided to an eligible entity under this section shall not exceed 35 years.

“(2) INTEREST RATES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary, at the discretion of the Secretary, shall charge interest on a loan provided to an eligible entity under this section at a fixed rate equal, or approximately equal, to the interest rate charged on Treasury securities of comparable maturity.

“(B) LEVERAGED LOANS.—The interest rate and other terms of the loans provided to eligible entities under this section shall be established in a manner that ensures that the total amount of the loans is equal to not less than 20 times, and not more than 50 times, the amount appropriated for credit subsidy costs pursuant to subsection (g)(1).

“(3) NO PENALTY ON EARLY REPAYMENT.—The Secretary shall not assess any penalty for early repayment by an eligible entity of a loan provided under this section.

“(4) RETURN OF UNUSED PORTION.—As a condition of receipt of a loan under this section, an eligible entity shall agree to return to the general fund of the Treasury any portion of the loan amount that is unused by the eligible entity within a reasonable period after the date of receipt of the loan, as determined by the Secretary.

“(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall use a loan provided under this section to establish or expand 1 or more financing programs—

“(A) the purpose of which is to enable residential building owners or tenants to conduct energy efficiency upgrades of residential buildings;

“(B) that may, at the sole discretion of the eligible entity, require an outlay of capital by owners or residents of residential buildings in accordance with the goals of the program under this section; and

“(C) that incorporate a consumer-friendly loan repayment approach.

“(2) STRUCTURE OF FINANCING PROGRAM.—A financing program of an eligible entity may—

“(A) consist—

“(i) primarily or entirely of a financing program administered by—

“(I) the applicable State; or

“(II) a local government, utility, or other entity; or

“(ii) of a combination of programs described in clause (i);

“(B) rely on financing provided by—

“(i) the eligible entity; or

“(ii) a third party, acting through the eligible entity; and

“(C) include a provision pursuant to which a recipient of assistance under the financing program shall agree to return to the eligible entity any portion of the assistance that is unused by the recipient within a reasonable period after the date of receipt of the assistance, as determined by the eligible entity.

“(3) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance from an eligible entity under this subsection may be provided in any form, or in accordance with any program, authorized by Federal law (including regulations), including in the form of—

“(A) a revolving loan fund;

“(B) a credit enhancement structure designed to mitigate the effects of default; or

“(C) a program that—

“(i) adopts any other approach for providing financing for energy efficiency upgrades producing significant energy efficiency gains; and

“(ii) incorporates measures for making the loan repayment system for recipients of financing as consumer-friendly as practicable.

“(4) SCOPE OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided by an eligible entity under this subsection may be used to pay for costs associated with carrying out an energy efficiency upgrade, including materials and labor.

“(5) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—In addition to the amount of the loan provided to an eligible entity by the Secretary under subsection (b), the eligible entity may provide to recipients such assistance under this subsection as the eligible entity considers to be appropriate from any other funds of the eligible entity, including funds provided to the eligible entity by the Secretary for administrative costs pursuant to this section.

“(6) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) INTEREST RATES.—

“(i) INTEREST CHARGED BY ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The interest rate charged by an eligible entity on assistance provided under this subsection—

“(I) shall be fixed; and

“(II) shall not exceed the interest rate paid by the eligible entity to the Secretary under subsection (d)(2).

“(ii) INTEREST CHARGED BY ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS.—A recipient of assistance provided by an eligible entity under this subsection for the purpose of capitalizing a residential energy efficiency financing program of the recipient may charge interest on any loan provided by the recipient at a fixed rate that is as low as practicable, but not more than 5 percent more than the applicable interest rate paid by the eligible entity to the Secretary under subsection (d)(2).

“(B) NO PENALTY ON EARLY REPAYMENT.—An eligible entity, or a recipient of assistance provided by an eligible entity, shall not assess any penalty for early repayment by any recipient of assistance provided under this subsection by the eligible entity or recipient, as applicable.

“(f) REPORTS.—

“(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of receipt of the loan, and annually thereafter for the term of the loan, an eligible entity that receives a loan under this section shall submit to the Secretary a report describing the performance of each program and activity carried out using the loan, including anonymized loan performance data.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary, in consultation with eligible entities and other stakeholders (such as lending institutions and the real estate industry), shall establish such requirements for the reports under this paragraph as the Secretary determines to be appropriate—

“(i) to ensure that the reports are clear, consistent, and straightforward; and

“(ii) taking into account the reporting requirements for similar programs in which the eligible entities are participating, if any.

“(2) SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress and make available to the public—

“(A) not less frequently than once each year, a report describing the performance of the program under this section, including a synthesis and analysis of the information provided in the reports submitted to the Secretary under paragraph (1)(A); and

“(B) on termination of the program under this section, an assessment of the success of, and education provided by, the measures carried out by eligible entities during the term of the program.

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section—

“(1) \$20,000,000 for the cost of credit subsidies;

“(2) \$37,500,000 for energy advisor programs;

“(3) \$5,000,000 for administrative costs to the Secretary of carrying out this section; and

“(4) \$37,500,000 for administrative costs to States in carrying out this section.”.

(b) REORGANIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by redesignating sections 362, 363, 364, 365, and 366 as sections 364, 365, 366, 363, and 362, respectively, and moving the sections so as to appear in numerical order;

(B) in section 362 (as so redesignated)—

(i) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by striking “section 367, and” and inserting “section 367 (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the State Energy Efficiency Pro-

grams Improvement Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 6201 note; Public Law 101-440)); and”;

(ii) in each of paragraphs (4) and (6), by striking “section 365(e)(1)” each place it appears and inserting “section 363(e)(1)”;

(C) in section 363 (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subsection (b), by striking “the provisions of sections 362 and 364 and subsection (a) of section 363” and inserting “sections 364, 365(a), and 366”; and

(ii) in subsection (g)(1)(A), in the second sentence, by striking “section 362” and inserting “section 364”; and

(D) in section 365 (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in paragraph (1), by striking “section 362,” and inserting “section 364”; and

(II) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 362(b) or (e)” and inserting “subsection (b) or (e) of section 364”; and

(ii) in subsection (b)(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “section 362(b) or (e)” and inserting “subsection (b) or (e) of section 364”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 391 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6371) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(M), by striking “section 365(e)(2)” and inserting “section 363(e)(2)”; and

(B) in paragraph (10), by striking “section 362 of this Act” and inserting “section 364”.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 note; Public Law 94-163) is amended by striking the items relating to part D of title III and inserting the following:

“PART D—STATE ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

“Sec. 361. Findings and purpose.

“Sec. 362. Definitions.

“Sec. 363. General provisions.

“Sec. 364. State energy conservation plans.

“Sec. 365. Federal assistance to States.

“Sec. 366. State energy efficiency goals.

“Sec. 367. Loans for residential building energy efficiency upgrades.”.

SEC. 4. OFFSET.

Section 422(f) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17082(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2013;

“(5) \$125,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

“(6) \$85,000,000 for fiscal year 2015;

“(7) \$80,000,000 for fiscal year 2016;

“(8) \$70,000,000 for fiscal year 2017; and

“(9) \$70,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.”.

SA 1933. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 45, strike lines 3 through 24 and insert the following:

SEC. 301. ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND ENERGY-SAVING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES.

Section 543 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (f) (relating to large capital energy investments) as subsection (g); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) FEDERAL IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY FOR ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND ENERGY-SAVING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(B) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—The term ‘information technology’ has the meaning given the term in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code.

“(2) DEVELOPMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, each Federal agency shall collaborate with the Director to develop an implementation strategy (including best-practices and measurement and verification techniques) for the maintenance, purchase, and use by the Federal agency of energy-efficient and energy-saving information technologies.

“(3) ADMINISTRATION.—In developing an implementation strategy, each Federal agency shall consider—

“(A) advanced metering infrastructure;

“(B) energy efficient data center strategies and methods of increasing asset and infrastructure utilization;

“(C) advanced power management tools;

“(D) building information modeling, including building energy management; and

“(E) secure telework and travel substitution tools.

“(4) PERFORMANCE GOALS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2014, the Director, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish performance goals for evaluating the efforts of Federal agencies in improving the maintenance, purchase, and use of energy-efficient and energy-saving information technology systems.

“(B) BEST PRACTICES.—The Chief Information Officers Council established under section 3603 of title 44, United States Code, shall supplement the performance goals established under this paragraph with recommendations on best practices for the attainment of the performance goals, to include a requirement for agencies to consider the use of—

“(i) energy savings performance contracting; and

“(ii) utility energy services contracting.

“(5) REPORTS.—

“(A) AGENCY REPORTS.—Each Federal agency subject to the requirements of this subsection shall include in the report of the agency under section 527 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17143) a description of the efforts and results of the agency under this subsection.

“(B) OMB GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY REPORTS AND SCORECARDS.—Effective beginning not later than October 1, 2014, the Director shall include in the annual report and scorecard of the Director required under section 528 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17144) a description of the efforts and results of Federal agencies under this subsection.

“(C) USE OF EXISTING REPORTING STRUCTURES.—The Director may require Federal agencies to submit any information required to be submitted under this subsection through reporting structures in use as of the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013.”

On page 47, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SEC. 304. ENERGY EFFICIENT DATA CENTERS.

Section 453 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17112) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, the Secretary and the Administrator shall—

“(A) designate an established information technology industry organization to coordinate the program described in subsection (b); and

“(B) make the designation public, including on an appropriate website.”;

(2) by striking subsections (e) and (f) and inserting the following:

“(e) STUDY.—The Secretary, with assistance from the Administrator, shall—

“(1) not later than December 31, 2014, make available to the public an update to the Report to Congress on Server and Data Center Energy Efficiency published on August 2, 2007, under section 1 of Public Law 109–431 (120 Stat. 2920), that provides—

“(A) a comparison and gap analysis of the estimates and projections contained in the original report with new data regarding the period from 2007 through 2013;

“(B) an analysis considering the impact of information technologies, to include virtualization and cloud computing, in the public and private sectors; and

“(C) updated projections and recommendations for best practices through fiscal year 2020; and

“(2) collaborate with the organization designated under subsection (c) in preparing the report.

“(f) DATA CENTER ENERGY PRACTITIONER PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c) and in consultation with the Administrator for the Office of E-Government and Information Technology within the Office of Management and Budget, shall maintain a data center energy practitioner program that leads to the certification of energy practitioners qualified to evaluate the energy usage and efficiency opportunities in data centers.

“(2) EVALUATIONS.—Each Federal agency shall consider having the data centers of the agency evaluated every 4 years by energy practitioners certified pursuant to the program, whenever practicable using certified practitioners employed by the agency.”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (j); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) OPEN DATA INITIATIVE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c) and in consultation with the Administrator for the Office of E-Government and Information Technology within the Office of Management and Budget, shall establish an open data initiative for Federal data center energy usage data, with the purpose of making the data available and accessible in a manner that empowers further data center optimization and consolidation.

“(2) ADMINISTRATION.—In establishing the initiative, the Secretary shall consider use of the online Data Center Maturity Model.

“(h) INTERNATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS AND METRICS.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c), shall actively participate in efforts to harmonize global specifications and metrics for data center energy efficiency.

“(i) DATA CENTER UTILIZATION METRIC.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c), shall assist in the development of an efficiency metric that measures the energy efficiency of the overall data center.”

SA 1934. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . DELAY IN APPLICATION OF PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

(a) ONE-YEAR DELAY IN PPACA PROVISIONS SCHEDULED TO TAKE EFFECT ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2014.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of (including any amendment made by) the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) or of title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2011 (Public Law 111–152) that is otherwise scheduled to take effect on or after January 1, 2014, shall not take effect until the date that is one year after the date on which such provision would otherwise have been scheduled to take effect.

(b) ONE-YEAR SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN TAX INCREASES ALREADY IN EFFECT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of any tax which is imposed or increased by any provision of (including any amendment made by) the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) or of title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2011 (Public Law 111–152), if such tax or increase takes effect before January 1, 2014, such tax or increase shall not apply during the 1-year period beginning on such date.

SA 1935. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4 ____ . REGIONAL HAZE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not consider any element of a proposed better-than Best Available Retrofit Technology (“BART”) alternative to a Federal regional haze implementation plan under the regional haze regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency described in section 51.308 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations) that is not substantially and directly related to the regulation of regional haze.

SA 1936. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 47, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 4 ____ . ENERGY-RELATED AGREEMENTS THAT IMPACT INDIAN TRIBES.

The Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Energy, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not enter into any agreement under this Act or the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.)

that directly affects an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)) or the trust assets of an Indian tribe without first consulting the affected Indian tribe.

SA 1937. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 37, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 44, line 23.

SA 1938. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, lines 23 through 25, strike “Not later than 2 years after the date on which a model building energy code is updated, each” and insert “If a State of Indian tribe has submitted written notification to the Secretary that the State or Indian tribe has decided to participate in the program under this section, not later than 2 years after the date on which a model building energy code is updated, each participating”.

SA 1939. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4. OFFSETS FOR INCREASED COSTS TO FEDERAL AGENCIES FOR REGULATIONS LIMITING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency proposes a rule that limits greenhouse gas emissions and imposes increased costs on 1 or more other Federal agencies, the Administrator shall include in the proposed rule an offset from funds available to the Administrator for all projected increased costs that the proposed rule would impose on other Federal agencies.

(b) NO OFFSETS.—If the Administrator proposes a rule that limits greenhouse gas emissions and imposes increased costs on 1 or more other Federal agencies but does not provide an offset in accordance with paragraph (1), the Administrator may not finalize the rule until the promulgation of the final rule is approved by law.

SA 1940. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:

SEC. 4. ENERGY EFFICIENCY RETROFIT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPLICANT.—The term “applicant” means a nonprofit organization that applies for a grant under this section.

(2) ENERGY-EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “energy-efficiency improvement” means an installed measure (including a product, equipment, system, service, or practice) that results in a reduction in use by a nonprofit organization for energy or fuel supplied from outside the nonprofit building.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term “energy-efficiency improvement” includes an installed measure described in subparagraph (A) involving—

(i) repairing, replacing, or installing—

(I) a roof or lighting system, or component of a roof or lighting system;

(II) a window;

(III) a door, including a security door; or

(IV) a heating, ventilation, or air conditioning system or component of the system (including insulation and wiring and plumbing improvements needed to serve a more efficient system);

(ii) a renewable energy generation or heating system, including a solar, photovoltaic, wind, geothermal, or biomass (including wood pellet) system or component of the system; and

(iii) any other measure taken to modernize, renovate, or repair a nonprofit building to make the nonprofit building more energy efficient.

(3) NONPROFIT BUILDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “nonprofit building” means a building operated and owned by a nonprofit organization.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term “nonprofit building” includes a building described in subparagraph (A) that is—

(i) a hospital;

(ii) a youth center;

(iii) a school;

(iv) a social-welfare program facility;

(v) a faith-based organization; and

(vi) any other nonresidential and non-commercial structure.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a pilot program to award grants for the purpose of retrofitting nonprofit buildings with energy-efficiency improvements.

(c) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award grants under the program established under subsection (b).

(2) APPLICATION.—The Secretary may award a grant under this section if an applicant submits to the Secretary an application at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may prescribe.

(3) CRITERIA FOR GRANT.—In determining whether to award a grant under this section, the Secretary shall apply performance-based criteria, which shall give priority to applications based on—

(A) the energy savings achieved;

(B) the cost-effectiveness of the energy-efficiency improvement;

(C) an effective plan for evaluation, measurement, and verification of energy savings;

(D) the financial need of the applicant; and

(E) the percentage of the matching contribution by the applicant.

(4) LIMITATION ON INDIVIDUAL GRANT AMOUNT.—Each grant awarded under this section shall not exceed—

(A) an amount equal to 50 percent of the energy-efficiency improvement; and

(B) \$200,000.

(5) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A grant awarded under this section shall be subject to a minimum non-Federal cost-sharing requirement of 50 percent.

(B) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The non-Federal share may be provided in the form of in-kind contributions of materials or services.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, to remain available until expended.

(e) OFFSET.—Section 942(f) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16251(f)) is amended by striking “\$250,000,000” and inserting “\$200,000,000”.

SA 1941. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

Subtitle E—Technical Assistance Program

SEC. 241. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Local Energy Supply and Resiliency Act of 2013”.

SEC. 242. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) a quantity of energy that is more than—

(A) 27 percent of the total energy consumption in the United States is released from power plants in the form of waste heat; and

(B) 36 percent of the total energy consumption in the United States is released from power plants, industrial facilities, and other buildings in the form of waste heat;

(2) waste heat can be—

(A) recovered and distributed to meet building heating or industrial process heating requirements;

(B) converted to chilled water for air conditioning or industrial process cooling; or

(C) converted to electricity;

(3) renewable energy resources in communities in the United States can be used to meet local thermal and electric energy requirements;

(4) use of local energy resources and implementation of local energy infrastructure can strengthen the reliability and resiliency of energy supplies in the United States in response to extreme weather events, power grid failures, or interruptions in the supply of fossil fuels;

(5) use of local waste heat and renewable energy resources—

(A) strengthens United States industrial competitiveness;

(B) helps reduce reliance on fossil fuels and the associated emissions of air pollution and carbon dioxide;

(C) increases energy supply resiliency and security; and

(D) keeps more energy dollars in local economies, thereby creating jobs;

(6) district energy systems represent a key opportunity to tap waste heat and renewable energy resources;

(7) district energy systems are important for expanding implementation of combined heat and power systems because district energy systems provide infrastructure for delivering thermal energy from a CHP system to a substantial base of end users;

(8) district energy systems serve institutions of higher education, hospitals, airports, military bases, and downtown areas;

(9) district energy systems help cut peak power demand and reduce power transmission and distribution system constraints by—

(A) shifting power demand through thermal storage;

(B) generating power near load centers with a CHP system; and

(C) meeting air conditioning demand through the delivery of chilled water produced with heat generated by a CHP system or other energy sources;

(10) evaluation and implementation of district energy systems—

(A) is a complex undertaking involving a variety of technical, economic, legal, and institutional issues and barriers; and

(B) often requires technical assistance to successfully navigate those barriers; and

(11) a major constraint to the use of local waste heat and renewable energy resources is a lack of low-interest, long-term capital funding for implementation.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this title are—

(1) to encourage the use and distribution of waste heat and renewable thermal energy—

(A) to reduce fossil fuel consumption;

(B) to enhance energy supply resiliency, reliability, and security;

(C) to reduce air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions;

(D) to strengthen industrial competitiveness; and

(E) to retain more energy dollars in local economies; and

(2) to facilitate the implementation of a local energy infrastructure that accomplishes the goals described in paragraph (1) by—

(A) providing technical assistance to evaluate, design, and develop projects to build local energy infrastructure; and

(B) facilitating low-cost financing for the construction of local energy infrastructure through the issuance of loan guarantees.

SEC. 243. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **COMBINED HEAT AND POWER SYSTEM.**—The term “combined heat and power system” or “CHP system” means generation of electric energy and heat in a single, integrated system that meets the efficiency criteria in clauses (ii) and (iii) of section 48(c)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, under which heat that is conventionally rejected is recovered and used to meet thermal energy requirements.

(2) **DEMAND RESPONSE.**—The term “demand response” means a change in electricity use by an electric utility customer, as measured against the usual consumption pattern of the consumer, in response to—

(A) a change in the price of electricity during a given period of time; or

(B) an incentive payment designed to induce lower electricity use when—

(i) wholesale market prices are high; or

(ii) system reliability is jeopardized.

(3) **DISTRICT ENERGY SYSTEM.**—The term “district energy system” means a system that provides thermal energy to buildings and other energy consumers from 1 or more plants to individual buildings to provide space heating, air conditioning, domestic hot water, industrial process energy, and other end uses.

(4) **LOCAL ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE.**—The term “local energy infrastructure” means a system that—

(A) recovers or produces useful thermal or electric energy from waste energy or renewable energy resources;

(B) generates electricity using a combined heat and power system;

(C) distributes electricity in microgrids;

(D) stores thermal energy; or

(E) distributes thermal energy or transfers thermal energy to building heating and cooling systems via a district energy system.

(5) **MICROGRID.**—The term “microgrid” means a group of interconnected loads and distributed energy resources within clearly defined electrical boundaries that—

(A) acts as a single controllable entity with respect to the grid; and

(B) can connect and disconnect from the grid to enable the microgrid to operate in both grid-connected or island-mode.

(6) **RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCE.**—The term “renewable energy resource” means—

(A) closed-loop and open-loop biomass (as defined in paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively, of section 45(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986);

(B) gaseous or liquid fuels produced from the materials described in subparagraph (A);

(C) geothermal energy (as defined in section 45(c)(4) of such Code);

(D) municipal solid waste (as defined in section 45(c)(6) of such Code); or

(E) solar energy (which is used, undefined, in section 45 of such Code).

(7) **RENEWABLE THERMAL ENERGY.**—The term “renewable thermal energy” means—

(A) heating or cooling energy derived from a renewable energy resource;

(B) natural sources of cooling such as cold lake or ocean water; or

(C) other renewable thermal energy sources, as determined by the Secretary.

(8) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

(9) **THERMAL ENERGY.**—The term “thermal energy” means—

(A) heating energy in the form of hot water or steam that is used to provide space heating, domestic hot water, or process heat; or

(B) cooling energy in the form of chilled water, ice or other media that is used to provide air conditioning, or process cooling.

(10) **WASTE ENERGY.**—The term “waste energy” means energy that—

(A) is contained in—

(i) exhaust gas, exhaust steam, condenser water, jacket cooling heat, or lubricating oil in power generation systems;

(ii) exhaust heat, hot liquids, or flared gas from any industrial process;

(iii) waste gas or industrial tail gas that would otherwise be flared, incinerated, or vented;

(iv) a pressure drop in any gas, excluding any pressure drop to a condenser that subsequently vents the resulting heat;

(v) condenser water from chilled water or refrigeration plants; or

(vi) any other form of waste energy, as determined by the Secretary; and

(B)(i) in the case of an existing facility, is not being used; or

(ii) in the case of a new facility, is not conventionally used in comparable systems.

SEC. 244. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a program to disseminate information and provide technical assistance, directly through the establishment of 1 or more clean energy application centers or through grants so that recipients may contract to obtain technical assistance, to assist eligible entities in identifying, evaluating, planning, and designing local energy infrastructure.

(2) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—The technical assistance under paragraph (1) shall include assistance with 1 or more of the following:

(A) Identification of opportunities to use waste energy or renewable energy resources.

(B) Assessment of technical and economic characteristics.

(C) Utility interconnection.

(D) Negotiation of power and fuel contracts, including assessment of the value of demand response capabilities.

(E) Permitting and siting issues.

(F) Marketing and contract negotiations.

(G) Business planning and financial analysis.

(H) Engineering design.

(3) **INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.**—The information disseminated under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) information relating to the topics identified in paragraph (2), including case studies of successful examples; and

(B) computer software for assessment, design, and operation and maintenance of local energy infrastructure.

(b) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—Any nonprofit or for-profit entity shall be eligible to receive assistance under the program established under subsection (a).

(c) **ELIGIBLE COSTS.**—On application by an eligible entity, the Secretary may award a grant to the eligible entity to provide amounts to cover not more than—

(1) 100 percent of the cost of initial assessment to identify local energy opportunities;

(2) 75 percent of the cost of feasibility studies to assess the potential for the implementation of local energy infrastructure;

(3) 60 percent of the cost of guidance on overcoming barriers to the implementation of local energy infrastructure, including financial, contracting, siting, and permitting issues; and

(4) 45 percent of the cost of detailed engineering of local energy infrastructure.

(d) **APPLICATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An eligible entity desiring technical assistance under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require under the rules and procedures adopted under subsection (f).

(2) **APPLICATION PROCESS.**—The Secretary shall solicit applications for technical assistance under this section—

(A) on a competitive basis; and

(B) on a periodic basis, but not less frequently than once every 12 months.

(e) **PRIORITIES.**—In evaluating projects, the Secretary shall give priority to projects that have the greatest potential for—

(1) maximizing elimination of fossil fuel use;

(2) strengthening the reliability of local energy supplies and boosting the resiliency of energy infrastructure to the impact of extreme weather events, power grid failures, and interruptions in supply of fossil fuels;

(3) minimizing environmental impact, including regulated air pollutants, greenhouse gas emissions, and use of ozone-depleting refrigerants;

(4) facilitating use of renewable energy resources;

(5) increasing industrial competitiveness; and

(6) maximizing local job creation.

(f) **RULES AND PROCEDURES.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall adopt rules and procedures for the administration of the program established under this section, consistent with the provisions of this title.

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 245. LOAN GUARANTEES FOR LOCAL ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) ASSURANCE OF REPAYMENT.—Section 1702(d) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16512(d)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) LOCAL ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE DOCUMENTATION.—No guarantee shall be made for local energy infrastructure unless the borrower submits to the Secretary—

“(A) an independent engineering report, prepared by an engineer with experience in the industry and familiarity with similar projects, that includes detailed information on—

“(i) how the technology to be employed in the project is a proven, commercial technology;

“(ii) project siting;

“(iii) engineering and design;

“(iv) permitting and environmental compliance;

“(v) testing and commissioning; and

“(vi) operations and maintenance;

“(B) a detailed description of the overall financial plan for the proposed project, including all sources and uses of funding, equity and debt, and the liability of parties associated with the project over the term of the guarantee agreement;

“(C) all applicable financial statements of the borrower and any non-Federal parties providing financial assistance to the borrower, which shall have been audited by an independent certified public accountant;

“(D) the business plan on which the project is based and a financial model presenting project pro forma statements for the proposed term of the guarantee, including income statements, balance sheets, and cash flows;

“(E) a copy of any power purchase agreement, thermal energy purchase agreement, and other long-term offtake or revenue-generating agreement that will be the primary source of revenue for the project, including repayment of the debt obligations for which a guarantee is sought; and

“(F) a list of each engineering and design contractor, construction contractor, and equipment supplier for the project, as well as any performance guarantee, performance bond, liquidated damages provision, and equipment warranty to be provided.”.

(b) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—Section 1703 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16513) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

“(11) Local energy infrastructure, as defined in section 243 of the Local Energy Supply and Resiliency Act of 2013.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) SPECIAL RULES FOR LOCAL ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a)(2) shall not apply to a project described in subsection (b)(11).

“(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR LOAN GUARANTEE.—A loan guarantee shall only be made available for a project described in subsection (b)(11) to the extent specifically provided for in advance by an appropriations Act enacted after the date of enactment of the Local Energy Supply and Resiliency Act of 2013.”.

SEC. 246. DEFINITION OF INVESTMENT AREA.

Section 103(16) of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4702(16)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) has the potential for implementation of local energy infrastructure (as defined in section 243 of the Local Energy Supply and Resiliency Act of 2013).”.

SEC. 247. STATE ENERGY CONSERVATION PLANS.

Section 362(d) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (16), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (18); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:

“(17) programs to support the evaluation and implementation of local energy infrastructure (as defined in section 243 of the Local Energy Supply and Resiliency Act of 2013).”.

Beginning on page 47, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 48, line 2, and insert the following:

“(4) \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2013;

“(5) \$180,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

“(6) \$130,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(7) \$80,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018.”.

SA 1942. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4. PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 404(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(c)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “The Administrator” and inserting “Until such time as a permit under this section has been issued by the Secretary, the Administrator”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) takes effect on October 18, 1972.

SA 1943. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, after line 16, add the following:

TITLE V—CLEAN WATER COOPERATIVE FEDERALISM**SECTION 501. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act of 2013”.

SEC. 502. STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.

(a) STATE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.—Section 303(c)(4) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(2) by striking “(4)” and inserting “(4)(A)”;

(3) by striking “The Administrator shall promulgate” and inserting the following:

“(B) The Administrator shall promulgate”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A)(ii), the Administrator may not promulgate a re-

vised or new standard for a pollutant in any case in which the State has submitted to the Administrator and the Administrator has approved a water quality standard for that pollutant, unless the State concurs with the Administrator’s determination that the revised or new standard is necessary to meet the requirements of this Act.”.

(b) FEDERAL LICENSES AND PERMITS.—Section 401(a) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1341(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) With respect to any discharge, if a State or interstate agency having jurisdiction over the navigable waters at the point where the discharge originates or will originate determines under paragraph (1) that the discharge will comply with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307, the Administrator may not take any action to supersede the determination.”.

(c) STATE NPDES PERMIT PROGRAMS.—Section 402(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1342(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR TO WITHDRAW APPROVAL OF STATE PROGRAMS.—The Administrator may not withdraw approval of a State program under paragraph (3) or (4), or limit Federal financial assistance for the State program, on the basis that the Administrator disagrees with the State regarding—

“(A) the implementation of any water quality standard that has been adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c); or

“(B) the implementation of any Federal guidance that directs the interpretation of the State’s water quality standards.”.

(d) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR TO OBJECT TO INDIVIDUAL PERMITS.—Section 402(d) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) The Administrator may not object under paragraph (2) to the issuance of a permit by a State on the basis of—

“(A) the Administrator’s interpretation of a water quality standard that has been adopted by the State and approved by the Administrator under section 303(c); or

“(B) the implementation of any Federal guidance that directs the interpretation of the State’s water quality standards.”.

SEC. 503. PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.

(a) AUTHORITY OF EPA ADMINISTRATOR.—Section 404(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(c)” and inserting “(c)(1)”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any permit if the State in which the discharge originates or will originate does not concur with the Administrator’s determination that the discharge will result in an unacceptable adverse effect as described in paragraph (1).”.

(b) STATE PERMIT PROGRAMS.—The first sentence of section 404(g)(1) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(g)(1)) is amended by striking “The Governor of any State desiring to administer its own individual and general permit program for the discharge” and inserting “The Governor of any State desiring to administer its own individual and general permit program for some or all of the discharges”.

SEC. 504. DEADLINES FOR AGENCY COMMENTS.

Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) is amended—

(1) in subsection (m) by striking “ninetieth day” and inserting “30th day (or the 60th day if additional time is requested)”;

(2) in subsection (q)—

(A) by striking “(q)” and inserting “(q)(1)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) The Administrator and the head of a department or agency referred to in paragraph (1) shall each submit any comments with respect to an application for a permit under subsection (a) or (e) not later than the 30th day (or the 60th day if additional time is requested) after the date of receipt of an application for a permit under that subsection.”.

SEC. 505. APPLICABILITY OF AMENDMENTS.

The amendments made by this title shall apply to actions taken on or after the date of enactment of this Act, including actions taken with respect to permit applications that are pending or revised or new standards that are being promulgated as of such date of enactment.

SEC. 506. REPORTING ON HARMFUL POLLUTANTS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall submit to Congress a report on any increase or reduction in waterborne pathogenic microorganisms (including protozoa, viruses, bacteria, and parasites), toxic chemicals, or toxic metals (such as lead and mercury) in waters regulated by a State under the provisions of this title, including the amendments made by this title.

SEC. 507. PIPELINES CROSSING STREAMBEDS.

None of the provisions of this title, including the amendments made by this title, shall be construed to limit the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, to regulate a pipeline that crosses a streambed.

SEC. 508. IMPACTS OF EPA REGULATORY ACTIVITY ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.

(a) ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS OF ACTIONS ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.—

(1) ANALYSIS.—Before taking a covered action, the Administrator shall analyze the impact, disaggregated by State, of the covered action on employment levels and economic activity, including estimated job losses and decreased economic activity.

(2) ECONOMIC MODELS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Administrator shall utilize the best available economic models.

(B) ANNUAL GAO REPORT.—Not later than December 31st of each year, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the economic models used by the Administrator to carry out this subsection.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—With respect to any covered action, the Administrator shall—

(A) post the analysis under paragraph (1) as a link on the main page of the public Internet Web site of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(B) request that the Governor of any State experiencing more than a de minimis negative impact post such analysis in the Capitol of such State.

(b) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator concludes under subsection (a)(1) that a covered action will have more than a de minimis negative impact on employment levels or economic activity in a State, the Administrator shall hold a public hearing in each such State at least 30 days prior to the effective date of the covered action.

(2) TIME, LOCATION, AND SELECTION.—A public hearing required under paragraph (1) shall be held at a convenient time and location for impacted residents. In selecting a location for such a public hearing, the Administrator shall give priority to locations in the State that will experience the greatest number of job losses.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—If the Administrator concludes under subsection (a)(1) that a covered action will have more than a de minimis negative impact on employment levels or economic activity in any State, the Administrator shall give notice of such impact to the State's Congressional delegation, Governor, and Legislature at least 45 days before the effective date of the covered action.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) COVERED ACTION.—The term “covered action” means any of the following actions taken by the Administrator under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.):

(A) Issuing a regulation, policy statement, guidance, response to a petition, or other requirement.

(B) Implementing a new or substantially altered program.

(3) MORE THAN A DE MINIMIS NEGATIVE IMPACT.—The term “more than a de minimis negative impact” means the following:

(A) With respect to employment levels, a loss of more than 100 jobs. Any offsetting job gains that result from the hypothetical creation of new jobs through new technologies or government employment may not be used in the job loss calculation.

(B) With respect to economic activity, a decrease in economic activity of more than \$1,000,000 over any calendar year. Any offsetting economic activity that results from the hypothetical creation of new economic activity through new technologies or government employment may not be used in the economic activity calculation.

SA 1944. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4. ENERGY INDEPENDENCE INVESTMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) for the last 5 years, the Department of Energy has had \$8,000,000,000 available for loan guarantees for advanced fossil energy projects, but in the 5 years that the funding has been available, the Department of Energy has not approved any projects;

(2) advanced fossil energy technologies will increase energy efficiency and result in less wasted energy in the United States; and

(3) advanced fossil energy technologies will result in dramatic reductions in greenhouse gas and other emissions.

(b) PROJECTS AUTHORIZED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall give final approval to applications for loan guarantees totaling \$2,000,000,000 for advanced fossil energy projects.

SA 1945. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4. STUDY ON REDUCTIONS OF CARBON DIOXIDE EMISSIONS IN ELECTRIC GENERATING SECTOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) electric generating units were the top source category of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States in calendar year 2011, accounting for approximately 33 percent of the total greenhouse gas emitted in the United States;

(2) in calendar year 2011, carbon dioxide equivalent emissions attributable to the electric generating sector declined by 4.5 percent from calendar year 2010 emissions levels;

(3) significant changes in the number, fuel source, and efficiency of electric generating units have occurred in recent years and are expected to continue to occur as a result of various factors, including—

(A) the major capital expenditures and operating expenses that would be incurred to meet new environmental regulations that the Environmental Protection Agency or individual States have recently adopted or are currently developing;

(B) the current low price of natural gas; and

(C) Federal and State programs to improve energy efficiency and deploy low- or zero-emitting generating technologies; and

(4) carbon dioxide emissions attributable to electric generating units can be expected to continue to decline significantly because existing units will be converted to or replaced by more highly efficient coal-fired and natural gas-fired generation or zero-emitting nuclear, renewable power generation, and energy efficiency gains.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Energy Information Administration shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the changes that have occurred and will occur in the electric generating sector that have resulted in reductions in carbon dioxide emissions, including the annual capacity by fuel type and the quantity of carbon dioxide emissions reductions that are expected to result from the changes, as described in subsection (c).

(c) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (b) shall—

(1) quantify carbon dioxide emissions on an annual and cumulative basis from electric generating units in the United States and (using a calendar year 2005 baseline) calculate the annual and cumulative reduction in carbon dioxide emissions in each of calendar years 2005 through 2020 that is attributable to the—

(A) changes in the composition of the electric generating fleet that—

(i) has occurred since calendar year 2005 for whatever reason; and

(ii) are expected to occur by calendar year 2020, as determined by the Energy Information Administration based on—

(I) the consultation process described in subsection (d);

(II) a review of Federal and State laws (including regulations) or other requirements

for the addition of renewable resources, incorporation of energy efficiency improvements, and other measures that have the effect of reducing carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions in the electricity generating sector; and

(III) comprehensive economic modeling of the electric power sector, as developed by the Energy Information Administration; and

(B) other changes in operation of the existing electric generating fleet in the United States due to any Federal or State environmental regulations, renewable energy initiatives, or market conditions;

(2) compare the average generation efficiency, expressed in terms of carbon dioxide emissions per megawatt hour, that the electric generating fleet in the United States (including all emitting and nonemitting energy resources) achieved in calendar years 2005 and 2010 to the average generation efficiency projected to be achieved in calendar year 2020; and

(3) quantify the total quantity of megawatt hours that are generated in the United States by each fuel type on an annual basis for each of calendar years 2005 through 2020.

(d) CONSULTATION PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To identify changes in the number and fuel type of electric generating units that have occurred since calendar year 2005 or are expected to occur prior to calendar year 2020, the Energy Information Administration shall consult on an individual basis with the owners and operators of electric generating units regarding the announced plans or legal obligations of the units.

(2) LONG-TERM REDUCTIONS.—If, during the consultation process, the Energy Information Administration identifies units with announced plans or legal obligations that will result in carbon dioxide emissions reduction after calendar year 2020, the units and associated emission reductions shall be identified in the report.

SA 1946. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 30, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

“(C) an outreach program based at each of the industrial research and assessment centers that would—

“(i) deploy liaisons to identify industry needs and connect manufacturers with resources available under this subsection;

“(ii) ensure that the liaisons have experience working with the manufacturing industry the liaisons serve; and

“(iii) ensure that the industrial research and assessment centers and entities described in paragraph (2) make comprehensive information about the program available to the liaisons for distribution to manufacturers; and

“(D) evaluation of outreach activities and coordination activities under this subsection to identify—

“(i) emerging needs;

“(ii) best practices; and

“(iii) opportunities to streamline duplicative efforts.

SA 1947. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy sav-

ings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 45, after line 24, insert the following:

(C) STUDY AND REPORT ON ENERGY SAVINGS BENEFITS OF OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS AND SERVICES.—

(1) DEFINITION OF OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS AND SERVICES.—In this subsection, the term “operational efficiency programs and services” means programs and services that use information and communications technologies (including computer hardware, energy efficiency software, and power management tools) to operate buildings and equipment in the optimum manner at the optimum times.

(2) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct a study and issue a report that quantifies the energy savings benefits of operational efficiency programs and services for commercial, institutional, industrial, and governmental entities, including Federal agencies.

(3) MEASUREMENT AND VERIFICATION OF ENERGY SAVINGS.—The report required under this subsection shall recommend methodologies or protocols for utilities, utility regulators, and Federal agencies to evaluate, measure, and verify energy savings from operational efficiency programs and services.

SA 1948. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 47, strike line 17 and all that follows through page 48, line 2, and insert the following:

SEC. 4. CONSUMER ACCESS TO ELECTRIC ENERGY INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall encourage and support the adoption of policies that allow electricity consumers access to their own electricity data.

(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR STATE ENERGY PLANS.—Section 362(d) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (16), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (18); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:

“(17) programs—

“(A) to enhance consumer access to and understanding of energy usage and price information, including consumers’ own residential and commercial electricity information; and

“(B) to allow for the development and adoption of innovative products and services to assist consumers in managing energy consumption and expenditures; and”.

(c) VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES FOR ELECTRIC CONSUMER ACCESS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) RETAIL ELECTRIC ENERGY INFORMATION.—The term “retail electric energy information” means—

(i) the electric energy consumption of an electric consumer over a defined time period;

(ii) the retail electric energy prices or rates applied to the electricity usage for the defined time period described in clause (i) for the electric consumer;

(iii) the estimated cost of service by the consumer, including (if smart meter usage

information is available) the estimated cost of service since the last billing cycle of the consumer; and

(iv) in the case of nonresidential electric meters, any other electrical information that the meter is programmed to record (such as demand measured in kilowatts, voltage, frequency, current, and power factor).

(B) SMART METER.—The term “smart meter” means the device used by an electric utility that—

(i) measures electric energy consumption by an electric consumer at the home or facility of the electric consumer in intervals of 1 hour or less; and

(II) is capable of sending electric energy usage information through a communications network to the electric utility; or

(ii) meets the guidelines issued under paragraph (2).

(2) VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES FOR ELECTRIC CONSUMER ACCESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall issue voluntary guidelines that establish model standards for implementation of retail electric energy information access in States.

(B) CONSULTATION.—Before issuing the voluntary guidelines, the Secretary shall—

(i) consult with—

(I) State and local regulatory authorities, including the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners;

(II) other appropriate Federal agencies, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

(III) consumer and privacy advocacy groups;

(IV) utilities;

(V) the National Association of State Energy Officials; and

(VI) other appropriate entities, including groups representing commercial and residential building owners and groups that represent demand response and electricity data devices and services; and

(ii) provide notice and opportunity for comment.

(C) STATE AND LOCAL REGULATORY ACTION.—In issuing the voluntary guidelines, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be guided by actions taken by State and local regulatory authorities to ensure electric consumer access to retail electric energy information, including actions taken after consideration of the standard established under section 111(d)(17) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2621(d)(17)).

(D) CONTENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The voluntary guidelines shall provide guidance on issues necessary to carry out this subsection, including—

(I) the timeliness and specificity of retail electric energy information;

(II) appropriate nationally recognized open standards for data;

(III) the protection of data security and electric consumer privacy, including consumer consent requirements; and

(IV) issues relating to access of electric energy information for owners and managers of multitenant commercial and residential buildings.

(ii) INCLUSIONS.—The voluntary guidelines shall include guidance that—

(I) retail electric energy information should be made available to electric consumers (and third party designees of the electric consumers) in the United States—

(aa) in an electronic machine readable form, without additional charge, in conformity with nationally recognized open

standards developed by a nationally recognized standards organization;

(bb) as timely as is reasonably practicable;

(cc) at the level of specificity that the data is transmitted by the meter or as is reasonably practicable; and

(dd) in a manner that provides adequate protections for the security of the information and the privacy of the electric consumer;

(II) in the case of an electric consumer that is served by a smart meter that can also communicate energy usage information to a device or network of an electric consumer or a device or network of a third party authorized by the consumer, the feasibility should be considered of providing to the consumer or third party designee, at a minimum, access to usage information (not including price information) of the consumer directly from the smart meter;

(III) retail electric energy information should be provided by the electric utility of the consumer or such other entity as may be designated by the applicable electric retail regulatory authority;

(IV) retail electric energy information of the consumer should be made available to the consumer through a website or other electronic access authorized by the electric consumer, for a period of at least 13 months after the date on which the usage occurred;

(V) consumer access to data, including data provided to owners and managers of commercial and multifamily buildings with multiple tenants, should not interfere with or compromise the integrity, security, or privacy of the operations of a utility and the electric consumer;

(VI) electric energy information relating to usage information generated by devices in or on the property of the consumer that is transmitted to the electric utility should be made available to the electric consumer or the third party agent designated by the electric consumer; and

(VII) the same privacy and security requirements applicable to the contracting utility should apply to third party agents contracting with a utility to process the customer data of that utility.

(E) REVISIONS.—The Secretary shall periodically review and, as necessary, revise the voluntary guidelines to reflect changes in technology, privacy needs, and the market for electric energy and services.

(d) VERIFICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State may submit to the Secretary a description of the data sharing policies of the State relating to consumer access to electric energy information for certification by the Secretary that the policies meet the voluntary guidelines issued under subsection (c)(2).

(2) ASSISTANCE.—Subject to the availability of funds under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall make Federal amounts available to any State that has data sharing policies described in paragraph (1) that the Secretary certifies meets the voluntary guidelines issued under subsection (c)(2) to assist the State in implementing section 362(d)(17) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322(d)(17)).

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 4. OFFSET.

Section 422(f) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17082(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) \$200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014;

“(5) \$145,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(6) \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018.”.

SA 1949. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. INCREASING WATER EFFICIENCY IN FEDERAL BUILDINGS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ANSI-ACCREDITED PLUMBING CODE.—The term “ANSI-accredited plumbing code” means a construction code for a plumbing system of a building that meets applicable codes established by the American National Standards Institute.

(2) ANSI-AUDITED DESIGNATOR.—The term “ANSI-audited designator” means an accredited developer that is recognized by the American National Standards Institute.

(3) GREEN PLUMBERS USA TRAINING PROGRAM.—The term “Green Plumbers USA training program” means the training and certification program teaching sustainability and water-savings practices that is established by the Green Plumbers organization.

(4) HELMETS TO HARDHATS PROGRAM.—The term “Helmets to Hardhats program” means the national, nonprofit program that connects National Guard, Reserve, retired, and transitioning active-duty military service members with skilled training and quality career opportunities in the construction industry.

(5) PLUMBING EFFICIENCY RESEARCH COALITION.—The term “Plumbing Efficiency Research Coalition” means the industry coalition comprised of plumbing manufacturers, code developers, plumbing engineers, and water efficiency experts established to advance plumbing research initiatives that support the development of water efficiency and sustainable plumbing products, systems, and practices.

(b) WATER EFFICIENCY STANDARDS.—The Secretary shall work with ANSI-audited designators to promote the implementation and use in the construction of Federal building of plumbing products, systems, and practices that meet standards and codes that achieve the highest level of water efficiency and conservation practicable consistent with construction budgets and the goals of Executive Order 13514 (42 U.S.C. 4321 note; relating to Federal leadership in environmental, energy, and economic performance), including —

(1) the most recent version of the ANSI-accredited plumbing code; and

(2) if no ANSI-accredited plumbing code exists, alternative plumbing standards and codes established by the Secretary.

(c) TRAINING PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall work with nationally recognized plumbing training programs that meet applicable plumbing licensing requirements to provide competency training for individuals who install and repair plumbing systems in Federal and other buildings, including—

(1) the Helmets to Hardhats training program; and

(2) the Green Plumbers USA training program.

(d) WATER EFFICIENCY RESEARCH.—The Secretary shall promote plumbing research

that increases water efficiency and conservation in plumbing products, systems, and practices used in Federal and other buildings and reduces the unintended consequences of reduced flows in the building drains and water supply systems of the United States, which may include working with the Andrew W. Breidenbach Environmental Research Center and the Plumbing Efficiency Research Coalition—

(1) to provide and exchange experts to conduct water efficiency and conservation plumbing-related studies;

(2) to assist in creating public awareness of reports of the Plumbing Efficiency Research Coalition; and

(3) to provide financial assistance if applicable and available.

SA 1950. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. ALTERNATIVE FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ALTERNATIVE FUEL.—The term “alternative fuel” has the meaning given the term in section 400AA(g) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6374(g)).

(2) ALTERNATIVE FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term “alternative fuel infrastructure” means any ancillary equipment necessary to provide alternative fuel to vehicles.

(3) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term “covered individual” means—

(A) any employee (as defined in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code); or

(B) any other individual who performs services for or on behalf of a Federal agency under a contract or subcontract with a Federal agency.

(4) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term “Federal agency” has the meaning given the term “Executive agency” in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of a Federal agency may—

(A) construct, operate, and maintain alternative fuel infrastructure on a reimbursable basis in parking areas under the jurisdiction of the Federal agency; and

(B) provide alternative fuel on a reimbursable basis in parking areas under the jurisdiction of the Federal agency for use by privately owned vehicles used by covered individuals.

(2) VENDORS AUTHORIZED.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the head of a Federal agency may use 1 or more vendors on a commission basis.

(c) FEES.—The head of a Federal agency shall charge fees for alternative fuel provided to covered individuals sufficient to cover the costs to the head of the Federal agency of carrying out this section, including the costs of any vendors or other costs associated with maintaining the alternative fuel infrastructure.

(d) DEPOSIT AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES AND COMMISSIONS.—Any fees or commissions collected by the head of a Federal agency under this section—

(1) shall be—

(A) deposited into the account of the Treasury from which the amounts were made available to carry out this section; and

(B) transferred from the Treasury to an appropriate account of the agency if the agency operates with a budget outside of the Treasury; and

(2) shall be available for obligation by the head of the Federal agency without further appropriation during—

(A) the fiscal year collected; and

(B) the fiscal year following the fiscal year collected.

(e) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, the head of each Federal agency participating in the activities authorized by subsection (b) shall submit to the Administrator of General Services a report on the financial administration and cost recovery of activities carried out under this section with respect to that fiscal year.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 3 years thereafter, the Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Secretary, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, including the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, a report that—

(A) aggregates the information provided by the heads of Federal agencies in the annual reports under paragraph (1); and

(B) provides information on whether the fees collected under subsection (c) are sufficient to cover the cost to the head of a Federal agency of carrying out this section.

SA 1951. Mr. HARKIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 401 and insert the following:

SEC. 4. COMMUNITY ENERGY PROGRAM.

Part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended by inserting after section 364 (42 U.S.C. 6324) the following:

“SEC. 364A. COMMUNITY ENERGY PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting in conjunction with State energy offices, shall establish and carry out a community energy program under which the Secretary shall make grants to eligible entities to support community energy systems improvement projects, including projects involving energy assessments, development of energy system improvement strategies, and implementation of those strategies so as to reduce energy usage and increase energy supplied from renewable resources.

“(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall be—

“(1) a municipality (including a town or city or other local unit of government); or

“(2) a nonprofit institutional entity (including an institution of higher education, hospital, or school system).

“(c) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall—

“(1) provide to the Secretary evidence that the entity has a commitment to improving the energy systems of the entity;

“(2) encourage broad citizen participation in the project carried out with the grant;

“(3) submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require; and

“(4) meet such other eligibility criteria as are established by the Secretary.

“(d) TYPES OF GRANTS.—The Secretary shall provide to eligible entities under this section—

“(1) planning and assessment grants to support—

“(A) the assessment of current energy types and uses of the eligible entity;

“(B) the identification of potential alternative energy resources to serve the energy needs of the eligible entity, including energy efficiency measures and renewable energy systems; and

“(C) the development of energy improvement project plans that specify energy efficiency measures to be adopted and renewable energy systems to be installed; and

“(2) implementation project grants to support the implementation of energy system improvements, regardless of whether the eligible entities received planning and assessment grants for the improvements under paragraph (1).

“(e) USE OF GRANTS.—

“(1) PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT GRANTS.—An eligible entity may use a planning and assessment grant provided under subsection (d)(1)—

“(A) to assess energy usage across the eligible entity, including energy used in—

“(i) public and private buildings and facilities;

“(ii) commercial and industrial applications; and

“(iii) transportation; and

“(B) to formulate energy improvement plans that describe specific energy efficiency measures to be adopted and specific renewable energy systems to be installed, including identification of funding sources and implementation processes.

“(2) IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT GRANTS.—An eligible entity may use an implementation grant provided under subsection (d)(2) to implement energy efficiency measures, or install renewable energy systems, in support of energy improvement plans.

“(f) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal cost of carrying out a project under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of total project costs.

“(g) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall establish criteria for program participation and evaluation of proposals for projects to be carried out under this section, including criteria based on—

“(1) energy savings; and

“(2) reductions in oil consumption.

“(h) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To assist eligible entities in carrying out projects under this section, the Secretary may—

“(A) provide training and technical assistance and support to entities that receive grants under this section; and

“(B) support regional conferences to enable entities to share information on energy assessment, planning, and implementation activities.

“(2) EVALUATION PROGRAM.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall develop and support use of an evaluation program that measures and evaluates the energy and economic impacts of projects carried out under this section.

“(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

“(1) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2014; and

“(2) \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018.”.

SEC. 4. OFFSET.

Section 422(f) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17082(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2013;

“(5) \$190,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

“(6) \$130,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(7) \$80,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018.”.

SA 1952. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

Subtitle B—State Energy Race to the Top Initiative

SEC. 411. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “State Energy Race to the Top Initiative Act of 2013”.

SEC. 412. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to assist energy policy innovation in the States to promote the goal of doubling electric and thermal energy productivity by January 1, 2030.

SEC. 413. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) ENERGY PRODUCTIVITY.—The term “energy productivity” means, in the case of a State or Indian tribe, the gross State or tribal product per British thermal unit of energy consumed in the State or tribal land of the Indian tribe, respectively.

(2) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(3) STATE.—The term “State” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6202).

SEC. 414. PHASE 1: INITIAL ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue an invitation to States to submit plans to participate in an electric and thermal energy productivity challenge in accordance with this section.

(b) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to section 417, the Secretary shall use funds made available under section 418(b)(1) to provide an initial allocation of grants to not more than 25 States.

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant provided to a State under this section shall be not less than \$500,000 nor more than \$1,750,000.

(c) SUBMISSION OF PLANS.—To receive a grant under this section, not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of the invitation under subsection (a), a State (in consultation with energy utilities, regulatory bodies, and others) shall submit to the Secretary an application to receive the grant by submitting a revised State energy conservation plan under section 362 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322).

(d) DECISION BY SECRETARY.—

(1) BASIS.—The Secretary shall base the decision of the Secretary on an application submitted under this section on—

(A) plans for improvement in electric and thermal energy productivity consistent with this subtitle; and

(B) other factors determined appropriate by the Secretary, including geographic diversity.

(2) RANKING.—The Secretary shall—

(A) rank revised plans submitted under this section in order of the greatest to least likely contribution to improving energy productivity in the State; and

(B) provide grants under this section in accordance with the ranking and the scale and scope of a plan.

(e) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—A plan submitted under subsection (c) shall provide—

(1) a description of the manner in which—

(A) energy savings will be monitored and verified and energy productivity improvements will be calculated using inflation-adjusted dollars;

(B) a statewide baseline of energy use and potential resources for calendar year 2010 will be established to measure improvements;

(C) the plan will promote achievement of energy savings and demand reduction goals;

(D) public and private sector investments in energy efficiency will be leveraged with available Federal funding; and

(E) the plan will not cause cost-shifting among utility customer classes or negatively impact low-income populations; and

(2) an assurance that—

(A) the State energy office required to submit the plan, the energy utilities in the State participating in the plan, and the State public service commission are cooperating and coordinating programs and activities under this subtitle;

(B) the State is cooperating with local units of government, Indian tribes, and energy utilities to expand programs as appropriate; and

(C) grants provided under this subtitle will be used to supplement and not supplant Federal, State, or ratepayer-funded programs or activities in existence on the date of enactment of this subtitle.

(f) USES.—A State may use grants provided under this section to promote—

(1) the expansion of policies and programs that will advance industrial energy efficiency, waste heat recovery, combined heat and power, and waste heat-to-power utilization;

(2) the expansion of policies and programs that will advance energy efficiency construction and retrofits for public and private commercial buildings (including schools, hospitals, and residential buildings, including multifamily buildings) such as through expanded energy service performance contracts, equivalent utility energy service contracts, zero net-energy buildings, and improved building energy efficiency codes;

(3) the establishment or expansion of incentives in the electric utility sector to enhance demand response and energy efficiency, including consideration of additional incentives to promote the purposes of section 111(d) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2621(d)), such as appropriate, cost-effective policies regarding rate structures, grid improvements, behavior change, combined heat and power and waste heat-to-power incentives, financing of energy efficiency programs, data use incentives, district heating, and regular energy audits; and

(4) leadership by example, in which State activities involving both facilities and vehicle fleets can be a model for other action to promote energy efficiency and can be ex-

panded with Federal grants provided under this subtitle.

SEC. 415. PHASE 2: SUBSEQUENT ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO STATES.

(a) REPORTS.—Not later than 18 months after the receipt of grants under section 414, each State (in consultation with other parties described in subsection (b)(3)(F)) that received grants under section 414 may submit to the Secretary a report that describes—

(1) the performance of the programs and activities carried out with the grants; and

(2) in consultation with other parties described in subsection (b)(3)(F), the manner in which additional funds would be used to carry out programs and activities to promote the purposes of this subtitle.

(b) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the receipt of the reports required under subsection (a), subject to section 417, the Secretary shall use amounts made available under section 418(b)(2) to provide grants to not more than 6 States to carry out the programs and activities described in subsection (a)(2).

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant provided to a State under this section shall be not more than \$15,000,000.

(3) BASIS.—The Secretary shall base the decision of the Secretary to provide grants under this section on—

(A) the performance of the State in the programs and activities carried out with grants provided under section 414;

(B) the potential of the programs and activities described in subsection (a)(2) to achieve the purposes of this subtitle;

(C) the desirability of maintaining a total project portfolio that is geographically and functionally diverse;

(D) the amount of non-Federal funds that are leveraged as a result of the grants to ensure that Federal dollars are leveraged effectively;

(E) plans for continuation of the improvements after the receipt of grants under this subtitle; and

(F) demonstrated effort by the State to involve diverse groups, including—

(i) investor-owned, cooperative, and public power utilities;

(ii) local governments; and

(iii) nonprofit organizations.

SEC. 416. ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall invite Indian tribes to submit plans to participate in an electric and thermal energy productivity challenge in accordance with this section.

(b) SUBMISSION OF PLANS.—To receive a grant under this section, not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of the invitation under subsection (a), an Indian tribe shall submit to the Secretary a plan to increase electric and thermal energy productivity by the Indian tribe.

(c) DECISION BY SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the submission of plans under subsection (b), the Secretary shall make a final decision on the allocation of grants under this section.

(2) BASIS.—The Secretary shall base the decision of the Secretary under paragraph (1) on—

(A) plans for improvement in electric and thermal energy productivity consistent with this subtitle;

(B) plans for continuation of the improvements after the receipt of grants under this subtitle; and

(C) other factors determined appropriate by the Secretary, including—

(i) geographic diversity; and

(ii) size differences among Indian tribes.

(3) LIMITATION.—An individual Indian tribe shall not receive more than 20 percent of the total amount available to carry out this section.

SEC. 417. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—To evaluate program performance and effectiveness under this subtitle, the Secretary shall consult with the National Research Council regarding requirements for data and evaluation for recipients of grants under this subtitle.

(b) COORDINATION WITH STATE ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Grants to States under this subtitle shall be provided through additional funding to carry out State energy conservation programs under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.).

(2) RELATIONSHIP TO STATE ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A grant provided to a State under this subtitle shall be used to supplement (and not supplant) funds provided to the State under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.).

(B) MINIMUM FUNDING.—A grant shall not be provided to a State for a fiscal year under this subtitle if the amount of funding provided to all State grantees under the base formula for the fiscal year under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) is less than \$50,000,000.

(c) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—The participation of a State in a challenge established under this subtitle shall be voluntary.

SEC. 418. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2017.

(b) ALLOCATION.—Of the total amount of funds made available under subsection (a)—

(1) 30 percent shall be used to provide an initial allocation of grants to States under section 414;

(2) 61 percent shall be used to provide a subsequent allocation of grants to States under section 415;

(3) 4 percent shall be used to make grants to Indian tribes under section 416; and

(4) 5 percent shall be available to the Secretary for the cost of administration and technical support to carry out this subtitle.

SEC. 419. OFFSET.

Section 422(f) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17082(f)) (as amended by section 401) is amended by striking paragraphs (5) and (6) and inserting the following:

“(5) \$175,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

“(6) \$125,000,000 for fiscal year 2015;

“(7) \$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017; and

“(8) \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.”.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in executive session on Wednesday, September 18, 2013, at 10

a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to mark-up S. 1086, The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2013, the Committee Funding Resolution for the 113th Congress, the nominations of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., to serve as General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, and Scott Dahl, to serve as Inspector General of the U.S. Department of Labor, as well as any additional nominations cleared for action.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224-5375.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

Ms. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in open session on Thursday, September 19, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "The Triad: Promoting a System of Shared Responsibility. Issues for Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act".

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224-5501.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

Ms. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in open session on Tuesday, September 24, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "U.S. Efforts to Reduce Healthcare-Associated Infections".

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224-7675.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on September 18, 2013, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting to authorize expenditures by the Committee through February of 2015.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224-2251.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, October 1, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this hearing is to consider the following legislation:

S. 812, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take actions to implement the Agreement between the United States of America and the

United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico; and,

H.R. 1613, a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510-6150, or by e-mail to Lauren_Goldschmidt@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Abigail Campbell at (202) 224-4905 or Lauren Goldschmidt at (202) 224-5488.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO
MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC
WORKS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2013, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2013, at 2:45

p.m., to hold a briefing entitled, "Update on Syria".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Larcus Pickett, a fellow in our office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of consideration of S. 1392.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. KING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 335; that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Kenneth Allen Polite, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

Mr. KING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 336 and 337; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Jon T. Rymer, of Tennessee, to be Inspector General, Department of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Steve A. Linick, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of State.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1513, S. 1514, H.R. 2009, AND H.R. 2775

Mr. KING. Madam President, I understand that there are four bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1513) to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 1514) to save coal jobs, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 2009) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

A bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING. Madam President, I now ask for a second reading en bloc, and I object to my own request en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Republican leader, pursuant to Public Law 106-567, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Public Interest Declassification Board: Kenneth L. Wainstein of Virginia.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2013

Mr. KING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, September 18, 2013; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided

and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; that following morning business the Senate resume consideration of S. 1392, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KING. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:41 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, September 18, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

DAVID J. ARROYO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2016, VICE ELIZABETH COURTNEY, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CYNTHIA H. AKUETTEH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE GABONESE REPUBLIC, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF SANTOME AND PRINCIPE.

ERIC T. SCHULTZ, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA.

MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL FOUNDATION

CAMILLA C. FEIBELMAN, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 15, 2017, VICE STEPHEN M. PRESCOTT, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. JILL J. NELSON

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. DAVID G. PERKINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ROBERT B. BROWN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ROBERT L. WALTER, JR.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

BRIAN J. HOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOHN P. SCHUMACHER

To be major

SCOTT T. JENSEN
PAUL A. PARDON
PAUL C. ROBINSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

SCOTT P. IRWIN
RODNEY C. WADLEY

To be major

ANGELA M. FAGIANA
DAVE C. PRAKASH

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

RICHARD L. PIONTKOWSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

SARY O. BEIDAS
GERRY R. GERRY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

BENJAMIN P. DONHAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

ANTHONY P. CLARK
JOHN J. DRISCOLL
MICHAEL FERRIS
GILBERTO HERNANDEZ III
WILLIAM J. OBRIEN, JR.
KAREN L. RYAN

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 17, 2013:

THE JUDICIARY

PATRICIA E. CAMPBELL-SMITH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

ELAINE D. KAPLAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

KENNETH ALLEN POLITE, JR., OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JON T. RYMER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

STEVE A. LINICK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, September 17, 2013

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 17, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID G. VALADAO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

NATIONAL TRUCK DRIVER APPRECIATION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Truck Driver Appreciation Week.

Professional truck drivers in America deliver goods safely and on time to our hospitals, schools, and local grocers each day and are vital to both our local and our national economy.

Mr. Speaker, last week, I recently sat down with a number of my North Carolina truck drivers and learned that their industry, like so many others in America, is facing a host of new rules and regulations by the Federal Government that is impacting their ability to retain current drivers and hire new ones.

In North Carolina right now, Mr. Speaker, there is a shortage of up to 15,000 truck drivers. These are good-paying jobs that can average a salary of \$50,000 and include benefits. In these difficult economic times, the Federal Government must be promoting policies that encourage companies to go

out and hire that additional worker. Trucking is a great example of such an industry.

Mr. Speaker, professional truck drivers have a vested interest in keeping our roads safe not only for their businesses but for everyone else that shares the highway.

Let's commit, Mr. Speaker, to finding sensible solutions that reduce burdensome regulations and keep our roads safe.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Lord God of Heaven and Earth, thank You for giving us another day.

As this assembly gathers after a long weekend at home, we note the observance of Constitution Day, when our Nation's founding document was signed at the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

Grant a deepening knowledge of, and appreciation for, our Constitution to all Americans but especially to the Members of the people's House, who have sworn an oath to defend it.

May they have the freedom to realize that their responsibility is to the Nation and its welfare as well as to their own constituents. Give them the wisdom to discern the greater good when those allegiances might seem to conflict.

May all that is done today be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLÁN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SABLÁN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

OBAMACARE MANDATE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, given President Obama's reflexive opposition to offering all Americans fair treatment under ObamaCare, you'd think the cost of "fairness for all" must be pretty astronomical. Not so.

Extending "fairness for all" by giving American families the same break from ObamaCare that businesses are getting will save taxpayers and cut the Federal deficit.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found that delaying ObamaCare's weighty individual mandate tax on the American people would reduce Federal deficits by roughly \$36 billion over the 2014-2018 period.

Fairness makes sense. It's not just good policy; it's good for taxpayers and for the economy. No wonder Republicans and Democrats joined together this summer to stop the individual mandate just like President Obama decided to stop his Big Business employer mandate.

We encourage President Obama to rethink his insistence on the individual mandate and to support "fairness for all."

CONGRATULATING THE CNMI PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM ON ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. SABLÁN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABLÁN. Mr. Speaker, public education in the Northern Mariana Islands was transformed 25 years ago by the Education Act of 1988, creating an autonomous public school system outside of the executive branch of government, overseen by an elected board of education.

This decision coincided with a period of political maturation, economic expansion, and population growth on the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

islands; and the intervening years have proven its value. PSS students are excelling, winning national awards for their acting talent, debate skills, spelling abilities, and science acuity.

This year alone, the Marianas High School Aeronautical Dolphins won the national Real World Design Challenge and \$50,000 scholarships for each team member. Three students were awarded Gates Millennium scholarships. It is the third year in a row students from our small community have won. Last summer, Saipan Southern High School's Manta Ray Band performed at the Olympics and brought home a silver medal from the London Celebration Music Festival.

These achievements were made possible through the extraordinary and cumulative support of the leaders, teachers, and staff of the public school system.

Please join me in saluting PSS for 25 years of service to our youth.

THE DELICATE BALANCE OF POWERS

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today is the 226th anniversary of the signing of one of the most important documents in world history.

A lot of us talk about the Constitution, and talk about it often; but sometimes we forget the ground-breaking influence of that document and the fact that that very document was written by the States to create the Federal Government and not the other way around.

It has provided the basis for our representative Republic; it has provided the foundation for our government; and it has had a lasting influence across the world. In various corners of the globe, our Constitution has served as a model for other countries as they strove to build their governments and to make liberty and freedom for their citizens one of their first priorities.

Today's anniversary marks the spot where history diverged from the history of colonial rule and forged a path based on the rule of law and the rights of individuals. I hope that everyone takes a moment to reflect on the enormous insights of our Founders in creating this document.

A FISCAL CUL-DE-SAC

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the recognition of the signing of our Constitution, which has been described as a document created by geniuses for a government that could be run by idiots. It looks pretty idiotic

around here today to have been driven into a fiscal cul-de-sac, risking a government shutdown or default on the national debt. We can help the Republicans out of the cul-de-sac they've driven into.

First, just allow the House to vote on a continuing resolution. Second, if you want to cut the budget, bring your House budget bills to the floor. You pulled them back, and you wouldn't even allow a vote on them. Third, if your own budget is too onerous that your own Members don't want to vote on it, allow a conference committee to be formed with the Senate and create a budget that's more realistic. But one thing should be off limits—wrecking the global economy by defaulting on the national debt, which is money we've borrowed for money that has already been spent.

Every small business, church, union, rotary club, contractor, home builder, and bank should tell the Republicans: don't play games with the national debt.

A NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday marked the first annual National Day of Remembrance, a day to solemnly mark the sorrowful loss of life caused by abortion.

Last spring, the murder conviction of abortionist Kermit Gosnell forced our Nation to take a long, hard look into the brutal realities of abortion and the unborn lives that are killed by abortion every day. With Gosnell behind us, it may be tempting for some to look away again and ignore the truth: abortion is the taking of a human life.

I want to acknowledge and thank the pro-life groups and leaders who began the National Day of Remembrance.

It is a double tragedy when an unborn child is killed in abortion, and research has shown us the complications and emotional scars that can linger with the child's mother, compounding that tragedy. That's why we grieve and long for an end to abortion, and it's why pro-lifers must continue to make every effort to educate people about abortion.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) at 4 p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

KEEP THE PROMISE ACT OF 2013

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1410) to prohibit gaming activities on certain Indian lands in Arizona until the expiration of certain gaming compacts.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1410

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Keep the Promise Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) In 2002, the voters in the State of Arizona approved Proposition 202, the Indian Gaming Preservation and Self-Reliance Act.

(2) To obtain the support of Arizona voters to approve Proposition 202, the Indian tribes within Arizona agreed to limit the number of casinos within the State and in particular within the Phoenix metropolitan area.

(3) This Act preserves the agreement made between the tribes and the Arizona voters until the expiration of the gaming compacts authorized by Proposition 202.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act—

(1) the terms "Indian tribe", "class II gaming", and "class III gaming" have the meanings given those terms in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703); and

(2) the term "Phoenix metropolitan area" means land within Maricopa County and Pinal County, Arizona, that is north of latitude 33 degrees, 5 minutes, 13 seconds north, east of longitude 113 degrees, 20 minutes, 0 seconds west, and west of longitude 110 degrees, 50 minutes, 45 seconds west, using the NED 1983 State Plane Arizona FOPS 0202 coordinate system.

SEC. 4. GAMING CLARIFICATION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Class II gaming and class III gaming are prohibited on land within the

Phoenix metropolitan area acquired by the Secretary of the Interior in trust for the benefit of an Indian tribe after April 9, 2013.

(b) EXPIRATION.—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall expire on January 1, 2027.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1410, the Keep the Promise Act, introduced by a bipartisan group of Members from the Arizona delegation, would preserve Arizona's voter-approved gaming compact by prohibiting any Indian casino on land acquired in trust after April 9, 2013, in the Phoenix metropolitan area. This prohibition would expire on January 1, 2027, when the current gaming compact negotiated with the Arizona Governor expires.

This bill helps to resolve public promises that were supposedly made in good faith to the voters of Arizona. In 2002, the voters supported the passage of Proposition 202, which limited the number of tribally owned casinos in the State, and it granted tribes exclusive rights to operate casinos in Arizona. During the Proposition 202 campaign, a public promise was made by a coalition of 17 Arizona tribes, including the Tohono O'odham Nation, to limit casino gaming in the Phoenix metropolitan area. Unfortunately, it appears that a tribe is on the verge of breaking that commitment, and more than a majority of the tribes in the State are upset.

The immediate effect of the bill is to block the Tohono O'odham Nation from opening an off-reservation casino in the Phoenix area. This is a modified version of a bill passed by an overwhelming majority of the House last year.

As mentioned earlier, the bill has bipartisan support, including a majority of the House delegation, the Governor of Arizona, and six of the tribes that took part in the Proposition 202 agreement: the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hualapai Tribe, the Pueblo Zuni, the Cocopah Indian Tribe, and the Fort McDowell Yavapai Tribe.

It is important to point out that it is not just Arizona tribes that support

this bill. I have met tribes from other States, and they are very concerned about what is happening in Arizona. They believe that if our legislation is not signed into law, a dangerous precedent could be set, leading to the expansion of off-reservation casinos in Arizona and other States. They want to see Congress protect State gaming compacts.

For me, today's deliberations are not about stopping one casino or gaming as a whole. I support gaming. The Keep the Promise Act is about protecting the integrity of my State's gaming compact, the future of gaming in Arizona, and, ultimately, the future of Indian gaming in this country.

I urge adoption of the measure and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We're back again. This is the second time with a different piece of legislation. And, quite honestly, H.R. 1410 is nothing more than special interest legislation designed to protect the Phoenix market from a few wealthy tribal gaming enterprises.

The legislation not only upsets settled law, but potentially subjects the United States to new liabilities for breach of trust, breach of contract, and taking claims valued in the hundreds of millions of dollars, but it also creates a dangerous precedent for hundreds of tribal-State compacts and land and water rights settlements that are found nationwide.

Let's talk about those promises. The Gila Bend Act, approved and enacted by this Congress 25 years ago, entitled the Tohono O'odham Nation to acquire nonreservation land anywhere within three Arizona counties in order to replace original reservation land rendered economically useless by the Painted Rock Dam, the San Lucy District in particular, which that community was totally destroyed.

The settlement specifically promised that the nation could acquire new replacement land that could be used by the nation for economic development and as a "Federal reservation for all purposes."

H.R. 1410 would impose additional restrictions beyond those agreed upon by the United States and the Tohono O'odham Nation 25 years ago, breaking the solemn promise made between two sovereign nations. This would mark the first and only time in the modern era in which the United States unilaterally reneges on a tribal land and water rights settlement.

Last time around, the special interests behind this legislation tried to amend the actual settlement language from 1986. They soon discovered that that would open up a Pandora's box, potentially rendering more than a century's worth of binding, legal agreements with Native American tribes and nations moot.

This time, they thought they would be clever and instead attack the actual State compact, but this legislation sets equally dangerous precedent. In the 2003 compact, the State explicitly agreed that the nation could conduct gaming on any of the nation's lands that meet the requirements of IGRA. Proposition 202, the voter-sanctioned State law which gave the Governor the authority to enter into the very tribal gaming compact now in force, includes the exact same language allowing the Tohono O'odham Nation to conduct gaming on lands that meet the requirements of IGRA.

H.R. 1410 breaks this contractual promise that Arizona made to the Tohono O'odham Nation. It would also be the first and only time that the United States unilaterally inserts new terms into a tribal-State gaming compact. Let me restate that. With H.R. 1410, the Federal Government will be stepping in and unilaterally altering a voter-approved, legislature-approved, tribal-approved, and Governor-approved binding tribal-State compact.

How's that for a dangerous precedent? This legislation would put all tribal gaming compacts at risk of collateral attack by Members of Congress.

Now the special interests are bringing H.R. 1410 up this time because they have lost yet another court case. Since its predecessor, H.R. 2938, was introduced in 2011, almost every argument to justify H.R. 2938 and now H.R. 1410 has been rejected by Federal courts in multiple cases. In fact, there have been 11 administrative and judicial decisions rejecting justifications for this legislation. The latest came on June 25, 2013, when the Federal district court ruled the Arizona tribal-State gaming compact was fully integrated and contained no prohibition of new gaming in Phoenix, and this foreclosed any alleged promises not to game. The court dismissed all remaining claims brought by plaintiffs.

Aside from making good on what the Federal Government promised the Tohono O'odham Nation, this is also about jobs, jobs that this project would create, 9,000 of them, and \$300 million in annual economic impacts that are critical to the economic well-being of the west valley of Phoenix and the State of Arizona. This is why many of the surrounding cities and hundreds of business leaders and trade organizations are supportive of the project.

The city of Glendale, where the casino would be located and which was initially party to the lawsuits, is now actively working with the nation to move forward on the project. They see the economic benefits it will bring. In fact, they are asking Congress not to pass this legislation as it will only undermine their ongoing talks.

Congress needs to stop trying to interfere in this issue in order to pick winners and losers. This bill is just a

waste of time and energy that this Congress should be spending on many more pressing issues that face this Nation.

It should be noted that the administration has twice testified against this bill in both versions, which regardless of what happens today in the House, it will not become law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. TRENT FRANKS, the author of this bill.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a lot of the Members here of the House of Representatives, I want to thank Peggy Sampson for her tremendous work to help us all. This is her birthday, Mr. Speaker, and we wish her a happy birthday. We hope she has 100 more and that at least 90 of them are spent helping us here in this House to do a better job. We appreciate her very much.

Mr. Speaker, let me also thank Chairman HASTINGS and leadership for bringing this bill to the floor today, as well as the bipartisan group of cosponsors for their support. I certainly want to thank all of the Members of the Arizona delegation that are in support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1410, the Keep the Promise Act, seeks to prevent Las Vegas-style gaming in the Phoenix metropolitan area until the gaming compact that both the tribes agreed to and the Arizona voters approved expires in 2027.

One Tucson-area tribe is trying to build a major casino on lands that were purchased in the Phoenix metropolitan area at the very same time they were in negotiations with other tribes in the State to craft this gaming compact. These actions are contrary to the public commitments that this particular tribe made between 2000 and 2002 to the 16 other Indian tribes in Arizona, the State itself, and the voters of the State of Arizona; and they publicly supported the passage of Proposition 202, a State referendum to limit casino gambling in the Phoenix metropolitan area. Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan cosponsors of H.R. 1410 are simply trying to keep all the parties to their publicly stated commitment to the people of Arizona not to engage in gaming in the Phoenix metropolitan area.

Mr. Speaker, during the subcommittee hearing on this bill, witnesses made clear that there is a problem and a serious threat to the negotiated gaming structure in Arizona if this tribe is able to break its promise and develop a Las Vegas-style casino in the Phoenix metropolitan area.

□ 1615

H.R. 1410 prevents an onerous precedent that could lead to an out-of-control expansion of off-reservation casino

as well as dangerous changes to the complexion of tribal gaming in other States across America.

Mr. Speaker, tribes across this Nation, including many of the other Arizona tribes that played an integral role in the 2002 gaming compact, strongly support this legislation due to the impact this situation could have on tribal gaming enterprises nationally. The bill is also supported by the State of Arizona, the city of Glendale, the city of Litchfield Park, the city of Scottsdale, the city of Tempe, the town of Gilbert, and the editorial board of *The Arizona Republic*, which is the largest newspaper in the State.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, even if the casino weren't in violation of Federal law or contrary to the voter-approved gaming compact, claims that the operation would create jobs and benefit the economy of the surrounding area are woefully misinformed at best and shamefully dishonest at worst.

Tellingly, multiple organizations, including the city of Glendale, asked that the tribe release the data and methodology supporting their economic study, which was conducted roughly 4 years ago, and to this day the tribe continues to steadfastly refuse. In other words, the tribe released a batch of numbers extolling the supposed amazing economic benefits of this new casino and then refused to tell anybody how they came about finding and coming up with those numbers.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not impact any tribe's ability to have lands taken into trust, nor does it impact any water or land claims. Consistent with the intent of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act and Proposition 202, this bill merely restricts the ability of tribes to game on the very lands on which they agreed they would not game.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that my colleagues join me and the Members of Arizona's delegation in supporting this bill, I will include other comments in the RECORD, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Let me enter into the RECORD three letters. One is from Councilwoman Norma Alvarez from the city of Glendale. Let me quote from it:

As a member of the Glendale City Council, I urge you to oppose H.R. 1410, the so-called Keep the Promise Act. This bill is aimed at halting the Tohono O'odham Nation's resort and casino project in the West Valley in order to preserve the market share of two wealthy tribes on the other side of the valley. In serving these narrow interests, H.R. 1410 will also be harmful to my constituents, who want the thousands of jobs that the West Valley Resort and Casino will create.

I am part of a majority of the Glendale City Council that supports beginning discussions with the Tohono O'odham Nation to

find ways to work together. These talks are long overdue and they need an opportunity to succeed.

From Councilman Samuel Chavira from Glendale, let me quote from him:

As a local elected official, I believe that this legislation is not only detrimental to my community, but is an affront to the notion of fairness in attempting to overturn a land settlement resolved by Congress three decades ago brought by parties who have repeatedly failed to sustain their position in court. My constituents want this project to go forward, the sooner the better. Please join me in opposing H.R. 1410.

From Ian Hugh, councilman, city of Glendale:

There is now a consensus of the Glendale City Council that favors pursuing discussion with the Tohono O'odham Nation about its project, which represents our first opportunity in years to work together constructively. Passing H.R. 1410 at this moment would undercut the very local communities it is supposed to protect.

I ask you to please oppose this bill and oppose any effort to move forward on H.R. 1410 until after the discussions between the city and the tribe have run their course.

I also have one additional communication to enter. It is from Glendale Grassroots Tea Party Activists, and let me quote from their communications to Congress:

I feel confident that I speak for the majority of those involved with the grassroots Tea Party in Glendale as well as other Tea Party organizations in the West Valley that we all can be in agreement that to continue on this insane spending, egotistical stubbornness, and refusal to sit down in a professional-like manner and talk regarding this issue will eventually be the death trap financially of this city and the State, and hurt many innocent families in keeping good-paying permanent jobs out of their reach.

I am sending each of you a copy of this letter as well as posting it on Facebook Web pages of many of the legislative districts, Tea Party organizations, Republicans coalitions, and various other organizations, to ensure a peaceful resolution.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

SEPTEMBER 13, 2013.

Hon. TRENT FRANKS,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

As a member of the Glendale City Council, I urge you to oppose H.R. 1410, the so-called Keep the Promise Act of 2013. This bill is aimed at halting the Tohono O'odham Nation's resort and casino project in the West Valley in order to preserve the market share of two wealthy tribes on the other side of the valley. In serving these narrow interests, H.R. 1410 will also be harmful to my constituents, who want the thousands of jobs that the West Valley Resort and Casino will create.

I am a native and lifelong resident of Glendale and have supported the West Valley Resort project since I was elected to the Glendale City Council in 2010. I have watched as the opposition's misinformation about the Nation's project, all of which has been totally discredited point by point. I have also seen the enduring support for the project among my own constituents and voters across the West Valley, where public support remains overwhelming.

AUGUST 12, 2013.

I have met with the leaders of the Nation and they are honorable people. The Nation has been a strong community partner in Glendale and the West Valley, supporting our schools, our community events, and our local nonprofits. Even before a single brick has been laid, they have already established themselves as good neighbors.

I am part of a majority of the Glendale City Council that supports beginning discussions with the Tohono O'odham Nation to find ways to work together. These talks are long overdue and they need an opportunity to proceed.

WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE SAMUEL U. CHAVIRA, CITY OF GLENDALE, ARIZONA YUCCA DISTRICT COUNCILMAN

Chairman Young, Ranking Member Hanabusa, and distinguished members of the Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs, my name is Samuel (Sam) Chavira and I am respectfully submitting these comments opposing H.R. 1410.

I am submitting these comments on my own behalf although I would have strongly preferred to share them with you in person but apparently the Subcommittee did not want to hear from the many in our local community who are opposed to H.R. 1410. Allowing the minority local opposition to appear while denying the majority local supporters the same opportunity is an abuse of discretion and protocol to which I strongly object.

I am among three members of the Glendale City Council who support this project, two of whom were elected to the Glendale City Council in November of 2012 to a four-year term. The West Valley Resort and casino project was a cornerstone of my campaign as I defeated a four-term incumbent who opposed the resort and casino. I spoke to literally thousands of constituents over several months and nine out of every ten people I talked with joined me in support of the project because of the jobs and economic impact that it will provide to Glendale. So today I am submitting this written testimony in opposition to H.R. 1410 on behalf of my constituents in the Yucca District which borders the Tohono O'odham Nation's West Valley Resort and casino property. Not only is this legislation detrimental to our local community, but is even worse than Representative Franks' previous proposal, which I also opposed. Under this version, we would be left with the Nation's land in reservation status but without the ability to develop the land to its highest and best use.

For those of you who are not familiar with the West Valley, it is a reference to the communities west of the City of Phoenix. The City of Glendale is the largest community in the West Valley, with a population of more than 230,000. My district is home to approximately 40,000 Glendale residents and is fortunate to have community assets like Luke Air Force Base, Jobing.com Arena, University of Phoenix Stadium, the Glendale Municipal Airport and Camelback Ranch Spring Training facility. While on the campaign trail, I was pleased to learn so much about my district and the needs of my constituents. The issue that my constituents were particularly eager to discuss was the Tohono O'odham Nation's West Valley Resort and casino. The overwhelming majority of the residents I spoke to favor the proposed project, and were quick to share with me the many benefits associated with the project's construction and development.

As the Yucca district is the only Glendale City Council district adjacent to the Nation's land, I wanted to share my perspective

with you. The City of Glendale's financial situation is precarious, and I strongly believe that a project of this magnitude will significantly contribute to the City's economic stability and ultimate recovery. The Nation seeks no subsidies and has committed to pay their fair share for infrastructure and services, and the employment their project will generate will bring thousands of quality jobs to the region that my constituents want and need.

As a local elected official, I believe that this legislation is not only detrimental to my community, but is an affront to the notion of fairness in attempting to overturn a land settlement resolved by Congress three decades ago brought by parties who have repeatedly failed to sustain their position in court. My constituents want this project to go forward, the sooner the better. Please join me in opposing H.R. 1410.

SEPTEMBER 13, 2013.

Hon. TRENT FRANKS,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FRANKS, I am writing to ask you to oppose H.R. 1410, a bill aimed at halting the Tohono O'odham Nation's proposed West Valley Resort and Casino.

I speak from the perspective of a lifetime Glendale resident; business owner for 35 years, former City Councilmember from 1986-1991; 8-year former Board Member and Past President of the Glendale Union High School District; and current Glendale City Councilmember.

Glendale is faced with a unique opportunity for a major economic development project in the West Valley Resort and Casino. I have met with the leaders of the Tohono O'odham Nation and have studied the impacts of their project. It would be the largest construction project in the region and would create thousands of permanent jobs, as well as hundreds of millions of dollars in economic impacts.

It just does not make any sense for Congress to intervene to stop this project, especially with H.R. 1410. This legislation unilaterally amends the Nation's settlement with the federal government to draw an arbitrary line across the state in a fashion that does more to protect the market share of special interests than serve any public good.

It's also a terrible deal for Glendale because H.R. 1410 would still leave us with the Nation's land in reservation status, while preventing the property from being put to its highest and best use.

There is not a consensus of the Glendale City Council that favors pursuing discussion with the Tohono O'odham Nation about its project, which represents our first opportunity in years to work together constructively. Passing H.R. 1410 at this moment would undercut the very same local communities it is supposed to protect.

I ask you to please oppose this bill and oppose any effort to move forward on H.R. 1410 until after the discussion between the City and the tribe have run their course.

Sincerely,

IAN HUGH,
Councilmember.

Mayor JERRY WEIERS,
Councilman IAN HUGHES,
Councilwoman NORMA ALVAREZ,
Councilman SAM CHAVIRA,
Councilman MANNY MARTINEZ,
Councilwoman YVONNE KNAACK,
Councilman GARY SHERWOOD,
Attorney General TOM HORNE,

TO THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF GLENDALE, ALL MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA.

I am speaking as an individual concerned citizen of the City of Glendale with regards to the excess spending in lawsuits for the past 4+ years against the Tohono O'odham Nation in their pursuit of creating a Free Enterprise project that entails the creation of upwards of 3500-4000 permanent much needed jobs for the people in Glendale and surrounding West Valley communities.

Free Enterprise is one of our greatest US Constitutional rights. To continue to deny this venture that will help families keep their homes, put food on their tables, clothing on their children, and pursue the American Dream is a travesty. Taking away good hard earned money in the form of taxes to continue to pay lawyers who knowingly continue this mockery of so called justice to suit only a small special interest group in their quest of having a monopoly on a specific enterprise is outrageous.

This is purely all about keeping all the profits to one-two specific tribal groups who do not want any competition as I've been personally told by both Senator McCain and Congressman Franks. To use the words spoken specifically to me by Senator McCain—It's All About The Money. Truer words were never spoken.

The Tohono O'odham Nation have won all lawsuits costing both the State of Arizona and City of Glendale millions of dollars in taxpayer money to fight frivolous lawsuits—State of Arizona to the tune of \$4.4 million and the City of Glendale \$5-6 million. How much longer can the State and the City continue this insanity before either one or both go bankrupt and for what. Ego?

Mayor Weiers, you campaigned on the promise that if the TO Nation won their suit that was pending last October/November 2012, you would go with whatever the courts decided. The courts, Again, decided in favor of the TO Nation and once more after that. So that's 2 more Wins for TO Nation. Isn't it about time you kept your promise to the citizens of the City of Glendale.

I understand that thousands of letters are pouring into Councilmembers hands as well as to the Mayor all in favor of stopping the insane spending to continue fighting a fight that is a Gila River Indian Community Fight to keep all the money that they feel is 'their' money from profits from their Casinos. This is not about the Casino any longer. It is about taxpayers money, lost jobs, and lost revenue to the City of Glendale as well as hurting Westgate businesses and other surrounding businesses.

Surely all of you Councilmembers, the Mayor and Attorney General Tom Horne recognize the wall you are up against and realize to maintain your integrity you must see, recognize and adhere to the will of the people in the City of Glendale, Phoenix, Surprise, Sun City, Peoria, Tolleson, Buckeye, and other surrounding cities who want the Spending to STOP!

Please be adults and good, principled business people. Be willing to accept the Olive Branch that has been provided to you all to sit down at the table to talk and pursue negotiations of what will be feasible, productive both financially and opportunistically

to all parties including We The People who voted you all into office. We The People, with our tax dollars, pay all of your salaries. It is in all of your best interests to listen to the majority who are asking that you STOP the wasteful spending in lawsuits and become more productive in pursuing an amicable solution by coming together with the TO Nation in sit down in talks with the sole intent of coming to a resolution that provides for everyone.

I have spoken to many people in the Grassroots Tea Party Activists in Glendale who are definitely in favor of stopping the wasteful spending of taxpayer money on these frivolous lawsuits against the TO Nation especially when it is costing people their livelihood, and chance of better jobs, or just at having permanent jobs. We have a few who are not in favor of Casinos, any casinos, on moral principles. Vast majority though will concede the common sense thing to do right now after the TO Nation has already won approximately 12 lawsuits, leaving the State of Arizona & the City of Glendale in debt to the TO Nation combined total at around \$10 million plus.

I feel confident that I speak for the majority of those involved in the GRTP in Glendale as well as other Tea Party Organizations in the West Valley that we all can be in agreement that to continue on in this insane spending, egotistical stubbornness, and refusal to sit down in a professional like manner and talk regarding this issue will eventually be the death trap financially of this City and the State and hurt many innocent families in keeping good paying permanent jobs out of their reach.

I am sending each of you a copy of this letter as well as posting it on Facebook webpages of many of the Legislative Districts, Tea Party organizations, Republican Coalitions and various other organizations, to ensure that a peaceful resolution be brought to the table and No More Lawsuits. Thank you.

In Liberty,

FRANCINE ROMESBURG,
*Grassroots Tea Party Activists—Glendale
Facilitator.*

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire regarding the amount of time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman GOSAR, and from all of us, I see Peggy has slipped off the floor, but happy birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I actually come here before the body with somewhat of a unique perspective on what's going on here. And I hate to admit that I'm getting this old, but in 1993, I was the majority whip in the Arizona State house. I was the one who was assigned to work as a negotiator on the original IGRA compacts between the State of Arizona—the legislature had to put its text together—and the tribal communities, our 21 land-holding tribes within the State of Arizona. So I spent a year of my life with lawyers and tribal members and their lawyers and members of the legislature and members of the Governor's office going over this over and over.

And the concern that constantly came up was, if we make this deal as IGRA, that had passed a few years earlier and was sponsored by one of our U.S. Senators, are we confident that this very situation that's happening right now would not happen.

Look, I know many of the players have changed in those 20 years, but this is what we talked about. And now I need to take you to the next reason: Why is this so dangerous to our State?

Arizona does something, and I don't know if it's unique to our State, but there's the ability for my poor rural tribal communities to transfer their machines to urban communities. I believe if this casino goes into my metropolitan area, my State, within a couple years, becomes a full-scale gaming State because the horse track and the others are already lining up, gearing up, I believe, to do the initiative, saying, hey, we all thought we had this deal. Look what's happening. They're coming into your neighborhood. Let's just put it on the ballot and let everyone participate in full-scale gaming. And the moment that happens, the value of the machine transfer for these poor rural tribes that are just now starting to build that consistent cash flow will go away.

This is much more than just dealing with the Tohono O'odham and where their aboriginal lands are and this acquisition of lands that are 100 miles beyond. This is an issue of: Are you about to allow something to happen that will change the very nature of my State?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It has been impossible to correct the misrepresentations, and to put that mildly, the constant and sophisticated disinformation lobbying campaign has persisted without regard to facts or reality. There has been some constant points that were made—that H.R. 1410 is about stopping reservation shopping and off-reservation gaming, akin to the situation that's going on in Michigan. It is totally different. It is unrelated, and the decree by Congress in law, upheld by State and Federal law, points to the fact that that is not real, and it is totally different.

The 202 initiative that the public voted on and passed, that that somehow is in jeopardy. The last court hearing reaffirmed that that was not the case.

And that it is a precedent for all State compacts to be opened up. Each State compact is unique, different, with its own checks and balances, and Arizona is no different.

This is a violation of the State gaming compact, and that there was a gentleman's agreement. Again, the courts pointed that that was not in fact part of the record or part of the decision, and that court decisions, very interesting, court decisions, Interior Department findings, are of no matter:

In 2009, April 30, the Department of Interior ruled in favor of Tohono O'odham Nation.

In 2009, June, ruled in favor of the Tohono O'odham Nation.

In 2010, July 23, Echohawk Trust decision letter, in favor of the Tohono O'odham Nation.

The Gila River v. U.S., 2011, March, court summary judgment in favor of the Tohono O'odham Nation.

May 20, 2013, Ninth Circuit Court decision in favor of the Tohono O'odham Nation.

The Tohono O'odham Nation v. Glendale on an annexation issue 2011, May, Court of Appeals decision, Tohono O'odham Nation.

2011, October, Supreme Court denial of petition for review, Tohono O'odham Nation prevails.

2011, December, Supreme Court fee award, Tohono O'odham Nation prevails.

2012, January, Superior Court judgment, Tohono O'odham Nation prevails.

Tohono O'odham Nation v. Arizona, 2011, June, district court summary judgment, Tohono O'odham Nation prevails.

2011, June, again district court judgment, Tohono O'odham Nation.

Arizona v. Tohono O'odham Nation, district court order on a motion to dismiss claims 5 and 6; claims 1, 2, 3, and 7 in part, Tohono O'odham Nation wins.

2013, May, district court summary judgment order, all remaining claims except breach of contract under restatement, Tohono O'odham Nation wins.

2013, June, district court summary judgment order, all remaining claims, including breach of contract, Tohono O'odham Nation prevails.

Again, June, 2013, district court judgment, Tohono O'odham Nation prevails.

Eleven in total administrative and judicial decisions—but let's not let facts and judicial precedent and the fact that the Tohono O'odham Nation has prevailed consistently against the State, against the city of Glendale, against competing tribes over and over again and has had the Interior Department, which, as I stated earlier, has testified twice against the previous legislation and against this legislation.

I want to quote from The Glendale Star from their editorial of August 1:

Is it any wonder so many people distrust government—at any level? When there are so many questions about the motives of the plaintiffs that are suing the Tohono O'odham Nation, one begins to ask about the greed factor.

Does anyone believe the future of Indian gaming in Arizona is at risk if the Tohono O'odham Nation eventually wins this long, drawn-out battle in the courts? Who is willing to bet on the future of Indian gaming in our State?

If the congressman who is sponsoring this legislation is so set against gambling, he

should be trying to get rid of all the casinos in the State. He should be out stumping for the end of gaming altogether.

Instead, he is working on the side of the two major gaming operations in the valley, both in the East Valley, by the way, and not the West Valley.

This congressman needs to start looking in his own backyard and trying to come up with solutions to unemployment, help for small business owners, transportation gridlock, and more than blocking what could be a big step toward economic stability, i.e., jobs. At least, the nation's resort-casino would provide construction jobs for many out-of-work carpenters and masonry workers for a year or two. Those jobs are needed now.

□ 1630

I mention all this because, as I said earlier, it's been difficult to try to counter the allegations and the misrepresentation and the disinformation that have been leveled against the Tohono O'odham Nation's efforts to establish a casino under a congressional decision and law that afforded them, to make them whole because of the land they lost because of the dam, and we're still back here on this particular piece of legislation.

So court decisions, administrative decisions matter not. Precedent matters not. The opening of Pandora's box, in terms of water claims and other settlements with Indian country, matters not.

What matters is to protect some very important gaming interests and special interests for two gaming entities that have had the luxury for the last 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 years.

Tohono O'odham Nation has prevailed in court. The issue of a back-room deal that wasn't kept has been ruled moot by the court. The issue that this is somehow reservation shopping and offsite gaming has been ruled moot by the court.

And then you have the Glendale City Council, a principal plaintiff in this, now retreating and, rather, working with the Tohono O'odham Nation to work out some agreements, as opposed to continuing the litigation.

The courts have ruled \$4.5 million is owed to the tribe in legal costs by both the State and the affected gaming industry, also from Glendale; and I think it's time, as this legislation goes forward, that people ask a very fundamental question about this legislation: Is it intended to preserve a gaming compact? Which, I believe, and the court has ruled, no.

Or is it intending to preserve a market share for two gaming entities that have enjoyed that market share by themselves?

The free market requires competition. The free market requires opportunity. And all that is happening in this legislation is to try to constrict the ability of people in this free market of ours to compete, to create jobs, and to create opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to acknowledge that out of our committee this bill was reported 35-1 in favor of this bill, so a heavily bipartisan bill reported to the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There's no question that the prevailing point of view—and I talked about the disinformation—will prevail here today. I have no question about that.

The fact that we are going against judicial decisions, undoing a law that was passed by this Congress to make whole a tribe that lost their land 25 years ago, and interjecting ourselves, for the first time in the history of this Nation into a State and Native American gaming compact, that doesn't negate that.

So, you know, my opposition, whether it's in the distinct minority or not, is based on what I believe is reality and fact. And if this debate were about reality and fact, and not about supposition, disinformation, or misinformation, the debate would be in a whole different tone.

This is about economic development for the State. This is about Congress making true on a decision they made 25 years ago, and this is about Congress not short-cutting judicial decisions that have been made over the course of the last 5 years, in which the Tohono O'odham Nation has prevailed in every one of them.

So, given all that, bipartisanship, I love it, but being correct and holding true to a decision that this Congress made 25 years ago, I think, is consistent with the work of this House and consistent with preserving gaming compacts in States and, more importantly, making whole a tribe that lost valuable resources to the Federal Government in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding some time to me.

I rise in support today of H.R. 1410. The Saginaw Chippewa Tribe in Michigan, whom I have the privilege of representing here, and for reasons that I concur with, have asked that I support this legislation, along with several other Michigan tribes that are opposed to off-reservation gaming. And so I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation and in opposition to off-reservation gaming.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, let me say that the situation in Michigan, as I mentioned, is unrelated to this. There is no legal precedent, and there is no congressional action to guide the decisions of courts, which has been the case with the

Tohono O'odham decision and with the casino in the West Valley.

Let me just say, this is about fairness. This is about Congress upholding its word.

This is not about reservation shopping. It's not about offsite gaming. It is not about a gentlemen's agreement.

And it is totally and entirely about an act that was taken 25 years ago, upholding that act, making a tribe whole, and not opening up a Pandora's box in which litigation will continue to proceed once this legislation goes forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Trust is a series of promises kept. That's the basis of all government functions. And that is the same thing that is required of the Tohono O'odham. When they entered into the agreement in 2002, they publicly supported the compact which limited the amount of casinos in the Phoenix-Greater Phoenix area.

Yes, it is true there are other precedents behind it, but contractual law always follows and subjugates itself when you look at this.

The speaker from Arizona spoke about the dialogue with the courts. The courts had to rule because the Tohono O'odham hid behind sovereignty in which the tapes and discussion in which they were truly negotiating or negotiating behind closed doors in dire dissent against this compact would not be disclosed. So the court only had one way to look.

Congress has the ability to rectify this answer, and that's why we are here today. This is good legislation. It doesn't prohibit any of the jurisdictions over that, except just complying with the compact to the end of the compact, 2027. Once upon that time, then they can renegotiate, and everybody is fairly into the game.

This is about trust, but it is trust from the Tohono O'odham to the Federal Government, to the taxpayers of Arizona, to the Governor, and to the other tribes of Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1410.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY TO EXTEND THE UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 2449) to authorize the President to extend the term of the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Civil Uses of Nuclear Energy for a period not to exceed March 19, 2016.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2449

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY TO EXTEND THE UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENT.

The President is authorized to extend the term of the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Civil Uses of Nuclear Energy for a period not to exceed March 19, 2016, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, over the past six decades, the United States and South Korea have built a strong and enduring alliance, which is the cornerstone of peace, the cornerstone of security in the Asia-Pacific region.

Ever since the dark days of the Korean war, our two nations have stood side by side to meet some of today's most pressing challenges. The alliance between our two countries is a model for global partnership in every field, whether it's in the economic field or political or concerning security.

And earlier this year, my good friend, the ranking member, and I led a bipartisan delegation to South Korea to reaffirm our Nation's steadfast commitment to the good people of South Korea. It was during this visit that we witnessed the tremendous sacrifice that South Koreans made in order to live in freedom.

The ranking member and I stood by the wreckage of the naval ship *Cheonan*, paying our respects to the 46 South Korean sailors who perished as a result of the unprovoked North Korean attack, a poignant reminder of the constant threat that our two nations face.

When Madam Park Geun-hye, the first woman to be elected President of

South Korea, addressed a joint session of Congress, she honored the deep sacrifice that Americans have made in protecting her beloved nation. I was pleased to serve on the host committee when she visited the Congress.

Madam Park and her delegation were warmly received when in southern California as part of her official visit to the United States.

Today, South Korea is at the forefront of global innovation, with the world's 13th largest economy; and as a result of the landmark U.S.-South Korea trade agreement, South Korea is our seventh largest trading partner.

One of the most important areas of our close economic cooperation is commerce and, particularly, commerce in nuclear energy. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, it is so important that the Congress approve this piece of legislation before us today.

South Korea's nuclear energy sector is extensive. It's critically important to its economy. Its 23 operating reactors produce one-third of the nation's electricity. In an effort to secure greater energy independence, the government plans to double this figure over the next two decades, with 11 more power plants to be completed.

Much of South Korea's nuclear infrastructure is of American origin, and U.S. businesses provide millions of dollars' worth of spare parts and services every year to that nation. That is one of the reasons expansion of this vital sector will be good for the U.S. economy as well.

South Korea also plans to become a major nuclear exporter in the international market. Given the truly global nature of this industry, American suppliers stand to make considerable gains as well.

For example, in 2009, a consortium of Korean companies was selected to build four nuclear power reactors in the United Arab Emirates, a deal worth \$20 billion. Of this total, American companies will earn up to \$2 billion for this project alone through sales of equipment and of services. It is estimated that this one project will support 5,000 jobs in 17 States.

□ 1645

The ability of American companies to export to South Korea's nuclear power sector rests upon our two countries' 40-year-old nuclear cooperation agreement, which expires on March 19, 2014. The U.S. and South Korean negotiators are currently negotiating a long-term extension of this agreement.

But to prevent an unnecessary interruption that would have a major negative impact on our alliance with South Korea and on U.S. exporters alike, Ranking Member ENGEL and I introduced this bipartisan legislation to extend the existing agreement for 2 years, to March 19, 2016. The State Department is in support of this legislation.

Testifying earlier this year on behalf of an extension, a top State Department official told the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

An extension would also ensure there is no lapse in our ongoing civil nuclear cooperation, preserving stability and predictability in our joint commercial activities.

This bill is a simple extension of the existing agreement—with no modifications or changes—that will allow negotiators time to focus on substance instead of the clock.

The Foreign Affairs Committee voted unanimously in favor of the bill, which now has a total of 41 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation so that it can be sent to the Senate and then on to the President for his signature and thereby ensure that the cooperation between our two countries in this vital area can continue without interruption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2449, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'd like to begin by thanking my good friend, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, ED ROYCE, and the ranking member, ELIOT ENGEL, for their work on this bipartisan legislation.

The current U.S.-South Korea civil nuclear cooperation agreement, also known as a "123 agreement," allows the U.S. and South Korea to work together on peaceful uses of nuclear energy. That agreement is set to expire next year. Because our two countries have not yet completed negotiations for a new agreement, H.R. 2449 allows a 2-year extension of the existing agreement to provide more time for the two sides to come to an agreement.

An extension would help ensure that there's no lapse in our ongoing civil nuclear cooperation, preserving stability and predictability in our joint commercial activities. South Korea is a vital economic and security partner of the United States, and passing this bill would help ensure that we maintain the strongest possible relationship with our trusted ally.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2449 enjoys wide bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chairman emerita of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who currently chairs the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our gracious chairman for the time.

I rise in full support of H.R. 2449, an important bipartisan bill that will extend the U.S.-South Korea civilian nuclear energy agreement for another 2 years.

South Korea is indeed an important ally of the United States, and our bilateral relationship is a cornerstone of America's national security interests in Asia. By passing this stopgap measure, Mr. Speaker, we will avoid the expiration of the original 40-year agreement and allow the United States and South Korea to continue to negotiate on a renewed agreement in good faith.

If we do not pass this bill, the current agreement will expire early next year. This would not only cause damage to the U.S.-South Korea relationship, but it will also harm the United States manufacturers who provide parts and services to South Korea's energy industry and will negatively impact the technological, safety, and non-proliferation efforts of both of our countries in the civilian nuclear energy sector.

Mr. Speaker, South Korea has become a major user of domestic nuclear power, with the partnership of American technology. Nuclear power provides about one-third of all of South Korea's electricity, and South Korea is looking to even further expand that percentage. They are looking to the United States and American businesses to help them achieve their goals.

South Korea's partnership with America for civilian nuclear projects already has resulted in billions of dollars for our economy and has created thousands of jobs. Continued cooperation with South Korea would bring more revenue to America and create much-needed jobs for Americans. But this can only happen, Mr. Speaker, if our two countries can negotiate a long-term agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the chairman.

They cannot negotiate this when they're constantly watching the clock, which I should have done as well. Passing this bill will give them the much-needed time to focus on the negotiations and finally come to a mutually beneficial agreement.

So I urge my colleagues to support this strong bipartisan and much-needed bill that will help the U.S. economy, U.S. jobs, and strengthen the alliance between the United States and our key trading partner in South Korea.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today as a strong supporter and cosponsor of H.R. 2449, legislation to extend for 2 additional years the existing U.S.-South Korea civilian nuclear energy agreement.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, it's my strong belief that passage of this legislation is in the national interest of the United States and also in the vital interest of the U.S.-South Korea alliance.

Earlier this year, we held a hearing in our subcommittee to examine the facts behind the current nuclear energy agreement with South Korea and why it needs to be extended. Simply put, the agreement with South Korea strengthens America's nonproliferation priorities, it helps to create American jobs in the energy sector, and it's an important symbol of our long friendship with South Korea.

I want to commend my colleague from California (Mr. ROYCE), the chairman of the full committee, and also the ranking member of the committee from New York, ELIOT ENGEL, for introducing this bipartisan legislation.

America's friendship with South Korea is stronger today than probably at any other moment in our history. Forged on the cold, dark battlefields of the Korean war, this year's 60th anniversary of the U.S.-South Korea alliance marks a significant milestone in our ever-growing relationship. There is no doubt it has indeed become the cornerstone of peace and security in East Asia. In fact, it is the enduring, relevant, and forward-looking qualities of our alliance that makes today's consideration of this bill, H.R. 2449, so important.

Today in South Korea, a once war-torn nation has become a world-class economy and leader in high-tech innovation. Its commitment to democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in a region where these ideals are oftentimes hard to come by is a testament to the trust we have in our ally and friend, South Korea.

I once again thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for putting this particular legislation together. I would like to join them in urging my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MEEKS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I think we have one final Member who wishes to speak on this. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a member of the Foreign Affairs, Judiciary, and the Oversight Committees.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate you yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2449, I think the merits of which you have spoken of. I also want to rise and discuss the relationship with the Republic of Korea.

Since the 1950s, the Republic of Korea has been a strong ally of the United States and an economic leader in the Pacific region. South Korea is an example of how the free market brings about an increased quality of life.

The Republic of Korea is Asia's fourth largest economy and the world's 12th largest economy. In the 1960s, South Korea was on par with levels of poverty seen in Africa. Fast forward to 2004, when South Korea joined the trillion-dollar club of world economies—in stark contrast to its neighbor to the north. North Korea is one of the most oppressive regimes in the world.

The U.S.-South Korea alliance is one that shows the world the promise of democracy and free enterprise. Today, we recognize just one partnership between our nations—the civilian nuclear energy program. This agreement maintains a safe, secure nuclear program in a very turbulent international environment.

I'm grateful to be an original cosponsor of this legislation. Congress needs to continue to show how much it values our Nation's relationship with South Korea, and a positive vote on this agreement will be a strong step in that regard.

When you look at the area, you see the strong light of freedom in South Korea tarnished only by the darkness of the tyranny in North Korea. That's why we stand with South Korea. That's why this agreement is important.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, let me again thank the chair and the ranking member for their hard work. I listened to the chair talk about his trip and what he and the ranking member observed, as well as the information they brought back to the subcommittee and the committee. It is so tremendously important. It highlights the importance of our great ally, South Korea.

We recently passed a trade agreement with South Korea because we worked together and were able to create jobs through that trade agreement, not only in South Korea, but here in America. This is an example of what can be accomplished when you work together and try to make sure there's no lapse in our ongoing civil nuclear cooperation. It shows that we can work collectively to make sure individuals use nuclear forces for the good of mankind and make sure that there is power in their communities.

I'm delighted today to join in a strong bipartisan manner to support H.R. 2449. I ask all of my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 2449, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to stand in solidarity with the remarks of Mr. MEEKS of New York. We're both in complete agreement here, as we've discussed in the past, about how vital this relationship is with South Korea. It is one that, for decades, we've stood side-by-side as South Korea and the United States have tried to promote policies in that region in defense of freedom, to support

democracy, to support human rights, and, at the same time, to support economic growth. I think it is just as important that we stand together to extend the U.S.-South Korea civilian nuclear energy agreement.

So I would urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation. I think it is critical not only to our friend and ally, but I would say, without this bill, tens of thousands of American workers would be at a grave disadvantage. This bill extends, without modification, the existing agreement between the U.S. and South Korea for 2 additional years so that the current negotiations can continue uninterrupted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2449, thereby building upon the already strong relationship between the United States and South Korea by extending the current U.S.-Korea Civil Nuclear Agreement for another two years.

Mr. Speaker, Korea and the United States have a long and storied alliance stretching back sixty years, with many shared political and cultural values. Our current nuclear agreement is set to expire in 2014. Extending it is a mutually beneficial proposition, as past nuclear agreements with Korea have demonstrated. South Korea is one of the largest consumers of nuclear energy in the world, and U.S. companies export billions of dollars worth of equipment to Korea each year, while Korea uses nuclear power to increase its own energy independence. H.R. 2449 represents a new chapter in energy partnership between the U.S. and Korea and I look forward to its passage.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership on this very important piece of legislation. For 60 years, the alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea has brought stability, security and prosperity to the Korean Peninsula and Asia-Pacific region. Most recently, the U.S.-Korean Free Trade Agreement has demonstrated our mutual commitment of shared future economic growth and prosperity.

I rise in strong support of this bill as it is critically important to extend the current U.S.-South Korea civilian nuclear energy cooperation agreement for two years. While substantial progress has been made by the negotiators, more time is needed to properly complete a new agreement that recognizes both our countries' status as global leaders of nuclear energy. Swift passage of this 2-year extension will give both countries the confidence that cooperation between our two countries will continue smoothly.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 2449.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2449, a bipartisan bill to extend the current U.S.-Korea civil nuclear agreement for two years.

This year we celebrate the 60th anniversary of the U.S.-South Korea alliance. Over the decades, South Korea has become a key U.S. ally in Asia and we stand shoulder to shoulder in political, strategic, military, cultural, and other issues.

One of these crucial issues is energy. This extension will allow the U.S. and Korea to enter into a new era of energy partnership.

The current nuclear cooperation agreement is due to expire in March 2014 and its prompt extension is vital to avoid trade disruptions.

It is critical that we uphold the reputation of the U.S. as a stable and reliable trading partner, in light of the energy industry's long-lead items and use of long-term contracts for nuclear components, fuel and services.

Ultimately this is about jobs: red, white, and blue American jobs. Billions of dollars in U.S. exports and thousands of U.S. jobs are at stake if we fail.

This is about jobs for U.S. companies such as Westinghouse, which is headquartered in Cranberry, PA, in my own district. Westinghouse, which employs about 9000 employees in the U.S., has been a leader in energy cooperation with Korea for nearly four decades.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2449.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1700

PROVIDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL ENVOY

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 301) to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 301

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) More than 500 Baha'is in Iran have been arbitrarily arrested since 2005. Roughly 100 Baha'is are presently imprisoned because of their religious beliefs.

(2) In May 2010, suspected terrorists attacked two mosques in Pakistan belonging to the Ahmaddiya minority Muslim sect, killing at least 80 people. Ahmadis consider themselves Muslim, but Pakistani law does not recognize them as such.

(3) Said Musa, an Afghan Christian convert, was arrested in May 2010 on charges of apostasy, a crime which can carry the death sentence, and was released in February 2011 only after sustained international pressure.

(4) On October 31, 2010, gunmen laid siege on Our Lady of Salvation Church in Bagh-

dad, Iraq, killing at least 52 police and worshippers, including two priests, making it the worst massacre of Iraqi Christians since 2003.

(5) Iraq's ancient and once vibrant Christian population that numbered an estimated 1,500,000 out of a total population in Iraq of 30,000,000 in 2003 has been reduced by at least one half, due in significant part to Christians fleeing the violence.

(6) In November 2010, a Pakistani court sentenced Aasia Bibi, a Christian mother of five, to death under the country's blasphemy law for insulting the Prophet Muhammad.

(7) Since early 2011, violent sectarian attacks targeting Coptic Orthodox Christians and their property increased significantly, resulting in nearly 100 deaths, mostly Coptic Christians, surpassing the death toll of the 10 previous years combined.

(8) In Egypt, with the ascent of the Muslim Brotherhood, Coptic Christians, numbering 8 to 10 million, have been under increased threat and many are reported to have fled the country during former President Mohamed Morsi's rule.

(9) On March 2, 2011, Pakistani Federal Minorities Minister Shahbaz Bhatti, the only Christian member of the Cabinet, who was outspoken in his opposition to Pakistan's blasphemy laws was assassinated by extremists.

(10) The former Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism, Hannah Rosenthal, has noted that Holocaust glorification "is especially virulent in Middle Eastern media, some of which is state-owned and operated, which calls for a new Holocaust to finish the job".

(11) In the midst of a devastating civil war, Syrian Christians and other religious minorities, which comprise roughly 10 percent of the population, are particularly vulnerable lacking their own militias and regional protectors.

(12) Many of these ancient faith communities are being forced to flee the lands which they have inhabited for centuries.

(13) The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom has recommended that Egypt, Tajikistan, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan be designated by the Department of State as Countries of Particular Concern in accordance with the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998.

(14) The situation on the ground in the region continues to develop rapidly and the United States Government needs an individual who can respond in kind and focus on the critical situation of religious minorities in these countries.

(15) There are historical precedents, including the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism, the Special Envoy for North Korea Human Rights Issues, and the South Sudan and Sudan Special Envoy, for the Department of State, either as a result of legislative mandate or initiative of the Secretary of State, to create positions with a targeted focus on an area or issue of recognized import.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL ENVOY TO PROMOTE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM OF RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN THE NEAR EAST AND SOUTH CENTRAL ASIA.

(a) APPOINTMENT.—The President shall appoint a Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia (in this Act referred to as the "Special Envoy") within the Department of State.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Special Envoy should be a person of recognized distinction in the field of human rights and religious freedom and with expertise in the Near East

and South Central Asia regions. The Special Envoy shall have the rank of ambassador and shall hold the office at the pleasure of the President.

(c) **PROHIBITION.**—The person appointed as Special Envoy may not hold any other position of Federal employment for the period of time during which the person holds the position of Special Envoy.

SEC. 3. DUTIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Special Envoy shall carry out the following duties:

(1) Promote the right of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia, denounce the violation of such right, and recommend appropriate responses by the United States Government when such right is violated.

(2) Monitor and combat acts of religious intolerance and incitement targeted against religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(3) Work to ensure that the unique needs of religious minority communities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia are addressed, including the economic and security needs of such communities to the extent that such needs are directly tied to religious-based discrimination and persecution.

(4) Work with foreign governments of the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia to address laws that are inherently discriminatory toward religious minority communities in such countries.

(5) Coordinate and assist in the preparation of that portion of the report required by sections 116(d) and 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d) and 2304(b)) relating to the nature and extent of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(6) Coordinate and assist in the preparation of that portion of the report required by section 102(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6412(b)) relating to the nature and extent of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

(b) **COORDINATION.**—In carrying out the duties under subsection (a), the Special Envoy shall, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate with the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration of the Department of State, the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and other relevant Federal agencies and officials.

SEC. 4. DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION.

Subject to the direction of the President and the Secretary of State, the Special Envoy is authorized to represent the United States in matters and cases relevant to religious freedom in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia in—

(1) contacts with foreign governments, intergovernmental organizations, and specialized agencies of the United Nations, the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe, and other international organizations of which the United States is a member; and

(2) multilateral conferences and meetings relevant to religious freedom in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

SEC. 5. PRIORITY COUNTRIES AND CONSULTATION.

(a) **PRIORITY COUNTRIES.**—In carrying out this Act, the Special Envoy shall give priority to programs, projects, and activities for Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—The Special Envoy shall consult with domestic and international nongovernmental organizations and multilateral organizations and institutions, as the Special Envoy considers appropriate to fulfill the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. FUNDING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the amounts made available for “Diplomatic and Consular Programs” for fiscal years 2014 through 2018, \$1,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for each such fiscal year to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) **FUNDING OFFSET.**—To offset the costs to be incurred by the Department of State to carry out the provisions of this Act for fiscal years 2014 through 2018, the Secretary of State shall eliminate such positions within the Department of State, unless otherwise authorized or required by law, as the Secretary determines to be necessary to fully offset such costs.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for “Diplomatic and Consular Programs” to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 7. SUNSET.

This Act shall cease to be effective beginning on October 1, 2018.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and that they also might have the ability to include extraneous material on this resolution in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this legislation because this legislation provides for a very needed Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and in South Central Asia.

This bill, introduced by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), is substantially identical to one which we brought up last year and tried to get out of both bodies; it was H.R. 440. This body passed that legislation by more than 400 votes.

Sadly, in the 2 years that have elapsed since then, the dangers motivating this bill have only grown more acute. In many areas of the Middle East, the first freedom, as we called it, the freedom of religious liberty, is disregarded.

Minority communities are not merely under threat; those communities are

now under attack. From Afghanistan, to Iran, to Syria, to Egypt and elsewhere in these regions, religious minorities have been increasingly subjected to unconscionable—often violent—persecution. These alarming trends are occurring in the midst of growing regional instability as brutal regimes and terrorists and insurgents seek to assert control over populations and seek to enforce their ideologies by use of fear, by use of brute force.

As the bloody civil war rages in Syria, ancient Christian communities are being forced to flee the lands they have inhabited for centuries in the midst of this bloody civil conflict.

In Egypt, Coptic Christians have experienced unspeakable abuses at the hands of radical Muslim groups and have been fleeing their country in droves to escape further violence. I have met with many from the vibrant Coptic Christian community in southern California.

In Iran, more than 500 Baha'is have been arbitrarily arrested since 2005 by the Iranian Government. In Pakistan, 80 members of the Muslim Ahmadiyya sect were killed by terrorists in their places of worship in 2010, in addition to consistent incidents of violence and even judicial persecution of Christians there. Many of us are aware of the violations of the rights and the deaths of the Shi'a minority there as well.

For all of these alarming reasons, this legislation is at least as timely as it was 2 years ago. I commend our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), for bringing it to our attention.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill and yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bipartisan legislation creates a Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia. Housed at the State Department, the Special Envoy would be responsible for monitoring and combating acts of religious intolerance, engaging with foreign governments to address laws that discriminate against religious minorities, and working to ensure that the unique needs of religious minority communities are being addressed.

This bill is important because religious minority communities all around the world—particularly in the Near East and South Central Asia—are facing increased attacks and persecution. For example, Egypt's recent governments have failed to prevent, investigate, or prosecute crimes against members of religious minority groups, especially Coptic Christians. Churches have been burned to the ground and numerous Christians murdered.

Iraq used to have a significant number of religious minorities. These groups have been subject to escalating violence, persecution, and discrimination for their religious beliefs, and

today they comprise only about 3 percent of Iraq's population. By some estimates, half of Iraq's Christian population has fled since 2003.

In Iran, the arrest and harassment of members of religious minorities, including Sunni Muslims and Christians, continues to rise. In one notable case last year, an Iranian-American Christian pastor was imprisoned for threatening Iranian national security. And what was his crime? Helping to set up small churches in people's homes. Iran's minority Baha'i community is particularly harassed, punished, imprisoned, and even killed simply because of their religion.

This past August, a Baha'i community leader in Bandar Abbas, Iran—Mr. Ataollah Rezvani—was found murdered in his car on the outskirts of the city, shot in the back of the head. He had been the subject of threats and pressure from agents of the Ministry of Intelligence, and until shortly before his death he had been receiving menacing phone calls from unidentified persons. There is little doubt that his murder was religiously motivated. Until now, the Iranian Government has not begun a formal investigation into his murder or the murder of many other Baha'is that have been killed in recent years. It is past time for the Iranian Government to move immediately to seek justice for the cruel deaths of its Baha'i citizens. I wish these were isolated cases, but countless other examples exist, from Afghanistan to India to Saudi Arabia.

We indeed are fortunate to live in a country that was founded by religious refugees on principles of tolerance. But it is important that we do everything we can to ensure that religious minorities elsewhere in the world enjoy the freedoms and protections they deserve—the freedoms and protections enjoyed by all Americans. Appointing this Special Envoy would be an important step in that direction, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science, cochairman of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, author of this bill, and long a spokesman for religious freedom for those of all creeds.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking Chairman ROYCE for swiftly moving the bill and for his comments today. I also thank the Republican leadership for recognizing that this simple but critical legislation is worthy of making it a priority by this Congress, even as there are other issues that face us at this time.

In January 2011, following a spate of attacks against Christians in Iraq and ongoing persecution in Egypt, I convened a Tom Lantos Human Rights

Commission hearing focusing on the plight of religious minorities in Egypt and Iraq. Among the witnesses was Representative ANNA ESHOO, who ultimately became the lead Democrat on this bill for two consecutive Congresses.

During the hearing we heard sobering testimony about the challenges facing these communities. A resounding theme emerged: Chaldo-Assyrian Christians and Coptic Christians were being marginalized and targeted for violence. These realities were all the more troubling given the historic roots of the faith communities in these two countries—amazingly, many Iraqi Christians today still speak Aramaic, the language of Jesus.

Not only were these communities being threatened in the lands they had inhabited for centuries, their plight was largely unknown and seemingly unimportant within the broader foreign policy apparatus. Notably, at the time of the hearing, the post of the U.S. Ambassador for International Religious Freedom had been vacant for 2 years.

While the hearing predated the so-called "Arab Spring," without question the dramatic changes in the region have only further jeopardized these communities. I was convinced then and remain convinced today that religious minorities in the Middle East and in key countries in South Central Asia, such as Pakistan—as the chairman mentioned—and Afghanistan need someone who can be their voice both within the halls of Foggy Bottom and abroad with foreign governments.

Last Congress, this legislation overwhelmingly passed the House only to stall in the Senate in the face of opposition by the State Department—the same State Department which to date has failed to designate any Countries of Particular Concern for egregious religious freedom violations since August of 2011.

The administration's opposition is shortsighted and, frankly, indefensible. As we debate this legislation, Coptic Christians are leaving Egypt in droves. As we debate this legislation, several Baha'i leaders languish unjustly in an Iranian prison, as does American citizen Saeed Abedini.

As we debate this legislation, Ahmadi Muslims, as the chairman said, in Pakistan are prohibited from voting and their graves are desecrated. As we debate this legislation, Syrian Christians fear they too will be caught in a crossfire like Iraqi Christians, or worse yet, like the Iraqi Jewish community. I am told only a single Jewish person remains in the country today where once a vibrant Jewish community flourished.

This legislation is supported by such diverse groups as faith-based organizations, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, United Methodist Church, The

Ahmadi Muslim community, Southern Baptist Convention, and Christians United for Israel, among others, as well as a multitude of diaspora organizations which are directly linked with the very people the Special Envoy would serve.

Will a Special Envoy guarantee these communities' survival—and even flourishing? I do not know. But I am certain that to do nothing is not an option—lest on this administration's and this Congress' watch we witness a Middle East emptied of ancient faith communities, foremost among them the "Sunday People."

German Lutheran Pastor Dietrich Bonhoeffer, faced with the tyranny of and horror of Nazism, famously said: "Silence in the face of evil is itself evil. Not to speak is to speak. Not to act is to act."

I want to thank the chairman again, Mr. ROYCE, and urge my colleagues to join me in sending an undeniable message to persecuted people of faith the world over—and just as importantly to the forces that oppress them—that America, this shining city on the hill as envisioned by our Founders, will not be silent in the face of evil.

Please vote "yes" on H.R. 301.

Mr. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the coauthor of this bill, the gentle lady from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. I want to begin by thanking the ranking member. I also want to thank the chairman of the committee, and most especially my colleague and friend, Congressman WOLF.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 301, a bill that will create a Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

This legislation responds, as has been said so eloquently by those that spoke before me, to the urgent needs of Christians and other religious minorities who are really under siege in the Middle East precisely because they are Christians and because they are minorities.

In light of the ongoing events in Syria, this legislation could not be more timely. I commend Representative FRANK WOLF, whom I have worked closely with as cochair of the Religious Minorities Caucus, for his partnership in this effort. Most importantly, I thank him for his conscience.

We first introduced this legislation in 2011 after Congressman WOLF chaired a hearing to review the violence and the hardship faced by Middle Eastern religious minorities. I testified that day about the plight of who I am descended from, the Assyrians—the world's oldest Christians who have fled and continue to flee Iraq.

We agreed to press forward with this legislation to create a Special Envoy

at the State Department, the ambassador level, to elevate this issue for the attention that it deserves. The United States of America needs a high-level official dedicated to religious freedom in the region and committed to addressing the concerns of minority communities.

Appropriately, H.R. 301 has attracted solid bipartisan support, with 68 cosponsors calling for the State Department to elevate religious freedom in the Middle East as a diplomatic priority of our country.

□ 1715

Just as Senator John Danforth served our Nation as Special Envoy to Sudan and Senator George Mitchell Special Envoy to Northern Ireland, religious minorities in the Middle East require and deserve a high-level authoritative voice to address their situation.

The history of violence against Christians in the Middle East must not be allowed to repeat itself, and it is. Notably, Syria's ancient Christian population, which makes up 10 percent of the country, has been forced to flee their ancestral homeland, as noted in today's New York Times in a lengthy article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlelady an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. ESHOO. Churches have been, and continue to be, attacked and sacred objects ransacked, and the very lives of those that stand against this are being threatened.

The Christians of Syria, as well as Iraq, Iran, Israel, and Egypt, are the oldest in the world. Christianity was from the beginning a Middle Eastern religion. The Assyrian Christians, the Chaldeans, actually celebrate mass in Aramaic, which is the language Jesus spoke. For more than 2,000 years, Christians have been a key part of the Middle Eastern community.

From the founding of our Nation, religious freedom has been a pillar of our democracy, and it remains one of the great hallmarks of our country.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this critical legislation to create a Special Envoy focused on the freedom and survival of these ancient faith communities, and I thank Representative WOLF most especially for his tireless advocacy.

I also thank the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops for supporting this legislation and for writing to every Member of the House urging their full support, as well as the honor roll of faith-based organizations who support the legislation.

Let us go forward and send a very clear message, not only to the other legislative body, but also to people around the world, that we remain the beacon of hope and light and that we

uphold this pillar of religious freedom, not only in our own Nation but in countries around the world where people of faith are under siege.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, let me thank the authors of this bill, Mr. WOLF and Ms. ESHOO, for your dedication, your focus, and your hard work.

It would seem that in the year of our Lord 2013 we would learn religious tolerance by now all over the world, we would have learned that it is the right thing to do to be patient with individuals who might believe different than we do, to allow them their way of life so that they can prosper and grow and pray in their own beliefs. Unfortunately, that's not true. For all of us, we should be concerned wherever religious tolerance is not adhered to.

I recall the words—and why it concerns us—Dr. King said once that “injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.” If we allow minorities who believe differently than we do anywhere to think that it is okay, and we are not going to use whatever diplomatic or other forms of relationships that we have to try to have religious freedoms, they're mistaken. We must not allow our voices to be silent, we must speak aloud in clear language, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit that Mr. MEEKS articulated there, we Americans who cherish religious liberty and all people of goodwill who value the rights of conscience cannot remain silent in the face of this rising regional intolerance. I think, as he put it, and as Mr. WOLF and Ms. ANNA ESHOO put so eloquently, I think it is time to bring about this Special Envoy to deploy in the Middle East. I thank Mr. WOLF for his leadership and certainly urge passage of H.R. 301.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 301, legislation to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia. I want to thank my colleagues Congressman WOLF and Congresswoman ESHOO for introducing this important legislation, which I am proud to cosponsor.

Ethno-religious minorities face serious threats in many countries in the Middle East, and it is critical that U.S. policy is sensitive to the needs and concerns of those endangered communities. Years of warfare, as well as specific persecution and targeting minority groups, has taken a serious toll on once-vibrant communities. While there were once over 1.5 million Christians in Iraq, today there are less than 400,000.

In October 2010, an attack on the Our Lady of Salvation Assyrian Catholic Church in Baghdad left more than 50 clergy, worshipers

and police dead. This brutal massacre, just one of many in recent years, drew international outrage and condemnation. We need a clear strategy for the protection of targeted minority communities.

My district in the Chicagoland area has a large and vibrant Assyrian population. In recent years, they have been extremely active in calling for greater attention to the ongoing persecution and targeting of their brothers and sisters in the Middle East, including a large march in Chicago in the wake of the 2010 Baghdad massacre. I am proud to work with them on this issue and to push to see H.R. 301 enacted into law.

Today's legislation will ensure that this serious issue is given the high-level attention it deserves within the State Department. A Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia will be a voice for persecuted communities, ensuring that U.S. policy is responsive to their needs. It is a critical step toward protecting these ancient and vibrant communities, and toward ensuring a peaceful and secure future for all residents of the region.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of H.R. 301, a bill to establish a Special Envoy to promote religious freedom for minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia and to applaud Representative FRANK WOLF for his leadership on this timely and important issue.

No one should be made to feel that the practice of their religion is a crime or a source of shame. When people are persecuted in the name of one religion against another, such persecution violates their inalienable right to worship as they choose and promotes political instability. Around the world, many conflicts are rooted in sectarian differences and rivalries. Today in Syria, Christians and other religious minorities are in direct peril and are the target of abuse and persecution as a result of the civil war. On April 22, 2013, Greek Orthodox Archbishop of Aleppo Bouloze Yazigi and the Syriac Archbishop of Aleppo, Yohanna Ibrahim were kidnapped by a faction of rebel extremists while carrying out humanitarian work in the area around the city. To this day they remain missing.

To the extent the United States can promote religious tolerance, we advance the cause of human rights, justice and peace around the globe. This bill creates a special envoy in order to monitor and combat acts of religious intolerance and incitement targeted against religious minorities and to work with foreign governments to address laws that are inherently discriminatory toward religious minority communities.

I encourage my colleagues to support of H.R. 301. By helping protect minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, we contribute to the safety of minorities all over the world who live in fear for their lives merely because they practice a different religion than those around them.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am an original cosponsor of this legislation and look forward to its passage by the House.

One of the most important services our State Department Special Envoys perform is

to help highlight the concern of the American people for specific, often troubling, developments beyond our shores. Such is the case and the need where issues of the persecution of religious minorities are concerned.

During my tenure in Congress, I have heard from many of my constituents on the scope and brutality of state-sponsored or state-sanctioned persecution of religious minorities. Whether it has been Coptic Christians in Egypt, Baha'i in Iran, Falun Gong in China, or Muslims in Burma, the story is always the same: a violent element of the majority religion—or in China and Iran, the state itself—commits the most horrific acts of violence against religious minorities in their midst, including the destruction of the sacred places of those religious minorities. Our government must do more to help combat this insidious evil, and one mechanism for doing so is creating and properly funding this position.

As a nation founded by religious minorities seeking a safe haven in a new land, we have both a history and an obligation to do all in our power to protect the rights and the lives of religious minorities around the world. Creating the position of Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia is one important step in making good on that commitment. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 301, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES REVITALIZATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2013

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 793) to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 793

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Organization of American States Revitalization and Reform Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Charter of the Organization of American States recognizes that—

(A) representative democracy is indispensable for the stability, peace, and development of the Western Hemisphere; and

(B) a purpose of the Organization of American States is to promote and consolidate representative democracy, with due respect for the principle of nonintervention.

(2) The United States supports the purposes and principles enshrined in—

(A) the Charter of the Organization of American States;

(B) the Inter-American Democratic Charter; and

(C) the American Declaration on the Rights and Duties of Man.

(3) The United States supports the Organization of American States in its efforts with all member states to meet our commitments under the instruments set forth in paragraph (2).

(4) Congress supports the Organization of American States as it operates in a manner consistent with the Inter-American Democratic Charter.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to promote democracy and the rule of law throughout the Western Hemisphere;

(2) to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms in the Western Hemisphere; and

(3) to support the practices, purposes, and principles expressed in the Charter of the Organization of American States, the American Declaration on the Rights and Duties of Man, the Inter-American Democratic Charter, and other fundamental instruments of democracy.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Organization of American States (OAS) should be the primary multi-lateral diplomatic entity for regional dispute resolution and promotion of democratic governance and institutions;

(2) the OAS is a valuable platform from which to launch initiatives aimed to benefit the countries of the Western Hemisphere;

(3) the Summit of the Americas institution and process embodies a valuable complement to regional dialogue and cooperation;

(4) the Summit of the Americas process should be formally and more effectively integrated into the work of the OAS, the Inter-American Development Bank, and other Members of the Joint Summit Working Group, and the OAS should play a central role in overseeing and managing the Summit process;

(5) the OAS General Assembly and the Summit of the Americas events should be combined geographically and chronologically in the years in which they coincide;

(6) the OAS has historically accepted too many mandates from its member states, resulting in both lack of clarity on priorities and loss of institutional focus, which in turn has reduced the effectiveness of the organization;

(7) to ensure an appropriate balance of priorities, the OAS should review its core functions no less than annually and seek opportunities to reduce the number of mandates not directly related to its core functions;

(8) key OAS strengths lie in strengthening peace and security, promoting and consolidating representative democracy, regional dispute resolution, election assistance and monitoring, fostering economic growth and development cooperation, facilitating trade, combating illicit drug trafficking and transnational crime, and support for the Inter-American Human Rights System;

(9) the core competencies referred to in paragraph (8) should remain central to the strategic planning process of the OAS and the consideration of future mandates;

(10) any new OAS mandates should be accepted by the member states only after an analysis is conducted and formally presented consisting of a calculation of the financial costs associated with the mandate, an assessment of the comparative advantage of the OAS in the implementation of the mandate, and a description of the ways in which the mandate advances the organization's core mission;

(11) any new mandates should include, in addition to the analysis described in paragraph (10), an identification of the source of funding to be used to implement the mandate;

(12) the OAS would benefit from enhanced coordination between the OAS and the Inter-American Development Bank on issues that relate to economic development;

(13) the OAS would benefit from standard reporting requirements for each project and grant agreement;

(14) the OAS would benefit from effective implementation of—

(A) transparent and merit-based human resource standards and processes; and

(B) transparent hiring, firing, and promotion standards and processes, including with respect to factors such as gender and national origin; and

(15) it is in the interest of the United States, OAS member states, and a modernized OAS to move toward an assessed fee structure that assures the financial sustainability of the organization and establishes, not later than five years after the date of the enactment of this Act, that no member state pays more than 50 percent of the organization's assessed fees.

SEC. 5. ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES REVITALIZATION AND REFORM STRATEGY.

(a) STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a multiyear strategy that—

(A) identifies a path toward the adoption of necessary reforms that prioritize and reinforce the OAS's core competencies described in section 4(8);

(B) outlines an approach to secure from the OAS effective adoption of—

(i) a results-based budgeting process in order to strategically prioritize, and where appropriate, reduce current and future mandates; and

(ii) transparent hiring, firing, and promotion practices;

(C) reflects the inputs and coordination from other Executive Branch agencies, as appropriate; and

(D) identifies a path toward the adoption of necessary reforms that would—

(i) lead to an assessed fee structure in which no member state would pay more than 50 percent of the OAS's assessed yearly fees; and

(ii) seek to minimize the negative financial impact on the OAS and its operations.

(2) POLICY PRIORITIES AND COORDINATION.—The Secretary of State shall—

(A) carry out diplomatic engagement to build support for reforms and budgetary burden sharing among OAS member states and observers; and

(B) promote donor coordination among OAS member states.

(b) BRIEFINGS.—The Secretary of State shall offer to the committees referred to in subsection (a)(1) a quarterly briefing that—

(1) reviews assessed and voluntary contributions;

(2) analyzes the progress made by the OAS to adopt and effectively implement a results-based budgeting process in order to strategically prioritize, and where appropriate, reduce current and future mandates;

(3) analyzes the progress made by the OAS to adopt and effectively implement transparent and merit-based human resource standards and practices and transparent hiring, firing, and promotion standards and processes, including with respect to factors such as gender and national origin;

(4) analyzes the progress made by the OAS to adopt and effectively implement a practice of soliciting member quotas to be paid on a schedule that will improve the consistency of its operating budget; and

(5) analyzes the progress made by the OAS to review, streamline, and prioritize mandates to focus on core missions and make efficient and effective use of available funding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield myself such time as I may consume to explain that this legislation would require the Secretary of State to develop a multiyear strategy to bolster the Organization of American States, OAS as we know it, and improve the performance and the process for managing the budget and the personnel at the OAS.

When it was founded in 1948, it was the sole multilateral body in the Western Hemisphere. As the premier hemispheric organization, the OAS' key institutional documents—its charter, the American Declaration of Rights, the Inter-American Democratic Charter—enshrine values that are the foundation for political systems in the Americas.

Since its founding, the OAS has accepted too many mandates from its member states, resulting in a loss of international focus, and in turn has reduced, frankly, the organization's effectiveness. This bill seeks to push the OAS to refocus on those two core principles of promoting democratic governance and institutions and resolving regional disputes.

This push comes as other regional bodies are competing with the OAS for regional influence. There is the Central American System of Integration, the Union of South American Nations, and the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, which includes Cuba

but excludes both the United States and Canada.

Many of these political bodies do not represent our values. Most exclude the U.S. Many are used by governments in the region to undermine the U.S., thus undermining U.S. diplomacy in the hemisphere.

In order to maintain the OAS as an influential, positive force and to defend U.S. engagement, it is important that the U.S. spearhead an effort to reform the OAS and address its many administrative challenges.

This bill calls on the administration to develop a strategy that helps the OAS focus on its core mission, shed nonessential programs, install a results-based budgeting process, and adopt transparent, competitive personnel practices.

Additionally, this bill was strengthened in committee to recognize that it is not politically or financially viable for any OAS member state, including the United States, to pay more than 50 percent of the institution's assessed fees.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of S. 793, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, the OAS remains the premier regional forum for the countries of the Americas to conduct multilateral business, an important aspect of U.S. relations with its neighbors.

The bill before us today seeks to support the organization, particularly with respect to democracy promotion and the protection of human rights.

The version we are poised to pass today in the House adds an important provision to the bipartisan Senate bill introduced by the Senator from New Jersey, BOB MENENDEZ, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

This new provision requires the State Department to examine ways to ensure that in the future no OAS member state pays more than 50 percent of the regular budget.

Currently, based on a legacy fee structure from a different era, the U.S. does pay more than 50 percent, with a series of distorting results.

A modernized OAS would benefit from a more egalitarian fee structure. The new provision asks State to lay out a roadmap to achieve such a fee structure, and hopefully opens up the conversation with our fellow member states in the OAS in the spirit of consensus and partnership.

I would like to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for working, truly, again, as we have done and seen time and time again on the Foreign Affairs Committee, really working in a bipartisan manner on this bill. We know sometimes it is not easy, but they have managed to do it. I thank them for that.

I urge my colleagues to support it, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I would like to thank Mr. MEEKS.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and that she be able to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank our esteemed chairman for this privilege to speak about an important bill before us.

I would like to commend Senator BOB MENENDEZ, my dear friend from New Jersey, for introducing this pivotal bill, an important bipartisan bill, to bring desperately needed reforms to this failed Organization of American States.

I remain deeply disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the OAS continues to fail to live up to the principles of the Inter-American Democratic Charter. The OAS should be, but is not, an important regional body that stands up for democratic principles, that promotes the rule of law and condemns human rights violations.

However, the OAS has strayed. This bill is a positive step forward to bring it back onto the right path.

Throughout the region, Mr. Speaker, we have seen ALBA nations continue to ignore their own constitution and deprive their people of the most basic human rights.

Has the OAS spoken out against the illegitimate elections in Venezuela? How about the illegitimate elections in Nicaragua? Or what about the continued human rights abuses against the people of Cuba?

Just this past Sunday, Mr. Speaker, more than 30 pro-democracy advocates who were peacefully gathering in Cuba were detained and beaten by agents of the regime—for doing nothing. But the OAS remains silent on all of these important topics, and in doing so it fails to hold accountable the authoritarian regimes that oppress millions in our own hemisphere.

□ 1730

That is why real and concrete reforms are needed at the OAS. I fully support this legislation because it strengthens our mission at the OAS, and it ensures that U.S. taxpayer dollars are used well and no longer go to waste as they are at the OAS right now.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. I have no further requests for time and am ready to close, and so I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just state again about the hard work of Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL and their working in a bipartisan manner to get this bill done. It's difficult at times when you have different views on different issues; but I think that, when you have individuals working together across the aisle who are trying to come up with the appropriate compromise for an organization that is needed to have the strength to protect human rights and to make sure there is democracy, working together to get them on the right track, as Mr. ROYCE has indicated, is important. To also have the other body, the Senate, working with us so it's bicameral is a tremendous effort, I think, on both sides in trying to make sure that we have an organization in our hemisphere that is doing the right thing, and we've got to do it on a continuous basis, being sturdy, being forceful but also being bipartisan.

Let me just finally say that the manner in which this bill has come together is the manner in which I wish many bills could come together on this floor and in working with the other body.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank our esteemed chairman, Mr. ED ROYCE of California, and our committee's ranking member, Mr. ELIOT ENGEL of New York, for their work on this bipartisan-bicameral effort to take one step—just the first step—at deep OAS reform.

I want to thank Senator BOB MENENDEZ, the author of the bill, who has been a longtime supporter and a leader in favor of human rights, the rule of law and democracy, especially in our hemisphere. All of us and our committee look forward to working with Senator MENENDEZ and with all of our Members and the other body, as well, as we move forward to enact this bill and make sure that we have true, meaningful reforms and that we endeavor to get the OAS, once again, focused back on their core mission, which should be and remains promoting democracy and human rights in the Americas, a mission from which it has strayed far too often, including up to today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 793, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

E. CLAY SHAW, JR. MISSING CHILDREN'S ASSISTANCE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3092) to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3092

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "E. Clay Shaw, Jr. Missing Children's Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 402 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (9) as paragraphs (4) through (10), respectively, and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) many missing children are run-aways;"

(b) DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF ADMINISTRATOR.—Section 404 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking "Representatives, and" and inserting "Representatives, the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives,"; and

(ii) by inserting ", and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate" after "Senate";

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as (5) and (6), respectively, and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) coordinate with the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness to ensure that homeless services professionals are aware of educational resources and assistance provided by the Center regarding child sexual exploitation;"

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by striking "and" after "governments,"; and

(II) by inserting "State and local educational agencies," after "agencies,"

(ii) in subparagraph (R) by striking "and" at the end,

(iii) in subparagraph (S) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon, and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

"(T) provide technical assistance and training to State and local law enforcement agencies and statewide clearinghouses to coordinate with State and local educational agencies in identifying and recovering missing children;

"(U) assist the efforts of law enforcement agencies in coordinating with child welfare

agencies to respond to foster children missing from the State welfare system; and

"(V) provide technical assistance to law enforcement agencies and first responders in identifying, locating, and recovering victims of, and children at risk for, child sex trafficking,"; and

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) LIMITATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds may be used to pay the compensation of an individual employed by the Center if such compensation, as determined at the beginning of each grant year, exceeds 110 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the Federal Government's Senior Executive Service (SES) for that year. The Center may compensate an employee at a higher rate provided the amount in excess of this limitation is paid with non-Federal funds.

"(B) DEFINITION OF COMPENSATION.—For the purpose of this paragraph, the term 'compensation'—

"(i) includes salary, bonuses, periodic payments, severance pay, the value of a compensatory or paid leave benefit not excluded by clause (ii), and the fair market value of any employee perquisite or benefit not excluded by clause (ii); and

"(ii) excludes any Center expenditure for health, medical, or life insurance, or disability or retirement pay, including pensions benefits,"

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) by striking "periodically" and inserting "triennially"; and

(B) by striking "kidnapings" and inserting "kidnappings"; and

(4) in subsection (c)(2) by inserting ", in compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (20 U.S.C. 1232g)" after "birth certificates".

(c) GRANTS.—Section 405(a) of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5775(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting "schools, school leaders, teachers, State and local educational agencies, homeless shelters and service providers," after "children,"; and

(2) in paragraph (3) by inserting "and schools" after "communities".

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 407 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5777) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "such" and all that follows through the period at the end, and inserting "\$40,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2018, up to \$32,200,000 of which shall be used to carry out section 404(b) for each such fiscal year."; and

(2) by striking "SEC. 407" and inserting "SEC. 408".

SEC. 4. OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

The Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 406 the following:

"SEC. 407. OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

"All grants awarded by the Department of Justice that are authorized under this title shall be subject to the following:

"(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—For 2 of the fiscal years in the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of the recipient of grants under this title to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse by the grantee.

"(2) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—If the recipient of grant funds under this title is found to have an unresolved audit finding, then that entity shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this title during the 2 fiscal

years beginning after the 12-month period described in paragraph (4).

“(3) REPAYMENT OF GRANT FUNDS.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this title during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall—

“(A) deposit an amount equal to the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

“(B) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

“(4) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term ‘unresolved audit finding’ means an audit report finding in the final report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within a 12-month period beginning on the date when the final audit report is issued.

“(5) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section and the grant programs described in this title, the term ‘nonprofit’, relating to an entity, means the entity is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General shall not award a grant under any grant program described in this title to a nonprofit organization that holds money in off-shore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under this title and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations under section 53.4958-6 of title 26 of the Code of Federal Regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness of the compensation for its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information available for public inspection.

“(6) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

“(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated under this title may be used to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 unless the Deputy Attorney General or the appropriate Assistant Attorney General, Director, or principal deputy director as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a conference.

“(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audio/visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any entertainment.

“(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved by operation of this paragraph.

“(7) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this title may not be utilized by any grant recipient to—

“(i) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of any grant funding; or

“(ii) lobby any representative of a Federal, state, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

“(B) PENALTY.—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a grant under this title has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall—

“(i) require the grant recipient to repay the grant in full; and

“(ii) prohibit the grant recipient from receiving another grant under this title for not less than 5 years.

“(C) CLARIFICATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, submitting an application for a grant under this title shall not be considered lobbying activity in violation of subparagraph (A).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3092.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3092, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a father of three children, I can't imagine the horror if one of my children were missing or were in harm's way. Just like any other parent, the thought is unthinkable and is one that I am thankful to have never experienced.

My first exposure to the issues facing at-risk populations, such as those served by programs authorized by the underlying law, was as a cadet at West Point, which is just north of New York City. There was a shelter in New York City for runaway children. It was heartbreaking to hear the stories of these children, many of whom were abused or neglected and had no homes to return to. Oftentimes children who have run away from their homes are the most in danger of being killed or exploited. Approximately 80 percent of children reported missing are, in fact, categorized as “endangered runaways.” These vulnerable kids deserve help.

My bill, H.R. 3092, will reauthorize the Missing Children's Assistance Act at current funding levels. Reauthorizing this critical law will ensure that the coordination of State and local law enforcement efforts to identify, locate, and recover missing, abducted, and sexually exploited children continues. We cannot afford to wait.

The world around us, while often kind and beautiful, can also be cruel and ugly; but it is through the work of groups like the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children that resources are available to assist those in dire need. Chances are that you've seen a hotline come across your TV screen that is looking to collect information about a missing child but you've never thought about the infrastructure behind these efforts. This legislation seeks to reauthorize these critical programs and ensure no gap in access for the children, families, and communities in need.

Since its founding in 1984, the center, while partnered with local law enforcement, has helped recover more than 188,000 missing children across the United States. April 9, 2014, marks the 30th anniversary of the Justice Department's awarding the first national clearinghouse grant to the center. Just 2 months after its creation, in June of 1984, President Reagan celebrated the official opening of the center at a White House ceremony, praising this model of public-private partnership, which has fulfilled his vision for three decades.

I applaud the efforts of Chairman KLINE, Representative WALBERG, and my fellow committee members for understanding the importance of this legislation and in helping to move it forward. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3092 so we can continue to support these vital programs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3092, the Missing Children's Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2013. This bill will be named after former Congressman E. Clay Shaw, from my State of Florida, who was a defender of children's rights and who recently passed away.

Since its inception in 1984, the Missing Children's Assistance Act has helped identify and recover millions of missing and exploited children across our Nation. Now that it is due to expire at the end of this month, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reauthorize this critical legislation that protects society's most vulnerable citizens—our precious children. We have made progress. We now have the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and the AMBER Alert, but we still have so much work to do. There are still too many tragic cases of children being abducted, raped, sexually abused, and murdered.

As a parent, a grandparent, an elementary schoolteacher, and a school principal, I was deeply shaken when a beautiful 4-year-old girl, who was in the custody of the foster care system, went missing in my own community. She was missing for 2 years before anyone even knew it. She has never been

found. Rilya Wilson's disappearance exposed many of the shortcomings of the Department of Children and Families in my home State of Florida. One of the most troubling aspects of Rilya's case was the fact that Rilya had been withdrawn from preschool. No one gave the foster parent permission to withdraw her.

If she were still in school, there would have been so many eyes watching—teachers, parents, and her peers. If she were still in school, somebody would have known that she was missing. If this bill were in place, Rilya would have been saved by sensible procedures. H.R. 3092 adds commonsense coordination and oversight provisions that will facilitate the protection of foster youth like Rilya.

First, the bill updates the law that provides Federal support for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. The center, which heads national efforts to locate and return missing children to their families, helps to stop the kidnapping and sexual exploitation of young people nationwide. They staff 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week call lines to both recover missing children and report child exploitation.

Since its inception in 1984, the center has received 200,062 calls for missing children, or an average of 548 calls per day; and it has responded to over 3.7 million calls overall. Thanks to the center's call hotline, the vast majority of missing children has been recovered quickly.

Second, and specific to Rilya's case, H.R. 3092 requires the national center to help law enforcement work with child welfare agencies to respond to missing foster children. Foster children continue to go missing at much higher rates than their peers, and their disappearances tend to go unreported for much longer periods of time.

Under H.R. 3092, law enforcement agencies must notify the national center of each report received relating to missing children from foster care. This reauthorization also requires that Federal resources support the training and technical assistance of law enforcement to work effectively with public schools in order to identify and recover missing children. It assists law enforcement in preventing and recovering missing children with disabilities.

H.R. 3092 improves the current efforts of the center to identify, locate, and recover victims of child sex trafficking. It also directs the center to raise awareness about prevention and educational services for programs that support homeless youths who are at significant and increasing risk of sexual exploitation.

I am delighted to see Democrats and Republicans come together in order to stand up strong for missing and exploited children. I would like to thank Chairman KLINE and his staff for their efforts in working with Ranking Mem-

ber MILLER and his staff. I would like to thank the nonprofit advocates and the bipartisan Senate staff for developing this legislation to reauthorize the Missing Children's Assistance Act.

□ 1745

For me, this is personal. It is about a little girl named Rilya Wilson, a foster child born to a drug addicted mother. It's about Rilya's legacy and the legacy of so many foster children who suffer. For all of us, this should be a simple and sensible way to honor our children and protect society's most vulnerable citizens. This is a great day in the House of Representatives.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the strong words of support from my friend from Florida.

I now yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), my friend.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding the time and for introducing this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support today of H.R. 3092, the E. Clay Shaw, Jr. Missing Children's Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2013.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3092 will help prevent the abduction and sexual exploitation of children. Since 1984, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children has worked with the Department of Justice to build a coordinated national system to aid the recovery of missing children, protect children from sexual exploitation, and promote child safety and crime prevention. Over the last three decades, the center has assisted law enforcement in finding thousands of missing children, and its success rate has grown from 62 percent in 1990 to 97 percent today; and through its CyberTipline, the center has received and referred for investigation more than 2 million reports of crimes against children.

This bill will ensure the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children can continue its work on behalf of our most vulnerable citizens while also taking steps to protect taxpayers through enhanced accountability and oversight. Additionally, the legislation supports greater coordination between law enforcement and States, districts, and schools in the race to recover missing children. Furthermore, the E. Clay Shaw, Jr. Missing Children's Assistance Reauthorization Act includes language from a bill authored by my colleague from Michigan, Mr. TIM WALBERG, that will strengthen the center's work with law enforcement to rescue victims of sex trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It helps to protect and defend America's children and their families. I applaud and thank Mr. GUTHRIE for his work on this legislation, and I strongly urge my colleagues to lend their support.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, as my friend from Florida said, we were able to work together—House and Senate, Republicans and Democrats—for a very important issue. And I want to thank my colleagues who were here speaking to the importance of H.R. 3092, the E. Clay Shaw, Jr. Missing Children's Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2013.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children has assisted law enforcement in the recovery of more than 188,389 missing children since it was founded in 1984. As of June 2013, the center's toll-free, 24-hour call center received more than 3.8 million calls. Reauthorizing this law will ensure that the critical coordination of State and local enforcement efforts by the center on behalf of missing, abducted, and sexually exploited children continues.

I'm honored to take the lead on this important legislation and urge my colleagues to support this bill so we can continue these vital programs.

Again, I thank both sides for working together, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3092, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-62)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)) (the "Social Security Act"), I transmit herewith an Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Slovak Republic (the "United States-Slovak Republic Totalization Agreement"). The Agreement consists of two separate instruments: a principal agreement and an administrative arrangement. The Agreement

was signed in Bratislava on December 10, 2012.

The United States-Slovak Republic Totalization Agreement is similar in objective to the social security totalization agreements already in force with most European Union countries, Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, and the Republic of Korea. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation and to help prevent the lost benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries. The United States-Slovak Republic Totalization Agreement contains all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and other provisions that I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233, pursuant to section 233(c)(4) of the Social Security Act.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report prepared by the Social Security Administration explaining the key points of the United States-Slovak Republic Totalization Agreement, along with a paragraph-by-paragraph explanation of the provisions of the principal agreement and administrative arrangement. Annexed to this report is another report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the effect of the United States-Slovak Republic Totalization Agreement on income and expenditures of the U.S. Social Security program and the number of individuals affected by the United States-Slovak Republic Totalization Agreement.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 17, 2013.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHAFFETZ) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 761, NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-214) on the resolution (H. Res. 347) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to

require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3092, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2449, by the yeas and nays;

S. 793, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

E. CLAY SHAW, JR. MISSING CHILDREN'S ASSISTANCE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3092) to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 2, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 460]

YEAS—407

Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bentivoglio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Ciilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble

Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent

DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating

Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen

Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rohy
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao

Van Hollen	Wasserman	Wilson (SC)	Bridenstine	Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Rokita	Shimkus	Veasey
Vargas	Schultz	Wittman	Brooks (AL)	Fudge	Luetkemeyer	Rooney	Simpson	Visclosky
Veasey	Watt	Wolf	Brooks (IN)	Gabbard	Lujan Grisham	Ros-Lehtinen	Sinema	Wagner
Vela	Waxman		Broun (GA)	Gallego	(NM)	Roskam	Slaughter	Walberg
Velázquez	Weber (TX)	Woodall	Brown (FL)	Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray	Ross	Smith (MO)	Walden
Visclosky	Webster (FL)	Yarmuth	Brownley (CA)	Garcia	(NM)	Rothfus	Smith (NE)	Walorski
Wagner	Welch	Yoder	Buchanan	Gardner	Lummis	Roybal-Allard	Smith (NJ)	Walz
Walberg	Wenstrup		Bucshon	Garrett	Lynch	Royce	Smith (TX)	Wasserman
Walden	Westmoreland	Yoho	Burgess	Gibbs	Maffei	Ruiz	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Walorski	Whitfield	Young (AK)	Bustos	Gibson	Maloney,	Runyan	Southerland	Waters
Walz	Williams	Young (FL)	Butterfield	Gingrey (GA)	Carolyn	Ruppersberger	Speier	Watt
	Wilson (FL)	Young (IN)	Calvert	Gohmert	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)	Stewart	Waxman
			Camp	Goodlatte	Marchant	Ryan (WI)	Stivers	Weber (TX)
			Campbell	Gosar	Marino	Salmon	Stockman	Webster (FL)
			Cantor	Govdy	Massie	Sanchez, Loretta	Stutzman	Welch
			Capito	Granger	Matheson	Sanford	Swalwell (CA)	Wenstrup
			Capps	Graves (GA)	Matsui	Sarbanes	Takano	Westmoreland
			Capuano	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (CA)	Scalise	Terry	Whitfield
			Cardenas	Grayson	McCaul	Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Williams
			Carney	Green, Al	McClintock	Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)
			Carson (IN)	Green, Gene	McCollum	Schneider	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
			Carter	Griffin (AR)	McDermott	Schock	Thornberry	Wittman
			Cartwright	Griffith (VA)	McGovern	Schrader	Tiberi	Wolf
			Cassidy	Grimm	McHenry	Schweikert	Tierney	Womack
			Castor (FL)	Guthrie	McIntyre	Scott (VA)	Tipton	Woodall
			Castro (TX)	Hahn	McKeon	Scott, Austin	Titus	Yoder
			Chabot	Hall	McKinley	Scott, David	Tonko	Yoho
			Chaffetz	Hanabusa	McMorris	Sensenbrenner	Turner	Young (AK)
			Chu	Hanna	Rodgers	Serrano	Upton	Young (FL)
			Ciilline	Harper	McNerney	Sessions	Valadao	Young (IN)
			Clarke	Hartzler	Meadows	Sewell (AL)	Van Hollen	
			Clay	Hastings (FL)	Meehan	Shea-Porter	Vargas	
			Cleaver	Hastings (WA)	Meeks			
			Clyburn	Heck (NV)	Meng			
			Coble	Heck (WA)	Messer			
			Coffman	Hensarling	Mica			
			Cole	Himes	Michaud			
			Collins (GA)	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)			
			Collins (NY)	Holding	Miller (MI)			
			Conaway	Holt	Miller, George			
			Connolly	Honda	Moore			
			Conyers	Horsford	Moran			
			Cook	Hoyer	Mullin			
			Cooper	Hudson	Mulvaney			
			Costa	Huelskamp	Murphy (FL)			
			Cotton	Huffman	Murphy (PA)			
			Courtney	Huizenga (MI)	Nadler			
			Cramer	Hultgren	Napolitano			
			Crawford	Hunter	Neal			
			Crenshaw	Hurt	Negrete McLeod			
			Crowley	Israel	Neugebauer			
			Cuellar	Issa	Noem			
			Culberson	Jackson Lee	Nolan			
			Cummings	Jeffries	Nugent			
			Daines	Jenkins	Nunes			
			Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Nunnelee			
			Davis, Danny	Johnson (OH)	O'Rourke			
			Davis, Rodney	Johnson, E. B.	Olson			
			DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Owens			
			DeGette	Jones	Palazzo			
			Delaney	Jordan	Pallone			
			DeLauro	Joyce	Pascarella			
			DeBene	Kaptur	Pastor (AZ)			
			Denham	Keating	Paulsen			
			Dent	Kelly (IL)	Payne			
			DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Pearce			
			DesJarlais	Kennedy	Pelosi			
			Deutch	Kildee	Perlmutter			
			Dingell	Kilmer	Perry			
			Doggett	Kind	Peters (CA)			
			Doyle	King (IA)	Peters (MI)			
			Duckworth	King (NY)	Peterson			
			Duffy	Kingston	Petri			
			Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger (IL)	Pingree (ME)			
			Duncan (TN)	Kirkpatrick	Pittenger			
			Edwards	Kline	Pitts			
			Ellison	Kuster	Pocan			
			Ellmers	Labrador	Poe (TX)			
			Engel	LaMalfa	Pompeo			
			Enyart	Lamborn	Posey			
			Eshoo	Lance	Price (NC)			
			Esty	Langevin	Quigley			
			Farenthold	Lankford	Radel			
			Farr	Larsen (WA)	Rangel			
			Fattah	Larson (CT)	Reed			
			Fincher	Latham	Reichert			
			Fitzpatrick	Latta	Renacci			
			Fleischmann	Levin	Ribble			
			Fleming	Lewis	Rice (SC)			
			Flores	Lipinski	Richmond			
			Forbes	LoBiondo	Rigell			
			Fortenberry	Loeb sack	Roby			
			Foster	Loftgren	Roe (TN)			
			Fox	Long	Rogers (AL)			
			Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal	Rogers (KY)			
			Franks (AZ)	Lowey	Rogers (MI)			

NAYS—2

Amash Broun (GA)

NOT VOTING—23

Aderholt	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Capito	Higgins	Sánchez, Linda
Cassidy	Lee (CA)	T.
Daines	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Diaz-Balart	Miller, Gary	Sherman
Gerlach	Polis	Sires
Grijalva	Rahall	Tsongas
Gutiérrez	Rohrabacher	Waters

Messrs. HARRIS, KENNEDY, and Ms. HAHN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

□ 1856

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 460, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

AUTHORITY TO EXTEND THE UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2449) to authorize the President to extend the term of the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Civil Uses of Nuclear Energy for a period not to exceed March 19, 2016, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 0, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 461]

YEAS—407

Aderholt	Barrow (GA)	Bishop (NY)
Alexander	Barton	Bishop (UT)
Amash	Bass	Black
Amodei	Beatty	Blackburn
Andrews	Becerra	Blumenauer
Bachmann	Benish	Bonamici
Bachus	Bentivolio	Boustany
Barber	Bera (CA)	Brady (PA)
Barletta	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Barr	Bishop (GA)	Braley (IA)

NOT VOTING—25

Cohen	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Diaz-Balart	Miller, Gary	Sherman
Gerlach	Polis	Shuster
Grijalva	Price (GA)	Sires
Gutiérrez	Rahall	Tsongas
Harris	Rohrabacher	Vela
Herrera Beutler	Rush	Velázquez
Higgins	Sánchez, Linda	Yarmuth
Lee (CA)	T.	

□ 1902

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN TRIBUTE TO THE 12 NAVY YARD SHOOTING VICTIMS

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank four former officers of the United States Navy—Representatives MURPHY, BROUN, BRIDENSTINE, and DESANTIS—for joining me as I rise in tribute to 12 Americans, almost all Federal employees, who lost their lives in the service of the United States yesterday in a mass shooting at the Navy Yard. They were civilian employees doing work for the Naval Sea Systems Command. Unlike the blue collar workers of the old Navy Yard, Naval Sea Systems Command employees are skilled white collar workers, highly trained to offer technical support for building, buying, and manufacturing the Navy's ships and combat systems.

The Navy Yard was renovated with historic deference to the old manufacturing workplace, and the Naval Sea Systems Command jump-started the development of the neighborhood that received them. The Naval Sea Systems

Command became a good neighbor, though we knew little of the work done in that secure facility. We did know this: these Federal employees deserved our respect and our admiration because they and their work were vital to our Nation.

We ask the House to join us for a moment of silence for these 12 who gave all they had for their country:

Michael Arnold, Martin Bodrog, Arthur Daniels, Sylvia Frasier, Kathleen Gaarde, John Roger Johnson, Mary Francis Knight, Frank Kohler, Vishnu Pandit, Kenneth Bernard Proctor, Gerald L. Read, and Richard Michael Ridgell.

The SPEAKER. The House will observe a moment of silence.

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES REVITALIZATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 793) to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 24, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 462]

YEAS—383

Aderholt	Burgess	Cook
Alexander	Bustos	Cooper
Amodei	Butterfield	Costa
Andrews	Calvert	Cotton
Bachmann	Camp	Courtney
Bachus	Campbell	Cramer
Barber	Cantor	Crawford
Barletta	Capito	Crenshaw
Barr	Capps	Crowley
Barrow (GA)	Capuano	Cuellar
Barton	Cárdenas	Culberson
Beatty	Carney	Cummings
Becerra	Carson (IN)	Daines
Benishek	Carter	Davis (CA)
Bentivolio	Cartwright	Davis, Danny
Bera (CA)	Cassidy	Davis, Rodney
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	DeGette
Bishop (NY)	Chabot	Delaney
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	DeLauro
Black	Chu	DeBene
Blackburn	Cicilline	Denham
Blumenauer	Clarke	Dent
Bonamici	Clay	DeSantis
Boustany	Cleaver	DesJarlais
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Deutch
Brady (TX)	Coble	Dingell
Braley (IA)	Coffman	Doggett
Bridenstine	Cohen	Doyle
Brooks (AL)	Cole	Duckworth
Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)	Duffy
Brown (FL)	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Brownley (CA)	Conaway	Edwards
Buchanan	Connolly	Ellison
Bucshon	Conyers	Ellmers

Engel	Lipinski	Rogers (KY)
Eshoo	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)
Esty	Loebback	Rokita
Farenthold	Lofgren	Rooney
Farr	Long	Ros-Lehtinen
Fattah	Lowenthal	Roskam
Fitzpatrick	Lowe	Ross
Fleischmann	Lucas	Rothfus
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Roybal-Allard
Forbes	Lujan Grisham	Royce
Fortenberry	(NM)	Ruiz
Foster	Luján, Ben Ray	Runyan
Fox	(NM)	Ruppersberger
Fox	Lummis	Ryan (OH)
Frankel (FL)	Lynch	Ryan (WI)
Franks (AZ)	Maffei	Sanchez, Loretta
Frelinghuysen	Maloney,	Sarbanes
Gabbard	Carolyn	Schiff
Gallego	Maloney, Sean	Schneider
Garamendi	Marchant	Schock
Garcia	Marino	Schrader
Gardner	Matheson	Schweikert
Garrett	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Gibbs	McCarthy (CA)	Scott, Austin
Gibson	McCaul	Scott, David
Gingrey (GA)	McClintock	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	McCollum	Serrano
Gosar	McDermott	Sessions
Gowdy	McGovern	Sewell (AL)
Granger	McHenry	Shea-Porter
Graves (MO)	McIntyre	Shimkus
Grayson	McKeon	Shuster
Green, Al	McKinley	Simpson
Green, Gene	McMorris	Sinema
Griffin (AR)	Rodgers	Slaughter
Griffith (VA)	McNerney	Smith (MO)
Grimm	Meadows	Smith (NE)
Guthrie	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Hahn	Meeks	Smith (TX)
Hall	Meng	Smith (WA)
Hanabusa	Messer	Southerland
Hanna	Mica	Speier
Harper	Michaud	Stewart
Harris	Miller (FL)	Stivers
Hartzler	Miller (MI)	Stutzman
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Swalwell (CA)
Hastings (WA)	Moore	Takano
Heck (NV)	Moran	Terry
Heck (WA)	Mullin	Thompson (CA)
Hensarling	Mulvaney	Thompson (MS)
Himes	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Hinojosa	Murphy (PA)	Thornberry
Holding	Nadler	Tiberi
Holt	Napolitano	Tierney
Honda	Neal	Tipton
Horsford	Negrete McLeod	Titus
Hoyer	Neugebauer	Tonko
Huffman	Noem	Turner
Huizenga (MI)	Nugent	Upton
Hultgren	Nunes	Valadao
Hunter	Nunnelee	Van Hollen
Hurt	O'Rourke	Vargas
Israel	Olson	Veasey
Issa	Owens	Vela
Jackson Lee	Palazzo	Velázquez
Jeffries	Pallone	Visclosky
Jenkins	Pascrell	Wagner
Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	Walberg
Johnson (OH)	Paulsen	Walden
Johnson, E. B.	Payne	Walorski
Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Walz
Jordan	Pelosi	Wasserman
Joyce	Perlmutter	Schultz
Kaptur	Peters (CA)	Waters
Keating	Peters (MI)	Watt
Kelly (IL)	Peterson	Waxman
Kelly (CA)	Petri	Webster (FL)
Kennedy	Pingree (ME)	Welch
Kildee	Pittenger	Wenstrup
Kilmer	Pitts	Whitfield
Kind	Pocan	Williams
King (IA)	Pompeo	Wilson (FL)
King (NY)	Posey	Wilson (SC)
Kinzinger (IL)	Price (NC)	Wittman
Kirkpatrick	Quigley	Wolf
Kline	Radel	Womack
Kuster	Rangel	Woodall
LaMalfa	Reed	Yarmuth
Lance	Reichert	Yoder
Langevin	Renacci	Yoho
Lankford	Richmond	Young (AK)
Larsen (WA)	Rigell	Young (FL)
Latham	Roby	Young (IN)
Latta	Roe (TN)	
Levin	Rogers (AL)	
Lewis		

NAYS—24

Amash	Huelskamp	Ribble
Broun (GA)	Jones	Rice (SC)
Duncan (SC)	Kingston	Salmon
Fincher	Labrador	Sanford
Fleming	Lamborn	Scalise
Gohmert	Massie	Stockman
Graves (GA)	Perry	Weber (TX)
Hudson	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—25

Bass	Larson (CT)	Rush
Diaz-Balart	Lee (CA)	Sánchez, Linda
Enyart	McCarthy (NY)	T.
Fudge	Miller, Gary	Schakowsky
Gerlach	Nolan	Schwartz
Grijalva	Polis	Sherman
Gutiérrez	Price (GA)	Sires
Herrera Beutler	Rahall	Tsongas
Higgins	Rohrabacher	

□ 1914

Messrs. POE of Texas, PERRY, and DUNCAN of South Carolina changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, due to a flight delay, I was unable to be in attendance for tonight's votes. Had I been present, I would have voted in support of H.R. 3092, H.R. 2449, and S. 793.

THE FIRST RESPONDERS OF THE COLORADO FLOODS

(Mr. GARDNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the many first responders, National Guard, volunteers, and local leaders who have worked tirelessly, beginning in the middle of last week, in order to respond to the floods in Colorado. An area the size of Connecticut has been impacted by over 20 inches of rain in certain areas of the State; 19,000 homes have been damaged or destroyed; and countless people have had their lives changed forever.

But as is the case with all tragedies in Colorado and across this great country, we come together as a community, as neighbors to help one another in times such as these. We know in the months and years to come there will be great challenges, and there will be trying times as we try to find answers for those families who lost so much.

So, Mr. Speaker, we recognize those efforts, such as HelpColoradoNow.org, that are doing so much good for the people there. This has happened before—a great tragedy. We've come together, but we will rise up. We will be stronger because we are Colorado.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(Ms. DUCKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, we had a deeply partisan debate about cuts to SNAP. The proposed cuts by the majority were then \$20 billion—a number that many of my colleagues and I found unacceptable and rejected. The majority has now doubled these cuts to \$40 billion a year—nine times the amount passed in a bipartisan vote in the Senate. They have abandoned all attempts at bipartisanship and compromise to satisfy the unreasonable demands of the far right.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be playing politics with a program that means so much to American families. The \$40 billion in cuts will slash benefits to as many as 6 million Americans, including 170,000 veterans. The average benefit for SNAP is only \$4.50 a day—just \$1.50 a meal.

As someone who benefited from food stamps when I was a teenager, I know what the safety net means. This benefit is the difference between a child going to bed hungry or having the energy to focus on school. It is the safety net that allows low-income seniors to be able to both eat and afford medication. In my district, the poverty rate rose from 5.3 percent in 2000 to 9.2 percent in 2011. We need to be finding ways to reduce poverty in our communities, not cutting programs that work, like SNAP.

ODD GUN POLICY

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it seems the administration has finally made up its mind and will arm the Syrian rebels. Never mind Syria is in the messy midst of a civil war. That involvement is not in the national security interest of the United States.

The other rebel groups include foreign mercenaries, criminals, and, in my opinion, half are al Qaeda operatives. That includes al Qaeda from the state of Iraq and al-Nusra, an al Qaeda terrorist group. The last I heard, Mr. Speaker, the United States is at war with al Qaeda.

There is no way our government can prevent the guns sent to Syria from getting into the hands of al Qaeda rebels. The administration constantly and conveniently goes out of its way to keep Americans from possessing firearms, but it seems to be enthusiastically delighting in running guns into other countries—to groups like drug cartels in Mexico, rebel groups in Libya and al Qaeda in Syria.

Odd gun policy, don't you think, Mr. Speaker?

And that's just the way it is.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mr. WAXMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, the Safe Climate Caucus held a remarkable forum. It was the first time in Congress that individuals were invited to talk about the personal hardships they have experienced as a result of climate change. We heard from witnesses from around the country.

Matt Russell, an Iowa farmer, told us how his crops had been flooded by record rains. Hugh Fitzsimons, a Texas rancher, described how his herd was decimated by a record drought. Emily Dondero from Sonora, California, explained how the massive California Rim fire is devastating her community. Stephanie Kravitz, a New York homeowner, talked about the devastation she suffered when Superstorm Sandy struck Long Island, New York, and Reverend Tyrone Edwards from Louisiana spoke movingly of the damage inflicted on his community by enormous hurricanes.

For these Americans, climate change is already painfully real. They told us climate change is not a distant threat. As scientist Noah Diffenbaugh explained, it is already affecting families across the country.

The witnesses ask that Congress stop denying the science. They want action, and I think it's about time we start to listen.

MEDICARE ORTHOTICS AND PROSTHETICS IMPROVEMENT ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when unlicensed and unaccredited providers are allowed to deliver prosthetic and orthotic services through Medicare, both Medicare beneficiaries and the American taxpayers are shortchanged.

Unfortunately, the orthotics and prosthetics market currently is prone to fraud and abuse, where substandard products and services are being furnished to Medicare beneficiaries and other patients. Despite congressional mandates, not enough has been done to ensure that legitimate practitioners are providing these items and services.

Moments ago, I, along with my colleague MIKE THOMPSON of California, introduced the Medicare Orthotics and Prosthetics Improvement Act of 2013. This commonsense piece of legislation will protect Medicare beneficiaries by identifying and addressing fraudulent payments, and it will hold government accountable by reducing fraud and abuse within Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in this bipartisan effort by co-

sponsoring H.R. 3112, the Medicare Orthotics and Prosthetics Improvement Act of 2013.

ANOTHER MASS SHOOTING IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. "I heard 'pow, pow, pow.' Then for a few seconds, it stopped and then 'pow, pow, pow.' I just started running."

Mr. Speaker, the sentiments of this newspaper fell upon me and many other Americans, the words again—"another mass shooting in the United States of America."

Now, at the Naval Sea Systems Command—the naval command here in Washington, D.C.—and in coming from Texas, it reminded me of the horrific tragedy and terrorist act of Fort Hood. If you cannot call this terrorism, you could call it a domestic rampage, but what you could call it is a failing for what we in the United States Congress have not done, and that is to pass universal background checks and to focus on the mental health needs of those who are disturbed and might cause the havoc and the loss of life of so many that families today mourn.

As we stand here today, the question becomes: How much longer will it take us to pass sensible gun legislation to stop this violence?

I pray for those who have lost their lives, Mr. Speaker, and I ask this Congress to act and to pass universal background checks and the stopping of these ridiculous top secret clearances by outsourcing.

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month.

Childhood cancers are the leading cause of death by disease amongst children in our country; and each year, nearly 13,400 children are diagnosed with cancer.

I have been privileged to have met with many doctors and researchers who spend every day searching for answers in Minnesota's award-winning institutions, like the Mayo Clinic, the Children's Hospital of Minnesota, the Gillette Children's Hospital, and the University of Minnesota. There is no doubt that we can be proud of the incredible work that they are doing in Minnesota.

I am also cosponsoring legislation that will make cancer treatments more affordable for families and will encourage the development of new treatments by redirecting taxpayer funds that are

spent on Presidential campaigns into childhood cancer research.

Mr. Speaker, we all look forward to the day when cancer is 100 percent treatable in our children, and that's why I stand alongside doctors and families and, most importantly, cancer patients in the search for a cure.

AMERICA'S INHERENT FREEDOMS ARE BEING ATTACKED

(Mr. HUELSKAMP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, freedom of speech and religion and the recognition of the God-given dignity of every human life are core principles upon which America was founded, but these inherent freedoms are being attacked.

The Southern Poverty Law Center is one of the worst offenders—targeting and persecuting Americans who stand up for their moral convictions. This group routinely attacks mainstream, pro-family organizations, slandering them with false accusations of hatred and bigotry. Motivated by their inflammatory rhetoric, a gunman burst into the Family Research Council's lobby last year and shot a security guard, later admitting that the assault was inspired by the Southern Poverty Law Center's hate list.

We cannot let the beacon of freedom, known as America, become home to hate groups and other extremists, including those who slander their political opponents.

□ 1930

CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. BENTIVOLIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, on this Constitution Day, I want to applaud those in the Armed Forces who take a pledge to honor and defend the Constitution at the risk of life and limb.

Every generation of Americans has been protected by what Frederick Douglass once called "that glorious liberty document." We should take the time today to salute those who defend the Constitution. I fear that sometimes we take for granted the sacrifice that these brave men and women bear.

They, like their predecessors, are the ones who allow us to secure our freedoms in the Constitution to pass down to future generations. They are the ones that allow us to gather here today to do the will of the people. They are the reason why the Constitution has lasted over two centuries as the prime example in the world of a free government.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the session today, we paused in remembrance of those who were killed here in Washington, D.C., yesterday, yet another tragedy for this Nation, another shooting, senseless rage by some individual. We heard on the floor here a few minutes ago a plea by some of our colleagues to call us to action so that we who represent the millions upon millions of Americans would find within ourselves the courage to take action on wise gun safety legislation, mental health, and other things that we know can help to address the problem that plagues this Nation. So today, as we start this one-hour, I want to just remind ourselves that we have work to do here.

Joining me tonight is PAUL TONKO, a Representative from the State of New York. We often have had the opportunity to speak on the floor about the issues that confront us. Perhaps, PAUL, you may want to comment on this tragedy, and then we'll turn to the other issues that we want to take up today.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, and thank you for bringing us together on what will be thoughtful discussion in how to invest in America and grow the economy and grow job opportunities, create that climate that best cultivates job action and job growth in our society.

Just moments ago on the House floor, we held a moment of silence in recognition, in commemoration and respect for those who gave it their all, as many were Federal employees in that situation. I also want to attach my comments to those of yours in extending my condolences to the many family members and friends who are so impacted by this tragedy, this horrific act that wiped out their lives prematurely. May they rest in peace.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I join you in those condolences.

Our subject matter for the evening was really going to be about the economy, about income within this Nation, or the lack of it.

I want to just start by referring to a statement that Franklin Delano Roosevelt made during the economic crisis of the 1930s. In fact, this statement is etched in the marble at the F.D.R. memorial here in Washington, D.C. He said:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

The test of our progress. Well, what has been our progress over these last several years?

This last week, the economic study of the progress of America since the great crash of 2007 was made public. There has been progress. There has been economic growth. There has been the creation of wealth. We have seen progress, but it's not the kind of progress that F.D.R. talked about in the thirties. What we have seen is exactly the opposite of what he called for: to provide more for those who have little.

Here it is, the tale of two Americans, a stunted recovery, but, nonetheless, a recovery.

Where did the economic growth go? Where did the wealth go that was created? Was it to those who have little? No. No. No. Ninety-five percent of all of the wealth that this economy created since 2007 in the great crash went to the top 1 percent. Ninety-five percent of all of the wealth went to the top 1 percent. The remaining 99 percent wound up with 5 percent of the wealth that the Nation's biggest economy created since the crash of 2007. Franklin Delano Roosevelt would not have stood for it, and he didn't. Nor did Bill Clinton.

From 1993 to 2000, the economy grew very rapidly. The distribution of the wealth that was created during those years went in a remarkably different way than what has happened over the last 5 years. During the Clinton period, 55 percent of all the wealth that this Nation created went to the bottom 99 percent. The top 1 percent did very well. They got 45 percent of all of the wealth. You can say that was not enough for the bottom 99 percent, and I would agree; but compared to what's happened over these last 5 years, it's a remarkable improvement on the distribution of wealth.

What is the distribution of wealth? It's not a class struggle. It's about the men and women of this Nation that work hard, that get up every day, go to their jobs, as did those 12 people who were killed yesterday here at the Navy Yard in Washington, D.C. They got up. They went to their job. They worked hard for themselves, for their families, and for this Nation.

So men and women all across this Nation are doing what we want them to do: participating in this society, following the American Dream. They work hard, play by the rules, get on the economic ladder and climb.

Here's what happened to them: not much.

Something is desperately wrong here in America that the result of 5 years of labor by the 99 percent, that they would find their reward to be 5 percent of the wealth that was created. We need to address this, and tonight our subject matter is how we can do that.

Before we go to that, I want to put up one more chart and then ask my colleague to join in.

What does it really mean down home? What does it mean out there in

the subdivision or in the tenements? What does it mean in America when 95 percent of all of the wealth created winds up in the hands of 1 percent?

Here's what it means:

It means that there's hunger in America;

It means that mothers and fathers are not able to have a job that they can provide their children with a meal, with food on the table;

It means that in this House of Representatives there will be this day, this week, an effort to provide even more hunger in America, more children going without food as the supplemental food program is slashed by \$40 billion. That's \$4 billion a year for 10 years, \$40 billion, so that the 1 percent can have even more.

This is not right. It is not right in this Nation that we have hunger. It is not America as it should be, and it certainly is not the way Franklin Delano Roosevelt said America should be when the test of our progress is not whether we add more abundance to those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

We have a challenge here in America. We need to change things. We need to change the public policies that would deny food to hungry children, to parents, to our seniors, to our children in schools. It's time for us to put in place policies that create a real economic growth, real growth that the working men and women of this Nation can share in the economic progress of our Nation, and tonight we're going to spend some time talking about how we can do that.

My friend from New York, PAUL TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, you have highlighted in very stark contrast the difference in the thought process and the philosophy of what was then under President Franklin Roosevelt and what is now, and certainly what had happened during the Clinton years, which proved much more progressive in its nature.

If we think of that quote of President Roosevelt where society needed to be tested as to whether or not they were going to add more, add to the abundance of those who have much, that was a tremendous litmus test. It was a challenge to this country to search deep into its moral compass. What you're highlighting here, Representative GARAMENDI, is that it's an ebb and flow. It's looking for ways to pay for tax breaks for those who are perched way on the top.

Where you talk of that 95 percent, 98 percent of the growth of the economy going to the top 1 percent, that's unsustainable. When you think of the gimmickry that is going on, to be able to provide for the cost of such spending—because these tax breaks for those perched on the top is an order of spending—it's done through cuts to pro-

grams that speak to hunger, cuts that will impact seniors, cuts that will impact our very young, cuts that will impact our struggling families.

There is no mistake between the correlation of tough times and those who are dependent on a number of Federal programs. Throughout history, you can suggest through data that are compiled that those charts go upward when you have tough times and the reliance on some of these programs grows, and it's not unusual that has happened during the recession. So some struggling families required assistance.

You also have the elderly population that have nutrition inserted as part of their health care formula and is part of their wellness agenda. If a diabetic does not get their nutritional needs met, there are problems. If there are situations where people are doing without food, it can be the difference between quality of life and sometimes survival because of the absolute need to have a well-balanced nutritional program.

The same is true of our very young. We cannot ask our young children to go without the nutritional values they require or ask them to study at their best level in a classroom on an empty belly.

The moral compass is very direct here. It points our way and challenges us to take those words uttered decades ago by President Roosevelt. They speak with greater resonance, a deeper more profound resonance than they had when they were perhaps first uttered by the late former President. We need to take that to mind. We need to have history speak to us. We need to look at what happened when we invested in America, in her working families in the toughest of times.

When we think of the progress made during those Roosevelt years, that was a gentleman who was challenged in his own right and who led this Nation, lifted this Nation's economy while serving in a wheelchair. That is a powerful statement, one that had progressive outcomes written all over it. We need to go forward and look at these orders of investment that will grow the economy, a tax policy that draws fundamental fairness so that there isn't this gross disparity between growth for some and denial for others.

It's absolutely statistically tracked now from as far along as the mid to late seventies to today. You can chart what has happened with some of these efforts to reduce assistance to working families in middle-income communities. It is unsustainable. We cannot grow an economy with these sorts of policies in play.

So tonight, let's look at those investments, from education, higher education, to infrastructure, to advanced manufacturing that is required so as to allow us to compete effectively in a global economy where our manufac-

turing base can survive if we do it smarter, not necessarily cheaper. If we do it smarter, we will land contracts, grow jobs with the productivity factor that is developed by inserting our policies into the transformation into an advanced manufacturing economy and by providing the investments that will draw policies that are progressive and more resources that will provide a lucrative dividend, make them an investment rather than outright spending, as we saw with some of these tax relief measures which did not produce a growth in the economy and just made life very comfortable for a very relative few.

□ 1945

So I think the challenge is before us to go forward and put a sound budget together—none of this kicking the can down the road with a continuing resolution. Let's name the designees to the conference table from each House, from each party. The President has outlined the budget with his administration. The United States Senate passed its version of a budget. The House has passed its version of a budget. Let's name the participants at the conference table. Let's do it in daylight. Let's flood the lights on the process. Let's show the sharp contrast between the various solutions and recommended approaches that will allow the public to be best engaged in the process and to understand the wisdom or lack thereof of some of the moves that are required or requested of us here in the House.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you very much. You are quite correct that we need to move in that direction. The American economy is about 60–70 percent based upon consumer purchases of homes and cars and all those other goods. Part of that reason that we're not seeing the kind of economic growth that would normally occur in a recovery is the 99 percent don't have money. They lost a great deal of their wealth. Trillions of dollars of their wealth was wiped out in the financial collapse, their pensions, their homes and equity in their home. As the economy has recovered, the creation of the growth, the wealth, didn't go to them so they have not been able to really increase their purchasing power, which has dampened the economy.

Now, there are things that we can do. You were beginning that process. Let's go through them. I'm going to put this back up because this is not just a picture of the distribution of wealth in the economy, that is, the economic growth; it is also a picture of why the economy hasn't really returned. There are other factors, to be sure, but clearly the absence of purchasing power, that is, new wealth in the hands of the 99 percent, the absence of that has retarded the economic recovery.

This is something we have talked about here many, many times, and Mr.

TONKO brought this up, many of these issues. We call it the Make It In America agenda. This follows along on President Obama's jobs program. Many of these elements are the same as he proposed. They are displayed a little differently here.

Tax policy; critically important. We need to redo our tax policy. Mr. TONKO talked about the tax policy and the effect that we've seen over these many years. But what I would like to do today is focus on these other issues, the issue of infrastructure, research, education, labor, and energy.

On the labor side, we have talked about that a great deal here. The working men and women, laboring as they are, are they getting a fair share of the economic growth? The answer is categorically, no. Are there policies that can change that? Yes. One of them has been of discussion here in Congress, which is the minimum wage issue. California has a minimum wage law that is before the Governor. He is expected to sign it, and that will push the minimum wage up to about I think \$10 an hour, and that will cause the entire wage structure in California to move upward, shifting wealth to the working men and women in California. Whether the Nation will follow that, the President has called for an increase in the minimum wage, and that will certainly be helpful in shifting to the working population of this Nation a larger share, or at least a fair share of the growth of the economy.

Let's talk about infrastructure for awhile. I know this is an issue you were working on, Mr. TONKO, following the floods of a year ago. We see those same floods—different floods, but devastating floods, occurring in Colorado. You were one of the strong advocates for rebuilding our infrastructure. Why don't you pick that issue up, and let's talk about how we might be able to accomplish that.

Mr. TONKO. There again, it's policy or lack thereof that's impacting us heavily. Witnessing some of the unusual 100-year storms, 500-year storms as they're designated in a rapid succession over the last several years, dating back to the late 1980s, but then in rapid succession 2006, 2011 and 2012 in upstate New York in an area that I represent, or just south of me in the area that borders my district, tells me that even the nomenclature is ludicrous. It is not a 100 or 500-year storm; it's happening frequently. And it is because we don't embrace some of the science out there that, through data compilation, is begging our attention. If we're going to continue to ignore those impacts of Mother Nature, if we're going to ignore the global warming and impacts of Mother Nature on our infrastructure, we are going to have more and more bills for cleanup.

And is it just replacement, or are we talking about reevaluating situations?

For instance, some of the electrical utility efforts that stayed most abundantly strong were distributed energy projects along the coast in metro New York with Superstorm Sandy. I saw infrastructure, bridges displaced by the powerful force of water, in some places equated to the cfs, the cubic feet per second, flow of Niagara Falls. So the data are telling you that these storms are more and more frequent, you're going to get this extra volume of water, precipitation, do you just replace, or do you take a longer span, greater height to that bridge design? These are things that need to be discussed. Again, it is going to be money coming out of the pocket because we're not dealing with the fundamental science that is telling us we should anticipate more and more of these storms.

The infrastructure along these efforts, the coastal erosion, is requiring all sorts of improvements of ports. This affects our economy. This requires a master plan. This requires a Make It In America agenda that puts into play investments into our infrastructure, to replace what has been damaged with a sound investment, reinvestment here, that improves upon a situation rather than just replaces when we know that it will probably not withstand the forces of Mother Nature into the future. So infrastructure is critical, and the millions that we can put to work with that kind of legislation. The President has called for improvement in our infrastructure that will put millions to work. The best way to resolve a deficit in this country is to have people going to work. The dignity that comes with that investment in work opportunity is good for working class families across this country. So we know what to do. Let's get on with the business.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, we were talking about this earlier before we came up here, and you may want to take up this issue. This is an issue of what an infrastructure investment needs to grow the economy.

Mr. TONKO. It speaks also to the order of investments, rather than the order of spending, as some might label it. As we improve our infrastructure, for every dollar invested, according to Mark Zandi, chief economist with Moody's and former economic adviser to Senator JOHN MCCAIN, \$1.57 is realized for every \$1 that's invested. To me, that is a lucrative dividend. That is an opportunity for us to grow the economy by investing dollars, with the anticipation that there will be a good return on that investment. That's how it works. That's the beauty of building. I think it's what President Roosevelt saw in the 1930s and 1940s. He saw this opportunity to respond to the needs of America, public works projects that were absolutely essential, building water treatment centers, building

schools and infrastructure, roads and the like.

President Eisenhower saw the beauty of an interstate highway system, putting people to work and making strong opportunities available for commerce. These are the fundamental needs of a sophisticated society. It's the needs of certainly America in a modern age, innovation economy. So the roads and bridges as traditional sources, water treatment facilities, utility grid upgrades, telecommunications, this goes well into the new technology spheres of today where you wire communities and neighborhoods for business. There is a dire need for that sort of activity. That puts people to work. That's an investment that will draw a rate of return on the dollars invested in those projects, and that's what makes the wisdom of that approach very remarkably sound and comprehensible.

I think history has taught us well, and for us to ignore history at a moment when we are still struggling with this comeback. And yes, there has been a steady growth in private sector jobs, but many propositions sent to the House and to the United States Senate by the Chief Executive, by the President, have been denied simply because of the source from whom they are coming. Let's be frank about this. This is not the time to play personality warfare. It's time to do sound, progressive policies that provide for then good politics, bipartisan politics for this Nation and her people and her working families. It's as simple as that. Let's go forward, invest in our manufacturing base. Innovation economy, clean energy economy, which requires the tools of a modern-day economy so we can build it cheaper and smarter perhaps, but definitely cheaper. That's how you land those contracts in the international marketplace.

So I am hopeful that our best days, Representative GARAMENDI, lie ahead if we have the tenacity, if we have the integrity to go forward with what are the soundest of policies and the boldness of investments that are done, that are placed on the table with the full anticipation and expectation that there is a reasonable rate of return on that investment.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We know there is an immediate return on investment in infrastructure. Mark Zandi laid it out there. You invest \$1 in infrastructure now, and you get back \$1.57, and you have somebody working immediately. They become a taxpayer rather than a tax receiver. So there are some real opportunities here.

I want to just take a couple of seconds. I was reading *The Wall Street Journal* as I was flying from California today, and there was an article by Martin Feldstein, who was Ronald Reagan's chief economic adviser, and he focused in his article on several things and growing the economy. How do you

get the economy growing? He specifically talked about infrastructure. He talked about infrastructure as a way to immediately employ people. We certainly agree with that. And it's also a way you lay the foundation for future economic growth because that infrastructure is then available for the future.

I was in Fresno, California, I guess 2 or 3 years ago, and went to the high school to talk at an educational conference there, and they are setting this conference in an auditorium that was built by the WPA, the Works Progress Administration in the Roosevelt period, the Franklin Delano Roosevelt period. So we were using this wonderful auditorium 70 years later. You go, wow, there's an infrastructure investment in education.

So it is by building this infrastructure we employ people immediately, and we then have the foundation for future economic growth.

You mentioned the water system, sanitation, electrical energy systems. Roads, highways and the like. And it's jobs today. I want to talk about how we can finance them.

Mr. TONKO. Don't forget our ports, our rail, our airports.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let's not forget, this is not new economics. George Washington in his first month in office, and this is the first President, folks, his first month in office, turned to his Treasury Secretary, Alexander Hamilton, and said, develop an economic policy. Hamilton came back a couple of months later, not with a report that we would have, several thousand pages, but maybe 50 or 60 pages, and he laid out an economic policy. Number one on his agenda was to build America's infrastructure—ports, canals.

I know you're going to launch into the Erie Canal now that I've mentioned canals, which is your favorite subject. And he also talked about roads. He talked about laying down the infrastructure for the growth of the economy.

Before we get to your Erie Canal, I want to talk about something that actually happened. This is a good thing. This is a very good thing.

In the stimulus bill, which by the way did work, not as robust as we would have liked, but it did work, there was a provision to build locomotives for Amtrak. I think it was about \$800 million over a period of years would be spent on building locomotives for the east coast.

□ 2000

This is so you can get home, Mr. TONKO, on the east coast here. These locomotives were to be 100 percent American-made. I don't know who wrote that provision, but it was one of the very few provisions in the stimulus bill that said make it in America, 100 percent American-made.

Siemens, a German company, one of the big international industrial companies, said, \$800 million. Oh, you have to make it in America. Okay.

Siemens had a factory in Sacramento, California, to manufacture light rail cars, you know, street cars and the like. They got this contract.

This is the first locomotive made in America by Siemens under that stimulus provision. They're going to make, I think, 80 of these over the period of the next several years, 100 percent American-made.

And now, across the United States, as a result of this infrastructure investment, we're beginning to see companies in a supply chain, some that are making the wheels, the truck underneath, which is where the wheels attach to the locomotive, the facility up on top that attaches to the electric lines. All of this, American-made, 100 percent American-made.

And by the way, I have a piece of legislation in that would continue that that says if you're going to spend your tax money on transportation systems, highways, bridges, locomotives and the like, it's going to be your tax money used to buy American-made equipment, just like George Washington said we ought to do it.

Mr. TONKO. Well, you know, it does go back to our humble beginnings. And again, history instructs us. History, if we allow it, will guide us. In some of our toughest times we realize some of our greatest, most monumental success stories.

And you did mention the canal, which for my area, I see the 20th Congressional District that I represent, is a donor area for that canal.

But I just want to make this factoid available. In those times, people look back, and they think, well, what a wonderful project, and it probably sailed through. No, it met with great controversy, and it was proposed because of economic difficult times.

And here was a vision. That's leadership. Give us the vision of how you can grow the economy, what can we do that is strong and forceful and will change the outcomes out there. And it was this connection of a port, in a little town called New York, that gave birth to a necklace of communities called mill towns in upstate New York that became epicenters of invention and innovation.

That all came about with a struggle, a struggle to find the investment available to build this canal. So the struggle will always be there.

Mr. GARAMENDI. What was that canal?

Mr. TONKO. The Erie Canal, barge canal history, which is wonderful.

But my point here is that there will always be struggle. For issues, there will be a counterforce to every force of perceived good that can happen, but that doesn't mean we should walk

away because the climate or the environment is difficult.

We go forward. We know what has to be done. History has been instructing us here. Science, through data compilation, is reminding us of some very tortuous outcomes that have been part of very atypical storms. Superstorm Sandy, which gripped the entire Northeast, was atypical. Tropical storms and hurricanes in upstate New York, unheard of, that produced all sorts of damage, including loss of life, loss of farm land, valuable farm land, loss of businesses, loss of homes in some ways, totally swept away by the forces of water.

That is a difficult situation that needs to be addressed with infrastructure improvements. If not, if we do not take this to heart and mind, we will be, I believe, a lesser society for not having paid strict attention to both science and history which ought to guide us.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, if you take a look at Superstorm Sandy—I don't know what they're going to call the storm that is occurring in Colorado, but we're also seeing the necessity to prepare for climate change and these new very strong, very dangerous storms that we now have seen repeated.

There's going to be a major infrastructure investment rebuilding Colorado, just as there was a major infrastructure investment in rebuilding the east coast following Superstorm Sandy. As that investment is made, we will see the economy begin to pick up as men and women return to work, if we take—what I think we ought to do is to spend that money on American-made concrete and steel and the like. As we rebuild these necessary infrastructure works we will add to the economic potential of that rebuilding.

Now, how are we going to pay for it?

Let's get down to what has been, I think, the most common complaint here: oh, you're just going to borrow the money and we're going to run up the deficit.

Well, Martin Feldstein was very clear today that if you make an investment in infrastructure, you're going to immediately employ people, and you will be making a major step towards solving the deficit problem. You do that now, he said. Begin that investment now.

Yes, you're going to borrow the money, not all of it, and there are ways that we can get, that we'll deal with that.

But there is a necessity of enhancing the economy. His suggestion was the infrastructure as one of the principal ways of doing that.

Now, we have ways of financing this. It's been discussed forever, dating back to the mid- and early nineties, that we ought to have an infrastructure bank.

The Europeans have an infrastructure bank. It's proved to be very successful. The money goes out to build

infrastructure. The repayment is made by bridge tolls, by fees on roads, by canal fees, other kinds of fees. That money comes back. It's circulated.

The President has called for an infrastructure bank, taking an idea that's been before Congress for the last 20 years, and he said, let's do it. Let's do it. We can borrow money at the Federal level still, less than 3 percent, sometimes 2 percent, put that into an infrastructure bank, invite the private sector pension funds and others to become part of that bank, and then lend that money out to those projects that have a cash flow, toll bridges, sanitation projects, waterworks, other kinds of things, so that we can get this economy moving.

We also had a program coming out of the stimulus bill called Build America Bonds, BABs, Build America Bonds. Those lasted all of 2 years, and then our colleagues here refused to reenact the Build America Bonds. These are other ways in which local entities can borrow the money and build the infrastructure and get their economy going.

And, furthermore, laying the foundation for future economic growth: you can't build a city on yesterday's infrastructure. You need to replace it, to be sure; and this is part of the problem in our cities, the aging infrastructure, the waterworks, the sanitation system and the rest. We need to rebuild that, but you also need to expand the infrastructure.

One final way that we can talk about financing this is how we do spend the tax revenue that does come in to the American Treasury.

Right now, Congress is debating on how to spend money for the next fiscal year which begins on October 1, how are we going to spend it.

Part of that appropriation process is to appropriate \$87 billion for the Afghanistan war in the coming year, October 1 through the 2014 year, until September 30, \$87 billion for Afghanistan.

How much money for flood protection in Colorado, flood protection in my district, flood protection across the Eastern Seaboard to build the sea-walls? Virtually nothing.

But \$87 billion for Afghanistan. For what? For what? To build facilities that we will either destroy as we leave or will be destroyed shortly after we leave?

Seven billion dollars for the Afghan National Army, \$2.5 billion of which is for good things to be done, no line items, no particular knowledge about what they're going to spend that money on. I suspect most of it's going to wind up in some bank account by some crook in the Bahrain banks. \$2.5 billion.

What could we do with \$2.5 billion here in America?

And by the way, we're drawing down the troops in Afghanistan. We're actu-

ally going to spend more money in Afghanistan next year than we are this year, even though we have 60 percent fewer troops in Afghanistan.

We're making choices. Your Representatives, 435 of us, and 100 Members of the Senate, are making choices about how your money's going to be spent.

And by the way, I haven't talked about the nuclear bombs, 5,000 of them. We're going to rebuild them. Now, there's a good investment. Really?

I don't think so, not when the levees in my district can't be rebuilt to protect my citizens from floods, to rebuild a nuclear weapon that we don't need in the first place. I don't think so.

So we're making choices. We're making choices for you, the American taxpayers, about how your money's going to be spent.

For me, I want to spend it in America. I want to spend it on American-made goods and equipment, not on products from China, as happened with the newly reopened San Francisco-Oakland Bay bridge—steel from China, not from America.

I want that money spent here, and I want that money spent on our infrastructure, on our education, on research, energy projects.

We're going to make choices. We're making those choices right now. We're up against the wall. By the end of this month, September 30, the government runs out of money.

Where are we going to spend it?

Or are we going to spend it all?

Are we just going to shut down government?

I don't know. I'm worried. I'm worried about the choices that we're making. I'm worried about more expenditure in Afghanistan and not here at home. I'm worried about rebuilding all these nuclear weapons that, God willing, we'll never use.

Choices. Can we actually build America?

Can we find the willingness to create an infrastructure bank?

Can we find the willingness to bring the money back home and spend it here to build this economy?

Because, ultimately, as our Joint Chiefs of Staff have said repeatedly, it's the American economy. Without that strength, there won't be military strength.

I've gone on too far here. Mr. TONKO, let's begin to wrap this up.

Mr. TONKO. Yes. In fact, I will offer my closing comments here, Representative GARAMENDI.

You know, I think what you talk about in choices are exactly what a budget is about. It's the priorities we establish, in a bipartisan fashion and a bicameral way, that enable us to go forward with the best blueprint that grows the most hope and promise for this Nation. If we can deliver that hope, we've done our job.

This is about investing in the American Dream. It's about responding to that old, old adage within this Nation that you tether that American Dream here in this wonderful Nation, where people rightfully anticipate that if they play by the rules, they roll up their sleeves, they invest their talents and their skills and their intellect and their passions into work, they rightfully anticipate to taste success; and that allows them to have an equal shot at opportunity in this Nation.

That has not been the guiding course. We have had an unlevel playing field. We have made choices that have penalized the great percentage of Americans; 95 to 98 percent of Americans have been impacted by some of these choices and priorities to the negative.

And so it's important for us, I believe, to offer that dream, that American Dream, the underpinnings of support that it rightfully requires.

The cost of a college education ought to be addressed by Washington. We need to forcefully come up with a plan that reduces that cost, because that higher ed opportunity, those apprenticeship programs are training the workforce of tomorrow. And without that workforce, without that human infrastructure, we are less robust in our competitive force.

What about the investment, as Representative GARAMENDI mentioned, in infrastructure?

What about that infrastructure bill that has worked well in sections of the globe?

Why not go forward with that opportunity so that small business can prosper in that outcome?

The great engine of this economy, of this comeback, has been small business growth; jobs provided by those business citizens who are tethered to their community, who have enabled women and men in all sections of this country to draw a paycheck through some sort of commitment that they make as a small business person, giving that work opportunity to their neighbors and to the communities that they call home.

That's the strength that we need for small business so that we can continue to be that engine of comeback. That comeback scenario is incredibly valuable to this Nation.

And what about going forward with the commitment?

There's a soundness of that moral compass that should guide us. Forever there will be those who require justice in our society, economic and social justice.

We're reminded by our Founding Parents that we are in search of a more perfect Union. Well, the imperfections need to be addressed by those priorities that are established, established by us, the people's representatives in this House and in the Senate and in the White House, all of us working in a bicameral, bipartisan way to put aside

petty partisan differences, to put aside personality warfare, and make certain we go forward with an agenda that is truly all-American, driven, ignited, and lifted by the American Dream.

□ 2015

Our days, Representative GARAMENDI, that lie ahead hold great promise, great hope. I'm convinced that our best days lie ahead if we allow history and science to instruct us and to reach our hearts, our souls, and our minds as we go forward with the development of a budget that will be sound and reflective of all of America, with every one of her daughters and sons reflected in those decisions.

So I thank you for bringing us together this evening.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you very, very much. Indeed, our best days are ahead of us. Even in the dismal days of the Great Depression in the thirties, Franklin Roosevelt laid it out very clearly when he said:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

If 95 percent of the wealth that's been generated over the last 5 years winds up with 1 percent, we've got a problem, because the economy isn't going to grow and what will happen is this: hunger in America.

Later this week, we'll take up the nutrition bill for this Nation. There are those who want to remove \$40 billion from the nutrition programs for our children, for our seniors, for those that are unemployed, and for those that are searching for work. We can do better; we really can.

The best days are ahead of us if this Congress and the Senate, together with the President, work together and lay out those plans that have informed us historically that they work.

Investment—investments are those things that make America strong—infrastructure, research, education, those are things that are timeless and work year after year. They're also things that have recently been reduced and cut.

We can't let this happen in America. We cannot allow that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

SURVIVAL OF THE COAL INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLINS of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to be standing before the House this evening to talk about a very, very important issue, an issue that is important not only to my con-

stituents in eastern and southeastern Ohio, but to Americans across the Nation, and the issue is the survival of the coal industry.

Coal has provided America's energy engine for generations, and can for many future generations if we have policies out of this administration that reflect the value that the coal industry has meant to America and the future that it has in front of us.

Coal is an abundant, affordable, and reliable form of energy. Coal directly or indirectly employs nearly 800,000 Americans and supplies approximately 40 percent of our Nation's power generation. Coal mining employees across my district number in the thousands in eastern and southeastern Ohio. It also provides nearly 80 percent of Ohio's electricity, and it's the energy engine for Ohio's manufacturing industry which so many of my constituents depend on for their livelihood.

I'm very proud to be joined tonight, Mr. Speaker, by some of my colleagues who are equally passionate about the coal industry and its value to America, both in the past and in the future.

At this point, I yield to my friend and colleague from the great State of Kentucky's Sixth District, Representative ANDY BARR.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman, my friend from Ohio, for yielding and for organizing this Special Order on coal.

This fall marks the fifth anniversary of the financial crisis. We remain burdened by a weak economic recovery, with unemployment still lingering above 7 percent, two-thirds of the American people living paycheck to paycheck, and only 58 percent of the working-age population in this country employed. But this does not seem to concern this President or this administration. Unable to wage a war in Syria due to immense public opposition, the President, for some reason, seems intent on conducting a war on jobs.

Whether it's driving up the cost of health care with the disastrous Affordable Care Act or burdening community banks with mountains of bureaucratic red tape from the Dodd-Frank Act, this administration is seemingly intent on doing everything in its power to ensure this recovery remains slow and painful.

The finalization of the New Source Performance Standards rules from the EPA for greenhouse gas emissions this week will represent the latest and perhaps the most damaging barrage in this war on jobs. This regulatory carbon tax is the keystone of a radical environmental agenda, the disastrous results of which are already known in my district of central and eastern Kentucky. The consequences of these regulations have echoed throughout the hills of Appalachia, and they will reverberate across the country in years to come.

The New Source Performance Standards will finish the job that a dead-

locked permitting process and multi-billion-dollar regulations like Utility MACT have started: killing the coal industry and driving up the cost of energy, a top-line budget item for families already struggling to get by in this President's economy.

But then, no one should be surprised. This is the one promise the President made and has kept. When running in 2008, President Obama, then Candidate Obama, said his policies would make the cost of electricity "necessarily skyrocket." More recently, White House climate adviser Daniel Schrag recently admitted this administration's previously only thinly veiled position. Mr. Schrag said, famously now, "a war on coal is exactly what's needed."

Mr. Speaker, I can't think of another example of a Presidential administration pledging to put hardworking Americans in a centuries' old industry totally out of work, apparently for the crime of providing low-cost energy that drives the engine of our economy.

The damage of these policies is already clear in Kentucky. Just yesterday, another 525 coal miners employed at three eastern Kentucky mines operated by the James River Coal Company were given pink slips. My heart goes out to these miners and to their families. And I have met some of these people. They're just trying to follow their ancestors by digging up a piece of the American Dream in the Appalachian foothills.

Last month, the Commonwealth of Kentucky released statistics on the health of the coal industry for the second quarter of this year, and the story they tell is dire, even before yesterday's news of another 525 layoffs. Eastern Kentucky coal mines facing the brunt of this President's regulatory overreach shed another 851 jobs last quarter, leaving the total number of Kentucky employed at the mines at just 12,342. That is the lowest number since Kentucky began keeping such statistics in 1927. Eastern Kentucky coal production is down a whopping 41.4 percent in just the last 2 years. And with those reductions, we have lost over 5,700 mining jobs.

And now the New Source Performance Standards will prohibit coal from even competing in the energy marketplace, even though the final regulations have now been delayed a year due to industry and public opposition, as so often before this administration has brushed those concerns aside and proceeded apace. The EPA even forecasts, given the regulatory environment, that there will be no new coal plants built after this year.

Rather than phasing in rules to allow all types of fuel to adapt, these regulations on new and existing plants single out coal, stifling the promise of carbon capture in its crib, a technology that could have provided the United States

with a revolutionary technology on the magnitude of hydraulic fracturing that could have changed the course and shape of our economy, driven exports, and paid real benefits in terms of carbon emissions reductions. Instead, the United States will endure unilateral economic disarmament while our international competitors continue to pursue growth-oriented energy policies.

Over the next few years as these policies take hold, the rest of the country will be made aware of this disaster that is already taking place in Appalachia. Already, one-fifth of the Nation's coal-fired plants—204 plants across 25 States—closed between 2009 and 2012. The rest will shutter prematurely in the years following implementation of the New Source Performance Standards.

Seven EPA regulations already proposed over the last 4 years are forecast to cost \$16.7 billion annually once fully implemented. The New Source Performance Standards will trump even that figure, constituting the largest energy tax of all time implemented by regulatory fiat without the consent of the people's elected representatives in Congress. That's because this President's own party couldn't enact this radical environmental agenda through cap-and-trade in the first 2 years of this President's administration.

The loss of 69,000 megawatts of coal-fired power will ripple through the economy, costing an estimated 887,000 jobs in the mining, utility, shipping, and manufacturing sectors per year. The President had pledged to spur growth in manufacturing, and low energy costs at home coupled with rising wages in countries like China and India promised to restore our competitive advantage in manufacturing. But the New Source Performance Standards will quickly put an end to those prospects.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has 250 years' worth of coal reserves at current consumption rates that could, if utilized, provide affordable energy and high-tech manufacturing feedstocks. But the President isn't interested in playing this ace up America's sleeve. Instead, he wants to stay the course on a disastrous energy rationing policy that has already put thousands in the unemployment lines in my neck of the woods in Kentucky and all throughout central Appalachia and will put hundreds of thousands of more hard-working Americans there in the years to come.

So I urge the President to abandon these disastrous, job-killing policies and to come to Congress to work on a plan that will relieve energy costs for our families. Put the American people back to work and protect the environment. Otherwise, this week's announcement of these New Source Performance Standards will demonstrate a willful denial of these ambitions and a

ruthless attack on a centuries-old industry that has provided jobs and economic opportunity for thousands of Americans.

I want to end my comments this evening by telling a story that illustrates the human cost and the human dimension of this administration's war on coal.

In the eastern edge of my district sits a small town of Campton, Kentucky, in Wolfe County, Kentucky. When I was home during the August recess, I went there and had a town hall meeting to listen to the concerns of people who are struggling.

□ 2030

I met a young woman by the name of Sally. She came up to me after a town hall meeting with tears welling up in her eyes. She looked at me and she said, my husband just lost his job in the coal mines—he's a coal miner. He lost his job because the Environmental Protection Agency would not issue a coal mining permit to his employer. As a result, they had to lay off all of the coal miners, including my husband—is what this woman told me.

She said, Here's the problem: My children need to go back to school. It's August, and it's time to go back to school. They're growing up, and they don't have shoes, they've grown out of their shoes. And so I don't know what to do because we can't afford shoes. So I went ahead and bought them flip-flops so they wouldn't be embarrassed to go back to school.

Imagine that, politicians and bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., putting this working family in central Appalachia in that kind of economic distress so that they can't even afford shoes for their children. I don't care if you're a Republican or a Democrat, a supporter of this administration or not, it is fundamentally wrong, it is fundamentally immoral for the Federal Government to put working American families into economic distress.

So I call on my colleagues in Congress to stand firm and stand in opposition to this radical agenda, which is destroying jobs, destroying opportunity, and destroying the American Dream.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank our colleague.

I think you can see, Mr. Speaker, the passion that's coming to Washington to advocate on the part of the coal industry. We're not just talking about a black rock that's dug out of the ground; we're talking about lives. We're talking about American lives. We're talking about jobs and the ability to put food on the table, to put clothes on our children, to provide a manufacturing base so that Americans have somewhere to work and to do what America knows how to do best—innovate and compete and solve problems.

I'm proud now to yield to another one of our colleagues, Representative

KEVIN CRAMER, from the great State of North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank my colleague and friend from Ohio for leading this important discussion on this very important and somewhat scary week.

Mr. Speaker, I love the opportunity to tell the story of North Dakota. You know, a lot of people think of North Dakota these days as just an oil-producing State out there somewhere in the Wild West. While we're the second-leading producer of oil—and we're rather proud of how well we do it—long before that, even long before North Dakota was one of the 10 top producers of wind energy, long before that North Dakota was producing electricity by burning coal. In fact, for decades, North Dakota has been generating electricity burning coal. In fact, at the current burn rate, there's an 800-year supply of lignite coal under our prairies.

Prior to being elected to this great institution of the people's House, I was a public service commissioner for 10 years and carried the portfolio of coal mining in our State. I got to oversee the data collection, the pre-mine permitting, the permitting of the mine, the inspections of the mines, the releasing of the bond at the end of the life of the mine.

North Dakota companies mine over 30 million tons of coal every year, Mr. Speaker, generating about 5,000 megawatts of electricity. Currently, we have about 120,000 acres under permit for coal mining in our State. It's very important to North Dakota, as it is to the rest of our Nation.

The lignite industry in North Dakota, a State with fewer than 700,000 citizens, employs more than 28,000 of those 700,000 people. It has an annual economic impact in our little State of \$3 billion and generates over \$100 million of tax revenue to help fund the priorities of our State.

To provide some perspective, Mr. Speaker, on the wage impact of the industry on North Dakota, two counties—Mercer and Oliver Counties—are home to three coal mines and five generating plants. They are the two counties with the highest wages of any county in our State, and we have a State with very high wages. But those direct economic benefits are just a small part of our story. Because, you see, 79 percent of North Dakota's lignite is used to generate electricity for over 2 million citizens in the upper Midwest; 13.5 percent is used to generate synthetic natural gas that is piped to over 400,000 homes in the East.

Every time I have this opportunity to address the House, I like to tell a little piece of the story. You see, 7.5 percent of that coal is used to generate fertilizer for our number one industry, agriculture. It's a great part of our culture. It's what I believe makes us very good at coal mining, it's those agricultural roots.

Let's talk about electricity generation for a moment that's under such attack today. No industry in America is more under attack today than this by this administration.

We're home to seven plants, as I said, owned by rural electric cooperatives and investor-owned utilities that provide low-cost electricity to our region. Beyond the direct employment of the high-paying jobs in this industry by the coal mines and the generation plants, the transmission companies and the utilities that distribute the electricity, our low-cost coal provides the region with some of the cheapest utility rates in the country. In fact, just today I printed out the most recent Electric Power Monthly Report of Average Retail Price of Electricity by State year to date, and North Dakota and the State of Washington have the lowest retail prices of any State in the country. Can you imagine what a tremendous advantage that is in the global marketplace when you're trying to attract other industries, as my colleague from Kentucky talked about, the opportunity for manufacturing and other industries?

Now, we're also home to the Great Plains Synfuels Plant, which takes our coal and turns it into gas. It is used by homes and industry. In the process of gasifying that coal, 50 percent of it is captured—the carbon is captured—and it's shipped via pipeline to Saskatchewan for tertiary oil recovery. So we capture half of the carbon and then inject it into old oil wells and generate more oil from it.

Long before carbon capture and sequestration was cool, North Dakota innovators saw it as a commercially viable byproduct of energy development. Now all of that is going to get squashed by these rules that we're hearing about this week.

Another innovation of our coal is that we use the ash from the plants, a byproduct of the power plants. Instead of it being emitted out of the stacks, it's collected. And other entrepreneurial-minded individuals have discovered productive ways to utilize the coal ash instead of sending it to landfills. It creates a stronger, longer lasting, and easier to work with concrete that's used in our Nation's infrastructure—something that we need very badly these days. It's used in paint, insulation for stoves and refrigerators, ceiling and flooring tiles, lumber, bricks and masonry, shingles and roofing materials. This is a byproduct, not a waste product, and it's certainly safe.

It is used to make better bridges, like the new I-35 Bridge in Minneapolis; better footings for wind towers. The many, many wind towers in North Dakota are actually attached to coal ash concrete. And their ability to sell this byproduct allows our utilities to keep electricity rates low for everyone.

But you might ask: What of the environment? After all, it's the air, land

and water that concerns the magnitude of rules and regulations that are coming at our industries with such zeal out of this administration. I love talking about our environment in North Dakota. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to our colleagues, that very few places on Earth are cleaner and greener than the State of North Dakota.

With regard to our air, you might assume that a State with seven power plants would have dirty air; but no, we are one of very few States that meet all Ambient Air Quality Standards as prescribed by the EPA. We're very proud of that. By the way, remember those two counties, Mercer and Oliver, with the five power plants and the three coal mines? Once again, this year they received an A grade from the American Lung Association for their clean air in their annual report for 2012.

But perhaps the area I'm most proud of is the reclamation of our mine lands. Before the Federal Government passed the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act, the State of North Dakota passed its own reclamation laws which were stricter, higher standards. We return our land to pre-mining use. I wish every Member of Congress could come to North Dakota. I wish our President could come to North Dakota and see how good America could be, and see how we reclaim our land, because we love our land. We're farmers and ranchers. Our mines take great pride in and invest vast resources in protecting our environment—their environment. Our companies have won many awards for stewardship.

You see, coal miners and utility company employees not only enjoy high-paying jobs, but they live there, they breathe the air, they drink the water, they farm the land. They're not just farmers and engineers; they're accountants, machinery operators, environmental scientists, rangeland biologists, truck drivers. The care of our natural resources is more important to us than it is to the EPA, quite honestly. And we do it quite well. We're a place made up of people who have proven for centuries you don't have to compromise quality of life for a high standard of living.

We are an all-of-the-above State, and I'm very, very proud of it. And I'm proud to be here with you, my colleague from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), to tell the story one more time about the importance of this industry. And if a war on coal is what's being waged, then we'd better be armed for the war because it's worth fighting for. It's for our future.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

And the point that you just made and that our colleague from Kentucky made—it's not simply a war on coal, it's a war on American jobs. It's a war on the American way of life. We have to stand.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud now to yield to another one of our colleagues who—no one in the House knows more about the impacts of the coal industry to the economy of her State and her region than does our colleague from West Virginia, Representative SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO.

Mrs. CAPITO. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for having this Special Order to talk about coal, to talk about energy, to talk about jobs, to talk about quality of life in our States—North Dakota, Kentucky, Ohio, West Virginia. West Virginia is the second largest coal-producing State in the country, and it is part of who we are—and has been for many, many years.

Living in West Virginia and being home as we were in August, there's a lot of pessimism in the entire State. It's not just about coal—if you're a coal miner or directly involved—it's the whole community, it's the whole area, it's the whole region. There's a feeling that the President, through his policies, has really picked winners and losers in this country, and our region is going to lose.

The job issue, we're seeing hundreds of jobs—we just had a mine close last week, or a week before, 250 miners. But then that's the transportation, the truck driver, the Stop-and-Go owner, the oil and gas market, the electrician, the pipes, all the things, equipment manufacturers. Everything. It's not just about those 250 jobs, it's a multiplying effect in our region of West Virginia.

The abundance of coal in West Virginia nationwide gives us real potential. We get criticized: Oh, you're fighting an old fight; that fight is no longer part of the future. We've got to make it a part of the future because it makes good sense. Producing more domestic energy means reliable, it means an affordable supply of power and energy.

I think about a State like mine that has a lot of folks who are living on fixed incomes, a lot of older folks. When it comes to the end of the month and they see their electric bill, they're having trouble now meeting that challenge of paying for that, making choices of medicine or food—food for their pets or whatever is important to them—because of the high cost now. That's just going to go up and up and up if we disenfranchise ourselves in this country, our most abundant resource, and that being coal.

Let's talk about the tax revenues that are lost to all the counties, the school systems in our State. If you don't have the tax revenues in our State that coal produces and energy produces, whether it's natural gas—we've all got a lot of natural gas in our States too, we're blessed with that. But if we don't have the tax revenues there, this just wounds county commissioners, wounds county boards of education.

□ 2045

That to me is not one of the unintended, but one of the consequences that never gets talked about that really will harm a way of life, a future for the children. So let's talk about the potential.

We have been exporting a lot of coal. By doing that, we create jobs because we're exporting our coal. I see nothing wrong with exporting coal to our allies because exporting energy means we're producing the resource.

Earlier this year, Bloomberg News reported that Germany will start up more coal-fired power stations this year than at any time in the past 20 years. When we think about Germany, we think about somebody who's environmentally conscious. They have a very healthy Green Party over there. They're considered to be very cutting edge when it comes to conservation and clean energy, yet they're building more coal-fired power plants in their country than they have over the last 25 years.

During the first campaign, the President said that if you build a coal-fired power plant, we will bankrupt you. We've all seen the tape. On Friday, that's what his statement is going to be from the EPA. It will be impossible to build a new coal-fired power plant or it will bankrupt you if you try to do it.

One of his major advisers has said that a war on coal is exactly what this country needs. How can you say a war on an industry that employs thousands of people in the heartland of our country and thousands more in ancillary businesses, and it's a way of life? It's domestic energy. The administration supports this attack on hardworking people in an industry that provides good jobs and affordable energy. It's affordable energy, not just for our folks on fixed incomes, but for our manufacturers, our small businesses. A cheaper, affordable energy is going to create jobs in other industries, as well, and it has.

You don't have to look too far to see the administration's attack on coal. We know about the EPA's unprecedented action of retroactively pulling a validly issued clean water permit. That was shocking on the face of it. They said, Oh, we've done that before. Well, when you look at it, maybe once, maybe a long time ago, but this was a 10-year process, millions of dollars to get this permit that was yanked out from under this company. Who's going to invest in an industry when you're in danger of losing a permit retroactively after you've jumped through all the hoops, met all the standards, worked with the Corps, done all the things you're supposed to do, and still this administration will come back and take your permit back?

The administration has attacked the use of coal. Recent figures say that 295 coal units across 33 States are closing.

They're closing in our States, and we can already see it. It's a source of great concern.

In 2012, the EPA proposed a New Source Performance Standard. They kind of backed off from it, but they placed coal plants and large natural gas plants under the same standard for carbon dioxide emissions, 1,000 pounds per megawatt hour. What we heard from earlier reports is they're going to create two standards, but the standard for coal is going to be unmeetable because the carbon capture and sequestration technology is not there. This is where I think, if we look to the future, where the real future lies for our abundant resource, coal.

But earlier this year they scrapped the 2012 proposal, and the President instructed revised standards. Basically what we're going to see on Friday is the same thing. It's like Groundhog Day: same thing, same rhetoric, same standards, same results. Lost jobs, higher utility costs, seniors and others on fixed incomes worried about how they're going to heat their homes or cool them in the hot summers. All of these things are very daunting in my State of West Virginia.

The truth is that without new performance standards, carbon dioxide emission generation in the United States is falling.

Let's talk about the rest of the world. At the same time, global emissions have increased by 1.4 percent. So if the administration wants to impose carbon dioxide standards, regulations that will harm the American economy, then at a minimum, it should act as part of an agreement with other countries. The Senate unanimously took that position in 1997 when it passed a resolution sponsored by then-Senator Robert C. Byrd from West Virginia and current Obama Secretary Chuck Hagel which said that the United States should not ratify the Kyoto treaty unless specific standards were agreed upon to limit emissions by developing countries.

The Byrd-Hagel principle was common sense in 1997, and it remains so today. For that reason, I will be introducing legislation that would delay the implementation of the new source rules for coal plants unless other countries, that account for 80 percent of the total non-USA carbon dioxide emission standards, enact those standards so that we are not disadvantaging our workers, our jobs, our economy, our seniors, our folks who have manufacturing jobs in small businesses.

The American people want us to work together. They really do. We hear that when we're out. It's Republicans, Democrats, Independents, nonparties, old, young, educated, less educated, blue collar, white collar. They want us to work together. They want common-sense policies. They want an energy policy that creates jobs, that includes

everything, that is an all-of-the-above energy plan. That's what we want, and that's what we're fighting for. The President stood up here in January and said he was for all-of-the-above energy. On Friday, he's going to say all of the above except coal, which is abundant in the heartland of America.

I urge my colleagues on the floor tonight to think about coal as I know some States do not realize what their portfolio is in coal. So I looked up Florida. Twenty-two percent of the power generation in Florida is coal, yet you hear many of the Florida delegation right on board with the climate change philosophy of this President. Their renewable portfolio in the Sunshine State is slightly over 2 percent. The renewable portfolio in the State of West Virginia, who has some of the most abundant resources in the country, is at least twice that. It goes back to actually do what you say and say what you do.

So I think that we need to work with our colleagues and educate our colleagues about what a great role coal plays across this country. Even if you don't mine it in your region, you're using it, you're powering it. Your seniors in Florida are using it to cool themselves down on a hot summer day.

With that, I would say I look forward with dread on Friday to see what the new EPA Administrator has come forward with because I feel that it's going to pick winners and losers in this country and that our region, and really our own domestic energy supply and in some ways our domestic energy security, is going to be disadvantaged. That, to me, in a time of high unemployment, in a time of more part-time jobs being created than full-time, we're going to turn our back on an industry that looks to the future to do it better, to do it cleaner, to do it more efficiently, to do it with higher technology, to do it with better research, to do it with education, to employ the next generation in an industry that has been part of the backbone of this country and certainly of our region.

I thank the gentleman for having me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman, and certainly we can see the passion that she brings to the table.

I think one of the things that is important for the American people to understand is this notion of energy independence and security. We hear those terms a lot, but not everybody understands what those terms really mean and how it affects them, their families, their future.

I think there are some lessons that can be learned about America's past that would help us understand how energy independence and security might affect our future, and I'd like to spend a little bit of time talking about that. To do so, I want to set the stage just a little bit by taking us back to March of

2011 when right here in this Chamber the Prime Minister of Australia addressed a joint session of Congress. She came to this Chamber and she started her speech off by saying:

You know, I remember being a young girl sitting on my living room floor watching Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin land on the Moon, thinking to myself, "Wow, those Americans can do anything."

She went on to talk about America's and Australia's engagement in world issues, how America stood alongside of and often in front of Australia during World War II. At the end of her speech, she summarized by saying:

I'm not that young girl anymore. Today I'm the Prime Minister of our country, and yet still today I believe that Americans can do anything.

When she said that phrase the second time, this notion that Americans can do anything, you could have almost heard a pin drop in this Chamber. There was a hush as Members from the Senate, from the President's Cabinet, dignitaries, military leaders, Members of the House sort of took a collective cleansing breath, sucking that air in, that notion that Americans can do anything. It's not like we don't believe it. It's certainly not that we haven't proven it. But we don't hear it these days. We're certainly not teaching it to future generations the way we once did.

You see, when President Kennedy launched us on that great vision to put a man on the Moon in 10 years, he engaged every fabric of our society—our scientific community, our technological community, our academic community, our military, our economic will, our political will. And he said before the American people, We're not doing these things because they're easy. In fact, we're doing these things because they're hard and because by doing these things we're going to invent and innovate and discover things that we might not have discovered otherwise.

I'm paraphrasing what President Kennedy said, but that was the message that he delivered to the American people. He did such a good job of rallying the American people around this vision of American exceptionalism on that day that we didn't make it to the Moon in 10 years; we actually made it in 8 years. We saw one of the most expansive and innovative periods in American history unfold right before our very eyes, and we still see the benefits of that era today: the cell phones that we carry around, the flat-screen TVs that we watch, the computers that we use, the GPS systems that navigate us from place to place, medical technology, communicating technologies. So much innovation came out of that period of time.

We have an opportunity in America to harness that great American character of innovation just like President

Kennedy did around an idea of energy independence and security. As my colleague from West Virginia just pointed out, the President stood in this Chamber and said that back in January. He advocated, in his words, for an all-of-the-above energy policy, one that includes all forms of energy, yet his policies continue to do the opposite, particularly where the coal industry is concerned.

What if we had a national energy policy that went something like this? Starting today, America is setting a goal to become energy independent and secure in America by the year 2020.

□ 2100

And we are going to harvest the vast oil and gas resources that we have? Experts say we have more of that resource now than any nation on the planet. We are going to expand our nuclear footprint. It is the cleanest form of energy on the planet. We're going to invest in and advocate for alternative forms of energy like wind and solar, biofuels and hydro, but we are going to let the market drive those innovations. And yes, we are going to continue to mine and use the vast coal resources we have because we have got enough coal in this country to fuel our energy needs for generations. It's the most affordable, most reliable form of energy that we know.

But we're not going to stop there. We're going to have a regulatory process that requires that regulatory agencies, like the EPA, become partners in progress with America's industries and businesses, rather than just throwing up barriers and saying "no." If there's a reason to say no for public health or public safety reasons, then say no, but don't let no be the final answer. The American people have an expectation that their tax dollars are going to be used to move America forward, not to put on the brakes, kill jobs, ruin families, and make America less competitive in future generations.

I believe if we had that kind of energy vision we would once again see America's innovative wheels begin to turn. We would see young people lining up to get into technical programs and college programs to prepare them for careers in energy development, domestic energy development. We would see millions of jobs created. We would see industries crop up, and we would see a resurgence in manufacturing. We would see America go back to work.

And it would put in play the American Dream once again for millions of Americans, millions of middle class Americans, that have begun to think that perhaps the American Dream doesn't apply to them anymore. The American Dream is still alive and well in our country, and all we have to do, all we have to do is plug in to the type of American exceptionalism that put us on the Moon, and go after a real en-

ergy independence and security policy that harvests our coal, uses the natural resources that we have, and puts Americans back in charge of their own destiny.

I want to go into a little detail here on some of the comments that my colleagues from West Virginia, Kentucky, and North Dakota made just a few minutes ago. We know that coal-fired power plants like the Cardinal, Ohio, and Sammis plants, both of which are in my district, can be built with scrubbers in place so that coal can be used in a very environmentally safe way.

The President and his administration have started this war on coal that focuses on both the mining of coal and the use of coal in power plants. This week the EPA is expected to issue a rule on new power plants that will almost certainly ensure that under existing technology no new coal-fired power plant will be built in America. The new rule will require a technology called carbon sequestration and storage, and it's not commercially available nor commercially viable. My friend from West Virginia, DAVID MCKINLEY, has legislation that says that the EPA can't issue a rule that requires technology that isn't commercially viable. I hope we will consider that legislation in the House for two reasons. I think the American people have an expectation that people that make regulations that affect the economy, that affect the jobs, that affect the livelihood of Americans all over this country, that those rules are based on scientific fact and that they are technologically viable. That's not what we're seeing out of the EPA today.

And number two, I think it is absolutely irresponsible for the Federal Government to ban, essentially ban a form of energy that has fueled America's energy needs for generations and can for future generations. Remember what I said earlier: 800,000 jobs are produced either directly or indirectly across our country by the coal industry.

Before long, grid reliability will be in question, and rolling blackouts will be the norm again if we don't have coal power as part of our energy mix. I come from a background in information technology, and I can tell you that much of our technology is designed to operate on stable, reliable power, and blackouts and brownouts and dips in our power grid will put great stress on our technological resources. Don't take my word for it, ask the experts. Not to mention that energy costs are going to rise. People will lose their jobs and hardworking families will be forced to pay higher utility rates.

Sadly, this new rule on power plants is just the beginning. Next year, the EPA is expected to release a new rule regulating existing coal-fired power plants. Now if that rule is anything like the rule coming out this week,

coal-fired power plants could go extinct in just a few years. We're already seeing the effects of the EPA's crusade against coal. In my district alone, one coal-fired power plant has already closed, leaving over 100 people without jobs. Furthermore, there are six other coal-fired power plants in my district, and if the EPA issues that unworkable rule next year, thousands in my district could be without jobs.

Now, if the President's war on coal simply stopped here, the coal industry and the people employed either directly or indirectly by the coal industry might be okay. However, the EPA rules are just the tip of the iceberg because the rest of the administration is also actively trying to shut down coal producers with a series of new rules. First, at the Department of the Interior, the administration has been trying to rewrite the 2008 stream buffer zone rule for nearly 5 years now. This rewriting of the rule has been a disaster from the beginning as the administration has wasted nearly \$10 million and 5 years of our time on this environmentalists' dream. It might be a dream of theirs, but it is going to be a nightmare for the coal industry and the families across this country that are dependent upon it. We know that the preferred rule by the administration would cost thousands of jobs because the consultants they hired to do the analysis told us so, and it will lead to coal production being cut by nearly half in America. And yet, the administration appears unfazed and continues its effort to rewrite the rule.

That's why last year I introduced the Stop the War on Coal Act that would have stopped not only the rewrite of the stream buffer zone rule but also the EPA's misguided attempts to regulate coal-fired power plants. My colleague from Colorado, DOUG LAMBORN, and I, have reintroduced similar legislation this year, and I hope that the House will once again pass it and send a strong signal to the President to stop this rewrite.

Next, let's look at the Department of Labor. The President's Department of Labor is actively writing a rule dealing with coal dust that could potentially shut down totally underground mining. The rule is so unworkable and unreasonable that it has even been said that coal miners wearing full oxygen masks and tanks would not be in compliance with the rule. Think about that. Coal miners that would be breathing in pure oxygen would still be in violation of this new rule. And I'm not sure how a coal company can continue with a rule like that, and that's why we've been fighting against the implementation of this rule, called the coal dust rule, as well.

We and the American people should not be surprised by the President's actions nor the actions of his administration against the coal industry since he

came into office. As our colleague from West Virginia pointed out, he told us back before he was first elected that his anti-coal policies would cause electricity prices to skyrocket and that it would bankrupt a utility company if it wanted to build a new coal-fired power plant in America. It might have taken him almost 5 years to deliver on those promises, but we're about to see him issue rules that will cause energy prices to skyrocket, make it impossible to build a coal-fired power plant, and kill thousands of jobs across the country.

However, as we have seen tonight, there is a strong will here in the House of Representatives to stand up and fight back against the President's policies. So here's the message: we will not roll over because the future of our economy and the livelihoods of our constituents, our children and grandchildren are on the line. We will continue to fight through the appropriations process. We will continue to work hard to educate the public on these destructive policies until the President backs down.

I want to share one final story before I yield back. I wasn't born into the coal production industry. I didn't grow up knowing a lot about coal production, but I sure learned a lot about coal consumption. I spoke to the Ohio association of rural electric co-ops about a month ago and I shared with them that as a small boy, I was the utilities manager at a rural utility co-op. Now they looked at me like some of you are looking at me. They cocked their head kind of sideways and said, how can a young boy be the director of a utility co-op?

You see, on that rural farm where we worked, we had no indoor plumbing, and my grandmother heated and cooked on a big, black, round potbellied stove. My job as a young boy before I went to bed each night was to make sure that the coal bucket was full on the back porch so when my granddad got up at 4:30 in the morning to fire up that stove so grandmother could get up and start breakfast, it was there. It was also my job to bring in a cistern of water from the outside pump so she didn't have to go outside and get it.

So in a very real sense, I was the utilities manager for that farm. I provided the fuel and ensured that the fuel was there to heat and cook, and provided the water.

Folks, that's the character that America was built on. That's what hardworking people along Appalachia, Ohio remember. They dreamed of a future for their children and their grandchildren because they lived that kind of character. They still live it today.

I want to thank my colleagues for coming tonight and joining me in this effort to stop the administration's war on the coal industry.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 18, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2965. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Harmonization of Compliance Obligations for Registered Investment Companies Required to Register as Commodity Pool Operators (RIN: 3038-AD75) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2966. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Clearing Exemption for Certain Swaps Entered into by Cooperatives (RIN: 3038-AD47) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2967. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting notification of the President's intent to exempt all military personnel accounts for FY 2014; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2968. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Curtis M. Scaparrotti, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2969. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Susan S. Lawrence, United States Army, and her advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2970. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General James D. Thurman, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2971. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Connecticut: Hartford) (Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2972. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Annual Report entitled, "Delays in Approvals of Applications Related to Citizen Petitions and Petitions for Stay of Agency Action for Fiscal Year 2012"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2973. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition and Revision to the List of Validated End-Users in the People's Republic of China [Docket No.: 130826763-3763-01] (RIN: 0694-AF95) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2974. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Memorandum of justification for the 2013 certification regarding U.S. Assistance to the Government of Colombia's Air Bridge Denial Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2975. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 804 of the PLO Commitments Compliance Act of 1989 (title VIII, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 1990 and 1991 (Pub. L. 101-246)), and Sections 603-604 (Middle East Peace Commitments Act of 2002) and 699 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 2003 (Pub. L. 107-228), the functions of which have been delegated to the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2976. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period April 1, 2013 through May 31, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2977. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting U.S. support for Taiwan's participation as an observer at the 2013 International Civil Aviation Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2978. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2979. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Diamond Darter (*Crystallaria cincotta*) [Docket No.: FWS-R5-ES-2013-0019] (RIN: 1018-AZ40) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2980. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Species Status for Jemez Mountains Salamander (*Plethodon neomexicanus*) Throughout Its Range [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2012-0063; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AY24) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2981. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery off the Southern Atlantic States;

Amendment 28 [Docket No.: 121004515-3608-02] (RIN: 0648-BC63) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2982. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surclam and Ocean Quahog Fishery [Docket No.: 120604138-3684-03] (RIN: 0648-BC21) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2983. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Tilefish Fishery Management Plan; Regulatory Amendment, Corrections, and Clarifications [Docket No.: 120416018-3679-02] (RIN: 0648-BC05) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2984. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Closure [Docket No.: 121210694-3514-02] (RIN: 0648-XC783) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2985. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery off the South Atlantic States; Amendment 22; Correction (RIN: 0648-BA53) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2986. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Thornyhead Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC818) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2987. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Management Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 120814338-2711-02] (RIN: 0648-BD47) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2988. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — List of Fisheries for 2013 [Docket No.: 121024581-3714-02] (RIN: 0648-BC71) received September 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2989. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the 2012 annual report concerning intercepted wire, oral, or electronic

communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2990. A letter from the Controller, Daughters of the American Revolution, transmitting the Audited Financial Statements of NSDAR for the Fiscal Year ended December 31, 2012 (short fiscal year), pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(20) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2991. A letter from the Administrator, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Federal Aviation Administration's Capital Investment Plan (CIP) for fiscal years 2014-2018, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2203(b)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2992. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the Corp's report on the Corpus Christi Ship Channel Deepening and Barge Shelves; (H. Doc. No. 113—61); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

2993. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Debt That is a Position in Personal Property That is Part of a Straddle [TD 9635] (RIN: 1546-BK89) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2994. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Medicare Ombudsman report to Congress for the year 2012; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROYCE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 2449. A bill to authorize the President to extend the term of the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Civil Uses of Nuclear Energy for a period not to exceed March 19, 2016 (Rept. 113-209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1410. A bill to prohibit gaming activities on certain Indian lands in Arizona until the expiration of certain gaming compacts (Rept. 113-210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2011. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a two-year extension of the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education (Rept. 113-211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 813. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for advance appropriations for certain discretionary accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs; with amendments (Rept. 113-212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1526. A bill to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service

management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-213 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 347. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness (Rept. 113-214). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 3105. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to exempt from such Act animals accidentally included in shipments of aquatic species produced in commercial aquaculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself, Mr. MESSER, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 3106. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider decisions to inter or honor the memory of a person in a national cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARKE:

H.R. 3107. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish cybersecurity occupation classifications, assess the cybersecurity workforce, develop a strategy to address identified gaps in the cybersecurity workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 3108. A bill to amend the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 to extend the period during which supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits are temporarily increased; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3109. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to exempt certain Alaskan Native articles from prohibitions against sale of items containing nonedible migratory bird parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3110. A bill to allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BARTON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr.

NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MESSER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HALL, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. YODER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FINCHER, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. COOK, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GOMMERT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COLE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. HURT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. VELA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MULVANEY, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 3111. A bill to declare the November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas, a terrorist attack, and to ensure that the victims of the attack and their families receive the same honors and benefits as those Americans who have been killed or wounded in a combat zone overseas and their families; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3112. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify the designation of accreditation organizations for orthotics and prosthetics, to apply accreditation and licensure requirements to suppliers of such devices and items for purposes of payment under the Medicare program, and to modify the payment rules for such devices and items under such program to account for practitioner qualifications and complexity of care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consider-

ation of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. ROONEY):

H.R. 3113. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment and implementation of guidelines on best practices for diagnosis, treatment, and management of mild traumatic brain injuries (MTBIs) in school-aged children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 3114. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the increase in the income threshold used in determining the deduction for medical care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 3115. A bill to amend the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 to extend and expand the State Trade and Export Promotion (STEP) Grant Program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUNYAN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JONES, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 3116. A bill to promote the development of meaningful treatments for patients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 3117. A bill to bring an end to the spread of HIV/AIDS in the United States and around the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 3118. A bill to improve the retirement security of American families by strengthening Social Security; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. BARTON, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Taiwan and its 23,000,000 people deserve membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. RUNYAN,

Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. CONNOLLY:

H. Res. 348. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 2013 as "National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 3105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 3106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. CLARKE:

H.R. 3107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill, The Homeland Security Cybersecurity Boots-on-the-Ground Act, is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 3111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution clause 14, which grants Congress the power to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and including, but not solely limited to Article I, Section 8, Clause 14.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 3113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 3114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 3115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States), and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 3116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 3117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 3118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 75: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 183: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 184: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 274: Mr. ENYART and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 301: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 318: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 366: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 460: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 485: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 495: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 523: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 565: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 685: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. COOK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HURT, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 690: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 708: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 713: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 718: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 721: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 732: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 805: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 813: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 846: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 855: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. JOHN-SON of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 875: Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 900: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 920: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. YODER, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 921: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 961: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1001: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1009: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1020: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1077: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 1125: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1140: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1146: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1179: Ms. ESTY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1213: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1224: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1250: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1252: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1263: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1284: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1309: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 1339: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RUNYAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1373: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1389: Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1440: Mr. LATTI.

H.R. 1449: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1496: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1503: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1518: Mr. KILMER and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1528: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1563: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1588: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1601: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1666: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1695: Mr. NADLER, Mr. RADEL, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1708: Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 1717: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1731: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1771: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1772: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1779: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1796: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1803: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1835: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1861: Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 1905: Mr. COOPER, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 1950: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 1995: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2023: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2053: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2103: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 2113: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 2116: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2134: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2146: Mr. WELCH and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2156: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2201: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2224: Mr. COHEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2283: Mr. BACHUS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HURT, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 2288: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2309: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. POSTER, and Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 2311: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2350: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2361: Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 2375: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 2376: Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 2385: Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 2414: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2429: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2446: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 2459: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2477: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2479: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2480: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2485: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2499: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 2500: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 2502: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2504: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 2509: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2511: Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 2536: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2537: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2545: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2549: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2632: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2663: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2682: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 2692: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2715: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2717: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 2725: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ROKITA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2735: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2783: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2809: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 2837: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 2841: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2842: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 2856: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2870: Mr. NUNES, Mr. RENACCI, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2876: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. YODER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. YOHO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 2908: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2932: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2936: Mr. KIND and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2986: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2998: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3017: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3035: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3037: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 3043: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3067: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3076: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 3077: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 3092: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. REED.
H.R. 3095: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. JONES, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. JOYCE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HUNTER, and Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 3099: Mr. CASSIDY.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. AMODEI.
H.J. Res. 52: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.J. Res. 62: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. YODER, Mr. HALL, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. WALZ and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. POE of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 53: Mr. HOLT.
H. Res. 36: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. COOK.
H. Res. 101: Ms. BONAMICI.
H. Res. 109: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 123: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H. Res. 285: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. VARGAS.
H. Res. 302: Mr. KEATING.
H. Res. 307: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H. Res. 345: Ms. MENG, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative ALAN LOWENTHAL, or a designee, to H.R. 761 the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in H.R. 3012 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. KLINE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. LUCAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agricultural in H.R. 3102 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING CADET COLONEL
SEGIE RAY McCLENDON III

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable Cadet Colonel Seggie Ray McClendon III, who is Jackson Public Schools' JROTC Cadet of the Year for 2013. The Wingfield High School senior had earned many JROTC and school awards and has received countless other awards on the local and state level. Cadet McClendon serves as Mr. Wingfield, Mr. JROTC, and as the Cadet Battalion Commander for the Falcon Battalion.

Cadet McClendon has been accepted to attend several colleges and universities in Mississippi, including Jackson State University, Alcorn State University, Mississippi State University, Mississippi Valley State University, Hinds Community College, and Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College. His military goal is to receive an active duty commission as a Second Lieutenant in the United States Army.

Cadet McClendon competed for this honor against the top cadets from each of the seven JPS high schools. The Cadet of the Year candidates were required to appear before an eight-person selection panel of District administrator, military officials, and business leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Cadet Colonel Seggie Ray McClendon III.

HONORING THE WORLD WAR II
VETERANS OF NEW YORK'S HUD-
SON VALLEY

HON. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor dozens of World War II veterans and volunteers traveling to our nation's capital, many seeing for the first time the memorials that stand as a tribute to their selfless service.

As a son of a Navy veteran, it is a tremendous honor to welcome these American heroes to Washington, and I am proud to accompany them on a visit to the United States World War II Memorial, in recognition of their service to our nation.

We owe these brave veterans a debt of gratitude. They stood in defense of our freedoms and the freedoms of those around the world, and their sacrifice has made our country and the world a safer place. Our nation can never fully repay our veterans for their service,

but we can continue to honor all the brave veterans who fought for our country and the many who gave their lives in defense of our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, today we should honor the sacrifices of these brave veterans from the Hudson Valley who bravely stood up in defense of our freedoms. Please join me in thanking these American veterans for their tremendous service to an eternally grateful nation.

HONORING LINDA KAY MCKIM

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Linda Kay McKim. Linda was a very special individual whose life was an example of courage and patriotism.

In 1966, Linda married Hosein Radmanesh, an Iranian foreign-exchange student at Northeast Missouri State University in Kirksville, Missouri. Together, they would have two children and move to Iran, where Linda was routinely mocked and cursed at for being an American Christian. Her entire family was imprisoned during the Iranian Revolution, beginning in 1979. There she was beaten and offered clemency if she renounced the United States, but she held on to her faith and her patriotism throughout the ordeal. In 1986, she escaped from Iran with her daughter, followed the next year by her son and husband. After returning to Kirksville, she worked as a health and nutrition aide at Residential Care and Grimm Smith Hospital, and was a member of First Assembly of God in Kirksville.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending the family of Linda Kay McKim for her inspirational life and her dedication to her faith, her family, and her country.

HONORING THE UNITED STATES
CONSTITUTION

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the United States Constitution.

Among our nation's founding documents, the Constitution stands out for its singular importance, ingenuity, and lasting effect on global politics. Since its drafting in 1787, the Constitution has continued to inspire generations of people committed to making democracy work.

In their brilliant defense of the Constitution, Founders such as James Madison, Alexander

Hamilton, and John Jay discussed the delicate balance of power engineered in this document. It is important to remember their words today and the role that Congress plays in oversight of the other branches of government.

We should voice support for programs that aim to educate our nation's students on these fundamental Constitutional principles. The next generation of leaders must understand the workings of our government and the historic role the Constitution has played in our national story.

I am pleased to recognize a Colorado organization that promotes this very idea throughout the country. Liberty Day provides educators and students with free Constitutions, copies of the Declaration of Independence, and other landmark American documents. Efforts like these increase awareness and build appreciation for the institutions our Founding Fathers created more than 220 years ago.

I am proud to honor our Constitution and support those organizations like Liberty Day that ensure its meaning is not lost to the passage of time.

RECOGNIZING KYLE WEINTRAUB
AS A STAR STUDENT

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the courage and determination of Kyle Weintraub. Kyle, a Davie resident, is currently being treated at the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia for Anaplastic Large Cell Lymphoma (ALCL). Faced with the possibility of spending up to a year in the hospital receiving treatment, he decided that he would not let this obstacle prevent him from attending school.

By continuing to learn and attend school Kyle has demonstrated admirable resolve in fighting this life-threatening disease. He is a shining example for all students of what dedication and commitment to education looks like.

I would also like to commend his determination in the face of continuous treatments and the support of his family and friends in facilitating that effort. This is especially true in the case of Marni Rosenblatt, who was able to raise \$4,000 to help Kyle's parents with the costs for the special technology necessary, to allow him to continue his education.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in sending best wishes and prayers to this tenacious young man, Kyle Weintraub. He exemplifies the strength and courage we all hope to find within ourselves when faced with such a hardship.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HONORING THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSERVATION CORPS OF MINNESOTA AND IOWA

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 80th Anniversary of the Conservation Corps of Minnesota and Iowa. The Conservation Corps has a rich history of providing first-hand experiences with environmental stewardship to youth all over the State of Minnesota. The Conservation Corps has a distinct goal of assisting young adults from diverse backgrounds and engaging them in various leadership opportunities while building skills and learning about environmental initiatives. Through this critical involvement in the community, young people are able to gain insight as well as employment skills. This organization thrives through the many programs offered, whether it's the Home Energy Squad installing a programmable thermostat in a home or AmeriCorps Youth Leaders engaging teens in outdoor service-learning summer camps. The reach of the Conservation Corps is far and wide.

The Conservation Corps began in the 1930s and were called the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) which provided much needed employment to young men during the Great Depression. The CCC allowed these workers to provide for their families through the dismal economic times with natural resource jobs. By the 1970s the Youth Conservation Corps was launched by the federal government along with the year-round Young Adult Conservation Corps. When federal support for the Conservation Corps ended in 1981, the Minnesota Legislature stepped in and created the Minnesota Conservation Corps and continued to provide these invaluable opportunities through the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.

In 1999 the Friends of the Minnesota Conservation Corps, made up of community supporters and program alumni, was incorporated as a nonprofit organization. In 2003, they joined with the Conservation Corps and began to operate under the Minnesota Conservation Corps. In 2010, the organization changed its name to Conservation Corps Minnesota to maintain consistency with the branch created in Iowa. The organization, now headquartered in Ames, Iowa, continues to provide service-learning opportunities at their site though the reach of the organization extends far beyond our neighbors to the south. The effects of the Conservation Corps can be seen throughout the Midwest in Wisconsin, Upper Michigan, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota. No matter the location, the legacy of restoring our natural resources and changing lives remains the same. Minnesota, known for its 10,000 lakes and abundant natural resources, is indebted to the many hours, years, and volunteers that Conservation Corps has dedicated to preserving our environment.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of the community, history, and legacy of the Conservation Corps of Minnesota and Iowa, celebrating their 80th Anniversary, I am pleased to submit this statement.

HONORING THE KING SOLOMON BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a pillar of the community, the King Solomon Baptist Church. King Solomon has served as a catalyst for the civil rights movement of Warren County.

The Church was built by former slaves in 1860, it boasted nearly a thousand members in the 1940's. Its Pastors have been leaders in the State Baptist Convention as well as the National Baptist Convention.

King Solomon is an inner-city ministry located in the heart of downtown Vicksburg. The pervasive influence of the church has shaped the social fabric of central and southwest Mississippi and impacted the lives of thousands of its residents. The church serves the Vicksburg/Warren County community through its nursing home, prison, outreach, multi-media and food ministries. Church services are broadcast across Central Mississippi, Western Louisiana, Southwestern Arkansas and throughout the Mississippi Delta.

King Solomon Baptist Church dedicates the fourth weekend in April of each year to Family Empowerment Weekend (FEW). FEW is designed to bring awareness of the Biblical Family as the central building block of the community, state and nation.

King Solomon is in the final stages of completing a second location at 180 Oak Ridge Road where the Word will continue to be taught and preached.

The members and the pastor acknowledge that they exist for the glory of God and to exalt Christ in a fallen world. The ministry is centered on Salvation, Reaching the unadulterated Word of God, Love, Unity and Living an Obedient Life that exemplifies Jesus Christ. The Church motto is, "Christ First, Christ Only, Christ Always".

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the King Solomon Baptist Church for its rich heritage in Southwest Mississippi, dedication to serving others and giving back to the community.

HONORING TAYLOR LUKE PARRISH

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Taylor Luke Parrish. Taylor is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 138, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Taylor has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Taylor has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous

merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Taylor has earned the rank of Ordeal in the Order of the Arrow and become a Warrior in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Taylor has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Taylor improved the landscaping and installed a gravel walkway and patio at Mission Woods Community of Christ Church in Blue Springs, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Taylor Luke Parrish for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CONGRATULATING THE CNMI PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM ON ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, public education in the Northern Mariana Islands was transformed twenty-five years ago with the enactment of Public Law 6-10, the Education Act of 1988, creating an autonomous Public School System, overseen by an elected Board of Education, and administered by a Commissioner of Education. Establishment of a Public School System, outside of the executive branch of the Commonwealth government, coincided with a new period of political maturation, economic expansion, and population growth in the Northern Marianas; and the intervening years have proven the wisdom and value of this decision.

Twenty-five years ago, the Public School System comprised just over 6,000 students throughout 14 schools. Since then, PSS has grown dramatically. Student population is now 10,646, 75 percent greater. There are now 19 schools. Kagman High School, Chacha Ocean View Middle School, Kagman Elementary School, Saipan Southern High School, and Sinapalo Elementary School have all been constructed to better serve our students. And there are now 900 PSS personnel across the islands of Saipan, Tinian, and Rota.

As PSS has grown in size, so have the achievements of our students. These future leaders of our community regularly participate in national scholastic competitions, winning awards for their acting talent, debate skills, spelling abilities, and science acuity. Their successes are testament not only to students' efforts, but also to the school system that supported them and helped shape their minds.

Just this year, the Marianas High School Aeronautical Dolphins won the national Real World Design Challenge here in Washington, DC. Each student on that team was awarded a \$50,000 college scholarship.

For each of the past three years, PSS students have been recipients of Gates Millennium Scholarships, which pays for up to eight years of postsecondary education. This year alone three students from our small island community were awarded these scholarships. That is an amazing accomplishment—and a tribute to the efficacy of our public schools.

The Saipan Southern High School Manta Ray Band and Marianas High School Choir have both received national recognition for their musical talents. Last summer, the Manta Rays were chosen to perform in the 2012 Summer Olympics in London. They participated in the London Celebration Music Festival, as well, and brought home a silver medal.

These achievements—academic and extra-curricular—were made possible through the extraordinary and cumulative efforts of a group of individuals whose dedication knows no peer: the leaders, teachers, and staff of the Public School System. From science teacher to physical education instructor, maintenance employee to bus driver, each of these individuals makes their contribution to the educational success of our youth.

They are led by a Commissioner of Education, appointed by the Board of Education. Six men and women have served as Commissioner, each of whom has left an indelible imprint on PSS and the lives of its students.

The first Commissioner, Mr. Henry Sablan, led the organization through a period of transition from a Department of Education organized under the Office of the Governor to an autonomous public education system answerable to an elected Board. Dr. Elizabeth Diaz Rechebei then shepherded the school system for two years, followed by Mr. William S. Torres, who served for six years and initiated a move towards regional accreditation.

Dr. Rita Hocog Inos, in whose memory the junior and senior high school on the island of Rota is named, served as Commissioner of Education for eight years and implemented the SAT10 testing program and standards-based assessment for students, as well as the PRAXIS highly qualified teacher initiative for instructional staff. Dr. David Borja then led the system for two years, followed by our current Commissioner, Dr. Rita A. Sablan.

Dr. Sablan has, since assuming her role in 2008, focused tremendous attention on student academic achievement and guided the organization through a period of declining financial resources and increasing performance standards.

Thanks to the cumulative efforts of these six leaders, and their thousands of colleagues over the years, our students are performing better than ever on SAT10 tests, standards-based assessments, and on STAR reading and STAR math assessments. That performance is reflected in the 60 percent of graduating high school seniors who go on to college. Another 30 percent choose to serve our country in the armed forces. And 10 percent join the workforce.

Please join me in saluting those elected officials who, twenty-five years ago, recognized the value of an autonomous education system in the Northern Mariana Islands and enacted the Education Act. Also, join me in celebrating the many who built upon that foundation. The prescience of those leaders, and the hard work and dedication of the members of the Board of Education, the Commissioners, and the thousands of instructors and staff has brought us to the present-day successes of our Public School System.

Each and every individual who contributed to this achievement deserves the esteem and

gratitude of the people of the Northern Mariana Islands.

HONORING SHANICE WIMSATT

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Shanice Wimsatt, a dedicated student, who is making a difference in her community.

Shanice Wimsatt, was born in Chicago, IL on October 9, 1994. For about six years she grew up in an apartment in Chicago with her mother, Vivian Mitchell, her father, James Wimsatt and two older brothers, Jermaine and Andre Mitchell.

At about the age of six, they moved to Yazoo City, MS. She quickly began to excel in her studies. By doing so well, she was invited to be in a high performance program called DIG. But, upon entering into the fourth grade, DIG offered her a chance to skip a grade or two. This was one of the first most important decisions she faced and she was not able to accept the offer, because by then her mother had started moving to Pickens, MS where she currently lives.

Life in Holmes county has taught her many things. Her strengths and decisions have been tested and challenged. She quickly learned that she was in poverty and did not like it at all. She set out to change or at least help change her community.

She first started an all girls group, during a critical pregnancy period and called it I.Y.G. (Independent Young Girls). Her goal was to empower the young ladies at her school by showing them that they have supporters. Next, she and a friend teamed up and created Teens on a Mission. This was created to provide more jobs for the teens in the area and to show the world that teenagers can make a difference, being that, some were voted least likely to succeed.

She is now making a great difference in her community and for herself.

REMEMBERING THE 9/11 ATTACKS

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, it has been twelve years since that terrible day when nearly 3000 of our fellow citizens perished in an unprovoked series of attacks on our nation. And while the key perpetrators of that horror are now themselves either dead or in our custody, the pain and the heroism of Americans on that day are something we must never forget.

I remember Todd Beamer of Cranbury, New Jersey, who, along with the other passengers on Flight 93, made the ultimate sacrifice to save more people in Washington, DC from almost certain death. I also remember “the Jersey Girls”—Kristen Breitweiser, Patty

Casazza, Lone Van Auken, and Mindy Kleinberg—who, along with other family members, battled President Bush to force the creation of the 9/11 Commission. These men and women of 9/11—those who perished and those who preserve their memory—remind us of the strength and resilience of the American spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the spirit of unity and common purpose that we experienced in the wake of the 9/11 tragedy can be rekindled in our nation and used to confront the many serious problems facing America. May we each play our part in reviving that spirit, even as we honor the memory of those who showed on that fateful September morning twelve years ago.

HONORING THOMAS ALAN REILLY, JUNIOR

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Thomas Alan Reilly, Jr. Thomas is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 251, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Thomas has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Thomas has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Thomas has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Thomas Alan Reilly, Jr., for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

MABEL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL “PEACE DAY”

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the students at Mabel Elementary School in Watauga County are observing “International Peace Day” this Friday.

I commend them for taking the time to pay such special attention to a cause as important as peace.

Each student at Mabel Elementary School has a part to play in building peace.

As I told the student, peace starts with respect—respect for yourself, your family, your classmates, your teachers, and for our American values of life, liberty, personal responsibility, and equality.

Pursuing peace goes hand-in-hand with practicing respect. And practicing respect is a choice each of us will make for the rest of our lives.

President Ronald Reagan, in a speech to students at Moscow State University, said "A people free to choose will always choose peace."

In this country, we not only have the freedom to make that choice, we also have wonderful examples to follow as we learn to practice respect and build peace.

No one values peace more than the men and women who serve in our armed forces. These brave people and their families sacrifice to defend freedom and pursue peace in our world. When bad things happen and when we find ourselves in danger, they answer the call to protect us and they always work to find peace.

It takes courage and conviction to choose to treat others with respect and pursue peace. But peace is a noble calling and a just goal.

By practicing peace and respect at home and in school, Mabel Elementary students can help build a more peaceful North Carolina, a more peaceful America, and even a more peaceful world.

Again, I commend them on their Peace Day celebration.

HONORING PROFESSOR RICHARD
M. MURRAY

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration and respect that I rise today to speak of the contributions Professor Murray has made in the field of engineering. This month, a faculty member of the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, California was inducted into the National Academy of Engineering's Class of 2013. Professor Richard M. Murray, the Thomas E. and Doris Everhart Professor of Control and Dynamical Systems and Bio-engineering, was inducted for his contributions in control theory and networked control systems with applications to aerospace engineering, robotics, and autonomy.

Election to membership at the National Academy of Engineering (NAE) is one of the highest professional honors accorded an engineer. While members are elected into the NAE by their peers and colleagues, only a handful of engineers are inducted each year. Richard's accomplishments and research have allowed him to distinguish himself among his peers.

As the Chair of the Engineering and Applied Sciences Division from 2000–2005, Director of the Information Science and Technology Council from 2006–2009, and Interim Chair of the Engineering and Applied Sciences Division from 2008–2009, Richard has distinguished himself not only as a university faculty, but also as an effective academic administrator.

I am proud to represent such a distinguished scholar and engineer and could not be more proud of the achievements he has made at the California Institute of Technology. I sincerely thank Professor Murray for his dedication to scientific innovation and research as well as teaching and mentoring future engineers. I urge my colleagues to join me in commending Professor Murray for his service,

contribution, and ongoing commitment to scientific progress.

HONORING THE MOUNT ZION
BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a pillar of the community, the Mount Zion Baptist Church.

The Mount Zion Baptist Church was founded in 1899 in Cary, MS. The Church has had several great leaders: Rev. Threadgill, Rev. James Merrill and Rev. Jack Wilson to name a few.

In the 60's the church elected Rev. C.B. Smith. Rev. Smith was a visionary leader and believed in pushing the church forward. In 1992 Rev Smith led the Church into a new edifice. Rev. Smith nurtured the church through Christian education. Rev Smith was the longest serving Pastor.

After Rev. C.B. Smith's tenure the congregation elected Rev. Henry Wilson who served the church faithfully until his health began to fail. Under his leadership the church continued to labor in the ministry.

In 2009 the church elected Dr. Peter Jackson and he served for nearly three years before he resigned.

After much prayer the church elected Rev. Travis J. Gully to serve as the Pastor. He began to preach and teach the word of God and things began to change. The church has recently decided to build the C.B. Smith Family Life Center. The church has begun to press forward in the new season. Rev. Gully's goal is to have the church to do ministry in a dynamic way.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Mount Zion Baptist Church as they celebrate 114 years of standing firmly on the word of God.

CONGRATULATING BEN'S CHILI
BOWL ON ITS 55TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Ben's Chili Bowl on its 55th anniversary of service to the residents of the District of Columbia and its thousands of visitors, who have carried its reputation far and wide.

Ben's was founded in 1958 by newlyweds Ben and Virginia Ali, who converted an old pool hall on U Street into today's Ben's Chili Bowl, a virtual DC institution. The Ali's made Ben's into a prominent family business that their sons Kamal and Nizam later joined. Ben's has expanded from its signature U Street location to Ben's Next Door, Nationals Park, and FedEx Field, and will soon open locations on H Street NE and in Arlington, Vir-

ginia. From the beginning, Ben's Chili Bowl was frequented by the neighborhood, then the city, and soon celebrities, entertainers, actors, and political figures as they visited DC's historic U Street, also known as "Black Broadway." After the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and the riots that soon followed, Ben's Chili Bowl was given special police permission to remain open to provide food and shelter for all who were trying to restore peace in the city.

The popular restaurant saw a surge in customers during the 1970s but also big-city problems. In 1987, the expansion of DC's Metro rail to the U Street corridor made U Street a construction site, drastically reducing customer traffic and threatening Ben's survival. But Ben's survived while many U Street businesses died. Five years later, when the Green Line was completed, Ben's Chili Bowl returned to full business. Its core strength, which ensured the loyalty of its customers, had taken Ben's through civil disturbances that destroyed the old U Street and construction that took much of what was left.

Today, Ben's Chili Bowl flourishes as a DC destination that tourists visit the way they tour the official historic sites. Its regulars include celebrities like Bill Cosby and Dick Gregory, politicians like President Obama, and visitors from throughout the world. Ben's famous half-smokes continue to tantalize the tastes of regulars and newcomers alike.

Ben's Chili Bowl has given the District of Columbia its own fun cuisine beginning with its half-smokes. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the 55th anniversary of Ben's Chili Bowl and in wishing the Ali family continued success.

HONORING JOHN BRADLEY THARP

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize John Bradley Tharp. John is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 249, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

John has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years John has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, John has earned the rank of Foxman in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and led his troop as Senior Patrol Leader. John has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. John installed erosion breaks and provided needed trail maintenance on a three-mile walking trail in Weston Bend State Park in Weston, Missouri. This trail is used by 25,000 people annually and is a major attraction in Platte County.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending John Bradley Tharp for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

SENSELESS VIOLENCE AT THE WASHINGTON NAVY YARD

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deepest condolences to those whose lives changed forever as a result of the senseless violence at the Washington Navy Yard.

As a military chaplain who served in a combat zone, I have counseled many soldiers and families in times of loss.

While we are aware of the danger of casualties during overseas deployments, we certainly do not expect to lose members of our military on our own soil.

I want the friends and family of the active duty and civilian Navy employees who lost their lives in service to their country on Monday to know their sacrifice will be remembered.

I also want these individuals to know that I join with all Americans in my commitment to see justice done.

Along with all members of our Armed Forces, I offer my unwavering support to the Navy family in this time of grief.

We mourn all the victims of this tragedy, including the law enforcement officers who lost their lives, and send our best wishes to survivors as they recover.

My prayers and thoughts will continue to be with the victims and families of the Navy Yard shooting.

HONORING DR. MELVIN B. GIRTON, SR. ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Melvin B. Gorton, Sr., who, after 50 years of dedicated service, has retired as the senior pastor of Christ Missionary Baptist Church in Indianapolis.

Throughout his career, Dr. Gorton has been a champion for civil rights and an outspoken advocate for social justice. As spiritual leader of the 94-year-old congregation, he has organized and hosted hundreds of events to bring the people of central Indiana together in celebration, remembrance, and hope. He remains dedicated to these goals even in retirement and will continue to serve as host pastor for the annual Indianapolis Emancipation Proclamation service, an event that is attended by dignitaries and officials from around the country. Dr. Gorton's advocacy has not been limited to the pulpit, though. He has worked tirelessly for equality and opportunity as Vice President of the Indianapolis Branch of the NAACP and has been an ever present force in efforts to strengthen our community.

Recognizing a need for job training and the redevelopment of local neighborhoods, Dr. Gorton founded the Christ Missionary Baptist Economical Training & Development Center in

1998. The Center began as a small laundry mat in an underused strip mall near the church, but over time has grown to provide a powerful social outlet for seniors, job training for local youth, and reintegration services for juvenile and adult offenders.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. Gorton for his years of dedicated service to his parishioners, the Indianapolis community, and all Hoosiers.

HONORING THE KING SOLOMON MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a pillar of the community, the King Solomon M.B. Church. King Solomon served as a permanent staple in Yazoo City, Mississippi.

King Solomon M.B. Church was established when nine members of Holy Green Missionary Church decided to revolutionize and become an independent embodiment of Christians. In October of 1903 the church was organized under the leadership of Rev. Kyzer, Rev. G.P. Green and Rev. A.C. Carter in the home of Sister Mollie Carey. Then Sister Mahalia Turner named the church King Solomon Missionary Baptist Church.

The first service was held under a brush arbor due to lack of proper facilities under the direction of Rev. A.C. Carter. As the fall season grew colder services were held at the home of Sister Vickie Love. Under the leadership of Rev. A.C. Carter, membership continued to grow therefore needing a larger and more appropriate facility. Members appointed a group to form the building committee, who arranged to build a frame structure in the Lintonia subdivision which is today's current location, 1409 Calhoun Avenue. On May 12, 1904, the church was built after long period of hard work and dedication.

In 1948, Rev. Hammond was elected as pastor. During this time the church divided and the New King Solomon was organized. The church suffered greatly during this upheaval. It was not until Rev. R.S. Scott was elected as pastor at King Solomon in 1948 that the church began to rejuvenate, unify and prosper once more. Rev. Scott served the church with compassion and strong conviction.

In 1960, Rev. G.H. Hankins was elected and under his leadership the church was remodeled. He later resigned in October of 1987 after twenty-seven years of faithful service.

Rev. Benjamin Hall Jr. was elected in 1989 and continues to serve in this capacity today. In 1997, grounds were broken to begin the building of the facility that they now occupy. The reconstructed annex was completed, dedicated and renamed the "Waymon C. Crump Education Complex".

Members of King Solomon pride themselves with the energy they put into the youth of the church. Their motto is "We are Family," and they promote it not only in the church family but the community through their many ministries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the King Solomon Missionary Baptist Church as they strive to be the "beacon on the hill" that guides others to the joy of serving God through His Son, Jesus Christ.

HONORING THE HONORABLE ELIHU M. HARRIS

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary career of the Honorable Elihu Harris as we celebrate over 30 years of his dedicated public service and accomplishments. Mr. Harris continues to be a celebrated individual, and we join together in praise of his remarkable contributions to the Bay Area, California, and our great nation.

Born Elihu Mason Harris in Los Angeles, California on August 15, 1947, Mr. Harris grew up in Berkeley, California and graduated from Berkeley High School in 1965. He received his B.A. degree in Political Science at California State University, Hayward (East Bay), and went on to earn an M.A. from the Graduate School of Public Policy at the University of California, Berkeley. Mr. Harris received his J.D. from the University of California, Davis in 1972.

Mr. Harris' esteemed career has spanned over four decades as an attorney at law, politician, and community college administrator. He became a senior partner for the firm of Harris, Alexander and Burris in 1978 for twelve years. He was an instructor teaching at various higher education institutions in the Bay Area, and later served on staff for Congresswoman Yvonne Burke and Assemblymember John Miller. In 1975, he was appointed as the Executive Director of the National Bar Association before forging his legacy in California politics. In 1978, Mr. Harris was elected to the California State Assembly to represent the 13th District. During his thirteen year tenure, he chaired the Joint Legislative Audit Committee, served as Chair of the Select Committees, and was a member of the Judiciary Committee as well as the Transportation, Health, Labor and Ways and Means, subcommittees on Education and Finance. In 1981, Mr. Harris authored the historic legislation that designated Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday a California state holiday. The Oakland Elihu M. Harris State Office Building was dedicated in his honor in 1998.

From 1991 to 1999, Mr. Harris served as Mayor of Oakland. In that role, Mr. Harris helped to restore and strengthen Oakland following the devastating aftermath of both the Loma Prieta earthquake and Oakland Hills Firestorm. He developed Oakland Sharing the Vision, a community strategic plan involving Oaklanders setting goals and objectives for the City. He also established community policing for Oakland neighborhoods, and created new city programs and initiatives to improve the community such as Oakland Healthy Cities and Camp Read-A-Lot, one of the many education endeavors he supported in office.

In 2000, Mr. Harris was appointed by Governor Gray Davis to serve as a board member

on the California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board. From there, Mr. Harris was appointed in 2003 as interim Chancellor of the Peralta Community College District before receiving the post on a permanent basis in 2004. During his term as Chancellor, Mr. Harris was a strong supporter for students and championed equal access to education for all. He served in this capacity until 2010.

Throughout his prolific career, Mr. Harris has been an ardent advocate for social justice and civil rights. The Martin Luther King Jr. Freedom Center and Merritt College has recognized Mr. Harris' contributions and aptly named its lecture series program as "The Barbara Lee and Elihu Harris Lecture Series."

On a personal note, Elihu has been my brother and my friend since the early 70's. He has been my trusted confidant and provides honest feedback and constantly "watches my back". For this and so much more, I am deeply grateful.

Therefore, on behalf of California's 13th Congressional District, the Honorable Elihu Harris, I salute you. Your over 30 years of public service have made an indelible mark in our community. Best wishes to you and your loved ones in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING WILLIAM ST.
GEMME, ALL AMERICAN COM-
MANDER

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize William St. Gemme, Commander of Springfield, Missouri's Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) Post 3404, to whom the VFW has given All American status as a Post Commander.

William was drafted into the United States Army in November of 1967. He served in a number of locations, including Vietnam, as a Captain in the Medical Service Corps and was honorably discharged in October of 1971. William joined the VFW Post 3404 in 2005 and was named Commander in October of 2011.

The title of All American Commander is the most prestigious honor given by the VFW. Out of more than 7,200 VFW Posts, only 204 VFW Post Commanders have been selected worldwide as an All American Commander. This honor is based on outstanding achievements in membership growth and participation in other VFW programs that benefit veterans and their communities.

Post 3404 and the Ladies Auxiliary of Springfield, Missouri also received the Veterans of Foreign Wars National Outstanding Community Service Post Award. There were only 68 recipients of this award. These Posts are remarkable examples of nearly 12 million hours of community service throughout the U.S. valued at over \$263 million performed by VFW volunteers last year.

I am honored to recognize William's achievements as Post Commander of VFW Post 3404.

DANIEL DEMELFI, UNICO
HAZLETON CHAPTER

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Daniel DeMelfi, the outgoing president of the UNICO Hazleton, Pennsylvania Chapter.

Mr. DeMelfi has served as the president of the UNICO Hazleton Chapter since 2010 and has held positions as a core committee member and entertainment co-chair for UNICO's Bell'Italia Festival. UNICO is the largest Italian American organization in the United States. Members seek to improve their communities by providing assistance to area and national charities through fundraisers and donations. Additionally, they strive to honor and educate others about their Italian culture and ethnic heritage.

Mr. DeMelfi's commitment to the community does not end with his service to UNICO. He serves as the founder and former president of the Hazleton Area Landlords' Organization, a core committee member for the Sounds of the Season Concert, and lector and piano accompanist for the Most Precious Blood Roman Catholic Church. Additionally, he is a board member for both the Hazleton Silent Santa organization and the Wiltsie Performing Arts Center.

Mr. Speaker, for his dedicated service to both his Italian heritage and our community, I commend Daniel DeMelfi, outgoing president of the UNICO Hazleton, Pennsylvania Chapter.

IN MEMORIAM OF STAFF SER-
GEANT ROBERT E. THOMAS, JR.

HON. GLORIA NEGRETE McLEOD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, the nation mourns the passing of Staff Sergeant Robert E. Thomas, Jr., age 24, who died last Friday at Brooke Army Medical Center in San Antonio, Texas, for injuries sustained while serving in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan.

A native of Fontana, California, Sergeant Thomas was stationed with the 1st battalion of the 36th Infantry Regiment, 1st armored division in Fort Bliss, Texas. He is survived by his wife, Kristina and daughter, Hailey, as well as his father and mother.

I send my condolences to the family, friends, and all those who knew and loved Staff Sergeant Thomas. We honor his love of country and his dedicated service to our nation.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

HON. JOHN FLEMING

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my thanks to the Louisiana Society

Daughters of the American Revolution for their efforts to promote Constitution Week, September 17–23. The women of the Louisiana Society Daughters of the American Revolution have dedicated themselves to promoting a better understanding of the Constitution since 1895, and I commend them for their continued contributions.

The Constitution of the United States of America sets us apart from every government that had come before. We are a nation of laws, not men. Our Constitution has survived the test of time in embodying and protecting that fundamental principle. Further, the Constitution guarantees our freedom of speech, religion, our right to bear arms and protects us from the government itself. Our Founding Fathers well understood the need to limit the power of any one branch of government through checks and balances.

We owe the Daughters of the American Revolution a debt of gratitude for their efforts to promote the study of and reflection upon this critical document, as only an informed public can protect its own rights.

When I was sworn in as a Member of Congress, I took an oath to support and defend the Constitution. The principles found in our Constitution have propelled our country to be a "shining city on a hill." I believe our nation's greatness can be renewed by returning to our founding ideals.

INDIA'S MISSING GIRLS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a hearing that my subcommittee held last week examined the problem of "India's Missing Girls." While for most of us today our attention was drawn to the unfolding crisis in Syria—I was on C-SPAN's Washington Journal Program call-in program and introduced a resolution calling for establishing a Syrian War Crimes Tribunal—other atrocities continue unabated around the world. We cannot ignore these atrocities, among the most egregious of which is violation of the human rights of the girl child and women in India.

Women in India are confronted with a compounding crisis. By most estimates, there are tens of millions of women missing in India due to the devaluing of female life beginning in the womb.

Sex-selective abortion and female infanticide have led to lopsided sex ratios. In parts of India, for example, 126 boys are born for every 100 girls. This in turn leads to a shortage of marriageable women, which then leads to trafficking in persons, bride selling and prostitution.

Perhaps the best figures we have concerning the magnitude of the problem come from India's 2011 census figures, which find that there are approximately 37 million more men than women in India.

Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh has addressed this issue head on, stating "the falling child sex ratio is an indictment of our social values. Improving this ratio is not merely

a question of stricter compliance with the existing laws. What is more important is how we view and value the girl child in our society . . . It is a national shame for us that despite this, female feticide and infanticide continue in many parts of our country."

Even when they are not killed outright either in the womb or just after birth, this bias against girl children manifests itself in situations where family resources are limited and little food is available, in boys being fed before girls, leading to greater incidents of malnutrition among girls and a mortality rate that is 75% higher for girls below age 5 than for boys.

The desire for a male child can be so great that there is a trend towards sex change operations for girls between ages 1 to 5, a process known as "genitoplasty." Each year, hundreds of girls reportedly are pumped with hormones and surgically altered to turn them into facsimile boys. India's National Commission for Protection of Child Rights has correctly stated that this "highly unethical" procedure is a violation of children's rights as well as a "perpetuation of the age old preferences for boys and biases against the girl child."

But the roots of the present problem lie not only with cultural factors, but also misbegotten policy decisions—including population control policies that were hatched in the United States—which have had a disproportionately negative impact on India's women.

We learned from our witnesses that this includes policies advanced by the United States Agency for International Development, or USAID, and funded by foundations such as the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation, and abetted by non-governmental organizations such as the Population Council and the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

During the debate in the U.S. House of Representatives on a bill to ban sex selective abortion, I noted that for most of us, "it's a girl" is cause for enormous joy, happiness and celebration. But in many countries—including our own—it can be a death sentence. Today, the three most dangerous words in China and India are: it's a girl. We can't let that happen here.

Our witness today, Dr. Matthew Connelly, in his book *Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population* traces the sordid history of sex-selection abortion as a means of population control. In her book, *Unnatural Selection: Choosing Boys Over Girls, and the Consequences of a World Full of Men*, Mara Hvistendahl, elaborates "[b]y August 1969, when the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the Population Council convened another workshop on population control, sex selection had become a pet scheme . . . Sex selection, moreover, had the added advantage of reducing the number of potential mothers . . . if a reliable sex determination technology could be made available to a mass market," there was "rough consensus" that sex selection abortion "would be an effective, uncontroversial and ethical way of reducing the global population."

Fewer women, fewer mothers, fewer future children.

At the conference, one abortion zealot, Christopher Tietze co-presented sex selection

abortion as one of twelve new strategies representing the future of global birth control. Planned Parenthood honored Tietze four years later with the Margaret Sanger Award.

Hvistendahl writes that today "there are over 160 million females 'missing' from Asia's population. That's more than the entire female population of the United States. And gender imbalance—which is mainly the result of sex selective abortion—is no longer strictly an Asian problem. In Azerbaijan and Armenia, in Eastern Europe, and even among some groups in the United States, couples are making sure at least one of their children is a son. So many parents now select for boys that they have skewed the sex ratio at birth of the entire world."

In the *Global War Against Baby Girls* renowned AEI demographer Nicholas Eberstadt wrote in *The New Atlantis*; "over the past three decades the world has come to witness an ominous and entirely new form of gender discrimination: sex-selective feticide, implemented through the practice of surgical abortion with the assistance of information gained through prenatal gender determination technology. All around the world, the victims of this new practice are overwhelmingly female—in fact, almost universally female. The practice has become so ruthlessly routine in many contemporary societies that it has impacted their very population structures, warping the balance between male and female births and consequently skewing the sex ratios for the rising generation toward a biologically unnatural excess of males."

Many European nations including the UK as well as several Asian countries ban sex selection abortion. Only four U.S. states—Arizona, Illinois, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania—proscribe it.

Sex-selection abortion is cruel and discriminatory and legal. It is violence against women. Most people in and out of government remain woefully unaware of the fact that sex-selection abortion was—a violent, nefarious and deliberate policy imposed on the world by the pro-abortion population control movement—it's not an accident. The Congress can—and must—defend women from this vicious assault today.

While India has taken steps to curb these practices, passing laws to ban sex selective abortion and temper cultural facts such as the need for brides to provide a high dowry that contribute to parents looking at their daughters as a liability, these laws are irregularly enforced. Moreover, there are laws at the state level which exacerbate the problem, mandating that parents only have two children, penalizing those who exceed this number and denying benefits. This leads inevitably to sex-selective abortion and, particularly in poorer areas, female infanticide, as parents will opt to have a son over a daughter, especially when their first child is a daughter.

We hope that this hearing will better understand how we can play a role in curbing such horrific abuses.

What, for example, can we do to help ensure that companies based in the US, such as General Electric, whose ultrasound equipment is used to determine the sex of the child in utero, take steps to prevent what should be a tool to promote life of both mother and child from being used as an instrument of death?

Given the past role of U.S. agencies such as USAID in coercive population control policies, what oversight do we need to conduct to make sure such abuses do not creep their way into existing programs?

Similarly, to what extent are organizations that receive funding from the United States government implicated in such practices?

What role can our State Department play, beyond compiling information regarding what is occurring in India with respect to what some have labeled "gendercide," to influence positively the Indian government, so that it reforms laws and policies that exacerbate skewed sex ratios, such as two-child laws?

By shining a light on what is happening in India with its missing girls, we hope to move toward a world where every woman is valued and respected because of her intrinsic dignity, and where every child is welcomed regardless of his or her sex.

HONORING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF BROWNELL-TALBOT

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Brownell-Talbot School, an educational institution in my district that is celebrating a truly remarkable milestone in their rich history.

Today marks the Brownell-Talbot School Sesquicentennial. This school played a visionary role in Omaha during our city's formative years and has now enjoyed 150 years of rich history. Rt. Reverend Joseph Cruickshank Talbot, D.D. originally founded the school in 1863 as a girls' boarding school named Brownell Hall. It was established to bring cultural and educational opportunities to the daughters of the pioneers.

The school held the first commencement exercise for high school graduates in the State of Nebraska in 1868. It eventually became co-educational in 1952 under the name Brownell Hall-Talbot School for Boys. The school was ultimately renamed Brownell-Talbot School in 1963, and today is the only independent, pre-school through grade 12, college preparatory school in Nebraska.

Brownell-Talbot School continues to graduate some of the city's best and brightest students. The school has very high academic standards and has earned the highest published average composite ACT score in Nebraska.

This 150th Anniversary honors all of Brownell-Talbot School's founders, board members, supporters, past and present students and their teachers, administrators, and staff. All of these members of the Brownell-Talbot School community have had a hand in the exemplary education of Brownell-Talbot students, a tradition that will undoubtedly continue long into the future.

HONORING TERRIONA COWAN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable student, Ms. Terriona Cowan, who was born in Jackson, Mississippi, on July 11, 1993. She is the daughter of Mr. Reginald and Tianna Bennett. She is a student at Jackson State University, majoring in Chemistry Pre-Medicine. As an ambitious chemistry student, majority of her time is spent in class or doing biochemical research. She enjoys being a research scholar in her field of study and has many long term goals to enhance it.

Aside from using her intellectual gift, she is also committed to the community where she believes service is the way to build the world. She is a dedicated volunteer at Blair E. Batson Children's Hospital. Tending to kids with sickness is her motivation throughout the day. On her free time, she often goes to the reservoir and meditates on the blessings that God has yet to cease in her life.

After accepting Christ at a young age at Pleasant Grove M. B. Church in Benton, Mississippi she understands the importance of giving God credit for the things that he has done. In the future, she looks forward to being a positive role model to others that want to make the world a more peaceful and positive place.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Terriona Cowan.

RECOGNIZING THE MEMBERS OF AMERICORPS

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the members of AmeriCorps and their service to this country. On Saturday, September 21, 2013, AmeriCorps will celebrate their 20th anniversary. For 20 years, their first priority has been the communities of America. Their members have served in thousands of ways across the nation. In my own home state, members of the AmeriCorps Conservation Corps were critical in assisting the management of the Coloclock Tarps Fire this past year—a fire which burned across over 20,000 acres. This is only one small example of their commitment to helping others in any way possible.

Members like these set an example to all Americans. Their actions continually encourage people of all ages and from all walks of life to engage in community service projects and help others. I am encouraged by their dedication and witness daily the benefits of community engagement and service that they work so hard to promote. Once more, I thank and congratulate them on achieving this milestone.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.

Today, it is \$16,738,502,722,145. We've added \$6,111,625,673,232 to our debt in 4 years. This is \$6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING 50 WWII VETERANS VISITING THROUGH HONOR FLIGHT OF EASTERN OREGON

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 50 World War II veterans from Oregon who will be visiting their memorial this Friday in Washington, DC through Honor Flight of Eastern Oregon. On behalf of a grateful state and country, we welcome these heroes to the nation's capital.

The veterans on this flight from Oregon are as follows: James Bray, U.S. Army; Howard Brink, U.S. Army; Donner Fearing, U.S. Army; Murray Hale, U.S. Army; Dan Jackson, U.S. Army; Franklin Jenkins, U.S. Army; Robert Michael, U.S. Army; Warren Norton, U.S. Army; Frank Passmore, U.S. Army; Wilbur Rasmussen, U.S. Army; Deryl Richter, U.S. Army; Joseph Sequito, U.S. Army; Charles Wilkins, U.S. Army; Thomas Wright, U.S. Army; Howard Bunker, U.S. Army Air Force; Phillip Chaperon, U.S. Army Air Force; Walter Davis, U.S. Army Air Force; Everett Endicott, U.S. Army Air Force; Hiram Hern, U.S. Army Air Force; Thomas Herrod, U.S. Army Air Force; William Keating, U.S. Army Air Force; Carl King, U.S. Army Air Force; James Minturn, U.S. Army Air Force; Richard Strom, U.S. Army Air Force; Robert Bullock, U.S. Coast Guard; Fred Coulter, U.S. Coast Guard; Mel Baldivia, U.S. Marine Corps; Robert Tinsley, U.S. Marine Corps; Calvin Weissenfluh, U.S. Marine Corps; Richard Drexelius, U.S. Merchant Marine; William Anderson, U.S. Navy; John Brainerd, U.S. Navy; Jack Burtch, U.S. Navy; John Clarke, U.S. Navy; John Emerson, U.S. Navy; Albert Emmons, U.S. Navy; Alta Halliday, U.S. Navy; Orlin Hansen, U.S. Navy; Darell Hillard, U.S. Navy; Frederick LaMear, U.S. Navy; Robert Ledford, U.S. Navy; Harry Maxwell, U.S. Navy; Donald Morris, U.S. Navy; Harold Schumock, U.S. Navy; Russell Sichley, U.S. Navy; Ellis Skidmore, U.S. Navy; Gordon Smith, U.S. Navy; Donald Tippet, U.S. Navy; Arthur Vinall, U.S. Navy; and Jeffrey Walker, U.S. Navy.

These 50 heroes join more than 98,000 veterans from across the country who, since 2005, have journeyed from their home states to Washington, DC to reflect at the memorials built in honor of our nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, each of us is humbled by the courage of these soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who put themselves in harm's way for our country and way of life. As a nation, we can never fully repay the debt of gratitude owed to them for their honor, commitment, and sacrifice in defense of the freedoms we have today.

My colleagues, please join me in thanking these veterans and the volunteers of Honor Flight of Eastern Oregon for their exemplary dedication and service to this great country. I especially want to recognize and thank Dick and Erik Tobiason for their tireless work with Honor Flight of Eastern Oregon.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ERNIE BANKS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize baseball legend Ernie Banks for being selected to receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom. Among other recipients of the nation's highest civilian honor will be former President Bill Clinton; the late Sally Ride, the first American female astronaut; country singer Loretta Lynn; North Carolina basketball coach Dean Smith and Oprah Winfrey.

Ernie Banks made his debut to the Major League on September 13, 1953, 60 years ago. I am proud to say Ernie Banks is a native of my Congressional District in Dallas, Texas. Ernie Banks, who went on to have a Hall of Fame career with the Cubs, grew up at 1723 Fairmount Street, Dallas, Texas. His parents, Eddie and Essie Banks raised Ernie and 11 other children there.

He attended Booker T. Washington High School, also in Dallas, which didn't have a baseball team at the time. Despite that, he excelled playing on the school's softball team. He was a wide receiver on the football team and also ran track. He played basketball down the street at the Moorland YMCA. He worshipped at St. Paul United Methodist church. As Banks states, "Our North Dallas—was a great place to grow up." After two years in the Army and a brief return to the Monarchs,

Ernie Banks, at 22, was selected to play for a Major League team, the Cubs, becoming only the ninth black player to take the major league field. To date, Banks holds Cubs records for games played (2,528), at-bats (9,421), extra-base hits (1,009), and total bases (4,706). As one of the Nation's pioneers in baseball, Ernie Banks has inspired and enlightened so many throughout his life.

Our country has benefitted immensely from his career, and I hope he will continue to inspire others. I wish to commend Ernie Banks and thank him for his service to this great nation. As a pioneer in baseball, he has created positive pathways many future generations.

TO TRINITY ELMS RESIDENTS ON
THE OCCASION OF GRAND-
PARENTS DAY

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the residents of Trinity Elms on the occasion of Grandparents Day.

It is an honor to extend to Trinity Elms residents another expression of much deserved thanks and appreciation for the critical role they, as grandparents, play in the lives of their families and our larger Clemmons community.

Grandparents fortify and exemplify the values we seek to teach our children. They encourage children to dream, teach them the importance of duty, and push them always to do their best. Trinity Elms residents are to be thanked for providing this direction.

As an anchor of love and stability in many families, grandparents often help their children bear the responsibilities of parenting. They possess invaluable knowledge and wisdom, and are a reservoir of life experiences which transcends generational differences and stand the test of time.

Though gratitude for the part grandparents play is oft under-sung, we will not make that mistake today. For the many hats Trinity Elms residents wear as grandparents, those of teacher, comforter, cheerleader, coach, disciplinarian, and even adjunct parent, I salute them. A grandparent's love is something that can never be replaced in a child's life.

May we continue to treasure the blessing of grandparenting as an affirmation of the generosity of Almighty God. That we, as individuals, have the opportunity to love and encourage our children and grandchildren as they grow and navigate the challenges of this life is astounding. And through the process, grandparents too are changed for the better.

In fond remembrance of my own grandparents, and as the proud grandmother of two, I commend Trinity Elms residents for their service and offer them my sincerest thanks.

HONORING SABRINA CALDWELL

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable student, Ms. Sabrina D. Caldwell, a Kosciusko High School Senior who is the Oprah Winfrey Boys and Girls Club Youth of the Year and has assumed the role of 2013 Youth of the Year for the state of Mississippi by the Boys and Girls Clubs of Mississippi. She was named state runner-up earlier this year and assumed the role after the current winner was unable to fulfill his duties as Mississippi's Youth of the Year.

In addition to winning the title, Ms. Caldwell will also receive scholarship money from the Mississippi Area Council as well as the Tupperware Corporation. She was selected

among 18 organizations across Mississippi for her sound character, leadership skills and willingness to give back to the community.

Being named the 2013 State Youth of the Year is one of the highest honor a Boys and Girls Club member can receive. The title recognizes outstanding contributions to a member's family, school, community and her Boys and Girls Club, as well as personal challenges and obstacles that are overcome. She is the daughter of Roschella and Billy Caldwell.

Ms. Caldwell has maintained a 3.0 grade point average at Kosciusko High School. Her awards include: Advanced On Biology I, Algebra I and English II. She is the secretary for the Mayor's Youth Council, a hospice volunteer for Sta-Home, a member of the Keystone and the Leadership Club at the Oprah Winfrey Boys and Girls Club and a member of the Kosciusko High School Beta Club.

She is also currently enlisted in United States National Guard. Ms. Caldwell plans to attend Meridian Community College to major in physical therapy and later go on to a major university to further her education.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Sabrina D. Caldwell.

THE TROUBLING PATH AHEAD
FOR U.S.-ZIMBABWE RELATIONS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, despite more than a decade of targeted sanctions, Zimbabwe has continued to be a major U.S. trading partner through the Generalized System of Preferences, even though it has been excluded from the African Growth and Opportunity Act. Chromium, platinum and diamonds have enriched Zimbabwe's leaders, but not its people.

Zimbabwe had been one of Africa's leading industrial powers and agricultural producers until its government diminished the ability of the country to sustain its industrial or agricultural production. Illegal and disruptive land seizures resulted in political cronies gaining control of productive agricultural land rather than the black farm workers as promised. Agricultural production suffered, dragging down manufacturers of agricultural equipment—the base of the country's industry. The reduction in tax revenues led to a desperate search for foreign funding to stabilize an economy whose inflation rate reached globally historic levels.

Nevertheless, Zimbabwe is a major player in southern Africa, even more so now that newly reelected President Robert Mugabe has been chosen as Vice Chairman of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the organization's anticipated Chairman next year. Facing international appeals for an end to sanctions on Zimbabwe and threats from the Mugabe government of economic retaliation, the U.S. must devise a policy that safeguards American interests while maintaining our support for democracy, human rights, good governance and economic development. Today's hearing will examine how the process of policy formation is going now and discuss what that

policy should look like at the conclusion of that process.

The United States has experienced a troubled relationship with Zimbabwe since this southern African nation achieved majority rule in 1980. Robert Mugabe, the liberation leader who has led his country since 1980, has always resented that our government did not support his war against the previous white minority government. Despite our efforts to establish a mutually beneficial relationship with Mugabe's government over the past couple of decades, his regime has spurned our hand of friendship and flouted international law and convention.

Using colonial-era laws as models, Mugabe's government has eliminated the possibility that the political opposition can credibly challenge his rule. It has limited the ability of the media to effectively report on the news of the day. It has restricted civil society advocates from documenting and verifying the many human rights violations that have taken place in Mugabe's Zimbabwe.

When Congress passed the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of 2001, or ZDERA, it set out a range of aid restrictions requiring U.S. representatives on the boards of international financial institutions to vote against loans or debt cancellations benefitting the Zimbabwean government, pending fulfillment of a range of conditions based on repeal of the limitations on the freedom of Zimbabweans.

Recent annual appropriations laws also have barred U.S. support for international loans or grants to the government, except to meet basic human needs or to promote democracy. Generally, bilateral aid is prohibited, except that pertaining to health, humanitarian needs, education, or macroeconomic growth. Such prohibitions are maintained unless the Secretary of State certifies that "the rule of law has been restored . . . including respect for ownership and title to property, freedom of speech and association."

However, Mugabe's August 22, 2013 inauguration marked the end of a five-year period of often uneasy political power sharing with the opposition and partially fulfilled reforms pursued by the Government of National Unity under the Global Political Agreement. The end of the unity government means that unless a deal is struck with the ruling ZANU-PF party, its former partner in government, the opposition MDC-T party will likely no longer play a role in executive branch policy-making.

Past patterns of ZANU-PF governance, along with recent actions by ruling party officials and the MDC-T's new marginalization, indicate that Zimbabwe may be entering a period characterized by a pattern of unilateral exercise of state power potentially accompanied by manipulation of the rule of law in its favor; a lack of national political consensus and the absence of vehicles for alternatives to ZANU-PF policies; continued restrictions on the activities of civil society organizations and opposition activists, including legal and extralegal harassment and violence both by the police and by ZANU-PF supporters, and weak economic growth due to ZANU-PF's pursuit of a nationalist economic agenda focusing on state interventions in the economy.

The Mugabe government has long blamed the United States and Great Britain for hampering its economic growth due to sanctions, but aside from direct aid limitations, most sanctions are targeted toward Mugabe and his government's leadership. SADC is now calling for a removal of sanctions against Zimbabwe and is being joined by a growing international chorus that includes a few voices from within the Congress of the United States. Meanwhile, President Mugabe has threatened to punish Western firms operating in Zimbabwe unless sanctions are lifted.

But questions remain about the willingness of the Mugabe government to take the steps necessary to rescind U.S. sanctions. If Zimbabwe takes a defiant stand, where does that leave U.S.-Zimbabwe relations? The Administration has tried limited relaxation of sanctions only to be met with continued refusal to accept reform. Where does this leave U.S. policy?

However problematic our relationship with Zimbabwe has been, we need to devise a policy that fulfills our national interests, protects the human rights of Zimbabweans and enables this former industrial power to resume its rightful role in Africa's economy and the global economy as a whole.

IN HONOR OF LYNN RHYMER

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 2013 North Carolina Principal of the year, Lynn Rhymer.

Ms. Rhymer, who lives in Cabarrus County and is originally from Asheville, N.C., is currently the principal at Central Cabarrus High School in Cabarrus County, N.C.

She has served in education for the past 25 years, dedicating 15 years as a high school mathematics teacher and basketball coach and the past 10 years as an administrator.

She first received her bachelor's degree in mathematics and a teaching certificate from Western Carolina University. Since receiving her master's degree in school administration from Appalachian State University, Ms. Rhymer has served as an assistant principal and principal.

She began her career as principal at Northwest Cabarrus High School, transforming it within three years from a failing school to the sixth best for the state of N.C. as ranked by U.S. News & World Report. She is in her seventh year as principal and loves the time she gets to spend with staff and students.

When asked about her profession, Ms. Rhymer simply states, "I wouldn't do anything else in the world than what I'm doing now. This is my fate, and it's a pretty amazing job."

As the son of a school teacher, I understand that education is imperative for the future of our nation, and I appreciate Ms. Rhymer's dedication to our students. Her success serves as an example to other teachers in North Carolina and across the nation.

The students of the Eighth District of North Carolina are fortunate to have administrators, teachers and mentors like Ms. Rhymer who recognize the importance of building a culture where every student can succeed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday September 9, 2013, I missed rollcall No. 448. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea." I was at the classified briefing on Syria in which Members of Congress were briefed by Secretary Kerry, Secretary Hagel, General Dempsey, and National Security Advisor Rice.

HONORING THE MONK FAMILY
FARM

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 185th anniversary of the Monk farm's founding in Worth County, Georgia.

As one of the Georgia Centennial farm recipients, this farm is one of Georgia's historic landmarks and a beloved and cherished part of our past.

In 1828, a newly married William and Alcy Monk built a home on a hill in what was to become southern Worth County. William would eventually come to purchase plots of land totaling almost 2000 acres, where he would cultivate sugar cane, tobacco, and cotton. The beginnings of the Monk farm are in many ways, reminiscent of Georgia—and America's—agricultural heritage.

Beginning in the early 1900s, it saw recent Mercer Law School graduate and later State Court Judge Chesley Monk practice law farm the property for over 50 consecutive years. It saw naval officer Ridley Monk return home to operate the farm after fighting World War Two in the Pacific. And it has even seen—and was home to—the very first farming tractor in Worth County.

But the Monk farm is not only a story of the past; it also embodies the story of Georgia's growth. Despite its success, however, it has remained in the Monk family for six generations, and has filled the farm with countless memories. Though the Monk family's dreams and careers have taken them near and far away, the farm and the family's devotion to it remain.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great enthusiasm that I congratulate the Monk family on their farm's long-standing place in Georgia's—and America's—rich historic past. Here's to their place in the next 185 years of American history.